

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Friday, March 6, 2009 at 2:30 p.m.
Colleges 9&10 Multipurpose Room
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes (none)
2. Announcements
 - a. Chair Williams
 - b. Chancellor Blumenthal
 - c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger
3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)
4. Special Orders: Annual Reports (none)
5. Reports of Special Committees (none)
6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Educational Policy and Academic Assessment Grievance Committee
 - i. Amendment to Appendix C: Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure (AS/SCP/1596) p. 1
 - b. Committee on Educational Policy
 - i. Amendment to Regulation 10.2 on General Education Requirements (AS/SCP/1597) p. 5
 - c. Committee on Faculty Welfare
 - i. Report on Housing, March 2009 (AS/SCP/1598) p. 18
7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair
8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President
9. Petitions of Students (none)
10. Unfinished Business (none)
11. University and Faculty Welfare
12. New Business

February 25, 2009

Members of the Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues,

Our second Senate meeting of winter quarter will take place on Friday, March 6th at 2:30 p.m. at our usual meeting spot of the College 9 & 10 Multipurpose Room. Our last meeting, which was a grand total of 2.28 weeks before this meeting, resulted in the passage of legislation establishing Disciplinary Communications as part of our General Education requirements (many thanks to all who attended!). This meeting will, of course, involve a discussion of the other portion of the revisions to our General Education Requirements proposed by our Committee on Educational Policy. Hence, our current system of alphabetically-denoted requirements and topical is up for revision. Such changes in the curriculum to which our undergraduates will be exposed are of critical importance for our educational enterprise, and the legislation to revise this system will be put in front of the Senate at THIS meeting. [Click here](#) to view the meeting call.

We'll also hear updates on topics of current interest from our campus leadership—and, in this instance, 2.28 weeks (and a state budget) may be sufficient to provide additional important information on subjects like the budget and its implications for UCSC.

Please come to this really important meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Quentin Williams".

Quentin Williams, Chair
Academic Senate

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
AND THE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**
Amendment to Appendix C: Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

In conjunction with the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee (AAGC), the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is proposing an amendment to Appendix C regarding the AAGC procedure. In particular, we suggest a change in the deadline for filing an appeal to allow for a more timely resolution.

We believe that six months is sufficient time for a student to take the preliminary steps necessary before filing an appeal associated with summer, fall, and winter quarter courses, and nine months for spring quarter courses. These include contacting the instructor (step A) and then contacting the sponsoring department chair or college provost (step B). Resolving grievances in a more timely manner strikes us as in the best interests of all involved. Both the student and the faculty are more likely to have relevant records and recall more details about the course. Also, the outcome of the appeal may affect the student's academic planning.

Current wording

Proposed wording

Appendix C Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure	Appendix C
<p>I. A grievance may be filed if the student believes that the instructor has given a course grade or evaluation of the student’s work by criteria that were not clearly and directly related to the student’s performance in the course for which the grade or evaluation was assigned, as by the use of:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A. Non-academic criteria such as ethnicity, political views, religion, age, sex, financial status, or national origin;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B. Capricious or arbitrary application of academic criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements.</p> <p>II. A grievance must be initiated within the time limits specified in Part III of this Regulation.</p>	<p>I. Unchanged.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A. Unchanged.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B. Unchanged</p> <p>II. Unchanged</p>

<p>III. Resolution of a grievance should follow these steps in this sequence:</p> <p>A. A student who has a grievance concerning an evaluation or grade should first approach the instructor to see if the issue can be resolved. The initial contact must take place within one regular academic quarter from the issuance of the grade or evaluation.</p> <p>B. If the matter is not resolved, the student should submit the grievance and documentation in writing to the executive officer of the academic sponsoring unit (department chair or college provost). The executive should attempt to facilitate a consensual resolution of the grievance between the student and the instructor.</p> <p>C. If the grievance is not resolved by steps A and B, the student may appeal to the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee. A formal appeal must be filed within one calendar year of the date on which the disputed grade or evaluation was made part of the student's permanent record by the Registrar.</p> <p>D. The Academic Assessment Grievance Committee will review the grievance and consult with the appropriate chair(s). If the Committee finds there is substantial evidence that the grievance has merit, it will hold a hearing at which the student and instructor can present evidence.</p>	<p>III. Unchanged.</p> <p>A. Unchanged.</p> <p>B. Unchanged.</p> <p>C. If the grievance is not resolved by steps A and B, the student may appeal to the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee. A formal appeal must be filed within one calendar year <u>six months for summer, fall, and winter quarter courses or nine months for spring quarter courses</u> of the date on which the disputed grade or evaluation was made part of the student's permanent record by the Registrar.</p> <p>D. Unchanged.</p>
---	---

<p>E. After the hearing, the Academic Assessment Committee shall attempt to facilitate a consensual resolution of the grievance with the student and the instructor. If no resolution is reached, the Committee will vote on a decision and report the matter to the Committee on Educational Policy for implementation. The decision may include: 1) no change, 2) removal of course from transcript, 3) removal of evaluation from transcript, or 4) change of grade to Pass, No Pass, or Withdraw. In the case of option 4, if the course was originally taken for a letter grade, the change to a Pass will not affect the student’s ability to graduate under letter grade requirements. The Committee’s vote is final. A faculty member may request his or her name be removed from the course in the official transcript.</p>	<p>E. Unchanged.</p>
<p>These procedures are designed solely to determine whether non-academic criteria or the capricious or arbitrary application of academic criteria have been used in assigning a grade, and if so to affect a change of that grade.</p>	<p>Unchanged</p>
<p>No punitive actions may be taken against the instructor on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of charges nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become a part of the personnel file of the instructor. The use of non-academic criteria in assigning a grade is a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Sanctions against an instructor for violation of the Faculty Code may be sought by filing a complaint in accordance with CAPP 002.015. A complaint may be filed by the student or by others.</p>	<p>Unchanged</p>

<p>No punitive action may be taken against the complainant on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of charges nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become a part of the complainant's file. The instructor may, if he or she feels that his or her record has been impugned by false or unfounded charges, file charges against the complainant through the office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.</p>	<p>Unchanged</p>
--	------------------

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Linda Burman-Hall

David Helmbold

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Loisa Nygaard

Donald Potts

Eileen Zurbriggen

Jaye Padgett, Chair

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NSTF Representative

Matthew Palm, Student Representative (SUA)

Ravi Rajan, Provost Representative

Shawn Riley, Student Representative (SUA)

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Jorge Hankamer

Pradip Mascharak

Campbell Leaper, Chair

Patty Yu, Student Representative (SUA)

February 13, 2009

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Amendment to Regulation 10.2 on General Education Requirements

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

CEP is proposing amendments to Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 10.2 regarding campus general education requirements. The changes proposed would replace our current general education requirements with new ones, effective fall 2010.

This proposal is the outcome of a two-year conversation among many campus constituencies. We have been guided by feedback from individual departments, from divisional chairs councils, from students, from college provosts, from advisors, from the administration, and from very many individual faculty. Our thinking was significantly shaped by these conversations, by the forum on general education and “brown bag” lunches held last fall, and by the feedback we received to our “pre-proposal” distributed last spring.

A full text of our proposal for general education, which includes proposals that do not require legislation, can be found at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPREFORMREV2.pdf>.

Higher-level goals of general education

The goals intended for individual requirements are given further below. Here it is worth stating what we take the “high-level” goals of general education to be.

At the highest level, general education should encourage lifelong learning, and prepare people to handle the complex and unexpected problems of the future with wisdom and resourcefulness. Somewhat more concretely, we think general education should...

- 1) Provide students with a base of knowledge and skills that future learning can build on.
- 2) Expose students to a broad range of disciplines and methodologies, to better prepare them for a world of complex problems and rapid change.
- 3) Enhance the abilities of students to approach problems in appropriately analytical ways.
- 4) Prepare students to function as responsible and informed participants in civic life, considering pressing societal issues (such as the environment, the economy) productively and from a variety of perspectives.

We can also state the more important “design principles” that guided our discussions. We assumed that our requirements should...

- be easy to understand
- be less burdensome than current requirements, if possible
- be interesting (with matters of recruitment and retention in mind)
- reflect faculty and student feedback
- reflect our campus’s principles and identity

It is not always easy to optimize based on these principles, which often seem to conflict with each other.

The chart below summarizes the proposed new general education (GE) requirements. It consists of seven required course categories (top rows), one requirement from a “Perspectives” choice category, and one **two-credit** requirement from a “Practice” choice category.

The chart also shows two Composition courses (C1 and C2) and a Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement. The legislation proposed here does **not** make changes to these writing requirements. We propose to carry over our current C1 and C2 requirements. The Senate voted on legislation for Disciplinary Communication on February 18.

Proposal

		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)	Creative Process Collaborative Endeavor Service Learning	PR-C PR-E 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

Descriptions of each of these requirement categories can be found in the Appendix below.

For comparison, below is a chart of our existing GE requirements. (Here we show the Writing-Intensive requirement, instead of the DC requirement.)

Current requirements

	Category	Code	Distinct Courses	Possibly Overlapping
Humanities & Arts	Intro Discip	IH	2	
	Topical	T	1	
Social Sciences	Intro Discip	IS	2	
	Topical	T	1	
Natural Sciences & Engineering	Intro Discip	IN	2	
	Topical	T	1	
Writing	Composition	C1&C2	1	1
	Writing-Int	W		1
Math	Quantitative	Q		1
Other	Ethnic / Non-Western	E		1
	Arts	A		1
Total (= 10-15)			10	5

Major differences from current system

The proposed requirements differ in several important ways from our current requirements.

