

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
May 19, 2017

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, May 19, at the College 9/10 Multipurpose Room. Chair Ólóf Einarsson called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m, with Wlad Godzich present as acting Parliamentarian.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

An amendment to the minutes was submitted to the Senate prior to the meeting and was approved by voice vote.

The meeting minutes of March 8, 2017, with the submitted amendment, were approved by voice vote.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Einarsson

Chair Einarsson remarked that the Senate worked on several issues this year, including graduate growth, enrollment management, and Writing and College Core curriculum. Furthermore, with the recent surge of protest activities on campus, such as the May 1 occupation of Kerr Hall, Senate leadership has received comments from various constituencies across campus, and has relayed those concerns to the Chancellor and Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC). There have also been concerns expressed by students regarding sexual harassment and sexual violence on campus, including reporting processes. In this context, the Beyond Compliance group sponsored two events earlier this year, a restorative justice circle and a town hall, to provide updates on both campus and UC policies. The Senate and Administration are working to improve communication about these issues between various groups on campus.

The floor was given to Chancellor Blumenthal.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal reported that incoming CP/EVC Tromp will begin in her position on June 1st. The campus is currently in negotiations with one of the Social Sciences Dean candidates. There is a search underway for the Vice Provost for Student Success (VPSS); Jaye Padgett, Professor in Linguistics, remains in this position as an Interim VPSS. Vice Provost and Director of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Richard Hughey will serve as Interim Vice Provost for Global Engagement (VPGE), and will discuss how to move forward with the search once CP/EVC Tromp arrives. The campus is also down to two candidates for the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Services (VCITS) and a decision is expected soon.

Regarding the May 1 protests on campus and at Kerr Hall, the focus was on ensuring the safety of faculty, staff, and students. Luckily these activities ended without anyone getting physically injured. Many were upset at the way these events were handled, and the Administration is working to improve procedures to make future activities less disruptive and difficult for UCSC

employees. In addition, the administration is working with student groups to help ameliorate their concerns and improve student/Administration communications.

The current campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) ends in 2020. A new LRDP for 2040 is currently being worked on. An official LRDP Committee, with broad representation from faculty and students, and community members was charged earlier this month to begin the LRDP process. The LRDP will be a planning tool to help UCSC accommodate students through 2040. The first draft will likely be finished by late 2018, to be followed by an intensive environmental review.

The public/private/partnership (P3) campus housing project, Student Housing West, is part of a system-wide program to build housing and other facilities for students. It is intended to leverage the skills of the private sector, and is quickly moving forward. The goal is to add 3,000 beds for a mix of upper division undergraduate, graduate, and family student housing. Once these are built, the plan is to restore lounges to reduce crowding, and house more students. The campus has reviewed proposals for this plan and has narrowed its search down to three possible developers. Staff, faculty, and student panels will select one of these developers by the end of summer. The first beds - approximately 900 - will likely be built by 2020. The rest will be built by 2022. The development firm will construct the beds, but will not own them. They will be owned by a third party non-profit organization. The student experience in this new housing structure will be the same as the student experience in other campus housing. There will be an information session at 1:00p.m. on June 1, at the Stevenson Event Center.

UC recently underwent a state audit wherein its \$175 million reserve fund was put under intense scrutiny due to lack of transparency. Only \$38 million of this fund is actually held as a reserve at the Office of the President. The remaining funds are allocated to presidential initiatives, such as protection of undocumented students and carbon neutrality, and other ongoing activities such as UC Press. The UCOP did agree to implement all 33 recommendations from the State Auditor's report. Another issue that came up during the audit was UC's poor handling and parsing of comments from campuses. The Regents are engaging an outside firm to conduct an investigation regarding UCOP's role in modifying the surveys of the ten campuses.

The May revised budget was released by the Governor last week. It was largely the same as the budget released in January, with one change being that the \$50 million of the UC budget will now be released only if three conditions are met: the implementation of activity based costing, implementation of the auditor's recommendations by the Regents, and that all campuses – with the exception of San Francisco and Merced – achieve a 2:1 ratio of frosh to transfer students. At their most recent meeting, the Regents approved a policy on non-resident students. With the exception of Berkeley, L.A., San Diego, and Irvine, there will be an 18% cap for non-resident students at each UC campus.

The Chancellor congratulated some faculty on recent achievements before giving the floor to Interim CP/EVC Lee.

c. Interim Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Lee

CP/EVC Lee remarked that FTE allocations for next year have been sent to the deans, and that growth of doctoral enrollments is a top priority for the campus as this is a condition for the rebenching funds that the campus receives.

