The Meeting of the Division was called to order by Chair Chehab on June 2, 2014 at 2:00 in room C-701. A quorum was present. The meeting was also available via video simulcast.

Special Orders
The minutes of the February 24, 2014 meeting (Attachment 1) were approved via the Consent Calendar. Revisions to the Graduate Council bylaws (Attachment 2), revisions to Appendix VII (Attachment 3-4), approval of a new program-PhD Program in Physical Rehabilitation (Attachment 5), and 2014-2015 Appointments to Academic Senate Standing Committees (Attachment 5) were also approved via the Consent Calendar.

Announcement from the Division Chair – Farid Chehab
Division Chair Chehab recognized and thanked outgoing committee chairs for their Academic Senate service and participation in shared governance.

Topic Updates
Gift and Endowment Tax Proposed Changes – Sandra Weiss, Member, Academic Planning & Budget Committee

Sandra Weiss advised that campus leadership had reviewed the alternative proposal put forth by the Academic Senate and the APB Subcommittee on the gift and endowment tax. After reviewing the proposal, campus leadership agreed to allow for the increase to be incrementally phased-in, but rejected the other recommendations.

Campus leaders did concede that they didn’t consult with the Senate early enough in the process, and that there needed to be more transparency on how core administration funds are spent, so that faculty can understand that the revenue gained from the gift assessment proposal will ultimately go back to the faculty.

Senate Bylaw 55 and Results of the Climate Survey – Paul Green, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee

FWC Chair Green advised that UCSF had the highest response rate among all UC campuses. One issue raised is that all members of the review panel were Caucasian with only three women included. Overall, those present in the audience believed that as UCSF prides itself on excellence, the campus shouldn’t be middle-of-the-pack. Senate members present advocated for a strong cultural climate—not only because it’s the right thing to do—but also because it makes for a better environment to work within.

*Agenda items deemed noncontroversial by the Chair of the Divisional Senate, may be placed on a Consent Calendar under Special Orders. Approval of all business on the Consent Calendar requires a single unanimous vote. At the request of an Divisional Assembly member, any Consent Calendar item may be extracted for consideration under “New Business” later in the agenda.*
After initial remarks, Chair Green opened it up to questions:

Q: The survey revealed that nearly half (47%) of UCSF faculty have considered leaving. How does this compare with other UC campuses?
A: This information cannot be directly mined from the data; however, FWC can request a specific search be done for this data. Chair Green will follow up with the panel and report back if any additional information is available.

Space Governance Policies & Procedures – Srikantan Nagarajan, Chair, Committee on Research
COR Chair Nagarajan provided an overview of the Committee on Research’s Communication in response to reviewing the campus and SOM Space Planning Initiative (space.usf.edu).

Overall, COR was in support of the policies as authored. It did have the following concerns:

- Governance and implementation of the overall plan: is it School-wise or at a Department level?
  - COR is concerned that without clarity on this, individual investigators and COREs could be adversely affected.
- At present the Space Committee didn’t have broad representation of UCSF faculty.
- At present there is nothing in the core principles to address space growth within a department/group
- COR is hoping a new Standing Committee will be formed to address space issues on an ongoing basis but if not, a standing Task Force is recommended.

Questions that arose from audience members included:

- What are the plans to decant from Laurel Heights?
- What are the next steps?
  - COR was asked to opine by campus leadership. This committee would hope to have full support of the Senate in its interactions with campus leadership. They will continue to examine at a more detailed-level when feasible.
- How are training programs—with no indirect costs—impacted by these space policies? It’s unclear if they’re included or excluded.
- Is there a waiver mechanism?
  - At present the space principles and policies are very broad and campuswide. They do not go into this level of detail as of yet.

Informational Updates
Stanton Glantz, Member, Faculty Association presented an overview of results from the Faculty Association’s Operational Excellence Survey. (Attachment 7-9)

Member Glantz went over the results of the OE Survey conducted by the Association, which is unaffiliated with the Academic Senate. Overall, most departments have seen a rise in cost for pre-award expenses and a similar rise for cost of remaining staff—both dollar and time spent on matters. This dollar value was even higher where HR was involved.

Highlights from the Survey include the following comments:
Faculty commented that they spend more time doing administrative tasks than they did before. Faculty viewed themselves as being seen by Administration as “cash cows and nothing else.” Should be the other way around.

Action Items from the survey included:
1. Having an independent audit performed to determine the cash flow.
2. Dismantling the components of HR and OE that aren’t working and reconstruct, preferable without any loss of staff.
3. Having the Senate’s Academic Planning & Budget (APB) committee canvas Department Managers to determine how much they are outsourcing things and how much are spending to keep people in-house. Also have APB draft a study on central cost data.

**Adjournment**
Chair Chehab adjourned the meeting at 5pm