REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
APRIL 22, 2010
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, April 22, 2010 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presiding. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Martha Conklin

The Senate Chair thanked the faculty members for their service on Senate committees, thanked systemwide Senate Chair Henry "Harry" Powell and systemwide Vice Chair Dan Simmons for attending, introduced the new Senate Director Susan Sims, thanked Senate Analysts Fatima Paul and Simrin Takhar for their work, and announced that Senate Vice Chair Heit will be next year's Senate Chair. Chair Conklin then reported on the following topics:

A. 2010-2011 Budget. UC President Yudof announced he is terminating the furloughs in August 2010. Any budget shortfalls will be distributed to the individual campuses. UCM has been shielded up to this point but the same cannot be promised for AY 2010-2011.

B. UC Retirement Program (UCRP). Chair Powell announced that the UCRP task force will provide information in late June 2010, and then a proposal will be presented to the Senate. Chair Conklin encouraged faculty to respond to any surveys or requests for information that may be distributed this summer. Academic Council has been asked to be available for a possible teleconference meeting on the UCRP in August.

C. UCM funding. The Senate and Administration have been in negotiations with OP for a more feasible funding model for the campus for the next three years. OP proposed giving UCM $6 million next year for student growth, $12 million the year after, and $18 million in the third year. OP initially offered to provide UCM with $20 million for a new academic building. They later suggested that we wait one year and they work with the State to provide $40 million to construct a bigger, more permanent building. Funding for the larger building depends on whether the State will issue lease revenue bonds. The new building will contain classrooms (90-100 seats), faculty and staff offices, and research/graduate student space.

D. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with OP. UCM is working on this document that will be an agreement between UCM and OP on how we are going to grow over the next three years in terms of faculty hiring, space, and types of majors. The MOU deadline is May 15, 2010. The Senate is working with the Administration on budget projections. Our ladder rank faculty-to-student ratio is 1: 30, which is among the highest in the system and that is a major concern for the Senate. Chair Conklin announced she will not sign the MOU without a faculty vote. In the next month, information will be distributed to Senate members and she encouraged faculty to review it.

E. UC Commission on the Future/Gould Commission. Preliminary recommendations have been released about how the UC should grow. Each Division has been requested to

provide comments on each of the recommendations. Response templates have been distributed to each Senate standing committee as well as the Schools. Chair Conklin encouraged faculty to read the recommendations and respond with comments.

F. Program Review. UCM initiated its first ever program review (Applied Math) this year. The Senate and Administration created the Senate Administrative Committee on Assessment (SACA) co-chaired by Senate Vice Chair Heit and Dean of Natural Sciences, Maria Pallavicini. SACA evaluates what resources are needed for the assessment process. SACA is working on a set of recommendations to be finalized by May 15, 2010. These recommendations will be placed in the budget request to EVC/Provost Alley for next year. The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) is also due this summer.

G. Miscellaneous. The Senate is revising the UCM Bylaws (Committee on Rules and Elections Chair Peggy O'Day will discuss this later in the meeting), working to launch the new Senate website this summer, and is continuing to engage in shared governance. Chair Conklin announced that she looks forward to the Budget Committee meeting next week and hopes that budget transparency will continue to improve. The Senate was informed by the Administration that the tracking of research grant expenditures will be a high priority next year. The Senate also plans to continue its process of formal consultation with the EVC/Provost on all issues via memos.

EVC/Provost Keith Alley

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

A. School of Engineering Dean Search. Preliminary review of candidates took place in San Francisco last week. Four candidates will visit the campus within the next two weeks.

B. WASC Accreditation. The EER is underway and is due to WASC on December 14, 2010. The WASC site team will visit the campus the second week of March 2011. UCM did very well on the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR). We will keep pursuing the idea of fast track despite WASC's original rejection of the suggestion.

C. Admissions for AY 2010-2011. We will have approximately 800 new students ,which is 200 over where we were this time last year. Graduate admissions are down, which is a concern. This year, the Chancellor and I allocated $500,000 for graduate student funding and the funding will continue for the next three years. GRC was given jurisdiction over the distribution of the funds.

D. S&E 2. It will become Engineering 1 with the exception of spaces for organic chemistry. The Bioengineering space in S&E 1 will remain there. The architects reported that the design meetings last week went well. A planning meeting with the faculty will be held in May. A discussion followed about whether the decision to devote the new building to Engineering was widely discussed amongst the Natural Sciences faculty. There was concern over the lack of communication to faculty.

E. MOU. The Budget Office is working with the data needed to do the proper modeling for the MOU. The first piece was student enrollment data. We will have 600 new students per year for the next three years and we have to model different growth scenarios for the following three years. We have to model 1) continued growth at 600, 2) growth at 300, and 3) no growth. We are modeling through to the year 2020.

Systemwide Senate Chair Harry Powell

The Systemwide Senate Chair reported on the following topics:
A. Vice Chair Simmons and I are here because we are holding meetings with each of the UC campuses on post-employment benefits (PEB). We held a faculty open forum earlier today. We anticipate presenting PEB for formal review this summer.
B. UC Commission on the Future/Gould Commission. The Commission has released its first set of recommendations. An additional set will be released in the summer. Important issues include online education and three-year degrees. A controversial group of proposals on indirect costs is forthcoming. The proposals seek to ensure that every dollar in grant funding is matched by an NIH-equivalent rate in indirect costs. Humanities, social sciences, and health sciences disciplines dislike the proposals because their patterns of funding do not fit the NIH model.

C. UC Advocacy. During the current academic year, UC has been involved in chairing the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS includes the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC. Vice Chair Simmons and I will be in Sacramento next week for UC Legislative Day. April 27th is the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan and we will use the anniversary to emphasize the importance of protecting public higher education.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR
A. Draft Minutes of the December 3, 2009 meeting
ACTION: Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
CAPRA – Chair Mike Colvin
This has been an unusual year in that the committee has devoted a lot of time to commenting on systemwide proposals due to the array of budget issues. We have made UCM's voice heard at OP about many crucial issues. CAPRA is currently reviewing the Schools' strategic plans. Now that the campus is bigger, CAPRA is pushing much of the decision-making to the Schools (CAPRA used to decide what kind of faculty to hire.). Schools now develop three-year plans that CAPRA reviews in consultation with EVC/Provost Alley. Feedback from CPRA to Alley on the strategic plans will be sent in a few weeks and then to the Schools shortly thereafter.
CAP – Committee member Jan Wallander
CAP continues to meet a few times a month. Many personnel cases were delayed this year so CAP has received a heavy workload this spring that will last until summer. There are four external and six internal CAP members. CAP appreciates the service and contributions of the external members as their broad range of experience has proved very useful to the committee. The Chair, Joseph Cerny (UCB), is instrumental. As usual, an Annual Report will be released at the end of the academic year that details the number of cases CAP deliberated on and other metrics such as the extent to which CAP's decisions matched those of the EVC/Provost.
CoC – Chair Carlos Coimbra
The committee's main function is to populate the slate of Senate committees. For the next academic year, the leadership positions of the standing committees are filled but we are still filling the positions of the regular members. Due to the scarcity of faculty, we have to recruit

more Assistant Professors than we would like. We try to shield un-tenured faculty from excessive service as much as we can. CoC has received nominations for the elected positions on CoC and DivCo At-Large members. These nominees will be placed on the ballot for the spring election. Due to the large workload at the campus level, CoC is attempting to find faculty to fill the positions on only those systemwide committees that are essential for UCM.

GRC – Chair Chris Kello

At this time, GRC has reviewed and approved two graduate proposals: Quantitative and Systems Biology (QSB) and Cognitive and Information Sciences (CIS). Both proposals were submitted to CCGA. GRC completed, in conjunction with CAPRA, the first round of review for two ORU proposals -- Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI) and Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI). Also in conjunction with CAPRA, GRC is reviewing two CRU proposals -- Center for Autonomous and Interactive Systems (CAIS) and Spatial Analysis and Research Center (SpARC). GRC also reviewed 43 faculty research grants and awarded just over half. Many of them are eligible for the Chancellor's Awards and are being reviewed by EVC/Provost Alley and the Chancellor. EVC/Provost Alley made available $500,000 for graduate student support. In order for the money to have an impact this year, GRC decided to apportion half the funds directly to the nine graduate groups/emphasis areas relative to the number of currently enrolled PhD students in each program. Any unspent funds roll over into the next fiscal year. The other half of the funds was devoted to a new, graduate student summer fellowship competition for conference travel or summer stipend. GRC received 77 applications and is currently reviewing them. Graduate offers and admissions are down this year. Before the semester is over, GRC and VCR Sam Traina, who established a graduate education task force, will gather information to see what can be improved for next year.

UGC – Chair Susan Amussen

In addition to the usual workload of reviewing and approving courses, programs, and minors, UGC has spent a great deal of time on the recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future/Gould Commission, especially the question of what constitutes UC quality and education. UGC will submit its suggestions to OP. UGC has also opined on online education, particularly the way many of our students would be disadvantaged by this method of delivery. Another major item UGC is working on is UCM's first program review, Applied Math. UGC is setting up the site visit in the next few weeks, and then the committee will re-review our program review procedures and simplify them for the process next year.

V. DISCUSSION ITEM – PROPOSED REVISIONS TO UCM BYLAWS – ***CRE Chair Peggy O'Day***

CRE Chair O'Day provided the rationale and background of the process to revise the Bylaws. UCM's Bylaws were written by the UCM task force in AY 2003-04 prior to the arrival of most faculty; the adopted Bylaws were intentionally sparse in order to allow UCM faculty the opportunity to shape the character of their Academic Senate. Although a few amendments have been made to the Bylaws in the intervening years, there are major gaps in the descriptions of the powers, duties, responsibilities, and functions of Senate officers and standing committees. These gaps have resulted in confusion and conflicts regarding Senate authority over academic matters and ambiguity in procedures. Fuller descriptions of the powers, duties, and authority of Senate

standing committees were needed to clarify committee responsibilities and jurisdiction over various Senate and Faculty matters. Several procedural issues required modification or clarification in order to comply with UC Academic Senate Bylaws. Language needed to be clarified and enumeration of Bylaw clauses needed improvement.

The CRE decided that wholesale review and revision of the Bylaws were warranted as the most expedient way to make a consistent set of comprehensive changes. During AY 2008-2009, the CRE solicited input from all Senate standing committees for potential changes to the Bylaws and for comments on existing committee duties, powers, and functions. It also reviewed Bylaws from all other UC campuses to identify important differences and items missing from the UCM current Bylaws. Dan Simmons, CRE member during AY 2008-2009 from UC Davis, provided a set of draft Bylaw revisions in August 2009. CRE reviewed, discussed, and revised the proposed changes, taking into account comments from the Senate standing committees and the Bylaws of the other campuses.

In AY 2009-2010, CRE consulted with the Senate standing committees on its proposed revisions to the Bylaws. CRE submitted the revised Bylaws to University Counsel to ensure the Bylaws were in compliance with systemwide rules. CRE made further revisions based on committees' feedback. CRE then conducted a poll -- accompanied by an explanatory memo to the Schools -- on UCMCROPS to obtain comments from all Senate members. (A summary of all proposed changes, results of the poll, faculty comments from the poll, comments from Senate standing committees, and background material are posted on UCMCROPS.) Input received from faculty was very helpful to CRE, but CRE ultimately decided which to accept and which to reject. CRE's decision and rationale is summarized in the last memo that was distributed to the faculty along with a copy of the proposed revised Bylaws.

CRE Chair O'Day clarified that there will be no vote on the Bylaws at this meeting. A vote of Senate members will be conducted in the spring election on the same ballot as the CoC and DivCo At-Large member nominees. The ballot will be distributed to Senate members tomorrow and is due on May 7. Passage requires a 2/3 approval of those Senate members voting. If the Bylaws are approved, they will be submitted to the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (UCR&J) for review. UCR&J will decide if our revised Bylaws affect anything at the systemwide level. If not, our revised Bylaws will be placed on the Academic Council agenda for approval in fall 2010. If Council approves, the implementation date for the new Bylaws will be January 1, 2011.

A discussion then followed between faculty members and Chair O'Day about several major proposed Bylaw revisions. Controversial issues included the proposed revision that the Vice Chairs of GRC and UGC serve on CAPRA instead of the Chairs. There was also discussion about deleting the proposal that the Vice-Provost for Academic Planning be appointed to CAPRA as an *ex officio* member. A faculty member suggested a clarification of the provision of not having Administration Senate members serve as Senate committee representatives.

