Item

DIVISIONAL COUNCIL May 13, 2019 10:30 A.M. – 12:30 P.M. KL 362

Zoom URL: <u>https://ucmerced.zoom.us/j/2092287954</u> Zoom Phone: 1 669 900 6833, Meeting ID: 209 228 7954 Supporting Documents available on <u>Box</u> <u>Committee Bylaws</u>

Ι.	Α.	air's Report & Announcements – <i>Chair Schnier</i> Deans' Council (4/30) Meeting EVC/Provost Camfield (5/2)	5 Min
11.		nsent Calendar The Agenda	5 Min
	А.	The Agenua	
III.	Ca	mpus Review Items	45 Min
	A.	Economics B.S. Proposal – UCG Chair Sharping The <u>Proposal for an Economics B.S.</u> was approved by Undergraduate Council on May 8, 2019 effective fall 2020. UGC's approval followed endorsement by <u>CAPRA</u> and <u>Graduate Council</u> . <u>CRE</u> supported the proposal as did <u>the EVC/Provost</u> . All other committees declined to comment.	
		Requested Action: Endorse and transmit the proposal to the administration for its consideration.	
	В.	Department Chair Duties – <i>GC Chair Westerling</i> Members are asked to discuss <u>committee comments</u> on <u>the proposed implementation</u> <u>sequencing</u> of the duties of department chairs. Chair duties are taken from APM 245 and 210. All committees were invited to comment; there were no lead committees for this review.	
		Requested Action: Transmit Division comments to the Dean Dumont, Chair, Transition Oversight Committee.	
		 Committee Comments: CAPRA offered a number of resource-related comments. CRE noted the importance of excellence staff support, and the need to address "systems fatigue". D&E made two recommendations and desired additional information about the UCM processes by which hospitable department climates are supported. FWAF endorsed the document and hopes that department chairs will be well supported in their efforts to maintain a hospitable department climate. GC offered a number of comments. UGC offered a number of comments. SoE EC endorsed UGC's comments. SSHA EC offered a number of comments. 	

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP, CoR, and the School of Natural Sciences Executive Committee.

C. <u>Academic Planning Work Group Proposal</u> – *Vice Chair Kelley* Members are asked to discuss <u>committee comments</u> on <u>the proposal by the Academic</u> <u>Planning Work Group</u>. All committees were invited to comment; there were no lead committees for this review.

Requested Action: Transmit Division comments to the Co-chairs of the APWG, CAPRA Chair Trounstine and EVC/Provost Camfield.

Committee Comments:

- <u>CAPRA</u> offered a number of criteria-focused comments.
- <u>CRE</u> offered a number of comments and questions.
- <u>Cor</u> offered a number of specific comments but noted overall that it is unclear how most criteria relate to predicting impact of funding requests, nor is it clear how most measures connect with resources needed to deliver degree programs.
- <u>D&E</u> hopes that the pursuit of grant dollars does not burden or hinder SSHA's ability to hire faculty, and that ORUs will be integrated and empowered in the institutional strategic planning activities.
- <u>FWAF</u> raised concerns regarding the goal of "UC Quality Scholarship".
- <u>GC</u> desired more continuity with prior planning efforts and recommended broadening the membership of CAPRA.
- <u>UGC</u> made recommendations regarding the approach to, and criteria for, measuring student success.
- <u>SoE EC</u> desired more clarity to about how to interpret and implement the proposed process and metrics and offered additional specific comments.
- <u>SNS EC</u> forwarded a number of questions, including how the criteria will be used for resource allocation.
- <u>SSHA EC</u> offered a number of comments and noted that a fundamental concern was that the link between the measures of excellence and the distribution of FTEs is unclear.

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP

D. Office of Space Planning's Role in the Faculty Hiring Process – CAPRA Chair Trounstine Members are asked to continue discussion, initiated at the March 4 meeting, of <u>committee</u> <u>comments</u> on the document titled <u>The Office of Space Planning's Role in the Faculty Hiring</u> <u>Process</u>. At that meeting, members noted the document needs to be updated in light of the transition to departments and the chair's responsibility for space, as well as the EVC/Provost's intention to allocate lines to schools rather than departments. Members supported determining if appropriate space is available before initiating a search, and not initiating the search if appropriate space is unavailable, and that candidates be able to tour and evaluate possible space during a visit. Members were opposed to the Space Planning Office having the authority to terminate a search, and to candidates having any knowledge of, or interaction with, institutional space planning related to their hire. Members also agreed that the criteria for making decisions about allocating or reallocating space need to be established and publicly available. There were no lead committees for this review.

