

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Wednesday May 19, 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, May 19, 2021 online via Zoom. Chair David Brundage, History, called the meeting to order at 2:30pm, with Jorge Hankamer, Professor of 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 the public as always. Only members of the Senate may second or vote on motions. Committee Representatives and Students with Privilege of the Floor have the 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 the meeting. The Senate Chair advised members to use the raise hand function to be granted the floor. Additionally, Chair Brundage advised that GSA President Rora was not available to present the GSA's remarks according to the normal order of business. Chair Brundage moved that the Senate vote to approve a change to the order of business such that the GSA remarks are delivered immediately following item 5, the discussion of the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education. A vote via zoom poll was circulated. The Chair clarified a vote to Approve will move the GSA President's remarks to just after item 5 on the agenda. Parliamentarian Jorge Hankamer seconded this proposal.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

a. Chair Brundage advised there were no corrections to the noticed minutes from the March 3, 2021 meeting and asked if there were any corrections from the floor, there were none. Secretary Chen accepted the Minutes.

The motion to move the order of business was approved.

2. Announcements

- a. **Chair David Brundage** – waived remarks to allow time for others.
- b. **Chancellor Cynthia Larive**

After thanking the Senate Chair, the Chancellor began with comments about the Senate Meeting agenda. The Chancellor expressed her gratitude to the joint Senate-Administrative Working group on Graduate Education for their thoughtful report. The recommendations outlined in this report would put UCSC on a pathway to stronger graduate programs and improved mechanisms for supporting students and recognizing faculty contributions to graduate student mentoring and advising. The Chancellor reflected on her 12 years of experience with UC Riverside's cohort funding. The Chancellor advised the Senate to consider establishment of a graduate mentoring award. We could consider two awards each year recognizing faculty in STEM and non-STEM areas since the mode of mentorship varies between the disciplines. Though an award is in no way a substitute for clear and comprehensive faculty workload policies, awards are a way to recognize the efforts of faculty who excel in mentoring and to tangibly showcase work that we all value.

The Chancellor, CPEVC, and Graduate Studies Dean are participating in ongoing facilitated listening sessions with graduate students. Several of the recommendations of the report would directly address the concerns our graduate students are sharing. The Chancellor expressed her gratitude to everyone who has taken the time to meet, share their experiences, and begin building better communication pathways. Our

goal is to provide more clear and transparent communications about issues related to graduate student support. Once we are done meeting with all of the graduate programs, we will share a summary of the feedback we received. Along with the summary, we also plan to provide a list of action items that we will begin implementing before fall - hopefully in partnership with a new grad dean. There are some challenges that we must work through. As you are likely aware, we have a systemwide contract currently in place between the Regents and the UAW 2865 and the UC system is still in the process of defending an Unfair Labor Practice charge brought against the university by the UAW, including last year's \$2500 housing stipends for UCSC graduate students. Our campus is waiting for the PERB to decide if we can provide these types of support for ALL graduate students regardless of employment status or if such decisions must be made through the bargaining process with the Office of the President.

The Chancellor expressed her gratitude for today's In Memoriam item. What a meaningful way to recognize faculty and emeriti who are no longer with us. The past year has been such an incredible period of loss and in addition to the deaths of faculty, staff and students, we know that many in our community have also lost dear family and friends. Earlier this quarter the Chancellor established a working group comprised of Judith Aissen, Gary Dunn, Anna Finn, Adrienne Harrell, Suz Howells, Herbie Lee, Marianne McIvor, Garrett Naiman and Linda Scholz to provide recommendations about holding a Celebration of Life event as a way to come together to honor the memory of those members of our community we lost during the past year. After considering a virtual event this spring, it was decided that it would be better to hold the celebration of life in September, hopefully in person.

The Chancellor took a moment to recognize the many faculty, students and staff who have worked this year as members of the Campus Safety Community Advisory Board, co-chaired by Marcia Ochoa and Isabel Dees. The Chancellor was grateful to everyone serving on the board for their ongoing work and for their leadership in helping our community engage in difficult, but necessary conversation about what campus safety means. In addition, it is my understanding that President Drake will be sharing a Campus Safety Presidential Plan in late May or early June for a 30-day public comment period. The office of the president indicates that this plan is being formulated as a result of widespread community input, including campus safety task-force updates/reports, symposia, Academic Council recommendations, and various meetings with students, staff, faculty and other UC stakeholders. This plan is likely to have a significant impact on campus safety in the future.

