

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Wednesday, May 18, 2016 at 2:30 p.m.
Stevenson Event Center
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
 - a. Draft Minutes of February 12, 2016 (AS/SCM/314)
2. Announcements
 - a. Chair Brenneis
 - b. Chancellor Blumenthal
 - c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway
3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)
4. Special Orders: Annual Reports
CONSENT CALENDAR:
 - a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1826) p. 1
5. Reports of Special Committees
 - a. Special Committee on Athletics
 - i. Interim Report (AS/SCP/1827) p. 3
 - b. Special Committee on Development and Fundraising
 - i. May 2016 Report (AS/SCP/1828) p. 9
6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Academic Personnel
 - i. Teaching Evaluation and CAP Top Ten Lists (AS/SCP/1829) p. 11
 - b. Committee on Committees
 - i. Committee Nominations for 2016-17 (AS/SCP/1830) p. 12
 - c. Committee on Educational Policy
 - i. Amendment to Regulation 10.5.2 (AS/SCP/1831) p. 17
 - d. Committee on Faculty Welfare
 - i. Oral Report
 - ii. Report on Child Care, Housing, Healthcare, and Transportation and Parking (AS/SCP/1832) p. 20
 - e. Committee on Planning and Budget
 - i. Oral Report Introducing A Resolution Calling on the UC Academic Assembly to Request that all Senate Divisions (a) Discuss and (b) Vote on a Memorial to the Regents to Divest the UC's General Endowment Pool of Fossil Fuel Holdings (AS/SCP/1834) p. 24
 - f. Committee on Teaching
 - i. Report to the Academic Senate on May 18, 2016 (AS/SCP/1833) p. 25
7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair
8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President
9. Petitions of Students (none)
10. Unfinished Business (none)
11. University and Faculty Welfare
12. New Business
 - a. Student Academic Senate Oral Report - Slug Struggles: Problems with Academic Quality

May 11, 2016

Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to encourage you to join your fellow Senate members at this year's last Academic Senate meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, May 18, at 2:30 in the Stevenson Event Center. I will very briefly highlight some of the key topics on our agenda, which may be viewed at – <http://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-meetings/agendas-minutes/2015-2016/2016-May-18-Meeting/index.html>

Once again, a number of issues critical for the near future and longer term trajectory of our campus and the university will figure centrally in our discussions, and I strongly encourage you to be part of the conversation. The Committee on Educational Policy is proposing legislation concerning the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). The Committee on Faculty Welfare will provide an update on child care, housing, and other issues. The Special Committee on Development and Fundraising and the Special Committee on Athletics will present updates on their committee work. The Committee on Academic Personnel will report on teaching evaluations and preparing personnel files. The Committee on Teaching will provide information on the new Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, as well as a recommendation (jointly with the Committee on Informational Technology) that Canvas be adopted as the new campus learning management system. Finally, the Committee on Committees will be presenting the slate of nominations for Senate consideration.

The Student Academic Senate will present an oral report on academic quality at UCSC. There will also be a motion brought forward by faculty from Environmental Studies proposing a resolution that calls upon the Assembly of Academic Senate to consider and vote on a Memorial to the Regents regarding fossil fuel divestment.

As you can see, it is a full agenda, and one that includes several consequential issues. I strongly encourage you to join us on Wednesday, May 18th.

Sincerely,



Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
February 12, 2016 Senate Meeting

The draft minutes from the February 12, 2016 Senate meeting were distributed via email on January 15, 2015 and will be presented for approval at the Senate Meeting on May 18, 2016. 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, May 17, 2016**. They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to senate@ucsc.edu.

Heather Shearer, Secretary
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

April 26, 2016

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE
Annual Report 2015-2016

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture enthusiastically nominates Sandra Chung, Professor of Linguistics as the Faculty Research Lecturer for the 2016-2017 academic year,

Professor Chung's research focuses on syntax and semantics, and her contributions are empirical as well as theoretical. Her work helps explain similarities and differences of word order and grammar agreement across languages, and their implications for communication and meaning.

Trained in Linguistics at Harvard University, Professor Chung combines theoretical rigor with an unusually deep empirical analysis. Her empirical focus is the understudied Austronesian languages—some 1,200 languages dispersed over a large area that includes Pacific island archipelagos—that form one of the world's largest language families. She began doing fieldwork on Maori, Tongan, and Samoan (all languages of the South Pacific) as an undergraduate and as a graduate student, she also did fieldwork on Indonesian language. Since 1977, she has focused especially on Chamorro, a language of the Mariana Islands. Her fieldwork on Chamorro takes her regularly to Saipan—a beautiful corner of the world.

Some of the questions she has investigated include: How is verb-first word order derived? What is the best way to understand ergativity? (This denotes a type of verb that takes the same noun as either a direct object or as subject such as “he fused the lights” or “the lights fused” where “fuse” is an ergative verb.) Professor Chung's research is highly regarded since she combines theoretical analysis with field research and documentation. Professor Chung, along with a UCSC colleague, is now exploring syntactic questions by means of psycholinguistic behavioral experiments with Chamorro participants. This is a pioneering methodology in her field.

Professor Chung's documentary work goes beyond her own research agenda. She has taken the lead in a project to create a Chamorro grammar dictionary. This work illustrates how her research expertise contributes to the larger public good.

Professor Chung is an internationally renowned scholar. A past president of the Linguistics Society of America and a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Professor Chung has received at least three National Science Foundation grants, and her affiliations beyond the University of California include the Max-Planck-Institut für Psycholinguistik. Professor Chung is recipient of the Governor's Humanities Award for Preserving Traditional Cultural Practices (U.S. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands), and is a former Lansdowne Scholar and Fulbright Scholar. Dr. Chung also recently held the Gary D. Licker Memorial Chair of Cowell College in the Division of Humanities.

Professor Chung has published widely. Her books include *Case Marking and Grammatical Relations in Polynesian* (1978), *A Book of GB Syntax Problems* (1993), *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro* (1998), *Restriction and Saturation* with William Ladusaw (2004), and *A Festschrift for William F. Shipley* (co-ed., 1991). Dr. Chung has served as an

editorial board member for several top-tier journals including *Language and Linguistics*, *Te Reo*, and the *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*. Chung has also delivered over 70 papers at conferences, professional meetings, and universities in the United States, New Zealand, Indonesia, Jakarta, Europe, Japan, Taiwan, and the Northern Mariana Islands and has authored or co-authored over 40 peer-reviewed articles and book chapters.

Professor Chung is also an outstanding teacher, and has received our campus' Excellence in Teaching Award and Innovations in Teaching Award. Her American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) fellowship cited her "distinguished contributions to teaching and research in linguistics, advancing syntax through insights from under-studied languages, notably Chamorro, and engaging minority communities in linguistic research." Besides courses in the Linguistics major, Professor Chung also teaches undergraduate courses in logic, poetics, and historical linguistics. She has advised fourteen Ph.D. recipients, some of them now distinguished academics in their own right.