The recent Science and Engineering Library consolidation project was part of a broader initiative to not only create more study and social spaces in the library, but also to help keep up with the rapidly changing ways that people can access information. Digitizing some of the collections in the Science and Engineering Library keeps the campus more in line with modern practices. However, the Administration acknowledges that the lack of communication regarding the consolidation project was unacceptable, and will make efforts to improve this in future endeavors, including having better consultation with the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) and other groups across campus. As of now, there are no other large consolidation projects planned for the campus. There will a symposium on May 31 at the McHenry Library to foster conversation about possible future library initiatives at UCSC.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Emeritus Michael Nauenberg asked why the lapse in communication regarding the consolidation project occurred, when a list of the books that were removed from the Science and Engineering Library would be circulated to faculty, and if the budget for the project included restructuring the building to adhere to fire codes required for the study/social space conversion taking place.

Interim CP/EVC Lee responded that the reported budget was for the entire project and not just the conversion, and that there are multiple budgetary priorities for this project. Senate consultation will be essential to figure out how to move forward on these priorities.

Professor Onuttom Narayan asked what steps will be taken to ensure safety and access to and from campus for everyone, including those who live on campus, during future demonstrations.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that there are many steps currently being taken in this regard, including making more police available during demonstrations to ensure that access to and from the campus is not impeded.

Literature Professor Loisa Nygaard commented that it seems that our campus is trying to turn the Science and Engineering Library into a student study center instead of a library. Other universities across the country have these centers in addition to their libraries. She remarked that this may be good for the campus to consider in the future, and fundraising for such an initiative would likely draw many donations from alumni and others.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that a study center would be great for the campus and will be a fundraising priority.

Physics Professor Steve Ritz commented that during demonstrations on campus, it is antithetical to UCSC's educational goals to let protests by a few students completely disrupt the education of the many who aren't participating in such demonstrations. He noted that this message seemed to

get lost in the uproar, and should be communicated to students. He also noted that the demonstrations were largely ineffective for the groups holding them, and that finding ways to communicate this to the demonstrators, via consequences for their actions or otherwise, is important.

Microbiology and Environmental Toxicology Professor Karen Ottemann commented that the consultation with COLASC regarding the library consultation project did not appear to follow proper Senate protocol. She also noted that the decision to destroy the books, rather than give them away to faculty, was due to a policy that University property is not allowed to be handled in this manner, and asked how it would be possible to change this policy.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that he would support changing this policy as well.

Senior Lecturer Emeritus Gildas Hamel of History asked about the hidden costs of using digitized books, such as whether there is a charge each time the same person rents the same book, or only for the first use by that person. He also echoed other concerns that the consultation process for this project was not adequate.

Interim CP/EVC Lee responded that he did not know the answer to the question of costs off-hand, and it would be good to ask about this at the May 31 symposium. He agreed the consultation was insufficient for the project, and that future consultations regarding these types of initiatives would need to be better.

Physics Professor Jason Nielsen commented that 14 thousand of the books that were destroyed don't exist within UC, and some don't even exist outside UC. For the books that do still exist within UC, the cost of an inter-library loan can be up to half the purchase price of the book. He asked if this was being considered by the Administration, and whether it may be more cost effective to simply re-acquire some of these books.

Interim CP/EVC Lee responded that the library is open to re-acquiring some of the books if it ends up being more cost effective to do so, or if they fill a specific need that could not be filled otherwise.

Literature Professor and Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) Director Jody Greene commented that the consultation regarding the library should not only have included those involved with library itself, but also should have included Housing, Student Success, and other groups focused on problem solving on campus. Collaborative consultation and decision making will be important for future initiatives like this.

CP/EVC Lee responded that consultation should have been broader for this project, and that the Administration is actively working with the Senate to ensure that consultation will be improved for future projects.

Literature Professor Juan Poblete reiterated that it would be worth looking into changing the policy that prohibits the University from giving the books away rather than destroying them.

Lecturer Hamel commented that efforts to completely digitize large libraries have mostly fallen flat across the country, noting issues with costs and access to digitized books. He noted that any effort to digitize books on campus should be researched thoroughly before destroying or getting rid of print copies.

Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)

3. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1856)

Chair Dan Friedman announced that the Committee selected Economics Professor Carl Walsh to be the 2018 Faculty Research Lecturer, noting his many achievements that led to his nomination.

