ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others

4. Special Orders –

   Consent Calendar

Minutes of the June 11, 2020 meeting (Attachment 1)

In Memoriam
Esperanza Jefferson, Spanish and Portuguese, 1943-2020
John Ridland, English, 1933-2020
Barbara Uehling Charlton, Chancellor 1987-1994, 1932-2020
Charles H. Long, Religious Studies, 1926-2020
Ian Kenneth Ross, Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, 1930-2019
Perry Shapiro, Economics, 1941-2019
Augustine H. Gray, Electrical and Computer Engineering, 1936-2019
Inés Talamantes, Religious Studies, 1930-2019
Napoleon Chagnon, Anthropology, 1938-2019

2019-20 Annual Reports (Attachment 2)
Bren School of Environmental Science & Management Faculty Executive Committee
Charges Officer and Charges Advisory Committee
College of Creative Studies Faculty Executive Committee
College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee
Committee on Academic Personnel
Committee on Diversity and Equity
Committee on International Education
Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards
Council on Planning and Budget
Council on Research and Instructional Resources
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Faculty Executive Committee
Graduate Council

5. Reports of Special Committees

6. Reports of Standing Committees

  Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

  Proposed Revision to Bylaw 95: Committee on Diversity and Equity (Attachment 3)

  Regulation 335: Requirements for the Master of Environmental Data Science (Attachment 4)

Graduate Council

Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology (Attachment 5)

7. Petitions of Students – None

8. Unfinished Business

9. University and Faculty Welfare

10. New Business

  Proposal for a Mail Ballot: Request for a Memorial from the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate to the Board of Regents Regarding the Bernard Zakheim Mural Cycle at UC San Francisco (Attachment 6)
The Faculty Legislature of the Santa Barbara Division met via Zoom teleconference at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 11, 2020, with Chair Henning Bohn presiding. 38 voting members, 5 ex-officio members, and other interested parties attended the meeting.

Announcements by the Chancellor (from the slides presented)

Thank you to Senate Chair Henning Bohn and to all of our faculty colleagues for your commitment to shared governance especially during these difficult times. We find ourselves facing not only the challenges of a global health pandemic, but also national and international outrage over the deep hurt and devastating effects of anti-black racism and discrimination on our country. We are yet again confronted by acts of injustice that are beyond measure. As a university dedicated to educating the leaders of tomorrow and learning from each other, we are committed to being part of the culture change.
Collective Healing and Organizing Space
Thanks to student Taylor Jackson, our Office of Black Student Development, and CAPS for organizing last Thursday’s healing space.

Town Hall Tomorrow at Noon
Thanks to our Center for Black Studies Research for organizing, and Professors Sharon Tettegah and Victor Rios for moderating.

COVID-19 Response Update

Our Path Forward
On May 14, we announced our extensive planning efforts for:

- Measured and phased return of our campus research operations (scheduled to begin Monday, June 15; 15% normal research personnel, or ~500 researchers, at any given time)
- Carefully managed, phased return of staff to campus and resumption of on-campus instruction

Consulting with our administrative and Academic Senate colleagues, faculty, researchers, staff, and students to help us understand our community’s needs, and we have also received important feedback from alumni, parents, Trustees, and friends. Also working with county officials and following statewide guidance.

Deans and administrative colleagues have been working with faculty in every department to prepare for and explore all options for fall quarter.

Our goal is to announce key decisions on fall operations this month.

Range of Scenarios for Fall – Outlined in May 14 Memo

- Hybrid scenario
  - Instruction: some in-person, some remote
  - Housing: guided by public health directives
  - Library: allow some access
- Largely Return to normal instruction
  - Unlikely for fall quarter
  - Still accommodate students who need remote access
- Full remote instruction for fall quarter
  - Guided by public health requirements and safety concerns
  - Still ramp up some approved on-campus research
  - Operate predominantly with remote workforce

2
COVID-19 Testing

- Research testing program approved by IRB at Cottage Health
- Collaboration between Student Health; MCDB researchers who have developed CRISPR-based test; and clinicians at Cottage Health and Santa Barbara County Public Health Department
  - Anonymous positive results communicated to Cottage sub-investigator who has the ability to decode the identity and report it to SBCPHD. SBCPHD will contact all positive individuals for further diagnostic testing and follow-up instructions.
- Up to 1,500 volunteers (students, faculty, and staff) are being tested in this initial phase; phase II will include testing focused on our research community
- Current testing site at Calaveras Lounge (west campus)
  - Identifying central testing site for faculty/researchers/staff
  - Identifying lab space to be CLIA-Certified for diagnostic testing (CLIA approval process underway); Dr. Emily Waterhouse at Cottage Health has agreed to oversee our future CLIA lab.
2020-21 Governor’s May Revise
California faces $54 billion budget deficit due to “COVID-19 Recession”; 22.3% decline in revenue since January

Revised budget for UC
- May Revise eliminates most new investments in UC, including January proposal of 5% increase ($173M) to UC general fund
- Trigger cut of 10% ($364M) in recurring funding to UC unless federal government provides sufficient stimulus funding

Campus impact
- Without 5% increases = $8 million cut to our campus
- With 10% trigger cut = $32 million cut to our campus

Last week, the State Legislature proposed a budget plan for 2020-21 that provides UC with a 5.6% increase ($209.2M) over the 2019 budget

Deadline to pass state budget is June 15

COVID-19 Budget Impact
President Napolitano announced on May 18 a number of systemwide steps to help address the expected budget impact:
- Systemwide freeze on salaries for policy-covered staff employees;
- Systemwide freeze on salaries for policy-covered, non-student academic appointees.
  To ensure a stable faculty pipeline and to maintain our teaching and research enterprise, we will continue the regular academic peer-review merit advancement program;
- Voluntary pay cut of 10 percent for current Chancellors and President Napolitano.

Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy
The committee, co-chaired by Henning Bohn and EVC David Marshall, met last Friday, June 15, to discuss the state budget update and our campus planning scenarios. Our next meeting has been scheduled for next Friday, June 19.

A Few Sample Highlights of Faculty Research on COVID-19
Bren School Professor Patricia Holden and researchers in her lab are working on techniques to use wastewater to monitor COVID-19 infection rates in our local community.

Team of anthropologists, physicians, and tribal leaders led by Professor of Anthropology Michael Gurven has developed a strategy for managing COVID-19 among the Tsimane, an indigenous population in the Bolivian Amazon.
Our faculty look at the drop in pollution worldwide amid stay-at-home orders and what this means for the future:

- Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies Ranjit Deshmukh
- Associate Professor of Environmental Studies Simone Pulver
- Assistant Professor of Environmental Economics Kyle Meng

Professors of Communication Tamara Afifi and Walid Afifi commission national survey to assess well-being of Americans during COVID-19 crisis.

Professor of Communication Robin Nabi explores the use of entertainment media as therapy for stress, anxiety, and hopelessness.

**Transitions on Campus**

**Academic Senate Chair**
Special thanks to Henning for your leadership and dedication as Senate Chair over the past four years. You have been an invaluable partner through the toughest of times, including the Thomas Fire and the current pandemic. Congratulations to incoming Senate Chair Susannah Scott. We look forward to your leadership.

**Dean of College of Creative Studies**
Following a national search and the recommendation of our advisory committee, we announced on May 29 the appointment of Professor of Chicana and Chicano Studies and of Anthropology Gerardo Aldana as our next Dean of CCS, effective July 1.

**Student Health Executive Director and University Physician**
Dr. Vejas Skripkus will join our campus from USC, effective July 13.

**Student Updates**

**Fall 2020 Admit Data**

- 90,958 freshman applicants (109,922 total)
- 33,527 freshman admits (including 6,491 from waitlist/appeal)
  - 37% admission rate (up from 30% in F19)
  - Average self-reported GPA: 4.31 (down from 4.32)
  - 67% California residents (up from 64%)
  - 18% domestic nonresidents (up from 15%)
  - 16% international nonresidents (down from 21%)
  - 21% underrepresented minorities (down from 23%)
  - 26% first-generation (no change)

**Fall 2020 SIR Update**

- Freshman SIR deadline was May 1
- Transfer deadline was June 1
- SIR Targets:
  - CA: 4,324
  - Nonresident: 1,200
- Current SIRS:
  - CA: 4,331
  - Nonresident: 1,156
- Enrollment Targets:
  - CA: 4,090
  - Nonresident: 950

**UC SAT/ACT Policy**

- UC Regents last month approved suspension of the standardized test requirement (ACT/SAT) for all California freshman applicants until fall 2024
- The suspension will allow the University to create a new test that better aligns with the content the University expects students to have mastered for college readiness
- If a new test does not meet specified criteria in time for fall 2025 admission, UC will eliminate the standardized testing requirement for California students
Campus Updates and Highlights

Projected Private Giving FY20

By Source

$92.2 MILLION

$48.4M Individuals
$29.6M Foundations
$12.9M Corporations
$1.3M Other

$48.4M from Individuals
Friends
$29.6M Alumni
Faculty & Staff
$12.9M Parents & Grandparents

Projected Private Giving FY20

By Purpose

$92.2 MILLION

$44.3M Research
$32.1M Department Support
$10.1M Student Support
$4.2M Capital Projects
$1.0M Unrestricted
$0.5M Instruction

UC SANTA BARBARA
FY20 Proposals of ~$10M+

- Spencer Smith, Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies, ($14.5M NSF proposal)
- Nick Nidzieko, Marine Science Institute, ($11M UCSD proposal)
- Susannah Scott, California Nanosystems Institute, ($25M NSF proposal)
• Jeffrey Richman, Physics, ($9.6M DOE proposal)
• James Speck, Institute for Energy Efficiency, ($12M DOE proposal)
• Beth Pruitt, California Nanosystems Institute, ($12.5M NSF proposal)

National Science Foundation HSI Grant

$2-million NSF grant for FUERTE
(Field-based Undergraduate Engagement through Research, Teaching, and Education), a program to increase diversity and inclusion in conservation and environmental sciences

Professor of EEMB Gretchen Hofmann (PI)
Professor of EEMB Doug McCauley (co-PI)
Professor of EEMB Hillary Young (co-PI)
Director of Valentine Eastern Reserve and SNARL Carol Blanchette (co-PI)
Director of Academic Success Initiative Malaphone Phomassa (co-PI)
Professor of Chicana and Chicano Studies Aida Hurtado

Jules Zimmer Dean’s Chair
Jules Zimmer Dean’s Chair in our Gevirtz Graduate School of Education is established by an anonymous gift. Dean Jeffrey Milem is our inaugural chairholder.

2020 John M. Prausnitz AIChE Lecture
Professor of Chemical Engineering Michael Doherty is selected by the American Institute of Chemical Engineers for this prestigious honor.

College of Fellows of the American Theatre
Professor of Theater and Dance Risa Brainin is inducted into the College of Fellows of the American Theatre.

Fellow of the Ecological Society of America
Bren Professor of Marine Ecology, Ben Halpern

NSF Early CAREER Award
Assistant Professor of MCDB Julie Simpson
2020 Searle Scholar
Assistant Professor of MCDB Sung Soo Kim receives three-year, $300,000 grant.

Air Force Young Investigator Award
Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering Enoch Yeung

Moore Foundation Experimental Investigator Award
Assistant Professor of Physics Andrea Young

Class of 2020 Virtual Celebration

Visit ucsb.edu/2020-virtual-celebration to view the Class of 2020 Virtual Celebration, starting this Saturday, June 13, at 9 a.m.

Search for hashtag #UCSB2020 to view photos, videos, and messages of congratulations to the Class of 2020.

Isla Vista Update

6th Anniversary of Isla Vista Tragedy
Virtual commemoration from Student Affairs and Associated Students
#SixFeetApartButTogetherAtHeart

The floor was opened for questions. A discussion ensued regarding reopening the childcare center, the use of police force, and the University’s reflection on current events.

Announcements by the Chair

Chair Bohn stated that the mistreatment of Black people is not acceptable, and must change. A year ago, the university formed a committee to oversee the campus police with the goal of
improving student-police relations. Chair Bohn also announced that the upcoming Town Hall meeting would not take place because there were multiple meetings occurring at that time. Chair Bohn and Incoming Chair Scott are representing the Academic Senate at the COVID-19 Response Working Group and contingency planning meetings.

Chair Bohn reported that the university is facing many budget challenges. The combination of State budget cuts, loss of revenue from university rental housing, and a potential drop in nonresident student enrollment could reduce the core budget by $50 million.

Chair Bohn provided an update on the UC Presidential Search. Chair Bohn has been a member of the Academic Advisory Committee, but the group has not met since the shift to remote operations. The Academic Assembly passed a resolution on February 12 to express their concern and disappointment that the Chair of the Academic Advisory Committee had been excluded from the Regents Special Committee for the Presidential Search. Chair Bohn also stated that UC Provost Michael Brown will convene a working group to assess the feasibility of developing a new standardized test to be used for freshman admissions. Furthermore, the Academic Council released a letter of unanimous support for Assembly Constitutional Amendment 5 (ACA-5), which would allow California voters the opportunity to repeal Proposition 209. Also, the university will work to ensure compliance with the new federal regulations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH), which will take effect August 14, 2020.

**Consent Calendar**

Minutes of the April 30, 2020 meeting

**Motion:** To approve the Consent Calendar.

The motion was seconded and passed with a vote of 42 in favor, 0 against, and 3 abstentions.

**Proposed Revisions to the Academic Senate Manual**

Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections Chair Leonard presented proposed revisions to Divisional Bylaws 15, 20, and 105 to reflect long-standing practices in the Academic Senate.

The proposed modifications to Bylaw 15 (Chair) reflect a long-standing Senate practice that the Divisional Chair may serve a second consecutive term. Indeed, all Divisional Chairs since 1998 have served two consecutive terms.

The proposed revisions to Bylaw 20 (Vice Chair/Secretary) reflect long-standing practices regarding the appointment and duties of the Vice Chair/Secretary and a second Vice Chair. Only twice in the past two decades has a second Vice Chair been appointed. The changes codify best practices according to which a second Vice Chair is appointed only where the Chair determines
that some particularly pressing set of tasks warrant the creation of such a position. The revised language also clarifies the duties of a second Vice Chair (if appointed), including their newly specified role of acting as Chair in case both the Chair and Vice Chair/Secretary are absent or unable to serve.

The proposed changes to Bylaw 105 (Faculty Code of Conduct Charges Officer) were made to ensure that the Bylaw is consistent with the current version of the Campus Procedures for Enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct (Campus Procedures). In particular, the revisions remove language referring to cases where the Charges Officer “believes that a formal complaint lacks merit.” According to the Campus Procedures, the Charges Officer does not make such a determination. Rather, the Charges Officer refers formal complaints to the Charges Advisory Committee for a *prima facie* determination, which dictates whether an *ad hoc* Charges Committee will be formed to conduct an investigation. The updated language for Bylaw 105 has been endorsed by the current Charges Officer and Charges Advisory Committee.

**Motion:** To approve proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Manual.

The Motion was seconded and passed by a vote of 32 in favor, 0 against, and 4 abstentions.

**Proposal to change the name of the M.A. and Ph.D. in Theater Studies to Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies**

The Department of Theater and Dance proposed a simple name of the M.A. and Ph.D. in “Theater Studies” to that of “Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies.” In the past twenty years, the scholarly field of Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies has moved from a field centered in theater studies and dramatic literature to a more interdisciplinary one, with recent dissertations on topics or theories across multiple artistic genres (theater, dance, performance art, and performance in everyday life). In parallel, the program has developed from one named Dramatic Arts, focused primarily on theater history and dramatic literature. With the addition of faculty who specialize in Performance Studies and Dance Studies, “Theater Studies” no longer represents the seminar offerings and the research interests of many students. A change in the program’s name to “Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies” will thus reflect changes that have already occurred in the department, students, and the field.

**Motion:** To change the name of the M.A. and Ph.D. to Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies.

The motion was seconded and passed by a vote of 36 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

**Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Climate Science and Climate Change**

Graduate Council granted final approval to establish the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Climate Science and Climate Change, effective Spring 2020.
The floor was opened for general comments and discussion. Hearing none, Chair Bohn adjourned the meeting at 4:44 p.m.
August 26, 2020

To: Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division

From: Bren School Faculty Executive Committee

RE: Bren School of Environmental Science & Management Faculty Executive Committee
Annual Report, 2019-2020

The 2019-2020 FEC membership consisted of Sarah Anderson (chair), Mark Buntaine, Frank Davis, and Roland Geyer. In this report, we identify the primary accomplishments and activities over the year and identify ongoing activities and priorities. The FEC had three major priorities for the year: MEDS Program Implementation, the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition proposal for the MESM program, and the Strategic Plan for Increasing Student Diversity. In addition to those major priorities, the FEC dealt with ongoing issues regarding COVID-19 and other concerns described here.

Major Priorities

MEDS program implementation

The implementation of a new Masters of Environmental Data Science (MEDS) program at the Bren School was a major focus of time and planning efforts during the year. The faculty began the year with a retreat on the topic of the new degree program. This retreat served to engage all Bren faculty in the planning and governance of the MEDS program with the primary aims of:

- Determining appropriate governance structure for MEDS program.
- Identifying MEDS staffing needs and support for staffing.
- Reviewing the MEDS curriculum and determining strategies to fill teaching gaps.
- Gaining consensus on FTE in environmental data science.
- Developing concept for MEDS capstone proposal process and advising structure.
- Identifying prerequisites and criteria for admission to MEDS program.
- Considering strategies to build the MEDS career development program.

At the retreat, the faculty made governance decisions about the program. In particularly, they decided that the MEDS curriculum will be governed by a combined master’s curriculum committee in order to account for the tradeoffs and synergies between the two master’s programs. Likewise, recruitment and admissions will be governed by the Recruitment, Admissions, and Support (RAS) committee and the Capstone project process will be governed by the Group Project committee. In addition, the faculty agreed on the importance of reputation, came to consensus on the LPSOE search in MEDS and an Assistant Professor search in the coming year, began work on an admissions rubric, and decided on the basic structure of the
capstone project. Individual faculty and committees took the lead on implementation of the portions of the program and reported back to the faculty to gain consensus throughout the year. The MEDS program is now in a position to hire the support staff and to launch for summer 2021.

*We anticipate that this will continue to be a priority for AY 2020-2021.*

**PDST proposal for MESM program**

The second major priority for 2019-2020 was guiding the UC Office of the President and UC Regents review of the proposal for professional degree supplemental tuition (PDST) for the MESM program and advising on the allocation of those funds. In January 2020, the UC Regents approved the PDST proposal for implementation in Fall 2020. The rollout of the fee for the existing MESM students was challenging until we became aware that we could remit full fees back to them. The funding from PDST has been allocated to student aid, especially to students from diverse backgrounds, and budgeted toward curricular needs. In a promising development, we have the most diverse incoming MESM class yet to matriculate to the Bren School.

**Strategic plan for increasing student diversity**

An ad hoc committee of faculty and staff met all year to develop a strategic plan for increasing student diversity. A draft plan was due to be discussed by the faculty at the Spring retreat, which was cancelled due to COVID-19. Progress on the strategic plan has continued over the summer, including discussions with the Black students of Bren and the Bren Alumni Students of Color Association (BASCA). Both groups presented the Bren School with productive demands for reform that will inform further work on the strategic plan.

*The Fall faculty retreat will include anti-racism training and be focused on refining the plan and its implementation.*

**Other Activities**

**Program Learning Outcome 3 Assessment report**

The Curriculum Committee and Assistant Dean led the continued implementation of Program Learning Outcome (PLO) Assessment. In 2013-14, the faculty established PLOs for MESM and PhD programs. The MESM PLOs include 1) Core Knowledge, 2) Specializations, 3) Research Methods and Analysis, 4) Scholarly Communication and 5) Professionalism. For #3, the faculty wrote an assessment plan and created a rubric for evaluation. The staff have deployed the rubric to faculty during 3 years of Group Project faculty reviews. Based on the data gathered, it appears that MESM students are achieving program learning outcomes with respect to PLO3, research methods and analysis, with some improvement needed in a few areas. A report on PLO3 was submitted. Faculty determined that PLO5 would be the learning objective to assess in the next three years because professionalism is key to our brand.

**New Bren School website**
A new website has been launched for the Bren School. While staff and outside vendors led the website design and development, faculty served on the Web Design Review Committee and made the new website a priority for 2020.

**Ongoing issues from COVID19**

The FEC served as a clearinghouse the many issues concerning faculty that arose from COVID-19. These included use of Bren Hall, teaching online, sick leave, student concerns, and virtual events. We especially want to thank the Pinnacles team, Bruce Kendall, Steve Miley, and Heather Hodges, for guiding faculty through the online instruction transition.

**Revisions to the Bylaws:**

Revisions to the Bren School faculty bylaws were adopted in AY 2018-2019, but not formally incorporated into the bylaws. These were formally adopted, including provisions about conflicts of interest and revisions to Personnel committee responsibilities.

**FEC Election Process:**

With the previous system, faculty may be elected to the FEC with just 4-5 votes. This is a problematic way of aggregating preferences due to the small number of votes needed to be elected. The FEC proposed a new system of voting that will reduce the potential for undue influence of small coalitions over elections. The new system would be a two-stage vote, with nominations in the first round followed by a vote. Faculty voted all in favor of a two-round voting process starting in 2021.

**Bren Governance:**

Two new faculty committees were established in 2020. The Compute team requested a small committee of faculty to work with them on priorities for computing and a new committee was convened to assist with career development and alumni relations.

New oversight procedures were developed for special academic programs (Eco-E, Communication) that streamline personnel reviews. The procedures also prescribe the role for the oversight committees. In the beginning of the fall, the committee should come up with goals for the year, and at the end of the year the committee sends a report to the Master’s Curriculum committee on how the goals were achieved. In addition, the personnel committee would like to have a strategic review every 2-3 years about how the special academic programs are designed, implemented and organized.

**Possible Priorities for AY 2020-2021**

The FEC noted that some priorities remain or were pending at the end of the year. As a result, some possible priorities for AY 2020-2021 FEC are:

- Strategic Plan for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
- MEDS program implementation
- Revision of PhD core curriculum
- Budget, including budgeting for retentions, reducing lecturer spending
- Reducing MESM specializations and/or courses required for specializations
- PhD program with Environmental Studies, on which there have been ongoing discussions.
- New Environment building proposal, which will be led by Environmental Studies
- Bren Hall space allocations
- Bren School Faculty Computing Hardware Policy
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Purpose (per Divisional Bylaw 105):

The Charges Officer considers informal complaints of possible violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct on the part of Senate members, undertaking informal resolution and/or referring complainants to other appropriate campus persons or agencies, as indicated in Appendix IV of the Manual of the Santa Barbara Division. With respect to formal complaints with potential merit, the Charges Officer consults with the Charges Advisory Committee to evaluate the merits of the case and to assess whether or not the complaint should be forwarded to an Ad Hoc Charges Committee for further investigation, consonant with Appendix IV of the Divisional Manual.

During 2019-20, the Charges Officer responded to two formal complaints, and continued ongoing efforts in relation to one complaint that was filed with the Senate during the previous year. The Charges Advisory Committee was consulted regarding the two newly submitted formal complaints.

Based on recommendations of the Charges Advisory Committee, two ad hoc Charges Committees were formed to investigate allegations and determine whether there was probable cause for undertaking disciplinary action. The results of the investigations were communicated to the appropriate parties as defined in the Campus Procedures for Enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Along with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Charges Officer and the Charges Advisory Committee responded to recommendations from the University Task Force on Faculty Disciplinary Standards.

Members of the Charges Advisory Committee:
Denise Bielby
Andrew Norris
Jane Mulfinger
Karen Szumllinski

Submitted by Andrew Teel, Charges Officer
COLLEGE OF CREATIVE STUDIES FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT, 2019-2020

CHARGE OF THE COMMITTEE

To govern the College of Creative Studies in accordance with the provisions of Divisional Bylaw 40A. (Am 25 Oct 01; 27 May 04; 09 Mar 17) specifically:

1. To represent faculty in all aspects of the curriculum of the College.
2. To authorize the Dean, at the committee's discretion, to enforce all regulations concerning students, including the regulations governing transfer and academic disqualification.
3. To advise and assist the Dean in the administration of the College.
4. To appoint all committees of the Faculty not otherwise provided for.

SUMMARY

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the College of Creative Studies (CCS) met 7 times during the academic year 2019-20 and addressed many issues. In Spring 2020 meetings were held remotely via Zoom due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Notable issues included:

Admissions audit
Changes in the admissions interface were implemented to provide the least intrusive mechanism possible in order to be in compliance with suggestions from auditors.

Admissions equity
Multiple discussions were held concerning the issues of diversity, equity and inclusion and how they apply to the admissions procedure to CCS

FEC response to request for comments on the Program Review of the Department of Mathematics.
The CCS FEC was broadly supportive of the concept of a data science emphasis in CCS within the existing major. It has been proposed that math’s undergraduate committee undertake a survey on climate.

FEC response to request for comments on the findings of the Ad Hoc Committee on On-Line Course Evaluations.
The CCS FEC was supportive of the move online, but had a mixed response to the recommendation that online surveys be conducted in class and was strongly opposed to the idea of using incentives to encourage participation.

FEC response to request for comments on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on ESCI evaluations.
The CCS FEC Strongly agreed that the current system is not valid or reliable, but the question remains: how to move forward and what measurements to use in its place.

FEC response to proposal to adopt the NCAA’s requirements for athletic eligibility as a campus standard.
The CCS FEC felt that this is better for the students and was in favor of the new standard.
Concern was expressed that this would be adding more assessment into the K-12 system and about the bias inherent in the SAT. A suggestion was made to recommend engagement with the College Board about issues with the SAT rather than adding another standardized test. Concerns were expressed about how out of state admissions would be handled.

FEC response to the BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT SAT Essay Requirement
It was noted that it is common knowledge in writing field that timed writing is not indicative of success in writing.

FEC response to pilot proposal to alter the Fall registration timeline
The proposal is welcomed but addresses the symptoms and not the cause - more students than seats. Although the waitlist system has helped in some cases it is now being asked to do things it was not designed for and the waitlist system may need to be reviewed.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John G. Latto, Chair, Senior Lecturer SOE, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, College of Creative Studies
Tengiz Bibilashvili, Senior Lecturer SOE, Physics, College of Creative Studies
Kara M. Brown, Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies, Writing Program
Maria Isabel Bueno Cachadina, Senior Lecturer SOE, Mathematics, College of Creative Studies,
Phill Conrad, Senior Lecturer SOE, Computer Science, College of Creative Studies
Sarah Gibson, Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies
Leroy E. Laverman, Senior Lecturer SOE, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Creative Studies
Jane L. Mulfinger, Professor, Art
Raisa E. Feldman, At-Large Member, Associate Professor, Statistics and Applied Probability
Sharon Tettegah, At-Large Member, Professor Black Studies
Leslie Hogan, Non-Senate Academic Rep
Bruce Tiffney, Ex Officio, Interim Dean CCS, Professor, Earth Sciences
Sara C. Sterphone, Consultant, CCS Student Affairs Officer
Savannah Parison, Consultant, CCS Student Affairs Officer
Lynn Clark, Advisor
Jennifer R. Johansen, Advisor
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The following summarizes the business of the College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) for 2019-2020.

Summary of Actions:

Courses, Curricular Matters and Program Reviews

1. Chemical Engineering curriculum proposal to add ChE166/266 as new elective – committee approved proposal
2. Committee approved an individual major request
3. Mechanical Engineering curriculum proposal to add ENGR 120A and ENGR 120B to the electives list – committee approved proposal
4. Chemical Engineering curriculum proposal to offer ChE W 5 (online) – committee approved proposal
5. Engineering Sciences curriculum proposal to renew ENGR W 3 (online) as a permanent course offering – committee approved proposal
6. Mechanical Engineering curriculum proposal to add CS/ECE 181 to the electives list – committee approved proposal
7. Chemical Engineering curriculum proposal to revise their Student Outcome – committee approved proposal
8. Computer Science curriculum proposal to remove CS 48 and CS 56 and add CS 148 and CS 156 – committee approved proposal
9. College of Engineering proposal to adjust the Quarterly Honor’s threshold – committee approved proposal
10. Biological Engineering proposal to establish a graduate degree program and academic unit – committee approved proposal
11. Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering curricular proposal to add ECE 157A and ECE 157B as electives and count as a sequence – committee approved proposal
12. Mechanical Engineering curricular proposal to add ME 154 to electives list – committee approved proposal

Review of Policies and Proposals

1. Proposal to adopt NCAA Eligibility Requirements – committee approved proposal
2. ESCI Ad Hoc Committee – committee provided comments
3. ESCI Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course – committee provided comments
4. UC Washington Center – committee provided comments
5. BOARDS recommendation to eliminate the ACT-SAT Essay Requirement – committee supported recommendation
7. Extending Remote Instruction – committee provided comments
8. P/NP grading for Spring 2020 – committee provided comments
9. EVC Request for Program Review in 2021-22 – committee provided comments
10. Fall 2020 Registration Timeline Pilot – committee approved proposal
11. Questions on Summer/Fall – committee provided comments
12. Draft UCSB 2020-2025 5-year planning perspectives – committee provided comments
13. EVC Call for PRP nominations for 2020-21 – committee provided comments

2019-2020 Committee Members

Rod Alferness, Dean
Glenn Beltz, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies
Subhash Suri, Computer Science
Chandra Krintz, Computer Science
Michelle O’Malley, Chemical Engineering
Jim Rawlings, Chemical Engineering
Dan Blumenthal, Electrical & Computer Engineering (Chair)
Pradeep Sen, Electrical & Computer Engineering (Vice-Chair)
Chris van de Walle, Materials
James Speck, Materials
Beth Pruitt, Mechanical Engineering
Igor Mezic, Mechanical Engineering
YiLing Yang, Undergraduate Student Representative
Varun Hegde, Graduate Student Representative
Tiffany Sabado, Staff Coordinator
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division

The charge of the College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) is defined in Part III, Appendix II, D1.93A of the Santa Barbara Division’s Bylaws and Regulations as follows: “Each FEC of the Faculty of a College, often abbreviated as ‘FEC of the College,’ is a committee of the Academic Senate. These Committees are authorized by the Bylaws of each Division of the Academic Senate as organizations through which the Faculty of each College can coordinate the academic affairs of their College.” The FEC provides oversight on academic and other matters pertinent to the welfare of departments, faculty, and students within the College of Letters and Science.

The FEC met 12 times during the academic year, four meetings per quarter for two hours each.

Professor James Roney was elected FEC Chair at the meeting on October 10, 2019, and offers this Annual Report for academic year 2019-20.

Executive Summary

Academic year 2019-20 was an unusual and challenging time given both the onset of the coronavirus pandemic and significant social justice issues in the country at large. The university may be entering a period of transition in which it adjusts to continuing effects of these events. The FEC engaged in discussions of many significant issues related to this transition that may be especially relevant to the Faculty Legislature in the near future. This Executive Summary highlights recurring significant issues that the committee discussed in 2019-20.

- Perhaps relevant to all of the issues that follow is the principle of shared governance. What role does the faculty have in determining new directions the college may take during this time of potentially significant transition? This issue was central to our discussion of the Regents’ and Office of the President’s decision to suspend the use of standardized testing in admissions decisions. As noted in our memo from June 15, this decision was contrary to a unanimous vote of the Assembly of the Academic Senate despite the fact that university by-laws state that the Academic Senate shall determine the conditions for admission. Decisions like this raise questions regarding the limits of shared governance, which may be an important issue for the Faculty Legislature moving forward.

- The issue of how to build a more diverse, inclusive, and welcoming college, which was a significant topic of discussion in all department PRP reviews. A recurring suggestion was the possibility of developing a clear, standardized protocol for reporting and investigating
The development of new methods for evaluating teaching effectiveness. The FEC had in-depth discussions of the ad hoc task force reports on student evaluation of teaching. We strongly endorsed the conclusion that ESCI scores and similar assessment devices are not valid or unbiased indicators of teaching effectiveness. Given this, they should be replaced by methods that are supported by evidence. What should these methods be and what role will faculty have in determining this?

Many discussions were informed by the mass movement of students away from the Humanities and into STEM fields. This has caused some departments to be impacted by rising enrollments to such a degree that their majors are no longer functioning well, in addition to diminishing the academic job opportunities for HFA graduate students. How can L&S produce a coordinated plan to distribute resources and alter graduate training in ways that respond to these shifts? Our view was that this is not a problem that can be solved by individual departments on their own, some of which may be unfairly criticized in PRP reports for what are college-wide problems that require college-wide solutions.

The FEC reviews online course proposals. There was some discussion of how this approval process should change given the possibility that online or hybrid instruction that began during the pandemic may continue at elevated rates in the coming years. How will the college adjust its course approval processes to this new landscape, as well as ensuring quality control for instruction? This issue will intersect with many of the others listed above, as it carries implications for teaching evaluation, managing large enrollments, and potential inequities in student access to technology.

The FEC would like to acknowledge the contributions of its ex officio members, Executive Dean Pierre Wiltzius and AVC and Dean of Undergraduate Education Jeff Stopple. Their perspectives and extensive background knowledge of campus issues provided important context and greatly facilitated the productivity of the committee’s discussions. We also express great appreciation to Assistant Dean Barbara Gilkes for her indispensable efforts in organizing and ensuring the smooth operation of all FEC business.

Academic Program Reviews

Maintaining excellence in College departments, undergraduate programs, and graduate education is essential for the continued excellence of the University. As such, the FEC takes its role in Academic Program Review very seriously. In 2019-20 the committee provided extensive comment during the reviews of the Departments of Communication, Mathematics, and Statistics and Applied Probability as well as a combined review of the Comparative Literature Program, the Department of French and Italian, and the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies. Many of the significant issues highlighted in the Executive Summary arose within the context of these reviews.

