

MINUTES  
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
December 1, 2017

**Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, December 1, at the Stevenson Event Center. Chair Ólóf Einarsdóttir called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m, with Don Potts present as acting Parliamentarian.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

The meeting minutes of May 19, 2017 were approved by voice vote.

**2. Announcements**

**a. Chair Einarsdóttir**

Chair Einarsdóttir remarked that the Senate and Administration have been collaborating on several projects, including the campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), and the 2:1 frosh to transfer student admissions mandate from the state legislature.

The Senate has also been actively participating in Beyond Compliance efforts, with Senate Vice Chair Kim Lau chairing the Beyond Compliance working group on campus. The focus of this group is to engage faculty to improve campus culture by figuring out ways to help eliminate sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) on campus. The group has developed a three-year program focused on faculty education, participation, and leadership on these topics, and has successfully attained funding from the CP/EVC to develop courses with SVSH-related themes and to incorporate SVSH units into existing courses. The workgroup would also like to create faculty reading groups and student education series' so the faculty can better understand the complexities of SVSH issues.

The floor was given to Chancellor Blumenthal.

**b. Chancellor Blumenthal**

Chancellor Blumenthal noted some recent faculty achievements and campus rankings before reporting on the recent audit on the UC Office of the President (UCOP). The UC Regents called on former California Supreme Court Chief Justice Carlos Moreno to assess what happened during the audit. Moreno's report has now been released, and the Regents have admonished UC President Janet Napolitano for her activities during the audit.

Chancellor Blumenthal remarked on the three resolutions that were passed at the May 19, 2017 Senate meeting. Regarding the resolution on concerning campus actions with regard to the termination of the federal Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, the Chancellor reported that the campus has been making efforts to address the many concerns that undocumented students face at UCSC. Many of these efforts are being overseen by the Educational Opportunity Projects (EOP) EOP Office, and are being led by Vice Provost for

Student Success (VPSS) Jaye Padgett and Assistant Vice Provost for Student Success (AVPSS) Pablo Reguerin. Additionally, the campus has allotted \$300k in funding to assist DACA students facing emergency situations. The campus also provides legal services and wellness support for undocumented students, among many other programs designed to assist them. Regarding the resolution on Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) on campus, the Chancellor noted that legally, UCSC cannot bar federal agents from entering the campus. However, this does not mean that the campus must cooperate with immigration authorities. As of now, the campus has not, is not, and will not be cooperating with these officials, should they arrive on campus. Regarding the resolution concerning the protection of student records on campus, the Chancellor noted that the campus has done, and is currently doing everything possible ensure that student information pertaining to legal status is protected on campus. The campus Registrar is also working closely with the Office of the President to review policies regarding records, to ensure that this information is not kept on campus any longer than is legally required.

The new tax law that was proposed by the U.S. House of Representatives includes a requirement that tuition scholarships for graduate students be counted as taxable income, and limits the ability for graduate students to defer interest payments on student loans. This would severely impede graduate students from being able to be able to attend UCSC. More information will be available after both the House and Senate votes move forward.

Chancellor Blumenthal reported on several housing projects across campus. The Administration is continuing to meet with students, faculty, and staff regarding the Student Housing West project. This project will add 3,000 beds to campus, and should be complete by 2022. Some of these beds will be used to replace those in family and student housing, and others will be used to re-establish student lounge spaces that had been converted into dormitories, so the net number of new beds will be approximately 2,100. This housing will be for upper-division students, graduate students, and for students with families on campus. The campus is also planning an expanded child care facility for staff, faculty, and students. The designs are currently being finalized. The family and student housing at Hagar may be ready by fall of 2019, the child care facility may be done by this time as well. In November, 2017, the Regents approved the planning phase for UCSC's Kresge College project. The campus is currently considering which buildings will be renovated, and which will be replaced. This project will also include new spaces for student life and student support, a new lecture hall and classrooms, and more housing. Construction will begin in fall of 2019.

There is a campus committee working on UCSC's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), co-chaired by Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services Sarah Latham and Senate Vice Chair Kim Lau. There is also a community group that facilitates dialogue and solicits input from the greater Santa Cruz community. The first draft of the LRDP plan should be finished in late 2018.