The Chancellor advised that our budget outlook is very promising, a turn-around from last year. Regarding the Governor's May budget revise, Chancellor Larive noted an important element for our campus is ongoing state funding. Under the Governor's proposal, the \$300M cut from last year's budget would be restored and the UC would receive an additional \$173M increase to our ongoing base budget. A portion of the new ongoing funding will be used to fund a 3% salary increase for policy covered staff and a 3% increase to the faculty salary scales. Ongoing funding to the UC would also be provided for several programs important for our campus \$15M for student basic needs, including mental health and technology, and \$1.5M for immigrant legal services. The Governor's plan also includes several one-time items that would have an impact on UCSC including \$325M for deferred maintenance across the system and \$5M for faculty development. We hope that the governor's plan will be incorporated into the budget ultimately passed by the Legislature and given this year's positive financial picture, that we will have clarity about our fiscal year 2022 budget in plenty of time to plan for the coming year. It's become a cliché to say, but this has been a very difficult year and we will be feeling the after effects of it for years to come. The Chancellor was proud that we made the right bet in taking our budget cut using one-time funds to protect jobs, that we de-densified the campus to promote health and well-being, and that we served our students and our research mission this year in all of the ways that we could and in some ways that we didn't think were possible previously. There is always another crisis around the corner, but the Chancellor hopes that we can all take

a moment to reflect on the collaboration, values-based decision-making, and hard work that brought us to this moment, where we are justified in feeling hopeful about what the fall will bring. The Chancellor noted she was happy to take questions following the Campus Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Lori Kletzer remarks.

c. Campus Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Lori Kletzer

CPEVC Kletzer offered her congratulations to the following faculty and acknowledged that this list is a small sampling and is not meant to be exhaustive:

- Three faculty members among the 252 newly elected fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences: Angela Davis, Distinguished Professor Emerita of History of Consciousness and Feminist studies, James Estes, Professor Emeritus of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, and Barbara Rogoff, Distinguished Professor of Psychology.
- Two UC Santa Cruz arts professors have been selected to receive 2021 Guggenheim Fellowship awards: Irene Lusztig Professor of Film and Digital Media and Elizabeth Stephens Professor of Art were among the 184 artists, writers, scholars, and scientists selected this year from nearly 3,000 applicants. Brava to Irene and Beth.
- The Ecological Society of America has chosen Erika Zavaleta, Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, to receive its 2021 Commitment to Human Diversity in Ecology Award. The award recognizes long-standing contributions toward increasing the diversity of future ecologists through mentoring, teaching, or outreach.

The CPEVC announced the appointment of Celine Parreñas Shimizu as dean of our Arts Division. Dr. Shimizu is an award-winning film scholar and filmmaker, and her work focuses on race, sexuality and representations in global popular culture. She joins us from San Francisco State University, where she is a Professor of Cinema and Director of the School of Cinema, a position she has held since 2019. For Celine, this is a return to the UC, as she was previously a member of the faculty at UC Santa Barbara. She will take up the post on July 1. The CPEVC thanked the search advisory committee and invited the Senate to welcome her to our community.

Fall 2021 will be a transitional quarter, from 15 months of basically fully remote instruction back toward many aspects of pre-pandemic in-person instructional life. The CPEVC acknowledged some unknowns: the specifics of a vaccine mandate and campus capacity to vaccinate; continued good and steady progress with low infection rates and very low rates of hospitalization; how schools and childcare will be in-person available in the fall. Primarily in-person instruction, as specified in President Drake's January 11 message, is working out now to be 68% of classes are scheduled to be in person. 65% of lower division, 65% of upper division, 78% of graduate, and 71% of classes below 150 are scheduled to be in person.

Throughout our fall planning, the CPEVC has communicated with Senate Leadership. Chair Brundage is a member of the euphemistically titled Academic Recovery Workgroup and faculty and senate committee chairs have been involved in planning subgroups. We have been of one voice in regard to the need to be flexible while planning: flexible in the face of unknowns, and flexible in regard to faculty and TA preferences for remote or in-person instruction. Guidance to departments and programs, conveyed through divisional academic coordinators, has specified the primacy of pedagogy, curriculum and student needs in determining instructional modality. That same guidance included flexibility for individual faculty members, lecturers, and TAs. Above all, because faculty have authority for determining our curriculum, the CPEVC reflected that she agreed with Senate Leadership that the "flexibility message" should be communicated by the Senate and repeated by administration.

