

DIVISIONAL COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, January 25, 2021

Attendees: Chair Robin DeLugan, Vice Chair LeRoy Westerling, Christopher Viney, Ashlie Martini, Patti LiWang, Hrant Hratchian, Matthew Hibbing, Abbas Ghassemi, Kara McCloskey, Jesus Sandoval-Hernandez, Erin Hestir, Jessica Trounstine, and Justin Yeakel.

I. Consultation with EVC/Provost Camfield

- A. EVC/Provost Camfield thanked CoC for selecting Senate faculty for the Senate/Administration joint task force that will consider ways to amend policies related to academic personnel review in light of COVID-19 disruptions.
- B. VPDUE Frey is leading a committee that includes Senate faculty representatives that is examining ways to approach instruction in the fall semester. EVC/Provost Camfield is confident that the campus will return to in-person instruction in the fall but with lower than normal density. He added that APO will process accommodations for those faculty who cannot return to in-person instruction. The campus will also formulate contingency plans should in-person not be viable due to public health conditions, or in the event of future outbreaks caused by a new variant of the virus.
- C. EVC/Provost Camfield stated that it is unclear whether UC Merced is in the educator tier (1B) of the vaccination roll out phase. Unfortunately, Merced County is not receiving a sufficient number of vaccines and prioritizing K-12 educators. The campus is working with UC Health on acquiring its own allotment of the vaccines. UC Merced's relationship with the county has generally been positive but the county is not receiving clear messaging or sufficient supplies from the state. A Divisional Council member inquired about the impact of Governor Newsom's budget on the UC. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that the state's progressive income tax system has improved the budget outlook, but the state remains cautious. The state budget proposes to restore only one third of the \$300 million cut the UC received last year but OP is advocating for more. A Divisional Council member asked about the 25% reduction to the TA budget. He added that the Chancellor relayed positive admissions numbers at the recent town hall, but other sources suggest the admissions outlook is not sufficient for UC Merced's needs. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that UC's applications are up substantially, and UC Merced's applications are up by 3%. If UC Merced were to return to its yield rate from two years ago, then what the campus has in its application pool might restore the campus to its pre-pandemic state. EVC/Provost Camfield reminded Divisional Council members that the former US president's administration curtailed visas so UC campuses lost money by not being able to enroll international students. Those campuses turned to their waiting lists and accepted students that would have enrolled at UC Merced. He added that the campus has made a significant push to ease the transfer pathways for community college students to the UC and transfer applications have increased. With regard to the reduction in the TA budget, EVC/Provost Camfield is scheduled to meet with APAPB Schnier and Interim VPDGE Kello to work on consistent messaging.

II. Chair's Report – Robin DeLugan

- A. Academic Council (Dec 16, 2020)
 - i. Academic Council endorsed UCEP's request to approve divisional flexibility to modify the provisions of SR 782, which outlines the upper limit on courses a student may take on a

Pass/No Pass basis, until further notice, and retroactive to the spring quarter or semester, 2020.

- ii. Academic Council is reviewing the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force report which contained three distinct policy options that Divisional Council discussed at its November 13 meeting. Option 2 is favored: UC-Quality Remote Degree would support the formation of entirely remote degree programs but require that programs meet all ordinary expectations for a UC degree.
 - iii. Academic Council approved BOARS request for a systemwide Senate review of a proposed new ethnic studies subject requirement for UC admission affecting graduates of California secondary schools.
 - iv. Academic Council endorsed UCAADE recommendations to mitigate the impacts of COVID-19.
 - v. Academic Council is discussing 2030 planning.
- B. C19 EOC/Cabinet meetings (Jan 7, 13, 14 & 21, 2021)
The campus anticipates that employees will return to work in person beginning in the fall semester. The campus is working on on-campus COVID-19 testing capacity. Employees who are currently on campus are being tested every two weeks. UC Merced is working with the county and UC Health on acquiring our own allotment of the coronavirus vaccine. Employees will be required to sign a statement that they received a vaccination when they return to work in the fall. A process will be in place for employees to accept or formally decline the vaccination.
- C. Chancellor’s Town Hall (Jan 15, 2021)
The town hall was co-hosted by the Chancellor, Senate Chair DeLugan, and the Staff Assembly president.
- D. Spring 2021 Meeting of the Division (May 4, 2021, from 2:00-3:30pm)
- E. The call for nominations for the annual Senate awards will be distributed by the Senate office today. Chair DeLugan encouraged Divisional Council members to bring the call for nominations to their colleagues’ attention.

