

**DIVISION COUNCIL**  
**Monday, October 12, 2015**  
**MINUTES**

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

- [September 30](#) Academic Council Meeting
  - Chair Hare reported on the status and importance of shared governance.
  - UC Health Care Plan – The President established a working group to review the UC Health Care Plan. The goal was to have one unilateral UC Health plan for faculty and staff. In response to faculty concerns about the lack of consultation when the working group was established, President Napolitano agreed to reconstitute the working group. Senate faculty have expressed strong concerns about the proposal. Most of the concerns were related to the lack of faculty representation on the newly constituted committee, the purview of the committee, and voting rights.
  - Three-Year Degree Pathway. Each UC undergraduate campus (except Merced) will develop three-year degree pathways for 10 out of its top 15 majors by March 1, 2016. Merced, which has far fewer majors than the other campuses, will develop three-year degree pathways for three out of its top five majors, which is proportional to what other UC campuses are expected to do. UC has committed to promoting these accelerated pathways for use by students where appropriate, with a goal that 5 percent of all UC undergraduate students will access these accelerated tracks by the summer of 2017.
- Chair Ricci welcomed newly appointed CoR Chair Ajay Gopinathan, CAPRA Chair Mukesh Singhal and Josh Viers, Senate Vice Chair/PROC Co-Chair.
- Members suggested the following topics for the December 2 Meeting of the Division:
  - Principles of Intolerance
  - Project 2020 including the mechanisms for strategic planning vs. academic planning, whether they should be conducted simultaneously and how they connect to Project 2020.
  - Lack of directives with regard to cluster, foundational, and research pillars hires (SAFI).
  - The Provost's vision with regard to cluster hires as interdisciplinary hires for multiple units and how it will be implemented in a fair way.
  - Status of Provost's response to the April, 2015 CAPRA survey.

In April 2015, CAPRA conducted a faculty survey to solicit faculty's input on the Provost's ladder-rank faculty recruitment plan, AY 15-16 through 20-21. Survey results showed that roughly 65% of the faculty were opposed to the Provost's proposal. CAPRA relayed those results to the Provost in May, 2015. This semester, in verbal communications with the Provost, some clarification was provided about the revised hiring plan: 16 new hires plus a minimum of 12 as replacement hires or carry-over from previous years. Next year, there is a commitment for 8-12 foundational hires plus 3 in the research pillars.

**II. Consent Calendar**

- A. The agenda was approved as presented.

**III. Committee Chairs' Reports:**

- [Academic Personnel](#) (CAP) – Vice Chair Fanis Tsoulouhas
  - The CAP/APO meeting took place today. The Provost, AP chairs, and Deans were in attendance. Several issues were discussed, including the diversity of the CAP membership.

The CoC response to CAP on this matter was discussed at the meeting. Vice Chair Tsoulouhas clarified that members do not have to be step VI or above to serve on CAP, as long as they are full professors.

- Compensation for CAP members –During one of the meeting’s sessions, the Provost raised the issue of compensation.
  - o Compensation for service on CAP is a topic that should be addressed by the Senate in the future.
  - o Publication counting - If a faculty has a paper that is accepted, he/she can report it as “accepted” or wait until it is published and report it as “published”. It would be useful to allow faculty to decide when they want their publications to be counted. This may be suggested in the future and faculty will be asked to provide their input.
  - o Acceleration – An external CAP member pointed out that UCM is conservative in recommending accelerations for faculty members. The VPF stated that AP chairs will be provided with additional training on the review process so that AP chairs will be more confident when to recommend acceleration. In some cases, CAP will recommend acceleration even when the candidate’s unit and dean did not.
  - o Time to tenure – Only UCI and UCM have a five-year clock that encapsulates publications within those these five years. CAP considers the dossiers on the sixth year. The rest of the UCs have a six-year clock which can be advantageous. As a new campus, it would be good for UCM to have an additional year. Some faculty have started asking for postponements.
  - o The Career Equity Review – Faculty has to have been at UCM for at least four years in order to be considered for equity review.
- [Academic Planning & Resource Allocation](#) (CAPRA) – Chair Mukesh Singhal
  - This year, the Provost/EVC released four foundational FTE lines. CAPRA has not received any further updates from the Provost and it is not clear if a campus wide call will be issued.
  - CAPRA has also requested information on campus budget updates and the Provost/EVC is consulting with the Chancellor on which budget items are ready to be shared with CAPRA.
  - IPSJ – Professor Amussen, Chair of the IPSJ Steering Committee, gave a presentation on September 23. A DivCo member mentioned that the IPSJ’s Steering Committee vote closes today at 5pm (about 50~ faculty have identified themselves as IPSJ faculty) The next steps for IPSJ is to meet with the Provost/EVC.
  - Sustainability Steering Committee representatives will present to CAPRA at the October 14 meeting.
  - The Computational Science and Data Analytics Steering committee is planning to present at a future meeting.
  - On September 23, AVC of Real Estate Abigail Rider gave a presentation about Project 2020. The Validation book has been distributed to faculty.
- [Committees](#) (CoC) – Chair Patti LiWang
 