First, they are smaller, both in the number of courses and the number of credits required. 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. As the chart above shows, 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, the proposed system allows almost no overlap of GE requirements. The one exception is for the college core courses (which provide satisfaction of either C1 or C2, depending on the student). Current practice is to allow core courses to satisfy a general education requirement apart from C1/C2, and we propose to continue this practice. The main reason for this is to provide “incentivization” for students to enroll in college Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters (ITCs). Our hope is to foster the development of ITCs at several colleges (following a model currently being developed at College 8); we think it will be important to students who sign up for clusters that they receive substantial GE credit for them. (For more information, see the full GE proposal at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPGEREFORMREV2.pdf>.)

CEP deliberated a great deal over whether to allow overlap of requirements. In the end we were persuaded by two arguments against overlap. The first made by many faculty, is that overlap

leads to a perversion of the educational goals of GE. Because students are under pressure to finish GE requirements, their choices of class can be based not on interests or educational goals but on calculations about which course will “get the most requirements out of the way”. In a similar vein, faculty can be tempted to design and offer courses with multiple designations not due to educational convictions but to attract student enrollments.

The second argument against overlap comes from our concern that courses should focus in a deep and sustained way on the educational goals of a given objective, and that when objectives are allowed to combine they will often each be diluted in the meeting. Of course this does not have to be the case, and one could reasonably argue that combining some requirements could lead to an educational synergy. This is a real consideration, but CEP was more persuaded by arguments against overlap.

The third major difference between the proposed requirements and the existing ones is that we have eliminated the distinction between “Topical” and “Introductory” breadth courses. In the view of many faculty, this distinction is not as successful at meeting its intended goals as it might have been. Roughly speaking (and acknowledging possible differences of opinion), Topical courses are meant to i) be organized around a topic or theme of importance to society rather than around a discipline, and ii) be interdisciplinary, if possible. CEP believes that these goals are praiseworthy, and that they can be better met in other ways. For example, we have proposed that the campus try to meet them in part by means of the Interdisciplinary Topical Clusters. (ITCs are not a legislative item, but the reader can find out more about this line of thinking in CEP’s full GE proposal.) Furthermore, we will encourage faculty to structure *any* GE course around topical themes if they wish to. Many, if not all, of our GE categories allow for this possibility.

A last general difference between the proposed and existing requirements is possibly the most important: our proposed requirement categories are more specific than our existing ones, and they reflect specific educational goals rather than administrative divisions. There is a tension between specificity on the one hand, and freedom or inclusiveness on the other. In the end we opted for a degree of specificity, because specificity is what makes a set of requirements interesting and distinctive. The trade-off is that we had to make some difficult choices about what to include or not include. We have endeavored to make choices that best reflect our faculty’s vision as we have discerned it over our many consultations.

The substance of our proposal is really in the draft descriptions given in the Appendix, which amount to our statement of the goals and expectations for each category. We urge you to read them and give us your comments. It is important to note that these descriptions are not part of legislation; we are not voting on them. Instead they constitute draft policy statements, and as such we expect them to change. In fact, even if this legislation passes these statements could, and probably should, evolve over time, depending on the views of CEP and of faculty who discuss them with CEP. We welcome your input.

Again, for a fuller discussion of GE reform, we refer the reader to <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/CEPGEREFORMREV2.pdf>.

Current wording**10.2.2 General Education Requirements.**

10.2.2.1 [Amended by the Senate, February 18, 2009] Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Science, or Music are required to fulfill the following campus general education requirements. The courses used to satisfy these requirements must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.2.6). Only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

a. **Introductions to disciplines.** Two five-credit hour courses or the equivalent are required from different departments or programs of study in each of the three academic areas: Humanities and Arts; Social Sciences; and Natural Sciences. These courses shall introduce the scope, methodology, and content of the discipline or one of its major subdivisions. No more than one course from the Arts may be used to satisfy this requirement. For the purpose of these regulations, all literatures are considered one department; likewise, all languages are considered one department.

b. **Topical courses.** Three five-credit hour courses or the equivalent are required, no more than one from any academic division. Topical courses shall present issues of broad social importance at a level appropriate to non-majors from either a multidisciplinary or disciplinary perspective.

c. **Quantitative course.** One five-credit hour course or the equivalent that entails use of advanced algebra, statistics, or calculus is required. The course may be offered by any

Proposed wording**10.2.2 General Education Requirements for Students Entering before Fall Quarter 2010.**

10.2.2.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Science, or Music either: (1) **between in fall quarter 1986 and spring quarter 2010** ~~or thereafter~~, or (2) between fall quarter 1984 and spring quarter 1986 with fewer than 45 quarter units of transfer credit, are required to fulfill the following campus general education requirements. The courses used to satisfy these requirements must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.2.6). Only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

a. Unchanged.

b. Unchanged.

c. Unchanged.

