

**Division Council (DivCo)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**September 8, 2016**

Pursuant to call, the Division Council met at 12:00 p.m. on September 8, 2016 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Susan Amussen presiding.

Present: Kurt Schnier, Anne Zanzucchi, Ignacio López-Calvo, Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Rick Dale, David Noelle, Lin Tian, Patti LiWang, David Kelley, and Jayson Beaster-Jones. Ramen Saha represented the Committee on Research.

**I. Chair's Report and Announcements—*Chair Amussen***

- Chair Amussen welcomed Rick Dale, Chair of the Committee on Committees and UCM representative to the University Committee on Committees.
- Chair Amussen and Vice Chair Schnier met with the Vice Provost of the Faculty and the Provost to discuss the management of cluster hiring and faculty growth. The Chair and Vice Chair communicated that support for cluster hires could not exist without academic planning for 2020. Senate leadership proposed that an academic plan be developed by having the deans request a five year teaching rotation (i.e. how many courses will be taught, and what will be taught) based on predicted student growth. Separately, in response to the Provost's desire to create a committee to link faculty growth and cluster hires, the Chair and Vice Chair urged that this effort be spearheaded by CAPRA, as per the committee's Bylaws.
- Chair Amussen and Vice Chair Schnier met with Chancellor Leland and Provost Peterson on 8/29/2016. Discussion focused on a number of issues including
  - The administrative leadership's priorities for the year, which include
    - Ensuring clear stakeholder engagement in the ongoing procurement process for 2020. This includes the Academic Senate. Timelines will be short and responses need to identify essential attributes necessary to ensure function.
    - Creating a policy and criteria for space allocation to facilitate transparency in the process.
    - Improving internal and external communication.
    - Developing a budget policy to guide decision-making at the campus level as distinct from system or state-level policy. For instance, 19900 funds are swept at the end of each year, per UC policy. However, there could be a campus policy that funds are swept on June 30<sup>th</sup> and returned on July 2<sup>nd</sup>. A member asked if there had been any discussion about the instructional budget as UCM has not had an instructional budget in two years. The Chair responded that budget details were not discussed, but that the Chair and Vice Chair will be attending in November, with the deans, a two day retreat on budget policy.
  - Realignment of school administrative structure. A task force, which includes the three school deans and two AP chairs from each school, has been established by the Chair and the Provost. Each school's executive committee has reviewed the faculty appointments. The task force has been asked to evaluate the pros and cons of chairs and deans holding the responsibilities outlined in APM 245. From this step, the support needed to enable those roles and responsibilities were identified.
- The need for a transparent budget that is communicated to the entire faculty in order to clarify the choices and tradeoffs being made. Similarly, the Chair and Vice Chair requested that the Workforce Plan (WFP) information be made public. Senate leadership also asked for school-level consultation on the deans' WFP requests. At the institutional level, the Senate will consult on WFP plans through the Extended Cabinet. Members suggested that through consultation the faculty might evaluate if the original proposals appropriately identified needs. The faculty might also help to establish parameters to guide WFP-related decision-making given that WFP requests exceed available resources. Another member suggested that the campus look at faculty to staff ratios across the system, and faculty to administrator ratios, to see what success looks like at other campuses. The Chair noted that planning-related information like the number of staff positions for the next four years are derived from the campus' budget model and suggested that CAPRA pursue questions about the assumptions underpinning the model.
- Members discussed the need to push harder on the administration to generate the planning-related data needed by the campus rather than asking the faculty to provide it. The Senate needs to be sure that deans are consulting,

not briefing, school Executive Committees as decisions are being made. The Senate also needs to work with the Chancellor to push for additional resources for the campus. Adequate resources to support quality education, together with access and affordability, is a system-wide issue and one raised at the system-level Chair, Vice Chair, and Executive Director retreat on 9/7.

## II. Consent Calendar

The day's agenda was approved as presented.

## III. Committee Chairs' Reports

- [Academic Planning & Resource Allocation](#) (CAPRA) – Chair Mukesh Singhal (absent)  
The Senate Vice Chair, and CAPRA member, reported that CAPRA has not yet met but will meet next Monday.
- [Academic Personnel](#) (CAP) – Chair Ignacio López-Calvo  
CAP has not yet met. Its first meeting is September 23<sup>rd</sup>. Members discussed the concerns associated with removing CAP from the hiring process in that deans have considerable authority without oversight. A member noted that SSHA is changing its policy to allow AP chairs to negotiate with candidates rather than deans. Members raised questions about chairs having the budget and space authority necessary for negotiations.
- [Committees](#) (CoC) – Chair Rick Dale  
CoC will convene once a month. A liaison has been assigned to each committee. This individual will contact committee chairs to address membership needs.
- [Committee on Research](#) (CoR)– Member Ramen Saha  
CoR will meet every two weeks. The committee will meet with the new UC Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies soon. CoR will be continuing discussions initiated last year about what Research and Development Services (RDS) functions will be supported by schools and which will be supported centrally. The gap between the RDS and schools will be affected by Workforce Planning and there is discussion about polling faculty members about their RDS experience thus far. CoR is working with CoC to identify representations to serve on the SNRI (ORU) review. CoR has three high priority areas to address this year: (1) institutional use of money; (2) policy on core facilities and funding for the formation of core facilities; and (3) SAFI and what influence CoR may have on the process. CoR found the draft policy on Research Data Storage unacceptable and sent its comments to Chair Amussen. CoR also raised questions about the Unmanned Aircraft Policy and sent its comments to the Chair.
- [Rules and Elections](#) (CRE) – Chair Lin Tian  
CRE has not yet met but will meet on September 16. Chair Tian will miss the next two DivCo meetings and will ask a committee member attend.
- [Diversity and Equity](#) (D&E) – Chair Tanya Golash-Boza<sup>1</sup> (absent but provided written report prior to today's meeting)  
In her written report, Chair Golash-Boza noted that last May, DivCo approved of changes for the Selection and Appointment of Endowed Chairs at UC Merced. These changes involved a revision of the MAPP and created more transparency in these appointments. Under the current cycle of MAPP revisions, these revisions will be effective July 1, 2017. DivCo could, however, request that the Provost consider these changes to be effective sooner (as they have already been approved by DivCo). In practice, this would mean that the new procedures could be used in any appointment or reappointment of Endowed Chairs. Chair Golash-Boza will write a memo to be reviewed and voted on at the next DivCo meeting. This memo will suggest that the new procedures for the selection and appointment of Endowed Chairs be effective immediately. That will give everyone plenty of time to prepare for any appointments (of new or existing faculty) or reappointments that will be effective July 1, 2017. The second topic is Faculty Equity Advisors. Three faculty members have been appointed as Faculty