Since joining UCSC in 1986, Professor Chung has served as chair of the Linguistics Department, chair of the Philosophy Department, and chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel.

Professor Chung is much in demand as a speaker. She has presented her research in countless university seminars and professional meetings around the world, and her presentations to broader audiences are said to be "clear, engaging, and fun."

In conclusion, Professor Chung is a world-renowned researcher and teacher, highly deserving of the honor of presenting her research to the University and the larger community as the 2016-17 Faculty Research Lecturer.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE
Dimitris Achlioptas
Grace Delgado
Jennifer Parker
Patricia Zavella
Daniel Friedman, Chair

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS

Interim Report

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Executive Summary

As we submit this interim report, UCSC students will be polled to assess their support for a steep rise in student fees to nearly fund the entire operating budget of UCSC's student athletics program. By all appearances, this program has been successful, both in competition and in the classroom; for instance, the current student athletes boast over a 3.3 GPA and the program has retained and graduated 100% of its students for 5 years running. Nonetheless, the administration has stated its intent to terminate student athletics if the unprecedented mechanism of an administration-mandated opinion poll fails.

We believe any such action would be premature, for numerous reasons. First, in our limited time as a committee, we have already identified many potential co-benefits to the university and affected constituencies that seem to have been underappreciated or ignored in the decision-making process. Second, the athletics budget is more complex than has been previously represented and requires further examination in light of current funding constraints. Third, we are concerned that the university has failed to engage properly and fully the key stakeholders of the student-athletics program in this process: the full student body, faculty, alumni, and the surrounding community. This is especially problematic given that the likely low rate of student participation in the voting process may not fairly represent the student body as a whole, and that this one cohort of undergraduates is assigned to make a decision that impacts a much greater constituency. Fourth, abruptly eliminating a successful program that serves and promotes UCSC would publicly signal a university in decline. We therefore recommend that the administration, in partnership with these stakeholders (including our committee), work together in 2016-2017 to foster a comprehensive investigation and campus-wide conversation about the value and costs of athletics to UCSC.

Introduction

At the winter 2016 meeting, the Senate approved the creation of a special committee on student athletics to examine the value and costs of NCAA athletics at UCSC. Because the committee membership was not determined until late April, we are not prepared to issue a complete report. However, intervening events compel us to bring this matter to the Senate's immediate attention. Specifically, the campus administration has declared that they will end NCAA athletics unless students express significant support to raise substantial new fees for student athletics. As this report is being submitted, students are voting on an unprecedented opinion poll as part of the spring student elections process. The question is as follows:

“Would you support a new student fee of approximately \$90 per quarter (\$270 per year) to retain the current NCAA Athletics program at UC Santa Cruz?”

According to the university campus elections website:

“If a simple majority of students who vote in the 2016 election vote YES, the question will be placed on the 2017 ballot as a student fee referendum. If the simple majority threshold is not met, the NCAA Athletics Program will be eliminated by June 2017 when the temporary funding expires.”

Yet as we quickly discovered during our preliminary research, the issue is far more complex than has been presented to the students in the opinion poll. Specifically, we have uncovered a number of important factors that warrant additional investigation and discussion before implementation of such a drastic decision as termination.

Such an outcome would make UCSC the only UC or CSU without either NCAA or NAIA athletics. Nationwide, Spelman College is the only other university or college to have eliminated NCAA athletics. We feel strongly that such an action has the potential for long-term consequences that affect the campus along the many dimensions of recruitment, retention and community relations, as well as student life, and we are alarmed that the process has proceeded without extensive consultation with the Academic Senate.

Brief Background

Since 1981, the University of California, Santa Cruz has participated in intercollegiate athletics as a member of the NCAA Division III. Over 5,000 student athletes have participated in UCSC athletics, distinguishing themselves in the classroom and in competition. MIT, Emory, NYU, and the University of Chicago are examples of other institutions that support Division III athletic programs -- an academically selective and rigorous cohort. Division III athletics do not allow athletic scholarships for student athletes. All other UC campuses (save Merced) are members of the NCAA at Divisions I or II. Their athletics budgets and programs dwarf those of UCSC.

At UCSC, the athletic program (currently consisting of 15 teams, men and women) has been supported by a combination of campus funds and student fees. Our student athletes regularly pay for their own equipment and travel for athletic events. The UCSC funding level is below even that of the smallest Division III schools, which are often 1/10 the size of the UCSC undergraduate population (e.g. Mills, Cal Tech, Scripps, Pomona, University of LaVerne).

In 2014 the University announced its intent to suspend campus funding of UCSC athletics following a three year period when they would provide increased support (~\$1M per year) to cover wage and benefits increases for coaches on contract agreements and several other new expenses. After this period, funding would need to be derived from student fees. Last year Athletics staff developed a referendum to fund student athletics with a \$117 per quarter fee. The proposed athletics fee received 40% approval in the spring 2015 vote. It should be noted that starting in 2014 student referenda have required a supermajority of 66% approval from at least 25% of the student body. Even when the

threshold for approval was a simple majority almost no fees over \$10 a quarter, for any purpose, had passed in recent years.

UCSC Athletic Budget and Comparison to Other UCs

UCSC is noteworthy for its lean athletics budget. Athletics has been funded by a \$5 per quarter student fee, which raised \$162,263 in 2015, and by some limited central funds, which were recently enhanced for the three-year period. Prior to 2014, the central contribution was about \$225,000 per year. As noted, for two years the central contribution has been temporarily raised to \$1 million.

Other UCs, most of which are either Division I or II, typically have much higher student fees designated for NCAA athletics. For example, Riverside has a \$105 per year fee and Merced \$150 per year. Merced, it should be noted, is currently a member of NAIA but plans a transition to NCAA. UCSD funds its annual ~\$7M budget for student athletics primarily from fees. We are soliciting more information because some UC fees for athletics are consolidated into omnibus categories, such as Davis' \$549 per year campus expansion fee.

At several UC campuses at least, the central administration makes a substantial contribution toward athletics. As an example, the Irvine athletic budget includes “institutional support” (tuition, state) of \$9.5 million while student fees provide \$3.8 million. Riverside is another example with about \$8 million in direct institutional support and \$2 million in student fees.

In sum, other UC campuses use a range of funding models. A successful and sustainable program at UCSC may require a combination of central funding and significant student fees.

Future Budget

The present opinion poll specifies a \$270 yearly fee which, if eventually funded, would yield ~\$2.9 million for the athletics program ($\$270 \times \sim 16,000$ undergraduates, less 33% redirected to student aid funds). Given sufficient time, the Special Committee on Athletics is prepared to bring to the Academic Senate an analysis of how this figure relates to the current and future funding requirements of UCSC athletics. Among relevant considerations are: careful examination of the current athletics budget, possible increases in salary levels as mandated by the Department of Labor, and the potential loss of significant gifts and donations to the campus.

