

## MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division

Wednesday March 3, 2021 at 2:30 p.m.

Location: Online via Zoom

### Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday March 3, 2021 online via Zoom. Chair David Brundage, History, called the meeting to order at 2:30pm, with Professor Jorge Hankamer, Linguistics, as Parliamentarian. The Senate Chair greeted everyone, and asked for continued understanding and flexibility for the remote meeting format. Chair Brundage advised the meeting is open to public as always. Only members of Senate may second or vote on motions. Committee Representatives and Students with Privilege of the Floor have privilege to ask questions or make comments. Chair Brundage advised any voting on legislation will be done by electronic ballot following the meeting, as we have done since Spring 2020 accommodating the remote format of the meeting. This change from regular practice was intended to ensure votes be cast only by those with voting privileges. Motions will be open for discussion and can be amended during meeting. The Senate Chair advised members to use the raise hand function to be granted the floor.

### 1. Approval of Draft Minutes

a. There were corrections to the noticed minutes. Senate Director Mednick shared these on screen. *VPAA Herbie Lee noted the statement regarding faculty personnel reviews should state, "SETS results do not need to be primary source of evidence. The VPAA encourages faculty to submit other sources of evidence of teaching excellence for evaluation also."*

Chair Brundage asked if Secretary Chen accepted the proposed changes in the Minutes?

After seeing a raised hand, the Senate Chair acknowledge CAP Chair Junko Ito, who clarified SETS are "Not the primary source, there needs to be another source such as personal statement or syllabus. It is definitely not the primary source of evidence."

Chair Brundage thanked CAP Chair Ito and asked if Secretary Chen and VPAA Lee accepted these proposed corrections. Secretary Chen accepted them and thanked all for the clarification.

The corrected minutes were accepted.

### 2. Announcements

a. **Chair David Brundage – waived remarks to allow time for others.**

b. **Chancellor Cynthia Larive**

The Chancellor stated her appreciation for the opportunity to see everyone. The Chancellor provided an update that the Student Conduct Process internal review committee has begun their work. The Chancellor was grateful to Alan Christy, Cowell Provost and Associate Professor of History, who has agreed to co-chair the review committee along with Associate Dean of Students Brian Arao. Together, they have elevated the process with community engagement. Alan Christy is also central to the ongoing review of our

### Academic Integrity Procedures.

The UC Santa Cruz Campus Safety Community Advisory Board (co-chaired by Marcia Ochoa, Oakes Provost and Associate Professor of Feminist Studies and Isabel Dees, Associate Vice Chancellor of Equity and Equal Protection) will provide recommendations by the end of the year and has focused their work around four sub-committee areas:

- Protest and Free Speech
- Budget Transparency and Annual Reports
- Harm Reduction and Envisioning Community Safety/Response
- Community Engagement

The board is also asked to opine on issues that arise and the Chancellor will soon share with them a proposal for a Crisis Intervention Team that will support students experiencing mental and emotional crises. In collaboration with UC Berkeley, we will also soon be releasing a survey to the campus that will help gather and bench mark information on our community's experiences with campus police. The board, along with other responsible administrators, will be asked to review the results of the survey. The Chancellor acknowledged the value of the board's work to the campus community.

Our budget outlook is looking promising and the Chancellor is grateful that the Governor and legislative leadership have announced a plan for the FY 22 state budget that includes the restoration of the cuts we sustained over the previous years, restoring us to FY 18-19 levels. Though this would not impact the \$20M cut we took in the current year, it is far beyond what was in the Governor's January budget and frankly anything I had hoped for in FY 22. In addition, though at this point it seems less certain, there could be a possibility of additional ongoing funding, on the order of \$135M and potentially millions more in one-time funds for items such as deferred maintenance. We will continue advocating for funding for UCSC and look forward to the Governor's May revise and the final budget that will hopefully be passed by the Legislature in June.

Despite this good news, we have a lot of lost ground to make up for, and until we have stable funding, the campus will face the ongoing challenge of having mandatory cost increases that outpace our revenue. At UCSC we feel this strongly because state support and student tuition and fees comprise 94% of our core budget, a much greater percentage than many other UC campuses. UCSC has worked to grow alternative revenues, including non-resident tuition (which took a big hit due to COVID), extramural research funding and philanthropy and we will continue that work, but still state funding has an outsized impact on our core budget.

Each year, every UC campus produces a presentation to the UC Office of the President. OP provides highly templated slides and uses this as an opportunity for accountability on our progress toward shared goals such as carbon neutrality and the 2030 Student Success goals.

This year we were also asked to identify our three biggest challenges and our three biggest opportunities. The challenges are closely related to the goals the Chancellor articulated at the time she joined UCSC:

Advancing undergraduate student success, equity and achievement. We must also increase our investment

in research and graduate education. Finally, we must address our limited resources and our core funds challenge. By core funds challenge, we mean that the increased costs of running the university exceed the increases in tuition and state support that primarily fund UC Santa Cruz and have for many years. Addressing this challenge requires that we diversify our revenue streams - grow the pie rather than cutting it into increasingly small pieces. This is also an opportunity to advocate for UC Santa Cruz to receive equitable state funding from the system.

Our three opportunities include:

Thinking differently to reimagine the future of learning. We've learned a lot this year about what works and what doesn't for remote education and we have new tools to enrich the in-person classroom experience and new ways to make a UC Santa Cruz education more accessible.

Our second opportunity is envisioning a forward-looking, distinctive and agile university. Even before COVID, we were a networked campus with the West Side Research Park, Coastal Science Campus, MBEST center in Marina, Scotts Valley Center, and the Silicon Valley Campus expanding our reach throughout the region. By leveraging successful virtual and remote experiences implemented during the pandemic such as, options for advising, telehealth, recreation, and community engagement and events, we can take the idea of the networked campus to the next level extending the reach and impact of UC Santa Cruz.

And lastly, we are currently planning for the future growth and development of our campus. This includes growth in programs, growth in our collaboration with the community and other institutions of higher education, and the careful growth and development of our residential campus. This leads directly into our current phase of the Long-Range Development Planning process.

One can find all of the information on the Long-Range Development Plan and the draft EIR at [lrpd.ucsc.edu](http://lrpd.ucsc.edu). To make understanding the LRDP easier, we've also created a community handbook that gives a summary of the proposed LRDP, draft EIR. Details on how to do that are on the website. The Chancellor advised she could not take comments on the proposed LRDP or draft EIR in this forum because every instance of community feedback must be recorded and responded to through this open-comment process.

The LRDP sketches out in broad strokes what our main campus might look like two decades from now. It is simply a land use map and designates specific areas on campus for certain uses, such as learning spaces, dining halls, housing, recreational areas or open space - it's like a city or county's general plan.

Contrary to what some say, the LRDP does not mandate or approve enrollment growth, it simply lays out where the infrastructure to support growth might occur if it is needed and funded. Every project in the plan would need some level of environmental analysis and its own approval before we put a shovel in the ground.

The Chancellor highlighted some positive recent developments including progress on Fall Planning. CPEVC Kletzer will provide a more thorough update on our planning for fall. It was not easy to switch so abruptly to remote instruction and no matter how long we have to plan, it will not be simple to return to primarily in-person instruction. The values that have brought us this far will not change. We are

committed to the health and well-being of our community. Well-being is multilayered including mental health.

