AY 2008-2009 UGC AGENDAS & MINUTES

- September 17, 2008
- October 1, 2008
- October 15, 2008
- October 29, 2008
- November 12, 2008
- December 3, 2008 (not attached)
- January 14, 2009
- January 28, 2009 (not attached)
- February 11, 2009
- February 25, 2009

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • MERCED**

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Notice of Meeting
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2008
10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
232 Kolligian Library
Contact: Nancy Clarke (209) 228-7954

AGENDA

Action	No.	Item	Encl.
Information	I.	**CHAIR'S REPORT** – ***Manuel Martin-Rodriguez*** • Welcome New and Returning UGC Members and Guests • Introduction of Academic Senate Chair Martha Conklin • UGC Goals for 2008-2009	
Information	II.	**ELECTRONIC CRF SYSTEM** *(Scheduled for 10:30)* *Assistant Dean of Engineering, German Gavilan, will demonstrate the new CRF System*	
Information	III.	**ADMINISTRATIVE GUEST** – ***Kevin Browne, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management*** • Introduction of Registrar Laurie Herbrand • Recent Agreement between Merced College and UCM. *(See Information Item A)* • Plans for a Post Baccalaureate Program • Progress Report on University Extension	
Information	IV.	**VICE CHANCELLOR STUDENT AFFAIRS** – ***Jane Lawrence*** • Enrollment Update • Housing	
Information	V.	**VICE PROVOST FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION** – ***Christopher Viney*** • CORE 100 Update	
Discussion	VI.	**EXECUTIVE SESSION (*Voting Members Only Please*)** *UGC Subcommittees:* • Admissions • Policy • Courses	

Systemwide Senate Committees Associated with UGC:

University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP)
Meets monthly. UCEP considers the establishment or disestablishment of curricula, colleges, schools, departments, institutes, bureaus, and the like, and on legislation or administrative policies involving questions of educational policy.

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
13 Meetings each year, some 2-day meetings. BOARS oversees all matters relating to the admissions of undergraduate students. BOARS regulates the policies and practices used in the admissions process that directly relates to the educational mission of the University and the welfare of students. The committee also recommends and directs efforts to improve the admissions process.

University Committee on International Education (UCIE)
Meets 3 to 4 times each year. UCIE oversees all academic aspects of the UC Education Abroad Program, which operates in conjunction with offices on the campuses and serves all UC students. The committee is responsible for approving new programs, changes in programs, and all program courses and credits. The committee also oversees the regular formal review of programs and advises the President on the appointment of study center directors.

University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE)
Meets 2 to 3 times each year. UCOPE monitors and conducts periodic reviews and evaluations of preparatory and remedial education. In addition, the committee supervises the Subject A requirement with special emphasis on establishing appropriate and uniform Universitywide standards for the Subject A examination. Each year the Committee selects the essay/prompt that is to be used in administration of the Subject A examination and also sets the passing standard for the exam.

Discussion **VII. MEMBERS' ITEMS**

Information Items "A"
Merced Sun-Star article re: Discount for Merced College Students

Wednesday, September 3, 2008
Merced Sun-Star

UC offers discount to Merced College students
The institutions hope the deal will encourage more transfers and help ease the transition By Danielle Gaines

Merced College trustees approved an agreement Tuesday that allows Merced College students to enroll in one course per semester at UC Merced while paying Merced College tuition rates.

One goal of the agreement is to expose Merced College students to the university environment and coursework before they transfer.

"Sometimes our students think that all students in the University of California system are geniuses and they get intimidated," said Anne Newins, Merced College's vice president of student personnel services. "They are plugging away at school themselves and just don't realize their ability. We hope this program allows them to do that."

While students can only take advantage of one course per semester, it comes at significant savings. Tuition and fees for full-time students at UC Merced are $3,875 each semester.

Newins said she also hopes the program will increase the number of Merced College students transferring to the university. Now 30 to 40 students transfer there each year.
"Our goal is definitely to increase that number and we think this program is the best way to do that," Newins said.

Kevin Browne, the assistant vice chancellor of enrollment management at UC Merced, said the program is essentially a way to give community members access to untapped resources at the university.

"If we have a class with 24 seats and only 22 students, that is a lost resource," he said. "We want to be able to utilize every seat available at the university."

Browne expects that most of the Merced College participants will enroll in upper-level courses to get a jump-start on their baccalaureate degrees.

The option to enroll in UC Merced courses will be open next semester to all Merced College students who have completed one semester and 12 units of coursework, have a cumulative GPA of at least 2.0, and have taken all prerequisites.

Both Newins and Browne say the program is a win-win for the students who choose to enroll.

"At the end of the day, whether they transfer to UC Merced or not, they will have credits from a University of California," Newins said.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
September 17, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, September 17, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Manuel Martin-Rodriguez presiding.

II. Chair's Report

UGC Goals for 2008-2009

- General Education and accreditation will be the two main issues. An ad hoc committee has already been appointed by the Administration to address WASC accreditation. UGC will work with the ad hoc committee.
- The importance of maintaining the balance of shared governance.
- UCM needs system-wide representation for UCEP, BOARS and UCIE. Chair Martin-Rodriguez emphasized the importance of having a representative at UCOP and stated that he contacted faculty to encourage them to serve on those system-wide committees.
- Classroom space. UGC will be asking the Registrar's office to provide the committee with some quantitative data analysis on current classroom space needs and projections for instructional space.
- Need for a formal protocol for interacting with CAPRA. UCM's bylaws state that UGC has to consult with CAPRA but there is no language beyond that.
- Honors program. UGC did not have time to consider this last year. A UGC subcommittee will deal with Honors this year.
- UGC Admissions subcommittee will need to provide an assessment of the performance of certain programs such as the Shared Experience.
- The implementation of the web-based CRF system.
- A committee member inquired as to the level of preparation of undergraduates who come to UC Merced in comparison with other UC undergraduates. AVC of Enrollment Management Kevin Browne replied that all students that are admitted to UC Merced are fully eligible to the UC system.
- A committee member inquired about a newspaper article that reported on UC Merced's retention numbers from freshman to sophomore year. VC for Student Affairs Jane Lawrence stated that UC Merced is at 80%. That is ahead of the national average (60%) and behind the most selective UC campuses (90%).

- UC Merced has the highest percentage in the UC system of students on financial aid, the highest percentage of first-generation college students, the highest percentage of students from rural areas, and the highest percentage of students coming from low API schools.

III. CORE 100 Update – VP for Undergraduate Education, Christopher Viney

- A report from UGC to the Division Council recommended that a faculty committee be established to examine the sustainability of the CORE 100 model. The CORE 1 problem also needs to be addressed. Some students are not ready for CORE 1 because they need to complete remedial work. We need to scale CORE 1 in terms of space issues and still retain the good quality features.
- College One is the home of General Education. The College One Executive Committee went into receivership with the Division Council and Division Council now oversees it but delegates some aspects to the VPUE's office.
- A committee member inquired about CORE 100 and spring deadlines. VPUE Viney replied that the recommendation of UGC to DivCo was that the proposed fix of the writing courses would pertain to spring. It has been suggested that there be a one or two year trial period in which the original CORE 100 would be offered for a small group of students. There is an important deadline for getting CORE 1 sorted: the CORE 1 committee has proposed a fix for the upcoming semester.
- For CORE 1, the problem is a combination of two things: lack of preparedness of the students and lack of space. We have tried using video link in classrooms but it was not an ideal pedagogical situation.

IV. Enrollment Update - Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Jane Lawrence

Enrollment

- In the summer, we had 485 students. Last summer, we had 346.
- Last fall, we had about 1,870 students. This fall, we have about 2,700. (Over 1,000 new freshmen, transfer, and graduate students). We have met or exceeded our enrollment target for this fall. Official enrollment data will be distributed to the committee.
- Our enrollment goal for next fall is to have 3,300 students. That is assuming we can backfill all the students who are going to graduate in May 2009 (about 450 students).
- The office of Admissions is holding events at various high school campuses. On Saturday, UC Merced will host a counselor conference with 600 high school and community college counselors.
- While enrollment numbers are positive, space is a continuing problem.

Housing

- At the Regents meeting yesterday, $42 million were approved for UC Merced to build additional student housing. By fall 2010 there will be approximately 1,300 students living on campus.
- This year, almost 300 students have returned to live on campus.
- At the present, we are concentrating on freshmen and sophomore housing, but the next housing projects will be for upper division, graduate, and international students.
- A committee member inquired about plans for a multi-leveled parking building since the new housing will be built on a current parking lot. VC Lawrence replied that the issue around parking structures is that they cost about $25,000 per parking spot. Arrangements with Merced College to use one of their parking lots. That will be used as remote parking for our residential students and will free up some space on this campus. In the future, there are plans to have four large parking structures but there is nothing planned in the short term.

Senate Chair Martha Conklin joined the meeting and stated the importance of UC Merced being linked to the UC system. She emphasized the need for representation on system-wide committees particularly on BOARS as it is the most important undergraduate system committee.

V. <u>Kevin Browne, AVC of Enrollment Management</u>

AVC Browne introduced the new Registrar, Dr. Laurie Herbrand

Agreement between Merced College and UC Merced (info posted on ucmcrops)

- AVC Browne reported that his office did not know that the Trustees of Merced College approved this agreement until the university received a call from the press.
- This program is mandated by the state through legislation in 1996.
- The program does not allow ineligible students to take any UC Merced courses. Our Registrar's office will check that the Merced College students have the proper pre and co-requisites. They have to be certified by Merced College and will take our courses on a space-available basis only. These are open classes in which no UC Merced student either wants to enroll or has enrolled during the first two weeks of instruction.
- Merced College students will go through an approval process at Merced College that shows they are full time students in good standing. Our Registrar's Office will validate the information, the students will get an add card signed by the instructor, and then a record gets created for them on our campus. They have to have one previous term (12 units) at Merced College already completed.

- Other UC campuses have this same agreement with their local community colleges.

VI. Electronic CRF System demonstration – German Gavilan

As time has run short, Chair Martin-Rodriguez announced that AVC Browne's next presentations will be skipped. (AVC Browne handed out materials) Chair Martin-Rodriguez announced that if anyone has questions, AVC Browne will be attending UGC meetings throughout the year and members can ask to have items placed on the agenda.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, October 1, 2008, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources::Meeting, Oct 1 2008

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**Chair's Report – *Manuel Martin-Rodriguez*** A. Student Representative B. System-wide Representatives for BOARS, UCEP and UCOPE C. Electronic CRF Submission D. Slate of UGC Subcommittees E. Block Scheduling (*please refer to crops UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Oct 1, 2008/Block Scheduling/UGC 0708 Block Scheduling Memo)*	
Approval	II.	**Consent Calendar:** *Draft Minutes, September 17, 2008 [TBD]*	
Information	III.	**Administrative Guest – *Kevin Browne, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management*** A. Plans for a Post Baccalaureate Program B. Progress Report on University Extension	
Action	IV.	**CRF Subcommittee Report:** *Andy Aguilar (Chair), Yihsu Chen, Dunya Ramicova*	
Information	V.	**UGC Academic Calendar and Deadlines** *2007-2008 Calendar to be reviewed by UGC-Available on crops: UGC0809/Resources/MeetingOct 1, 2008/2007-2008 Calendar_Courses_Majors*	1
Discussion/ Action	VI.	**Review of 2007-2008 Policies and Procedures for Approval of Courses** *2007-2008 Policies and Procedures available on crops: UGC0809/Resources/MeetingOct 1, 2008/P&P for Approval of New Courses*	2-6
Discussion	VII.	**General Education** *Please refer to email from Senate chair Conklin and UGC Report on Gened sent to Divco in June 2008 available on crops: UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Oct 1, 2008/Gened*	7-26
Discussion	VIII.	**Senate Reviews**	

A. School of Management Proposal *(UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Oct 1, 2008/School of Management Proposal)* – ***UGC Comments due to Division Council by November 21st 2008***
B. Strategic Academic Planning Documents *(UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Oct 1, 2008/Strategic Academic Planning)*

Discussion **IX. Executive Session *(voting members only please)***

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
October 1, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, October 1, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Manuel Martin-Rodriguez presiding.

