

**SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES**  
**May 24, 2023 Senate Meeting**

The draft minutes from the May 24, 2023 Senate meeting were distributed via email on July 18<sup>th</sup> and will be presented for approval at the Senate Meeting on November 29, 2023. After being approved, these minutes will be posted on the Senate web site (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/index.html>).

Senators are asked to submit any proposed corrections or changes to these draft minutes to the Senate Office in advance of the next meeting, via EMAIL or in WRITING. All proposed changes will be compiled in standardized format into a single list for display at the next meeting.

This approach gives Senators an opportunity to read and review changes before being asked to vote on them, provides the Senate staff and the Secretary with time to resolve any questions or inconsistencies that may arise, and minimizes time spent on routine matters during meetings. While proposed changes may be checked for consistency, they will not be altered without the proposer's approval. This approach complements, but does not limit in any way, the right of every Senator to propose further changes from the floor of the meeting.

To assist the Senate staff, proposed changes should specify:

1. The location of the proposed change (e.g., item, page, paragraph, sentence);
2. The exact wording of existing text to be modified or deleted;
3. The exact wording of replacement or additional text to be inserted;
4. The reason for the change if not obvious (optional).

Please submit all proposed changes to arrive in the Senate Office **no later than 12:00 noon, Tuesday November 28, 2023**. They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, via email to [senate@ucsc.edu](mailto:senate@ucsc.edu).

Deborah Gould



Secretary, Academic Senate  
Santa Cruz Division

**MINUTES**

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division

Wednesday, May 24, 2023 at 2:30 p.m.

Location: Online via Zoom

**Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, May 24, 2023 online via Zoom. Senate Chair Patty Gallagher, Professor of Theater Arts, called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm. Chair Gallagher reminded everyone that though the Academic Senate meeting is open to the public, only members of the Senate may second or vote on motions. Non-Senate representatives to Senate committees and representatives of the College Academic Senates also have privilege of the floor. Chair Gallagher advised that when items arise that need formal action from the body, such as proposed amendments to the Senate Bylaws and Regulations, a Division-wide electronic ballot would be distributed post-meeting. This method would be used to ensure that only those with voting privileges vote on matters which impact Senate bylaws. These items would be open to discussion and potential amendment before balloting. Patty noted that there were some parliamentary actions of the meeting today, which would be conducted by zoom poll functions. She advised members to use the raise hand function to be granted the floor and questions or comments would be taken in the order they were queued. Chair Gallagher announced that the Fall Senate 2023 meeting is being planned as an in-person meeting to be followed by a reception. Remote participation would be enabled.

Chair Gallagher announced several changes to the order of business: the Faculty Research Lecture Annual Report would move to the beginning of the consent calendar and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity legislation would be held until 3:15 pm.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

- a. One edit had been submitted for the noticed March 10, 2023 minutes: a correction to the name of a speaker. As no further corrections were submitted, from the floor, Secretary Deborah Gould accepted the meeting minutes of March 10, 2023 as amended.

**2. Announcements****a. Chair Patty Gallagher**

Chair Gallagher then invited Chancellor Larive to take the floor and asked that questions be held until after both the Chancellor and CPEVC had concluded their remarks.

**b. Chancellor Cynthia Larive**

The Chancellor expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to address the Academic Senate and then shared slides along with the following remarks:

As you know, one of our goals as a campus and as a system is to advance student success. Widely accepted student success metrics include retention rates (particularly from the first year to the second) and graduation rates defined by the percent of first-time students graduating within 4 or 6 years, or transfer students graduating within 2 or 4 years. More recently, the presence and magnitude of equity gaps have emerged as an important student success metric. These equity gaps, which measure how different demographic groups like first gen students, Pell grant recipients and

students from historically underrepresented groups, are retained or graduate compared with the average. For us at UC Santa Cruz, these equity gaps are a social justice issue.

There are also metrics that measure the success of students as alumni. These include salaries after graduation and the institution's contributions to social mobility, and student loan debt.

Before Lori and I started in our positions, as part of a systemwide initiative UC Santa Cruz set goals for student success in 2030. At the system level, progress towards these goals is an important component of the compact with the Governor. The systemwide average 4-year graduation rate is expected to be 76% in 2030, and our goal is 70% with no equity gaps.

It is interesting to see the positive bump in 2020 graduation rates. I hypothesize that this was due to fully online instruction and not much else for students to do in the summer of 2020, so some students took summer courses and graduated early.

This data shows that we were making good progress towards our 2030 goal before the pandemic. And while the average graduation rate in 2022 nearly rebounded to the 2020 peak, equity gaps for students graduating in 2022 are significantly greater than in 2021. We have seen the ways in which the pandemic amplified inequities across society, so it is not surprising that we see increased disparities in the graduation rates for first gen, Pell and historically underrepresented students in the 2022 data. The question is – how can we work together to reverse these trends - again this is an important social justice issue for our campus.

The data presented shows the two-year graduation rates for transfer students. The trends are similar – we were making progress towards our goal of a 70% 2-year graduation rate before the pandemic, then graduation rates decline. The average transfer student graduation rate plummets from 57.8% in 2021 to 51.9% in 2022, and the equity gaps narrow. One way to interpret this data is that, compared with the data for first time students, transfer students as a group are more similar in the way they experienced COVID and the university, and may need greater support than we have been providing them to recover.

How can we work together to reverse these trends to improve the graduation rates for transfer students while narrowing the equity gaps?

I have been working with data provided by IRAPS and Richard Hughey that summarize outcomes for all courses with enrollments of at least 50 taught in Fall 22 and Winter 23. The results shown here are for gateway STEM courses in chemistry, computer science, economics and math that have a D,F,W rate less than 13%. The blue bars represent the number of students who passed, and the orange bars the number who received a grade of D, F, or withdrew; the overall height of each bar is the total enrollment in the course. For these courses, D,F,W rates ranged from 0.6% to 12.6%, 6016 students passed and 556 students did not. The displayed slide also indicates whether the course was taught in person (P), synchronous online (S), or asynchronous online modalities (A). Of the 24 courses, 16 were taught in person, 5 were synchronous online and 3 were asynchronous online.

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) was instrumental in working with the instructors of many of these courses to make changes to curricula and pedagogies. Though not captured in this data, the TLC and participating faculty are also working to eliminate equity gaps and increase the number of students who achieve competency in these courses. Achieving competency in gateway STEM

courses is especially critical for overall student success in STEM majors because of the hierarchical nature of the course material.

