

March 6, 2018

To: Cindy Larive

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

From: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair Riverside Division

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability Re:

Dear Provost Larive:

Please accept the attached set of consultative responses from the Senate Committees and Faculty Executive Committees solicited for consultation on the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability.

You will see that the committees uniformly support the principles underlying the Report, and a few committees provide input on a few substantive matters. I will refrain from a full summary of the responses here, and will instead offer a view of several particular concerns raised by the review.

The Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) expresses concern regarding the structuring of the sustainability office at UCR and the potential adverse effects on the academic/faculty component of enriching the sustainability infrastructure and discourse on the campus. Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) does not support the creation of a separate Senate Committee for Sustainability and instead recommends that the Sustainability Office form a committee of stakeholders that includes Senate representation. Graduate Council strongly affirms the need to encourage and support the growth of graduate student engagement with sustainability initiatives on campus, and supports creative approaches to doing so.

CAF, CEP, Committee on Physical Resources Planning (PRP), Committee on Planning and Budget (P&B), Graduate Council, BCOE Executive Committee, and the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) raise a variety of questions regarding the need for an additional executive administrator to fulfill the sustainability mission as well as the reporting structure for the prospective Sustainability Office. These committees' feedback encourages consideration of other alternatives in establishing an administrative infrastructure that is symbiotic with the academic infrastructure. Multiple committees suggest the need for a holistic vision of how the sustainability mission might be incorporated in a foundational (rather than piecemeal) way into the existing UCR administrative structure, including Facilities Services and the Office of Planning and Budget.

Most seriously, the Committee on Physical Resources Planning, School of Public Policy Executive Committee, Library and Information Technology raise direct concerns over the lack of administrative engagement in the Shared Governance relation during the effective dismantling of the Sustainability Office during AY 2016-2017. The overall feedback on this recent history suggests the

need for a sustainability infrastructure that fundamentally assures the involvement of appropriate Senate faculty in the governing of the office and UCR's broader approach to sustainability.

I trust that this vast consultation will assist your office in developing a long-range plan for fulfilling the vital sustainability mission at our campus. As always, i appreciate your engagement with our Senate members and leadership on this matter.

dylan



November 6, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: John Levin, Chair

Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Report

The Committee on Academic Freedom met to consider the Sustainability Ad Hoc Report at its November 3, 2017 meeting and is in general agreement with the concerns raised in the report. Of particular concern is the structure of sustainability and the diminution of an academic component which limits or hampers UCR academics from expression of their views or elaboration of their expertise. Members support the principles of the proposal; however, we are not necessarily certain of the administrative organization of this initiative or restructuring. Does UCR really need another Executive Administrator?



November 6, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez

Riverside Division Academic Senate

From:

Vyjayanthi Chari, Chair
Committee on Academic Parasa

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Report

The Committee on Academic Personnel met to consider the Sustainability Ad Hoc Report. Members stressed that faculty input into this process is crucial and unanimously support the formation of a standing Senate committee to encourage further collaboration and cooperation between the three pillars.



December 5, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Tim Paine, Chair

Committee on Educational Policy

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee Report

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee report at their December 1, 2017 meeting and were generally supportive of the report. The Committee was not supportive of creating a Senate Committee for Sustainability and instead recommends that the Sustainability Office form a committee of stakeholders and include representation from the Senate. Additionally, the Committee was not supportive of the recommendation for a Vice Provost for Sustainability and instead recommends that a Director of Sustainability be appointed.



January 3, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez

Riverside Division Academic Senate

From:

Suveen Mathaudhu, Chair / Mathaudhu, Chair / Mathaudhu, Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Report

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered the Sustainability Ad-Hoc report at its December 7th meeting. The committee applauds the way the social justice issues of equity and equality are incorporated into the structure and the main definition of sustainability, however these aspects should not outweigh sustainability programs for planning, budget, and facilities. The committee encourages a balance between the three pillars of the proposed structure for sustainability.



November 27, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Amit Roy-Chowdhury, Chair

Committee on Research

RE: Campus Review: [Report Review] Sustainability Ad Hoc

The Committee on Research reviewed the Sustainability Ad Hoc report and supports the implementation but felt that there should not be another online training course. Members acknowledged the need to educate students about sustainability and felt the certificate mentioned in the report would be a great way to support students looking to build a career in sustainability. Integrating sustainability issues within the existing curriculum could be considered.



December 8, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Wee Liang Gan, Chair

Committee on Courses

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee Report

The Committee on Courses reviewed the Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee report at their December 7, 2017 meeting and have opted not to submit a response as the report is outside the Committee's purview of courses and instruction.