III. PROC Updates - Vice Chair Westerling

PROC discussed how to better integrate program review with campus academic planning. Vice Chair Westerling suggested that the Senate should hold the same discussion. With respect to undergraduate programs in the School of Engineering that are ABET-accredited, PROC agreed to accept their ABET-accreditation documentation as their UCM periodic review so that the programs do not have to duplicate their efforts. However, PROC will provide guidance to the programs on campus-relevant items when they prepare their ABET documentation. As part of the program review documentation, deans will submit a memo regarding resources. Regardless of whether a review is handled by PROC or ABET, PROC will endeavor to better track the recommendations provided by outside reviewers that contain resource implications and will bring those recommendations to the attention of the EVC/Provost.

IV. Consent Calendar

- A. Approval of today’s agenda
- B. Approval of the December 11, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Action: The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

V. Campus Review Items

- A. Academic Planning Targets – CAPRA Chair LiWang

These are proposed institutional-level targets for a select subset of the Measures developed by the Academic Planning Work Group. As part of this review, to inform the development of the campus' strategic plan, the Senate is asked to advise on the following two items, with particular focus on #2:

1. The proposed targets.
2. The institutional support and infrastructure that need to be developed for the campus to reach the three, five and 10-year targets outlined in the document.

Prior to this meeting, Divisional Council members reviewed the responses from Senate committees and School Executive committees.

CAPRA Chair LiWang summarized the proposed academic planning targets which relate to the three overarching goals for academic planning that were established in a previous academic year. She explained that CAPRA was skeptical about the campus's ability to achieve the goals. Chair LiWang was asked by Assistant EVC Laura Martin if CAPRA and other Senate committees could advise the administration on what resources would be required to achieve specific academic goals.

CAPRA Chair LiWang then summarized CAPRA's memo which focused on their two main concerns: the campus's low research grant funding and number of PhDs conferred. There are a variety of factors that contribute to these low numbers, one of which is challenges regarding staffing. GC Chair Hratchian pointed out that the COVID-19 pandemic caused major delays with regard to PhD conferrals. However, in some fields, there may be a rebound effect in which case third and fourth year students will be back on track. He added that according to the information in the census, and judging by what is occurring in the pipeline, the campus should experience an uptick in conferrals in the next two years.

GC Chair Hratchian also emphasized that per capita grant funding needs to grow. The campus needs to determine the per capita numbers in each field. When those thresholds are met, we will see a better incentive structure in the departments. GC Chair Hratchian also mentioned that the campus does not have a way to close unproductive programs. The campus needs to address this so that weak programs receive the support they need; if the weak programs are still unsustainable, then the campus needs to be prepared to make difficult decisions.

CoC Chair Chin pointed out that the academic planning targets only take into account gender and racial diversity. The definition of diversity needs to be broader to include gender expression and disability status. The targets should also reflect the new California law about the non-binary gender category. Divisional Council members agreed.

Divisional Council members then held a discussion on whether certain programs (e.g. book fields) should be asked how they measure success. A member responded that some faculty believe that establishing metrics is too confining. Another member acknowledged that the campus is focusing on what will help the "bottom line", i.e. increased undergraduate enrollment and increased research funding both of which will financially benefit the campus and will help further other goals.

A Divisional Council member stated that many universities will ask faculty without productive research programs to take on more teaching duties and inquired whether UC Merced can do the same. Divisional Council members debated whether such an initiative should derive from the deans or the department chairs. Department chairs would need an incentive structure in place to take such a recommendation to the deans. Other Divisional Council members countered that teaching is not a punishment and an increased teaching load should not be perceived as punitive.

Action: Divisional Council’s comments will be transmitted to EVC/Provost Camfield by January 29, 2021.