The next slide shows the other end of the dataset for Fall 22 and Winter 23 courses with enrollments of at least 50. These results are for all courses – not just gateway STEM courses - that have a D,F,W rate greater than 20%. Because the results are not complimentary, I am not showing the identity of the courses. Of these 46 courses, 41 were taught in person, 2 were synchronous online and 3 were asynchronous online. For these courses, D,F,W rates ranged from 20% to 55.6%, 4438 students passed and 1829 students did not. What happens to the 1829 students who did not pass? Some of them will take the course again, which means we will have taught them twice if they are successful on the second try. Some of them may change majors. And a proportion of them will give up entirely and leave the university, feeling like failures. But with courses with such high DFW rates – aren't we the ones who have failed the students?

The other thing that comes through in the data on these two slides is that the success of students does not appear to be correlated to modality. There are thoughtful online synchronous and asynchronous courses where students pass at similar rates to the in-person counterparts. And as shown in this slide, there are in-person courses in which large swaths of students are unsuccessful.

Thanks for the opportunity to share this information. I found it thought provoking and I hope that it will spur further discussions about how we as a faculty and leadership can work together toward greater student success.

The floor was then given to CPEVC Lori Kletzer.

c. **Campus Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Lori Kletzer**

CPEVC Kletzer expressed her gratitude to the Senate and then provided the following remarks:

I want to start by voicing my sense of horror and outrage over the recent antisemitic incidents on and off campus. Chancellor Larive and I, as campus leaders, take ownership of our primary organizational and moral responsibility to improve campus climate for Jewish students and all students who experience hateful speech and actions. For too long, the visible administrative response has been words and not systematic action. Since the start of this academic year, staff colleagues in Student Affairs and Success have been meeting regularly with Jewish students to better understand their experience here, and to explore actions we can take collectively to foster a campus community that supports a stronger sense of belonging for Jewish members of the campus. As I have been able to join some of these groups, the sense of being heard is clear. I fully anticipate that we will have more to say, and to act on, in the weeks ahead.

I shared with a close colleague last week that one of the very basic and enduring joys of my work and job is the intellectual community I get to live in. Paraphrasing myself, I shared that the joy of the work lies in the events I can be part of and/or attend. And I try to get to as many talks as I can. Our community has been nothing but deeply inspiring over these weeks of spring. Chair Gallagher's conveyance message, of today's agenda, listed a few of those events. I want to add just one - this past Sunday, many of us enjoyed a humorous, if dark, interview of Elizabeth Kolbert by Ezra Klein, as the conclusion to this year's Deep Read.

**Faculty Accolades**

I'd like to stick with this theme of celebrating and offer, as I do at this meeting, some selective faculty accolades.

**Emily Brodsky**, professor of Earth and planetary sciences, has been elected to the National Academy of Sciences in recognition of her distinguished and continuing achievements in original research. Brodsky's research focuses on the mechanics underlying earthquakes.

**Beth Shapiro**, Professor of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, has been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Beth is a leader in the field of paleogenomics and ancient DNA, using genetic material recovered from the remains of plants and animals that lived long ago to study evolution and explore how species and ecosystems have changed over time.

Beth was interviewed on CBS Sunday Morning last month about de-extinction - the possibility of bringing extinct species back, such as the dodo and the woolly mammoth. She explained that extinct species cannot be brought back but it is possible to resurrect extinct traits or maybe move adaptive traits between species.

**Brant Robertson**, professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, was on "60 Minutes" last month. He talked with reporter Scott Pelley through some of the recent images, including 130-thousand galaxies - many never seen before - captured by NASA's James Webb Space Telescope. Brant helps lead the telescope's most ambitious mission, the deep extragalactic survey, which is an effort to discover galaxies at fantastically early times in the distant universe. He also shared an image of the most distant galaxy found so far - more than 33 billion light years away.

**Sharon Daniel**, professor of Film and Digital Media, and **Anna Friz**, associate professor of Film & Digital Media have received 2023 Guggenheim Fellowship Awards. Daniel is a media artist and innovator in the field of interactive documentary. Friz is a radio and sound artist, composer, performer and installation artist.

**Sikina Jinnah**, professor of Environmental Studies, has been appointed as a member of the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine Committee for Atmospheric Methane Removal to assess viable technological options for reducing this powerful greenhouse gas.

**Karen Miga**, assistant professor of biomolecular engineering, has been named a 2023 Searle Scholar. This prestigious award will support Miga's research on constitutive heterochromatin, regions of the genome that have been previously unexplored due to their complexity.

**Mark Fathi Massoud**, professor of politics and director of legal studies, was recently named among 26 Berlin Prize winners for the upcoming academic year. The Berlin Prize is awarded annually to US-based scholars, writers, composers, and artists who represent the highest standards of excellence in their fields, from the humanities and social sciences to journalism, public policy, fiction, the visual arts, and music composition.

### **Faculty Hiring**

We have had a number of successful faculty recruitments across campus this year and there are more in progress. Arts Division: 7 Signed, 1 in progress; Baskin Engineering: 5 signed, 8 in progress; Humanities: 6 Signed, 1 in progress; Physical and Biological Sciences: 4 Signed. 14 in progress; Social Sciences: 7 Signed, 7 in Progress.

The number of in-progress recruitments is admittedly a bit surprising, given how late we are in the recruiting cycle. That said, over the past 2 years, we have authorized, recruited, or hired 105 Senate faculty. A very few are authorizations with now failed searches, but not many. Some are partner hires, a small number are TOEs, several Presidential and Chancellor Post-docs.

I have heard concerns expressed about how PIs will cover contractual salary increases for GSRs and postdoctoral scholars, particularly for PIs with existing grants. For currently active research funds, the anticipated total impact of the contractual salary increases is estimated to be approximately \$4-\$5M for our campus. In a message released on Monday May 22, we announced a Pay Increase Relief (also Research Relief) Fund to help PIs cover at least some of these costs, if needed.

This fund is a collaboration targeting assistance to instances where investigator-level solutions are not sufficient. Approximately \$1.5 million will be available from this central fund that will be overseen by the vice chancellor for research.

PIs need to demonstrate that they have thoroughly considered and analyzed all approaches to cover as much of the salary increases as they are able, with the goals of preventing lay-offs and reductions in scope of work and providing student support, while maximizing future research competitiveness. Carryforward on existing grants should be utilized prior to making any request.

And now for some acknowledgement and gratitude to Paul Koch, as he leaves the Deanship of PBSci and plots his return to the faculty. As Paul returns to the faculty, let me start with this statement. Paul is an accomplished scientist, with research interests in vertebrate paleobiology, ecology and conservation biology, paleoclimatology, isotope biochemistry.

Paul is a Distinguished Professor of Earth and Planetary Science, having arrived at Santa Cruz in 1996 from Princeton where he was an Assistant Professor. Prior to Princeton, he was a postdoc at the Carnegie Institute of Science and the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History. Going further back, it was Geological Sciences for his Ph.D. and MS at University of Michigan, and Geological Sciences and English for his BS/BA at University of Rochester.

Paul is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the California Academy of Sciences and the Geological Society of America.

Why this background? Because Paul as dean is all of this background. He took up being dean in 2011 when Steve Thorsett decamped to become President of Willamette University. My experience with Paul as dean has been one that I can only characterize as bringing his full intellectual self, authentically and deeply. PBSci has grown in size, impact, scope, influence, prestige, research expenditures, diversity, student accomplishment, faculty awards, all under Paul's watch. PBSci's leadership in advancing student success is very clear and Paul's leadership in committing the division to being student-centered is visibly present. Paul is a dogged advocate for the division, and I mean dogged, as maybe only a CPEVC can say. That dogged persistence comes from an unflagging belief in what PBSci faculty can do for science, for impact, and for our students. Of course, he and I have not always agreed. Yet I have always seen the merit in his arguments and his sense that you fight the best fight you can and you take up the next one on another day, no matter what. And we have never disagreed on a point that I feel is one of Paul's compass points, or north stars. That he believes in UC Santa Cruz, in our role as a public research university and in what we do for the local region, the state and the world.

And he's not done yet. I am thrilled for him that there's a next and return adventure to the faculty. He is an amazing, Renaissance-like human, in his reading interests. I was recently at a dinner with him, and the breadth of his reading put the entire table to shame.

CPEVC Kletzer thanked Paul for his devotion to the campus and to PBSci, and for the impact of his accomplishments.

Chair Gallagher then opened the floor to questions.

Pascale Garaud, Professor of Applied Mathematics, was given the floor and spoke to the need for centrally supporting transfer students by providing tutoring programs and identifying any learning gaps they may have, coming into UCSC. Tutoring programs in the summer can address learning gaps before students begin courses in the fall. Professor Garaud asked about the Summer Edge program and if there was the ability to provide summer tutoring for students and allow them to come to campus ahead of time to take these courses.

Chancellor Larive replied that campus learning support services does operate in the summer and then requested Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Richard Hughey to speak on the Summer Edge.

VPDUE Hughey, who is Dean of summer session, took the floor and stated that there are effectively four programs for students: both remote and in-person each for incoming Freshman and Transfer students. The focus is to deliver the programs where the students are. The summer tutoring idea is something that the different modalities would definitely want to explore in how best to help students have a successful fall and career at UCSC.

Christine Hong, Associate Professor of Literature and Chair of Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES), addressed the Chancellor, whose remarks she said were sobering. Associate Professor Hong asked about the class which had 50% of its students flunking, wondering what the demographic status of those students was and what approach is being proposed as a solution.

Chancellor Larive did not have that demographics data at hand, but stated that her focus was on laying out, in a simple clear way, the challenges campus is facing. She also did not have data on these kinds of failure rates before the pandemic, but believed that there were courses with high failure rates then as well. A number of things can be looked at, including more involvement with the Student Success Task Force. Several aspects of courses with high DFW rates could be looked at, such as the course's position in the curriculum. Sometimes students entering a course don't have the prerequisite skills or courses to be successful. This requires the faculty in that department to determine whether a requirement needs to be put in place. Sometimes it may be the instructors who are not designing a curriculum that is as equitable, though she was not implying that correlation with the course she showed in her presentation. She brought up the Math19 course, which worked with the Teaching and Learning Center to redesign the curriculum and pedagogy and increase the success and competency rates. The Chancellor hopes to engage the Senate's help, support and ideas in order to do a better job helping our students.

Jason Nielsen, Professor of Physics was given the floor and added that our greatest gaps with respect to UC systemwide are actually graduation rates for students with the highest academic index scores. That's something not talked about much, but the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has identified it as one of the places where we could improve on campus. It may be that those students are not leaving UCSC because of issues with DFWs, but because of academic challenge. He encouraged the Academic Senate and the administration to work together on that as well.

Jamie Hindery, student representative on CEP, was given the floor and mentioned that the Chancellor's charts reflected something they had heard from many students, namely that there can

be a significant range in the difficulty of a course or identical courses based on the instructor or the modality. They mentioned the need for accountability and publicly available information. They felt that students would like to see more data on those classes that have the significant—almost 50%—failure rates.

The Chancellor stated that the data should be seen in the departments, as the departments are the fundamental organizing unit of the University and the departments own the curriculum.

CPEVC Kletzer then emphasized that departments need to be the center of this conversation, as they assign instructors to courses. The same courses can have dramatically different DFW rates. We have to analyze all the elements and support departments, as they own these curriculums.

Daniel Halpern-DeVries, Co-Chair of the Student Union Assembly (SUA) and undergraduate representative to the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), was given the floor and asked if there is a more complex metric than just four-year graduation rates that can be used. There are students who might take longer than 4 years, not because they have to, but because they decide they want to. Could this be accounted for and not counted as a negative in success rates? If a student does four years plus one quarter, how does that get classified?

The Chancellor replied that Time to Degree is one metric that is used, and often it is four years plus one quarter, which presents costs for students. Moving them to graduate in June or August can provide savings for those students and will help UCSC with housing and classrooms. Additionally, these are the metrics that are used across the country as a way of normalizing across universities: four-year graduation rates for freshman, six-year graduation rates for entering freshmen, and two- and four-year graduation rates for transfer students.

Chair Gallagher thanked everyone for the questions and comments and moved on to the Consent Calendar.

3. **Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)**

4. **Special Orders: Annual Reports**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture 2022-23 Annual Report (AS/SCP/2056)

Chair Gallagher then invited Barbara Rogoff, Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL) to present the selection for the 2022-23 Faculty Research Lecture. Chair Rogoff reported that CFRL enthusiastically nominates Feminist Studies Professor Gina Athena Ulysse as the 58th Faculty Research Lecturer. She then highlighted Professor Ulysse's work and accomplishments.

Chair Gallagher asked for a vote on the nomination by Zoom reaction. With no questions regarding the annual report, the report was approved by acclamation.

b. Committee on Committees - Carol Freeman Senate Service Award (AS/SCP/2055)

Elizabeth Abrams, Provost of Merrill College and Chair of the Committees on Committees (COC), was given the floor and mentioned that it is a great pleasure to hear the faculty accolades given for colleagues in the Senate and in the Administration. She then described the systemwide Oliver Johnson Career Award for service to the Academic Senate and the corresponding campus career award, the Dean McHenry Award. She explained that a campus award had also been created for those people only part way through their careers



who dig in and accomplish tremendous work on behalf of the Senate. With pleasure, she announced the inaugural Carol Freeman Award for Leadership in the Academic Senate and presented it to Associate Professor of Music and Chair of CPB, Dard Neuman. Chair Abrams then highlighted Professor Neuman's work and accomplishments.

CPB Undergraduate Rep. Halpern-DeVries was then given the floor and noted that as a student representative, he had clearly evidenced Chair Neuman's hard work and dedication and the amazing good he was able to do for the Senate and campus as a whole.