CPEVC Kletzer stated that she and Chancellor Larive support the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education report, conclusions, and recommendations. The CPEVC stated further that

strengthening the graduate enterprise overall, advancing research excellence and professional and career development, advancing diversity, promoting inclusion and equity, and providing an environment for student success are all key elements of enhancing our status as an outstanding public research university.

Specially CPEVC Kletzer highlighted possible future discussions:

1. About graduate program growth - yes, within a more sophisticated context of disciplinary aspirations, economic sustainability, and programmatic commitment to professional and career development. Not a simple 15% doctoral to undergraduate (or 12% for that matter). Yes to growth - we are small relative to our research ambitions and relative to our AAU membership status.
2. Attention to TAs and GSIs - academic student employment in the instructional area serves 2 purposes - i) providing financial support to graduate students (and offering professional development opportunities) and ii) in support of undergraduate education. I believe we all realize that it's both and not binary. Yet I agree that our TA/GSI funding model comes out of undergraduate enrollments and as such, its predictability needs strengthening, particularly in the context of 5-year funding packages.
3. I agree that we rely on TAs and GSIs to support our doctoral students, particularly in the Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities. I appreciate how the report highlighted that many faculty feel they do not receive sufficient TA support for their courses. How we balance these 2 perspectives will be important in the future, particularly because we must be attentive to time to degree and the barriers to timely completion while maintaining the quality of undergraduate instruction.
4. We must be attentive to the point that many faculty do not feel their efforts in mentoring/advising doctoral and MFA students are adequately valued or recognized in the merit review process, and this includes within their own departments. This is particularly true for faculty from under-represented and historically marginalized groups.
5. We must prioritize, at the highest level, the development of professional and career development in departments, programs, divisions and centrally.

The CPEVC noted the May 11th communication from the CPEVC and Committee on Academic Personnel Chair Junko Ito. This memo addresses impacts of COVID-19 in the Faculty Personnel Review Process and provides assurance that 2020-21 reviews would be viewed with understanding and compassion, under the principle that faculty should neither be held responsible nor penalized for exigent events related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The sentiments expressed in that communication remain relevant today and in the coming years. The memo has additional details. The guidance implements the recommendations of the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group that met several times during winter quarter to address COVID-related disruptions to faculty work and advancement.

Although the pandemic has impacted all of us, it has not done so equitably. Our colleagues with children whose daycares and schools were shuttered, or who are primary caregivers, or who have been prohibited from accessing critical venues (research facilities, field sites, performance venues, etc.) are among those with the most impact. In each faculty member's next advancement action, whether in this year or in the next two or three years (depending on rank and step), faculty who have been progressing successfully in normative time should continue to do so. This does not imply any diminution of academic standards, but rather an acknowledgement that the situation calls for a flexible and holistic approach consistent with APM 210-1d.

The CPEVC addressed the November 2019 Senate resolution on faculty salary competitiveness:

In a memo to Nico Orlandi as chair of CFW, the CPEVC advised she has requested Senate consultation on how the Annual Report of Faculty Salary Competitiveness, produced annually by the Academic Personnel Office, might address the cost of living/cost of housing in the Santa Cruz area. At the April 27 meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), the CPEVC acknowledged the depth and urgency of concerns about the cost of living/cost of housing, faculty remuneration, and housing actions and assistance available

both at the campus level and the systemwide level. The CPEVC expressed concerns about the methodologies of measuring cost of living/cost of housing, and particularly the complexity of pursuing a “cost of living/cost of housing” adjustment to Santa Cruz faculty salaries, especially in the context of a systemwide faculty salary scale. None of this precludes consultation, discussion, and analysis and, in fact, the CPEVC believes we have a shared sense of the need and urgency of full consideration of these issues. The CPEVC concluded her remarks by saying “more on the grad dean search soon.” Thank you and welcoming questions.

Chair Brundage opened the floor to questions, there were none.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

a. CER In Memoriam (AS/SCP/1998)

Chair Brundage expressed his gratitude to Judith Aissen, Professor Emerita and Chair of the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) and to all of CER for re-establishing a Senate In Memoriam process to recognize the passing of esteemed colleagues. The Senate Chair called for a moment of silence to reflect on those in our campus community whom we lost this year. The Senate paused to observe this moment and reflect. There were no questions. The CER In Memoriam report for Spring 2021 was declared accepted.

5. Reports of Special Committees

a. Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education Final Report: March 2021 (AS/SCP/1999)

Chair Brundage invited Co-Chairs of the Joint Working Group on Graduate Education (JWGGE), Don Smith, Professor of Microbiology & Environmental Toxicology and Graduate Council Chair and Dard Neuman, Associate Professor of Music and Committee on Planning and Budget Chair, to present an oral report on the group’s findings and recommendations.

