

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- **Robert C. Dynes (written report)**

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **George Blumenthal (Oral Report)**

V. SPECIAL ORDERS (None)

VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Report of the Academic Senate's Task Force on UC Merced (UCM)(Action)

- **Shawn Kantor, Chair**

ACTION REQUESTED: The approval of the establishment of the UC Merced Division

BACKGROUND and JUSTIFICATION

Message From Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal:

Professor Shawn Kantor, chair of the Academic Senate's Task Force on UC Merced and Chair of the UC Merced proto-division of the Academic Senate, has submitted a petition requesting that the Academic Assembly approve the establishment of a Merced Division of the Academic Senate. This UC Merced formal request is appended.

In support of this request, Professor Kantor addresses the four key elements needed to become a division:

- **Bylaws** – The UCM Task Force has drafted a full set of divisional bylaws, which were vetted by the entire UCM faculty. These bylaws are currently being reviewed by UCR&J.
- **Resources** – At its March meeting, the Academic Council approved a letter to UCM Chancellor Carol Tomlinson-Keasey setting forth the minimum support requirements for Council to agree to the establishment of a division. This letter is included in the packet. At this time, I would note that EVC Ashley and Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey have been engaged in good faith discussions with Professor Kantor and me regarding an acceptable funding plan for a Merced division, and I am optimistic that these discussions will be successfully concluded. In any event, Council has taken the position that Assembly approval of a Merced division should not be effective until Council determines that there is adequate funding for the division to operate effectively and professionally.
- **Divisional Membership** -- As of July 1, Merced will have at least 51 Senate members, of which 39 are faculty members without an administrative appointment. In addition, Professor Kantor notes that there are 11 offers in the process of going out as well as 15 other active recruitments in various stages of completion. Of the current non-administrative faculty, 18 are tenured, and this number of tenured faculty is expected to grow at the rate of 2-4 per year over the next few years. [Note that Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost David Ashley, estimates that 13 additional faculty will join UCM

by opening day, which would yield 64 Senate members and 52 faculty without administrative appointments

- **Capacity to Operate as a Division** – Professor Kantor points out that except for the CAP function, the proto-division at Merced has essentially operated this year as a division of the Senate, with authority delegated to it from the UCM Task Force. In support of that assertion, Professor Kantor has supplied the [agendas and minutes](#) of all proto-divisional committee meetings. The membership of UCM CAP, which is a Special Committee of the Academic Council, is roughly half from Merced and half from other UC campuses, and Professor Geoffrey Mason (UCSC) chairs it. The UCM CAP has begun the practice of allowing several “listeners” from the full professoriate at UCM to attend their meetings, and I understand from the chair of the UCM CAP that every single full professor (other than administrators) at UCM has volunteered to serve as a “listener”. The proposed Merced bylaws allow for external members of CAP, and Professor Kantor points out in his letter that it is his expectation that if the UCM division is approved, then CAP would continue to have significant membership from other UC campuses. While it would certainly be possible for the Academic Council to retain control of the CAP function for some defined period of time after the Merced division begins, it is possible that UCM divisional control of CAP might produce more regular oversight and reporting on the CAP outcomes.

The action being requested of the Academic Assembly is to approve the following change in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate:

Present and Proposed Language (Proposed language in bold and underlined. Language to be eliminated reflected in bold strikeout.)

Title I. Membership and Authority

305. Divisions

The Academic Senate has ~~nine~~ ten Divisions: Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz.

This bylaw amendment would take effect only when the Academic Council certifies that there is an agreement in place to provide sufficient funding for the UCM division to operate effectively and professionally, consistent with the [April 11, 2005 letter](#) to Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey.

Office of the Chair
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: george.blumenthal@ucop.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 11, 2005

**CAROL TOMLINSON-KEASEY
CHANCELLOR – UC MERCED**

Re: Resources Needed to Establish and Support a UC Merced Division

Dear Carol:

Knowing how important it is to both you and the Academic Council that a fully functional Merced Division be established by opening day, I thought it might be useful for me to set forth, in writing, the Academic Council's position regarding the funding of the Merced Division. I know that we have agreed that David Ashley and Shawn Kantor will be discussing these matters with a view toward reaching an agreement that you and the Academic Council can endorse.