II. Chair's Report

- Chair Martin-Rodriguez introduced UGC Student Representative, Phillip Marzouk.
- UGC still needs representatives for BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE. This year, it is particularly important to have representation on UCEP and BOARS because of the new eligibility system that is likely to pass. UC Merced will be hit the hardest because of the resource implications. The other option is to ask CoC to name our representatives.
- The web-based CRF system is up and running. SoE assistant dean German Gavilan and his team have been receiving feedback and fixing glitches.
- A Chair is needed for the UGC Admissions subcommittee.
- Block Scheduling has been implemented for the spring. UGC will monitor it.
- Chair met with the Admissions Board and received a preliminary report. There are two important issues: International students (how to handle curriculum of the institutions they are coming from) and transfer students (how to ensure they are prepared when they come to UC Merced and not to lose them to other institutions.)
- The plans for new buildings are not satisfactory in terms of new classroom space. Chair Martin-Rodriguez has spoken to members of the Division Council and CAPRA and it was agreed that UGC will survey the needs of the faculty. UGC will work with the Registrar's Office and Institutional Planning and Analysis Director, Nancy Ochsner to get some projections. The Schools' curriculum committees might take the lead and solicit the faculty's input. Faculty input should be solicited before any building plans are finalized.
- VC for Student Affairs Jane Lawrence suggested that UGC invite Diana Ralls to present on scholarships and the awarding process for Regents scholarships at the freshman and transfer level. VC Lawrence will email Chair a memo she wrote to the Chancellor regarding space. The memo contains a chart with the number of classrooms and seats we have.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: Chair Martin-Rodriguez announced that approval of the Consent Calendar will be conducted either by an email vote or at the next meeting.

IV. AVC of Enrollment Management – Kevin Browne

Plans for a Post Baccalaureate Program

- The campus is looking to join the California Post Baccalaureate Consortium. It is a partnership between UC campuses with medical schools and UC Riverside and conceivably UC Merced to create a program using our existing courses to allow students to meet pre-requisite course requirements for medical school. It is heavily supported by The California Endowment. It is a one year program in which students work in an intensive summer program either at UCSF or UCLA. It consists of one year of curriculum and test preparation. (AVC Browne handed out materials)
- A cohort of 8-10 students would be admitted in the summer. They would complete an intensive program at UCSF (one week paid for by The California Endowment), then they would enroll in our usual biology and chemistry courses in fall and spring. In terms of selection, UC Merced graduates would come first, then graduates of local CSU campuses, then other UC and CSU campus students.
- This is a non-degree seeking, non-certificate program. There are no direct curricular issues we could identify nor are there any negative resource implications for us.

Progress Report on University Extension

- UC Merced is trying to merge with UC Berkeley to create an extension program for the Central Valley. It will cover Modesto to Bakersfield. This would allow us to offer the UC Berkeley catalog of extension coursework through the UC Berkeley administrative process. The coursework and faculty appointments would all go though UC Berkeley departments.
- This program is seen as a 3-5 year arrangement to build an infrastructure in the Central Valley. (AVC Browne handed out materials)
- We are meeting with UC Berkeley this week to develop a draft MOU and then we will go through full consultation.
- The instructors will be in Bakersfield, Fresno, and Modesto. They could possibly be at this campus.

V. CRF Subcommittee Report - (Professors Aguilar, Chen, and Ramicova)

- The new web-based CRF system is operational.
- CRFs should be submitted to the subcommittee by the Friday before a UGC meeting. The CRF must already have cleared all the approval steps and be at the UGC approval stage.

- Registrar's Office needs CRFs to be approved by November 10 for spring priority registration. If a CRF is approved after November 10, the course will be made available for regular spring registration. The detriment is that students will have already planned their schedules during priority registration.
- There is a CRF amendment to one of the CORE courses. One of the lecturers in CORE 1 had tried to upload a change to a CRF for CORE 1. Chair suggested that any changes to a CORE course be approved by CORE 1 faculty.
- VPUE Viney stated that the College One Executive Committee used to be delegated the power of taking votes on these issues, but that committee was taken into receivership by the Division Council. In that sense, it is a Division Council vote.
- Chair replied that UGC will probably be the delegated committee to deal with the issue once the Division Council has cleared changes, as General Education is on UGC's agenda. The CRF will have to come to UGC for approval. CAPRA might want to weigh in because of the resource implications.
- Chair mentioned that German Gavilan will have to be consulted as to how the CRF system can handle this. Chair has to hear from the Division Council before anything in the CRF system is changed.

Deleted: DIVCO

VI. UGC Academic Calendar and Deadlines

- The UGC Calendar for Program(s) and CRF submission 2007-2008 will be revised to reflect the new academic year.
- VCSA Lawrence noted that she will send a draft Catalog production schedule. The deadlines will be a little different from last year. She also mentioned that courses will be entered in the Catalog provided the course approvals meet the deadline. If UGC approves a course after the deadline, the course could be included in the class schedule, but probably not the Catalog.

Action: Draft deadlines will be emailed to UGC members for electronic approval.

VII. Review of 2007-2008 Policies and Procedures for Approval of Courses

- The last UGC meeting before the November 10 spring priority registration deadline is October 29. CRFs must be submitted to the CRF subcommittee by Friday, October 24.

Action: Senate Analyst will edit the policies and procedures. Changes will be emailed to UGC for electronic approval.

VIII. General Education

- Division Council has requested that UGC re-examine General Education.

- Chair Martin-Rodriguez suggested telling the Division Council that UGC stands by what was approved last year. Another option is that UGC revisit the issue this year as there are new members who might have some opinions on what the committee did last year. The analysis of resource implications is a CAPRA issue.
- VPUE Viney pointed out that the major issue is what to do about CORE 100 in the long and short run. There are students who need to graduate with accreditable credentials and courses this summer. Without CORE 100, they need alternatives, and UGC did recommend what courses should be the equivalent in the meantime. Interviews with writing instructors need to take place in the next few weeks.
- VPUE Viney also pointed out that the WASC steering committee will be putting out a report in the summer. He claimed that we can't tell WASC that we are developing CORE 100 but have not yet decided what courses students should take in the meantime.
- Chair Martin-Rodriguez stated that his personal preference is to send UGC's previous General Education recommendations back to the Division Council and ask that CAPRA conduct the resource analysis. Chair Martin-Rodriguez also suggested rewarding faculty who are willing to take one or two years to do CORE and tie that to resources in supporting faculty and faculty research rather than having more lecturers doing the writing portion.
- VPUE Viney said that if CAPRA is going to weigh in, it needs a proposal to look at. He reminded the committee that in UGC's recommendations, it is suggested that the faculty should to come up with a proposal about CORE 100.

Action: Chair Martin-Rodriguez will draft a memo to the Division Council stating that resources are a CAPRA issue. UGC voted to approve last year's UGC memo to the Division Council.

IX. <u>Senate Reviews</u>

The Senate is being asked to review Strategic Academic Planning (SAP) documents and the School of Management proposal. UGC will closely examine curriculum issues and the delivery of courses. Comments on the SAP are due to the Division Council by October 20th. Since many UGC members have not yet had a chance to read the document, it was agreed that the committee discuss it at the next UGC meeting on October 15. The School of Management proposal will be discussed at the October 29th meeting.

Action: Written comments on the SAP are due to senate analyst by October 13th.

Regarding the UC Merced/Merced College agreement, Chair Martin-Rodriguez inquired if there will be any follow up on the Merced College students' progress on this campus. AVC Browne replied there will be. The UC system has looked at this program for years and has found that community college students tend to do very well. AVC Browne said we can identify the Merced College students in our system as a concurrent enrollment. We will likely only start out with a few students, so their progress will not be difficult to track.

VC Lawrence mentioned that the Communications office sent out a press release on enrollment. We have 2,718 students officially enrolled this fall. 925 of them are new freshmen, 139 are new transfers, and 66 are new graduate students. The total number of undergraduate students is 2,534. VC Lawrence will send Senate Analyst Fatima Paul a copy of the memo from Nancy Ochsner. The data will also be available on: ipa.ucmerced.edu.

There being no other business, meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, October 15, 2008, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources::Meeting, Oct 15 2008

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**Vice Chair's Report – *Andy LiWang*** o *System-wide Representatives for BOARS and UCEP*	
Approval	II.	**Consent Calendar** o *Draft Minutes, September 17, 2008* o *Draft Minutes, October 1, 2008*	
Information/ Discussion	III.	**General Education** *Guests – Professors Martha Conklin, Tom Hothem, Robert Ochsner and Wil Van Breugel (Scheduled for 10:15 until 10:35am)*	
Action	IV.	**CRF Subcommittee Report** *Andy Aguilar (Chair), Yihsu Chen, Dunya Ramicova* SoE Courses: o *ENGR 191, Professional Seminar* o *ME 140, Vibration and Control*	
Discussion	V.	**SSHA Honors** *Last year UGC discussed a proposal for Honors for SSHA and for the History Major. UCM has not yet established policies for guidelines for these types of awards. It was decided that SSHA should contact the Division Council and the current UGC.*	
Discussion	VI.	**Executive Session – Senate Reviews (*voting members only please*)** **Paper copies of the SAP and SOM will not be distributed at the meeting** o *Strategic Academic Planning Documents (UGC **Voting 0809**/Resources) – **Committee members were asked to submit comments to Fatima Paul by October 13th*** o *School of Management Proposal (UGC0 **Voting 809**/Resources)* ***UGC Comments due to Division Council by November 21st 2008***	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
October 15, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, October 15, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Vice Chair Andy LiWang presiding.

II. Chair's Report

▪ *System-wide Representation*

Virginia Adan-Lifante will serve as the UC Merced representative at the UCOPE (University Committee on Preparatory Education) as an ex-officio, non-voting member. UGC has not yet identified a representative for BOARS and UCEP. Vice chair LiWang and AVC for Enrollment Management Browne emphasized the urgency of having a representative at those committees.

▪ *October 29th UGC Meeting*

Chair Martin-Rodriguez and Vice chair LiWang will be absent on October 29th. Chair Martin-Rodriguez has previously solicited some UGC members to preside over the meeting during his absence. An alternate will be identified by the end of today's meeting.

III. Consent Calendar

UGC Minutes for the September 17 and October 1 Meetings were approved.

IV. CRF Subcommittee Report

▪ *Approval of Courses*

Action: UGC approved the following engineering courses:
- ENGR 191 – Professional Seminar
- ME 140 – Vibration and Control

Senate Analyst will notify the registrar's office and will update the status of those courses on the online system.

▪ *Policies and Procedures for Approval of Courses*

A set of policies and procedures for approving courses was recently circulated within the committee for review and approval. The approved guidelines were sent to the Schools on October 7th.

Professor Ramicova requested that the committee reconsider the language in the current guidelines and procedures for approving new courses, section 3 in particular:

> 3. *New courses* should be indicated on the CRF and should attach a **brief course outline** (1 page maximum) summarizing the **course purpose, format, topics, and required book or reading** (if known).The course outline is intended to give reviewers more information about the general nature and subject of the course. Actual details of the course (e.g., specific topics, reading, student assignments) may vary with course delivery and instructor.

Professor Ramicova noted that this section of the policies implies that UGC can judge, assess or determine the appropriateness and/or purpose of a course. It is difficult, if not impossible to judge a course format and topics for a non-specialist. Furthermore it is inappropriate for a research university to request a course outline and a book list. Courses may be taught by other professors in the future who may have other sources of reading and/or may have different lists of specific topics. Unless UGC is approving courses that will be taught by one professor only for a limited time, the inclusion of specific topics and book lists is inappropriate. By formally requiring this type of information UCM is establishing a pattern which may become part of the institutional culture and will be impossible or very difficult to modify in the future. UGC should instead focus on the scope of the course and how it fits into the overall program, major or general education. Course formats and book list(s) should be discussed at the school level. This will become increasingly important during the WASC review.

A committee member noted that last year's UGC extensively discussed these issues.