The Special Committee on Athletics is sensitive to the competing fiscal needs of our students and of our campus. However the significant consequences of the loss of intercollegiate athletics compel us to request sufficient time to provide a careful budget analysis, one that is essential both to justifying the level of any proposed student fee increase and to communicating to students and faculty how these funds would be utilized.

Our Student Athletes

Approximately 300 undergraduates participate on the NCAA teams at UCSC (52% are women). The program has recently added a men's track and field team and is expanding the women's track and field squad. This will increase participation significantly.

The UCSC athletes are talented students who have performed significantly above campus averages in the classroom. According to OPERS, NCAA student-athletes at UCSC have a 3.3+ average GPA (versus a 3.08 campus average). 71% of the student athletes have a GPA of 3.0 or better, and 31% have 3.5 or better. Regarding retention, athletics reports a 100% graduation rate for five years in a row. This greatly exceeds the campus average of 58%.

Admissions and Retention

Athletics can be viewed, in part, as a recruitment and retention program. Through athletics we attract a talented and diverse cohort of students who wish to compete at the NCAA level. If the administration terminates athletics, that source of applicants will be eliminated. And, most of the current student athletes have expressed their intent to transfer from UCSC if the program is terminated.

The absence of athletics at UCSC could well have a broader and ongoing effect on admissions. It is not simply the scholar-athletes who will enroll elsewhere. We must consider the potential impact on many applicants who are not athletes. Upon learning UCSC has no intercollegiate athletics program, their first – and quite rational – reaction might be to wonder what else is lacking at our university.

As noted above, the retention rate for student athletes at UCSC has been 100% for 5 years running. Student retention is now a priority for this administration. Over the past several years, it has developed several recruitment and retention programs at substantial administrative cost. Many of these resources are rightly aimed at students whose preparation puts them at risk of not succeeding. NCAA athletics at UCSC has a record of attracting and retaining students who, as a cohort, are well above average and who graduate on time. Our committee wishes to examine the success of these new retention programs relative to their cost and relative to the record of athletics in recruiting and retaining successful students.

Alumni

At most universities, student athletics offers a sustained connection between the university and its alumni. This holds true even for smaller, Division III programs (e.g., Amherst, Pomona). Overall, our student athlete alumni have a favorable impression of their experience at UCSC, and University Relations reports alumni interest in providing support. For instance, when revered men's tennis coach Bob Hansen retired, tennis alumni raised an endowment in his honor that generated several five-figure gifts. The men's tennis endowed fund has a market value in the \$25-30K range. Given that our student athlete alumni are typically in their 20s, 30s, and 40s, and have not yet reached maximum earning potential, this kind of support is remarkable for demonstrating their commitment and appreciation to the university and the athletics program. At the same

time, our research has revealed that alumni appreciation of athletics has been severely tempered by the administration's handling of the athletics program and the proposal to terminate the program. It has been reported to us that major gifts to the university have been rescinded or postponed specifically because alumni are dismayed by the prospect of termination. As our research uncovered, when alumni feel that their university is not even covering the basics of a program for which they care deeply, there is a limit to what those alumni are willing to contribute, even if they have significant funds to offer.

Fundraising and University Relations

The concerns of alumni are shared among a wider group of supporters, including parents of current and former students and members of the local community. Parents are often shocked by the very lean budgets for athletics programs. In response, parents often support their children's athletics experiences, on top of paying tuition, simply so that their children have a good experience. As noted, we have reports that several very large planned gifts to upgrade university athletics facilities and programs have been withdrawn. These programs and facilities would not be exclusive to the athletics program but shared by and benefit the larger university community, comprised of students, faculty, staff, and Santa Cruz residents. Hence, this potential loss would not only damage the public image of the university, but also would also reflect poorly on the university's efforts to engage meaningfully with supporters in ways that benefit the entire university community on and off campus.

Community

UCSC's athletics program is deeply invested in the larger community beyond campus. The majority of the 300 student athletes at UCSC engage and promote a range of outreach activities within Santa Cruz County. These include youth clinics, summer camps, volunteer coaching (over 100) in youth programs, and in-school K-12 programs. With the termination of Santa Cruz Shakespeare, athletics is one of the few UCSC programs that consistently engages our university with the surrounding community. Additionally, the program provides the community one of the few opportunities to attend high-level sporting events in the county.

UCSC's Broader Image

The UCSC Slug mascot was conceived by athletics and stands as the most recognizable image of our campus. While student athletics may never be, and perhaps should never be, a focal point of our campus, intercollegiate sport is widely viewed as a fundamental component of higher education. Intercollegiate activities such as athletics, among others, greatly enhance the university and our students' experiences by taking our campus to other campuses and bringing other campuses to ours. Our student-athletes are among the best public representatives of our campus.

Perhaps more importantly, as faculty, we have great concern that the termination of UCSC student athletics, a program that distinguishes itself in the classroom and in competition, would signal to the world that we cannot maintain a first-class university. At the least, it may contribute to our reputation as a lower-tier campus in the UC system.

Despite the capital campaign, higher tuition, and deals with the governor and legislature, UCSC seems stuck in a perpetual budget crisis. In such an environment, nearly any expenditure not related to the classroom is up for grabs. And each individual cut or program termination seems justifiable and free of notable negative consequences. The university is nearly unique in not having an Arts and Lectures program, which it dropped in 2009. Likewise the university ended a 30-plus year relationship with Shakespeare Santa Cruz by withdrawing funding in 2013 and then removing them from the glen in 2015. None of these things by itself has been a true catastrophe. At some point, however, we will have no relationship to the Santa Cruz community, no campus life beyond what students can manage to create for themselves, and few of the extra-curricular attributes that characterize a top-notch institution.

Concluding Remarks

With student athletics at this critical juncture, the administration has failed to properly engage its stakeholders – students, faculty, alumni, and the community – in the matter. Nor has the administration successfully informed students on the critical role student fees play in supporting campus activities more generally. The administration’s neutrality and passivity can be viewed as an abdication of leadership on issues vital to the campus: let the students decide, even when few students fully understand the context and implications of the choices they confront.

Irrespective of the outcome of the ongoing opinion poll, we recommend that Academic Senate advise the administration to take the next year to further consider how the campus can develop a sustainable model for student athletics that incorporates the needs and wishes of all its stakeholders: foremost students, but also faculty, alumni and the community. This committee offers to extend its activities through the 2016-2017 academic year to work with the administration and other constituencies to achieve this goal.

Respectfully Submitted;
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS
Lissa Caldwell
Matt O’Hara
Greg O’Malley
Gene Switkes
Dan Wirls
Cliff Dochterman, *Ex Officio*
Jason X. Prochaska, Chair

April 12, 2016

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDRAISING
May 2016 Report

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Constituted in fall 2014, the Special Committee on Development and Fundraising (SCDF) mission recognizes the need, given the increasing importance of fundraising to the campus, for the faculty voice in development. We began with three aims: to bring a broader, more diverse range of faculty into direct contact with University Relations (UR) and the fund-raising process; to find innovative ways to support graduate education as well as to enhance graduate student-alumni engagement; and to make the UC Santa Cruz culture of philanthropy reflect a coordinated faculty-UR collaboration better suited to our intellectual interdisciplinarity, less fragmented by departmental and divisional territoriality, and overall more responsive to campus needs and goals.

