

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division May 19, 2006

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 19, 2006 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Secretary Deborah Letourneau and Parliamentarian John Isbister present, Chair Faye Crosby called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Crosby asked if there were any additional changes, other than those submitted in writing, to the minutes of March 8, 2006. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Crosby

Chair Faye Crosby noted how much work the Senate has done this year and recognized the terrific work of the Academic Senate Office. In addition to all of the regular committee work, there were four Senate meetings, two forums; one on retention and the other on affordable housing, two retiree informational sessions, numerous diversity study meetings, a welcome event for our new librarian, and a reception this afternoon honoring 22 pioneer faculty who are still on active service. All of these special additional events have taken a lot of work. She thanked the Senate office professionals, particularly Director Mary-Beth Harhen and the following staff: Laurie Babka, Jan Carmichael, Pam Edwards, Roxanne Monnet and Susanna Wrangell.

There will be continuing scrutiny of the University of California compensation practices which have caused diminishing public support for the university. It's not just UCSC that is suffering; it is all the campuses of the UC system. One report put forward by The University Office of the President (UCOP) shows that ten years ago, about a third of a penny out of the pocket of every California taxpayer went to the University of California and now it's about a fifth of a penny. Rising costs have been covered partly by increasing student tuition. The issues of scholarly communication copyright and diversity are also being reviewed system-wide.

The Hayashi Report, commissioned by the UCSC administration, is a follow-up to the Senate's Tent University Task Force Report. Patrick Hayashi concluded that UCSC has great people in the Senate and in the administration. He noted, however, that the administrators failed to work together effectively as a team at the time of the Tent University disturbances. Thus, there were things that happened that didn't serve the campus very well, and we need to think about some restructuring. The Chancellor and Chair Crosby have had some communication regarding this report; and Chancellor Denton hopes that the Senate will join with her in addressing these important issues.

Chair Crosby noted that we have increased the number of regents' scholars accepting our offer to 54 this year, compared to 15 last year. She announced the recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Awards: Martin Berger, Associate Professor, History of Art and Visual Culture, Ruth Hoffman, Lecturer in College 9, John Isbister, Professor of Economics and our own Parliamentarian, Dean Mathiowetz, Assistance Professor in Politics, Ken Pedrotti, Associate Professor in Electrical Engineering, Hilde Schwartz, Lecturer in Earth Sciences, and Ana Maria Seara, Lecturer in Portuguese. She also announced the 2005-06 Honorable Mention recipients: David Anthony, James Davis, Kathy Foley, Francesca Guerra, Charles Hedrick, Dee Hibbert-Jones, Neill Korobov, William Marotti, and Jaye Padgett.

b) Chancellor Denton

Chancellor Denton announced that CPEVC Klinger would not be making announcements today as they merged their comments into one presentation. Our top priority is to recruit and retain outstanding students, staff and faculty. In regards to student recruitment, the campus this year perfectly hit our enrollment target. She thanked faculty for the work that went into meeting this target. The good news is that more than 3,700 students submitted their Statements of Intent to the Register as of May 1st placing us among only three UC campuses that hit their targets this year. The others were either over enrolled or under enrolled, some by very large amounts. After the summer melt, UCSC expects 3,325 frosh in addition to the 950 students expected to transfer. She pointed out that among the incoming students we had this year, we had an increased number of males versus females, more African American, Chicano-Latino and Asian American students than we had in the previous class and more than half the entering frosh class are people of color. We are really stewarding our responsibility to reflect the demographic of the state of California. She thanked everybody for their help in achieving this goal. UCSC has achieved excellence through diversity in that we have outstanding acceptance rates from the Regent Scholars; the boost from 15 to 54 is obviously very significant and bodes well for the coming years.

UCSC had a good year with graduate enrollments. The campus had 487 individuals accept our offer of admission for next year. The number of Asian Pacific Islander graduate students is up 48%. There is an increase in the number and percentage of female students. Last year's class was about 50/50 and the incoming class of graduate students will be 55% female. Chancellor Denton acknowledged Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, Lisa Sloan, for her leadership in making all this happen. Given our focus on excellence and diversity, Dean Sloan has tried to identify those departments that have excelled with respect to diversifying their incoming graduate student class. These include computer engineering, computer science, digital arts and new media, education, and ocean sciences. Dean Sloan will be putting out a summary of the diversity demographics for the incoming graduate class so faculty can see how their department fared versus other departments.