<p>unit but should teach, not just evaluate, mathematical skill.</p> <p>d. Composition courses. Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, in fall 2005 or thereafter are required, in addition to satisfying the ELWR requirement, to complete a sequence of two five-credit hour courses or the equivalent in composition and rhetoric. These courses shall usually be taken in a student's first year and must be completed before the student enrolls in the 7th quarter. Student admitted prior to fall quarter 2005 are required to complete one five-credit course in English Composition in addition to satisfying the ELWR requirement.</p> <p>e. Writing-intensive course. [Amended by the Senate, February 18, 2009] Students who entered the University of California, Santa Cruz, before fall 2009, are required to complete one five-credit hour course or the equivalent that provides instruction and substantial practice in writing within the context of any academic subject.</p> <p>f. Disciplinary communication (DC) requirement. [Amended by the Senate, February 18, 2009] Students entering the University of California, Santa Cruz, in or after fall 2009, must have instruction and substantial practice in modes of communication appropriate to their major. The largest component of the DC curriculum must involve writing. The requirement must be satisfied either within one five-credit upper-division course or within a combination of up to three upper-division courses totaling at least five credits. Major program requirements must include disciplinary communication curricula that are approved and regularly assessed by the Committee on Educational Policy.</p> <p>g. Arts course. One five-credit hour course or the equivalent is required in the performance, theory, or history of the arts.</p>	<p>d. Unchanged.</p> <p>e. Unchanged.</p> <p>f. Unchanged.</p> <p>g. Unchanged.</p>
---	---

<p>h. Ethnic studies course. One five-credit course or the equivalent is required which deals with ethnic minorities in the United States or with a non-Western society or culture. This requirement applies only to students entering fall quarter 1986 or thereafter.</p> <p>i. A given course may apply toward as many as three of the requirements above. However, no single course may satisfy both the disciplinary Introduction and the Topical requirement.</p> <p>10.2.2.2 [Amended by the Senate, February 18, 2009] Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 except the Writing-intensive/disciplinary communications courses, which must be taken at UCSC. An eligible transferred course of 4.0 quarter units or 3.0 semester units may be considered one course with respect to campus general education requirements. Responsibility for assessment of work completed at other campuses of the University of California or at other institutions is delegated to the Director of Admissions. In making such assessments, the Director consults with the Faculty when appropriate.</p> <p>10.2.2.3 [Amended by the Senate, February 18, 2009] Students admitted with three or more quarters of advanced standing from another campus of the University of California are required to fulfill in their entirety the University of California, Santa Cruz, campus general education requirements (SCR 10.2.2.1). However, students who, at the time they enroll at the University of California, Santa Cruz, campus, have completed the general education requirements of another University of California campus will be deemed to have completed the University of California, Santa Cruz, general education requirements.</p>	<p>h. Unchanged.</p> <p>i. Unchanged.</p> <p>10.2.2.2 Unchanged</p> <p>10.2.2.3 Unchanged.</p>
---	--

<p>10.2.2.4 Petitions for the granting of an exception to the general education requirements must be recommended by the student's preceptor and reviewed for approval by the Committee on Educational Policy.</p> <p>10.2.2.5 [Amended by the Senate, February 18, 2009] When colleges, departments, and other agencies propose a course, they designate which of the general education requirements (SCR 10.2.2.1), if any, the course is presumed to meet. The Committee on Educational Policy approves or disapproves the designation.</p> <p>[NOTE: 10.2.3.1.a Composition courses remains unchanged from 10.2.2.1.d.]</p> <p>[NOTE: 10.2.3.1.b Disciplinary communication remains unchanged from 10.2.2.1.f]</p>	<p>10.2.2.4 Unchanged.</p> <p>10.2.2.5 Unchanged.</p> <p>10.2.3 General Education Requirements for Students Entering Fall Quarter 2010 or Later.</p> <p>10.2.3.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, in fall quarter 2010 or later, as candidates for a Bachelor's degree, are required to fulfill the campus general education requirements given below. Courses used to satisfy these requirements are subject to the following restrictions: i) they must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.3.4); ii) each course may apply toward only one of the requirements, unless a specific exception is granted by the Committee on Educational Policy; iii) only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.</p> <p>a. Unchanged.</p> <p>b. Unchanged.</p> <p>c. Cross-cultural analysis. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that emphasizes understanding of one or more cultures and societies outside the United States.</p>
---	---

	<p>d. Ethnicity and race. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on issues of ethnicity and/or race.</p> <p>e. Interpreting arts and media. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on the practice, analysis, interpretation, and/or history of one or more artistic or mass media (media in which non-textual materials play primary roles).</p> <p>f. Mathematical and formal reasoning. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that emphasizes university-level mathematics, computer programming, formal logic, or other material that stresses formal reasoning, formal model building, or application of formal systems.</p> <p>g. Scientific inquiry. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on the essential roles of observation, hypothesis, experimentation and measurement in the natural sciences.</p> <p>h. Statistical reasoning. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on developing skills in approaching quantitative data and statistical reasoning.</p> <p>i. Textual analysis and interpretation. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that has as its primary methodology the interpretation or analysis of texts.</p> <p>j. One additional five-credit course or equivalent is required in one of the following areas.</p> <p>i) Environmental Awareness. Focuses on humankind's interactions with nature.</p> <p>ii) Human behavior. Focuses on aspects of individual human behavior or the</p>
--	---