To these ends, the SCDF developed three projects, in varying stages of completion:

1. Creation of an Experts' List to enable the media, campus administrators, campus visitors, and others to contact faculty with appropriate areas of expertise for interviews, information, etc. The committee worked intensively with campus IT staff to refine our interactions with Senate faculty in undertaking the challenging task of how to describe our research and expertise. These interactions included the development of a nuanced interface and deliberations on how best to present academic disciplinary boundaries in meaningful ways to the general public. A standard resource in most large universities, our list went online in December 2015 and is now in its second phase.¹
2. Involvement of alumni and Silicon Valley companies in new and innovative interdisciplinary programs at UC Santa Cruz. A pilot project is drawing on the under-utilized 2012-13 Faculty-Initiated Group Hires (FIGH) proposals as the basis for a special development effort, using them beyond the cluster-hiring that was originally intended: to increase the visibility, life-span and potential for fund-raising of the FIGH faculty clusters. Representing the current strengths of UC Santa Cruz collaborative research, these proposals will provide the basis for a SCDF pilot program, developing direct faculty-UR partnerships for specific faculty-generated research/teaching projects. Of the Senate top-ranked proposals, we chose Natural Language Processing (NLP) and worked with the lead faculty from Linguistics and Computer Science (who are in the process of creating both a Designated Emphasis and a Master's program) on a trial presentation for an audience of graduate alumni and Silicon Valley companies. The aim is to create a two-way, university-industry partnership, not to ask for money but rather advice on the new NLP program and to offer the possibility of hosting Visiting Research Professionals at campus (to teach selected Master's classes, be involved in the department/program, and work with researchers). After an extended period of coaching by UR staff and several rehearsals with SCDF, we held a successful event on April 20 in Menlo Park.² Specific follow-up is ongoing and will be presented at the Senate meeting.

¹ <http://campusdirectory.ucsc.edu/expertise>

² http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/special-committees/committee-on-development-and-fundraising/Presentation_NLP_Menlo%20Parkver_04_20_2016.pdf

3. Organization of a graduate alumni panel organized in partnership with the Graduate Division, for Alumni Weekend, “From graduate degree to innovative and meaningful work,” with five panelists representing a range of disciplines across campus.³ Organization of a graduate alumni panel organized in partnership with the Graduate Division, for Alumni Weekend, “From graduate degree to innovative and meaningful work,” with five panelists representing a range of disciplines across campus:
 - 2015 Joint Senate-Admin Task Force Report on Graduate Growth, especially the section on Professional Development, pp. 24-27.⁴
 - Institute for Humanities Research project PhD+, a workshop series launched this year to discuss possible career paths for humanities PhDs, online identity issues, internship possibilities, work/life balance, elements of style, grants/fellowships and more.⁵
 - MCD Biology Training Grant Program (Director Susan Strome).⁶

As a Senate committee with a campus-wide purview, the SCDF has a mandate that we will continue to use to help coordinate these different disciplinary and administrative efforts. A growing percentage of PhDs are pursuing non-academic careers, in the natural and social sciences, humanities, and the arts. Those used to be called “alternative” careers, implying that they are back-ups to the one true path of academia. Our committee aims to find new ways to support a sustained, all-campus engagement with graduate programs that seek to expose students to diverse career options and provide customized training for each student to pursue his/her target career(s).

Respectfully submitted;

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDRAISING

Ben Carson

Enrico Ramirez-Ruiz

Susan Strome

Noah Wardrip-Fruin

Erika Zavaleta

Don Brenneis, *Ex Officio*

Susan Gillman, Chair

Keith Brant, Vice Chancellor for University Relations

May 12, 2016

³ http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/special-committees/committee-on-development-and-fundraising/SCDF_Graduate%20Panel_AlumWeekend_04_29_2016.pdf

⁴ <http://senate.ucsc.edu/archives/Current%20Issues/Task%20Force%20on%20Graduate%20Growth/TFGG%20Report>

⁵ <http://ihr.ucsc.edu/event/phd-humanists-work/>

⁶ <http://pbse.ucsc.edu/mcd-trainee-outcomes.html>

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Teaching Evaluation and CAP Top Ten Lists

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

In recent years, CAP has created lists of “tips” for preparing personnel files: one for faculty, and one for divisional deans and departmental chairs. Last spring, CAP revised its Top Ten Tips for Faculty. This year the committee is happy to announce that its memo, CAP’s Top Ten List of Tips for Personnel Files for Chairs and Deans, was divided into two separate documents: CAP’s Tips for Department Chairs,¹ and CAP’s Suggestions to Deans Regarding Letters for Major Actions.² The Tips for Department Chairs has been greatly expanded, offering suggestions both for reviewing the file as well as writing effective letters. All three lists may be found on the CAP webpage³ located on the Academic Senate website.

In light of recent and prominent research regarding the potential inequities and biases that may be associated with student teaching evaluations and the evaluation process itself, CAP would like to take the opportunity to emphasize that the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) requires more than one kind of evidence of teaching effectiveness in each review file.⁴ Additional types of evidence of teaching effectiveness include: the opinions of faculty members based on class visitations or public lectures; departmental review of syllabi, exams, assignments, and other materials; the number and caliber of students mentored by the candidate; and the development of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction. Because mentoring of students at all levels is a critical aspect of teaching, mentorship should be explicitly evaluated by the department. CAP encourages those preparing personnel files to embrace a multi-pronged approach in the evaluation of teaching.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Nameera Akhtar
Amy Beal
Shaowei Chen
Andrew Fisher
Hiroshi Fukurai
Gail Hershatter
Todd Lowe
Armin Mester
Carolyn Dean, Chair

May 12, 2016

¹ http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/CAPTips_Chairs_021816.pdf

² http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/CAPDeanLetterSuggestions_021816.pdf

³ <http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cap-committee-on-academic-personnel/index.html>

⁴ [APM 210-1.d.1](#) – Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal, Teaching

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Committee Nominations for 2016-17

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate
2016-17 Committee Membership

OFFICERS

(4) Senate Director: Matthew Mednick

Ólöf	Einarsdóttir	Chair	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Kimberly	Lau	Vice Chair	Literature
TBD		Parliamentarian	
Heather	Shearer	Secretary	Writing

ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATIVES

Dorian	Bell	Assembly Rep.	Literature
Kimberly	Lau	Assembly Rep.	Literature

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (SEC)