VPDUE Hughey then spoke of the namesake of the award, Carol Freeman, mentioning that she had been a fantastic mentor in their first Senate committee assignment as a member of CEP.

Ben Carson, Provost of Kresge College and Associate Professor of Music was given the floor to share his gratitude to Chair Neuman for his work in multiple capacities in the music department over the last seven years, shepherding them through a revisioning of curriculum, which is now heralded nationwide as an exemplary act of decolonization and of progress toward racial justice.

Associate Professor Hong was then given the floor and expressed appreciation for Chair Neuman's collaboration and partnership during CRES's earliest years.

Chair Abrams then called for approval of the award, which was given by acclamation.

5. **Reports of Special Committees (none)**

6. **Report of Standing Committees**

a. Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity - Legislation; Name Change (AS/SCP/2057)

Sylvanna Falcón, Professor of Latin American & Latino Studies and Chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), was given the floor and explained that CAAD is seeking to update its name to the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) in order to better align with the principles on campus and systemwide. UC Santa Cruz and UC Davis are the only committees with "Affirmative Action" in the title and others have adopted the terms of "equity" and "inclusion" in their names, which are terms that this current CAAD agrees better reflect the committee's ongoing work.

Professor Nielsen was given the floor and, speaking in his capacity as a member of the systemwide University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, asked two questions. First, have there been any discussions of plans to change the name of the University systemwide committee (UC AADE), given that the divisional committees are changing their names?

Chair Falcón stated that, though she was just stepping in as Chair for spring, she had looked over all of the notes from the previous systemwide meetings and there had been no discussion of name change at the systemwide level.

Professor Nielsen agreed, as he had also looked and had wondered if there was a reason for that. He stated that clearly our campus' current committee is named CAAD because it matches very closely what we have in the systemwide committee. His second question was if there was a particular urgency about changing the name right now, before the rest of the charge is updated? He felt it might be more appropriate to change the name of the committee at the same time that the charge is also updated.

Chair Falcón explained that there was not necessarily a sense of urgency, but that the committee saw the order as 1) getting support from the Senate to change the name, and 2) updating the charge. Changing the charge is a much lengthier process, so the initial step was to obtain support for changing the name, and then the process of updating the charge language could be a carry over for next year's CAAD.

Chair Falcón responded to a question in the chat, stating that she did not know why the committee names are so varied across the UC campuses, but that it is up to the discretion of each campus.

Associate Professor Hong noted that the terms 'diversity, equity, and inclusion' are an 'institution speak' that don't necessarily imply a commitment to justice. She felt that 'affirmative action', by contrast, had a vision of reparation baked into the concept.

Chair Falcón responded that the commitment from the committee has not wavered. The proposed name change is meant to align the committee to some degree with the systemwide names and the conversations that have been happening there. But it is not meant to suggest that the committee is not deeply committed to these issues in profound ways.

Chair Gallagher reminded the Senate that this is legislation that requires a vote by members of the Senate and that a ballot on this legislation would be sent out after the meeting.

b. Committee on Committees - Senate Committee Roster 2023-24 (AS/SCP/2058)

COC Chair Elizabeth Abrams presented the Senate committee roster for 2023-24 for approval, thanking everyone who has agreed to serve on a committee. She noted that it is part of COC's process to try to maintain about a 50% turnover on committees.

The floor was opened for questions.

Jamie Hindery stated that they were a CRES and Education double major and that it appeared both of these departments seemed to be drastically underrepresented. Powerful committees like CEP, CCI, and RJE need to include on them campus' most critical minds if we want to remain on the forefront of social justice.

Chair Abrams responded that in looking over the roster, it will be seen that there are faculty that are CRES- affiliated, though they may not be listed as principal faculty with CRES. She explained that the process of filling committees is a complex task with many factors involved. The fact that fewer names from any specific department seem to be indicated does not mean that there was not tremendous effort on COC's part to secure diversity.

Jamie Hindery stated that there are obviously structural barriers to members of those departments. Whether faculty have other commitments or meetings during the committee meeting times, it was hoped that the Senate can work together to find ways to overcome the structural barriers.

Chair Abrams noted Professor of Education and Department Chair George Bunch's comment in the chat that several of the departments named are small departments, with a fair number of assistant professors and heavy departmental service loads, as well as other types of demanding service loads which may be more important for them at this moment.

Distinguished Professor of Physics and Chair of the Committee on Career Advising (CCA) Steve Ritz stated that in case COC was having trouble filling the roster for CCA, he wanted to mention

that it is a great committee doing the important work of supporting new faculty and even mid-career colleagues. It runs some very important workshops, and makes sure that the faculty mentoring program is working.

Associate Professor Hong was given the floor and expressed that CRES has attempted to work with COC to place their faculty on these committees, but it has been difficult due to the meeting times already fixed for Senate committees and also because CRES faculty tend to be doing a lot of service oftentimes in emergent areas. She asked if committees could be diversified by factors beyond multi-divisional representation. It would be good for committees to make it a practice to consult with Senate colleagues who have relevant content expertise when committees are considering a matter in which no faculty with specific content expertise is represented on the committee.

A vote was then taken by Zoom poll and the COC Roster was approved.

c. Committee on Emeriti Relations - Senate In Memoriam (AS/SCP/2059)

Judith Habicht Mauche, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology and Chair of the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) was given the floor and presented on the screen the Senate In Memoriam, listing the names of recently deceased colleagues who were Senate members at the time of death. In lieu of accepting the memorial report by acclamation, the Senate was asked to join together in a moment of silence to remember their colleagues who had passed away. Deepest condolences were extended to their families, colleagues, and friends.

Chair Gallagher thanked Chair Habicht Mauche for helping the Senate remember and memorialize these colleagues, who remain in our hearts.

d. Committee on Educational Policy - Oral report: Policy Update - Replacement of Missing Grades with P

David Lee Cuthbert, Professor of Performance, Play & Design and CEP Chair, was given the floor and provided an update on the extensive policy review done by CEP regarding replacing missing grades with a P. The review involved consultations with the registrar's office, advising, and other units, as well as reviewing historic correspondences of previous CEP committees on the subject. After lengthy discussions and consideration of several alternative approaches, CEP found that none of the other approaches considered were superior to the existing approach, specifically with respect to outcomes for students. The other potential approaches considered could not as effectively address the range of serious concerns and deadlines for avoiding undergraduate educational impacts, such as financial aid and time to graduation. Now, while CEP acknowledges that the 30 day to P approach is an imperfect approach, they are prepared to establish this as the policy moving forward. CEP also recognizes the necessity for flexibility in future reviews. Future iterations of CEP may need to revisit this policy and consider its appropriateness, particularly in extraordinary circumstances when there's been a major disruption to instruction or the grading process, such as have been seen in the last few years. The pandemic, strikes, storms, power outages, and fires have all been disruptive to a business-as-usual approach to education, and required flexibility and unique considerations. That flexibility needs to be a prime consideration for future CEP committees and the Senates. CEP also recognizes that there are persistent problems of missing grades even in ordinary circumstances. In every quarter, there are unsubmitted grades for students, even after multiple reminders from the registrar. Providing grades to students in a timely manner is a core responsibility for faculty and instructors. CEP is considering how to better ensure a timely submission of grades, such as making this consideration for future CEP reviews of programs: as well as encouraging CAP and GC to take this into consideration as well.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for questions and there were none.

