

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
February 22, 2019

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 20 at the Merrill Cultural Center. Chair Kim Lau called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm, with Jason Nielson, Physics, present as Parliamentarian.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

The meeting minutes of January 9, 2019 were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Lau

Chair Lau remarked on Helene Moglen who passed away in the fall. She was a feminist literary scholar, community activist, and organizer, among many other roles on campus and beyond. She was the former Dean of Humanities, Provost of Kresge College, and Chair of the Academic Senate. She was fundamental in the hiring of visionary scholars, program building, and the cultivation of generations of young faculty, especially young women faculty. If anyone would like to honor Helene Moglen, she asked that tributes be made to the Center for Cultural Studies. There will also be a memorial for Helene Moglen at Kresge Town Hall on March 15 at 4:00pm. The 53rd Annual Faculty Research Lecture will take place on Tuesday, February 26th at 7:00pm at the Music Recital Hall, and it will feature Dr. Lise Getoor, Computer Science and Engineering.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

The Chancellor remarked on Jonathan Zehr, who is a professor of Ocean Sciences who was recently named an AAAS Fellow. He also remarked on Enrico Ramirez-Ruiz who is the Chair and Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, who was recognized by the American Astronomical Society and NSF. Three professors were elected Fellows for the California Academy of Sciences; these professors are Biologist Beth Shapiro and Astronomers Claire Max and Natalie Batalha. And, finally, the Chancellor remarked on Ruby Rich, a professor of Film and Digital Media on being invited to join the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. Many junior faculty were acknowledged as well, including Rebecca Covarrubias and Adriana Manago, both from Psychology; Biomolecular Engineer Angela Brooks; Astronomer Alexie Leauthaud, and Computer Engineer Chen Qian.

The Chancellor then remarked on some notable departures from the UCSC campus, including Susan Solt, former Dean of the Arts, who will retain her position on the faculty. Dean of Graduate Studies Lori Kletzer has agreed to extend her service as interim dean until we can find someone who can focus their full energy on the position. There will be a national search for Arts Dean Solt's replacement. Assistant Vice Chancellor Sherry Main has left UCSC for a promotion at UC Irvine.

At the March Regents meeting, there will be a number of UCSC-related items on the agenda. The first one is Student Housing West, where there were presentations by both proponents and oppositions when previously presented to the Regents. The Regents had asked for more information on a pair of fronts. UCSC will now have an independent party reviewing the numbers. There will also be additional videos and renderings made for the Regents so that they can get a sense of location and visualization. This project is intended to alleviate the need for housing for current students. The administration understands and sympathizes with the opposition but believes the project deserves support.

Another project is the Kresge College project which is currently in the design phase. Decisions are being made to determine which buildings will be renovated and which will be replaced while honoring the original architect's vision. Eleven of the twenty-one buildings will be renovated and rebuilt while the rest will be removed. These changes will involve new lecture halls and classrooms, better circulation of pedestrians, and more housing. The new project will increase the number of beds from 363 beds to about 550 beds. Early reception of this plan by the regents has been positive, so it is being brought for approval.

The third major project is replacement of the current University House; the new facility is meant to serve both as the Chancellor's residence and as a university event center that can be used for development as well as for programs celebrating staff, faculty, and students. More than sixty events per year were hosted in it while it was still in use. In November 2015, the University House was deemed uninhabitable by campus building officials due to structural issues. University of California, Santa Cruz is currently the only UC without a University House. The Office of the President has offered to cover half the replacement costs. The Chancellor believes he should advocate this before the Regents because it meets the needs for the campus and should be on him rather than the next Chancellor.

The Chancellor noted the new Governor of California and the reference to higher education in his State of the State speech the previous month. The Chancellor believes that Governor Newsom will reinvest in higher education. The budget that was released in January has generated some mixed reviews because there were increases of funding at some levels but permanent funding to compensate for the buy-out of tuition was not included in the budget report.

