

**MINUTES**  
**A Special Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division**  
**November 27, 2000**

**Meeting**

A Special Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Monday, November 27, 2000 in room B206 Earth and Marine Science Building. With Parliamentarian Allen Van Gelder and Secretary David Koo present, Chair Roger Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:40pm. The Special Meeting was called by the Chair on 14 November 2000 to address the legislation (AS/SCP/1271) originally submitted for the 31 May 2000 Spring Senate meeting. This legislation would repeal mandatory narrative evaluations.

Chair Anderson announced that Professor Ronald Henderson had passed away and the Senate honored him with a moment of silence in his memory.

Chair Anderson asked for and received approval without objection to start the meeting with a series of pre-programmed presentations from different sides of the arguments of six minutes apiece before opening the discussion for general debate with two-minute time limits per person.

**1. Minutes**

Chair Anderson asked for a motion to table the minutes of February 23, 2000. The motion was so moved and seconded and carried by unanimous voice vote.

**2. Repeal of the Divisional Senate Regulations that Require Mandatory Narrative Evaluations**

Professor Maria Schonbek introduced legislation (AS/SCP/1271), which strikes out all of 9.2 Written Evaluations, i.e., 9.2.1 and 9.2.2, of the Regulations of the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division. The motion was seconded.

Professor Manfred Warmuth read into the record a speech submitted to Secretary Koo. It is reproduced in full:

“Thanks to the Chair Roger Anderson for arranging this meeting.

The narrative evaluation system has always been one of the defining elements of this campus. There has been an on-going discussion on how to modify the narrative evaluation system during all of my twenty years here.

The founders of UCSC dreamed of small class sizes and instructors getting to know their students personally in each class. But after 35 years of budgetary realities, we have to face the fact that small classes (though there are some) are not the norm.

I strongly suspect that the distribution of class sizes on this campus is about the same as on other campuses across the country with around 11,000 students. It has to be the same as within the rest of UC, because money is supplied in strict proportion to student numbers.

Certainly, some of our classes are quite large. In large classes it is not feasible to produce personalized evaluations. So instructors resort to templates summarizing measurable facts about the students' performance. Students understand this, but the template summary evaluations make little sense to outside readers of UCSC transcripts.

In the original NES system established on May 26, 1966, an instructor could petition not to write evaluations for classes with more than 40 students. And departments, known then as boards of studies, were given the option of electing that their upper-division courses be graded A-B-C-D-F for all majors. It was only later that narratives started being an obligatory part of evaluation for all courses, and started to overshadow grades altogether.

Opinions differ widely about what should be done now with the NES. Each senator seems to have a slightly different opinion. I would call this meeting a success if we can clearly define today what the NES will look like in the years to come. The campus needs to move on to other pressing issues.

The original legislation drawn up by Maria Schonbek and myself asks for a ``repeal of mandatory evaluations''. *This is not abolition*. What we proposed was the repeal of the legislation making evaluations mandatory, that is, required of every instructor for every student in every class whether the instructor thinks it appropriate or not.

We have met with lots of Senate members, who have expressed a wide range of opinions about the ideal future of the system. We were urged to be more explicit about our intent to establish a voluntary system. So we are presenting a modified version of our legislation that we would like to submit to the Senate for consideration:

[PUT UP SLIDES OF BOTH ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED VERSIONS]

Substitute legislation Submitted Nov. 27 by Schonbek and Warmuth  
Amendment to Senate Regulations in order to establish an optional performance evaluation system.

This legislation shall take effect September 1, 2001. This legislation applies to all undergraduate students entering the University of California at Santa Cruz after September 1, 2001. For undergraduate students who enter before September 1, 2001, this legislation shall take effect for all courses taken after July 1, 2004.

9.2.1 At the end of the term, each instructor teaching a credit-granting course has the option to prepare a written performance evaluation for any student registered the class. Each such evaluation shall describe the quality and characteristics of the student's academic performance in the class.

9.2.2 was struck in the original version of the Call. Now it remains unchanged.<sup>1</sup>

Edited version that shows how original was modified:  
Bold type indicates new text.

9.2.1 At the end of the term, each instructor teaching a credit-granting course ~~shall~~ **has the option to** prepare a written **performance** evaluation for **each any** student ~~who receives a grade of P, A, B, C, or D~~ **registered** in ~~his or her~~ the class. ~~Each such~~ **The narrative** evaluation ~~must evaluate~~ **shall describe** the quality and characteristics of the student's **academic** performance in the class.