Regarding the state-mandated 2:1 frosh to transfer student ratio, the Chancellor reported that for this year's budget, the California legislature will withhold \$50 million from UC if three conditions are not met. One of these conditions is that UC Riverside and UCSC must show that progress is being made toward the 2:1 goal, or that satisfactory efforts are being made towards

achieving progress on that goal. As such, UCSC has submitted a plan to the Governor's office which details campus efforts, and a list of deliverables that UCSC is working on in an effort to reach the 2:1 ratio.

The state legislature will release their budget in January, 2018, after which the Regents will meet to discuss the budget for UC.

The AB-97 bill was passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor last year, and calls for UC to admit 1,500 additional undergraduate students next year, and proposes to pay for these additional students by making cuts at UCOP. These cuts will likely not affect UCSC.

UCSC's fundraising campaign ended in June of 2017. Fundraising on campus has continued since the close of the campaign, and gifts and pledges have increased by more than 50% since last year.

### **c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Tromp**

CP/EVC Tromp reported that the campus is currently undergoing a landscape analysis as part of the Strategic Academic Plan (SAP). The company that has been charged with collecting data for this plan, Entangled Solutions, will be sending representatives to meet with various groups on campus as the plan moves forward. The first faculty open forum will be held on Wednesday, December 6, 2017. The goal is to create five-year plan with benchmarks and targets, with a clear implementation strategy for the campus. There is also an enrollment council, led by VPAA Lee, which will be creating an enrollment strategy as part of the SAP.

The EVC has met with many groups on campus regarding Academic Analytics, which is a tool that the campus uses to compile data and compare different units on our campus to those of other institutions. The goal is to use this data to help see where the campus might change and grow, and to find new ways to foster interdisciplinary collaboration.

The campus is currently searching for an Athletics Director, and a Title IX Director. Other current campus initiatives include Beyond Compliance, which is aimed at eliminating SVSH on campus, and the newly opened Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning, to help enhance the teaching experience at UCSC.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Karen Bassi of Literature commented that the Santa Cruz Faculty Association has concerns about UCSC's contract with Academic Analytics. These concerns regard the accuracy of the reporting provided by Academic Analytics, the ways this data will be used, the level of transparency in the processes, and the costs associated with this project.

Professor Megan Thomas of Politics remarked (on behalf of Professor Richard Montgomery of Mathematics) that using algorithms as the primary basis for making policy changes can be very dangerous, and that the faculty tested Academic Analytics and found that there were many discrepancies in the data the software compiled, and asked why the university insists on paying

for and using such high-risk software.

CP/EVC Tromp responded that the Administration is aware of the possible risks associated with Academic Analytics, and that it will not be used to create or change campus policy. The goal right now is to determine whether Academic Analytics could be a useful tool for the campus, and whether the data pulled from Academic Analytics could be utilized in a beneficial way.

Professor Thomas asked how the Administration will guarantee that the data from Academic Analytics will not be used for personnel actions, if the data influence decisions about funding departments or programs, if individual faculty members will be able to see their own profiles, and how much using Academic Analytics costs the university.

CP/EVC Tromp responded that since UCSC has such a robust review process, use of this data is unnecessary and would add no value to the personnel review process. This data will also not be used as the sole basis for making decisions about funding departments or programs.

Dean of Graduate Studies Tyrus Miller responded that while it may be possible that individuals would be able to access their own data, the university does not yet have a policy in place regarding this practice.

The CP/EVC commented that the cost would be slightly more than \$100k per year should the Academic Analytics be extended beyond the current end date. The university proposed that the contract be extended for a two-year period.

Professor Gina Langhout of Psychology asked if a report containing the steps the university is taking to protect undocumented students will be given to the Senate. She also asked what steps are being taken to help mitigate the some of problems that undocumented students face, such as food insecurity, and long waits to see counselors and immigration lawyers.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that a written report would be provided if this is what the Senate desired. The university has also put programs in place to help undocumented students with the issues they face on campus, which have also been supplemented with extra money to help further support these students. The Administration is open to further discussion regarding the issues these students are dealing with, and how to best address them.

UCSC Student Michael Kushner asked if the money lost if UC doesn't achieve the 2:1 frosh to transfer ratio would be more detrimental to the campus than accepting additional students that the campus does not have the funding or infrastructure to support. He also asked that, since enrollments cannot be increased due to insufficient housing, if efforts to reach the 2:1 ratio would include admitting fewer frosh.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that many of the programs that support students and infrastructure on campus are independent of state financial support. The university also needs to show that it is willing to work with the state legislature, as cooperation could lead to additional funding later on. As such, the campus has an obligation to try and meet the 2:1 goal, even if we

need more support than what will be provided once we reach this goal. The campus does not intend to admit fewer frosh to make room for more transfer students.