(14 all ex officio) Cte Analyst: Matthew Mednick

Ólöf	Einarsdóttir	Chair	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Kimberly	Lau	Vice Chair	Literature
Heather	Shearer	Secretary	Writing
Dorian	Bell	Assembly Rep.	Literature
Micah	Perks	(COC)	Literature
Stefano	Profumo	(CFW)	Physics
Minghui	Hu	(CAFA)	History
John	Tamkun	(CEP)	MCD Biology
Miriam	Greenberg	(CAAD)	Sociology
Jorge	Hankamer	(P&T)	Linguistics
Steve	Whittaker	(COR)	Psychology
Carla	Freccero	(CAP)	Literature
Don	Smith	(GC)	METOX
Abel	Rodriguez	(CPB)	Applied Math & Statistics
Yat	Li	(CIE)	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Matthew	McCarthy	(COT)	Ocean Sciences

ACADEMIC FREEDOM (CAF)

(5) Cte Analyst: Susanna Wrangell

Thorne	Lay	Chair/UCAF Rep	Earth & Planetary Sciences
Gopal	Balakrishnan		History of Consciousness
Eva	Bertram		Politics
Darrell	Long (W&S)		Computer Science
Tanya	Merchant		Music

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (CAP)

(9) Cte Analyst: Jaden Silva-Espinoza

Carla	Freccero	Chair/UCAP Rep	Literature
Amy	Beal		Music
Martin	Berger		History of Art & Visual Culture
Robert	Boltje		Mathematics
Shaowei	Chen		Chemistry & Biochemistry
Kent	Eaton		Politics
Donka	Farkas		Linguistics
Ethan	Miller		Computer Science
Brad	Olsen		Education

ADMISSIONS & FINANCIAL AID (CAFA)

(7-9) Cte Analyst: Esthela Bañuelos & Chad Silva

Minghui	Hu	Chair/BOARS Rep	History
Alan	Kawamoto		Psychology
Jennifer	Maytorena Taylor		Film & Digital Media
Charlie	McDowell		Computer Science
Rita	Mehta		Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Jose	Renau		Computer Engineering
David	Smith		Physics
Veronica	Terriquez		Sociology

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION & DIVERSITY (CAAD)

(6) Cte Analyst: Chad Silva

Miriam	Greenberg	Chair/UCAAD Rep	Sociology
Suzanne	Alonzo		EE Biology
Laurie	Palmer		Art
Ingrid	Parker (F)		Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Nader	Pourmand		Biomolecular Science & Engineering
Ana	Ravelo		Ocean Sciences
Ronaldo	Wilson		Literature

CAREER ADVISING (CCA)

(5) Cte Analyst: Jaden Silva-Espinoza

Maria	Evangelatou	Chair	History of Art & Visual Culture
Christopher	Chen		Literature
Scott	Oliver		Chemistry & Biochemistry
Barbara	Rogoff		Psychology

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (COC)

(5) Cte Analyst: Matthew Mednick

Micah	Perks	Chair/UCOC Rep	Literature
Brandin	Baron Nusbaum		Theater Arts
Maureen	Callanan		Psychology
J. Xavier	Prochaska		Astronomy & Astrophysics
Hamid R.	Sadjadpour		Electrical Engineering

COURSES OF INSTRUCTION (CCI)

(3) Cte Analyst: Susanna Wrangell

Gina	Dent	Chair	Feminist Studies
Noriko	Aso		History
Mayanthi	Fernando		Anthropology
Kevin	Karplus		Biomolecular Science & Engineering
Anatole	Leikin		Music
Jie	Qing		Mathematics

EDUCATIONAL POLICY (CEP)

(6-9) Cte Analyst: Susanna Wrangell & Matthew Mednick

John	Tamkun	Chair /UCEP Rep	MCD Biology
Cindy	Cruz		Education
David	Draper		Applied Math & Statistics
Suresh	Lodha		Computer Science
Onuttom	Narayan		Physics
Tonya	Ritola		Writing
Lynn	Westerkamp		History

EMERITI RELATIONS (CER)

(3) Cte Analyst: Jaden Silva-Espinoza

Shelly	Errington	Chair	Anthropology
Barry	Bowman		MCD Biology
Linda	Burman-Hall		Music
Wlad	Godzich		Literature

FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE (CFRL)

(5) Cte Analyst:

Dan	Friedman	Chair	Economics
Dimitris	Achlioptas		Computer Science
Jennifer	Parker		Art
Seth	Rubin		Chemistry & Biochemistry
Patricia	Zavella		Latin American & Latino Studies

FACULTY WELFARE (CFW)

(6-8) Cte Analyst: Jaden Silva-Espinoza

Stefano	Profumo	Chair/UCFW Rep	Physics
David	Cuthbert		Theater Arts
Shelly	Grabe		Psychology
Ricardo	Sanfelice		Computer Engineering

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)

(10) Cte Analyst: Esthela Bañuelos

Don	Smith	Chair/CCGA Rep	METOX
Lissa	Caldwell		Anthropology
Ben	Crow		Sociology
Michael	Dine		Physics
Kimberly	Jannarone		Theater Arts
Roberto	Manduchi		Computer Engineering
Andrew	Mathews		Anthropology
Paul	Roth		Philosophy

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (CIT)

(8) Cte Analyst: Kim Van Le

Brant	Robertson	Chair/UCCC Rep	Astronomy & Astrophysics
Brent	Haddad		Technology Management
Glenn	Millhauser		Chemistry & Biochemistry
Travis	Seymour		Psychology
Abe	Stone		Philosophy
Maziar	Toosarvandani		Linguistics
Meg	Wilson		Psychology

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (CIE)

(6) Cte Analyst: Esthela Bañuelos

Yat	Li	Chair/UCIE Rep	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Zsuzsanna	Abrams		Languages & Applied Linguistics
Jorge	Aladro Font		Literature
Qi	Gong		Applied Math & Statistics
Michael	Hutchison		Economics
Jimin	Lee		Art

LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION (COLASC)

(5) Cte Analyst: Kim Van Le

Eileen	Zurbriggen	Chair/UCOLASC Rep	Psychology
Dimitris	Achlioptas		Computer Science
Chelsea	Blackmore		Anthropology
Michael	Cowan		American Studies
T.J.	Demos		History of Art & Visual Culture
Graeme	Smith		Astronomy & Astrophysics

PLANNING & BUDGET (CPB)

(9) Cte Analyst: Esthela Bañuelos

Abel	Rodriguez	Chair/UCPB Rep	Applied Math & Statistics
Elizabeth	Abrams		Writing
Adrian	Brasoveanu		Linguistics
Cormac	Flanagan		Computer Science
Lindsay	Hinck		MCD Biology
Tracy	Larrabee		Computer Engineering
Lourdes	Martinez-Echazabal		Latin American & Latino Studies
Rick	Prelinger	Vice Chair	Film & Digital Media
Carl	Walsh		Economics

PREPARATORY EDUCATION (CPE)

(3) Cte Analyst: Susanna Wrangell

Trish	Stoddart	Chair/UCOPE Rep	Education
Dongwook	Lee		Applied Math & Statistics
Debra	Lewis		Mathematics

PRIVILEGE & TENURE (P&T)

