

DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2022

The Fall meeting of the Berkeley Division was called to order at 3:10 p.m. on Wednesday, October 19, 2022 in Sibley Auditorium in the Bechtel Engineering Center. Professor Mary Ann Smart, Chair of the Berkeley Division, presided. The quorum of 50 Senate members was met.

I. Minutes

Minutes of the October 19, 2021 meeting of the Division (Enclosure 1)
Minutes of the May 3, 2022 meeting of the Division (Enclosure 2)

ACTION: The minutes of the October 19, 2021 and May 3, 2022 meetings of the Division were approved as presented.

II. Announcements by the President

President Michael V. Drake was unable to attend.

III. Other Announcements

A. Chancellor Carol Christ

The Chancellor provided a campus strategy update presentation with a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis structure.

UC Berkeley strengths include the University's outstanding reputation in innovation and discovery, increasing diversity among students and faculty, expanding capacity for innovation, and UC Berkeley's longstanding partnership with the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

For weaknesses, UC Berkeley houses the lowest proportion of undergraduates of any UC campus, and state funding has continued to decline in nominal and real numbers. The faculty/student ratio is skewed, due to the fact that the number of ladder faculty has remained stagnant for decades. State support, tuition, and student fees do not adequately fund undergraduate education, and there are many seismically challenged and some obsolete buildings on campus.

Threats identified include the cost of deferred maintenance and seismic retrofitting, which is an \$8.5 billion issue. Also, despite the space challenges, there is statewide pressure to increase enrollment.

One opportunity lies in the data science major, which is the fastest growing major at Berkeley. Another is the development of a campus at NASA Moffett Field. Additionally, there is opportunity for expansion at Richmond Field station, and Berkeley is also looking to expand its already successful partnership with UC San Francisco. Campus is

moving toward a 100% electric renewable energy supply as part of the decarbonization plan.

The UC Berkeley strategic plan has three main focuses: student experience; research; and diversity and community building. There are plans to increase student housing capacity, but there is still a long way to go. However, the \$6 billion campaign has been successful, and the goal is expected to be reached by the end of October 2022.

B. Berkeley Division Chair Mary Ann Smart

Division Chair Smart spoke to the challenges campus is facing after the pandemic, and the importance of identifying the supports, shelters, and connections that require attention – and to understand how to restore and improve them.

Division Chair Smart shared her hope for the year, which was that the Berkeley community could take on some of the more ambitious aspects of rebuilding and reimagining what was lost during the pandemic – not that the pandemic is over, but that we're now in a better space to assess and progress.

Though teaching larger classes can be difficult, Division Chair Smart said that many faculty feel a sense of pride that campus is serving a larger and more diverse student body. Last year, Berkeley received more than 128,000 applications and admitted a class in which nearly 70% were U.S. students of color. While the energy on campus and constant list of things to be done can create the impression that life is back to normal, this is an energy that should be both celebrated and resisted, as it is important to hold and honor the losses of 2020 and 2021. From surveys performed by UCOP, last year, 36% of faculty and 40% of female faculty felt that their research had suffered greatly during the pandemic. Roughly another 40% of faculty reported that their research had suffered somewhat. Junior faculty, underrepresented faculty, and female faculty took the biggest hit, which will result in the narrowing and slowing of the pipeline for these faculty into senior and leadership positions. What faculty need most now is time, and it is very difficult to retrieve lost time.

Division Chair Smart spoke briefly about the budget situation, which continues to face complications, especially now that the gains of cohort tuition and last year's illusory increase in state funding stack up against rising costs, especially for personnel. However, Berkeley administration has been effective with making more with less, which is evidenced by the programs introduced to support faculty early in the pandemic, such as the new task force on reducing bureaucratic burden, and the plan to address deferred maintenance.

Division Chair Smart expressed that now is the moment for faculty to begin to imagine the future of what a Berkeley education could look like, both for students and faculty. To meet the capacity plan introduced by President Drake, not only will the size of the ladder faculty need to be increased, but a plan for the right balance of online and in-person instruction will need to be realized – which will take additional time and energy.