The report was accepted by acclamation.

4. Reports of Special Committees (none)

5. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Graduate Council

i. Subcommittee Report on Graduate Growth, May 2017 (AS/SCP/1857)

Graduate Council (GC) Chair Don Smith reported that while undergraduate enrollments have grown substantially on our campus, graduate student enrollments, particularly doctoral enrollments, has remained relatively flat.

Graduate Council has identified a number of challenges for graduate growth on campus, some of the biggest being increasing the number and capacity of graduate programs, finding the financial means to support graduate students, and incentivizing faculty participation in graduate mentoring. The campus has made some efforts toward graduate growth, including initiatives from the Graduate Division to increase enrollments and financial support for graduate students.

Graduate growth, particularly doctoral growth, is one of the criteria for FTE authorization because increases in graduate enrollments correlate with faculty increases. As a campus with one of the lowest number of faculty throughout UC, this is especially important for UCSC.

The Committee recommend that the Administration, in consultation with the Graduate Division and the Senate, develop a comprehensive strategic plan for strengthening and growing doctoral and master's programs at UCSC. This plan should include achievable, proportional, and absolute growth targets for doctoral and master's program enrollments, along with timelines for achieving these goals. It should also include accountability metrics to track progress toward established goals, and measures to enhance graduate student welfare on campus.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Narayan commented that in the Physics department, the Graduate Advisor position had been empty for some time because Staff HR hadn't released the position. He asked when that position would be released.

Interim CP/EVC Lee responded that he would be following up with Staff HR regarding this question.

Politics Professor Ronnie Lipshutz asked what sacrifices the campus may have to make to promote graduate growth.

Chair Smith responded that moving any funds and resources toward graduate growth would take them away from other areas on campus, so any decisions in this regard must be made strategically to help minimize impact. This may mean putting resources toward programs that have the capacity for graduate growth and not giving them to those that do not.

Graduate Student Association (GSA) President Jess Whatcott commented that increasing graduate enrollment would not be advisable, considering current lack of campus housing and funding for graduate students. She asked if there was any discussion in the GC subcommittee about how doctoral degrees are paying off for students who have graduated from UCSC.

Chair Smith responded that this was discussed. Any plan for graduate growth would need to include clear career paths and training for graduate students.

Former GSA President Whitney DeVos asked what specific measures the committee recommends to enhance graduate student welfare and success.

Chair Smith responded that the committee can't implement anything specific, they can only raise issues and make recommendations, but in their report, they recommended among other issues ensuring professional development for graduate students, and looking more closely at the housing problems on campus.

b. Committee on Committees

i. Committee Roster for 2017-18 (AS/SCP/1858)

Chair Micah Perks presented the roster, along with some amendments submitted prior to the meeting.

The amendments were passed by voice vote.

The amended roster was passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Manual Chapters for Undergraduates (AS/SCP/1859)

CEP Member Onuttom Narayan remarked that the changes in this amendment clarify the distribution of responsibilities between CEP and the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI).

The amendment was passed by a voice vote.

ii. Amendment to Bylaw 13.17 (AS/SCP/1860)

Professor Narayan presented an amended version of the amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were passed by a voice vote.

He then explained that the amendment would clarify areas where the Committee works with or delegates to units in the Undergraduate Education Division, bring the delegations policy in compliance with system-wide bylaws, and update information that was omitted when the legislation was originally approved last winter. The amendment also clarifies that the CCI Chair serves ex officio on CEP.

The amendment was passed by a voice vote.

The floor was opened for questions.

Writing Professor Elizabeth Abrams asked why the CCI Chair is not a voting member on CEP.

Professor Narayan explained that after this change goes into effect, the CCI Chair will be a voting member. Ex officio members are voting members unless stated otherwise.

iii. Amendment to Regulation 10.5.2 (AS/SCP/1869)

Professor Narayan explained that this amendment after the Senate approved changes to Regulation 10.5.2 at the May 18, 2016 meeting, CEP consulted with the Writing department, the Council of Provosts, and the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA) and concluded that an additional year will be required for a smooth implementation of 10.5.2. CEP therefore recommend delaying the implementation of the changes to 10.5.2 until fall 2018. No change is being proposed to the wording of the regulation, only to the implementation date.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Abrams commented that the original legislation was passed without researching the financial implications of the change, and asked if the campus will have a full financial understanding of this legislation by the time it is implemented.

Professor Narayan responded that the Committee does not currently have this information, but will work to get it from the Administration as fast as possible

once fall quarter begins.