(7) Cte Analyst: Chad Silva & Matthew Mednick

Jorge	Hankamer	Chair/UCPT Rep	Linguistics
Josh	Deutsch		Physics
Julie	Guthman		Sociology
Sharon	Kinoshita		Literature
Shigeko	Okamoto		Languages & Applied Linguistics
Larry	Polansky		Music
Bruce	Schumm		Physics

RESEARCH (COR)

(9) Cte Analyst: Kim Van Le

Steve	Whittaker	Chair/UCORP Rep	Psychology
Karen	Bassi		Literature
Daniel	Costa		Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Wlad	Godzich		Literature
Fernando	Leiva		Latin American & Latino Studies
Longzhi	Lin		Mathematics
Todd	Lowe		Biomolecular Engineering
Gustavo	Vazquez		Film & Digital Media
Ahmet Ali	Yanik		Electrical Engineering

TEACHING (COT)

(5) Cte Analyst: Kim Van Le

Matthew	McCarthy	Chair	Ocean Sciences
Kimberly	Helmer		Writing
Marc	Matera		History
Danny	Scheie		Theater Arts
Judith	Scott		Education

RULES, JURISDICTION & ELECTIONS (RJ&E)

(5) Cte Analyst: Chad Silva

Jason	Nielsen	Chair	Physics
Margarita	Azmitia		Psychology
Dave	Belanger		Physics
Chris	Connery		Literature
Audun	Dahl		Psychology

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDRAISING (SCDF)

Susan	Gillman	Chair	Literature
Ben	Carson		Music
Enrico	Ramirez-Ruiz		Astronomy & Astrophysics
Susan	Strome		MCD Biology
Noah	Wardrip-Fruin		Computational Media
Erika	Zavaleta		Environmental Studies

Respectfully Submitted;
 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
 Sri Kurniawan
 Micah Perks
 Jason X. Prochaska
 Vanita Seth
 Patty Gallagher, Chair

May 11, 2016

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Amendment to Regulation 10.5.2
Revisions to ELWR Satisfaction Requirement

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Educational Policy is proposing changes to Regulation 10.5.2, which describes the mechanisms by which students satisfy the Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). All students admitted to the University of California must demonstrate an acceptable level of ability in English composition by fulfilling this requirement. Students can satisfy ELWR before entering UCSC based on their SAT, ACT, IB or AP scores; passing an acceptable college or university English composition course; or passing the UC Analytical Writing Placement Examination (AWPE). Although ELWR is an “entry-level” requirement, it is not required for admission to any campus in the UC system. A student can satisfy ELWR after entering UCSC by passing a portfolio review conducted by the Writing Program. Students who fail to satisfy ELWR by their fourth quarter are prevented from enrolling until ELWR is satisfied.

The satisfaction of ELWR helps ensure that students are prepared to take the courses that satisfy the Composition 1 and 2 (C1 and C2) general education requirements. In 2005, the C1 and C2 writing requirements were integrated with the required College Core courses, which are usually taken during students’ first quarter at UCSC. As a result, a significant number of UCSC undergraduates take a C1 course before satisfying ELWR. Indeed, Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 10.5.2 requires them to do so by stating that students who have not satisfied ELWR “must enroll in an Entry Level Writing section of Composition 1 in their first term of residence.” For additional information on this topic, please refer to CEP’s report on the lower-division writing requirements and their relationship to the College Core courses on our website.¹

CEP strongly favors the vertical integration of writing instruction on our campus: a logical progression of writing from entry to graduation. Students should satisfy ELWR before attempting a C1 course; what is learned in C1 should prepare students for C2; and what is learned in C2 should prepare students for upper-division writing courses, including the courses that satisfy the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement. To ensure that the satisfaction of ELWR is a prerequisite for enrolling in a C1 course, we are recommending the following changes to 10.5.2, effective Fall 2017.

10.5.2 Entry Level Writing: English Composition.

Every student must demonstrate an acceptable level of competence in writing. This may be done in one of the following ways:

¹ The CEP website is located at - http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cep-committee-on-educational-policy/reports-and-presentations/Senate_Meeting_OverviewUCSCwritingrequirementsandMLC.pdf

Existing Regulation	Proposed Regulation
<p>10.5.2a. By achieving a score of 30 or better on ACT Combined English/Writing test; or 680 or better on the College Board SAT-II Writing Test; or 680 or better on the College Board SAT Reasoning Test, Writing section; or 3, 4, or 5 on either Advanced Placement (AP) Examination in English; or 5 or above on the International Baccalaureate High Level English A exam; or 6 or above on an International Baccalaureate Standard Level English A exam. (See SR 636.B.2.) (EC 31 Aug 09)</p>	<p>10.5.2a. No change.</p>
<p>10.5.2b. b. (Pertaining particularly to transfer students) By completing an acceptable college-level course of at least four quarter credits, or the equivalent, in English composition with a grade of C or better; or</p>	<p>10.5.2b. No change.</p>
<p>10.5.2c. (Pertaining to students without CEEB scores) By achieving a satisfactory score on the Analytical Writing Placement Examination administered by the University of California at the beginning of each term. (CC 31 Aug 98)</p>	<p>10.5.2c. (Pertaining to students without CEEB scoreswho do not satisfy the requirement as described above) By achieving a satisfactory score on the Analytical Writing Placement Examination administered by the University of California at the beginning of each term. prior to the start of instruction in the student’s first term. (CC 31 Aug 98)</p>

<p>Entering students who have not satisfied the requirement in one of the above ways must enroll in an Entry Level Writing section of Composition 1 in their first term of residence; pending satisfactory passage of the requirement, continued enrollment in an Entry Level Writing course is mandatory. Satisfaction of the Entry Level Writing Requirement is a prerequisite for receiving credit in Composition 1, enrollment in every other university-level undergraduate course in English composition and for the Bachelor's degree. (Am 30 Apr 69, 22 Oct 75; CC 1 Aug 77; CC 31 Aug 06)</p>	<p>Entering students who have not satisfied the requirement in one of the above ways must enroll in an Entry-Level Writing section course of Composition 1 in their first term of residence; pending satisfactory passage of the requirement, continued enrollment in an Entry-Level Writing course is mandatory. Satisfaction of the Entry-Level Writing Requirement is a prerequisite for receiving credit in enrolling in a Composition 1 course, enrollment in every other university-level undergraduate course in English composition and for the Bachelor's degree. (Am 30 Apr 69, 22 Oct 75; CC 1 Aug 77; CC 31 Aug 06)</p>
--	---

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Doris Ash
Faye Crosby
Matthew Guthaus
Dee Hibbert-Jones
Tonya Ritola
Felicity Schaeffer
Tchad Sanger, *ex-officio*
John Tamkun, Chair

Sean Keilen, Provost Representative
Erica Halt, NSTF Representative
Seamus Howard, Undergraduate Representative
Vanessa Sadsad, Undergraduate Representative

May 9, 2016

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Report on Child Care, Housing, Healthcare, and Transportation and Parking

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) will report on several issues highly relevant to faculty welfare and family friendly resources: Employee Child Care, Housing, Healthcare, and Transportation and Parking. These issues each play a part in the overall quality of life for UCSC faculty. CFW aims to update faculty on recent developments in these areas, of which the general campus may not be aware. CFW is monitoring these and other topics and will continue to make recommendations for improvements. The committee welcomes your comments, feedback, and suggestions at the May 18, 2016 Senate meeting.