Does everybody have a hard copy of the substitute legislation?

Thanks to all the senators who helped us formulate the legislation.

Let us be clear: by voluntary we mean that the instructor decides which students in a class to write evaluations for. The administrative mechanisms for submitting narrative evaluations and distributing them from the Registrar's office remain in place, but the writing of an evaluation is an instructor option.

Why voluntary evaluations?

- return to the non-coercive philosophy of the late 1960s
- recognize the diversity of faculty approaches to student's evaluations
- give faculty control of their own grading process
- largely self editing system in that mostly meaningful evals will be written
- good students will be rewarded
- templates become largely superfluous
- saves resources

Why should we vote on the proposed legislation?

- Most important remaining educational policy issue since grades have become mandatory
- The campus has to move on!

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 9.2.2 currently reads as:

9.2.2 Evaluations are to be filed with the Registrar and the student's college at the time of filing the end-of-term course reports or no later than 15 working days after the close of the term. The college makes available one of its copies to the student and one to the student's adviser.

At the Kresge Student Food Co-op, students have posted some examples of meaningful evaluations with a sign over it saying "OUR LEGACY". I read some of them. I would have loved to get one of these evaluations if I were a student. They were all beautiful examples of thoughtful assessments of the student's academic performances.

However, the problem is that for each one of these finely crafted evaluations there are thousands of other evaluations that --- to put it mildly --- we cannot be proud of. I noticed that none of the evaluations posted at the Co-op were in template format.

In my opinion, evaluations in template form, and evaluations that essentially just contain a repetition of the grade --- when the grade will appear in the transcript anyway --- are bad evaluations. Who will have the patience to sift through the sea of computer-generated clutter in UCSC transcripts in search of the few meaningful evaluations?

I empathize with the students who posted the exemplary evaluations. If I try to put myself into their position then the question might be the following: Which system will produce a larger number of meaningful evaluations, a system in which evaluations are mandatory for every student and every course, forcing instructors of large classes to use templates? Or, as we propose, a system in which evaluations are voluntary, with the instructor deciding which students to write evaluations for?

We are arguing that the voluntary system will produce a larger number of good evaluations.

In the voluntary system the task of writing evaluation will be a privilege rather than a burden. I will know that I don't have to do it --- but I will want to do it for the students about which I can say something meaningful. I will only write the evaluations I want to write. Most likely these will be for students who deserve honors, though there will be some other cases, such as giving feedback for College Provosts through evaluations for borderline students.

The non-coercive system proposed in this legislation respects the tradition of narrative evaluations, but also allows us to respect each other in our differing opinions about when narratives should be added to a grade and when they should not.

We should not be telling our colleagues in other divisions what they have to write at the end of term, or tell them that they have to write something even for a student about whom they have nothing meaningful to say.

The voluntary system simply acknowledges our academic freedom.

U C Santa Cruz is one of the few research campuses in America where such detailed information about students' performance is gathered and disseminated. We should be proud of that. And we have an administrative system for collecting evaluations in place. We should not destroy it. Making the submission of narratives voluntary does not destroy it.

We would like to know from the academic legislative body of this campus whether evaluations should be compulsory or not. We think that voting on this legislation is both timely and constructive. Either outcome is a win for this campus: either we will learn that the majority thinks voluntary evaluations are an improvement, or we will know that compulsory evaluations have majority support.

No matter what the outcome of the vote will be in this assembly, there will most likely be a mail ballot on this legislation.

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction will count (and perhaps manually recount) the ballots and by next year we should know whether evaluations will be voluntary.

(Seriously, many thanks to all the members of the RJ&E committee; they have had a tough year.)

The alternative proposal by Senators Rogoff and Ladusaw requiring mandatory evaluations still has a number of coercive elements: First, timeliness reports are retained. Second, a minimum evaluation has a course description as a new and additional requirement. And third, CEP is given the authority to issue guidelines on how to write evaluations.

We advocate a system that does not have these coercive or potentially coercive features.

We want to make writing narrative evaluations a voluntary act by instructors who have comments on individual students that they want to make part of the record.

With a firm promise not to go to the Supreme Court if the vote goes against our legislation, we respectfully submit the presented legislation to this assembly for discussion and voting.”

Professor Warmuth then moved the substitute motion above, which would change the existing regulations to make the writing of narrative evaluations optional at the instructor's discretion.