e. Committee on Faculty Welfare - Oral Report: Preliminary CFW Salary Analysis

Alexander Sher, Professor of Physics and Chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) was given the floor to present the committee's current version of the faculty salary analysis, stating that the official report will be coming in fall 2023. The analysis is conducted yearly with the purpose of assessing the effects of the special salary practice (SSP) introduced in 2008 with the goal of making UCSC salaries equitable relative to those of other campuses. The program was changed in 2018 to become less progressive. The latest data set is from 2021, spanning all nine UC campuses, and supplied by APO. Chair Sher explained how the data were divided and showed the comparison since 2018. He remarked that the overall picture showed that our campus is not much better than where we were in 2018. Before curtailment of SSP we were improving but since the change, we are catching up less quickly or even falling behind. Salary disparities vary according to the different job ranks. Salary data adjusted according to the cost of living showed much greater decline. The cost of living factor may be concentrated heavily in the housing area, affecting people differently who are at different stages of their career.

The floor was opened to questions.

Stefano Profumo, Professor of Physics and Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel was given the floor and remarked that it looks like there is clear evidence that the curtailment of the special salary practice that happened right at the cusp of 2017/2018 might well be responsible for the slowdown in the growth of faculty salaries on this campus as compared to our peer campuses in the system. He stated that at last year's spring Senate meeting, he had inquired as to whether the Academic Personnel Office could conduct a cost analysis of reverting to the original SSP. According to data available to the Senate, it appeared that the cost of going back to the original SSP could be on the same magnitude as the cost of the recent salary equity increases from the administration. He wondered if that cost analysis had been created and if it would show that we would catch up to the salary of peer campuses if the Administration, in the interest of becoming as competitive as the rest of the system, would be willing to consider reverting to the original SSP.

Chair Sher stated that as far as he knew, APO was not doing that analysis, but he supported it as being beneficial.

CPEVC Kletzer was given the floor, stating that she had been able to see and discuss this data with CFW prior to the Senate meeting. She remarked that for her it was not completely clear that the distinction being drawn could be attributed solely to a change in our SSP. An analysis across the campuses should take more data to control for other things that happened over this time period. Other campuses have salary equity reviews. Other campuses have a longer and more aggressive history of preemptive retentions. This analysis is important, but it's not an event study and doesn't control for the kinds of changes that can happen. She does not dispute what the numbers are showing, but cautioned against concluding that our change in the SSP resulted in this data analysis.

Chair Sher remarked that CFW enjoyed their consultation with her, finding it very productive. He clarified that he did not mean to give an impression that the drop off in our catch-up rate is solely due to the decrease or curtailment of the SSP, because they don't have the data to support all things that have happened since 2018. What they do see is that the reduction (from 1/2 step to 1/3 step salary for GN's) of that special salary practice certainly coincided with the big decrease in the rate with which campus faculty salaries were catching up. Some campuses might be more aggressive in retention and salary equity than UCSC, but we have those programs as well. In the end, what is

important is the result, and we are still behind. We have not fulfilled what we wanted to do in 2008. Before 2018, our standing was improved quite a bit and it was a very successful program. He does not believe it will be less successful if implemented now. He stated that it does not look like an expensive program and there's no indication that it will not achieve the goal that we all want to achieve.

Grant Hartzog, Professor and Chair of Molecular, Cell, & Developmental Biology, was given the floor and remarked that he was most concerned about the gaps for the assistant professors, because we're rapidly getting to the point where we're not going to be able to recruit and retain new faculty on this campus. One way to address this is by raising their salaries, and the other way is to create more campus housing opportunities for new faculty and staff.

Herbie Lee, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) was given the floor, responding that the assistant professor salary issue noted had greatly changed over the last year through the 2022 equity program. One of the things that program highlighted was disparities across departments and divisions in hiring of assistant professor salaries, so in this year's cycle, a number of the assistant professors have been hired at significantly higher salaries than before. When the analysis is rerun next year, a large change to the assistant professors will be seen, due to the equity increase from last summer. This is an important issue, but one that is quite different from the SSP. Assistant professors haven't had time to really get much out of the special salary practice, which has more impact at the associate and full professor levels.

f. Graduate Council - Statement of Support for Graduate Implementation Task Force (ITF) Report (AS/SCP/2060)

Andrew Fisher, Distinguished Professor of Physical & Biological Sciences and Chair of the Graduate Council (GC), was given the floor to speak about and give support for the Graduate Implementation Task Force (ITF) Report. Chair Fisher thanked the members of the Joint Senate Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (JWG) who produced the extremely vital JWG report that came out about 2 years ago and the Implementation Task Force, who worked for more than a year, meeting dozens of times and crafting the ITF Report. The members of those groups put in thousands of working hours in drafting these documents. Never in the history of the campus have we had such a deep dive into data and into outcomes based on factors that help to advance graduate education and success and factors that can be impediments. Chair Fisher noted that the work of these two committees is unique for our campus, and it puts us in a unique place. Both of these reports make the path forward crystal clear. He then invited the co-chairs of the report: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Peter Biehl, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs Don Smith, and CPB Chair Dard Neuman to give brief information on selected highlights from the ITF report and recommendations.

VPDG Biehl expressed thanks for the other co-chairs and over forty faculty, staff, and students who worked all those hours and he also pointed out the extraordinary work of the graduate students who attended the meetings, bringing their insight and experience to the report.

CPB Chair Neuman took the floor, stating that their report would cover three topics: 1) a brief history of how the campus got here; 2) the specific implementation recommendations; and 3) an invitation for us collectively to deliberate and decide on who we want to become as a campus, as we think about this extraordinarily important ecosystem of our research, teaching, mentorship of our graduate students and their research, and our undergraduate education history.