Action Requested: Transmit Division comments to the EVC/Provost.

Committee Comments:

- <u>CAPRA</u> commented on each of the six numbered points in the proposed process.
- <u>CoR</u> offered several comments on the Space Planning Office's role in the hiring process.
- <u>CRE</u> raised questions related to the agility of the Space Planning Office in the hiring process, and implications for job candidates.
- <u>FWAF</u> believes the search chair, rather than Space Planning Office, should be in contact with candidates; concerns were also expressed about the introduction of delays which could disadvantage the campus in competing for candidates.
- <u>GC</u> opposes the proposal in its current form, raising several concerns.
- <u>School of Engineering Executive Committee</u> offered a number of comments, including on process.

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP, D&E, UGC

E. <u>Space Allocation and Assignment: Definitions, Process and Standards</u> – CoR Chair Scheibner Members are asked to discuss <u>committee comments</u> on the draft <u>Space Allocation and</u> <u>Assignment: Definitions, Process and Standards</u> document. There were no lead committees for this review.

Action Requested: Transmit Division comments to the EVC/Provost.

Committee Comments:

- <u>CAPRA</u> recommended revisions to address the lack of departmental budgets to support space renovations.
- <u>CoR</u> offered a number of comments on the document.
- <u>CRE</u> identified considerations for academic space use that are not addressed by the document.
- <u>FWAF</u> supports the document.
- <u>GC</u> recommends "available space" be explicitly described, together with criteria to guide the allotment and assignment of space.
- <u>School of Engineering Executive Committee</u> offered a number of comments, including on process.

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP, D&E, UGC

IV. Systemwide Review Items

20 Min

A. <u>UC Center Sacramento Review</u> – UGC Chair Sharping

Members are asked to discuss <u>committee comments</u> on <u>the report</u> summarizing the UC system's assessment of the UC Center Sacramento. As per the <u>associated cover letter</u>, the assessment is part of President Napolitano's efforts to determine whether and how to transition selected systemwide programs to campuses. UGC, GC, and CoR were the lead committees for the review.

Requested Action: Transmit Division comments to the systemwide Senate Chair by June 19, 2019.

Committee Comments:

- <u>CoR</u> encouraged programming to facilitate sharing UC faculty and student research with the legislature.
- <u>D&E</u> raised a number of questions regarding diversity-related trends and initiatives outlined in the report.
- <u>GC</u> emphasized the importance of ensuring both that the Center is financially sustainable *and* that its duty to students at campuses across the UC, particularly those like Merced, be fully preserved going forward.
- <u>UGC</u> offered a number of comments, and noted that the program is very valuable if given the proper resources, and that the experience must be accessible, uniform, and more equitable for students.

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP, CAPRA, CRE, FWAF, and the School of Natural Sciences Executive Committee.

B. <u>New APM – 011</u> – CRE Chair Viney

Members are asked to discuss <u>committee comments</u> on the <u>proposed new APM section</u> APM - 011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees. <u>The cover letter</u> provides helpful context. CRE, LASC, and P&T are the lead committees for this review.

Requested Action: Transmit Division comments to the systemwide Senate Chair by June 19, 2019.

Committee Comments:

- <u>CoR</u> supports the policy and made a recommendation to clarify the policy regarding ensuring norms set by external organizations have been vetted for congruence with UC values.
- <u>CRE</u> supports the addition.
- <u>D&E</u> endorses the proposed new policy.
- **<u>FWAF</u>** endorses the proposed new policy.
- <u>LASC</u> endorses the proposed new APM section.
- <u>P&T</u> recommends it be adopted as policy.
- <u>UGC</u> endorses the proposed new policy.
- <u>SoE EC</u> endorsed the proposed new policy.

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP, CAPRA, GC, and the School of Natural Sciences Executive Committee.