Chair Anderson clarified that during the debate, both the substitute and the original motion could be addressed. He then asked for presentation of the arguments for and against the motion from Committee on Educational Policy Chair Carol Freeman, two faculty groups, and one student group.

CEP Chair Carol Freeman:

She urged Senators to vote so as to preserve the existing Senate regulations and thus against the proposed or substitute legislation. She argued that unless or until experience proves otherwise, the NES should be retained as it can work with the recently adopted mandatory letter grades. Together, UCSC's system of assessment meets and exceeds conventional needs and expectations to achieve something far superior. Current regulations already grant instructors the latitude to determine what constitutes appropriate, useful and feasible narrative evaluations for any class, depending on its nature and size. Faculty who believe that it is best to submit a minimal summary statement; to reproduce some form of their grade book electronically to show how the grade was determined; or to contextualize a summary grade with a multi-dimensional performance evaluation may do so. Given this flexibility, CEP believes that we can and should attempt to address legitimate workload issues within the system before we decide to dismantle it.

In arriving at its decision to preserve the current regulations, CEP considered and rejected several options that narrative evaluations be:

1) required only in classes below a certain size

This was rejected because of the reasons given by CEP last spring, including the lack of evaluations for students in large majors (who will be taking many courses in their majors with large class sizes); the evidence that many instructors of large classes currently find it feasible to provide meaningful narrative evaluations; and the enhancement of letter grades even with less-than-ideal, minimal, menu-driven narratives.

2) required only in upper-division courses

This was rejected because there is no good reason to delay the beneficial effects of narratives, such as the changes in students' relationships to their work, peers, and instructors when students discover that multiple aspects of their performances may be commented on rather than disappearing into the compilation of a summary grade.

3) optional at the instructor's discretion

This was rejected because leaving the production of narrative evaluations up to the instructor's discretion removes the institutional commitment to providing a narrative evaluation for every student in every class and removes much of the narrative's value. This value comes from UCSC already having a formal incorporation of the concept of multi-dimensional assessment into its pedagogy and educational policy. Making narratives optional is not so much a policy as a vague gesture with unpredictable consequences and the potential for unequal treatment, as well as saying nothing about what UCSC believes or stands for. The institutional commitment will hopefully provide impetus for improving technological systems and faculty support in a way that optional narrative evaluations will never achieve.

Mandatory narrative evaluations, in the context of mandatory grades, will result in a system of assessment:

- unique in its ability to acknowledge the vast differences inherent in various disciplines' modes of evaluation;
- that instructors can adapt to complement their pedagogical values and practices;
- that recognizes students and individual patterns of performance;
- that can meet the varied unpredictable preferences of fellowship and postgraduate selection committees and prospective employers;
- that can deal with grade inflation;

- that doesn't exempt courses that students take pass/no pass from meaningful assessment;
- that recognizes an assessment system can do more than provide graduate, professional schools, and employers with student records;
- that can shape a student's relationship to his or her education and influence an instructor's mode of teaching; and
- that makes a statement about the nature and values of the institution.

Professor Joel Yellin:

Professor Yellin pointed out that we appear to be approaching a consensus on our grading system, since the practical effects of the proposed legislation making evaluations optional are likely to be much the same as the CEP's interpretation of the current mandatory system. He made the further point that recognizing explicitly that evaluations are optional for instructors is consistent with the history of the NES. He noted that a check of the Senate records shows that the original narrative evaluation system set up by the campus founders was not coercive. Every department had the option to choose conventional A through F grading for courses that receive credit in a major. And the Senate records further show, according to Professor Yellin, that from September 1, 1965 through January 24, 1979, there was an explicit exception from the NES for large classes. In particular, the original NES regulations provided: "Exceptions may be made when the class is too large for written evaluations to be practicable." Professor Yellin suggested that it would be helpful in the debate if those with experience with the original non-coercive system would discuss the lessons learned in its operation. Professor Yellin noted that in 1979, even though the campus was growing, the system was changed from its earlier non-coercive form to one that relied upon coercion. As evidence for that view, he referred to a letter he received from the Registrar in the mid 1980's announcing that the Registrar intended to edit Professor Yellin's evaluations to delete any mention of conventional grades. Professor Yellin argued that the most constructive outcome of the meeting would be a real consensus on the issues that have divided the Senate. He posed the question whether, given the effects of the current system on the reputation of the faculty and of the University, a consensus ought to include an agreement that narrative evaluations should be only for internal use, rather than being included on transcripts sent to the external world.<sup>2</sup>

With the six minutes still not totally used, the Chair invited Professor Geoffrey Pullum to use the remaining time to argue in favor of optional narratives.