B. New MAPP 025 (supersedes MAPP 1003) – D&E Chair Sandoval-Hernandez

Per APM 025-14, all faculty holding appointments in the following title series are subject to this policy: (1) Professor, including Acting titles, (2) Professor in Residence, (3) Adjunct Professor, (4) Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), (5) Health Sciences Clinical Professor, (6) Clinical Professor of Dentistry, (7) Lecturer with Security of Employment, including Acting titles. The title series currently used at UC Merced which are subject to this policy include: **Professor, Adjunct Professor, and Lecturer with Security of Employment (also known as Teaching Professor).**

Summarized below are the proposed key policy revisions:

- i. Renumbered the policy as MAPP 025 to align with the system-wide policy APM 025
- ii. Reformatted the content to align with the system-wide policy outline
- iii. Removed language that is redundant of system-wide policy
- iv. Outlined key responsibilities for Faculty, Department Chairs, Deans, the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

In light of current Senate activities related to anti-Black racism, all committees, specifically D&E, were invited to review this item with special attention to generating recommendations for ways to intentionally maximize and promote equity, diversity, and inclusion, reduce, and eventually eliminate anti-Black racism and other forms of structural racism and inequities.

D&E Chair Sandoval-Hernandez summarized the proposed, new MAPP 025 and D&E’s memo which was supportive. Divisional Council members agreed with D&E’s position and had no further comments.

Action: Divisional Council’s comments will be transmitted to the Academic Personnel Office by January 29, 2021.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

A. Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State – UGC Chair Hibbing

The review of ILTI was completed in 2018 by the Provost’s Office, with the assistance of Huron Consulting, to gain a better understanding of its current state and determine the best options for ILTI’s future. Prior to this meeting, Divisional Council members reviewed the comments received from Senate committees and School Executive committees.

UGC Chair Hibbing informed Divisional Council members that Senate committees raised a variety of observations about the ILTI review, but no committees were opposed. Divisional Council members commented that with the pandemic we have seen the reliance on learning technologies, and any future ILTI review could specifically focus more on hybrid learning technologies.

Action: Divisional Council’s comments will be transmitted to Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain by February 17, 2021.

B. Faculty Salary Scales and Recommendations – Vice Chair Westerling

The report and recommendations were prepared by the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. As noted in Provost Brown’s letter, the Task Force was charged with examining

the issues surrounding the salary scales, in particular, excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation. The report offers recommendations to address the issues, including annual scale adjustments and transparency in compensation decisions.

Senate Vice Chair Westerling informed Divisional Council members that meaningful feedback was received from Senate committees and School Executive committees. For example, D&E noted the tension between equity and the need to compensate faculty appropriate to their disciplines. CAP was concerned about flexibility as deans need to be able to make retention offers. When we hire new faculty, their prior experience does not always align with our UC salary scales. One way to ensure they are given enough time to advance is to appoint them at a lower step but at a salary that appropriately reflects their experience. CAPRA's concern related to the implementation process and the need to proceed in an equitable manner. The UC has to be honest about the considerable costs of the proposal.

A Divisional Council member asserted that the UC salary scale system is a strength and a weakness. While it is a good thing that faculty can advance through the ranks and steps with almost-guaranteed salary increases, it is difficult to compete with offers from other institutions. Also, pre-retention measures are difficult.

Senate Chair DeLugan summarized the conversation by suggesting that Divisional Council supports the proposal conceptually but is concerned with the implementation's costs.

Action: Divisional Council's comments will be transmitted to Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain by February 17, 2021.

VII. Update on Bylaw Revisions – CRE Chair Viney

CRE Chair Viney informed Divisional Council members that last academic year, CRE began a process of rationalizing and streamlining the Senate bylaws to remove inconsistencies. That process was later joined with an initiative prompted by the events of last summer with respect to the Black Lives Matter movement. Several Senate committees submitted input on how their bylaws could incorporate diversity, equity, inclusion. CRE will discuss the requested bylaw revisions at a Divisional Council meeting in March. After that, the revised bylaws will be distributed for Senate review. The final step is to present all proposed bylaw revisions at the May 4, 2021 Meeting of the Division for a vote.

Chair DeLugan stated that at the next Divisional Council meeting, members will address the Senate action plan on anti-racism and receive input from the Anti-Black Racism Task Force. The Chancellor has allocated funds for these issues and Divisional Council will be asked to advise him on how to use the funds to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.

Attest: Robin DeLugan, Senate Chair