The Provost of the University System, Michael Brown, has appointed a working group to look at the issue of Freedom of Expression by Non-Senate Faculty members. The co-chairs of that working group are Robert May and Chancellor Blumenthal. There is not a representative from every campus but there are two representatives from UCSC, including Gail Hershatter and Chancellor Blumenthal. The working group has been looking at rights of non-senate faculty who do not hold a position in regard to freedom of expression as currently covered under APM 010. Currently there is a UC policy being worked on to address the issue.

c. CPEVC Tromp

CPEVC Tromp began her remarks with an update on the Strategic Academic Planning process. She congratulated Herbie Lee and Andrea Cohen, who have shepherded this project. There is complete information on this project at sap.ucsc.edu. The Senate reviewed and gave feedback on

the draft document over the summer. The team that is leading this project took that draft and made revisions to a document that was more reflective of the UCSC campus. Through the feedback received, the team has developed 3 academic priority areas that allow a range of campus constituents to engage in an effort to help the Deans with the academic priority areas. Earth Futures is meant to predict what the planet would be like in the future, considering our impact on the life of the planet. Digital Interventions is thinking about the relationship between technology and people, and Justice in a Changing World will advance new ways of thinking that will help shape a better world. The design principle part of the plan has been voted on by faculty, staff, and students to create enriched learning opportunities for students and to engage the faculty, staff, and student body to lead research that will affect the world. Barrier reduction determines the ten leading factors that prevent our community from conducting their research through a series of questions. The Deans have also been asked to determine the main barriers in each of their departments and describe their efforts to engage in this plan. We are currently accepting feedback for the strategic academic planning process.

The housing crisis is a major issue among students, staff, and faculty. CPEVC Tromp believes that space used to develop faculty housing can't be changed to supplement the need of student housing, as several opponents of the East Meadow site for Family Student Housing and a childcare center have been advocating to the Regents.

Christopher Connery, Professor of Literature, enquired about the Student Housing West Project. He has asked the administration to erect story poles in the representation and asked Chancellor Blumenthal if the new representation will include story poles. The Chancellor replied by stating there is no plan to include story poles, but rather there are staff working on creating new visuals to help people better understand what the project will look like. These should be superior to erecting story poles.

3. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

a. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1927)

With no questions regarding the report, the report was approved by acclamation.

4. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Academic Personnel

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.10.1 – Committee Charge (AS/SCP/1928)

CAP Chair Lynn Westerkamp is requesting the increase in the membership size of CAP from 9 members to 11. Ethan Miller, Computer Science and Engineering, asked how big the CAP committees are at the other UC campuses. Chair Westerkamp responded that the CAP committee closest in size is that of UC Santa Barbara at 13 committee members. Regina Langhout, Psychology and Provost at Oakes College, asked to understand the purpose of the current system to move toward equal representation from all divisions rather than thinking of the undergraduate population size. Chair Westerkamp stated that CAP needs members from various disciplines to

bring each member's expertise to the entire committee. After taking a vote, the motion to increase membership size passed.

b. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Regulations for Chapter 9 (AS/SCP/1929)

ii. Amendment to Regulations for Chapter 10 (AS/SCP/1930)

Chair Narayan proposed changes to Chapter 9, including a requirement that interdisciplinary programs' statements be reviewed by CEP and an extension in the pass/no pass grading option changes. The current process is based on student ability to better determine in advance which grading option they will do better on. The change will also minimize the number of student grade option change petitions to minimize the workload of both CCI and advisors. CCI reviews the petitions in cases of a student who needs a letter grade for their major and forgot, graduate courses that default to the pass or no pass option, or graduating students that have not taken 75% of their coursework for a letter grade. The final proposed change is to repeal the IP grade. The Registrar's workload increases in the scenario that a professor does not change a student's IP grade, forcing the Registrar to contact the professor to extract the grade. This change will also help to decrease the increase in students requesting "W" grades because it gives them more time to be evaluated in classes. Chair Narayan clarified that the changes are in regards to undergraduate students and not graduate students. A vote was taken on the proposed changes to Chapter 9.

Ethan Miller commented that this would complicate the situation.

Barbara Rogoff, Psychology, asked if this amendment would end the satisfactory/unsatisfactory system for graduate students.

Chair Narayan clarified that this change was only for undergraduate students enrolled in graduate level courses.