She noted that at UCLA, the system was very streamlined. It required a description of the course(s), reason for action, some professors attached an outline others included a bibliography.

Action: Policies and procedures for reviewing/approving courses will be discussed at a future UGC meeting.

IV. General Education – Core 1

Some members of the Core 1 course planning committee (Professors Van Breugel, Hothem and Ochsner) were invited to today's meeting to discuss the issue of general education and the delivery of core 1 in particular.

In addition to other general education requirements, two "core" courses were created to be offered during two semesters: core 1 and core 100. Last year, the UGC proposed to

the Division Council that a temporary ad hoc curriculum committee be formed to determine how students will fulfill general education requirements during AY 2008-2009. The Division Council is currently in receivership of general education, so ultimately the senate is responsible for decisions relating to general education. Last year UGC created a report on general education (Core 100). In its report, the committee made recommendations, one of them being that faculty from the three schools including the VPUE be involved in the facilitation of meetings to discuss general education and to make sure that decisions were taken.

Core 1 is currently set up as a two-hour lecture and two-hour discussion per week. The lectures would be delivered by ladder rank faculty and the discussion section by the writing program. This arrangement is suitable for 350 students but it becomes impossible to deliver the course for additional students given the current space limitations (Lakireddy auditorium can accommodate up to 350 students). Next spring UCM will have 700 students who will need to take Core 1 to satisfy general education requirements. Possible options are to redesign the courses or to make some suitable modifications for spring delivery. There is an urgent need for a solution because the Registrar needs to make appropriate reservations for the auditorium. Additional issues surrounding Core 1 discussed during the meeting included the following:

- Limited pool of faculty committed to teaching core courses
- Faculty not being compensated for their teaching load
- Lack of faculty involvement across the three Schools
- Lecturers cancelling at the last minute
- Need procedure for submission of Core CRFs (the current online system is not set up for these types of courses). Since the COEC was taken into receivership by the Division Council, it would be logical for the Division Council to review/approve core courses.
- WASC Accreditation -The absence of a viable solution will impact UC Merced's accreditation. During the initial WASC review of the campus, Core 1 was highlighted as one among three outstanding features of UCM. If the course is not sustained at least through the spring in a manner analogous to what was offered the last few years, if the structure of the course is altered now, this change will need to be justified during the WASC review. Therefore it is best to sustain the current model.
- The three schools need to reach an agreement on the amount of resources that will be dedicated to the delivery of general education.
- It might be helpful to make the syllabus widely available to faculty across the three schools to help identify which faculty may be able to contribute to the delivery of general education. The guest lecturer concept is appealing but it

becomes impractical for three sections of the class. Ultimately, this becomes a ladder-rank faculty issue.

Action: UGC will send a request to the Division Council to table Core 1 for discussion at an upcoming division council meeting. Division Council will be asked to consider a temporary solution for the delivery of core 1.

V. SSHA HONORS

Last year UGC discussed a proposal for Honors for SSHA and for the History Major. In the absence of policies or guidelines for these types of awards, the committee recommended that SSHA contact the Division Council and the current UGC.

Action: UGC policy subcommittee will draft a set of guidelines for these awards. This will be tabled for discussion at a future meeting.

VI. Executive Session – Strategic Academic Planning

This section of the minutes will be distributed separately.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 29th.

Attest:

Andy LiWang, Vice chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, October 29, 2008, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources::Meeting, Oct 29 2008

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**Chair's Report – *Professor Manuel Martin-Rodriguez*** A. System-wide Representatives for BOARS and UCEP	
Approval	II.	**Consent Calendar:**	
		A. Draft Minutes, October 15, 2008	1-4
		B. Graduate Courses CRFs (approved by GRC)	
		-ES 252, Remote Sensing of the Environment (Revision)	5-10
		-MEAM 211, Nonlinear Controls (New)	11-14
		-WCH 221, US Latino/a Literature (New)	15-21
Action	III.	**CRF Subcommittee Report** *Professors Andy Aguilar, Yihsu Chen and Dunya Ramicova*	
Discussion	IV.	**Policy Subcommittee Report - SR.70.B** (course withdrawal). *Ariel Escobar, Ajay Gopinathan* This item was discussed at the October 6 UCEP meeting and by the 2007-08 UGC.	
		-UCEP Agenda Re SR.70.B	22-26
		-UGC Comments	27-29
Discussion/ Action	V.	**Request from Registrar – Proposal for New Academic Probation, Dismissal and Minimum Progress Policy** *Laurie Herbrand, Registrar* *Proposal available on crops [**UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Oct. 29/Proposal from Registrar** folder]*	30-32
Information	VI.	**Report on WASC** *Guest – Professor Gregg Camfield, Chair of WASC Committee (scheduled for 11AM)*	
Discussion	VII.	**Executive Session - Senate Reviews (voting members only please)** A. School of Management Proposal (***UGCVoting0809**/Resources/**SOM Documents folder) – UGC Comments due to Division Council by November 21st 2008***	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
October 29, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, October 29, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Martin-Rodriguez presiding.

II. Chair's Report

LRDP

Chair Martin-Rodriguez reminded members to review the Long Range Development Plan, which will be discussed at the November 12, 2008 agenda.

System wide Representation

UGC has not yet identified two UCM representatives to serve on the BOARS and UCEP system wide committees.

General Education

A request went to Committee on Committees to constitute an ad-hoc committee on General Education.

Space

UGC has requested some data about current and future instructional space needs from the office of the Registrar and from the three Schools. The registrar has provided some preliminary data. No data from the Schools has been received yet.

III. Consent Calendar

A. UGC Minutes for the October 15Meetings were approved.

B. The following Graduate Courses were approved:
- ES 252
- MEAM 211
- WCH 221

IV. CRF Subcommittee Report

Review of Courses

The CRF subcommittee reviewed twelve course requests. The Subcommittee will forward its recommendation to UGC by Monday, November 3. The committee will vote electronically.

CRFs Policies and Procedures

Policies and procedures for reviewing and approving courses will be discussed at the November 12th meeting.

V. Policy Subcommittee Report

Variance to SR.70.B

In May 2008 UCM submitted a request to change UCM Senate Regulation 70.B (Dropping a Course). The rationale was to clarify the assignment of the notation "W" to a student's record. The language was expanded to explain the meaning of the notation and to point out that it is not used for calculating a student's grade point average.

SR70.B. Dropping a Course:

During the first four weeks of instruction, students may drop a ~~class or classes~~ **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 (~~such as~~ 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)

A UCEP representative had requested that UCM consider a limitation on the number of drops. This was placed on the October 6 UCEP agenda.

The UGC policy subcommittee reconsidered the Regulation and clarified that the intent of the changes in the Regulations was not to allow students to repeat a course to obtain a better grade but to address emergency situations (e.g. death in the family, hospitalization). UGC does not feel the need to make any changes to the policy.

Action: Chair Martin-Rodriguez will notify UCEP.

VI. Proposal for a New Academic Probation Dismissal and Minimum Progress Policy

This proposal was put forth by the deans, assistant deans and the Registrar's office. The rationale was to clarify for students, faculty and staff what would happen under probation and dismissal. The original policy was written when there were no students at UCM and was revised to better serve current and future students. Main features of the proposed policy include the opportunity to appeal dismissal with the school having the last decision, and the option of removing a student from a major if the school would see fit.

Questions/Comments from the Committee on Section A of the policy:

Section 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:
    - Cumulative University of California grade point average of at least 2.0
    - Current semester grade point average of at least 2.0
    - Major grade point average of 2.0-2.5 (minimum varies by School)
    - 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.

****

A committee member was concerned about the potential impact on certain majors in the above section of the proposed policy. Although it is understandable that there should be some flexibility for probation, isn't it risky to combine putting a student on probation and removing

him/her from a declared major? The potential danger is the creation of a system of competitive majors and "dumping grounds" for those students who do not perform in those competitive majors. UGC would like to get an update on the outcomes of this policy in the future.

The Registrar noted that the proposed policy allows students to change their majors to "undeclared" which would enable them to receive the support they need if faced with difficulty within (a) certain discipline(s).

Q - Given the current scarcity of resources, how will large numbers of students be handled adequately?
A - Undeclared students are currently advised through the Student Advising and Learning Center. A full time advisor is dedicated to counseling undeclared students across the three schools. About a third of UCM freshmen students are undeclared and receive tutoring, learning support and attend workshops. It is anticipated that as the university grows, more advisors will be hired.

Q – Under the proposed policy a lower division student may be reinstated to a School provided he/she meets a few requirements. One of those requirements is a grade point average of 2.0-2.5 (minimum varies by School). How will this impact students enrolled in double majors with different requirements?
A – The highest grade point average is the one taken into consideration.

Action: Once the policy is implemented, the Registrar will update the UGC at a future meeting. The committee unanimously approved the proposed policy.

VII. SSHA HONORS

Last year UGC discussed a proposal for Honors for SSHA and for the History Major. In the absence of policies or guidelines for these types of awards, the committee recommended that SSHA contact the Division Council and the current UGC.

Action: UGC policy subcommittee will draft a set of guidelines for these awards. This will be tabled for discussion at a future meeting.

VIII. Report on WASC – Professor Gregg Camfield, Chair of the WASC Steering Committee

Professor Camfield noted that WASC has changed its review process. The new process involves two steps: 1) the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) and 2) the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). Under the new accreditation regime, WASC will not only evaluate the university's physical infrastructure but also its educational infrastructure. UCM will need to demonstrate the following that:

- It cares deeply about students education
- Learning is used to effectively measure teaching
- Goals are clear, institutionalized, program-wide and course-specific
- Students learning outcomes are clearly articulated/stated at the course and program levels

- Direct evidence is collected, assessed and used to clarify the university's goals
- There are many institutional forums (such as UGC) whose role is to guide the development of curricula

Professor Camfield asked UGC to consider incorporating learning outcomes and assessment plans into the new online CRF system so that the educational infrastructure of the university is reflexive for all faculty.

Q/A:
Q – Wouldn't it be easier to do this at the school level, where expertise lies? What would be the advantage of doing this within the UGC vs. the schools?
A – If UGC establish procedures then the process would be vetted appropriately at the lower levels. If this is done at the school level the process will not seem institutionalized.

Q – There are separate debates about the handling of courses within UGC. With this new review, how do we know the learning goals are met?
A - Adding a requirement to the course request form would add clarity and information. The issue here is that with the current form it appears that UGC is performing a review of courses beyond the committee's expertise. During the review of courses, UGC should focus on ensuring that the review of courses is WASC-oriented, that the process is transparent, that due diligence is performed and that the committee is not second-guessing faculty submitting courses. Faculty needs to think strategically about large goals and tactically, as individual faculty members, about course objectives. UGC's role is essentially to look at the big picture while making it structurally understandable and functional at the more reduced level.

Chair Martin-Rodriguez noted that it may prove difficult to incorporate program goals and objectives into the course request form, hence UGC may have to conduct two separate reviews. The solution may be to conduct reviews at the program level (instead of course by course). UGC may consider requesting that objectives and assessment plans be built into the course request forms, rather than into the review of programs.

Professor Camfield asked the UGC to draft a set of principles for review of programs and courses which would include the nature of the committee's expectations. Those documents would demonstrate that UCM does have a procedure taking into account the need to build a culture in which systematic review of teaching is performed. Such documents would be presented to WASC. Proposals for new programs will need to emphasize achievement of the program's learning outcomes.

Chair Martin-Rodriguez requested that Professor Camfield forward to UGC documentation about WASC expectations, goals and requirements to familiarize the committee with the WASC review process. UGC will then engage in preliminary discussions about the WASC review and will request additional information from professor Camfield, as needed.

Action: Senate analyst will collect data from Professor Camfield.