The amendment was approved by a voice vote.

d. Committee on Courses of Instruction

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.16 (AS/SCP/1861)

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Abrams asked to clarify what is meant by “faculties of the colleges” in the legislation.

CCI member Noriko Aso responded that for college courses, this means the provosts.

Professor Narayan responded that the college faculties are defined in the Senate manual, and the assumption is that this part of the legislation reflects what is defined in the manual.

The amendment was passed by a voice vote.

e. Committee on Emeriti Relations

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.18.1 (AS/SCP/1862)

The amendment was passed by a voice vote.

f. Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

i. May 2017 Report (AS/SCP/1864)

COLASC Chair Eileen Zurbruggen reported that after the passage of the library resolution at the November 18, 2016 meeting, University Librarian Elizabeth Cowell has agreed to broader consultation with the Senate regarding future library initiatives. Librarian Cowell has also provided Senate faculty with a list of books removed from the Science and Engineering Library. There is currently no large-scale effort to reacquire any of the books that were removed. However, faculty and departments are encouraged by COLASC to look through the lists of removed books and determine if there are any that would be essential to reacquire and request that those be purchased. For books that were removed that won't be reacquired, there will still be access to many of these titles via inter-library loan or other means. The Chancellor and CP/EVC have also reaffirmed the role of the University Library on campus, as was requested in the resolution.

COLASC noted the under-funding of UCSC's library and recommend that funding for the library be more of a priority for the campus. The Committee also reviewed the Business Case Analysis (BCA), required by UCOP for any major capital projects on Campus. The BCA documents all of the budgetary components of the Science and Engineering Library consolidation project, and outlines the campus goals and priorities for that library. The committee recommend releasing this information to the Senate, faculty, and students, and consulting with these

groups throughout the duration of this project.

COLASC is developing a faculty survey with general questions related to resources and services, which will likely be released in the fall.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Narayan commented that it would be inadvisable to increase the library budget until the goals of the Science and Engineering Library restructuring project are outlined in even the broadest of terms, as Senate faculty have not been consulted on this part of the project as of yet.

Chair Zurbruggen responded that COLASC is very interested in participating in the creation of these goals, and the Committee's only participation in this regard thus far has been reviewing the BCA.

Professor Nauenberg asked why the print journals were left in the library while books were removed.

Chair Zurbruggen responded that the licensing process for journals is very complicated, and our licensing agreements don't give us perpetual access to historical or older versions of these journals. The journals that were left are ones that we may not have access to otherwise.

Professor Nauenberg commented that no one seems to have accurate lists of what has been destroyed, transferred to other locations, or kept at the Science and Engineering Library.

Professor Poblete asked for clarification on the regulation that prevents UCSC from giving away or selling books instead of recycling them.

Chair Zurbruggen responded that while they aren't completely familiar with the regulation, during COLASC's consultation, they noted that it seemed wasteful to simply destroy the books rather than sell them or give them away to faculty.

Professor Narayan commented that the policy regarding whether books are allowed to be sold or given away states that when the University disposes of property, it shall do so in the most economical way and to make as much money as possible. He commented that destroying the books seemed to be a violation of the policy.

Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences Paul Koch asked if COLASC is looking at the criteria by which requests for new materials will be granted.

Chair Zurbruggen responded that COLASC doesn't have direct authority over this criteria, but may look at this in the coming academic year. Whether or not any

particular title is immediately needed, or whether or not it is available elsewhere, would likely be part of that criteria.

Professor Deanna Shemek of Literature asked if, prior to the arrival of the University Librarian on campus, UCSC began to eliminate positions for collections development. She also noted that reinstating these positions would likely have prevented some of the issues brought forward with the consolidation project.

Chair Zurbriggen commented that this is correct. As of 2013, the campus does not have any collections librarians, and all collections are driven by demand. COLASC will be reviewing the demand-driven policy in the coming year.

6. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

SUA President Tias Webster reported that the Assembly is noticing a trend of UCSC sacrificing quality in order to keep up with the quantity of students on campus. Examples of this include using predictive analytics for student success because there aren't enough student advisors, putting more students into housing meant for smaller numbers to make room for additional students on campus, and turning lounge and study spaces into housing. Counseling and mental health services are also getting harder to come by since so many students are trying to use them. Wait times for these services have increased so severely that many students view them as untenable. In classrooms, more lecturers and graduate students rather than professors are teaching courses to keep up with the increased demand, decreasing educational quality.