I anticipate that the Academic Assembly will approve the establishment of a division at Merced at its May 2005 meeting, since the UCM faculty has proposed the establishment of a UCM Division and has submitted a set of proposed divisional bylaws. However, I also anticipate that the Assembly will approve a Merced Division only on the condition that you have met the minimum resource requirements, listed on page two of this letter, and that there is a written agreement between you and the Academic Council on a timeline for when the Merced Division will be funded at the level recommended in Academic Council's 2004 report, "Framework for Establishing a Divisional Academic Senate Office."

As you well know, the Standing Orders of the Regents mandate that UC operate under a system of shared governance in which the Academic Senate bears the primary responsibility for admissions policy, courses and curricula, and the approval of degrees and graduation requirements, and, in addition, be consulted prior to decisions on both academic personnel matters and budgetary allocations. In order for the new Merced Division to effectively and fully carry out these responsibilities in shared governance, it is critical that it have adequate professional administrative staff support, and divisional faculty leaders who are compensated for the time they will need to commit to this new enterprise. This is particularly important for Merced, since there are relatively few faculty there who are familiar with UC's system of shared governance.

I have kept the Academic Council fully informed about the discussions we have had to date, and at its March 30 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed this letter, including the conditions set forth below.

The guidelines for determining the appropriate resources needed to establish and maintain a workable senate office are contained in the Academic Council's 2004 report, ["Framework for Establishing a Divisional Academic Senate Office."](#) President Dynes forwarded this report to the chancellors this past September and asked them to consider the needs of the Senate, as a vital participant in shared governance, when allocating campus resources. In recognition of the extreme funding constraints under which the Merced campus is operating as opening day approaches, the Academic Council will not expect UCM to begin its new divisional office with the level of support outlined in the report. Rather, Council will accept a lower level of funding at opening, but by agreeing to do so will require a written agreement and timeline from you showing when and how the Merced campus will support the divisional senate office in reaching the report's recommended funding levels. Presumably, ramp up of funding could be financed through enrollment growth funding.

The Academic Council has identified the following resource requirements as the minimum necessary to establish and maintain a beginning Division of the University of California Academic Senate. Once UC Merced has these resources in place, the Academic Council will give its final approval of UC Merced's proposal for divisional status:

- Full time MSP level Director – We believe that a division cannot operate professionally without the services of a professional director of the Senate office.
- 2/9 Summer support for the Academic Senate Chair
- Compensation (in the form of research funding) for the Senate Chair, and discretionary funds to be allocated for research support by the Divisional Chair or the Committee on Committees to other relevant Divisional Committee Chairs (e.g., CAP, CAPRA, etc.)
- Staff support (at the AA II level) to support the Senate Chair and Director
- Appropriate office space and access to meeting rooms
- All necessary equipment – Chair, Director and AA each have their own computer
- A fax and copier or immediate vicinity access
- Access with priority to a Programmer
- An agreement in principle to provide future funding for Senate awards of faculty research grants and teaching awards, as is the practice at all other UC campuses.

We look forward to working with you in anticipation of welcoming the UC Merced faculty into the University of California Academic Senate. Please let me know how I, or members of the Academic Council, can assist in UC Merced's progress toward attaining divisional status. The Academic Senate's Executive Director, Maria Bertero-Barcelo, is also an excellent resource to call upon for information and help.

Best regards,



George Blumenthal, Chair
Academic Council

Encl. ["Framework for Establishing a Senate Operation" and President Dynes's 9/21/04 letter](#)
Copy: Shawn Kantor, UC Merced Task Force and Merced Proto-Division Chair
David Ashley, UCM-EVC and Provost
Academic Council

GB/bm

April 18, 2005

GEORGE BLUMENTHAL, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Petition for UC Merced's Transition to Divisional Status

Dear George:

On behalf of the UC Merced faculty, I am honored to present UC Merced's petition to become a division of the Academic Senate of the University of California. This petition has the unanimous support of the Merced Proto-Divisional Council. The UC Merced Task Force will be meeting by teleconference on Monday April 25, 2005, and a discussion of this Petition will be a main agenda item. I anticipate being able to report on the Task Force's position on UC Merced's transition to divisional status at the Academic Council meeting on April 27, 2005.

