

**DIVISIONAL COUNCIL**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**Wednesday, January 22, 2020**  
**9:00 A.M. – 10:30 A.M.**  
**KL 362**

---

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

**Guests:** Maggie Saunders, Executive Director of Space Planning & Analysis; Phillip Woods, Director of Physical and Environmental Planning; Professor Roger Bales, School of Engineering

**I. Chair's Announcements – Tom Hansford**

**A. Academic Council (January 8, 2020)**

Chair Hansford updated Divisional Council members on the following major items of business from the January 8 Academic Council meeting:

- Regents were scheduled to vote on the cohort tuition issue at today's Regents meeting, however, the vote has been postponed.
- The Governor's proposed budget has been issued. While the Governor has stated his wish to increase funding to the UC system, the proposed budget contains fewer line items for UC priorities. Other UC campuses are dismayed at the inadequate funding proposed for seismic retrofitting. Funding for seismic retrofitting will have to come from the General Obligation bond (assuming it is passed by voters) which will be on the March ballot.
- TAs at UC Santa Cruz are engaging in a wild cat strike (a strike that occurs without approval of union leadership) over the issue of the cost of living. The union has since decided to endorse the strike. This strike could have an impact on other UC campuses, including a possible re-visiting of the union contract. If TAs receive higher pay, that may lead to a commensurate increase in the pay for GSRs. On a related note, the Unit 18 lecturers' union contract is set to expire shortly. Negotiations have reached an impasse. If issues are not resolved, a strike is a possibility.
- A recommendation from the systemwide task force on standardized testing for undergraduate admissions is forthcoming in the next two weeks. Regents and systemwide administrators have each clearly signaled their preferred outcome. (GC Chair Westerling shared that in yesterday's GC meeting, the Council, in conjunction with the VPDGE, advocated for the abolishment of the campus wide requirement for GRE scores in graduate admissions and agreed to allow the graduate groups to decide whether to use GRE scores in admissions decisions.)

**B. Meeting with EVC/Provost Camfield (January 13, 2020)**

Per Chair Hansford's request, this item was moved to Executive Session which will be held at the conclusion of today's regular business.

### C. Reminder – Systemwide Senate Leadership Visit (January 31, 2020)

Chair Hansford reminded Divisional Council members about the scheduled visit of systemwide Senate Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani and systemwide Vice Chair Mary Gauvain on Friday, January 31. Divisional Council is meeting with the chair and vice chair at 1:00 pm. Additional sessions are scheduled, including for members of D&E, CoC, and School Executive Committees. A Divisional Council member asked if faculty can attend more than one session with the chair and vice chair and Chair Hansford confirmed that faculty members are welcome to attend both sessions.

Chair Hansford announced that another campus event is taking place on January 31 which has not been widely publicized: a Regents town hall meeting regarding the UC President search. The town hall will take place in the California Room. These town halls have been held at other UC campuses, but the publicity surrounding them has been somewhat light. Chair Hansford has learned from EVC/Provost Camfield that in order for faculty to provide their input at the town hall, they must be on the town hall agenda. (Information is forthcoming on how faculty can be placed on the agenda.) Chair Hansford encouraged faculty participants to keep in mind the UC Merced institutional perspective when voicing their opinion on what qualities they wish to see in the next UC President.

## II. Consent Calendar

### A. The Agenda

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

## III. Consultation with Maggie Saunders, Executive Director of Space Planning and Analysis and Phillip Woods, Director of Physical and Environmental Planning

Directors Saunders and Woods presented a set of slides for Divisional Council focused on the future Health & Behavioral Sciences (HBS) building and the Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP). This presentation was recently given to Joint Council. (The slides are hyperlinked to today's Divisional Council agenda.)

Director Saunders called to the Divisional Council members' attention the two initial deadlines, namely, the Planning Fund proposal and the Full Project Planning Guide, both due towards the end of the spring semester. The Faculty Planning Committee – which includes Professors Jessica Trounstone and APAPB Kurt Schnier – has met multiple times and collaborated to develop an initial space program. In addition, the Affordable Housing Study is due soon. (The provisions of Assembly Bill 48 pertaining to the General Obligation Bond Funding states that as a condition of receiving funds from the 2020 University Capital Outlay Bond Fund, the UC Regents shall adopt a five-year affordable student housing plan for each campus covering the 2020–21 to 2024–25 fiscal years, inclusive.)