ACTION: Based on the feedback received at this meeting, CRE Chair O'Day will make final revisions to the Bylaws and distribute to all Senate members along with an explanatory memo. Senate members will receive the revised Bylaws and memo in advance of the election.

VI. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW) – *UCM Representative Sean Malloy*

Most of UCFW's work is related to the PEB taskforce. The unfunded liabilities associated with UCRP have potentially catastrophic consequences for the survival of the UC system. There is a sense of urgency to begin fixing the problem. Professor Malloy urged faculty to pay close attention over the next few months to any information associated with UCRP and to direct any questions or comments to him. Malloy also asked faculty to spread the word among their colleagues, especially the junior ones as many of the changes that UCFW is debating now will affect junior faculty in the future. Malloy concluded his comments by pointing out that UCFW also opines on issues such as child care, housing, and salaries.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest:

Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
DECEMBER 3, 2009

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, December 3, 2009 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presiding. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Martha Conklin

The Senate Chair thanked faculty members for their service to the Academic Senate. She reported on the following topics:

A. WASC visit. This was one of the campus's major accomplishments this fall. We are now in the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) stage and it is crucial that faculty get involved. UCM is undergoing its first program review with Applied Math.
B. Student to faculty ratio. It is currently 29:1. We are anticipating 600-650 new students per year over the next few years. We hope to hire 50 faculty during this time.
C. Majors. Faculty involvement in the decision-making process of the growth of majors is necessary.
D. Student fee increases. Academic Council released an open letter supporting the fee increases in light of reduced state funding. We need to market UC as an important budget priority for the state.
E. UC Commission on the Future. ("Gould Commission") The Commission is focusing on how to re-design the UC system. Faculty are encouraged to be informed about the Commission's working groups as the groups' information has significant implications for UC Merced.
F. Shared governance. UCM has a system of shared governance between faculty and the Administration. We have formal consultation in the form of written communication. An example of shared governance is our new procedure for the formation of academic units (Bylaw 55 units). Our degree program formation procedures are nearly complete. We are establishing better methods of communications on program review and course assessments. We have a newly formed Senate-Administration Committee on Assessment. We also have a Senate-Administration Council that is streamlining campus-wide processes and deals with an array of campuswide issues. We look forward to improving communication with our Budget Committee. Other examples of shared governance are: UGC's initiation of program review, CAPRA's development of guidelines to facilitate Strategic Planning, and the Chancellor and EVC/Provost Alley's recent commitment to hiring a part-time campus Ombudsman.
G. Staff. Chair Conklin thanked retired Senate Director Nancy Clarke for all her hard work. In addition, Chair Conklin thanked Senate staff Fatima Paul and Simrin Takhar for their tireless work in supporting the standing committees and DivCo—particularly shouldering the workload of the Director. They are the institutional memory of the Senate.

Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang

The Chancellor reported on the following topics:

A. Welcome to Interim Provost Pitts, Senate Chair Powell, and Senate Vice Chair Simmons.
B. Admissions update. Compared to last year at this time, freshmen applications are up by 18%. Transfer applications are up by 47%.
C. WASC visit to UCM. Thank you to the faculty for your participation and leadership. The WASC team was complimentary to us. We look forward to doing as well for the second phase of WASC's visit.
D. Academic Innovation Symposium of November 13, 2009. It was hosted at UCM and was successful. Attendees included UC President Yudof, Chancellors Block, Drake, and Katehi, and Regent George Marcus.
E. Student fee increase. Due to the vast shortfall in the state budget, it was necessary for the Regents to approve the fee increases. President Yudof is doing his best to discontinue furloughs next year.
F. State budget. There is a $20.1 billion deficit. My office has been issuing op-ed pieces in newspapers in the Central Valley.
G. Strategic Academic Vision 2025. It was completed. We had a workshop last summer and we will continue to build on that Vision for academic planning.
H. Space. S&E 2 is a high priority for the UC system but we do not know when it will be completed. We also have classroom and office space needs.
I. Governor Schwarznegger recently came to the campus. He was impressed by the diversity of our student body as well as the percentage of first-generation college students.
J. Future. We are making good progress on campus despite the challenges. The next few years will be challenging but we need to work together and create a plan on what we need to grow. We have a positive vision and mission.

EVC/Provost Keith Alley

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

A. UCM has a "routine" now. Everything is not an emergency the way it is when we first began. The establishment of a routine is a great accomplishment.
B. Academic Planning. Yesterday, I sent out the documents to the Deans, CAPRA, and DivCo along with the criteria that CAPRA will use to provide guidance on allocation. We are trying to do a three-year rolling plan in the Schools around faculty allocation and program development. Out of the 50 new faculty positions, we are going to use five as a strategic investment group that will address the issues that are in the Strategic Academic Plan. There were five research themes in that Plan. All three Schools can potentially compete in almost all of those research areas. I will work with CAPRA to identify the sequencing and process.
C. WASC Report. We received a preliminary report on the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR). The final report first has to go to Academic Council before coming to us. We will post it on the web. We are starting the EER stage and are assembling the appropriate groups of faculty and administrators.
D. We are starting to formulate the search committee for the new Dean of Engineering. As we did with the Dean of SSHA search, we put out a contract to hire a search firm.
E. Application numbers. The numbers reflect the great diversity of our campus.
F. UC Commission on the Future ("Gould Commission"). Seven members of UCM are on the various working groups. We are planning on holding open forums in January,

February, and March with the seven representatives to provide information to the campus community and to listen to your input.

G. OP. We have worked very hard with OP over the years. They are genuinely trying to help us solve our problems. That is a tribute to UC leadership. Many of them have been to UCM multiple times.

UC Interim Provost Larry Pitts

The Interim Provost reported on the following topics:

A. It is impressive that the UCM faculty accomplishes as much as they do with such low faculty numbers. President Yudof has made clear that the success of UCM is high on his priority list.
B. The lack of a funding model makes planning difficult for UCM. But there will be enrollment funding for the next three years.
C. OP allocated $20 million in capital funding for UCM. UCM will decide how to use it.

Systemwide Senate Chair Harry Powell

The Systemwide Senate Chair reported on the following topics:

A. Visiting UCM is very important to Dan (Systemwide Senate Vice Chair) and I. The faculty and staff should be thanked for their hard work.
B. The UC system is California's greatest achievement. UC faculty, staff, students, alumni, and Regents are strongly committed to excellence.
C. State funding for UC. The UCs play an important role in the state of California. They are part of the vision on which the state was founded.
D. Gould Commission. The Commission is taking a systematic and systemwide look at how the UC operates and what UC will do in the future. In the spirit of shared governance, we would like to ensure that the standing committees of the Academic Council interact closely with the working groups.
E. Advocacy. Dan and I have constant discussions and a formal relationship with the Senates of the CSUs. Tomorrow, we are going to L.A. for a meeting with the intersegmental committee of Academic Senates: UCs, CSUs, and CCCs. Assembly Member Ira Ruskin will speak to us about the UC and the Master Plan. On Monday, we will be at the state Legislature participating in the informational hearing on the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan.

Systemwide Senate Vice Chair Dan Simmons

The Systemwide Senate Vice Chair reported on the following topics:

A. I have been involved with the planning of UCM since 1995. I served as Chair of UCM's Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE).
B. Shared Governance. (Simmons reviewed the authorities granted in the Regents Standing Orders "Mending the Wall", a document that describes shared governance.) 1 Faculty authority includes curriculum, course requirements, admissions requirements, establishing the minimum quality for degree programs, defining the membership and quality of the faculty, and advising on the budget to ensure it is being used to maintain the quality of the UC. He described how the authority of the Administration intersects with the authority of the Senate. He congratulated UCM faculty on how much they have accomplished.
http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/shared_governance_report.pdf

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Draft Minutes of the May 4, 2009 meeting
B. Annual Committee Reports (2008-2009)

ACTION: Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM

A. Proposed Revised Bylaws

In CRE Chair Peggy O'Day's absence, Senate Chair Conklin summarized the discussion item. CRE has proposed revisions to the UCM Bylaws. A set of revised Bylaws were sent to DivCo for review and will be sent to the Schools for comments. CRE solicited Bylaw revision suggestions last year from each Senate standing committee. The revised Bylaws have fuller descriptions of Senate standing committees, clarify committees' jurisdictions and duties, and have a standard numbering system.

B. Academic Unit Formation Procedures – *Senate Chair Conklin*

Currently, the three legal Academic units we have at UCM are the Schools of Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts. They were granted to us when the campus opened and we have not gone through formal procedures to form other Academic units. Chair Conklin presented a diagram on Academic Unit formation, a process developed by DivCo and EVC/Provost Alley. She reiterated the importance of consultation and shared governance. There is also an issue between School-specific graduate groups versus graduate groups that span Schools. GRC Chair Chris Kello mentioned that VCR Traina has established an administrative committee on graduate education and is working with GRC on graduate education issues.

C. Program Review and Assessment – *UGC Chair Susan Amussen*

UCM is going through the process of regular annual assessment of learning outcomes. Every major has developed program learning outcomes (PLO). These assessments are mandated by WASC. WASC also mandates regular program review. Last year, UGC and GRC formulated undergraduate and graduate program review guidelines. UCM is currently undergoing its first program review with Applied Math. DivCo has requested that UGC opine on the resource needs associated with both annual assessment and program review. There are resource needs surrounding both the self-study process and the review committee that visits the campus. A faculty member pointed out that faculty time and workload is a problem. EVC/Provost Alley acknowledged the need for more staff for program review but it is unknown what level of support is needed. Alley said his own top spending priorities for this year and the next are hiring faculty, getting the necessary support in place for assessment and program review, and student support in the Schools (i.e., academic advising).

V. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

CAPRA – Committee Member Evan Heit

CAPRA Chair Mike Colvin was absent. CAPRA member Heit presented Colvin's notes: School strategic planning now has a longer planning horizon of three years. The CAPRA guidelines for School strategic plans were sent yesterday. What will be transmitted to Schools is how many faculty lines they can expect as well as expectations about space and start up funds. CAPRA will opine on a method to review established programs. The committee will ask programs and groups to list their goals over the next five years. There was a brief

discussion on whether academic units have to prepare annual strategic plans. EVC/Provost Alley answered that it is crucial that units prepare strategic plans. 5

UGC – Chair Susan Amussen
The most important task the committee is doing this academic year is the Applied Math program review. Another item on UGC's agenda is to develop policies for the review of online courses.

GRC – Chair Chris Kello
The committee is reviewing two graduate group proposals, Cognitive & Information Sciences (CIS) and Quantitative Systems Biology (QSB). GRC is also reviewing the procedures for submitting and reviewing graduate groups particularly in the context of WASC. The committee is going to review two ORU proposals, the UC Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI) and Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI). Lastly, GRC is proposing a revision to the annual research/travel/shared equipment grants. The revision would expand the grants program.

CoC – Chair Carlos Coimbra
CoC populated all the major Senate committees. As in previous years, CoC has had a large percentage of untenured faculty and they have a significant workload.

CAP – Vice Chair Tom Harmon
This semester, following WASC requirements, CAP has requested a second line of teaching evidence to be presented in the personnel cases in addition to student evaluations. CAP is not prescribing what that additional piece of evidence should be; the Schools will make that decision. CAP has also requested that Mid-Career Appraisals be submitted earlier so that faculty can receive feedback in a timely manner.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Attest:
Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Monday, May 4, 2009 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presided. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Martha Conklin

The Senate Chair reported on the following topics:

A. Chair Conklin thanked the faculty members who serve on Academic Senate committees.
B. We are ending the academic year with grave concerns about the budget and UC Merced's issues being set aside in favor of systemwide issues. UC President Mark Yudof has stated that there will be a review of the policy on pay cuts and furloughs.
C. Formation of Bylaw 55/Academic units. The Senate has formulated a draft policy that was forwarded to EVC Alley.
D. The Senate has begun to re-examine its Bylaws and Regulations. (CRE Chair Peggy O'Day will discuss this in more detail later in the agenda.)

Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang

The Chancellor reported on the following topics:

A. Strategic Academic Vision. The document is now available on the UC Merced website. After this academic year, we plan to move on to the next phase of planning. We continue to seek faculty input and support.
B. 404 Permit. It was a significant achievement to attain the permit and a milestone for the campus. Immediate projects benefitting from the permit are site expansion for the May 16 Commencement and the 1MW solar farm.
C. Blue Ribbon Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. The Commission released its recommendations on April 22. The next step is to appoint an advisory committee for the formation of athletic programs.
D. Beginnings Sculpture. It was erected on April 21 and was a concerted staff and community effort.
E. Commencement on May 16. In addition to keynote speaker First Lady Michelle Obama, many VIPs are expected to attend including state elected officials, UC Regents, and President Yudof. The Bowl is being prepared for nearly 12,000 seats. The financial cost will be large but it is good publicity for our campus. The University Relations team is trying to raise private funds to defray the cost.
F. Building Updates. The Early Childhood Education Center building will be completed before May 16. The Social Sciences & Management building project is ongoing; OP has assured us that money is available to complete the building. The Student Housing 3 project will proceed for fall 2010 occupancy and will add over 300 beds. Funding for the Science & Engineering 2 building (S&E 2) is unclear but our team is still working on the design.

A question arose as to whether the faculty would be able to interact with the distinguished guests at Commencement. The Chancellor answered that their time will be limited but he will check with Associate Chancellor Janet Young if there is any opportunity for faculty to meet the guests.

EVC/Provost Keith Alley

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

A. Incorporation of new faculty. More senior faculty were hired during this academic year. According to CAP Chair Joe Cerny, the cases presented to CAP this academic year have been much better than they were in the past.
B. Enrollment. Last year on this date, we had 1,081 SIRs. This year, we have 1,360. Last year, the melt (students who filed a SIR but did not enroll) was about 12%. The goal is to reduce the melt by half a percent. We will have a student enrollment of about 150 FTEs for summer. We will not get additional dollars if we over-enroll.
C. WASC Accreditation. The documents for the Capacity review are almost complete and will be submitted on July 7. Accreditation is going to be a very critical piece of the budget process this year in terms of finding the money to provide support for the Educational Effectiveness phase. In the coming year, we will have to collect the data and one program will go through initial program review. In Spring 2011, WASC will come to campus for the second phase. If all goes well, we will get initial accreditation in June 2011. The problem of UC Merced students being turned down by other institutions because UC Merced is an unaccredited university has, for the most part, been overcome on a case-by-case basis. EVC Alley asked the faculty to report to him any student complaints, and he will contact the institution that the student is applying to. He mentioned that in nearly all cases, the institutions have been willing to overlook the accreditation issue and accept the students' grades.
D. Budget. For the next three years, we lose the $14 million in state supplemental support. There are no enrollment growth dollars due to the state budget crisis. Other campuses provided us with the $6.3 million that was our enrollment growth dollars. Next year, OP will provide the $6.3 million. But, they are uncertain about providing it after that. We will continue to fight to make UC Merced a systemwide priority. If Proposition 1A fails, higher education will likely take another sizeable hit. S&E 2 will probably not materialize without the passing of the Proposition.

A faculty member inquired about alternative measures if Proposition 1A fails. EVC Alley said OP wants to bring in a group of people from other campuses to look at alternative growth scenarios. The Chancellor mentioned exploring the possibility of the state budget having a separate line item for UC Merced.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Draft Division Meeting Minutes, December 4, 2008
B. Proposed Academic Senate Regulation Changes
   1. Senate Regulation 65, Academic Probation and Dismissal
   2. Senate Regulation 75, Undergraduate Honors at Graduation

ACTION: Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM

A. Proposed Revised Bylaw Language II.1.A – *CRE Chair O'Day*

Chair O'Day briefly summarized the background of this proposed change and reiterated what this proposed change consists of (information contained in meeting packet). Faculty will vote by paper ballot. A Council member expressed concern that some senior faculty that have part-time administrative roles would be restricted from serving on Academic Senate committees and we would therefore lose their input and experience. Chair O'Day responded that there will be a time in the future when we will have more senior faculty. A Council member requested that a pro and con statement accompany the paper ballot. Another Council member suggested allowing individuals with administrative titles to serve on all committees, including CAP and P&T, but requiring them to recuse themselves when a case or issue comes up in their own discipline or area. A Council member tried to move to have a pro and con statement with the ballot. That move was seconded. However, Chair O'Day pointed out that this is a discussion item and there is nothing to move on. Furthermore, there is no quorum. Chair O'Day will ask CRE to consider the issue of a pro and con statement, but she pointed out that the ballots will be mailed to faculty this week.

V. ANNOUNCEMENT AND PRESENTATION OF SENATE AWARDS

Chair Conklin presented the following awards: Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award (Professor Teenie Matlock), Dr. Fred Spiess Award for Distinguished Service to the Academic Senate (Professor Shawn Kantor), Distinguished Early Career Research Award (Professor Cristián Ricci), and the Distinction in Research Award (Professor Michael Spivey).

VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

CAPRA – Chair Evan Heit

CAPRA tries to foster beneficial connections between academic planning and resources. The committee's guests have reported on capital planning, space planning, operating budget, School of Management planning, and WASC. The committee has helped the Administration prepare for budget meetings with the Office of the President and has improved communication between our campus and the Office of the President. The CAPRA chair serves on the systemwide budget committee, the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). This year, the committee has reviewed the Sociology major, the Psychology graduate group proposal, the History honors proposal, the School of Management proposal, WAG report, capitol improvement plans, the Long Range Development Plan, general education, and the Strategic Academic Vision. CAPRA also reviews strategic plans from the Schools and will work more on those during the summer to advise EVC Alley on resource and hiring issues. Chair Heit emphasized shared governance and stressed the importance of keeping OP and the systemwide Senate informed of UC Merced's excellence.

CAP – Committee Member Jan Wallander (Vice Chair Roland Winston was absent)

Six of the ten CAP members are external and have given us extraordinary service in reviewing personnel cases. The committee reviews appointments, merits, promotions, and mid career assessments. CAP has evaluated 49 cases so far this year. There is a meeting on May 8 with the CAP Members, campus AP Chairs, and the Deans to discuss the challenge of reviewing mid-

career assessments. The committee also reviewed the assessment of teaching and the systemwide policy on salary reduction and furloughs.

CoC – Chair Henry Forman

CoC's main responsibility is to populate the Senate committees and to respond to the Administration when it requests a Senate representative. Filling committees is a challenge due to the small number of faculty in general and of senior faculty in particular. Overburdening the junior faculty is a concern. The committee tries to strike a balance between retaining the same members to keep their expertise while also having the perspective of new members. Chair Forman pointed out that UC Merced's CoC is unique in that its recommendations are reviewed by Divisional Council.

GRC – Chair Valerie Leppert

GRC fulfills the task of what are normally three committees on other campuses: graduate council, research committee, and Library committee. The GRC chair serves on the corresponding systemwide committee, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) while GRC Vice Chair Patti LiWang serves on the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP). GRC worked with the campus WASC steering committee and the Graduate Dean to formulate a graduate program review policy. GRC also revised existing policies that needed to include WASC requirements such as the CRF policy and the procedures for establishing new graduate programs and emphasis areas. The committee has reviewed 17 CRFs so far, the Psychology Graduate program proposal, and opined on policies at the request of the systemwide Senate and DivCo. In addition, GRC gave out research and teaching awards, selected graduate students for NRT awards, and awarded the GRC research/travel/shared equipment grants.

UGC – Committee member Kathleen Hull (Chair Manuel Martin-Rodriguez left the meeting)

UGC reviewed over 100 courses this year and recently approved the 2009-2010 catalog copy for all the Schools. It reviewed over 60 applications for Regents Scholarships. In addition, it has reviewed the following policies: revised CRF policy (include WASC requirements), Honors programs guidelines, academic probation, dismissal, and minimal progress policy, policies for reviewing substantive changes to existing majors, and an undergraduate program review policy. UGC has also reviewed changes in majors submitted by the Schools and has opined on systemwide review items such as the Education Abroad Business Plan and the WAG Report.

Professor Chris Kello – UCM Representative to UCFW

(UC Merced does not have a Senate committee on Faculty Welfare so Professor Kello represents the campus on the systemwide committee.) UCFW drafted a memo regarding the lack of a clear, transparent procedure from the Administration on how to respond to the budget crisis. Other issues that the committee addressed are the pension fund and the UC pay scale.

There being no further business, committee adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Attest:

Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
DECEMBER 4, 2008

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, December 4, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presided. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. She introduced the Chair of the Academic Council, Mary Croughan.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Martha Conklin

The Senate Chair reported on the following topics:

- The Divisional Council sent a letter to the Academic Council requesting that Merced be considered a budget priority. The Academic Council endorsed DivCo's sentiment and forwarded the letter on to UC President Yudof. The letter detailed the lack of classroom space and the lack of funding for the Science & Engineering II Building (S&EII).
- The Academic Senate also sent a letter to Chancellor Kang indicating the Senate's campus priorities. Among them: focusing resources on core campus development and sustainability issues, and creating a sustainable funding model.
- UCOP released the University of California Accountability Framework Draft Report (9/21/08) in which UC Merced was not portrayed well because the report compared the campuses on a per dollar basis and research for number of students. The Academic Senate requested that metrics be examined on a per capita basis. On a positive note, UC Merced is a standout because it has two Presidential scholars.
- A new Senate/Administration Council has been established and will include the Chairs of certain Senate committees and the equivalent Administrative leaders. The Council will meet monthly and work on issues such as resource allocation and the need for more transparency. The Council is not a problem-solving committee; it will instead ensure that problems are directed to the right people. Faculty is encouraged to contact Chair Conklin with key issues they think need to be addressed.

Chair Conklin ended her comments by thanking all faculty members who serve on Senate committees.

Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang

Campus Accolades

- UC Merced's chapter of the National Society of Black Engineers won a regional competition, defeating teams from Stanford, USC, UCLA, the University of Washington, and Cal Poly Pomona. The team will be advancing to the national competition.

- For the second consecutive year, UC Merced has two winners of the Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE): SSHA Professor Sean Newsam and an awardee to be announced from the School of Natural Sciences. They will receive the award at the White House on December 19, 2008.

Campus Update

- We continue to work on the Long Range Development Plan. The campus footprint is 815 acres. The university community south of the campus will be about 2,000 acres. We are seeking the permit for the northern half which is 833 acres. The reaction of the community at last week's open session was positive and supportive. We are hoping to get the Regents' approval by March. We will then submit final documents for approval by the Army Corps of Engineers for a 404 permit, which is a permit related to navigable waters. We should have the permit by April or May 2009. This will be an important milestone for this campus.

Building Projects

- The child care center will hold 80 children and will be finished by early next year.
- The Social Sciences and Management building is being built near the end of Scholar's Lane and will be completed by February or March 2010.
- We still do not know what the funding source will be for the S&E II building. We are pushing for $75 million plus a $10 million loan so we can have a bigger footprint. OP sent $1.5 million for design preparation. They are withholding sending money until we have full funding.
- Student Housing III Project will begin soon. It will add as many as 340 beds and additional space for student activities.
- We are preparing for additional parking spaces.

Strategic Academic Planning

- We are on the ninth or tenth iteration. Some improvements need to be made, such as emphasizing the international eminence of our faculty research. State support is not enough; we have to engage in private fundraising. OP questions whether we can pay the borrowed money back.
- The current funding model by OP is inadequate. We have to work with them to figure out how OP can properly fund our campus. We must show accountability. Student enrollment will be reaching 5,000 and the supplemental support from the state is running out. Each year for the past three years, the supplemental support was $14 million, this year it is $10 million, next year it will be $5 million and thereafter it will be zero.
- UC Merced is the most diverse campus in the UC system. We need to keep promoting our excellence in this regard. We need to recruit diverse professors as role models for our students. Efforts will be made to recruit an individual to serve a Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Inclusion and Equity.
- We need to work together and continue shared governance.

- We want to continue to strengthen and develop the campus during the state's budget crisis. There is a gap between what is needed and what the state is providing. President Yudof is supportive of UC Merced. We have to have enrollment growth according to our long range enrollment plan, space expansion, more financial support for our students (more than half of them come from poor families or are first generation college students), WASC accreditation, successful completion of the long range development plan, and the 404 permit process. I am working with John Garamendi, Jr. and an outside consultant on a fundraising campaign.

Campus Standouts

- In terms of absolute numbers, the amount of our students participating in the Science and Math Initiative is high.
- We have more than $1 million in support for telemedicine and we are working with UC Davis to benefit the rural area for health care.
- Jorge Aguilar is a national leader in educational partnership programs. He is bringing in millions of dollars per year in federal support.

The Chancellor concluded his remarks by noting that even though we have a lot of challenges, we should celebrate the positive things being done on our campus.