The Chancellor also focused on campus efforts to build connections even while working and teaching remotely. The Division of Student Affairs and Success has been hosting Live! from the Quarry Concerts. Having the event on a webinar platform allowed realtime engagement and students could ask questions of the performers and engage in conversation.

Our students are also producing an almost daily podcast called the SlugCast that highlights campus resources, provides students with paid opportunities to professionalize in media production, and is incredibly entertaining and informative!

Lastly, the Chancellor noted the new Campus Advisory Committee on the Status of Womxn. This advisory committee will support the success and inclusion of women on campus through a range of activities. There is an expression of interest form on the Chancellor's website and the Chancellor will also solicit recommendations from the Committee on Committees to facilitate faculty engagement.

The Chancellor advised she would take questions after the Campus Provost and EVC Lori Kletzer's remarks.

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

The CPEVC greeted the Senate and took a moment to recognize the hard work of faculty and students in responding to the unique challenges of remote learning in a pandemic. The CPEVC acknowledged the personal losses, of family and friends, and losses of livelihood nationwide and in our local communities. The CPEVC thanked staff in ITS, CITL, Online Education, and in all our programs, divisions, and departments for their work to support the mission of the campus all year.

The CPEVC began with acknowledging recent successes:

Two faculty colleagues have grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to support research and writing leading to book projects. Associate professor of history Benjamin Breen was awarded a grant for his project "Experimental Drugs, Cold War Science, and the Future that Never Arrived, 1945–196." Assistant professor of politics Yasmeen Daifallah received a grant for her project "Thinking Past Islam and the West: Theorizing Politics in Contemporary Arab Thought."

J. Xavier Prochaska, distinguished professor of astronomy and astrophysics, and his coauthors (grad student Sunil Simha is one of the coauthors) have received the prestigious Newcomb Cleveland Prize from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). The prize is given annually to the authors of an outstanding paper published in the association's journal *Science*.

UC Santa Cruz has received three grants totaling \$875,000 from Genentech and the Genentech Foundation to support programs that provide academic support and mentoring for underrepresented students in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields. The funding will support our Academic Excellence (ACE) Program, The UCSC Institute for the Biology of Stem Cells (IBSC), and the MESA College Prep program in UCSC's Educational Partnership Center.

Yang Liu, assistant professor of computer science and engineering has received \$1 million in funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and Amazon for research on the long-term effects of human interactions with artificial intelligence (AI) systems used to support decision-making.

Italy's most widely read newspaper, *Corriere della Sera*, released its year-end list of the world's top women of 2020, and assistant professor of sociology Camilla Hawthorne made the list at number 20 for her highly influential research into the Black diaspora across Italy and the Mediterranean.

The CPEVC noted that Summer Session (Richard Hughey and PK Agarwal, co-leads) is key to undergraduate student achievement (time to degree, preparation and retention, graduation rates, graduate student professional training and employment, access and student progress, campus financials, and campus enrollment). The CPEVC advised 2020 Summer enrollment growth 38% was likely COVID driven and may not be sustainable. One important benefit of Summer Session was that remote classes were accessible throughout California and the world. The CPEVC noted that 50% of students who graduate on time have enrolled in a Summer Session. Fresh three-year graduation rate has grown from around 2.5% to 5% due to the increased availability of summer session courses.

The Online Degree Programs Initiative will be in Senate and COC consultation, starting this week. VPAA Herbie Lee and CEP Chair Tracy Larrabee, co-leads.

The campus budget planning initiative (Kim Register and Dard Neuman, co-leads). Our annual budget planning and resource-distribution processes have historically been driven by incremental mandatory cost increases, *ad hoc* spending requests, and reactive investments based on crises or current actions. Consequently, it has been difficult to understand fiscal health and engage in multi-year planning. Moving to a more formal and structured budget review and approval process will allow campus leaders and managers to make financial decisions that support campus and divisional values, priorities, and goals.

The consideration of a semester academic calendar (Paul Koch and Jennifer Baszile, co-leads) is delayed. The CPEVC looks forward to providing more information next quarter.

The Student Success Task Force (CPEVC and Jennifer Baszile, VC SAS Co-cChair) will establish priorities and provide direction to various groups on campus, including the Student Success Steering Committee and groups at the divisional and department level. Working within the frame of the UC 2030 goals, the Task Force will establish numerical goals for four and six year graduation rates for entering first year students and transfer students, and numerical goals for the closing of achievement gaps. Retention rates, course performance in gateway courses, and major migration are some of the other student success outcomes the Task Force will consider and provide direction. For all units on campus, this work must be data driven, student focused, and multi-year. To advance our students' success, we must identify barriers to student progression whether they are structural, curricular, or cultural and we must work to reduce these barriers and provide open, accessible and equitable pathways for students to achieve their goals.

Our success as a student-centered, research university will be in large part defined by the extent to which we provide equitable higher education pathways for first-generation students, students from lower income families, or from backgrounds that have for too long been marginalized and excluded from full participation in higher education. UCSC is proud to be a minority serving public research university that is designated both as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian American, Native American and Pacific Islander Institution (ANAPISI). We know that changes to curricula, pedagogies, advising, and co-curricular opportunities that come from efforts to advance student success for marginalized and historically excluded groups also benefit students from all backgrounds.

The CPEVC advised the Arts dean finalists "visits" begin next week, on March 8th and we will see five finalists, with the concluding visit on the first days of spring quarter. Finalists will have two days of meetings and two presentations, a scholarly talk and a town hall. The CPEVC was grateful to the search

committee for their hard work. Members of the search committee include:

Elizabeth Cowell Co-Chair University Librarian, University Library

Katharyne Mitchell, Co-Chair Dean, Social Science

Amy Bruinooge Assistant Dean, Humanities

Susanna Collinson Graduate Student, History of Art and Visual Culture

A. M. Darke Assistant Professor, Digital Art & New Media

David Glover Department Manager, Theater Arts

Karlton Hester Professor, Music

Isaac Julien Distinguished Professor, Digital Art & New Media

Jennifer Maytorena Taylor Associate Professor, Film and Digital Media

We also have a recruitment ongoing for a Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and we are not quite as far along as the Arts Dean search. We expect campus visits in April.