The SUA recommend that the Administration and faculty consider the implications of taking on so many students, and more measures to improve the quality of education and student life prior accepting additional enrollments on campus.

The floor was opened for questions.

Physics Professor George Brown asked what students thought about the exchange of books for space in the Science and Engineering Library.

President Webster responded the SUA passed a resolution in objection to what was done with the books and that students do see it as an inflammatory issue that has negatively impacted the quality of their experience and education at UCSC. However, students also feel that they currently do not have enough study spaces on campus, and they understand that there are not many options that are fiscally conceivable that would allow for new spaces.

Professor Nauenberg asked if students were aware that new study spaces cannot be created without major renovations to the library first.

President Webster responded that most students do understand this to some degree.

7. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Graduate Student Association (GSA) President Jess Whatcott reported that the GSA recently voted to endorse SB 201, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act, a California state bill that would allow the reclassification of graduate researchers to the category of employee, so that they may choose to unionize if they wish.

The GSA also passed a motion in favor of making no changes to the current parking rules on campus. The Association was visited at a meeting by a representative from TAPS, who reported that changes to weekend parking rules are being considered at the request of police in preparation for the reopening of the quarry amphitheater for concerts in the fall. Graduate students need the option of free weekend parking, as the shuttles don't run and buses are on limited schedules on weekends. Graduate students who live in on-campus housing also need parking for weekend visitors.

The GSA are concerned that international graduate students are being used primarily as a source of income for the University. The GSA raised these concerns about inviting international graduate students to our campus, knowing they will have to pay an additional \$15,000 each year in non-resident fees, and were told that most of these students are being funded by their home governments. However, this is not true for all international graduate students, and since international graduate students can't get jobs or take out any loans to pay for the extra fees, this has meant that many international graduate students are routinely forced to pass their qualifying exams on accelerated timelines, in some cases as quickly as one year. A new policy will be enacted in fall 2017 that will remit international graduate student tuition for three years, allowing them to pass their qualifying exams in the same timelines as non-international graduate students. However, current international graduate students are exempted from this policy, putting some at risk of dropping out. Several international graduate students report feeling purposefully misled by their departments about the support they would receive upon arrival. There have also been international graduate students whose departments were unaware they were international prior to their admission offer, leaving these students to arrive with no plan in place for non-resident fee remission. The GSA urge department heads to reach out to current international graduate students to help come up with a plan to help keep them in their programs.

Sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) is also an issue for graduate students on campus. In fall of 2015, graduate students were surveyed with questions regarding the training and information they received on SVSH when they arrived on campus. Since this survey was conducted, dozens of students (both graduate and undergraduate) have shared their stories of SVSH, both on our campus and in nearby areas involving campus community members. While the new policy from the Office of the President has the potential to deal with student-on-student assault and harassment, offenses by faculty members towards students appear to be treated inadequately in this policy. It is not technically against either this policy or the faculty code of conduct for faculty to have

sexual relationships with students. However, there are some faculty who seem to take advantage of this technicality, which is unacceptable. Some faculty members have given students cocaine or alcohol before making sexual advances, have promised to give students a ride home only to drive them to another location before making advances, or have taken advantage their position by pressuring students into feeling that they can't decline sexual advances without fear of retribution. The GSA have also been informed of some faculty members on campus who have a national reputation for having sexual relationships with students, and that students and faculty elsewhere have warned our students about studying and being alone with particular faculty members at UCSC. Some academic faculty may feel under attack by the current national political climate, and from what is perceived to be oversensitivity by an increasingly diverse student body. However, efforts to hold faculty accountable for SVSH offenses should not be conflated with these other kinds of political campaigns against faculty. While students are aware that UCSC's Title IX office works hard to investigate the increasing reports made to them, many feel that going through the Title IX reporting process only adds to their trauma. In some cases it has taken months, and in other cases over a year, to complete an investigation, only for the students to be told their report was unsubstantiated and that there was no policy violation. The GSA urge the Senate to press the University to conduct research on if/how the UCOP policy is working and how students are experiencing the process. The Title IX office alone does not have the resources necessary to effectively investigate all of the cases that come before them and the GSA urge the Senate to call for more resources for this office, and for SVSH prevention education for graduate students and faculty. Faculty also need to understand that their words and deeds as faculty members have direct effects on whether perpetrators of SVSH feel emboldened to continue to seek out sexual liaisons with students. Faculty words and actions can also have a direct effect on whether or not perpetrators feel empowered to retaliate against students who report them, and whether students feel confident enough to come forward with reports. Faculty behavior helps to build the culture and climate on campus, and it can be one that builds on and supports SVSH where students feel afraid, or one that expresses no tolerance for sexually aggressive behavior and creates a community of trust where those who are victimized feel comfortable coming forward. Currently, students widely perceive the faculty as falling more into the culture that condones SVSH, and the GSA urge faculty to work with students to improve this.