FEC also provided comment on academic units that should undergo program review next and nominated candidates for the Program Review Panel.
At the Graduate Level

The FEC provided input on:

1) An Interdisciplinary PhD Emphasis in Climate Science and Climate Change
2) A request from the Department of Feminist Studies to suspend Graduate Admissions for one year
3) Program name change for the M.A. and Ph.D. from "Theater Studies" to "Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies"
4) Establishment of a Geographic Information Science (GIS) 4+1 Master of Science program
5) Establishment of a Graduate Degree Program and new academic unit of Biological Engineering
6) A request from the Sociology Department to suspend Graduate Admissions for one year.

At the Undergraduate Level

In Winter 2019, FEC expressed its concern and called to the attention of the Undergraduate Council the lack of regulation requiring a syllabus for all courses. The FEC recommends that the UGC formally considers this matter.

The FEC has review authority over the modification of all undergraduate programs (majors and minors) in the College. Due to the sheer volume of academic programs being monitored and changes that occur on an annual basis, modifications are divided into two categories—technical (typos, course title adjustments, removing discontinued courses, etc.) and more substantive (impacting the major or minor program). Technical revisions are reviewed by divisional subcommittees (HFA, MLPS, SOSC). Substantive changes undergo full review by the entire FEC and are then forwarded to the Undergraduate Council for final approval to ensure equitable application of policies across the three colleges offering UG degrees (CCS, Engineering, and L&S).

During 2019-20, the L&S FEC endorsed the following substantive curriculum changes while FEC subcommittees reviewed technical adjustments to 94 major and minor sheets (or, just under 50% of all such academic study sheets), bearing in mind that the same adjustment could appear on multiple major or minor sheets, including emphases.

Significant curriculum proposals:

1) Biopsychology Premajor and Biopsychology Major
2) Museum Studies Emphasis and Minor
3) Pharmacology Major, including a new course
4) Various Biology Majors – Removing organic chemistry as a requirement
5) Curricular changes to the B.S. in Mathematical Sciences and a name change to B.S. in Applied Mathematics
6) Black Studies Major and Minor
7) B.F.A. in Dance
8) Economics Major and Economics and Accounting Major
9) In the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies, changes to the Japanese High Proficiency Major and the Chinese Minor
10) B.A. and B.S. in Environmental Studies

Other Undergraduate Academic Items
- The FEC strongly supported the Physics Department proposed changes to Transfer Admissions criteria for Physics majors.
- The committee approved an individual student petition to pursue a major and a minor from the same department, adjudging that there were sufficient disciplinary distinctions between the two programs.
- As the final authority on such matters, the FEC ruled on a grade appeal.

At the Level of Individual Courses
The FEC
1) Endorsed a Course Materials Fee for ENST 15BL; this has been forwarded to the Budget Office for further action
2) Endorsed re-unit requests for five courses: RS ST 157A, B, C; BLST 1; WRIT 2LK
3) Reviewed the following online courses, either for an initial offering or renewal based on assessment data:
   - EEMB W 146
   - ESS W 3
   - HIST W 4B
   - HIST W 80
   - INT W 20
   - INT W 188C
   - INT W 188E
   - SPAN W 2
4) Endorsed a pilot hybrid version of ARTHI 6, in anticipation of a proposal for a fully online ARTHI W 6R

Based on its experience reviewing online courses, the FEC sent to CCGE and Instructional Development its recommended Best Practices for Proposing Online Courses. As mentioned in the Executive Summary, this issue may require further discussion and policy development given the increase in remote instruction associated with the pandemic, which began after the FEC submitted this best practices proposal.

At the Campus Level
The FEC weighed in on
- Eligibility regulations for student athletes, endorsing campus adoption of NCAA regulations
- Changes to the student registration timeline (to be piloted in F2020)
- Campus instructional responses to the ongoing pandemic (remote instruction, one-time alterations to P/NP regulations, and the like)
• The administration’s report recommending that course evaluations (currently, ESCIs) be conducted online. Here, the FEC recommended that online course evaluations be collected in classrooms (when instruction occurs there) in order to avoid the sampling bias inherent to self-selected samples that occur when students decide whether to respond to e-mail solicitations of course reviews.

• The report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations of Teaching. As mentioned in the Executive Summary, the FEC strongly recommended a moratorium on use of ESCI scores in personnel evaluations, based on results from experiments showing that such evaluations are invalid (quality of teaching evaluations negatively predicted student performance in future courses in these studies) and biased against female and minority instructors. The Chair of the Academic Senate recommended de-emphasis of ESCI scores in personnel reviews (rather than a moratorium), though it appears that there has been no formal guidance to departments from Academic Personnel regarding this issue for the 2020-21 review cycle.

The FEC is pleased to coordinate selection of the Plous Memorial Award recipient. The 2020-21 recipient is Leah Stokes (Political Science). The committee also endorsed the nominations for the 2020 Mochizuki Memorial Awards within the college.

Systemwide Policy and Regulation Review

In 2019-20 the FEC responded to:
• Assessment Report of UCDC
• BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT-SAT Essay Requirement
• Academic Council report from Standardized Testing Task Force
• Subsequent ruling by the Regents on the use of standardized tests in UC admissions, as described further in the Executive Summary.

Selection of New Members

The FEC is grateful that the Committee on Committees identified collaborative and productive members to fill unexpected vacancies this year until the subsequent FEC election cycle. The first meeting of the year was canceled due to a lack of quorum when a full committee had not yet been appointed, although all deadlines for FEC responses were still met.

In spring 2020 a call for nominations was sent to all L&S faculty and an election was conducted under the regulations of the Senate. The following members were elected to serve on the FEC through August 2022:

Peter Ford, Chemistry and Biochemistry
David Paul, Music
Kevin Whitehead, Sociology
2019-20 FEC committee members

Walid Afifi, Communication
Peter Ford, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Sabine Frühstück, East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies (Vice-Chair)
Laurie Monahan, History of Art and Architecture (through fall quarter 2019)
David Paul, Music (from January 2020)
James Roney, Psychological and Brain Sciences (Chair)
Kevin Whitehead, Sociology

Ex officio members:
Jeff Stopple, AVC and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science

Student representatives:
Aimee Wang, Associated Students
Surojit Kayal, Graduate Student Association
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met a total of 62 times, approximately 2-3 hours per session, during the 2019-20 term. All meetings were held in executive session; transitioning to secure, remote meetings in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 campus closure. In addition, CAP leadership met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel throughout the 2019-20 personnel cycle.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Committee on Academic Personnel serves as a reviewing agency for all “expanded review” academic personnel actions and as an auditing agency for all additional academic personnel actions. The Committee equitably evaluates and reports recommendations for such actions in accordance with campus and systemwide guidelines, and provides advice on UC and campus issues pertaining to academic personnel.

The 2019-20 academic year included the following:

- Reviewed 364 academic personnel cases (including 42 post audits of Dean’s Authority cases), resulting in 406 personnel actions in 2019-20.
- Reviewed the biannual proposed revisions to the Red Binder
- Provided advice to the Senate Chair, the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC), the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel (AVC), and the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) on a number of UC policy issues.
- Met and consulted with the Deans, the AVC, and the EVC on the academic personnel review process at the beginning of the 2019-20 cycle
- Participated in orientations for department chairs and personnel analysts regarding the academic personnel review process
- Participated in tenure and promotion workshops for faculty members
I. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, expanded review merit advancements, and promotions. A total of 406 personnel actions were reviewed; a summary of the workload appears in Tables I and II attached to this report. CAP members recused themselves from cases from their own departments and in cases of conflict of interest, or the potential for perceived conflict of interest, with the candidate. The deans continued the established practice of review of normative merit advancements (Dean’s Authority) and appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor Steps II and III at starting salaries within a defined range, whenever the recommendations of deans and departments agreed. For cases in which salary recommendations between the respective dean and CAP differed by $4,000 or more, or when the recommended step differed between the dean and CAP, the Associate Vice Chancellor issued a Tentative Decision to one or both parties for comment. CAP conducted post audits of all Dean’s Authority merit cases and case deferrals of professors at the Assistant Professor or Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment ranks, subsequent to the actions of the deans. A Post Audit Report was submitted at the end of the cycle.

CAP’s review of individual merit and promotion cases, in accordance with Red Binder policy and APM 210-1-d, focused for the Professor series on the 4 areas of (a) research and creative activities, (b) teaching and mentoring, (c) professional activities, and (d) service, and for the Lecturer SOE series on the 3 review areas of (a) teaching, (b) professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, and (c) service. In its review, CAP took into account contributions to diversity and equal opportunity, following guidelines in APM 210-1-d and Red Binder I-75-VIII. CAP encourages candidates to submit (when appropriate) optional self-assessments concerning teaching, research, and contributions to diversity. These optional documents often provide valuable information that assists reviewing agencies in making more informed evaluations of personnel cases.

II. REVIEW COMMITTEES

CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee for promotion to tenure cases in which both the dean and the department recommended tenure. In addition, CAP continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for other promotion and career reviews unless deemed necessary for fair and equitable judgment. (No such cases arose in 2019-20.) CAP convened a “Shadow CAP,” appointed by the AVC, to evaluate one Expanded Review merit case of a current CAP member.

III. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY ISSUES

A number of policy issues were notable in the course of the 2019-20 academic year, some of longstanding concern. These included:

A. Solicitation of Extramural Letters for Appointments, Promotions, & Barrier Steps

In a handful of cases, CAP found the set of extramural letters submitted with the dossier to depart unduly from Red Binder guidelines. CAP (like other reviewing agencies) may request that additional letters be obtained in such cases, which can significantly delay case consideration. Departments are reminded to carefully follow
Red Binder guidelines in soliciting extramural letters, or to provide a compelling explanation when those guidelines cannot be followed.

B. Service
As one of the areas of review, CAP treats service (appropriate to rank) as an integral component in making its recommendations. Thus, CAP expects faculty and departments to give this area appropriate attention. In addition to service on Academic Senate committees, the Office of Academic Personnel has compiled a list of other possible campus service opportunities to assist faculty in this area: https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.academic.employees/service.opportunities.pdf

C. Providing Context
CAP depends on departments and deans to provide context for understanding the nature and scope of a candidate’s service, professional activities, and/or the importance of awards and honors. Without appropriate context, CAP at times finds it challenging to evaluate the differing demands of service positions across departments/divisions as well as the diverse range of campus service roles, especially in connection with UCSB’s many research centers and ORUs. Similarly, without necessary context CAP can have difficulty gauging the workload and significance of professional activities and evaluating accomplishments such as prizes or awards.

D. Collaborative Research
CAP depends on departments to provide sufficient background to allow reviewing agencies to evaluate the nature and scope of a candidate’s contributions to collaborative research. Without such information, CAP can find it difficult to evaluate a candidate’s contributions to scholarly work, especially when there are large numbers of co-authors on publications.

E. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching and Accounting for Teaching Load
CAP observes that a number of departments did not fully adhere to Red Binder requirements for the documentation and evaluation of teaching. First, it was not uncommon to find that departments failed to provide an accurate account of candidates’ teaching loads over the review period or furnish clear statements regarding how the candidate met the required teaching load. Red Binder I-27 requires that “The bio-bib should also contain a statement of normal teaching workload for the department overall (e.g., 2-2-1) and a brief explanation of any deviations from this workload (e.g., sabbatical, administrative assignment).” Second, in some cases, an insufficient number of sources for evaluating the teaching record were provided. As Red Binder I-34-VI states: “At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory.” CAP hopes that policy on criteria for the evaluation of teaching and accounting for the teaching load will be closely followed to avoid delays in processing personnel cases. Red Binder states in section I-75-V: “Reviewing agencies will return cases to the departments if they do not conform to these guidelines.”
F. Justification for Early Advancement and Accelerations
CAP notes with concern that a number of cases deviated from the qualifying criteria detailed in Red Binder I-36 in recommendations for accelerations in time and/or off-scale, particularly at the level of Above Scale.

IV. CAMPUS ISSUES

A. Report from ESCI ad hoc Committee
The ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching conducted a review of the current ESCI system, which included a study on systems of teaching evaluation both within the UC system and at other universities. CAP was asked to provide commentary on the findings of the report.

B. Report from ad hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluation
The ad hoc committee on Online Course evaluation provided a report on the background of online course evaluations and suggestions for implementation. CAP offered feedback on these recommendations.

C. Proposed Changes to Threshold for Dean’s Review Personnel Cases
CAP reviewed the proposed “Change to threshold for Dean’s Review personnel cases” from the Chairs of the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts and responded to the recommendation.

D. Proposed Changes to “Guidelines for Advancements: Academic Senate Titles”
CAP reviewed the proposed changes to the guidelines for advancements in the academic senate series and provided feedback and recommendations.

E. COVID-19 and CAP Practice
Due to the implications of COVID-19 for the campus environment, CAP made a number of necessary adjustments to ensure the timely completion of personnel cases, maintaining the highest standards of review. Further, this led to a recommendation that all materials in subsequent review cycles be submitted electronically, when possible.

F. CAP FAQ
CAP updated the newly created frequently asked questions (FAQ) page addressing the academic review process at UCSB and the role of the faculty senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The information is available via the Academic Senate website and the Academic Personnel website.

G. Revisions to the Red Binder
The Office of Academic Personnel disseminates to all Senate Faculty and appropriate administrators and committees any proposed revisions to the Red Binder, typically biannually in the fall and spring. CAP reviewed the proposed revisions circulated for comment in January 2020, May 2020, and July 2020. Additionally, CAP made recommendations for revisions to Red Binder I-36, I-43, and I-75. Consultations involved updates to several sections, including: https://ap.ucsb.edu/policies.and.procedures/red.binder/drafts/
V. SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES

A. Recommendations and Procedures for CAP Discussion and Consideration:

1. At the request of divisional Chair Bohn, CAP reviewed reports, recommendations, and analyses pertaining to:
   a. UC-wide Off-Scale Compensation
   b. UC-wide Above Scale Compensation
   c. COVID-19 exemptions and practices

2. CAP reviewed informational documents regarding ongoing systemwide discussions, as well as pertinent academic personnel approaches at other UC campuses, including:
   a. Proposed Revision of APM 230, Visiting Appointments
   b. Proposed Revision of APM 120, Emerita/Emeritas Titles
   c. Proposed Revision of APM 240, Deans, and 246, Faculty Administrators (100% Time)

VI. CARRY-OVER ISSUES FOR 2020-21

A. Campuswide recommendation for teaching evaluations and ongoing use of ESCIs

B. Evaluation of diversity statements and contributions to diversity

C. Integration of COVID Statements into review process

D. Continued discussion among reviewing agencies of areas of concern from Section III

E. Development of recommendations for optional self-assessments

F. Update of 2012 study on faculty advancement in the Humanities

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND APPRECIATION

UCSB’s process for reviewing faculty merit cases is complex and time-consuming, as it is designed to satisfy both UC’s tradition of shared governance and a strong desire on all sides to treat faculty across campus in an equitable and transparent fashion. The practice of having one faculty committee that looks at all campus cases grows from and upholds UCSB’s unique culture of interdisciplinary collaboration and cooperation. The entire complex process works only because of the committed efforts of many different individuals and groups, too numerous to name here.

CAP deeply appreciates the enormous amount of labor that departmental chairs, personnel committees, and analysts expend each Fall in preparing cases for review. CAP also thanks the home departments of this year’s committee for allowing our members to rearrange their own departmental workloads in order to accommodate the rigorous demands of CAP service.

CAP thanks the Academic Senate staff, headed by Debra Blake, its Analyst Jackie Grossberg, and its information technology staff, headed by Andy Satomi, for unfailing support, assistance, and advice in all matters.
2019-20 Committee Members:
Ann J. Adams, History of Art and Architecture
Stanley M. Awramik, Earth Science
Eileen Boris, Feminist Studies
Michael T. Bowers, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Rodney Garratt, Economics
B.S. Manjunath, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Kathleen Moore, Religious Studies
Dar Roberts, Geography
Omar Saleh, Materials, Biomolecular Science and Engineering Program
Sven Spieker, Germanic and Slavic Studies
Janet Walker, Film and Media Studies
Ruth Finkelstein, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology (Vice Chair)
Dana Mastro, Communication (Chair)
## TOTALS TABLES AND COMPARISON TABLES

*Tables I, II, and III are included with CAP's official annual report to be ratified by the Faculty Legislature.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Action</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair and visiting professor appts)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review (Prof Above, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CAP REVIEWED CASES**

| Series Transfers | 2     |
| Mandatory Reviews (included in Merits total) | 24    |
| No Change (included in Merits total) | 13    |
| Tentatives | 32    |

**TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS**

<p>| 438 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II - Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019-20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee in promotion to tenure cases in which both deans and departments recommended tenure. In addition, CAP continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for other promotion and career reviews unless deemed necessary for fair and equitable judgment (no such cases in 2019-2020).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actions requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of Ad Hoc Review Committees</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of cases submitted to CAP covering 406 personnel actions:** **438**
### Table III - 15-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair appts)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Committees (prev. SOE/Prof)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Audits of Dean's Authority (prev. Routine) Cases</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Initial Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER ACTIONS (INCLUDED IN MERIT TOTALS)**

| Mandatory Reviews/No Change (included in Merits total) | 38 | 11 | 27 | 21 | 29 | 26 | 21 | 27 | 23 | 14 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 24 | 1 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Series Transfers (Transfer completed as part of merit/promotion case) | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees**

| Number of ad hoc committees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 6 | 16 | 18 | 21 | 29 | 37 | 52 | 53 | 46 | 46 | 67 |

**Agreement Between Reviewing Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Submitted - No of Cases</th>
<th>Dean Yes</th>
<th>Dean No</th>
<th>Dean +</th>
<th>Dean -</th>
<th>Ad Hoc Yes</th>
<th>Ad Hoc No</th>
<th>Ad Hoc +</th>
<th>Ad Hoc -</th>
<th>CAP Yes</th>
<th>CAP No</th>
<th>CAP +</th>
<th>CAP -</th>
<th>Final Yes</th>
<th>Final No</th>
<th>Final +</th>
<th>Final -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDFH's Chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL APPOINTMENTS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROMOTIONS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANDED REVIEW (PREV. NON-Routine) MERITS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Prof/VI above</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Merits</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDICES**

- **Endowed Chair**
  - Not Applicable
  - Not Reviewable
  - Tenured

**PROMOTIONS**

- Associate Professor/Lecture SOE
- Professor/Associate Professor
- Professor/Professor

**TOTAL PROMOTIONS**

- 47
- 47
- 0
- 10
- 5
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 9
- 24
- 8
- 16
- 12
- 21
- 8
- 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconsiderations</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Review (CER)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MERITS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIES TRANSFERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Series to LSOE Series</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE Series to Professor Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SERIES TRANSFERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEARCH WAIVERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SEARCH WAIVERS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETENTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RETENTIONS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL CASES</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table shows the number of instances in which each reviewing agency agreed (Yes) or disagreed (No) with the departmental recommendation. The "plus" and "minus" columns reflect whether a reviewing agency's recommendation was above the departmental recommendation (+) or below the departmental recommendation (-). Inaccurate totals occur in some instances (bolded) for the following reasons: a number of cases are still pending; in certain cases, the Dean submits the original recommendation; some ad hoc committees opted not to make a specific recommendation; some candidates withdrew before the review process was completed or a reviewing agency may recommend a different step and salary altogether from the department.
Committee on Diversity and Equity
Annual Report 2019-20

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Committee Charge
The charge of the Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) is to work towards attaining the campus goals of diversity and equity and actively pursue the goals of affirmative action.

Membership
The Committee on Diversity and Equity consists of a Chair and at least five members. The Director of the Equal Opportunity and Discrimination Prevention Office and Director of the Title IX and Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Office serve as ex-officios on the committee. In addition, there is one non-Senate academic representative, one undergraduate student, and one graduate student representative.

Summary of CDE activities over 2019-20
There were a total of fourteen regularly scheduled meetings of the Committee over the 2019-20 term, as well as three meetings regarding specific issues. CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were: 1) working with the Committee on Academic Personnel on more clear instructions for contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statements for promotion and tenure, 2) discussing, researching and proposing a UCSB opt out Stop the Clock policy for faculty during the time of COVID-19, 3) building liaisons with new Faculty Equity Advisors, 4) building more open lines of communication with Student Affairs, 5) reviewing systemwide and divisional policy proposals and revisions, 6) continuing the second year of advertising, reviewing and awarding the Faculty Diversity award on campus as an Academic Senate award.

CDE discussed all of these topics at length and shared its recommendations with Academic Senate Chair Henning Bohn and incoming Chair-Elect Scott when appropriate. Topics and recommendations are briefly described below.

Reviews of Systemwide UC Issues

Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation
In September, Chair Morgan Consoli asked members to review the Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and repatriation in preparation for an upcoming University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity discussion. The proposed revisions would vastly change and expand the existing policy. Members had questions including the availability of enough qualified people to serve in some of the specific positions; if spiritual leaders would volunteer their time; and if UC is the only university system with a policy like this.

UC and CSU Anti-Bias Training Program
This year, the two university systems held a UC and CSU Anti-Bias Training Pilot Program. Just Communities was selected to develop the training program. The training program was developed for four specific populations: faculty, senior administrators, students, and staff. Campuses chose 10 participants from each of these four populations to attend an in-person training at a designated location. Chair Morgan Consoli and members Cynthia Benelli and Laurie Freeman attended the training.
over March 8-10 in Northridge. Member Freeman thought that there were some useful pieces but that some of the material was not always cohesive. Chair Morgan Consoli thought that this version was more interactive than the pre-pilot version she attended in December with ex-officio member, Ricardo Alcaíno, and that they did a good job making the training non-threatening and applicable to faculty. There were concerns, however, that there seemed to be data collection happening for a research project, but none remembered signing a waiver allowing for this. They provided feedback in their own evaluations.

Report of the Working Group on Comprehensive Access
In February, CDE discussed the Report of the Working Group on Comprehensive Access. The Working Group was charged with developing recommendations for UC’s collaborations with other health systems. The Working Group was divided, and two options were presented. CDE members expressed that this is an extremely complex matter and that there will be issues of access for different people no matter which option UC chooses. After much discussion, members agreed that they supported option #2, prohibiting affiliations with non-UC entities that prohibit certain services. It was felt that UC should stand on its own values. Members also expressed that for too long, UC has provided funding, research and training to these healthcare facilities, which has allowed their influence to grow across the state. Members hoped that UC would take a thoughtful look at the scope of damage this may cause to existing medical services, especially for UC faculty, staff and students, and consider a phase-out of some of these affiliations instead of cutting the cord immediately.

Report of the Academic Council’s Standardized Testing Task Force
In February, CDE discussed the Report of the Academic Council’s Standardized Testing Task Force, which analyzed UC’s use of standardized test scores for undergraduate admissions. The Committee felt that the most persuasive arguments in the report centered on the ways in which the ACT/SAT legitimize inequality, and how the University of California has supported and promoted systemic discrimination by continuing to use them. Most members were in support of removing the test scores as an admission requirement, and wanted to encourage UC to find a more timely solution other than the current nine-year timeframe to create its own test and expand the Eligibility in Local Context (ELC) program, which only considers high school grades for admission. Academic Chair Bhavnani was present at this meeting and provided additional insights for the members.

BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT-SAT Essay Requirement
In February, CDE reviewed the BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT-SAT Essay Requirement. Members agreed that if the exam is not being utilized for any admission purposes, and since there has been much controversy around the “test-fairness” with regard to diverse populations, then there is no reason to require it. CDE supported the elimination of this requirement.

Proposed Presidential Policy: Gender Recognition and Lived Name
In April, CDE reviewed the proposed Presidential Policy on Gender Recognition and Lived Name, which would expand the gender options on university documents and systems. The majority of members fully supported this proposal, while a couple of members questioned the necessity and purpose of collecting such data.

Reviews of Campus Issues

Faculty Diversity Award
Over fall and winter quarters, CDE prepared to award the second annual Faculty Diversity Award. The Committee reviewed and revised accordingly the guidelines and scoring rubric. The number of nominee packets received was much less than last year, so members discussed ways to increase publicity next year. The selection committee, comprised of CDE members and last year’s award winner, met in March to select the recipient. The 2020 Faculty Diversity Award was awarded to Kip Fulbeck, Professor in the Department of Art, at the April 30 Faculty Legislature meeting.

Consultation with Executive Vice Chancellor
In October, CDE met with Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall to discuss the Faculty Equity Advisor (FEA) program. Members had many questions they wanted the EVC to address, including what the overall vision of the FEA program is, what training looks like, and how the FEAs will interact with department equity committees.

EVC Marshall first presented an overview of diversity activities and initiatives in Academic Affairs, including diversity research, extramural funding and grant proposals for diversity initiatives, training, Faculty Diversity Enrichment Awards, and UC Advancing Faculty Diversity Grants. The EVC then explained the history of the FEA program at UCSB. FEAs were envisioned as faculty who would work in the Dean’s office; faculty recruitment would be core of the position. The AVC would be an important convener of the group. The EVC consulted with the Academic Senate last year about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statements. Over this past summer, some constituents, such as Deans and the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women, made it known that they thought the FEAs should have Associate Dean titles.

The Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors were appointed on July 1, 2019. Each college/school/division has one FEA. Deans have the ability to set priorities for their FEA. FEAs were tasked this year to look at including Contribution to Diversity Statements in faculty job applications. The Gevirtz Graduate School of Education agreed to be a pilot program for requiring these statements this year. The program will be assessed at the end of this first year, with the hope of reviewing annually to see what is or is not working. The FEAs have been meeting regularly to be trained, learn best practices, and/or discuss how the program should move forward.

Members had a variety of questions for the EVC, including the possibility of making diversity training mandatory for departments, how CDE could interact with the FEAs, and how the program is being introduced to campus. The EVC assured the CDE they would be involved with the FEAs.

Report of ESCI Ad Hoc Committee
In November, CDE reviewed the Report of the ESCI Ad Hoc Committee. Members wanted the discriminatory and inequitable aspects that have been found in student evaluations (scoring women and underrepresented minority faculty lower) to be highlighted further and more explicitly. Some felt quicker action on removing ESCIs from consideration in personnel reviews is needed. Finally, one member also had deep concerns about the lack of a statistician on the ad hoc committee. It was suggested that the ad hoc committee recruit a statistician.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations
In November, CDE discussed the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations, which was tasked with reassessing the possibility of an online system for course evaluations. Members had concerns about the low response rates in departments currently using online evaluations, accessibility
issues, and the use of incentives. Overall, CDE supported moving the campus to online course evaluations, as long as low response rates and accessibility are meaningfully addressed.

Consultations with Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors
In December, CDE was joined by three of the Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors: Sarah Anderson from the Bren School, Julie Carlson from the Humanities and Fine Arts Division and the Department of English, and Joan-Emma Shea from the Math, Life, and Physical Sciences Division and the Departments of Chemistry and Physics. The FEAs have been meeting every other week and their main focus in the first year is the faculty hiring process, and how best to engage with department search committees from the beginning to end. FEAs are trying to meet with all search committees to make themselves available as a resource. They have created best practices checklists for each step of the process. FEAs from different divisions are focusing on different things; those in smaller divisions with less faculty searches are beginning to dabble with student and staff climate issues. The FEAs are in flux due to there being no Vice Chancellor of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and no interim until one is hired. Another issue they would like to work on is faculty retention. This is difficult to study as there really is no available data to review. Members and the FEAs discussed issues that CDE and the FEAs could collaborate on, such as improving APM 210 and faculty diversity statements, receiving Academic Program Review and Academic Personnel data, and liaising with each other’s groups on a regular basis.

Priority Registration
Winter quarter Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple joined CDE to discuss inequities with undergraduate priority registration. AVC Stopple shared data showing that first-generation and underrepresented minority (URM) students are less likely to be a part of the two largest groups of students that receive priority registration, honors program and Disabled Students Program (DSP). It is a perk now abused by some students who only want to be a part of honors or DSP in order to have priority registration. AVC Stopple wants to propose eliminating all honors students from priority registration (which includes College of Letters & Science honors, College of Engineering honors, all College of Creative Studies students, and Regents Scholars) and some DSP accommodations. There are already plans to change the way that incoming students can use units earned through tests (like Advanced Placement) to have earlier pass times. AVC Stopple has met with the Undergraduate Council and it is supportive of a change. CDE awaits a draft proposal to review.

APM 210d/ Red Binder I-75
Winter and spring quarters CDE worked with Committee on Academic Personnel Chair Dana Mastro to suggest revised, more clear and instructive language for faculty including an APM 210d statement in their review files. At UCSB, this is Red Binder Section 1-75-VIII, “Self-Assessment of Contributions to Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (“Diversity Statement””). CDE and CAP Chair Mastro met in March to discuss ideas for additional language. CDE members thought that coming up with recommendations for Deans and Chairs, possibly as a set of guidelines, could provide some guidance to departments. Members also agreed that standardization is a critical missing piece, and asked if Divisional Chair Bohn could speak with Academic Personnel about why they say that UCSB cannot require diversity statements. CAP preferred all language regarding APM 210 be in one place.

The new wording was sent to Divisional Chair Henning Bohn and AVC of Academic Personnel Alison Butler for review and approval and subsequent inclusion in the UCSB Red Binder.

All Gender Restroom Policy Drafting Committee
Member Laurie Freeman represented CDE on the campus All Gender Restroom Policy Drafting Committee, which was looking at campus policies around gender-neutral bathrooms. There is a desire on the UCSB campus to develop a more robust gender-neutral restroom policy, create more single use bathrooms in buildings, and ensure that new buildings have equal access restrooms. The committee worked on the draft policy, an FAQ, and testimonials. Members asked if they could see the final version of the policy when it is ready. The policy will be distributed widely for comment in the fall.

Consultations with Student Affairs
CDE invited leaders from the Division of Student Affairs to two CDE meetings this year.

In January, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Life Katya Armistead, Coordinator of Equity & Inclusion in the Office of the Dean of Students Enn Burke, and Director of LGBT Resources Craig Leets, joined CDE to discuss some of the diversity initiatives and resources that the Office of Student Life provides. Members learned about the initiatives the Resource Center for Sexual and Gender Diversity (RCSGD) has for students, faculty and staff, and the projects that the Coordinator of Equity and Inclusion works on. Members discussed with the guests how faculty could navigate Student Affairs, if an orientation for new faculty would be helpful, and that hopefully the new Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, when hired, would be able to pull some of the many areas working on diversity issues on campus together.

In May, AVC Armistead and Coordinator Burke returned to discuss with CDE initiatives that Student Affairs has undertaken in response to COVID-19. Students faced a host of challenges, including not having access to technology needed for remote learning, poor home environments, and basic needs insecurity. Undocumented students were not eligible for CARES Act funding. Queer and LGBTQ+ could not access affirming services and may be living with family they are not out to. Suggestions for ways that faculty could help were to keep workload expectations realistic, understand that students feel overwhelmed, and to give positive feedback. Members also discussed ways they are being innovative and flexible with their curriculum.

Stop the Clock Opt Out Recommendations
CDE was alerted by Ex Officio member Ricardo Alcaíno that other UC campuses were requesting opt out Stop the Clock policies for their junior faculty. Currently, an assistant professor can “stop the clock” two times; a request for a third has to be submitted to and approved by the UC Provost. Other universities were granting blanket exceptions, and professional associations were recommending this course of action. The pandemic’s effect on junior faculty productivity will have a disproportionate effect on some populations (specifically women and faculty of color), and some departments are not accepting of the current tenure clock extension policies. Chair Morgan Consoli consulted with the Faculty Equity Advisors, who were also composing a recommendation in this area. The Committee wrote a memo suggesting research and evidence in support of granting automatic tenure clock extensions, and mentioned the endorsement of the FEAs in the letter.

COVID-19 Pandemic
Spring quarter, CDE discussed consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic over multiple meetings. Topics included:
- Academic quality concerns if summer and fall quarter must also be remote.
- Student issues, such as insufficient WiFi access, bad home environments, student mental health, the need for more TA resources, food and housing insecurity, and interruptions to doctoral funding and time-to-degree.
● Diversity and equity issues, which included the stop the clock policy concerns, interruptions to attempts to diversify faculty, and potential budget impacts.

Search for Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
CDE participated in the search for the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Chair Morgan Consoli had conversations with the search firm, and CDE members participated in the interview process with the four final candidates. At this time CDE is waiting to hear the Chancellor’s view on recommended applicants.

Institutional Racism Letter
Post spring quarter, some CDE members authored and signed a letter that was sent to Senate Chair Bohn and Chair-Elect Scott encouraging proactive steps that the campus should take to combat institutional racism, in the context of current racial injustice protests and call for action around the nation.