<p>[NOTE: 10.2.3.2 on transfer credit remains unchanged from 10.2.2.2]</p> <p>[NOTE: 10.2.3.3 on petitions for exceptions remains unchanged from 10.2.2.4 Composition.]</p> <p>[NOTE: 10.2.3.4 on course approvals remains unchanged from 10.2.2.5]</p>	<p>operation of human groups.</p> <p>iii) Technology and society. Emphasizes issues raised by the prevalence of technology in society.</p> <p>k. One additional course or equivalent, awarding a minimum of 2 credits, is required in one of the following areas.</p> <p>i) Collaborative endeavor. Provides significant experience with collaboration on a project.</p> <p>ii) Creative process. Teaches creative process and techniques in the arts (including creative writing), at an individual or a collaborative level.</p> <p>iii) Service learning. Provides the opportunity for supervised campus or community service that contributes to a student’s overall education.</p> <p>10.2.3.2 Unchanged</p> <p>10.2.3.3 unchanged</p> <p>10.2.3.4 unchanged</p>
---	---

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Linda Burman-Hall
David Helmbold
Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*
Loisa Nygaard
Donald Potts
Eileen Zurbriggen
Jaye Padgett, Chair

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NSTF Representative
Matthew Palm, Student Representative (SUA)
Ravi Rajan, Provost Representative
Shawn Riley, Student Representative (SUA)

February 20, 2009

Appendix: Draft objectives of proposed requirements

Cross-Cultural Analysis

Courses in Cross-Cultural Analysis aim to prepare students for a world that is becoming a global village, with increased interaction and integration among peoples, companies, and governments. These courses aim to encourage a broader and deeper understanding of cultures and societies outside the United States. Such courses might focus on an in-depth examination of one culture, or one aspect of such culture (e.g., art, music, history, language). Alternatively, these courses might aim to help students develop skills of cross-cultural comparison and analysis. A third option is courses that explore topics that are inherently cross-cultural such as international relations or the processes of economic globalization. Whatever the approach, these courses all aim to help students develop the openness and sensitivity necessary for cross-cultural understanding. Although themes of privilege and oppression are centrally relevant to the history and current experience of many cultures, such themes may, but are not required to be, addressed in cross-cultural awareness courses.

Ethnicity and Race

Courses in Ethnicity and Race aim to prepare students for a state and a world which are increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-racial. Beyond familiarizing students with the culture and/or history of one or more ethnic or racial groups, these courses also aim to develop theoretical and practical understanding of questions such as (but not limited to): how categories of ethnicity and race are constructed; the role they can play in identity formation; how ethnicity and race have historically been used to justify forms of enforced inequality; and the contributions of people of various ethnicities to society and to political change. These courses are particularly concerned with how ethnicity and race may intersect with other categories, such as gender, class, or sexual orientation, to shape self-understanding and patterns of human interaction. While such courses may often adopt an historical perspective on the issues they consider, they will address discrimination based on ethnicity or race as an ongoing problem whose resolution remains an unfinished social task.

Interpreting Arts and Media

Contemporary life bombards us with visual and auditory media, often in the form of advertising or advocacy. Interpreting Arts and Media courses explore the complex ways in which information of all kinds is represented by visual, auditory, or kinesthetic means, or through performance. They build in-depth understanding of one or more forms of artistic media: that is, media in which non-textual materials play primary roles. They offer skills in the practice, analysis, interpretation and/or history of one or more of these media, as well as the ability to analyze the means by which they encode and convey information.

Mathematical and Formal Reasoning

Disciplines such as mathematics, logic, and computer programming teach us to think with rigor and precision. In a world in which much thinking and discourse is directed by emotion and association, formal or mathematical models teach the value of dispassionate analysis. Courses in this category emphasize the development of mathematical, logical, and/or formal reasoning skills. Mathematics-based courses presuppose UC-level mathematics preparation, are focused on teaching significant problem solving skills, and are often oriented towards particular application areas. Other courses satisfying this requirement train students in formal reasoning skills and/or in

the construction and use of formal models. Formal reasoning domains include mathematical proof, logic, and applied logic. Some examples of formal models are: computer programming languages, generative grammars (from linguistics), supply and demand models, and formal music theory.

Scientific Inquiry

Courses in Scientific Inquiry teach students about the essential role of observation, hypothesis, experimentation and measurement in the natural sciences. Students should acquire key concepts, facts, and theories relevant to living systems and/or the physical universe; by the end of the course they should also be able to articulate an understanding of the value of scientific thinking in relation to issues of societal importance.

Statistical Reasoning

In today's globalized, media-saturated information society, we are continually presented with – or asked to present – numerical data. With their emphasis on classical mathematics, our schools may not do enough to prepare students to interpret quantitative claims and make judgments in situations of statistical uncertainty. The goal of statistical reasoning courses is to teach skills for effective reasoning about probability and the use of quantitative information. Students acquire an understanding of making informed decisions in the presence of uncertainty. Possible topics also include ways of (mis)representing data; correlation vs. causation; statistical inferences; experimental design and data analysis; understanding orders of magnitude.