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

Application Pool

- So far, in the freshmen application pool, we have received 8,826 applications. That is slightly down from last year so it is a cause for concern. By contrast, the transfer applications are up - right now there are 1,057 applications. This year, we will graduate our first class which will be a very exciting event. We have to backfill the 450 or so students that graduate this year. In addition, we have to grow by the approximately 700 students that we have in the Plan. The goal for next year is to recruit about 1,050 first year students, 250 transfer students, and 100 graduate students. This is a big increase from last year. The referral pool is expected to be large. The unknown factor this year is the economy. There might be pressure on many of our students to drop out of school to work to support their families. But, it might be a positive for us that students will gravitate towards public education rather than private because we might have a chance at a larger percent of the referral pool than we had in the past.

An Assembly member inquired if there will be more financial aid with the increased number of undergraduates we are bringing in. EVC Alley answered that it will scale as the numbers go up. For the last couple of years, OP has provided our campus some scholarship funding but it is unknown whether the funding will continue at the same level.

WASC Accreditation

- I thank the faculty for its efforts. The campus is now preparing for the Capacity Review and the documents have to be in on July 7. The Review is September 30-October 1, 2009. In the past, it has been about facilities, budget, and faculty. Now, it is about educational effectiveness: WASC wants to see if we have the capacity to deliver the instruction that we say we are going to deliver. We are the first campus that has gone through this. The faculty have shown a good understanding of this process and I am confident we will do well when WASC does its review.

SSHA Dean Search

- We are moving forward on the search for the next Dean of SSHA. A consulting firm has been contracted to assist in the process.

Budget

- Today, the Chancellor is signing a memo informing all units that we are instituting a hiring freeze. We are not sure how long the freeze will be in place. We are also reducing the supplies and expense budget by about 25%. This cut is not for this year - it is in preparation for next year. Next year, we lose the $5 million from the state. That money was to be backfilled by the marginal cost dollars that would come from the state for enrollment growth. There is no clear indication that we will get those dollars. This year, we received $6.3 million as marginal cost dollars from the other UC campuses. We might not get that money again next year, because all the campuses are preparing for significant cuts in the coming academic year. There are about thirty faculty lines out there: fifteen are in the budget already and are safe positions; ten were in the budget for this year; and five that we included in the budget models for next year. We will probably have to take a more detailed look at start-up costs. We may have to spread out any new faculty start-up for more years than we'd planned.

An Assembly member inquired if the campus can reinvest indirect costs into research infrastructure. EVC Alley replied that we have kept almost all the opportunity fund dollars to get a bigger S&E II building. Putting money aside that would allow us to pay the debt service on a loan to increase the size of the building was the most reasonable approach. Chancellor Kang stated that he is interested in investing some discretionary funds and creating a small incentive program where faculty can submit proposals to prepare for bigger proposals.

Academic Council Chair Mary Croughan:

The Council Chair prefaced her remarks by praising Chair Conklin for raising UC Merced's issues at every Academic Council. She then reported on the following topics:

Eligibility Reform

- There is a change in the freshman admission criteria that would take effect for the entering class of 2012 or for the students applying by November 30 of 2011. This was brought about by the fact that the Master Plan says that the UC is supposed to admit the top 12.5% of public high school graduates.

(We actually do not distinguish between public and private high schools when doing our admission process.) We have been around 15% again. The primary barrier for high school students is the SAT II subject test. By removing the subject test, we are eliminating one of the eligibility criteria for admission to the UC.

The Senate proposal is to use a 2.8 unweighted GPA to broaden the pool of students who are visible to the UC. The President's amendment is a 3.0 weighted and capped GPA which is what it is now. The other broadening is to go from 4% of eligible in the local context to 9% eligible in the local context. That significantly advantages students who come from schools who otherwise aren't producing students in the top 12.5% of the state. It makes them visible to the UC. In the end, about 10% of the UC's undergraduates will come through straight metrics of GPA and SAT reasoning test scores and an additional 2.5% of undergraduates will come from the broader pool of students eligible for comprehensive review. The fees that go to admissions are $60 per applicant and a lot of students get a waiver. We have discovered that a lot of that money gets siphoned off instead of going to the Admissions Office so Student Affairs and the Senate is doing an audit.

The Regents will vote on the eligibility reform proposal at their February meeting and next week I will go to the CPEC meeting because we need their permission. I will also spend time with state legislators and their staff. There is a side issue about eligibility reform that has surfaced in the local press. A well-funded fringe group claims that UC is lowering its standards and says that the elimination of the subject test is a disservice to the students of California. They have a lot of incorrect factual information. I am writing op-ed pieces and talking to legislators to counter this group's claims.

An Assembly member asked about comprehensive review. Council Chair replied that shared review has still not been approved between all the campuses. President Yudof has called for an examination of best practices of comprehensive review and we are probably going to do a workshop for all the admissions offices across the UC system. The campuses all have different models so shared review will not work yet.

Budget

- We expect an announcement in January of an additional budget cut. We are expecting it to go back to the $98 million dollar deficit we had in the original Governor's proposed budget a year ago. Basically, it is $200 million below what it takes the run the UC. There was $28 million dollars worth of savings at the OP last year from layoffs and the volunteer separation program and there will be about another 400 layoffs this year. OP will go from 1,800 employees to about 700.

An Assembly member asked Chair Croughan to comment on EVC Alley's discussion on the budget. The Assembly member was concerned that only 60% of our students get enrollment support next year. Chair Croughan responded that UC Merced is funded on a different model than the other UC campuses. President Yudof is requesting full funding of the UC system in the 09-10 budget. There is no proposal to change the funding model of the campuses.

The Assembly member then commented that UC Merced has been guaranteed funding for only 2,000 students next year even though we are aiming to take 3,400. We are not going to be fiscally solvent below 5,000 students. Chair Croughan said that she will check with OP to see how many students UC Merced is actually funded for and will relay that information to Chair Conklin.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of the Draft Minutes for the Division Meetings of December 5, 2007 and May 22, 2008.

B. Acceptance of the Senate Committee Annual Reports for 2007-2008.

C. Proposed Academic Senate Bylaw Changes: Senate Bylaw II.2.A., II.2.B., II.4.B., II.4.C., and Senate Bylaw II.1.A.

ACTION: Consent Calendar Items A and B were approved as presented.
Consent Calendar Item C, Bylaw Changes II.2.A, II.2.B., II.4.B., and II.4.C. were approved as presented. The proposed changes to Senate Bylaw II.1.A. were pulled from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Discussion:

CRE Chair O'Day explained that the proposed change seeks to address the issue of conflict of interest in terms of faculty serving on Senate committees. She said that the CRE looked at other UC campus's Bylaws regarding this issue and proposed the wording based on UC Davis's Bylaws to distinguish when it is appropriate or inappropriate for Senate members to serve on particular committees while they are in an administrative role. The intent is to eliminate a conflict of interest.

An Assembly member commented that CRE did not actually adopt UC Davis's language because theirs says these restrictions do not apply to Chairs of academic departments or programs. It was asserted that the CRE language was stricter than any of the cited campuses. Secondly, the Assembly asserted that true conflict of interest exists except only on personnel matters.

CRE Chair O'Day replied that UC Merced is unique right now because we don't have any academic or administrative chairs or heads. The only formal titles we have used are at the Dean level. It may be that an academic chair would not have a conflict of interest because his or her administrative responsibility is defined in a different way. Right now, it's impossible to state one way or another because we're not using those titles.

The Assembly member then asked if CRE could issue an opinion to that effect, to make it clearer that this isn't a problem for current chairs.

CRE Chair O'Day said that a formal Ruling had been made but, unfortunately, was included in today's Agenda.

ACTION: Senate members will receive all background material associated with the proposed Bylaw change and will be invited to forward their comments to the Divisional Council. Comments will be compiled and then, based on faculty input and additional comments by Divisional Council, the CRE will consider revisions to the proposed Bylaw language for consideration at a future Division meeting.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Committees (COC) – *Professor Henry Forman*

The Committee has done everything it could to get as many faculty included as possible.

There being no further business, committee adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest: Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
December 6, 2007

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, December 6, 2007, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Shawn Kantor presided. Chair Kantor welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Chair Kantor acknowledged the presence of distinguished guests UC President Robert Dynes and system-wide Senate Chair Michael Brown. He thanked Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang and Provost Keith Alley for making themselves available to provide updates on the state of the campus.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- ***Senate Chair Shawn Kantor***

In addition to academic planning and space issues, much of the Council's time has been devoted to the consideration of the Medical School Plan that Dean Maria Pallavicini has put forward. We have submitted to her seven pages of questions and she delivered back three times that much in response. This information will be placed on the Medical School website. The next step is for the Senate to solicit the comments of all Senate members via a survey or vote on whether or not UC Merced should continue to plan for a school of medicine. The Regents will make the ultimate decision on the issue of continuing to plan. However, the item will not be placed on the Regents Agenda without approval from the President's office. It is uncertain whether the President will support continued planning in the absence of a formal Strategic Academic Plan.

- ***Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang***

Section 404 Permit Process. The environmental permit process for the campus continues but has been modified. The original 910 acre footprint has been reduced to 810 acres and moved slightly south. This change is not expected to affect the overall scope or mission of the university. This new approach should allow the process to move along with renewed vision and momentum.

Student Enrollment. Compared to last year, undergraduate student enrollment is much improved. Graduate enrollment has grown to 130 students, ten times the number of our first contingent of graduate students who began in 2004. Faculty participation in the many student-yield events played an important role in both attracting and retaining students.

Child Care Center. Vice Chancellor Mary Miller's group is working diligently on opening a child care center on our campus. The facility is expected to open by January 2009, and will accommodate 50 to 80 children.

Strategic Academic Planning. The SAP process was launched in August. A leadership team identified seven areas of strategic emphasis to guide the university in the disciplined pursuit of its mission: (1) Deep engagement in student success, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; (2) World-class interdisciplinary research and education, with an emphasis on programs that take advantage of UC Merced's unique location and faculty; (3) Excellent educational offerings and outstanding research in core disciplines, both undergraduate and graduate; (4) Cutting-edge professional educational offerings, both undergraduate and graduate; (5) Commitment to supporting a diverse community of students, faculty and staff and to ensuring a high quality of workplace for all constituents; (6) Vital research and education in a global context; and (7) Robust relationship with the region to promote economic development.

On November 30, 2007, a full-day retreat was held and from that discussion three subcommittees were identified: *Subcommittee 1* will provide a vision for the academic organizational structure best enabling UC to achieve its undergraduate, graduate, and professional goals during the next two decades. *Subcommittee 2* will provide a vision of the types of graduate and professional programs that UCM should aspire to build in the next two decades. *Subcommittee 3* will provide a vision of what UCM's undergraduate programs and core disciplines should aspire to become in the next two decades.

The Chancellor acknowledged that the committee's timeline is tight but added that he is confident that the final report will showcase a collective vision to the community, to the President's Office, to the Regents, and other supporters, so that they can all support our programs. The goal is to have the subcommittee reports by the end of March. Following campus-wide consultation we will move on to see what type of metrics should be created and used to monitor our progress. Also, what type of process should be introduced so that we can allocate our precious resources effectively and with transparency. Then, on May 9, 2008, we will come up with a first report for campus-wide distribution and comments. The committee will reflect on those comments and come up with a second draft by the end of June 2008.

The Chancellor stressed the need to continually communicate our goals and he has formulated an acronym for Merced: **M**odel university of the 21st century, **E**ducation, **R**esearch, **C**ommunity engagement and service, **E**conomic development and a green environment, and **D**iversity. He added that, with faculty participation, we will make great progress. He concluded his remarks by mentioning that just this morning President Dynes talked about the possibility of providing additional support.

Questions & Answers

Q About Strategic Planning, my concern is with Subcommittee 2. Will the current graduate groups have input into that process between now and March when the subcommittee does its report? Or how will they get input from all the graduate groups? I'm concerned.
A They will absolutely have input; we will facilitate that. If a committee needs certain information to do a thorough job or if they need to meet with the Deans, graduate groups, and so on, they should do so. At the same time, I read our report to the President's Office on Enrollment Planning document that has a lot of good information. Each School also has a role in the Academic Plan. All this information needs to be matched together.

Q The risk is that the current graduate groups will be underrepresented in the school plan or in the Long-range Enrollment Plan, and that they will lag behind the schools in terms of developing detailed strategic plans.

A If you look at this region's top two priorities they are 1) competitive faculty salaries, and 2) graduate education. We need to put great emphasis and effort into how we can build great graduate programs on our campus.