CoC has a few outstanding committee appointments:

  - Additional member on GC
  - A non-life scientist on CAP (not necessarily a step VI), as a replacement for former member David Kelley.
  - A SSHA representative on CAPRA
  - A vice chair for P&T (the vice chair should be a UCM faculty)
- [Committee on Research](#) (CoR)– Chair Ajay Gopinathan
 

COR’s inaugural meeting took place last Friday. The Provost and the VCR were in attendance. Discussion items included:

- Last year, COR drafted a compelling memo to the Provost/EVC requesting an increase of the funds for faculty research grants. At the COR meeting, the Provost/EVC seemed to agree to provide a small increase of funds. One of COR's goals this year is to streamline the process for awarding faculty research grants.
- In 2014, the Senate approved a comprehensive set of policies drafted by COR in AY 13-14 on the establishment and review of ORUs, including centers and core facilities. These comprehensive policies were distributed widely to the campus. Subsequently, the Provost/EVC drafted his own policy on centers and the VCRED drafted a clarification process on ORUs. The Senate reviewed both of these policies and requested, via memos from Division Council in AY 14-15, the need for one, streamlined, campus policy on the establishment and review of ORUs, centers, and core facilities. At Friday's meeting, COR discussed the need to have one central campus policy. Both the Provost and the VCRED are willing to work with the Senate to move forward with one campus policy. The next step is for the administration to respond to the Senate's comments on the administrative policies.
- Limited Submission Opportunities – there was a general feeling that the process was not transparent. A policy, drafted by the VCRED, delegates most of the processes to the schools. The School Executive Committees will be asked to participate in a limited submission opportunity process to ensure faculty consultation and participation.
- [Rules and Elections](#) (CRE) – Chair Peter Vanderschraaf
  - CRE met recently. The agenda focused on the committee's goals this year, which include the drafting of a policy related to the process for voting eligibility in the Schools. A DivCo member asked if LPSEs have voting rights. Chair Vanderschraaf clarified that the policy states that LPSEs do not have voting rights for personnel cases but they can be granted those rights. Last year, in response to a question about voting on tenure cases by junior faculty, CRE recommended that only faculty at or above rank be granted to vote on personnel cases.
- [Diversity and Equity](#) (D&E) – Chair Tanya Golash-Boza
  - Diversity statement – The School of Natural Sciences requires all faculty candidates to submit a diversity statement as part of their application. SSHA and ENG will be asked to develop guidelines for diversity statements in the context of their hiring processes.
  - Some campuses currently have faculty equity advisors. These are Senate faculty who have an active role in faculty recruitment strategies and climate issues. D&E recommended that each School be assigned two faculty advisors.
  - Diversity criteria and Program review – the diversity component will be considered and included in the proposed revisions to the program review policies.
- [Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom](#) (FWAF) – Chair Rudy Ortiz
  - FWAF is collaborating with the VPF to offer faculty welfare development programs. The main issue is related to the recent Regent's Statement against the Principles of Intolerance.
  - FWAF will provide a recommendation on the implementation plan for the faculty salary increases.
  - FWAF has been interacting with the VPF with regard to the 2020 Project and space allocation for faculty in particular. FWAF met with the VPDGE to discuss graduate students space issues.
- [Graduate Council](#) (GC) – Chair Mike Dawson
  - GC is reviewing the policies and processes for CCGA proposals.
  - Teaching as scholarships – GC is discussing the idea of proposing TAs as scholarships and apprenticeships to provide a foundation for graduate students' future career opportunities
  - GC considered VPDGE Zatz's request to hire graduate students to work in non-academic units on campus (requested by a faculty member and a unit). Although the intention is good; due to

issues related to faculty oversight, salary logistics, the request was declined. There are issues related to faculty titles administrative vs. academic.