In conclusion, Division Chair Smart shared one of her priorities as Senate Chair for the year, which was to create space for visionary conversations, and to find support and incentives that would make it possible for faculty to engage in them.

C. Graduate Assembly Rules Officer Krish Desai

The Graduate Assembly (GA) Rules Officer Krish Desai shared the GA mission, which is to improve the lives of graduate students at Berkeley and create community. He then expressed that the messaging regarding academic freedom from campus administration has concerned graduate students, and they would like to work with faculty colleagues to ensure that academic freedom is upheld and not compromised in any way.

Desai then went on to share some of the issues and concerns facing graduate students, which include:

- The cost-of-living crisis.
- Graduate student working conditions.
- Lack of independent graduate student government and ability to advocate for themselves properly.
- The proliferation of self-supporting professional graduate degree programs (SSGPDPs).
- The need for increased administrative support staff, as the ratio of students to graduate student instructors (GSI's) has increased over the past several years.
- The urgency in advocating for a funding pool for graduate student resources.

IV. Special Orders-Consent Calendar

A. Proposed amendment to Berkeley Division Bylaw 25 (Committee on Research)

The Committee on Research proposed an amendment to its bylaw to reflect that the grant program for emeritus faculty has been transferred to the Office of the Vice Provost for the Faculty as of this year. The Committee on Rules and Elections reviewed the proposed amendment and found it to be consonant with Berkeley Division legislation. Divisional Council also approved the amendment.

25. RESEARCH (Am. 4.29.04, 11.14.06, 5.1.14, 11.1.16)

A. Membership

This Committee has a Chair and at least nine Senate members.

B. Duties

- This Committee advises the Division in matters pertaining to the research mission of the Division and the University;
- Confers with and advises the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor-Research on faculty perspectives regarding research policy matters; and
- ~~Administers and allocates funds designated for emeritus faculty in support of research and scholarship according to established policy; and~~

- Participates in reviews of Organized Research Units and makes recommendations to the Divisional Council based on these reviews.

B. Proposed amendments to Berkeley Division Regulation 882 (Master of Nutritional Science and Dietetics Degree)

The Department of Nutritional Sciences and Toxicology proposed amendments to BDR 882 to change the minimum course letter grade required to satisfy degree requirements for the Master of Nutritional Science and Dietetics degree from a C- to a C, and other minor revisions to the wording of the regulation. Graduate Council has reviewed and approved the change in degree requirements. The Committee on Rules and Elections reviewed the proposed amendments and found them to be consonant with Berkeley Division legislation. Divisional Council also approved the amendments.

882. MASTER OF NUTRITIONAL SCIENCE AND DIETETICS DEGREE (En. 05/27/22)

A. Admission Requirements

The candidate must have:

- Earned at least a bachelor's degree granted by a U.S. regionally accredited college/university or foreign equivalent
- Established their eligibility for graduate standing at the University of California
- Complied with requirements regarding supervised training facilities, including insurance requirements, drug testing, criminal background checks, and immunizations

B. Conditions

The degree of Master of Nutritional Sciences and Dietetics (MNSD) will be granted on the following conditions:

a. Admission

- i. Fulfilled requirements for admission in accordance with provisions of BDR 882A.

b. Unit Requirements and Internship Training

- i. Completed a ~~4~~four semesters plus one summer of graduate study and internship placements, or equivalent, as specified or deemed acceptable by the Faculty of the Program.

c. Grades

- i. Only courses in which the grades of A, B, C, or S are assigned may be counted in satisfaction of requirements for the Master's Degree.
- ii. No ~~grade~~course in which a grade lower than a ~~C-~~C is assigned may be counted in satisfaction of the requirements for the degree.

- iii. The candidate must maintain an average of three grade points per unit ~~in those courses and~~ in all courses required or elected during the candidate's residence as a graduate student at the University of California. "Satisfactory" grades will be disregarded for the purpose of counting the grade-point average.
- d. **Capstone**
 - i. Complete a capstone element prepared in accordance with the rules of the Graduate Council, under conditions as stated by the faculty of the program.
 - ii. Satisfactory evaluation of the capstone element.

