# EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Thursday, October 15, 2015  
2:10 PM to 4:00 PM  
1003 Kemper Hall

## Agenda Items - UPDATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:10-2:15</td>
<td>Welcome/Introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-2:30</td>
<td>Introduction to business conduct practices for Executive Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00</td>
<td>Chair’s Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget Framework Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Four-Year Degree Completion Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enrollment Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Small Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Animal Facilities Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:15</td>
<td>Appoint – Executive Council’s Student Petitions Subcommittee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-3:30</td>
<td>Request approval to establish the Executive Council Special Committee:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search Waivers During Academic Recruitment – Charge Enclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is carry forward business from the 2014-2015 Executive Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which supported establishment of a special committee to review the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use of search waivers during faculty recruitment. The need for a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special committee was established based on the recommendation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review Initiative, and growing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concern amongst the faculty concerning use of search waivers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-3:50</td>
<td>Confidential Correspondence from the Faculty Privilege and Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Advisers Committee – Whiteboard Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50-4:00</td>
<td>Student Evaluations of Teaching: What are the respective roles of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Senate and the Administration in the formulation and use of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student evaluations at the School of Medicine?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Consent Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IET Learning Management System Status Report</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Animal Facilities Task Force Status Report</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Access Status Report</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Future Executive Council Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor and Provost will attend one Executive Council meeting per</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 15, 2015

Dear Colleagues,

Annually, a Subcommittee of the Executive Council serves as the review body for student petitions to the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Each year the college Faculty Executive Committee Chairs are appointed to serve on the Subcommittee. This letter confirms your appointment, which begins immediately and runs through August 31, 2016. In recent years, as described below, we have created a process that limits workload for all subcommittee members.

Student petitions typically request exception to issues such as the residency requirement or correction of an administrative error. The colleges review such petitions and only those petitions approved by the college are forwarded to the Divisional Academic Senate.

The review process is managed by an analyst in the Academic Senate Office through ASIS, a secure web portal. In order to streamline review of petitions, those requesting approval to correct routine administrative errors will come directly to me, as Subcommittee Chair, and I will respond on behalf of the Subcommittee. Otherwise, the petition and any supporting documentation will be posted to the Subcommittee white board. You will be notified by email when this occurs and be given a reasonable amount of time – usually a week – to respond. When the responses are unanimous or consensus of majority, I will issue an approval letter. When there is a manageable difference of opinion, I will seek consent. Any subcommittee member may request a meeting to discuss a petition. If we are unable to resolve an issue or if the subcommittee believes the issue is too difficult for its review, the issue will be forwarded to the full Executive Council for review and decision. We usually average 50 petitions per year, with 2-3 being forwarded for subcommittee review; however it’s not possible to predict how many to expect this year.

Thank you for your willingness to share your time, ability and expertise in the vital process of shared governance of the University of California.

Sincerely,

André Knoesen, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

c: Executive Director Anderson
Executive Council Review Outcome:

**Davis Division of the Academic Senate**  
**Proposed Executive Council Special Committee:**  
**Use of Search Waivers During Academic Recruitment**

**Overview:**
In May 2015, the Davis Division of the Academic Senate completed review of the UC Davis ADVANCE Policies and Practices Review Initiative: Recruitment Recommendations\(^1\). Recommendation 6 discussed concern regarding use of search waivers to recruit faculty. The 2014-2015 Executive Council concurred with the recommendation that “a detailed assessment of the ways in which search waivers are currently being used and the criteria employed in reviewing each request…” and decided to appoint Special Committee.

**Duration:**
The Executive Council Special Committee: Use of Search Waivers During Academic Recruitment (Special Committee) will convene as soon as possible in Fall Quarter so that it may complete its work and submit its report to the Executive Council by April 1, 2016.

**Purpose:**
The Academic Senate Office will request a confidential report from the Vice Provost – Academic Affairs detailing search waivers approved over the past 5 years for all Academic Senate titles, including justification (Campus and Health System); and existing local unit practices for requesting search waivers by every school and college. The Special Committee will use the data to determine the alignment between practice and existing policy. The Special Committee report will outline its assessment as well as recommend actions to align practice with policy as well as methods to increase transparency of the process.

**Membership:**
The Chair and voting members will be appointed by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees. Six Academic Senate members: four members from a college and two members from a professional school. Members should have academic personnel process experience.

**Staff Support:**
Staff support will be provided by the Academic Senate Office

---

\(^1\) ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review Initiative November 2014 Recommendations:  
Dear Andre,

We spent the summer finishing our evaluation of the three learning management system (LMS) candidates, and a committee of faculty, staff, graduate students and undergraduates scored the best and final offers from the three LMS vendors. Working with Procurement and the University Counsel, we are now negotiating with the successful bidder and expect to have a contract finalized sometime in October. Once we have a signed contract, we look forward to making a formal announcement to the campus regarding the final decision. At that time we will also begin the process of implementation.

