



1156 HIGH STREET  
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

Office of the Academic Senate  
SANTA CRUZ DIVISION  
125 CLARK KERR HALL  
(831) 459 - 2086

May 9, 2024

JAMES STEINTRAGER  
Chair, Academic Council

**Re: Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Academic Senate Statement on UC Quality**

Dear James,

The Santa Cruz Academic Senate has reviewed your request for review of the Proposed Academic Senate Statement on UC Quality that was presented by UCEP. The Committees on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI), Educational Policy (CEP), Teaching (COT), Planning and Budget (CPB) have responded. We appreciate UCEP and Academic Council's recognition of the need to update the previous 2011 UC Quality definition.

All committees noted that the changes from the 2011 definition were minor in scope but encompassed the broad goals for educational quality at the University of California. COT also recommended that a redline version would have been beneficial. Although we appreciate the aspirational intention, multiple committees contemplated the environment in which these definitions are situated rather than the current reality of impacted departments and programs, limited resource allocations, shortage in available TAs, and increased undergraduate enrollments. CEP seeks clarification stating, "If the statement is truly "aspirational" in nature then it should clearly say so. If this statement claims to reflect reality, then it should do so." CPB questions, "If these are indeed central priorities for a UC Quality Education, then either resources need to be provided to meet these requirements, or UC and individual campuses need to acknowledge that we cannot afford to maintain the goals laid out in the document with the resources available." CODEI also raised the resource barriers to "actualizing the lofty visions, specifically around learning" and recommends, "the proposal emphasizes the centrality of learning throughout the document." They astutely point out that "there are structural problems systemwide – and on our campus – that impact the success of our learning environments." They further remark, "This budgetary reality clearly is forcing pedagogical decisions that unequally impact different kinds of learning and teaching styles." Additionally, committees expressed concern for FTE: student ratios and adequate financial support for TA's and lecturers. These responses reflect the paradox of characteristics of Educational Quality at the University of California as currently written.

CODEI noted how the statement implied references to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) characteristics but encouraged more specificity. CODEI states, “We would like to see, however, more explicit discussion of systemwide DEI priorities as this would bolster the ‘DEI belongs to all of us; ethos of the UC system.’” Similarly, COT remarked on the lack of specific diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) language and priorities. COT points out, “All of our campuses should be approaching Hispanic Serving Institute (HSI) status and should be supporting their minoritized students adequately.” If this proposed statement will be revised, our division recommends the review of the [Boyer Commission’s Report: Equity/Excellence Imperative: A 2030 Blueprint for Undergraduate Education at U.S. Research Universities](#).

We thank you for this timely and important statement on UC Quality as we collectively think about our role and place at the University of California.

Sincerely,



Patty Gallagher, Chair  
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

cc: Laura Giuliano, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid  
Gabriela Arredondo, Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
David Lee Cuthbert, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy  
Elisabeth Cameron, Chair, Committee on Teaching  
Raphael Kudela, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate