Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Wednesday, February 10, 2010 at 2:30 p.m.
Stevenson Event Center
ORDER OF BUSINESS

February 3, 2010

Members of the Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues:

Ten years have passed since the Academic Senate last considered the narrative evaluation system. In response to Senators who raised the issues to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), SEC has submitted a report, intended as a discussion piece, for the upcoming Senate meeting on **Wednesday, February 10 at 2:30pm in the Stevenson Event Center** (click here for agenda). I promise an engaging discussion.

We will also hear updates from Chancellor Blumenthal and EVC Kliger. Our Senate committees have submitted several items: an update on General Education revision from the Committee on Educational Policy, a status report on the Education Abroad Program from the Committee on International Education; a report on the ongoing budget reduction process from the Committee on Planning and Budget; and proposed bylaw amendments from two committees.

I look forward to seeing you at the Senate Meeting.

Sincerely,

Lori Kletzer, Chair
Academic Senate

UNIVESITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
of the
October 28, 2009 Senate Meeting

The draft minutes from the October 28, 2009 Senate Meeting were distributed via email on February 2, 2010 and will be presented for approval at the Senate Meeting on February 10, 2010. After being approved, these minutes will be posted on the Senate web site (http://senate.ucsc.edu/meetings.html).

Senators are asked to submit any proposed corrections or changes to these draft minutes to the Senate Office in advance of the next meeting, via EMAIL or in WRITING. All proposed changes will be compiled in standardized format into a single list for display at the next meeting.

This approach gives Senators an opportunity to read and review changes before being asked to vote on them, gives the Senate staff and the Secretary time to resolve any questions or inconsistencies that may arise, and minimizes time spent on routine matters during meetings. While proposed changes may be checked for consistency, they will not be altered without the proposer's approval. This approach complements, but does not limit in any way, the right of every Senator to propose further changes from the floor of the meeting.

To assist the Senate staff, proposed changes should specify:
        1. The location of the proposed change (e.g. item, page, paragraph, sentence…)
        2. The exact wording of existing text to be modified or deleted
        3. The exact wording of replacement or additional text to be inserted
        4. (Optional) The reason for the change if not obvious

Please submit all proposed changes to arrive in the Senate Office **no later than 5 p.m., Monday, February 8, 2010.** They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to senate@ucsc.edu.

                                        Norma Klahn
                                        Secretary, Academic Senate
                                        Santa Cruz Division

February 2, 2010

Draft M I N U T E S
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
October 28, 2009

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, October 28, 2009 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine present, Chair Lori Kletzer called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes (none)

2. Announcements

a. Chair Lori Kletzer

Chair Kletzer began by introducing Senate secretary Norma Klahn, Senate parliamentarian Michael Dine and Senate director Mary-Beth Harhen. Chair Kletzer then provided an update on the resolutions that were tabled at the October 18, 2009 Special Senate Meeting. The two tabled resolutions were taken up by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The tabled resolution, on residing salary reductions for new hires and faculty making below $75,000 a year, was then directed to four Senate committees for review. The second tabled resolution, from UC Santa Barbara regarding President Yudof, was directed to a SEC subcommittee for analysis and comment. Chair Kletzer stated that once she receives updates she will share them with the Senate.

Chair Kletzer then reported that the Senate resolutions that passed at the October 18, 2009 Special Senate Meeting will go to a mail ballot. The mail ballot procedure will be conducted by the Senate secretary, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E).

Chair Kletzer closed her remarks by asking all Senators to move to the seats marked Senators, when the Senate proceeds to a vote.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal began by welcoming everyone to the new academic year, and then acknowledged the debates about decisions made in at the state level, the office of the president (OP) and on the campus. He stated that while occasionally the parties involved passionately disagree, everyone still cherishes and practices the principle of academic freedom. The University of California (UC) is a public research university with a mission to pursue knowledge, to provide access and transform students.

Chancellor Blumenthal said that during these challenging times there are many reasons to be proud. Last Friday the campus celebrated Founder's Day where outstanding alumnus, Faculty Research Lecturer Dan Friedman, Pat and Rowland Rebel and UCSC Foundation medalist Ed Catmull were honored.

Chancellor Blumenthal then informed the Senate that to date the campus has received nearly $17 million in stimulus funds, including more than $2 million to the Social Sciences Division. In August the *Chronicle of Higher Education* ranked UCSC as the

fourth biggest gainer in federal funds for academic research and development from 2000 to 2007. Chancellor Blumenthal acknowledged Anthropologist Nate Dominy who was named one of this year's "Brilliant 10" young researchers by *Popular Science* magazine. Also, five young professors won early career awards from the National Science Foundation.

The chancellor said there is an outstanding new class of frosh and transfers. The frosh class is smaller than last year and more diverse. 37 percent will be the first in their families to graduate from a four year university. The higher grades and test scores of the frosh class are consistent with UCSC's increasing selectivity. Issues of access and affordability are paramount; students feel the effects of fee increases and fewer classes.

Next Chancellor Blumenthal provided an update on the UC Commission for the Future (UC Commission) which is co-chaired by President Yudof and Regents chair, Russell Gould. Representatives from four of the five working groups of the UC Commission will visit campus on Thursday, October 29, 2009 to gather ideas from the faculty. The UC Commission is charged with developing a new vision for the university within the context of the university's mission and budget. There are five working groups: Size and Shape of UC, Education and Curriculum, Access and Affordability, Funding Strategies and Research Strategies. Chancellor Blumenthal is the co-chair of the Size and Shape work group. Issues the working group is considering include:

- The right size and shape of the university going forward?
- The mix of students needed to meet the needs of the state?
- How UC and its partner segments interface with the Master Plan.
- The relationships of the campuses to each other and to OP.

The chancellor said it is essential that UCSC's voice be a key part of the discussion which is why he agreed to co-chair the working group.