Chancellor Denton announced the appointment of two new deans: Steve Thorsett, Dean of Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences, and Georges Van Den Abbeele as the Dean of Humanities. Both of these appointments are effective July 1, 2006. Professor Thorsett

has had considerable administrative experience on campus, which includes services as the Associate Dean in the Division, Chair of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Research, two years as the Senate's Parliamentarian, and has been serving as the Interim Dean in the last few months. Professor Van Den Abbeele will join us from UC Davis where he is a Professor of French and Italian. He has held a number of significant administrative appointments overseeing academic departments and directing interdisciplinary, local and regional research centers. We hope to announce a new Dean for Social Sciences soon. Thanks to the search committees, chaired by Abe Seiden, Gail Hershatter, and Maureen Callanan, for their fine work.

Chancellor Denton spoke about specific goals for the coming year. She believes that interdisciplinarity is key and a hallmark of our campus, and she proposed today that we continue to focus on this very important attribute. Other universities speak of interdisciplinary work, but UCSC actually leads as an exemplar in this arena. By working across boundaries and at the margins of the disciplines, UCSC gives the potential to uniquely address the challenges of the 21st Century. To bolster this effort, we will continue to refine the campus academic plan by building on the divisional plans. We believe that if we work together around some of these areas, we can more effectively recruit a diverse and excellent faculty. There are some departments who currently invite faculty from other disciplines to serve on Search Committees, but this isn't a common practice. Interim VPAA Galloway will be working on identifying recruitments in different departments and divisions and related areas of scholarship based on divisional plans. This will facilitate a cross-departmental, cross-divisional approach that we believe will result in more effective outcomes.

Similarly, we are exploring the possibility of using graduate groups more effectively to recruit outstanding graduate students. Chancellor Denton has met with a lot of faculty in the last few months, and one of the emerging themes from many of those conversations is the goal to be more effective about recruiting graduate students. In order to retain our faculty and ensure the future success of the campus, Interim VPAA Galloway, Graduate Dean Sloan, and Chancellor Denton will be working this summer on leadership programs for current chairs, Senate leadership and deans. They will also be focusing on junior faculty development and mentoring programs. Dean Sloan will also be working with the Graduate Council and the Graduate Student Association on a mentoring program for graduate students. They will be developing a mentoring award for faculty members to recognize this important activity. These efforts will be based on best practices both on campus and nationally.

Our campus and academic goals will require both growth and additional resources. In the coming months, CPEVC Kliger and Chancellor Denton will work closely with the Senate leadership on the final stage of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). Vice Chancellor for Research Donna Murphy and her team are currently working on developing the time line for the campus' first comprehensive campaign. Faculty involvement is going to be critical to the success of the campaign. Chancellor Denton has asked the Senate Executive Committee to provide feedback on processes to identify

our key campaign priorities. The UCSC Foundation is very excited about the coming campaign and the trustees are really engaged. The trustees will be meeting in early June to learn about each of the Academic Divisions and then they are going to “choose their major”. They are going to focus on particular areas that they want to work on fundraising and philanthropies.

Chancellor Denton closed by acknowledging the 22 pioneer faculty members who will be honored at the reception later today. The campus is very lucky to have had such an outstanding cohort of great folks who came here 40 years ago and created the kind of energy, enthusiasm and vision that got us to where we are today.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1492)

The report was received without comment.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture 2005-06 (AS/SCP/1494)

Sandy Faber, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL), presented the report. CFRL is nominating Professor Geoffrey Pullum as the recipient of the Faculty Research Lectureship for next year. The committee believes that Professor Pullum is an absolutely outstanding nominee for this award because of his monumental work. In the committee’s view, there is absolutely no doubt that he is one of the campus’s leading scholars. Professor Pullum’s nomination was approved by acclamation.

b. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections 2004-05 (AS/SCP/1496)

The report was received without comment.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity: Oral Report on Climate Study Results