In his May 2003 report to the Academic Assembly, former UC Merced Task Force Chair Peter Berck concluded that "As senior faculty are hired, substantial authority will be delegated to bodies made up mostly or even entirely of UCM faculty. Where the previous years of Task Force existence have been dedicated to serving as a Senate, its role will shift to building an enduring UCM Division that will carry on the proud UC tradition of meaningful shared governance." I am proud to report that the Task Force's expectations have largely been realized during the 2004-2005 academic year. UC Merced faculty have independently taken on the duties associated with elevating the Merced faculty's prominence in the shared governance process both locally and system-wide and have taken on the critical senate roles of approving courses and curricula and consulting the administration on resource allocation issues. At this time CAP activities are still handled mostly by external members, though Merced has four senior faculty on the committee and three additional senior faculty have been appointed to act as 'observers' so that they may become acculturated to the CAP process. The Merced faculty are eager to take on the added responsibility of CAP and to assume a more prominent role in the administration of the committee.

Given the Merced faculty's increasing independence and experience with Academic Senate work, we feel well prepared to transition to divisional status. Attaining division status will elevate the prominence of the Academic Senate on the Merced campus and will have the motivational effect of signaling to Merced faculty that they are peers in the University of California system.

Based on our prior conversations I understand that at least three essential elements are needed for our transition to a full division: approved bylaws; dedicated resources that will ensure the professional operation of the Merced senate office; and an appropriate number of Academic Senate members. I would add another criterion to the portfolio – capacity to independently carry out the work of the senate.

Bylaws

A set of bylaws was drafted by the Task Force in early 2004, slightly revised by the Rules Committee appointed by the Merced Committee on Committees in late 2004, was vetted by all Merced faculty in December 2004, and then approved by the Proto-Divisional Council in early 2005. On January 13, 2005, I transmitted the proposed Bylaws of the Merced Division to your office. Once we receive comments back from UCR&J, we will proceed with putting the proposed Bylaws to a vote of the Merced faculty. As the Merced faculty had the opportunity to comment on the proposed bylaws late last year, I foresee no major issue in obtaining final faculty approval.

Resources

The disposition of our senate office resources is still under negotiation with EVC David Ashley. While I do not have concrete information to provide at this time, I am optimistic that my communications with the EVC will result in a set of resources that will provide a propitious start for the Merced division and that will be consistent with the resource parameters established by the Academic Council. I hope to be able to convey a memorandum of understanding between the Merced senate and EVC Ashley within the month.

Membership

Appendix I contains a listing of the Academic Senate members who are currently in residence at Merced or whose appointments begin July 1, 2005. By July the Merced Academic Senate will have a minimum membership of 51, of which 12 members hold administrative appointments. The tabulation below provides detail on the nature of the membership:

Faculty	39
Professor	16
Associate Professor	2
Assistant Professor	20
Lecturer (PSOE)	1
Administration	12

I have every expectation that we will have many more than 51 senate members by July 1, with the additional members being non-administrative faculty. For example, the School of Engineering has five cases that are before CAP, Natural Sciences has two cases through CAP review with offers outstanding, and Social Sciences/Humanities/Arts has four cases in front of CAP. Moreover, there are approximately 15 active recruitments going on between Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences/Humanities/Arts, all varying in terms of completion. I am confident that by the start of the Fall 2005 semester Merced will have an adequate number of faculty to operate as an effective and vibrant division of the Academic Senate.

