

DIVISIONAL COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, April 27, 2020

Attendees: Chair Tom Hansford, Vice Chair Robin DeLugan, Christopher Viney, Nella Van Dyke, Patti LiWang, LeRoy Westerling, Jay Sharping, Michael Scheibner, Erin Hestir, Michael Dawson, Asmeret Asefaw Berhe, Carolin Frank, Linda Hirst, and Josué Medellin-Azuara.

I. Consultation with EVC/Provost

EVC/Provost Camfield announced that UC Merced’s student enrollment for fall 2020 looks positive. Statements of Intent to Register are slightly up from this time last year. However, the state’s budget does affect our future. UC Merced may be able to absorb the significant losses sustained by auxiliary services as long as enrollment continues its positive trajectory.

EVC/Provost Camfield acknowledged that he has recently requested the formation of ad hoc committees to work on research and educational resilience in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, he announced that he wishes to scale back the proliferation of ad hoc committees and asked for Division Council’s support on this plan.

A Division Council member called attention to UC Berkeley’s message about exam culture and academic integrity that was issued in advance of the final examination period. He suggested that UC Merced take this opportunity to send a message more focused on the trust between faculty and students in relation to exams. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that he would support such a statement but clarified that the statement would have to be drafted by the Senate. He is willing to issue the statement on behalf of, or in conjunction with, the Senate.

A Division Council member inquired whether plans for the future reopening of the campus will take into account differences between graduate and undergraduate students; the former are important for the campus research mission. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that that option is being discussed and that VCORED Traina and VPDGE (and future interim VCORED) Zatz are consulting on ways to ramp up campus research operations. EVC/Provost Camfield speculates that non-human research projects may be back online in late summer.

II. Consent Calendar

- A. The Agenda
- B. April 20 Meeting Minutes

Action: The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

III. Chair’s Announcements

- A. Senior Leadership Team Meetings

UCOP has issued to the campuses a working document regarding planning the resumption of normal campus activities. The plan includes six indicators meant to guide decision-making on resuming activities:

- The ability to monitor and protect the UC community through testing, contact tracing, isolating, and supporting those who are positive or exposed;
- The ability to prevent infection in people who are at risk for more severe COVID-19;
- The ability of the UC Health System and Student Health to handle surges;
- The ability to develop and/or have rapid access to therapeutics to meet the demand;
- The ability for classrooms, campus housing and dining, administrative offices, laboratories and other spaces to support physical distancing and the ability to implement other mitigation measures;
- The ability to determine when to reinstitute certain measures, such as the remote learning, telework, and research curtailment, if necessary

A Division Council member pointed out that criteria four pertaining to access to therapeutics will be challenging to satisfy. Chair Hansford suggested that a supplement to criteria four could be the ability of the UC to contribute to the acquisition of knowledge to develop therapeutics.

Chair Hansford stated that he will be analyzing how UC Merced meets the above criteria. He suggested the scheduling of additional Division Council meetings on a monthly basis over the summer. Members agreed.

Action: Monthly summer Division Council meetings will be scheduled.

B. Reminders:

- i. Academic Council/UCEP Survey (closes at 4pm, April 27, 2020)
Chair Hansford encouraged Division Council members to complete the survey if they are teaching.
- ii. May 7 Meeting of the Division
Chair Hansford asked Division Council members to encourage their colleagues to participate.

IV. Revised ORU Policy

Prior to this meeting, CoR's revised policy was distributed to Division Council members that addresses comments received by Senate committees and ORU directors.

CoR Chair Scheibner summarized comments received from CAPRA and the ORU directors. With regard to the role of ORU directors, he suggested that this issue should not be included in the policy and perhaps best left to the decision making of senior leadership.

A Division Council member pointed out that the new, campus integrated academic planning should offer opportunities for ORUs to align themselves with campus processes and strategic planning.

CoR Chair Scheibner asked Division Council members for input on addressing CAPRA's ongoing concerns about the budgets of ORUs. With regard to CAPRA's concern about multiple committees and reporting, Chair Scheibner clarified that only one committee would be generating a report and the remainder of the committees would only add their consent.

Action: This discussion will continue over email.

V. Consultation with LASC Chair DePrano and Librarian Li

LASC Chair DePrano shared with Division Council that LASC's main accomplishments this year were the joint memo with CoR to OSTP on supporting the zero embargo, encouraging UC Merced faculty to respond to UCOP's poll on the impact of the loss of access to Elsevier journals, and planning to support the Library during its periodic review which has been postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

LASC Chair DePrano then turned to the memo on today's agenda from LASC, requesting that the Library be consulted by faculty who are developing proposals for new programs and majors to ensure that the Library has the appropriate resources. LASC Chair DePrano and Librarian Li both advocated for Library consultation to be held in the proposal drafting stage rather than during the review stage at the Senate. When a proposal is submitted to the Senate for review, there is not sufficient time for the Library staff to analyze their collections and services to determine whether the Library can support the new program or major.

Some Division Council members pointed out that most faculty only draft these proposals once or twice in their careers and are likely unaware of all the campus constituents that would need to review their proposals. They suggested that Library consultation could occur while proposals are under review by the Senate. Librarian Li replied that the timeline of Senate review is not enough and that the staff would need 2 – 4 weeks to analyze the collections and resources.

A Division Council member suggested that the Library produce a form containing a list of items that they would need to analyze in their resources and collections. That form would be provided to the authors of proposals for new programs and majors. The authors could include the completed form to be used in the proposal review process. LASC Chair DePrano suggested that that form be provided to faculty earlier, in the proposal drafting stage.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 pm.

Attest: Tom Hansford, Senate Chair