Our timeline is as follows:

During the coming fall and winter quarters we will focus on integration of the new LMS with key university databases and information systems, especially CAS and Banner, as well as train all necessary technical and support staff. We will also finalize strategies for the migration of data and content to the new LMS.

We will be looking for about 50 faculty members to serve as early adopters for spring 2016 classes. We anticipate that the new LMS will be available for use by any and all interested faculty members beginning in the summer of 2016. We plan for the full migration of faculty and students to the new LMS during the 2016-2017 school year, with a focus on fall and winter of that year.

SmartSite will be formally retired as a teaching platform at the end of spring, 2017. However, we courses will remain accessible to faculty until 2020. This will help to accommodate faculty who wish to write letters of recommendations, address grade change requests, and consult classes taught in what will then be our previous LMS.

In addition to course sites, SmartSite has been used for numerous project sites. Starting this fall, Academic Technology Services staff will be contacting project site owners to work with them to move their sites to the new learning management system, or to help them transition to other modern collaborative communication tools and platforms.

As our transition process progresses we will provide you with further updates. Please let me know if there are other Academic Senate leaders you would like us to include in these updates.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions you or your Academic Senate colleagues might have.

Best regards,
David

David S. Levin, Ph.D.
Director
IET-Academic Technology Services
University of California, Davis
(530) 754-7065
http://ats.ucdavis.edu

Received:  September 28, 2015
I. Strategic Vision

UC Davis will establish a comprehensive plan to modernize animal teaching and research facilities, infrastructure and services. This plan will be managed by a respected and highly qualified leader, in collaboration with key stakeholders, who is empowered with adequate resources to achieve clearly defined strategic and operational objectives.

II. Executive Summary

Animal research is the cornerstone of scientific discovery in many research fields and the transference of that knowledge to the classroom and the business community are strong elements of academic excellence. The breadth and scale of the animal program at UC Davis is unparalleled to any other academic institution. Our facilities, systems, space, equipment, and infrastructure to sustain this enterprise have grown organically over a century in a manner that parallels other campus support systems. Each unit does its best to optimize its individual operation, yet the campus misses strategic opportunities to proactively align campus resources, research and academic priorities at the institutional level.

In order to achieve the aspirational goals as outlined in the 2020 Initiative, we must implement a new approach in managing animal facilities and animal care programs that honors both the unique attributes of the academic units while allowing for common services and regulatory oversight to be efficiently provided. It is acknowledged that some units currently have high user satisfaction and efficient operations. Our goal is to balance the needs for unit flexibility with institutional economies of scale and compliance needs.

The observations and recommendations that follow are the synthesis of much thoughtful work that has transpired over the past seven years by various groups. Most recently, the Academic Senate Committee on Research compelled a call to action to position the campus for success in this vital academic endeavor that is critical to our academic and research enterprise.

In summary, we recommend the following actions:

1. Establish a leadership position (Director) with a clear mandate and resources to drive the program based on established goals. He/she will report to the VC for Finance, Operations & Administration (who is also the university CFO and Institutional Official) and the Vice Chancellor for Research in a matrixed fashion.
2. Develop a comprehensive financial and operational framework for all vivaria, including a published and transparent rate methodology by species and service level that provides flexibility to account for the wide range of requirements among investigators and is responsive to competitive and affordability demands. The Director will be responsible for driving space utilization policies, operational efficiency and securing appropriate institutional investment.

3. Create a multi-year animal facility master plan and capital funding plan to align with institutional academic priorities. This will require a ten year view with committed and substantial resources earmarked for animal care affiliated with teaching and research. This includes giving priority to the planning for new state of the art facilities. [Note: From prior reports and general stakeholder input there is strong consensus that a new rodent building is required. This Task Force acknowledges that facilities for other species will likely also be needed.]

4. Establish/codify organizational reporting relationships and stakeholder groups to guide realization of this new operational model.

5. Prepare a detailed roadmap for each of the important components of a successful program with quarterly milestones and specific objectives. The Director and Cabinet (defined Section VI) is charged with the strategic and operational leadership associated with these items.

6. Establish a proactive and ongoing faculty feedback mechanism on teaching and research requirements.

**Implementation Timeline**

**July 31, 2015**  
**Director Search Initiated**  
**Status:**
1. Hiring of Search Firm in progress  
2. Position Description being finalized  
3. Nominations for Search Committee from Academic Senate and Academic Federation received  
4. Search Committee charge letter imminent

**July 2015 - Mar 31, 2016**  
**Financial structure including rate management**  
**Status:**
1. Task Force has weekly scheduled meetings through December.  
2. Two subteams:  
   a. Capital planning which addresses necessary capital investments for program sustainability. Topics include:  
      i. New campus cage wash facility  
      ii. Deferred maintenance of animal facilities  
      iii. Ideas to improve procedure space  
   b. Financial operations with addresses husbandry expenses for TRACS and non-TRACs vivaria  
      i. Documentation of total costs
ii. Discussion of comparison rates from other universities
iii. Discussion of allowable/non-allowable expenses per the NIH cost guidelines

3. Next Steps:
   a. Finalize scope for campus cage wash project
   b. Scenario planning for rates
   c. Hire a consultant to develop a facilities renewal plan

Future Plans

December 31, 2015  Director hired

Jan 1 – June 30, 2016  Assessment of Programmatic Needs
A consultant will be engaged to meet with key stakeholders of Animal related programs UCD wide. The deliverable is a report that characterizes current and planned programmatic (research and teaching) activities; a gap analysis concerning facility condition and support/procedure space vs. desired; and proposed prioritization schema considering a ten year time-horizon.

July 1, 2016  Creation of a Facilities Master Plan
Create a master plan for facilities based on programmatic assessment. Additional work will be undertaken to create and update a facilities management plan.
To: André Knoesen, Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Library Committee

Date: October 13, 2015

Re: Open Access

The Open Access Policy adopted by the Academic Senate in July 2013 allows Senate faculty to make their articles freely available to the public in an open access repository called eScholarship. The policy does not transfer copyright to UC nor allow UC to sell the articles. It does not prevent faculty from transferring copyright to publishers. And it permits faculty to opt out.

The initial launch of the UC Open Access Policy began in January 2015 at UCSF, UC Irvine, UCLA, and UCSB. Two key lessons emerged from these rollouts: (1) the importance of clear faculty outreach, education, and support with respect to the policy; and (2) the usefulness of a publication management tool that (a) notifies faculty of articles published after July 2013 not yet posted to eScholarship, and (b) helps upload or link affected articles to eScholarship.

In January 2016, UC Davis will launch Open Access. In other words, we have less than three months to conduct outreach with Senate faculty pertaining to their obligations and rights under the policy. (Currently, the UC Open Access Policy covers only Academic Senate Faculty. A pending Presidential Proposal would cover non-Senate members.)

On October 12, the Library Committee received a presentation from the University Library pertaining to implementation of Open Access at UC Davis. Subsequent to the presentation, the Committee discussed ideas for conducting faculty outreach, education, and support over the next three months as well as throughout the implementation period beginning in early 2016.

The list below summarizes suggested outreach efforts, all of which seek to keep the outreach simple, direct, user-friendly, and useful. The Library Committee will continue discussing the feasibility and implementation of these efforts over the next month (making sure not to duplicate similar efforts by the University Library). In addition, the Chair of the Committee will be prepared to deliver a presentation to the Executive Council at its meeting on November 15 describing how these and other ideas are being carried out. Possible outreach efforts include:

- Sending an email from the Library Committee to all Senate members describing Open Access, and highlighting Senate members’ obligations and rights under the policy. In particular, the communication will explain Senate members’ options under the policy, the timeline for implementation, and how they can deposit work to eScholarship, receive embargoes and waivers for specific articles, and get their questions answered.
  - The email will also include a link to the excellent website created by the Office of Scholarly Communication describing Open Access. This resource walks users through what the policy does and does not do, describes how to comply with the policy, deposit work in eScholarship, obtain embargoes or waivers, and provides
• Provide a way for Senate members to ask questions and raise concerns online, and to have those questions answered and concerns addressed within a reasonable period of time. At UC campuses that have implemented Open Access, the Library provides this service, and helps faculty with, for instance, the process of verifying articles for inclusion in the publications management system, uploading articles to eScholarship, and advising on copyright issues, author agreements, and negotiation with publishers. Either as an alternative or in conjunction with the above effort, we might consider hosting an interactive question/answer link on the Academic Senate website.

• Facilitate depositing articles or linking to articles (the latter in the event the article is already available via an alternative Open Access depository) by permitting faculty to appoint a delegate to verify their publications identified by the publications management system and to upload/link articles. Delegates can include faculty assistants, department administrators, research assistants, subject librarians, etc.
  o While this option is not yet available for UC Davis implementation, other UC campuses have deployed such a policy in rolling out Open Access. See http://www.library.ucla.edu/support/copyright-data-publishing/scholarly-communication-services/university-california-publication-management-system.

• Encourage departments, schools, other institutional units to identify/appoint a “concierge” or point person on Open Access. This person(s), perhaps members of an IT department, could work with the Library Committee (and the University Library) in outreach and implementation of Open Access.