IX. Executive Session – School of Management Proposal

This section of the Minutes will be distributed separately.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 12th.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, November 12, 2008, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources:: Meeting, Nov 12, 2008

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**Chair's Report – *Professor Manuel Martin-Rodriguez*** **A. System-wide Representatives for BOARS and UCEP**	
Approval	II.	**Consent Calendar:** Draft Minutes October 29, 2008 Meeting	tbd
Action	III.	**CRF Subcommittee Report:** *Andy Aguilar (Chair), Yihsu Chen, Dunya Ramicova* **A.** Review of 2007-08 Policies and Procedures for approval of courses [UGC0809/Resources/Mtg Nov 12, 2008/Proposed Revisions to CRFs Policies and Procedures] **B.** Discussion - What constitutes an Upper Division Course?	
Discussion	IV.	**Policy Subcommittee Report:** **A.** SSHA Honors *Last year UGC discussed a proposal for Honors for SSHA and for the History Major. UCM has not yet established policies for guidelines for these types of awards. It was decided that SSHA should contact the Division Council and the current UGC.*	tbd
Information	V.	**Administrative Guest: Diana Ralls, Director Financial Aid & Scholarships** **Scheduled for 10:15am-10:35am** Report available on crops [UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Nov 12, 2008/Report from Diana Ralls]	
Discussion	VI.	**General Education** [UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Nov 12, 2008/Core 1 Committee Memo]	
Discussion	VII.	**System-wide Review Items** **A.** Education Abroad Business Plan http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/EAP%20Business%20Plan%20Memo.pdf Also available on crops [UGC0809/Resources/**System wide review items** folder] *Should UGC wish to opine, comments due to the Division Council before Dec 1, 2008*	
Discussion	VIII.	**Executive Session - Senate Reviews (voting members only please)** **A.** School of Management Proposal	

[UGCVoting0809/Resources/SOM Documents folder]

UGC Comments due to Division Council by November 21st 2008

B. Review of the Long Range Development Plan

http://lrdp.ucmerced.edu/2.asp?uc=1&lvl2=40&contentid=40

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
November 12, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, November 12, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Martin-Rodriguez presiding.

II. Chair's Report

System wide Representation

A BOARS representative may have been identified. This will be confirmed in the near future. Chair Martin-Rodriguez noted that it is critical that in the meantime, an alternate to attend the November 14th BOARS meeting.

Chair Martin-Rodriguez will propose to Committee on Committees that the future BOARS representative be given the option to become a UGC member or to regularly report to UGC without being a member of the committee.

Ad Hoc Committee on General Education

The Division Council recently approved a slate of nominees for the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education. Two of the members are UGC members. The newly constituted committee will be closely working with UGC on the issues surrounding General Education.

WASC

UCSB will undergo WASC review in the near future and is emphasizing undergraduate research as a central element to highlight (UCM may want to consider this as well). Chair Martin-Rodriguez asked the Chair of the WASC Steering Committee (Professor Camfield) to gather information for the UGC. Chair Martin-Rodriguez will have more to report after the next UCEP meeting.

III. Consent Calendar

The following Graduate Course was approved:

- CSE 275, Matrix Computation

Minutes of the October 29th Meeting will be distributed at the December 3rd.

IV. CRF Subcommittee Report

Review of Courses

The CRF subcommittee reviewed six courses and recommended the following:

Engineering

- ENGR 097: Engineering Projects in Community Service –Recommend Approval
- CSE 030: Introduction to Computer Science and Engineering I – Recommend Approval
- CSE 031: Introduction to Computer Science and Engineering II – Recommend Approval
- ENGR 197: Engineering Projects in Community Service – Recommend Approval
- CSE 180: Introduction to Robotics – Recommend Approval

Natural Sciences

- BIO 141: Evolution – Recommend Approval

Action: UGC unanimously approved the above listed courses.

V. Report on Financial Aid and Scholarships

Diana Ralls, Director, Financial Aid & Scholarships

The following documents were distributed to members prior to today's meeting:
2008-Fall-Quick Financial Aid Stats
Summary of the Policies and Procedures for awarding Regents' Scholarships
Regents' Scholarship Review Criteria for Freshman
Regents' Scholarship Review Criteria for Transfers
Statistics for Freshman Regents 0809
Statistics for Transfer Regents 0809
Multi-Year Regents' Statistics
System wide Regents' Scholarship Survey (Fall 2008)

Overview of Financial Aid

Diana Ralls reported on the following:

- The Office of Financial Aid has received and processed 26,028 financial aid application transactions for 7,422 students and potential students. Multiple applications were received for students with updated information.
- The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships offered over $120M in financial aid and scholarships this year and has distributed nearly $14M in financial aid this semester. It is expected that $30M will be distributed by the end of the year.
- 80% of all enrolled undergraduate students applied for financial aid and 91% of them received some form of financial assistance, which include scholarships, loans, and grants
- 83% students were eligible for need-based aid
- 79% received gift aid
- Scholarships represent a small percentage of the amount of funding (about 4% of the total financial aid is in the form of scholarships)
- There is a scholarship program funded through a return-to-aid program, which is a need-based financial aid program. If a student has an appropriate GPA, he/she receives that aid in the form of a scholarship or a grant

- 15% of all enrolled undergraduate students received traditional scholarships, supported by donor funding, which represented $1, 761 per student. Average GPA of those students is 3.59 and they represent 39 different counties. 80% of them are the first in their family to attend College. UCM has several programs that are specifically designed for first generation students.
- In total this year, the Office of Financial Aid has awarded almost $650,000 in donor-based scholarships. It is expected that the number will grow as endowments mature and fundraising efforts continue.

How are Scholarships Awarded?

The Office of Financial Aid endeavors to make the process very simple, especially for incoming students. The Office of Financial Aid does not request a separate scholarship application for new students. Information is retrieved from their admissions application and from their financial aid scholarship application. Students are automatically considered for all the scholarships that are available. Continuing students; however do have to submit a separate scholarship application in February-March each year (same timeline as the financial aid application) because there are some scholarships that are restricted, or there may be information on the student(s) that can't be automatically extracted from the system (such as interest in a particular career). This year, $500,000 was set aside for new continuing students' scholarships. 204 students applied through that separate application process; 142 of those students met the 3.0 GPA requirement; 7 of those students did not complete the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) and 16 of those who did not complete the FAFSA were over the cut-off for financial need and were not considered for the scholarships that were available. Through this process, 41 students were given at least $1000 in scholarships, which represents about 30.4% of eligible students. Students with a 4.0 (or above) GPA were awarded $2000 in scholarships. No student was awarded more than $3000. Overall, 90 continuing students received scholarships totaling almost $240,000 and representing 15% of the total population that met the GPA requirement. Average GPA for continuing students' scholarship recipients is 3.5.

Regents Scholarships

The Regents Scholarship is the most prestigious scholarship in the UC system. Each UC campus establishes criteria for review and award of the scholarship. UCM has been using the same criteria since 2005. At the time, the criteria were developed to conduct a comprehensive review for admissions. Students were identified through these criteria and applications were read by faculty at least twice. The "manual read" score and the "major prep" score were averaged and that score was added to the electronic score. The review process has become somewhat cumbersome. This year, manual reads could not be performed in a timely manner due to faculty overload. The manual read was not done for transfer students. The Office of Financial Aid decided to go with the electronic score alone. Diana Ralls asked the UGC to consider if the manual read should still be a part of the process and if so, to identify a method to make it less cumbersome.

Questions/Comments from the Committee:

Q – What is the "take-rate"?
A – The take-rate is the percentage of students who accepted the offer and enrolled at UCM. It is also called the yield-rate.

Q - During the manual read, were all applications read or was there a cut-off?
A – 248 freshmen applications were read. The top percentage was extracted based on the electronic score alone.

Q – Do you have any sense of how many applications will need to be read this year?
A –We expect that we will receive about 320 freshmen applications.

Q – How many readers will be needed to perform the readings?
A – Last year we had nine readers (three from each school) and it took them two weeks to get through the applications. It is particularly important to have the right mix of readers at the transfer level.

Q – If readings are not performed, how will it affect the selection process?
A – We went with the electronic score for transfers. I can strip the manual read from the freshmen applications and see if it would have changed the number of students who were awarded scholarships.

> After today's meeting, Chair Martín-Rodríguez received the following information from D. Ralls: had the office of financial aid taken out the manual read portion from this past year's freshman selection there would have been a 12% change in the recipients (12 of the 99 recipients would not have been offered a scholarship. 2 of those 12 actually enrolled).

Q- What is overlooked if the manual read is not performed?
A – With the manual read, we are able to identify students who have overcome significant challenges. By not doing the manual read, the 1000 points given for "overcoming exceptional odds, exceptional contributions to the community", and/or "exceptional accomplishments or achievements" would be overlooked.

Q – Do students know the criteria?
A - They do not. The review criteria are not published.

Q – Do other UCs use the manual read as part of the Regents Scholarship criteria?
A – Most campuses review criteria involves some sort of manual intervention. UC Berkeley conducts interviews.

Q- Can readings be done in two tier stages with cut-offs?

A – We could pull fewer applications which will actually be read and award more to those that were selected. We could identify a percentage of the top students who will be awarded a scholarship and identify a smaller percentage of those that were actually read and whose eligibility would be determined based on their manual scores.

Action: Diana Ralls will meet with the UGC admissions subcommittee to discuss ways to make the review process less cumbersome. UGC will revisit the issue of manual reading at a future meeting.

Criteria for Maintaining the Regents Scholarship

Current criteria for maintaining Regents scholarship: "Students must enroll and pass 30 units per year, which may include courses taken during the summer session following their first two semesters of enrollments." (Approved by UGC in November, 2006).

The original criteria required 15 units per semester and were modeled after UCD. Under the current policy, students who completed 18 units in one semester and 12 units in the other were penalized. It was financial aid's recommendation to amend the criteria and require a 30-unit requirement. Students must maintain a cumulative 3.25 GPA to renew their scholarship.

Diana Ralls reported that her office is concerned about the effect the 30-unit requirement has on scholarships. She shared some examples where this requirement has proven to be an obstacle.

Example: student completes 16 units in fall 2007 and 12 units in spring 2008 for a total of 28 units during the academic year. Student is making minimum progress and has attended both terms full time; he/she is in jeopardy of losing his/her scholarship because he/she hasn't completed the 30 unit requirement. This is even more difficult because a lot of those students try to complete those units during the summer session. Unless those units are completed at UCM, the Office of Financial Aid does not become aware that the student has completed those units until the fall semester so it has been difficult to figure out if a student should or should not get a scholarship. Diana Ralls asked UGC to reconsider the 30-unit requirement and require a full-time attendance requirement instead.

Action: A motion was passed to amend the existing criteria to include a 12-unit per semester requirement instead of 30 units per year. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Tuition Fee Increase

VC Student Affairs Lawrence reported that there is some discussion within the Administration about a mid-year tuition fee increase. The UGC admissions subcommittee and the Office of Financial Aid will need to pay close attention to this increase because UCM has a high-need student population. This increase may adversely affect retention and recruitment at UCM.

Diana Ralls reported that there is a return-to-aid program within the UC system. A certain percentage of the tuition fee increase will go back to a return-to-aid program which will enable UCM to distribute more financial aid. The goal is always to cover the fee increase for those eligible students (60% of UCM's students) so those students will essentially be protected from the fee increase because the increase in financial aid will cover the increased fees.

VI. Review of Policies and Procedures for Approval of CRFs

Background: Professor Ramicova requested that UGC reconsider the language in the current guidelines and procedures for approving new courses, section 3 in particular. Professor Ramicova noted that this section of the policies implies that UGC can judge, assess or determine the appropriateness and/or purpose of a course. It is difficult, if not impossible to judge a course format and topics for a non-specialist. Furthermore it is inappropriate for a research university to request a course outline and a book list. Courses may be taught by other professors in the future who may have other sources of reading and/or may have different lists of specific topics. Unless UGC is approving courses that will be taught by one professor only for a limited time, the inclusion of specific topics and book lists is inappropriate. By formally requiring this type of information UCM is establishing a pattern which may become part of the institutional culture and will be impossible or very difficult to modify in the future. UGC should instead focus on the scope of the course and how it fits into the overall program, major or general education. Course formats and book list(s) should be discussed at the school level. This will become increasingly important during the WASC review.