Q Under the current structure, FTEs go to the school and the number of FTEs is pegged to the number of bodies that we can put in seats in the classroom. So the FTE goes to the school, the school writes their strategic plan, essentially based on their need for undergraduate teaching, and then we have all these graduate groups that have no means to really get any resources to support themselves. I agree that there is an excessive reliance in things such as the written plans of the schools and it is a really bad idea. Graduate groups are relatively powerless entities that really need to be consulted.

A That's why I think it's important that we do have this strategic planning and that's why participation by the full faculty is really important.

- ***Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley***

Student Enrollment. As mentioned earlier by the Chancellor, our enrollment is up. For the fall 2008 semester the number of applicants from first-year students is somewhere around 9000, about a 15% increase over last year at the same time. Transfer student applications are over 1000 compared to 700 last year, a 37% increase.

Part-Time Administrative Positions Filled. The new *Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education* is Professor Christopher Viney. The new *Vice Provost for Academic Personnel* is Professor David Ojcius.

Core 100. As many of you already know, I have suspended resource support to Core 100 for the semester. It was clear that we were going to have a great deal of difficulty delivering it and also delivering the necessary upper division courses for the majors. Each of the Schools is hopefully working on a plan to supplant Core 100, at least for now. Certainly, one of Vice Provost Viney's initial jobs will be to look at the whole core curriculum, the idea of the college system, and how we move forward, and whether we become a campus that has a college system or whether we don't.

Q For the record, making a decision about Core 100 is a curricular decision that is the Senate's responsibility.

A The Senate was consulted. There has been an ongoing dialogue with the Undergraduate Council (UGC). However, due to the timing issue, an interim solution had to be found. UGC will continue to take the lead on this issue.

Space. We are looking at alternative space opportunities and are focusing on three areas: modular buildings, the center of the third floor of the COB, and leasing retail space. The big issue obviously is around laboratory space, and especially around wet laboratory space.

Q How would you see the process for engaging faculty, the graduate groups, and Science and Engineering faculty in distribution of the space?

A First we have to identify the space. This first phase is simply to identify where there is space in the community and how we can use modular units on the campus. Once we get all the data, including costs, we will bring it to CAPRA. Right now we are talking with the Deans.

Q Is there a possibility to get the timeline for building SE2 moved up? It is currently scheduled for 2013 but was originally scheduled for 2012.

Comments: Several comments were made in response to the above question. President Dynes said that UCOP could put this item back on the table and rethink it. Vice Chancellor Miller said that her office has been looking at alternative funding methods and that there other parties are interested in helping our campus grow. These efforts will continue. Another consideration is a bond election. One faculty member suggested that UCOP consider diverting another campus's funds (monies that have been allocated but their use is delayed) to UCM. The President responded that this has happened in the past, although rarely.

- ***Michael Brown, Chair, Academic Council***

Council Chair Brown said that he was in attendance to listen and that that he is personally interested in Merced's success. He especially offered his support to his Merced colleagues "who are at the frontiers of a very new enterprise." He acknowledged that "some of the glow has gone off as you are actually in the throws of making it happen."

He then thanked Chair Kantor and the Merced Division for the invitation to attend today's meeting. He also thanked President Dynes for allowing him, as the Senate Chair, to accompany him on his Promise and Power of 10 campus visits.

IV. DIALOGUE WITH THE PRESIDENT – *Robert C. Dynes*

UC President Dynes explained that in 2004, a Long-Range Guidance Team, comprised of UC Regents, Chancellors, faculty and staff, was asked to explore a fundamental question: What will the University of California need to look like to serve the needs of the people of California 20 years from now? To help think through that question, the group met with experts in demographics and economics; with leaders from business and education; and with public officials. It explored different scenarios for California's long-term future, and in their light considered how the University of California of 2025 would have to adjust.

Dynes said that the vision that emerges is a system that works as one university, propelled by the *promise and power of its ten campuses*. It is based on a future of the university that is cross-disciplinary, nimble, innovative and responsive to the needs of society. This past year the President has been traveling to each UC campus, at the invitation of the Academic Senate, talking about this and listening to each campus's perspective. He then gave examples where this concept has already worked to the advantage of all:

- *California Digital Library*. The University of California libraries work together to expand the scope of their collections, improve access to information, and develop alternative modes of scholarly communication in support the University's teaching and research. Collectively, the more than 100 libraries on the 10 UC campuses make up the largest research/academic library in the world, with over 34 million volumes in their holdings and significant digital collections.

- *Creating Institutes*. **CITRIS** – Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society. Lead campus: UCB, cooperative campuses: UCSC, UCD, and UCM. **Calit2** – California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology. Lead campus: UCSD, cooperative campus: UCI. **CNSI** – California Nanosystems Institute. Lead campus: UCLA, cooperative campus: UCSB. **QB3** – California Institute for Qualitative BioSciences. Lead campus: UCSF, cooperative campuses: UCB and UCSC.

- *Strategic International Alliances*. Gretchen Kalonji, Director of International Strategy Development is working to create new models for international engagement. There are three initiatives in development with China, Mexico, and India. In China, UC already has approximately 130 research projects, primarily in agriculture, health sciences, and engineering. Working with China's Ministry of Education, the ten UC campuses will affiliate with ten Chinese universities to explore new models to integrate research and education. This new alliance has come to be called the 10+10. The China Scholarship Council is re-establishing a program to support doctoral students studying abroad. The Chinese national Commission of UNESCO will also be involved, providing opportunities for UC faculty and students to undertake research projects at UNESCO.

  UC campuses currently have collaborations with several Mexican universities, particularly through UC-MEXUS. Under development with the National Autonomous University of Mexico, new models are being developed. UC Riverside and UC San Diego will likely serve as pilot sites for new programs.

- *Systemwide School of Global Health*. Currently being developed by former UCSF Chancellor Haile T. Debas. Once fully developed, the Divisions will be asked to review and comment.

- *Science and Math Initiative.* Back in 2004, as part of the Governor's Compact with UC and CSU, established as one of its highest priorities the statewide improvement of K-12 science and math instruction. The goal was to improve the supply and quality of science and math teachers in the State of California and thus help better position the State for economic recovery.

Before inviting comments, President Dynes shared the reaction of several other UC campuses to his concept of the promise and power of 10. He said that some campuses have said "Excellent, right on!" other campuses have said "What's in it for me?" It has generated some debate. One thing is certain, the other campuses want the University to be as strong as possible and in the case of Merced, there is strong sentiment that it must be successful.

Questions, Answers and Comments

Comment: I especially appreciate your comment regarding China. I visit China frequently and when you say you are a professor from the University of California, be it Berkeley or Merced, you get a lot of respect.

A You're right, it does mean an awful lot. Interestingly, when I met with the Minister of Education he showed by a stack of paper and said that it was our California Higher Education Master Plan translated into Chinese. The Minister said that they have read it and have identified which of their universities are for research, those that are CSU equivalents and those that are community colleges.

Q Since you're talking about foreign countries, that brings up the subject of how to fund foreign graduate students which has been a hurdle for all the campuses.

A We haven't solved that yet but there are steps on the way. For example, the non-resident fees for foreign students. Fees come from the state and then back to the University. UCOP skims off a teeny tiny bit of that — not much I assure you — and then the funds go back to the campuses. The thing that I've done at this stage, is to flag that money as it goes back to the campus, indicating that this is out-of-state fees and is to be used for graduate education.

Q That works for campuses where they have a population of foreign students and have been paying those fees. But we're on a growth mode where we need capital funds to bring the students here so that we can basically recycle that money.

A I agree. Quite a few years ago the University of California negotiated with the state for funding based on the number of students and not on the basis of what the education costs. There should be a funding rate for graduate students, a funding rate for upper division undergraduates, and there should be a funding rate for lower-division undergraduates.

Q We have a very high fraction of Science and Engineering students here and it is very expensive to educate them. I don't think that we want to be in a situation where we are closing the door for people who want to be an Engineer or a Scientist. Other state universities charge different rates for some majors, are you considering that?

A Perhaps we should think about that. We have really overstayed our welcome on this single number of dollars per student. I felt uneasy when it happened and I didn't know why, but now I know why I was uneasy. We have sort of mortgaged the future. If you look at the ratio of active graduate students to undergraduates it has continued to drop.

Compared to our competition, we are dangerously low in the number of graduate students and we're a research university. Our undergraduates should be leaning the creative process from the graduate students, postdocs and faculty. The incentives are in the wrong place and there has to be change. Insofar as there is a difference in what it costs to educate an engineer compared to a sociology major, we need to recognize that.

Q In light of your recent announcement that you are stepping down as President, is there a search for your successor? Further, what are the qualities that person should possess?

A Yes, an active search has begun. The qualities that I believe are necessary — some of which I think I don't have — is a person who has the ability to bring a group of loose cannons together (The Regents). For whatever reason, I wasn't able to do that. The next UC President needs to command the respect of the entire state.

Q I hope the new president can create advocacy for graduate students and graduate research. Someone to bring to bear the full force of what graduate study and graduate research brings to the state. I've always thought that the OP has missed an opportunity to bring that together with organized labor and industry.

A As Council Chair Brown just noted, we have a new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Steven Beckwith, who will work to provide support to faculty and researchers at our ten campuses and the three UC-managed National Laboratories. He'll also ask a broader question of how do we muster the support of our alumni and industry (financial, hi-tech, biotech, entertainment, agriculture), and how do we deal with labor in a way that isn't always contentious. Another big issue is Sacramento. We have to educate all of them to the value of the University of California as a long-term investment.

Q What are your thoughts about degree programs from independent institutions? I believe they are attracting some of our students, particularly the transfer students. I fear that industry will start to recognize these program degrees and that will ultimately have an impact on the UC system.

A I hope you're not right. The number of applicants to the University of California keeps going up, and so it's not an immediate issue. People still continue to be proud of being a graduate of the University of California. Your question stimulates a lot of different thoughts. Degree inflation just happens and we will hopefully never become a degree-for-hire institution. But there are a lot of them, and hopefully society looks to see where that person was educated. I don't believe we should compromise what we do. The research university is the place to teach how to be creative. It's what we do and it's what we do best.

Q In terms of justifying state funding, we must articulate the true value of a University education versus that kind of experience (via technology, private communications, web-based, easy access, etc.).

A Yes, that's part of it but not all of it. Young people that come from environments and families where's there's no experience with research universities may not know what we are saying when we say "this is a really creative environment." We have to do better of communicating our message.

Q It seems that this is the place where industry could also help us out. They can help make the point of the value of a UC degree when students hear that this or that company favors candidates with a research university degree.

Q I want to go back to the "one university" discussion. That's very powerful with the amount of students that we have, the number of outstanding faculty that we have. It works for us in terms of the library, in terms for research, in terms of reputation. In my role as Vice Chancellor for Administration it doesn't seem to work very effectively. Administrators at UCOP and at the other campuses are very helpful when it comes to advice, when data is needed. But I don't see it with regard to funding, I can't see where there's any benefit to UCM being part of this wonderful single university when it comes to funding. Some campuses are taking in more money than they are spending and are seeking ways to invest their balances . . . we do not have balances to invest. So the rich get richer and we continue to struggle. Is there not any way that we can benefit as a single university by sharing some of those resources?

A Let me give you one or two examples and finish by saying we're still learning. We have learned that by putting our debt together we have a higher debt ratio which allows us to borrow more. The ultimate fiduciary responsibility rests with the University of California.

Q Yes, but we (Merced) still have to pay it back.

A Yes indeed, but you don't have to pay quite as much. All right so there's one benefit. So we are learning. Let me go to student issues because that's where we really should be working hard. It struck me as odd that we don't have a better communication system with our student applicants. At the same time a student receives a letter from Berkeley saying "sorry you have not been accepted" they should receive a letter from Merced saying "congratulations." We are working on this.

There's a third example. We have five UC Medical Centers and we now negotiate as a system. This is very powerful.

III. SPECIAL ORDERS – CONSENT CALENDAR

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar and received the annual reports as information as noticed.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation – *Professor Evan Heit***

In addition to a wider strategic academic planning process that we're doing, there's also a yearly process where the school's graduate groups and institutes put together their plans. I think we're getting good at that process now. We have more data and we have more experience. Perhaps the wider planning will lead CAPRA to changes next year. We have posted CAPRA's *Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Schools' 1-year Academic Resource Plans and School and Graduate Group 5-year Strategic Plans* on the Senate website (http://senate.ucmerced.edu). We've tried to make these as clear as possible and I encourage everyone with questions about this process to look at the Senate website. To focus on the positive, when I say that we've all been improving in planning, to be specific one way is in terms of prioritization. I think the school's priorities have been clearer every year and I am confident that trend is going to continue. The other improvement is better consistency. Consistency is very important because the graduate groups don't get to request their own faculty lines. That the school's plans are now consistent with what the graduate groups need, there has to be a meeting between research and teaching in this planning process. Likewise, from one school to another, it is very important that the schools talk to each other.

- **Committee on Academic Personnel – *Professor David Ojcius***

Because of my recent administrative appointment I will be resigning from CAP where I have been Chair for almost three years. CAP observations include:

- Personnel cases, compared to previous years, are being prepared more consistently.
- There have been fewer problems with the cases we've been reviewing.
- We had many administrative comments that were sent back to the schools regarding preparation of certain cases. Last year's Administrative Comments have been incorporated into the CAP 2006-2007 Annual Report which is available at the Senate's website. The number of administrative comments has decreased.
- We continue to rely strongly on our external CAP members. We have greatly benefited from their help but will begin to replace them with Merced members over time.

- **Committee on Committees – *Professor Michael Colvin***

As I look around the room I don't think there is a single person here that I haven't contacted in my past year and a half as CoC Chair. So I thank all of you have already said yes and I ask your help in broadening the engagement of your fellow faculty in these important Senate committees. On the one hand there is some criticism that we are becoming a benign oligarchy where we have the same people in the same roles or more or less the same roles, trying their best in the best of cases, but not getting a lot of engagement from other people.

- **Graduate and Research Council – *Professor Anne Kelley***

We all need to be thinking carefully about new graduate programs. We currently have one graduate program, the Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP) that was granted by the system-wide committee which deals with graduate affairs: the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA).

This initial approval allowed Merced to get Ph.D. programs off the ground without having enough faculty to have graduate programs. This approval has since expired but was recently extended on a one-year-at-a-time basis.

Undergraduate Programs can be established at the campus level. If we want to institute a new major in X we can do it ourselves, we don't need system-wide approval. That's not the case for graduate programs. We just got the Environmental Systems graduate program fully approved as a stand alone program that can grant graduate degrees. We still have eight IIGP graduate groups which are acting like graduate programs and developing their own curriculum. CCGA really would like to see us bringing these to maturity and applying for full graduate group status. Therefore, as one of my main roles as GRC Chair, I will encourage some of these groups that look like they might be close to being ready to go, to actually getting it done. It is a lot of work

My sense from talking to CCGA is that they are really supportive of us, they really want us to get our own graduate programs off the ground. They are really going to try to give us the benefit of the doubt to the extent that they possibly can. So, take that information back to your graduate groups and try to get things done.

- **Undergraduate Council – *Professor Peggy O'Day***

UGC has been busy in a couple of different fronts. We are working to clarify the procedure and policies for both course and program approval. In addition to efficiency, streamlining the process will allow for consistency and uniformity at the university level in terms of programs and courses. We've been working with our new Registrar, Kevin Browne, and I hope that the faculty can bear with us a little bit longer as we try to continue this process and, hopefully, we will launch an electronic system later this year. Streamlining the process will allow the faculty to focus on the important academic aspects.

A second area that UGC has been starting to work on is admissions. We've been working with Admissions Director Encarnacion "Chon" Ruiz and the Registrar on strategies for improving not only our applicants but our yield. Faculty will be invited to participate in a number of recruitment activities, hopefully in a strategic way. We also want to bring our graduate students to the undergraduate recruitment process.

Thirdly, mentioned earlier, UGC is working on the issue of general education and College One. Now that we have our new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education that will be a top priority. We will also bring more faculty into this discussion to clarify how we want to deliver our education.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. Members were reminded of the Chancellor's reception immediately following the meeting in honor of President Dynes.

Attest: Shawn Kantor, Chair

Minutes prepared by: Nancy Clarke, Senate Director

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
March 21, 2007
3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the Merced Division met on Thursday, March 21, 2007 in Room 232 of the Library, Senate Chair Shawn Kantor presided. Chair Kantor welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Chair Kantor acknowledge the presence of system-wide Senate Chair John Oakley, Professor of Law at UC Davis, and thanked Chancellor Kang, with three weeks on the job, for providing an update on the state of the campus.

II. COMMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR

- **Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang**

Chancellor Kang reported briefly on the recent death [from an accidental fall] of freshman student Hector Hugh Barrera-Barraza (18). Hector's family was very touched by the campus outpouring of support. More than 600 UC Merced students and faculty members attended the recent memorial ceremony.

On March 16th staff from the Army Corps of Engineers were here as part of the ongoing 404 Permit process. They visited various campus sites and also met with Congressman Dennis Cardoza (18th Congressional District of California), and UC President Robert Dynes. We believe that the visit went well.

Also on March 16th, President Dynes and Congressman Cardoza joined many faculty and staff at the reception honoring acting-Chancellor Park and his wife Kathy for their contributions to UC Merced. My wife and I were also warmly welcomed.

For the next 100 days Vice Chancellor University Relations John Garamendi and his team have arranged for me to meet with community leaders, educators, parents and students. We are scheduled to start in Merced. In parallel, internally I would like the opportunity to visit the individual schools and meet with the faculty. I want to learn more about your research programs and the challenges and difficulties you face.

The rescheduled WASC visit will take place April 4-6. They are in receipt of our supplement report to the Educational Effectiveness Review and we trust that this meeting will go well. As you know accreditation is very important for many reasons but especially for our students transferring to other accredited institutions.

You have received a letter, signed by myself and Provost Alley, regarding our decision to go forward in favor of the Redirect Program. While this program presents various challenges we are hopeful that many good students may choose to stay at Merced in appreciation of our education.

A brief question and answer period followed.

Q With regard to enrollment concerns, have you given any thought to what else can be done?

A Yes. Outreach is very important. The reputation of our academic program is also very important. Having individual faculty websites would be helpful. [This comment resulted in laughter and comments from several faculty indicating that they have been trying to do this for years.] One thought is to work with the School of Engineering and to consider having a class project in an Engineering course to develop websites. With current staffing limitations we have to find creative ways to solve some of our problems.

Q Are we considering enrollment strategies within the rules of the UC system? Specifically, ways to capture those students who may be getting early admissions from other universities?

A I will look into this but I do encourage all faculty to participate in yield activities. Although administrators and staff contact the students, it is contact with the faculty that is most important.

Q What is the status of the Dean search for SSHA?

A I am most grateful to Dean Hans Bjornsson for his leadership. Although the exact timing is not yet known, there will be a search for a new dean.

In closing, the Chancellor indicated that he was very excited and enthusiastic to be working with the faculty. Noting that his door would always be open, he invited the faculty to visit him.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **Shawn Kantor**

Chair Kantor commented briefly on the Chancellor's and Provost's letter and their decision for Merced to participate in the Shared Experience Program. The Senate's input in this process has been significant. For several months Merced's Undergraduate Council (UGC) was engaged in a dialog with Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Jane Lawrence as well as UCOP's Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur regarding the *Proposal for the UC Merced "Shared Experience" Pilot Program Redirecting UC Freshman Applicants to UC Merced for the Lower Division.* UGC's *Summary of Discussions on Dual Admissions/Redirect Pilot Program* was forwarded to the Division Council, and then to the School Faculties to weigh in on this issue. The School responses noted an overall approval rate of 61%, although accompanying comments indicated support was less than enthusiastic. In the end, the potential to bring needed resources to the campus outweighed the concerns. The Senate will monitor this program.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- **Minutes of the November 2, 2006, Meeting of the Division**

ACTION: The Minutes of the November 2, 2006 Meeting of the Division were approved as noticed.

- **Proposed Modification of Senate Bylaws:**

A. Change "days of instruction" to "calendar days" Part I.5.A and B; Part II.3.C.3, C.4, and C.51.
B. Committee on Academic Personnel, Part II.3.B. (1) change effective start date for CAP members, (2) set the normal service period for CAP members at 3 years, (3) as needed, CAP members may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
C. Expand Guidelines for Senate Student Representatives, Part II.2.C.b. 2 through 5.

ACTION: Proposed modifications to Merced Senate Bylaws approved as noticed.

- **Proposed Modification of Senate Regulations:**

A. Regulation 50 – Add S/U to Grading System
B. Regulation 65 – Amend Language
C. Regulation 75 – New Policy: Honors at Graduation

ACTION: Members approved the proposed modifications to Merced Senate Regulations, with correction of a minor typographical error (of to or) in 50.F.

V. SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Committee on Committees, Mike Colvin**

Professor Colvin invited faculty to take an active role in shaping our new campus via participation on a Senate committee. Faculty is encouraged to contact CoC Chair Colvin, or other Senate Chairs, if they have an interest in being on a particular Senate committee.

- **Graduate and Research Council, David Kelley**

The **Environmental Systems Proposal** has gone forward to the system-wide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) where it will be assigned reviewers. The **Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics Proposal** has been placed on the CCGA Consent Calendar.

The Senate is currently reviewing the establishment of the **Sierra Nevada Research Institute** as an ORU (Organized Research Unit). GRC has named a subcommittee, Professors Meyer, Hansford and Noelle, to oversee the process which includes external review.

Under the Interim-Individual Graduate Program umbrella, CCGA approved the **Biological Engineering and Small-scale Technologies** (BEST) program in 2003. Continuation of the program was recently approved.

GRC has a small pot of money that we will distribute. A request for proposals has already gone out.

The committee has also been active in the review and approval of numerous graduate Course Requests, and review of the *Graduate Advisor's Handbook*.

- **Undergraduate Council, Evan Heit**

The larger committee is served by three subcommittees: Admissions, Courses, and Policy. So far this year the Admissions Subcommittee (Peggy O'Day, Carlos Coimbra, Robert Ochsner) reviewed various admissions policies, Regents scholarships, and analyzed the dual admission (Shared Experience) proposal. The Courses subcommittee (Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Gerardo Diaz, Marcos Garcia-Ojeda) were responsible for the review of more than 300 Course Request Forms. The Policy subcommittee (Anne Kelley, Carlos Coimbra, Kara McCloskey, Katie Winder) prepared policies on double majors, minors, course repetition, honors at graduation, and out-of-class exams.

Other UGC business included the approval of the following majors: Economics, History, Literatures and Cultures, Political Science. Approved minors: Anthropology, Management, Natural Sciences Education, Political Science, and Sociology. UGC also reviewed the minimum class size policy and offered substantive comments on the role of the UC Merced website in undergraduate admissions.

Future issues include general admissions strategies, delivery of general education, Honors programs, and student retention.

- **Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Roger Bales**

Professor Bales explained that CAPRA is the Senate committee that advises the Chancellor on policy regarding academic and physical planning, budget and resource allocation, both annual and long range. CAPRA meets regularly with the EVC/Provost. Recent discussion items included space, UCM financing model, 2007-2008 faculty hires, strategic plans, making recommendations on undergraduate majors, graduate groups and sub-groups, and developing Institutes at UCM.

With regard to **UCM's financing model**, Professor Bales distributed a document that he prepared and presented to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). In the two-page document Bales highlighted the high fraction of temporary or one-time funds in the current budget; the flawed undergraduate enrollment-based-funding model; the lack

of infrastructure and the low fraction of full professors that jeopardizes investments made to date and the careers of the non-tenured faculty; the need to open too many majors with too few faculty; and the under-investment in UCM by the State.

At UCPB's request, a follow-up document detailing budget needs was prepared by Bales and Senate Chair Kantor and indicated an estimated structural deficit of approximately $30M. UCPB acknowledged that the small base funding from the legislature is not enough and apparently expressed concern about UC Merced succeeding. Bales said that this issue will be forwarded to the system-wide Academic Senate.

Long-range Strategic Planning. Provost Alley came to the Council asking for faculty input into the long-range planning of the campus and the need to grow the university strategically. The Council passed this item on to CAPRA. CAPRA first sought the input of the various Graduate Chairs. A preliminary report was passed back to the Council and it was hoped that it would then be passed back to Provost. Our original intent was that the Provost would forward the document to the general faculty for comments.

Chair Kantor interjected that the faculty were appropriately critical of the information gathering process and that they raised questions as to the purpose and how the results would be used. CAPRA was sent into this quagmire without any marching orders, policy or procedures, or how to ultimately formulate a Strategic Plan. After discussions with the Provost it was decided to hold off for now and to approach the process at a later date. When this item comes forward again the appropriate policies and procedures will be in place and faculty will be informed as to the process.

Questions and Answers

Q A chill went through my spine when I read the comment that this campus may not succeed. Do I need to look elsewhere?