The CPEVC provided an update on vaccine distribution as of Friday, Feb. 26<sup>th</sup>, Student Health is at 1425 doses given. Of those: 190 people are fully vaccinated (2 doses) 1235 people have received dose one. Over the last several weeks, the campus received our doses for distribution through the University of California, doses received directly from the state. Our campus implemented our vaccine roll out in phases to match state eligibility criteria, as well as UCOP prioritization for distribution. The Blue Shield third party administrator officially began their distribution oversight March 1. One of the goals of this new approach is to replace the differing distribution models across counties. Once transitioned, all clinics providing vaccines will utilize the state's MyTurn application. The state's goal is to scale up to 4 million immunizations per week, up from the current 1.4 million per week. Under this new distribution structure, our dose distribution from the UC system has and will change. It is likely that we will no longer obtain doses from UC. Santa Cruz County Board of Education has made arrangements so that County K-12 teachers are now being vaccinated. It is not certain how many more doses our campus will receive or how long we will be able to run a vaccine clinic. We continue to encourage individuals to get vaccinated through the earliest possible means available to them. Some concerns have been raised about workers in Dining and Custodial, since some of those team members do not regularly access their computers and email. People have been concerned those individuals were lost in the system. However, we provided several in-person information sessions during work hours for the staff. These sessions were facilitated by unit managers and Cindy Delgado, our Workers Comp manager. Cindy provided bi-lingual instruction. Some people have expressed concern about access to information for employees for whom English is not their primary language. The Student Health Center also has a Spanish version of the vaccine website at <https://healthcenter.ucsc.edu/services/covid-19/vaccine-appointments-es.html>. In addition, fact sheets about the Moderna and Pfizer vaccines and the UCOP FAQ are all linked in Spanish versions. With regard to UC policy as to being vaccinated, at this point the only policy in place is for personnel and trainees, and that policy is an opt-out policy. It is not clear how the policy will change moving forward or what the policy for students, who are not already covered in the current policy.

Will vaccination be mandatory? It is too early to say, largely because all available vaccines are EUAs, and only fully approved vaccines can be made mandatory. Also, demand currently far exceeds supply, and until vaccinations are broadly available, mandatory is a state of the world difficult to imagine. Mandatory is not a determination to be made at the campus level. It will be made at a high level.

In regards to Fall Planning: Health and wellbeing will come first. We must plan now, fully six months in advance and information changes every day. The CPEVC asked for patience and perspective and compassion while we solve these problems together. My greatest hope is that Winter 2022 can be scheduled

to look like Winter 2020. The CPEVC hoped that by late summer, all those who want to be vaccinated will have an opportunity to be vaccinated. This is not a statement about how or where people get vaccinated - it is a statement about the community-level availability of vaccine access. The CPEVC noted President Biden's announcement yesterday that all adults will be able to be vaccinated by end-May 2021.

Flexibility is critical; our assumptions and starting points could be impacted by a host of factors including the speed of the vaccination rollout across our communities. If there are challenges that delay the rollout, we will need to make adjustments to the mix of instructional modalities, classrooms, and housing capacity. More details are available at <https://keepteaching.ucsc.edu/fall-2021>.

Several principles guide our planning:

- We will operate in a manner that prioritizes the health and wellbeing of our University community and our Santa Cruz neighbors.
- Students who may be fully remote should be able to continue making academic progress.
- Departments and colleges should work with their instructors, their program faculty, their division, and the academic senate to determine the appropriate mix of remote, on-line, and in-person instruction.
- All plans are subject to change depending on public health guidance and regulations. Statewide and county guidance may place additional limits on our operations.

Right now, our planning involves two key local starting points: (1) Classrooms will operate at approximately 50 percent capacity due to distancing and ventilation requirements; (2) On-campus housing will operate at approximately two-thirds occupancy capacity. Given our local housing market, an on-campus housing constraint means that we must plan for students to have remote and online access.

Fall 2021 instruction will include a mix of remote, online, and in-person instruction. Courses that are scheduled now and in the coming weeks as remote for student enrollment will be offered remotely in Fall 2021, due to the complexities of classroom scheduling, there will not be a process for changing remote courses to in-person courses for Fall 21. Those same scheduling complexities dictate that courses desired to have in-person components should be scheduled as in-person now. The relevant Senate committees - Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI), and Graduate Council (GC) are delegating authority for approval of remote offering of courses to course sponsoring agencies for Fall 21. Fully online courses continue to require review and approval by CCI.

CEP, CCI, and GC will be sending out another letter with a more complete description of resources and processes for the fall soon. This will include guidelines for approving future online synchronous and hybrid courses.

Departments should offer sufficient remote or online course capacity so that students can make progress toward their major or major selection and qualification while remaining remote. Departments are encouraged to ensure that "packages" of remote/online courses reflecting standard major qualification pathways are available for first and second year students in their majors, and to communicate these to their prospective majors.

Classes with more than 100 students should be planned and scheduled now to be remote or online. Courses can have in-person or remote discussion sections, or a mixture of options, conditional on the availability of in-person classrooms. Due to the current planning cap at 50% of classroom capacity, all units on campus are encouraged to be creative in the use of the spaces they control, maximizing the use of available non-General-Assignment spaces such as meeting rooms for instruction, where possible.

Course meetings (primary or secondary sections) should generally be planned for all students to be either in-person or remote/online, rather than using “mixed delivery”, with some students in person and some remote at the same time in the same course meeting. Course sponsors can plan separate offerings of a course so that there are both in-person and remote/online options. For small graduate courses, the “mixed delivery” method may be easier to implement, and program instructors will retain the flexibility to consider this mode of instruction.

Please keep in mind the importance of in-person experiences for first year students in support of the transition to college, as well as for second-year students who have not yet had any in-person UC Santa Cruz courses. These could be in-person discussion or secondary lab sections for large courses, or a large course could be offered as two separate sections, one in-person and another remote.

Department and Program Chairs and College Provosts should work with instructors to determine the modalities of their courses. To the extent possible, chairs and provosts should accommodate instructor preferences to teach remotely or online when these modalities are feasible for the achievement of course learning objectives.

If course sponsors elect to offer in-person secondary discussion sections at 50% capacity, careful consideration should be made that TA duties and responsibilities are consistent with the collective bargaining agreement, including the description of duties form and assigned workload maximum per quarter.

Our planning principles underscore flexibility, community well-being, COVID mitigation, and ensuring educational access as we learn to work together in a new environment. Our plans continue to be subject to change due to variable public health regulations. We are committed to transparent communication and the prioritization of health and well-being. And to help departments and programs figure out their fall schedules. That concludes my remarks. Thank you for your patience and I look forward to your questions.

Chair Brundage Opened the floor to the audience and called on speakers in order.

Debbie Duarte, Graduate Student, Literature, made a statement to highlight some of the actions of Chancellor Larive and CPEVC Kletzer that have been relevant to the way some students have experienced the university. Number one, they met with undocumented students and offered no solution to multiple issues brought up and they did not commit to keeping ICE or Homeland Security off-campus. But the Chancellor did state when asked repeatedly that she was fine making half a million dollars while students struggle to survive at UC Santa Cruz, even as her salary is the equivalent of the funds allotted for the 500 and more undocumented students on campus. Number two, they brought department of Homeland Security to Campus when they paid \$300,000 a day to have police brutalize and surveil students at a picket line as part of the California threat assessment. Number three, they disciplined undocumented students and their allies for attempting to secure the resources they needed after being ignored and rejected multiple times. They banned them from the building where the few resources they do have were offered. And they cited their crime committed as “unauthorized entry.” Number four, they held, notably students of color, in student conduct discipline processes that lasted over a year while a world-wide pandemic unfolded, threatening students with expulsion and resulting in suspension of at least two students. This concurrently happening with the firing of graduate students. This is just to highlight that these acts have been profit-driven and they have been careless, and students now feel the Chancellor and CPEVC are not meant to be in position where they are responsible for students’ lives. The Graduate Student then left the meeting prior to the Chancellor and CPEVC’s response.



Chancellor Larive asked to respond. There's a lot in those comments and thank you for expressing your views. I wanted to talk a little about the email by interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Success Jennifer Baszile. This is a forward looking idea of a new initiative. It's an 18 month campus program to enhance structural support for undocumented students to thrive on campus moving on. My salary often comes up from students, on the one hand I think it's a bit of a red-herring. I think the members of this group know I voluntarily took a 10% salary cut this year to help support the campus. We need to all work together to help support our students. There have been a number of issues that arose last winter, spring that led to some student conduct issues. Those have now been resolved. They can take a very long time. Some students had requested extensions. I'm gratified that we are moving ahead with campus discussions about student conduct, academic misconduct, academic conduct and integrity. I would note that the Graduate Student Association sent a nomination to serve on the internal review team for the campus conduct review board and was accepted. We're trying to help move the campus in a positive direction and I appreciate the work you all do to help us do that as well.

CPEVC Kletzer added that I recognize that trust needs to be restored on many parts of campus particularly with graduate students. We will be embarking on a set of facilitated listening sessions with Graduate Students on a department and program basis. We will have facilitators so that all voices can be shared and heard. We will work through this and reflect back what we hear to everyone involved.

Chair Brundage asked if there were other questions or comments?

Faye Crosby, Emeritus Professor of Psychology, as an organizational social psychologist observed that we can see behaviors and they are very dramatic but it's a reflection of structures. I would like to commend this administration for an attempt to regularize and make good organizational structures. I saw Lori Kletzer's most recent email on that. I think you are trying hard to align responsibilities and resources so that there can be consultation but not continual discussion in ways that are not productive. If that's true, then I believe we will see the results of this in a few years and that resources will be better used for all of us. So that for example, we can spend money on instruction. We can have more money for the graduate student compensation. I think a figure like Chancellor Larive's high salary catches the eye, but if you look behind the scenes you can see there are millions and millions of dollars to be saved by having better structures. In this regard there was a comment that you all made and it would be a good example. The summer school program, I was involved in that years ago and it was evident that it was a potential for students to learn very well and for the university to get more revenue. The need was seen and the movement was taken, the results are that we can see good instruction in the summer. It is my hope that you'll have the good will and the fortitude to work, to reap the benefits for everybody for the changes you are trying to do now. So, thank you for trying to make those changes.

Chancellor Larive thanked Professor Crosby. It means a lot coming from you and your disciplinary expertise. We do talk about how to make the university more efficient and effective. And it is exactly for that reason. In a resource constrained university, we have two options. One is to find and grow revenue. And as you mentioned, summer is a great way to do that. The other option is to be more effective with the resources we do have so where we can be less bureaucratic we can be more efficient. Then we do have funds for things we can use for things that are really aligned with our values and our goals.

Chair Brundage advised there were no further questions pending.

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

### **4. Special Orders: Annual Reports**

a. Committee on Academic Personnel 19-20 Annual Report (AS/SCP/1995)

Chair Brundage opened the floor to discussion of the consent calendar. The only item was the CAP Annual Report for 2019-20. As there were no comments, Chair Brundage stated that the CAP annual report had been accepted.

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

6. **Reports of Standing Committees**

a. Senate

Executive Committee – Fall 2021 Instruction

Chair Brundage advised that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI), and Graduate Council (GC) have delegated authority for approval of remote offering of courses to course sponsoring agencies for Fall 2021. Fully online courses continue to require review and approval by CCI. Noting, that students may have difficulties meeting some program requirements during the pandemic, CEP, CCI, and GC are also prepared to receive and review in a timely way any requests from department chairs and program directors for temporary modifications of program requirements resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty are also encouraged to raise issues related to the resumption of research on or off campus, and the research of their graduate advisees. The Chair opened the floor for questions or comments.

Tracy Larrabee, Professor of Computer Science and Engineering and CEP Chair, provided additional perspective on this decision stating CEP has spent an enormous amount of time talking about how to adapt to uncertain times and the restrictions that we have and how to turn them into something workable. CEP Chair Larrabee acknowledge the anxiety many faculty are experiencing right now. CEP is doing the best we can to facilitate you and we welcome inquiries from any faculty member or chair who wants help thinking about how to make it so both in-person and online students can progress towards their degrees. CEP, GC, and CCI plan to draft a message to reassure faculty. The CEP Chair encouraged faculty to reach out to GC, CEP or CCI if unsure of just about anything. The CEP Chair noted Online Education has support options and noted that even a very technologically adept person can learn something new from what they offer. She encouraged faculty to feel free to reach out and have someone point you to marvelous new information and methods of coping with this crazy time.

Chair Brundage thanked the CEP Chair.

b. COC Legislation 13.4.2 (AS/SCP/1996)

Chair Brundage invited Chair of COC Micah Perks, to provide some introductory remarks on this topic.

Micah Perks, Professor of Literature and COC Chair, provided a preamble, advising that because the Committee on Rules Jurisdictions and Elections noted an ambiguity in the current divisional bylaws the committee on committees proposes the following revisions to divisional senate bylaw 13.14.4.2. Representatives to bring it in line with systemwide senate bylaw 128.e and with other UC campuses. To provide clarity and consistency in our process for appointing non senate representatives to our standing committees. And for reference, system senate bylaw 128.e provides systemwide senate bylaw 128e students who sit with standing committees as provided in these bylaws are non-voting representatives and shall be nominated by the student organization recognized by the academic council for that purpose and appointed by the university committee on committees. The systemwide bylaw makes clear the rule of the senate in appointing nominees of non-senate representatives to standing senate committees. The proposed language

will add the additional stack of acknowledgment and approval of the nomination to proceed actual appointment to the committee. COC is also responsible for the appointment of senate members on all committees.

Chair Brundage opened the floor for comments and questions.

SUA Vice President, David Miller Shevelev stated that he intended to talk about the role of student government. I was going to talk about how our campus' unique interpretation of the systemwide bylaw reflects our campus' value of student voice. And that by changing this bylaw we're running contrary to our value of the student and our colleagues' previous COC's and RJ&E's know best. I was going to argue that the senate is hypocritical for limiting student voice and imposing confidentiality agreements while also criticizing the administration for inadequate consultation transparency. I was going to complain that COC did not consult with the SUA or GSA on their bylaw. And I'm going to argue that SUA's appointing procedures are robust and worthy of your trust. But the truth is, I'm having a crisis of confidence and I don't know what's right anymore. Last year SUA nominated only three students to Senate Committees. My predecessor the previous SUA VPAA hardly knew what the Senate was. Outside of the Academic Senate, the SUA had some very notable scandals that affected our credibility. This isn't a good track record and I'm not sure if we've earned our place in shared governance. Faculty have raised concerns that students will be obstructions that we won't understand the mechanics of university governance or that we will violate confidentiality agreements. I wouldn't have admitted this a few weeks ago but today I'm no longer so sure my peers can be trusted with governance responsibilities.