Proposed changes to section 3 of the current policies and procedures:

3. *New courses* should be indicated on the CRF and should **be accompanied by** ~~attach~~ a brief course outline (1 page maximum) summarizing the course purpose, **its goals for student learning outcomes, and how these connect to the Program of B.A. objectives, and/or the Guiding Principles for General Education at UC Merced.** ~~format, topics, and required book or reading (if known)~~.The **content of the** course outline **should also aid reviewers in understanding whether proper assessment tools are part of the course.** ~~is intended to give reviewers more information about the general nature and subject of the course. Actual details of the course (e.g., specific topics, reading, student assignments) may vary with course delivery and instructor.~~

Professor Ramicova noted that in light of the upcoming WASC review, it might be a good idea to review these procedures and to indicate that as a committee, UGC is aware of how the proposed courses fit into existing programs. Under the current guidelines, faculty and UGC are being asked to review courses that are outside of the scope of their expertise.

Chair Martin-Rodriguez noted that there is no guarantee that the schools' curriculum committees have the necessary degree of expertise to perform the course reviews. Some UGC members feel that it is necessary to require some general list of topics/material to enable UGC to check potential course overlaps especially for courses offered in different schools. Some may find it helpful to have a syllabus which can be used as an illustration of the nature of the course,

knowing that the syllabus is not binding. These proposed revisions are particularly important because of the impending WASC review; therefore it would be useful to coordinate any changes to the existing policies with the WASC steering committee.

Professor Hull (chair of the UGC policy subcommittee) noted that part of the potential backlash is that these programs will have to present their goals. UGC is the place where cross-school comparisons can be done. The new policies and procedures will need to be very clear in terms of what UGC is requesting.

Action: The UGC CRF subcommittee and UGC policy subcommittee will work in consultation with the WASC steering committee to determine what kind of revisions would be reasonable. A proposal will be presented at a future UGC meeting.

Discussion – What Constitutes an Upper Division Course at Junior Standing?
This question needs to be addressed to better evaluate upper division courses that do not have prerequisites. UGC briefly discussed the following:

- One way to address this is by making sure that there is some sense that upper division courses are part of the courses evaluations
- Allowing lower division students to take upper division courses may become a problem because it is time consuming for the instructor who will have to evaluate each student's academic performance.
- Offering lower division and upper division courses concurrently may prove to become an issue for students and instructors alike: lower division students would have to do supplementary work in order to take upper division courses and instructors will have to teach both audiences in the classroom.

Action: The UGC subcommittee on courses will review the system wide Regulation related to this matter and report back to the committee at a future meeting.

VII. <u>SSHA Honors</u>
Background: last year UGC discussed a proposal for Honors for SSHA and for the History Major. In the absence of policies or guidelines for these types of awards, the committee recommended that SSHA contact the Division Council and the current UGC. At the last UGC meeting, the policy was asked to draft a set of guidelines for these awards.

Professor Hull reported that the authority to establish those policies lies within the UGC. Honors are usually handled at the school or college level. There exists a campus wide standard for Honors. There are usually three aspects to the Honors policy:

- Honors to Date: awarded on a semester/quarterly basis. At UCM these are recognized by the Dean's Honors List (semester) and Chancellor's Honor List (yearly)
- Honors at Graduation: percentile within School/College based on GPA at graduation with some stipulation of minimum number of units completed at a UC

- Honors Program: UCM's policy has no statement about Honors Programs. There usually are some admittance criteria under these types of Honors (e.g., minimum GPA, specialized course work or specialized research). These requirements are noted on a transcript. Some of these Honors have to be made public at some universities. There usually are some minimum campus wide standards for Honors programs. Majors or departments have the ability to specify their criteria as long as it meets – or is higher than - the minimum standards. The policy subcommittee provided some sample language to address this issue.

Resource Issues

The Honors program may require additional resources, from the Registrar and from the faculty involved. The Registrar will be charged with computing the minimum percentages and informing the schools. Should the schools have a different set of percentage; the Registrar's office will be responsible for calculating those. There usually are research requirements for Honors programs which may prove to be very labor-intensive for faculty. UGC could grant the schools the authority to approve Honors programs (done at other UCs) but do the schools curriculum committees have the ability to evaluate what those resource implications are.

The policy subcommittee asked that UGC to consider if these proposed Honors will represent a substantive change to a major as defined by WASC.

Comments from the Committee:

- Current majors are barely staffed. This proposal may represent a substantial burden to instructors
- It is too premature to implement this program due its resource implications
- Some majors already require a research capstone (e.g., History)
- This program may help UCM recruit and retain top students
- This program may not be implemented in the immediate future but UGC can certainly start drafting a policy which can be used in the future
- One way to limit resource implications is to implement a small and extremely selective Honors program
- UGC will be working in consultation with CAPRA

Action: the policy subcommittee will draft some language to be presented at a future meeting. The proposed language will emphasize that authority lies within UGC.

VIII. <u>General Education</u>

A memo from the Core Committee on General Education was forwarded to the UGC prior to today's meeting. The memo summarized the mission of Core I, challenges and actions that need to be taken to address those challenges.

Chair Martin-Rodriguez noted that the newly constituted Ad Hoc Committee on General Education will be charged with determining ways to deliver General Education at UCM. This committee will report to and consult with the Academic Senate through the UGC.

IX. System wide Review Items

A. Education Abroad Business Plan
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/EAP%20Business%20Plan%20Memo.pdf
Should UGC wish to opine, comments due to the Division Council before Dec 1, 2008

B. UC Accountability Framework Draft
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/documents/accountabilityframework_draft.pdf
Deadline for comments: November 21, 2008

UGC will comment on these items via email.

X. Executive Session

This section of the minutes will be distributed separately.

A. School of Management Proposal
Comments due to the Division Council by Friday, November 21, 2008.

B. Review of the Long Range Development Plan

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 3rd.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, December 3, 2008, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources:: Meeting, Dec 3, 2008

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**CHAIR'S REPORT** Professor Manuel Martin-Rodriguez	
Information	II.	**SYSTEM WIDE COMMITTEE REPORTS:** - BOARS, Kevin Browne, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management	
Approval	III.	**CONSENT CALENDAR:** - October 29th Meeting Minutes - November 12th Meeting Minutes	
Action/ Discussion	IV.	**CRF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:** *Andy Aguilar (Chair), Yihsu Chen, Dunya Ramicova* **A.** Review of 2007-08 Policies and Procedures for approval of courses [UGC0809/Resources/Mtg Dec 3, 2008/Proposed Revisions to CRFs Policies and Procedures] **B.** Upper Division Courses at Junior Standing *At the last UGC meeting, the CRF subcommittee was asked to review the system wide Regulations and report back to UGC* **C.** Courses to be approved by UGC: NS: BIO 127, General Virology BIO 148, Fundamentals of Ecology BIO 182, Bioinformatics ESS 148, Fundamentals of Ecology PHYS 137, Quantum Mechanics ENG: CSE 100, Algorithm Design and Analysis	
Discussion	V.	**POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:** *Kathleen Hull, Ariel Escobar, Ajay Gopinathan* **A.** SSHA Honors *The policy subcommittee was charged with drafting some language for Honors Program policies and procedures*	

Action

VI. REQUEST FROM NATURAL SCIENCES: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CHEMICAL SCIENCES MAJOR

Proposal posted on crops [UGC0809/Resources/Dec 3 2008/**Chemical Sciences Revisions** folder]

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, January 14, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources:: Meeting, Jan 14, 2009

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**CHAIR'S REPORT** *Professor Manuel Martin-Rodriguez*	
Information	II.	**SYSTEM WIDE COMMITTEE REPORT(S)** - BOARS, December 5th 2008 and January 9th , 2009 Meetings *Professor Susan Amussen*	
Information/ Discussion	III.	**WASC ACCREDITATION** *Guest: Professor Carlos Coimbra (scheduled for 10:30AM)* Discussion: Learning outcomes and program objectives database	
Discussion/ Action	IV.	**WASC ACCREDITATION PROCESS** Please review the WASC documents posted on crops: [UGC0809/Resources/Meeting Jan 14, 2009/**WASC** subfolder]	**1-17**
Action/ Discussion	V.	**CRF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT** *Andy Aguilar (Chair), Yihsu Chen, Dunya Ramicova* Courses to be approved by UGC: http://crf.ucmerced.edu/crf	
		- SSHA:	
		• ECON 121 and MGMT 121, The Economics of Money, Banking & Financial Institutions	**18-27**
		• POLI 106, Urban Politics	**28-36**
		• WRI 101, Writing in the Disciplines	**37-40**
		- ENG:	
		• BIOE 126 and MSE 126, Nanodevice Fabrication: Bridging Research & Education *Request for email vote sent to UGC on January 7th, 2009*	**41-51**
		- Request from SOE (via Registrar) to schedule two undergraduate courses (BIOE 104 and ENGR 120) in the same room to share 2.5 hours of lecture each week.	**52-54**

Action	VI.	**REQUEST FROM NS: REVISED APPLIED MATHEMATICS MAJOR** [UGC 0809/Resources/Meeting Jan 14, 2009/**AMS ug program**]	**55-60**
Discussion	VII.	**REQUEST FROM DIVISION COUNCIL: REVIEW OF THE MANAGEMENT MAJOR** *UGC to draft final report at its January 28th meeting.* [UGC 0809/Resources/Meeting Jan 14, 2009/**Review of the Management Major**]	**61-64**
Discussion	VIII.	**UC PRESIDENT YUDOF PROPOSAL TO MODIFY UC'S FINANCIAL AID PROGRAM** *Deadline for comments: February 1, 2009* [UGC 0809/Resources/Meeting Jan 14, 2009/**UC Financial Aid Proposal to Regents**]	**65-69**

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
January 14, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, January 14 2009, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Vice Chair Andy LiWang presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Martin-Rodriguez is not available on January 28th. Vice-chair LiWang will chair the UGC meeting.

III. System wide Committee Report

BOARS Meetings Dec. 5 and Jan. 9th – Professor Susan Amussen

Professor Amussen attended the Dec 5th meeting via telephone and in person on Jan 9th. She indicated that President Yudof joined the January 9th meeting but her telephone line was disconnected at that moment.

Items discussed within BOARS included the following:

- Status of the establishment of the ETR proposal based on CPEC weights and minimum GPA scenarios. BOARS is currently reviewing a "pro-con" document which summarizes the effect of a 2.8 un-weighted minimum GPA versus the other scenarios.
- President Yudof recommends the 3.0 weighted/capped minimum GPA scenario to the Regents. It appears that the proposal will go forward.
- Political implications of this reform.
- Issues regarding implementation and communication once the proposal is passed.
- BOARS is revisiting and attempting to clarify the meaning of some of the admissions requirements. The underlying principle for this reform is that the student who is admitted to UC should be able to take any introductory level course at the University.
- Shared Review Project – a template for organizing data to simplify the admissions process is being developed.
- President Yudof proposal to reform the UC Financial aid is out for system wide review.

Kevin Browne, AVC of Enrollment Management, reported on the following:
Of the 11 000 unfunded students across the system, 1800 are at UCM (2400 are at UCB). Our total enrollment is 2700 students. Proportionally, we are at a huge disadvantage. We may temper some of our targets based on financial realities. The goal is to be clear in terms of how many we are going to be able to accommodate. We need to know by early

February what our target is. We are not going to overexpose UCM to enrollments that we can't accommodate. Technically, we don't have impacted majors but we do have majors in high-demand. If 6 of the 9 campuses are cutting freshman enrollment, there is no way that we can accommodate a large referral pool. If we were fully funded and had the facilities to accommodate students and faculty, if SE II was built, if phase 4 housing was built, this would be a great time to boost enrollment. Our current target is 1300 new undergraduate students.

GPA issue: the 2.8 vs. the 3.0 – the calculations between a weighted and un-weighted GPA is about 2 tenths of a point. The difference between the two GPA is minimal. So a 3.0 weighted GPA is *really* on some level, a 2.8 un-weighted GPA. The university has four different GPAs but we cap weighted at 4.4. We were at 2.8 for decades we just went to 3.0 in the last 4-5 years.