Neferti Tadiar, Chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity (CAAD) reported on the status of the CAAD study that was launched this year. The survey and forums that were conducted allowed members of the campus community to engage in a serious conversation about the meaningful principals of diversity and our commitment to it. The survey gathered data to assess campus progress towards our diversity goals. It provides documentation of current everyday efforts that support segments of our community requiring both greater recognition and more consistent resources. Lastly, the survey was meant to expose the campus to a larger, more integrated framework for thinking about diversity in this historical moment by describing the interaction through research, teaching, learning, climate, finances and representation. There were three components of this study; quantitative assessment based on available data, a qualitative assessment based on focus groups, and a web survey which was launched in February 2006. This was a landmark survey and it’s the most comprehensive diversity survey launched to date at any university in the United States.

CAAD considers the survey to be largely about the perception of diversity on campus. Chair Tadiar stressed that the process of the study and how effective this study has been in terms of generating very substantive dialog across multiple groups is more important than the results. The survey had a very high response rate with over 5,000 responses, and CAAD is still in the process of analyzing the results. Over 60% of the responses were in Social Sciences and Humanities, with relatively low percentages in the Arts, Physical and Biological Sciences and Engineering – a topic for further discussion. The data collected for the study provide opportunity for further analyses beyond what will be included in the report.

Chair Tadiar presented a few examples of the preliminary findings. A strong majority found diversity to continue to be a meaningful term, but there were stark differences in the perception of the campuses success with diversity efforts. Many were strongly satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the level of diversity within their department. When the data were separated out by race, this dropped to somewhat dissatisfied and strongly dissatisfied among people of color. The strong majority believes that the campus is welcoming, but there was also an overall strong majority perception that some colleges are more welcoming to students of color than others, which highlights a contradiction. It also highlights issues of the relations between campus life and intellectual offerings that the colleges represent. At the same time, the survey results indicate that this is a very “queer friendly” campus. That again, is across the board, across self-identified sexual orientations, and CAAD considered this to be an opportunity for the campus. This is a possible area in which the campus can strengthen in terms of climate and in research offerings that could be a strategic niche that can promote the university and attract faculty, staff and students.

Among the greatest challenges facing the campus for improving diversity are expanding diversity frameworks rather than just thinking in terms of representation of specific groups. We have to expand what we mean by diversity in terms of funding, cost of living, class and intellectual diversity. CAAD hopes to circulate a draft of the report by the end of spring quarter to generate more discussion and obtain additional feedback. The data will be available at the CAAD website, including the final report in the fall of 2006.

b. Committee on Career Advising: Oral Report on Mentoring Survey

Carolyn Martin Shaw, Chair of the Committee on Career Advising (CCA) first noted that CCA develops, implements and evaluates mentoring activities that enhance the likelihood of faculty promotion and retention on our campus. The committee did some research to try to find out how junior faculty are doing on campus in terms of promotion and retention. Almost everybody gets tenure but about ten percent of the faculty members leave before tenure. Assistant Professors are getting through, but without very much help. One of the reports received said it was like the blind leading the blind. Chair Martin Shaw shared some results from the surveys they conducted. The survey included 77 Assistant Professors II and III. There was also a survey asking departmental chairs and managers to fill in the survey form. There appears to be a disconnection between what the departments think they are doing and what the junior faculty members are actually getting. CCA will have its complete report ready for circulation in the fall.

Supervision of students is one of the areas where there are problems. CCA looked at best practices at other campuses. UCSC is not trying to establish a mentoring program or mentoring office on campus, but we do want to have some resources available on the web. In the future, the Committee might concentrate on the bottleneck at step five and see what can be done to help people move from there.

c. Committee on Committees: Nominations 2006-07 (AS/SCP1493)

Carol Freeman, Chair of the Committee on Committees (COC) presented additional 2006-07 nominations. These included: Bruce Bridgeman for Parliamentarian, and Professor Ronnie Lipschutz for the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid. Chair Freeman also announced the Senate Scholar Service Award; COC invites chairs of departments to nominate assistant professors who will be awarded a course relief for one quarter of service on a major Senate committee. It has been a very gratifying program, both in the number and quality of the nominations and the people who have served. This year the Senate Service Scholar Award is Assistant Professor of Sociology, Gabriella Sandoval who will serve on the Committee on Planning and Budget. All the nominations were approved by acclamation.