Textual Analysis and Interpretation

Even in our current multi-media world, the written word remains a major vehicle of communication. Many fields, from literature and history to law, government, and religion, depend heavily upon the understanding and interpretation of written documents. Textual Analysis and Interpretation courses have as their primary methodology the interpretation or analysis of texts. The aim of these courses is to develop higher-order reading skills and to train students how to read attentively, to think critically and analytically, to produce and evaluate interpretations, to assess evidence, and to deploy it effectively in their own work. These abilities are not only necessary for academic success, but also for full participation in civic life at every level.

Environmental Awareness

The interactions between people and the earth's environments are subtle, complex, and influenced by a variety of natural, scientific, economic, cultural, and political factors. Courses satisfying the Environmental Awareness requirement teach students about the complexity of particular ecosystems and/or people's interactions with nature so that they will better understand the environmental issues and trade-offs that are likely to arise in their lifetimes. Courses deal with one or more of the following topics: the study of particular ecosystems or environments; natural forces, processes, and their effect on ecosystems; climates, climate models, and climate change; evolution and adaptation to the environment; bio-diversity and/or the robustness of nature and its feedback mechanisms; how cultures relate to their natural environments; human efforts to create, preserve, and modify environments; management of natural resources (such as fossil fuels, forests, and fisheries); issues of sustainability (such as sustainable agriculture or renewable energy); pollution and its effect on ecosystems; ecological impacts of non-native species and other ecological disasters.

Human Behavior

Courses in human behavior help students to prepare for a world in which many of the most pressing challenges (such as genocide, environmental degradation, poverty) are impacted by human thoughts, decisions, or practices. As well, they provide a kind of “owner’s manual” for students to assist them in understanding themselves, their roles (for example, parent, partner, leader), and their social groups (family, workplace, neighborhood, nation). These courses impart specific knowledge about some aspect of individual human behavior or the operation of human groups. As well, they are likely to provide an introduction to one or more specific methodologies, such as ethnography, longitudinal analysis, or experimentation. A central aim, however, is to help students appreciate that better solutions to problems (whether global or personal) can often be found by incorporating information about how humans think, feel, and act.

Technology and Society

Imparting a basic understanding of the dynamic technological society in which we live is an essential goal of academic institutions. The study of technology helps satisfy the need of society for knowledgeable people able to understand, participate in, and guide the rapid technological advances that play such a vital role in our world. Technology and Society courses focus on understanding technological advances, how they are developed, and their impacts on society.

Collaborative Endeavor

Students learn and practice strategies and techniques for working effectively in pairs or larger groups to produce a finished product. For example, students might learn specialized practical information such as how to use change-management software to monitor and manage changes initiated by multiple group members. Alternatively, they might learn basic information about leadership, teamwork, and group functioning, which they can incorporate into their own group process. What is common to all courses is that some instruction regarding the process of collaboration is provided, in addition to instruction specific to the academic discipline and the products being produced.

Creative Process

Creative Process (CP) courses teach creative process and techniques in a context of individual or collaborative participation in the arts, including creative writing. Courses may combine theory and experiment in the creation of a new artwork, or new interpretation(s) of an existing artwork. CP courses include studies in individual or group creativity or improvisation, and/or ensemble rehearsal and performance. Students who elect to satisfy the CP requirement will take at least two credits of individual or group creative work. CP may be satisfied within courses of greater than two credits. Where appropriate, sponsoring units may require a sequence of two or three 2-credit courses, with the CP designation assigned to the final quarter.

Service Learning

Service learning courses provide students with an opportunity to integrate their academic coursework with community involvement. Such courses provide supervised learning experiences where students reflect on, communicate, and integrate principles and theories from the classroom in real-world settings. Students gain valuable practical skills while giving back to the community.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE Report on Housing, March 2009

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) is charged with monitoring and, when deemed necessary, recommending programs for improving affordable housing options for UCSC Senate faculty. These programs are administered by the UCSC Housing Office and UCOP. The following briefly summarizes the current state of housing for faculty including on and off-campus housing availability and affordability, the status of loan programs and the resale/reindexing program, as well as recommendations for future action by the administration and Senate. Details of the housing programs can be found in the Employee Housing Master Plan (EHMP, Fall 2008)

[http://housing.ucsc.edu/employee-housing/pdf/EHMP\(11-12-08\).pdf](http://housing.ucsc.edu/employee-housing/pdf/EHMP(11-12-08).pdf)

Housing Inventory/Affordability

The general state of housing in terms of availability and affordability has improved over the last year, primarily as a consequence of a sizable decline in local home prices combined with recent expansion of on-campus housing.

Santa Cruz Area Housing

Median prices of all homes sold in Santa Cruz County during 2008 dropped by over 25% to \$525,000 (\$600,000 for a 3 bedroom home), even as the median listing prices rose slightly to over \$1,000,000 (data source: *Trulia*, Nov08-Jan09). They have evidently slipped even further, with a \$425,000 median price for all homes sold in January 2009, and a \$531,000 median price for single-family homes (comparable to Ranch View Terrace homes, according to Gary Gangnes of Real Options Realty (referenced in Santa Cruz *Sentinel*, February 18, 2009). These shifting figures emphasize above all the fluidity of local home prices in the current market.