The floor was opened for questions.

Literature Professor Chris Connery asked that the Chancellor also be included as someone on campus who can help encourage a better campus climate. He also noted that the way students respond to SVSH also has a direct effect on how faculty react to these issues, and rash actions by either side would likely elicit pushback.

President Whatcott responded that while the Chancellor does play a part in this, most of the direct interactions that students have on campus are with faculty, so the words and

actions of those faculty tend to have a larger impact than those of the Administration. She also noted that while student actions do have affect faculty responses to SVSH matters, it is important for both groups to work together so that both sides of the issue are heard and dealt with appropriately.

Feminist Studies Professor Marcia Ochoa reiterated that it is important to hear both sides of each SVSH issue, and that due process for these occurrences is paramount. Faculty need to work with students to help make them more comfortable reporting these issues without fear of retaliation.

8. Petitions of Students (none)

9. Unfinished Business (none)

10. University and Faculty Welfare

11. New Business

a. Professor Langhout: Resolution to Improve Conditions for Undocumented Students at UCSC (AS/SCP/1865)

Psychology Professor Regina Langhout introduced the following resolution:

Whereas: “The University of California welcomes and supports students without regard to their immigration status” and “is committed to creating an environment in which all admitted students can successfully matriculate and graduate”;

Whereas: Undocumented Students face a range of barriers and difficulties that have become even more acute during the Trump administration, including

- inadequate resources for counseling and safe, secure, meeting places
- ineligibility for many types of federal funding
- insufficient funds in the Professional Career Development Program (PCDP) internship and scholarship program
- reluctance to take out loans, including DREAM loans, due to uncertainty about future earning power due to immigration status

Be it resolved that: The Senate calls for the Chancellor and CP/EVC to take meaningful action to address the barriers and difficulties controlled by UCSC (e.g., inadequate resources for counseling and safe, secure, meeting places) and report back to the Senate at the beginning of the 2017-2018 academic year, and subsequently annually, until undocumented students have permanent protection within the U.S.. Programs for counseling and mentoring should be designed in consultation with Undocumented Student Services and representatives in the Undocumented Alliance, or an appropriate student successor organization representing undocumented students.

Be it resolved that: We call for the UC Office of the President to arrange for forgiveness of loans and increase funding for the Professional Career Development Program PCDP

internships and scholarships for undocumented students.

The floor was opened for discussion.

In favor:
Alice Yang
Juan Poblete

Opposed:

Points for the resolution:

Some provosts have been approached by undocumented students, many of whom who are afraid or unsure about their future feel unable to speak to faculty out of fear that they would be reported and subsequently deported. This resolution would send a message to these students and help reassure them that faculty will do everything they can to help them.

Education is a crucial part of the path to citizenship in the U.S., and it is important for the campus to help its undocumented students get the best education possible and protect their rights.

The resolution was passed by a show of hands.

b. Professor Langhout: Resolution of Non-Cooperation with ICE to Refuse ICE Physical Access to University (AS/SCP/1866)

Professor Langhout presented the following resolution:

Whereas: “The University of California welcomes and supports students without regard to their immigration status” and “is committed to creating an environment in which all admitted students can successfully matriculate and graduate”;

Whereas: “UCPD is devoted to providing professional policing services that strive to ensure a safe and secure environment in which members of the University’s diverse community can pursue the University’s research, education and public service missions. Community trust and cooperation are essential to effective law enforcement on campus or other UC locations”;

Whereas: President Trump has issued an executive order criminalizing undocumented status, by stating that it is the policy of the executive branch to “detain individuals apprehended on suspicion of violating Federal or State law, including Federal immigration law”

Whereas: In the wake of Immigration and Custom Enforcement operations in February 2017, Santa Cruz police chief Kevin Vogel stated, “We can’t cooperate with a law enforcement agency [Department of Homeland Security] we cannot trust”

Be it resolved that: The Senate calls for UC Office of the President to prohibit Immigration and Custom Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, and Homeland Security Investigations from coming on campus under any circumstances.

The floor was opened for discussion.