d. Committee on Education Abroad Program

Proposed Revision to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.16 (AS/SCP/1490)

Committee on Education Abroad Program (CEAP) Chair Casey Moore presented the proposed revision to Bylaw 13.16. This is a proposal to change the committee's name to Committee on International Education. We propose this name change to reflect the broadened responsibilities of our campus and to bring us into compliance with the UC wide committee and virtually every other campus (except for UCLA), all of which are named Committees on International Education. Student Committee on Committees representative Ray Austin asked Chair Moore to elaborate on the proposed revision. Chair Moore explained that the committee has been the Committee on the Education Abroad Program, which is a narrowly defined program to send undergraduates abroad and to bring students from abroad to study on our campus. The role of international education, particularly in a globalizing world, is much larger than that. The proposed name change and the responsibilities are broadened to reflect that broader constituency. This would include additional programs where students go abroad, but their activities are not specifically related to the Education Abroad Program. The bylaw change was approved by voice vote.

e. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.3 on Transfer Credit (AS/SCP/1491)

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair Richard Hughey presented the proposed amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.3 on Transfer Credit. He stated that it is currently impossible for students to transfer in topical and writing intensive courses. The net result of making this proposed change would mean that students who have already become students could take appropriate topical courses at other places, for example, during summer school. With respect to writing intensive course, CEP did not see the need for excluding these courses from those that receive transfer credit. The current CEP would

advise next year's CEP to move very slowly in establishing the criteria for which courses can transfer to meet the writing intensive requirement.

In Favor of the Amendment	Opposed to the Amendment
Bill Ladusaw	Carol Freeman
	Judith Habitch Mauche
	Carolyn Martin Shaw
	Blake Woodard

Points raised in favor of the amendment:

An example was given of a student who would like to finish her UCSC degree and whose sole remaining requirement is the W requirement. She is now a resident in Santa Barbara and UC Santa Barbara has an excellent writing in the disciplines program. There are plenty of courses that are at least of the character and quality of our courses, but this one particular requirement, of all the general education requirements, was stipulated as only being satisfied by taking a course on our campus.

Points raises against the amendment:

It was noted that the comments section of the amendment says "in the case of writing intensive courses, CEP will ensure that courses that articulated to carry this designation have a similar level of writing as is required in campus courses". This represents a fundamental change from the original purpose of the writing intensive requirement. The writing intensive requirement originally was seen as not having anything to do with competence or a level of competence, but was founded as a promise to every student at UCSC that they would take one course, preferably in their discipline, where particular attention would be paid to their writing. The idea was that this course would help weak writers, especially students who were having trouble making a transition from lower division to upper division work. It would also pertain to the classic 'B' students who are writing the same paper and getting the same grade in their courses year after year. It would also be a chance for the very fine writers who get relatively little attention to see how they can become even more excellent. It was also an opportunity for transfer students to take one writing intensive course in their discipline. About ten years ago, we had a system where we had not achieved the goal of doing this in an ideal form, but we were making progress. Since then, we have been on a steady decline, and the Writing Program offers no upper division courses in writing. UCSC is the only campus in the UC system that does not offer nonfiction writing courses beyond the freshman level. Although we still have a W requirement, its purpose is different from the one that we began with. In this regard, our commitment to undergraduate education is becoming more and more common.

Whether a course gets the W or not on this campus does not just have to do with how many pages are written, but how that writing is evaluated and the kind of feedback given. There has to be revision and actual teaching on writing within the course and there has to be substantive feedback on student writing. There is concern that this is an attempt for UCSC to offload a requirement that we no longer feel that we can meet on our own campus. If we don't want the W requirement anymore, the Senate should vote not to have it, and we shouldn't have the pretense of having it if we no longer have the will to

support it. At some point, UCSC will have to have other upper division classes in writing that people from those disciplines will take. It seems worthwhile for us to keep this. It's been a part of what made us distinctive. It is really not possible for many students who are coming to us from junior colleges to have the level of writing that we want. If we create the ability to satisfy the requirement at other institutions a trend could continue into other divisions or just across the board. We need the W available so students can graduate.

