

**DIVISIONAL COUNCIL**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**Friday, March 29, 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. Elsevier negotiations

EVC/Provost Camfield announced that the Elsevier negotiations were successful and the UC has reached a new agreement. One of the benefits of the new agreement is that the UC will save money on the cost of subscriptions to special packages of expensive journals (e.g. biomedical publications). The new agreement is also a long-term game changer in terms of open access for UC researchers.

B. Budget

EVC/Provost Camfield informed Divisional Council members that the state's revenues actually increase last year, but the costs increased as the state dealt with the impact of the pandemic. The most recent version of the Governor's budget proposes to restore the UC's cuts. The UC was slated to receive an increase to its budget before the pandemic and is lobbying to get that increase reinstated. The Regents were scheduled to vote on a tuition increase but elected to cancel it during the pandemic. EVC/Provost Camfield anticipates the Regents will vote on the tuition increase soon and it will be cohort-based. Each Congressional representative was given a small amount of money earmarked for local projects and Congressman Jim Costa's office has issued a call for proposals. EVC/Provost Camfield stated that faculty may receive requests from their deans to articulate what projects they would like funded. Faculty are encouraged to respond quickly.

C. Fall 2021 Planning

The UC system is striving for in-person instruction across the 10 campuses in fall 2021. However, there are variables and the UC has to plan for contingencies. EVC/Provost Camfield stated that if the coronavirus vaccine is moved to a regular use authorization, the UC could mandate the vaccine for students (currently, the vaccine is under an emergency use authorization). But campuses must also be wary of outbreaks of new variants of the virus.

Chair DeLugan mentioned to EVC/Provost Camfield that faculty were dismayed to receive the proposed MAPP 500 section pertaining to the recruitment and review of postdocs and project scientists. A Divisional Council member stated that the proposed new review process puts a burden on faculty; in addition, the revisions appear to be mandating to faculty how to manage their staff. EVC/Provost Camfield responded that APO has temporarily withdrawn the proposed MAPP 500 from consideration. A Divisional Council member replied that department chairs are still being told by APO that they must conduct time consuming reviews for research staff. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that he will speak with VPAP Matlock and Assistant VPAP Anders to clarify the situation.

**II. Chair’s Report – Robin DeLugan****A. C-19 Cabinet Meetings**

Chair DeLugan reported that recent meetings were cancelled.

**B. Meeting with EVC/Provost Camfield (March 22)**

- i. Chair DeLugan discussed with the EVC/Provost the UCOP MOU that allows the Senate an exemption to continue including external UC members on CAP. UCOP has allowed the MOU to be renewed in the past but it may not be possible to renew again beyond AY 2024-2025. Divisional Council members had differing interpretations of the MOU’s terms. Chair DeLugan stated that Divisional Council can discuss this further.
- ii. APAPB Schnier provided the names and contact information of CBS2 staff to each School dean. Those CBS2 staff members will be the points of contact for the Schools in an attempt to improve communication and accountability.
- iii. The systemwide Senate is discussing how to be more involved in climate change issues. Professor Mike Dawson will attend a future Divisional Council meeting to update members on the efforts of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Sustainability.

**C. UC Safety Symposium (March 25)**

The discussion included the problem of over-policing at the UC and how the UC can plan for the future. Some solutions are campuswide, others are systemwide. In 2019, the UC spent \$136 million on policing. Discussion centered on how the UC can redirect some of those resources to other areas.

**III. Updates from the Anti-Racism Work Group – Chair DeLugan**

Chair DeLugan reminded Divisional Council members of the previous conversation on integrating a preamble into the Division bylaws about diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Work Group also discussed ways to spend the money allocated by the Chancellor for anti-racism measures. Ideas included mini grants to advance anti-racism and the hiring of a consultant to conduct a study.

**IV. Consent Calendar**

- A. Approval of today’s agenda
- B. Approval of the March 12 Meeting Minutes

**Action:** the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

**V. LASC Chair DePrano Memo re: Program Proposals and Library Resources**

Prior to this meeting, LASC Chair DePrano submitted a memo to Divisional Council on the importance of consulting the Library when faculty create proposals for new programs, Schools, and ORUs.

A Divisional Council member stated that the Library is defining “consultation” as a formal memo from the University Librarian. He suggested that Divisional Council should be involved in defining what consultation is. Other Council members pointed out that the University Librarian does get invited to review proposals for new programs concurrently with the Senate’s review. Moreover, a few Senate committees include Library staff members as non-voting, ex-officio members who do have access to agenda materials, including those of proposed new programs. A Divisional Council member wondered if the real issue is ineffective communication between these staff members and the Library leadership. Council members suggested that the main issue is not consultation, but the fact that the Library is underfunded. This is a problem that must be rectified by administrative leadership, not the Senate.

A Divisional Council member suggested that the Library could provide an estimated, additional average cost of each new academic program which the administration would then take into account when funding the new program.

LASC Chair DePrano and University Librarian Li then joined the meeting. LASC Chair DePrano presented to Divisional Council a series of slides that reiterated LASC's memo. LASC recommends that every proposal for a new program, School, or ORU should demonstrate and document early consultation with the Library as part of the review and approval process. This documentation should include a letter from the University Librarian summarizing the resource implications of the proposal and the Library's ability to meet the proposed program's/School's/ORU's needs. LASC Chair DePrano pointed out that the CCGA handbook currently has a requirement that graduate program proposals must include an estimated additional cost of the program for the first five years for various categories including Library acquisitions. She also pointed out that the Library's budget has not increased commensurate with the growth of faculty, student, and staff numbers.