But this year we did try and turn things around. We developed a robust system for recruiting and screening students reps through the senate service. We received over 200 applications and narrowed that down and nominated 17 students. Compensating these students, the program costs over \$14,000. When we tried to provide support for these reps, meeting with them on a biweekly basis, find out if they are having any issues and giving advice on how they can improve individual advocacy projects. But I can't guarantee that this system will continue. I can't guarantee that we won't ever appoint some flaky, easily triggered immature student. But these characteristics are not entirely unique to my generation. I have heard about enough intra department squabbles to know that being immature isn't something that automatically goes away when you get your Ph.D. I objected to today's bylaw because it includes language that future committee chairs could use to sideline students. It includes language that can be used to reject unpopular nominations made by student government. And I object because this bylaw comes during the same year we put hundreds of hours into building student representation. The truth is COC already has the power to control who is on Senate Committees. Under the current bylaw COC has never delegated authority to SUA or GSA as the appointing body of student reps. As a result, COC has never had to defer to our appointments and instead can treat them as nominations. But by passing this bylaw you risk sending a very clear message. Students are a threat, they are unwelcome, they are immature, and they are irresponsible. Some of us are threatening, immature and irresponsible, but a lot of us are passionate young scholars. And if it is clear that we are unwelcome, one must ask why we bother to stay around. I don't know if my successors will always be thoughtful and passionate, I don't know if we will always made good decisions, but I do know that I'm a lot less excited about senate representation and shared governance that I was two quarters ago. The fight for the representation we do have has been exhausted. It's been attributed to my decision to not run for reelection in SUA and I honestly don't know if I will be able to in good faith tell my successor that I think they should continue trying to have robust representation in the Academic Senate. Maybe giving out snacks and scantrons during finals is enough. It certainly attracts more smiles and friends and conversations. Thank you.

COC Chair Perks: I'm very moved by that heartfelt response and I guess I want to show you that we really appreciate SUA's and you in particulars really hard work to get students participating in the Senate. To be

honest, SUAs desire to block this bylaw has been really bewildering to COC because we decided to create this new bylaw change in direct response to you. To your request this summer that this year's SUA Senate committee representative nominations be appointed by COC rather than our previous method which was an appointment through the Senate directors office. I have for example from the SUA on August 4<sup>th</sup>, "SUAs draft proposal specifies that COC will: 1 review the provisional appointments made this year, and 2 be responsible for the review and appointment of SUA's future nominations. In my notes from the SUAs VP of Academic Affairs presentation to COC I wrote "he made a persuasive argument that a more formal process of appointment would give student appointees a greater sense of their important role and though it has not been actual practice, SUA appointments should be made by the COC." COC agrees with the SUA presentation and proposal that the faculty Senate should have final appointment authority over those who sit with us or on faculty committees including Senate Faculty. Not just students but Senate faculty, undergraduate or graduate students, post doctoral scholars and non-Senate teaching faculty. But I really want to assure you all that COC has no interest in micromanaging nominations. When SUA presented us with their 40 or so nominations this year, we did not reject a single one. Our primary communications regarding nominations to both GSA and SUA this year have been to urge them to help us in our mission to diversify the Senate attending to diversity on all levels of the nominations.

Astrid Synth Hypernova, Crown College Student Representative: Good afternoon everybody, thank you for having me in this space. I want to say before I read my Senate's letter to this committee space, I come with an attitude of gratefulness and sincerity. I feel that this amendment has impacts on future collaborations and mentorships we have with faculty and staff. I understand that we are under a time of uncertainty with job security and educational insecurity. And I'm looking forward to having future collaborations and partnerships. Now I shall read my official Crown Senate's official letter to the committee:

"Dear Chair Brundage and members of the Academic Senate, We, Crown Student Senate of UC Santa Cruz, write to express our dismay at your decision to limit student representation on the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI). We are also profoundly concerned by your decision to disregard Chapter 13.4.2 of your own bylaws, and not recognize the SUA and GSA as the appointers of student representatives on Senate Committees.<sup>1</sup> Regents Policy 3301 empowers student governments "as official units of the University exercising authorities concerning student affairs by delegations from The Regents, the President, and the Chancellors." The Office of the President has enacted this policy through Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations and Students 120.00. PACAOS 120.00 establishes principles of student participation in university governance and requires that, consistent with these principles, campuses develop plans for facilitating student participation in university governance. Although PACAOS 120.00 acknowledges that "matters which have been delegated by The Regents to the Academic Senate are beyond the scope of these campus plans" it does instruct campuses that "direct discussions between students and the Academic Senate on student participation in the deliberations of the Senate should continue." It is clear that the Academic Senate has failed to engage in good-faith deliberations regarding student participation. By first attempting to remove students from CCI and, then defaulting to only allowing partial participation, the Senate is disregarding the University's commitment to shared governance. Not only does this disenfranchise students, but it delegitimizes the Senate as a participant in shared governance. It is our understanding that two arguments have been proffered in support of removing or limiting student involvement on CCI. The first is that participation in CCI's review of student petitions violates the privacy of students. Campus Counsel, on multiple occasions, has informed both the SUA and Academic Senate that "FERPA allows disclosure to school officials (includes student workers) that have a legitimate educational interest to access or view a student record."<sup>2</sup> Good faith discussions about student involvement in the petition process should not focus on erroneous claims related to FERPA. Rather, the SUA, GSA, and Senate should engage in dialogue regarding reasonable expectations and standards governing the conduct of student representatives on CCI. The second argument is that student representation on CCI is unnecessary because CCI simply implements policy set by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which has

student representatives on it. This argument ignores the fact that policy implementation is a form of policy making. The Senate Committee on Committees (COC) has recommended that the SUA follow the model of UC Berkeley's Student Advocate Office. Per COC's letter, at Berkeley, "case workers with SAO help students prepare the petitions which are then presented at the equivalent committee to 2 1 Senate Bylaws Chapter 13.4.2CCI."<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, COC's letter fails to acknowledge that at UC Berkeley a member of the Student Advocate's Office is a fully participating member of their Committee on Courses of Instruction. Finally, we are extremely concerned that the Academic Senate has failed to abide by chapter 13.4.2 of its own bylaws, which stipulates that "Representatives on Standing Committees as provided in these Bylaws shall be appointed by such bodies as may be recognized by the Divisional Committee on Committees." At UC Santa Cruz, the SUA Student Committee on Committees and the GSA President and Vice-President of Shared Governance have been delegated, by their governing documents which are approved by the Chancellor's designee, the authority to select student representatives on academic and administrative committees.<sup>4</sup> The Senate's decision to reserve the right to disregard appointments made by the official student government of the undergraduate students at UC Santa Cruz is highly problematic because 1. It allows the senate (to threaten) to reject appointments because of their viewpoints or because of the Senate's relationship with the SUA and GSA. 2. It shows that when compliance is inconvenient, the Senate will disregard its own bylaws. 3. It shows the Senate's disregard for the Regentially recognized representatives of the student body. We urge all members of the faculty to reject the Senate Executive Committee and Senate Committee on Committees' decision to limit student participation on CCI and disregard chapter 13.4.2 of the Senate's bylaws. Sincerely, Crown Student Senate."