Director Woods then shared with Divisional Council members a map of future campus site development as part of the LRDP. He acknowledged that outdoor research space was requested by faculty and is included in the LRDP. A Divisional Council member inquired about plans for the remaining parcel of land under the Virginia Smith Trust. Director Woods replied that the land will be

developed in the next 7-10 years. Director Saunders added that the LRDP includes 107 acres on which the campus can build.

Director Woods stated that in order to provide community access to the HBS building (in anticipation of community partners collaborating with UC Merced researchers on programs that will be housed in this building), an access road will be built. Director Saunders pointed out that the potential sites for the HBS building each have pros and cons. Site A, which is closer to the new research quad and provides better access to the vivarium, currently has the most support from those campus stakeholders engaged in planning.

A Divisional Council member asked how the HBS building will be designed given the dynamic nature of the medical program which will include the future School of Public Health and other programs. Director Saunders acknowledged that this will be a challenge, given the building will accommodate the Institute of Child and Family Development, core labs associated with HSRI, community outreach facility associated with Public Health, computer labs that are more portable, the need for funding for the specialty facilities, and faculty, students and staff for the various programs. Director Saunders added that 45,000 square feet of classroom space is in the plan for the HBS building that will help achieve the goal of 15,000 students.

A Divisional Council member inquired about the life span of the pre-2020 campus buildings. Director Saunders replied that she is working on backfill projects for these buildings and is discussing funding with Interim Chancellor Brostrom.

Director Saunders ended her presentation by stating that she would like feedback from the Academic Senate and intends to present the same information to CAPRA.

#### **IV. Campus Review Items**

##### **A. Proposal for a B.S. in Civil Engineering – UGC Chair Sharping**

The proposal for a B.S. in Civil Engineering was approved by the Undergraduate Council on December 17, 2019, effective Fall 2021. A full record of revisions to the proposal and Senate committee comments is appended to UGC's December 18, 2019 memo (hyperlinked above).

UGC Chair Sharping summarized for Divisional Council members the timeline of the Civil Engineering proposal. UGC received the original proposal in April 2019 and received the revised proposal in October 2019. The proposal was then issued for Senate committee review, and comments were received by GC and CAPRA. UGC approved the Civil Engineering proposal on December 17, 2019.

**Action:** A motion was made for Divisional Council to endorse UGC's approval of the Civil Engineering proposal for a B.S. degree. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

##### **B. Resolution to Address Climate Change – Chair Hansford**

Chair Hansford summarized for Divisional Council members that the proposed Resolution to Address Climate Change was distributed to several Senate Committees and the School Executive Committees on October 31, 2019. Overall, there was strong support for its overarching goals; however some committees requested clarification on some aspects of the proposal. Committee comments were hyperlinked on today's agenda for Divisional Council members' reference.

Professor Roger Bales then joined the meeting for a consultation with Divisional Council members. By way of summary, he presented a slide presentation that included foundational information such as why the UC should be carbon neutral, typical carbon neutrality strategies, UC's current pathway to carbon neutrality, faculty leadership in addressing carbon neutrality challenges, and potential faculty actions.

A Divisional Council member asked how Professor Bales' efforts interact with systemwide decision making, given that a similar resolution was discussed at the systemwide level. Professor Bales answered that his is a "bottom up" initiative and all UC campuses are engaged in a similar process. Professor Bales emphasized the need for campus leadership buy-in.

After Professor Bales concluded his consultation and departed the meeting, Divisional Council members discussed their options with regard to endorsing the carbon neutrality resolution. Theoretically, this resolution can be placed on the spring Meeting of the Division agenda for a vote of Senate faculty without the endorsement of Divisional Council, however, Council's endorsement would likely increase the chance of the resolution being passed.

A Divisional Council member stated that the Academic Senate should give its full support to Professor Bales' resolution, especially given the campus expansion plans in the LRDP and the critical need for energy efficiency and waste reduction. Another Council member agreed, pointing out that as a new campus, UC Merced is in a better position than other UCs to endorse the resolution and achieve the stated goals.