Capacity

As mentioned above, the Merced faculty have largely taken on the administration of their own senate committees this academic year. Operating under a proposed set of bylaws, in September 2004 the Merced faculty elected a Committee on Committees that has appointed a chair of the proto-division, a vice chair, a secretary/parliamentarian, and chairs and members of the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Undergraduate Council, and the

Graduate and Research Council.¹ The Proto-Divisional Council consists of the chair, vice chair, and secretary of the proto-division, the chairs of the CoC, CAPRA, UGC, and GRC, as well as one senate member who was elected at-large. The UC Merced CAP is an independent committee of the Academic Council, chaired by Professor Geoffrey Mason (Santa Cruz). Merced has four senior faculty on the committee and is adding three “observers” so that more Merced faculty can become acculturated to CAP’s important functions and processes. While the Merced senate looks forward to taking on the additional obligation of CAP, I should note that our proposed bylaws allow for outside UC faculty to serve on the Merced CAP. Given the size of our faculty on opening day, I anticipate that the Merced division would exercise the option of including external UC faculty on CAP.

In terms of system-wide participation, the relatively small UC Merced senior faculty means that our participation will initially be greatest for UCOC, as well as for the major committees represented on the Academic Council: BOARS, CCGA, UCAP, UCEP, UCFW, UCORP, and UCPB. We understand that of the 18 Assembly standing committees, these committees in particular will play a key role in the development of the Merced campus. Further, historian Gregg Herken is an active member of the Academic Council’s Special Committee on the National Labs. Finally, the chair of the proto-division also attends, as a guest, the monthly Academic Council meetings, which the UC Merced divisional chair would attend as a full voting member.

To follow is a brief synopsis of the activities of Merced’s Proto-Divisional Council and major committees. Minutes from their meetings have been submitted to the Academic Senate and are available for inspection.

Proto-Divisional Council (Chair, Shawn Kantor)

The Council has devoted the year to elevating the role of shared governance on the Merced campus and in creating and formalizing the institutions that will facilitate faculty input into the governance of the university. At the start of the academic year various aspects of faculty shared governance at the campus-wide level were in their infancy. Equally disturbing, the institutions that foster shared governance and “collegial governance” were virtually absent in the three schools. The Council has worked to remedy these shortcomings as swiftly as possible.

The Chair meets with the Chancellor once monthly and with the EVC/Provost about every 1.5 weeks. Both the Chancellor and EVC have been favorably responsive to the Council’s goal of formalizing the faculty’s input on major decisions that would affect the university’s academic mission or resource allocation. With the Council’s encouragement, the Chancellor and EVC have held at least three all-faculty meetings to discuss issues that are of broad interest to the faculty, namely facilities and information technology. Moreover, the Council has been invited to comment on various policy proposals, and in fact we are moving to a situation where the senate is being asked to submit a nominee for the committee formulating policy proposals. Finally, the senate has quickly established standard operating procedure that any hiring of important staff personnel that impacts student or faculty welfare requires faculty participation in the search and/or interview process.

¹ A Privilege and Tenure Committee was appointed but its services were never utilized.

In the absence of the numerous senate committees that other campuses might have, Council members have taken on ad hoc work that does not necessarily fall within the domain of the three main standing committees. Thus, Council has dealt with issues relating to faculty welfare, diversity of the faculty, evaluation of instruction, and ongoing program review.

Mechanisms for shared governance within the three Schools and College One were completely lacking at the start of the year. The starting point was a situation in which the Deans acted as interested faculty members, administrative chairs, and deans all at the same time. There were no formal structures that delineated faculty participation in the shared governance of their Schools. As a result, the Council has moved forward with establishing proto-faculty governments in each School which has entailed writing bylaws for the governments and electing chairs and executive committees. Once Merced becomes a division, we will move forward in formalizing these Faculty Governments, as required by Academic Senate Bylaw 50. Within the month, the faculty in all the three Schools will have representatives who can communicate directly with the Deans and begin to formalize shared governance institutions at the School-level.