ADGS Smith explained that the existence of the ITF is informed by things preceding it. The drive towards graduate growth was related to a larger effort, both systemwide and at UCSC, to support campuses beyond the flagship UC campuses to develop and grow doctoral programs so as to solidify our collective ranks as an R1 university, and to become at UCSC an AAU campus, which we recently achieved. He also recognized the re-benching process initiated at UCOP that led to UCSC receiving \$24M over the years 2012-17 to support graduate and primarily doctoral growth. UCSC also continues to receive annual aspirational enrollment funding of an additional \$8M for 1,778 doctoral students, which is several hundred more than we currently have enrolled. The UCSC Senate and Administration have been working jointly for decades on growing and strengthening graduate education. The ITF report flowed from the analysis recommendations of the Joint Senate Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (JWG) Report 2020-21, which was preceded by the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force and Graduate Education Report 2015, which was preceded by no fewer than seven different committee and task force reports issued between 1991-2015. Clearly there is a multi-decade history of our campus studying graduate education. The 2020-21 JWG Report effort was established during the wildcat strike, which crystallized to the campus and the UC system that we can and should be doing a better job supporting our graduate students and their success. In response to the JWG came a call to strategically shift from graduate growth to focus more on strengthening graduate education. Strengthening graduate education means that all matriculated students are supported financially and educationally to graduate and to succeed. The JWG recommendations were supported by the Chancellor and CPEVC, leading to the ITF being convened and VPDG Biehl to perform an essential analysis regarding the factors that were associated with student success and to implement the JWG recommendations.

ADGS Smith presented slides showing the portion of the total revenue received from graduate student enrollments which was actually spent in supporting graduate students (28%), as well as how UCSC distributes return to aid. These emphasized that UCSC has an opportunity to do a better job in supporting students.

Chair Neuman emphasized that the spirit conveyed by the report shows this as a collective effort and a collective responsibility for improvement in supporting, mentoring, retaining and graduating our doctoral students. Over a 15-year period, approximately 21% of matriculated students separated from the university before graduating. Students from underrepresented groups (URG) are more likely to separate. Up to 30% of graduate students finish beyond their program's Normative Time To Degree (NTTD), with females experiencing a higher rate. He also presented information regarding duration of support and the funding mix. Lower durations of support have historically been associated with increased quarters of Leave Of Absence (LOA) by students. Increased quarters of LOA are associated with higher attrition, which is the student withdrawing. The ITF recommendations are a call to view admission and student success as interlinked, so that we should strive and plan to support all our continuing students in good standing to graduation, in NTTD and, if necessary, beyond. The amount of support is determined by the UAW and UCOP, but summer is being discussed as a critically important time for additional funding to support doctoral and MFA students as well with regard to opportunities for professionalization. With regard to funding type, the two findings that emerge clearly and apply across divisions are: 1) student success is positively associated with fellowship support; 2) summer support of any type was positively associated with shorter TTD. Thus, the highest priority implementation recommendations focus on summer and diversity fellowships.

ADGS Smith shared that much of what we learned in the analysis of the ITF was not only that additional investments in sporting graduate education would be productive, but also that there are

things that campus is doing that we could improve on. Faculty and programs as well as the administration collectively working together to achieve greater efficiencies would lead to enhanced student success. There has been substantial progress in the development of a Graduate Student Support Model and Planning Tool and Dashboard, which allows the campus to better coordinate how we're providing support for students within a program. It's important to recognize that, after the UAW-UCOP agreement, we're entering a new landscape for graduate education within the UC system. We recognize the agreement raises questions about how student academic training and credit will be distinguished from employment-related work—GSRs and others, particularly in the STEM fields. We also recognize the agreement raises questions about how we might sustain—let alone grow—the number of TAships to appropriately support undergraduate instruction and student success more broadly. The ITF recommendations and implementation focus on what our campus has control over and what we think will positively impact graduate student success.

Chair Neuman encouraged the Senate to read over the various reports and the recommendations and then described summer support as the first of the higher priority recommendations.

ADGS Smith then described the recommendation for—and already notable progress towards—implementing structures to incentivize and enhance the support of mentoring and an annual student assessment process to promote student success on our campus. In the coming year, they hope to institute a regularized student academic progress tracking form and resources, which will allow better tracking and potential interventions for students that may not be progressing through levels of expectation. They are also recommending a summer graduate student support program to enhance student success. DEI support and programming is also being strengthened. They are exploring ways to incentivize increasing extramural GSR support for students. Finally, they're moving forward with establishing a professional development and entrepreneurship program. In closing, he expressed appreciation that the Strategic Plan Leading the Change looked closely at and adopted the ITF recommendations and stands behind them. This will allow campus to take concrete steps in achieving some of the things we've been talking about and working so hard for over the past decade.

Chair Fisher then provided the GC endorsement. He urged the Senate to take the ITF report seriously and resist the temptation to keep pushing problems down the road while hoping that they're just going to disappear. There are UC-wide committees being assembled to look at graduate education, but it's folly to think that they are going to do an investigation that's going to reveal how we can implement low-cost, easy solutions for problems in graduate education at UCSC; we know as much now as we're ever going to know. UCSC focuses a lot on program learning outcomes; this is a learning outcome. The problems are clear and the solutions are very clearly outlined in this report.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for comment.

Karen Holl, Professor of Environmental Studies and Chair of the Committee on Development and Fundraising (CDF) was given the floor and voiced her support. She highlighted as one problem that trying to reduce the number of TAships, which is good for graduate students, is creating a chronic TA shortage, which is impeding the ability to deliver undergraduate education.

CPEVC Kletzer shared thanks for the ITF and her endorsement as well. She highlighted the urgency and particularly the approach involving summer support. She looks forward to working together to develop a needs-based summer support program. In response to Chair Holl, she stated that we are in a transitional moment, and how each campus takes on the additional financial responsibilities

that come with the new collective bargaining agreements is not something we're going to solve from one year to the next. We're going to be in this, figuring it out for at least a couple of years, and it will likely affect our numbers. She also added that we need to think about our grad and undergraduate curriculum, what we teach, who teaches it, and who does the instructional support. She posited that we cannot keep doing that part the way we have been and accomplish what we all want to do together for graduate education.

## 7. **Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair**

SUA Vice President of Academic Affairs Dora Rasch and SUA Undergraduate President Jimmy Gomez were given the floor and provided the following remarks:

Hello everyone! My name is Dora Rasch. I use they/them pronouns, I'm a fourth year Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Politics double major, and I've been serving as the Student Union Assembly's Vice President of Academic Affairs for the last two years. I'm so thankful for the chance to speak at today's senate meeting. This is my last Senate meeting as VPAA, so I would like to leave you all with the issues I'm most passionate about as well as express my gratitude for being able to be here.

Hello everyone! My name is Jimmy Gomez, I am a senior triple majoring in MCD Biology, Education, and Psychology, and serve as the Student Union Assembly Undergraduate President. We appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Similar to Dora, this is my last formal engagement with the Academic Senate and I appreciate the existing relationship between us to advocate for students' needs.

Dora: I'd like to begin by discussing the ethnic studies area-H UC entry requirement. As many of you know, in 2020, through tireless activism of students and faculty, UC approved the creation of an ethnic studies A-G requirement. The following year, Governor Newsom signed into law Assembly Bill 101 requiring high school students to complete an ethnic studies course prior to graduation, and providing funding for California high schools to add ethnic studies courses to their curriculum. This was a huge step forward for antiracism in California and fulfilling the UC's commitment to equity and uplifting historically marginalized communities.

As many of you also know, the UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, also known as BOARS, is overseeing the implementation of the new requirement. Last year, under the pressure of a small but loud racist backlash to the new requirement, BOARS began to compromise and water down the requirement's curriculum. In response to this, students systemwide—and especially here at UCSC—stood up for ethnic studies. Our SUA passed a Resolution in Support of Ethnic Studies as an A-G requirement, which I will link in the chat in case anyone wants to review it, and in just two weeks our statement in support of the ethnic studies A-G requirement was signed by almost 200 students as well as our CRES department, the African American Resource & Cultural Center, the Chicax Latinx Resource Center El CENTRO, the Lionel Cantu Queer Center, the Asian American/Pacific Islander Resource Center, the American Indian Resource Center, the Center for Racial Justice, and the PUENTE Project Organization, as well as 4 of our college senates (Crown, Merrill, Cowell, and C9), the SUA, and the Grad Student Association. I'll link that document in the chat as well. Our campus' student support was strong, loud, widespread, and led students at other UCs to author make similar statements and movements. When I left you all last spring with a very similar speech to the one I'm giving now, I felt our student body was loud and clear in how they felt about ethnic studies, and I felt confident that our Senate and administration had heard our call.



Over the past year, BOARS has continued to discuss the implementation of the ethnic studies requirement, rather than implementing it as ethnic studies educators, scholars, and students had developed it. Though BOARS' meeting minutes are not very extensive, I have seen that there is once again discussion of considerably softening our ethnic studies requirement - talk of providing guidance to high schools rather than a requirement, concern over access and high schools' ability to mount the curriculum, and even concern about how to teach ethnic studies without making anyone feel guilty. I would like to remind us all about the facts surrounding ethnic studies - the fact that with the signing of AB 101 starting with the class of 2029-30, California high schools are in fact already required to teach an ethnic studies course, ethnic studies will already be a graduation requirement for California high schoolers, and the state has made funding available to develop and implement an ethnic studies course just the same as math, English, and science courses. Even more important is the fact that studies have established that, while ethnic studies education improves student outcomes regardless of identity, the students that benefit the most from ethnic studies education are the most historically disadvantaged - principally Black and Latinx students in poor school districts.

I am back today to remind you of our campus' overwhelming support for Ethnic Studies and ask that you stand with us in demanding implementation of the area H UC requirement as developed by the team of ethnic studies educators, scholars, and students assembled by the UC. From the 1969 commencement ceremony in which graduates turned their backs on the stage to protest racism in the university and call for ethnic studies, to the grassroots creation of our Critical Race and Ethnic Studies department, to the reclamation of Kerr Hall to fight against anti-blackness and for Black studies, UCSC students have been committed to the struggle for racial justice and for the centering of Native peoples and communities of color in our curricula for decades. Our passion for ethnic studies in K-12 education is no different nor separate. College is far too late to see yourself in your education and learn to think critically about systems of racism and colonialism. Students of color deserve to learn their own and their ancestors' histories.

We, your student body, ask you all, especially our BOARS representatives, to remain steadfast in support of ethnic studies and implementing it in the area H UC requirement as developed by the team of ethnic studies educators, scholars, and students assembled by the UC. In doing so, we have the power to uplift our most marginalized students.

Secondly, I'd like to speak briefly about our campus' academic integrity system - which is the reason I originally joined student government-, shed some light on issues I have seen, and make a call for our campus to improve our academic integrity systems' quality and capacity.

Our current academic integrity system rides on the backs of untrained instructors and extremely overworked provosts. Lack of training or support for instructors make instances of academic misconduct emotional and volatile for instructors and students alike. After accusations of academic misconduct, students may wait months to finish the process, and throughout the process students have limited rights, little to no support, and almost no information about the process itself or its potential outcomes. Outcomes for students are inconsistent between colleges and cases, and the process was built to be punitive rather than restorative. Cases where up to a hundred students from the same class are put through the academic misconduct process at once are painfully common, especially in certain introductory STEM classes. Despite the extensive efforts of our fantastic provosts—who provide a wonderful and important opportunity for personal and community connection for students—our academic integrity system is unnecessarily stressful, time consuming, and worryingly under-resourced for a system that decides whether students receive suspensions or expulsions. Our integrity system is in critical need of an update.

I urge the Senate and Administration to begin working together as soon as possible to develop and redesign our academic integrity system to prioritize educational and transformative outcomes for students and robust professional support for the instructors that utilize it. UC San Diego is a fantastic model for us to look to - they have a funded academic integrity office, transparently available overviews of their process and outcomes, rights and resources for students in the system, and support for instructors interacting with the system. Our campus is currently completely reworking our student conduct office with an orientation towards restorative and transformative justice - and our academic integrity system must be brought up to par with the new conduct office, or maybe even take advantage of all of the energy and resources dedicated to updating the conduct system right now to do so! And of course, I ask that students be a part of the effort to redesign our academic integrity system.

Lastly, I would like to encourage you all to keep utilizing and expanding digital tools that make our classrooms more accessible. To those of you who have heard me say this numerous times before, I apologize! This is simply too great an opportunity to let go. The tools and practices we developed over remote education, such as class zoom streams, lecture recordings, the uploading of slides and lecture materials, and a compassionate approach to pedagogy, are still vital even as most of our classes are in person. This accessibility helps eliminate barriers for engagement or the ability to attend class for disabled students, students who have families to care for, students that commute long distances because of our housing crisis, students who have to work to support themselves, and any student who happens to have a family emergency, injury, or illness, among many other examples! These tools and practices have done a lot to increase accessibility and equity for many of the students who are underserved at our university, and I hope that you all will continue and expand them. I also understand that these tools take a lot of effort to maintain, so I hope that our Chancellor and CPEVC will make providing support and resources for digital accessibility a priority. I will now transition our remarks to Jimmy.