GSA President Rora, Film & Digital Media: I will keep my comments brief. I want to dispute some of what my student colleague said about undergraduate representatives. Actually, in my time in student government, I have been extraordinarily impressed by undergraduate student leaders to know they have spoken clearly and articulately and eloquently about their experiences and I have no doubt that undergraduate students are capable of choosing their representatives. We just heard EVC speak about graduate students being fit to put their bodies at risk to teach in-person when many faculty might be lecturing remotely in the fall. I think that we are given a lot of responsibilities that we are not prepared for, I'm going to admit that. I think we are prepared to choose our representatives. If supposed clarification were existing in a vacuum, perhaps it would be a bureaucratic move to clarify. Because it comes in constellation with reported conflicts from SUA and appointments recently and for two years we had conflict with grad council in our attempts to appoint graduate students, this comes with great concern to us and in addition to the CCI issue. I think that this language isn't ready. I think that there needs to be recognition of what student bodies actually are because we are democratically elected. As well as, what do we do. What is the blueprint for conflict? Does there have to be a reason for the rejection of a student that is nominated or appointed by the SUA or GSA. I think we have to have robust discussion so that students are not disenfranchised, so that students are not discriminated against, because these are serious issues I think need addressing. I don't believe faculty would ever want representation by any individual or body that they themselves did not elect upon themselves. And we don't want that either. Thank you so much.

Chair Brundage acknowledged COC Chair Perks:

COC Chair Perks was appreciative of the responses so far. I only wanted to point out that CCI bylaw is not on the table today and that is because the Senate wanted to set up discussions with SUA around that before going forward and we have sent an email, a letter to SUA and to the colleges' student bodies to ask them to join us in discussion. In terms of the CCI issue, that's something that we would like to have a continuing discussion on.

Nick Mitchell, Associate Professor, Feminist Studies and CRES, observed that one of the questions that I think I posed to the Committee on Committees has to do with, what were the diversity implications on

making this kind of decision? I think we are at a university where the student body is considerably ethnically and socio-economically more diverse than the faculty is, and I think it is significantly more diverse than the faculty who participate with regularity on academic senate committees. So I think that not only are the questions about process that matter a lot here. It seems that this is sending the message to students that we will share governance with you so long as the sharing of governance is entirely organized on our terms. But more seriously, I think there are real structural implications to who ends up in the conversation. Who ends up at the table. I understand that students may be hard to work with, I think that's good frankly. Having to translate the arcane rules by which the institution is governed and organized is good. Because at times in encountering other people who view it from different perspectives actually forces us to deal with the absurdity that is the rules that govern the institution. I don't think that necessarily bringing into line with other institutions is a good argument. I just want to put my support behind robust student representation elected by student representatives on academic senate committees. Thank you.

Chair Brundage advised he would allow continued discussion and advised that we need to allow time for reports from the SUA and GSA as well as on Athletics later in the agenda.

Elizabeth Abrams, Professor and Provost of Merrill College, Writing Program, stated that both as former member and former chair of several Senate Committees, she wanted to echo Aurora's comment. I worked with a lot of graduate and undergraduate representatives on those committees and have always found it useful and illuminating to have student representation on those committees. I confess to being a little confused about what feels like inside baseball in the discussion of both the rule change and the argument against it. I'm particularly confused, David has quoted one regulation and Micah Perks has quoted another regulation. And these seem to be at odds with each other. I'd like to have an explanation from someone about what those two regulations are and why they seem to be at odds with each other. I also, from my perspective. It seems appropriate that independent bodies get to nominate their own representatives and they get to declare which representatives are on the Committees that they are being nominated for. This has been the way we operated in the past. Sometimes we will get members on those committees who are less capable or less cooperative or less collegial but I would say that happens at all levels on those committees. And so, most of the time everybody is working together judiciously and with good will. My inclination is to say, why do we need to change? And I'm going to agree with Nick that not every conformity with the larger system while appropriate as a governing principle is not always what's needed in order to run a tight ship.

Marcia Ochoa, Associate Professor and Provost Oakes College, Feminist Studies Department, added that I want to appreciate the student advocacy here. I wanted to say I was very concerned to hear about the CCI decision. I do think it's important for students to be part of that process and to raise issues that would otherwise be difficult for faculty to envision as we are making decisions. In particular, CCI has a lot of power. I haven't seen many great disputes for example overturned by CCI or ruled in the student's favor. It's something we in the campus provosts had some concerns about. We are making sure that students are represented. That's something we have to disentangle from the current matter before us. I think it's complicated, I would suggest we may table this matter until the CCI question has been more fully dealt with. I think the reason there has been a sort of a response to this matter is because it doesn't seem that the question of CCI exclusion has been resolved necessarily. I think that clarifying that question before moving to this question might make things a little easier to understand. So just encourage everyone here to support student participation in all of our processes in interest of transparency as well as perhaps, now I'm not the only person in this meeting as a faculty member who got my start understanding university processes as a student representative. In my case on a hiring committee actually as an undergraduate. I think that these are really important informative experiences in addition to the fact that they are necessary for our decision-making process to be fair and open. I'll stop there and I would just encourage tabling this particular question

until we can resolve the CCI question and get all people interested in the question to understand what's being asked and come to an agreement.

Chair Brundage advised COC Chair Perks could determine if this item should be tabled as proposed.

COC Chair Perks asked to hear from more speakers before moving forward.

Chair Brundage noted that this is a very important issue about student participation and asked that speakers be mindful of time and keep comments brief to accommodate the full agenda.

Jason Nielsen, Professor, Physics, I'm a past chair of RJ&E and past member of UCRJ&E and a current member of Committee on Committees. I'll speak in favor of this motion. I'll separate this completely from CCI and I'll argue that it would be useful for us to deal with this now so that we can move forward with the CCI issues. Just to remind people that is actually in response to the SUA request that we have the approval of the student nominations that are on the committees. We can from experience on RJ&E say it is useful to have one approval process instead of having multiple routes by which people will go on committees. As Micah has also said and I think David has also mentioned this is not intended at all to diminish student participation. This is actually COC has been working well with SUA in terms of getting people appointed to the committees. And this is really clarifying things so that we have one process to put people on committees no matter what their representation is.

Rachel Carson College's Student Representative, Lizette Jones commented that she had been employed by SCOC since her freshmen year. Today I'd like to strongly encourage the Academic Senate to continue allowing SCOC to continue appointing students. A major assumption is that students are immature and impulsive and therefore cannot be trusted with the matters the Academic Senate attends to. In my time working for SCOC, I have not found this to be the case. This year we received over 200 applications, we created a new way of overseeing these applications, and we selected 17 fantastic representatives. There were definitely some applications that were not up to snuff and people who were not necessarily capable of upholding the standard that the senate wants for student representation. But students are capable of seeing that and picking their own qualified representatives. All of our representatives are incredibly passionate about these issues. Furthermore, we pay our representatives which professionalizes them and encourages them not to act impulsively or engage in in-fighting or any of the things that you all are concerned about with student representatives. Yes, I would strongly encourage you to continue allowing SCOC to appoint representatives for the undergraduate student body. Thank you.

SUA Vice President David Miller Shevelev extended apologies to Chair Perks. I understand that you are justifiably feeling very frustrated right now. And for whatever it's worth, I'm pretty close to burning out so you hopefully won't be dealing with me for much longer. That being said, it's become apparent during this discussion that there's a lack of clarity on what this bylaw is trying to do and what is the state of legislation and practice currently and how this would affect that change. Given that uncertainty, which a majority of the faculty speaking today have expressed, if we proceed the vote, we will have people proceeding the vote on something we don't understand. I really urge you to accept the idea of tabling this and I'm happy to write a letter that if we can't negotiate things by week five you will have my sign-off on this bylaw and it won't be opposed. I just ask that we try one more time to negotiate things, do things in a way where all voting faculty understand what their voting on and if that doesn't work I'm going to endorse moving ahead with this bylaw.