Child Care

CFW consulted with CP/EVC Alison Galloway on April 14, 2016 on the topic of child care and was pleased to hear that the mandate to increase enrollment and accept additional students in fall 2016-17 has spurred President Napolitano to come up with alternative funding models for building on UC campuses. CP/EVC Galloway reported that the Office of the President (UCOP) will now allow campuses to go out to bid for several projects at a time in order to encourage larger companies (vetted by the President) to bid for more years of continuous building, which would result in cost savings and allow the campus to move forward with several projects at a time. One of the challenges of building an employee child care center in the past has been the limited debt capacity and the limit of the campus working on one project at a time. The new model would enable the campus to quickly expand student housing, while also providing an opportunity to enlarge the existing student child care center to include employee child care, and even initiate the second phase of Ranch View Terrace employee housing (RVT2). CFW strongly recommends that UC Santa Cruz take advantage of this new opportunity, which would serve multiple campus constituents and strengthen the mission of the campus using a multi-pronged approach.

As discussed in several consultations with campus administrators in the past, enlarging the current student child care center appears to be the best and most viable option for UCSC employee child care. In a consultation with VCBAS Sarah Latham on November 19, 2015, CFW was informed that the blueprints for the remodeling of the student child care center were already vetted and did not include an increase in square footage.¹ However in consultation, CP/EVC Galloway informed CFW that this new funding model opens up the option to re-envision this project. When the student child care center is replaced/remodeled in the next 5 years, it is imperative that it be expanded to accommodate faculty and staff. CFW will continue to consult with VCBAS Latham, as well as the next CP/EVC to ensure that employee child care remains a priority for our campus, and that CFW/Senate involvement occur at the beginning stages of development.

Housing

CFW has reviewed the UCSC Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendation for 2016-17, and the proposal to increase prices of housing units included in the program by 1.55% for the 2016-2017 academic year. In the committee's response to CP/EVC Galloway of May 5, 2016,²

¹ Zachos to Latham, 12/08/15, Re: CFW Post Consultation 11/19/15

² Zachos to Galloway, 5/5/16, Re: UCSC Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendation (2016-2017)

CFW approved of the proposed increase, and noted that the program is effectively serving the majority of its intended goals. The committee requested that an additional spreadsheet be included in future recommendation packets to further clarify how the proposed increase has been determined, and recommended that Colleges, Housing, and Educational Services (CHES) explore additional incentives to encourage unit turnover other than the Low Interest Supplemental Loan Program (LIO-SHLP).

During the 2014-15 academic year, CFW worked closely with Steve Houser, Director of Capital Planning and Employee Housing at CHES, to improve the transparency of the Re-Pricing program and highlight the need for Re-Pricing increases in the annual recommendation packets. As a result of these collaborative discussions, CFW was pleased to find that this year's proposal included additional graphs on program inventory and revenue and housing costs vs. new hire monthly income that will assist all levels of review of the proposal. However, the committee noted that the factors used to determine the need and level of an increase are still not clearly stated in the recommendation. CFW requests that future Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendations include information on the factors and trends that influence the level of need for an increase. Also, for a more realistic market comparison, CFW would like to see inclusion of homes within a 10 mile radius of campus in computing the median home price, not just the upper Westside.

This year's proposal emphasized the use of Low Interest Option Supplemental Home Loan Program (LIO-SHLP) loans to increase unit turnover and assist faculty in purchasing homes off campus. Although this may have been a realistic solution in the early days of the program, the LIO-SHLP program is now rarely used for reasons that remain unclear, and so listing this as a viable "solution" is somewhat of a misrepresentation. With the large new faculty cohort that is expected in the next 7-10 years, CFW would like to emphasize not only the need to increase campus housing inventory (e.g. break ground on Ranch View Terrace II), but the need for the CHES to consider additional ways to encourage unit turnover other than the LIO-SHLP program. CFW recommended that next year's recommendation packet should list other programs, encouragements, etc. that are being explored to accommodate for the low use of LIO-SHLP.

CFW would like to stress that with the historically high housing costs in Santa Cruz County, it is essential for the campus to build RVT2. Even though campus housing is only one part of the overall campus plan, it fills an important role for helping faculty afford housing. In this regard, RVT2 is ready to build and requires a financial plan to begin, which we hope the campus will start in the next two years.

CFW sincerely appreciates Director Houser and the Faculty and Staff Housing Office's willingness to work with the committee in recent years to improve the Housing Re-pricing Program recommendation process and increase the overall transparency of the program. The committee looks forward to future collaboration with Director Houser, CHES, and the administration on the topic.

Healthcare

The University of California health plans are monitored by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Health Care Task Force (HCTF). For the last several years the plans have been administered by Blue Shield of California. In the fall of 2015, a formal Request for Proposal (RFP)

was issued directed at improvement of the administration of our plans. Several medical plan and pharmacy vendors responded to the request. In April 2016 UCOP Human Resources announced the selection of the new vendor, Anthem Blue Cross, as the medical claims administrator and network provider for the following plans: UC Care, Health Savings Plan, Core, Medicare PPO, Medicare PPO without Prescription Drugs, and High Option Supplement to Medicare. In addition, behavioral health benefits for the non-Medicare plans (UC Care, Core and, Health Savings Plan,) will be integrated back into the health plan under Anthem. These benefits were previously administered by Optum. The Pharmacy benefits for these plans will be carved out and continue to be administered by OptumRx. The change in administration is effective January 1, 2017.

The impact of the new administration on provider networks and plan design is expected to be minimal. In the case of UCSC and local provider groups the Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) and Physicians Medical Group (PMG), both currently accept a number of Anthem plans and, barring any unforeseen issues during renegotiations of contracts, this should hold for 2017-18.

As for the current fiscal status of UC Care, the plan was in the black in 2015 with a modest surplus of ~\$8 million which will go into a reserve for cost overruns. This surplus came despite losing about 800 enrollees (out of ~22,000) to other plans (e.g. Healthnet HMO). UC Care is continuing efforts to add an HMO option in the not too distant future.

Transportation and Parking

In fall 2015, the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) was created to review policies, plans, capital improvement projects, transportation, parking, and circulation programs and services for the UCSC main campus, 2300 Delaware Avenue, and the Coastal Science Campus. The primary objective of the committee is to recommend a sustainable funding model that ensures adequate support of programs, services, and infrastructure to provide access to campus-owned facilities.³ The committee advises on annual updates to the 10-Year Parking Plan and 5-Year Transit Plan, and associated fees and fare proposals. Committee membership, headed by VCBAS Sarah Lathan, includes Senate faculty representatives from CFW, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), and a faculty member at-large. CFW participation on this committee has greatly enhanced the overall transparency of TAPS programs and the operating budget, and has assisted the committee in making more informed recommendations regarding programs, and fee and fare proposals.