A Chair Kantor asked to respond to the faculty member's concern. He indicated that this is basically a conversation about shared governance. With the previous administration the Senate had no input. The current Provost reformulated the campus Budget Committee and, for the first time, we were able to see budget numbers. Prior to this we have not been made aware of the situation. So that's why you are seeing it in such stark perspective now. Now, how we overcome these challenges is the question.

A Professor Bales commented that as a research university there is opportunity for most or all faculty to be individually successful.

VI. ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR

- **John Oakley**

Academic Council Chair Oakley addressed the faculty and stressed that this is a critical time for the life of this campus and the UC. He said that part of how UC has evolved to date, sort of "on the fly," is also a part of its success story. But you can't build a great research university that way. You have to invest money up front. He added that there was no invisible hand that will give the campus what it needs.

Putting the campus financial situation in historical terms, Oakley acknowledged that things were pretty grim but that the campus could still "win the war." "You have a new leader, Chancellor Kang, who will, with your support, lobby hard so that he can borrow from other sources. No one from UC is enhanced if UC Merced struggles or fails. But all of UC succeeds if UC Merced succeeds." He added that the campus cannot succeed with the current enrollment growth model.

The Senate's pivotal governance role within the UC will come into play. He added that the Senate is not just a guild but has important responsibilities assigned to it by the Regents. He added that it is important that the campus act in an aggregated not a disaggregated way to figure out what the campus priorities are and to empower Chancellor Kang to go after the means to support those priorities. Oakley acknowledged that Chancellor Kang has not been dealt a winning hand but added that there was still time to reshuffle that hand.

Oakley then urged the campus to realize that the best strategy is to appeal to the common good. He encouraged the faculty to unite in a collegial way. Faculty should put aside personal priorities and develop institutional priorities, which will lead to the campus' success.

Questions and Answers

Q Your call for unity – where does that come from?

A When I first made it my business to get involved with Merced was during the search committee process for your new Chancellor. The campus that I got to know a year ago was one that I understood to have some factions within it that were destructive to its welfare. I have no reason to think that this has gotten worse as opposed to getting better. I didn't mean to make any veiled references. With new leadership and new faculty, things should get better. Let's face it, you are all overstretched. You are on multiple committees and turf wars could easily develop. There is some evidence that there was some division among the faculty in the recent past and it would be unfortunate if those crevices were to continue or deepen.

Q Some people on the Regents may favor a *liaise fare* capitalist approach but there must also be some that understand capitalization.

A Yes, but they may be the same people. Oakley provided a brief overview of the issues being considered by the Regents which include student fees, salaries, strategic long-term financial planning and the management structure at UCOP. The Senate has been very active, and will continue to be active in these decisions.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- **TALX**

Chair Kantor explained that this item came to the Academic Council's attention by way of a UC Davis Divisional Resolution regarding W2 data that was transmitted to TALX Corporation. The UC Davis faculty considered this a violation of privacy and objected to the requirement to "opt out." The W2s of all faculty and staff (on all the UC campuses) who did not take the time to "opt out" were automatically enrolled. The Davis Resolution called for "*all* [TALX] *files to be expunged immediately and any subsequent request be on an opt-in basis only, after appropriate Senate consultation*." This item has since been reviewed by UCOP and there are assurances that in the future faculty will have to "opt in."

- **Regents' RE-89**

Noting that it was past adjournment, Chair Kantor briefly explained that a formal vote on accepting or rejecting the Regents' policy restricting University acceptance of funding from the tobacco industry will take place in May. Distributed at this meeting and posted on the Senate website (https://senate.ucmerced.edu) are documents that fully explain this item. With the strong support of the Divisional Council, Professor Arnold Kim (Merced's representative to the Assembly) and I stand firm on the side of academic freedom and will vote against the Regents' proposal. That being said, Professor Kim and I welcome a deeper discussion and will make ourselves available to meet with faculty either individually or in groups. A campus response has been requested by the Academic Council by April 13th so between now and then we have an opportunity to engage in a dialogue.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Attest: Shawn Kantor, Chair

Minutes prepared by Nancy Clarke, Senate Director

MINUTES OF MEETING
November 2, 2006
3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the Merced Division met on Thursday, November 2, 2006, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Chair Shawn Kantor presided. Chair Kantor welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the May 4, 2006, Meeting of the Division.
ACTION: Approved as written.

B. Modification of Senate Regulation 65.B Minimum Progress-Quantitative Standards.
ACTION: Approved as presented.

65.B. Minimum Progress-Quantitative Standards

An undergraduate student is subject to probation if he or she does not complete a minimum of 12 UC units, if he or she attends only one semester in an academic year, or 24 UC cumulative units for two semesters in an academic year (minimum progress is not calculated in the summer, although course work taken in summer can allow a student to catch up or get ahead of the minimum progress requirements). All deficient academic units must be made up on the next consecutive academic year in addition to the minimum 24 units required in that academic year. If the student meets the next applicable minimum progress requirement for quantitative standards, the student will return to good standing. If a student has not returned to good standing for quantitative standards in the next consecutive academic year, the student will be subject to disqualification.

Minimum progress requirements do not apply to students who have a dean's approval to carry less than the minimum progress load because of medical disability, employment, a serious personal problem, a recent death in the immediate family, the primary responsibility for the care of a family or a serious accident involving the student.

C. Annual Reports (2005-06)
ACTION: The Assembly received the 2005-2006 Annual Reports of the Standing Committees of the Academic Senate.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY INTERIM-CHANCELLOR RODERIC PARK

Chancellor Search. Interim-Chancellor Park assured the Senate that UCOP is performing its due diligence in finding a new chancellor for Merced. He indicated that the field has been narrowed to three final candidates and that it is likely that Merced will have a new chancellor by March.

Promise and Power of 10. UC President Dynes and Regent Chair Blum will be visiting Merced in the spring. They will be visiting each of the UC campuses to talk about "the promise and power of 10." UCOP's Long Range Guidance Team (LRGT) has identified this as "a primary theme that will influence and guide the University's aspirations to be the world's greatest research university in 2025." The LRGT deliberations concluded that the key to UC's continued success is finding ways to create a less redundant and more efficient infrastructure that will allow local (and cross-campus) academic programs to flourish despite the considerable financial and political challenges facing the University.

In anticipation of their visit, Chancellor Park forwarded a letter to Senior Vice President Darling and Provost and Senior Vice President Hume in which he suggested that President Dynes, during his visit to Merced, may wish to reemphasize certain points he has made previously that are less relevant to more mature campuses.

In his letter Chancellor Park noted former-Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey's successes in bringing awareness to the San Joaquin Valley the importance of a UC campus in preparing and training high school graduates for roles which will benefit this area both economically and intellectually. Additionally, she initiated many programs which encourage and directly benefit the K-12 programs of the Valley in preparing both teachers and students to take advantage of the opportunities offered by higher education. There are now 29 grant supported staff working under the direction of Jorge Aguilar implementing these programs at the Fresno Center.

Chancellor Park went on to say that the citizens of this area in large part have not yet internalized the differences between a research university and the 2 and 4 year colleges and the benefits that a research university brings to areas such as the San Joaquin Valley. The additional intellectual capital provided by our faculty and graduates will soon attract well-paying industries that complement the great strengths in agriculture for which this valley is renowned.

He concluded the letter by reemphasizing that the UC Merced research benefit, beyond the preparation and teaching of undergraduates, will serve two purposes: (1) it will educate this area on the broader role of a research university and (2) will help build the morale of our faculty and graduate students who so far have seen much of the media emphasis here on our role in teaching undergraduates.

Wetlands/Clean Water Act 404 Permit. The permitting process seems to be back on track. UC Merced representatives have met with the new Project Manager and are expecting to receive the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the end of January or early February. Then the EIS will go out for public comment for a period of 60 days. Next will be a period of negotiations and possibly compromise. It is unlikely that we will be able to avoid a new EIS. This process will take approximately another year.

Campus Art Committee. The chair of the Senate's Committee on Committees, Michael Colvin, has been contacted about nominating members to a Campus Art Committee. At some point soon UC Merced will need a committee, which should include faculty, to review donated art.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE EVC AND PROVOST KEITH ALLEY

WASC. The WASC visit scheduled for the end of October has been rescheduled until some time in early April. Although the WASC team found many positive elements in the UC Merced Educational Effectiveness Review, a supplemental report that more fully addresses the four WASC Standards has been requested.

[Standard I: Defining institutional purposes and ensuring educational objectives. Standard II: Achieving educational objectives through core functions. Standard III. Developing and applying resources and organizational structures to ensure sustainability. Standard IV. Creating an organization committed to learning and improvement.]

Absent accreditation, some of our students have experienced difficulty in transferring to other accredited institutions. The professional schools in question have been personally contacted resulting in a positive outcome in each instance. WASC and UCOP have been helpful in working with the Department of Homeland Security concerning problems with some of our international students.

UCOP has hired a consultant to help UC Merced with the accreditation process and that person will join us on January 10, 2007.

Summer Session. Provost Alley said that he will present a proposal next year for ladder rank faculty who teach one summer school course to receive 1/9th of their existing salary, if they teach two summer school courses they will receive 2/9^{ths}. Last year we made about $20,000 on our summer session.

Q Would it be possible for a ladder rank faculty member to teach during the summer in exchange for teaching in the fall or spring?

A Yes, if we can work that out in the policies. Current work load policies do not take that into consideration.

Recruitment Projections. Provost Alley presented a series of overheads showing next year's recruitment projections. Because we have not met our enrollment goals, justifying greater expenditures on faculty lines is difficult. For this year we want to recruit to a total of 109 faculty, hopefully to 124 by the next year.

Redirect Program. A plan has emerged from UCOP that would permit students who are not accepted at other UC campuses to be admitted to UC Merced for their first two years of instruction with guaranteed transfer to the campus of their choice. This group would likely consist of academically well-prepared. UCOP data indicates that the ethnicity of this group will be predominantly Asian and Caucasian.

Q We are doing a good job at attracting and retaining underrepresented students. Is UCOP aware of that?

A Yes they are. In fact if we can prove that we are making "reasonable progress" in our efforts to get accredited we will qualify as a Hispanic-Serving Institution with the Title V Program. This could translate into an additional $1M in financial aid. [A Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) is defined as a non-profit institution that has at least 25% Hispanic full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, and of the Hispanic student enrollment at least 50% are low income.]

Q Will we be able to contact prospective students earlier than last year?

A Yes, we will be able to contact students some time in January. Then in early February we will be able to contact the eligible freshmen applicants. That's about a month earlier than last year.

Q OP is essentially telling us, with the Redirect idea, that we are going to be preparing students the "real UC." Is there a commitment to this campus or not?

A Provost Alley -- I can't even answer that question. Plain talk: they will have egg on their face if we don't succeed.

A Professor Peggy O'Day -- From my perspective as a representative to the systemwide BOARS, neither OP nor the campuses want us to fail. The other side of that coin is that we have to get students here. We are getting the applicants but we are not getting them to enroll. It is incumbent upon us to do all we can to get the students to come here.

Q The students are not as naïve as we think. They see something that isn't functional.

A Remember that 80% of the students came back so we are doing something right! And look at the campus this year compared to last. It's much improved.

Q I am opposed to UC Merced acting as a feeder school.
A This Redirect proposal is just in the talking stages. There has been no decision to go ahead. Remember that students who are just barely getting into UCB have other options than UCM.

Space Issues. Provost Alley acknowledged the hard work and significant amount of time that went into the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Campus Space Committee. He and Vice Chancellor of Administration Mary Miller have been studying the current academic plan for the campus and the associated space needs.

Q Classroom availability is also an issue. We have a big gap between the 30 student class size and 180 student class size. As the freshmen become juniors we will have difficulty finding adequate teaching space.
Q Science and Engineering II has been delayed several times and now it appears that it will be delayed until 2013.
A Part of the problem is that UCOP factors in the space at Mondo and Castle.

Q Is it possible to make UCOP understand that the space in Mondo and to some extent the space at Castle just isn't useable?
A The bottom line is enrollment numbers.

Q At some point we will have to consider what administrative functions that do not require regular or continuous interaction with faculty or students can be moved off-campus..
A Agreed. When the Space Committee was putting together that report they didn't have the administrative needs or priorities and that is being looked at now. Clearly everyone wants to be here on campus. We are going to have to make some hard choices.

Q It would be good if the faculty were involved in that process.
A Agreed. It is my intent to follow the suggestions that were in the Space Committee Report and I promise you I will do that.

Q Are there funds for temporary buildings?
A That is something that we are looking at.