The Council also observed governance deficiencies in the normal administrative operations of the Schools. Capacity constraints and conflicts of interests are natural outcomes of a situation in which the deans were delegated, de facto, APM 240 and 245 duties. The Council passed a resolution that petitioned the Chancellor and EVC to assign in writing, after faculty consultation, APM 245 duties to the appropriate member or members of the Academic Senate and charged the Council itself to educate the faculty on the governance issues involved within the Schools. On behalf of the Council, Professor J. Arthur Woodward, who has over 25 years of experience at UCLA and who was the chair of the psychology department there for over a decade, wrote a document for the EVC and the faculty detailing the reasons for introducing administrative chairs at this stage in UC Merced's development. The document is included here as Appendix II. As a result of the Council's resolution, EVC Ashley will soon send the question of how the administrative chair's duties described in APM 245 will be distributed within each School. The deans, after consulting with their own faculty, will submit proposals to the EVC. At a minimum each School will appoint an administrative chair to handle personnel matters.

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (Chair, Christopher Viney)

CAPRA accepted a charge from the EVC to play a significant role in the planning process for FTE allocation at UC Merced. CAPRA defined clear Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Schools' 5-year Strategic Plans and 1-year Academic Resource Plans (see Appendix III). The criteria draw attention to the type of information that CAPRA (and the EVC) can usefully take into account in making informed recommendations and decisions. It is expected that the Schools' planning documents will address realistic resources needed to attract and accommodate new FTEs and the future growth of their activities. CAPRA is in the process of evaluating and making recommendations on the current revised planning documents submitted by Schools.

CAPRA has expressed strong concern that the structure of the annual planning cycle as implemented this year (involving inputs from just the three major-granting Schools, submitted individually) does not optimize faculty input, is not adequately representative of all the impacted stakeholders (which should include College One, the Institutes, and the Graduate Groups), and does not adequately promote interdisciplinarity.

CAPRA has engaged in dialog with the EVC with regard to implementing revised, more inclusive procedures in subsequent years, and is confident that improvements will be made.

As a continuing project, CAPRA is developing guidelines that address the optimization of space allocation from the perspective of faculty whose performance depends on the suitability and adequacy of space available for their research and teaching. Given the likely space limitations that UC Merced will face as its faculty grows rapidly, CAPRA is currently taking the lead role in recommending viable alternatives to the impending space shortage.

Undergraduate Council (Roger Bales, Chair)

This academic year the UC Merced Undergraduate Council (UGC) has met eight times and has another four meetings planned. The UGC handles all undergraduate issues, including admissions, course and curriculum approval, undergraduate student welfare, scholarships, and other issues that come up. Having a single council handling undergraduate affairs is necessary owing to the limited number of senior faculty at UC Merced presently. There are currently nine regular UGC members, two from each UC Merced School, plus three from other UC campuses. Disciplinary representation includes two faculty from engineering, three from the sciences, one from social science, two from the humanities, and one from the arts. There are also four ex-officio members of UGC.

Much of the UGC's effort has gone to reviewing curriculum and catalog changes, as new majors ramp up and as UC Merced prepares for its first class of undergraduate students this fall. UGC has approved new tracks or changes in tracks in five of the nine majors currently offered, plus about 70 new or revised course proposals. An equal number of course proposals are awaiting action. This relatively heavy load of course and curriculum changes came about because many new faculty have come on board since the inaugural catalog was prepared. UGC has also set policies for scholarships and a subcommittee reviewed applications for the awarding of Regents Scholarships. A number of other policy issues were addressed by UGC. Still remaining on the agenda for this academic year are proposals for six new majors, plus some policy issues that will require thoughtful and thorough deliberation.

Graduate and Research Council (Thomas Harmon, Chair)

Over the past year the GRC has been overseeing the development of UC Merced's academic programs for graduate studies and creating policies that will foster UC Merced's research mission. With respect to academic programs, GRC has completed the review of policy and bylaw documents for five graduate groups: [Environmental Systems](#), [Quantitative and Systems Biology](#), [Molecular Science and Engineering](#), [Social, Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences](#), and [World Cultures and History](#). These graduate groups are not being shepherded through the system-wide approval process yet, but are at various stages of completing their proposals to the Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). Roughly 15 graduate students are in residence at UC Merced and the GRC, in collaboration with Dean of Graduate Studies Keith Alley, met twice with the graduate students in open forums to discuss the state of graduate education at the university. These students elected two representatives who have been attending the monthly GRC meetings.