During its meeting of March 31, 2016, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) 3 Year Fee and Fare Proposal. The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has also reviewed the proposal and will be providing comments and feedback to the Chancellor. Overall, the committee was disappointed to see that little had changed from the original fare and fee increase proposed in May 2015, which was criticized by the Academic Senate and that recommendations for improvements made by the Senate were not addressed. However, in an effort to move forward and prevent further increase of the TAPS deficit, CFW approved the proposed 2016-17 fare and fee increases with a few conditions.

³ Draft Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (2015-16 Charge/Membership)

First and foremost, the effects of the proposed increases (~5%/year) may actually have a negative impact on revenue and increase the deficit, and thus need to be thoroughly researched before the fare and fee increases are placed into effect. Second, the list of guiding principles generated by TAPS this year focuses solely on finances and budgetary transparency and needs to include aspects of service or employee welfare needs in order to guide decisions regarding TAPS programs, fares and fees, etc. Although CFW is pleased to see that TAPS responded to the committee's request during the last review to create a list of guiding principles by which priorities and the need for proposed increases to fees and fares may be judged, the absence of service and employee welfare negates the fact that Transportation and Parking exists to provide a service to the campus. CFW recommends that improvements be made to TAPS guiding principles to include service and welfare concerns, and that these improvements be made through an active collaboration between the ACCTP, TAPS, and CFW. Third, TAPS must continue to look to internal improvements to remedy and improve the unit's budget before future increases to fares and fees are proposed.

During winter 2016 a number of faculty complained about the lack of spaces in the Core West Parking Structure and nearby surface lots. As a solution, CFW has recommended the transfer of some % of the pay station spots to permit parking during the winter (rain days) to accommodate the higher traffic. CFW has been informed that TAPS is considering this concept and during spring 2016, will transfer some pay station spots on a temporary basis.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Karen Bassi
Shelly Grabe
Melissa Gwyn
Ted Holman
Andrew Matthews
Grant McGuire
Ricardo Sanfelice
Nina Treadwell
Shelly Errington, *ex officio*
James Zachos, Chair

May 12, 2016

**A Resolution Calling on the UC Academic Assembly to Request that all Senate Divisions
(a) Discuss and (b) Vote on a Memorial to the Regents to Divest the UC's General
Endowment Pool of Fossil Fuel Holdings**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Whereas the threat posed by climate change is perhaps the biggest challenge facing humanity in the course of the 21st century, and the international community has consistently held that a total rise of less than 2 degrees Celsius is the maximum permissible warming of the planet,¹ beyond which the risk of uncontrollable and devastating climate change increases unacceptably, and

Whereas the remaining atmospheric space for additional greenhouse gas emissions is estimated at approximately 1000 gigatons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) or its equivalent in other greenhouse gases to give an 66 percent chance of staying below 2°C in this century,² and

Whereas the proven world fossil fuel reserves (natural gas, oil, and coal) are currently estimated at about 3,000 gigatons of CO₂, three times the additional greenhouse gas emissions “budget” that , if burned, yields only a 2/3rds chance of staying below 2°C, and

Whereas the University of California, and UC Santa Cruz in particular, should be at the forefront of building a sustainable future, and in a great many ways, already are making critical contributions in research, teaching, and community service that address the threat of climate change, and finally,

Whereas, the UCSC Student Union Assembly, the Associated Students of UC Santa Barbara, and the student associations of five other UC campuses have called upon the Regents of the University of California to divest the UC's General Endowment Pool from its holdings in the fossil fuel industry,

Therefore, we, the Faculty Senate of UC Santa Cruz, call upon the Assembly of Academic Senate of the University of California to (a) discuss divestment and to request that each UC campus's Senate Division (b) consider and vote on a Memorial to the Regents formulated in consultation with members of Fossil Free UC to divest the UC General Endowment Pool from direct ownership of fossil fuel public equities and corporate bonds, and of any commingled funds that include such equities and bonds.

Respectfully submitted;

Andy Szasz, Environmental Studies

May 13, 2016

¹ That is, 2 degrees since about 1800, the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. This benchmark has been repeatedly affirmed at U.N. climate summits, such as the one in Durban, South Africa, in 2011 (UNFCCC, “The Durban Platform,” http://unfccc.int/key_steps/durban_outcomes/items/6825.php).

² IPCC, 2013: Summary for Policymakers. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING
Report to the Academic Senate on May 18, 2016

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning

We are pleased to report that the plans for The Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning are moving forward. We will be interviewing candidates for the faculty director position before the end the quarter, with an anticipated start date of July 1st. Information will be forthcoming on the open candidate presentations.

Committee on Teaching - website - teaching.sites.ucsc.edu

Please visit the COT website. It contains new information, videos, and resources, including Research Spotlights by the Chancellor's Graduate Intern, Mecaila Smith capturing some of the findings from recent research studies regarding teaching and learning. The Excellence in Teaching award recipient interviews cover how to design effective courses, hints and ideas for effective teaching, and ways to connect with students to enhance their learning. Other resources include the National Academy of Sciences report on *How People Learn*, ways to incorporate active learning, technology and peer editing into your courses, and creating better syllabi and tools for assessing student learning.

Excellence in Teaching Awards

This year, for the first time, COT collected student nominations for the Excellence in Teaching Awards from three quarters, starting with Spring 2015. This resulted in a record number of student nominations for their instructors (a total of 619). We see this as evidence of the strong commitment by UCSC faculty and instructors to their students and their teaching. We are reviewing the nominations and will be pleased to announce the recipients of the award by the end of the month.

Canvas

The Senate Executive Committee and the Committee on Information Technology, in consultation with the Committee on Teaching, have recommended to the EVC Galloway that the campus move from the eCommons Learning Management System to the Canvas platform.

Course Evaluation Policy

The COT has a new policy role on campus. As a Senate Committee, we will have oversight over campus policy regarding teaching evaluations. We have been reading research on this issue, and collecting information about different types of course evaluations that go beyond student evaluations of instruction. Developing the policy will take time and will continue into next year. In the meantime, the campus will be moving to a new online student course evaluation system, as the current system is unreliable. The Committee on Teaching is working with campus administration, other committees, and the Online Course Evaluation Steering Committee to find a system that will go beyond summative evaluation used mainly for personnel actions to a system that can facilitate instructor pedagogy. We would like the new online student course evaluation system to provide instructors with analytical and timely mid-quarter data so that an instructor can make changes before the end of the term to facilitate student learning, and to allow instructors

to learn from the data collected.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Phil Hammack

Marc Matera

Matthew McCarthy

Danny Scheie

Judith Scott, Chair

Mark Baker, NSTF

Chris Kan, Graduate Representative

Jim Phillips, Learning Technologies

Jessica Xu, Undergraduate Representative

May 12, 2016