IV. WASC Accreditation

The second phase of the WASC accreditation process is currently underway. The WASC Steering Committee (chaired by Professor Camfield) requires the preparation of a Capacity Preparatory Review (CPR) report. The purpose of this report is to demonstrate that UCM has the necessary infrastructure to achieve its educational goals. Professor Camfield sent some materials (excel chart and examples of CFRs from other institutions) to the Senate and asked the Senate to gather some evidence for the Standards and CFRs.

UGC comments:

- One of the elements that Chair Martin-Rodriguez is mostly concerned about has to do with the appropriateness of educational programs in terms of delivery and content. The UGC can certainly generate a report on how the UGC reviews are conducted but UGC's role is not predominant during the WASC review.
- Section 4.4 of the excel chart: "Commitment to Learning and Improvement" - *The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic* ***program review****, ongoing evaluation, and data collection.*

UGC has never conducted program reviews. Furthermore there are no policies or procedures related to this activity. Program reviews are a collaborative effort between the Senate and the Administration. UGC recommends that the Division Council consider how program reviews are performed and who conducts them.

It was agreed that the UGC will act upon receiving a formal charge from the Division Council. In the meantime, senate analyst will gather UC policies and procedures for program reviews and forward them to Kathleen Hull, Chair of the UGC Policy subcommittee.

CRF Policies and Procedures

The current CRF policies and procedures will be revised upon receipt of the Schools programmatic learning outcomes. [UGC is currently in receipt of the SOE Mechanical Engineering, and the NS Applied Mathematical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Chemical Sciences and Physics, posted on crops].

V. WASC Accreditation Process

Professor Carlos Coimbra (Engineering)

Professor Coimbra gave an overview of the ABET system (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology). He explained that the WASC Accreditation system is quite similar to the ABET system. Parts of the requirements for ABET and WASC include significant faculty participation. Faculty gives input in the curriculum, learning outcomes and methods used to assess learning outcomes for each program and each class. Every group of faculty, for every major has to use this system. ABET only accredits the lowest programs offered (for example, if MS and PhDs are offered, ABET will only consider the MS programs).

The first three Program Educational Objectives and Program Outcomes (*a through k-see document on crops*) listed in the Mechanical Engineering Programmatic Learning Outcomes are derived from ABET. Faculty map each of the program outcomes onto classroom activities (for example, an ability to apply knowledge of informatics, mathematics, science, and engineering). The instructor is responsible for making sure that information contained in the learning outcomes is accurate. All of the educational objectives are listed in the Program Learning Outcomes.

In the database, each course includes the following sections:
- Course Basic Info
- Course Syllabus (distributed in the beginning of a course)
- Faculty Contribution to the Program
- ABET Student Feedback Questionnaire (distributed at the end of a course)

He noted that with adequate resources, this system will eventually be expanded to the whole campus.

VI. CRF Subcommittee Report

Professor Andy Aguilar, Chair, CRF Subcommittee

Engineering

- BIOE126/MSE126/BEST226, Nanodevice Fabrication: Bridging Research and Education

UGC members raised the following concerns about these courses:

- Implications of concurrently two undergraduate courses with a graduate course.
- How can one hour of lecture satisfy three different constituencies?
- The number of contact hours does not seem to justify the number of units. Is there outside work for these courses that would justify the number of units? Is this a common format for other ENG lab courses?

Professor Lu explained this is not a common format for other ENG lab courses and that there is no outside work for this course that would justify the number of units. She is hoping that students can accomplish all the required work during lab sessions. Extra reading can be done outside of class. A lot of the lectures will be done in the labs where students will work as a team. Demonstrations are also part of the lab sessions. There is 20-30% lab demonstration which could be considered as part of the lecture. She is hoping that students can accomplish all the required work during lab sessions. Extra reading can be done outside of class.

- Is lab space for concurrent undergraduate/graduate enrollment accounted for? Is the enrollment cap of 20 students justified?

Professor Lu: Enrollment will be increased to 20 once the promised space is allocated.

Action: The committee recommends approval with the provision that prerequisites include PHYS 19 and BIOE 102. Senate analyst will notify the school.

<u>Request from the Registrar RE: BIO104 and ENGR120</u>

The SOE has requested that the registrar schedule those two undergraduate courses in the same room to share 2.5 hours of lecture each week. After careful consideration, the registrar declined the request because the CRFs for both courses make no mention of the two courses being allowed to share resources and asked the UGC to weigh in on this issue.

CRF subcommittee chair Andy Aguilar explained that the school requested two lecture rooms with the flexibility to lecture all the students in one room when topics overlap. At certain point in time, they wanted to be able to separate the two lecture rooms when there are different labs and courses. There was also an issue of having these two courses share the same lecture. There was some concern that BIO 104 and ENG 120 students would not be getting all the material needed if they were just taking one course alone. It is a simple misunderstanding on the instructor's part. These two courses can be co-listed, share lectures and have separate discussions.

Professor Coimbra explained that these two courses were divided into two classes mainly due to prerequisites issues for the BIOE students and to address resource issues (lack of faculty lines). Thus, the only way to teach these courses was to join them. To

address the needs of the bioengineering students, special sessions are offered such as mass transport.

Shannon Adamson noted that the School of Engineering has cancelled BIOE 104.

Comments from UGC:

- It is unclear to UGC that these courses are offered separately when their contents are almost identical. Would it be possible to solve the problem by having a one-unit class for the BIOE students that would also offer all the material they need?
- Allowing these two courses to share the same lecture would not allow students to get all the material they would normally receive if the courses were offered separately.
- How can teaching be adjusted for courses with different prerequisites?
- Courses should not be cross-listed in response to resource issues.

Chair Martin-Rodriguez noted that this scenario may happen again in the future, particularly with an impending decrease of faculty lines. Chair Martin-Rodriguez encouraged the UGC policy subcommittee to consider drafting a policy to solve or prevent these misunderstandings in the future. The Registrar will also weigh in on this issue.

This will be a future agenda item.

SSHA

The following courses were approved as presented:

- ECON 121 and MGMT 121, Economics of Money, Banking and Financial Institutions
- POLI 106, Urban Politics
- WRI 101, Writing in the Disciplines.

VII. Request from Natural Sciences: Revision to the Applied Mathematics Major

The proposed changes would allow students to design custom emphasis tracks by combining existing courses to satisfy an emphasis track. No new courses are proposed and no additional resources are required.

UGC had some reservations regarding the following language in the proposed changes:

> "Students may also design their own emphasis track with the approval *of the faculty*"
>
> "The student may design their own emphasis track with approval from the faculty. The student wishing to design their own emphasis track should consult with Professor Arnold Kim."

Action – UGC recommends that the language in the proposed changes be changed to better define the approving body of faculty and to involve the approval of multiple faculty members.

Action: UGC recommends that the name of the professor be removed to address circumstances where he is not available.

Action: Senate analyst will notify the School of Natural Sciences of UGC's recommendations.

VIII. Request from the Division Council: Review of the Management Major

The Division Council asked the UGC to review the School of Management proposal and to address the following questions in particular during its review:

- Is the goal of the Management Major to provide a rigorous foundation in economics, organizations, finance, accounting and statistical methods being met?

- Is there sufficient faculty currently in-place, or proposed, to satisfy the Management Major requirements?

SSHA Dean Bjornsson will attend the next UGC meeting (1/28/09). UGC will then discuss this item with him and during the committee's Executive Session.

IX. UC President Yudof Proposal to Modify UC's Financial Aid Program (out for system wide review)

Members were asked to comment on this item. Deadline for comments: Feb 1, 2009

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 28th.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, January 28, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources:: Meeting, Jan 28, 2009

AGENDA

Action			
Information	I.	**VICE CHAIR'S REPORT** - *Professor Andy LiWang* **A. Review of the UCM 2009-2010 Catalog** *Review assignments to be made at today's meeting. Schools' deadline for Submission to UGC: March 1, 2009* **B. Regents' Scholarships** *Process for awarding scholarships is about to begin. Faculty participation needed.* **C. President Yudof UC Financial Aid Proposal** *UGC comments due to the Division Council by Feb. 1, 2009* **D. Washington Advisory Group (WAG) Report** *UGC comments due to the Division Council. No deadline set.*	
Approval	II.	**CONSENT CALENDAR** *January 14th Meeting Minutes*	1-6
Discussion	III.	**REQUEST FROM DIVISION COUNCIL: REVIEW OF THE MANAGEMENT MAJOR** *Guest: Dean Bjornsson (scheduled for 10:15-10:35AM)*	7-9
Discussion	IV.	**REPORT FROM THE REGISTRAR: CROSS-LISTED VS. CO-LISTED COURSES** *Laurie Herbrand, Registrar*	
Approval	V.	**REQUEST FROM NS: REVISED APPLIED MATHEMATICS MAJOR** *This item was discussed at the Jan 14th meeting. School of NS submitted a revised proposal, as requested by UGC.*	10-14
Discussion	VI.	**EXECUTIVE SESSION – VOTING MEMBERS ONLY PLEASE**	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, February 11, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources:: Meeting, Feb 11 2009

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**CHAIR'S REPORT** - *Professor Manuel Martin-Rodriguez* A. UCM 2009-2010 Catalog B. Regents' Scholarships C. WAG Final Report	
Information	II.	**SYSTEM WIDE COMMITTEE REPORT** *BOARS (Feb. 6, 2009 Meeting) – Professor Susan Amussen*	
Approval	III.	**CONSENT CALENDAR** *January 28th Meeting Minutes*	*tbd*
Discussion/ Approval	IV.	**CRF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT** *Professors Andy Aguilar, Yihsu Chen and Dunya Ramicova*	
		- BIO 1: Contemporary Biology	1-8
		- BIO 1L: Contemporary Biology Lab	9-13
		- BIO 2: Introduction to Molecular Biology	14-21
		- BIO 2L: Introduction to Molecular Biology Lab	22-25
		- CHEM 95: Lower-division undergraduate research	26-27
		- CHEM 195: Upper-division undergraduate research	28-30
Discussion	V.	**POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT** *Professors Kathleen Hull, Ajay Gopinathan, Ariel Escobar* A. Policies and Procedures for Program Reviews B. Policies and Procedures for Reviewing Substantive Changes to Existing Majors	31-40
Approval	VI.	**REQUEST FROM NS: REVISED APPLIED MATHEMATICS MAJOR** *Discussed at the Jan 14th and 28th meetings. ENG and SSHA had some concerns about some of the prerequisites.*	41-48
Discussion/ Approval	VII.	**REQUEST FROM SSHA: SOCIOLOGY MAJOR**	49-104
	VIII.	**EXECUTIVE SESSION – Voting Members Only, Please**	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Undergraduate Council (UGC)
Minutes of Meeting
February 11, 2009

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, February 11, 2009, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Martin-Rodriguez presiding.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT

UCM Catalog Review

UGC agreed to the following review assignments:

- SSHA: Professor Escobar (ENG) and Professor Andy LiWang (NS)
- ENG: Professor Ajay Gopinathan (NS) and Professor Steve Nicholson (SSHA)
- NS: Professor Kathleen Hull (SSHA) and Professor Yihsu Chen (ENG/SSHA)

Regents Scholarships

The UGC Admissions subcommittee has already met with the Offices of Admissions and Financial Aid to discuss the Regents Scholarships review process. Reviews of the applications are about to begin.

Washington Advisory Group (WAG) Final Report

Chair Martin-Rodriguez shared a few preliminary comments about the report:

- Shared Governance - Curricular plans were made without senate consultation. A campus press release stated: " President Yudof told the Regents today he is authorizing development of an undergraduate program at UC Merced to attract exceptional students to study the health sciences and he is approving our campus to plan for medical education and research programs in conjunction with an existing UC medical school."
- "The proposed program should attract highly qualified students". This seems to suggest that current UCM students are not highly qualified.
- Impact on existing programs that are currently under-funded and how resources will be (re)directed.

Additional UGC comments will be circulated within the committee. A final UGC memo will be forwarded to the Division Council.

Request from Professor O'Day, Chair of the Rules Committee

Rules Chair O'Day asked UGC Chair Martin-Rodriguez to address the following questions:

-Has UGC ever given any official designation, definition, or requirements regarding emphasis tracks, concentrations?