With respect to UC Merced's research mission, GRC has been collecting information and is in the process of drafting criteria for the creation of core research facilities. When a satisfactory draft has been created, GRC will make it available for review by the Merced faculty. Other major topics currently being discussed are royalty income and indirect cost return. Again, GRC will be drafting policies and possibly algorithms for insuring prudent use of these funds in the spirit of supporting research and graduate education at UC Merced.

Concluding Remarks

The UC Merced faculty are eager to take on the responsibilities associated with becoming a division of the University of California's Academic Senate. The faculty are moving rapidly toward establishing the institutions that will foster effective shared governance on the Merced campus. By becoming a full division of the Academic Senate, the faculty are enthusiastic about participating in the shared governance of the University as well.

Thank you very much for considering our petition to become a division of the Academic Senate.

Respectfully,

Shawn Kantor
Chair, UC Merced Task Force and Merced Proto-Division

cc: Cliff Brunk, Vice Chair
María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director
UC Merced Proto-Divisional Council

Appendix I

List of UC Merced Academic Senate Members

Faculty	School	Rank/Admin	Date of Hire
Bales, Roger	Eng	Professor	6/1/2003
Barlow, Miriam	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
Choi, Jinah	NS	Assistant Professor	4/1/2005
Colvin, Michael	NS	Professor	7/1/2003
Conklin, Martha	Eng	Professor	6/1/2003
Forman, Henry	NS	Professor	7/1/2003
Goggins, Jan	SSHA	Assistant Professor	5/1/2005
Green, Jessica	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Harmon, Thomas	Eng	Associate Professor	7/1/2003
Herken, Gregg	SSHA	Professor	7/1/2003
Kantor, Shawn	SSHA	Professor	7/1/2004
Kelley, Anne	NS	Professor	7/1/2003
Kelley, David	NS	Professor	7/1/2003
Kim, Arnold	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Leppert, Valerie	Eng	Assistant Professor	7/1/2003
Malloy, Sean	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
Manilay, Jennifer	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
Martin-Rodriguez, Manuel	SSHA	Professor	9/1/2004
Matlock, Teenie	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Medina, Monica	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
Meyer, Matthew	NS	Assistant Professor	1/1/2005
Mitchell, Kevin	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Mostern, Ruth	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Newsam, Shawn	Eng	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
		Lecturer/Writing Program	
Ochsner, Robert	SSHA	Director	7/1/2005
O'Day, Peggy	NS	Associate Professor	7/1/2003
Ojcius, David	NS	Professor	7/1/2004
Ortiz, Rudy	NS	Assistant Professor	1/1/2005
Ramicova, Dunya	SSHA	Professor	7/1/2004
Reyes, Belinda	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Ricci, Cristian	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004
Shadish, William	SSHA	Professor	7/1/2003
Tokman, Mayya	NS	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
Traina, Sam	NS	Professor/Director, SNRI	7/1/2002
Viney, Christopher	Eng	Professor	7/1/2003
Winder, Katie	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2005
Winston, Roland	Eng/NS	Professor	7/1/2003
Woodward, J. Arthur	SSHA	Professor	7/1/2004
Yoshimi, Jeffrey	SSHA	Assistant Professor	7/1/2004

Administration

Tomlinson-Keasey, Carol	Admin	Chancellor
Ashley, David	Admin	EVC/Provost
Desrochers, Lindsey	Admin	VC for Admin
Alley, Keith	Admin	VC for Research
Lawrence, Jane	Admin	VC for Student Affairs
(candidate pending)	Admin	VC for Univ Relations
Wright, Jeff	Eng	Dean
Pallavicini, Maria	NS	Dean
Hakuta, Kenji	SSHA	Dean
Miller, Bruce	Admin	Librarian
Ruiz, Encarnacion	Admin	Admissions officer
Kuo, Kent	Admin	Registrar