Professor Geoffrey Pullum:

The analogy (originally made by Professor Michael Urban at the 3 December 1999 Special Meeting) that optional narratives, like optional taxation, won't work is faulty. Faculty do a lot of work that is not required or directly related to the criteria for merit and promotion. Those faculty who believe strongly in narrative evaluations will not stop writing if narratives were optional. Moreover, their writing narratives does not depend on their having the power to compel their colleagues to do so. Professor Pullum then gave an example of the difficulty and confusion posed by narrative evaluations to review committees that must handle large number of files. The result is that UCSC students do not fare well against other institutions which provide high grades and a few strong letters of recommendation. Professor Pullum suggests that lowering the quantity and elevating the quality of evaluations, which would argue in favor of the proposed optional narratives, will be advantageous to our students.

Professor William Ladusaw:

He argued to retain the current evaluation system. He agreed with the proposers of the optional narratives that instructors need to account for wide diversity of situations in their evaluations. But he disagreed with them that evaluations should be optional if they cannot meet the ideal quality of evaluations that Professor Warmuth saw on the Kresge wall. Even template evaluations, by putting the grade in context, conveys more and relevant information. Professor Ladusaw also corrected Professor Warmuth's assertion that coercive elements remain in the alternate proposal by himself and Professor Rogoff. The part mentioning that certain kinds of course descriptions would be used as reasonable minimal evaluations served merely as an example, not as a requirement. As for the timeliness report issue raised as another example of coercion by Professor Warmuth, it does not follow from CEP policy nor from legislation presented here, though the alternate proposal advocates examining what is that policy from elsewhere. Moreover, the institutional commitment from mandatory narratives is important to assure students being recruited and their parents that UCSC will be providing narrative evaluations over and above the letter grade they receive from their instructors. If this substitute legislation passes, the uncertainty about if or when they will receive evaluations places UCSC in a logically weaker position from which to recruit.

---

<sup>2</sup> This text has been modified from the draft minutes distributed via e-mail January 5, 2001.

Professor Barbara Rogoff:

She and Professor Ladusaw represent 186 faculty who endorse streamlining and strengthening the NES and urged a vote against the motions. Software has been identified which will facilitate the writing of narratives by eliminating the need for unnecessary typing, cutting, and pasting. The Registrar's Office is creating a concise and professionally formatted transcript to replace the current cluttered 16-page transcript. Even with current cumbersome transcripts, UCSC students have already developed an outstanding record of selection for graduate schools, employment, and fellowships. A new streamlined transcript will further enhance their advantage. Performance evaluations address problems with grades and grade inflation and provide a more learning-focused environment. For these reasons, other institutions are interested in adopting them and look upon UCSC as a leader.

Professor Rogoff asked for a ruling on whether it would be in order to present a reform resolution to be considered later if the main motions are defeated. Chair Anderson asked the body for a vote to be decided by a majority on whether the reform resolution should be considered. Professor Phokion Kolaitis rose to state that the only thing to be considered was the legislation introduced by Professors Schonbek and Warmuth and, because the resolution was not part of the agenda, unanimous consent would be required. Chair Anderson responded that whether the meeting was broadly conceived to consider issues related to the narrative evaluation system or narrowly conceived to consider only a single piece of legislation is debatable. Professor Robert Meister pointed out that the reform resolution could be considered independently of the passage or not of the motions and thus may be in order. Professor Joel Yellin rose to a point of parliamentary information stating that the systemwide bylaws specify that a special meeting is called only for whatever item is on the agenda and that any other non-legislative business can only be undertaken by unanimous consent. Chair Anderson stated that the systemwide bylaw uses the word "business", which is not specifically defined; ruled the vote in order; and proceeded to call for a voice vote. That the resolution should be considered later was carried by voice vote.

Student representative Susan Vilayvanh (Student Union Assembly):

She spoke on behalf of the undergraduate students at UCSC. Although NES has been claimed to be out of date due to increased class sizes and changing conditions, the spirit of NES is renewed with each incoming freshman class. Narrative evaluations motivate students to excel in a different way than cramming for grades. Students are encouraged to express themselves through communication and interaction with teaching assistants and professors in spite of class size and find NES a refreshing change from the orthodox grading system in high school. NES benefits more than liberal arts majors. Testimony of women in the sciences, a field in which women are commonly underrepresented, demonstrates that narratives, among other factors, have contributed to excellence in UCSC's science departments. NES enables students to learn about their own academic abilities; to narrow down areas that need improvement; and to recover an interest in learning for its own sake.