Chair Lau commented that the IP grade is used in cases of academic integrity, that when the cases are being adjudicated during the period when grades are being assigned, the student is given designated "IP" as a place holder because there needs to be a grade assigned in order for the instructor to register all grades.

Richard Hughey, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, provided clarification on the Academic Integrity policy that indicates that faculty should assign what they think are the final grades assuming the misconduct occurred. If the instructor determines later that the misconduct did not take place, the grade is changed administratively.

The proposed changes passed for Chapter 9.

Chair Narayan introduced the amendments to Chapter 10. The first change states that

up to 3 Physical Education units will be counted for credits rather than 6. CEP felt that 6 credits was excessive and 3 was fair because it is more than half of a 5 unit course. The second change is in regard to repealing a section of the regulations which allows for a student in exceptional circumstances to waive 2 or fewer credits, in other words to graduate with 178 credits instead of 180 credits. Exceptional circumstances have never been clearly defined and, as a result, in practice any student who reaches 178 in credits can try and get a petition to be approved to waive the 2 remaining credits. College advisors seem to not like this because they do not know when the appropriate time is to send the petition forward. No other UC has this system. For UCSC, the waiving of the 2 credits was supposed to be temporary but was extended on the terms of flexibility. Because a grade of a D- earned still grants credit to a student, the last missing credits are not due to failing a course in the last term.

Richard Hughey questioned whether changes to the PE general education course changes with regards to transfer students coming to UCSC with PE credits.

Chair Narayan believes the changes will be effective with students entering this upcoming fall. He stated that the dispersion of credits will be up to the admissions office and CAFA. He also mentioned that for exceptional cases the transition could be managed by CCI to meet graduation requirements.

After discussion, the amendments passed.

c. Committee on Teaching

i. Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) Presentation (AS/SCP/1931)

Chair Lau called upon Kimberly Helmer, Chair of the Committee on Teaching, to discuss the Student Evaluations of Teaching, which COT has been working on along with CITL, CAAD, and CAP. The name has gone from Student Evaluation of Teaching to Student Experience of Teaching because it better characterizes the students' experiences in the classroom versus their being able to evaluate a teacher. Chair Helmer went through the two year process of explaining how SETs were created. The SETs were designed with all departments in mind, people who teach large classes and those who teach smaller classes; those who have writing in their courses and those who are test focused. There are four questions that ask the students about themselves: their demographic, how much work they put into the course. Then the SETs follow up with 14 questions that are specific to their courses and the instruction. The SETs then end with the students being able to comment on their preparation coming into the course. When preparing the questions, there was an attempt to eliminate as much bias as possible from the answers being given by the student. The SETs begin by explaining to the student that SETs will be used to evaluate their learning experience as well as to modify courses and will be included in faculty's personnel files. The questions now in SETs are very pointed and specific.

Phokion Kolaitis, Computer Science and Engineering, asked about the missing

information on the SETs regarding evaluations of the faculty member. Chair Helmer responded, saying that the broad, open ended questions were prone to biased responses. She believes the questions can correctly evaluate the instructor and the student's experience. Jody Greene, Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning, clarified that the four main questions on the SETs would be used to summarize the results.

Manel Camps, Microbiology and Environmental Toxicology, commented that he finds the summary questions useful because the comments regarding the professor are typically consistent among the various sections they teach. Ethan Miller from the Computer Science and Engineering department stated his concern for the lack of clarity on the SET questions. Chair Lau and Jody Greene responded by saying the questions could be revised to improve the overall clarity.

Carla Freccero, Chair of Literature and former CAP chair, asked if the cover letter of the results would be generated automatically. Rebecca Peet, administrator of the What Do You Think platform, responded by saying they are working to create a self-service that enables departments to collect the questions. Chair Freccero commented on her concern for a question regarding respect being used as a supposedly unbiased question. AVPTL Greene replied saying that it's a question meant to gather information on the climate of the classroom. Siobhan O'shea, representative from Merrill College, expressed her concern for entering students that aren't accustomed to the administrator vocabulary. Chair Lau indicated that faculty could make questions clear to students. Ethan Miller remarked that it would be inefficient to have a guide on filling out the survey on an instructor's syllabus. Chair Lau replied, saying it will not be necessary to have the information on a syllabus.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Katie Hellier, Vice President of Shared Governance for the GSA, provided comments in place of Randy Villegas, President of the GSA. The GSA has been working on a proposal for funding for undocumented students who are non-DACA. As of right now, there is a very big gap in regard to funding for these students and the amount of work opportunities available. Proposals have been filed with CPEVC Tromp and another group trying to figure out the best ways to provide funding for these students. A big focus of concern for graduate students is the privatization of the childcare center on campus. There is a very big concern with the potential drops in subsidies for graduate students who have families both on campus and off campus. There is also a concern with the guarantee of spots available in the childcare center.