In response to comments from the floor, CEP Chair Hughey said that the committee has been reviewing writing instruction and stated that the biggest problem is that there are three types of programs. We have programs that have disciplinary writing courses in the major that are designated as W courses, we have a small number of programs that have disciplinary writing in the major, but the courses are not designated as writing courses, and we also have a group of majors that do not have disciplinary writing courses discipline.

The motion failed by a show of hands.

ii. Report on Undergraduate Graduation Rates (AS/SCP/1495)

CEP Chair Richard Hughey stated that the first and second year retention rates are going up. The report shows that we do a worse job than might be expected retaining the top students. As we have increased the number of Regent Scholars coming to campus it is important that we be sure to retain all of these students to completion of their degrees. One of the main approaches from this report is to suggest engaging students early on with programs and to pay attention to the first and the second year curriculum. The primary intent of the resolution is to bring together in a broader domain (other than just CEP) the many campus constituencies that are involved in retention.

The resolution passed by voice vote.

f. Committee on the Library

Report on Senate Resolutions on Scholarly Publishing (AS/SCP/1497)

Bill Sullivan, Chair of the Committee on Library (COL), noted that due to skyrocketing costs, the number one priority for COL is journal pricing. UCSC had to cancel 152 subscriptions last year due to increased costs. The Committee has also been working on evaluations for promotions, copyright issues and stewardship of information. One way to deal with these issues is to unionize which has been successful because UC as a group is pretty powerful.

The second issue is evaluation for personnel actions. Next year, the Senate will form a task force that will look into each department's practices and review how venues for scholarly communications are handled in the personnel process. The third issue, copyright and ownership of the material, is difficult to deal with because of the complex legal issues involved. UC lawyers are writing drafts of legislation of how the university might retain ownership of material once it is published. The final issue of stewardship deals with electronic publishing. This is an on-going issue that we will be dealing with

for many years. COL Chair Sullivan noted that it is important to realize that we are in a crisis, especially when we consider how we will obtain the journals needed for new departments and areas of study.

g. Committee on Faculty Welfare: Oral Report on Quality of Life Issues

Paul Ortiz, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) acknowledged Senate Chair Faye Crosby for her facilitation efforts. He also thanked Steve Houser, the Assistant Director of Faculty and Staff Housing, for the recent update on Ranch View Terrace (RVT). The ground breaking on Phase 1 of RVT is scheduled for the week of June 19th. The completion date of Phase 1 units is September 2007. The marketing and sales of Phase 1 should begin in August 2006. Employees on waiting lists will receive information regarding the marketing and sales process around late June or early July, along with their preference questionnaires. The sales price of the units range from \$478,000 to \$618,000. Those who have further questions about the process should contact Steve Houser.

CFW has responded to EVC Kliger's request to compose a group of faculty who will be working over the summer with the administration to transition the housing "plan to plan", to an actual plan by October 1, 2006. The membership of this group includes CFW Chair Paul Ortiz, CFW member Ted Holman, CPB *ex officio* member Quentin Williams and CPB member Ray Gibbs.

CFW believes that access to campus childcare facilities remains in a critical state for UCSC faculty and staff. However, recent campus efforts represent a positive step in expanding access. CFW commended the Campus Childcare Advisory Committee (CCAC) for its efforts to find both policy-oriented and practical solutions to the childcare crisis at UCSC. CCAC has circulated a revised childcare access policy that proposes to increase faculty and staff access to campus facilities from one-third to 50% once appropriate funding to support this increase is allocated. CFW has reviewed the proposed revisions and they applaud CCAC's recommendation. CCAC hopes to have the revised draft approved by the end of spring quarter. Specific issues such as the timing and implementation of the increase in faculty and staff slots to 50%, the childcare waitlist, part-time or drop-in spaces, and childcare costs remain areas that must be resolved if the campus is to address the problems that faculty and staff face in getting affordable campus childcare.