Professor Chad Saltikov of Microbiology and Environmental Toxicology (METOX) asked if the LRDP and Strategic Academic Planning groups will work together at all and give each other feedback for these projects.

CP/EVC Tromp responded that there is a lot of overlap in these initiatives, and there will be a lot of collaboration between these groups as the projects move forward.

### **Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)**

#### **3. Special Orders: Annual Reports**

##### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- a. **Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1869)**
- b. **Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1870)**
- c. **Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AS/SCP/1871)**
- d. **Committee on Career Advising (AS/SCP/1872)**
- e. **Committee on Courses of Instruction (AS/SCP/1873)**
- f. **Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1874)**
- g. **Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1875)**
- h. **Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1876)**
- i. **Committee on Information Technology (AS/SCP/1877)**
- j. **Committee on International Education (AS/SCP/1878)**
- k. **Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (AS/SCP/1879)**
- l. **Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1880)**
- m. **Committee on Preparatory Education (AS/SCP/1881)**
- n. **Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1882)**
- o. **Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1883)**
- p. **Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (AS/SCP/1884)**
- q. **Committee on Teaching (AS/SCP/1885)**
- r. **Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1886)**
- s. **Special Committee on Athletics (AS/SCP/1887)**
- t. **Special Committee on Development and Fundraising (AS/SCP/1888)**

The reports were approved by acclamation.

#### **4. Reports of Special Committees (none)**

#### **5. Reports of Standing Committees**

##### **a. Committee on Faculty Welfare**

##### **i. Faculty Salary Analysis, May 2017 (AS/SCP/1863)**

Chair Stefano Profumo reported that the goals of the salary analysis were to understand how cost of living is factored into salaries, and to assess the

importance of the special salary practice, also known as the merit boost program.

In previous analyses the Administration stated that faculty salaries were above the median, but they only compared UCSC to seven of the nine UC campuses. UCLA and UC Berkeley were excluded from these analyses. CFW agreed that it was misleading to use the seven campus figure, as it does not accurately reflect how UCSC faculty salaries compares to those at the other UC campuses. UCLA and UC Berkeley are both coastal campuses like UCSC, with comparable costs of living (which are already factored into their campus data). When compared to all nine campuses, UCSC faculty salaries still fall below the median. With cost of living factored in, UCSC salaries lag quite significantly behind the other UC campuses. This is true for all ranks, but especially for the top earners on campus.

The merit boost program has helped to keep UCSC salaries higher, but they are still much lower than the UC wide median. If the merit boost plan were to continue, UCSC salaries would continue to fall below the median, but at a much slower rate than if the program were to be discontinued. Discontinuing the program would save the campus 200k per year, but would also negatively impact UCSC's ability to recruit and retain faculty, and would be detrimental to faculty morale on campus.

The floor was opened for questions.

Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Herbie Lee commented that UCSC is working to find additional revenue sources. One of the reasons UCLA and UC Berkeley can pay their faculty more is because they have higher revenue than UCSC. The cost of the merit boost program is also cumulative, so over ten years the cost would grow from \$200k to \$2M per year.

Professor Emily Brodsky of Earth and Planetary Sciences asked if the data from UCSF, a medical school was factored into the analysis.

Chair Profumo responded that CFW were not able to access this data, and adding in doctor salaries would skew the data and affect the results, so it was not factored in.

Professor Loisa Nygaard of Literature asked if CFW has looked at UCSC's faculty retention rates, and whether or not they are comparable to those rates at the other UC campuses. The faculty hiring process can be very expensive and labor intensive. Being able to retain faculty could lower these costs.

Chair Profumo responded that CFW wanted to look at this, but were not able to get much data in this regard, only the number of successful retention offers per year, historically. They were able to compare this data to the faculty salary data per year. Paying higher salaries is expensive, but allows the university to save

money on retentions.

**b. Committee on Educational Policy**

**i. Amendment to Regulations 10.2.3.1.a and 10.5.2 (AS/SCP/1863)**

Chair Onuttom Narayan explained that this legislation updates to CEP's regulations to reflect UCSC's new Academic Literacy program.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor John Tamkun of Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology commented that the Academic Literacy program appears to cut the number of writing courses students are required to take, and asked how this will help students to become more effective writers.