CDE Chair Work
Chair Morgan Consoli was involved with numerous campus initiatives, which supported the work of the committee:
● Served as the UCSB representative on the systemwide University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity
● Served on hiring committees for the Student Affairs position of Director of Women, Gender and Sexual Equity
● Met with the Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors, Student Affairs leaders, and other campus constituents working with diversity and equity issues
● Served on the UCSB Action Collaborative taskforce
● Served on the Academic Senate Executive Council

Pending Issues for CDE in 2020-21
● Continuing discussions about training for faculty hiring committees, as well as sensitivity training for faculty
● Continuing to expand collaboration with other campus entities doing diversity work, hopefully under the organization of a new AVC for DEI
● Possibly collaborating with Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to work on retention of URM students
● Discussing the creation of an African Center
● Inviting the new director of Black Student Development to meet with CDE
● Reviewing current policies and seeing what updates should be made to be inclusive of all groups
● Reviewing effects of likely reduction of staff support for faculty and student

Members 2019-20
Melissa Morgan Consoli, Chair, UCAADE Rep  Associate Professor, Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology
Bjorn Birnir  Professor, Mathematics
Miroslava Chavez-Garcia  Professor, History
Mhoze Chikowero  Associate Professor, History
Laurie Freeman  Associate Professor, Political Science
Philip Lubin  Professor, Physics
Jason Marden  Associate Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Cynthia Benelli, Non-Senate Academic Rep

Ricardo Alcaino, Ex-Officio Director, Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention Office

Ariana Alvarez, Ex-Officio Director, Title IX & Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Office

Paulina Ramirez Niembro, GSA Rep

Jocelyn Tapia, Undergraduate Student Rep

Kelly Rivera, Advisor
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) held nine regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year and consulted with relevant campus administrators regarding issues within its purview.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As per the Academic Senate bylaws, the purpose of CIE is “to provide advice and consent on all matters of international education and exchange, including practices that impact exchange students and scholars.”

During the 2019-2020 academic year, CIE:

- Provided review of Memorandums of Understanding with international institutions.
- Prepared for survey presentation of international undergraduate students results and biennial workshop.
  - Analysis of the results were distributed in Winter 2020. Reviewed systemwide policy concerning UC international activities.
- Consulted with administration as needed including:
  - Simran Singh (Director, Office of International Students)
  - Leesa Beck (Registrar)
  - Juan Campo (Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program)
  - David Marshall (Executive Vice Chancellor)
  - Lisa Przekop (Director, Office of Admissions)
  - Tricia Rascon (Director of Orientation Programs & Parent Services)
International Agreements

1. Memorandum of Understanding between UCSB and the Max Planck Institutes for Empirical Aesthetics, for Psycholinguistics and for Human Development

CIE reviewed and endorsed the MOU. However, the committee recommended MOU include explicit information regarding any funding obligations that it may incur.

2. CIE Response to the Memorandum of Understanding between UCSB and the Tohoku University Graduate School of Science

CIE reviewed and endorsed the MOU between UCSB and the Tohoku University Graduate School of Science.

3. MOU between UCSB and the University of Newcastle and Automation and Control Global Research Network

CIE endorsed the proposed MOU between UCSB and the University of Newcastle and Automation and Control Global Research Network. CIE noted that, due to the multilateral nature of this agreement, it is unclear how individual collaborations and exchanges between the various institutions named within the MOU would be arranged. CIE suggested that this be clarified within the MOU, and endorsed with the understanding that any such arrangements will be negotiated via appropriate campus channels

Survey of International Undergraduate Students and CIE Workshop

Last year, CIE conducted its 5th biennial survey of international undergraduate students between May and June 2019. The survey was commissioned by the Academic Senate, carried out by the Office of Budget and Planning, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (IRPA), with support from the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor. The online questionnaire was distributed via email to undergraduate international students, of which 461 completed the survey, resulting in a final response rate of 21.8%. The survey results were analyzed by a graduate student in the Statistics and Applied Probability Department and further comparative analysis continued over the summer.

In February 2020, CIE began preparations for the biennial CIE Workshop. The committee had planned to present on the results of the survey.

Three leading factors that correlated with satisfaction in overall social experience:

1. Opportunities to make friends, meet people from a different country, and to make friends with American students
2. Overall academic experience
3. Satisfaction with help received to develop English language proficiency.
There were four top factors that correlated with satisfaction in overall academic experience:

1. Overall social experience
2. Opportunities to make friends, meet people from a different country, and to make friends with American students
3. Effectiveness of UCSB communicating information and guidance about academic standards, expectations of a US research University
4. Overall sense of being a valued member of the UCSB community.

CIE was unable to present the results and the CIE Workshop (expected to take place in April 2020) was cancelled due to the COVID-19 crisis.

Information Items

- Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations
- BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT-SAT Essay Requirement
- UCIE internationalization memo

Local Issues

1. Evaluation System for Courses and Instruction (ESCI)

The Committee found the Report of the ESCI Ad Hoc Committee to be comprehensive and well documented. While the Ad Hoc Committee’s report addressed inherent biases against certain groups of instructors, CIE felt that it did not explicitly consider biases that arise from differences in English language proficiency or nationality. These biases may negatively affect international faculty members or international students in instructional roles. Therefore, it seemed valuable to consider concerns that are specific to this population when considering a potential redesign of the instructional evaluation process. It may also be important to recognize cross-cultural differences in the way students perceive the evaluation process.

International students seem to have a different view on student-teacher relationships which is often manifested in different (i.e., more formal and impersonal) styles of communication. These views may also manifest within the teaching evaluation process. CIE believed improved guidance for students regarding the nature of the teaching evaluation process, and suggested that a brief discussion of UCSB’s expectations about teaching evaluations within the student orientation programs provided by the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) be included.

2. CIE Response to the Internationalization Memo

CIE reviewed the Internationalization Memo: Recognizing International Activities as Part of the Merit, Tenure, and Promotion Process at the University of California. The proposal was prepared with input from UC Senior International Officers (SIOs) across all UC campuses, with the exception of UC Santa Barbara, which does not have an SIO. In response to the memo, the committee supported recognizing international activities as
part of merit, tenure, and promotion processes. In addition, the committee would also like to reiterate the importance of having an SIO to oversee internationalization efforts at UC Santa Barbara.

Systemwide Issues

3. CIE Response to Systemwide Review of BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT/SAT Essay Requirement

The committee reviewed and discussed the report on the Systemwide Review of BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT/SAT Essay Requirement. In response to the report, the committee felt that this should not affect international students and does not see issues arising due to other comprehensive assessments of international students such as Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), English Language Proficiency (ELP), and the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE).

4. CIE Response to the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) Memo

The Committee reviewed and discussed the report on the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF). The committee found the report to be comprehensive and well-grounded in evidence. After consulting with the local admission office, the committee expressed that standardized testing played an important role in the admission of international students and in the assessment of the “Compare Favorably” policy required for nonresident domestic and international students admitted to a UC campus. The committee stressed that changes in the use of standardized testing will require a restructuring of admission policies for international students.

Coordination with Administration

Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS)

The Director of OISS is a frequent attendee of meetings and is a valuable resource to inform CIE of current OISS initiatives, as well as news and policies that relate to the international community on campus.

Leesa Beck, Registrar, Office of the Registrar

The Registrar was consulted for clarification on the proposal concerning student conduct and degree clearance.

Juan Campo, Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program

The Director of EAP is an ex officio member of the Committee and acts as a resource regarding information about EAP.

David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor, UCSB
The Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor provided continued support for CIE’s biennial survey of international undergraduate students. CIE worked with EVC Marshall to add several new questions to the survey for 2019.

Lisa Przekop, Director, UCSB Office of Admissions

The Director was consulted regarding admissions procedures for international students and methods for testing English proficiency for international students.

Tricia Rascon, Director of Orientation Programs & Parent Services

The Director was consulted regarding orientation programs and procedures for international students, with particular attention to the registration process and programs to help inform students about the standards for academic integrity at UCSB.

Carry-over Issues and Future Initiatives

- Responses to results and committee recommendations for Survey for 2020-21
- Addressing COVID-19 impacts International Students
- Campus resources for international students
- Preparation for Biennial International Student Survey, including COVID-19 related impacts to questions.
- Monitor needs of international scholars and visiting faculty

MEMBERS:

Javier A. Birchenall, Chair and UCIE Representative
Maurizia Boscaglia
Erika D. Felix
Werner Kuhn
Cyrus Safinya
Spencer Smith
Candace Waid
Thomas Weimbs
Haochen Long, Undergraduate Student Rep
Juan E. Campo, EAP Campus Director, Ex Officio
Marsha G. Bankston, Associate Registrar, Consultant
Cristina M. Carney, OISS, Consultant
Sara A. Cook, Assistant Registrar, Consultant
Simran Singh, OISS, Consultant
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) considers grievances, disciplinary cases, and early termination cases. When called for, the Committee conducts hearings to determine fair and equitable outcomes on matters before it.

During 2019-20, P&T responded to four new grievances and continued processing two disciplinary cases initiated the previous year.

Along with the Charges Advisory Committee and the Charges Officer, P&T responded to recommendations from the University Task Force on Faculty Disciplinary Standards.

P&T Chair Eckart Meiburg represented UCSB on the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

2018-19 Members:
Risa Brainin
Nancy Collins
Kip Fulbeck
Barbara Harthorn
Matthew Potoski
Todd Squires
Richard Startz
Toshiro Tanimoto
Vesna Wallace
Eckart Meiburg, Chair
Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections  
Annual Report 2019-20

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJE) provides clarification and interpretation of Senate legislation and Divisional procedures. It also exercises formal supervision over Senate elections and proposed modifications to the Senate manual, prior to action by the Faculty Legislature. Business is generally conducted via email. The committee and Senate staff processed the following proposals during 2019-20.

**Student Conduct-Degree Clearance Proposal**  
RJE reviewed a revised proposal to add the language “the candidate shall be in compliance with Student Code of Conduct” to various Senate Regulations governing conferral of degrees. There had been some additional questions sent back and responded to by the initiator. RJE was in support of the proposed revisions to Senate Regulations 175A, 175B, 190, 200A, 200B, 200C, 225 and 255, but requested that the language be modified to “The candidate shall be in compliance with the UCSB Student Code of Conduct”. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of January 9, 2020.

**Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 87 – Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools**  
RJE reviewed proposed revisions to the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations of Schools Bylaw 87. The revisions added an Athletics-Admissions Review Committee in response to a campus audit of Admissions. RJE approved of the language. The Faculty Legislature approved the additional language at its meeting of January 9, 2020.

**Guidance on Replacing Committee on Committee Members**  
RJE was asked by the Senate Executive Director, on behalf of the Divisional Chair, to advise on a matter concerning membership of the Committee on Committee. The Committee on Committees (CoC) is composed of elected members. Bylaw 90.C.2 explains how CoC may replace CoC members in case of an “inability to complete the prescribed term of service”, but is silent on a procedure if a CoC member is on extended leave but does not wish to resign. After careful consultation, RJE recommended that CoC appoint a replacement member when a member is on an extended leave, in order to make the workload more manageable and ensure fair representation.

**Regulation 35**  
RJE was asked by the Divisional Chair to assess Divisional Regulation 35, which imposes limitations on undergraduate students’ ability to take courses on a Passed/Not Passed (P/NP) basis. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, many universities, including other UC campuses, were waiving P/NP restrictions for the spring term. Undergraduate Council reviewed the P/NP restrictions and concluded that one-time waivers of the 7th week deadline and major limitations on P/NP graded courses should be implemented. RJE agreed that Undergraduate Council could implement these one-time waivers. RJE did, however, suggest that a formalized set of rules be drawn up for emergency situations in the future.

**College of Engineering – Proposal to Modify Senate Regulation 235A2 (Quarterly Honors)**  
RJE reviewed a proposal from the College of Engineering to modify Senate Regulation 235.A.2, governing their quarterly honors. The proposal would increase the GPA requirement from 3.50 to 3.75. RJE approved of the revised language. The Faculty Legislature approved the revision at its meeting of April 30, 2020.
Senate Manual Revisions
RJE held two meetings with the Senate staff policy workgroup to discuss a wide array of potential revisions to Senate Bylaws and Regulations. The policy workgroup has been tasked with a thorough review of the Divisional Senate Manual, which has not been updated in quite some time. RJE was presented with many editorial and conforming changes that they approved, along with some more substantive changes. Some Bylaw revisions were to be sent to Faculty Legislature for final approval, and some would continue to be worked on throughout the following year.

Proposed Revisions to Divisional Bylaws 15, 20 and 105
Based on the Senate Manual revision meetings, RJE put forward revisions to three Divisional Bylaws: 15 - Chair, 20 - Vice Chair, and 105 - Faculty Code of Conduct Charges Officer. The revisions reflected current Senate practice and consistency with systemwide Bylaws. The revisions were presented to Faculty Legislature at its meeting of June 11, 2020, and approved.

2019-20 Divisional Election
In consultation with RJE, the Academic Senate Office conducted its annual nomination process in an effort to seek candidates for the election of one Academic Senate Divisional Chair, three Senate Assembly Representatives, and four members of the Committee on Committees.

Divisional Chair
A total of five Senate members were nominated for the position of Divisional Chair; two nominations were declined. Three candidates accepted nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. A ballot was conducted over the period from February 19 through March 4, 2020, with the following results:

- **Eric Matthys** (Mechanical Engineering) – 13.91% (48 votes)
- **Susannah Scott** (Chemical Engineering) – 57.97% (200 votes)
- **Jianwen Su** (Computer Science) – 28.12% (97 votes)

Total Votes – 345 (26.34%)

Susannah Scott will serve as the next Divisional Chair.

Senate Assembly Representatives
A total of two Senate members were nominated for the position of Senate Assembly Representative; one nomination was declined. As there were three open positions, a ballot was not conducted. Isabel Bayrakdarian of Music received the requisite number of endorsements and was appointed to serve as Senate Assembly Representative. The Committee on Committee filled the remaining open positions.

Committee on Committees
A total of four Senate members were nominated to serve on the Committee on Committees; one candidate declined to accept. Three candidates were nominated, accepted the nomination, and received the requisite number of endorsements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Pierre Fouque</td>
<td>Area A: College of Letters and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics &amp; Applied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability)</td>
<td>Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division and Donald Bren School of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sturman</td>
<td>Area C: College of Letters and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(History of Art and</td>
<td>Humanities and Fine Arts Division and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture)</td>
<td>College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Petzold</td>
<td>Area D: College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mechanical Engineering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As there were no faculty nominations for the position in Area B (College of Letters and Science Social Sciences Division and Gevitz Graduate School of Education), this position was filled by an appointment by the Committee on Committees.

**RJE Members, 2019-20**

- Paul Leonardi, Chair  
  Professor, Technology Management Program
- Charles Akemann, Parliamentarian  
  Professor, Mathematics
- Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi  
  Professor, Sociology
- Ruth Hellier-Tinoco  
  Professor, Music
- Ross Melnick  
  Associate Professor, Film & Media Studies
- David Sherman  
  Professor, Psychological & Brain Sciences
- Kelly Rivera  
  Advisor
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Executive Summary

Per bylaw 60, the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW) is tasked with studying and making recommendations on any matter of faculty or broader campus community welfare and academic freedom, and rewarding excellence in research and teaching.

Highlights:

- CFW identified affordable, convenient, and quality childcare for faculty, as a priority for ongoing attention.
- The Committee on Academic Freedom discussed the definition of Academic Freedom and an executive order by President Trump.
- CFW subcommittees presented 14 awards in recognition of outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and mentorship. In their deliberations, subcommittees took into account issues of diversity and gender.

Council and Committee Meetings

CFW held nine regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year, with the last two meetings conducted via Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic. General issues and concerns are summarized below.

Systemwide Issues and Reviews

All system-wide issues CFW responded to are listed below. Issues that CFW reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included.

Draft Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Disciplinary Standards

CFW was largely supportive of efforts to increase uniformity and consistency across campuses in faculty disciplinary SVSH cases. Some members were pleased to see a general framework provided that still left campuses with the authority and flexibility to determine individual outcomes.

Proposed Revised APM 120 Emerita-Emeritus Titles

CFW members were overall supportive of proposed revisions to APM 120.

Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Copyright Ownership

CFW members overall approved of the revisions to the Presidential Policy on Copyright Ownership.

Local Business

Revision of Powered Scooter Policy

CFW members generally endorsed the revisions. One member, however, pointed out that given the shortage of parking on campus and the difficulty for some faculty to get across campus, the revised policy should be more inclusive and open to alternative transportation options. Some members expressed interest in expanded flexibility for personally-owned scooters as compared to the shared, company-owned scooters. On page 3 of the revised document, at the end of Section II.3, a clearer definition of what constitutes ‘near University Property’ is needed.

Video Camera and Video Surveillance Policy
CFW members unanimously recommended faculty participation in the Video Camera Committee. The faculty representative should be a member of the Senate Committee on Information Technology. Members expressed a desire to see a map of existing cameras on campus. They had questions about who maintains the cameras, what the archival policy is for them, and how the program is funded.

Report of ESCI Ad Hoc Committee
CFW members agreed with the findings of the ESCI Ad Hoc Committee that ESCIs are not reliable assessments of teaching and changes are desirable. Members expressed confusion about what exactly ESCI is measuring and whether students understand the purpose of ESCIs. Members strongly disapproved of incentives suggested to increase participation. They wanted to see a clear definition of excellence in teaching. They agreed ESCIs should not be used in personnel cases and expressed interest in peer evaluations in teaching assessments.

Proposed Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Policy
CFW reviewed the proposal for automated license plate reader implementation. Members wanted more information about the functionality of the surveillance system and the overall cost.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations
CFW Members agreed with the Committee that the move to online evaluations presents tremendous savings in paper use and staff time. However, they noted the irony in changing the delivery format of a course evaluations system that is already acknowledged to be flawed. Members discussed the value of deploying evaluations in class and agreed the deployment method has to be consistent. Response rates go way down and/or are taken less seriously online. Members suggested encouraging faculty to inform students, possibly by listing on the syllabus, when the evaluation is scheduled so they can plan to be in class.

Childcare Access
CFW identified childcare for faculty as a priority issue. The chair and analyst met with representatives from the Chancellor’s Advisory Task Force on Childcare, subsequently the chair joined the task force as a faculty liaison. Divisional Chair Bohn attended a CFW meeting to brief the council on the current childcare landscape. Since childcare is overseen by Student Affairs, Margaret Klawunn (Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs), Annette Muse (Early Childhood Care & Education Services Program Coordinator), and Jesse Rosenzweig (Early Childhood Care & Education Services Business Officer) attended a CFW meeting to discuss the campus childcare setup. Members unanimously endorsed the following measures:

a) Revisiting some of UCSB childcare centers’ current policies, especially the "first come first served" policy, and the priority given to siblings. The Council also noted the need to identify more precisely the community members (beyond faculty, staff, and students) who are being served by UCSB facilities.

b) Having Senate members on the board of the childcare facilities. Currently the program is administered by Student Affairs.

CFW members strongly support the allocation of temporary relief resources to Assistant Professors. This is a strategic factor when it comes to hiring faculty and is also important in retention cases. To be true to its commitment to families, it is critical for UCSB to provide affordable, quality childcare, not only for its untenured faculty, but also for its tenured faculty, staff, students, lecturers, and post-doctoral scholars.

CFW discussed additional potential mitigation strategies such as:

- the creation of an online bulletin board to help parents make cooperative arrangements with one another or connect with students who might be willing to provide emergency childcare services.
- the creation of break rooms for general use (not specifically for daycare) strategically placed around campus to allow nursing mothers to have their baby nearby, and where the baby and sitter can go when the parents are busy teaching, meeting with students, or working in their office.
- allocating the annual cost of preschool/ infant care to Assistant Professors who have infants or toddlers to help them choose directly the services that suit best their priorities as parents and accommodate their work schedules, which might not necessarily include campus childcare options.
- planning new faculty housing projects with space set aside for childcare.
The majority of CFW members endorsed the proposal from the Chancellor’s Advisory Task Force on Childcare for a new childcare facility as soon as possible.

**Classroom Recording Policy**
The members discussed the Classroom Recording Policy that their council drafted several years ago and has been under consideration by the Campus Regulations Committee for inclusion in the Student Code of Conduct. The Campus Regulations Committee raised questions regarding clarification for specific circumstances. Chair Skenazi solicited changes to the existing language at the end of Spring quarter, but the members did not think changes were necessary. This issue will be revisited in the 2020-21 year.

**Committee on Academic Freedom**

**Statement on Academic Freedom**
The University Committee on Academic Freedom proposed the adoption of a statement defining Academic Freedom with the goal of posting it to its website and disseminating it to individual campuses for inclusion in training, discussion, and syllabi. CFW reviewed this and made suggestions on a draft statement.

**Executive Order on Combating Anti-Semitism**
The Committee on Academic Freedom was approached by several faculty members about the Executive Order on Combating Anti-Semitism issued by President Donald Trump in December 2019. They expressed concern that the Order would have the effect of threatening free speech and academic freedom on UC campuses. The Order adopts a controversial redefinition of anti-Semitism from the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) that has been criticized for conflating opposition to Israeli policies with anti-Semitism. The stated purpose of the Order is to “combat the rise of anti-Semitism and anti-Semitic incidents in the United States and around the world.” The Order, however, does not just target acts of anti-Semitism or discrimination based on religion or national origin but speech that some may construe as anti-Semitic. CFW issued a statement disavowing the Executive Order, noting that a similarly problematic definition of antisemitism had been previously rejected in 2016 by UC Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance. The CFW statement was unanimously approved and sent to Divisional Chair Bohn, Chancellor Yang, and EVC Marshall.

**Senate Awards**

CFW made no significant changes to the awards guidelines this year. They recommended the establishment of best practices to provide guidance for, but not strictly govern, selection committee operations.

Four committees reviewed nomination packets for Academic Senate awards for research, teaching, and graduate student mentorship. The table below outlines the number of nominations for each award per academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DTA</th>
<th></th>
<th>DTA</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Non-Senate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The winners were announced at the Faculty Legislature meeting of April 30, 2020 (conducted via Zoom). They are as follows:

**Distinguished Teaching Award (DTA)** – Diba Mirza (Computer Science); Claudia Moser (History of Art and Architecture); Matt Rioux (Earth Science); Tyler Susko (Mechanical Engineering); Mike Wilton (Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology); Kay Young (English)

**Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award (OTA)** – An Bui (Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology); Jordan Tudisco (Comparative Literature); Daniel Martini (Comparative Literature); Stephenson Brooks Whitestone (Communication)

**Graduate Mentor Award (GMA)** – Jin Sook Lee (Education); Thuc-Quyen Nguyen (Chemistry and Biochemistry); Stuart Sweeney (Geography)

**Faculty Research Lecturer (FRL)** – Alison Butler (Chemistry and Biochemistry)

**Carry-Over Issues**
Classroom Recording Policy
Council Members
Craig A. Carlson
Leila Carvalho
Sarah Cline
Leda Cosmides, UCAF Representative
Michael Furlong
Krzysztof W. Janowicz
Hunter Lenihan, UCAF Representative
William Patrick McCray
Yukari Okamoto
Cheng-Zhong Qin
William Robinson
Denise A. Segura, Vice Chair
Ziad Matni, Non-Senate Academic Representative
Raphael Chinchilla, GSA Rep
Casey Hankey, Advisor
Cynthia Skenazi, Chair, UCFW Representative

Committee on Academic Freedom
Krzysztof Janowicz
Hunter Lenihan, UCAF Representative
Leda Cosmides, Chair, UCAF Representative

Award Committee Membership

Outstanding Teaching Assistant
Tamara Affifi - Grad Council Rep (Communication)
Craig Carlson - CFW Rep (Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology)
Andres Consoli – Grad Council Rep (Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology)
Olga Faccani, 18-19 recipient (Classics)
Ashlee Kalauli, 18-19 recipient (Mathematics)
Yukari Okamoto, Chair & CFW Rep (Education)

Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award
Silvia Bermudez, 18-19 recipient (Spanish & Portuguese)
Heather Blurton, Grad Council Rep (English)
Karen Nylund-Gibson, 18-19 recipient (Education)
Mark Rodwell, Grad Council Rep (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
Susanne Stemmer, 18-19 recipient (Materials)
Cheng Zong Qin, Chair & CFW Rep (Economics)

Distinguished Teaching Award
Felice Blake, 16-17 recipient (English)
Randi Browning, 18-19 recipient – non-Senate (Writing Program)
Allison Horst, 18-19 recipient – non-Senate (Environmental Science & Management)
Joe McFadden, 17-18 recipient (Geography)
Scott Price, 17-18 recipient – non-Senate (Chemistry)
Heather Royer, 18-19 recipient (Economics)
Denise Segura, Chair & CFW Rep (Sociology)

Faculty Research Lecturer
Nelson Lichtenstein (History) (18-19 recipient)
Patrick McCray, CFW rep (History)
Linda Putnam, 14-15 recipient (Communication)
Chuck Samuel, 16-17 recipient (Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology)
Denise Segura, CFW rep (Sociology)
Cynthia Skenazi, CFW rep (French and Italian)
John Tooby, 11-12 recipient (Anthropology)

Umesh Mishra, Chair & 17-18 recipient (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Council: To initiate, coordinate and implement academic planning that promotes the quality and diversity of the academic experience; provide advice on the campus budget, capital planning and allocations of resources and space.

Highlights: Council

- participated in the academic program review of six academic units;
- studied FTE plans from each department and college / division, met with the Deans about their unit’s FTE needs, and made recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor about new FTE allocations;
- reviewed several campus-specific proposals, including proposals to establish new centers and new degree programs;
- considered nineteen requests for Academic search waivers and two requests for an inter-departmental FTE transfer;
- reviewed four proposals to establish endowed chairs;
- sought to understand relations among its primary focus, Academic Affairs, and the division of Administration as that affects academic activities, and to improve the exchange of information and ideas;
- met with Design, Facilities & Safety Services (DFSS) and Facilities Management (FM) to understand and improve relations between academic planning and facilities maintenance and renovation;
- pursued comprehensive permanent faculty FTE accounting over multiple years
- clarified criteria used to evaluate exceptions to existing search allocations, for use in departmental planning; and
- sought to reconnect planning to budgeting by increasing the availability and circulation of budget data.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 23 regularly scheduled sessions (six in fall, seven in winter, and ten in spring). Spring quarter meetings were held on Zoom because of COVID-19.

CPB’s agendas typically included the following items:
- Academic program reviews
- Review of campus issues (proposed centers, policies, procedures, reports, etc.)
- Review of systemwide issues (reports, proposals, etc.)
- Review of departmental and college/division FTE plans
- Consultations with Deans and other University administrators
- Requests for faculty recruitment Search Waivers
- Endowed chair proposals

CPB engages with longer-term structural and policy issues that concern academic affairs and its relations to other sectors of the University. This year’s efforts will be described below. We note that Academic Affairs is directly affected by operations in Administrative Services, Institutional Development, and Student Affairs. Council structure, with its three main Committees, reflects its members’ aim to see the campus as a whole, and to improve understanding, communication, and collaboration between Academic Affairs and adjacent divisions for the mutual benefit of all.

II. Academic Program Reviews

CPB participated in the academic program review of six academic units:

1. Department of Communication
2. Joint Review:
   - Comparative Literature Program
   - Department of Germanic & Slavic Studies
   - Department of French & Italian
3. Department of Mathematics
4. Department of Statistics & Applied Probability

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Comparative Literature; Germanic & Slavic Studies; and French & Italian); Social Sciences (Communication); and Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Mathematics and Statistics & Applied Probability). There were no academic program reviews in Engineering. As per the review procedures, in fall quarter CPB studied the data notebooks and submitted a list of suggested questions to the Program Review Panel (PRP) for consideration by the respective External Review Committee (ERC). During winter quarter, the CPB chair (or designate) attended a luncheon with the External Review Committee. In spring quarter, CPB reviewed each of the External Review Committee (ERC) reports and department responses and provided further comments to the Program Review Panel (PRP).
In addition to the specific commentary provided in each of CPB’s memos, Council members noted two recurring issues: patterns of racial and gender bias (in some of the reviewed departments) that will require sustained attention and oversight; and acute resource shortages that are undermining instructional quality and putting research ambitions at risk (in all of the reviewed departments).

The Academic Senate was asked by the Executive Vice Chancellor to provide recommendations for the review by PRP in 2021-22. CPB’s recommendations were based on the length of time since the last review and consisted of: Computer Science; East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies; Music; Environmental Studies; and Anthropology. As a lower priority, CPB also suggested that Film & Media Studies and Sociology be considered for a review.

The five academic units that were ultimately chosen for review were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Unit</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Languages &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five units had previously been selected for review in 2020-21: Chemistry & Biochemistry; Computer Engineering; Economics; Linguistics; and Philosophy.

III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

The EVC authorized 25 new searches for 2019-20 across campus. This number was in addition to 46 searches carried forward, although not all carryforwards were active. We estimate that 41 searches were conducted in 2019-20, not counting the search waivers that came in during the course of the year.

CPB reviewed 19 requests for search waivers from the following units:

- Bren
- Chemistry & Biochemistry
- Chicana & Chicano Studies
- Computer Science
- Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology (CCSP)
- Earth Science
- Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology (EEMB)
- Economics
- Education
- English
- Environmental Studies
- Film & Media Studies
- Geography
- Mathematics
- Philosophy
Of these, eight were for partner hires, eight were for exceptional opportunities, and three were for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows (PPFs). CPB also reviewed two requests to make an additional hire from an open search. CPB followed the guidance of the Policy on Open Recruitment (UCSB Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures, Section VII-1-III) in making its recommendations to the EVC. CPB offered either a full or qualified endorsement in 17 cases and withheld support for two requests.

In addition, CPB supported the following requests to permanently transfer FTEs:

- 0.50 FTE transfer from Black Studies to English
- 0.50 FTE transfer from English to Global Studies

CPB endorsed the requests with the understanding that these FTEs would revert to the original Dean upon the sitting professor’s retirement/separation.

Although not all search waivers will result in hires, CPB notes that a fairly high proportion of hires originate outside of the planning process. These exceptions should be carefully monitored as a matter that can affect the shape and quality of the UCSB faculty.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB’s Policy on Endowed Chairs (Section VIII-11 of UCSB’s Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures, “Red Binder”), CPB was consulted on endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the conformity with the academic mission of our campus. Council received requests for four endowed chair proposals and submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Office of Academic Personnel.

1. **Arnhold Director of Performance in Theater & Dance**: This position will be endowed by a $1 million gift to establish an administrative chair to be attached to the department’s Director of Performance. The Director will work “…with faculty and students in dance, theater, and design to formulate the department’s schedule of performances,” and play a “key role in devising the design and production budgets of each show.”

2. **Sorensen Director of Choral Music**: The Chair will be endowed through a pledged gift from Stephen Sorensen in the amount of $1 million (paid in full by 2024) to create an administrative chair to help realize the research, teaching, and programmatic mission of the Music Department.

3. **Vimalnath Endowed Chair in Jain Studies**: The Bhagvan Vimalnath Endowed Chair in Jain Studies, a true endowment, will be established through an irrevocable three-year pledge of $1,000,000 to the UC Santa Barbara Foundation. The primary purpose of the Chair is to support the research, teaching, and programmatic activities of an appointed faculty member in Jain and South Asian Studies in the Department of Religious Studies,
and it will serve as a permanent tool to ensure strong faculty in the department by attracting and retaining top scholars.

4. **Zimmer Chair in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education**: This position will be endowed by a $1 million gift to establish an administrative chair to be attached to the Dean of GGSE “…to further the mission and excellence of the Gevirtz School by allowing the incumbent to make strategic investments in research, teaching, and public service, as well as the flexibility to address the School’s most important needs and opportunities.”

**V. Campus Issues**

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2019-20 academic year.

**FTE Planning**

The Council on Planning & Budget was consulted by the Executive Vice Chancellor for its recommendations on academic positions (“FTEs” = Full-Time Equivalent appointments). The EVC’s call for academic FTE plans was sent to the Deans in November, and it included FTE templates that called for requested authorizations to recruit new faculty during the upcoming recruitment cycle. CPB consulted with Deans during the winter and early spring quarters.

In the midst of CPB’s review, the campus budget was severely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which added much uncertainty to the planning process. A stay-at-home order in mid-March prevented in-person meetings for the rest of the academic year, although meetings continued virtually through Zoom. In April, the EVC asked Deans to revise their FTE plans in light of the current conditions. CPB received updated FTE plans in May, and it was understood that previously-authorized, unfilled positions were no longer guaranteed.

CPB spent a great deal of time in spring quarter deliberating over the Deans’ and departmental FTE plans. To the extent possible, CPB took into account additional information concerning separations, retirements, or other events that may have taken place since department plans were submitted at the end of February.

CPB provided the EVC with its final FTE recommendations in early July, which included feedback and considerations for future years.

It should be noted that CPB renewed its periodic efforts to obtain systemic academic budget information as the appropriate context in which to conduct FTE planning. Council seeks to link the two halves of its planning-and-budget purview. Early in the year, the current Chair and Immediate Past Chair visited Institutional Research in order to see whether their new Tableau-based system would allow us to get department and division-level budgetary data to use as context for our FTE assessments. The Tableau system has user-friendly data about student enrollments and movements. It does not have budgetary data, and the online Planning Data Book ([http://bap.ucsb.edu/institutional.research/planning.data.book/tables/](http://bap.ucsb.edu/institutional.research/planning.data.book/tables/)) stops with 2016-17. This basic budgetary data resource should be available to CPB and other planning
bodies on campus, where financial data is integrated with enrollment and other data. We strongly urge that this problem be fixed for the 2020-21 year.

Each Dean does bring enrollment as well as some limited budgetary information to CPB during their regular visits. We can review teaching loads by department, see comparative FTE growth patterns, and the like. With some Divisions, we are shown individual budget categories in isolation. Usually these categories tell a story of shortfalls in allocations compared to expenditures. For example, MLPS spends $909,000 for the typical ladder faculty hire from an allocation of $603,600. That Division has a temporary sub-0 (mostly TAs and lecturers) instructional allocation of $1.8M in 2018-19, and a temporary sub-0 expenditure of $14.4M. (The term “temporary” is a misnomer, since the funds cover permanent workloads.) This enormous gap is filled on an ad hoc basis every year, rather than changing the allocation to match the division’s consistent instructional needs. There are two problems with such data (in addition to the clear problem of budgeting practice): they are isolated from other parts of the divisional, college, and campus budget; and the allocational imbalance blocks rational budget decision-making (a $12.6M temp sub-0 shortfall logically suggests no ladder faculty hiring should take place in the following year, but this should not and does not happen).