Parking on this campus is especially problematic for faculty members with mobility issues. CFW has been contacted repeatedly about this issue this year. Without adequate parking spaces earmarked for the disabled close enough to the buildings in which they teach, attend meetings or otherwise access the university, these faculty members are unable to perform their jobs at a most basic level. The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) specifically requires the university to provide "reasonable accommodation for disabled faculty." In practice, this means not just the existence of a few special spaces, but access to adequate parking at any given facility at the moment a faculty member needs to visit. Faculty members with mobility disabilities routinely report an insufficient number of accessible parking spaces across campus. At many sites, only one or two

designated spaces are available. If two or more students, staff or faculty need those spaces at a given time, access is suddenly not available to them. While the parking enforcement staff are helpful in responding to specific requests for enforcement of those parked illegally, staffing resources do not allow for constant vigilance. Most non-disabled members of UCSC faculty and administration are not aware of the amount of time and energy faculty with mobility issues regularly expend confronting these issues as part of their daily lives, simply trying to perform their jobs. CFW believes that the university's ADA Compliance Officer does a terrific job when called in to resolve specific problems, but that doesn't solve the larger problem of new barriers confronting disabled faculty and staff. CFW calls on the administration to work on addressing the problem of disabled employee parking and mobility issues on this campus in general. Specifically, we hope to open a dialog with the EVC's office on this critical issue. CFW also hopes that the Transportation Advisory Committee will tackle this problem head-on over the summer and fall.

h. Committee on Preparatory Education

Proposal for Increased Curricular Support for Students Under-Prepared for University-Level Writing (AS/SCP/1498)

Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair of the Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) noted that one of the charges of CPE is to oversee issues related to the UC-wide English language requirement. This is an entrance requirement to the university. Its former name was the Subject A requirement. Most students satisfy this requirement by taking a state-wide test called the Analytic Writing Placement Exam (formerly the Subject A exam). In reviewing this requirement, CPE noted with some concern that the number of students arriving on campus who have not satisfied the requirement has risen over recent years. About 35% of UCSC students have not met this requirement before entering classes in the fall. Most importantly, among this cohort of students, we see a definite increase in the percentage of students who are coming in, not having passed this requirement, that can be identified as English language learners (ELL). This was about 11% in 2001 and it's about 19 to 20% today. Last year there was an alarming decrease in the pass rate on the November offering of the Analytic Writing Placement Exam. At the same time, we've also seen an increase in the number of students at risk of being barred from further enrollment at UCSC for not being able to satisfy it by the end of the fourth quarter. We give students up to four quarters to pass this requirement and we had 14 people in 2001 who, at the beginning of their fourth quarter, had not passed the exam. Last year we had 42 students. Its small numbers, but it's a significant increase.

The ELL students make up the largest number of people at risk by the end of the fourth quarter. We need to take modest steps earlier in their academic careers to enhance and improve the support that we are currently providing our ELL and other at-risk students in order to help them meet the challenges of mastering university level English. CPE emphasized that they are not talking about offering courses in remedial work. They noted that the students who are experiencing difficulties are UC eligible students who have met the requirements for admittance to this university. It is important for UCSC to recognize the changing demographics of our state, and the increasing percentage of the top 12% students who will be ELL. This prominently bilingual generation may have more

difficulty meeting our expectations for university level analytical reading and writing in English without our providing additional support. The campus needs to start intervening to meet these challenges now at the front end of this demographic trend, rather than later when the problem may be more difficult to mitigate.

CPE is not proposing any immediate Senate action. Instead, they are hoping to work cooperatively next year with the college provosts, the Dean of Undergraduate Education, Bill Ladusaw, the Dean of the Humanities, the Writing Program and our sister committees of Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), to make some modest curricular changes, to enforce existing Senate regulations and to enhance tutoring support for at-risk students. This is an important issue to retention and particularly the retention of a diverse student body. The Committee thanks CEP and CPB, as well as the administrators, who provided responses to the draft report

i. Committee on Teaching

Oral Report on Electronic Student Evaluations of Instructor/Course

Charlie McDowell, Chair of the Committee on Teaching (COT) reported on the Committee's recommendation that UCSC implement an online system for collecting student feedback on courses and instructors. The new system would eventually replace the existing Scantron system. The online system would be adopted at the discretion of departments and divisions. COT, with the help of the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, Ruth Harris-Barnett, has been looking at this issue over the past two years. In April of this year, COT invited Dr. Dee Gallow, Director of Instructional Resources Center at University California Irvine (UCI), to visit UCSC and meet with interested individuals to discuss UCI's online system for collecting such feedback. Two formal meetings took place that day. One was a special meeting with COT with invited guests from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Graduate Council, Academic Human Resources (AHR), Information Technology Services (ITS) and the administration. The second meeting was open to the entire campus faculty, both Senate and non-Senate members.