Chancellor Blumenthal then brought up how the campus works in the current budget climate. He stated that the administration is fully committed to open, serious, transparent consultation with the Senate. The campus will face some difficult choices, and it is essential that the Senate and administration continue to work together to chart the best path forward. The chancellor believes the decisions the campus ultimately reaches will be sound ones if the Senate and administration continue to talk directly about both campus goals and priorities and fiscal constraints. Cuts to state funding are real, and even with painful increases in student fees the funding the campus has available to teach each student continues to fall. The chancellor said there will be real cuts to programs. The administration cannot guarantee that every program, every initiative, and every department, will continue to be funded at the same level as in the past. He also said that both EVC Kliger and the Senate have insisted that budget cuts should not be across the board. That decision has made the job of both the EVC and the Senate much harder, because the campus must make real choices about which programs must be protected, and which will receive deeper cuts. Chancellor Blumenthal thinks this is exactly the right

strategy if the campus is to protect the things it cares most deeply about and be able to invest in the right opportunities.

The chancellor used Silicon Valley (SV) as an example of an opportunity. He said the campus has gained a great deal of traction in SV. Several academic divisions have research collaborations with companies and with NASA Ames. The Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE) has significant and growing opportunities for students at the NASA site. The Arts Division is reaching out for support and collaborations in SV. The close linkage of UCSC with this center of innovation, technology and entrepreneurship has great potential for the campus.

Chancellor Blumenthal stated that an idea to create a School of Management in SV has generated a great deal of interest by CEOs in the SV and allowed the campus to build relationships that benefit the entire campus. The chancellor went on to say that UCSC will only establish a School of Management if it is both academically of UC quality and financially sound enough not to compete with general campus interests.

Finally, the chancellor informed the Senate that because of the importance of campus connections to SV, the Winter Scholarship Benefits Dinner has been moved from Santa Cruz to SV. The chancellor also said that private giving remains at over $30 million for the second year in a row and the quiet organizational phase of UCSC's Comprehensive Campaign has begun.

Chancellor Blumenthal closed by saying that the EVC, deans and other principal officers are engaged in a collaborative effort with the Senate, working to re-envision how UCSC can best continue to meets its historic commitments as public university to access and excellence for the students of California, despite the state's economic distress.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger
EVC Kliger began by stating that the campus is in an unprecedented time, a crisis point. The campus has an obligation to continue progress during these difficult times, to focus on the future and not on the past. The EVC said last year the Senate-administration collaboration did not go as smoothly as it should have. The EVC is committed to a more collaborative effort this year in working with the Senate.

With regard to the budget, the EVC is exploring what questions need to be asked including:
- How principal officers will take a range of cuts.
- The criteria for decisions.
- Communication and feedback strategies.

The EVC reported on a budget retreat for principal officers, where Senate, student and staff representatives met over the summer. At the retreat a number of work groups were formed. The goal of the working groups was to provide questions to units to guide their decisions as the campus moves through the budgeting process.

EVC Kliger then reported on the salary reduction and furlough program that was implemented on September 1, 2009. The program, he said, is extremely challenging and complex. Across campus managers and supervisors have been faced with difficult decisions and the loss of productivity.

EVC Kliger closed his remarks by reminding the Senate of the 20th anniversary of the Loma Prieta earthquake. The earthquake led to a loss of life and financial distress, but brought people together. It took a long time for the community to recover but it did. EVC Kliger hopes the same will happen with the current budget crisis. EVC Kliger would like to come out of the crisis with strength and pride.

Following the chancellor's and EVC's remarks Chair Kletzer opened the floor to questions.

Professor Karen Bassi (Literature) expressed concern about staff furloughs. Professor Bassi informed the chancellor about a new entertainment policy training staff are required to attend. The training lasts seven hours and Professor Bassi questioned if this was the best use of staff time. EVC Kliger responded that he did not know about that process specifically, but that he has asked every unit to think about what is essential and what is not, and ways to streamline processes.

Professor Gail Hershatter (History) asked for more information on the UC Commission and what the EVC meant when he referred to last year's consultation with the Senate. Chancellor Blumenthal said representatives from all five of the UC Commission working groups will be on campus. He is hoping that there will be productive interaction. The membership of the work groups is controversial, and he believes faculty should be the main voice. EVC Kliger stated that when the budget process began last year principal officers were asked how they would take cuts of certain sizes, and were told the information would remain confidential. Because there was a lot of concern about budget decisions affecting individuals, confidentiality was deemed necessary and impeded getting information to the Senate in a timely manner.

Professor Tim Duane (Environmental Studies) commented on the effects of decentralizing decisions by referring to the budget crisis of the mid-1990's when UC had a program that allowed faculty to retire early, in essence decentralizing decisions to the level of the individual which resulted in a random loss of faculty. Individual departments were harmed by this decision made by OP, and it took years to hire faculty back and recover. This campus has already lost faculty due to the budget cuts. Learning from the past, we have to look at the strategic implications of decentralizing decisions. The EVC said this was a major point of discussion during the summer budget retreat. He has asked the deans to think about academic plans in terms of what is really feasible with the current budget and come up with new five year plans. The EVC said the campus needs to look at the implications of cuts from a campus wide perspective.

Professor Chris Connery (Literature) asked about the School of Management and CPB's 2008-09 recommendation that the school not move forward. The chancellor said the

school will not move forward unless there is a sensible financial plan. The Senate has veto authority and nothing will move forward without agreement. The nascent school has though; put the campus in touch with contacts in SV. The chancellor said the companion benefits are worthwhile.

Professor Don Rothman (Writing) asked if the public has been invited into the conversations with the UC Commission. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that the UC Commission includes a number of people from outside the university.   When conceptualizing his own working group, Chancellor Blumenthal chose two outsiders who will bring a different perspective. Also, OP is setting up a web site that allows public comment.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports
Chair Kletzer introduced the consent calendar, explaining that anyone wishing to pull a report from the consent calendar for discussion might do so.

The items on the consent calendar were received without comment.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees
a. Committee on Committees (AS/SCP/1627)
    i. Additional Nominations
    The additional nominations were received without comment.
b. Committee on Educational Policy
    i. Update Report on General Education
Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair John Tamkun reminded the Senate that last spring changes to the general education (GE) requirements were approved. The changes will become effective in fall 2010, but the old requirements will not disappear immediately. There will be a transitional period of about three years.

CEP Chair Tamkun then provided the following update on the GE reform timeline:
- Summer 2009 – Development of revised course approval forms
- Fall 2009 – Consultation with deans and department chairs (ongoing). Solicited feedback from departments on course guidelines (due October 19). Finalize GE courses guidelines (early November). Proposals for DC and GE courses are due December 1.
- Winter 2010 – Begin review of course proposals. Begin capacity analysis. Ongoing consultation with faculty and the administration.
- Spring 2010 – Continue review of course proposals.   Review revised course descriptions and programs statements for the general catalog.

CEP Chair Tamkun informed the Senate more information can be found on CEP's website at http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/GenEdDeptGuideindex.html

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Matthew Palm, Commissioner of Academic Affairs (CAA) for the Student Union Assembly (SUA) provided an update on current SUA activities. He began by addressing the issue of academic integrity. CAA Palm stated that the numbers shared by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) show academic integrity to be an increasing problem. The SUA has put up a number of fliers in classrooms and across campus, attempting to bring light to the issue in a friendly way.

CAA Palm informed the Senate that over the summer the SUA hosted the UC SUA congress. The top issues discussed included lobbying to save Cal Grants and lobbying to pass the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act (SAFRA). SAFRA enables the federal government to make loans directly to students, eliminating the need for a third party.

CAA Palm said two members of the SUA are serving on system-wide committees as representatives to the Board of Admissions and Relations with School (BOARS) and UC Committee on Educational Policy.

Next CAA Palm said that the Student Committee on Committees has re-written their constitution to encourage accountability and feedback regarding students serving on committees. The SUA also worked with the Education Department on TA diversity training. The SUA is working with departments on implementing sustainability on campus. CAA Palm thanked Student Affairs for modeling ways to solicit feedback. He thanked the EVC for inviting students to the budget retreat and also thanked the library. He then thanked Dean Kamieniecki and Dean Yeager for conferring with students over budget decisions.

CAA Palm closed by saying that this is a year of over communication for the SUA. SUA is hoping to assert the student voice in a productive and meaningful way.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business
a. Resolutions C and D from October 19, 2009 Special Senate Meeting (AS/SCP/1612)

There was a motion and a second to open Resolutions C and D for discussion.

A discussion followed about Resolution C where a friendly amendment was accepted. The Senate voted to refer the motion to the Committee on Planning and Budget to revise, sending it afterward to RJ&E to review. The Senate asked that the revised resolution be brought back to the Senate by the next Senate meeting.

The motion to refer Resolution C to CPB passed by hand vote.

> **To the President re: Fiscal Transparency: Whereas the current fiscal crisis facing the UC system is having and will continue to have profound effects on all research and teaching functions in which faculty are engaged; and whereas faculty are therefore duty bound to fully understand the nature of the crisis and to analyze the full range of possible strategies for coping with the fiscal crisis; we the members of the Academic Senate of UCSC therefore request from UCOP complete budgetary transparency, including full details of all budget categories, definitions of the nature of any legal restrictions on how these categories of funds can be expended, and detailed alternative scenarios for addressing the fiscal crisis.**

Spoke in favor of the Resolution	Spoke against the Resolution	Comments about the Resolution
Craig Reinarman	Barry Bowman	John Jordan
Brent Haddad		Loisa Nygaard
		Diane Gifford-Gonzalez

Points made in favor of Resolution C:
- Many people are trying to understand the OP process and have no idea if OP listened to any of the feedback they received.
- We have no clue about the categories in the budget and what alternative scenarios were considered. We want to see the basis for decisions.
- A resolution like this would be helpful at UC Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) meetings. This will show UCPB that the faculty at UCSC wants details.

Points made against Resolution C:
- I do not get the point. This resolution falls into a basic feeling that these resolutions are a way to vent frustration and fight amongst ourselves.
- Who is this resolution going to? What is being requested? Who will analyze the data?

Comments about Resolution C:
- This resolution would be more effective if it was proposed to the president.
- Can we have a specific date to return this to the Senate?
- Can CPB consult with RJ&E to ensure the wording is correct?

Next the Senate discussed Resolution D.

A discussion followed about Resolution D where a friendly amendment was accepted. The Senate voted on Resolution D.

Resolution D passed by hand vote.

Sense of the Senate re: Good-Faith Negotiations: Whereas the UCSC faculty are formally represented by the Santa Cruz Faculty Association as their bargaining agent: therefore be it resolved that it is the sense of the UCSC Academic Senate that the UCSC administration and Association should continue to bargain in good faith with the Association on furlough policy options, possible strategies for coping with the fiscal crisis, and all other issues that may properly fall within the scope of collective bargaining.

Spoke in favor of the Resolution	Spoke against the Resolution	Comments about the Resolution
Dana Frank	Loisa Nygaard	Steve Thorsett
Chris Connery		John Jordan

The following points were made in favor of Resolution D:
- Although there is a legal obligation to bargain in good faith, it is a constant issue in a negotiation process where an administration goes to consultants who tell them to drag their feet.
- This is to affirm the comment that some of the decisions in this fiscal crisis are bargainable.

The following points were made against Resolution D:
- I support the Faculty Association's efforts, but do not know if we are weakening our position by passing a resolution about something we are legally bound to do.

Comments about Resolution D;
- This body has an unusual relationship to both sides. Both sides are voting Senate members. This resolution would be stronger if it were symmetrical with legal and ethical obligations.
- We should say that the administration and association will continue to bargain in good faith, and not just the administration.

Professor Shelly Errington, Anthropology, then formally invited the chancellor, EVC and UC Commission to a forum on the budget crisis.

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business
Professor Chris Connery, Literature, introduced a resolution from the floor. A motion and a second were made to open the resolution for discussion.

Following a discussion where a friendly amendment was accepted, the Senate voted on the resolution.

The resolutions passed by voice vote.

Whereas UC fee increases compromise the public mission of the University, be it resolved that the Senate opposes any further fee increase and urges the UCSC Administration and UCOP to advocate accordingly to the UC Regents.

Spoke in favor of the Resolution	Spoke against the Resolution	Comments about the Resolution
Bettina Aptheker	Brent Haddad	Rebecca Braslau
Chris Connery		Marc Mangel
Shelley Errington		Loisa Nygaard
Gail Hershatter		Matthew Palm
Robert Singleton		
Christine Hong		
Helene Moglen		
Bill Ladusaw		

Points made in favor of the resolution:
- 57.4 percent of the state of California are people of color and they are totally underrepresented.
- Those of us who put this together are actually hoping for less student fees.
- The problem with imagining that increases in tuition will help our academic programs is based on the fallacy that the money will go to academic programs.
- We are at a particular moment in time, which is that of the upcoming Regents meeting, where we have to say something. We have a very narrow window of opportunity.
- As a student who is dependent on Cal Grants, I strongly urge you to support this and send a message to OP.
- This is ethical and urgent, we must respond. Students cannot afford course materials.
- There is nothing more important than access.
- It is critical for the Senate voice to be heard.
- Students would have to work months at a minimum wage job to afford the fees. In the past, a summer job would have covered fees.

Points made against the resolution:
- A resolution like this means the funding will have to come from someplace else. We could end up eroding what we are trying to protect. We need more information before we consider this resolution.

Comments about the resolution:
- I understand there will have to be some fees increases, so I am uncomfortable with the word "any."
- We need to be careful about how we word this. UC does not have tuition for in-state students.

- Perhaps we should say something about the percentage of fee increases we have seen in the past year.
- Fees are up over 100 percent since 2001.

Professor Chris Connery, Literature, proposed a resolution from the floor.

Following a discussion, where a friendly amendment was accepted, the Senate voted on the motion. The resolution passed by voice vote.

Be it resolved that the UCSC Senate opposes reductions in pay for workers whose full time salary is $40,000 or less.

Spoke in favor of the Resolution	Spoke against the Resolution	Comments about the Resolution
Dana Frank	Barry Bowman	John Jordan
Megan Thomas	Elizabeth Abrams	Olof Einarsdottir
Gina Langhout		Brent Haddad
Danilyn Rutherford		Donna Hunter
Diane Gifford-Gonzalez		Eileen Zurbriggen
		Mayanthi Fernando

Points made in favor of the Resolution:
- I support this resolution. We need to put pressure on the administration.
- We are talking about a symbolic intervention.
- Who can be against this?
- Waiting to move on this is unethical.
- It is morally imperative for this group to make this kind of statement.
- Cuts to staff making under $40,000 are unconscionable.

Points made against this Resolution:
- We need more information on how much this will cost. We will lose something else if we pass this.
- I am worried about unintended consequences. There are staff who have a base of above $40,000 but are actually making less because they are part time.

Comments about the Resolution:
- CPB has asked about the cumulative impact of salary cuts for every salary tier.
- We should refer this to committee, so we can analyze how it will affect other programs.
- We should also be clear in saying that these reductions will not result in a loss of employment.

Adjournment: 5:15 p.m.

ATTEST:

Norma Klahn, Secretary

January 29, 2010

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Report on the Education Abroad Program

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

> *UCEAP is an academic program of the University of California. Its mission is to provide students with international learning opportunities to enhance their academic experience and to prepare them to be effective and responsible citizens of an increasingly interdependent global society. UOEAP coordinates summer, semester and year-long study abroad programs which combine high-quality academic experiences with immersion in the local culture; provides pre- and post-departure activities designed to help students gain the most from their international experiences; sponsors exchanges with international students; and helps to coordinate the efforts of individual campus EAP activities.*
>
> *proposed UCEAP mission statement*

The University of California Education Abroad Program (EAP) has been a vital, influential UC academic program since its creation in 1962, but deviation from EAP's core strengths has led to a host of problems that, combined with drastic budget cuts, seriously threaten the long-term viability of EAP. EAP expanded dramatically during the past decade, largely through the creation of short-term, non-immersion programs; this rapid shift away from EAP's unique, highly successful semester and year-long immersion programs led to fiscal disaster and put EAP in direct competition with for-profit third party providers. The current perception among some key administrators that EAP could be replaced by third party study abroad programs, or further remodeled in the image of such programs, must be corrected if EAP is to survive as a high quality academic program.

The Committee on International Education (CIE) is particularly concerned with two issues: the shift to an EAP-fee based budget model, and reciprocity agreements with partner institutions. From EAP's inception in 1962 until this year, EAP students enjoyed virtually the same funding status as students on campus. Affordable EAP programs are a crucial component of UC's diversity efforts; international experience is critical for employment and graduate study in many fields, and should be accessible to all students. EAP's system-wide state support has been reduced from approximately $18 million in FY 2008-09 to roughly $4 million in FY 2009-10 and $1 million in 2010-11. EAP is expected to be supported entirely by student fees within a few years. CIE is extremely concerned that EAP is rapidly becoming a luxury service program that is out of reach for many students: special program fees ranging from $750 to $4000 have recently been added to many EAP options, and all EAP participants now pay a substantial administrative fee. Commitment of return to financial aid from EAP fees is essential if the diversity of participants in the program is to be maintained.

The Committee is also very concerned about the potential loss of international students attending UCSC through EAP reciprocity agreements. While EAP sends approximately 4500 students abroad each year, approximately 1200 students from partner institutions attend classes at UC campuses. These students enhance international awareness on our campuses, enriching the classroom experience with different cultural perspectives, and increasing awareness of UC in their home countries. The 3:1 exchange ratio enables EAP to serve as an "eleventh UC campus", relieving overcrowding resulting from rapid enrollment increases and the current budget restrictions. Under the new budget model, reciprocity students, who pay their usual fees to their

home university, may become a financial burden on the campuses unless reciprocity support for campuses from UCOP's General Fund or Opportunity Fund is continued. Termination or significant curtailment of reciprocity agreements would undermine EAP's highly successful extended-stay immersion programs, and diminish the diversity of UC.

In April 2009, Interim Provost Pitts convened a joint Senate-Administration Task Force to review EAP. The Task Force recommended the establishment of a UOEAP Governing Committee (GC), appointed by the Provost, with representation from the Academic Senate, including ex-officio representation from members of UCIE, UCPB, and UCEP. However, the current composition of the Governing Committee and apparent chain of responsibility gives excessive influence to UCOP. Senate oversight of UOEAP has been undermined by repeated invocation of fiscal necessity as justification for one-sided decisions. The EAP-fee based budget model was adopted in spite of the strong disapproval of Senate committees. Several Study Centers have been closed without UCIE's approval, abruptly ending multi-decade partnerships with major universities. Communication between the UCSC Office of International Education, UOEAP, and CIE has been hobbled by the lack of a UCSC EAP Faculty Director.

It is essential that EAP continue as a system-wide academic program, serving all campuses equitably. The Governing Committee currently has four members from UCLA, and none from UCSB, in spite of UCSB's exceptionally high level of involvement in EAP. This disproportionate representation of a large campus with relatively low per capita EAP participation may lead to policies that the smaller campuses can't afford. UCSC sends almost as many students abroad through EAP's long-term immersion programs as UCLA does, and will face much greater challenges if key support services are shifted from UOEAP to the campuses at the same time that local EAP offices are suffering severe staffing cuts. UOEAP provided $933,000 for campus financial support in the 2008-09 budget; the February 2009 strategic plan eliminated this support entirely. UCOP's plan to transform EAP into a self-supporting service provider will catastrophically backfire if dramatic increases in student fees and abrupt reductions in administrative support drive students to third party providers, or deter them from studying abroad.

Our ever more closely linked global society desperately needs informed, insightful citizens. The UCSC Committee on International Education is extremely concerned that decisions being made by UCOP threaten the viability of the UC system's well respected Education Abroad Program, and the invaluable educational opportunity this program offers to UC students. The active support of the Senate and the Academic Council are essential if EAP is to survive and evolve to meet the current challenges in and outside the UC system, while maintaining its traditionally high standard of academic excellence.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Giacomo Bernardi
Karen Holl   Judith Harris-Frisk, NSTF
Armin Mester   Melissa Abel, SUA
Debra Lewis, Chair   Milicia Petranovic, SUA

January 29, 2010

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Report on 2010-11 Budget Process

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

By way of background, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has eight faculty members representing all academic divisions. The Senate Chair and Vice-Chair are *ex officio* members, and graduate students (via GSA) and undergraduate students (via SUA) appoint representatives who regularly participate in our meetings. Our weekly meetings include regularly scheduled consultations with CPEVC Kliger and as-needed consultations with other administrators.

The campus is in the process of preparing for another round of cuts to its core (state-funded) budget for the 2010-11 fiscal year, which begins July 1, 2010. Because this budget preparation process is now reaching full steam, this report focuses on describing the process and modes of Senate-administration consultation that will take place. It is important to understand at the outset that CPB is an advisory committee to CPEVC Kliger on budgetary matters. CPB has no authority to make budgetary decisions: our role is to advise the administration on the budget planning process. Furthermore, specifics of state funding for the University, and the University's allocation to the campus, are only forthcoming late in the academic year, thus campus budget planning must be carried out on the basis of expectations and contingencies.

Budgeting started last summer, with one-day administrative budget retreats that considered the campus overall budget. Academic Senate leaders attended some these retreats, as well as principal officers and other leading administrators. Out of these retreats, an administrative workgroup process emerged, in which committees were charged to present white papers on the context of budget problems facing important units on campus. The workgroups included: UG Education, Graduate Education, Organization Structures, Library, Research, and Strategic Academic Framework.

These white papers were due in fall quarter; to date CPB understands that one is complete (Library) and some are nearing completion. Their purpose was to frame an informed, campus-wide perspective on what was (and still is) presumed to be another round of budget cuts. Delays in producing final documents have reduced their direct influence on budgeting, although there is residual benefit to the participants from learning about campus activities and their costs.

This year's budget process to determine reductions for 2010-11 closely mirrors the process followed last year. CPB had little input in developing the process but is hopeful that the provision of information to the committee, as detailed below, will address our concern about consultation. Even as this year's process moves along, we want to note that, at the conclusion of last year's process, CPB called for a more comprehensive base budget exercise by the campus. From CPB's June 2009 report:

> "**We call on the administration** to change the budgetary model of the campus, too long
> based on incremental growth and too long perceived as in need of change. Our own
> "UCSC Budget Handbook" (issued by the CPEVC and dated December 2008) argues for

this change: "The annual budget process currently focuses on incremental resources available to the campus, recognizing the need to undertake a closer review of base budgets over time with an eye towards understanding the adequacy of the base. This would be developed within the context of a broader qualitative review that must bring budgetary reality to the process" ("UCSC Budget Handbook," p. 12).

Given that this base budget process was not agreed to by the administration, over the course of the winter and spring quarters, CPB will provide the campus with reports about ongoing budget deliberations and cuts. Through these reports, the committee aims to inform faculty and staff about the budget reduction process and projection scenarios, CPB's perspective on the principles and justifications underlying the process, and the overall budget context of the University. We hope these updates will help to provide some of the transparency necessary to enable greater faculty participation in the process and a more considered assessment of the impacts and risks.

The senior management (principal officers) of all campus units (academic divisions, academic support and institutional support units) have submitted their budget reduction plans. The principal officers have been asked to provide information--submitting both an itemized listing and a narrative explanation of projected cuts and their consequences-- on how each unit would cut 5.5% and 11% from their budgets, as well as a scenario if these cuts are reduced. Based on this input and the CPB analysis, CPEVC Kliger, working with his Budget Advisory Group, will produce a proposed set of campus-wide budget cuts.

We emphasize the high level of uncertainty about the size of the cut to the campus budget. The state-funded part of UC's budget will not be known until a state budget is determined. Given recent history, that information will not be fully known until June or July of this year. Thus, the campus process must prepare for various possible outcomes, ranging from (an unlikely) budget increase to a more likely (but unknown in size) budget cut in the projected 5.5% to 11% range.

CPB's role in this budget projection and implementation process will be as follows. The administration will forward all materials to us as received from divisional officers. We will continue to consult weekly with CPEVC Kliger, and other administrative officials, amplifying the exchange of information, questions, projections, and analysis.

CPB is in the process of undertaking a parallel review of budget reduction submissions from all units. We will submit comments on all proposed budget plans, along with our campus-wide proposal, in advance of proposals from the administration's Budget Advisory Group and the final decision-making by CPEVC Kliger so that CPB can provide timely input into the consultation and decision-making process.

Any final decision-making authority rests with CPEVC Kliger.

Preparing for the budget reduction process was a primary activity of CPB during the fall 2009 quarter, and budget projection and implementation is the primary issue for winter and spring quarters. CPB will consider individual unit reduction proposals in the widest possible context. CPB also welcomes suggestions from faculty about reducing campus costs or increasing

revenue. It would be most appropriate to receive these suggestions or this feedback in winter quarter since our report and recommendations will need to be completed by mid-March.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
JJ Garcia-Luna
Gildas Hamel
Lori Kletzer
Piero Madau
Marc Mangel
Cindy Pease-Alvarez
Warren Sack   Jennifer De La Torre, SUA
Gene Switkes   Jerroyd Moore, SUA
Rob Wilson   Kevin Schlaufman, GSA
Brent Haddad, Chair

January 28, 2010

COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION AND ELECTIONS
Amendments to Bylaw 8.4.1 & 9.1

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (CRJE) is proposing changes to Santa Cruz Division Bylaw (SCB) 8.4.1 and 9.1, in order to make the days by which to submit petitions for mail ballots match for these two Bylaws, and to make clear who conducts mail ballots versus oversees them in the Santa Cruz Division.

Days allowed for requesting mail ballots

In 2003 the days given in 8.4.1 on Referendum changed from "not later than 21 calendar days after the Minutes of the Divisional Senate meeting reporting such action have been placed in the mail" to "not later than 21 calendar days after the Notice of Divisional Actions of the Santa Cruz Division or of the Executive Committee has been circulated to the Division either by mail or through direct electronic communications".

CRJE finds that the rationale for changing the days to match the Divisional Action Report applies also to 9.1. Here is the relevant quote for the 2003 justification: "Currently, the deadline for submitting petitions requesting a mail ballot referendum on an issue decided at a Divisional Senate meeting is tied to the distribution of the "minutes", without specifying whether they are draft minutes or approved minutes. Draft minutes really have no official status, and minutes of a meeting have taken as long as a year to be approved. Instead, we are proposing that the deadline for such petitions be tied to the Notice of Divisional Actions, which our Secretary must distribute to all Senate members within two weeks after each meeting. It is only divisional actions which are subject to referenda, and this change would require that referenda be initiated in a timely fashion after the Division has acted." The justification for that change to SCB 8.4.1 as submitted to the Senate in February 2003 is attached in Appendix A.

Conducting versus overseeing mail ballots

CRJE finds what appears to be a conflict in the language of SCB 4.3 which says that the Secretary "*conducts all elections and all mail balloting in the Santa Cruz Division, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections*" versus SCB 8.4.1 which says "*the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections shall conduct a referendum by mail ballot*" and SBC 9.1 which says "*The mail ballot referendum will be conducted by the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections.*"

The Committee recommends that the Senate Secretary be designated to conduct all mail ballots with CRJE overseeing them.

Current wording	Proposed wording
8.4.1 Referendum. Upon petition by at least 25 members of the Santa Cruz Division, the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections shall conduct a referendum by mail ballot on any specific action of the Santa Cruz Division or of the Executive Committee acting for the Santa Cruz Division. Such a petition must be submitted not later than 21 calendar days after the Notice of Divisional Actions of the Santa Cruz Division or of the Executive Committee has been circulated to the Division either by mail or through direct electronic communications. The results of such a mail ballot referendum are deemed conclusive. The Santa Cruz Division may not reconsider for a period of one year a question substantially the same as that decided by the mail ballot. [DLI 1996.10C and 1996.10E]	**8.4.1 Referendum.** Upon petition by at least 25 members of the Santa Cruz Division, the **Senate Secretary** ~~Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections~~ shall conduct a referendum by mail ballot **under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections,** on any specific action of the Santa Cruz Division or of the Executive Committee acting for the Santa Cruz Division. Such a petition must be submitted not later than 21 calendar days after the Notice of Divisional Actions of the Santa Cruz Division or of the Executive Committee has been circulated to the Division either by mail or through direct electronic communications. The results of such a mail ballot referendum are deemed conclusive. The Santa Cruz Division may not reconsider for a period of one year a question substantially the same as that decided by the mail ballot. [DLI 1996.10C and 1996.10E]
9.1 Definition: A "Memorial to the Regents" is a declaration or petition addressed to the President of the University of California for transmission to The Regents. A "Memorial to the President" is a declaration or petition to the President not intended for transmission to The Regents. A "Memorandum" is a so-designated declaration or petition addressed to other than the President or The Regents, such as to the Chancellor of Santa Cruz or to the campus's representatives to the Assembly. [SB 90, SB 85]	**9.1** [No change to paragraph 1]
The Division may submit Memorials to the President of the University of California and may initiate Memorials to The Regents on matters of Universitywide concern to be submitted to The Regents through the President. [SB 90B]	[No change to paragraph 2]
Memorials to the Regents, Memorials to the President, and Memoranda may be sent forward only after approval in a mail ballot by a	Memorials to the Regents, Memorials to the President, and Memoranda may be sent forward only after approval in a mail ballot by

majority of members of the Division eligible to cast votes, unless the decision not to conduct a mail ballot is made by the Santa Cruz Division at a Regular or Special Meeting at which the language of the ballot proposal shall be presented. If the Division decides against holding a mail ballot, a mail ballot will nevertheless be held upon petition of 25 voting members of the Division. Such a petition must be submitted not later than 21 calendar days after the Minutes of the Divisional Senate meeting reporting such action have been placed in the mail. The mail ballot referendum will be conducted by the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections in accordance with Universitywide Senate procedures [SB 95]; approval of the referendum by a majority vote shall constitute direction to the Division to send the Memorial to the Regents, Memorial to the President, or Memorandum forward.	a majority of members of the Division eligible to cast votes, unless the decision not to conduct a mail ballot is made by the Santa Cruz Division at a Regular or Special Meeting at which the language of the ballot proposal shall be presented. If the Division decides against holding a mail ballot, a mail ballot will nevertheless be held upon petition of 25 voting members of the Division. Such a petition must be submitted not later than 21 calendar days after the **Notice of Divisional Actions of the Santa Cruz Division or of the Executive Committee has been circulated to the Division either by mail or through direct electronic communications** ~~Minutes of the Divisional Senate meeting reporting such action have been placed in the mail~~. The mail ballot referendum will be conducted by the **Senate Secretary under the supervision of the** Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections in accordance with Universitywide Senate procedures [SB 95]; approval of the referendum by a majority vote shall constitute direction to the Division to send the Memorial to the Regents, Memorial to the President, or Memorandum forward.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION AND ELECTIONS
Jean Fox Tree
K.C. Fung
Ira Pohl
William Scott
John E. Jordan, Chair

January 26, 2010

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Amendment to Chapter 6.3 – Special Meetings

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

In its review of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections' proposed changes to Bylaw 8.4.1, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) noted an inconsistency in the number of petitioners necessary to call for a mail ballot (25) and those necessary to call for a Special Meeting (10) and recommends that the number be increased to twenty five. The very low number (10) to call for a Special Meeting was established in the 1960's at a time when 10 senators constituted a more significant fraction of the faculty. SEC endorses the principle that a small number of faculty should have means to call for a special meeting, but the current number of 10 is outdated and seems artificially low.

Current wording	Proposed wording
6.3 Special Meetings A Special Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division may be held on any day of instruction in the fall, winter, or spring quarter, and may be called by the President of the Academic Senate or by the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division. Upon written request of ten voting members, a meeting shall be called within fourteen calendar days by the Chair of the Division. If the request is received within less than fourteen calendar days before the end of the quarter, the meeting will be called within the first seven calendar days of the next fall, winter, or spring quarter.	**6.3 Special Meetings** A Special Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division may be held on any day of instruction in the fall, winter, or spring quarter, and may be called by the President of the Academic Senate or by the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division. Upon written request of ~~ten~~ **twenty five** voting members **except as provided for in SB 75.B,** a meeting shall be called within fourteen calendar days by the Chair of the Division. If the request is received within less than fourteen calendar days before the end of the quarter, the meeting will be called within the first seven calendar days of the next fall, winter, or spring quarter.

The Senate Bylaw 75 <u>Petition for Reconsideration and Referendum</u> addresses reconsideration of actions taken by the UC Academic Assembly and can be viewed at:
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#bl75

Respectfully submitted,

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Elizabeth Abrams
David Brundage
Maureen Callanan
Mark Carr
Sue Carter
Bruce Cooperstein
Carla Freccero
Brent Haddad
Norma Klahn
Phokion Kolaitis
Marc Mangel
Loisa Nygaard
John Tamkun
Lori Kletzer, Chair   January 13, 2010

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Framing a Senate Meeting Discussion of the Narrative Evaluation System

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

In 2000, UCSC adopted a revised student evaluation system that added mandatory letter grades (previously optional) to the existing performance evaluation system. It has now been ten years since that modification. Across the divisions, conversations are occurring, asking for a consideration of the size and scope of written performance evaluations. A group of department chairs in the Humanities Division are on record asking for the elimination of narratives, as are department chairs in Physical and Biological Sciences. While elimination is certainly one option, as is maintaining the current system, there are more options available. Therefore in the spirit of open discussion, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) offers the following summary of our current situation and some options for consideration.

OUR CURRENT SITUATION

Regulations
The current environment is dictated importantly by the following Senate Regulations:

> **9.2.1** *At the end of the term, each instructor teaching a credit granting course shall prepare a written evaluation for each student who receives a grade of P, A, B, C, or D in his or her class. The narrative evaluation must evaluate the quality and characteristics of the student's performance in the class.*
>
> **9.2.2** *Evaluations are to be filed with the Registrar and the student's college at the time of filing the end-of-term course reports or no later than 15 working days after the close of the term.*
>
> **16.2.1** *Each instructor in a graduate course shall prepare a written evaluation at the end of the term for each graduate student in his or her class who takes the course for credit.*
>
> **16.3.1** *An appeal may be filed if the student is persuaded that the instructor has given a grade notation or narrative evaluation based on:*
> > *A. inappropriate criteria such as race, politics, religion, age, sex, or national origin.*
> > *B. capricious or arbitrary application of appropriate criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements.*

Operationally, the current situation is advised by a Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) document, "Advisory Guidelines on Writing Undergraduate Performance (Narrative) Evaluations," (November 2001).

Quoting from that document:

> "**These (Senate) regulations can be faithfully redacted as follows:** *The instructor of record must submit a performance evaluation for each undergraduate student who receives credit for the course. The evaluation must describe, and is limited to, the quality and characteristics of the student's work. It is due 15 working days after the end of the quarter*. (Italics in original)
>
> With the exception of excluding clearly inappropriate material, the only requirement on evaluations content set by Senate Regulations is that they describe the 'quality and characteristics of the student's work.' No list of characteristics is provided, nor is there any expectation determining length, thoroughness, or specific content. The decision on how best to describe the quality and characteristics of student work is yours. You may decide to write highly- individual evaluations of each student. You may decide to use a spreadsheet macro to transform your grade sheets into descriptive text or to drive menus and grids. Performance evaluations may simply state the grade received, they may go further and contextualize the grade awarded the student, or they may be more synthetic. It is left to the instructor of record to decide what form of evaluation is most efficient, effective, and appropriate for your course and your students."

Academic Personnel Policies
The Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) also has a number of guidelines and policies designed to enforce the completion and timely submission of narrative evaluations by faculty. (See Appendix A.)

Costs
The estimated ongoing costs of Narrative Evaluation System (NES), for Information Technology Services (ITS) administrative support and customer service and for Registrar data entry is approximately $50,000 (Planning & Budget, May 2009). The costs of narrative evaluation accountability, in department staff time, in department chair time and the Academic Personnel Office (APO) staff (largely in the divisions) is difficult to estimate. Similarly, it is very difficult to estimate the costs of faculty and Teaching Assistant (TA) time in preparing the evaluations.

OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

What is clear is that limited resources, most clearly reduced TA support and reduced departmental staff, are putting renewed pressure on faculty time. More pressure on staff workload highlights the time and resources spent on accountability measures within the personnel process. The calls for elimination of narrative evaluations are coming out of this environment.

It is not the purpose of this document to lay out the arguments for and against narrative evaluations. This document seeks only to present a set of options for a campus discussion, amongst faculty, students and alums, of the current system and possible alternatives.

We see a conversation around the following options:

1. Maintain the current NES.

2. Complete elimination of NES.

3. Modify the scope of performance evaluations, such as limiting the requirement to classes under a certain size threshold (perhaps 25), and/or graduate enrollments, and/or upper-division undergraduate elective courses.

4. Make the narrative evaluation system instructor-optional, for a course of any size. Drop the accountability measures in the CAPM.

5. Revise NES so that the catalog description of the course appears automatically and a grade designation is automatically inserted into a simple sentence, such as "First name Last name received a B in this course." This automatically generated performance evaluation could be added too, optionally, by an instructor wishing to provide additional information. With an automated system, drop the accountability measures in the CAPM.

We invite you to discuss these options and others that may arise at the Senate meeting Wednesday, February 10, 2:30 Stevenson Event Center.

Respectfully submitted,

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Elizabeth Abrams
David Brundage
Maureen Callanan
Mark Carr
Sue Carter
Bruce Cooperstein
Carla Freccero
Brent Haddad
Norma Klahn
Phokion Kolaitis
Marc Mangel
Loisa Nygaard
John Tamkun
Lori Kletzer, Chair

January 29, 2010

<div align="center">
APPENDIX A:
POLICIES RELATING TO THE NARRATIVE EVALUATION SYSTEM IN THE CURRENT
CAMPUS ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL:
</div>

006.000 GUIDELINES FOR DELINQUENT NARRATIVE EVALUATIONS

A. POLICY REFERENCE

Academic Senate Regulation 9.2

B. GENERAL

1. Faculty at UCSC must give, as part of each student's grade in each course, a narrative evaluation of the student's work. Evaluations are required for all courses taken for credit. For undergraduate students, evaluations are required for all passing grades (A,B,C,D,P). Evaluations are not required for I, W, F, or NP grades, although faculty members may write evaluations if they choose. For graduate students, an evaluation is required for any course taken for credit, regardless of the grade received (even a failing grade).

2. Evaluations are due within fifteen working days after the end of the quarter (Academic Senate Regulation 9.2.2). Delinquency is determined by: 1) timeliness and 2) proportion of total evaluations submitted. Evaluations will be considered substantially delinquent if 10% or more of a class are not received within fifteen working days after the due date (excluding courses with enrollment of one student). Mitigating circumstances such as delayed reports from field supervisors, illness, or other circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member shall be taken into consideration. Should there be a delay, the department chair must judge whether or not the circumstances are such that the faculty member can be considered to be in good-faith compliance with the requirement that the evaluations be written in a timely fashion.

3. Departments can access reports regarding narrative evaluation submission and timeliness via COGNOS. The Timeliness Report provides information on a faculty member's timeliness, but only lists courses for which narratives were submitted. The Outstanding Evaluations Report lists courses for which narratives have not been submitted. Both reports should be used to evaluate a faculty member's timeliness in submitting narrative evaluations.

4. Departments should be aware however that the Outstanding Evaluations Report will only report on those courses for which the faculty member submitted the corresponding grades. Therefore, departments may also wish to check the Missing Grades Report, available in COGNOS, to ensure greater accuracy.

C. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

1. It is the duty of the department chair to determine whether or not a faculty member has, in good-faith, complied with the requirement that evaluations be written and submitted within fifteen working days after the end of the quarter (CAPM 312.245).

2. In order to determine compliance, the chair should:

a) Make a written request to the faculty member for explanations of any missing evaluations and projected completion date.

b) If the faculty member replies that s/he has not yet written the evaluations, the chair will determine whether or not the reasons given for the delay are valid.

c) If the reasons for the delay are determined to be valid, the chair and the faculty member in question will agree in writing on a new completion date. If the new date for completion is not met, the faculty member must provide reasons why s/he needs another extension, or else be considered to be delinquent on the evaluations.

3. Evaluations submitted via e-mail will be entered into the NES system within 30 days of receipt. However, because of the possibility of delay in processing, department chairs may wish to check with the Registrar's Office to be sure that the evaluations have not been submitted by the faculty member.

4. The department letter for faculty personnel actions must include an assessment of the timeliness with which student narrative evaluations are completed. Substantially delinquent evaluations must be treated in department letters as a serious deficiency in evaluation of the faculty member's overall teaching record. The extent and duration of the deficiency must be documented in the review file. Failure to comply with narrative evaluation requirements may lead to a denial of salary increase, merit increase, promotion, reappointment, sabbatical or other leave. For Unit 18 titles, because teaching is the main responsibility of lecturer appointments, failure to comply with narrative evaluation requirements in a timely fashion is an especially serious deficiency.

D. DELINQUENT NARRATIVE EVALUATIONS AND ACCESS TO STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Student evaluations of a faculty member's teaching are normally part of the review file for a personnel action. Students are informed that the faculty member cannot have access to the student evaluations until the faculty member has completed the narrative evaluations for the class. If the chair determines that the faculty member has delinquent narrative evaluations at the time the faculty member is to submit materials for the review file, those student evaluations cannot be included in the file. Consequently, the chair will include in the department letter a statement that the student evaluations are not included because of delinquency in completing narrative evaluations for the course. The absence of student evaluations due to delinquent narratives will be considered a major deficiency in the faculty member's teaching record.

E. DELINQUENT NARRATIVE EVALUATIONS AND REQUESTS FOR LEAVE

1. Leave privileges (sabbatical or leave with or without salary) shall not normally be approved for faculty members who are substantially delinquent in submitting evaluations. It is the responsibility of the department chair to insure that delinquent narrative evaluations have been completed before forwarding or approving a leave (CAPM 312.245).

2. Chairs may recommend individual exceptions to this policy under justifiable circumstances. Authority for approval of exceptions to this policy rests with the individual with the authority to approve the leave.