With the recent survey that has been sent out from SHOP, it has brought up concerns regarding this survey and other surveys that have come out about METADATA and the actual validity of the confidentiality of these surveys. This specifically relates to what occurred at MIT a few years ago when a housing survey was taken by students. METADATA was collected through this survey and it was determined that this particular place was not safe for students with a large backlash from their community and alumni.

There has been a lot of conversation about Title IX and how campus SVSH policies have been enacted. The GSA Executive Vice President has been working with systemwide committees in order to better understand Title IX and how it is implemented. There is a lot of concern about how swiftly things move through the Academic Senate and how well the Academic Senate is responding to these situations. There is a feeling that faculty show a lack of concern regarding these issues on the part of graduate students. Some students feel that faculty do not take these allegations seriously and become extremely defensive of their peers, putting students in a poor situation where the student feels they cannot come talk to a faculty member about a situation that has occurred or seek resources to help with the incident. This is a topic that comes up very regularly in the GSA.

The travel and resource grants have recently been revamped in order to help the process go by faster. One of the concerns from students is that it takes a long time for stipends to come through and they are not able to communicate with their advisors about attending conferences or for research supplies. Because of the revamping, there is a higher chance students won't receive the stipends or will receive a smaller amount than what they need.

There is still some concern from graduate students on graduate student instructors. There has been a lot of concern that by increasing the number of GSIs we will be reducing the amount of time available to perform research and the time to graduate. It is a concern that it is reducing benefits for students and increasing costs for departments.

Chair Lau responded to the concerns that Vice President for Shared Governance Hellier raised over faculty who seem to be defending colleagues accused of violating Title IX and the campus Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH) policies. She discussed several efforts Beyond Compliance is undertaking. There is a Faculty Learning Community along with CITL to help faculty develop curriculum and integrate it into already existing classes. She stated that it is particularly disturbing that graduate and undergraduate students feel like they cannot come forward with complaints against faculty members because they feel as if other faculty will jump in to defend and/or look the other way. If anyone has ideas to better Beyond Compliance, please let us know as the CPEVC has provided funding to make programs and opportunities to do so.

12. New Business

- a. Resolution on the Commitment to Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Expression (AS/SCP/1932)**
 - i. CAF Comment on the Commitment to Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Expression (AS/SCP/1933)**

The meeting then moved to New Business, and Chair Lau introduced a Resolution on the Commitment to Free Speech and Freedom of Expression. Professor Ethan Miller has taken a leadership role on this resolution and was invited up to talk about it. In about 2015, the University of Chicago put forth a statement now known as the Chicago Principles supporting freedom of expression and freedom of inquiry at the University of Chicago. Since 2015, this statement has been adopted by about 50

universities. Professor Miller believes that it is important for the Senate to adopt this resolution because the search for truth is the cornerstone for the academy. The way to find truth is to expose our ideas to people who may not agree with us. This resolution is also about exposing ourselves and our students to new ideas because that's at the center of education and the pursuit of knowledge. Professor Miller brought up the point that freedom of expression and freedom of inquiry always protect the minority. Ideas from the minority have proven over time to be some ideas that people hold dearly.

Jessica Taft, a member of CAF, was called upon to share CAF's perspective about the resolution. CAF has two primary concerns about the resolution. The first concern is that the university already has excellent and robust policies on these issues and the policy would be redundant. In CAF's comments, there are links to all the current UCSC policies on freedom of expression and freedom of inquiry. The second concern is the lack of distinction between academic freedom and freedom of speech in the resolution, which are both valuable and important concepts to CAF. CAF would like to make sure that any resolution adopted clarifies the differences in those concepts. The final concern is that this resolution comes from a specific organization that has a clear position in this discussion; that FIRE is not a neutral group in the topics of academic freedom and freedom of speech and that the group is promoting this statement for particular reasons. CAF stated that they absolutely support academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of inquiry but that they do not support this specific resolution.