Q SEI is filling up. Where are we going to put new faculty and students? A year and a half down the road there will be no space. It should be a high administrative priority to figure out where we are going to put these people.
A We made cogent comments regarding SEII and they were rejected.

Q When we get to the 5,000 student number, we will still be one building short. If we turn to modulars, is there enough footprint in order to have active construction? Parking would also be a big problem.

A Perhaps another footprint will be necessary. Eventually we may need a more vertical nature to the campus.

V. REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES

Due to time constraints brief reports were provided by several of the Standing Committee chairs:

A. Committee on Committees – Chair Michael Colvin

The Senate is looking for members to serve on a variety of committees. If you have not been contacted personally but would like to serve please contact me or the Senate Director.

B. Graduate and Research Council – Chair David Kelley

GRC will be sending out a call for proposals shortly. Junior faculty are especially encouraged to apply.

C. Undergraduate Council – Vice Chair Peggy O'Day

In addition to the UGC's efforts to increase enrollment, the committee is fully functioning and ready to receive proposals for new courses and majors.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Attest: Shawn Kantor, Chair

Minutes prepared by: Nancy Clarke, Senate Director

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 4, 2006
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the Merced Division met on Thursday, May 4, 2006 in the Redwood Room at Castle. Academic Senate Chair Roland Winston presided. Chair Winston welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR

- **Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, Chancellor**

The Chancellor thanked the faculty for all their hard work this year. In recent meetings with the students, the Chancellor said that it was clear that they, too, were appreciative of the faculty. She noted a significant milestone for UC Merced with a total of one-hundred active grants.

Search for a new Chancellor. The search committee is almost set to select a new Chancellor for UC Merced. The committee will be headed by a professional search group and consist of five faculty members (three from the Merced campus and two selected by the Systemwide Academic Council); Regents; staff, alumni and foundation representatives; an undergraduate and graduate student; and community members.

Enrollment Issues. The current SIR (Student Intent to Register) data is a very significant cause of concern. There is a strong likelihood that we will yield approximately 400 less students than last year. Falling short by 400 translates into significant budget implications. If it weren't for the budget implications, there is something to be said for growing the campus more slowly. The Chancellor attributed the low numbers to three main reasons: lack of guaranteed freshman housing, few existing majors and the range of majors, and a need for more financial aid. She reminded members that these numbers are preliminary at this point and that additional students may come via the referral pool (May 14, 2006 deadline) and from transfer students (June 1, 2006 deadline).

Questions, Answers, and Comments

Question: Are there plans at the Office of the President to deal with the budgetary consequences of slower growth?
Response: We have to renegotiate the budget with the Office of the President. Of course budgetary consequences will also need to be renegotiated. Unlike all other campuses, UC Merced's state budget is a line item in the Governor's budget and will continue to be such until 2010. This should be drawn out several years past 2010.

Comment: You've mentioned quite a bit about the status of undergraduate enrollment, please comment on the graduate students. Several of the faculty consider the numbers to be low. We simply don't have enough time, money or scholarship to bring them here.

Response: I don't interpret the situation as negatively as you. In fact I believe that it looks very good with thirty-seven graduate students coming – this represents a 100% increase and is pretty remarkable for a faculty of this size. We are working hard to get international students here. And of course the financial implication of international students is very important to us. As we attend graduate student fairs we get a lot of positive feed-back and this year received two-hundred plus completed applications.
Comment: If we are not able to hire faculty at the rate we planned we won't be able to establish a credible graduate program. What prevents us from getting graduate students in a particular field is the lack of a viable research program.
Comment: More specifically, will the lower enrollment impact the previously projected number of FTE for faculty hires next year?
Response: We have carryover on searches we didn't complete last year or this year. But yes, the lower enrollment will affect the number of faculty we will be able to hire. Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost Ashley reported on the number of hires currently under review, open, and carried over from last year. Although too early to give specific numbers, he agreed that the lower enrollment will result in a reduced number of faculty hires.

III. IN APPRECIATION

On behalf of a grateful Academic Senate, Chair Winston presented Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey with a token of its appreciation. It is the Senate's hope that the framed photographs will serve as a fond remembrance of the campus she has helped build. He commented that as the curtain closes on a brilliant stage of Carol's career the adage "always leave them wanting more" is certainly apropos.

IV. SPECIAL ORDERS – CONSENT CALENDAR

Minutes of the November 21, 2005, Meeting of the Division
Modification of Bylaw, Part I, 3.A and 3.B
Modification of Bylaw, Part I, 4.A.2
Modification of Bylaw, Part III, 1.A
Modification of Bylaw, Part III, 2.B.2

ACTION: Hearing no objection, the Consent Calendar was approved as noticed.

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL

- **Shawn Kantor, Chair**

REPORT: Referring to the table provided with the Notice of Meeting, Chair Kantor indicated that two rounds of faculty awards have been funded and a third group is currently being reviewed. A fourth proposal for Shared Equipment Grants will be sent to the faculty next month.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESEARCH ALLOCATION

- **Roger Bales, Chair**

REPORT: One of CAPRA's main activities has been to provide input to the Strategic Plan process and then to review the Plans of the Schools, Institutes, and Graduate Groups. CAPRA is nearing completion of its review and formulating its recommendations. He thanked everyone for their hard work in producing the documents.

CAPRA will make recommendations on faculty hiring, space planning, the budget, graduate education, as well as undergraduate majors, and Institutes. Chair Bales offered preliminary comments on the following topics:
Faculty Hiring. CAPRA is concerned about the balance between non-tenured and tenured faculty and will recommend that a greater number of senior faculty be hired in the next round of faculty hires. He added that the Schools should have some flexibility in the hiring level.
Space Planning. CAPRA has gone on record both this year and last articulating a lack of confidence in the current process to plan for and provide adequate space for research at UCM. There is some hope, however, that the current ad hoc Campus Space Committee will help reverse this. CAPRA eagerly awaits the committee's report.
Budget. CAPRA will recommend increased faculty participation in the process.
Graduate Student Support. UC Merced needs a more aggressive model for out-of-state fee waivers than the other UC campuses.

Comment: Parliamentarian David Kelley commented that the Senate's Memorial to the Regents requesting ***"that the Regents of the University of California structure and advocate a budget for the University that eliminates non-resident tuition for academic graduate students"*** has been approved by UC Merced and goes forward, with the results from the other UC campuses, to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for consideration next week. If approved by the Assembly, the Memorial will be forwarded to President Dynes with a request that it be presented to The Regents.

Comment: Dean Pallavicini inquired about the status of two Natural Sciences proposals, the *Biomedical and Systems Biology Research Institute* and the *UC Merced Health Sciences and Medical Education* proposal. Feedback from the Senate would be useful.
Response: CAPRA has reviewed both proposals and is strongly supportive of the Biomedical and Systems Biology Research Institute proposal. The Dean will be invited to make a presentation to CAPRA. CAPRA's recommendation will be forwarded to the Division Council.

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

- **Mike Colvin, Chair**

REPORT: UGC's Subcommittee on Courses has forwarded nearly 200 Course Request Forms for approval. The committee has also dealt with appeals from students, approving new minors and new emphasis tracks. For new majors approved last year we dealt with the new course descriptions, Catalog copy, and the like. We also dealt with several policy issues. An electronic offset of UGC's Minutes and Agenda is available.

Question: Proposals for new majors come from the School. Is there something that UGC can do to smooth that process?
Response: Having approved several majors now UGC and the Schools have a sense of what works. I do have a Frequently Asked Questions document that I can share. One thing that I would emphasize is the fact that we have a fairly large number of emphasis tracks, especially in SSHA, that are almost ready to become majors. Although it may appear on paper that we offer few minors, with the various emphasis tracks we really do offer a lot of diversity in a small number of packages.

Question: Has there been any progress on developing double majors?
Response: Actually this has never come up. The challenge would be in double counting courses. If a student wanted to make a certain request then UGC would look at that.

DIVISION COUNCIL

- **Roland Winston, Chair**

REPORT: In the spirit of shared governance the Senate has an on-going dialog with the Chancellor and Provost. It is important to the Senate that a durable and fair shared governance structure be in place before our new Chancellor is appointed. The Senate concerns, in no particular order include (1) the personnel process; (2) space allocation and planning; (3) academic organization and support services; (4) budget responsibility and transparency; and (5) communication. A chart was displayed showing these topics with the Senate's recommendation and their current status.

<u>(1) Personnel Process</u>

- Adopt interim academic personnel policies and procedures from another UC campus (i.e. UCI) and transition them over the next several months into a final form that better fits UC Merced's situation.
- Disseminate the interim academic personnel policies and procedures to all involved in the personnel process.
- Develop a campus salary management policy for UC Merced in accord with APM 160.

Status: UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies are in progress.

<u>(2) Space Allocation and Planning</u>

- Delegate a campus-wide space committee to have final authority for space planning, determining all space policy, assigning staff space and allocating space to schools, to institutes, to College One and to other units.
- Create standing committee for space allocation and planning from the current ad hoc space planning task force to engage in continual process of capital and other space planning.
- Schools and other units to have the authority to allocate space internally.

Status: The ad hoc Campus-wide Space Committee is currently deliberating. The Provost suggests using their recommendations as a starting point.

(3) Academic Organization and Support Services

- Delegate academic support to the deans (e.g. IT, faculty support center) to build the appropriate accountability standards.
- Immediately adopt UC Berkeley policies governing summer school. UGC will adapt procedures to better fit UC Merced's situation and UC summer school policy.
- Appoint a search committee by the end of spring 2006 semester and begin search for a College One Dean over the summer.

Status: A Dean for College One is part of the ongoing budget discussions. Our initial centralized approach to providing faculty support was very efficient. However, as we continue grow, this structure will be examined and modified. We need to continue to explore ways to decentralize other services such as IT. User services and other direct support need to be located near the different user groups. Together we need to explore the right mix of centralized IT and distributed user services.

(4) Budget Responsibility and Transparency

- Implement Regents Standing Order 105.2.d, "The Academic Senate is authorized to select a committee or committees to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget."
- Delegate to schools, graduate groups, College One and other units the authority and responsibility over budget decisions.
- Consistent with UC practice, empower VC for Research with budget responsibility over a fraction (e.g., 50 percent) of Indirect Cost Recovery funds to be used in consultation with GRC and CAPRA.

Status: A centralized strategy has helped us monitor expenditures. CAPRA's role in the budget consultation process will be expanded.

(5) Communication

- Chancellor and EVC to establish monthly meetings with Divisional Council to report on major issues and respond to questions. EVC to meet bi-monthly with CAPRA.
- EVC to meet at least bi-monthly with CAPRA and with other senate committees semi-annually, as needed.

Status: Agreed

Chair Winston thanked those present for their active participation in today's meeting. There being no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Attest: Roland Winston, Chair

Minutes prepared by Nancy Clarke, Senate Director

Meeting of the Merced Division
November 21, 2005
Minutes of Meeting

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, the Merced Division met, at 8:00 a.m. on November 21, 2005, in the Redwood Room, Castle. Chair Anne Myers Kelley presiding.

II. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Kelley welcomed members to the first ever Merced Division Meeting. There were no Special Orders, Reports of Special Committees, Reports of Standing Committees, Petitions of Students, Unfinished Business, or University and Faculty Welfare.

Chair Kelley provided a brief overview of the University's dual-track system of authority and responsibility – ***Shared Governance***. She noted that the Standing Orders of the Regents grant Senate the authority to authorize, approve, and supervise all courses (except those of certain graduate professional schools) and to determine the conditions for admissions, certificates, and degrees.

In other areas of University life, the Senate exercises an active advisory role. It has specific authority from the Regents to advise the President and Chancellors of the University on budget matters and on the administration of one of UC's prime resources, its libraries.

Senate involvement in University affairs extends well beyond its delegated authority in the academic sphere and its designated advisory responsibilities. Campus and systemwide officials regularly seek advice and review from the Senate on a variety of issues affecting faculty welfare and the academic environment.

The Senate assists in searches for deans, chancellors, and presidents, and it taps the intellectual resources of the faculty to recommend faculty members for service on administrative committees.

Other members of the Divisional Council provided overviews of the responsibilities of the various Senate committees.

III. NEW BUSINESS -- CHANGE IN MERCED DIVISION LEADERSHIP

Chair Kelley announced that, effective immediately, she would be stepping down as the Division Chair. In accordance with UCM Bylaws, the Committee on Committees has appointed Professor Roland Winston as her successor.

There being no further business the Division Meeting ended at 9:30 a.m.

Attest: Anne Kelley, Chair