The decline in sold home prices reflects increased sales of smaller homes at the low end of the price/quality spectrum, a large percentage of which are foreclosures, while the rise in listing prices likely reflects a severe reduction in sales of high-end homes. Home prices (sales) on the Westside of Santa Cruz, while significantly higher than the county average, have dropped as well (for example, to a median \$665,000 for the 95060 zip code). Overall, it appears that current sold-home prices in the region are similar to 2004 levels. Despite increased numbers of foreclosures, however, the number of homes available on the Santa Cruz area open market has actually dropped a factor that has prevented home prices from declining as rapidly as elsewhere. In sum, though open market housing conditions have improved, housing within the vicinity of the campus continues to be unaffordable for most junior ladder rank faculty.

University Housing

The Campus housing inventory has increased with the near completion of Phase 1 Ranch View Terrace (RVT-1) homes (3 & 4 bedroom). Seven homes in the first cluster are now completed

and occupied. By March 1, 10 additional homes will be ready for occupancy. The remaining 28 RVT-1 homes are scheduled to be completed in sequence by mid-April 2009. The total number of unassigned homes in RVT-1 is 8 as of last count (February 2009) and the faculty waitlist for RVT-1 is currently depleted. The Colleges and University Housing Services (CUHS) office intends to rent unsold homes at market rates, and will continue to offer homes to faculty including those on the Phase 2 Ranch View Terrace (RVT-2) waitlist, as well as to non-Senate academics and staff. Pricing of RVT-2 homes (~\$300-310/sq.ft.) is still well below market for the west side of Santa Cruz (\$450/sq. ft. for a 3 bedroom home), so the lack of interest might be a symptom of the economic crisis. The first few occupants of RVT-1 have expressed overall satisfaction with their homes (personal interviews). The only complaints registered thus far have focused on the completion and availability of the playground, the expense of which was shifted to Phase 2 of RVT. CFW is in consultation with the administration about the possibility of a low-cost temporary solution.

LIO-SHLP and Housing Resale/Repricing Programs

Resale/Reindexing Program

The campus adopted the reindexing program in July 2007 (based on recommendations contained in the Employee Housing Master Plan). One objective of the program is to erase inequities in the pricing of older units whose values were well below those of newer units. The initial formula for reindexing sets the mortgage for a 1400 sq/ft home at 40% of the average gross income of an assistant professor. For the Cardiff Terrace and other units, this resulted in reindexing from \$150-190/sq ft. to \$260 /sq ft, similar to those for the Hagar Court units (constructed in 1993).

Profits from reindexing are being deposited in a stand-alone account to be used for renovation of dilapidated units, the LIO and other housing-related expenses such as planning/initiating future housing projects. A site analysis for the 2005 LRDP was funded through this program. As of Fall 2008, the campus has repurchased a total of 16 units (at an average cost of \$220,000) and 10 have been resold to faculty/staff (at \$265,000/unit). A total of 4 of those units have been completely remodeled (\$91,000/unit), while other units have undergone minor repair (\$1000/unit). Unsold units are currently being rented. With resale of the remaining units to faculty/staff, the program will have generated \$500,000 in capital (\$200,000 of which paid for a site analysis in the EMHP/Long Range Development Plan).

The Reindexing Program is to be re-evaluated every year to ensure that housing inventory is priced affordably for the average incoming assistant professor (based on average income and MOP interest rates). To this end, a report of funding and efficacy is to be submitted by the administration to CFW on the first of May annually.

LIO-SHLP

The Supplemental Home Loan Program (SHLP) is a down payment assistance program (funded by the campus) that targets the same user group as the Mortgage Orientation Program (MOP). Due mainly to unavailability of funds, the campus had underutilized the SHLP for many years. The Low-Interest Option Supplemental Home Loan Program (LIO-SHLP) was created to

provide additional incentives for eligible Assistant or Associate Professors to purchase homes on or off-campus. The LIO-SHLP is funded by a combination of campus funds and a portion of proceeds from the Re-pricing Program.

Based on data accumulated from the inception of the program (July 1, 2006 through December 31, 2008), it appears that the LIO-SHLP has been effective in enabling home purchases: 65 eligible Senate faculty across all divisions have applied for this program; and 36 of these have already purchased homes using program funds. The demographics of LIO-SHLP loans distributed by division are as follows; Arts, 1; Engineering, 10; Humanities, 7; Physical and Biological Sciences, 13; Social Sciences, 5. A total of \$1,580,000 has been distributed. The average funded loan is \$43,888K, with an average of \$70,833 to current campus homeowners (6), and \$38,500 to first-time buyers (30). These figures accord with the caps of \$75,000 for current campus homeowners and \$50,000 to non-owners. Most of the applicants are in line to purchase RVT homes.

CFW analysis and recommendations:

CFW has evaluated initial data for the first 18 months of the LIO-SHLP and reindexing programs. It appears the programs are achieving their stated goals of assisting Senate faculty (assistant and associate professors) in the purchase of homes. The number of faculty utilizing LIO-SHLP loans represents a large percentage of the eligible faculty. Nevertheless, there are a few issues that should be addressed.