January 4, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez

Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Daniel Jeske, Chair

Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Report

The Faculty Welfare Committee met on November 28, 2017 to discuss the Ad-hoc Committee on Sustainability Report that was dated October 23, 2017. The committee recognizes the proposal as a step in the right direction toward restructuring how the various sustainability efforts are managed by the office. However, the committee also felt the role of the proposed Vice-Provost of academic programs needs more explanation and/or thought. For example, what are the long-term academic goals of the office? How will current sustainability research at the University be integrated into the objectives of the office?

The committee also felt that the three proposed pillars should collectively report to a higher-level administrator on the campus, perhaps either the Provost or the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education. The thinking here was that unless this type of reporting structure was employed, there may not be a fair arbitration process to smoothly overcome situations where the three pillars had competing objectives. In particular, it was noted that the proposed academic program lead is a Vice-Provost while the lead for the other two pillars are Vice-Chancellors, which left the committee wondering if the perspective of academic programs might too often lose out when discussing priorities.



Graduate Council

December 15, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Christiane Weirauch, Chair

Graduate Council

Re: (Campus Review): Report Review Sustainability Ad Hoc

The Graduate Council reviewed the Sustainability Ad Hoc report at their December 14, 2017 meeting. The Council agreed that the campus needs to further enhance sustainability efforts. It was indicated that graduate students no longer have a sustainability liaison, and that it has become more difficult during the past year for graduate students to work with the Sustainability Office. The Council believes that the campus needs to encourage student driven sustainability initiatives and good working relationships with the Sustainability Office are therefore critical. The Council would also welcome additional sustainability initiatives, e.g. installing more tables with solar panels across campus and expanding water-wise landscapes. Given this timely and critical need to improve and expand on sustainability efforts on campus, the Council felt strongly that this office should not be folded into the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Capital Asset Strategies, but should be returned to being an independent office. This step would bring the office a higher profile on campus and outside, and better align with the important initiatives coordinated in this office.



January 8, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Jiayu Liao

Committee on Library and Information Technology

Frage Cia

Re: 17-18. Campus Review. Sustainability Ad Hoc

The Committee on Library and Information Technology reviewed the [Campus Review] Sustainability Ad Hoc at their December 14, 2017 meeting. The LIT committee has reviewed what happened in the last couple of years about the sustainability activities and the director's contributions to UCR. The committee believes that there was no shared governance involved in the decisions made by administration to layoff the director of Sustainability. LIT suggests keeping this as an ad hoc committee to continue review and evaluate the activities and appointment of the new director and would like to re-evaluate after a couple of years. The LIT committee suggests that a process be developed, or bylaw put in place so that administration cannot dismantle a department or committee without consulting the Academic Senate. The committee also suggests a charter be put in place for the sustainability office as this is an important subject for the University.



PLANNING & BUDGET

January 2, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Christian Shelton, Chair Chair Chair

Committee on Planning and Budget

RE: (Campus Review): Report Review Sustainability Ad Hoc

P&B discussed the ad-hoc committee's sustainability report and supports the academic goals that are to be achieved. P&B also strongly supports a standing Academic Senate committee on Sustainability.

However, the committee does not see the need for a Vice Provost of Sustainability. It seems to be a reaction to previous administrative changes that were unwelcome by faculty. Yet, it increases administrative roles, does not necessarily provide an advocate for the senate's views, and does not reduce the possibility for future unwanted administrative changes.

P&B would suggest that the potential new Senate committee create strong ties to administrators relevant to sustainability in Facilities and in Planning and Budget, either through official or unofficial mechanisms. A single Senate committee with views of administrative, curricular, and faculty efforts on sustainability would provide an excellent conduit for the exchange of ideas and plans and would help mitigate future problems.



November 2, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: James Brennan, Chair Juni Branch

Committee on University Extension

Re: Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee Report

The Committee on University Extension reviewed the Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee report and have opted not to submit a response as the report does not have any impact on University Extension and is outside the Committee's purview.



January 4, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Richard Seto

Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: Campus Review. Sustainability Ad Hoc

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning reviewed the [Campus Review] Sustainability Ad Hoc at its November 6, 2017 meeting. Issues regarding sustainability have taken an important role in world affairs on topics such as global climate change, the establishment of new technologies aimed at more energy efficient modes of transportation, and the sustenance of different populations of people. The University of California has set forth goals in response, such as the Carbon Neutrality Initiative.