The Library has thus far been able to support new and existing programs through electronic journal and book packages available through systemwide licenses. However, this strategy is not as effective in the areas of business management, public health, and medical education where the Library does not have licensed resources. Other areas of support new programs need are information literacy instruction, data management and curation, and GIS services. Consulting with the Library in the development of new program proposals allows the Library to determine if the new program will require additional resources beyond those already available.

University Librarian Li informed Divisional Council members that in the past, some authors of new program proposals (e.g. Master's in Public Health) have contacted him directly about their Library resource needs. But other program proposal authors have bypassed the Library and the Library only discovered the proposals when they went through Senate review. University Librarian Li wants everyone to think holistically about all the elements that are needed to support a new program. Divisional Council members reminded the Librarian that Library consultants on Senate committees do participate in committee discussions and have access to all relevant materials. The campus administrative leadership is ultimately responsible for ensuring that a new program can be funded. A Divisional Council member asked Librarian Li how the new agreement with Elsevier – and changing journals costs – will affect the Library's request for consultation on new program proposals. Librarian Li responded that it depends on the cost model. Another Council member suggested that Librarian Li could share with CAPRA an estimated budget for future new programs. That same information should be conveyed to the administration. Librarian Li replied that the costs will vary across disciplines.

LASC Chair DePrano reiterated that LASC is not asking for new policies to be crafted; rather, the committee is asking for a template to be provided as mentioned in her memo and as discussed last year with the AY 19-20 chairs of CAPRA, GC, and UGC.

After LASC Chair DePrano and Librarian Li departed the meeting, Divisional Council members continued the discussion. One Council member asked, if the Senate does modify the consultation process per the Library's request, what will be the outcome of a graduate program proposal at the systemwide level if the Library submits documentation that it does not have the resources to support the new program? Another Divisional Council member pointed out that LASC is a standing committee that regularly consults with the University Librarian and submits memos on proposals for new programs. Therefore, a consultation process is already in place. A Council member stated that the lack of appropriate journals is not necessarily prohibitive given the other alternatives, and it is up to

administrative leadership to decide what the real resource issues are. Another Divisional Council member agreed, stating that balancing resource implications when there are not enough resources to go around is the job of the administration. The Senate needs to hold the administration accountable.

**Action:** Divisional Council will transmit a memo to LASC in response to its memo on Library consultation.

## **VI. FWAF Proposal to Include Teaching Professors on CAP – FWAF Chair Frank**

FWAF Chair Frank summarized FWAF's proposal for Divisional Council members. The proposal's two main points are: 1) CAP bylaws should reflect that "Full Professors" includes Full Teaching Professors and 2) CoC should make it a best practice to consider adding a Teaching Professor to CAP's membership. CoC Chair Chin pointed out that the bylaws of RCAP and P&T (the other two Senate committees besides CAP that specify only Full Professors in their memberships) may also need to be addressed. A Divisional Council member stated that Teaching Professors' expertise is teaching and not research and wondered how they will review cases on CAP. However, she acknowledged that CAP should not have a two-tier system whereby a Teaching Professor member would only be allowed to review one element of a case file. Another Divisional Council member disagreed with FWAF's second point about CoC making it a best practice to appoint a Teaching Professor to CAP, stating that CAP should not be singled out.

CRE Chair Viney suggested that, since the Senate is currently reviewing the proposed, revised division bylaws, CRE could modify the division bylaws further to include a brief statement about the definition of Full Professors and make it clear it includes Full Teaching Professors. He recommended that Divisional Council could formally request CRE to draft such a definition.

**Action:** Divisional Council agreed to formally request that CRE revise the division bylaws to include a definition of "Full Professors".

## **VII. Review of the Proposal in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies – UGC Chair Hibbing**

The proposal for a Minor in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, effective Fall 2021, was approved by UGC on March 15, 2021.

**Action:** Due to time constraints, this item was tabled for the next Divisional Council meeting.

## **VIII. Systemwide Review Item**

### **A. Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures (the "Gold Book")**

Chair Frank summarized the comments received from Senate committees and a School Executive Committee. The proposed policies are not aligned with local and national conversations about policing. Nor do the policies prioritize de-escalation over the use of force as FWAF pointed out. Rather, it appears the policies were written with a focus on protecting the university against lawsuits. D&E argued that the system should engage in a broader discussion of ways to ensure public safety than the traditional policing model.

**Action:** Divisional Council’s comments will be transmitted to Academic Council Chair Gauvain by April 21, 2021.

**IX.** Other Business

CoR Chair McCloskey stated that after meeting with Associate VPF Valdez about the Data and Authorship Dispute Boards Policy, it became clear that the joint memo sent to Valdez by the chairs of CoR, GC, FWAF is not being interpreted in the manner in which it was written. Divisional Council members held a brief discussion about accountability and transparency of the campus administration and the importance of shared governance and appropriate consultation. A Divisional Council member suggested that the Senate needs to advocate for faculty more vigorously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.

Attest: Robin DeLugan, Senate Chair