Jimmy: Thank you Dora! Disability Justice is another initiative I encourage faculty, administration, and students to continue fighting for. A strong disability justice movement has taken shape as a result of passionate disabled students and faculty's advocacy on our campus, and a university request is calling for a disability cultural center and the dedication of additional resources for accommodation support. The SUA supports their call in an effort to foster structural support for everyone. The Disability Cultural Community Center will create and provide a safe and social space for our disabled students to form a community. Such centralized location will benefit faculty and students to build authentic connections with one another. The space would be designed by, for, and with the disabled community to serve as a platform to advocate, educate, and collaborate among disabled students, faculty, and staff to advance and empower both the community on campus and beyond, for disabled community members to fully learn, work, and live in our community as is their right. On numerous occasions the current accommodations approved by the Disability Resource Center are not enough for students (these include assistive visual software equipment, compacted testing rooms, and more); and the process for DRC affiliation is inaccessible to many - for many, it is difficult for students to find their original documentation and unaffordable to prove their disability in another way. These issues are still a violation of the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act). Often students' response from the Disability Resource Center can be mixed: the university is either doing everything they can or insufficient funding is responsible for high turnover with disability service providers resulting in minimal disability accommodations. Per UCOP President Michael Drake's request from conversations with all UC systemwide student governments, all individual campuses have been mandated to provide adequate solutions to enforce services seriously. We ask support from the Academic Senate, our Chancellor, and ongoing guidance from the Disability Resource Center to create a more equitable campus for our vibrant UCSC community.

Dora: It has been so incredibly moving to see my fellow disabled students and staff rally for disability justice, and I can't wait to see what we will achieve! I'd like to give some thanks at this point:

I want to thank my wonderful chief of staff Lily Dubois, who has written each of these senate speeches with me (among much else), and Jamie and Daniel, our Student Academic Senate chairs, who have worked so hard to connect students to the senate this year (and of course have edited most of these speeches as well).

I also want to thank all the student committee and appointed representatives for being a part of the senate with me, and thank the Senate for fostering such a positive community with us undergraduates! I have seen student involvement in the senate grow, and I'm grateful to all of you for our relationship.

Lastly, I want to say thank you again for the opportunity to speak, and the opportunity to be a part of the Senate for the last two years. This has been by far my favorite part of my job, and working with all of you has been fantastic and inspiring. Thank you for your compassionate and dedicated work and your unwavering care and support for undergraduates. (These remarks have been bittersweet!) Your work makes me proud to be a banana slug, and grateful for my time in the Senate.

SUA Undergraduate President Gomez expressed thanks to the Senate for being in community with the Student Union Assembly.

#### 8. **Report of the Graduate Student Association President**

President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) Tomas Ocampo was given the floor and provided the following comments:

Today I would like to share with you all some of the things myself and my colleagues have been working on throughout the year and discuss the challenge before us, here at UCSC, in an ever-changing world.

We have had quite a momentous year. Not only did we launch efforts to re-envision the campus through our 10-year Strategic Plan, graduate students and academic workers had their own re-envisioning sessions at the base of campus in the Fall. The effects of the strike are still felt today, but so is the scar of the Covid-19 pandemic and the adjustment to our daily lives as we've returned to majority in-person activities - despite the many interruptions from several rainstorms and power outages earlier this year - and Wi-Fi outages too. Nationally, we have seen tremendous efforts from graduate students and academic workers alike to unionize their workplace, with several campuses having gone on strike since the Fall and others winning better contracts. However, the retreat on and threat to rights for women, LGBTQ people, especially trans people, undocumented people, and black and brown communities has been incredibly alarming. I can feel the strain of these changes and events when I look at the faces of my colleagues and undergraduate students. Now more than ever we need to reaffirm our commitment to our students and our communities, and confront the myriad issues that threaten our most marginalized members, our quality of life, and our academic freedom.

Turning to the many things our graduate community has worked on this year, I've been a part of and supported the work of my colleagues to initiate and improve basic needs services across our campus and our 9 sister campuses.

It is clear from my meetings with my counterparts, the UC Council of Presidents, that our students need us to help provide food assistance, emergency cash assistance, health and reproductive care, and other support services. It is a shame that in the richest country in the world it is universities that are

left to buffer the effects of social ills, but I am glad that our campus steps up to the challenge to meet students' needs. Housing is still a major concern that our campus and others will need to continue to address in the immediate and long-term.

We have also had many conversations on improving the physical infrastructure for disabled students, to address parking needs, improve public transportation, and campus lighting. Some of these have progressed better than others, but I am hopeful that we can build a campus that aligns with our sustainability and climate goals while still improving access and mobility.

While the newest contract for academic workers has given us better wages and protections, we still have a long way to go to ensure our students and workers can afford to live in the place they study, teach, research and work. The major concern many of us graduate students share is the increasing class sizes and workloads that will come with fewer admitted students, which will also negatively impact student learning.

The Strategic Plan developed by the campus is now out and open for feedback. Graduate and undergraduate students, faculty, and staff all played a part in developing a long-term vision for the campus to address many of the challenges I've raised and that we will continue to face in the coming years. As was mentioned today, part of the Plan builds on the work of the Implementation Task Force on Inclusive Excellence in Graduate Education. I would like to thank all the faculty, staff and students involved in compiling all of this incredibly useful information. As it was hopefully clear, providing adequate funding is critical to supporting graduate education and time to degree completion. While it is great to have this and the Strategic Plan as a roadmap, implementing the goals will require all of our concerted efforts to ensure students succeed and graduate on time.

Finally, my colleagues helped organize two conferences this past week that I think speak to these issues I keep mentioning. Earlier in the week, the Higher Education's Labor Upsurge conference brought together academic activists, graduate students and faculty to discuss the situation of academic workers across the US. It was exciting to see a renewed effort and commitment to improving the conditions for all academic workers, which our campus community has been a leader on. And last week's Politics of Care conference brought together scholars, activists, and community leaders to discuss the care work that underlies much of the academic work we do here in the university. The conference made clear that all of our efforts to improve student needs, housing, wages - it all is centered on ensuring care, for ourselves and our community, so that we can go on to do the creative, innovative, and critical work we came here to do.

In my time as President, I've met with lots of graduate students across departments and divisions, and the main concerns are the ones we will continue to deal with: housing, wages, and cost of living. I want to reiterate my call from the previous Senate meeting for creating a world-class university, which will require us all to do our part to meet all of these challenges and make the university an inclusive, supportive space for all to grow and learn, especially as our national politics seem to take a darker turn.

Although my term as President is ending this year, I am proud of the work we have done to improve our campus. While my small part is over, this is only the beginning of these efforts which will require yet more commitment from us going forward. I tell my colleagues every chance I get to become engaged in all avenues available to effect change; we attend meetings, we go to forums and we strike as necessary, and I reiterate the same message to faculty - to utilize all of your resources to create a campus that you are proud of.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to seeing the great things we will accomplish in the years to come.

The floor was opened for comments and responses.

9. **Petitions of the Students (none)**
10. **Unfinished Business (none)**
11. **University and Faculty Welfare**
12. **New Business**

Chair Gallagher then asked if there was any new business.

As there was no other new business, Chair Gallagher expressed gratitude to the Senate and adjourned the meeting at 5:15pm.

ATTEST: Deborah Gould, Secretary