The current Scantron system generates at least 15,000 sheets of paper each quarter. That paper must be stored for many years. Often additional copies are made in order to provide individual's access to that information without risking loss of data. The Scantron form has limited room for department specific questions. An online form would provide greater flexibility for departments to gather the kind of information that they are really interested in gathering. COT, as well as CAP and CEP, would like to see more widespread use of a small set of common questions. Major concerns raised with online systems are the quality and quantity of the written responses and response rates in general. Although there are no truly definitive conclusions, in most cases response rates have remained roughly the same when campuses have gone to online systems, with some institutions reporting better response rates and some institutions reporting somewhat lower response rates. UCI believes they are getting longer responses from their students. It is worth noting that an online system provides greater anonymity to the students and

might allow them to be more candid in their responses, particularly for smaller courses where faculty recognition of student handwriting is a real possibility.

The current practice at UCSC is for instructor course evaluations to play a major role in a personal review process. The Scantron forms are the primary source of formative feedback to instructors. The quality and applicability of formative feedback could be improved with an online system. The same system that is used for an end of quarter online feedback could be used for a mid-quarter formative feedback. The new system would not only provide formative feedback to instructors, but it would also provide formative feedback to departments, divisions and the CEP about specific courses. COT envisions that the new system will allow some calibration of student responses to various courses or collections of courses. COT believes that the technology exists to economically move to electronic collection of student feedback. It is time to phase out the antiquated Scantron system and the huge amount of paper it generates. COT also believes it is appropriate for UCSC to move towards a limited use of student feedback for comparative purposes. An online system would greatly facilitate such comparisons.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair (none)

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Ian Dobbs Dixon thanked faculty for the support of the recent memorial to the Regents. The Graduate Student Association (GSA) feels strongly that UCSC, as a whole, needs to remain competitive. UCSC needs to promote the recruitment of international students into our departments. These students bring new perspectives and lifelong research connections. He urged faculty to continue to be vocal about this issue.

Two articles appear in the journal *Physics Today*, one entitled *Ethics and the Welfare of the Physics Profession* and the other entitled *Trust In The Future of Research*. The authors of these articles were concerned about ethics within the profession and thought that they were going to find evidence of plagiarism of data. However, the outcomes of their surveys were vastly different. Of those studies, by far, the most prevalent problem quoted was the mistreatment of subordinates by faculty. The two articles can be found on the GSA website under the committee section. The GSA also had a similar reaction. When GSA polled the graduate student population at large, an alarming number of students came back and said, "My experience hasn't been so wonderful. There have been problems." This year during the new graduate student orientation, GSA sponsored a panel of students and faculty to talk about the advising process. It is clear that mentoring is perhaps the single most important aspect in determining the success of a graduate student. The GSA has made this a major focus in our efforts this year and found a sympathetic ear in both the office of the Graduate Dean and the Graduate Council. GSA compiled several documents laying out procedures to help students and faculty members avoid confrontations and to deal with them should they arise.

Ian directed faculty to a document authored by GSA, entitled "*Mentoring Graduate Students at UCSC*". The document sets forth the roles and responsibility of each party involved in the career of a graduate student. This includes the Graduate Dean, the Chair

of the Department, the Thesis Committee, the Graduate Advisor and the graduate student. The document is short and concise, and was compiled after consulting similar documents that exist on other campuses and sister research universities. Although many faculty are excellent mentors, some do not fill their duties as well as they should. This document spells out the explicit minimum with the hope that faculty will help monitor their colleagues and students as they progress towards their degrees. I encouraged faculty members to think carefully about these issues as they apply to their particular discipline. The document tries to be all encompassing, but there are issues specific to each department. These guidelines could be the catalyst that's required to make this standard practice at UCSC.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 4:30 pm.

ATTEST:

Deborah K. Letourneau
Secretary
June 21, 2006