In favor:
 Laurie Palmer
 Elizabeth Abrams
 Jessica Taft
 Jennifer Gonzalez

Opposed:
 Jason Nielsen

Points for the resolution:

In the current political climate, it is important for the campus to ensure the safety and well-being of students, and to send a message that there are some political practices that will not be tolerated at UCSC. This resolution draws that line.

The resolution is not intended to be a law at the campus or anywhere else, it is meant to be an ethical statement from the campus that adhering to these guidelines is the morally correct practice for UCSC. It is also important to question the ethical merit of laws that seem dubious.

The campus should feel like a home to all students. The resolution would help undocumented students feel less afraid and more at home.

Points against the resolution:

Since the resolution is not technically lawful, calling on campus authorities to follow it would be a violation of the Senate policy of shared governance. UCSC needs to work within the system of laws to change the climate for these students, and this resolution goes too far outside of this system.

The resolution was passed by a show of hands.

c. Professor Langhout: Resolution to Protect Students' Records with Respect to Immigration Status (AS/SCP/1867)

Professor Connery presented Professor Langhout's resolution:

Whereas: "The University of California welcomes and supports students without regard to their immigration status" and "is committed to creating an environment in which all admitted students can successfully matriculate and graduate";

Whereas: Information in student records regarding students' and students' family members' immigration status is vulnerable to subpoena, and thus could constitute a threat to the safety and security of undocumented students or of undocumented family members

Whereas: UCSC staff members who sought to protect the privacy of student records by refusing subpoenas would be subject to contempt of court charges

Be it resolved that: The Senate calls for the Chancellor and CP/EVC to institute policies that will ensure that records of students' or students' families' immigration status will not be retained beyond the brief and limited time needed for determination of eligibility for grants, loans, or other programs. These policies would apply to all units on the campus, including the registrar, office of financial aid, student affairs, and colleges.

The floor was opened for discussion.

In favor:
Elizabeth Abrams
Shelley Errington

Opposed:

Points for the resolution:

Staff and faculty could easily implement these changes on campus. It is a small, sensible change that would make a large impact in helping to make undocumented students feel safer at UCSC.

The resolution was passed by a show of hands.

d. Student Union Assembly Vice President of Academic Affairs. Oral Report: "Classroom and Lecture Availability Student Survey"

SUA Vice President of Academic Affairs Jessica Xu reported that this year, 1,758 undergraduates participated in the CLASS survey. Regarding winter enrollment, approximately 68.9 percent of student participants reported that they were able to get the courses that they needed to fulfill their requirements while 6.4 percent reported that they weren't able to get into these courses. Approximately 2 percent of the students who couldn't get the courses they needed reported that they ended up taking fewer courses than planned. 81.6 percent of students did not attempt enrollment by attending a course after the first day of instruction and getting permission from the instructor, while 18.4 percent did. Students who attempt this type of enrollment are successful about 75 percent of the time. 25 percent of student participants reported that they enrolled in a course they intended to drop if they were able to register for a more ideal course. When asked which GE courses students had difficulty registering for. Most students reported the ER and PR GE's were the most difficult courses to register for.

Regarding spring enrollment, results were largely similar. 66.7 percent of students got all of the courses they needed to fulfill requirements while 25.9 percent reported being unable to do so. Only 1.7 percent reported taking fewer courses than intended since they were unable to register for the courses they needed. 76.7 percent of students did not attempt to register by attending a class after instruction began and getting permission from the instructor, while 23.3 percent did. 35.5 percent of students enrolled in a course they intended to drop if they were able to register for a more ideal course. The ER and PR GE courses were also the most difficult for students to register for in spring quarter, with IM following close behind.

6.8 percent of students reported attempting to add the same class for multiple quarters by attending after instruction began and getting permission from the instructor.

Students were also asked about any impact they felt due to shortened class periods. Students reported feeling more awake, instructors seemed more captivating since they had to fit more information into shorter time periods, and Art majors reported having more time to do their work. However, students also reported increased curtailment of discussion, inability to travel from class to class, decreased educational quality, increased tuition for shorter class periods, feeling rushed and pressured when professors go over their allotted time periods, and not being able to take breaks anymore in longer course periods. When asked whether they felt the overall impact of the shortened classes was positive or negative, 38.4 percent reported they felt no impact, and about 50 percent reported at least a somewhat negative impact.