- [Undergraduate Council](#) (UGC) – Chair Christopher Viney
  - UGC’s most substantive discussion was the review of the GASP proposal. UGC was fairly supportive and some clarification was requested regarding enrollment projections for the program. UGC will convene tomorrow with the main agenda item being the report from the task force on University Honors.
  - For the 2015-16 admissions cycle, UCB will not be soliciting recommendations at the time of application and will limit the opportunity of letter submission to a set of applicants that includes all those who are ranked as “possible”, based on the predictive index. Letters will also be solicited of any applicants ranked as “possible” by the review process who may not be predicted as such from the predictive index. Letters of recommendation will only be considered for admissions decisions of students who are ranked “possible” by a review, which includes a read by a reviewer without the use of letters of recommendation. The Berkeley website will reflect the fact that letters will not be solicited at the time of application and will only be requested of a select pool of applicants, and always on a voluntary basis for 2015-16.

#### IV. Project 2020 Questionnaire – Discussion of Results – Vice Chair Viers

This survey was the result of a suggestion made by CAPRA to identify a formal mechanism to solicit broad interest and discussion among faculty about Project 2020 and to provide them with a conduit for feedback. Survey results show that out of 235 faculty surveyed, 37 responded (a 10% response rate). One of the questions was “on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least informed (ignorant) and 10 being most informed (expert), how would you qualify your knowledge of the 2020 Project broadly?” The responses yielded an average score of 6.6.

The final question was “This is a new method of communicating your interests to UC Merced Academic Senate Divisional Council. How would you rate your experience?” The mean was 3.5. Some comments included the need to consult with an expert; to provide more room for comments; and the need to make the surveys shorter.

Most space-related responses were concerns about the functionality of space, the lack of instructional and graduate students’ space. There were some good suggestions about creating more faculty interaction opportunities. In some cases, there were very specific detailed responses which will be summarized and communicated to VC Feitelberg.

DivCo Members’ Comments:

- In SNS, faculty were asked to submit their comments on/concerns about the project directly to their unit chair. It is not clear if the chairs reported those comments via the survey. A DivCo member suggested that in the future, faculty comments be consolidated and sent to relevant campus leaders. CAPRA was suggested as the lead committee charged with facilitating this process.
- A member inquired about the existence of defined processes within the Schools that are available to faculty to provide input on Project 2020. It was noted that SSHA has a space committee. A suggestion was made to ask DivCo to encourage the schools Executive Committees and Bylaw units.
- A concern was raised about the mode of communication between the 2020 planning team and the Senate faculty.
- A request was made to ask the Deans to share their responses to the 2020 team with CAPRA.

Action: Vice Chair Viers volunteered to summarize the responses and send them to the administrative leadership on behalf of DivCo.

#### V. [Faculty Salaries Increases](#)

Provost/EVC Peterson requested the Division Council's feedback on the distribution of the 1.5% component of the faculty salary increase. Senate Chair Ricci has requested that the FWAF and D&E committees take the lead on providing feedback and suggestions for implementation.

- [D&E Proposal](#) (10/5/15)
- [FWAF Proposal](#) (10/7/15)

#### **Actions Requested:**

- Discuss FWAF and D&E proposals for distribution of 1.5% faculty salary increases.
- Send a recommendation to Provost/EVC Peterson by October 19, 2015.

D&E Chair summarized D&E's approach as follows.

- The Deans should review cases of obvious inequities within their Schools as they have access to refined tools for salary equity studies. In SOE and SSHA, the Deans have been in place for less than two months, therefore they may benefit from their faculty input.
- APO should publicly issue salary data so faculty can have a clear picture of discrepancies, inequities and thus, can better assess their situations vis-à-vis their peers. There needs to be very specific guidelines regarding the Deans' management of equity and exceptional merit. The idea is to encourage faculty to voice their concerns about potential inequities.

FWAF's approach:

- FWAF consulted with VPF Camfield and discussed the 1.5% increase and the source of those funds. Following discussion with the VPF, it was learned that this percentage represents 1.5% (about \$300K) of all ladder-rank faculty off-scale salaries. It is not clear how such a finite amount of money will be sufficient to address salary compression, inversion, equity, and exceptional merit. Therefore, funds may need to be used to address only two of the four areas.
- FWAF proposed to the VPF that 70% be used for compression/inversion and the remainder to be used for inequities. FWAF did not address exceptional merit or scholarship.

Interpretations of implementation of the increases varied among DivCo members. It is not clear how the 1.5% will be sufficient to increase everybody's salary.