Professor Miller's response to CAF had two points to it. Professor Miller stated that he agrees that there are already rules that protect speech at the university but that there are also rules against sexual violence and sexual harassment but per the statement made previously from the GSA these issues against freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry still occur. Because we have protections already in place does not mean that the university can't take a stance on adopting the resolution itself. The second statement Professor Miller made in regard to CAF's concerns is that he did not receive any information about the resolution from FIRE but from the University of Chicago itself. Professor Miller proclaimed that the only substantive comment that CAF remarked upon was the differences between academic freedom and freedom of expression. Professor Miller believes that it is important for the university to be able to investigate items about freedom of expression and inquiry because it is the only way change of any kind will ever happen.

Professor Debbie Gould from the Sociology department raised the question about what the resolution adds to the already existing policies about freedom of expression and inquiry because she believes that there has already been a commitment made by the University of California to protect speech. Professor Miller responded to Professor Gould by stating that this resolution commits the university to going one step further in protecting freedom of speech, expression, and inquiry. Professor Gould then asked how this resolution looks to go further than what the campus already has

since it is not an additional program being created. Professor Miller then read excerpts from the resolution to clarify what additions would be made by adopting the resolution. Professor Gould continued to question the clarity of what would be added to the campus by adopting the resolution. She also added that because this resolution is backed by FIRE, a group that supports expression from the conservative Right, it seems to be trying to promote a certain agenda instead of freedom of expression for all. Professor Gould clarified that she is not making the assumption that Professor Miller is connected to the organization but adopting this resolution would be essentially promoting an agenda that has a clear bias, and she expressed her concern about having UCSC connected with this organization as she believes it is an attack on dissent.

AVPTL Jody Greene raised concerns about the Chicago Principles in that they skip over the most vibrant questions that are being discussed on college campuses about academic freedom and freedom of speech. She had two key concerns about points raised in the Chicago Principles which articulated that people can have free speech until it comes into conflict with what the university states and/ or about harassment on campus. Instead of restating the question, a possible solution is addressing what constitutes harassment, what is the function of the university, etc. AVPTL Greene discussed how it would be appropriate to address the question rather than skip over it and issue a blanket statement because it is a chance to make students feel more comfortable with expressing their speech.

Siobhan O'Shea, an Academic Senate representative from Merrill College, stated that she does not think it is the place of the University to support the principles that come from some alt-right, conservative groups because she believes that not all minority opinions have a place on this campus. She believes that these principles actually do not support academic freedom because they do not give students a platform to discuss issues freely, and she does not believe they benefit students' proof of truth.

CEP Chair Onuttom Narayan wanted to point out the different organizations that have backed this resolution, which is essentially a copy of the University of Chicago Principles as well as to address the fact that the California State Assembly also endorsed these principles. The answer to whom we would be signing on to the resolution is the California Assembly.

Professor Miller wanted to bring up a point made by Siobhan about who gets to decide which minority opinions we listen to, which is the key question along with who decides what is acceptable and what makes one speech acceptable rather than another.

Chair Lau brought up APM 010, which is the bylaw on Academic Freedom, which gives protection to all faculty to speak freely. Chair Lau wanted to clarify Professor Gould's point by re-asking what new ideas the resolution brings to the University as well as what new protections it adds to APM 010.

Professor Miller responded that the resolution cannot bring any additional protections by law.

Chris Connery stated that he believes it is disingenuous to bring up this claim. He believes that this resolution is not about the freedom of inquiry and the search for truth but the legitimization of certain positions. He believes that the current political context of this resolution is a dangerous one for freedom of speech and that this resolution could increase the danger for freedom of speech.

A vote was taken for the resolution which required a majority to pass. The resolution did not pass.

The Meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

ATTEST:

Roger Schoenman, Secretary

April 30, 2019