- Do the terms "emphasis", "tracks" or "concentrations" appear on a student's diploma and transcript?
- The School of NS keeps a record of its enrollments in emphasis tracks. What is recorded at the University and at the Registrar level? Is the process the same whether it is called "track" or "concentration"?

The Registrar responded to this request:

"Emphases, tracks, and concentrations appear on the student's transcript if it has been approved through UGC. According to the American Assembly of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the major should appear on the transcript, but not on the diploma. Following that standard, emphasis, track, or concentration would not appear on the diploma either.

Regarding how an approved emphasis, track, or concentration appears in Banner, the system designates it as a "concentration" and each is treated the same."

Comments from the committee:
- The use of different labels does not seem to have affected the campus negatively.
- This was discussed a few years ago during the preparation of the Catalog. Faculty across the Schools were allowed to use different terminology.
- Some consistency across majors is necessary.

This issue was tabled for discussion at a future meeting until further comments from Rules Chair O'Day are received. UGC may also consider polling the Schools to see what language they are using.

Report from VCSA Lawrence
- On February 5th the Board of Regents approved the BOARS Eligibility Reform Proposal. The changes will take effect for the fall 2012 entering class. The Regents also approved a new financial aid plan (known as the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan). This plan is intended to support college access for lower-income families and students.
- Admissions Activities - The Admissions office has received - and is currently processing - over 10, 300 applications for freshman and transfer students for fall. The early January referral pool is also being processed. There will be a subsequent referral pool in March.
- The Admissions office is involved in several events across CA.
- April 18th is BobCat Day.
- UCM is currently engaged in discussions with OP regarding budget and how to make sure that the campus has adequate funding for incoming students and faculty.
- The Governor's budget proposed various reductions in the Cal grant program. This will affect UCM students who are already facing uncertain economic times which could affect their education. [The campus has the highest percentage of students who

receive financial aid]. VC Lawrence encouraged UGC to focus on issues surrounding retention and thanked the Schools for their efforts.

III. SYSTEM WIDE COMMITTEE REPORT

February 6th, 2009 BOARS Meeting – Professor Susan Amussen
Professor Amussen reported on the following:

Under the newly adopted Eligibility Reform Proposal, Students will need to:
- complete at least 11 of the 15 UC-required "a-g" courses (by the end of the 11th grade)
- Maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better (weighted with additional grade points for up to eight semesters of honors-level courses) – [The Senate had recommended a minimum GPA of 2.8 unweighted]
- Take either the ACT with Writing Assessment or the SAT Reasoning Examination (prospective students will no longer be required to take the SAT Subject Examination)

These students would be considered "Entitled to Review" (ETR) and would receive a full comprehensive admissions review on any campus to which they apply but would not be guaranteed admission at another campus if they were turned down.

BOARS is now contemplating ways to implement this reform and has asked its members to report on their respective campus Comprehensive Review policy.

Freshman performance
BOARS is considering the best methods for predicting freshman performance. There was a preliminary study that compared the California standard tests results and the SAT. Findings have shown that the CA standard test was a slightly better predictor. The data is not associated with students' records. The SAT test appears to be less socially discriminatory but overall they are both equally predictive.

"d" requirement (Laboratory Science)
Laboratory Science – Two years of laboratory science providing fundamental knowledge in at least two of these three disciplines: biology, chemistry, and physics.

Academic Council decided to release for system wide Senate review the recent proposal to add Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences (EESS) to the 'd' admissions requirement. At the moment, science courses in EESS may qualify for the elective requirement but not the lab science requirement which generally has to be met by at least two of the following disciplines: chemistry, physics or biology. There are few courses in CA that have been approved as lab sciences requirement.

BOARS will put together a pros and cons document for system wide review.

Enrollment Management Council

There is a new Enrollment Management Council for the system. It will advise the President about diverse enrollment options and how they will affect the University. Members of the newly-formed Council include Sylvia Hurtado (BOARS Chair) who will update BOARS regularly. Some of the topics that will be considered by the Enrollment Management Council include a study of the balance between in-state, out-of-state and international students, and if there is an ideal balance in any of the UCs. Some are concerned that more out-of-state and international students (who don't get in-state tuition) are admitted as a way to address budget cuts. The argument is that this practice may lead to a privatization of the University of CA.

IV. CRF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Members of the CRF subcommittee report were absent.

The subcommittee's recommendations were previously forwarded to Chair Martin-Rodriguez and to the senate analyst. The subcommittee recommended approval of CHEM 95/195 (Lower division undergraduate research/upper division undergraduate research). Due to the lack of quorum, UGC could not vote to approve these courses. They will be presented to the committee for electronic vote.

BIO1, BIO 1 L, BIO 2 and BIO 2L were pulled back by the School of Natural Sciences.

V. SSHA PROPOSAL FOR A SOCIOLOGY MAJOR

Professor Simon Weffer

Proposal was approved by the SSHA faculty on Feb 4, 2009. If approved, it would be offered in fall of AY 2009-2010.

Professor Weffer presented the sociology proposal to UGC:
Along with political sciences, sociology was noted as one of the majors that influenced students' decisions not to attend UCM. Furthermore, sociology is unique because it has strong connections to issues of inequality, ethnicity and immigration, issues that are part of the mission of UCM. Sociology is also a building block for inter and multi-disciplinary programs. The program does not yet offer gender studies or urban studies but it tends to play a pivotal role in offering core disciplinary classes that touch on these issues and serve as key elements for those programs.

Sociology is a historically strong discipline: Within the system, all the UCs - with the exception of UCSC and UCSF - have taught fifty programs with three of those programs ranked in the top 20 in the nation. It is a strong major nation wide, having surpassed economics in the number of BAs awarded. The sociology faculty in SSHA are confident that they have built a small, focused, tight program concentrating on three of the most central issues of the discipline: inequality, organizations, and political sociology as well as incorporating throughout the curriculum an emphasis on research methodologies, on how to do research as well as statistical methodology.

This major can be staffed with the current three ladder rank faculty and a full time lecturer. Two courses are to be offered each semester by lecturers. So in terms of additional resources, the current faculty could manage in the short-term. SSHA is currently conducting a search for a full-time ladder-rank faculty. If successful, this would be more than enough to staff the major.

The proposal includes an outline of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOS). The first two PLOS highlight issues that are unique to the Sociology major: "1) Think critically about the causes and consequences of social inequality and 2) Design and evaluate empirical sociological research".

Questions/Comments from the committee:

Q – What is the typical number of faculty in sociology?
A – It varies. In Stanford, sociology is considered a small program, and has about 12 faculty. UCB or University of Wisconsin have 30 or more faculty. UCB's program is considered the best program in the nation because it offers every flavor of sociology. UCM sociology faculty are not aiming to be like Berkeley, but instead are interested in being something like Stanford (i.e. very highly focused on a few key areas and on students' rigorous analytical ability). We think that we can - in 10-15 years - be part of the top 30 designations with adequate strategic hires. With the current faculty, we can address issues of race, gender, sexuality, urban issues and political sociology.

Q – Will the major mainly be offered to freshmen students or transfer students as well?
A – Our initial thought was to primarily target next year's freshmen students but transfer students could possibly declare sociology as their major if they meet certain number of requirements. For example, with the current sociology minor, students would only need one to six additional classes to go from a minor to a major so there is some flexibility for students who have already shown interest to pursue this degree.

Q - So the course load is three courses a year per faculty?
A – That has been the standard in SSHA and we will follow this model until the teaching load increases.

Q – Page 9 of the proposal ("resource needs and plan for providing them") states the following:
As of AY 2008-2009, the Sociology program has three full-time ladder-rank faculty and lecturers who teach 3 courses per semester. We are currently conducting a search for a tenured faculty member, and will also require the continued assistance of a 3-3 lecturer to staff the major. With these resources we anticipate that we will have no problem staffing the major for the next 3-5 years. As enrollment in the major grows, it is anticipated that additional faculty will be necessary to meet the instructional requirements. In addition, the proposed teaching rotation does not include graduate courses, which we hope to begin offering soon. Thus, the major would be best served by hiring additional ladder-rank faculty.

If those 3-3 lecturer were not available, could you still deliver the major?
A – With the current 2-2 lecturer, we could still staff the major. We could even staff the major with the three current faculty as long as the three core lower division courses are taught every year and combined with six additional upper division courses.

Q – You mentioned that "with four ladder rank faculty, we would have more than enough faculty to deliver the major" – Are you saying that if you get this fourth faculty line you will not need a lecturer?
A –We could manage with 12 courses at 3-3. The optimal model would be to have four ladder rank faculty and a lecturer in the short-term. We don't anticipate growing as quick as psychology. We anticipate our progression to be a little slower than political science. A fourth ladder rank faculty and some lecturer support would allow us to function until more lecturers are hired. The core of the discipline can be staffed with three faculty and can be staffed much more readily with four faculty. With the teaching rotation that we envision, a diversity of courses will be offered (e.g., race, gender, social movement, political sociology, crime and deviance). There are a number of classes that we would like our students to take and that are currently being offered by existing majors. For example, Professor Delugan's qualitative methodology class can easily substitute for SOC 170 (introduction to sociology). Since certain majors are in flux in terms of hiring and course offering, we have not yet created an exhaustive list of political science classes that can fit within our program. Furthermore we do not want to make a premature list of courses. We will need to convene with our colleagues in other disciplines and formulate an inventory of upper division classes that can satisfy our requirements. Upon approval of the proposed major, we will work very hard with our colleagues, with the Dean in SSHA and with the Office of Advising to determine what makes sense, what works and we will use our resources as best we can.

Q – Resources are the main issue and this will be addressed in further detail by CAPRA. Strategically, wouldn't it be in your best interest to maximize -at least for the short-term- the interdisciplinary components and raise the number of units that students will need to take in other areas so that you can actually account for the courses in a way that doesn't raise any issues. For example, page 13 of the proposal states: *12 units of related courses from the social sciences (Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Anthropology, Cognitive Science). See an advisor for a list of acceptable courses. Humanities courses may be approved on a case-by-case basis.* ***Total Load 56 Units***

Have you considered raising the number of units? There are several courses that will benefit the sociology major; furthermore, from a curricular point of view, UGC would like to know which courses are proposed as opposed to "related courses". This language seems vague and unpractical especially for the advisors. Including those courses will make the proposal stronger. This is a major that should be offered at UCM and if a higher number of units does not affect the sociology faculty, then from a strategic point of view, the major will get more faculty lines.

Comment – Some of the Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Anthropology, Cognitive Science classes will have additional prerequisites that sociology students may or may not already have satisfied so it is important for UGC to be able to assess how feasible it is for those students to take those 12 units classes. For example, students who have already taken SOC 10 (comparable to POLI 10, ECON 10 and PSY 10) could have the option of taking upper division classes such as American Politics, or Economics courses if the political science and/or economics faculty teaching those courses consent to SOC 10 as a prerequisite. Students have to be able to see what prerequisites they need in order to take classes outside of the sociology major. This involves a lot of work but it is critical for sociology students to know what their options are and what is required to o satisfy the major.
A – W are not looking to specialize at this time because we find that sociology tends to be a broad discipline and has more intersections with other disciplines; therefore we do not want to impose limitations on what our students should take or feel that they have to take aside from SOC 001, 010 and 015 (which set them up well particularly for graduate studies).

UGC's recommendations:

- This is a highly desirable major and resources are going to be an issue. From a curricular point of view it would benefit the major to draw from other disciplines.
- Regarding SOC 10: consider allowing other classes (e.g., POLI 10, ECON 10, PSY 10) to potentially substitute for students who have already taken the "10" class in that major. The inclusion of those courses in the Catalog would make the sociology major more visible and more accessible to students.
- It might be helpful to include as part of the requirements of the sociology major a lower division class in Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Anthropology or Cognitive Science. Adding one of those classes as a requirement may add a little more coherence to the upper division requirement.
- SOC 191 is listed as "Honors Thesis". This requires a proposal for an Honors track in Sociology separate from this proposal. There are currently no precedents for Honors programs at UCM. A History Honors program is currently undergoing senate review but has not yet been approved. From an academic point of view, it would benefit the program to include this course but the resources need to be assessed.