Chair Narayan responded that presently, students who do not satisfy the C2 writing requirement take two courses with writing instruction: one College Core course, and one course with the Writing program. Neither course has only taught composition. The new system will be more of a rearrangement of topics between the two courses rather than a reduction in writing instruction.

Professor Faye Crosby of Psychology remarked that students who are poor writers are often poor readers. Many students come to UCSC as poor readers. Strategic instruction of these topics is paramount, which is why this rearrangement of course material is necessary. It is not a reduction in writing instruction.

An Oakes student currently enrolled in College Core asked when the Academic Literacy program would take effect, and if this would affect students currently enrolled in College Core.

Chair Narayan responded that if passed, the regulations will be implemented fall 2018 and will affect students registering for classes at that time. Students who were previously enrolled in College Core can choose to adopt subsequent catalogs in their entirety.

Professor Grant Hartzog of Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology asked if section sizes will be kept smaller in this new program, and asked if there was not a more efficient way to teach this material to students, such as larger class sizes, which would not require such a significant amount of new resources.

Chair Narayan responded that both the Administration and CPB told CEP that the Academic Literacy program was within the budget envelope allowed by the University. CEP did recommend one change that actually reduced the cost of the program by approximately \$80k, and there were other suggestions to explore associated costs that may no longer be budgetary necessities for the new program. At most, the cost of the new program would be \$200k more than what it is at

present. The campus is also so constrained by the diminished availability of classrooms, that even if class sizes for these courses were to be increased, there would likely be nowhere suitable to teach them. The quality of education and learning outcomes would also likely be diminished.

Professor Elizabeth Abrams of the Writing Program commented that since College Core courses require students and teachers to spend significant amounts of time working together to improve student learning outcomes, larger class sizes would be detrimental to this process.

Professor Abel Rodriguez of Applied Math and Statistics asked how the university will track the changes that arise as a result of the implementation of this program, and how its impact on learning outcomes will be monitored.

Chair Narayan responded that just as with the current program, there will be regular assessments of the new program, as well as the Core courses. Feedback from departments will also be solicited.

The legislation was passed by a show of hands.

**c. Committee on Teaching**

**i. 2016-17 Survey of Department Chairs, Managers, and Provosts on the use of Student Evaluations of Teaching (AS/SCP/1990)**

Chair Matt McCarthy reported that the goals of the survey were to assess the effectiveness of course evaluations in improving teaching and learning, and how they could potentially be improved. The survey focused on evaluation content, response rates, time windows, and usage of response data.

The survey results showed that most departments only use the standard 25 questions in their course evaluations, while the colleges primarily use customized questions. The perception of bias in course evaluations was prevalent across these results, with a majority of respondents noting concerns in this regard. The way respondents reported the evaluation data was used was extremely varied, with many different uses and ways of aggregating the data reported across the responses.

Overall, respondents were supportive of shifting the basic framework of these evaluations away from ratings, and toward ways that would be more informative on teaching and learning outcomes. Many respondents suggested in-class time for course evaluations as a way to boost response rates, and as a way to change the quality of the responses. Peer evaluations were also suggested in this regard.

COT will be surveying faculty again in fall 2017, and will be putting together a proposal that will likely be released in spring 2018.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

**6. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair**

SUA President Maxine Jiminez reported that the SUA recently passed two resolutions. The first resolution condemned the termination of former Director of Admissions Michael McCawley. The second resolution regarded increased enrollments, recognizing that UCSC has mandates from the Governor, UCOP, and the UC Regents among others, and that it is the job of the Administration to concede to these demands promptly. However, in the condition UCSC is currently, the campus does not even have the resources to accommodate and address the needs of current students, so it is unrealistic and unreasonable to expect that additional incoming students will have what they need to succeed. There is also a protest clause in the resolution. The form of protest that the SUA intends to pursue is a system-wide petition against over-enrollment, which is to be signed by students across all UC campuses. Additionally, all the campus SUA's will release statements in solidarity with regard to the overcrowding issues here at UCSC. These materials will be presented by the SUA's External Vice President at the January Regents meeting when they convene to discuss tuition hikes.