**Action:** In light of the recent update from APO, FWAF Chair will request clarification from the VPF.

#### VI. **Report on the Status of Endowed Chairs - D&E Chair Golash-Boza**

During its 9/21 meeting, the Diversity and Equity Committee discussed the memo from last year's Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom on the lack of diversity in UCM endowed chairs. To better inform the committee's discussion, VPF Camfield later circulated to committee members the draft section of the MAPP pertaining to endowed chairs. D&E recommended revisions to this section of the MAPP accordingly.

- [D&E Memo](#) with proposed MAPP revisions (October 5, 2015)
- [FWAF Memo](#) (May 15, 2015)

Last year, the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom submitted a memo to Division Council, pointing out the lack of gender and ethnic diversity in UCM's endowed chairships. The memo was discussed at the September 14 Division Council meeting. After a brief discussion, D&E members decided to review the Endowed Chairs section of the MAPP and recommend revisions. The revisions will need to be addressed by the Senate in consultation with VPF Camfield.

There are 15 endowed chairs on campus, half of them are unoccupied and only one seat is occupied by a woman. Given these disparities, D&E suggested that a proper nomination process be identified to ensure equity issues are taken into account and that a clear criteria nomination be identified. D&E recommended that a call for nominations be issued with a clear description of the nomination process and timeline. It is not clear if the Senate will be asked to make recommendations for potential candidates to the Deans.

A discussion ensued about the eligibility of faculty members who become administrators. It was noted that this is not unusual in medical schools as some deans or department chairs hold endowed chairs titles.

It was suggested that DivCo send a memo to the administrative leadership urging them to fill the vacancies as soon as possible.

**VII. [Revised Global Arts Studies \(GASP\) proposal](#) (effective Fall 2016) – *Chair Ricci***

Comments were solicited from standing senate committees, the Provost, the VPDUE and the Coordinator of Institutional Assessment.

Comments:

- [CAPRA](#)
- [GC](#)
- [UGC](#)
- [Provost/EVC, VPDUE, Director of Institutional Assessment](#)

**Action Requested:** discuss revised proposal and comments received. DivCo sends its recommendation to Interim SSHA Dean Jeff Gilger.

Chair Ricci reported that he read all the comments received on this proposal and it seemed that all committees seemed favorable to the establishment of this major.

A comment was made about last year's GC's concerns with regard to the delivery of graduate courses, in particular. In the revised proposal, it is not clear if the program will be able to deliver graduate courses given the current faculty body. Although the number of faculty has increased, it is still disproportionate with the amount of graduate classes. GC's perspective is that this is a general shortcoming for graduate groups and as a general principle; there should be an infrastructure within all programs to support and ensure the delivery of graduate courses. GC would like some clarification on how the program plans to deliver graduate instruction.

CAPRA seemed to be in favor of this proposal.

A question was raised about CAPRA's view with regard to resources. CAPRA chair reported that CAPRA's concerns revolved around the hiring of Unit 18 lecturers to deliver some of the courses. This

was later changed to LPSOEs in the revised proposal. CAPRA felt that the program's response addressed the concerns previously raised by the committee. CAPRA's view is that the decision of space allocation should be addressed by the administrative leadership.

UGC requested more information about enrollment projections.

Action: The proposal will be sent back to the School Dean with a request that GC's concerns be addressed.

#### VIII. Regent Blum's Remarks on Proposed Statement of Principles Against Intolerance

Link to proposed statement and Regent Blum's remarks:

<http://academeblog.org/2015/09/25/cucfa-and-aaup-statement-on-uc-regent-blums-remarks/>

Professor Malloy, UCFW Representative, has requested comments from the Senate leadership on Regent Blum's remarks. FWAF was asked to issue a statement.

- [FWAF Memo to Chair Ricci](#)

**Action Requested:** Discuss FWAF's statement. Draft Statement on behalf of DivCo to UCFW.

FWAF Chair Ortiz reported that this summer, President Napolitano asked the Regents to constitute a task force to develop a statement of Principles against Intolerance. This stemmed from an issue at UCLA, related to anti-Semitism and repercussions on the campus. There currently exist policies that protect individuals from any form of harassment. The President wanted the task force to delve into the issue of intolerance. The initial statement fringes on encroaching on the first Amendment, because the initial statement restricted freedom of speech as designed to harass or discriminate. At the 9/17 regents meeting, Blum alluded to the fact that if the UC does not comply with this statement, there would be political repercussions.

The University Committee on Academic Freedom is drafting a statement that will be sent to the President.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:10pm.