GC Chair Smith began with an acknowledgment of the very hard, dedicated work of all the members of the JWGGE. GC Chair Smith continued that the JWGGE was also appreciative of the written letter expressing support and agreement from Chancellor Larive and CPEVC Kletzer. It’s a very important first step in making forward progress.

GC Chair Smith provided context for the group’s efforts, stating that the JWGGE focused on developing a comprehensive revenue analysis of the graduate enterprise, exploration of alternative graduate student funding models (including the “cohort model” implemented at UC Riverside), development and analysis of the Faculty Graduate Education Survey (FGES), and analysis of Graduate Division staffing levels. *The JWGGE was not charged with developing implementation plans.*

The report provided background information about the UCOP ‘rebenching’ process initiated in 2012-13 in hopes of more transparent and equitable budget allocation especially for the smaller campuses. It resulted in an allocation of \$24.3M in one-time funding to UCSC distributed over a 5 year transition period. Importantly, it also resulted in an on-going doctoral student enrollment-base. Most of the JWG was not previously aware that our campus was receiving funding for more doctoral students than we actually enroll. A figure was shared displaying target versus actual enrollment since rebenching. The JWGGE found that doctoral growth will not produce more state enrollment-based funds in the near term (but would generate more tuition revenue). For context, in 2018-19, 441 aspirational doctoral enrollments equated to 8 million dollars in additional funding. Some recommendations from the JWGGE regarding revenue are:

The campus should:

- Develop concrete strategic plans with UCOP for the stabilization of aspirational doctoral enrollment dollars.
- Articulate specific plans and resources to support doctoral enrollment growth that are sensitive to disciplinary desires for growth.
 - The Faculty Graduate Education Survey (FGES) revealed important differences across disciplines in the desire and ability to grow doctoral enrollments.
 - UCSC should emphasize a strategy of “strengthening” graduate education, balanced with “graduate growth” based on disciplinary aspirations and capacity.

GC Chair Smith observed that in the past there has been a strong emphasis on growing graduate student enrollment; now the JWGGE is recommending an emphasis on strengthening graduate programs.

Committee on Planning and Budget Chair Dard Neuman provided information regarding the major sources of funds that support graduate students: CORE funds, extramural funds, other sources (sales etc.) UCSC is heavily reliant on ASEs to support doctoral students. CPB Chair Neuman posed the question if TAships are viewed as a primary mechanism to support graduate students, to support undergraduate education, or both? If both, what are the appropriate levels of ASE funding that should be driven by graduate support needs?

Recommendations regarding funding support for graduate students are:

- Allocation of ASE funds should not be driven entirely by undergraduate enrollments and should include a baseline for graduate support needs.
- Increase fellowship opportunities beyond the first year to include at least one quarter in the qualifying exam year and one quarter in the dissertation write up year. We see that grad students were serving too frequently as TAs, at the expense of grad education.
- Use JWGGE framework of Graduate Division data to conduct a cost-benefit analysis to determine whether increased fellowship support for doctoral/MFA students would reduce time to degree and offset the increased costs of support

GC Chair Smith noted that only 29% of funding that supports graduate students comes from extramural sources. There is an opportunity to grow support for grad students by growing extramural funds.

Recommendations regarding extramural funds:

- Increase opportunities to grow extramural funding by reducing barriers for increasing both the number of extramural proposals submitted, and the proportion of proposals with significant graduate student support,
 - Levels of institutional support (matching funds, seed funds, staffing)
 - Workload recognition
 - Accommodation, etc.
- The campus should develop a cost-sharing program for faculty supporting graduate students as GSRs on extramural awards to incentivize including more graduate student support in extramural proposals.

CPB Chair Neuman stated that it was clear from the faculty survey that access to graduate students is important to all of us. Citing that 90% of faculty responded that having access to doctoral/MFA students is important to them. However, the degree to which having access to doctoral/MFA students advances faculty’s research varies widely by division (Arts: 40% agree/strongly agree; 85 - 100% in PBSci and BSOE). Many faculty do not feel that their efforts mentoring/advising doctoral/MFA students are adequately valued/recognized in the personnel merit review process, especially faculty in Arts.

- Women were ~20% less likely than men to state their work advising doctoral/MFA students has been adequately recognized/valued by their home department.

URM faculty, especially URM women, were more likely to disagree/strongly disagree that their work advising/mentoring graduate students is adequately recognized.