Many students are repeatedly facing the same issues with housing. Lounges are being converted into dormitories, students have faced eviction from their homes off campus with as little as 48-hours notice, and students on campus have experienced flooding, insect infestations and fumigation, mold, and rodents in their dormitories. Regarding Student Housing West, many students feel uncomfortable knowing that housing will be privatized, as many come from different socioeconomic backgrounds, and privatization brings uncertainty that all students, even those with lower income, will have the resources necessary for their success. The SUA understands that 60-70% of Student Housing West will be singles because upperclassmen want more privacy. However, the SUA agree that affordability, which is a necessity, should be more concern regarding housing than privacy, which is more of a luxury.

Many students face food insecurity on campus. When surveyed, 4 in 10 UC student reported that they do not have a consistent source of high-quality, nutritious food. The campus does have pantries that help alleviate these issues. However, this should not be the normal way for students to access food. Food pantries should be for emergencies only.

70% of students who are able to attend this UCSC receive financial aid. This aid has not been delivered to students in a timely manner. In weeks 9 and 10 of fall quarter there are still lines of students waiting for their financial aid to process. Many students rely on their refund checks to purchase books, and even groceries. There are also many students who are still unable to enroll in their classes because their financial aid has not yet been processed.

Due to the issues already stated, student mental health on campus is declining. UCSC does not have sufficient resources to support students and their problems that are often induced by the University. Students referred to off-campus mental health services are still facing these

issues because there is either no availability, and/or it is unaffordable.

The SUA would like to be a part of the decision-making process on campus, and not just hear about decisions made after the fact. Since students are the ones utilizing the services provided by these decisions, it would logically follow that they should have a say in the process beforehand.

#### **7. Report of the Graduate Student Association President**

Graduate Student Association (GSA) Chair-of-the-Council Sara Nasab reported that the GSA is utilized by many graduate students for its Travel Grant program. This program financially assists students with travel to conferences related to their projects, with maximum awards of up to \$500 per year. This assistance from the GSA has been helpful to many students, and for some is the only source of funding for their events. Without the ability to attend these conferences, graduate students are not able to share their research with others in their field, and they also lose the added benefit of discussing ideas with researchers in person. The GSA is currently in talks with VPDGS Miller and other representatives from the Graduate Division about overhauling the program to make it more streamlined and sustainable.

The GSA is concerned with the growing cost of housing in Santa Cruz (on and off-campus), and with the Student Housing West project currently in development. The GSA, along with the UAW UC-Student Workers Union and the Graduate Student Commons Governing Board, have discussed the needs of the graduate student population and call for the improved accommodation of UCSC graduate students in Student Housing West. The city of Santa Cruz does not appear to be able to keep up with the pace of the increasing student enrollments each year, which can be seen in the housing shortage and unaffordable rent prices. The GSA is asking the UCSC Administration for support with the following demands:

First, during this transition process, the Student Housing West construction which will displace the current Family Student Housing renters will guarantee, in written form, that all FSH renters will be housed equally.

Second, that in accordance with the 2005 LRDP, UCSC provides space for the 25% of projected student enrollment on-campus by Student Housing West.

Third, a guarantee that housing will be properly maintained -- housing should be built in a way that will last longer than 50 years.

Fourth, with increased enrollment of students there will be a need for corresponding increase in public transportation. Even now, the increased on-campus population has the potential to impact graduate students who need flexible transportation options to attend meetings and appointments on and off campus.

Finally, graduate students need affordable housing. Current on-campus housing rates for graduate students are classified as a “Severe Housing Burden” by US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The GSA urge faculty and staff to stand with students and to support this movement to aid current and future graduate students.

The GSA appreciates the mission that UCSC has against sexual violence and sexual harassment. Faculty and staff voicing their opinions on this topic have allowed graduate students to find their own voice in this matter. Graduate students are in a unique position such that there are times when they deal both with undergraduates and graduate students, and faculty at a personal level. It is paramount that graduate students receive training on reporting inappropriate conduct. This need is being met with the Title IX training required of incoming students and the available refresher courses throughout the year, and the other available resources available through CARE offices. The GSA appreciates the continued support faculty and the Administration have shown thus far, and hope to see that support continued in the future.

The floor was opened for comments.

CP/EVC Tromp commented that the Administration are aware of the difficulties regarding housing that students face, and the campus needs to find better solutions to this issue. Under-funding is the greatest barrier that the University faces for fixing this problem, so UCSC must work to innovate and find solutions that fit within the campus budget, and look for other revenue sources.

**8. Petitions of Students (none)**

**9. Unfinished Business (none)**

**10. University and Faculty Welfare**

**11. New Business (none)**

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

Heather Shearer

Secretary

May 5, 2017