Student representative Manuel Schwab (Kresge College):

He spoke in support of retaining mandatory narrative evaluations. Such a system is an institutional commitment to an educational environment that maintains learning as the motivation of a student's interactions with their teachers. Narrative transcripts communicate the specific vocation and aptitude of students rather than their generalized ranking. There has been no demonstration of the effects of having a dual narrative-grade system and so it is premature to reduce the use of the narrative component at this time by making it optional.

Chair Anderson then opened the floor for debate on the main and substitute motions.

**Speaking for the motions:**

Barry Bowman  
Joseph Bunnett  
Karen McNally

**Speaking against the motions:**

Jim McCloskey  
Ian Ellis (Porter College representative)  
Donald Brenneis

**Points made for the motions for repealing narratives or for optional narratives:**

With optional narratives, quantity will go down and quality up. 35 years of experience with narratives show that between 10 and 35 percent deviate from the ideal. Currently more than 100,000 narratives are written every year, with probably between 20,000 to 30,000 of these being badly written, not being done, being done very late, evaluating something other than performance, or being in conflict with the letter grade. There is no way to monitor what people write. Evaluations should not be part of the transcript, the official permanent record, because if they are, they are not written for the students, but instead for readers of the transcript and this distorts the whole process. Students should be concerned more with what they are learning and the intellectual experience than with the evaluation of it.

The cost of NES is substantial - based on ten minutes per evaluation, approximately 12 faculty appointments -- and not worth it. Optional narratives would allow for a cost-effective redistribution of resources so that faculty can do narratives in a way that they consider to make sense pedagogically.

For many, the information provided on a narrative evaluation is not different from what is already provided as feedback on homework and exams, so they don't provide anything new to the student.

Optional evaluations would be beneficial for untenured faculty who come to the university and must quickly get new teaching and research programs going. The flexibility of optional narratives without penalty in the academic personnel process would reduce workload and avoid concerns on how the administration will handle enforcement of a mandatory responsibility.

**Points made against the motions for repealing narratives or optional narratives:**

When work of a ten-week record is boiled down to a single point on a six or seven point scale, a lot of information useful to the student or readers of transcripts who make decisions based on them, is lost. An informal survey of five top-ranked programs of American linguistics in North America indicates that four out of five believed that narratives gave UCSC students a competitive edge. UCSC students currently do much better going on to Ph.D. programs than students from any other campus in the UC system except Berkeley; thus UCSC should retain narratives so that their students are not deprived of the competitive advantage of narrative evaluations in their applications. From narrative evaluations, students learn how to be better students. Some Regents Scholars are attracted to UCSC because of the learning environment created by narrative evaluations. Transcripts with narrative evaluations can be extremely helpful to reviewers, like those on the NSF panels selecting graduate research fellowships, especially when the number of qualified students far outnumber the number of fellowships or when GPAs are distrusted.

Professor Darrell Long called the question to vote on whether the substitute motion would be adopted in place of the original motion. Calling the question was passed by unanimous voice vote. Professor Ladusaw rose to a point of clarification regarding the preamble to the legislation as it appeared in the CALL of the meeting. Professor Warmuth clarified that the substitution was for the legislation only and that the conditions in the preamble regarding effective dates would remain.

Chair Anderson stated the question as voting to accept the substitution or to vote on the main motion.

Professor Pamela Roby rose to a point of information asking which way would one vote, if one wanted to support the arguments presented by the CEP Chair? Chair Anderson clarified that it would not matter, since this was a vote on whether to replace the main motion by the substitute motion, and not on either motion itself. The Chair then recognized Professor Charlie McDowell, who said he would not provide an answer but stated that this vote on substitution did present a calculated risk. If one didn't want either motion to pass, then one might choose to vote for whichever motion one thought least likely to pass.

After an inconclusive voice vote, Chair Anderson called for a rising vote. The motion to substitute failed a majority by a vote of 64 in favor of substitution and 102 opposed, thus retaining the main motion for consideration of a vote.

Professor Michael Warren called the question on the main motion which was seconded and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Anderson then stated the main motion as a repeal of mandatory narrative evaluations (AS/SCP/1271). After an inconclusive voice vote, the main motion failed a majority by a show of hands.