Overall, CPB does not have the budgetary data that it needs to assess FTE requests properly. We can judge the coherence, consistency, and scope of academic plans in the context of instructional need, but we do not know whether the department or division have the fiscal resources to carry them out. We cannot fully respect either departmental thinking or campus resource constraints without being able to compare the resources required to the resources available.

At a minimum, Council needs data on:

1. the Division’s allocated but unfilled permanent sub-0 budget;
2. the share of that budget the Dean is able to fill that year;
3. the dollar value of the FTE referred to as “dean’s inventory” in search waiver requests—presumably (1) minus (2) with identified exceptions;
4. the Division’s start-up budget, including renovations;
5. start-up costs estimates given that division’s cost history and the mix of junior and senior positions under search; and
6. revenue shortfalls and anticipated fluctuations in the division for the coming year.

This is a short list of the information that would allow CPB to make planning judgments in the context of resource constraints. Such data would form a more valid and functional base for decision-making than our current practice. CPB has heretofore used the Deans’ plans as a baseline and made adjustments on academic planning grounds, without knowing how our (or the Deans’) recommendations affect budgets (and the many related activities budgets affect control). CPB needs the systemic budget data described above to do its job properly.

BioEngineering Program

In April, CPB reviewed the proposal to (1) create the Biological Engineering Program within the College of Engineering and MLPS in the College of Letters and Science and (2) establish a new graduate degree, a PhD in Biological Engineering, which the Program would administer. CPB felt that the strong interdisciplinary research climate at UCSB may position it to be a leader in
biological engineering, a relatively new discipline combining “engineering for biology and engineering from biology”. The Program and the new degree lie at the interface between engineering and the sciences. Together they will benefit from and complement the strong, existing research relationships between these communities at UCSB.

The Council expressed several concerns regarding the allocation of faculty and resources. The first involved the new resources that would be required to meet the challenges presented by start-up and ongoing administration of the Program, including faculty FTE, Teaching Assistants, staff resources, and space. CPB also provided feedback regarding the BioEngineering’s relations with other programs, noting that the loss of FTE from other units without replacement would cause “devastating negative impact” on the revitalization and rebranding efforts now underway in BMSE and could create competition for resources in a tight budgetary climate.

Overall, CPB strongly endorsed the proposal’s vision and plan for the new Program and associated PhD in Biological Engineering, while asking that the deans, core Program faculty, and other affected parties weigh the budgetary and planning implications together in the new post-COVID environment.

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS) 4+1 Degree**

In February, CPB reviewed the proposal to establish a Master of Science degree in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The degree is a 4+1 format, where the additional year of graduate work links to an existing BA in Geography with an emphasis in GIS. The proposed degree builds on the outstanding reputation of the department in this field and is unanimously supported by the faculty. The proposal addresses a growing need in the workforce for advanced training in GIS – including employers who specify a desire for a Master’s degree in GIS – that is not currently served within the UC system.

While finding the proposal well-crafted with important and achievable goals, CPB communicated two minor concerns. The Council endorsed the proposal and fully supported the department’s projected resource needs.

**M.Ed. in School Psychology**

In January, CPB reviewed the proposal to reinstate the M.Ed. in School Psychology. The M.Ed. program was suspended in 2013 to allow the Department of Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology (CCSP) to streamline course requirements and to ensure more robust funding for its doctoral students. With those tasks completed, the department plans to rebuild (and expand) its terminal M.Ed. program to meet the growing need for practicing school psychologists at local, state, and national levels. The Council found the proposal well-articulated and compelling in its vision and goals.

In March, the Graduate Council Graduate Council (GC) considered feedback on the proposal by a number of reviewing agencies and determined that there were a few areas of concern that needed to be further addressed. GC was generally supportive of the initiative but offered an opportunity for further refinement of the proposal before moving forward.
In May, CPB reviewed the additional materials regarding the proposal to reinstate the M.Ed. in School Psychology. While CPB previously found the proposal well-articulated and compelling in its vision and goals, we appreciate the additional information. CPB was satisfied by the initiator’s response to the Graduate Council memo, and supported the proposal.

Bren Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)

In October, CPB reviewed a request to add a Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) fee to Bren’s Master of Environmental Science & Management (MESM) degree. The members of CPB were concerned about the impact on diversity and inclusion of the proposed additional $10,000 annual tuition fee increase, though we understood the School’s need for it. Dean Gaines’s visit helped diminish our concerns, and we would like to emphasize the importance of the following components:

- A large portion of the professional fee is dedicated to providing tuition relief for students from disadvantaged backgrounds and/or in underrepresented groups. CPB feels that this investment is very important to preserving access to the program as its costs to students increase. It is pleased with the revised targets for underrepresented students in the program.
- The majority of the additional funds are to be used to hire job placement personnel of various kinds. As Bren graduate incomes are modest, at least at first, the fee supplement places additional responsibility on the School to pursue full employment for its graduates.
- The allocated funds do not total to the revenue raised. CPB suggests that more clarity be provided as to the disposition of the unallocated amount.

CPB appreciated the Bren School’s pursuit of the highest quality program and its deep concern for student employability, but also suggested that more reviewing agencies should weigh the long-term implications of this epochal shift in the financing of the Bren School’s flagship program. We also commended Dean Gaines for the high quality of the School’s data collection and internal analysis, and the candor and completeness of the presentation. The fee increase has since been approved.

Graduate Student COLA Strike

CPB expressed concern about the genuine “rent burden” experienced by a large proportion of UCSB’s graduate students. We noted the impact of graduate student frustration and lowered morale on UCSB’s instruction and research programs. Before the strike issue was overwhelmed by COVID-19, we identified two financial issues:

- A doctoral wage survey indicated that grad stipends vary by as much as 50% across UCSB departments. These data are not definitive, but such inequality could aggravate grievances unnecessarily.
- The campus cost of alleviating rent burden is likely much lower than UAW union figures suggest. The chair calculated that the additional “rent-COLA” supplement is $524 per month in Santa Barbara. Even if all off-campus doctoral students (55% of 2977 grads)
were rent burdened, the cost would be $1627 \times 524 = \$852,548 per month, or \$8.5M over 10 months, and \$10.2M over 12 months.

Council recognized that this is serious money for the campus ($10.2M is about $2 million less than all mandatory cost increases for the campus in 2020-21). Council made no recommendation here, but did note that graduate student living costs is an issue that is likely to resurface when COVID-19 is under control.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2019-20 term:

**APM 240 and 246**

In January, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to Sections 240 and 246 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) which would make changes regarding the salaries and reporting of compensated and uncompensated activities of Deans and Faculty Administrators as well as technical changes to improve language and correct errors. The Council discussed these revisions and had no objections to the changes.

**Seismic Safety Policy**

In June, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the UC Seismic Safety Policy which moves Policy implementation procedures to the UC Facilities Manual, updates the technical seismic engineering standards to reflect current California Building Code, and reorganizes sections for clarity. The revision clarifies that all retrofit and abatement projects require a funding plan and schedule, including incorporation into the Capital Financial Plan when applicable. The Council had no objections to the changes.

**UC Washington Center**

In February, CPB reviewed the report and proposal for the future state of the UC Washington Center. The UC Washington Center and the UCDC Academic Program provide the opportunity for undergraduates in the University of California, from all disciplines, to study and intern in Washington, DC. Students enrolled in the UCDC Academic Program are housed in the 276-bed center. The report followed President Napolitano’s wish to explore the possibility of transitioning selected systemwide programs, including UCDC, to individual campuses.

CPB concluded that the program has not been well-managed over the years. We put forth the following recommendations: (1) that UCDC stay at UCOP; (2) that UCDC receive a top-to-bottom administrative restructuring that (3) cuts some administrative staffing and moves other staff to direct student services. Council also recommended, (4), that UCSB explore extricating itself from its UCDC contract in order to place its students directly with Washington-area universities that could offer both courses and an internship. UCDC has a very high expenditure level of
approximately $29,000 per student; UCSB could spend less to purchase high-quality student support services from an outside provider while covering local university fees.

VII. Committees

The Council has three standing committees, per Senate Bylaw III-3-70:

1. Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
   Chair: Doug Steigerwald
2. Committee on Development & Community Relations
   Chair: Joao Hespanha
3. Committee on Capital & Space Planning
   Chair: Shelly Gable

Most of the business of these committees was conducted by email; after UCSB’s closure in March, email became the primary medium of deliberation. Issues were delegated to the appropriate committees for prior review, and recommendations were then forwarded to the full Council for deliberation.

The principal issues under review by CPB were spearheaded by CAPRA. These included systemwide reports and reviews, as well as many of the local issues under review. The Committee on Development & Community Relations conducted a preliminary review of endowed chair proposals.

The Council also continued a tradition of four ad hoc “area subcommittees,” based on Colleges and Divisions:

- Division of Social Sciences and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
- Division of MLPS and Bren School of Environmental Science & Management
- Division of HFA and College of Creative Studies
- College of Engineering

The area subcommittees were primarily tasked with conducting preliminary analyses of the academic program reviews. In addition, Academic search waiver requests were first sent to the respective area subcommittee for initial consideration before review by the full Council. Finally, the subcommittees took the lead in reviewing Deans’ and departmental FTE plans and developing the respective parts of the overall FTE recommendations for 2020-21, presenting recommendations for full Council discussion.

VIII. Council Representation

The Council Chair served as a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, as Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee, as a member of the Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy, and consulted with the Risk Assessment/Audit Committee. The CPB Chair, along with the Chair of the Committee on Development & Community Relations, served as Trustee of the UCSB Foundation.
IX. CPB Relationship with University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)

The CPB Chair served as the UCSB representative on UCPB and regularly reported on UCPB business conducted at the monthly meetings in Oakland, soliciting comments from Council members on pending UCPB issues.

X. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning & Budget consulted with several members of the Administration during the 2019-20 term, including: the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Director of Capital Development; the Deans of the College of Letters & Science; Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; Dean of the College of Creative Studies; Dean of the Bren School for Environmental Science & Management; and Dean of the College of Engineering.

The Council Chair and Vice Chair held regular (bi-weekly) consultations with EVC David Marshall. These meetings provided an opportunity to discuss issues and concerns informally and play an effective role in shared governance.

The Council engaged in several informative discussions with Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning Chuck Haines. A list of questions was developed in advance of his meetings to help facilitate the discussions. The conversations addressed a number of budget-related issues: budget overview of the campus; income & expenditures; new initiatives; research; unfunded mandates; undergraduate enrollment surge; and staff support.

This year’s main domains of interaction are listed below.

**Academic Personnel and EVC’s Office for FTE Accounting**

CPB improved its picture of hiring patterns across multiple years. AP appears to have a hard time identifying in which year a particular search was authorized. But we are making progress towards an understanding of the timing of authorizations, the number of FTE already authorized by Divisions in the current year, and FTE resources past and present on a departmental level.

**Comprehensive Budget Data and Communication**

As noted in the section “FTE Planning,” Council does not have adequate budgetary information to place FTE planning in the appropriate resource context. To this end, the Chair used UCOP’s Financial Schedules to create a preliminary picture of UCSB’s overall budget and to identify data gaps. These data were presented in the form of Sankey charts. The Chair and Vice Chair held several meetings with Associate Chancellor for Budget & Planning Chuck Haines and several of his colleagues to try to understand cash flows on campus, to put academic resources in a broader campus resource context. After three meetings, we had made some progress, but B&P was unable to provide data integrated across control points: we were told that monies that leave B&P and enter Academic Affairs are not tracked at the unit level that would allow Council to link FTE requests to available resources. COVID-19 interrupted these budget sessions, and they should be continued in the coming year.
This effort to get a full picture of the campus budget was motivated in part by testimony we heard from a number of key senior administrators about their lack of essential budgetary information. Meetings with the EVC, multiple deans, and administrators in other divisions all revealed serious, chronic gaps in basic budget data. Several officials described the budgeting process as “irrational.” We heard accounts of budget information being withheld from academic officers, with the Office of Budget and Planning being most often named. A situation in which one floor of Cheadle doesn’t tell the other what it is doing impressed us as a kind of managerial dysfunction that no campus can afford. It can be fixed, and should be at a time when COVID-19 threatens the campus’s fiscal stability.

One simple improvement would be for the Deans to share their plans and budgets directly with each other. As it is, the EVC and CPB see all of the Deans’ plans, but the Deans see only their own. Overall planning could be improved by Deans pooling all of their plans and related information with one another, and collaborating on the basis of shared data.

**Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee for Budgetary Strategy** (Chair only)

The problem of limited and incomplete budget data also affected CCBS, putatively the campus’s top-level budget policy group. This committee began to meet every two weeks or so in late spring and summer. Several of the meetings provided better budgetary information that CPB was able to obtain on its own: this information covered COVID-19 revenue loss projections for the campus, distinguished between the situation in “core” vs. “non-core” sectors of campus, itemized some puzzling aggregate categories, and offered useful airing of varying perspectives. Perhaps most usefully from the Chair’s point of view, members headed off an exercise of ranking the value of 19 separate units on campus as a first step to allocating different percentage cuts on the basis of the total scoring (Student Affairs might rank 4, and Facilities Management 6, and Deferred Maintenance 12, so DM would be cut 12% and Student Affairs only 3%?). Members objected to a process that would artificially label something like DM as “less important” when a campus needs both Student Affairs and deferred maintenance, and likely increase internal competition and decrease cooperation at a time when the latter was particularly needed.

Concern was increased by the fact that, at least in Academic Affairs, the cuts following the 2007-10 financial crisis, coupled with inadequate revenue growth thereafter, left all Divisions with very little to cut for 2020-21. Concern was sustained by the absence of shared budget information that would allow joint deliberation on the best ways to get through the next couple of years. The summer meetings did not complete the budget picture or identify budget options. For example, CCBS had not discussed the Chancellor’s decision of August 28th to convert fall quarter to all-online instruction or analyze its fiscal implications.

CCBS would be more effective with the following changes: the co-chairs, the EVC and the Divisional Senate Chair, should issue an agenda in advance of the meeting, along with systematic budget data and supporting materials so that members can study these materials in advance. A shared “Box” archive could be set up for members to consult materials in between meetings. B&P should answer questions about budgetary detail promptly and respectfully, and the answers should be aggregated so that members can continuously improve their understanding of the overall budget situation. The Committee co-chairs should formulate budgetary options for
discussion as the meetings continue, and preferences for some options over others should be deliberated and formalized by a predetermined deadline.

Universities are systems of distributed intelligence, and CCBS can increase this intelligence among its members with a more organized approach to budget data and meeting materials.

**Capital Planning and Facilities**

The CPB Chair served as a Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC), which reviewed or discussed several issues and campus projects. A 10-Year Capital Financial Plan has not been reviewed by CPB in several years, although Capital projects presentations by the Deans were made to CPC over the past year.

CPC had no significant projects to discuss this year. We reviewed a donor-funded upgrade of the campus tennis facility and a Student Affairs bicycle shop, which apparently has been in the works for many years. At the same time, the campus student population has surged—UCSB has arrived at its 25,000 enrollment cap 5 years ahead of schedule. Classrooms, offices, and laboratory space are in chronic short supply. In the Chair's view, CPC should take a much more active role in generating essential new facilities and discussing—and identifying—funding sources for them.

CPB also looked into the two additional issues of renovation and of maintenance of existing facilities. Departments whose research depends on laboratory space are generally unhappy with the lab renovation process. While most campus departments face space shortages of various kinds, including faculty offices, all campus departments face deteriorated and dilapidated physical conditions, many of which have persisted for years. No one on Council disagreed with the statement that the condition of UCSB facilities is a burden on its academic ambitions.

To improve Council's understanding of the situation, CPB set up several meetings with representatives of the Division of Administrative Services. In the first, CPB was joined by four members of the Design, Facilities, & Safety Services (DFSS) team:

1. Julie Hendricks, Director of Design & Construction Services
2. Kerry Bierman, CFO of Business & Financial Planning
3. David McHale, Interim Director of Environmental Health & Safety
4. Chris Kelsey, Interim Director of Facilities Management

The group gave an overview of their work and discussed their major projects. They noted that the campus has about $600 million in deferred maintenance items and continues to fall farther behind. The Chair observed that the $3.5 million allocated in the previous year to the DM backlog would, if doubled, require 100 years to complete. One result is that FM has had to give up on some major repairs, such as restoring central heating in the six-story South Hall office building. A list of urgent items that are expected to fail in the next 1-5 years adds up to about $200 million.

CPB members asked questions about the related issue of lab renovations for new faculty. FM representatives noted that those are sometimes delayed by the need to conduct underlying repairs to the building where the upgraded lab will be located (HVAC system upgrades were mentioned as a common example). The discussion included problems caused by the recharge
system, in which Deans need to pay DFSS for renovation advice, which makes Deans and departments minimize communication with DFSS (which costs money), which means a common lack of coordination between recruitment promises and renovation planning. Senate-Facilities communication improved notably during our series of meetings, suggesting that blockages between DFSS, deans offices, and departments can be resolved. Budgeting remains an issue, affected by both the recharge practices noted above and recharge rates, (too high for departments, too low for real FM solvency), along with the role of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR).

In April, a follow-up meeting was held via Zoom between CPB leadership (Chair, Vice Chair, and Chair of Committee on Capital & Space Planning) and DFSS representatives (Julie Hendricks, Chris Kelsey -- Associate Director of Operations & Maintenance, and David McHale). The Chair met again with DFSS in May. These meetings were opportunities for DFSS staff to meet with campus stakeholders to discuss ways to improve processes and outcomes; this consultation with Academic Senate representatives was to specifically connect with faculty. Much of the April meeting was spent giving updates to CPB about COVID-19 response, and they also shared updates on capital projects, a planned power outage in September, and deferred maintenance. CPB asked about the following:

- Investigating a more rational budget structure for start-ups and deferred maintenance.
- Increased reliance on core campus funds and less on interdepartmental recharges.
- Increased communication with Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services Garry MacPherson and Associate Vice Chancellor Rene Bahl.

In sum, UCSB recharge practice has imposed a cost on collaboration and communication in design and renovation (in addition to its inhibiting effect on routine maintenance). It quite literally costs deans and departments money to coordinate offers with facilities expertise.

We recommend that the campus explore one of two remedies: (1) paying for design and renovation planning centrally, so divisions can plan early and often for hiring needs; (2) giving each dean a “design planning budget” for each hire likely to require renovation (say $10,000), so that DFSS can start early on a systematic design process. Council prefers solution 1, as the recharge system separates units and impairs communications, a point which returns below.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB and UCPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:

- UC Budget crisis
- UCSB Budget transparency, communication, and deliberation
- Accounting of FTEs and Deans’ discretionary budgets
- Campus-wide Capital Planning priorities
- Campus facilities and deferred maintenance

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christopher Newfield</th>
<th>Chair / UCPB rep</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Steigerwald</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Academic Senate invited participation of representatives from Associated Students and the Graduate Students Association but did not receive replies. CPB believes student representation is very important in senate councils and committees. CPB is eager to include representatives from these bodies in the future.

Final comments from the Chair.

UCSB has always had high academic aspirations, ones which have generally exceeded its material resources. As one campus in the UC system, it is also unable to control the policy environment that determines its revenues and expenses. This environment has been shaped by three rounds of state cuts since 1990, and a fourth bout of revenue declines likely in 2020-22; and on the expenditure side, by an underfunded "surge" of resident undergraduates in the 2010s).

However, the campus does control administrative practice, including standards of communication and interaction. This year, Council and its Chair (in other meetings) witnessed a pervasive difficulty, in virtually all administrative units we spoke with, to plan openly, to freely and systematically share financial and other information, and to engage in data-driven, collaborative problem solving across unit boundaries. UCSB’s systemic problems cannot be addressed by any unit operating in isolation. And yet information isolation has become a pervasive feature of UCSB’s administrative culture. It can lead to a kind of administrative Stockholm Syndrome, in which campus leadership, and the Senate, resigns itself to lowered quality, reduced outputs, and the permanent “kludging” of problems that remain unresolved for years or decades. Examples we encountered this year include chronically unmaintained facilities, understaffing of instructional programs so severe as to damage their reputations with their own majors, and the ad hoc filling of revenue shortfalls in divisional temporary sub-0 budgets, the latter being one example of opaque budgeting that impairs academic planning. Most of these problems cannot be fixed overnight, but they can be addressed in a sustained way through open
collaboration among the many affected units and their complementary experts. This culture of information isolation can and should be changed.

I would also like to commend UCSB’s administration, faculty, and staff for decades of tireless effort to fulfill their ambitions with fewer resources than their ambitions and capabilities deserve. These individual efforts, under the circumstances, have been impressive. This has been especially true during COVID-19 Spring and Summer, where nearly everyone stayed in continuous crisis mode without a break. The same goes for the members of CPB, who brought unflagging energy, intelligence, and insight to the work we did this year. Working with them has been a pleasure, and has helped keep me optimistic about UCSB’s future.
UCSB has an elaborate process for planning academic hiring. It starts with departmental discussions that lead to requests for permanent faculty lines, which are reviewed by deans, who make recommendations to the EVC, who makes the final decision. As part of this process, CPB reviews the departmental and decanal priorities and makes recommendations of its own. For CPB, the process of analyzing and making recommendations for regular FTE allocations takes four to six weeks of analysis.

Each year, departments and deans also make a number of requests for hires in addition to their existing allocations and outside of this planning process. Some of these are requests to make second offers in a concluded search, and thus emerge directly from an approved academic plan; others are requests for search waivers that form at least partial exceptions to the existing departmental or divisional plan. Waiver requests are often numerous; in 2019-20, they added 19 potential hires on top of 28 new allocations.

While acknowledging the special circumstances involved in requests for additional hires and waivers, CPB would like to ensure that departments and deans explicitly link such cases to their existing academic planning process, and that the integrity of academic planning be sustained. We have thus articulated planning questions that clarify and elaborate the Red Binder’s requirement for such exceptions, namely, that there be “discussion of three major issues: 1) the candidate’s qualifications; 2) the candidate’s programmatic fit within the departmental academic plans; and 3) the source of the FTE and the impact of the appointment on the departmental FTE plan” (VII-1-III-B). CPB’s purview consists of the 2nd and 3rd of these questions. To address them, we plan to ask a series of questions of future requests for exceptions to authorized searches.

1. Does the department enthusiastically support the proposed hire as a waiver? Is there evidence from the vote and from the chair’s comments about the candidate’s scholarship? (If the answers are “no,” consideration of the request stops here.)
2. What is the key argument as to why the department should be allowed to go outside of the standard resource allocation process? The Red Binder allows the categories of exceptional scholar, President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Recipient, and partner hire (VII-1-III-B)
3. Does the department identify an FTE source for the appointment that is either a currently authorized search or a pre-authorized position for a future search year?
4. "Does the dean endorse the use of the authorized FTE, or if the department does not have an authorized search, does the dean commit an FTE to the position requested by the department? (If the answers to both (3) and (4) are "no," consideration of the request stops at this point.)
5. Does the requested faculty position
   A. add to an established, acknowledged departmental strength in a national or international context?
   B. address an important diversity objective?
   C. fill a curricular or research gap at a high level of quality?
   D. start a new, important, promising, and/or original area where the department has a real shot at near-future distinction?
6. If at least one of the subquestions in (5) cannot be answered strongly in the affirmative, will the position created by the newly-authorized search be part of a multi-departmental initiative, one that has
● received formal support from a dean or deans?
● already been under development and has some documented interdepartmental plan?
● a real chance at future distinction, both because of the exceptional personnel involved and the research agenda?
● Commitment of campus financial resources over a period of years to put this initiative on the map? (CPB is most likely to approve exceptions justified by (6) if the answer to all four questions be “yes.”)

CPB requests that this protocol for reviewing exceptions to authorized searches be conveyed to deans and departments. Council also believes that these questions could usefully inform regular departmental planning processes.
Executive Summary

Per bylaw 65, the purpose of the Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR) is to promote an optimal research and educational environment, to manage Senate resources and provide advice in a manner that fosters quality and diversity of research and instructional programs.

Highlights:

- UC resumed negotiations with Elsevier publishing in July 2020 after an encouraging approach from the publisher. An Open Access agreement with Cambridge University Press began in September 2019, and another with Springer Nature was announced in July 2020.
- The Committee on Faculty Grants awarded $999,978.00 to 114 proposals submitted for the Faculty Research Grant and $12,000 to two proposals for the Pearl Chase Research Grant. Proposal submission was up 22% from last year, with 126 total proposals compared to 99 in 2019-20.

Council and Committee Meetings

CRIR consists of three standing committees: Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP), Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources (CLIIR), and Committee on Information Technology (CIT). The Council met once as a whole during both fall and winter quarters, but regularly convened in its respective subcommittees. Both CRPP and CLIIR met seven times over the course of the year and the Committee on Information Technology met eight times.

The Committee on Faculty Grants (FG) met four times during spring quarter; all CRIR members participated as part of their CRIR service, with additional members added by Committee on Committees for divisional balance.

System-Wide Issues and Reviews

All system-wide issues that CRIR responded to are listed below. Issues that CRIR reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included.

Foreign Influence on Research
CRPP reviewed information from the Office of Research (OR) on international collaborations. In recent years, there has been increasing concern at the federal level about potential “attempts by foreign governments to unfairly exploit U.S. researchers for that country’s gain” (OR website). Faculty were notified about this issue. Researchers must report any conflicts and collaborators properly and should contact OR if they have any questions. Proposals may not go forward if they are not compliant with the new policy.

Revised Presidential Policy on Copyright Ownership
CRPP members agreed the revised policy was an improvement over the original. They sought clarification on how the policy regards software code produced by a project that is intended to be shared with researchers at other institutions and what procedures should be followed for compliance when the university exerts ownership. They also expressed concern over the use of “Significant University Resources” and whether it might unfairly render some projects property of the university, specifically in the cases when faculty receive Academic Senate Faculty Research Grants. They expressed a wish for the parameters to be clarified such that campus-based funding would be excluded from the criteria.
The members of CLIIR also found the revision to be an improvement overall. Like CRPP, they took issue with the use of “Significant University Resources” and wanted the policy to exclude Faculty Research Grants from the criteria. They sought more information as to how exactly disputes of ownership would be resolved. Lastly, they recommended that all campuses establish or maintain a copyright office to assist with questions regarding academic use of copyrighted materials as well as ownership.

**Office of Science and Technology Embargo Policy**
The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) solicited campus letters of support for its appeal to the Office of Science and Technology Policy to remove the one year embargo on public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications, data and code resulting from federally funded research. The UCOLASC draft letter was unanimously endorsed by Academic Council. CLIIR Chair Berkowitz brought the issue to both CLIIR and CRPP. The committees both had broad discussions that included disagreements about whether the embargos were necessarily bad and whether benefits varied by discipline, whether datasets ought to be included in the policy, as well as the merits of open access overall and whether the transition to OA is disproportionately harmful to those with less resources. Overall, the letter received majority support and was sent by Divisional Chair Bohn to the Office of Science and Technology.

**Composite Benefit Rates**
The Composite Benefit Rates Workgroup announced its recommendations for mitigating the negative impacts of the implementation of composite benefit rates for postdoctoral scholars across the UC. The plan is for the Budget and Planning Office to issue a call for those whose projects were impacted. They recommended $2,000 as the minimum mitigation amount for eligible projects i.e. projects that suffered a smaller loss would not be eligible. The threshold at UC Berkeley and UCLA was set at $5,000; $2,000 is the lowest in the system and is being utilized by UCSC. CRPP, in hopes of minimizing impacts to faculty as much as possible, recommended a lower threshold of $500. This would impact grants from the near term to the next four years. Composite rates do not significantly hurt UCSB as a campus; our rates are lower than most other campuses. The recommendations were sent to Finance Management for implementation. The workgroup included Senate representation from CRPP members Liming Zhang (co-chair) and Forrest Brewer, along with Claudio Campagnari in 2019-20, and Harry Nelson (co-chair), Arturo Keller, and Liming Zhang in 2018-19.

**Fireeye Audit**
Alex Bustamante, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer at UCOP, took steps to request unfettered access to the FireEye system for members of the UCOP Cybersecurity Audit Team (CAT). The request cited regental policy but was made without limitations on scope or timing and it was not presented in the context of an audit. The CAT team subsequently withdrew their request. Following that, the CAT team initiated a systemwide audit of the FireEye system at all locations. The audit consisted of two phases. The first examined configuration and procedures related to the system. The second included a hands-on examination of two FireEye operational consoles by multiple members of the CAT team and their external auditor, Deloitte. The audit is now complete. All access granted to the internal and external auditors has been revoked.

**Report of the Academic Council’s Standardized Testing Task Force**
All CRIR members reviewed this report within their respective subcommittees. All agreed that although standardized testing is a complex issue, they felt this report was thoughtful and made reasonable recommendations. They expressed overall support for the recommendations of the report.

CRPP members took issue with the follow up letter from select members of the Task Force advocating for a more expeditious timeline to eliminate standardized tests in admissions consideration. They did not feel that this minority statement provided sufficient evidence to support its opposition to the recommendations of the Task Force.
ORU reviews were postponed for a year by the Office of Research due to COVID-19.

Proposed Presidential Policy on the Protection of Human Subjects in Research
CRPP felt the proposed policy seemed reasonable and did not identify any aspects that seemed radically different from the current structures in place. Members noted a potential discrepancy in which the policy referred readers to the website for procedures, but none were there.

Local Business

Proposal to Establish a Biological Engineering Graduate Degree Program and Academic Unit
CRPP members were supportive of the program overall. They felt that the proposed program and academic unit make sense for the future of the university. The members are concerned over the extent to which this program will compete with the existing Biomolecular Science and Engineering program. The members would like to ensure that the program has a strong start. Given the significant effort to start a program, and the current climate and budgetary adjustments related to the COVID-19 pandemic, they expressed reservations about the 2021 start date. Members questioned why none of the core faculty had appointments greater than 50% and whether that might hinder the success of the program. Finally, members would like to see an explanation of the Center for BioEngineering (CBE)’s role in the program and academic unit and an explanation of whether they are to remain separate entities.

CLIIR members noted that the program seems strong and needed by campus. They had no concerns as the proposed program does not require additional demand for library or instructional resources. The committee was unanimous in support of the proposed program and academic unit. They did note that the main issue with the proposed program seems to be how to support students but considered that issue outside their purview.

Proposal to Establish a 4+1 Master of Science in Geographic Information Science
CRPP members overall supported the proposed program. The rationale was strong and the request for one additional LSOE was reasonable. Members wanted to see data to justify the eligible GPA as well as a clearer illustration of the overlap in courses that shows the difference between the two year master’s and the 4+1 program.

CLIIR was likewise overall supportive of the program. Members wanted to see issues of space addressed in further detail. The proposal indicated that some offices would be commandeered by this program; where will those people go? The committee rejected the request for priority access to active learning space as unreasonable; these spaces are heavily scheduled, popular spaces under general assignment by the Registrar. The committee was concerned by the proposed budget. Assumptions of funding contributed by Collaborate seem lofty. However, a campus-level commitment to funding is necessary. The proposal highlights a systemic problem of increasing enrollment; until the classroom building comes online, there doesn’t seem to be sufficient space. Like CRPP, CLIIR members were unclear that the program had sufficiently outlined the requirements for students currently earning a master’s as compared to the 4+1 students; they must all follow the same requirements and it was not clear that they would in terms of final exams.

Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology
Overall CRPP was supportive of the proposed program. In its initial review, CRPP felt that the justification of expanded enrollment was weak; given that the program was previously canceled due to floundering enrollment, members wanted to see a more detailed strategy for recruitment and discussion of what is different in 2020 that would avoid a repeat problem. Members also expressed a preference to see one ladder faculty added rather than the teaching professors requested in the proposal. They expressed concern over the trend of hiring teaching professors in lieu of research professors and felt that a master’s program would benefit from an increase in research activity.

CRPP received responses to its comments. Several members remained skeptical regarding the demand for the program and whether assumptions of student enrollment were overly optimistic.
One member was likewise dissatisfied with the response to the question of LSOEs but acknowledged the possibility that the department is different. Although the response clarified the need for LSOE’s to manage practicum work, the members still felt they would not be a replacement for ladder faculty research capacity and they would still like to see ladder faculty included in growth plans. Members agreed this was necessary to support a robust research mission within the department and they maintained their recommendation of half ladder faculty.

CLIIR also reviewed the proposal to add a Master’s of Education in School Psychology. They were satisfied with the contention that no new library resources would be necessary to support the program. The proposal contained $10k for assessments and some members worried this amount was unrealistically conservative. Members also felt that the explanation of why this program was previously suspended was not sufficiently detailed and questioned whether the demand exists as projected.

Members received responses to their concerns regarding enrollment potential and costs for assessments which they deemed satisfactory.

**Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations**

CLIIR overall supported the move to an online evaluation format. Members noted the difficulty of lowered return rates online and the significant impact this drop had for small classes; however, with more students having access to laptops/smartphones, this is not as big a problem as it used to be. The members had significant concerns about potential administrative efforts to incentivize evaluation participation, particularly tying the completion to grades or final exam scores which they considered unethical. Members noted that enrollment impacts and staff time to deal with ESCIs has been hugely mitigated by the move to online deployment. They also were in agreement that departments should deploy a consistent evaluation method, as opposed to a hybrid model of paper and online.

**Report of the ESCI Ad Hoc Committee**

CLIIR was supportive of the short and long term goals identified by the ESCI Ad Hoc Committee. Members acknowledged the difficulty of developing an effective course evaluation process but also the necessity of doing so. They appreciated the report’s fairly strong statement about the lack of correlation between ESCIs and teaching success and the suggestion to deemphasize the relevance of ESCI scores in personnel reviews. Members noted the discrepancy in evaluation scores of required versus elective courses, the latter of which are often more popular. They appreciated the effort to solicit information on students’ engagement and level of commitment. They also commended the lack of any suggestion to incentivize participation. The members recommended continued follow-up by the Ad Hoc ESCI committee.

**Proposed Automated License Plate Reader Policy**

Overall, CIT members were supportive of the program. They commended campus efforts to realize cost savings and convenience for users. There was a question as to whether uses of the data/technology were possible that might not be detailed explicitly in the proposal. They sought more information regarding deployment logistics and expressed a desire for more transparency. They noted that the provisions listed in paragraph 3.K. “Sharing” are quite broad. Members were curious whether a greater buffer time between data collection and review could be useful to protecting privacy. They also noted that data retention itself is a liability and questioned the extent to which the data could be anonymized as the policy intends. Members were interested to learn more about the costs as compared to the perceived benefits, particularly those of data retention.

**Video Cameras and Video Surveillance Policy**

CIT agreed to endorse the policy with the recommendation that the Video Camera Committee add a faculty representative to provide guidance on research issues. Members commended the policy’s specifics about different camera uses for research, for example the remote monitoring of instruments. At the end of the school year, Chair Frew solicited a CIT representative to join the Video Camera Committee.
Library Updates

Reorganization
In Spring 2019, faculty and subject librarians raised concerns about the planned reorganization and requested a one-year moratorium on changes in the library. However, some aspects including recruitments were already underway and some actions could not be put on hold. Librarian Antelman continued to meet with department chairs to address concerns in the 2019-20 school year. Collection development purchasing duties have not changed. Allocations are tied to majors, number of faculty, number of grad programs/students. The numbers are calibrated annually, but the overall approach has not changed in a long time. A greater focus on collections strategy is needed.

The reference desk was eliminated in late Summer 2019. Overall use of librarian time on the desk was not efficient. Reference transactions had decreased by about 85% in the past two decades as traffic has moved to the internet. Staff also decreased by 20% during that time. There was substantial similarity in the questions that were formerly asked at the Service Desk and Reference Desk. An integrated service point has been established at the Service Desk. The library assesses student responses to the changes by surveying graduating students. The number one issue for students is insufficient power in the parts of the library that were not renovated as well as crowding during dead week and finals. In response, the policy was changed last year to require student ID earlier for access during dead and final weeks, which should decrease the number of non-UCSB students present. The amount of space open for 24 hours was also increased.

Open Access
Meetings continued with Elsevier and Wiley this year but no deals have been announced. An Open Access agreement with Springer Nature was announced in July 2020.

Annex 2 Site Change
Annex 2 is the last remaining offsite storage facility for library materials. The UCSB Library is in the process of leaving the site, with the goal of finishing by October. It costs $23,000 per month to rent the facility and the library is looking for a more sustainable storage solution. The storage includes some music materials which will be returning to campus; compact shelving is being built for these materials now. LPs are coming back to the library. Additionally, Art and Architecture materials, map cases and a GIS photo collection will be going to Iron Mountain for climate-controlled storage. The library is considering space under Harder Stadium for special research collections; it would require security and climate control. All materials are being retained, just their location is changing.

Hathi Trust
Hathi Trust, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, began providing temporary collections access to members (4.5-5 million volumes) digitized by Google. This is controlled digital lending that has already been vetted by lawyers and experts; the access will only be provided until the stacks are able to be reopened. The Hathi Trust is open to the world, but additional benefits are extended to members, including UC affiliates.

Reopening the Library
The vision for reopening the library includes three phases. The first is part of the research ramp-up in consultation with VCR Incandela in which the library will initiate request and pickup service – "curbside delivery." Materials may also be mailed if someone is not in town or unable to come to campus. The second phase entails opening the building to researchers to come in and obtain materials. Librarian Antelman intends to continue the paging service, however the current Hathi Trust access terms require that physical copies of digital material are not available. Therefore, the library cannot circulate those books in order to avoid losing digital access, but will provide books (not digitized) that are not available through Hathi Trust access. Book drop boxes were reopened at the main library as well as at the Music library to collect materials before people left for the summer. Returned books were left to sit for a while, even though the CDC released updated guidance that the potential for disease spread through surface contact is quite low. There is no need to urgently re-shelve since no one is there. Minimal staff completed a significant amount of scanning for course
reserves in preparation for summer courses. The third phase is for staff and students to be able to safely re-enter the building. Though plans are not definitive, the assumption is for at least some human presence in Fall and the library wants to provide services and collections access when that time comes. All departments are tracking expenditures related to COVID-19; the library has installed plexiglass for the service desk and procured a massive amount of wipes and hand sanitizer. The major costs are access fees for electronic collections, streaming media, and online experiments.

**Instructional Development Updates**

**Classroom Building**
The campus secured a general contractor for the new classroom building who is working with architects on the design phase (unusual for the campus). Proposals were sent to the Office of the President to obtain the next round of funding. The architects finalized plans for external materials, treatments, some of the interiors, and provided an updated construction schedule. Preconstruction activity commenced during Winter and Spring 2020 quarters to prep the site. The bike path is being rerouted toward the UCEN. The barracks building by Psychology will be razed; contaminated soil will need mitigation. Redwood will be removed for access. Groundbreaking is intended by the end of summer, with Winter or Spring 2023 the intended date for opening.

**Assistive Listening System Upgrade**
ID undertook the Assistive Listening System (ALS) Upgrade Project. Any space that seats over 50, per CA building code must have adaptive listening capability. The project is done and was under budget with funding from the Campus Accessibility Committee.

**Infrastructure for Remote Instruction**
The transition to remote instruction highlighted the need for a new registration system, based on how course ‘crashing’ took place in Spring quarter. This period has added impetus to move to a commercial student information system. The current system was produced in house. For normal operations, it does what it’s supposed to; however, commercial outfits like Banner have more options to handle special needs, as in the current extreme situation. The most vexing issue is Zoom bombing. Instructional Development has provided simplified instructions for how faculty can safeguard against these intrusions.

There was a question of whether Gauchospace would be able to handle the volume of traffic; there were some freezing issues at the beginning of Spring quarter. High-traffic times are being targeted by administration to give the server more resources to handle the load. Between midnight on Monday March 30 until 4pm Thursday April 2, Gauchospace received 4.5 million hits. Gauchocast had 1.3 million hits of video viewed or downloaded in one week. An increased ability to handle mass traffic is one of the benefits of having moved to the cloud.

One element not yet in place is a chat facility such as Slack. Such a tool must be FERPA compliant and easy to populate with course enrollments. The campus is adopting Nectir. The Library, ID, and Collaborate have committed funds and the contract is in place.

One challenge has been the ability of classroom services staff to assist remotely. Staff have been trained to use the Zendesk ticketing system to provide online tech support since they cannot do so in person. The average response time in Spring quarter was no more than five hours compared to the industry average of 23 hours.

**Information Technology Updates**

**Campus IT Assessment**
Every three years the Chief Information Officer (CIO) undertakes an intensive assessment process to examine information technology across the UCSB campus. He completed the first assessment in
June 2016, and the second concluded in December 2019. This assessment focuses on major accomplishments, expenditures, management effectiveness, governance, the campus IT labor force, the present state of technology on campus, and business and mission attainment risks associated with IT.

A comparison of the 2016 and 2019 assessments revealed rising expenses, consumption, and complexity across UCSB’s IT ecosystem. UCSB’s present IT capabilities related to support, easy-to-use services, and a complete portfolio of digital capabilities remain out of sync with rising societal expectations and increased use. Matching societal and community expectations to the skills and capabilities of our labor force requires the Office of the CIO to put substantial efforts into labor force transformation, engagement, satisfaction, and professional development.

Security
Multiple funding sources have contributed to improving the campus security posture. The Chancellor funded the Palo Alto Unified Threat Management system in FY 2016-17. UCOP funded a FireEye device. The Common Good Fee (CGF) has funded a Lastline appliance, Splunk, Sophos Server & Endpoint Malware Protection, a new VPN, and a UCOP Risk Assessment in addition to adding one new Security staff member.

Zoom
There were 8,000 instructional sessions in the first week of spring quarter with 6 “zoom bombing” incidents. Although members of the UCSB Faculty Association expressed concern about security infrastructure with Zoom, the numbers demonstrated a fairly successful experience with the platform in terms of security controls. Moreover, per the CIO, Zoom has been fairly responsive to critiques. At the start of the shutdown, Zoom announced it was pivoting its internal focus entirely to security improvements, with other feature development on hold. The program has 70 “common vulnerabilities.” All programs have these; Skype has 69 for comparison. The more standardized a tool becomes, the more hackers can concentrate their attacks on that tool. More than 50% of UCSB Zoom users are accessing the program through macs, which have additional security vulnerabilities within the program. Zoom’s encryption level is something to be concerned about but not in the short term. Currently it is considered “breakable” which is why governments advise against using Zoom to communicate sensitive information. The CIO does not see substantive security issues for the campus apart from “pilot” error or broader sociological issues. The controls are fairly reasonable, though there is a large learning curve. For the things we are doing on campus, it is not worrisome from a FERPA or intellectual leakage aspect. Zoom is as secure as any tool is going to get right now.

Some faculty reported struggling with the extensive options for configuring Zoom settings and requested that the campus produce a document pointing to recommended settings. “Keep Teaching Keep Learning” (https://keepteaching.id.ucsb.edu/) exists as a resource run by Instructional Development providing tools for faculty in the remote teaching realm.

Faculty Grants

Policy and Procedures Updates
The following updates were approved or discussed:

- The committee agreed to update the guidelines to reflect that postdocs cannot be funded using Faculty Research Grant money. This reflects a consistent position that this money should not be used to pay benefits.
- The committee discussed the computer funding policy and agreed to leave it as is. Occasionally requests are made for laptops that are described as necessary for the research, but will be used for work beyond the life of the research project. Members agreed to continue to leave this to both the proposer, to make the case for the needed item, and to the reviewers to decide.
- New phrasing was introduced to specify travel restrictions in accordance with University Policy AB 1887 prohibiting use of state funds for travel to certain states.
• The committee did not find it necessary to stipulate encyclopedias in the list of what is considered or not in publication charges, and leave the decision to the reviewers if an argument is made that the work is a research or creative publication.

• The committee stipulated that journal fees are not eligible for FRG funds. Requests have been made more recently for the high cost of open access journals; there is a fund set up through the library that can offset these costs.

• The committee considered whether a PI could apply for a grant autonomously in addition to applying as a Co-I. The members determined that only one proposal per PI is acceptable; if co-PI’s want to apply independently for different components of the same project, they can, but there cannot be multiple proposals for the same professor.

Travel Grants

• The committee approved clarifying language to the Travel Grant Frequently Asked Questions document adding, “session chair” as an example of a position that is not supported by travel grants. The Senate has received an increasing number of applications for travel grants for roles/purposes that are not explicitly covered. CRPP members agreed that it is not possible to rule on any blanket exceptions by discipline; within a given field, a position generally considered a non-presenter may rise to the standard of funding, but that does not mean every request will be appropriate. If faculty requests are denied, they have the opportunity to appeal their situation to the co-chairs of the Committee on Faculty Grants.

• In recent years, travel grants had been erroneously awarded to those traveling internationally in back to back years, even though the rule only allows funding for international travel every other year. Because domestic travel is funded annually, some faculty had argued that they should receive the domestic rate and choose whether to spend the lesser amount on international travel. The committee ruled to keep the policy as is and only fund international travel every other year, regardless of whether a domestic trip is taken.

• The committee considered the policy designating a professor ineligible for a travel grant due to being on unpaid leave from the University. The committee upheld the current policy but pledged to revisit the concept at a later date.

• CRPP considered a revised structure for faculty travel grants i.e. dropping the tiers of international travel in favor of simplified domestic and international rates. Members weighed the pros and cons and, because of the uncertainty of the travel landscape, decided that any changes should be tabled and revisited in the 2020-21 year.

• The members clarified the current reimbursement policy as follows: if a conference is postponed to next year, that can still be counted/funded as a trip from 2019-20; in practice that may mean some people receive funding to take two trips next year. The current caps apply, based on the destination. However, if a non-refundable ticket was purchased with grant money and the trip was not completed, a second trip cannot be funded for the given term.

Summary of Grant Applications and Awards

The Faculty Research Grant (FRG) budget allocation for the 2019-2020 cycle was $1,000,000 and the Pearl Chase Research Grant (PC) budget allocation was $32,000. During this cycle, 126 completed applications were reviewed by the Committee on Faculty Grants; 116 proposals were fully or partially funded.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the co-chairs allowed extensions to the submission deadline (March 29, 2020). Upon request, or if an initiated application was discovered as incomplete in the submission portal, faculty were given through April 8, 2020 to submit an application. It was announced by email that the opportunity for special accommodations existed for those in need.

The total amount of FRG funds awarded was $999,978.00. PC funds awarded totaled $12,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>$175,506</td>
<td>$115,526</td>
<td>65.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$9,455</td>
<td>52.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$137,163</td>
<td>$76,833</td>
<td>56.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>$390,482</td>
<td>$247,291</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$622,783</td>
<td>$424,238</td>
<td>68.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$137,222</td>
<td>$126,635</td>
<td>92.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,481,156</strong></td>
<td><strong>$999,978</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.51%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Executive Committee Annual Report: 2019-2020

According to Academic Senate Divisional Bylaws and Regulations, the Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education is a committee of the Academic Senate authorized as an organization through which the Faculty of the School can coordinate the academic affairs of the School. The Committee reports to, and is responsible to, the Academic Senate and its officers. The Executive Committee is distinguished from Administrative Committees that are created by the Administration and are responsible to, and report to, Administrative Officers.

2019-2020 Members
Andrew Fedders, Chair – GGSE Credential Leadership Committee Representative, Teacher Education Program Representative, Department of Education
Tarek Azzam – Department of Education Representative
Andrew Maul – Department of Education Representative
Ty Vernon – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Maryam Kia-Keating – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Victoria “Tory” Harvey – Non-Senate Faculty Representative (Teacher Education Program)
Shane Jimerson, Vice Chair – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Stephanie Arguera, Student Representative - Department of Education
Vacant, Student Representative - Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Jeff Milem, Dean
Aaron Ballett, Advisor
Briana Villasenor, Advisor

Executive Summary
The Faculty Executive Committee met seven times during the 2019-2020 academic year and addressed policy matters, curricular and academic matters, and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) matters presented by the Academic Senate and members of the GGSE.

Policy Matters:
- ESCI Ad Hoc Committee
  - The FEC appreciates the Ad Hoc committee’s work and began to look at alternatives or augmentations to the ESCI also
- Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations
The FEC echoes the concerns about low response rates of online course evaluation though we understand the inordinate amount of staff time required for paper evaluations. Potential changes or augmentations to the ESCI could help alleviate concerns about response rates and skewed results by providing more context and data on the quality and effectiveness of our instruction.

- **NCAA Eligibility Requirements**
  - The FEC supports UCSB adopting the NCAA eligibility requirements

- **BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT-SAT Essay Requirement**
  - The FEC approves the recommendation to eliminate the SAT/ACT Essay requirement for undergraduate admission

- **Report of the Academic Council’s Standardized Testing Task Force**
  - The FEC also agree with the additional recommendation by Glater, Gardana, Lynch, Maul, Cai, and Francis that the UC system consider eliminating consideration of scores on these standardized tests in admissions in a shorter time period than the nine-year span contemplated by the Report and potentially before an alternative suite of assessments is developed.

- **Flexibility of Grading Options**
  - The FEC did not have a planned meeting in time for the deadline on this item, and requested feedback email did not meet a quorum, but those that offered feedback did so in support of the proposed changes

- **Units for Program Review in 2021-22**
  - The FEC recommends that programs that have not undergone reviews in ten or more years be prioritized. This would include Computer Science, East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies, Film and Media Studies, Media Arts and Technology Program, Latin American and Iberian Studies Program, Environmental Studies Program, Anthropology, Sociology, and Military Science

- **Fall 2020 Registration Timeline Pilot**
  - The GGSE opted not to opine

### Curricular and Academic Matters:

- **UG Ocean Literacy Course**
  - The FEC approved the creation of this proposed new course

- **Master of Education in School Psychology**
  - The FEC approved the reinstatement of the M.Ed in School Psych

- **ED Minor Changes**
  - The FEC approves the creation of a new undergraduate course: ED 196, a general practicum course as an elective in the Educational Studies minor.
We also approve the increase of ED 128, ED 129, ED 130, and ED 131 to be increased from 3 to 4 units. This also will result in an increase in the units required in the Science and Mathematics Education minor tracks. This increase will be from 24 to 26 upper-division units in the Elementary Track and from 22 to 23 upper-division units in the Secondary Track.

**GGSE Matters:**

- **Syllabi Statements for GGSE**
  - In the 2017-18 school year the FEC worked to draft school wide language to be used in all syllabi. After further review, discussion, and vetting with other campus offices, the FEC voted to adopt the language and use it in all syllabi.

- **ESCI**
  - There have been repeated critiques that ESCI scores reflect implicit bias against racial minorities and women. In an effort to explore alternatives, the FEC has been reading and discussing research pertaining to teacher evaluation, other efforts on campus to find alternatives/additions to the ESCI. This work is ongoing and will be explored more fully in the next academic year.
Graduate Council
Annual Report 2019-20

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Graduate Council met for fourteen regularly scheduled two-hour sessions and one additional session during the 2019-20 term.

Executive Summary
The Graduate Council’s purpose is to set standards for and policy on graduate education; to ensure the viability and quality of graduate programs; and to provide advice and consent on all matters of policy, planning, programs and practice that impact the quality and diversity of UCSB’s graduate students and their educational experience.

The Graduate Council discussed and took action on a variety of key issues during the 2019-20 term, among them:
- Responding to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on graduate students by approving exceptions to current policies and practices, including extending time-to-degree by one year for all graduate students and allowing more flexible S/U grading for spring quarter.
- Approving the establishment of: a terminal Master of Education in School Psychology; a graduate degree program in Biological Engineering; and an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Climate Sciences and Climate Change.
- Commenting on various divisional draft policy documents including: proposed addition of language stipulating that students must be in compliance with the Student Code of Conduct to have their degree conferred; reports of ad hoc committees on ESCIs and Online Course Evaluations; part-time study and part-time tuition for graduate students; and a proposed graduate program name change for the Department of Theater and Dance.

I. Graduate Course Requests
Graduate Council authorizes, supervises, and regulates all graduate courses except such courses exempted by action of the Regents. During the period between 7/1/2019 and 6/30/2020, Council processed a total of 262 course requests, including new courses, modifications, and discontinuations.

II. Review of Academic Programs and Research Units
In cooperation with the Program Review Panel, Graduate Council participated in the Academic Program Review of the following departments and programs during the 2019-20 term: Communication; Comparative Literature Program/French and Italian/Germanic and Slavic Studies; Mathematics; and Statistics and Applied Probability.

Graduate Council recommended four departments and one program for Academic Program Review in 2021-22.

III. Proposals to Establish Programs, Emphases, Academic Units and Research Units
- Issued its support for a proposal from the Bren School to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) to its Master of Environmental Science and Management graduate program.
- Reviewed, sent back two rounds of questions to the initiators, and ultimately approved a proposal to establish an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Climate Sciences and Climate Change.
Considered, sent questions back to the initiators, and ultimately approved a proposal to establish a terminal Master of Education in School Psychology in the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology.

Reviewed and sent feedback to the initiators of a proposal to establish a 4 Plus 1 Master of Science in Geographic Information Science (GIS).

Reviewed and approved a proposal to establish a graduate degree program in Biological Engineering, and supported the establishment of an academic unit in Biological Engineering.

IV. Name Changes
Approved the name change of the graduate programs in the Department of Theater and Dance from “Theater Studies” to “Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies”.

V. Changes to Existing Programs
- Approved request from the Department of Feminist Studies to suspend graduate admissions for one year.
- Approved removing the oral dissertation defense requirement for the Ph.D. tracks in Hispanic Languages and Literatures in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.
- Approved the creation of a course subject code for the Master of Environmental Data Science.
- Approved the addition of the Department of Philosophy to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Cognitive Science.
- Approved the proposed changes to the degree requirements for the Department of Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology graduate programs.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the Master of Technology Management.
- Approved removing the shorter time-to-degree for the Ph.D. in Physics.
- Approved curricular changes to the Ph.D. in Theater, Dance and Performance Studies.
- Approved revisions to the Ph.D. qualifying exam in Portuguese and Brazilian Literatures in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.
- Approved changes to required courses in the Teacher Education program.
- Approved proposed changes to the D.M.A. curriculum.
- Approved the addition of a field to the graduate program in the Department of History.
- Approved curricular changes and an increased Ph.D. time-to-advancement and time-to-degree for the Department of Chicana/o Studies.
- Approved curricular changes to the graduate programs in East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies.
- Approved conforming curricular changes in Biomolecular Science and Engineering.
- Approved the proposed changes to the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Cognitive Science.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the M.A. in Global Studies.
- Approved changes to the Composition emphasis in the Department of Music.
- Approved changes to the qualifying exams for the Comparative Literature Program.
- Approved request from the Department of Sociology to suspend graduate admissions for one year.

VI. Student Petitions
Graduate Council did not receive any student petitions for 2019-20.

VII. Local Business
Faculty Graduate Student Mentoring Guidelines
Graduate Council continued work on the graduate mentoring guidelines started last year. Dean Genetti explained that graduate mentoring has been “under the radar” and something that faculty have not
been thinking about explicitly. Some members voiced the ongoing concern that mentoring looks very different among disciplines, while other members thought GC’s document was broad enough to apply to all faculty. Some ideas discussed included having the document as a way to spark discussions within departments; requiring departments to address mentoring within the Academic Program Review process; and presenting the guidelines as being part of a more holistic approach to mentoring on campus.

A draft was sent to a selection of graduate advisors (one from each college/school/division) for feedback. Comments received were generally very positive. Overall, members felt that the document encourages mentoring efforts from many different angles, is not prescriptive, and helps the campus be more proactive in regards to mentoring. There is a sense that student mental health issues are increasing, which faculty feel ill-equipped to handle. There is also evidence, through Academic Program Review surveys and national reports, that students are finding it increasingly difficult to find effective mentoring. Consultation with the Senate Chair is ongoing and the hope is to distribute this document in this next academic year.

Student Conduct-Degree Clearance Proposal
Graduate Council was joined by Leesa Beck, University Registrar, to discuss the proposal to require that students be in compliance with the Student Code of Conduct in order to have their degree conferred. GC reviewed the proposal last year, and had some serious concerns about students being “guilty until proven innocent”. Registrar Beck explained to GC that revisions to the UC Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations and Students (PACAOS) now require that campuses withhold awarding degrees to students who are in the middle of an investigation. This proposal would allow withholding degrees for students who commit a serious conduct violation near the end of their academic career, and complete their coursework before a sanction takes effect.

Ultimately, members agreed that this policy would address the current inequities in the sanctioning process, and GC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

Part-Time Study and Part-Time Tuition for Graduate Students
Dean Genetti presented a proposal to implement part-time study and part-time tuition for graduate students. A 1981 Presidential Policy allowing part-time study for graduate students was recently discovered; UCSB was one of two campuses that had not implemented this. The implementation policy would allow terminal master’s degree students, teaching credential students, and doctoral students who have not yet advanced to candidacy be eligible for part-time status. Part-time status would reduce half of tuition and non-resident supplemental tuition fees. Allowable reasons for part-time status would be limited to health, specific occupation and family responsibilities. Overall, GC was supportive of Graduate Division implementing a policy to adhere to the 1981 Presidential Policy.

Report of ESCI Ad Hoc Committee
GC discussed the Report of the ESCI Ad Hoc Committee. Members had a great degree of recognition of the problem, and thought the report disturbing, but well-founded. GC agreed that the ESCI system has had detrimental effects on instruction. There was concern about how the Committee on Academic Personnel uses ESCI scores and written comments for merit and promotion cases, and how one or two student comments can be used to represent a whole class. Members discussed how other institutions use faculty visits and peer review.

In terms of the effect on graduate education, members discussed how ESCIs are effectively the record of
teaching for graduate students and postdoctoral students. ESCI scores are used for TA and associate appointments, as well as when a student enters the job market. Many graduate courses are small, and some departments effectively erase graduate student feedback because of this. Graduate students may also be fearful to provide comments, as they worry faculty will be able to identify them and they could face repercussions. Council agreed that it would like to see the report address graduate students as a constituency of concern, as they are not mentioned. GC sent forward a memo with its main concerns.

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations
Graduate Council reviewed the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluations. Members overwhelmingly agreed that this ad hoc committee should speak with the ad hoc committee tasked with completely overhauling the current ESCI system. There was discussion about accessibility and students with differential access; the need for the online system to adapt to new or revised questions; having a system that would allow faculty to create their own additional questions; concern about the likely drop in response rates; and the environmental impact of continuing to use paper. The Council voted and by majority agreed that the plan to move campus course evaluations online should proceed, after areas of concern are addressed. GC sent forward a memo with a summary of members’ comments.

Fall 2020 Registration Timeline Pilot
Graduate Council reviewed the Fall 2020 Registration timeline pilot, which would adjust registration timing and unit thresholds to address numerous issues with the current registration process. Members were overall supportive of this pilot, but pointed out that there should be a contingency plan for new student registration during the summer if orientation programs must be moved online.

Winter NG Resolution
Winter quarter, graduate students at UCSB joined graduate students at UCSC in a wildcat strike for a Cost of Living Adjustment. Some striking students withheld winter quarter grades for undergraduate students. Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple circulated a memo that asked faculty members to get involved in obtaining those grades. Multiple members referenced a memo sent from the Office of the Registrar on March 24, which stated that missing grades would not be converted into F grades until the end of Fall Quarter 2020. It turned out that this communication was incorrect, and missing grades would be converted into F grades at the end of spring quarter. While many members objected to the tone and message of the memo, some members expressed a need to provide constructive input to help resolve the current situation. The suggestion was to instead inform the undergraduate students “that they can request the grade from their respective Teaching Assistant or the Instructor on Record”. There was also a minority suggestion that in addition to extending missing grades until Fall Quarter, all such grades should ultimately be converted into a Satisfactory (S) grade.

With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Graduate Student Association detached themselves from the movement. Most if not all missing winter quarter grades were eventually submitted.

Nominations for Program Review Panel
Graduate Council submitted the names of five Senate faculty members to the Committee on Committees for consideration for service on the Program Review Panel (PRP) beginning in 2020-21.

COVID-19 Graduate Student Issues
Graduate Council held its last meeting of winter quarter right before the California Stay-at-Home Order went into effect. Graduate Council held all of its spring quarter meetings via Zoom, and held an
additional meeting in early April in order to address urgent issues affecting graduate students. Action that Graduate Council took in spring quarter:

- Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) grading. Graduate Council voted to allow departments to relax their requirements for letter-graded courses for spring quarter (Senate Regulation 30). Departments could offer any graduate course for an S/U grade and courses taken for an S/U grade could count towards departmental requirements.

- Time-to-degree extensions. Graduate Council approved an automatic one-year extension to time-to-candidacy and time-to-degree norms, available to all current master’s and doctoral students. Members recognized that students extending their time would need additional funding, but that this could not be guaranteed.

- Approving a statement to be sent from Graduate Division encouraging departments to consider not requiring the GRE for admissions for the next cycle and reiterating the importance of holistic admissions to prospective graduate students.

- Encouraging deferments be granted more liberally this year, but on a student-by-student basis.

Graduate Council also discussed many other issues due to COVID-19, including:

- The possibility of summer sessions and fall quarter moving online. Members were concerned about how to uphold academic quality and standards, how they could create adequate online courses for future terms, and what criteria was being used to evaluate proposals for new online courses. Members also talked about the impracticalities for graduate students to learn, teach and conduct research online, while at the same time trying to take care of their own family and financial responsibilities.

- The well-being of graduate students. Graduate students serving as Teaching Assistants and Teaching Associates had an immense responsibility to move instruction from in-classroom teaching to remote teaching. Many students had field travel and research cancelled, which would delay progress to their degrees. Graduate students with children were affected by the closures of schools and childcare providers. Many graduate students were already vulnerable in terms of food and housing, and this pandemic only exacerbated this vulnerability. Graduate students who augmented their income by working for hourly and temporary wages both on-campus or off-campus saw their income sources disappear.

- Extending the 18-quarter limit for serving as a Teaching Assistant. This is a UC policy, and discussions were happening systemwide. Eventually, it was decided that the COVID affected quarters would not count towards the 18-quarter limit.

- In May, meeting with Vice Chancellor of Research Joseph Incandela and Librarian Antelman to discuss research and Library reopening plans.

- The Presidential Proclamation issued by President Trump on May 29 that would implement further restrictions on foreign nationals affiliated with the People’s Republic of China and the People’s Liberation Army. There are a handful of Chinese institutions affected, but it is likely there are current and incoming students from those.

- Whether international students who enroll remotely this fall will be eligible to be employed. There are a number of issues such as taxation and payroll for students who have not actually stepped foot into the U.S. UCOP sent out in-depth guidance during the summer.

- Potential cancellation of courses that serve as graduate program requirements.

- Some departments exploring suspending admissions for the 2021-22 year. Some departments are keeping ABD students on, if they have not gone over time-to-degree, in order to provide some funding for these students who would be entering a terrible job market.
VIII. Systemwide Business
Graduate Council was not asked to formally comment on any systemwide issues this year.

IX. Committees
Over the past several years, Graduate Council has opted to handle the vast majority of its business in full Council sessions, rather than delegating issues to the subcommittees. The subcommittees are called to meet only on an ad hoc basis.

X. Carry Over Issues for 2020-21
- Dealing with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and addressing its impacts on graduate students.
- Widely distributing the faculty graduate student mentorship guidelines.
- Conducting a review of the policies and procedures for establishing new interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases.
- Reviewing a revised proposal to establish a 4 Plus 1 Master of Science in Geographic Information Science (GIS).

Members 2019-20
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October 9, 2020

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Don Marolf, Chair
   Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections

Re: Revision to Bylaw 95: Committee on Diversity and Equity

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections (RJE) reviewed the proposed revision to Bylaw 95: Committee on Diversity and Equity, adding the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as an ex-officio member. RJE also reviewed the Committee on Diversity and Equity’s unanimous approval of this change. RJE approves of this ex-officio addition to Bylaw 95.

Cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
October 6, 2020

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
    Academic Senate

From: Melissa Morgan, Chair  
      Committee on Diversity and Equity

Re: Committee on Diversity and Equity Bylaw Revision

At its meeting of October 5, 2020, the Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) discussed adding the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as an ex-officio member. CDE voted to unanimously revise Bylaw 95 to reflect this member addition.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
95. Committee on Diversity and Equity

A. Purpose

To work towards attaining the campus goals of diversity and equity and actively pursue the goals of affirmative action.

B. Membership

The Committee consists of a Chair and at least 5 members appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, the Director of Equal Opportunity and the Director of Title IX & Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance serve as ex-officio members. In addition, there is one non-Senate academic representative, one undergraduate student, and one graduate student representative, appointed by the Committee on Committees, the Associated Students, and the Graduate Students Association, respectively. One Committee member is appointed to the Universitywide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity by the Committee on Committees. The Chair is a member of the Executive Council.

C. Duties

The Committee promotes campus diversity and equity, ensuring the equal treatment of women, ethnic minorities, individuals of diverse sexual orientations, individuals with disabilities, and other members of the campus community. In meeting this charge, the committee may:

1. initiate studies on campus diversity and equity, using data collected from all campus sources.
2. formulate and disseminate recommendations on any matter influencing campus diversity and equity.
3. address matters involving the hiring, employment, educational, and social circumstances of faculty, staff, and students. (En 8 Apr 76; Am 2 Jun 94) (En 30 May 02; Am 2 Jun 16)
October 9, 2020

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Don Marolf, Chair
      Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections

Re: Regulation 335: Requirements for the Master of Environmental Data Science (M.E.D.S.)

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections (RJE) reviewed the proposed new Regulation 335: Requirements for the Master of Environmental Data Science (M.E.D.S.). The new graduate program in Environmental Data Science was approved by Faculty Legislature April 18, 2019, and ultimately received approval by the UC President. However, the new regulation governing the MEDS degree was not reviewed and approved at that time.

RJE finds the new Regulation 335 to be similar to and in compliance with the other Master’s degree regulations, and approves its addition to Santa Barbara Division Regulations.

Cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Regulation 335: Requirements for the Master of Environmental Data Science (M.E.D.S.)

A. The provisions of Divisional Regulations 250 through 300 shall apply.

B. Completion of a minimum of 54 quarter units of course work approved by the faculty of the Environmental Data Science program.

C. Completion of an integrative capstone project acceptable to the student’s master’s advisor.
September 14, 2020

TO: Susannah Scott, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: Henry T. Yang  
Chancellor

RE: Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Proposal  
to Establish a Terminal Master of Education in School Psychology

Per the policy and procedures for the Establishment of a Graduate Program Leading to a New or Existing Degree, Graduate Council has forwarded to our offices a proposal from the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology (CCPS) to establish a terminal Master of Education in School Psychology. The Council seeks administrative review and approval.

Graduate Council distributed the original proposal to Carol Genetti, Dean of Graduate Division; Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; and Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources (CLIIR), and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP), for review and comment. The proposal was accompanied by letters of support from Jeffrey Milem, Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, and Tania Israel, Chair of the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology. The review process was iterative. The Council and reviewers requested revisions to the original proposal, as well as responses to some substantive concerns. CCSP responded to those requests. Council once again sent the updated materials to campus reviewers. It reviewed all updated materials and at its meeting of June 1, 2020, unanimously voted to approve the proposal.