Action: The sociology proposal will be revised by SSHA and will be resubmitted to UGC for review and approval. UGC will also be asked to review/approve some sociology courses.

VI. APPLIED MATH MAJOR REVISIONS

Shannon Adamson noted that MATH 131 and ME 135 are listed under the same semester. MATH 131 is the prerequisite for ME 135 and should therefore be taken during the previous semester. The proposed sample plan lists those two courses together in the same semester.

Action: UGC approved the AMS proposed revisions contingent on the above-mentioned modification.

VII. POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Kathleen Hull, Chair, UGC Policy Subcommittee

A. Policies and Procedures for Program Review

The Division Council asked the UGC to develop policies and procedures for program reviews.

A summary of UC practices was distributed to UGC prior to today's meeting.

Program Reviews include, in many cases, the review of both graduate and undergraduate programs. The process requires the collection of a large amount of statistical data. Common elements of program review policies and procedures:

- Faculty conduct a self-study of the program undergoing review
- Specified review cycle (6-8 years)
- External review
- Student input
- Data collection
- Comment and response mechanism

UGC's recommendation:

- UGC should not be solely responsible for generating program review policies because some of their elements involve graduate education.
- UCM does not have any of the upper level administrative capacities that other UCs delegate this function to. Other UCs have entire committees or entire offices responsible for this.
- Program review policies should be combined with some of the campus' planning documents (e.g. schools strategic plans) in an effort to identify some type of structure that satisfies multiple requirements.
- An ad-hoc or standing senate committee should be formed and charged with program reviews.

Action: Professor Hull will incorporate UGC's recommendations into a memo. A draft will be circulated within the committee for input before going to the Division Council.

Item B - Policies and Procedures for Reviewing Substantive Changes to Existing Majors will be addressed at a future UGC meeting.

Due to time constraints, the committee was not able to hold an executive session.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 25th.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, February 25, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ROOM 232– Kolligian Library
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
UGC0809:: Resources:: Meeting, Feb 25 2009

AGENDA

Action			P.
Information	I.	**CHAIR'S REPORT** - *Professor Manuel Martin-Rodriguez*	
Approval	II.	**CONSENT CALENDAR** *February 11th Meeting Minutes*	1-9
Discussion/ Approval	III.	**CRF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT** *Professors Andy Aguilar, Yihsu Chen and Dunya Ramicova* Please refer to crf.ucmerced.edu. Hard copies of the CRFs will not be distributed at the meeting. List of courses to be approved	10-11
Discussion	IV.	**POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT** *Professors Kathleen Hull, Ajay Gopinathan, Ariel Escobar* Policies and Procedures for Reviewing Substantive Changes to Existing Majors	
Discussion/ Approval	V.	**REQUEST FROM SSHA: REVISED SOCIOLOGY MAJOR** Proposal not included in packet: SSHA has revised its Catalog copy and will incorporate it into the final proposal. Will be posted on crops and distributed at the meeting.	[tbd]
Discussion	VI.	**REQUEST FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS (CRE): RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO BYLAWS**	12-32
Discussion	VII.	**EXECUTIVE SESSION – Voting Members Only, Please**	

Undergraduate Council
Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, February 25, 2009

I. Chair's Report

- The Division Council asked UGC to draft a policy for program reviews. (GRC has agreed to adopt the UC Davis' model). Chair Martin-Rodriguez called for a meeting with Senate Chair Conklin, GRC Chair Leppert, GRC WASC subcommittee Chiao and WASC Steering Committee Chair Camfield to discuss the process.

- Views diverge in regards to the establishment of this policy. Some seem to believe that GRC will address the research part whereas UGC will be concerned with undergraduate programs as they relate to teaching. It is not clear to UGC how these reviews can be performed separately because: 1) research plays a significant role with undergraduate programs and cannot be dissociated from undergraduate education and; 2) some faculty are not affiliated with any graduate groups; therefore a program review exclusively focused on research and graduate programs will exclude that group of faculty. Furthermore, the WASC Steering Committee has stated that the UCD policy is not appropriate for UCM. UCD has an established undergraduate instruction and program review committee. UGC will revisit this issue after the meeting with the individuals mentioned above.

- The Schools were asked to send their sections of the Catalog by March 1st. Updated sections of the Catalog will be forthcoming. UGC reviewers will be examining sections outside of their School.

- UGC has recently received a proposal from SSHA for an Honors program. The review of this proposal will be done in consultation with CAPRA. Members were encouraged to review this item as soon as possible.

- VCSA Lawrence will be reporting on the May Commencement at the next UGC meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

Minutes of the February 11, 2008 were approved as presented.

III. CRF Subcommittee report

List of SSHA courses reviewed by the subcommittee are attached to the minutes for the record.

The subcommittee reviewed 37 SSHA courses. Four of those courses were submitted for discontinuance. Instructors were notified that those course numbers may not be used for six years. The subcommittee also reported that some of the proposed courses indicate that they satisfy a general education requirement.

Action: UGC approved the courses with the provision that faculty articulate how those courses fulfill general education requirements. Senate analyst will notify the School. The School will convey UGC's recommendation to the faculty.

IV. Policy Subcommittee Report

Professor Kathleen Hull, Chair, Policy Subcommittee

The Division Council asked UGC to respond to the WASC Steering committee's request (via the senate) that UGC (and GRC) amend policies, procedures and/or forms, related to the approval of new programs or courses, to include questions to alert faculty to the need to seek WASC Substantive Change in the following circumstances:

1. A new degree
2. New modalities
3. New off-campus sites
4. Change in duration of a program

WASC is requesting that faculty be informed that new degree programs not yet approved through substantive change review be considered as "pending the review of our accreditation agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)".

The policy subcommittee revised the existing policy for review and approval of undergraduate programs. UGC reviewed the proposed language and made a few suggestions.

Action: UGC unanimously approved the proposed policy. Senate analyst will forward the approved policy to the Senate and to the Schools. (*Policy available on crops*).

Action: UGC made a few changes to the proposed language and unanimously approved the document. Final draft will be forwarded to the Senate and to the Schools.

The policy subcommittee also considered whether Honors tracks (and tracks within majors) should be included during this revision. The subcommittee opted against undertaking this revision for the present time and welcomed input from UGC.

It was noted that there is an Honors policy; however there are no policies and procedures for submission of tracks within existing programs. UGC recommends that proposals for new tracks be accompanied with a statement describing the nature of the proposed changes, how they affect the existing program and if there will be resource implications.

UGC also recommends that faculty be aware that the committee needs a reasonable amount of time to consider any proposed changes.

Action: In an effort to establish more transparency, the UGC policy subcommittee will draft a policy on changes to existing majors that do not qualify as substantive changes.

V. Admissions Subcommittee Report

The subcommittee reviewed 60 applications for the Regents Scholarship. The top 40 were selected. Applications that had a very high score (a combination of academic score

and extraordinary circumstances) were not read, which allowed for a more efficient review process.

VI. Request from SSHA: Revised Sociology Major

The revised proposal was received shortly before today's meeting.

UGC greatly appreciates the efforts that the Sociology faculty have invested in addressing the issues previously raised by the committee (on Feb. 11, 2009). Before voting on the proposal the committee needs to wait for CAPRA's comments regarding the resource implications. CAPRA will be considering this proposal on March 16th. UGC is anticipating voting on the proposal on March 25th, 2009.

UGC Comments on the proposal:

Page 4, Section II. Program Requirements:

"We will be adding additional courses that will satisfy the upper and lower division requirements as we hire more ladder rank faculty."

Are those the requirements that *all* students have to take or are they electives?

Page 4, Section II, Last paragraph:

"It should be noted that the 12 units of upper division non-Sociology units is more than is required by any other major in SSHA. In comparison, Economics, Psychology, History and Management all have zero additional upper division units outside of the major; Anthropology has four (4) units, and Political Science eight (8)."

This comparison is not necessary because every discipline is different.

Page 10 (top):

"We will offer Soc 1 every semester. With one additional faculty member we could offer all of the required courses each semester."

UGC is interested in knowing why the sociology faculty feels that it is necessary to offer -potentially all - their required classes every semester. Looking at the CRFS for the various classes, sociology lower division courses range from a maximum enrollment of 120 to 200 students. This involves a resource use. If it is not necessary to offer the classes every semester, why offer them? This does not seem to be justified.

Page 10, third paragraph:

"Though Sociology has not admitted any students to the SCS graduate program, the faculty have, and will continue, to work with graduate students on a case-by-case basis."

The underlined statement may not be accurate.

Page 12, second paragraph:

"The substantive breadth and skills in conducting and analyzing research that sociology majors obtain can be useful for a range of career paths including: business and marketing, criminal justice, education, environment and technology, graduate school,

law, medicine and health, leadership in faith communities, non-profit and social service organizations, public policy, social welfare and social work."

Graduate school does not qualify as a career path.

Page 13- Upper Division Major Requirements
Choose 6 from the following 13 courses: 24 units
Social Movements, Protest and Collective Action (SOC 110)
Political Sociology (SOC 115)
Sociology of Culture (SOC 120)
Social Stratification (SOC 130)
Urban Inequality (SOC 131)
Sociology of Education (SOC 132)
Sports and Society (SOC 134)
Organization Behavior (SOC 140)
Self and Society (SOC 150)
Sociology of Gender (SOC 160)
Sociology of Sexuality (SOC 161)
Qualitative Methods (SOC 170) [Ethnographic Methods (ANTH 170) may be substituted]
Race and Ethnicity (SOC 180)

Are *all* the upper division courses listed above? Would this need to be altered if new courses are added? If so, UGC recommends that the faculty refer to those courses in a categorical manner (e.g. "upper division SOC courses (courses with numbers higher then SOC XXX", etc.).

Page 13. Transfer Students
"Transfer students who wish to major in Anthropology [...]

Please replace "Anthropology" by "Sociology".

UGC also briefly discussed the fact that actual names of the faculty are listed in the proposal. Some members believe it makes a lot of sense to put faculty names if the submitting faculty is in jeopardy of being questioned about their ability to deliver the major. It is a good initiative to clearly show who will deliver the major. If the faculty listed in the proposal leaves, theoretically that faculty line remains in the proposal. It is certainly not something that will stay permanently but it helps the committee during its review of the proposal.

Action: UGC comments will be forwarded to CAPRA and to SSHA.

VII. Request from the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) - Recommended Changes to UGC Bylaws

CRE is currently engaged in revisions of the Bylaws of each UCM Academic Senate committee and asked UGC to review its Bylaws and list any substantive changes it feels is necessary.

UGC made the following comments:

- System wide Representation - UGC strongly feels that there is a need for a better system for appointing system wide representatives. Perhaps the inclusion of some statement in the Bylaws describing the process for appointment of system wide representatives would help the process.
- Section II.4.B. (Membership) states the following: This Committee consists of *at least five* Senate members and one student member [...].
  Faculty are currently faced with increasing workloads. Should the committee consist of only five members, UGC would not be able to conduct any business in circumstances where quorum is not met due to some members not being able to attend a meeting. UGC recommends that the minimum number of members be increased.
- Structure of the committee - Reconfigure the current structure of UGC by establishing a UGC Executive Committee composed of subcommittees. The Executive Committee would handle most of the UGC business and only the chairs of the subcommittees (or their representatives) would be expected to attend the Executive Committee's meetings; therefore alleviating faculty participation in committee meetings.
- Section II.4.B (Duties) states the following: "Initiates, receives, and funds proposals for instructional improvement and development".
  UGC would like to note that the committee has never performed any of the actions listed in the above statement and wonders if this is not a function that would fall under the purview of the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE). Members are aware that the CRTE is not a senate committee and would like to consider if other senate committees at sister campuses have some kind of oversight over the CRTE (or equivalent).

Action: UGC's comments will be forwarded to CRE Chair Peggy O'Day.

VIII. <u>Executive Session</u>

This section of the minutes will be distributed separately.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30am. The next UGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 11th.

Attest:

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul