Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Wednesday, October 28, 2009 at 2:30 p.m.
Stevenson Event Center
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes (none)

2. Announcements
    a. Chair Kletzer
    b. Chancellor Blumenthal
    c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports
    CONSENT CALENDAR:
    a. Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1613)   p. 1
    b. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1615)   p. 7
    c. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1614) p. 14
    d. Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AS/SCP/1616) p. 24
    e. Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1617) p. 27
    f. Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1618) p. 30
    g. Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1611) p. 40
    h. Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1619) p. 45
    i. Committee on International Education (AS/SCP/1620) p. 52
    j. Committee on Preparatory Education (AS/SCP/1621) p. 54
    k. Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1622) p. 57
    l. Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1623) p. 59
    m. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (AS/SCP/1624) p. 65
    n. Committee on the Teaching (AS/SCP/1625) p. 69
    o. Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1626) p. 73

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees
    a. Committee on Committees
        i.   Additional Nominations (AS/SCP/1627) p. 78
    b. Committee on Educational Policy
        i.   Update on General Education Reform

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair
8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President
9. Petitions of Students (none)
10. Unfinished Business
    a. Resolutions C and D from October 19, 2009 Special Senate Meeting (AS/SCP/1612) p. 79
11. University and Faculty Welfare
12. New Business

October 22, 2009

Members of the Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues:

Building from the energy and enthusiasm in evidence at our Special Senate meeting last week, we will meet for a second time this month at our first planned regular Senate meeting of the 2009-10 academic year. Please confirm this previously-announced date in your calendars: **Wednesday, October 28 at 2:30pm in the Stevenson Event Center** (click here for agenda). We have much to discuss. We will hear from Chancellor Blumenthal and EVC Kliger. The annual reports of our hard-working Senate committees are included in the agenda. I encourage you to take a look at these reports, as there are and will continue to be many provocative issues studied and discussed by our colleagues on these committees. We will also hear an update on General Education from the chair of our Senate committees on Educational Policy (CEP) We will take up unfinished business from our October 19 Special Senate meeting. I will provide an update on issues raised at that Special meeting.

At the risk of repeating myself, as preparation, I encourage you to check out the Senate web page for our 2008-09 CPB's reports on the budget process (click here for CPB/Budget Cuts), and various Senate Executive Committee (SEC) letters on the salary reduction/furlough plan, along with my September 8 letter (click here). In addition you can find information on and about the various Senate committees.

I look forward to seeing you on October 28.

Sincerely,

Lori Kletzer, Chair
Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) met quarterly this year, in addition to sponsoring a major public event on digital privacy. CAF reviewed and discussed matters generated from UCSC as well as UCAF matters. Specific areas are outlined below.

Forum on Security with Eben Moglen
Eben Moglen, Professor of Law at Columbia University, Founding Director of the Software Freedom Law Center, and one of the country's leading scholarly authorities on public information and electronic privacy, gave a public lecture on October 23 and held a working meeting with research and Instructional Technology (IT) staff on October 24. The lecture (available on audio file from the media center) was very stirring and well-attended, and treated the philosophical, political, and juridical roots of information freedom and privacy. Prior to the working meeting, Professor Moglen distributed a working document to discuss possible policy modifications, a copy of which is attached to this report. The IT staff was uniformly interested in Professor Moglen's proposals, and Professor Moglen felt that UCSC, given the quality and commitment of its IT and research staff, was well positioned to make policy alterations that could have a major impact on electronic freedom and privacy in higher education across the country. The deteriorating and ambiguous budget situation—and its impact on our IT sector— made it difficult to pursue these recommendations over the past year. We hope that continued attention will be paid to these important matters.

RE-89 protocols on campus
At its September, 2007, meeting, the Board of Regents adopted RE-89, a Regental resolution requiring adoption of special review, approval, and reporting procedures for proposals to obtain research funding from the tobacco industry. Each campus was required to have local implementation procedures in place by January 2009. CAF ascertained that UCSC's procedures were satisfactory, and reported this to UCAF. Local procedure has Vice Chancellor of Research (VCR) Bruce Margon determine whether it is necessary to form an ad hoc committee for further review and management of a research activity. The VCR would contact CAF if such a committee was necessary and a CAF member would service ex- officio on the ad hoc.

Collegiality Issue from University Committee on Academic Freedom, (UCAF)
CAF reviewed a document on collegiality from UCAF suggesting changes to the APM that would give some guidelines as to appropriate and inappropriate use of collegiality in personnel evaluations. Opinions were mixed on the advisability of changing the APM in this regard.

UCAF Bylaws 125A, 128, & 130
The Committee on Academic Freedom strongly supports the proposed change to the UCAF bylaws, which would give the chair a two-year term, as well as a seat on the Academic Council. Although Chairs have routinely been appointed to more than one term, a two-year term would, in part through a better use of the learning curve, help the chair function more efficiently. The Academic Council component was deemed more important. UCAF found that there were often matters on the Academic Council agenda that had serious academic freedom implications. On

several occasions our non-representation resulted in lengthy back and forth discussion. It would have been very useful and more efficient to have direct representation on the Council. It would also signify that academic freedom will continue to be taken seriously at the central level. Unfortunately, this was not approved by the Council.

Administrative Oversight of Changes to Departments or Programs
There was quite a bit of confusion in the last academic year about possible changes to the Community Studies Department. CAF took this matter very seriously. In the current budgetary climate, there could very easily be pressure on administrators to close, combine, or rearrange departments, and we feel that extra attention to possible academic freedom issues is always warranted in these cases. Community Studies was an important example. The department had on several occasions been attacked by right-wing media and political groups, and while there is no reason to suspect that such attacks had any bearing at all on the possible reorganization, in cases such as this it is especially important to rigorously avoid even a semblance of outside interference. Procedural matters—including the first use of Appendix G (appended to Academic Programs & Departments: Guidelines for Establishment and Disestablishment)—led to a Senate review. CAF was not part of this review, but CAF communicated to Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Galloway and the SEC that in the future CAF should be consulted on all matters related to establishment and disestablishment. SEC Chair Quentin Williams recommended to VPAA Galloway that CAF be added to Appendix G with Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Graduate Council (GC), and Planning and Budget (CBP). The Office of the VPAA will be reviewing Appendix G and will send out a revised version for consultation in fall quarter.

Review Systemwide Policy APM -010 on Academic Freedom for Students Appendix B
UCSC's Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) met to discuss the Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry document forwarded from UCAF. We appreciate and approve the spirit of the document. The Committee made some minor recommendations for changes to the Senate Chair, who incorporated our response in his response to the Academic Council.

Issues for the Coming Year
If time permits, we hope that renewed attention can be paid to the electronic privacy issues raised in the Moglen visit. These issues have important implications for academic freedom, and UCSC would be able to have a national impact on academic policy in this regard.

All members opined that the CAF would need to pay careful and focused attention to academic freedom issues that could arise in conjunction with budget-driven changes to instruction and research. Compromises to academic freedom could take a number of possible forms, such as: excessive deference to real or perceived donor, regential, legislative, or gubernatorial preferences, resulting in the discouragement of potentially controversial areas of scholarly inquiry, corporate or private partnerships that could adversely affect members of the campus with interests in conflict with said partnerships; and other policies designed to avoid controversy or improve access to funding. In moments such as the present crisis, it is especially important that the Senate protect and extend its deepest and most important freedoms.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM
David Draper
Raja Guha Thakurta
Nicole Paiement
Mary Beth Pudup
Chris Connery, Chair   Ellen Newberry, Non Senate Teaching Faculty

August 31, 2009

Appendix 1

Policies for a Free University Network

Eben Moglen

October 20, 2008

Network data services are rapidly becoming indispensable to ordinary daily life everywhere, and nowhere more than on university campuses. Students, teachers, researchers, and the general public depend extensively on data delivered over the public internet to enable a diverse range of activities without which their work, learning and socializing would be impossible.

But very few users of the network understand the extent to which surveillance and data mining subject them to scrutiny, influence and control in the net, just as very few understand the extent to which bad monopoly software has created the security problems in the net that threaten their safety at every turn. Unconstitutional and illegal actions by a national government capitalizing on fear to establish some of the preconditions of a 21st-century police state have infected commercial ISPs and all the long-haul telecommunications oligopolists who control the wide pipes in the national net. And although networks are intended and designed for sharing data, incumbents—particularly entertainment packagers—whose business models depend on prohibiting decent interpersonal conduct now roam the net attempting to intimidate and extort money from young people using the network for its intended purpose. Inevitable near-term technological developments will add the textbook publishers to the list of parties seeking to make university students the victims of their efforts to protect their businesses at the expense of the public.

In this context, the university's decisions about the operation of its network are crucial not only to the university's own freedom of action in pursuit of its responsibilities, but also to the civic freedom of students, teachers, and the larger public.

Beyond meeting operational performance commitments, therefore, network management should be designed to achieve other policy goals:

- Assuring freedom of access to knowledge, technology and culture for the protection of academic freedom and the advancement of the university's core mission;

1

Moglen / *Free University Networks*   2

- Preventing the university network from becoming a powerful surveil-lance system subsidizing criminal, illegal, or unconstitutional activities by outsiders aimed at harming or controlling students, faculty, staff and other community members;

- Protecting both the university and the community against abusive or bur-densome litigation;

- Serving as a source of information, and an example of free public access, to the broader community of taxpayers whose fiscal contribution makes the university possible.

Implementing these policy goals occurs in both IT and Legal areas of compe-tence and responsibility in these major areas:

- *Principle of minimal information collection*: University networks should be managed to collect and preserve information about users only to the ex-tent required for University purposes. Information not needed by the University should be discarded at the earliest possible moment.

  This principle means that layer seven services (library circulation, reg-istration, bursary, etc.) should be authenticated and access-controlled. Layer 2 and 3 services (getting a wireless or wired IP address and access-ing the public internet) should be public: unauthenticated, anonymous, and uncontrolled. MAC addresses should be discarded in DHCP logs and elsewhere as unreliable data, trivially forged, whose preservation is an invitation to abuse by outsiders. Location information for real-time tracking of users not employing authenticated services should not be ob-tainable regardless of the degree of legal compulsion applied.

- *Principle of active privacy maintenance*: The University should accept prac-tical though not legal responsibility for the protection of community-members' privacy. Email privacy should be encouraged by distribution and support for industry-standard public key encryption software that is freely available at no charge. All authenticated services should be SSL-based so browsers automatically provide basic privacy services. Firefox Campus Edition with NoScript and AdBlock should be provided free to everyone (as it is, of course, free to the University) for the same reason.

  At the legal level, the University should commit to challenging *every* sub-poena or national security letter requiring it requiring it to spy on or be-come a testimonial resource against members of the community. To re-quire parties to prove to a neutral magistrate that they have good legal ground to invade the precincts of academic freedom in order to enforce their legal rights or powers is not too much to ask. The University should guarantee that students who have a right under PURPA or otherwise to challenge legal actions invading their privacy or assigning liability based on their use of campus network resources have access to competent, free

counsel. The University of California's law schools now contain clinics capable of providing such representation, and a commitment to support those clinics politically (without any additional economic commitment) would be sufficient to inspire the provision of all necessary legal person-power under the intellectual direction of existing teachers and lawyers.

The University should actively push back against parties attempting to force deployment of the University network against students and faculty. Merely complying with—or even occasionally challenging—subpoenas issued to the University to fish for information about people who reject anti-Islamist witch-hunting, or who don't accept movie-company propaganda against fair use rights, is insufficient. Parties outside the University community must understand that there is a price to pay for breaching centuries-old understandings of the right to free inquiry, free speech, and free discussion. The University should commit to associating itself with the other forces that protect and defend those rights, and to adding its mite to the ongoing attempts to ensure the values for which the University stands.

- *Principle of maximum public access*: All universities are beacons of access to knowledge in the age of the Net. But public universities are also public spaces, accountable for access to the community of which they are a part in the narrower traditional sense that the town square or the park is a venue of public expression. The University should seek to extend its network to provide low-cost and freedom-respecting network transport services for everyone it can conveniently and economically reach, including where possible the neighborhoods where students live, as well as the locale in which students and faculty work.

Adoption of policies that implement these goals is no more optional than the changes made by universities to adapt to the changing nature of American society forty and more years ago. UC Santa Cruz exists because visionary leaders perceived the need for an institution that didn't just accept those changes reluctantly, but made the adaptation of the university to the needs of a new generation the very reason for its being. Nothing less is demanded of UCSC now.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Duties
The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) makes recommendations to the Chancellor, the Campus Provost/ Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) and/or the Divisional Deans on appointments, promotions, merit increases, and mid-career appraisals for Senate faculty, adjunct faculty, and professional researchers. During the past year, CAP also made recommendations on faculty salary issues, and advised the Academic Senate and the administration on policy matters related to academic personnel issues. CAP's role is to provide senate consultation and to make recommendations on faculty personnel cases. CAP is not a deciding authority.

This year CAP had one representative from Arts, one from Engineering, two from Humanities, two from Physical and Biological Sciences, and three from Social Sciences (including the chair).

CAP members were very impressed again with the high quality of our colleagues' scholarly accomplishments, their dedicated and innovative teaching, and their heavy workload in valuable service. The most rewarding aspect of the committee's work is learning about the exciting new work of our colleagues and gaining appreciation for the full scope of their activities.

Workload
In 2008-09 CAP continued its established practice of meeting weekly on Thursday afternoons. The Committee met 31 times during the academic year (9, 11, and 11 meetings, in fall, winter, and spring quarters, respectively).

CAP made recommendations on 272 personnel cases – 6 fewer than last year, but an increase of about 100 in the ten years since 1998-09. Furthermore, almost half of the cases involved requests for accelerations or greater-than-normal salaries. These cases typically require more reading and discussion. As stated in the last two years' Annual Reports, this increased workload is combined with lower levels of compensation than that offered to CAP members on other UC campuses.

In recent years our CAP has reduced our use of Ad Hoc committees, bringing our campus more in line with practices on other UC campuses. This year we reduced the number even further – with a total of 23 Ad Hoc committees formed this year – reduced from 40 in 2007-08. Typically CAP constituted itself as the Ad Hoc committee for Midcareer reviews and for advancement to Step VI, unless there was substantial disagreement at previous levels of review.

CAP reviewed 43 appointment files for tenure track positions.   Even with the adjustments in the salary scales that were enacted in October 2007, most initial appointments are being made with significant off-scale salary increments to meet competing offers. CAP encouraged more consistency in starting salary offers across divisions than has been the case in previous years.

CAP reviewed 6 retention /salary increase files, and 2 Career Equity review files.

CAP's Recommendations Compared to Administrative Decisions
During 2008-2009 the number of cases in which the final administrative decision differed from CAP's recommendation was up slightly compared to the numbers in recent years. The two concurred 89% of the time (243 out of 272 completed files), up from 81% last year though still a bit lower than for the other UC campuses (which all report agreement above 90%). Of the 29 disagreements, 7 concerned new appointments. In 4 of these cases the final negotiated salary was higher than the original offer, 2 resulted in lower salaries than CAP had recommended, and one hire was at a higher step than CAP had recommended.

In three merit or promotion cases CAP disagreed with the CP/EVC about the appropriate Step – two in which CAP recommended a lower step, and one in which CAP recommended a higher step.

In 22 merit or promotion cases there were disagreements concerning salary (7 with dean authority, 13 with CP/EVC authority, and 2 with Chancellor's authority). In 3 of the dean authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded, and in 4 cases a lower salary. In 12 of the CP/EVC authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary than was awarded, and in 1 case CAP recommended a lower salary. In Chancellor authority cases, CAP recommended a higher salary on 1 case and a lower salary on 1 case.

Consultation
At the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year the CAP chair together with CAP members from the appropriate divisions met with Deans and department chairs of each division. The CAP chair also attended two group meetings with department chairs and department managers arranged by the CP/EVC's office, one in the fall and one in the spring. CAP met with all of the deans and divisional coordinators in the fall to discuss off-scale salary practices (see Faculty Salaries section below).

CAP met with CP/EVC Kliger early in the year and we agreed that all preliminary disagreements would be discussed with CAP Chair Callanan, and with the committee if deemed necessary. The same arrangement was made with the Deans, and with Chancellor Blumenthal, for the cases on which they were the deciding authority. Our communication with the Deans, the Chancellor, and the CP/EVC was excellent throughout the year. A number of meetings with CAP were held and the discussions were very useful in ensuring that the different views on the case were carefully considered before a decision was made. We look forward to following this practice in the coming year.

Throughout the year the CAP Chair consulted with the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Pamela Peterson and with Professor Sandra Chung, Faculty Assistant to the CP/EVC for academic personnel when questions arose about policy issues.

Case Flow, Ad Hoc Committees
Timely submission of personnel files to CAP continued to improve this year. The caseload was more consistent across winter and spring quarters than in previous years and things were uncharacteristically uncongested toward the end of spring quarter. We commend the Academic

Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Personnel Coordinators for their work in reminding departments of the deadlines and encouraging them to meet those deadlines. Still there were some cases submitted quite late. Three cases were carried over to 2009-10 – two of these did not

reach CAP by the last meeting of spring quarter, and the third was sent back for additional information.

We have occasionally heard that some faculty believe CAP to be the rate-limiting step in the review process. This is rarely true, although there was one exception in Fall 2008 when CAP held back a number of recommendations until we had reached an agreement on new guidelines for off-scale salary recommendations (see Faculty Salaries section below). We regretted this delay but felt it was necessary to ensure that consistent recommendations were made across all cases being considered during the year. Other than this period in the fall, however, all cases were reviewed within two weeks of receipt, and the recommendation letter from CAP was sent forward one week after the review. The average turnaround is two weeks for actions not requiring an Ad Hoc Committee. The only other significant delays occurred when an ad hoc committee was convened. It should be noted that CAP nominates members of these committees (typically 9 nominees), but the appointment of members and supervision of the Ad Hoc Committee review is a function of the administration. In our view, the Academic Personnel Office has been very efficient in their attempts to form committees and get the report to CAP.

During 2008-2009, 60 Senate members served as members of Ad Hoc committees. Six people served twice and 54 people served once. The academic personnel process cannot function without our colleagues' continued willingness to serve on ad hoc committees, and CAP thanks each and every Senate member who so served.

Faculty Salaries
The Senate-Administrative Joint Task Force on Faculty Salaries that met in 2007-08 made a number of recommendations regarding low faculty salaries at UCSC compared to the other UC campuses. CAP spent many hours in meetings on this issue during fall 2008. We conferred with the Senate Executive Committee, the CP/EVC, the Deans and their Divisional Coordinators, the Academic Personnel Office staff, and also with UCAP (who had the Joint Task Force report on their agenda throughout the year). The major concern for CAP was the Task Force recommendation that CAP should recommend higher off-scale salaries for greater-than-normal merit increases (although the CAP chair also served on a subcommittee of the Senate Executive Committee to consider the other recommendations of the report). Our typical campus practice for many years has been to recommend an additional half-step of off-scale salary for faculty whose files are evaluated as "greater than normal" because they have exceeded expectations in some areas, and a full step acceleration for those faculty who are evaluated as having exceeded expectations in all areas (research, teaching, and service). Based on our discussions with CAP members from other campuses on UCAP, we believe that our past off-scale practices may not be directly responsible for our salary distribution differences from other campuses. However, with CP/EVC Kliger's support, we took the recommendation very seriously as a way to begin to address the problem through adjustment of CAP salary recommendations.

With the help of the APO staff we used salary data to examine several "what if" scenarios estimating what current salary levels would be if different off-scale amounts had been awarded in the past, and comparing these with the median salaries for each rank on the other campuses. Based on these data we developed a proposal to revise our practices in recommending off-scale salary levels. CP/EVC Kliger, the Deans, and the divisional and APO staff all discussed the proposals and a consensus was reached. We began this revised practice in 2008-09, and carried it out consistently for all cases reviewed that year, with the understanding that the same practice will remain in effect for at least three years.

The change in recommendations for greater-than-normal merit increases and accelerations involves the use of two types of greater-than-normal salary increases. As in the past, when a file demonstrates merit beyond the level of excellence required for a normal merit or promotion, it is classified as either a greater-than-normal (single step advancement plus an off-scale component) or an acceleration-in-step advancement. What changes in the current practice is that two levels of off-scale amounts are used. In particular, while greater-than-normal files that are closer to a normal merit will be considered for an increase of one-half-step of off-scale salary, files that are closer to meriting a full step acceleration will be considered for an off-scale increase equal to $100 less than the next step. Further, recommendations of accelerations in step, to steps lower than Professor Step 6, can be considered for an additional off-scale component beyond the full step, usually an additional one-half step. While merit increases corresponding to these various levels have been used intermittently in the past, the intent was to systematically consider this suite of possible actions when strong faculty dossiers were discussed, and to make appropriate recommendations. CAP strives for consistency in its recommendations, but every case is considered individually, and some exceptions were made to what was otherwise a suite of standard recommendations.

We expect to continue to monitor the faculty salary data for our own campus as well as the other UC campuses. UCAP plans to request regular monitoring of the median salaries across the UC campuses as well as monitoring UC-wide salaries versus our comparison universities (where UC has been steadily falling as well). And CP/EVC Kliger has requested careful monitoring of our salaries relative to other UC campuses as we evaluate the new off-scale system.

Other Policy Issues
CAP was asked to discuss and comment on a number of other policy issues throughout the year – either by the campus Senate chair or by UCAP. In particular, CAP commented on the UCOP proposed furlough and emergency powers policies in the spring and added our voice to the Senate's concerns about the procedures by which this policy was implemented. We expect that the furloughs will raise a number of policy issues that will be discussed by CAP and UCAP in the coming year. CAP also discussed the issue of evaluation of teaching across disciplines and will continue discussions in the coming year, including consultation with the chair of the Committee on Teaching.

In spring 2009 CAP was also asked to comment on the report of the campus Academic Personnel Work Group regarding potential changes to the personnel review system. A number of changes in delegation of authority have been made in recent years, with the Deans being delegated more

types of personnel cases. The work group recommended further delegations, and this year's CAP will be meeting with APO staff to discuss the possibility of these further changes to policy.

CAP also discussed a number of issues that came up through our deliberations. We worked very hard to consistently recognize faculty contributions to diversity, and were impressed to find the variety of ways that our colleagues are making such contributions to diversity on the campus and in their disciplines. We will continue to discuss implementation of the diversity criterion of the APM next year, including a discussion with the chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity as part of the CAP fall orientation.

One other area of consideration for CAP throughout 2008-09 was our many discussions regarding how to treat faculty from all divisions and departments uniformly, while also recognizing the vast differences in how they carry out their work. We spent a great deal of time considering, for example, the patterns of productivity for faculty from disciplines focused on articles vs. books vs. exhibitions, and other types of scholarly pursuits. While it is an enormous challenge to balance across the many factors that we consider, the strong intention was always to make equitable recommendations that take inherent disciplinary differences into account.

Retention
The number of retention cases was down slightly this past year, although they have been slightly more common in recent years. The administration has asked CAP to comment on some possible best practices for retention; we expect to engage in further discussion on this topic in the coming year.

2008-09 – 6 files
2007-08 – 8 files
2006-07 – 12 files
2005-06 – 10 files
2004-05 – 2 files
2003-04 – 1 file
2002-03 – 1 file

Suggestions for Improving Personnel Files
In a memo dated May 27, 2009 CAP attempted to clarify some of the confusing issues regarding Bylaw 55 voting rights, especially the categories used to report votes on personnel actions. Please reference this memo (which is available on CAP's website http://senate.ucsc.edu/cap/) should you have questions about such issues as when a vote should be counted as waived versus recused, what abstaining means, and a number of related issues.

In the paragraphs below we reiterate some of the advice given in previous CAP annual reports. In the past year we saw evidence of careful work in preparation of files from most departments, and evidence that past CAP advice had been heard. For example, the number of excessively long department letters has declined. We thank the many faculty and staff involved in the personnel process for their hours of work and attention to detail. At the same time, we provide below a reminder of some of the tips that may make the process easier for all involved.

It is understandable that departments want to advocate for step and salary increases. However, the most effective letters contain a balanced evaluation of the performance during the period under review. For example, if the teaching evaluations contain a significant number of negative comments, or the rate of publication is lower than typically seen in that discipline these issues should be addressed in the letter.

Although most departments do an excellent job with their letters, some could still be more concise and could include less jargon. The best letters, even for significant accelerations, are typically three to five pages long. Keep in mind that long quotes from external letters are not helpful since we read the external letters as well. CAP members (and other reviewers) need a concise summary of the key focus of the work, and an assessment of the impact of the work.

Some explanation of the nature of the work, in terms that non-specialists can understand, is always appreciated. Lengthy expositions can work to the disadvantage of the faculty member because key summary points are buried in pages of text that are skimmed through quickly.

If a department requests more than a one-step advancement they must specify the areas in which they judge the performance of the professor to be exceptional. Advancement of more than one step should be justified by a level of achievement that is clearly above the norm in all three areas: scholarship, teaching, AND service. Be specific about which publications and activities are new for the current period of review, and which have been considered in previous reviews.

Faculty should not be expected to write lengthy personal statements. Three to five pages will always suffice. These statements are not required, but they can be useful for the department's preparation of the file and for later reviewers. For advancements that require letters from external evaluators, five or six letters are sufficient if at least three of these are solicited by the department, not the candidate. External letter writers really should be external – except perhaps in the case of a mid-career review, external letters from collaborators or former mentors are evaluated in a very different light than "truly" external letters.

Acknowledgements
We wish to commend the very hard work of the exceptionally strong staff of the Academic Senate and of the Academic Personnel Office. We are deeply indebted to Terilynn Bench, Elizabeth Dane, Nancy Degnan, Susan Fellows, Grace Little, Leslie Marple, Lorayn Tiffany, and Linda Tursi. Senior Analyst Nancy Furber and AVC Pamela Peterson were always available with detailed information about subtle aspects of policy. We are also very grateful to our Senate Analyst Pamela Edwards for keeping our work moving so smoothly, and for taking on her exceedingly heavy workload with grace and good humor. We also thank Senate Administrative Assistant Tamara Blake for her able assistance with agenda and file preparation.

Finally, we once again thank all of our colleagues who have contributed to the personnel process. The process works as well as it does only because of your hard work.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Carolyn Dean
Margaret Fitzsimmons
Peter Kenez
Thorne Lay
Glenn Millhauser
Paul Roth
Dana Takagi
Manfred Warmuth
Maureen Callanan, Chair

October 16, 2009

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) had a successful year, working with the Offices of Admissions and of Financial Aid, and achieving significant accomplishments in campus connections, committee configuration, and admissions policy.

I. Data on Admissions and Financial Aid
A. Admissions
For Fall 2009, we admitted 65 percent of our 32,874 applicants, a significant rise in selectivity from last year's 72 percent admit rate. Of these, 19 percent accepted our offer of admission with the result that the class will have about 3200 new frosh and 800 new transfer students. Compared with the previous two years, the number of applicants remained about the same, and the admission rate and the yield rate (acceptance of admission/admission) declined slightly. Combined with a lower target enrollment, the class is 16 percent smaller than last year.

Among frosh Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs), there were only modest shifts in planned majors and fields. For Fall 2009, the percents of frosh SIRS for majors in the Arts was 6.6 percent; in Engineering 8.5 percent; in Humanities 8.2 percent; in Physical and Biological Sciences 24 percent; and in Social Sciences 25 percent.

B. Financial Aid
In 2008-09 the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office administered $160 million in financial assistance for graduate students, undergraduate students and their parents. Undergraduate students received $80 million in grant and scholarship assistance from university, state, federal and private sources. In addition the office administered $80 million in federal student, federal parent and private education loans.

About 65 percent of undergraduates (9,300) received financial support, 52 percent received grant or scholarship support, and 28 percent of received Federal Pell Grants—a needs-based grant program for low income students.

UC Santa Cruz scholarship programs provide $3 million for undergraduate students. In 2008-09 154 Regents Scholars received $965,000; 28 Karl S. Pister Leadership Opportunity Award Scholars received $250,000, and $1.8 million was awarded to 1,100 undergraduates based on academic achievement combined with financial need.

Nonetheless, there is a significant and growing gap between family need and available funds. Scholarship support for UC Santa Cruz undergraduates, $210 per undergraduate, lags behind support at other UC campuses. UCB averages $1075 and UCLA averages $650 in aid per undergraduate student.

The need for aid has increased for 2009-2010, both among new applicants and among continuing students requesting a re-evaluation of their eligibility for financial aid.

C. Appeals

There were 431 on-time frosh appeals, with 110 offered fall admission, 165 offered the Shared Experience with UC Merced, and 156 denied. Among the 110, more than half met our selection criteria, but this could not be determined from the self-reported academic record. A bit less than half of the appeals were compelling and within 100 to 200 points of the point cutoff. About a dozen had a single bad grade but looked good overall. 5 cases were treated as Admission by Exception.

II. Work of CAFA in 2008-2009
A. Campus Connections
The Committee interfaced with several campus and Senate processes, with mixed results.

1. Web Presence.

CAFA discussed the project several times this year with University Relations, Information Technology Services project leadership, and the new Web Council. Overall progress appeared to Be slow but not intangible.

CAFA was unable to gain the full support of Student Affairs in its attempt to create a single web page for students on ―how to get involved.‖

2. *High Level Indicators*

During the fall quarter, the campus worked to evaluate a set of ―high level indicators‖ that might be used to judge the success of the campus in achieving its aspirations. The outcome of this process of developing campus-level indicators, and potential inclusion of measures related to admissions and financial aid, surprisingly absent from the original is unclear.

3. Student Affairs

CAFA took part in this year‗s ultimately cancelled search for a Director of Admissions. We expressed our deep concern about the current situation to the Chancellor and to the Senate Executive Committee. CAFA is also worried by the elimination of the EOP Director position and the Executive Director of Student Academic Support Services. Both of these positions are intended to increase student retention, especially for low income and minority students. Senate consultation was absent in these decisions that directly affect our academic mission.

B. Committee Configuration
New this year, CAFA established five working subcommittees: Appeals, Data, Honors, Publications, and Web Presence. The new configuration helped CAFA achieve many goals and is expected to continue in future years.

1. The Appeals subcommittee

The Appeals subcommittee agreed on the following principles for considering appeals for frosh status.

a. Appeals will be granted for students who meet UCSC's selection criteria but had been denied in error.

b. Appeals will be granted for students whose Comprehensive Review Score is within approximately 200 points, provided no other issues (see below) exist and who have compelling explanations.

c. Appeals will generally be denied for students whose grades in the senior year have gone down, especially if the schedule is not extremely demanding or the overall grade point average has slipped a lot from previous years.

d. A single D or F grade in an ‗a-g‘ course in the senior year does not preclude the consideration of the appeal.

e. If the student presents information about a disability, the Disability Resource Center will be consulted to gain insight on the affects of the disability on their academic performance.

f. If students are UC eligible, and they present no senior year grade issues, but their appeal is not very compelling and/or they are not close to UCSC's selection cutoff (this year 5,425), the student will be offered the UCSC – UCM Shared Experience option, which guarantees admission to UCSC at the junior level provided that standards are met at Merced.

g. If the student has submitted recommendations, those that speak to the student's potential for academic success will be given slightly more weight than other recommendations. Recommendations may not be the sole reason for a positive admissions decision.

The subcommittee made no policy decisions about transfer student appeals. Due to a complex transfer appeals case during the summer, the 2008-9 and 2009-10 CAFA chairs determined that all transfer appeals and variations on the conditions of enrollment should be subject to CAFA chair review pending the creation of similarly-specific policies.

2. The Data subcommittee.

The Data subcommittee, assisted by Analyst Mary Masters, Analyst Sue Grimes, and Associate Director Michael McCawley, sought to discover which factors, among an array of variables, most influenced first year GPA at UCSC. A preliminary set of regression analyses revealed that High School GPA, SAT total, and SAT SUBJ scores all had large and statistically significant positive effects on first year GPA. Subsequent analyses were conducted to gauge the effects on first year GPA and related factors of some modifications to the present system of admissions. Currently, applicants are given a score that is mechanically generated by a formula and is called

the Computed Index (CI).   They are then awarded additional points based on individualized readings by Admissions staff to obtain a total score. According to analyses of Fall 2007 and Fall 2008 data sets, contrary to what one might expect, the inclusion of reader scores had an adverse effect on the diversity of the admitted students as well as the number of first generation students among the admitted group of students as contrasted with the outcome if selection had been based solely on the computed index. On the other hand, first year GPA would not have been significantly higher nor lower had we relied only on the CI. Thus, it appears that the use of readers seems to put students of color and first generation students at a disadvantage.

Using the same two data sets, the subcommittee also found strong evidence in favor of additional modifications to the present system. Specifically, the best formula for predicting first year GPA turned out to be: (high school GPA times 1000) plus (SAT total) plus (0.5 SAT subject). The subcommittee considered that using this as a starting point and adding additional criteria and points, such as 500 points for a being a first generation applicant, might best realize the tripartite goals of excellence, access, and diversity.

3. The Honors subcommittee.

The Honors subcommittee primarily worked on the awarding of merit scholarships (Regents' and Campus Merit Scholarships).   Regents' Scholarships are the most prestigious and valuable scholarships the campus offers. They are worth a total of $20,000 for an incoming student. Campus Merit Scholarships carry a minimum award of $2,000 over four years.

The process for determining candidates for the Regents' has been to identify the very top cohort of applicants to UCSC primarily on the basis of grades and test scores and then invite these students to submit essays. This year we instituted some modifications to the procedure, having each essay be rated on an A to F scale by two readers. The goal was to make about 75 Regents' Scholarship offers, hoping to yield 15 new Regents' Scholars.

This year, 982 students were invited to apply, an increase from last year's 905. Of these, 237 submitted essays, down significantly from 409 (45 percent) in Fall 2008. Of the 237 applicants, 44 received double As and were offered Regents scholarships. The remaining 31 offers were selected from the AB lists by taking SAT and high school GPA into account, and the remaining students received campus merit award offers. Ten frosh and three transfer students accepted the Regents' offers, down from 12 and 4 last year.

4. The Publications subcommittee.

The Publications subcommittee evaluated outreach material for the coming year and provided extensive feedback on content and improvements. One member walked the self-guided tours, finding many ways to increase clarity and the route of the tours. With the close cooperation of the Office of Admissions, the subcommittee established a procedure so that CAFA can continue the detailed reading and evaluation of publications throughout the calendar year.

5. The Web Presence subcommittee.

The Web Presence subcommittee continued the work of the prior year that helped push the establishment of the campus web initiative. Browsing the campus websites, the subcommittee found much variation and many causes for concern including confusing and dead links, inadequate content, and contradictory information. As has been clear for several years, the UCSC web presence needs significant overhaul. Our wide array of administrative units still often operate and interact in a pre-web, paper-based manner, unlikely to appeal to today's techno-savvy youth.

After some initial skepticism, the web subcommittee was gratified to see that the administration has hired consultants to help UCSC solve its web problems. Based in the Bay Area, the consultants have a good track record, having helped Stanford, Santa Clara, Rutgers, and other universities.

One particular project of importance to CAFA is the establishment of a single page where students can learn about activities and opportunities for participation across campus regardless of the sponsoring agency. Student Affairs appeared enthusiastic about the project at first, but then appeared resistant.

Given the enormous importance of a good web presence for prospective students and their families, CAFA will need to maintain constant vigilance and continuous pressure to ensure that some long overdue changes take place.

C. Policy

Under current University policies, high school students who have taken the required ―a-g" sequence of approved courses and who have sufficiently high grades and test scores are considered to be UC-eligible and are guaranteed admission on one UC campus although not perhaps their campus of choice (there will be some changes in the UC requirements for Fall 2012, discussed below). UCSC selects its student body from its applicant pool of UC-eligible students using a set of 14 system-wide criteria. As spelled out in our admissions materials, points are awarded for each criterion, up to a total of 10,000. (See: http://admissions.ucsc.edu/apply/freshman_guide.cfm). Nine of the criteria and part of a tenth form the ―Computed Index". The computed index represents criteria that can be automatically converted into the scoring system, such as GPA, test scores, participation in an Equal Opportunity Program, coming from a low-performing school, and completion of honors courses. The remaining criteria form the reader score, calculated by hand. Applications with a sufficiently high computed index are admitted without calculating reader scores, though they are of course reviewed for correctness of the computed index.

Campuses may also extend offers to students who have not met the UC eligibility requirements, for example by not completing the full UC course pattern or having a GPA below 3.0. Under this policy, known as ―Admission by Exception", no more than 6 percent of matriculated students may fall in this category. Heretofore CAFA has instructed Admissions to review the students who are not UC-eligible (―Admission by Exception") separately, and to predominantly only admit applicants likely to participate in the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), with the intent of attaining the 6 percent system-wide limit.

When this system was instituted, UCSC admitted virtually all applicants. However, in 2009, UCSC admitted only 64 percent of frosh applicants. Our evolution into a selective campus has prompted data-supported analysis which, in turn, has resulted in three policy changes.

The first policy change is the application of the same selection criteria for all students, regardless of UC eligibility definitions. That is, for the cohort entering in Fall 2010, all students will be scored according to CAFA's comprehensive selection criteria, and the highest scoring students will be admitted. Students who are not UC eligible will have the additional requirements that, following long-standing CAFA policy, they must have completed UC's four years of English and three years of mathematics, may only be missing up to two semesters of other required coursework, and are subject to a final qualitative review to ensure that, in the words of the system-wide policy, they ─demonstrate high potential for academic success and leadership." This change eliminates the anomalous situation in which a student who has succeeded in the face of many challenges and earned reasonable test scores would be admitted (by exception) with a 2.99 GPA but would not be admitted with a 3.00, or even higher, GPA (as part of the eligible pool). To enable programs such as the summer bridge program, CAFA reserves the option of admitting up to one percent of the incoming frosh class with additional or alternative pre-determined review criteria.   http://senate.ucsc.edu/cafa/AbyE%20Policy%20072009.pdf

The second policy change is a one-year experimental modification in the point weighting for the manually-scored components of the application.   CAFA has established a rubric for awarding points in categories such as statewide recognition for special projects or academic accomplishments, improvement in high school GPA from the sophomore to junior year, and academic accomplishment in life experiences. Data analysis for the Fall 2007 and Fall 2008 admissions cycles showed that these ─reader scores" were both inversely correlated with first-year student performance and with common measures of access such as percentage of first-generation students and percentage of EOP students. Given these doubly negative results, CAFA reduced the weight of these criteria by approximately 50 percent for the Fall 2010 admissions cycle. http://senate.ucsc.edu/cafa/Fall%202010%20Reading%20Policy%20072009.pdf

The final policy change is to regularize the appeals process according to the principles outlined above.

III. Issues for the near future
There are at least two admissions policy issues that CAFA will need to address in the near future.

1. UC Admissions Changes

Beginning with the class of 2012, the UC system will no longer require subject tests, will expand the percentage of students guaranteed UC admission due to class rank within their high school, and also will expand the percentage of students who may be admitted to a UC without falling into what is currently defined as ─Admission by Exception". The removal of the subject test and the availability of additional class rank and other data will require either significant adjustment to the current point system or a new system of evaluation.

2. Transfer Student Admissions

Over the past three to five years, UCSC has moved from being unselective to being truly selective. This year's frosh selection policy changes take advantage of data and our new-found selectivity to better shape the incoming class for excellence, diversity, and access. The current transfer student selection practice is to admit all UC-eligible transfer students as well as additional ―admission by exception" students who appear likely to succeed. With selectivity, CAFA will need to establish a transfer student policy as well.

As part of this review, CAFA and programs will also need to consider implementing the existing ―major preparation" criterion, currently not used in campus transfer student review, and whether or not major choice should impact campus admission or only major declaration.

IV. Committee Process
The admission of students profoundly affects the character of the campus and our execution of UCSC's public mission. CAFA this year was fortunate to have a wide range of views on whether or not there should be any changes to the admissions process and, if so, how they should be evaluated. Thus, the process of analyzing for the first time our comprehensive review system, which takes into account a broad range of academic, access, and diversity measures, produced lively discussion.

The process began with committee members selecting which subcommittees they would be most interested in joining, with the data subcommittee taking the lead on developing, with Enrollment Management, the information and reports necessary to evaluate comprehensive review. As this was the first such review, a methodology was not yet available, and so the first analysis did not move from subcommittee to committee until Winter quarter, later than the Fall target.

The results, discussed above, indicated that through tuning the specific weightings in the comprehensive review system, different goals could be achieved. For some, the prime goal of selection appeared to be enhancing social mobility; for others the specific effects of this approach seemed to present elements of class discrimination. For some, the prime goal of selection appeared to be enhancing first-year GPA performance; for others this discounted our strong commitment to diversity and access. For the committee as a whole, the goal lay somewhere in between all the extremes, a middle simplified by the data's conclusion that it was possible to both increase measures of academic success, such as projected first-year GPA, and simultaneously increase measures of access such as percentage of first-generation students, (lower) median family income, and ethnic diversity, through the two proposals the committee has adopted. Our guiding principle has been to find meeting points between the quest for excellence and our strong commitment to access and diversity, rather than see these matters in opposition.

The conversation leading to these decisions was complex, as there were at times approaches taken that many in the committee came to regard as obstructionist or filibustering, rather than collaborative and considerate. Belatedly, the Chair determined that rules of order would need to be strictly followed for remaining meetings. This new approach led, in a compressed time frame, to more effective meetings and use of committee members' time. At its May 29th meeting, the

committee with one 'no' vote determined to keep working on the issues and to develop modified policies for Fall 2010. At its long June 9 meeting, the committee unanimously voted twice (9-0, and then 7-0 following discussion and two members' need to depart) to complete the process it had worked on all year. The committee determined that a subcommittee should work out the final details, for email discussion and vote, resulting in the two adopted policies.

Because of the heavy workload, desire to accomplish committee goals, and substantial time allocated to opposing views, the committee was unable to include as many guests as might be desired. However, continuity of membership – half of the faculty – meant that many took part in the prior year's interactions with various guests.

Overall, the committee enjoyed ―the chance to listen to and consider viewpoints and ways of thinking very different from [their] own" as well as the chair's ―calm and centered reactions" to the spirited discussion.

The minutes of all 2008-09 CAFA meetings are available on the committee web site, http://senate.ucsc.edu/cafa/.

V. Thanks

This has been a particularly interesting and productive year for the committee, and we would like to conclude the report with some formal appreciations. The committee was fortunate to start the year with a full complement of members and three exceptional student representatives with a breadth of experiences. The Committee would particularly like to congratulate Michelle Romero on her appointment to the 2009-10 Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the system-wide admissions committee. CAFA enjoys a close working relationship with the Enrollment Management unit, in particular the Offices of Admission and of Financial Aid. Without the advice and extensive collaboration of the Associate Vice Chancellor Michelle Whittingham, Director Ann Draper, Associate Director Michael McCawley and Advisor Cheryl Perazzo, the work of the committee would be impossible to complete. The committee is also grateful for the logistics support that the Enrollment Management unit offered for many of the subcommittee meetings and for the fall kickoff meeting. CAFA could also not function without the help of the Senate Office and the detailed work of Pamela Edwards.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID
Raoul Birnbaum
Robert Coe (W & S)
Bruce Cooperstein
Faye Crosby
Gabe Elkaim   Amy Weaver, NSFT Rep
Scott Oliver   Michael Morrissey, SUA Rep
Juan Poblete, BOARS Rep   Michelle Romero, SUA Rep
Richard Hughey, Chair

October 9, 2009

Minority Report
We had during the first couple of quarters of our regular CAFA meetings during 08/09 regular and sometimes forceful requests to engage in a substantial conversation about what the goals of a thorough review of Comprehensive Review could be. When I made such request (and I was not the only person to make such interventions but I would rather represent my own views here) I was thinking of considering questions such as: Where, now that we were becoming a selective campus and in the general context of the incoming system-wide new admissions policy did the committee want to lead UCSC's admission process? What educational goals had been attained or not attained with the existing system and which could be revised or added? This in my view required a serious and open conversation about diverse viewpoints on the very crucial issues at stake.

Instead of truly engaging in such a conversation the Chair proceeded to push first and foremost for his ideologically limited understanding of a data-based approach to arrive at what he and another committee member had always already decided was the right answer to UCSC's admissions issue: getting rid of CR first and then, when that proved difficult due to clear resistance from other committee members, limiting the part of CR that considers achievement in life context, limiting or eliminating AbyE, etc. This was based on an ideological, by which I mean never discussed or questioned, presupposition about what constituted a "true metric" of merit (presumably GPA+ SAT scores+AG courses), with consideration of other factors in admissions deemed as necessarily diluting standards.

In this process a number of significant methodological and procedural mistakes were made:

Only one year of data was used to base the original analysis. This was later extended to two years at the insistence of some committee members. The expert analyst who supposedly helped design the analysis was never invited to explain to the committee what the limitations of such a data-set could be, what it allowed us to see and what perhaps it precluded us from seeing (what other variables could be incorporated for consideration, etc)

A number of wrong presuppositions about AbyE and EOP and Bridge students were included in the analysis because of lack of substantial conversation with the key institutional actors in those areas: first year GPA was used as a "universal benchmark" for measuring performance for all students without considering that many of those students in the AbyE, EOP and Bridge cohorts are often required and or advised to take P/NP classes (thus one bad numerical grade during the year can have a disproportionate effect on final annual GPA); the whole of the AbyE cohort was repeatedly reduced to the profile of the 120 or so Bridge students. These serious mistakes were made more consequential by the Chair's disregard for his own calendar of consultations with CAFA related administrators on campus. In the previous year and under the same Chair the committee had unanimously voted in a strict calendar for the annual consideration of CAFA's basic issues. In that calendar the director of EOP was supposed to have been invited for a regular annual conversation with the committee. She was never invited despite my repeated requests for

that to happen. Thus the committee made decisions on AbyE and EOP and Bridge students without ever bothering to talk to the people on campus who truly know those students.

Finally said calendar, "Review Cycle for Issues and Approval of Policies", approved during the previous year and posted on the Committee's public web site (http://senate.ucsc.edu/cafa/) clearly stipulated that Review of Comprehensive Review criteria was to take place in the fall with a March 1 deadline for changes. Instead, the Chair kept on adding additional meetings to our regular yearly session during spring quarter despite my (and others') significant resistance, in the hopes to finally pass his proposals. Not surprisingly he also disregarded his own time framework for these added meetings. The final meeting was thus extended beyond four hours when it was originally slated to last two. Because a number of the committee members had previously scheduled appointments the final proposals during that meeting were made in the absence of about half of the committee members. As a model for serious consideration of the very important issues CAFA is charged with, this modus operandi was not only a disgrace and highly irregular but likely illegal. I have decided not to legally challenge these decisions because two former CAFA chairs including the incoming one eventually made significant efforts to temper the Chair's proposed reforms and some caution was finally introduced, in the way of one year trials and partial consideration of factors other than those included in the Chair's "true metrics of merit".

As a returning member of CAFA and under a new Chair I am very committed to participating in serious, careful and informed discussions to make UCSC a better public university.

Juan Poblete
CAFA Member, BOARS Representative

September 25, 2009

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity (CAAD) is pleased to report on a very active and productive year. Overall, we sought to enhance UCSC"s diversity initiatives and to follow-up on some of the previous work of the committee.

Climate Study
In 2006 CAAD undertook a year long, multi-faceted study of the climate with respect to diversity issues with the support of then Chancellor Denton. A draft of this report was completed, and a very, very brief Executive Summary was submitted in the following year. The Committee invited Professor Gina Dent, who headed the study and she met with us at length. Following this there was an effort to design a more comprehensive summary, but lack of time and the pressures of current issues prevented us from completing this effort.

Faculty Retention Study
In 2007-2008 then Senate Chair Faye Crosby drafted the protocol for a faculty retention survey with input from CAAD and representatives from Academic Human Resources and EEO/Affirmative Action. The purpose of this study was to review why faculty left UCSC and what, if any; new policies could be put into place that would encourage retention. A significant number of these voluntary separations were women and/or faculty of color. Although the sample of returned interviews from recently separated faculty was small, the results showed that issues relating to diversity were a significant factor. Major causes sited were: spousal/partner employment, teaching load and service obligations, housing, and climate, including intradepartmental strife.

CAAD made two recommendations. The first was that the study be made available to interested faculty through the Senate office. The second was that Academic Human Resources (AHR) uses the faculty retention survey to develop a web-based exit interview for faculty who are leaving UCSC so that more reliable data could be consistently gathered.

Enhancing Affirmative Action Initiatives
We invited campus counsel, Carole Rossi to meet with us to give us a better understanding of affirmative action law and appropriate diversity protocols for the campus. As a result of this consultation committee members felt they had a much better understanding of the legal enforcement of affirmative action especially following federal guidelines in faculty and staff search procedures.

In accord with this CAAD commented on proposed amendments to APM 240 on the appointment and review of deans, and APM 210 on the significance of diversity-related initiatives by faculty in merit and promotion reviews. CAAD then met with CAP Chair Maureen Callanan. This resulted in a most productive discussion. Following procedures in place at other UCs it was agreed that each academic year the chair of CAAD would meet with the incoming CAP in order to review guidelines, and to emphasize the significance of diversity in the review

process. This was not intended to penalize, but rather to give proper, enhanced recognition and credit for diversity efforts on the part of faculty in the review process.

In accord with the request of Ashish Sahni CAAD gave feedback on the proposed job description for a new Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) position for the campus. While affirming the importance of such a position the committee urged that the job description be narrowed and more focused to a manageable level, that the position be elevated to that of a Vice-Chancellor, and that additional staff be added to insure adequate resources for the CDO. These proposals were rejected. A CAAD member was on the search committee for a CDO, and reported that the search was completed and three viable candidates were selected. Subsequently, Assistance Chancellor Sahni aborted the search because of budgetary concerns. CAAD expressed grave concern over this decision.

Change in Committee on Affirmative Action Charge
With the assistance of the chair of the Senate Committee on Committees CAAD requested that Senate Bylaw 13.12 be revised as follows: "The Committee on Committees has noted that the position of the EEO/AA Director has been eliminated . . . we ask that your committee review your committee"s charge in consideration of this new administrative structure . . . and that until this review is completed and appropriate legislation is in place, no administrator is charged to ,sit with" CAAD and none should participate in the committee deliberations without CAAD"s explicit invitation." This was recommended by CAAD and approved by the Academic Senate at its Spring 2009 meeting.

Diversity Fund Program
We wish to thank CPEVC David Kliger for his generosity in once again funding this program that offers academic units and programs up to $2000 for proposals of projects that advance diversity goals at the graduate and faculty levels. CAAD revised the guidelines for these proposals to update them and make them more explicit and specific. With the $30,000 grant from EVC Kliger we were able to recommend funding to 13 different units.

Consultation on TOE Appointments
CAAD participated in the review of two Target of Excellence appointment proposals providing recommendations to CPEVC Kliger. In one case the committee also worked very hard to secure a partner hire to assure the candidate"s acceptance of the UCSC offer. In addition, CAAD participated in a request for a search waiver to insure a retention and made a recommendation to CPEVC Kliger.

Diversity & the Budget Crisis
The CAAD chair and CAAD members met with numerous administrators, staff and faculty to seek ways to minimize the impact of the budget crisis on women and/or faculty and staff of color. CAAD expressed (and continues to express) grave concerns about the ways in which budget decisions will impact those who are most vulnerable in times of fiscal scarcity, and especially in those programs that most effect the academic success and retention of students of color at the graduate and undergraduate level. These efforts are ongoing.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
Rebecca Bernstein
Sri Kurniawan
Marcia Ochoa
Reyna Ramirez
Karen Yamashita
Bettina Aptheker, Chair

August 31, 2009

COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (CCT) met bi-weekly this year to work on several overlapping issues from the previous year as well as routine and new business.

The continuing issues included: Google Gmail for students, a possible student laptop requirement, dark fiber connection to campus, the new web transformation project, and an update on the Delaware Street Data Center.

CCT reviewed and discussed routine and new business concerning the final draft policy on security and electronics, which incorporated Senate committee recommendations, the white paper on creating a "Seminar Network" of lectures to be shared systemwide, charges for long distance telephone calls, campus support for the Sakai course and learning management system, and plans for the new Silicon Valley Center.

Google Gmail
CCT had several concerns about Gmail after carefully studying the draft contract. Most of CCT's recommendations to UCOP were incorporated into the final contract, including the following: user retention of copyright and ownership of the data, privacy issues, and getting the data back in a useable form if or when the contract is terminated (the current contract is for 7 years). The motivation for the switch to Gmail is better service for the students and their ability to retain accounts after graduation; there is essentially no cost savings to ITS, only a savings of storage space. UCSC plans on rolling it out in fall 2009 for the students; whether the roll out will be incremental or universal (as at UC Davis) is still to be decided. Students will log on with their UCSC account information.

Laptop Requirement
The student laptop requirement was discussed as a possible benefit to students receiving financial support if a contract with several computer vendors could be set up at the bookstore. Apple representatives met with CCT and described similar programs at other campuses.

ITS held a town hall and conducted a survey for students about IT services on campus. Many students don't want a laptop requirement on campus for several reasons:
- network for wireless infrastructure is not set up on campus to meet the current needs;
- a computer requirement could limit the models they can buy;
- funding options are also a concern;
- worried about lower income students forced to purchase laptops.

CCT was disappointed by the negative response students to a laptop requirement on campus. CCT learned later on that our goal was not fully explained to the students, how this program could actually benefit the campus and students. This discussion has been tabled by this year's committee.

Dark Fiber Update
CENIC and CalREN worked together with the contractor, Sunesys, to bring high speed internet connection to UCSC, the only UC campus without it. The contract deadline was the end of 2008. CCT has now been told that the fiber connection will be here in fall quarter. This delay was caused by different utility districts that must issue permits for passage of the fiber connections, funding, and red-legged frogs. Some of the work is in the red-legged frog habitat. The endangered frogs are protected and none can be killed, so the trenching had to be postponed until it was safe. The good news is CENIC is bringing 10 Gigabit connections, and will order electronics equipment to light the fiber when the construction is completed. CCT also discussed with ITS priorities for improving campus connectivity, but were told that lack of funds continues to be a serious limitation.

Web Transformation
CCT met with IT Web Program Manager, David Turner throughout the year. Mr. Turner updated the committee each quarter on the progress of determining UCSC needs for a more consistent web presence on campus. Rolling Orange Web Consulting Firm was hired to carry out this project.

Rolling Orange has experience with Stanford and other institutions of higher education. Due to the many different programs, departments, units, etc. a university's web page can become decentralized around web organization. Rolling Orange can provide framework that is much easier for UCSC to update, like a design system, tools are all there with a Content Management System (CMS) in place. The consultants will use the data that Mr. Turner's group collected on our audience, how to market UCSC to this specific group and make it easy for them to get information. The work has already started on creating an easy to use template for all members of the campus community: faculty, staff and students. The web management system will be an opt-in centrally supported tool, and should be purchased before the end of the year with implementation occurring during the next academic year. Please visit the website for more information: http://webprogram.ucsc.edu

Data Center – Delaware Street
UCSC is now nearly out of space and cooling capacity on campus for new computer systems. The datacenter that was planned for Building C on Delaware Street is now ADA compliant. It is still on the capital plans, but as an alternative UCSC has been running a test model at UCSD where there is an 80,000 square foot facility that is available to UC campuses, including both rack space and computational capability. Right now it seems to be cost efficient to go with UC San Diego. The cost of utilities, rack space, and staffing is still being worked out.

Long Distance Telephone Charges
The rates being charged for long-distance telephone calls from campus phones to many foreign countries have been very high. CCT was told that new contracts are being negotiated, and that ITS hopes that the new rates will be so low that billing for most long distance calls can be discontinued.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS
David Cuthbert (F, S)
Hiroshi Fukurai
Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani
Matt O'Hara
Dominic Massaro
Charlie McDowell
Andrew Moore   Niklas Moran, Student Representative (SUA)
Joel Primack, Chair   Mary Doyle, Vice Chancellor ITS

August 31, 2009

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy"s (CEP) work can be divided into two categories. There is the work the Committee carries out as a matter of course, including reviews of campus programs, approval of program statements and of new and revised courses, consultations with other committees and administrative units, and consideration of student petitions. Then there are policy initiatives raised by CEP (sometimes in tandem with other bodies). CEP continued work this year on a major initiative, general education reform. We begin with discussion of this initiative.

I. General Education

Culminating a three-year effort, the Santa Cruz Division Academic Senate passed comprehensive general education (GE) reform in the winter quarter. The full CEP report on GE reform is available at http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPproposal2.pdf. Here we present a brief overview.

The larger goals of GE reform were i) to converge through faculty conversation on a set of educational goals for general education at UC Santa Cruz at the beginning of the 21st century (our last major general education reform occurred 25 years ago); ii) to make those goals more explicit and clear than they have been in the past; iii) to make the general education curriculum more topics-based and less division-based, and therefore (we hope) more interesting and reflective of UC Santa Cruz"s identity; iv) and finally, to redress some clear shortcomings in the current GE requirements, such as the shortage of writing-intensive classes and the unclarity of distinctions such as "topical" vs. "introductory".

Requirements

The chart below summarizes the new general education requirements. Except for the writing-related Disciplinary Communication requirement (discussed below), these requirements become effective in fall 2010. Departments are being asked to submit proposals for new GE course designations by the December catalog deadline of this year.

Under the new requirements, students will take one 5-credit course from each of the first seven categories. They will also take one 5-credit course fulfilling any of the three *Perspectives* categories, and one course (minimally 2-credit) fulfilling any of the *Practice* categories. The C1 and C2 (composition) requirements are carried over from current GE requirements.

Detailed descriptions, and educational goals, for these GE categories can be found in the document linked to above. At a broader level, the new requirements differ from our current ones in several ways. First, the number of required courses/credits is smaller. Whether the difference is modest or substantial depends on how successful a student might have been under our current system at "overlapping" requirements that is, finding courses that satisfied more than one requirement at a time. Depending on the amount of overlap, a student under our current system

will take anything from 10 to 15 five-credit courses. Under the proposed system, the range would be from 9+ to 10+ courses, where "+" refers to a two-credit course in the "Practice" category. Second, as just noted, there is no overlap of requirements allowed (except that, at CEP"s discretion, C1 or C2 may overlap another designation for certain core courses). Third, there is no more distinction between "Topical" and "Introductory" courses. Fourth, the new GE requirements are more specific, and tied to UC Santa Cruz"s educational identity. This relates to a fifth difference from the current GE requirements: the new requirements are not anchored to divisions; many will plausibly arise out of several divisions.

		Code	Distinct Courses	Possibly Overlapping
Cross-Cultural Analysis		CC	1	
Ethnicity & Race		ER	1	
Interpreting Arts & Media		IM	1	
Mathematical & Formal Reasoning		MF	1	
Scientific Inquiry		SI	1	
Statistical Reasoning		SR	1	
Textual Analysis & Interpretation		TA	1	
Perspectives (Choose 1)	Environmental Awareness Human Behavior Technology & Society	PE-E PE-H PE-T	1	
Practice (2-credit) (Choose 1)	Collaborative Endeavor Creative Process Service Learning	PR-E PR-C PR-S	+ (2cr)	
Writing	Composition	C1&C2	1	1
	Disciplinary Communication	DC	*	
Total (= 9+ to 10+)**			9+	1

*CEP advocates building DC into existing major courses

** „+" refers to a 2-credit course. So, „9+" means nine 5-credit courses and one 2-credit course

Writing

GE reform has also recast the post-composition writing requirement. Until now students have been required to take one 5-unit Writing-intensive (W) course in any academic discipline. The new Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement differs from the W in the following ways:

- It specifies training **appropriate to a student's major**, rather than training in "any academic subject". This does not mean that departments (or other major-sponsoring entities) must mount DC courses themselves; however, departments are responsible for

articulating their own educational goals for their majors in the area of disciplinary communication, subject to the general policies defined by CEP.

- The requirement is broadened to embrace forms of disciplinary communication besides writing (e.g., oral presentation, poster presentation). However, as the proposed guidelines make clear, writing still forms the most substantial component of the requirement.

- It is possible to meet the requirement over any of 1-3 courses (totaling no fewer than 5 credits), giving departments more flexibility in meeting their goals. These courses have to be upper-division (so that transfer students are not left out), and **all** pathways through a major have to meet the DC goals.

Unlike the other new GE requirements, the DC requirement is effective as of fall 2009. Since it is an upper-division requirement, though, and since transfers bring catalog rights, departments generally have at least a year in order to implement their DC curricula. Departments are being asked to do so this year, so that DC courses will be in place at the same time as other new GE courses, in fall 2010.

Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters

A third element of GE reform, called Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITCs), are particularly interesting. But since they do not require legislation and are not required, they are less apparent to the faculty. At this point they remain largely an idea to be encouraged, and one of CEP‟s tasks this year will be to continue publicizing the idea and fostering potential ITCs. Only one ITC exists currently, discussed below.

Our new GE requirement categories seen above are more specific than categories like the existing "Humanities and Arts" or "Social Sciences" categories. We hope that this gives general education a stronger sense of vision and identity. Our requirement categories are nevertheless still distributional categories. The freedom and choice offered by a distributional system is good, but in some respects distributional systems can leave something to be desired. Because no course chosen relates to any other course chosen, a student‟s GE curriculum usually lacks any coherence or unifying vision.

CEP is proposing the establishment of ITCs as a way to bring more coherence and unifying vision to a part of a student‟s GE curriculum. ITCs are clusters of two or more GE courses defined by attention to a specific issue or question of importance to society. An ITC is not normally attached to any division or department; ITCs should be genuinely interdisciplinary. The faculty who design ITCs must work together to ensure that each course fits well into one overall vision and that educational objectives of later courses build on outcomes of earlier ones.

For example, the first existing ITC is summarized in the chart below; more information can be found at http://eight.ucsc.edu/core-course.html. On the right is a list of new GE designations a student might conceivably earn by taking this cluster. (The actual list of 3-4 designations will be decided this year as CEP approves GE designations.)

Nurturing Environmental Citizenship

Courses	Candidate GE designations
The Environment and Society (College 8)	3 or 4 of… Environmental Awareness
Fundamentals of Environmental Science (EE Biology / Earth Sciences)	Mathematical/Formal Reasoning Statistical Reasoning
Technological Innovation and Environmental Challenges (Electrical Engineering)	Scientific Inquiry Technology & Society Collaborative Endeavor Service Learning

A cluster is not an additional set of required courses. Rather, the courses of a cluster themselves satisfy GE requirements. Each course in a cluster should normally belong to a different GE category. Nor are ITCs required. Rather, groups of faculty or departments should be encouraged to create them, and students should be encouraged to take them.

A clustered curriculum has benefits beyond purely academic ones. Clusters create learning communities within UC Santa Cruz, and one might hope for the sort of benefits to institutional identity, retention, and educational success that such learning communities can foster. In fact, ITCs are an attempt to accomplish some of the very same goals that colleges try to accomplish: they represent a kind of core curriculum built on a theme with the intent of fostering identity and community. As a separate proposal, we see great appeal in the idea of linking a cluster to a specific college. Clusters can work as learning communities with or without college affiliation. But to establish them entirely independently of colleges might be missing an opportunity–the chance of fusing *learning* and *residential* communities–that is unique to UC Santa Cruz.

The ITC *Nurturing Environmental Citizenship*, for example, is linked to College 8; only College 8 students will normally take it. Yet two of the courses of this cluster are mounted by departments, just as GE courses usually are. Student FTE for teaching these courses will accrue to the departments, as it does now. General education courses are already funded, so there are no obvious new resource implications to them. Furthermore, the ITC above involves ladder-rank and other long-term faculty in the academic life of a college without the familiar and intractable problem of involving them in existing core courses.

II. Other CEP initiatives

A. SCR 6.5 on "special approval courses"

CEP sponsored a change in Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 6.5 regarding "special approval courses" (e.g., independent studies, field studies, etc.–see below). This change passed at a spring quarter Senate Meeting. The most substantive changes that resulted from these amendments are i) that students without declared majors can take no more than seven credits of special approval courses per quarter; ii) that students *with* declared majors can take more than seven credit hours of such courses per quarter, given permission from their major-sponsoring authority; iii) that there is no campuswide limit on the number of quarters over which a student can take (with

permission) an unusual number of special approval credits. Existing Regulation limited all students to five credits per quarter of special approval courses barring special permission, and strongly restricted exceeding this limit in a second quarter or beyond.

The kinds of courses affected by this legislative change include the following. In CEP"s view, what these course categories have in common is that *they lack a curriculum that has been approved in advance by CEP*. Hence our term "special approval course".

Independent study courses
Group study courses
Independent field study courses
Supervised field study courses (only if lacking a pre-approved curriculum)
Internships
Laboratory research courses
Senior thesis or project courses

Systemwide Regulation (SR) 764 states that "Credit in special study courses for undergraduates is limited to five credits per term". UC Santa Cruz has had an active variance to this Regulation that allows a student to take up to 15 credits of special study courses in one quarter, given permission. This variance also allows a student to take more than five credits of such courses in any *subsequent* quarters only "in special circumstances and for students of outstanding demonstrated ability."

In response to a recent inquiry by our campus, the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) ruled that SR 764 applies to all of the course types listed above, while our campus variance (see below) applies only to courses numbered 199. It follows from the latter ruling that students may not take more than five credits of *any* special study course apart from a 199, under any circumstances.

CEP raised several concerns about SCR 6.5, as well as SR 764 and the variance, especially the following:

- CEP does not support an inviolable limit of five credits per quarter of special approval courses.
- CEP does not support a restriction to only one quarter of extra special approval courses or credits.
- These restrictions are not followed on our campus. The most notable example of this involves the Community Studies major, whose *requirements* have for decades included two 15-credit quarters of field study.

CEP argued that the degree of presumption against special approval courses, implicit in both SR 764 and SCR 6.5, is too restrictive for our current educational setting. (These Regulations are about 40 years old.) The amendments to SCR 6.5 had the following specific effects:

- They define "special approval" courses as those whose curricula are not approved in advance by CEP.

- While existing Regulation required that students obtain permission to take "two or more" special approval courses in a term (the number of credits was unclear in 6.5 but set at five by systemwide), the new Regulation sets the threshold at above seven credits.
- The seven-credit threshold is absolute for students without declared majors, because i) there is no realistic means to provide oversight and approve exceptions outside of departmental structures and ii) students who have not found a major should probably not take excessive amounts of special approval courses in any case.
- For students with declared majors, the seven-credit threshold can be exceeded given permission of a student"s major-sponsoring unit(s). Requiring approval ensures that students are using special approval courses prudently, making progress toward degree, etc.
- Approval for individual students to exceed the seven-credit limit will be waived when it follows from degree requirements already approved by CEP.
- Unnecessary portions of the existing legislation were removed, and many changes were effected to improve clarity, update terms, and improve consistency.

It is inconsistent with SR 764 to allow more than five credits of special approval courses per term. The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) proposed to the Academic Council that SR 764 be rescinded, and the Council voted to send the question for systemwide Senate review. After that review it will be voted on by the systemwide Assembly. If SR 764 is not rescinded, then our campus will seek a variance to it, including a variance to the limit on amount of special approval courses beyond one quarter.

B. SCR 10.2.2.3 on Topical Requirement waivers for transfer students.

CEP proposed to amend SCR 10.2.2.3 on general education requirements and transfer credit, and these amendments passed.

Before fall 2007 SCR 10.2.2.3 prohibited the articulation of transfer courses to meet the Topical general education requirement. The relevant text of 10.2.2.3 before fall 2007 is given here:

Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 [i.e., general education requirements, CEP] except the Topical and Writing-intensive courses… Because it is difficult to judge whether courses passed elsewhere meet the spirit of the topical course requirement, transfer students shall be exempted from up to three of these courses depending on the amount of credit transferred at the time of entrance.

In the fall of 2006 the Senate amended this legislation, among other things removing all text specific to the Topical requirement. The change was justified by the Senate"s judgment that individual transfer courses *can* be evaluated as satisfying (or not) the Topical requirement. Hence Topicals were to be treated like any other general education course (except the Writing-Intensive requirement). Since then the Admissions office has been working to identify Community College courses that can be articulated to specific Topical courses at UC Santa Cruz.

Since then our campus has passed comprehensive general education reform, to go into effect fall 2010. The Topical requirement will cease to exist as of that time, though some students will

continue to satisfy it for several years due to catalog rights. CEP argued that the Admissions Office should not continue devoting significant time to finding and articulating courses to satisfy this requirement, since Admissions will have to begin identifying courses to satisfy all of our *new* general education requirements.

The change to SCR 10.2.2.3 re-establishes a transfer student"s right to be exempted from 1-3 Topical courses based on credits transferred in, as existed for students before fall 2007. Departing from the earlier legislation, however, it does not *prohibit* the transfer of courses to satisfy Topical requirements. Both students and the Admissions Office can therefore continue to benefit from the work that has already been done toward identifying courses for articulation and applying them toward requirements.

Given catalog rights beyond the 2010 date of the general education change, this legislative change will affect a significant number of students for about 3 more years.

III. Other work

A. Budget cuts and Senate process

This was a year of serious budget stress. The pressure to make significant decisions in a short amount of time resulted in inadequate Senate consultation in some cases. A notable example involved decisions that threatened the existence of the Community Studies major (and perhaps even the department). CEP spent a good deal of time in the spring quarter responding to budget-related decisions. Given this experience, the chair has recently sent a letter to deans, provosts, and program chairs reminding them of the extensive requirements for consultation when decisions are made affecting the content, feasibility, or existence of academic programs on campus. The requirements for consultation are laid out in detail in the document "Academic Programs and Departments: Guidelines for Establishment and Disestablishment", at http://planning.ucsc.edu/budget/AcadPlan/guidelines.full.feb08.pdf.

B. Miscellaneous responses

CEP read and gave feedback on the following:

1. A draft Accountability Report provided to the Senate by the UC Office of the President.
2. A draft new business plan for the University Office of the Education Abroad Program.
3. A document provided by our EVC"s office called Action Plan High-Level Indicators, intended to provide metrics by which the campus can measure progress in meeting some of its goals.
4. A proposed amendment to Regents Standing Order 100.4 (Duties of the President) giving the UC President authority to declare an Emergency (subject to Regental approval) and implement furloughs or salary reductions for UC employees.
5. A report of the 2009 Undergraduate Advising Workgroup.
6. Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment at UC, drafted by BOARS.

C. External Reviews

This was an unusually heavy year of program review activity. The Committee read and responded to eleven external reviews and participated in the related closure meetings (Astronomy and Astrophysics, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, History of Consciousness, Information Systems Management, Literature, Mathematics, Ocean Sciences, Politics, Sociology, Theater Arts). CEP also commented on charges for four external reviews (Economics, Feminist Studies, Film and Digital Media, History).

D. Programs

As usual, CEP reviewed a great deal of proposed changes to the general catalog.

CEP reviewed and approved two new campus majors. These were a combined major in Economics and Mathematics (sponsored by Economics), and a major in Physics Education (Physics). CEP also provided feedback on two proposed new majors, one in Cognitive Sciences (Psychology), and an Economics intensive major. CEP approved the discontinuation of one major, the general Earth Sciences B.A. (Earth and Planetary Sciences Department). CEP also approved the discontinuation of the Dual Degree Engineering Program (run in cooperation with UC Berkeley).

CEP reviewed and approved one new campus minor (after revision), in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Education (Education Department). CEP approved the discontinuation of one minor, in Western Music (Music).

The Committee also approved the following three new concentrations: Bioeducation (MCD Biology), Integrated Critical Practice (Film and Digital Media), and Science Education in Earth and Planetary Sciences (Earth and Planetary Sciences).

CEP also reviews proposals for new University Extension certificate programs and, as of this year, periodically reviews existing ones. CEP reviewed and re-approved existing programs in Accounting, Business Administration, Internet Programming and Development, and Very Large Scale Integration. CEP also reviewed programs in Clinical Trials, and in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, but returned these proposals for review next year pending the appointment of UC Santa Cruz Senate faculty member liaisons. CEP thinks that each UNEX certificate program should have at least one specially designated Senate faculty member on the advisory board, someone who would take part in the review process, would be available for consultation with CEP, and would also, along with the relevant department chair(s), review and approve changes to courses and curricula.

E. Other

University and Dean's Honors were implemented smoothly, effective fall 2008.

The campus has long struggled with problems that arise when a department makes significant changes or cancels a course without always consulting adequately with other departments and

programs that depend on that course in some way. With the crucial support of the Registrar's Office, CEP has been working on campus "stakeholder maps". These "maps" will allow anyone to see, for any course taught at UC Santa Cruz: what majors outside of the sponsoring department require it or allow it to satisfy a requirement; what courses it is a prerequisite to outside of the sponsoring department; what courses are prerequisite to it outside of the sponsoring department. Our hope is that these stakeholder maps will greatly improve cross-unit consultations.

With CEP's support, the Registrar's Office refined two-pass enrollment appointments effective fall 2009, improving equity: enrollment appointments are now assigned by class level in descending order according to credits earned rather than randomly.

Following up on CEP's efforts to encourage timely grade submission, the Registrar's Office developed specific communications with faculty regarding late grades, which met with resounding success, significantly reducing the number of late grades at the deadline, the number of late grades from past quarters, and improving faculty understanding of the grading process.

UC Santa Cruz students are approved to take one UC Santa Cruz course through UC Santa Cruz Extension ("concurrent enrollment"). CEP approved a new policy on concurrent enrollment courses that ensures that concurrent enrollment courses are treated consistently with regard to their effect on the UC Santa Cruz GPA. The policy now (ignoring some details) is that such courses count toward the UC Santa Cruz GPA.

Students are currently dropped from classes for which they have not met the prerequisites after grades are in for classes in the previous quarter. This is enforced by the Registrar's Office for classes in which students earn a D, F, or NP grade. CEP agreed to extend this policy for the grades of Incomplete, Z, and DG.

CEP discussed and approved a new language requirement for Literature majors.

CEP Subcommittees reviewed 200 new courses, 887 course revisions/substitutions/cancellations, 61 program statements, and 9 individual majors.

CEP approved 279 Writing-Intensive Course substitutions.

The Chair reviewed another 386 petitions:

- Other general education substitutions (89). Most often these involved the Topical or Introduction to the Discipline courses.
- Late requests to change the grade option (letter grade vs. pass/no pass) of a class (45). Most were denied. Approximately 10 were approved so that a student could meet the graduation requirement that 75 percent of credits be letter graded. In such cases students are not allowed to choose which class(es) to change. Rather, all courses of their last quarter are changed to letter grade option (with the exception of P/NP only courses).
- Requests for a grade change (84). All of these involved late withdrawals from a course, usually for medical reasons, leading to the grade W.

- Late add and drop requests (143).
- Miscellaneous other petitions (25).

Thanks

CEP meetings are large, typically around 16 people. In spite of this size they work very well. This is a tribute to the individuals who make it up. We are grateful, first of all, to the Committee‗s guests. CEP would be at a loss without the dedication, expertise, and infinite patience of Academic Editor Margie Claxton; Academic Preceptor Elaine Kihara; Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bill Ladusaw; Articulation Officer Barbara Love; and Associate Director of Admissions Michael McCawley. We thank all of you for your commitment of time and energy.

CEP relies on its Analyst Roxanne Monnet to function. Roxanne juggles managing materials and planning for a weekly 2½ hour agenda, holding long meetings with the chair, and dealing with a torrent of emails and phone calls from around the campus. (This ignores her work for *other* Senate committees…) More than that, Roxanne helps to keep CEP members on track and focused on what is most important. This was needed more than ever in a year of general education reform. We thank her.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Linda Burman-Hall
David Helmbold   Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NSTF Representative
Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*   Matthew Palm, Student Representative (SUA)
Loisa Nygaard   Ravi Rajan, Provost Representative
Donald Potts   Shawn Riley, Student Representative (SUA)
Eileen Zurbriggen
Jaye Padgett, Chair

August 31, 2009

COMMITTEE ON EMERITI RELATIONS
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) met throughout the year and was well aware of the budgetary crises looming on the horizon. The issues CER took up this year concerned: new fees for emeriti, library mailing policy changes, and divisional support for "actively engaged faculty". We did so in the hope that emeriti would feel encouraged to increase their service to the campus.

Unfortunately this has been a frustrating year for CER and its efforts. No doubt in large measure due to the budgetary crises CER's efforts either received a sluggish response (Council of Deans) in developing a "still actively engaged" Emeriti policy for IT and computer support when they are "actively engaged" in serving the campus and a negative response from the central Administration regarding the pending issue (academic year 08-09) on OPERS Wellness card fees for emeriti and retired staff.

New Fees for Emeriti
During the summer of 2008 the outgoing and incoming chairs of CER met with the Chancellor seeking a reconsideration of newly imposed OPERS Wellness card fees. Little or no consultation with Senate committees had taken place and the Chancellor agreed to fund the modest number of emeriti OPERS users (fewer than 20 faculty) until December. I am happy to report that emeriti continued to have the promised perk throughout the academic year 2008-2009 and we thank the Chancellor for that. Senate consultation on the OPERS issue had not occurred with CER during Academic year 2007-2008. The Chancellor agreed to review the matter during academic year 2008-2009 and during this past year consult with relevant Senate committees. At the same time figures were generated to indicate that the sums involved are very small since fewer than 20 emeriti held OPERS Wellness cards.

It was with sadness that we received the letter sent by the Chancellor to the Chair of the Academic Senate in June 2009 indicating that his review had been completed and that free wellness cards would not be issued for the coming academic year. The Chancellor indicated that a review by the administration staff found no promise for the permanence of this perk. It was and is CER's view that Human Resources indicated Wellness Cards as a perk upon retiring and that indeed posters and some letters to VERIP faculty also indicated it. CER noted that the administration itself changed the language in its letters to new retirees in the past couple of years indicating safeguard language that this perk would be reviewed annually. Earlier generations of emeriti received no such language. The administration rightly pointed to budgetary issues. Still since few actually use wellness cards it was our view that the budgetary impact is minimal and if the administration at least grandfathered in those faculty who retired before the "guarded language" was added it would have procured the sort of good will and donations to OPERS which would have far exceeded the small loss in revenue. CER was sad to learn as per the Chancellor's June 2009 letter that he terminated the OPERS Wellness card benefit for even older generations of emeriti.

Library Mailing Policy Changes
 A new policy was announced by the Library ending the mailing of books directly to faculty mailstops. The measure was justified as a needed cost cutting measure. Again little prior Senate consultation appeared to have taken place. While many faculty were and are unhappy with this policy the new policy has a particularly negative impact on emeriti. Both age and at times disabilities make it difficult for some emeriti to access the library due to the location of parking lots. Several emeriti expressed concern that they are not able to walk much less carry heavy book loads and that the library had reduced disability parking spaces and there are no ten minute parking spaces. While the overall situation continues to be a difficult one for emeriti I am happy to report that Librarian Virginia Steel was very responsive to our concerns and worked with campus officials to provide at least some additional handicapped spaces which helps some but not all emeriti. Lack of easy access to the Library is time consuming for regular faculty but constitutes a special burden on emeriti. An ideal solution does not as yet exist and consultation between senate committees and campus administration is needed.

"Still Actively Engaged Faculty"[1]
Any number of emeriti faculty continue to teach and do research and campus service. CER asked the Deans for an informal policy in all divisions that would develop a category of emeriti jointly with their departments to identify those faculty who are "still actively engaged" and make sure that such faculty receive the IT and computer support which allows them to work. The pattern of getting timely IT and computer support has up to now been very uneven and largely up to each Dean. Even within the same Division a new Dean has been known to precipitously order that emeriti should not get IT support. We have made the argument for support for still actively engaged faculty because we believe it is in the best interest of the campus to encourage rather than discourage still active teachers, researches and those serving the campus actively in various capacities. Treating emeriti reasonably is cost effective since their research and service is mostly done without compensation. Emeriti teaching while compensated, benefits the campus disproportionally to cost. Enjoying the good will of emeriti also has the prospect of increasing emeriti donations to this campus. In short the work of emeriti and the acclaim that some still bring to the campus should not be undervalued. It seems short sighted to us that some emeriti scholars have had to plead for IT support when a computer crashes or data is at risk or that someone teaching at a modest stipend should be told "buy your own computer" with no campus IT assistance. Most emeriti either are no longer active or will be active for a limited number of years. Giving appropriate IT and computer support to still actively engaged emeriti strikes us as a no brainer.

We have worked diligently all year to bring forth a response from the Deans. Again, it was disappointing to receive an email from the outgoing Chair of the Council of Deans in June indicating that they had not discussed the issue fully and would not this academic year. Even more disappointing was his assertion that CER had not spelled out the how and why a "still actively engaged" category was needed and what it would entail and that in any event we already have a category of "On Recall".

---

[1] See Appendix A: Policy on "Still Actively Engaged Faculty"

Our definition of "Still Actively Engaged Faculty:" included those:

- who do considerable free labor without being on Re-call- such as supervise independent studies, graduate students, sit on Senate Committees, serve on Ad hocs etc.;
- who serve on College committees, give lectures, set up conferences etc.;
- who still teach, prepare course materials and courses outside the 10 weeks when they are literally teaching and considered on Recall.

So far, at least, our request seems not to have made sense to the Deans. The Deans email made the point that these matters are best handled on a Divisional basis. This argument has merit but our proposal was merely to set up some umbrella norms and we had suggested that Deans and Department Chair determine who fits the still "actively engaged" category, determine reasonable needs and when a person qualifies. The level of support process would be reviewed as determined by the department and Dean.

CER will continue to work on the above issue. However we wish our colleagues to know that the emeriti do not seek special consideration in times of hardship. Rather CER is trying to sustain and develop the conditions under which emeriti are willing to help the University with teaching, research and service activities in larger numbers than during better times when the campus has less need for the augmentation of activities by emeriti.

CER also received the appointees for the 2009-10 Dickson Professorships. Please join us in congratulating: Ralph Abraham, Audrey Stanley and David Cope. The professors will be teaching courses starting in fall quarter.

The Chair of CER maintained contact with the officers of the UCSC Emeriti Group.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EMERITI RELATIONS
Anatole Leikin
John Lynch (W, S)
Isebill Gruhn, Chair   Elizabeth Abrams *ex officio*

August 31, 2009

Appendix A: "Still Actively Engaged Faculty" Divisional Support Policy

Appendix A

"Still Actively Engaged Faculty" Divisional Support Policy
By the
Committee on Emeriti Relations

Introduction:

This document proposes a policy to deal with one of the concerns expressed by emeriti faculty on the Santa Cruz campus through a survey conducted by the Committee on Emeriti Relations in December 2007. Although most emeriti are generally satisfied with their relationship to the campus, several emeriti still active in teaching, research, or service noted that they have not received support for their computer and teaching needs or have been warned that they may not receive such support in the future.

From the administrative point of view, the problem is one of financial resources and priorities. Administrators would like to have (1) a way to know which faculty are still engaged with the university and to (2) some guidelines as to what kind of administrative support the emeriti would like to receive.

Proposal:

We propose that all emeriti who can be defined as "still actively engaged" by any one of the following three criteria should be eligible for administrative support as defined by the department chair and dean.

First, all those who have the title "Professor Recalled," whether paid or unpaid, should be considered as active emeriti because they are teaching classes, sponsoring independent studies, or serving on senior thesis or doctoral committees.

Second, all those who have the title "Research Professor" should be considered as active emeriti because they have already provided evidence of their continuing scholarly involvement to their departments and the Committee on Academic Personnel through (1) publishing journal articles, monographs, or books; (2) serving on panels at scholarly meetings; (3) applying for research grants from off-campus sources; or (4) receiving research support from on-campus sources, such as the Committee on Research.

Nature of the Support:

Our proposal is a simple and limited one that is consistent with the policies that pertain for regular faculty, but does not suggest that emeriti receive quite the same level of support as regular faculty:

(1) Active emeriti should receive servicing for the computer the university provided them before they were retired. Because the university does not service regular faculty's personally owned computers, emeriti would not receive such service either;

(2) If the computer used by an active emeriti becomes dysfunctional or out of date, emeriti should be eligible to receive a used replacement computer—not a new one, as is the case with regular faculty.

(3) The needs of active emeriti should be included in the licensing of various software applications provided to regular faculty in the retiree's academic division.

(4) Active emeriti should be eligible to be on the waiting list for a laptop loaner for teaching or research needs if their academic division provides laptop loaners to regular faculty.

Conclusion

Many emeriti continue to write works of scholarship or produce artistic work that brings recognition to the campus. Others are teaching courses or working with graduate students. Still others provide service to the campus as consultants or volunteers for campus organizations. The Committee on Emeriti Relations urge that these contributions be recognized by providing administrative support—as defined by each Division--for active emeriti—a status that has been defined in this document.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met every other week throughout the academic year. Representatives from CFW sat on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC), and the Campus Welfare Committee (CWC). Together with chairs and representatives of the Committees on Planning and Budget, Academic Personnel, and Privilege and Tenure, the CFW chair also sat on a subcommittee of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged with analyzing faculty salary data and recommending an approach to redressing the lag in UCSC ladder faculty salaries.

Academic year 2008-09 began with the meltdown of the financial markets, and the ripple effects have touched many of CFW's traditional concerns, including benefits, salary, housing, and childcare. CFW will have a great deal to do in the coming year to monitor, comment on, and intervene in the many changes that have already taken place and are certain to continue. In particular, in the coming year CFW expects to be particularly active in helping develop a more robust advisory structure to oversee the future of child care for faculty and staff families; to renew planning for a child care program supported by an academic program; and to attend very closely to the highly fluid situation of the UC Retirement Program (UCRP) and retiree health benefits, which have been buffeted by the statewide budget crisis and legislative reluctance to shore up these programs. Finally, in light of salary losses due to furloughs and the anticipated effects on take-home pay of mandatory contributions to the UCRP, CFW is already involved in reviewing the assumptions the campus employs about "affordability" when it determines prices for re-sales of campus housing.

Retirement Benefits
Recent losses in the UCRP emerged as one of the most urgent concerns of CFW this year. The ratio of UCRP assets to liabilities gradually decreased over several years in spite of solid economic growth between 2002-2007. This ratio is expected to plunge far below healthy levels—defined as above .95—by 2013. Concerned about the transparency and accessibility of information about the retirement programs—much information is available but relevant information has not been gathered into a single, easily accessible location—CFW worked diligently to gather all the facts from disparate sources to produce a comprehensive report on UCRP that set our concerns about the program into the larger context of UC plans for restructuring. (See http://senate.ucsc.edu/cfw/UCRPreport041709.pdf.)

Some of the key concerns related to retirement include whether current, retired, and newly hired UC employees will receive the financial and health benefits our retirement programs have promised when they retire. Additional concerns include the return of member contributions in the next five years regardless of salary increases, freezes, or even cuts, and whether these contributions will be sufficient to bring UCRP back to sustainable levels. Although the UC Presidential Steering Committee and UC Presidential Task Force have begun to look into these questions, CFW believes the key data related to these questions should be made available to

UCRP members in an easily accessible, transparent, and timely manner so that members can meaningfully make individual decisions such as whether to take a lump sum cash-out upon retirement or not. CFW believes that UC employees will have a better understanding of the decisions the UC Presidential committees and the UC Regents will make, and will engage more effectively in decisions about their retirements, if they have appropriate data easily available.

These concerns about transparency and accessibility of information spurred CFW to co-sponsor, with the Campus Welfare Committee, a very well attended forum on the status of the UCRP (April 22, 2009) led by UCOP representative Gary Schlimgen. CFW circulated its report in advance of the forum, and presented it formally at the May 2009 Academic Senate meeting.

These concerns also caused CFW to propose, at the May meeting, a resolution designed to make UCRP investment information more accessible by gathering the information together on the UC Treasurer's website.   With minor revisions, the Senate adopted the resolution (see http://senate.ucsc.edu/cfw/CFWUCRPResSCP1610.pdf), which was endorsed by at least one other UC campus. Subsequently UCFW endorsed a number of the recommendations. As of June 2009, UCFW planned to submit a request to the UC Treasurer to post specific UCRP investment information online according to a suggested timetable. CFW will continue to monitor the accessibility of this information and will consider renewing the recommendations not adopted by UCFW.

Together with significant uncertainty over the status of UCRP given the reluctance of the legislature to provide funds to support it, CFW anticipates that potential changes to post-retirement health benefits will also become a matter of urgency this year. Through our representation on the systemwide committee, UCFW, we will continue to monitor and participate in these and other matters related to faculty welfare systemwide.

Finally, following the practice of the past several years, CFW continued to co-sponsor a series of brown bag retirement forums during the academic year for faculty and staff.

Faculty Salaries
CFW itself did not participate directly in faculty salary discussions in academic year 2008-09, though the CFW chair served on a Senate Executive Committee (SEC) subcommittee charged with analyzing comparative salary data and recommending an approach to a one-time salary infusion. We summarize this information on salary here for the sake of general interest, as UCSC salary lag, especially in light of the cost of living in the Santa Cruz area, the imposition of furloughs, and the anticipated return of mandatory employee contributions to the UCRP, is an area of critical concern for faculty.

UC faculty salaries generally lag comparison eight institutions by approximately 20 percent. Furloughs representing 4-10 percent cuts for 2009-10 will compound the effect of salary lag, as will the long-delayed start of employee and employer contributions to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) in April 2010. Employee contributions are projected to begin at 2 percent annually and ramp up to 5 percent over five years.

Efforts to increase UC faculty salaries generally and UCSC faculty salaries specifically have been delayed indefinitely as a result of the statewide financial crisis. A four-year COLA rolled out with some fanfare in 2007 to bring ladder faculty salaries up to par with those at other institutions has not progressed beyond the first year—the remaining three years have been postponed.

UCSC ladder faculty salaries are, as a group, the lowest in the ten-campus system. An effort to bring UCSC faculty compensation up has also been delayed. In 2008, a Joint Senate/Administration Task Force on Faculty Salary recommended a two-stage effort to bring UCSC faculty salaries to parity first with the next-lowest paid campus (UC Davis), and then with the nine-campus median (excluding the newest, UC Merced). (See http://senate.ucsc.edu/JointTaskForce/SECFacSalSCP1607.pdf.) Noticing significant gaps in off-scale amounts between UCSC faculty and those at other UCs, the Task Force recommended focusing on high performers by increasing median off-scale salary as a solution to the salary lag.

In 2008-09, an SEC subcommittee further analyzed the faculty salary data reviewed by the Task Force and presented a report, together with a recommended methodology for reaching the first goal, salary parity with UC Davis. This methodology rewards high performers but defines them somewhat differently by focusing on faculty with one or more recent accelerations who are at the 75th percentile for rank and step. The report also recommends a small across-the-board increase to all UCSC faculty. SEC presented this report to the administration and Senate as SEC's recommended approach to a one-time salary infusion (see http://senate.ucsc.edu/JointTaskForce/SECFacSalSCP1607.pdf). Acknowledging UCSC's budget crisis, SEC also recommended delaying implementation, but annually reviewing the proposal, monitoring salary data changes, and reviving the plan when the budget crisis resolves sufficiently to do so. Together with SEC as a whole, CFW will make it its business to ensure that this annual review of data and reconsideration of the plan takes place.

Housing
In housing, the big news was the roll-out of 45 homes in Phase 1 of the Ranch View Terrace (RVT) development, the sale of older campus housing by faculty moving to RVT, and the subsequent campus purchase, renovation and resale of many of those older units—a significant movement in campus housing sales and a considerable achievement in the wake of lawsuits, increased construction costs, and other challenges. Nevertheless, the financial downturn, among other forces, has slowed housing sales. To prevent the builder from exercising the right to sell outside the campus community, as of September 30, 2009, UCSC has purchased 13 RVT homes and resold 5. UCSC is holding 7 RVT homes for future sale; an eighth home has been "assigned" to an employee, meaning that a buyer has signed an agreement to purchase and earnest money is being held in an escrow account. None of these homes are currently being rented as new homes not previously occupied provide a handsome tax incentive to purchasers, at least into November 2009, a program that may extend.

Under its re-pricing and re-purchasing program, UCSC has also purchased 11 homes at Hagar Court, Hagar Meadows, Cardiff Place, and Laureate Court. Three homes in those locations have been assigned to buyers; the remainder are, presumably, undergoing renovations in advance of

resale. The total cost to campus of these re-purchased homes is (other than RVT) is a little over $3M.   CFW will continue to monitor the sale of homes in these campus developments.

In our housing report to the Senate (March 2009) and in subsequent reviews for Senate leadership of the various UC and UCSC programs to assist in home ownership, CFW has indicated that the re-pricing/re-indexing of UCSC housing stock is generally working as planned: making home ownership possible for more starting faculty by generating funds for the "LIO-SHLP" (Low-Interest Option-Supplemental Home Loan Program), for renovation of existing campus housing, and for planning further housing. Per agreement made with the administration, CFW reviewed recommendations for the 2009-10 re-pricing program, including the "campus affordability value" central to the proposal. We found the recommendation to be sound, based on the methodology outlined in the report and the aim of keeping campus housing affordable to faculty.

CFW must follow up on several concerns. First, the annual review of the re-pricing plan must consider not just changing market conditions but also changing employment conditions such as those that faculty are now facing. The new campus programs are based on a definition of "affordability" that allows homes that are 95 percent financed, debt-to-income ratios of 50 percent, and 40-year adjustable-rate mortgages. Faculty who purchased homes with MOP and LIO loans based on actual base salary are feeling the effect of take-home salary reduction now as a result of furloughs. The start of employee contributions to the UCRP will also affect take-home pay. CFW is already starting to review these assumptions about affordability and will recommend changes as warranted by market and employment conditions.

Second, in our March 2009 report on housing, CFW raised the concern that as the re-pricing program had been conceived and initiated at the tail end of the housing bubble, pricing per square foot may be inflated vis-à-vis comparable local housing costs. Given the multiple goals of the re-pricing program, which is intended, among other things, to fund LIOs, CFW will follow up with a request for a robust analysis establishing how much "profit" is needed to make the re-pricing program run effectively and meet its multiple goals. If the current assumptions of the program mean that campus home-buyers are paying more than is needed to run the program, the assumptions will need to be adjusted.

Early Education Services (EES)
In summer 2009, Campus Provost, Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC) Kliger announced to a small group of faculty and staff leaders that EES would close to the children of faculty and staff at the end of December 2009, and that remaining child care services, for children of students alone, would be concentrated in the Faculty Student Housing, leaving the recently renovated Granary empty. Cost-cutting measures also included dispensing with the summer child care program. The rationale for the decision was that while the program for children of students is largely self-supporting through student registration fees and grants and subsidies available through the Title V program, the unsubsidized children of faculty and staff made the program prohibitively expensive, a budget shortfall that could not be addressed via a tuition hike. (According to the budget analysis, tuition would have to approximately double in order to approach the budget gap.)

Senate and Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) members who attended the meeting advised the CP/EVC that this move would make UCSC the only UC campus without child care services for faculty and staff, and would disproportionately affect women and likely underrepresented minorities, and would adversely affect students needing summer care to continue their research or their classes. Attendees were enjoined from consulting with their committees on grounds of confidentiality, as teachers' jobs would be at stake—hence the announcement of the impending closure, when it came, proved explosive.

This announcement precipitated an effort by faculty and staff parents and EES teachers to plan an alternative child care center. Planners solicited UCSC support featuring in-kind and cash donations, possible use of the Granary, and an extension of EES services to faculty and staff children to make the transition possible in exchange for preferential admission of faculty and staff children and sufficient relationship between UCSC and the new center to soften UCSC's divorce from child care for faculty and staff. This effort has hardened into a formal proposal and business plan currently under consideration by the CP/EVC. Because of contractual obligations, layoff notices have been sent to EES teachers, but may be rescinded if the proposal is approved by the CP/EVC.

Should the proposal be adopted, it will, we expect, provide a bridge to the recommendations of CFW's 2008 Academic Vision Plan for Child Care Education Services at UCSC (http://senate.ucsc.edu/cfw/), which called for a new administrative structure tied to the academic mission of the University and apart from the governance of Student Affairs. Together with the Child Care Advisory Committee, which CFW intends to help redefine in the wake of the recent changes in EES, CFW intends to make planning for the future of child care a central part of its mission in 2009-10.

Though the summer announcement overshadowed all that preceded it, CFW did spend a fair amount of time and energy in 2008-09 investigating EES. We concentrated on three main issues:

(1) The program's operating status in 2008-09, and especially its progress in reorganizing under a new director in the wake of serious violations that jeopardized EES's licenses and led to a lengthy period of probation. This was a considerable success, with an initial rocky period swiftly settling down into an outstanding program with significant parent satisfaction. Though enrollments were kept artificially low in order to ease the program back to operational viability and in anticipation of a long-awaited "toddler/2s" room, which opened in winter quarter 2009, they were robust enough to indicate the clear success of the programs after several years of considerable change.

(2) The program's future under the Academic Vision Plan presented by the previous year's CFW, and especially how EES might transition from a services-oriented child care under Student Affairs into a lab school arm of the Social Sciences division. On this front, CFW decided that an appropriate first step would be to initiate something analogous to an external review for an academic unit, beginning with what we thought of as a kind of self-study. Though we did not conclude this effort, we spent considerable energy requesting and

analyzing operations, organizational, and budgetary data about EES, and tracking the rising costs of the facilities in the wake of various changes to the funding structure, including loss of some grant monies, the effects of the new Child Care Access Policy on use of student fees, and new costs such as salary for a director.

(3) The increasing size of the EES budget over the course of the year, which underwrote and, finally, overshadowed both of the other elements.

Transportation and parking
The CFW goal for the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) in the 2008-09 academic year was sustainability. Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) leadership embraced this goal, making it one of their priorities for the year. CFW has also closely reviewed the TAPS budget and student interest in increasing their authority over the use of student transportation fees.

While TAPS has had some notable successes in recent years, especially in sustainability programs, there continues to be a significant mismatch between the TAPS budget and demands on it. Successes include the ZIP car program, which has been popular enough to merit additional car purchases, and other sustainability efforts: bicycle shuttle use and requests for bus passes went up, while total demand for on-campus parking went down (a reduction concentrated in the number of [R] permits). Indeed, the past three years have seen a 20 percent decrease in the number of cars on campus.

However, TAPS has also maintained a significant budget deficit—close to $1.9M as of November 2008—that indicates a business model that is not working. (Its nearly $1.3M in reserve funds as of the same date, meant to cover new infrastructure and capital projects such as new parking lots or structures, cannot be tapped to cover deficits.) Prospective revenue increases from increased parking fees, decreased subsidies for such programs as vanpools, grant funding, and so on, cannot be expected to cover the budget gap. Some TAPS successes may potentially contribute to the budget trouble. One example: Decreasing the number of cars on campus—good for sustainability—means decreasing parking revenues, which themselves help subsidize the bus pass program.

TAPS has also come under some pressure by students interested in how student transportation fees subsidize alternative modes of transportation. Student representatives to TAC indicated that they did not want student fees used to subsidize programs, such as carpools, that did not significantly benefit students. Student representatives also indicated they wanted a stronger voice in how fees are used to support Metro bus passes, and that they would like to limit Metro stops on campus to a single location in order to prevent use of Metro buses in lieu of campus loop shuttles. CFW will monitor this closely, as Metro service to multiple campus locations is important to faculty bus riders. Finally, the recent cancellation of the shuttle to the Long Marine Lab—a costly service with a small ridership—may cause some faculty to schedule classes on the main campus.

Responding to the TAPS Budget Advisory Group report of June 2009, CFW strongly recommended that expenditures more closely align with the TAPS core mission: to

accommodate and manage physical access to the UCSC campus. Insofar as the current funding model employs Student Transit Fees, expenditures such as funding of shuttle buses and their periodic replacement, and transportation services for disabled riders, among other things, are a good fit for this mission. Other activities and expenses are not a good fit, including some that might be described as mission critical for the campus but secondary to the core mission of TAPS itself. These include the cost of compliance with state and federal regulations, the cost of new parking lots for state-funded buildings, the extension of parking programs to off-campus sites. CFW recommends that such activities be split off and supported from central funding rather than from Student Transit Fees.

CFW has stated that with reduced parking demand, and, hence, reduced parking revenues, TAPS must reduce its operating costs by focusing on its central mission, pursuing cost-cutting measures such as automation in parking services, and aggressively pursuing revision of the budget model for state-funded campus buildings so that building budgets include funding for new or replacement parking spaces.

In response to concerns brought to CFW by campus members, CFW raised several safety issues with the Campus Welfare Committee: recent car burglaries in campus lots, inadequate lighting during power outages, and a dangerous intersection of car, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic at the access road to Ranch View Terrace. Analysis (from campus police and other sources) indicated that effective installation of security cameras would be prohibitively expensive, as would back-up lighting during outages, but that additional safety measures might be effective in warning cars and pedestrians of bicycle traffic crossing the RVT access road. CFW should review action taken on this item.

Acknowledgments
The work of CFW would be infinitely more challenging without the guidance, organization, and excellent institutional memory of analyst Pamela Edwards, to whom we owe great thanks for hard work and good company.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Roger Anderson (F, W)
Maria-Elena Diaz
Joel Kubby
Suresh Lodha
Pete Raimondi (W, S)
Jennifer Reardon
Elizabeth Stephens (F)
Trish Stoddart (S)
Marilyn Westerkamp (S)
Jim Zachos (F, W)
Isabel Gruhn *ex officio*
Elizabeth Abrams, Chair

October 16, 2009

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) met twice per quarter in 2008-09, twice as often as in the previous year. During fall and winter quarters, the committee spent most of its time discussing and critiquing the Universitywide Office of the Education Abroad Program (UOEAP) Business Plan Proposal submitted by UOEAP Director Michael Cowan. The proposal reflected the severe cuts (50%) to UOEAP that Director Cowan was facing and also UCOP's plan to reduce UOEAPs general fund budget from $20M to $4M over 3 years. To accommodate this reduction, Director Cowan proposed that several EAP programs be cut entirely and that many study center directorships be eliminated. Implicit in the proposal was the idea that the various UC campuses would rely increasingly on third-party programs, many of which have little or no academic oversight or course control.

CIE members were not generally supportive of Cowan's business plan: it presumed that retrenchment and reduction was the best way to go, without exploring the possibility of expansion through entrepreneurship. CIE felt that UOEAP should strive to retain its worldwide presence by itself becoming a third-party provider to the California State system and perhaps also to nearby campuses in Oregon, Nevada, and Arizona. On the positive side, CIE supported Cowan's idea that instructional funds should go directly to UOEAP or to the campuses to promote EAP and other international programs.

In March 2009, the new Office of International Education (OIE) Director George Barlos began to sit with the committee. He provided regular updates on the projects being undertaken by his office, and his goals for expanding and increasing the levels of service provided by the Office of International Education in the face of further cuts to OIE's budget.

During spring quarter the committee discussed a wave of EAP program closures that occurred. It was quite clear from the spring UCIE meeting in Oakland that Director Cowan had made these decisions without prior consultation with the campus CIEs. UOEAP was not able to provide any clear criteria to explain the various program closures or to provide convincing information as to how the decisions were made. Both the campus CIE and the UCIE view this as an unacceptable lack of transparency in the decision-making process that needs to be addressed in 2009-10. CIE would like to see a comprehensive strategy regarding closures that speaks specifically to academic goals and costs. The criteria appear to be program cost, redundancy and low enrollments, but a formal set of metrics would be useful.

In March 2009, Interim Provost Pitts announced a joint Senate-Administrative Task Force to review and offer advice on the program's long-term design and business model.   At the committee's final spring meeting, CIE discussed the preliminary draft report submitted by the Task Force. Overall, the committee had few problems with the recommendations, but did provide EAP Faculty Director Sharp with some specific feedback that he agreed to incorporate into his formal response to the draft report.

CIE also provided feedback on the "Principles for Non-resident Enrollment" proposal by BOARS.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Michael Hutchison   Mary Flannery, NSTF
Debra Lewis
Armin Mester
Buchanan Sharp, *ex officio*
Mark Cioc, Chair

September 25, 2009

COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) met once or twice per quarter throughout the academic year to deal with specific issues related to its charge. The work and accomplishments of the Committee during the 2008-09 year are summarized below.

Tracking Entry Level Writing Requirement pass rates:
In 2006-07, CPE noted an upward trend in the percentage of students who did not complete the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) by the end of their first quarter of enrollment. In order to mitigate the impacts of this trend, CPE worked on strengthening the enforcement of Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 10.5.2. The good news is that the trend seems to be reversing, as the ELWR pass rates at the end of fall quarter rose to 73 percent in 2007 and 70 percent in 2008 from a low of 66 percent in 2006. However, this is still significantly below the average pass rate of 78 percent from 1999-2004. It seems worthwhile to keep a close eye on the ELWR pass rates, particularly in light of the recent report on ELWR core course performance cited below.

In 2007, CPE discussed with the administration the tracking of students in order to see how language, culture or other factors correlated with students' success or lack of success in completing ELWR and with their overall academic success at the university. These data, and others, now show a disturbing pattern as seen in an analysis of ELWR core course student performance data prepared by Holly Gritsch de Cordova (Director, Learning Support Services), Charis Herzon (Assistant Director, Learning Support Services), Rebecca Anderson, (MSI/Tutor Coordinator, Learning Support Services), and Sarah-Hope Parmeter (ELWR Coordinator), submitted to CPE June 1, 2009. This study focused on students enrolled in ELWR sections of the core course at all ten UCSC colleges in fall 2008. It was reported that only 51 percent of the Equal Opportunity Program (EOP) students satisfied ELWR by November 2008 compared to 79 percent of the non-EOP students. According to the report, "Low-income, first generation university students perform academically less well than more privileged students when enrolled in the same classes. Furthermore, students of color from low-income backgrounds and the first generation in their families to attend a university achieve less academic success than low-income, first generation white students enrolled in the same classes. The ELWR Core courses do not appear to be educating students equitably."

CPE is concerned with this finding, and hopes that this report informs the direction of the Committee in 2009-10. In our opinion, the delayed completion of ELWR by the most vulnerable members of campus is worth further investigation and intervention. We speculate that acculturation to academia, or the need to work more hours than others, may play a part in lower scores. CPE wonders whether there could be data to support these speculations and whether receiving financial aid other than work-study during their first year might mitigate the difference in scores between EOP and non-EOP students.

Math preparation, sequencing and placement exams:
CPE spent the majority of the year considering math preparation, sequencing, and placement

exams. In October, we were asked by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to consider a request by the Math department to revise policy concerning the mathematics placement exam. According to CPE's charge (SCR 13.25.2), the Committee supervises mathematics placement exams. At issue were the number of times students were allowed to retake the exam, and the use of the exam to place out of Math 3 if they received a failing grade. Our discussion revealed an additional problem with two distinct populations in Math 3--those who were continuing in a mathematics series of courses and those for whom it was a required terminal course for another major (e.g., Psychology).

CPE members voted in support of the request to limit students to three attempts at the Math Placement Exam and to disallow the exam as a substitute way of passing beyond a class that they previously failed. The change will be effective with the 2009-10 catalog year.

CPE also investigated the course offerings by Math and Applied Math and Statistics for social science majors and the requirements of various departments for mathematical coursework. In this, members considered the results of the May 2008 undergraduate student opinion poll conducted by CEP which contained comments related to mathematics at UCSC, course syllabi, and the opinion of course instructors. These data suggest that another course, such as Math 4, should be offered for social sciences students. Fortunately, Math 4 was developed for this purpose and offered as a new course this year. The Psychology Department confirmed that they are considering AMS 2 and Math 4 as alternatives for their precalculus requirement, which is usually satisfied through completion of Math 3. To date, a formal request has not been submitted to CEP to change the requirement in the catalog. The Math Department will continue offering Math 4 for non-mathematics majors in 2009-10.

Response to Proposed Revision to Senate Regulations Governing Undergraduate Admissions:
CPE discussed the proposed revisions to Senate Regulations governing undergraduate admissions. These were proposed to bring Regulations into compliance with the admissions eligibility criteria adopted by the UC Regents earlier this year. CPE's response focused on the areas of their charge related to preparatory education in mathematics and English.

On April 30, 2009, CPE submitted a letter to Santa Cruz Division Academic Senate Chair Quentin Williams this discussion. UC admissions currently require three years of Mathematics. The Committee would like to see four years of High School Mathematics required for UC eligibility.   CPE also strongly recommends that students who are interested in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) majors take a year of precalculus as one of the four classes, in preparation for the University STEM courses. In addition, while CPE agreed that four courses of English is an appropriate requirement for admission, we would like at least one of these courses to involve writing on topics beyond literature. This change in subject area writing is aligned with the new UCSC Disciplinary Communication requirement and would begin to address the same concerns.

University Committee on Preparatory Education meetings:
The chair attended two University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) meetings in which the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) prompts were evaluated and chosen for

future use. Scoring was also calibrated for the exam. It was anticipated that approximately 17,500 students would take the AWPE in spring, even with a reduction in the freshman class. Budget implications were discussed systemwide and at individual campuses.

Continuing Concerns:
1) Academic Preparedness of Transfer Students
CPE remains concerned about the preparedness of transfer students to tackle upper-division course work. The Committee feels that there needs to be more formal academic support for transfer students at UCSC, especially in the areas of math and writing. There was speculation that some transfer students come to UCSC lacking academic vocabulary or experiences that could help with success in university. CPE recommends that next year's Committee consult with Services for Transfer and Re-entry Students in order to consider what support may be given to transfer students to help bridge gaps that might exist between expectations and experiences that are part of community college versus expectations and experiences at the university level.

2) Pre-Admission requirements for majors
CPE is concerned about a growing trend toward pre-admission requirements for certain majors at UCSC. Specifically, we are concerned about students' ability to obtain degrees of interest in light of such policies. The Committee wonders whether students who need more preparatory classes for English or math earlier in their time at UCSC will be shut out from some majors. The Committee wrote to CEP encouraging them to explore this important topic early next year and to ask that CPE be included in the loop.

3) Perceived gap between Math 2 and Math 3
Members of the Committee identified a perceived gap between Math 2 and Math 3 (or equivalent courses) this year. To view the contours of such a gap, it would be worthwhile to find out the correlation between the grades received in Math 2 with that of Math 3 and the fail rate for students who took Math 3 (and like courses) after taking Math 2. This can establish whether or not there are issues with this particular transition, whether or not the curriculum for Math 2 should be restructured, and what, if any, additional support might be given to students who take Math 3 (or equivalent courses) after Math 2.

Acknowledgements:
The Committee is once again grateful to Committee Analyst/Advisor Roxanne Monnet from the Academic Senate Office for her expert staffing and support throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
Tony Tromba
Anna Tsing
Nate Mackey (F)   Nandini Bhattacharya, NSTF Rep
Judith A. Scott, Chair   Sarah-Hope Parmeter, ELWR Coordinator

August 31, 2009

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) met fifteen times this academic year, including three special meetings added for review of grievances only. The Committee took part in an orientation in the fall with members of the Charges Committee, Privilege and Tenure Advisors, Carole Rossi, Chief Campus Counselor and Rita Walker, Title IX/Sexual Harassment officer.

P&T researched and developed a Recusal Policy in the fall and implemented it in winter 2009. UCSC P&T was the second UC P&T to do so (UCB being the other). General procedures for Committee review of grievances were also developed during the course of the year.

The Committee was asked to consider and to respond with a written consultation report on the following policies and topics found in the Academic Personnel Manual APM (UC system-wide), Campus Academic Personnel Manual CAPM (UCSC) and Senate issues:

- Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries Report - feedback on draft and final report. The P&T chair was added to the SEC salary subcommittee towards the end of fall quarter
- Proposed Revisions to APM Policies - Systemwide review of (1) proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 110-4, 230-17 and 18, 279-20, 360-80-a, 520-4, 710-14-b, 710-14-1, 710-38, 710-36 and 46; and (2) proposed new Academic Personnel Policy 765
- Formal Review of CAPM 108.00 - Waiver of Recruitment for Ladder-Rank Faculty: Domestic Partner
- Action Plan High Level Indicators: Measuring Our Progress, Next Steps
- Formal Review of Proposed Revisions to CAPM 416.220 - Joint Appointments for Senate Faculty
- Management Consultation Review of Proposed Revised CAPM 506.235 - Acting Professor Series Appointment and Regularization
- Review of Technical Revisions to APM 028 - Disclosure of Financial Interest In Private Sponsors of Research
- Formal Review of Updates to CAPM 100.500 - Academic Recruitment
- Review Five-Year SMG Performance Review Administrative Guidelines
- Proposed Amendment to Standing Order 100.4 – 100.4(xx) – Emergency Furlough and Salary Reductions Policies

Grievances

P&T reviewed three grievances in 2008-09. One was received last year and one was received in June 2008 after P&T's final meeting of the year. P&T did not review this grievance for *prima facia* until the fall. The third grievance was received in fall 2008.

Charges

There were no charges presented by the Administration this year.

P&T Advisors:
P&T advisors are faculty members who can give advice and assistance to colleagues who
believe that their rights and privileges may have been violated. Through the help they
provide to faculty in analyzing, preparing, and filing their cases, P&T advisors are crucial to the
Committee's smooth operation. A list of P&T Advisors is available at:
http://senate.ucsc.edu/p_t/.

The Committee wishes to express its thanks and appreciation for the excellent Senate staff
support provided by Pamela Edwards.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
David Belanger
E.G. Crichton
David Feldheim
Julie Guthman (W)
Michael Loik (F, S)
Richard Terdiman
James Whitehead
Catherine M. Soussloff, Chair

October 12, 2009

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

I. COR Activities Regarding Matters of Research Policy

A. Relations with the Vice Chancellor of Research (VCR) and Office of Research

The 2008-09 the Committee on Research (COR) continued its interaction and coordination with VCR Bruce Margon, who attended most meetings of COR as a guest, participated in discussions, and on several occasions sought COR‟s input on matters of research policy. COR also invited Bill Clark, Director of the Office of Sponsored Projects, to attend one of COR‟s meetings to give committee members an overview of the organization of his office and of the services provided in support of faculty research. Next year‟s COR will determine whether to recommend that a review of the Office of Sponsored Projects be conducted in the near future.

B. Intellectual Property Management

This year, COR embarked on an in-depth examination of issues of intellectual property on campus. COR held extensive discussions during the first part of the year and consulted with Vanessa Tollefson, Acting Director of the Office of Management of Intellectual Property. COR also consulted with Professor Chris Connery, Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom.

Intellectual property is a complex territory that spans a wide spectrum, from patents and licensing to scholarly communications. COR felt that there is a need to clarify the services available on campus, but also delineate the limitations associated with the management of intellectual property. As a first step towards disseminating information, COR hosted an educational forum on Intellectual Property, co-sponsored by the Office of Research, which took place in May 2009. At this forum, which was geared mainly towards engineering and sciences faculty, Acting Director Tollefson gave an overview of her office, discussed UC policies and processes concerning patents, collaborations, and licensing, and also presented a number of recent test cases.

Next year‟s COR will consider hosting a second forum on intellectual property that will be geared towards faculty in other divisions and will cover, among other things, issues of copyright and sharing of educational material.

C. Reviews of Divisional Research Units

At the request of the Dean of Social Sciences, COR reviewed the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems (CASFS) and the New Teacher Center (NTC). COR also reviewed the self-study and provided comments on the draft charge for the upcoming review of the Institute for Marine Sciences (IMS).

A broader related issue is COR‟s concern that there are no clear processes across the divisions on formally involving COR in reviews of divisional research units and centers (apart from ORUs). COR discussed the possibility that COR and CPB work together to develop processes for

reviewing divisional research units and centers on a regular basis. Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.27.2 1) on COR''s charge appears to support COR''s role in this way.

D. Indirect Cost Recovery

This year, UCORP and UCPB declined to pursue further the issue of tracking and analyzing indirect cost recovery, an issue that had been raised repeatedly in the past. COR examined an aspect of current policy which inhibits return of a portion of indirect costs to academic Divisions/Schools via the otherwise-standard formula in the case when the underlying source of funds is a federal grant or contract, but these funds are passed to UCSC as a sub-award by another party, such as another university or UC campus. In June, COR wrote a letter to VCR Margon requesting a change in policy to the effect that the original source of sponsored research funds determines the indirect cost redistribution on campus, not the presence of a "middleman" third party that merely passes the funds through.

E. Miscellanea

At the request of VCR Margon, the Committee discussed the issue of allowing postdoctoral scholars to serve as principal investigators (PIs) on extramural grants. The Regents (and not the Senate) have set policy on who can be a PI. Distinguishing "co-PIs" is more complicated and differs from agency to agency. Furthermore, even on our campus there are different interpretations as to whether assigning a postdoctoral scholar as a co-PI requires an exception. It would be desirable to develop a set of guidelines that include examples of when an exception to the PI status can be approved by the Office of Research, as well as circumstances likely to lead to a denial of that status.

COR also discussed potential implications on research following the formation of a union of postdoctoral scholars in the UC system.

II. COR Activities Involving the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP)

A. MRU/MRPI Competition

In November 2008, VP Beckwith sent out a call for proposals for Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPIs). All existing Multicampus Research Units (MRUs) were invited to apply for funding competitively, except for UCO Lick and White Mountain, which will participate in a future MRPI competition. UCSC submitted 20 proposals for new programs and existing MRUs with UCSC as the lead campus, and four such proposals were eventually recommended for funding.

Midway through the proposal process, it was brought to the Chair''s attention that the MRPI competition that is currently underway does not include provisions for vetting by Senate committees, as outlined in the UC Compendium. COR discussed the lack of Senate participation in the new MRU/MRPI competition, and agreed that it was problematic that the proposal review does not adhere to the Compendium, especially in cases that may result in a de facto MRU disestablishment, but also agreed that it was too late to intervene in the MRPI competition underway. UCORP and Academic Council Chair Croughan had extensive correspondence with Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Beckwith about this issue. The Academic

Senate has been assured that proper Compendium procedures will be followed if the MRPI competition results in the establishment or disestablishment of any programs, and that the involvement of Senate committees will be integrated into future requests for MRPI proposals.

III. COR Budget and Grants Programs

A. COR Budget
As a result of the budget crisis, COR received a permanent reduction of $2900 to its base funding. Additional cuts are expected in 2009-10. The total amount of 2008-09 funds allocated to COR was $500,109. Taking a longer view, UCSC COR funding continues to slip behind levels during the late 1980s and early 1990s, and remains well below funding levels at most other UC campuses (as documented in the COR 2004-05 annual report and the 2002-03 report on COR funding levels).

B. COR Grants Programs
COR continued to fund three primary grant programs during the 2008-09 year: Faculty Research Grants (FRGs), Special Research Grants (SRGs), and funding for Scholarly Meeting Travel (SMT). The FRG and SRG awards were made in the Spring, whereas SMT awards were made throughout the fiscal year. In addition, COR funded New Faculty Research Grants (NRFGs) in the Fall for newly-arrived faculty. Total funding in support of these programs was $593,322 (Table 1). The amount expended by COR in support of research in 2008-09 that exceeded 2008-09 funding was made up by carry-forward from the preceding year. It should be noted that the FRG expenditures listed below were allocated by the 2007-08 COR but paid with 2008-09 funds.

Table 1. Summary of COR Research Expenditures during the 2008-09 Year

Category	Amount	Comments
FRG (awarded in Spring 2008 by the 2007-08 COR) & NFRG (awarded in Fall 08 by the 2008-09 COR)	$227,757	Paid with 2008-09 funds
SRG (awarded in Spring 2009 by the 2008-09 COR)	$238,575	Paid with 2008-09 funds
SMT (awarded throughout the year by the 2008-09 COR)	$126,990	Paid with 2008-09 funds
Total expenditures	**$593,322**	

As in 2007-08, the „basic" award for FRGs and NFRGs was $2,000 for untenured faculty and from $1,500 for tenured faculty. Due to the budget crisis, COR was unable to offer an additional $500 for exceptional applications, as it had in the past. SRG awards ranged between $6,000 and $12,000, with an approximate average of $8,000. SMT funding was limited to $650, with up to $1,000 available every third year.

The vast majority of FRG, NFRG, and SMT requests were funded in full. Although there are restrictions as to how funds can be used in these programs, applicants who follow the instructions and properly justify their requests are generally funded.

This year, COR received 53 proposals for the SRG competition, which represents a 35.9% increase over the number (39) of proposals received last year. Furthermore, COR received 146 proposals for the FRG competition, which represents a 16.8% increase over the number of proposals (125) received last year.

Given the overall high quality of the submitted proposals, COR felt that it was important to award as many SRG grants as possible. Many of the submitted proposals were towards the completion of important ongoing scholarly work, while others aimed at initiating new research projects or preparing proposals for major extramural grants. In view of the limited funds available, however, almost all successful SRG proposals were funded for amounts lower than those requested in the proposal.

Table 2. Summary statistics on the 2008-09 FRG and SMT programs.

Division	FRG apps funded	FRG amount funded	SMT apps funded	SMT amount funded
Arts	33	$63,452	24	$18,400
Engineering	2	$3,595	11	$8,550
Humanities	32	$51,262	51	$37,347
P&BS	15	$24,089	20	$15,318
SocSci	46	$85,359	65	$47,375
Campus	**128**	**$227,757**	**171**	**$126,990**

In Table 2, the FRG awards were made by the 2007-08 COR but, as noted earlier, they were paid with 2008-09 funds. In Table 3 below, the SRG awards were made by the 2008-09 COR and paid with 2008-09 funds.

Table 3. Summary statistics on the 2008-09 SRG program.

Division	SRG apps requested	SRG apps funded	SRG amount funded
Arts	13	7	$53,475
Engineering	7	5	$39,000
Humanities	5	4	$25,500
P&BS	10	7	$60,000
SocSci	18	7	$60,600
Campus	**53**	**30**	**$238,575**

In Spring 2009, COR also adjudicated the FRG awards for the 2009-10 academic year. Though these awards will be paid out of next year''s budget, Table 4 outlines the awards granted by the 2008-09 COR.

Table 4. Summary statistics on the 2009-10 FRG program.

Division	FRG apps requested	FRG apps funded	FRG amount funded
Arts	43	36	$50,280
Engineering	2	2	$3,500
Humanities	40	35	$49,810
P&BS	18	17	$23,272
SocSci	43	39	$58,730
Campus	**146**	**129**	**$185,592**

IV. COR Events and Initiatives

In addition to the Forum on Intellectual Property hosted in May 2009 (see above), COR also embarked on a plan to institute an annual Convocation on Research. The aim of this event is to recognize high-profile external research awards and recognition earned by UCSC faculty during the previous academic year. This is consistent with COR"s long-term interest in supporting, advocating, and making research visible on campus.

V. Other COR Business
COR also discussed and commented on several system-wide policies and discussed a number of other local issues, among them:

- Academic Plan Metrics and High-Level Indicators (12/2/08)
- Revisions to CAPM 416.220 – Joint Appointments for Senate Faculty (12/2/08)
- Proposed UC Seminar Network (5/12/09)
- Proposed Amendment to Standing Order 100.4 – Emergency Furlough and Salary Reduction Policies (5/12/09)
- SMG Performance Review Administrative Guidelines (6/2/09)

VI. COR Representation

The COR Chair represented the campus on the system-wide University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), which met monthly; furthermore, he represented COR on the Senate Executive Committee, which met biweekly. COR member Shaowei Chen represented the Committee throughout the year during most Instructional Technology Committee meetings.

VII. COR Senate Support

During the fall quarter, COR was supported by Laurie Babka, who retired in December of 2008. Stephanie Casher succeeded Laurie Babka as Senate Committee Advisor in winter of 2009. Roxanne Monnet attended most of the fall meetings and provided support during the transition period. COR is deeply indebted to these three staff members for their dedication, professionalism, and thoughtful support. Their contributions were enormously important to the functioning of the Committee throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
Shaowei Chen
Donka Farkas
Carla Freccero
Donna Hunter (F)
Judit Moschkovich (F, W)
Holger Schmidt
Vanita Seth (S)
Sriram Shastry
Lewis Watts (W, S)
Meg Wilson
Phokion G. Kolaitis, Chair

October 9, 2009

COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION, AND ELECTIONS
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (CRJE) met eight times in 2008-09. This report summarizes the Committee's work during the year.

Advice and interpretation of legislation:
No formal legislative interpretations were issued this year, and therefore none were reported to the Senate.

SCR 6.5 and SR 764: CRJE considered an inquiry from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) about Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 6.5 which deals with students taking independent study courses. Strong restrictions are placed on such courses by Systemwide Regulation (SR) 764, somewhat loosened by an approved variance for the Santa Cruz Division. In response to a question from CEP about an existing Major program at UCSC, CRJE stated that the program was not in accordance with the local or systemwide Regulations. Since CRJE learned that CEP was contemplating proposing that SCR 6.5 should be amended, an inquiry was sent to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) about the interpretation of the variance from SR 764, so that CEP would know what amendments to SCR 6.5 would require a new variance. Under UCRJ's interpretation, subsequently changed to a Legislative Ruling, SCR 6.5 would need a new variance even without any amendments. In a letter to the Senate Chair after the Legislative Ruling was issued, CRJE explained its reservations about the ruling.   In view of the discussion at the systemwide level about whether to rescind SR 764, which would make the question of a variance moot, CRJE has deferred to next year's committee the task of seeking a new variance (for SCR 6.5 as amended by the Division in its May 2009 meeting).

Review of proposed legislation and resolutions:
SCR 6.5: CRJE reviewed the changes proposed by CEP. As noted by CEP in the justification to the legislation, the change to SCR 6.5 requires the Assembly of the Academic Senate to approve a variance from SR 764 before it can be valid. CRJE also recommended that the term "special study courses" in the draft legislation be changed to avoid confusion with the same term in SR 764 which possibly carries a different meaning. CEP changed the term to "special approval courses".

Santa Cruz Bylaw (SCB) 13.12.1: CRJE reviewed the proposed change to the charge of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) and held that it was clear and not in conflict with existing legislation. Since the membership and charge of the various standing committees are primarily the responsibility of the Committee on Committees (COC), CRJE advised that COC should have had a chance to consider the proposed change; this had already been done.

UCRP Resolution: CRJE reviewed the Resolution about the University of California Retirement Plan submitted to the Division by the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW). CRJE made various recommendations about whom the different clauses in the Resolution should be

addressed to. The revised Resolution was found to be clear and not in conflict with any legislation.

SCR 10: CRJE reviewed CEP's proposal to change the writing-intensive requirement to disciplinary communication. Minor changes were recommended for clarity; the proposal was found to be consistent with existing legislation.

SCB 13: CRJE reviewed the changes to Chapter 13 proposed by COC, dealing with the rights of invitees and representatives to standing committees of the Division. The legislation proposed by COC for the February meeting of the Division and the revised version submitted to the Division in May were both found to be clear and not in conflict with existing legislation.

SCR 10.2: CRJE reviewed CEP's proposal to restructure the General Education requirements for undergraduate students. It found the proposed legislation to be clear and not in conflict with existing legislation.

SCR 10.2.2.3: CRJE reviewed CEP's proposed change to how transfer credit for Topical requirements is determined, and found it to be clear and not in conflict with existing legislation.

Appendix C: CRJE reviewed the proposal from CEP and the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee to change the time provided in Appendix C of the Divisional Manual for a student to file a grievance. It found the proposal to be clear and not in conflict with existing legislation.

COC elections:
This year, fresh elections had to be announced for COC because, in response to the original announcement, fewer nominations were received than the number of vacancies. Subsequently, CRJE felt that the procedure to deal with such situations should be spelled out clearly in the Divisional Bylaws. Accordingly, CRJE proposed changes to Chapter 11 of the Bylaws; an additional amendment to Chapter 11 was proposed to make it clear that ballot votes in Divisional meetings--consistent with established practice--are not conducted by mail. These changes were approved by the Division in its May meeting. CRJE is pleased with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and COC's plan to consider how participation in COC can be increased.

The CRJE chair provided informal advice that, as per SCB 13.14.2, if a COC member fails to complete their term and an election is held to fill a vacancy for the second year of the term, the newly elected member only serves for one year.

Santa Cruz Division Manual updates:
College Bylaws: CRJE reviewed the Bylaws submitted by Kresge College and College 8. Various revisions were suggested for clarity. The final versions were found to be not in conflict with any Divisional or systemwide legislation, and are included in the 2009 edition of the Senate Manual, which now includes Bylaws from nine of the ten colleges. CRJE also suggested revisions to the Bylaws for Oakes College, and expects that these will be finished early in fall 2009.

Divisional Regulations: CRJE undertook an exhaustive--and exhausting--review of all Divisional Regulations to check for clarity, internal consistency, and compliance with systemwide legislation. Various Regulations were identified that may require amending; CEP and the Graduate Council (GC) have been informed about them.   Some Regulations conflict with systemwide Regulations; after CEP has decided whether to recommend that the Division amend these, variances will have to be sought from the Assembly of the Academic Senate. Because the review was completed towards the end of the academic year, these actions will have to take place in 2009-10.   Various editorial changes were made by CRJE to improve the clarity of the Regulations in accordance with SCB 13.28.5.

CRJE also learned of two places where the General Catalog is in conflict with Divisional Regulations. In practice, these documents control how Regulations are implemented for students, regardless of what is written in the Senate Manual. We recommend that CRJE undertake a review of the relevant sections of the General Catalog and The Navigator in 2009-10 to see if there are other such instances, and institute a mechanism so that changes to these sections are checked by the Committee before new editions of the Catalog and Navigator are published.

Appendix B: CRJE found several discrepancies between Appendix B of the Divisional Manual and Appendix III of the systemwide Senate Manual, both of which list variances approved by the Assembly. In some cases, CRJE corrected omissions in Appendix B. In others, after obtaining agendas and minutes of relevant Assembly meetings, CRJE confirmed that Appendix B was correct and requested UCRJ to update Appendix III. As far as possible, the wording of the items in Appendix B was changed to reference the Divisional Regulations for which variances have been obtained.

Divisional Regulations for which variances have been obtained from the Assembly should be numbered with an "A" prefix, according to Senate Bylaw (SB) 80.D. Errors had accumulated in this over time. Correcting these errors by inspecting Assembly agendas was not straightforward: when a variance is requested, extra Divisional Regulations are sometimes sent to the Assembly to provide context. Moreover, some Divisional Regulations require approval from the Assembly even if they do not conflict with anything systemwide (e.g. the Honors Policy). UCRJ has been informed of the choices CRJE made when updating the "A" prefixes; any corrections from UCRJ should be reflected in next year's Manual.

Appendix D: GC sent CRJE a revised version of Section XII of Appendix D of the Senate Manual. The revisions address concerns that CRJE expressed with the 2008 version and lacunae identified by GC. The revised version has been included in the 2009 Senate Manual.

Other issues:
CRJE considered an inquiry from a member of a standing committee about the right of members to access documents submitted to their standing committee. After consulting relevant Divisional and systemwide Bylaws and Regulations and *The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure* by Sturgis, CRJE agreed that all officially submitted documents that pertain to a topic should be made available to all committee members prior to discussion of that topic by the full committee. Committees may set up their own procedure about the timing when access will be provided (e.g.

number of days before the committee meeting). Documents not officially submitted to the committee are not subject to this requirement, but the committee may (by a majority vote) request additional documents before its decision is issued. As per SB 20, the authority of a committee cannot be redelegated to a subcommittee unless authorized in the legislation by which the committee is established.

The CRJE chair provided informal advice to a department chair about the extension of SB 55 voting rights to emeriti and lecturers. It was explained that, as per UCLR 12.75 and 5.67, SB 55 voting rights could not be extended to lecturers. SB 55 rights could be extended to emeriti, and the department could choose to extend voting rights under SB 55.B.1 but not under SB 55.B.8. (An extension of voting rights under SB 55.B.8 requires Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) approval.) The difference between a "waiver" and "absent not voting" as per SCB 13.4.5 was explained. Votes within search committees are not covered by SB 55. The CRJE chair also provided informal advice to the chair of CAP about a document CAP was going to circulate to departments explaining how to record SB 55 votes; minor changes were made in accordance with the advice.

CRJE wrote to the Senate Chair recommending that one week be provided between the legislative and agenda deadlines for Divisional meetings, as has been customary before the May meeting. With less time between the two deadlines, the likelihood that CRJE will be unable to examine and respond to a complicated piece of legislation will increase.

CRJE wrote to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) pointing out that the deadline to request a Mail Ballot for a Memorial or Memorandum in SCB 9.1 is different from that in SCB 8.4.1 for actions of the Division, and asked whether SEC felt this was an oversight when SCB 8.4.1 was last changed. SEC responded that it had no objection to CRJE proposing an amendment to SCB 9.1 to match SCB 8.4.1. (If this is done, an amendment to SCB 6.7.2 would be needed for consistency.) It was not possible to follow through this year.

CRJE considered an inquiry from a Senator asking whether the term "department" in the Divisional Regulations should be replaced with something broader. CRJE decided that each instance would need to be considered separately to determine whether the term should be broadened to include college, program of study and/or degree sponsoring entity, but that the meaning of the term was clear from the context in each instance. No further action was taken.

The Committee would like to thank analyst Roxanne Monnet for her invaluable help throughout the year.

Respectfully Submitted,

COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION, AND ELECTIONS
Jean Fox Tree
Carol Freeman
K.C. Fung
David Koo
Onuttom Narayan, Chair

August 31, 2009

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division,

The Committee on Teaching (COT) met regularly every other week throughout the academic year to deal with the extensive agenda related to the charge to foster and promote good teaching, to recommend and evaluate methods of assessing teaching performance, to oversee instructional support services on campus, and to advise the Academic Senate as requested.

Center for Teaching Excellence
One of the mandates of the Committee is to provide direction to the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) in matters regarding COT business, and when required, in any matters concerning instructional support. Ruth Harris-Barnett, Director of the CTE, resigned at the end of the 2007-08 academic year and two COT members served on the search committee for a new director in the summer of 2008. In the absence of a director, COT invited Jessica Fiske Bailey, Assistant Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, to sit with the Committee in the CTE director's stead. Throughout the year, COT advised Bill Ladusaw, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE), while decisions were being considered and made concerning possible restructuring of the Center. The VPDUE visited COT on three occasions to address the purpose of the CTE and its relationship to COT. Committee members conducted research on other teaching and learning centers in comparable universities throughout the country and presented, through Jessica Fiske Bailey, this research to the VPDUE. COT approved a new name for CTE (The Center for Teaching and Learning) and encouraged the VPDUE to appoint a faculty member with the title Faculty Assistant to the Dean of Undergraduate Education to bridge the gap in the directorship.

Instructional Improvement Program Grants
The Instructional Improvement Program (IIP) provides seed money in the form of grants to encourage experimentation with new ideas in teaching and learning at the undergraduate level. One of the regular charges of COT is to adjudicate applications for Instructional Improvement Program (IIP) grants. Adjudication of IIP grant proposals is a responsibility that COT takes very seriously and on which it spends a great deal of its time throughout the year.

COT awarded a total of $88,180.22 out of requests totaling $145,472. Seventeen grants were funded out of 32 proposals. Awarded funding was approximately 60% of the total requested. IIP grants fell into the following categories:

- **Mini-grants** are available throughout the year when COT is in session. They support small-scale projects designed to improve undergraduate instruction. Mini-grants have a maximum budget of $2,000. In the year-long competition for Mini-grants, there were 16 submissions requesting $26,775.80. Of these, 5 were funded for a total $9,500.

- **Course Development Fellowships** provide approximately $7,000-$8,500 (depending on division) to cover one course release for the fellowship recipient. Course Development Fellows use the course release to develop a new undergraduate course or program in their

departments or to make significant revisions in an older course. Thirteen applications for Course Development Fellowships were received, with a cumulative budget of $93,452.22. Eleven were funded for a total of $72,788.22.

- **Major grants** are for major projects aimed at improving undergraduate education. These involve incorporating instructional technology, creating new course materials, or designing interactive or collaborative learning activities. Of the 3 proposals received for a total of $25,243 requested, COT funded 1 for a total of $5,892.

Based on discussions during the 2007-08 year, the Committee modified the call to emphasize the evaluation and dissemination plans of the grants. Individual members of the Committee worked with faculty members to strengthen this aspect of individual grant proposals. Doris Ash, the COT Committee member from the Education Department, and Jessica Fiske Bailey, were the primary resources for this project. The Committee also began research on the effectiveness of past awards as part of a revision of IIG guidelines and criteria for the coming year.

In order to make the administration of these grants more manageable, COT agreed to institute two deadlines for the Mini-grants, one at the end of Fall Quarter and one at the end of Winter Quarter. Grants to deal with emergency situations will be accepted at any time.

Excellence in Teaching Awards
From a pool of 26 eligible nominees, one of the largest in COT history, COT selected four faculty to receive the Excellence in Teaching Award for 2008-09, and one faculty member to receive the Ron Ruby Award for Teaching Excellence in the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences. In addition, three nominees were recognized with Honorable Mentions. The Excellence in Teaching Awards ceremony was combined with the Student Achievement Awards ceremony on June 5 and the awards were presented by Chancellor Blumenthal. The recipients were as follows:
Teaching Awards:
- Bettina Aptheker, Feminist Studies
- Alice Yang, History
- Robin King, the Writing Program
- Herbert Lee, Applied Math and Statistics

Ron Ruby award:
- Peter Raimondi, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

Letters of honorable mention:
- Daniel Wirls, Politics
- Richard Mitchell, Physical and Biological Sciences
- Wendy Hibbert-Jones, Art

A letter of commendation for being selected by students to receive an award for their teaching was sent to remaining faculty who were nominated.

COT is concerned and worked throughout the year to increase the selectivity and status of the Teaching Awards. After researching how teaching awards were selected in comparable universities, COT made the goal of getting a larger pool of candidates and involving the Deans

by asking for their comments for use in the evaluation process. COT worked with Matt Palm, Commissioner of Academic Affairs Student Union Assembly (SUA), to advertise the process among students in large classes and College governments and post flyers throughout campus. As a result of SUA's efforts and cooperation, COT received 42 nominations for 27 instructors. COT asked the divisional Deans to comment on the teaching record, student evaluations, and timeliness of narrative evaluations of each of the candidates in their division. Nominees who had already received an Excellence in Teaching Awards within the last five years were excluded from consideration. Only nominees who were up to date in submitting narrative performance evaluations, as reported by the Registrar, were considered for an award. In an effort to continue to refine the process, COT members will be rewriting the call for nominations during the Summer of 2009.

U.S. Professor of the Year Nomination
The Committee decided to ask the Deans to nominate a candidate for Professor the Year. No names were submitted.

Annual Teaching and Learning Symposium
No Teaching and Learning Symposium was held this year due to the limited staffing in the CTE where the work of organizing the symposium resides.

Learning Management System (LMS)
Throughout the year, COT was advised about the selection process for the new Learning Management System (LMS). In addition, several COT members participated on an individual basis in this process. The Learning Technology Group selected Sakai and the target date for its implementation will be Winter 2010.

Online Instructional Evaluations (OIE)
Following the work of the Committee on Teaching from previous years, this year's COT continued to pursue an online system for collecting, storing, and analyzing course/instructor evaluations. Ruth Harris-Barnett conducted the Alpha test in Spring of 2008 with the goal of replicating the Scantron form, now available through the CTE, in an on-line platform (WebCT). Four faculty took part in the test. A second more extensive pilot was run in Fall of 2008 and involved 9 faculty and 12 classes. The response rate was 71.8% (not much different than other systems currently being used on campus—but we should note that incentives were provided in the way of iPod Shuffles given to randomly selected participants). In spite of the challenges inherent in a pilot, students were generally pleased with the system. They noted the more confidential nature of the evaluations, their ability to think more carefully about their answers, and to provide more detailed feedback. The department staffs involved with the pilot were enthusiastic, noting that a move to on-line systems would provide a significant time-savings for departmental staff campus-wide. COT concluded that the pilot was a successful learning process and COT and ITS are eager to move forward. One strong recommendation, based on research and the results of our own pilots, is that the OIE needs to be part of the LMS and tied into AIS. The new LMS, Sakai, has a built-in OIE module. As soon as Sakai is launched, COT hopes that steps can quickly be taken to turn on and fine tune the OIE.

At present, CTE is processing Scantrons and will continue to do so until an online-system is in place. In the 2008-09 academic year, a total of 67,746 evaluations were scanned by hand representing 2,036 courses from 28 departments and/or colleges. This represented a 14% increase from the year before. An additional 3-4,000 Summer Session evaluations are not counted in these statistics. The single CTE staff person spends a minimum of 50% of her time processing the Scantrons. With the departure of Ruth Harris-Barnett and the failed search for a new director, CTE has been severely understaffed and the focus on CTE resources to the single service of Scantrons has significantly restricted what services can be provided and has even prevented it from being restructured. COT has encouraged the VPDUE's office to move Scantrons out of the CTE and to discontinue them as soon as possible.

GE Reforms
COT made an offer to CEP to play a role in GE reform discussions as it has a direct effect on the quality of teaching. Jaye Padgett, Chair of CEP, visited COT to ask for feedback on the proposed Disciplinary Communications and to give COT a preview of the proposed GE reform. Individual COT members also attended different CEP events and reported on them to COT.

Classroom Environment
SUA, through Matt Palm, expressed concern regarding the current classroom environment as pertains to creating a climate of inclusiveness. They requested that COT sponsor a survey of students concerning their experiences with diversity in the classroom with the goal of starting TA diversity training. COT encouraged SUA to work closely with the Graduate Division and the Office of Institutional Research. COT offered support but asked SUA to find out what information already exists on campus in the hopes of moving directly to TA training. SUA had already identified the 2007-08 student survey in which there were questions concerning diversity.

Acknowledgements
The Committee would like to thank Jessica Fiske Bailey, Assistant Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, who is charged with overseeing the Center for Teaching Excellence in this time of transition, Henry Burnett, Director of Media Services, and Jim Phillips, Director of the Instructional Technology Group, for their invaluable contributions to the Committee. The Committee on Teaching thanks Tammi Blake for excellent service during this academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING
Doris Ash
June Gordon   REPRESENTATIVES
Claire Max   Ian Fulmer, SUA
Daniel Selden   Jim Phillips, Director Instructional
Hongyun Wang   Technology Group
Elisabeth Cameron, Chair

August 31, 2009

GRADUATE COUNCIL
Annual Report 2008-2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Graduate Council Organization
Generally the Graduate Council (GC) met bi-weekly during the academic year, with a total of 16 regularly scheduled meetings over the course of the year. An additional ad hoc meeting with the Philosophy Chair took place on May 12. The voting membership of the Council comprised: Gopal Balakrishnan, Scott Brandt, David Brundage, Weixin Cheng, Patricia Gallagher, Wally Goldfrank (F, S), Athanasios Kottas (F,W), Tracy Larrabee (W,S), Susan Schwartz, with Sue Carter (Chair, F, W) and Sandra Faber (Chair, S), and Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Lisa Sloan sitting *ex officio*. Meetings were also attended by Laurie Babka (F) and Stephanie Casher (W,S) of the Academic Senate staff, Bob Hastings (F,W) and Jim Moore (S) of the Graduate Division; Graduate Student Association Representatives Misty Blakely, Marcel Garcia, and Travis Orloff; and LAUC Representatives Beth Remak-Honnef (F) and Paul Machlis (W,S). Guests included Associate Graduate Dean Tyrus Miller, Nirvikar Singh (Professor of Economics), Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Felicia McGinty, Associate VC of Student Affair Jean Marie Scott, Acting Assistant VC of Student Affairs Sue Matthews, Paul Roth (Chair of Philosophy), and a GSA representative from Philosophy. In their capacity as Chair, Sue Carter and Sandra Faber served as representative to the systemwide Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and the Senate Executive Committee. Chair Carter also served as representative to the campuswide Subcommittee on Instruction.

Several subcommittees met separately, both throughout and at particular moments in the year. The standing Subcommittee on Course Approvals included Gopal Balakrishnan, Patricia Gallagher and Sandra Faber. During winter quarter, Gopal Balakrishnan, Sue Carter, Patricia Gallagher, and Susan Schwartz evaluated applications for the Cota-Robles Fellowship. In the spring David Brundage and Weixin Cheng reviewed Dissertation Year Fellowship candidates, and Patricia Gallagher and Susan Schwartz were central to the Outstanding Teaching Assistant competition.

Longstanding staff members Laurie Babka (ASO) and Bob Hastings (Graduate Division) provided invaluable support to the Council, bringing deep knowledge, expertise, and a remarkably clear understanding of both the issues and what we did about them to the table. Both Laurie and Bob retired from the University this year, and Graduate Council thanks both of these colleagues for their singularly indispensable participation in our work over this and many other years. In January, Stephanie Casher took over staff support for the Graduate Council, and came up to speed remarkably quickly on all aspects of GC's business.

1. New program proposals
The Council reviewed and provided feedback on two pre-proposals for new degree programs—the Graduate School of Management and an Electrical Engineering Master's in Engineering.
The M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Technology and Information Management (TIM), approved by Graduate Council in June 2008, also moved forward, and was approved by President Yudof effective April 23, 2009.

2. Graduate program review

GC had a very packed schedule of current and forthcoming external reviews of graduate programs. External Reviews conducted during 2008-09 included Astronomy and Astrophysics, Computer Engineering, Computer Sciences, Economics, History of Consciousness, Information Systems Management (ISM), Literature, Mathematics, Ocean Sciences, Politics, Sociology, and Theater Arts. GC also responded to the draft charges for External Reviews in Economics, Feminist Studies, Film and Digital Media, History, and the Institute for Marine Sciences. GC also approved a one-year deferral of the Psychology External Review, and the movement of Science Communications and Physics to an 8-year review cycle.

3. Parenthetical Degree Notations

Graduate Council approved several parenthetical degree notations:
- • Environmental Studies to offer a Statistics parenthetical to Environmental Studies PhDs.
- • Sociology to offer a revised Environmental Studies parenthetical to Sociology PhDs.
- • Anthropology to offer a Visual Studies parenthetical to Anthropology PhDs.
- • History of Consciousness to offer a Visual Studies parenthetical to HistCon PhDs.

Graduate Council also approved revisions to the current parenthetical degree requirements for Environmental Studies and American Studies.

4. Graduate Program Changes

- In November 2008, GC approved a request from the Economics Department to change the curricular sequence, timing, and types of final papers required for their Ph.D. program.
- In December 2008, GC approved the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology's request to not require the GRE subject test in Biology for graduate admissions.
- In January 2009, GC approved the Psychology Department's request to add a new course requirement in the Social Psychology area.
- In February 2009, GC approved a request from the Astronomy and Astrophysics Department to 1) shorten time to degree by ensuring that all students exit in a maximum of six years, with five being preferred, 2) require the passing of the Qualifying Exam by the end of the third year, 3) require one lead-author paper to a refereed journal by the end of the second year, and 4) reduce the course load by two, to allow students more time to spend on research.
- In April 2009, GC approved a request from the Education Department to change the internal structure of their Ph.D. program to move from assignment of grad students to a particular specialization to a loose alliance with one or two emphases or concentrations.
- In June 2009, GC approved a request from Bioinformatics to change their thesis and dissertation requirements.
- In June 2009, GC approved a request from the Linguistics Department to add Ling 213 as a required course.
- In June 2009, GC approved a request from the Social Documentation Program to add SOCD 294C to the curriculum.

6. Graduate Policies
The Graduate Council and the Graduate Division worked throughout the year on revising and clarifying official procedures for Graduate Student Appeals and Hearings. Graduate Council also made revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy.

7. Suspension of Admissions to the Philosophy Graduate Program
Monitoring the Philosophy Graduate Program was on GC's action list owing to critical comments about the program in the department's Closure Review report of March 24, 2008. Concerns were sufficiently serious that the Closure Report directed the department to report annually to the Graduate Council until those concerns were addressed.

To learn more about the program, Graduate Council invited a Philosophy Ph.D. student for a confidential discussion on October 23, 2008. GC then had a discussion with Department Chair Roth at a special meeting of the Graduate Council on May 12, 2009. The Council prepared several detailed questions for the chair and sent them in advance. Chair Roth came well-prepared to address the questions and was very open with the Committee about the department and the challenges it faces.

After consultation with Chair Roth, the Graduate Council determined that the problems mentioned in the Closure Review still largely persist, with minimal progress being made on many of them during the past year. As a result, exercising its plenary authority over graduate programs, Graduate Council decided to suspend the Philosophy department's right to admit students for fall 2010-11 to allow the department time to institute further improvements. However, Graduate Council did develop a list of milestones for the department, and the decision to suspend admissions could be reversed if review by the Graduate Council indicates substantial progress.

8. Improvements to the External Review and Visitation Process
Graduate Council dedicated a significant amount of time during spring quarter to discussing improvements to the External Review and Visitation Process. This work was prompted by some recent UCSC self-studies that have been falling short in providing the essential information that the Council needs about graduate programs. Finally, since the Committee wrestles constantly with the need to maintain high standards for graduate education *between* reviews, GC began to think about changes to the mid-cycle updates that would aid and abet the committee's work.

Graduate Council provided Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Alison Galloway with an extensive set of recommendations pertaining to the external review process, including: revised and expanded self-study guidelines; a data sheet requesting basic statistics for all departments in a uniform manner; and a graduate student questionnaire.

9. New procedures for the annual review of program statements and graduate degree requirements
Because the General Catalog is the legal document of record for graduate degree requirements, it is important that it be up to date and that all other departmental versions of degree requirements agree with it. A check of department web sites in spring 2009 revealed a large number of discrepancies. Graduate Council accordingly adopted the following principle: **Departments are**

responsible for assuring that all graduate program statements and degree requirements on department web sites and in departmental brochures match the corresponding statements in the General Catalog.

To ensure that departments comply with this rule, department chairs and managers will be required to co-sign a new form (the Department Degree Requirements Certification form) certifying that they have checked to see that all departmental versions of their program statements and degree requirements (e.g., web sites, brochures, etc.) are consistent with the General Catalog version. This form must be submitted to the Registrar's Office along with the first course approval form for the year.

10. Redrafting policy and procedures pertaining to graduate degree annotations

Graduate Council began discussion about ways to clarify and improve the current policies and definitions for graduate degree annotations. Annotations at UCSC are of two types: specialization within a graduate department, usually indicated by the term *concentration,* and interdepartmental training, usually called a *parenthetical notation*. However, the requirements for these are not carefully spelled out or monitored, are not conveniently posted for students and faculty, and not correctly listed in the *General Catalog*. GC started to develop a simplified system that would streamline concentrations and redefine parentheticals as ‑Minors". Feedback is being sought from departments, and the revised system will be finalized and implemented next year.

11. Other business

Graduate Council also discussed and commented on several systemwide policies and discussed a number of other local issues, among them:

- Report on the Professional Doctorate (10/23/08)
- Academic Plan Metrics and High-Level Indicators (12/4/08)
- Administrative Reorganization of the Community Studies Department (5/7/09): In a letter to the Social Sciences Dean, GC expressed concern that the proposed reorganization, though ostensibly confined to staff, appeared to significantly impact instruction and therefore only minimally conformed, if at all, to the principle of shared governance.
- Proposed UC Seminar Network (4/30/09): GC wrote to Senate Chair Quentin Williams saying that endorsing the proposal to broadcast seminars throughout UC would first require having a more realistic cost estimate.
- Proposed Amendment to Standing Order 100.4 – Emergency Furlough and Salary Reduction Policies (5/7/09): GC expressed the opinion to Senate Chair Williams that furloughs should be planned to have minimal impact on instruction and that minimal graduate student services should be maintained at all times. The Council preferred furloughs to salary cuts.
- Proposed Rent Increases at Family Student Housing (5/21/09): GC met with Felicia McGinty, Jean-Marie Scott, and Sue Matthews from Student Affairs to discuss proposed future rent increases in Family Student Housing. In a letter to Executive Vice Chancellor David Kliger, the Council expressed extreme concern over both past and future rent increases, which over the long term are eroding UCSC's ability to competitively attract graduate students.

- Graduate Admissions Policy (6/4/09): GC approved new policies from the Graduate Division concerning late admits, rolling admissions, and applications to graduate groups. A fourth proposal to permit simultaneous applications to multiple departments raised serious questions, and the issue was deferred to next year.

12. Issues Carrying Over to 2009-10
The Council identified the following issues carrying over into the next academic year:
- Monitoring Philosophy Department progress and suspension of admissions.
- Finalize Graduate Admissions policy, particularly the simultaneous applications policy.
- Implementation of the new procedures for annual review of program statements and graduate degree requirements.
- Finalize new definitions of graduate degree annotations (replacing parenthetical notations) and clean up the listings of degree annotations in the catalog.

Respectfully submitted,

GRADUATE COUNCIL
Gopal Balakrishnan
Scott Brandt
David Brundage
Weixin Cheng
Patricia Gallagher
Wally Goldfrank (F, S)
Athanasios Kottas (F, W)   Beth Remak-Honnef (F), LAUC Representative
Tracy Larrabee (W, S)   Paul Machlis (W, S), LAUC Representative
Susan Schwartz   Misty Blakely, GSA Representative
Lisa Sloan, *ex officio*   Travis Orloff, GSA Representative
Sue Carter, Chair (F, W)   Marcel Garcia, GSA Representative
Sandra Faber, Chair (S)

October 8, 2009

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Additional Nominations 2009-10

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The following nominations are changes and additions to those confirmed at the May 20, 2009 meeting of the division. A full list of Senate Committee membership can be viewed at: http://senate.ucsc.edu/cmmtes/StCom0910.pdf

Academic Personnel
Delete: Yin - Wong Cheung   Economics
Add: Donald Brenneis   Anthropology
Add: Kathy Foley (W, S)   Theater Arts

Committee on Committees (for information only)
Loisa Nygaard   ADD: Chair   Literature

Graduate Council
Delete: Margarita Azmitia   Psychology
Add: Craig Reinarman (F,W)   Sociology
Add: Rob Fairlie (S)   Economics

Privilege & Tenure
Delete: Kathy Foley (S)   Theater Arts

Research
Delete: Derek Murray   Art
Add: Elliot Anderson   Art
Delete: Meg Wilson   Psychology
Add: Ray Gibbs   Psychology

Respectfully Submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Diane Gifford-Gonzalez
David Helmbold
Ted Holman
Norman Locks
Loisa Nygaard, Chair

October 16, 2009

SPECIAL SENATE MEETING, OCTOBER 19, 2009

RESOLUTIONS:

C. To UCOP 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 this 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.

D. 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 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.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Shall the Senate support the "no furloughs for those making under $40k" proposal that is making the rounds at other campuses?

2. Shall the Senate support the "no fee hikes" position taken by faculty and student groups at other campuses?

3. Shall the Senate urge UCOP to stop all new building construction until the fiscal crisis is resolved, as other groups of faculty and students at other campuses have done?

4. Shall the Senate formally endorse and participate in the UCSC "Campus Forum on the Crisis," which is scheduled for October 29, 2009?

Respectfully submitted,

Craig Reinarman
Professor of Sociology
On behalf of the ten UCSC Senate members who requested this special meeting