---

<sup>1</sup> DE Chair was absent due to travel.

Equity Advisors: Teenie Matlock (SSHA); Arnold Kim (SNS); and Tom Harmon (ENG) to work with the search committees in the schools.

- [Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom](#) (FWAF) – Chair Jayson Beaster-Jones  
Campus Safety Issues will be discussed at FWAF’s first meeting in light of November 4, 2015.
- [Graduate Council](#) (GC) – Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam  
GC identified three major responsibilities this year: (1) Review of course requests. CRF deadlines will be enforced; (2) Review of CCGA proposals. Two CCGA proposals going forward this year. (3) Addressing workload associated with responsibility for handling all graduate student awards and fellowships. GC will work on a strategy for devolving some responsibility to graduate groups while facilitating transparency in the decision-making process.
- [Undergraduate Council](#) (UGC) – Chair Anne Zanzucchi  
At its upcoming meeting, UGC will be discussing the proposal for Heritage Studies minor. UGC will also be considering the policy implications of minors with very low enrollment.

#### IV. Discussion Items

##### A. DIVCO follow-up on the SAFI survey – *Member David Kelley*

Items relevant to this discussion include

- The [results](#) of the May 2016 survey.
- [CAPRA’s memo to the Provost](#), dated 6/2/2016, summarizing its analysis of the results.
- [CAPRA’s memo the Provost](#), dated 7/1/2016, responding to its 6/23/2016 meeting with the Provost.
- A member provided a history of the SAFI process, noting that the “timeout” from hiring faculty had created concerns among the faculty. CAPRA conducted a survey about 15 months ago, the results of which were strongly against the SAFI, though the process continued unchanged. Toward the end of the 2015-16 academic year, a group of senior faculty met with the Chancellor who agreed to another survey. The Chancellor assured the group that a survey would be welcome and that the provost would welcome it too. This survey, far more detailed than the one the year before, again indicated that only a small fraction of faculty supported the SAFI.
- It was suggested that, because the Chancellor wanted to survey done, DivCo, or the group that brought this to the Chancellor’s attention last May, should meet with chancellor to review the results. The Senate, as representatives of the faculty, need to ensure that faculty’s concerns as raised in the survey are addressed. Chair Amussen asked CAPRA to take the lead role in addressing this issue, including advising DivCo, out of respect for CAPRA’s responsibilities in this area.
- A member asked whether the group of senior faculty who raised the issue have discussed if they would be fine with the Senate taking the lead in addressing this. The conclusion was that it is appropriate for follow-up to be through the official lines of the Academic Senate.
- The Vice Chair asked DivCo for its perspective on the process to inform CAPRA’s discussions. A member encouraged strong follow-up with the Provost based on the difference between CAPRA’s June discussion with the Provost and the eventual decision to move forward with hiring into multiple SAFI pillars.

##### B. Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Regents: Amendment of Policy on Honorary Degrees – *Chair Amussen*

See <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept16/a2.pdf>

This was not discussed; it was removed from this Regent’s agenda to facilitate consultation with the faculty.

#### V. Campus Review Items

##### A. Three draft policies were submitted for review by the UC Merced Office of Campus Culture and Compliance. Comments are due to the administration by September 16<sup>th</sup>.

1. [Unmanned Aircraft Systems \(UAS\) and Model Aircrafts](#)

- Comments were received from CoR, which made several suggestions to improve the policy, including clarifying criteria for approving requests for UAS use on campus and revisions to address a potential loop-hole for the authorization of purchases. In general, CoR found the policy to provide a reasonable balance between the interests of the research community, public safety, and civil liberties.
  - **Action Item:** The Senate Chair will draft a memo to Associate Chancellor Putney summarizing DivCo's response.
2. [Interim Policy on Research Data Storage](#)
- Comments were received from [CoR](#), [CAPRA](#), the [SSHA Executive Committee](#), and an [Engineering Faculty Member](#).
  - Comments were uniformly negative; the policy was noted to be poorly drafted, unclear, and overly broad.
  - **Action Item:** The Senate Chair will draft a memo to Associate Chancellor Putney summarizing DivCo's response.
3. [Policy on Prohibition of Abusive Conduct and Acts of Violence](#); [guidance from the President](#), including a [cover letter to Chancellors](#), regarding this policy was released July 2016.
- No comments were received. D & E and FWF also declined to comment but noted they plan to monitor developments in relation to this policy and may choose to comment as the academic year progresses.
  - The Chair noted that this policy has implications for the APM. Those revisions will be coming to the campus through the normal review process.
  - **Action Item:** The Senate Chair will draft a memo to Associate Chancellor Putney summarizing DivCo's response.

**Attest: Susan Amussen, Chair**