Chair Anderson then recognized Professor Rogoff. Professor Darrell Long rose to a point of parliamentary information quoting the bottom of page 92 of Robert's Rules of Order: "With the possible exception of details of very minor importance, only business mentioned in the call of a special meeting can be transacted at such a meeting." Before the Parliamentarian could respond, Professor Yellin rose to a point of order against considering the resolution, quoting Senate bylaw 315: "Special meetings. The order of business shall be: Business stated in the call", and then, "Other matters authorized by unanimous consent of the voting members present."

The Chair then invited the Parliamentarian to speak directly to the Senate to clarify the point of information. A viewgraph from pages 112 and 113 of Robert's was presented:

"5) If the general problem posed by a main motion might be better dealt with by an alternative measure which cannot conveniently be proposed as an amendment in the form of a substitute (see above), a member speaking in debate can urge rejection of the pending main motion, saying that if it is voted down he will offer a different main motion which he can describe briefly and which deals with the general problem in a substantially different way (see, however, paragraph (2) on p. 108). If the pending motion is thereafter voted down, the chair immediately recognizes this member again for the purpose of making his alternative motion, even if another member rises to claim the floor first and addresses the chair."

The Parliamentarian said this excerpt indicates a procedure whereby, when there is something that is not appropriate as an amendment that is offered as an alternative, this is the mechanism by which it can be brought before the body. He said that he thought there is a reasonable argument that this resolution is the same part of the business for which the meeting was called. It is like an amendment to deal with the same problem that the original motion was brought up to address. If the resolution is considered to be part of the same business, then it appears to be in order, per this procedure in Robert's. Because of uncertainty over the correctness of this interpretation, earlier in the meeting Chair Anderson had asked the body to vote on whether to consider this issue.

The Chair ruled that the resolution would be considered after adding that, besides approving consideration of the resolution if the main motion failed, the body had earlier considered a substitute motion which was also not in the CALL.

Professor Rogoff then rose to state that the compelling reason to consider the resolution at this meeting is that it will provide closure so that the institution can proceed forward on reforming NES.

Professor Yellin rose to appeal the Chair's ruling on his point of order against considering the resolution. Chair Anderson stated that he accepted the Parliamentarian's reasoning that the body may vote to determine the appropriateness of considering a matter as the same part of the business for which the meeting was called. The Chair then called for and received approval by a majority voice vote to sustain his ruling that the Senate consider the resolution.

Professor Rogoff moved the following resolution, which was seconded.

**Resolution:**

*Whereas* the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate has been committed since the founding of the campus to providing a rich and challenging educational experience for its undergraduates, including multidimensional assessment of student performance;

*Whereas* the campus has grown to the point where new guidelines for student performance evaluations are needed that will reaffirm UCSC's commitment to its educational goals while allowing for flexibility in the range and extent of student assessment;

**It is Resolved:**

*That* the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate affirms its commitment to multidimensional assessment of student performance whenever practical;

*That* at the discretion of the instructor, student evaluations may range from a coursework description plus a simple summary of the quality of student performance, which may be a grade, to more extensive multidimensional assessment (usually fewer than 150 words);

*That* the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate affirms its commitment to maintaining the status of student performance evaluations in the official transcript;

*That* the transcript be formatted concisely and professionally to provide an easy-to-read report of the student's evaluations;

*That* this resolution serve as the basis for the UCSC administration and Academic Senate committees to provide the infrastructure support and fair policies to implement this intent.

Professor Richard Hughey rose with a question on the wording of the resolution regarding evaluation content. Professor Rogoff clarified that a resolution is, unlike legislation, advisory and non-binding.

The question was called by an unidentified Senate member, seconded, and passed by voice vote. The motion to accept the resolution then passed by a majority with a voice vote.

Professor John Isbister rose to a point of order requesting clarification on whether a mail ballot may be undertaken on the further existence of narrative evaluations, since no new legislation was adopted. Chair Anderson stated that the Parliamentarian believes a mail ballot can be conducted on things that fail as well as things that pass, but that the final determination for this lies with the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections. The Chair also expressed his belief that the main motion which was defeated would likely become subject to a mail ballot.

**Adjournment:**

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and approved without objection. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm.

ATTEST:

David Koo, Secretary  
December 28, 2000

Recording Secretary: Mary-Beth Harhen