UCR has had a very successful Office of Sustainability, led by John Cook which has had many successes outlined in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability. In December of 2016, this office was abruptly re-organized, and John Cook was dismissed without consultation of the faculty. While there were assurances of the continuing support of sustainability issues on campus, we find this a complete disregard for shared governance and a corresponding lack of transparency, leading to unwise decisions in which matters regarding sustainability were transferred to the AVC for Capital Assets, which in turn falls under the purview of the Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget. The report from the Ad Hoc Committee outlines three pillars of a sustainability strategy. (1) Academic Programs in which students are trained in issues regarding sustainability (2) Facility Services, including the upkeep and repair of infrastructure and (3) Planning and Budget which includes the planning for buildings and other facilities. In addition to the disregard of shared governance, we find that there are two additional problems. First, the issues regarding sustainability pertain to, more than fall under, the purview of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and budget, but also include Academic Programs, and Facilities Management. Secondly, the recent actions have replaced individuals with expertise in sustainability issues, with administrators with very little experience in the relevant fields.

The report recommends a "three pillars" approach ("Academics", "Facilities", and "Planning and Budget"), with the academic pillar being led by a new appointed Vice

Provost for Sustainability which would coordinate a new standing academic senate committee on sustainability. Coordination between the three pillars would be done via a monthly meeting. While the Senate Committee on Resource Planning endorses the general ideas, two points need to be made. First, it must be clear that the role of the new Vice-Provost (an administrator) would be as a coordinator for programs such as internships and outreach events and as a liaison with other programs on campus, and not as a coordinator of academic programs which is solely the purview of the faculty. The report also recommends that this VP would coordinate a new standing academic committee on sustainability. It is not clear what is meant by "coordinate" in this context. It is not appropriate for a new standing senate committee on sustainability to be chaired by an administrator. Such a person can, of course, be a non-voting ex-officio member. Secondly, a monthly meeting to coordinate the role of the three pillars is probably not adequate to facilitate cooperation since many of the activities may need to be more tightly coordinated. For instance, the person given leadership of sustainability would need to be active in the planning for new construction, or the repair and upkeep of facilities in an environmentally friendly manner.

The committee does not endorse a specific set of actions, but recommends that the issue be taken up by the Senate executive committee, taking into consideration the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. The resolution of the recent difficulties relating to the previous EVC might serve as a good model. The hiring of administrators is the purview of the administration with the faculty serving in an advisory capacity. One solution would be that senate executive committee discuss the matter of the organization of the sustainability effort on campus (with or without administrators' present) coming to a general consensus. Further and more specific discussions could happen during the Senate Chair's regular meeting with the Chancellor and EVC. They can be joined by others chosen by the Senate Chair or the Executive Committee who can render expert advice. In the present case, they might also be joined by other appropriate administrators such as the VC on Planning and Budget. In this way, a mutually acceptable and beneficial resolution could be reached on the leadership of sustainability issues on the campus.



January 31, 2018

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

FR: Thomas Stahovich, Chair

Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability

On December 12, 2017, the BCOE Executive Committee reviewed the October 23, 2017 Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability. We are appreciative of the efforts of the Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee.

Thomas of Stationer

The BCOE Executive Committee is supportive of the sustainability efforts on campus, and specifically of the Office of Sustainability. We encourage the new Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget to reinstate the Office of Sustainability, to engage faculty in the Office's oversight, and to seriously consider the recommendations of this report. We support the three-tiered structure proposed in the report. Furthermore, we believe that the Role of Academics outlined in Sec. 4.1 is important because integrating sustainability within the curriculum and research is essential to comprehensive sustainability efforts on campus. Finally, while the committee is supportive of creating a standing Senate committee on sustainability, the committee is reluctant to recommend an additional Vice Provost position. We believe that the Provost's Office is best suited to determine how that Office should engage the academic efforts related to sustainability.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

December 06, 2017

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Academic Senate

FROM: Kate Sweeny, Chair

CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Response to the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability Report

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability Report at the regular meeting on November 29, 2017. There were no objections and the committee had nothing to add at this time.

Kate Sweeny, Chair

CHASS Executive Committee



January, 2018

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

UCR Academic Senate

FROM: Jan Blacher, Chair

GSOE Executive Committee

SUBJ: Review of report: Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability

The Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) met to discuss the Ad Hoc Committee's Report on Sustainability at UCR. We appreciate the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee and feel informed about the situation at UCR. At this point, we recommend that the report be sent to the campus administration with the Senate's endorsement, in hopes that UCR will remain in the forefront of these efforts. However, we do not concur with the tone of the UCR Alumni letter attached, and strongly object to the politicized definition of sustainability included in that letter.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.