C. Interim Policy Responding to Immigration Enforcement Involving Patients on UC Health Facilities – D&E Vice Chair Asmeret Berhe

Members are asked to discuss <u>committee comments</u> on the proposed interim policy *Responding to Immigration Enforcement Involving Patients on UC Health Facilities*. With respect to this Interim Policy, the term "health facility" would *not* include UC Student Health and Counseling Centers. FWAF is the lead committee for this review.

Requested Action: Transmit Division comments to the systemwide Senate Chair by May 15, 2019.

Committee Comments:

- <u>CoR</u> requested clarification as to whether human subjects in research studies who are in UC health facilities would be affected by this policy and whether faculty researchers conducting these studies would be legally required to report personal information about the patients if requested by authorities
- <u>CRE</u> recommended a revision to protect patient information.
- <u>D&E</u> supports implementation of the policy.
- <u>FWAF</u> endorsed the policy but raised concerns about the training and staffing needed to execute it and suggested that cash-strapped health centers be resourced to comply.

Committees that declined to comment, but appreciated the opportunity to opine: CAP, CAPRA, GC, UGC, and the School of Natural Sciences Executive Committee.

V. Discussion: Next Steps Carbon Neutrality Proposal - Chair Schnier

10 Min

Members will continue discussion, initiated at the April 29 meeting, regarding the SNRI Director's <u>draft points</u> presented for Senate action. In prior discussion, members raised questions about existing work and commitments in relation to the dimensions identified in the draft points, and the level of prioritization proposed by the first bullet.

Action Requested: Determine next steps.

VI.	Unit 18 Faculty Participation on Senate – Vice Chair Kelley		
	Members are asked to consider the draft Principles to Guide the Involvement of Unit 18		
	<u>Lecturing Faculty on Senate Committees</u> , developed by the Senate Chair, the Senate Vice Chair, and the Chair of the Committee on Rules and Elections as directed by Divisional Council at its February 20, 2019 meeting.		
	Action Requested: Determine next steps.		

VII. Discussion Item: Chairs' Reports 5 Min Committee chairs' reports were circulated to members by email on Friday, May 10. Members are invited to follow-up on any reported items. 5 Min

VIII. Enrollment Management 15 Min The Chair of CSE, Stefano Carpin, and the Chair of EECS, Marcelo Kallmann, will provide a presentation outlining CSE's enrollment management needs, which include having an enrollment management plan in place for the fall 2020 application and admissions cycle and a process for achieving this end.

Action Requested: Determine next steps.

IX. Consultation with EVC/Provost Camfield

10 Min

X. Informational Items

5/2 – <u>VC Traina has extended the embargo</u> on engagement with Huawei, ZTE and their subsidiaries, consistent with the actions of several UC campuses and a growing number of research universities around the country. This situation will be revisited after the first of the calendar year.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE – MERCED DIVISION

- 5/3 <u>Senate Chair May writes to President Napolitano</u> regarding shared governance consultation with the Retiree Benefits Working Group and the UCFW Health Care Task Force in the evaluation of an RFP for a Medicare Advantage PPO.
- 5/3 <u>Chair May transmits to President Napolitano</u> the Academic Council's statement in response to reports from two Tiger Teams, *Vulnerabilities Associated with International Students*, and *Sensitive Information and Materials Related to International Agreements*, concerning UC engagements with specific foreign network equipment companies.
- 5/3 <u>Chair May transmits to President Napolitano</u> the Academic Council's endorsement of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare's recommendation that UCOP convene an independent panel of in-house UC faculty experts to evaluate the design and content of systemwide surveys by external contractors before they are administered.
- 5/6 <u>Chair May transmits to President Napolitano</u> the Academic Council's endorsement of a UCORP recommendation that UCOP adopt a mitigation plan to redress the research funding shortfall of faculty affected by the implementation of Composite Benefit Rates.
- 5/6 <u>In a memo to the Senate Chair</u>, LASC supports the LAUC memo requesting participation on Senate committees.
- 5/6 FWAF adopts a <u>Conflict of Interest Statement</u>.
- 5/8 The Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Sustainability, Mike Dawson, provided <u>a summary</u> of the committee's deliberations on sustainability initiative organizational structure.