Overcrowding was also shown to be an issue, with 86.8 percent of students reporting that they have experienced overcrowding in their courses or sections at UCSC. 77.8 percent of students reported that they felt the large size of the class negatively impacted their quality of education. The classroom quality has also decreased with overcrowding, with students reporting the highest levels of dissatisfaction with the cooling systems, seating comfort, and seating arrangements in classrooms.

When surveyed about online courses, about 30 percent of students reported that they have taken online courses through UCSC. 46.7 percent of these students reported that the experience of taking an online course at UCSC was worse than the experience of a traditional, in-person course, 42.4 percent reported that the online and in-person courses provided similar experiences, and 10.9 percent reported preferring the online course experience. Students reported that they liked the flexibility of online courses, that they could set their own work pace, and that they had continuous access to course materials. They also reported that some of the more complicated courses were difficult to teach online, cheating was easier, forming study groups was more difficult, online videos and other materials being confusing, technical errors that prevent them from being able to do their coursework, and the desire that concurrent in-person courses be offered as well as the online versions so that students can select which option they would prefer.

When asked if they felt on track to graduate on time, most students said yes, but about 25 percent were either unsure or felt they would not graduate on time. Most students who answered no reported that this was due to difficulty passing at least one required course for their major.

Many students reported frustration with the campus waitlist system, with 53.7 percent stating that they find the system difficult or somewhat difficult, and 64.8 percent stating they find the system satisfactory. Students reported that the system caused them to not be able to register for necessary classes, and that swapping classes in this system can be very confusing.

Students reported advising experiences varying from department to department. Some positive experiences included receiving necessary support and information from knowledgeable advising staff. Negative experiences included increased wait times and insufficient advising staff for the number of students, advisors giving misinformation about available classes and graduation paths, and advising sessions feeling very impersonal and dehumanizing. When asked what they felt was most important about academic advising, students reported that getting assistance understanding graduation requirements and getting help finding classes they should take were most important, followed by clarification of educational goals and assistance finding endeavors related to student majors and careers.

When rating the extent to which polling platforms in the classroom impacted quality of education, 27.3 percent reported no impact, and over 1/3 of students who have used these polling platforms felt the experience was positive.

Students were also asked how much money they were spending on course materials. On average, students reported spending between \$100 and \$300 per quarter.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

e. Professor Rofel: Resolution on Scholars at Risk (AS/SCP/1868)

Politics Professor Megan Thomas introduced Professor Rofel's resolution:

I propose a resolution to have University of California, Santa Cruz become an institutional member of Scholars at Risk (SAR). Begun at the University of Chicago in 1999 and relocated to New York University in 2003, SAR is an international network of institutions and individuals whose mission it is to protect scholars and promote academic freedom.

By arranging temporary academic positions at member universities and colleges, Scholars at Risk offers safety to scholars facing grave threats, so scholars' ideas are not lost and they can keep working until conditions improve and they are able to return to their home countries.

Our campus can become a member of this important network. We would be supporting our colleagues around the world who are threatened and sometimes face violence, punishment, or other forms of sanction by authoritarian regimes, solely for exercising their academic freedom. Most recently, we can think of Turkey and Syria, whose academic scholars have joined the refugee crisis.

In 2002, SAR partnered with the Institute of International Education which was then establishing IIE's Scholar Rescue Fund. The Fund provides vital financial support to scholars facing grave threats so that they may escape dangerous conditions and continue their academic work in safety. IIE-SRF fellowships support visiting appointments for threatened scholars to continue their work in safety at partnering academic institutions worldwide.

To join this important network, our campus would pay \$ 800 per year to be a contributing

member or \$ 5,000 per year to be a sustaining member. That membership would give us access to SAR's list with all the particulars for each scholar listed. If we choose to invite someone from the list for a visiting appointment on our campus, for whatever length of time we choose, IIE-SRF would share the cost of such an appointment.

Other UC campuses have already joined the network, including UC Irvine, UC Santa Barbara, UC Davis, UCLA, UC San Diego and UC Merced. UC Riverside and UC Berkeley are also currently going through the process of considering membership.

I urge the Academic Senate to approve this resolution and thereby call upon the Provost and Chancellor to pay the annual membership fee and also appoint a faculty member to oversee the process for our campus.

The floor was opened for discussion.

Professor Narayan noted that the document was not formatted as a formal resolution, and asked the Senate Chair Einarsdóttir to rule on whether order the resolution was in order prior to taking a vote.

Chair Einarsdóttir moved to table the resolution until the fall. This was agreed to by a voice vote.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

ATTEST:

Heather Shearer

Secretary

November 1, 2017