ACTION: The proposed amendments were approved as presented.

V. Reports of Special Committees (None)

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Committee on Rules and Elections (written report only – Enclosure 3)

VII. Petitions of Students (None)

VIII. Unfinished Business (None)

IX. University and Faculty Welfare

A. The Future of Online Education (Discussion only)

A panel discussion considered lessons learned about online instruction during the pandemic and envisioned the appropriate role for online instruction over the next decade in an environment of constantly increasing enrollment. Panelists included Jenae Cohn, Executive Director, Center for Teaching and Learning; Sean Gailmard (Political Science), Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom (ACFR); Joshua Hug, Associate Teaching Professor, (Electrical Engineering & Computer Sciences); Andrea Roth (Law), Chair, Committee on Teaching (COT); and Ronit Stahl (History), Member of the Task Force on Online and Remote Instruction Post-COVID. The panel was moderated by Felix Fischer (Chemistry), Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI).

After being introduced by the moderator, the panelists shared their own thoughts and experiences pertaining to online learning.

Executive Director Cohn shared her thoughts on the importance of considering the spectrum of environments that can harness the power of social interaction and recognizing the benefits, opportunities, and values that different academic spaces hold.

Professor Stahl discussed the benefits of online learning, and how we have an opportunity to think deeply and engage critically in what practices make classes more accessible for students. Currently, we are in the phase of trying to move forward with lessons learned from the previous phases of online instruction, however our environment lacks flexibility. Effective teaching requires flexibility and does not exist in a vacuum. There is a need for processes that value faculty time and minimize burdens on students, GSIs, faculty and staff.

Dr. Hug explained that as a part of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), he was online heavily prior to the pandemic. He then went on to describe some things that have worked with online teaching, such as providing students with a range of options, such as textbook, videos, recorded lectures, and discussions. Dr. Hug also discussed some tools he has experimented with, such as one that helps students form study groups by using a matching algorithm.

COT Chair Roth shared her disagreement with the notion that there is a pure classroom experience and everything else is a replacement for it. There are various asynchronous experiences within synchronous learning, such as handouts or other assigned readings. A few pros of online learning are: ESL students find it helpful to go back and watch the lecture; it allows for a flipped classroom; and it is helpful to review recorded lectures as a part of teaching evaluations. Some concerns include access to recordings, intellectual property, and academic freedom.

ACFR Chair Gailmard spoke to the implications that online instruction has for academic freedom. Some class discussions may focus on acutely sensitive topics that need to stay within the classroom setting. Another issue is recording and offsite storage – this kind of offsite access imposes a responsibility to inform students, and based on fulfillment of that responsibility, the university has to accept freedom of expression in those classes.

Audience questions were taken following the panel discussion. Some questions and comments that were raised included unauthorized classroom recordings, what labor looks like in a flipped classroom, and the difference between online instruction and the remote instruction that was done during the pandemic.

B. Resolution concerning funding of the Library

Academic Senate members introduced the following resolution:

“In order to protect the quality of the university’s research and teaching mission, the Academic Senate urges the administration to restore support for the library in line with the commitment made by campus in response to the 2013 Report of the Commission on the Future of the Library. This would amount to a permanent restoration of the annual funding level in 2014/5 which, accounting for inflation, would be \$62m, \$17.5m more than the library currently receives.”

Chair Smart explained voting procedures and introduced James Vernon, professor of History.

Professor Vernon expressed that as the most essential part of teaching and research, the library's collections have been degraded due to a lack of resources. In 2014, the library received \$11.5m less than it did in 2008, and it is that lower amount that is being asked of the administration. The library has had a structural deficit of \$5m each year.

Professor Vernon then read the resolution above and moved it to a vote. The motion was seconded.

Various Senate members took the time to comment and express their support of the library resolution as well as the importance of library resources and the negative impact that dwindling resources would have on research.

Following comments by Senate members, the resolution went to a vote. The majority voted in favor of the resolution.

X. New Business (None)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

J. Keith Gilles
Secretary, Berkeley Division