One Divisional Council member raised a concern about multiple carbon neutrality efforts on campus. The Faculty Advisory Committee on Sustainability (FACS) submitted its Phase II plan to the Senate in fall 2019 that outlined its proposed, joint Senate/Administration committee plans. In that plan, FACS recommended coordination between itself, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability (CACS), and ASUCM. The member inquired how Professor Bales' resolution encourages the coordination of these groups' efforts.

Members agreed that the Council should endorse the resolution as presented by Professor Bales, with the following recommendations: continued and strengthened campus coordination of carbon neutrality efforts that includes FACS, CACS, and ASUCM; utilization of the current committee infrastructure as previously proposed by FACS; and acknowledgement of the campus expansion efforts detailed in the LRDP which may inform the campus's carbon neutrality efforts.

**Action:** A motion was made to endorse the resolution with the above recommendations. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

#### C. Divisional FTE Transfer Proposal - **CAP Chair Van Dyke**

VPF Matlock has invited comments from the Senate on a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) template for a division-level faculty appointment and, more generally, the establishment of a campus policy governing division-level faculty appointments. The VPF cover letter provides helpful context. The proposed MOU is available [here](#).

Comments from committees are hyperlinked on the agenda for Divisional Council members' reference.

CAP chair Van Dyke briefly summarized the concerns raised by Senate committees and School Executive Committees. One of the major concerns about the proposal pertained to the modified role of the deans, who, according to the proposal, would have the authority to assign to faculty members with Division-level appointments their courses and their service responsibilities. However, empowering deans to allocate departmental resources and manage curriculum circumvents the authority of department chairs. Moreover, the proposal provides no guidelines on how these responsibilities will be executed by the deans.

CAP's overarching concern about the policy is whether the professional standards of academic personnel review will be applied equitably to faculty in departments and faculty with Division-level appointments. For example, the proposal suggests that faculty with Division-level appointments would be allowed to select the members of their review committees, which is a right not currently afforded to faculty in departments. Additional concerns by Senate committees and School Executive Committees include confusion about voting rights for faculty with Division-level appointments, and questions about space and resources (how to allocate vacated faculty FTE lines).

A Divisional Council member suggested that the VPF should research models at other UC campuses in order to clarify the various points in her proposal.

Another Divisional Council member explained that there is a need on this campus for Division-level appointments and pointed out possible reasons why faculty members would move out of their departments. Council members understood his rationale, but clarity is needed on what specific conditions could lead to a Division-level appointment. Members also stated that such an appointment should be enacted only when other relevant problem-solving measures on campus have been exhausted.

Council members ultimately agreed that while Division-level appointments would be desirable in rare cases, the proposal submitted by the VPF needs a significant amount of clarification and enhancement. It was suggested that the VPF be invited to attend a future Divisional Council meeting for a consultation.

**Action:** A motion was made to forward all Senate committee and School Executive Committee comments to the VPF with a cover memo that requests she research models of Division-level appointments at other UC campuses. The memo will include an invitation for the VPF to consult with Divisional Council at a future meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

#### C. Four New Endowed Chairs – **Vice Chair DeLugan**

The Department of External Relations has requested the Senate review and approval of the following new Endowed Chairs:

- Monya Lane and Robert Bryant Presidential Endowed Chair in Excellence in Engineering
- Grey Roberts and Bette Woolstenhulme Presidential Chair in History
- UC Merced Presidential Chair in Climate Change (Two Chairs)

Per procedure, the Senate Vice Chair reviews the proposals on behalf of DivCo, in consultation with the Chairs of the relevant School Executive Committees. The Vice Chair then shares their analysis orally with DivCo for action. Actions may include approval, comment, and/or electing to solicit input from committees.

The three School Chairs have been invited to comment. Their comments are hyperlinked on the agenda for Divisional Council members' review.

**Action:** Due to time constraints, this item was tabled for a future meeting.

**V. Executive Session**

No minutes recorded.

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

Attest: Tom Hansford, Senate Chair