Appendix II**UC Merced CAPRA:*****Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Schools' 5-year Strategic Plans and 1-year Academic Resource Plans*****Background**

1. CAPRA has welcomed the charge from EVC Ashley (memo to CAPRA Chair dated 15 November 2004; attached) that it should perform two reviews during the annual planning cycle:
 - a review of individual School plans, with feedback given to Schools as to how the plans might be optimized;
 - a review of the revised plans, with comments and recommendations provided to the EVC.
2. It is anticipated that, each year, the first of these reviews will commence in mid-January, when Schools provide current versions of their planning documents to CAPRA.
3. CAPRA and EVC would like Schools (Faculty and Deans) to be aware of CAPRA's significant evaluation criteria.
4. CAPRA considered the (very limited) information about evaluation criteria that apply on other UC Campuses, as well as experience about practices elsewhere. CAPRA also recognizes that unique circumstances pertain to UC Merced as a new campus, and the need for the evaluation criteria to evolve together with the campus. It is expected that in future years, CAPRA will refine and revisit the ideas set forth here, and that this will be done with input from the full Faculty, including the Deans and Provost.

5. CAPRA anticipates that UC Merced's Institutes, ORUs, Graduate School and General Education Colleges (e.g. College One) will annually prepare 5-year Strategic Plans and 1-year Academic Resource Plans according to the same schedule and routing as the plans from Schools that offer undergraduate majors.

Guiding Criteria

Each School should be free to format its plans in whatever style is best suited to communicating its particular needs and vision. However, it is anticipated that persuasive Strategic Plans and Academic Resource Plans will be characterized by many of the attributes in the list that follows. Not all attributes will apply to all cases, and those that assume an analysis of track record cannot, of course, apply immediately. However, *Schools are encouraged to proceed now on the basis that track record may count in the future.*

CAPRA's primary concern is for the effective allocation of FTEs and space across the campus. It is expected that Schools' planning documents will address realistic resources needed to attract and accommodate new FTEs and the future growth of their activities, including:

- likely cost of cash and/or in-kind startup package
- likely laboratory space requirements
- likely office space needs of associated research staff and graduate students
- likely special infrastructure needs (classroom space, library holdings, IT, specialized software for teaching, central facilities, animal room, clean room, fume hoods, heating/cooling, electrical service, shielding, regulatory compliance staff...)
- plans for mentoring new junior Faculty.

In addition, a persuasive plan will address and/or demonstrate the following:

1. Likely postgraduate and/or undergraduate student demand for the affected programs, and the employability of students after graduation.
2. A clear sense of purpose and direction with respect to academic and research goals, along with an indication of how the School might respond to sudden changes in circumstance (e.g. windfalls, cuts, or special initiatives).

With the volatility of circumstance in mind, CAPRA urges the EVC to retain an ability to respond to opportunities and needs outside the regular schedule of the planning cycle.

3. How the plan complements (and explicitly doesn't duplicate) the use of resources proposed by other Schools. It will consider trans-disciplinary research and teaching that expands the horizons of graduate groups, majors and/or Schools. Opportunities for FTEs shared between schools will be explored.
4. Both proactive (creating opportunity) and reactive (responding to opportunity) elements.

5. Elements of both program nucleation and program growth. For both elements, the plan will demonstrate how the affected programs will be encouraged to achieve international excellence.
6. (In time) references to external reviews / standards (e.g. WASC / professional accreditation) in arguing its case.
7. (In time) consistency with previous plans. If it is not consistent, an explanation for the divergence will be provided. Plans will include a realistic timeline for bringing new FTEs on board.
8. Desiderata concerning the diversity of UC Merced's faculty, and the route to achieving them. If the proposing School has not made significant efforts to optimize its diversity in the past, what evidence is there that the effort will be made with the new FTE(s)?
9. Workload balancing, including the likely extent of reliance on adjunct appointments.
10. An assessment of the most likely obstacles to the plan's success.
11. Explicit strategies for evaluating the plan's success when implemented.
12. The extent to which the plan reflects consensus / buy-in from the School's faculty.