(1) **General financial impacts:** Unanticipated costs associated with the downturn in the financial and local housing markets are affecting the campus. The campus is purchasing, at high cost, unsold homes in RVT-1. While presumably these homes will eventually sell, in the meantime the campus absorption of the purchasing costs means reassignment of funds that would otherwise be available for other purposes.

(2) **Cost of housing:** Even with the decline in local real estate, home prices are still well above the 40% mortgage/gross income target for junior faculty, as they were in 2001 prior to the bubble. This will be compounded by additional erosion of take-home salaries anticipated in 2010, a consequence of the anticipated resumption of employee contributions to the UC Retirement System. CFW thus views as essential the goal of keeping campus housing affordable. Older, lower-priced units (Cardiff Terrace, Laureate Court and Hagar Court/Meadow) partially address the need for affordable housing, but demand for these units remains high (waitlist exceeds 100) in large part because the prices are still below market and, most importantly, at affordable levels for junior faculty (40% of income on mortgage payments). The re-pricing program complicates the affordability and access problem. While the goals are supported by CFW, the program was devised and adopted at the peak of the real estate housing bubble (2007). As a consequence, the current target of \$260/sq. ft. may be artificially inflated.

Recommendation: CFW recommends an administrative analysis that includes revised projections of local housing trends. This should be used to determine if the reindexing and the expense of remodeling homes needs to be adjusted, and what should be done with any profits from reindexing. Naturally, a significant continued decline in off-campus housing prices will

provide Senate faculty with viable off campus options regardless of reindexing.

(3) **Ratio of Senate to non-Senate buyers:** A third issue concerns the distribution of home sales between Senate faculty and non-Senate UCSC employees. With the number of unsold units in RVT higher than anticipated, in order to clear inventory there may be pressure to deviate from the formula for the percentage of homes allocated to Senate faculty.

Recommendation: Any plans to deviate from the prescribed ratio in the EMHP should first involve consultation with the Senate.

(4) **RVT playground:** When RVT was transformed into a phased project in response to costs associated with the CLUE lawsuit, the Housing Office shifted the development of a playground to RVT-2—a decision made before any homes were offered to buyers. The Senate was informed at the time (ca. 2006). RVT-1 buyers were informed when they met with Housing representatives prior to purchase, as most of them did. RVT-2's planned roll-out would have involved a delay of perhaps a year in the delivery of a playground. With the indefinite delay in construction of RVT-2, the prospect of waiting more than a year for a playground for children currently living in RVT became much more troublesome.

CFW acknowledges that Housing staff did not make this decision lightly and also that they fully understand the draw a playground has for potential buyers as a center for a community. CFW also understands that Student Affairs, and especially Housing, have been extremely pressed by the responsibility to build and sell housing stock in a plunging market. However, we are troubled that stakeholders (home buyers and CFW) were not alerted directly about a potentially much more lengthy delay in playground construction at the point when it became clear that Phase 2 would be delayed indefinitely. CFW reminds Student Affairs of the value of clear communication and regular consultation on matters that affect faculty.

Recommendation: CFW recommends that some form of playground be completed as soon as possible for home owners who bought at RVT with the understanding, based on project plans, that a playground would be built. We further recommend consultation with CFW about possible solutions and strongly recommend that our Student Affairs contacts or their representatives in Housing alert stakeholders (home buyers and the Senate, by way of CFW) in a timely manner about further changes to community infrastructure and consult with CFW about such changes prior to decisions' being made.

(4) **Future on-campus housing:** It now appears that RVT-2 will be delayed indefinitely. Nevertheless, the campus must keep in sight ongoing campus needs for housing. The faculty waitlists for Cardiff Terrace, Laureate Court, and Hagar Meadow/Court homes continue to be oversubscribed (>100) suggesting that smaller homes are more desirable, presumably for affordability, by first-time UCSC home buyers. Planning for additional on-campus housing should move forward in conjunction with the LRDP.

Recommendation: Given the state of the economy and volatility of the local housing market, CFW recommends that Administration planning for RVT-2 be re-evaluated with regards to timing, demand, and type of housing, method of delivery, and per-unit target pricing. Prices may

need to be readjusted to reflect demand and changes in market conditions just as they were readjusted during the price run-up.

(5) **Divisional use of LIO-SHLP:** While the LIO-SHLP option was intended to make housing more accessible to faculty in all the divisions, it seems that faculty in the Division of Arts (1 LIO-SHLP) have been significantly less likely to employ it than faculty in other divisions. CFW has not yet investigated the reasons for this imbalance, but will do so in the coming weeks and offer recommendations as warranted.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Roger Anderson
Maria-Elena Diaz
Joel Kubby
Suresh Lodha
Pete Raimondi (W, S)
Jennifer Reardon
Elizabeth Stephens (F)
James Zachos (F, W)
Elizabeth Abrams, Chair

February 20, 2009