Recommendations:

- Develop/institute clear and comprehensive faculty workload policies for all departments and divisions, appropriate for the discipline, that appropriately recognize and value efforts associated with mentoring and advising graduate students.
- Establish a committee to investigate whether demographic and disciplinary inequities exist in faculty workload associated with graduate advising and its recognition in personnel actions.

UCSC's Graduate Division is under-resourced re: staffing, with likely significant negative impacts on the graduate enterprise. Recommendations:

Increase investment in the Graduate Division to provide much needed support for students and the graduate enterprise.

- Staffing and programming to support significantly increased efforts to recruit, retain, and graduate demographically diverse students.
- Enhanced professional development opportunities for students across all disciplines.
- Improved student success.

Regarding Cost of Attendance:

- 75% of faculty say UCSC should provide full COA for doc/MFA students
- 65% of faculty state that UCSC should provide partial/most/full support for MA/MS students
- Currently, only 23% of faculty state their doctoral students graduate within 5 years or less.

Recommendations:

- Provide resources to better meet students' cost of attendance needs.
- Develop a plan to implement a 5 year **Cohort Funding Model** at UCSC for allocation of ASE and Graduate Division resources.
 - Cohort funding model would guarantee a base level of ASE and fellowship support per doctoral/MFA student each year.
 - In this model, support of doctoral/MFA students would be a primary driver of baseline ASE funding allocations to divisions and programs.

These steps would stabilize and render more predictable graduate student support over the 5 year guaranteed funding duration. This will require close communication and a greater level of communication for all parties involved in graduate education.

Next steps include Graduate Council (GC) and the Committee on Planning & Budget (CPB) collaborating on analysis of the Masters Incentive Program (MIP), as well as the role of master's programs in the graduate ecosystem. Other next steps include developing implementation plans for recommendations.

Chair Brundage thanked GC Chair Smith and CPB Chair Neuman for the very comprehensive presentation and opened the floor to questions:

Barbara Rogoff, Professor of Psychology, wondered if the report reflected discrepancies across divisions regarding TAs/ship workload for grad students. Social science graduate students have a higher number of students that they serve.

GC Chair Smith: We did not consider workload in terms of the number of students. We are sensitive that this would further exacerbate time to degree.

Olof Einarsdottir, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry & Biochemistry, asked a question about extramural funding. Surprised that it was so low. How does it compare to other UCs? How much would your recommendations cost? Are those resources available? Quite a price tag.

GC Chair Smith responded that he was not sure if other campuses have done this breakdown. CPB Chair Neuman advised that Scott Brandt, Vice Chancellor of Research, may have this information. Other campuses have not put together this data, now campuses are considering this at UC level. We did do some modeling with Planning and Budget that made Kim Register feel ok. Increased fellowships for example.

Carla Freccero, Distinguished Professor, Literature & History of Consciousness, Literature Department Chair, and Associate Dean, Humanities Division, thanked the group for their work and asked about implementation. The report recommends departments come up with solutions to recognize mentoring workloads but the survey indicates the CAP and review level are most impactful. Can this be addressed? The differences between divisions in terms of capacity is extreme. Humanities offers few grants that allow writing in GSIs. Cohort funding model – would amounts be adjusted as costs rise annually? Who is responsible for overages when costs rise? Would caps be set on admission plans?

Chair Brundage apologized for a pause on this discussion but due to time constraints invited GSA President Rora to the podium to make remarks, after which the JWGGE report discussion continued.

7. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

GSA President Rora thanked the Senate and noted the importance of the JWGGE report. First and foremost, as we reflect on the past year and look forward to the next, President Rora recognized the faculty's flexibility in teaching and the support that has been given to students. This has been a seemingly unending series of trials for all of us. Your work on our behalf is far from invisible. Thank you for that. The joint letter dated May 7th titled "Curricular flexibility in Fall 2021," that states flexibility to teach remotely or in person should be given equal rather than secondary weight, is particularly meaningful. Getting through this year, however, does not mean we are in the clear. Many graduate students have moved off site, primarily due to the high cost of living. GSA President Rora notes figures showing Santa Cruz rent increased 18-20%. We need drastic change if we want our grad programs to be sustainable. We cannot ask grad students to return to Santa Cruz to perform underpaid work, particularly when the time beyond Fall 2021 is so uncertain. I want to reiterate the demands generated through UAW 2865 from an all grad student meeting on reopening. The demands are:

- Every ASE must have the right to choose their section modality, with no effect on their prospects for securing appointment.
- Every ASE returning to Santa Cruz must receive a \$2,000 relocation stipend to cover moving costs, deposits, and visa renewal. In terms of visa renewals, international students are precarious right now as we don't know how people might be able to return.
- There is a call for an answering session with the administration. Students are demanding a meeting open to all grads to address questions.
- Vaccination and boosters for all in person employees and guaranteed space for social distancing in all classrooms.