COC Chair Perks affirmed after the discussion that she was persuaded to table it at this point and that we should move forward with the discussion on SUA and CCI and on this bylaw.

Chair Brundage clarified that we are not actually voting to table the motion as COC is simply pulling this back for further reflection and later consideration and thanked all the speakers for their input and voices on this important matter.

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

SUA President Shivika Sivakumar provide a brief introduction. I'm a third year Computer Science and Politics double major here at UCSC. And I am the SUA president. For those of you who don't know the SUA, it is the Student Union Assembly. We are the undergraduate student body on campus. Our primary goals are student advocacy and representation as you heard all of our amazing students speak. I remember last quarter when I came in, I spoke to establishing connections and looking forward to working with the Academic Senate. In my remarks, for today I want to touch upon three different things. First one is, student representation and student voice within the Academic Senate. The second one is Fall 2021 planning and concerns over lack of student input in the decision-making process. And the third is continued support and understanding for students in this online world.

Regarding student representation and student voice within the Academic Senate, the decision to limit student representation on the committee on courses of instruction was an attempt to remove students from CCI and now allowing partial participation. There are so many concerns over CCI there was another bylaw brought up by COC so it kind of shows how there's a lot of issues at play and there is not much discussion going on, and I do want to say that we had a formal communication, an email chain and we have a meeting coming up with David Brundage and Chair Micah Perks, where we are going to be discussion CCI and COC. So I'm really glad the bylaw change did get taken back, because I think we need a lot more discussion in this matter.

I remember last quarter when I came in, we were trying to get students on all these different Academic Senate Committees, And I do want to say my Vice President of Academic Affairs, David Miller Shevelev has been working really hard. All these students here have been trying their best to be involved and raise their student concerns and really bring student perspective. And we really need to make sure that the student representation continues to be here in the Academic Senate. I'm pleased to say that we have students in all 10 Academic Senate committees and there are 17 students. Now this decision to change the bylaw is very concerning. And the reason I want to bring this up again in front of a larger body, rather than just going to the meeting I will be having with Chair Brundage and with other student leaders, is because I wanted to remind everyone student representation and student input is not only helpful for students, it's helpful for all. It's very important to understand that yes there are complications and I understand that faculty may have a perspective different from students. But shutting students out is not the solution. You need to work with students to understand these concerns, why is there a difference in opinion, and then we all work together. So once again, I want to say it's not helping just students it's helping all of us.

Now I kind of want to transition to my second point which is Fall of 2021 planning. Again, continuing the discussion of student representation. Let me start by saying, the first email that came from UC President Drake was super vague. And I did have a meeting with other UC presidents where I brought up the concern over it being vague and it did raise a lot of false hope within students. I was also able to bring this up with Chancellor Larive and CP/EVC Lori Kletzer and really tell administration that there's a lot of uncertainty but there's also a lot of uncertainty around the planning of it. And students have no idea what is going on. I know some of my friends have already started looking for housing on-campus until that updated email came out where we knew it was going to be a hybrid situation. And the reason I'm giving this background information is to say when we were trying to advocate to administration, a lot of the decision-making process they told us was coming also from faculty. Specifically, fall curriculum, the fall planning, what classes are going to be on campus remote, is a lot of faculty input as well as faculty has that decision making



process. So this is me urging all of us to include students in those decisions. It doesn't have to be students in those meetings, trying to make those decisions, but it can be like you all sending out surveys to students. Maybe for example, I heard in earlier discussions that classes over 150 students will be in-person rather than remote. Sorry, will be remote rather than in-person, but maybe we can start with sending out surveys to students, what students want. So as you all go into Fall 2021, I just want to make sure that students are being involved in every single process and it doesn't have to be in meetings.

I also want to take this opportunity to kind of get support from faculty in encouraging administration to involve students in the decision-making process specifically in task forces and planning committees. Again we don't need a voting right and we don't need to be making the whole decision, we just want to be there to observe what's happening, take it back to students and provide a student lens. And that is to say, again emphasizing, student input and student representation not just in Academic Senate but also in administrative decisions helps us all not just students.

Lastly my third point, I just want to thank you all for all the work you're doing. Thank you for this opportunity to be here. I understand this is a really hard and challenging time and there's a lot going on but I just want to remind you all there's still a lot going on. There's still technological issues, a lot of mental health issues and I really appreciate you all being so considerate and giving students that extra time to finish their homework or giving extra support. But I just want to remind you all to continue doing that. Continue being lenient and continue checking in on your students and thank you always for continuing to teach us despite all that's going on. My last sentence again is student representation and input is important and we are continuing fighting, we have been fighting for years, but we are now advocating against administration input, but now we are trying to talk to Academic Senate about student representation. I really just want you all to understand that we don't have to fight, we are all working towards the same cause, we are a university, we are trying to educate our students, we are trying to serve our students, so then why is there an issue in including students in all of these matters? Thank you everyone.

Chair Brundage noted he was looking forward to the meeting with SUA Leadership. There were no questions for the SUA President.

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

Chair Brundage invited the GSA President to address the Senate.

GSA President Rora thanked the faculty, administrators, staff, and esteemed colleagues for the opportunity to speak today. There's so much going on it sometimes seems impossible to know where to be. As graduate students juggle teaching, research and planning for future career endeavors within or outside academia, we also continue to respond to the changing political, social, environmental, and health situations around us. First I would like to commend our campus for taking what taking what appear to be appropriate health and safety precautions. Working alongside representatives from other campuses, I can say with assurance that not all UC campuses have done as laudable a job. And I'm grateful for our reservation in inviting community members back to campus too eagerly. I'm hoping that we will continue to exercise restraint and follow health guidelines first and foremost. But we also need to contend with other kinds of safety and unsafety. A lot of students have reported that Black Lives Matter posters have been defaced on campus and that their complaints have been dismissed. They've also reported general experiences on campus that undermine their ability to function and exist as equal and welcome community members. We thankfully recognize recent messaging from administration denouncing hate crimes. And we look forward to working together to address anti blackness on our campus on all levels. And I will speak more about relevant subjects. While few would call me an optimist, I do believe our devastating situation gives us the opportunity to reshape this campus to more accurately reflect the image we have of it. To that end the GSA

have been articulating the caveats upon which any shift to a more in-person hybrid fall situation must rely. They are broadly health, housing and real safety.