Council’s approval came with caveats. The Council acknowledged the unprecedented times and the uncertain budgetary outlook for the campus. It was understood that the Department, Dean, and campus administration needed to evaluate the budgetary realities and possible impact on requested resources before the proposal could move to final approval. Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall consulted with Dean Milem. The Dean is aware of the concerns of Graduate Council and of the current state of the campus budget. An additional faculty appointment was made this year that will support the program, and the Council on Planning and Budget supports another faculty appointment in the area. However, the Dean and EVC Marshall agreed that it would be wise to wait to implement the new degree until all resources are in place to ensure the successful launch of the degree program.

Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall has endorsed this proposed degree with the above caveats, and the understanding that the actual launch and reinstatement of the program would occur only upon a request from the dean and the concurrence of the EVC, and he recommended that I offer final administrative endorsement at this time.

I reviewed the proposal. It strongly emphasizes the recruitment and acceptance of individuals from diverse and bilingual student populations. As Dean Milem notes in his letter of support, the proposed degree is consistent with the strategic planning project that GGSE carried out during 2018-19. It is also aligns with the vision, mission, and values of GGSE. As such, I concur with the Executive Vice Chancellor and endorse this proposal with the caveats he noted.

With this final administrative endorsement, the proposal can be placed on the Agenda of a future meeting of the Faculty Legislature for final legislative action.

cc: David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor  
Toby Lazarowitz, Executive Assistant  
Shasta Delp, Executive Director
June 26, 2020

To: David Marshall  
Executive Vice Chancellor

From: Divyakant Agrawal, Chair  
Graduate Council

Re: Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology – Proposal to Establish a Terminal Master of Education in School Psychology

Per the policy and procedures for the Establishment of a Graduate Program Leading to a New or Existing Degree, we are forwarding for your review and consultation with the Chancellor a proposal from the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology to establish a terminal Master of Education in School Psychology.

The Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology previously offered a terminal M.Ed. in School Psychology from 1991 until 2013. The program was originally cancelled at the recommendation of an external review committee that suggested it pulled resources from doctoral students, in the form of block grants and faculty mentoring time. In this new iteration, the program has been redesigned and reorganized with this history in mind. Its larger intent is to redress the shortages of school psychologists across California and nationwide by training and credentialing 15-20 each year. The proposal has a strong emphasis on recruiting and accepting diverse and bilingual student populations. The proposal convincingly shows a demonstrated need for well trained, compassionate, and above all, diverse and bilingual school psychologists to serve in a professional capacity across California.

The proposal was distributed to Carol Genetti, Dean of Graduate Division; Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; and Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources (CLIIR), and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP), for review and comment. The proposal was accompanied by letters of support from Jeffrey Milem, Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education and Tania Israel, Chair of the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology. During the Council’s meeting on February 24, 2020, GC evaluated a first submission of all materials. While GC and reviewing agencies were generally supportive of the proposed program, there were areas that needed to be further addressed. Concerns from GC and the reviewing agencies were conveyed to the initiator with a request for revisions and response to substantive concerns. A detailed response to concerns, along with a minimally revised proposal, was received and distributed to all reviewing agencies on April 30 for a subsequent review.

Graduate Council received revised letters, with varying levels of support, from all reviewing agencies. The Council reviewed the updated documentation at its meeting of June 1, 2020, and agreed that the faculty satisfactorily addressed all major concerns. GC unanimously voted to approve the proposal, with 6 members absent or not voting. The full proposal, initiator response and accompanying reviewing agency comments are attached for your review.
Graduate Council acknowledges the unprecedented times and the uncertain budgetary outlook for the campus. While GC approves the establishment of this graduate program, it is to be understood that there needs to be conversations between the Department, Dean, and campus administration regarding the budgetary realities and possible impact on requested resources before the proposal can move on to the next stages of review.

CC: Henning Bohn, Chair, Academic Senate
Debra Blake, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Carol Genetti, Dean, Graduate Division
Robert Hamm, Assistant Dean, Graduate Division
Rickie Smith, Director, Academic Services, Graduate Division
Toby Lazarowitz, Executive Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor
Steven Velasco, Director, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment
Jeffrey Milem, Dean, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
Tania Israel, Chair, Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Shane Jimerson, Professor, Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Briana Villasenor, Assistant Dean, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
Date: June 8, 2020

To: Divyakant Agrawal  
Chair, Graduate Council

From: Carol Genetti  
Anne and Michael Towbes Graduate Dean

Re: Proposal to Reinstate the School Psychology Master’s Degree in Education

The Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology (CCSP) within the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) has put together a compelling proposal to reinstate the School Psychology Master’s in Education. I offer my strong and unqualified support. First, a bit of background. The Department of CCSP requested permission to suspend admission to this program in 2014. The primary reason for this was the need to obtain “clarity regarding [the] mission, vision, purpose, and ... rationale for including the Terminal M.Ed. in School Psychology” (2/4/14 letter from the CCSP Department Chair to the Dean of the Graduate Division). The letter of the current Chair notes additional reasons for the termination: low enrollments and the program’s propensity to draw resources away from the doctoral program (including both block grant and faculty time for mentoring). Finally, the break in admissions permitted the Department to streamline the curriculum for the doctoral program, following recommendations that emerged from a 2013 program review.

The proposal to reinstate the program addresses the reasons for the discontinuation in four ways. First, it offers a clear vision for the Master’s in School Psychology as training diverse and bilingual cohorts of school psychologists who are able to meet the challenges of an increasingly diverse student population in the state and the nation. The curriculum has been explicitly designed to train students for this work. Second, it provides rationale for the program by citing the increased demand for school psychologists overall and in light of predicted retirements. Third, the proposal includes a plan to hire two PLSOEs to handle half of the teaching and to direct the third-year internship program. Under this plan, ladder-ranked faculty will teach the other half the Master’s curriculum (split across five ladder faculty), allowing them to maintain their focus on doctoral mentoring while still providing master’s students direct access to research faculty. Fourth, the proposal includes plans for aggressive outreach and recruitment designed to eventually provide cohorts of about twenty students per year. The changing market for school psychologists, the program’s focus on diversity and bilingual communities, and its outreach and recruitment strategies, should make this goal attainable.

The stated goals for restarting the program are laudable and worthy of university and systemwide support. They include: bringing contemporary science to the practice of school psychology, recruiting and training a more diverse pool of school psychologists to serve an increasingly diverse school population, and establishing a model program to train psychologists to work with linguistically diverse students and families. In addition, reinstating the program will increase graduate enrollment for the university and for GGSE/CCSP courses, provide opportunities for faculty to apply for training grants or other extramural funds, and increase opportunities for Ph.D. students to TA in the Master’s program. The proposed program is well designed. The curriculum follows national models and provides students with the necessary preparation for credentialing in the field.

The proposal also adequately addresses how the program will deal with access and affordability given that the target demographic will be students who traditionally come from low-income backgrounds. The Department notes that while this MA degree is self-funded (as is true of most MA degrees), there will be numerous opportunities for support. In year three of the program, students will be taking full-time paid
internships which, when coupled with the reduced tuition provided by part-time enrollment, will make the final year affordable. During the first two years, there will be various resources to help address financial need, at least partially. For example, support for students may come from service contracts with the school districts throughout Santa Barbara and Ventura counties; TAships at UCSB, in the GGSE minor and other programs on campus; extramural funding for professional preparation grants aimed at preparing diverse professionals; serving as resident hall coordinators; and Departmental block grant support. For students who must take out loans, the Health Resources and Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services provides several loan forgiveness programs to encourage health professionals to work in health professional shortage areas. Moreover, the program is committed to monitoring student debt and pursuing philanthropic and other sources of financial support for students.

Finally, the administration of the program will not require new staff and the demand for the degree is supported by market assessments and the expressed interests of our own undergraduates. This is an exciting program coming at a time when the need for bilingual school psychologist in California and across the country is not only great but is likely to increase. I enthusiastically support the proposal to reinstate the School Psychology Master’s in Education.
May 7, 2020

To: Henning Bohn, Chair  
Academic Senate, UCSB

From: Andrew Fedders, Chair  
Faculty Executive Committee, GGSE

Re: Proposal to Establish a Masters of Education in School Psychology

The Faculty Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education supports the work the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology has put into the proposed establishment of the Masters of Education in School Psychology. We appreciate the questions and concerns raised by other reviewing councils and committees. We are satisfied with the responses Dr. Jimerson provided. We reiterate our enthusiastic support for the reestablishment of this program.
May 27, 2020

To: Henning Bohn, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Christopher Newfield, Chair
      Council on Planning & Budget

Re: Proposal to Reinstate M.Ed. in School Psychology

The Council on Planning & Budget has reviewed the additional materials regarding the proposal to reinstate the M.Ed. in School Psychology. While CPB previously found the proposal well-articulated and compelling in its vision and goals, we appreciate the additional information. CPB is further satisfied by the initiator’s response to the Graduate Council memo, and we support the proposal.

cc: Debra Blake, Academic Senate Executive Director
May 29, 2020

To: Divyakant Agrawal, Chair
    Graduate Council

From: Eric Prieto, Chair
       Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposal to Re-Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology

The Undergraduate Council has discussed the response of the Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology to the earlier reviewing agency comments. While UgC is not opposed to the re-establishment of the program, the Council would like to continue to emphasize that the Department take care to ensure that new programs do not impact the health of existing programs, particularly the minor.

CC: Debra Blake, Executive Director
May 27, 2020

To: Henning Bohn, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Paul Berkowitz, Chair
       Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources

Re: Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology

At its meeting of May 22, 2020, the Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources (CLIIR) reviewed the responses to the Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology.

The committee is satisfied by the initiator response to its previously stated concerns.

CC: Debra Blake, Executive Director, Academic Senate
May 20, 2020

To: Henning Bohn, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Jianwen Su, Chair
       Committee on Research Policy and Procedures

Re: Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology

At its meeting of May 15, 2020, the Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP) reviewed the responses to its comments on the Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology.

The members remain concerned about demand for the program and that estimates of applicants are optimistic, particularly if the program is targeting underserved populations.

CRPP recommends that the program consider an even split of ladder faculty and teaching faculty for new hires. Although the program lays out its philosophy that no hierarchy exists within CCSP, the members feel that LSOEs are still not a replacement for research capacity and that research faculty are necessary to support a robust research mission within the department.

CC: Debra Blake, Executive Director, Academic Senate
April 24, 2020

To: Divyakant Agrawal, Chair Graduate Council

From: Shane Jimerson, on behalf of the faculty of the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology

Re: Responses to GC feedback to Proposal to Reinstate the Master of Education in School Psychology

Dear Dr. Divyakant Agrawal and members of the Graduate Council committee,

Thank you for your review and thoughtful feedback regarding the proposal to reinstate the Master of Education in School Psychology in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education. Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic, it took a couple of extra weeks to obtain the consultation that we were seeking from colleagues in other programs, national and state school psychology associations, and the department faculty. It is our hope that each of you are doing well and remaining healthy amidst the many challenges presented by COVID-19.

First, we sincerely appreciate the enthusiasm and support for the proposal – “The aims of the program are commendable, and the program has garnered support across campus agencies and administrators. The proposal convincingly shows a demonstrated need for well trained, compassionate, and above all, diverse and bilingual school psychologists to serve in a professional capacity across California. CCSP has also consistently tracked its graduates, demonstrating that all of its alumni are gainfully employed. ... In sum, GC is generally supportive of this initiative and would like to offer an opportunity for further refinement of the proposal before moving forward.” (GC memo 3.6.2020)

Second, we also appreciate the feedback provided by the Graduate Division Dean; Faculty Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; and Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources (CLIIR), and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP).

Third, we understand the volume of materials that the GC members receive to review, thus, we have attempted to succinctly address each of the questions. Our responses to each of the questions are included below. If additional information is sought, we are available to meet or connect via ZOOM with the GC or others who may seek to further discuss specific items.

1. If the intent is to produce bilingual school psychologists, why is there no specific foreign language requirement? The burden, thus, falls to students who already are bilingual, either through previous study, or are heritage speakers. As most heritage speakers are also students of color, this creates an undue burden on the most diverse student body, both as being the only students who can then be placed to work with
bilingual clientele, but without officially crediting or acknowledging this skill as a true credential. Further, this fails to encourage monolinguals to become bilingual and, in turn, serve a multilingual community. Requiring language study and setting a goal of basic fluency would also address the problematic homogeneity and monolingualism of the current populace of school psychologists.

In brief, we had initially considered a foreign language requirement; however, based on initial consultations with three colleagues who have been leaders in the field and have been responsible for preparing school psychologists who are bilingual for more than 20 years, we were advised against such a requirement. Notably, our colleagues suggested that foreign language requirements disadvantage heritage speakers and have little predictive validity of candidates’ foreign language proficiency in the professional context. Upon receiving the GC comments, we sent the comments regarding “specific foreign language requirements” to 5 additional colleagues who have each been immersed in preparing bilingual school psychologists for more than two decades. Each of these 5 colleagues indicated that they “disagreed” with the comments and that “their experiences were inconsistent” with the comments. The GC comment that “this creates an undue burden on the most diverse student body” was roundly rejected by each of our external colleagues. Instead of a burden, the opportunity to become a bilingual school psychologist has been perceived and experienced by heritage speakers as a tremendous advantage, one which has been rewarded handsomely in the career opportunities for these students. As with previous consultation, each of these additional external reviewers recommended against a foreign language requirement for the proposed program.

Consistent with the best programs training bilingual school psychologists, rather than a foreign language requirement, we plan to explore language proficiency through the admissions process and then, as appropriate, continue to focus on foreign language development during the program. Colleagues noted that “heritage speakers” do not always do well with formal language assessments AND that doing well on a formal language assessment does not necessarily result in the student having the skills to engage professionally with children and/or families. In addition to questions for applicants regarding foreign language skills, it is important to note that the UCSB school psychology program holds multiple interviews with students to assess their goodness of fit. As with our doctoral program, the school psychology faculty propose to conduct preliminary Zoom interviews with each individual applicant whose applications document the best fit with the program, which presents an opportunity to ask clarifying questions and explore foreign language skills and related experiences. Following this first phase of individual interviews, we invite candidates who demonstrate the best fit with the program to a second interview with us on campus, which includes numerous interactive activities throughout a full-day. These on-campus interviews offer extensive opportunities for the school psychology faculty to explore language proficiency, including interactions with students, faculty, and supervisors with bilingual language experience. Based on the abundance of information gathered through a multi-tiered and multi-faceted admissions process, applicants with the best fit with the program would be offered admission.
Based on extensive consultation, we are inclined to not include a specific foreign language requirement. If UCSB faculty colleagues have other experiences in preparing bilingual professionals, wherein, a specific foreign language requirement has proven valuable, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you and obtain further insights about how a specific foreign language may contribute.

2. As an unfunded terminal master’s program, disadvantaged, often minority, students may not have the necessary funding to enroll in this program. As Dean Genetti writes, “self-funded seems problematic.” This lack of affordability becomes prohibitive when combined with lack of access for the poorest students, who are also potentially the ones to lend the program credibility as multilingual and ethnically diverse. Was previous low enrollment related to a lack of M.Ed. funding? There is no cost analysis included for students’ living expenses, which are high here, and a concern especially for current students who are funded, not to mention students from diverse and low-income backgrounds. Potentially, the service contracts with local school districts could provide an important funding partnership. A stronger statement about realizing this potential is needed. Would TAships also offer a source of funding?

In brief, yes, it is true that nationally Masters degree programs in school psychology are self-funded and the vast majority of students in Masters degree programs in school psychology are self-funded. Based on the GC comments, we followed up with leaders of the National Association of School Psychologists, the California Association of School Psychologists, as well as the School Psychology Educators of California to seek further consultation. Indeed, all sources provided a single response – Masters degree programs in school psychology are self-funded. As noted by Dean Genetti, we have and would continue to make extensive efforts to secure support that would help to off-set the costs of graduate students at UCSB. We envision numerous opportunities, including: a. extramural funding for professional preparation grants aimed at preparing diverse professionals, b. external fellowship programs that aim to support the education of diverse professionals (e.g., the Gates foundation), c. working as resident hall coordinators in graduate housing, which has been a great experience for many of our school psychology students, d. working in service-contracts with the schools throughout Santa Barbara and Ventura counties during their graduate work, and e. seeking TAships at UCSB, in the GGSE minors, and with expertise that could contribute greatly to the ethnic studies, global studies, and other programs on campus seeking highly qualified diverse graduate students. The GGSE is also in the process of developing a major; thus, it is likely that even more TA opportunities would be available in the GGSE. In addition, as stated in the proposal, there would be an opportunity for students in the Masters program to apply for support from the Department, which would be awarded based on need. Notably, for school psychology Masters degree students, the third year internship is typically a paid internship, for the full academic year. Thus, masters graduate students only have two years in residence here at UCSB. Additionally, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) provides several loan forgiveness programs to encourage health professionals to work in health professional shortage areas. In exchange for a 2-year commitment to work in a shortage area, behavioral/mental health professionals may receive up
to $60,000 to help them repay qualified education loans. Participants have the option to extend their service to receive additional loan repayment assistance. This loan repayment assistance is tax-free. The CCSP faculty remain committed to helping to facilitate opportunities for support for the students in the Masters program in school psychology.

Regarding the student living cost analysis (while such information is not requested in the proposal guidelines), we had previously reviewed the UCSB website that clearly delineates the “cost of attendance” for graduate and undergraduate students ([https://www.finaid.ucsb.edu/cost-of-attendance](https://www.finaid.ucsb.edu/cost-of-attendance)). For CA residents, the cost will be between $36k-$40k annually depending on whether they live in graduate housing or off-campus, and for non-residents, $51k-$55k. While slightly higher than some schools, it is slightly lower than some other schools. Even if the student was fully funded through student loans, given the high salaries of school psychologists, the Return on Investment is very high (e.g., projected lifetime earnings more than double, and an initial return across the first decade projected to be and ROI of 525%, annualized ROI 18%). The career opportunities, compensation, benefits, and retirements are incentives for graduate students pursuing a Masters degree in school psychology. As discussed below, the previous low enrollment was a function of our infrastructure and faculty to facilitate the Masters degree in school psychology – NOT a function of low-funding, as there were numerous highly qualified applicants who were not admitted to the program. Moreover, our past Masters degree students received support through block grants, TAships, and GSRs. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you.

3. **On our campus alone, the number of disabled student certifications continues to rise each year; clearly, this begins much earlier in a student-career trajectory. How does the M.Ed. program intend to address this through curricular or internship opportunity?**

In brief, yes, the increase in students with disabilities attending college partially reflects the success of student support services throughout the individual’s pre-K through high school experience. We are enthusiastic to collaborate with the UCSB Disabled Students Program (we would prefer to refer to these efforts as Support for Students with Disabilities). Graduate students pursuing the Masters degree in school psychology could benefit and contribute to UCSB DSP efforts, and perhaps this may be an additional source of support for the school psychology students.

4. **A strong hierarchy will be introduced between the LSOEs versus ladder faculty, and as well, this potential exists between Ph.D. and M.Ed. cohorts, all whom might compete for advising attention from ladder faculty. It is neither ethical nor advisable to simply hire LSOE’s to address the additional teaching burden this program introduces. Why is this preferable to hiring ladder-rank faculty? The report does not sufficiently address the problem of advising: is that a part of this LSOE job description, or will this be absorbed by the existing ladder faculty, potentially leading to the same problems the program encountered before? The proposal should perhaps be expanded to point out the additional LSOE responsibilities that will be undertaken for degree certification as well as interfacing with external entities (e.g., K-12 institutions).**
In brief, we note that the LSOE position is a tenure-track, academic senate, ladder faculty position and we respectfully disagree with the suggestion that a “A strong hierarchy will be introduced between the LSOEs versus ladder faculty.” Perhaps this is informed by the experiences of faculty colleagues in other departments. This is not our experience within the CCSP department. Within the CCSP Department, we have consistently included both LSOEs (Assistant, Associate, and Full Teaching Professors) and Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors. Within the CCSP Department we have recently had a Teaching Professor transition to Full Professor, and an Associate Professor transition to Teaching Professor. The appropriate job title is about primary responsibilities in educating students. Each faculty member contributes importantly to the preparation of the students, with Teaching Professors engaging in more instructional activities focused on professional development, including extensive school and clinical practice supervision activities. Consistent with parallel clinical teaching positions in medical and other applied settings, the Teaching Professors provide ample advising as the graduate students progress through a series of internal and external fieldwork experiences focused on developing their clinical knowledge and skills. Throughout their teaching and supervision activities the Teaching Professors will interface with K-12 institutions and other community and campus agencies that afford opportunities for further learning, development, and contributions consistent with the preparation of school psychologists. Moreover, the Teaching Professors are colleagues who have extraordinary professional practitioner skills and knowledge and a commitment to preparing students for such activities, providing supervision, advising, and guidance in a way that most traditional research focused faculty do not. Thus, the balance of skills and competencies among CCSP faculty (including Teaching Professors) is intentional, purposeful, and necessary in a degree program that trains its students for careers requiring professional credentials and certifications. Considering the unique combination of professional practice and scholarship that is emphasized to successfully prepare graduate students, the CCSP faculty remain committed to the importance of all faculty colleagues. The CCSP Department FTE plan continues to emphasize further growth across Teaching Professors as well as Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you.

5. The program will use significant staff resources, especially for the internal individual evaluation of every student each quarter. The minimal increase in staff workload seems unrealistically low.

In brief, it is important to note that it is our GGSE staff who stated this budget projection based on their projections in workload. One staff member with about two decades of experience with the CCSP Department and the school psychology credential program, and who is responsible for all credential programs in the GGSE, was directly involved in establishing the projections included in the proposal. Others have extensive experience with admissions processes and other activities additional graduate students may warrant. The staff involved have extensive experience and we believe them. It is important to note that there has been declining enrollment in the GGSE during the past decade, thus, current staff have experienced what it takes to fulfill their responsibilities with various numbers of students. Furthermore, the staff
highlight that given the highly structured school psychology program, the amount of time and energy to support these students is minimal. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you to further understand what may be optimal.

Below are a few brief comments on additional items that were not highlighted in the GC comments. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you to share additional information.

**Committee on Research Policy and Procedures** - *The members felt that the justification for expanded enrollment was weak.*

In brief, the UCSB school psychology faculty currently write over 30 letters of recommendation a year for extremely talented and diverse UCSB undergraduate students applying to school psychology Masters programs. At least half of these students would prefer to stay at UCSB to continue their graduate studies in school psychology. Moreover, top school psychology Masters programs in California are currently receiving 100-200 applicants each year. With targeted outreach to students across the University of California and California State University education and psychology programs (as well as programs throughout the country), highlighting the tremendous career opportunities for school psychologists from historically underrepresented and/or marginalized groups, we anticipate that within a few years we would yield over 100 applicants each year. Given the tradition of excellence at UCSB in school psychology (e.g., high national rankings, faculty leadership, faculty distinction), the UCSB program will undoubtedly yield a high level of exceptionally qualified applicants. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you to share additional information.

**Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources** - *Although the committee noted that no new library resources appear necessary, the committee is concerned that cost estimates for the program, specifically $10,000 cited for assessments, are unrealistically conservative.*

In brief, our estimates are based on three decades of preparing students in the CCSP Department. These assessment resources are Department based. Based on our experiences with purchasing assessment kits, scoring packages, and consumable materials, with the increase of 20 graduate students, we fully expect this to be below the annual projection of $10,000. It is important to highlight the 50-75% discount that graduate training programs receive on assessment materials from most publishers. Also, as noted in the proposal, we have had tremendous success accessing assessment materials from publishers through their graduate program giveaway initiatives and other publisher “assessment grants” programs that have yielded assessment kits, scoring packages, and consumable materials. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you to share additional information.
Graduate Division Dean Genetti also noted - ... the inclusion of the credentialing exam as the final exam for the master’s degree (p. 16). In my view, the academic program and the credentialing process should be independent of each other, and the academic degree should not be dependent on passing the exam of an external accrediting agency. Also, I note that students currently doing the doctorate in the school psychology track of CCSP can pick up a master’s degree in the process, and the degree sheet for that master’s does not include passing the credentialing exam. It also does not require students to do the year’s internship. If both sets of students are getting the same master’s degree, then they should need to complete the same set of requirements. This means that either the requirements for the credential need to be removed from the current curriculum, or there need to be two separate tracks for the master’s, one for students aiming for a credential and one for students in the doctoral program.

In brief, we understand, and we have made these revisions in the degree sheet to be consistent with Dean Genetti’s recommendations. To further illustrate the distinction between those courses for the MED and those required for the credential, we have if there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you to share additional information.

a. Required and recommended courses, including teaching requirement.

Courses with * highlighted in blue below are PPS credential courses = 24 units
Other courses below are listed for the Med = 60 units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course UNITs</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year (on campus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274A*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 250</td>
<td>Cognitive Assessment for school psych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CNCSP stats/Methods class for SP MEd students</td>
<td>Applied Statistics and Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274B*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 257B</td>
<td>Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262B</td>
<td>School-Based Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274C*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 256</td>
<td>Behavioral Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Bases of Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year (on campus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274D</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262C</td>
<td>Counseling Children and Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 220</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274E</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 291C</td>
<td>School and Family Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 223B</td>
<td>Developmental Psychopathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274F</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 292</td>
<td>Risk and Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 264A</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the above required courses, 84 Quarter Units would be required, this includes 60 units for the M.Ed. (which is awarded by UCSB) and 24 additional units for the PPS credential (awarded by The California Department of Education – Commission on Teaching Credentials – Pupil Personnel Services Credential). Completion of the above coursework would fulfill the external accreditation requirements that are consistent across the National Association of School Psychologists and the California Department of Education for the professional preparation and credentialing of school psychologists. For instance, the NASP Practice Model has two major parts: (a) Professional Practices and (b) Organizational Principles. Professional Practices include 10 domains of school psychology practice that are organized into three areas: (a) foundations of school psychological service delivery; (b) practices that permeate all aspects of service delivery; and (c) direct/indirect services to children, families, and schools.

Below is a copy of the revised version of the Appendix 4. M.Ed. School Psychology Degree Requirements
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING, CLINICAL, & SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY
https://education.ucsb.edu/ccsp
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara

Student Name: ___________________________  Perm: ___________________________

M.Ed. – Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology:
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY Specialization – 2021-22 (Plan II - Project)

In addition to departmental requirements, candidates for graduate degrees must fulfill University requirements described in the ‘Graduate Education’ section of the UCSB General Catalog.

The M.Ed. in Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology with an emphasis in School Psychology is issued to students enrolled in the CCSP doctoral program. If you have successfully completed two years of full-time courses (all courses passed with a B or higher and totaling a minimum of 60.0 units) you may file for the M.Ed. (recommended by May 15th of their second spring quarter). The M.Ed. will be awarded no sooner then the end of the student’s second year in the program, following a review by CCSP faculty. A committee consisting of the student’s faculty advisor, the credential coordinator, and two additional CCSP faculty must sign this form (available from the Student Affairs Office) upon completion of degree requirements, indicating the student’s eligibility for the M.Ed.

### COURSE REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE #</th>
<th>COURSE NAME</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESEARCH METHODS AND STATISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SCIENTIFIC, METHODOLOGICAL, AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 220</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 223B</td>
<td>Developmental Psychopathology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274D</td>
<td>Assessment and Data-Based Decision Making in the Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 291C</td>
<td>School and Family Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT AND INTERVENTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 250</td>
<td>Cognitive Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 256</td>
<td>Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 257B</td>
<td>Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262B</td>
<td>School-Based Mental Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262C</td>
<td>Counseling Children and Families</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 264A</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274F</td>
<td>The School Psychologist as the Intervention Consultant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CULTURAL AND INDIVIDUAL DIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP ??? NEW</td>
<td>Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Bases of Diversity in the Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274E</td>
<td>Ethics, Diversity, &amp; Specialized Assessment &amp; Intervention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 292</td>
<td>Risk and Resilience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FIELDWORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 260B</td>
<td>Basic Practicum I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students are required to submit a portfolio as part of the M.Ed. oral comprehensive exam process (typically during the spring quarter of the second year of study). The student portfolio documents student products produced as part of coursework, fieldwork experiences, and other creative products (e.g., publications and conference presentations). The M.Ed. oral examination occurs as part of the year-2 portfolio examination and involves faculty affiliated with the school psychology area.

**M.Ed. Committee:** Chair: ___________________________ Project Date: ____________

   Member: ___________________________
   Member: ___________________________
   Member: ___________________________
   Member: ___________________________
   Graduate Advisor: ___________________________

   Degree Quarter: ___________________________

---

**FOR GRADUATE DIVISION USE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence requirement-minimum 3 quarters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required units completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language requirement Satisfied <em>(if required)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No grades of I, NR, or NG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 or better GPA overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conclusion, we appreciate the thoughtful reviews and comments provided by the UCSB committees, councils, and leaders. If there is further explanation or clarification that is needed, we would enjoy the opportunity to meet with you to share additional information. We look forward to further communications to reinstate the Master of Education in School Psychology in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education.
March 6, 2020

To: Shane Jimerson, Professor  
Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology

From: Divyakant Agrawal, Chair  
Graduate Council

Re: Proposal to Establish a Master of Education in School Psychology

Graduate Council (GC) has considered the proposal to establish a Master of Education in School Psychology in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education. The proposal was distributed to the Graduate Division Dean; Faculty Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; and Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources (CLIIR), and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP). All responses are attached.

GC reviewed the proposal at its meeting of February 24, 2020. The discussion was informed by the reviewing agency comments. The aims of the program are commendable, and the program has garnered support across campus agencies and administrators. The proposal convincingly shows a demonstrated need for well trained, compassionate, and above all, diverse and bilingual school psychologists to serve in a professional capacity across California. CCSP has also consistently tracked its graduates, demonstrating that all of its alumni are gainfully employed.

However, members determined that there are a few areas of concern that need to be further addressed. GC’s concerns and questions are presented below. The reviewing agency comments should also be thoroughly read and addressed, particularly Dean Genetti’s detailed comments about access and affordability and the credentialing exam.

- If the intent is to produce bilingual school psychologists, why is there no specific foreign language requirement? The burden, thus, falls to students who already are bilingual, either through previous study, or are heritage speakers. As most heritage speakers are also students of color, this creates an undue burden on the most diverse student body, both as being the only students who can then be placed to work with bilingual clientele, but without officially crediting or acknowledging this skill as a true credential. Further, this fails to encourage monolinguals to become bilingual and, in turn, serve a multilingual community. Requiring language study and setting a goal of basic fluency would also address the problematic homogeneity and monolingualism of the current populace of school psychologists. The statistics offered in the report state that 86% of school psychologists are fluent in English only and that culturally diverse school psychologists are severely underrepresented: 87% of them are Caucasian and only 8% offer services in a second language (pg. 21).

- As an unfunded terminal master’s program, disadvantaged, often minority, students may not have the necessary funding to enroll in this program. As Dean Genetti writes, “self-funded seems problematic.” This lack of affordability becomes prohibitive when combined with lack of access
for the poorest students, who are also potentially the ones to lend the program credibility as multilingual and ethnically diverse. Was previous low enrollment related to a lack of M.Ed. funding? There is no cost analysis included for students’ living expenses, which are high here, and a concern especially for current students who are funded, not to mention students from diverse and low-income backgrounds.

Potentially, the service contracts with local school districts could provide an important funding partnership. A stronger statement about realizing this potential is needed. Would TAships also offer a source of funding?

- On our campus alone, the number of disabled student certifications continues to rise each year; clearly, this begins much earlier in a student-career trajectory. How does the M.Ed. program intend to address this through curricular or internship opportunity?

- A strong hierarchy will be introduced between the LSOEs versus ladder faculty, and as well, this potential exists between Ph.D. and M.Ed. cohorts, all whom might compete for advising attention from ladder faculty. It is neither ethical nor advisable to simply hire LSOE’s to address the additional teaching burden this program introduces. Why is this preferable to hiring ladder-rank faculty? The report does not sufficiently address the problem of advising: is that a part of this LSOE job description, or will this be absorbed by the existing ladder faculty, potentially leading to the same problems the program encountered before? The proposal should perhaps be expanded to point out the additional LSOE responsibilities that will be undertaken for degree certification as well as interfacing with external entities (e.g., K-12 institutions).

- The program will use significant staff resources, especially for the internal individual evaluation of every student each quarter. The minimal increase in staff workload seems unrealistically low.

In sum, GC is generally supportive of this initiative and would like to offer an opportunity for further refinement of the proposal before moving forward.