The GSA is advocating for similar items. We believe these are rational expectations.

- Assurance that no student will be without a safe and dignified place to live. The administration follows through on its promise to stop ignoring this dire issue.
- We also demand that our campus heed the demands of the Black Student Union that include the eradication and divestment from UCSC police. Staffing to promote diversity is not enough. Unless

we listen to the students who constitute this “diversity” we won’t have success in maintaining this diversity.

The GSA is disappointed and frankly ashamed that our insistence that our administration address its responsibility for the police violence on our campus in response to COLA demonstrations has resulted in listening sessions that were reported to UCOP as the core of our efforts to change policing. These issues are related however, silently hearing us on a host of grad student related issues is not the same as doing work that even other UCs have been doing and the plans they have begun to implement for changing policing. We are sorely behind. This move shows disinterest in real action, dismissing the urgency of this issue, particularly as it impacts the Black and Brown community members. We can give lip service to the concept of diversity but unless we actually listen to the community members that are most vulnerable this remains within the symbolic realm. We cannot return to a campus where cops are called on peaceful demonstrators. Where we have yet to receive a statement that what happened last year was unacceptable and that our administration commits to do better. This isn’t asking for much, in fact it is baseline. Both faculty and students deserve a safe working environment and learning environment. We continue to see the deferment of action on the issue of policing. I urge you all to do whatever possible to accommodate your Tas, GSI, GSRs needs as many of you have been doing.

Addressing the JWGGE final report directly: Many recommendations run parallel to what grad students have been saying for years. The real and regular assessment of grad student needs, which include enhanced fellowship support, is for us self-evident. We have been reporting for years that it is impossible to complete a degree within normative time within such strained financial circumstances. Years ago I wrote a white paper to then-UC President Napolitano about this and it has only gotten worse.

The recommendation regarding graduate division understaffing however is not uncontroversial. We have encountered huge issues with the Grad Division. While GSA looks forward to new leadership, we don’t want to spend our limited resources on increased administrative bloat when funds might be better spent directly on grad student needs. The issue of how much this will cost is valid. The GSA has implemented a grant to return what can be spent from our own budget directly to grad student pockets. This is important since the Grad Division has reserved the funds for travel grants until sometime that travel is deemed safe; instead of granting it directly to the students whose fees have supported the grant in the first place as we have repeatedly demanded. Is the issue that we don’t have enough people or that we don’t have partners in working towards the needs of grad students? In the time that so many are suffering financially we have found this move unacceptable. Other elements that are necessary for graduate student success in completion are good advising, clear expectations and professional development in both academia and other fields. I am not sure if this should reside within the Grad Division or within individual divisions. The Career Center does not serve grad students. We hope to further develop these areas, however it is difficult when advocacy for grad student basic needs keeps taking precedence for us. Thank you again for your attention to grad student issues. Our allyship with faculty is integral to our success. We look forward to continuing working with you for the betterment of our university.

Chair Brundage opened the floor to questions.

Don Smith, Professor of Microbiology & Environmental Toxicology and GC Chair, underscored the point GSA President Rora made, “I think we in the JWGGE agree adding more bodies is not the point. Adding bodies that go directly to enhancing grad education and grad student needs. Things may not necessarily be appropriately centered in the Grad Division but there certainly could be better coordination across campus.” GSA President Rora replied, “I see irony in and great intentions behind this recommendation. We have seen clear insistence that even as the university disregards the student’s requests. This report is great as a concrete study and I know things don’t change unless there are systematic reports. Do we need staff or implementation of the demands of students themselves? There is a lack of partnership.”

Chair Brundage called on Associate Professor Christine Hong, Literature Department, Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, who asked GSA President Rora about the cost of living. Whether or not grad students have had discussions about the mode of delivery on graduate education, both in graduate student seminars and GSIs/TAships. Remote seminars as a way of addressing that grad students can't afford to live in Santa Cruz? That graduate students are living in the larger Bay Area and beyond. Also a question for Professors Neuman and Smith about faculty women of color not having their mentorship load be sufficiently recognized. Does that require a more thorough thinking through of the personnel evaluation and assessment? How are findings going to be addressed?