February 6, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Ward Beyermann, Chair, Executive Committee College of Natural and Agricultural Science

Re: Campus Review: Ad Hoc Committee Report on Sustainability

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the ad hoc committee's report on sustainability at its November 14, 2017 meeting. Sustainability is an important concern for both the faculty and students. It is unfortunate that the old system, which seemed to work exceedingly well, was discarded with no justification. While the administration is primarily responsible for this activity, given its importance with the faculty, the lack of transparency and faculty participation in the restructuring process by VC Anguiano was inconsistent with the principles of shared governance.

Even though some expressed a need for more detail, overall, the committee supports the recommendations in the report. At a more nuanced level, the committee noted an increase in the administrative oversight of this program within the three pillars, perhaps in response to the poorly executed restructuring process. However, given the effectiveness of the old system, some questioned the necessity to hire a Vice Provost for Sustainability. Also establishing Senate oversight is important, but we wonder if this is possible with existing standing committees instead of a dedicated committee. The Senate may want to consider appointing a special committee on this issue and reconsider conversion of this committee into a standing committee at a later date. With or without a Committee on Sustainability, standing committees that have overlapping interests will need to opine for context within their broader previews.

Yours sincerely,

Ward Beyermann, Chair

CNAS Executive Committee

Ward Beyerm

School of Public Policy UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE INTS 4133 | 900 University Ave Riverside CA, 92521



TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

FR: Kurt Schwabe, Chair

Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: Report from Sustainability Ad Hoc

Date: January 5, 2018

The SPP Executive Committee is unanimous in its support for increased efforts to address sustainability on campus, efforts that include shared governance across the three "pillars" referenced in the document, and increased energies and structure to more clearly and fully include faculty and students. We thank the Sustainability Ad Hoc Committee on its labor in generating an excellent and comprehensive report that addresses past events (some of which we feel still need some explanation), current challenges, and presents a framework for the future. The SPP Executive Committee has five points for additional consideration.

First, we feel it is imperative that the Sustainability vision and mission clearly stipulate the importance of interactions with faculty and staff and that such interactions are written into the mission. The previous Director, Dr. John Cook, seemed to understand this and, from all accounts, was extremely successful in engaging faculty and students in the campus sustainability efforts. From what we can gather from the Ad Hoc committee's report, this element of UCR's sustainability efforts has received short shrift since the departure of Dr. Cook and the restructuring of the Sustainability Office under the direction of the Office of Planning and Budget. Consequently, we support the committee's recommendation that one of the three "pillars" of sustainability on campus relates to the academic community.

Second, we feel the importance of staff to UCR sustainability efforts cannot be overemphasized. We would hope that Facilities Services continues to further develop sustainability programs that are inclusive and incentivize staff participation.

Third, we are appreciative of the efforts to more formally document the Office of Sustainability's restructuring in 2016 and the efforts of Dr. John Cook during his tenure at UCR. Given the importance of sustainability to UCR, along with the role faculty and students play in this mission, such documentation clearly illustrate a significant failure on

the administration to include faculty/academic senate and student counsel on this issue prior to making such a significant decision.

Fourth, with respect to the newly suggested definition for "sustainability," we recognize the difficulty with developing such a definition and commend the Ad Hoc committee on their efforts and success in providing a new and more contemporary definition. With this said, we would make one suggestion for item #2 to include the phrase, "potential tradeoffs", so that it reads:

"...2) academic and policy investments that support ecological health and investigate interconnections and potential trade-offs among the economy, social wellbeing, and the environment, with attention to legacies of the past, constraints of the present, and well-being of the future;..."

Fifth, and as a potential alternative ("second-best"?) structure relative to what's being offered by the Ad Hoc committee, perhaps all that is needed is to the add some additional safeguards and input surrounding decisions pertaining to the management and efforts of the Office of Sustainability. The reason we raise this is that what was evident in both the report as well as from many of our own experiences, the Office of Sustainability under Dr. Cook's direction was extremely successful in its sustainability efforts on campus, in the community, and through its interactions with faculty, students, and staff. As an example of the sort of adjustments that might be added to the previous structure, perhaps a more formal relationship with faculty and staff be included (e.g., through the development of an academic senate committee on sustainability), and safeguards added that require consultation with the academic senate prior to any major decisions pertaining to the office of sustainability management and policies.