CC: Henning Bohn, Chair, Academic Senate
Debra Blake, Executive Director, Academic Senate
David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor
Toby Lazarowitz, Executive Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor
Jeff Milem, Dean, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
Tania Israel, Chair, Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Carol Genetti, Dean, Graduate Division
Paul Berkowitz, Chair, Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources
Andrew Fedders, Chair, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Faculty Executive Committee
Christopher Newfield, Chair, Council on Planning and Budget
Eric Prieto, Chair, Undergraduate Council
Jianwen Su, Chair, Committee on Research Policy and Procedures
Robert Hamm, Assistant Dean, Graduate Division
Shasta Delp, Analyst, Undergraduate Council
Casey Hankey, Analyst, Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures
Kyle Richards, Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
Briana Villasenor, Assistant Dean, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
Aaron Ballett, Advisor, GGSE Faculty Executive Committee
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of the School Psychology Masters in Education Program
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Graduate Degree Program Proposal

**Title:** Proposal for Reinstatement of the School Psychology Masters in Education Program

**Date of Preparation:** March - October 2019

**Section 1. Introduction**

The School Psychology (SP) Masters in Education program was established at UCSB in 1991. Historically, the program was small, enrolling only 3-5 students each year, thus, graduating about 80 MEd students 1992-2014. Following the Academic Program Review in 2013, with the primary focus on streamlining the PhD course requirements, the faculty in the Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology (CCSP) determined that it would be prudent to submit a request to Graduate Division that the program stop admitting students to the terminal Master's degree program in School Psychology, as we needed to focus squarely on streamlining and adjusting the doctoral program. During the past five years, program faculty were able to implement modifications to the PhD program and have now redesigned the terminal Masters in Education program in School Psychology. Following the CCSP department successfully a) streamlining the PhD degree program requirements (reduced required units by 28% through the review / revision / modification process), as well as b) making adjustments to maximize the funding for the PhD students, the faculty of the Department of CCSP now submit this proposal to reinstate the terminal Masters in Education School Psychology program (see discussion below regarding CCTC accreditation continuing and reestablishing the NASP accreditation). With the opportunity to rethink and reconstruct the program, this proposal highlights the need and infrastructure to admit cohorts of 15-20 students into the 3-year terminal Masters in Education School Psychology program (thus, at full capacity, each year there would be approximately 50-60 students enrolled in this program across the three cohorts – see discussion below regarding related faculty and staff implications). Guidance from UCSB central campus staff indicated that we should complete this Graduate Degree Program Proposal to re-establish the terminal Masters in Education School Psychology program.

With shortages of school psychologists extensively documented in the State of California and nationally, the CCSP working group determined that the Masters in Education and credential program will meet a critical and urgent need for school psychologists prepared to meet the needs of diverse children and families across the state of California, nationally, and internationally. Based on applications to other terminal Masters School Psychology programs in California over the past decade, we anticipate over 100 applicants each year and immediate career opportunities for graduates. Based on the Salary, Job Market, Future Growth, Stress, and Work Life Balance -- the 2018 US World News Report indicates that a School Psychologist is the #2 career option in Social Services career opportunities. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that this profession will grow at a rate of 14 percent between 2016 and 2026, which will equate to more than 20,000 new jobs for school psychologists across the nation. A heightened awareness of mental health’s connection to learning and the rising need for mental health services in schools are driving the demand for more school psychologists. School psychologists in California earn an average salary (for 9 months) of $90,210. In several
areas of California, starting salaries are $80k-$90k, with many in these districts making more than $110k salary (for 9 months of employment).

Furthermore, with the reinstatement of the Masters in Education we anticipate being well positioned and highly competitive for extramural funding via Federal training grants that other School Psychology masters’ degree programs have successfully secured. We would aim to be a model program for the preparation of school psychologists trained to support ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students and families. These efforts are consistent with the mission of the CCSP department (particularly the emphasis on engaging in scholarship and preparing professionals who will foster the psychological well-being and social equity of all people, especially vulnerable populations), and is also consistent with further educating and preparing students at UCSB to actualize UCSB’s commitment as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI).

The reinstatement (reopening of admissions) for the terminal Masters in Education School Psychology program within the current context presents numerous opportunities. See for instance Table 1, which delineates several opportunities (aims and objectives).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Problem that is Addressed</th>
<th>Impetus and Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation of School Psychologists to serve DIRE needs throughout, County, State, and Nation</td>
<td>COUNTY, STATE, NATIONAL Documented shortage of School Psychologists</td>
<td>See for instance, 2017 NASP document detailing the shortage of school psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparation of School Psychologists to serve diverse children and families (at the County, State, and National levels)</td>
<td>COUNTY, STATE, NATIONAL Documented shortage of diverse School Psychologists</td>
<td>See for instance, 2017 NASP document detailing the shortage of school psychologists from diverse backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preparation of more school psychologists prepared to serve linguistically diverse children and families (at the County, State, and National levels)</td>
<td>COUNTY, STATE, NATIONAL Documented shortage of School Psychologists with bilingual skills</td>
<td>See for instance, 2017 NASP document detailing the shortage of school psychologists from diverse backgrounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Mobilization of Knowledge - Translation of Science to Practice - Prepare school psychology professionals, within UCSB context of accomplished scholars to further promote bringing contemporary science to practice. | **COUNTY, STATE, NATIONAL**

*Many school psychology masters programs are not situated within a program emphasizing advancement of knowledge* | See for instance, previous rankings of UCSB SP faculty contributions to advancing knowledge placed UCSB SP as the #2 SP program in the country |

| 5. Opportunity to offer the SP Masters in a manner that allows it to flourish | **CCSP will operate a Masters program without compromising the doctoral program** | Previous efforts to reduce the PhD required courses for SP allows for reconceptualizing the Masters coursework - see SP masters proposal |

| 6. Increase in Graduate Enrollment benefits CCSP / GGSE as UCSB Long Range Development Plan delineated growth in graduate enrollment | **CCSP, GGSE, UCSB**

*CCSP is a very small portion of UCSB graduate enrollment, -- the Masters in SP affords the opportunity to Double the Graduate Enrollment of the CCSP Department, and contribute to increase of UCSB graduate student enrollment* | See UCSB Long Range Development Plan (2010)
See communications from CCSP Department Chair regarding proposals for new degree programs (Fall 2017) |

---

This School Psychology Masters in Education program proposal emerges from the current context of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (The Gevirtz School), which has been engaged in strategic planning throughout the academic year.

From this process, a renewed commitment has been articulated to the Mission and further delineation of the Vision and Values of The Gevirtz School (areas underlined below are each emphasized within the School Psychology Masters in Education program proposal).
Mission:
(1) To conduct scholarly inquiry into education, especially into educational responses to the challenges posed by individual, economic, linguistic, and cultural diversity in our multicultural society;
(2) To educate scholar researchers and scholar practitioners to address educational opportunities and challenges arising from diversity;
(3) To develop and maintain exemplary programs that serve as models for teaching, research, and service.

The Gevirtz School’s research and instructional programs are committed to provide the best possible balance between the equally valued goals of equity and excellence in education in a manner consistent with our democratic society.

Vision:
The Gevirtz School will be a leader in addressing pressing social issues through interdisciplinary collaborations grounded in educational and applied psychological research, teaching, and service.

Values:
We pursue this vision by...
- Embracing our responsibility as a Minority-Serving Institution (MSI) to catalyze the strengths of diversity and address the challenges of our complex world
- Teaching leaders who will help build equitable communities locally and globally
- Transforming school and community-based systems to better serve vulnerable populations
- Collaborating with community stakeholders in leveraging data to maximize the impact of our work

The School Psychology Masters in Education program is consistent with the Mission, Vision, and Values of The Gevirtz School that have been discussed and delineated through the recent strategic planning process.

The following sections provide information outlined in the Graduate Degree Program Proposal guidelines.

1.1 Aims and objectives of the program. Any distinctive features.
Our central aims in the development of this program are to: (a) prepare school psychologists who will bring contemporary science to practice, (b) to recruit and prepare exceptionally diverse graduates to meet the needs of diverse children and families across California and throughout the country, and (c) to establish a model program for the preparation of school psychologists with skills to work with linguistically diverse students and families. Most practicing school psychologists are master’s level as this is the minimum degree required. Therefore, offering this Master’s degree in school psychology and admitting cohorts of 15-20 students will afford the opportunity to make meaningful contributions in bringing the science
and scholarship to practice to benefit children, families, and education professionals across California and throughout the country.

1.2 Historical development of the field and historical development of departmental strength in the field.

The field of school psychology has expanded tremendously during the past 5 decades. With increasing emphasis on evidence-based practice in the field of school psychology and increasing recognition of the need to support the social, emotional, behavioral, and mental health and well-being of all children, in addition to facilitating their academic success, the field of school psychology has flourished. Ratios of school psychologists to students have gone from 1 school psychologist to 2,000 students 30 years ago, to 1:1,500 20 years ago, and 1:1,000 in the recent decade, and many school psychologists working in a setting with a ratio of 1:500. Thus, there is tremendous opportunity and need for school psychologists in schools throughout California and across the country. All professional and scholarly indicators highlight that school psychology as a field and a profession are flourishing.

When established in 1991, the UCSB school psychology faculty included Dr. Michael Furlong and Dr. Gale Morrison. In 1997, Dr. Shane Jimerson joined the school psychology faculty. In addition, various lecturers contributed to coursework necessary required for State and National accreditation in school psychology, most notably, Dr. Jill Sharkey in the early 2000’s. In 2007, Dr. Erin Dowdy and Dr. Matthew Quirk were hired to further expand the school psychology faculty and Dr. Jill Sharkey became a full-time faculty member. As PhD courses were streamlined in 2013, lecturers no longer continued teaching courses for the program. In 2016, Dr. Chunyan Yang was hired as a school psychology Tenure-Track faculty member – further enhancing the bilingual and bicultural capacity of the faculty, however, she was recruited by UC Berkeley in 2019 and given spousal hire considerations has transitioned to UC Berkeley. Although Drs. Morrison and Furlong retired over the past few years, the program has maintained its strong reputation. Through the scholarship, as well as state, national, and international leadership of the school psychology faculty (having UCSB faculty as past and present Presidents of 4 of the 5 major state, national, and international school psychology associations), the UCSB school psychology program is recognized as a top 10 program by colleagues throughout the world (e.g., Wagner, Lail, & Viglietta, 2006). In 2006, results of a study published in the School Psychology Review journal, which examined all scientific publications of all school psychology programs and faculty in the United States, revealed that the UCSB program faculty were the #2 most productive in the country. During the past two decades UCSB faculty have received numerous research awards from leading associations and journals (American Psychological Association, National Association of School Psychologists, California Association of School Psychologists, International School Psychology Association, The Society for the Study of School Psychology, Journal of School Psychology, School Psychology Review, School Psychology Quarterly), in addition to leadership as President, Executive Committee Members, Editorships, and Associate Editors of each of these major associations and journals in the field of school psychology. In addition, the school psychology faculty through their efforts in the Center for School Based Youth Development have yielded millions of dollars of extramural funding, including many
collaborative projects with schools in Santa Barbara County and recent federal grants from the Institute of Educational Sciences for over 1 million dollars. Furthermore, despite being a small program, during the past decade the school psychology program has prepared over 25 doctoral graduates who have taken faculty and research positions in programs throughout the country. During the past 20 years, the UCSB school psychology program has established a tradition of excellence that is recognized by colleagues throughout the world. Thus, the UCSB school psychology program is a highly successful program and is a highly desirable context for students to seek both the PhD and MEd degrees in school psychology.

1.3 Proposed implementation date and timetable for development of the program, including enrollment projections. Consistency of these projections with the campus enrollment plan. If the campus has enrollment quotas for its programs, state which program(s) will have their enrollments reduced in order to accommodate the proposed program.

The proposal to reinstate/reopen the program is submitted for review Fall of 2019. Considering the various committees that we understand the review process will include, we anticipate that during the 2019-2020 academic year, a decision should be forthcoming. Given that most of the necessary courses exist on the books for the MEd students (some of which have not been offered since the department stopped admitting students to the terminal Masters program), we anticipate that there would only be a few courses necessary to add to meet the needs of MEd students. In addition, we propose that 2 additional Lecturer PSOE (Teaching Professors) with bilingual skills and school psychology preparation be hired to fulfill the supervision and teaching demands, in addition to the contributions of the current school psychology faculty. The additional Teaching Professors have been included in previous CCSP Department FTE requests and given the ongoing support of Dean Milem for this proposal and expected allocation of FTE, these additional faculty could be hired during the 2020-2021 academic year. As noted in Dean Milem’s letter of support, “This proposal is consistent with GGSE strategic planning discussions, processes, and outcomes during the 2018-2019 academic year.” Furthermore, Dean Milem has communicated that he supports the rationale for the additional FTE and that they are a priority. Dean Milem previously communicated with the Committee on Planning and Budget (2019) that the 2020 GGSE FTE plan will include top priorities that emerged from the strategic planning, which includes these FTE. It is crucial that these FTE be allocated and recruited prior to admitting students so they are at full teaching capacity as the program starts to ramp up enrollment. Starting in fall 2020, we would setup all necessary course sequences and begin to review applications for students to enter the fall of 2021. We understand that this is an ambitious timeline, however, given that CCSP faculty have; a) previously offered the terminal Masters program for School Psychology, b) already been immersed in redesigning the necessary coursework for the terminal Masters program, c) has maintained the California Credential for Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) necessary to qualify for practice as a school psychologist in California, as well as national certification through the National association of school psychologists, d) has been actively involved in reviewing school psychology programs with the California Board of Institutional Reviewers (California Department of Education), -- we anticipate that we will
be prepared to open admissions cycle for 2021. If reviews and approvals take longer on the front-end, then we would adjust the timeline to begin in fall of 2022.

During the first few years of the program, it is anticipated that cohorts of 10 Masters students would permit refining the infrastructure to support their preparation and that during the next few years, the number of students admitted would be increased to consistently yield 15-20 Masters students in each cohort. The table below outlines the anticipated enrollment across the next decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year student cohort</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year student cohort</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year student cohort (on internship)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note regarding the internship year – the California credential for school psychologists requires a 1500 hour culminating internship experience. Students are placed in school districts (who compensate them) for this final culminating internship experience. Students are enrolled at UCSB, provide a record of internship hours and experiences, and receive supervision and consultation as needed from the UCSB faculty member responsible for the internship course (which is the only course the students enroll in during their final year in the program).

Based on discussions among CCSP faculty it is anticipated that most of the current courses that would be included among the MEd degree program would absorb the additional enrollment, and the other relevant courses that have not been offered in the past few years would be designed to support the cohorts of 20 MEd students and in some instances also include the 5 PhD school psychology students.

1.4 Relationship to and effect of the proposed program on existing programs on campus and the Campus Academic Plan. If the program is not in the Campus Academic Plan, why is it important that it be established now? Evidence of high campus priority. Effect of the proposed program on undergraduate programs offered by the sponsoring department(s).

When the campus academic plan was developed, the proposed terminal Masters program
was established, therefore, it would not be included in that plan. However, as we have seen the enrolled percentage of graduate students at UCSB decline (relative to when the 2025 plan was established), it is evident that increasing graduate enrollment and meeting the needs of California children, families, and communities, will require the development of high quality Masters programs that can efficiently and effectively enroll more graduate students relative to the faculty load, compared to the enrollment and advising of doctoral students. As described in other sections, there is tremendous need for more school psychologists, and the career opportunities are outstanding.

While the GGSE is currently exploring possible undergraduate programs, the school psychology faculty have prepared, and will continue to contribute to, undergraduate instruction. It is anticipated the current Minor in Applied Psychology and any forthcoming major in the GGSE would provide an opportunity to offer instruction and encourage undergraduate minor (and or major) students to apply and pursue the graduate Masters in Education degree in School Psychology. If possible, in the future, we would like to explore the possibility of some UCSB students being afforded the opportunity to begin their school psychology studies as undergraduates. Such a program would be detailed in a future proposal, as we have recently engaged in preliminary discussions with Graduate Division Dean Carol Genetti to explore these possibilities.

### 1.5 Contributions to diversity: All proposals must include (a) a vision for how the program will advance UC's goals for diversity and (b) a plan that details what steps the program will take in its first five years to move it toward the identification, recruitment, and retention of underrepresented minority students and faculty. The proposal should clearly document the ways in which the program will evaluate its diversity goals.

The proposed reinstatement of the Masters of Education School Psychology program at UCSB includes an emphasis on advancing diversity in the field of school psychology, which is consistent with the UC’s goals related to diversity. These efforts are consistent with further educating and preparing students at UCSB to actualize UCSB’s commitment as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI). In considering ethnic / racial demographics of contemporary school psychologists, there is notable incongruence between school psychologists and the populations they serve. Whereas about 50% of the school-age population are members of racial/ethnic minority groups, only 12% of school psychologists are not white, and less than 10% of Division 16 members report an ethnicity other than white.

Given the commitment of the school psychology faculty and UCSB, there is tremendous opportunity to contribute to the preparation of graduate students from historically underrepresented and/or marginalized backgrounds. The identification, recruitment, and retention of underrepresented minority students and faculty, is an essential component of the proposed program. We will highlight the multi-cultural emphasis of the UCSB school psychology program, in efforts to recruit high quality applicants, both as students and also as faculty. We have established communications with scholars and leaders in school psychology from diverse backgrounds, whom we will reach out to share the job
announcements and ask them to consider the opportunity and also share with colleagues and also those whom they have mentored, thus, we anticipate a diverse applicant pool. This network of colleagues from diverse backgrounds includes those involved with: Division 16 of APA (e.g., Vice-President of Social, Ethnic, and Minority Affairs; Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs; Development of National Directory of Faculty Addressing Cultural and Diversity Issues, Diversity Mentorship Program; involvement of colleagues from HUMGs) and NASP (e.g., Multicultural Affairs Committee, Social Justice Committee; Minority Scholarship Program; Leadership Development Committee; Bilingual School Psychologists Interest Group; and numerous membership reports regarding the diversity of school psychologists), and Trainers of School Psychologists (e.g., Social Justice Committee).

Similarly, in outreach to potential applicants, we will use this same network of colleagues, including those at other HIS, AANAPISI, and Historically Black Colleges (HBC) to encourage undergraduates to apply to the Masters of Education School Psychology program at UCSB. In addition, UCSB faculty participate in annual gatherings and meetings specifically focused on engaging and advancing diverse colleagues and students at the NASP and APA conferences, thus, we would continue to engage with these colleagues and distribute materials across each of these networks to further encourage applications from faculty and students from diverse backgrounds. Another strategy to further increase diversity among applicants is to provide annual correspondence to colleagues in the California State University system, to encourage students to apply to the Masters of Education School Psychology program. We are familiar with and will employ the guidance provided by the NASP Position statement regarding Recruitment and Retention of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse School Psychologists in Graduate Education Programs.

The goal of the program is to admit and graduate a diverse group of students, at least half of whom will be from historically underrepresented and/or marginalized groups. Based on tremendous diversity reflected in previous student enrollment and current students in the doctoral program, along with ongoing efforts to identify, recruit, and retain students from diverse backgrounds, we expect to meet the goals. Annual review of student data would be used to examine whether the goals of admitting and graduating a diverse group of students (at least half of whom will be from historically underrepresented and/or marginalized groups) were being met.

1.6 Interrelationship of the program with other University of California institutions, if applicable. The possibility of cooperation or competition with other programs within the University should be discussed. Initiators should send copies of their proposal to all departments on other campuses offering similar degrees. Review letters should be obtained from chairs of such departments and these letters should be attached to the proposal.

There are no other Masters of Education School Psychology programs at UCSB or any other University of California institutions. UC Berkeley offers a PhD in School Psychology and UC Riverside offers a PhD in School Psychology, neither offer the MED in school psychology. We fully anticipate cooperation of other UC and CSU programs in efforts to recruit undergraduate students who may have an interest in pursuing the Masters of
Education in School Psychology. There are no other programs at UCSB that offer similar degree programs. We expect to engage in regular communications with relevant undergraduate advisors (e.g., education, psychology, sociology, ethnic studies, etc.) to share communications that announce and promote the Masters of Education in School Psychology program. As this degree was previously and successfully offered at UCSB up until 2014, we do not expect any conflicts with other programs. As discussed in a following section, across California there are 13 Masters in School Psychology programs. Data from the past five years indicating increasing numbers of applicants (with several exceeding 200 applicants each year) and admissions of school psychology students.

The following table details the School Psychology Masters Degree programs in California that are approved by the National Association of School Psychologists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Pacific University</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>89sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Chico</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>71sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-East Bay</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>90qtr</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Fresno</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>EdS</td>
<td>71sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Long Beach</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>76sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Los Angeles</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>76sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Monterey Bay</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>76sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Northridge</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>76sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-Sacramento</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>103sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman University</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>69sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>63sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>110sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>76sem</td>
<td>CTC, NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Department or group that will administer the program. Vote of the faculty.

Following extensive review and discussions, the Department of CCSP faculty voted March 1, 2019 in support of the proposal for reinstating the Masters of Education in School Psychology program. The faculty vote was 12 in favor, 2 against, 0 abstentions out of 14 eligible voting members. There is one faculty member (Dr. Michael Brown) who is eligible to vote, but since his appointment and service at the UCOP office as UC provost and executive vice president for Academic Affairs, he has not voted on department matters.
1.8 Plan for evaluation of the program within the offering department(s) and campus-wide.

Regular evaluations of the Masters of Education in School Psychology program will occur as a natural process of accreditation that is provided through the California Department of Education – Pupil Personnel Services credential program review, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the American Psychological Association (all of which the school psychology program currently participates in for full external accreditation for the doctoral and credential program; we successfully obtained previously for the Masters program also). These evaluations are extensive, examining all aspects of the program. We have excelled in previous reviews of the school psychology program and anticipate that this program would continue to be recognized by the highest standards across accreditation bodies. As part of this external review process, data are collected and reviewed annually regarding student, staff, supervisors, coursework, fieldwork, etc.

Program learning objectives (PLOs see Appendix 1) are based on the California Credentialing and the National Association of School Psychologist standards for the preparation of school psychologists (also see Appendix 2 - Student Handbook, which includes overview of the program). There are no proposed changes to the program learning objectives previously approved by the UCSB Graduate Division and Graduate Council.

Section 2. Program

A detailed statement of the requirements for the program including the following:

2.1. Undergraduate preparation for admission.

The basic requirements would be the completion of the Bachelor’s degree or international equivalent. Many applicants from Psychology, Education, and Sociology majors would be anticipated, however, admissions would not be limited to these undergraduate degrees. Fieldwork experiences in educational settings and / or with children is optimal, but not required. An introductory applied statistics and research methods course specifically designed for these students will be required in the first year of the program, thus, we do not have a specific prerequisite. Based on our previous experience with including this requirement for the Masters of Education in School Psychology program candidates, previous math coursework is optimal, but not required. For any students with an undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or lower, an exception would need to be submitted for review and consideration for admission. As recommended by UCSB Graduate Division, a holistic review of applicants will be completed. In addition to review of application materials, the school psychology program also conducts interviews (via ZOOM), then on-campus follow-up interviews / recruitment day to ensure the goodness-of-fit between the top applicants and the UCSB program. A waitlist is developed among highly qualified candidates who are not initially offered admission, and then we are able to admit from the wait-list to fill slots that decline the offer of admission.
2.2. Foreign language. “The CCGA recognizes that foreign language competence may be an important element of graduate education of doctoral programs. It is the responsibility of the Divisional Graduate Councils to insure that the proponents of new doctoral programs have carefully considered the value of a foreign language requirement. We shall assume that when a proposal for a new doctoral degree has been forwarded to CCGA, this issue has been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Division. Divisional Graduate Councils should apply the same standard adopted for new programs in reviewing existing doctoral programs.” (CCGA Minutes, 5/14/85, p. 6)

No specific foreign language requirement is proposed for the Masters of Education in School Psychology program. Many of the students entering the program will be bilingual individuals pursuing preparation to meet the needs of bilingual students and families.

2.3. Program of study:
   a. Specific fields of emphasis.
      School Psychology
   b. Plan(s): Master I and/or II; Doctors A or B.
      Master’s Plan II: Project.
   c. Unit requirements.
      84 units of coursework will be required to complete Masters of Education in School Psychology program
   d. Required and recommended courses, including teaching requirement.
      Courses with * highlighted in blue are PPS credential courses = 24 units
      Other courses below are listed for the Med = 60 units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year (on campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274A*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 250</td>
<td>Cognitive Assessment for school psych</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Additional Section Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CNCSP stats/Methods class SP ME</td>
<td>Applied Statistics and Research Methods</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Quirk or others) - New course to be proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274B*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 257B</td>
<td>Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Quirk or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262B</td>
<td>School-Based Mental Health</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Dowdy or others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274C*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 256</td>
<td>Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Jimerson or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Diversity course</td>
<td>Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Bases of Diversity in the Schools</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - New course to be proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Year (on campus)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274D</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach and existing faculty will contribute (Sharkey or others) - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262C</td>
<td>Counseling Children and Families</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Felix or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 220</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Jimerson or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274E</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach and existing faculty will contribute (Sharkey or others) - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 291C</td>
<td>School and Family Violence</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Felix or others) - Boost Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 223B</td>
<td>Developmental Psychopathology</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Jimerson or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274F</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach and existing faculty will contribute (Sharkey or others) - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 292</td>
<td>Risk and Resilience</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Dowdy or others) - Boost Enrollment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 264A</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internship Year (Year 3 - off campus)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the above required courses, 84 Quarter Units would be required, this includes 60 units for the M.Ed. (which is awarded by UCSB) and 24 additional units for the PPS credential (awarded by The California Department of Education – Commission on Teaching Credentials – Pupil Personnel Services Credential). Completion of the above coursework would fulfill the external accreditation requirements that are consistent across the National Association of School Psychologists and the California Department of Education for the professional preparation and credentialing of school psychologists. For instance, the NASP Practice Model has two major parts: (a) Professional Practices and (b) Organizational Principles. Professional Practices include 10 domains of school psychology practice that are organized into three areas: (a) foundations of school psychological service delivery; (b) practices that permeate all aspects of service delivery; and (c) direct/indirect services to children, families, and schools.

2.4. Degree credential requirements. When a degree program must have licensing or certification, the requirements of the agency or agencies involved should be listed in the proposal, especially the courses needed to satisfy such requirements (CCGA Minutes, 1/17/78, p. 5).

Currently we have obtained and would continue to maintain credential approval and accreditation from;
The California Department of Education – Commission on Teaching Credentials – Pupil Personnel Services Credential
The National Association of School Psychologists – Program Approval
The American Psychological Association – Program Accreditation
The courses required to meet these agency requirements include those listed in the proposed courses.

2.5. Field examinations – written and/or oral.
Students engage in fieldwork across first, second, and third years. Each quarter student performance and professional development is evaluated by external and internal supervisors.

2.6. Qualifying examinations – written and/or oral.
Comprehensive Portfolio Review and oral exam is required – as with present students in School Psychology credential program. We have the infrastructure and processes completing these portfolios and oral exam in place. Students must complete a comprehensive portfolio of experiences to meet CCTC and NASP standards at the end of Year 1, Year 2, and one final time after they have completed all field signature assignments (year 3). It is expected that student fieldwork plans will plot a course of activities that will be showcased in the portfolio. An electronic version is mandatory. The students invite 3 School Psychology faculty to serve on their committee. The portfolio reviews are regularly scheduled for Week 10 of Spring Quarter. During the oral exam, the faculty ask questions about the contents included in their portfolios to ensure that students can clearly articulate understanding of each of the domains. The students receive the detailed portfolio assignment guidelines, including the scoring rubric that faculty use to complete the portfolio reviews and ratings (see appendix 2). This is consistent with the Plan II masters project.
2.7. **Thesis and/or dissertation.**
Not required.

2.8. **Final examination.**
Not required.

2.9. **Explanation of special requirements over and above Graduate Division minimum requirements**
None.

2.10. **Relationship of master’s and doctoral programs.**
The proposed Masters of Education in School Psychology program is a terminal degree program. However, there are some students who may choose to apply and if accepted, then pursue the UCSB School Psychology PhD program.

2.11. **Special preparation for careers in teaching.**
Those interested in pursuing careers as faculty will be encouraged to apply to the UCSB School Psychology PhD program.

2.12. **Sample program.**

The Masters of Education in School Psychology program will implement a Science-to-Practice model. We are committed to emphasizing the implications of research findings in psychology and education for psychological services in school settings. In turn, we emphasize the analysis of problems encountered in school settings from a scientific/evaluative/research point of view. We recognize the need for school psychologists to apply research-based skills and evidence-supported strategies to assist all students to learn and maximize their human potential. This means that school psychologists work with regular education students and with students who have special learning needs. In addition to core content courses, this analytical perspective may be complemented by ongoing fieldwork experiences in local schools and agencies. These practicum experiences are closely supervised by both university and field supervisors.

The UCSB school psychology training model emphasizes the integration of theory, research methodology, professional role development, and practice/skills, with an emphasis on developing strong research and data analysis skills. The theoretical areas of study include strands in human development, prevention/interventions, assessment, consultation, programs and services, legal/ethical, as well as evaluation/research. Research methodology includes courses in research, evaluation, and quantitative analysis. Professional role development involves the engagement of students in reading and active discussion about the changing role of the school psychologist in the schools. Field-based practice and skill development is accompanied by university-based supervision designed to integrate the areas of theory, research, and role development with what the students are experiencing in the field.
Students will enroll in 4 units per quarter during their internship year. Only 4 units per quarter is required for degree requirements, and enrollment in 6 or less units during that year will allow the student to qualify for part-time tuition, since they will be working full-time during that year.

All students would proceed through the same sequential cohort model program to fulfill the necessary program requirements (as outlined below).

_Courses with * highlighted in blue are PPS credential courses = 24 units_
_Other courses below are listed for the Med = 60 units_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year (on campus)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274A*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 250</td>
<td>Cognitive Assessment for school psych</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CNCSP stats/Methods class for SP MEd students</td>
<td>Applied Statistics and Research Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274B*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 257B</td>
<td>Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262B</td>
<td>School-Based Mental Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274C*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 256</td>
<td>Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Diversity course</td>
<td>Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Bases of Diversity in the Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Second Year (on campus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>CNCSP 274D</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNCSP 262C</td>
<td>Counseling Children and Families</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNCSP 220</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>CNCSP 274E</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNCSP 291C</td>
<td>School and Family Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNCSP 223B</td>
<td>Developmental Psychopathology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>CNCSP 274F</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNCSP 292</td>
<td>Risk and Resilience</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNCSP 264A</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internship Year (Year 3 - off campus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intellectual underpinnings of the Masters of Education in School Psychology program are reflected in the NASP Professional Practice model, which includes 10 domains of school psychology practice (see appendix 3). See draft of program degree sheet in appendix 4.
2.13. Normative time from matriculation to degree. (Assume student has no deficiencies and is full-time.) Also specify the normative lengths of time for pre-candidacy and for candidacy periods. (If normative time is subsequently lengthened to more than six years, prior approval of CGCA is required.) Other incentives to support expeditious times-to-degree: what policies or other incentives will assure that students make timely progress toward degree completion in the proposed program, if the proposal is for a joint doctoral degree with a State University campus, please refer to the “Program Proposal” section of the Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs at http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdochandbook030502.htm#5.

The program duration is 3 years, as outlined in the sample program. The students would be at UCSB in residence for the first two years, and during the 3rd year, each of the students are required to complete an internship in a school. Thus, 3 years total, with 2 years at UCSB. For students who are not matriculating as expected due to medical or other personal issues, there is an opportunity for them to apply to take a leave and return into the program as warranted.

**Section 3. Projected Need**

3.1. Student demand for the program.

Across the current school psychology programs in California, there are more than 1000 applicants annually. Current capacity of programs is only about 350 across the programs (most have been increasing their enrollment). As noted previously, the career opportunities are numerous and fulfilling. With extensively documented shortages of school psychologists in the State of California and nationally the Masters in Education and credential program will meet a critical and urgent need for diverse, bilingual school psychologists across the state of California, nationally, and internationally. Meeting the NASP training standards and the national PRAXIS exam qualifies each of the graduates to be Nationally Certified School Psychologists, thus, they are able to be employed in California as well as all other states in the United States, as well as work within International Schools, Department of Defense Schools, and other settings that recognize the Nationally Certified School Psychologist credential.

3.2. Opportunities for placement of graduates. UC anticipates that CPEC in particular will expect detailed and convincing evidence of job market needs. This will be especially true for programs in graduate fields now well represented among UC campuses and California independent universities, as well as programs in the same field proposed by more than one campus. If UC already offers programs in the field, what are their placement records in recent years? What recent job listings, employers surveys, assessments of future job growth, etc. can be provided to demonstrate a strong market for graduates of this program, or for graduates of specialty areas that will be the focus of the program?

Based on applications at other terminal Masters School Psychology programs in California, we anticipate a high number of applicants and immediate career opportunities for graduates.
Based on the Salary, Job Market, Future Growth, Stress, and Work Life Balance -- The 2018 US World News Report indicates that School Psychologist is the #2 career option in Social Services career opportunities. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that this profession will grow at a rate of 14 percent between 2016 and 2026, which will equate to 20,900 new jobs for school psychologists across the nation. A heightened awareness of mental health’s connection to learning and the rising need of mental health services in schools are driving the demand for more school psychologists. School psychologists in California earn an average salary (for 9 months) of $90,210. In some areas of California, starting salaries are $80k-$90k, with many in these districts making more than $110k salary (for 9 months of employment). School psychology faculty receive weekly emails from employment agencies seeking to hire school psychologists from throughout California and across the United States. There are currently no other Masters of Education in School Psychology programs in other UCs. Job listings in all search engines yielded hundreds of searches for school psychologists throughout the country.

Research reveals that shortages of school psychologists continue to threaten students’ access to needed school psychological services (American Association for Employment in Education, 2016; Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2004; Curtis, Hunley, Walker, & Baker, 1999; Fagan, 2004; Reschly, 2000). Results of research forecasts continuing shortages of school psychologists throughout the next decade and possibly beyond if the number of school psychologists graduating does not increase to outpace the increased needs and retirements (Castillo, Curtis, & Tan, 2014; Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2004). As of 2010, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP; 2010) recommends a ratio of no more than 1,000 students per school psychologist, in general, and no more than 500 to 700 students per school psychologist when more comprehensive and preventive services are being provided. Unfortunately, evidence suggests that most school districts do not meet these standards:

- The ratio of students per school psychologist was estimated to be 1,381 to 1 in the United States in the 2014–2015 school year (Walcott, Hyson, & Loe, 2017).
- Only seven states in the country met the recommended ratio of no more than 1,000 students per school psychologist in the 2009–2010 school year, and 23 states had 1,500 or more students per school psychologist in that year (NASP, 2011).
- The ratio was 1,442 students per school psychologist in the 2012–2013 school year, if one compares the public school enrollment of 50,044,522 (NCES, 2017) with 34,697—the number of certified, full- time-equivalent school psychologists who were providing special education services in public schools in that year (Office of Special Education Programs, 2016).