GSA President Rora stated, "The GSA has requested that grad students be allowed to continue to work remotely if they wish to. Grad students are afraid of being asked to incur financial costs to move back to Santa Cruz. They have concerns about saying no to a TAship, that it will break the five-year guarantee. We have no clear answer. We ask that if someone turns down an in person TAship they be given a remote one. Grad students are vulnerable and have been trying to articulate their needs, they have asked for an answer session even if so much is precarious. We do need answers."

GC Chair Smith replied, "We as a group are not implementing. We take the mentoring workload issue seriously. We recommend addressing the workload issue at the department level and Senate level."

Dard Neuman, Associate Professor of Music and CPB Chair stated, "This issue requires more analysis and is not only in the arts. We found that women faculty of color in arts, humanities and social sciences reported this. To Carla, caps imposed are not in the spirit of our recommendation. We view this as a very important conversation, each department has to express what it considers to be the appropriate cohort size. We did not structure these recommendations as a top down dialogue."

GC Chair Smith: "Regarding the differences across divisions in supporting grad students with extramural potential, we recognize there are differences. Part of our drive for recommending incentives for lowering the cost of supporting students with extramural funds includes some level of cost sharing, to reduce barriers across campus."

The Senate Chair echoed this, that the JWGGGE was recommending some kind of cost sharing. Susan Gillman, Distinguished Professor of Literature, stated, "Perhaps other senate committees that can collaborate should think about increasing extramural support. I know in the past Graduate Council has thought about creating a list of best practices involving professional development and internships. I wonder if involving the Committee on Development and Fundraising in these discussions around extramural funding would be beneficial? There is interest in adding grad students to campus central fundraising practices."

GC Chair Smith: the JWGGGE did have discussions about the role of UR and fundraising. This should be the centerpiece of an effort to increase extramural funds for graduate students, a UR campaign focused on grad education.

GC Chair Smith added that he had been remiss in not acknowledging Esthela Bañuelos, analyst for GC and CPB – she was integrally involved and did a tremendous job.

Mark Anderson, Professor and Department Chair of Anthropology, inquired what next steps would there be on the Senate side. If a cohort funding model includes a different model for grad admissions down the line? Where do you imagine these conversations going, how will departments be involved?

GC Chair Smith: The JWGGGE would like to see a group including faculty to determine next steps.

CPEVC Kletzer agreed, “We will have a new grad dean and anticipate becoming more specific about implementation and how to stage our cohort model.”

CPB Chair Neuman added that in the report summary, there is a recommendation that identifies key constituents and different senate bodies are called out.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. CCI, CEP, and GC Presentation on the Online Course Policy revision (AS/SCP/2001)

The Senate Chair invited Tracy Larrabee, Professor of Computer Science and Engineering and CEP Chair to provide an update on the Online Course Policy revisions. Chair Brundage added that in the event there are related questions which may be best responded to by the Online Education Office, I move that we grant Michael Tassio, Director of Online Education privilege of the floor for this discussion. We will initiate a vote to provide floor privileges to Director Tassio as Chair Larrabee gets us started. Parliamentarian Jorge Hankamer seconded this proposal.

The motion was approved unanimously.

CEP Chair Larrabee explained that teaching through technology has been very important to us over the past year plus. We had some excellent online courses before. When we started having online courses we were justifiably skeptical of what they could do, how good they could be and how well they could meet our educational goals. As things evolved we found that some of the things the previous Online Policy was asking were somewhat onerous and not helpful to CCI. GC, CCI and CEP worked together with several groups on campus to revise the policy. The prior policy addressed only Asynchronous courses, we now know we need to address hybrid and synchronous courses. This is important as some forms of these courses may continue into the future. The policy would need to change if we were ever to implement a fully online degree. We got feedback from SEC, CAAD, COT. We have reduced the number of questions from 14 to 7. Checkbox statements encourage engagement with Online Education, CITL and ITS, those agencies being critical to teaching people using technology. The reporting requirement was removed as it was previously ignored. Now we ask that courses be resubmitted after 3 years. There is a mechanism for permanent approval after the first renewal. Required courses for undergraduate majors and minors, as well as graduate degrees, cannot be offered exclusively in an asynchronous online format. Required courses must be taught in-person at least once during any academic year in which they are offered. Exceptions to this policy can be requested and may be approved by CCI, and must be based on clear pedagogical advantages or on student demand. For all requirements there are ways to ask for exceptions. There are 3 workflows now: Asynchronous, Synchronous, and Hybrid. This work could not have happened without the help of CITL and Online Education. CEP Chair Larrabee concluded by offering to answer any questions.

Professor Abe Stone, Philosophy: When an online course goes up for renewal or permanent approval is there any procedure for checking whether learning outcomes are comparable to an in-person course, particularly success in future courses for which it is prerequisite?

CEP Chair Larrabee advised that she hoped departments make their strongest case and provide this information if it was available. Some assessment of the learning outcome would be helpful.

No other questions.

b. CCA Fall Faculty Survey Oral Report

Senate Chair Brundage invited Committee on Career Advising Chair Professor Adrian Brasoveanu, Linguistics, to present an oral report on the proposed fall 2021 survey of faculty.

Adrian Brasoveanu, Professor of Linguistics and CCA Chair advised the Faculty Workplace Experience & Negative Acts will be released in Fall 2021. It was a difficult survey to name. The term “negative acts” comes from the literature on bullying. The survey was proposed by CCA and IRAPS has agreed to support and administer it. Bullying related issues in the workplace are important factors in job satisfaction and retention. We want to measure the prevalence of such experiences overall, and also by source of the negative acts (other faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, staff). We also want to determine whether particular subgroups of faculty are affected more significantly. Finally, we will collect narrative feedback (optional) and suggestions for possible interventions. . The survey will include the option for narrative feedback, which is important to developing possible interventions. The data will only be reported in aggregate and kept confidential. The more respondents, the more we will be able to extract from the data. CCA Chair Brundage asked that all faculty participate in the survey! Senate Chair Brundage opened the floor to questions.

Elizabeth Abrams, Senior Teaching Professor for the Writing Program and Provost of Merrill College, asked if CCA is working with CAAD to develop the survey questions? As difference can be tied to bullying.

CCA Chair Brasoveanu advised that CCA gathered extensive feedback from other committees in the planning of the survey. The actual questions were drafted mostly with IRAPS based on the feedback.

8. Report of the Student Union Assembly President

SUA President Shivika Sivakumar thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak and extend gratitude to faculty for their continued support. The SUA has been less engaged with the Academic Senate as the SUA VP resigned earlier this quarter. Students appreciate flexibility regarding pandemic related issues, excusing late submission due to internet issues, test rescheduling due to vaccination side effects. Students have not forgotten all the hard work faculty have done. There is much uncertainty for Fall 2021, we hope to be part of the conversation regarding the hybrid instruction and planning for next year. President Sivakumar appreciates that following the Winter Senate meeting, she was invited to participate in many planning workgroups. SUA Academic Affairs is looking into data regarding the effectiveness of Pass / No Pass grading options in helping reduce withdrawal rates with help of VPDUE Richard Hughey.

Additionally, the SUA passed a resolution denouncing the 2021 UCPD Goldbook policy changes, quoting directly from the resolution: “We reinstate our unquestionable disapproval of the UCPD’s use of military grade surveillance technology on COLA strikers, graduate and undergraduate students alike, and asserts to the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) that we will not be complicit to the advances of the paramilitary state agenda that is being pushed forward. That the Student Union Assembly reinstates its unquestionable solidarity with the COLA movement, the Graduate Student Association, and the various grassroots and identity organizations at UCSC that tirelessly raise awareness of these issues that persist within the UC system and threaten the wellbeing of the student community.”

We hope the Senate will denounce these changes officially. The SUA emphasized our university’s lack of adequate response to the countless policing concerns highlighted by our very own students. To end on a note of gratitude, staying together, communicating and ensuring our slug community is the only way forward. The SUA looks forward to staying in close communication with the Academic Senate and addressing student concerns and advocating for what is right.”

Senate Chair Brundage thanked the SUA President and noted that the UCSC Senate response to the UCPD Gold Book Policy revisions was extremely critical as well.

There were no questions for the SUA president.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business

As new business Senate Chair Brundage advised he was sharing the draft Senate Committee Roster for next year, 2021-22. The roster was circulated in advance of the meeting. Micah Perks, Professor of Literature and COC Chair, was available for questions. COC Chair Perks commented that this is still a work in progress. COC is deeply thankful to everyone who served on senate committees this year or has volunteered to serve next year. It has been a challenging year and COC appreciates your service.

As there were no further comments the Senate Chair declared the COC Roster accepted.

Chair Brundage asked if there was any other new business from the floor, there was none. Senate Chair Brundage thanked everyone for their presence and participation. Have a good end of the quarter, and a great summer. The Chair adjourned the meeting.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

ATTEST:

Grant McGuire, Secretary, 11/12/2021