First of course vaccination. We are heartened that administration agrees that widespread vaccination is a non-negotiable factor in our ability to expect in-person learning to expand beyond its current state. While we have yet to receive assurance that TAs will not be stripped of funding if they are forced to turn down in-person TAs for COVID related reasons, and that includes mental health reasons, and this will likely become a union issue, we believe we are moving along the right path in prioritizing good health. Hearing that elementary school teachers are being told that they must return to work without vaccination gives all collectively good reason to be afraid. And we're glad we will have higher standards. We are also of the mind that this campus must ensure that no student is invited back to campus without safe and dignified living situations. We should never have gotten to the point we were in Fall 2019. For years I have advocated for on campus housing students. For years this campus, albeit under prior administration, has continued to sweep this issue under the rug. We've received a promise from this administration that this will not continue to be the case, and we look forward to working with the campus to ensure that they are true to their word. We've recommended check-ins and questionnaires be distributed to all students to assess who will be returning to Santa Cruz and to ensure that they are able to find adequate housing. We also need infrastructure for providing resources to those who will inevitably fall short. The Covid related caps that exist on housing, also means that graduate students will be streaming into off campus housing. We must not open beyond our capacity to ensure that students have safe and dignified housing. No student should be living in a car or a campus office. One year in my department alone, I counted 8 graduate students, and it's a small department, who were partially or fully unhoused and I was one of them. This was and has always been unacceptable and we must do better. The LRDP has already been criticized for lacking planning toward and consequences surrounding the promise to house 100% of all these students. We need to prove that we are capable of eradicating homelessness among our student populations now. Finally, I'm seeing other campus associations begin to organize around making fall opening contingent upon police abolition. This goes back to the problem of anti-blackness on our campus, as well as concerns that property is protected above people. UC Office of the President held the first part of their policing and campus safety symposium, a title that already divulges a belief system contrasting our abolitionist stance because police do not make us more safe or equally safe. And students across the system were broadly disappointed. We have yet to see real movement on our own campus or even acceptance of responsibility for the missteps that resulted in the violence on our campus around the COLA protests, almost exactly a year ago. We continue to raise these issues, to fight for accountability and to do whatever we can to ensure we never again get to a point of police violence on our campus. We eagerly press for a real reckoning with our recent history and the deleterious effect UCPD has on our community. Particularly students, faculty, and staff of color. The removal of UCPD from our campus would increase campus safety for so many reasons and make UC Santa Cruz the workplace in sight of learning that we envision.

We know that in order for this university to continue to viably operate, online education will continue. Graduate students want the quality of their own education and those they impart undergraduates to remain as high as possible. We have been online for nearly a year and yet best practices are not being gathered and implemented. Lessons learned on the job have not been transmitted to those moving forward. And we are not making decisions that we measurable improve teaching. Much of this needs to happen on the departmental level, but coordination is key. Envisioning the future in education that involves technological mediation, we also want to make graduate students competitive for future employment. And we are advocating for training and certification in online learning that might help grads interested in continuing to work remotely, improve their skills and advance professionally.

Virtual implementation is not without its pitfalls. We are cautious about asynchronous courses and the potential for implementation in courses without compensation to the instructors who initiated them.

Security and privacy of online platforms to ensure academic freedom is essential. We are concerned that virtual TA sections and section size will increase now that classroom capacity is not an issue. Or that faculty will be able to lecture remotely while TAs are physically at risk by being told to teach in-person. We are also extremely concerned about the new online model the UC Santa Cruz bookstore has taken, which involves a proposed private partnership and mandatory opt-out fees. There is no real reason to make a deal with the devil and contract a company founded on taking advantage of students is not necessary. Particularly if we had the infrastructure through our library or other services, to provide free e-textbooks for students. Moreover, opt-out fees are a non-starter and they necessarily rely upon negligence and other campuses have reported complaints about similar systems. We don't need this and we don't want it.

We appreciate all the work faculty does on these issues that are of such deep concern to us and that shape our lives and our futures. I hope that we can work together in this space and others toward achieving our common goals for this campus. I hope that any conflicts that we have around bylaws and resolutions and how we implement our shared governance never clouds the solidarity that faculty and students have. Thank you so much for your time and attention and I conclude my remarks.

Chair Brundage: Thank you so much. Are there any questions for the GSA president?

Jody Greene, Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning, Literature, thanked the GSA President for their remarks. AVPTL Greene advised that changes and resources have been made which were guided by the data from a survey of approximately 5,000 students that took place this fall that was a collaboration between CITL, Online Education and IRAPS. The survey specifically asked the question "What is the student experience of remote instruction." We have used information that we gathered last year to inform our practice for Fall. And we have used the information that we have gathered for fall to inform our practice for Winter. And we have shared all of that information in as many forms as we have been able to think of from our monthly teaching newsletter, to the daily updated key teaching website. So I want to assure you that we are paying attention.

GSA President was appreciative of this information and asked have TAs been surveyed and asked about their experiences teaching?

AVPTL Greene was not certain about this but was open to engage in a project like that.

GSA President was receptive and added that as TA, and someone who is in touch other TAs, we haven't really been given much of anything. We've been thrown in without any instructions and that's something that I hear left and right. So I'm glad that there has been data gathered but I also think that particularly if it's foreseen that TAs will be the one largely implementing in person, I'm TAing for an asynchronous course, I'm the only one in contact with the students. I don't know why instructor would be surveyed and I wouldn't, considering I'm the only one interacting.

AVPTL Greene, clarified the instructors have not been surveyed, the students have been surveyed. And I'll post a link in the chat to the resources that have been created for TAs during remote instruction.

Chair Brundage Thanked the GSA President and AVPTL Greene.

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

a. Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) Report (AS/SCP/1997)

Chair Brundage invited the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) Jason X. Prochaska, Professor, Astronomy and Astrophysics, to discuss a report on feedback from student athletes.

FAR Prochaska provided context on the this role which primarily focuses on academic issues but also includes assessing and assisting student athletes with a broad range of issues, such as mental health. Professor Prochaska met with fifteen student teams and discussed their experience of remote learning. The information was then turned into a report present to CPEVC Kletzer. It serves as a snap shot of where student athletes are with online learning. The report is somewhat dated as restrictions and responses to COVID have changed. One significant issue student athletes experienced was a need for a separate study space. Students were not aware of on campus study space. Now that this has been communicated the students are happy to take advantage. A common theme was also that synchronous lectures were going beyond slotted times while asynchronous courses were adding more work. Students reported higher workload than previously. I want to get the message to instructors to be respectful of student time. There was widely reported insufficient interaction with instructors and peers. Some of this has changed, using Discord. I encourage instructors to engage in this kind of communication platform with students to increase student, instructor and peer interaction.

AVPTL Greene spoke to these concerns. Noting the survey of student athletes was done without consultation of CITL or IRAPS. AVPTL stated that relying solely on student feedback to determine policy is not entirely optimal. Pandemic specific questioning should be included in such a survey. The issue of classes running over was of interest and was not reported elsewhere. It was helpful. Regarding student workload while remote, AVPTL Greene noted this is a conundrum at all levels of learning. We are trying to quantify what we do in person and make more opportunities to connect which seems like more work. Workload estimators are one tool that might aid in finding a more balanced approach. We are open to helping survey student more if needed.

Amanda Smith, Assistant Professor, Literature, added that faculty are struggling too. Faculty are also experiencing an increased workload and asking faculty to engage in an additional platform to make the instructor more accessible increases the burden on faculty.

As there were no other questions, the Senate chair advised this is now the opportunity for new business to be raised from the floor, if any.

Chair Brundage asked if there were any other comments or concerns. As there were none, the Chair adjourned the meeting.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

ATTEST:

Nancy N. Chen, Secretary, 5/11/2021