The growing needs of U.S. public schools will continue to limit how prepared schools are to meet the academic, mental health, and behavioral health needs of their students, especially if these shortages continue. For example, the total number of public school students in 2014 was 50,312,581, up 6.6% from 47,203,539 in 2000, and the student population is predicted to reach 51,737,900 by 2026 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). With 13–20% of children in the United States experiencing a mental disorder each year, and with the
prevalence of those disorders increasing among children (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013), it is clear that a growing student population—in and of itself—presents schools with more challenges to meeting the needs of students.

Students who experience adverse social conditions or who are from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds may have additional needs that schools struggle to address. Children from disadvantaged backgrounds are disproportionately exposed to factors that may impair brain development (Hair, Hanson, Wolfe, & Pollak, 2015), which can negatively impact their cognitive, social, and emotional functioning. In 2015, approximately 20% of children under the age of 18 were living in poverty, 1.3 million public school students were homeless, and 4.6 million (9.4%) were English language learners. The percentage of students of color enrolled in public schools was 50.5% in 2014, up from 42% in 2004 (McFarland et al., 2017), and poverty levels among children of color are even higher when the children are living in single-mother families (Child Trends, 2016). School psychologists have the specific expertise needed to help teachers and administrators address the wide variety of challenges stemming from the growing and increasingly diverse student population (NASP, 2015a).

These two opposing forces—the continuing shortages in school psychology and the growing need for services for students and schools—pose significant threats to the ability of schools to meet the needs of their students now and in the future. The following are selected research findings on factors related to the shortages in school psychology.

**Shortages of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse School Psychologists**

The divergence between the cultural and linguistic characteristics of the school psychology workforce and the population of students that they serve continues to grow. A few examples follow:

- Culturally diverse school psychologists are underrepresented within the school psychology workforce: About 87% are White, and only 6% are Hispanic (Walcott, Charvat, McNamara, & Hyson, 2016), which differs sharply from the student population (McFarland et al., 2017).

- Bilingual school psychologists are in short supply: 86% of school psychologists are fluent in English only, and among those who are fluent in a second language, less than 8% provide services in that language (Walcott et al., 2016).

**Shortages—Graduate Education Through Retirement**

Several factors impact shortages in school psychology, from the availability of graduate programs and faculty to the rates of enrollment in graduate programs and the rates at which school psychologists leave the profession via attrition and retirement. For example:

- The overall availability of graduate programs in school psychology has increased only 9% over nearly 40 years (Rossen & von der Embse, 2014).
- In a national survey, 94 school psychology programs reported 136 faculty openings and 79% indicated one or more openings in the three most recent academic years, with more than one in four of the positions going unfilled (Clopton & Haselhuhn, 2009).

- The percentage of school psychologists who were predicted to reach 35 years of total work experience and, thus, to retire soon was more than 20% in 2015 (Castillo et al., 2014).

References and resources documenting the shortage and need for school psychologists in the United States are delineated in Appendix 5.

### 3.3. Importance to the discipline.

Clearly, there is a tremendous need for additional school psychologists prepared to meet the needs of diverse students. School psychologists make tremendous contributions to promoting and supporting social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, academic, and mental health development. Each of these aspects of development are important to facilitating healthy adaptation, adjustment, and well-being of youth and sets the foundation for healthy adult adjustment. Importantly, the proposed program will include an emphasis on meeting the needs of linguistically diverse student populations, with a particular emphasis on preparing professionals who are bilingual (e.g., Spanish / English). We have been collaborating with colleagues nationally and internationally to develop course content that will exemplify a model program. Presently there are few school psychology programs that have this proposed emphasis.

### 3.4. Ways in which the program will meet the needs of society.

In the United States, most children, most days, are at school. Given the documented risks and needs of children across the US, there are tremendous opportunities to meet the needs of students each day. This means addressing challenges such as poverty, mental and behavioral health issues, bullying, homelessness, increasing cultural and linguistic diversity, record high student enrollment—to name just a few. Therefore, schools represent the penultimate context to actualize social justice in providing social, emotional, behavioral, mental health, and academic supports for ALL students. Moreover, there is a tremendous shortage of school psychologists that is anticipated to persist for at least the upcoming decade, and there is a paucity of bilingual professionals prepared to meet the needs of the diverse students and families throughout the country. The UCSB program will be a leader in preparing professionals to serve diverse children and families throughout California and the country.
3.5. **Relationship of the program to research and/or professional interests of the faculty.**

The Department of CCSP faculty includes 5 faculty with a specialization in school psychology and at least five additional faculty who focus on meeting the needs of vulnerable youth. These faculty each engage in scholarship that informs the practice of school psychology, and students will have an opportunity to enroll in courses with these faculty. Moreover, the school psychology faculty have engaged in extensive leadership in the field of school psychology, thus, facilitating the access of graduates to service and leadership in professional organizations in California, across the country, and also internationally.

3.6. **Program differentiation. How will the proposed program distinguish itself from existing UC and California independent university programs, from similar programs proposed by other UC campuses? Statistics or other detailed documentation of need should be provided.**

As described previously, the Masters of Education in School Psychology program will provide professional preparation for school psychologists who will meet the needs of diverse students and their families. This will include particular emphasis on preparing school psychologists who are uniquely prepared to meet the needs of linguistically diverse children and families, which is desperately needed throughout California and across the country. As illustrated in the NASP 2017 report regarding the small number of programs and number of graduates relative to the large number of openings and vacancies for school psychologists, the UCSB program will contribute to this tremendous need. UC Berkeley and UC Riverside presently offer the PhD in School Psychology, however, neither program offers the Masters of Education in School Psychology.

The distinctive emphasis on preparing school psychologists to meet the needs of diverse populations of students / families, including bilingual school psychologists is particularly important in the California context. California has the highest percentage of dual language learners in the country, including one third of the Latino/a/x population, and over 22% of the total student enrollment in K-12. In 2016, California schools identified 1.376 million students as English Learners [California Department of Education (CDE), 2017].

**Section 4. Faculty**

4.1 **Present faculty who will teach in the program. A statement on present faculty and immediately pending appointments. This should include a list of faculty members, their ranks, their highest degree and other professional qualifications, and a citation of relevant publications; data concerning faculty should be limited to only that information pertinent to the committee’s evaluation of faculty qualifications.**

The current core school psychology faculty have extensive experience and expertise to contribute to the success of the Masters in Education School Psychology program. In addition, it is proposed that two additional Teaching Professors would be hired to provide
additional expertise and course coverage for the larger cohorts of students in the Masters in Education School Psychology program. See CVs for each in Appendix 6.

Shane Jimerson, Ph.D., Professor – Joined UCSB faculty in 1997. Dr. Jimerson has over 400 publications, including more than 30 books, over 400 presentations, and more than 30 extramural funded projects. He has provided leadership as the President of the International School Psychology Association, as the President of the Society for the Study of School Psychology, as the President of the School Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association, and has served on many executive committee and leadership positions for school psychology associations across the State, Nation, and Internationally. He has served as Editor (and Senior Editor of International Science) for the School Psychology Quarterly journal, published by the American Psychological Association, and Editor of the Contemporary School Psychologist, published by Springer Science, and Associate Editor of School Psychology Review, published by the National Association of School Psychologists. Dr. Jimerson has received numerous awards for his scholarship including early-career, mid-career, best journal article, advocacy, as well as many awards for distinguished contributions to leadership. Two recent analyses of scholarship in school psychology also provide further information regarding the scholarly impact of Dr. Jimerson’s publications. A paper published during the current review period by Watkins and Park-Chan (2015), examined the research impact of scholars in the field of school psychology and provided h-index norms. Based on those analyses, his h-index of 21(Scopus) and his Google Scholar h-index of 47 places Dr. Jimerson at the 99th percentile among scholars in school psychology doctoral programs. Recent analyses of school psychology publications since 1907-2014 (including over 4,560 scholars), using the Science Citation Index from the Scientific Information Web of Science database, provides perspective within the field of school psychology. Analyses reveal that Dr. Jimerson is presently among the top 20 most cited authors in the area of school psychology in the past 100 years (Liu & Oakland, 2016).

Jill Sharkey, Ph.D., Professor and Associate Dean – Joined UCSB faculty 2004. Dr. Sharkey is currently the School Psychology Credential Program Coordinator. In addition to teaching and mentoring doctoral students, she is heavily engaged in community-based research designed to understand optimal family, school, and community responses to neglected or vulnerable youth. Her funded contracts and grants focus on community efforts to implement data-driven interventions that inform the practice of school psychology and related fields. Her h-index of 13 (Scopus) and her Google Scholar h-index of 22 places Dr. Sharkey at the 90th percentile among scholars in school psychology doctoral programs (Watkins & Park-Chan, 2015). Her active and robust research lab has been awarded $2 million in contracts and grants in the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. Dr. Sharkey’s role as the Credential Coordinator includes monitoring student fieldwork supervision and assessment data to address multiple accrediting bodies including the California Teacher Credential Commission, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the American Psychological Association. She has successfully navigated the accreditation reviews of all these organizations frequently over the past 12 years. In addition, from 2007 to 2014 she oversaw the School Psychology Masters in Education program, which included curriculum and course development, individual mentoring,
fieldwork supervision, and masters and credential examinations. She also has extensive administrative experience in the GGSE. In her role as Associate Dean, she is co-chairing school-wide strategic planning efforts that embrace the development of new graduate programs that serve the state of California and meet the critical need for highly trained and diverse professionals in the schools.

**Erin Dowdy, Ph.D., Professor – Joined UCSB faculty 2007.** Dr. Dowdy is a licensed psychologist and a nationally certified school psychologist. Dr. Dowdy’s research career and scholarly publications have focused on behavioral and social emotional assessment, particularly universal screening for social and emotional health and risk. She is the co-principal investigator on several screening measurement projects funded through the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Dr. Dowdy has a record of past success at disseminating research findings in peer-reviewed publications and numerous presentations at local and national conferences. She is an associate editor for School Psychology Review. From 2014-2018, Dr. Dowdy served as the Director of Clinical Training in which she had to attend to training requirements as delineated by external reviewing agencies. Additionally, she has served as a member of the Department’s Executive committee and UCSB’s Graduate Council.

**Matthew Quirk, Ph.D., Associate Professor – Joined UCSB faculty 2007.** After completing doctoral studies at the University of Georgia in Educational Psychology in 2005, Dr. Quirk spent two years as an Assistant Professor at California State University, Long Beach. Since coming to UCSB in 2007, Dr. Quirk has remained active in research examining student’s academic motivation and engagement, early literacy and language development, and school readiness with a specific focus on Latino/a/x and dual language learner student populations. From 2010-2018 Dr. Quirk served as the Undergraduate Advisor for the CCSP Department, working closely with students, other faculty, and staff to support the administration of the Applied Psychology track of the Education minor. Within this role, in 2014 Dr. Quirk lead the CCSP Department in its development of a new minor program in Applied Psychology (also phasing out the old track of the Education minor), which has since become the largest minor on UCSB’s campus. Dr. Quirk has also served on multiple committees relevant to the development of new academic programs, including Undergraduate Council, the Faculty Executive Committee for the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, and the Executive Committee for CCSP.

**Erika Felix, Ph.D., an Assistant Professor – Joined UCSB faculty 2014.** Dr. Felix received her B.A. in psychology from the University of Southern California and her Ph.D. in clinical-community psychology from DePaul University. After completing a postdoctoral research fellowship at UCSB, she continued as a professional researcher for several years before joining the faculty in 2014. Dr. Felix is committed to a career that contributes to evidence-based efforts to promote the mental health and educational well-being of diverse children and youth. Her research is focused on understanding the individual, relational, and contextual factors that promote positive youth development or recovery despite contexts of risk, trauma, or stress; informing and evaluating prevention efforts; and improving service delivery. Her work spans three related areas: (1) promoting adaptive recovery for youth
following disaster, terrorism, or other collectively-experienced traumas, (2) youth victimization and its consequences, and (3) research and evaluation to improve community-based services. Her research has been funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, National Institute of Child Health & Human Development, private foundations, and local community organizations.

Section 5. Courses

5.1 A list of present and proposed courses including instructors and supporting courses in related fields. The catalog description of all proposed courses should be appended (see Appendix 7). The relationship of these courses to specific fields of emphasis and future plans. How will the courses be staffed given existing course loads?

The table below details each of the courses and provides information pertaining to who is anticipated to teach each of the courses.

Courses with * highlighted in blue are PPS credential courses = 24 units
Other courses below are listed for the Med = 60 units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year (on campus)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274A*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and Supervision included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 250</td>
<td>Cognitive Assessment for school psych</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Additional Section Req'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CNCSP stats/Methods class for SP MEd students</td>
<td>Applied Statistics and Research Methods</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Quirk or others) - New course to be proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274B*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as meeting substantive credentialing</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Faculty and Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 257B</td>
<td>Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Quirk or Dowdy or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262B</td>
<td>School-Based Mental Health</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Dowdy or others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274B*</td>
<td>First Year Induction including basic helping skills content, as well as</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 256</td>
<td>Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Jimerson or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Diversity course</td>
<td>Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Bases of Diversity in the Schools</td>
<td>New faculty will teach - New course to be proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Second Year (on campus)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274D</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing</td>
<td>New faculty will teach and existing faculty will contribute (Sharkey or others) - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 262C</td>
<td>Counseling Children and Families</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Felix or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 220</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Jimerson or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274E</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork -</td>
<td>New faculty will teach and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 291C</td>
<td>School and Family Violence</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Felix or others) - Boost Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 223B</td>
<td>Developmental Psychopathology</td>
<td>Existing faculty will teach (Jimerson or others) - Boost enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 274F</td>
<td>Second Year Topics and Fieldwork - meeting substantive credentialing standards for NASP &amp; CTC – Fieldwork included</td>
<td>New faculty will teach and existing faculty will contribute (Sharkey or others) - Revise current course (Year Long); morning content, afternoon supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 292</td>
<td>Risk and Resilience</td>
<td>New faculty will teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCSP 264A</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship Year (Year 3 - off campus)</td>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>CNCSP 275*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>New Faculty will teach - 1 Additional Section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal of two additional Teaching Professors will provide additional bilingual
expertise and sufficient faculty to handle the Masters of Education in School Psychology students in the intensive first and second year coursework, including fieldwork and relevant supervision. The existing faculty will contribute their expertise, facilitate the collaborative partnerships with school districts throughout the central coast, and also contribute to coverage of specific substantive courses that are required for the school psychology credential (see Appendix 8 for letters of support from instructors). Thus, the proposal builds upon the incredible talent and expertise of current CCSP faculty, and recognizes that the additional faculty are necessary to actualize this proposal. As noted previously, additional Teaching Professors to fulfill are included in the Department of CCSP FTE requests. See appendix 9 from the Department Chair and Appendix 10 from the GGSE Dean describing the FTE plans at the Department and the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education.

Section 6. Resource Requirements

Estimate for the first five years the additional cost of the program, by year, for each of the following categories:

6.1. FTE faculty
Two Teaching Professors – Salaries likely to begin at approximately $75,000, so additional $150K for salaries for additional instruction and supervision responsibilities

6.2. Library acquisition
None, we already have the necessary materials for the Doctoral students. See appendix 11, letter of support from the UCSB librarian.

6.3. Computing
None – new students easily absorbed into existing email and other campus systems

6.4. Equipment
$10,000 for necessary assessment materials for professional preparation – we will also pursue support from publishers as we have in the past to access another $10,000 of assessment materials necessary for the larger student enrollment

6.5. Space and other capital facilities
No additional space or capital facilities needed – anticipate having a room where Masters Students will use when on campus and it is anticipated that will use existing space assigned to the CCSP Department within the GGSE.
### 6.6. Staffing requirements and costs

Minor Additional Costs for Staff – Staff currently involved in admissions and school psychology credential process will continue to be involved and have more students to process. Therefore, there may be an increase in staff time allocated to the SP credential. We anticipate that the increase in workloads may translate to an additional expense of $5K per year in the early years for extra staffing time, increasing to about $10K for extra staffing as the number of students increased to full capacity. Each year we would plan to add a one day MEd recruitment day, it is anticipated this would cost about $2,000 to host this event in the GGSE. We engaged in consultation with current GGSE staff and directors to discuss, explore, and determine these increases relative to the current staffing context.

### 6.7. Other operating costs.

Increase in support for Teaching Assistants – Given the number of Masters students enrolled in each of the courses and the intensity of the assessment courses and other courses requiring fieldwork, the addition of Teaching Assistants (Doctoral Students) to further support the program will be important. We anticipate that the cost of additional Teaching Assistants will require an increase of $40K to the department instructional budget each year, beyond current levels. This support will further increase opportunities for PhD students in the program to obtain important instructional experiences to prepare them for academic careers in school psychology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
<th>2025-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE faculty (for 2)</td>
<td>$150K</td>
<td>$160K</td>
<td>$170K</td>
<td>$180K</td>
<td>$190K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE benefits (for 2)</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$110K</td>
<td>$110K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE staff (increase workload)</td>
<td>$5K</td>
<td>$5K</td>
<td>$10K</td>
<td>$10K</td>
<td>$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other facilities/equipment</td>
<td>$10K</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>$60K</td>
<td>$60K</td>
<td>$80K</td>
<td>$80K</td>
<td>$90K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up costs</td>
<td>$5K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Anticipated New costs per year</td>
<td>$330K</td>
<td>$325K</td>
<td>$370K</td>
<td>$390K</td>
<td>$410K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.8. Indicate the intended method of funding these additional costs.

The Department has submitted the following items: a. Additional FTE (as included in the FTE plans), b. additional Teaching Assistant FTE (as communicated with the Dean), c. an increase in the base budget of about $10K per year for assessment materials, and d. an increase of about $10K per year for additional staff support. While it is understood that the program is not funded by the income generated, it is noted that once the Masters in Education School Psychology program is at full capacity, the additional enrollment (with tuition from in-state, out-of-state, and international students) will generate significant income (projected to
exceed $1 million each year), which would go to the general fund. Thus, we are projecting that the income generated will exceed the overall cost of the program over time, so that we do not anticipate this program being a financial drain on the campus.

6.9 If applicable, state that no new resources will be required and explain how the program will be funded. If it is to be funded by internal reallocation, explain how internal resources will be generated.

It appears that the hiring of the two Teaching Professors fits within the current allocation of FTE within the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education. The Department and Dean have both expressed support for the requested Teaching Professor positions.

6.10 State Resources to Support New Program. The resource plan to support the proposed program should be clearly related to campus enrollment plans and resource plans. Campuses should provide detailed information on how resources will be provided to support the proposed program: from resources for approved graduate enrollment growth, reallocation, or other sources. What will the effects of reallocation be on existing programs? For interdisciplinary programs and programs growing out of tracks within existing graduate programs: What will the impact of the new program be on the contributing program(s)? When the proposed program is fully implemented, how will faculty FTE be distributed among contributing and new programs?

As the UCSB long range development plan includes an increase in graduate enrollment, as well as an increase in the diversification of students, further advancing contributions as a HSI, and also making further contributions to the state of California (and the community) through contributions that benefit the residents. This program will contribute to each of these important objectives. The funding for FTE, staff, and graduate students will contribute to further infrastructure within the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, which is consistent with the goals and objectives emerging from the recent 2019-2020 GGSE strategic planning process.
Section 7. Graduate Student Support

It is recommended that all new proposals include detailed plans for providing sufficient graduate student support. In fields that have depended on federal research grants, these plans should also discuss current availability of faculty grants that can support graduate students and funding trends in agencies expected to provide future research or training grants. Are other extramural resources likely to provide graduate student support, or will internal fellowship and other institutional support be made available to the program? Describe any campus fund-raising initiatives that will contribute to support of graduate students in the proposed program.

7.1 How many teaching assistantships will be available to the program? Will resources for them be provided through approved enrollment growth, reallocation, or a combination? How will reallocation affect support in existing programs?

As a professional program that is only three years and leads to well-paying career opportunities, we anticipate that students will use their savings, family support, loans, extramural fellowships, and other sources of support to cover the costs of completing the program. Program faculty will also pursue training grants focused on preparing the next generation of professionals to meet the needs of diverse children and families in the schools. There are numerous such training grant opportunities through the U.S. Department of Education. For instance, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) regularly offers competitive training grants for graduate preparation of professional who will provide leadership in advancing support services to meet the needs of children with special needs. There are many school psychology Masters degree programs that have successfully secured these resources. When such grants are secured, this would contribute to offsetting the tuition / fees for students.

We anticipate the department receiving additional Block Grant funds due to the increased graduate student enrollment. These funds would primarily be used to support students in the doctoral program, however, we plan to use a portion of the additional funds for recruitment fellowships to help support a few Master’s students based on financial need and consistent with program goals.

In addition, given the need for highly qualified school psychologists in the local schools, we would work with the school districts to arrange service contracts that could help to provide support for students in the Masters of Education in School Psychology program. These efforts would parallel our current efforts wherein, doctoral students are able to work in the schools during their doctoral studies and receive compensation from the schools. The school districts throughout Santa Barbara county and Ventura county are consistently asking for more students to work in the schools, thus, we anticipate establishing further agreements to help provide support for students in the Masters of Education in School Psychology program. Such service contracts also benefit children and teachers in the local schools, by increasing the support services that are available. Hence, such projects help to support graduate students, and make important contributions to the well-being of children, families, and professionals within the community. This is precisely the UCSB community engagement and contributions that are mutually beneficial.
The Department has and would continue to make extensive efforts to secure support that would help to off-set the costs of graduate students at UCSB. We envision numerous opportunities, including: a. extramural funding for professional preparation grants aimed at preparing diverse professionals, b. external fellowship programs that aim to support the education of diverse professionals (e.g., the Gates foundation), c. working as resident hall coordinators in graduate housing, which has been a great experience for many of our school psychology students, d. working in service-contracts with the schools throughout Santa Barbara and Ventura counties during their graduate work, and e. seeking TAships at UCSB, in the GGSE minors, and with expertise that could contribute greatly to the ethnic studies, global studies, and other programs on campus seeking highly qualified diverse graduate students. The GGSE is also in the process of developing a major; thus, it is likely that even more TA opportunities would be available in the GGSE. In addition, as stated in the proposal, there would be an opportunity for students in the Masters program to apply for support from the Department, which would be awarded based on need. Notably, for school psychology Masters degree students, the third year internship is typically a paid internship, for the full academic year. Thus, masters graduate students only have two years in residence here at UCSB. Additionally, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) provides several loan forgiveness programs to encourage health professionals to work in health professional shortage areas. In exchange for a 2-year commitment to work in a shortage area, behavioral/mental health professionals may receive up to $60,000 to help them repay qualified education loans. Participants have the option to extend their service to receive additional loan repayment assistance. This loan repayment assistance is tax-free. The CCSP faculty remain committed to helping to facilitate opportunities for support for the students in the Masters program in school psychology.

Regarding the student living cost analysis (while such information is not requested in the proposal guidelines), we had previously reviewed the UCSB website that clearly delineates the “cost of attendance” for graduate and undergraduate students (https://www.finaid.ucsb.edu/cost-of-attendance). For CA residents, the cost will be between $36k-$40k annually depending on whether they live in graduate housing or off-campus, and for non-residents, $51k-$55k. While slightly higher than some schools, it is slightly lower than some other schools. Even if the student was fully funded through student loans, given the high salaries of school psychologists, the Return on Investment is very high (e.g., projected lifetime earnings more than double, and an initial return across the first decade projected to be and ROI of 525%, annualized ROI 18%). The career opportunities, compensation, benefits, and retirements are incentives for graduate students pursuing a Masters degree in school psychology. As discussed below, the previous low enrollment was a function of our infrastructure and faculty to facilitate the Masters degree in school psychology – NOT a function of low-funding, as there were numerous highly qualified applicants who were not admitted to the program.
Section 8. Changes in Senate regulations

8.1 If the proposal is for a new degree title, please append draft enabling legislation. If the proposal requires amendments to any Senate regulations, please so state. May be submitted later in the review process. Contact the Director of the Academic Senate for assistance.

Not Applicable. This proposal is for the reinstatement of the School Psychology Masters in Education program.

8.2 CIP code for the Masters of Education School Psychology program
School Psychology / CIP Code 42.2805

The proposal's appendices may be accessed here.
ATTACHMENT 6

Professor Miroslava Chavez-Garcia, UCSB Department of History
Professor Ann Plane, UCSB Department of History
Laura Voisin George, UCSB Ph.D. student in History
October 15, 2020

Request for a Memorial from the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate to the Board of Regents:

Executive Summary:

We are urging the U.C. Regents to demand best-practices preservation methods be employed at UCSF for treatment of the New Deal-era “History of Medicine in California” mural cycle by renowned artist Bernard Zakheim, and to commit to their public accessibility. The imminent threat to this irreplaceable cultural resource is buried in the draft EIR document for UCSF’s Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan, and damage to or destruction of the mural cycle could commence in November 2020. We ask for their immediate action to suspend the awarding of a UCSF contract for an inappropriate intervention to de-install the murals and remove them to indefinite storage in a non-climate-controlled warehouse. UCSF has not recognized city or community calls for appropriate conservation, and immediate action by the University of California’s Academic Senate and Board of Regents is needed to prevent inappropriate treatment or destruction.

Explanation:

UCSF is preparing a comprehensive redevelopment plan for its Parnassus Heights campus (CPHP). A draft EIR was released in July 2020 which identified a number of cultural resources on the campus, and the project’s potential impact on them. One of these is the demolition of the 1917 UC Hall for a new Research and Academic Building planned on its footprint; this building has not yet been designed.

A series of murals depicting the “History of Medicine in California” are housed in a one-story auditorium (Toland Hall) adjoining UC Hall. Produced in 1936-1938 in the rich context of social commentary via murals of Depression-era San Francisco, the fresco murals were created by Bernard Zakheim, a Jewish émigré from Poland who had studied with Mexican muralist Diego Rivera. The panels depict pre-European indigenous medicine, and the transfer of their traditional knowledge to Euro-American doctors, as well as the major contributions of UCSF’s founders and faculty through the 1930s – describing the epitome of the field just before the introduction of antibiotics and the advent of modern medicine. One of the panels features African-American nurse and midwife Biddy Mason (1818-1891), who is shown as an equal in a group of Anglo doctors treating a patient. It is the earliest-known
representation of Biddy Mason, a former slave who is an icon in Los Angeles’ Black community for her professional and financial success, community philanthropy, and as one of the founders of L.A.’s First African Methodist Episcopal church during Reconstruction and the Jim Crow era.

The Zakheim mural cycle has been recommended eligible for the National Register. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has nominated the Zakheim mural cycle as a Landmark, with its final designation expected in December 2020.

This mural cycle was funded in 1937 by the federal Works Progress Administration (WPA) as part of the Federal Art Project. Thus in June 2020 the federal General Services Administration (GSA) notified UCSF of its ownership interest in the “History of Medicine in California” murals and offered to partner with UCSF in the development of a plan for their preservation. UCSF disputes the GSA’s claim of ownership, which has not been resolved.

The CPHP’s draft EIR states that UCSF determined it would not attempt to preserve the Zakheim murals from the Toland Hall due to the challenges of removing them without impairing their artistic integrity; it describes the destruction of the murals as a significant but unavoidable impact to an identified cultural resource. However, two contemporary Zakheim murals in UCSF’s Cole Hall were successfully removed by Bernard Zakheim and Nathan Zakheim, the artist’s son and a professional art conservator, when that building was demolished in 1967.

Shortly before the CPHP draft EIR was released in July 2020, UCSF notified the Zakheim family they had a 90-day period to remove the murals at their own expense; UCSF estimated the cost of the project at $8 million, but stated it was not appropriate to use public funding for their removal. UCSF stated that at the end of that period, it would invite bids from other qualified entities for the murals’ removal by publishing a notice in the San Francisco Chronicle. Nathan Zakheim pledged to remove the “History of Medicine” mural panels for no more than $1 million, however the Zakheim family does not have the financial resources expected of them to perform this task alone.

UCSF did not honor its stated 90-day time period, and instead issued a request for proposal (RFP) for outside bids in early August via a membership construction management website (not published in the San Francisco Chronicle), with a target bid amount of $1.5 million to be paid by UCSF. (The balance of
the original $8 million estimate was stated to be collateral costs for selective demolition of UC Hall to remove the de-installed mural panels, administrative costs, etc.) The RFP stipulated the bidder’s team should include an art conservator, but the qualifications for the conservator were negligible. The hastily-released RFP and its inadequate qualifications, minimal engagement with the GSA’s offer to develop a plan for the murals’ preservation, and the emphasis on identifying the “best value” bidder instead of the best approach for the treatment of the murals, do not represent best practices in the conservation of fresco murals.

Additionally, UCSF’s bid documents directed bidders to prepare the de-installed mural panels for storage for at least five years in a non-climate-controlled UCSF warehouse in South San Francisco. In response to questions about where and when the murals will be re-installed, UCSF representatives reply only that an architect has not yet been chosen for the overall CPHP project. Its leadership has refused to make a commitment to the public accessibility of the Zakheim murals, threatening their future.

UCSF received a number of bids to remove the murals on September 11, 2020 – hours before the public comment period for the EIR elapsed. To date, no selection of the “best value” bidder has been posted on the UCSF Supply Management website, however the bid documents specified the 8-month project schedule is to be completed by June 2021, indicating a November 2020 start.

Under the leadership of UCSB Professor Ann Plane, the Public History Studies program of UCSB’s Department of History circulated an Open Letter to be included the draft EIR public comments, gaining over 80 signatures (the majority from UC faculty systemwide), calling for UCSF to make an immediate commitment to preserve the threatened “History of Medicine in California” mural cycle, and to securing a permanent home for the murals where they can be regularly accessed by the public.

Because the future UCSF Research and Academic Building has not yet been designed, the existing Toland Hall auditorium could be preserved and incorporated into it, keeping the Zakheim murals in situ and in their original context. If this design alternative is proved in the future to be infeasible, UCSF must designate another location to make the “History of Medicine in California” murals publicly accessible.
The peril to the Zakheim “History of Medicine in California” murals and the community’s support for their preservation has been reported in recent months in the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Jewish News of Northern California*, and other print and online publications.

UCSF’s actions with regard to the Zakheim “History of Medicine in California” murals has not exemplified integrity or good faith. Throughout this process, UCSF’s leadership has high-handedly maintained that as a state institution, the University is not bound by City or County of San Francisco regulations or designations (such as the Landmark status of the Zakheim murals cycle). While this is technically correct, this choice does not embody the community-oriented values and engagement that the University of California upholds.

UCSF cannot exempt itself from the guidance of the University of California Academic Senate and the Board of Regents. We are asking UCSB’s Academic Senate for a memorial to the Board of Regents to address the threat to the remarkable “History of Medicine in California” mural cycle before the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan final EIR is certified at their January 2021 meeting.

Attachments:
UCSB Public History Studies Open Letter, August 31, 2020
General Services Administration letter to UCSF Legal Counsel, June 18, 2020
Excerpt from Robert Sherins, *Illustrated Guide, Toland Hall Frescos, UCSF School of Medicine*
An open letter to the UC San Francisco Chancellor from University of California Faculty
(Sponsored by the Program in Public Historical Studies, UCSB History Department)

August 31, 2020

Sam Hawgood, Chancellor
Office of the Chancellor
513 Parnassus Avenue
MSB
San Francisco, CA 94117

Dear Chancellor Hawgood,

We, the undersigned, are deeply alarmed by the University’s expansion plan for its Parnassus Heights campus and destruction of the historically and culturally significant murals as part of the campus redevelopment. We urge UCSF to make an immediate commitment to:

- Preserve the mural cycle, *History of Medicine in California* by Bernard Zakheim that is currently threatened with planned demolition of Toland Hall in UC Hall.
- Secure a permanent home for the murals where they can be regularly accessed by the public, preferably by leaving them *in situ*.

Produced between 1935 and 1939 with the support of public funds from the Works Progress Administration, the mural cycle of ten panels was described by UCSF’s own archivist as “the jewel of the university’s art collection,” which has served as an enduring backdrop for the teaching of medicine at UCSF over many generations. This mural cycle is both artistically significant and a critical example of this art form. As a student of the famed Mexican muralist Diego Rivera, Zakheim is regarded as a major New Deal artist with deep ties to the Bay Area. The UCSF murals represent his largest and best single work. (1)

Equally important, the murals seek to represent the totality of medical history, and in so doing, they offer a rare memorial to the diversity of these origins. Perhaps most striking is their memorialization of Biddy Mason, an enslaved healer who had to sue for her freedom; she went on to amass wealth and notoriety as a philanthropist in late nineteenth-century Los Angeles (2). As you know, a rare portrait of Mason appears in one of the murals, representing one of the “vanishingly few monuments to women of color” (3). This work—the first known artistic representation of Mason—tells a vital and overlooked story of Black empowerment. Such tributes to women of color from this era are
extraordinarily rare and deserve not only preservation but also celebration. The University’s plan to demolish these murals is embarrassingly out of step with the national movement over race and representation, particularly for an institution that seeks to create a culturally and socially diverse medical community. Leaders from across the country are demanding an honest reckoning with our past in an effort to forge a more just future. We urge you to join this effort by preserving the murals.

On the strength of both its artistic and historic significance, the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission recently voted unanimously to recommend historic landmark designation for the mural cycle. Many of the commissioners noted in their public comments that the UCSF had the chance to stand on the right side of history by finding a creative architectural solution that would allow the murals to be preserved in situ.

We hereby endorse the importance of these murals both as irreplaceable works of art representing the best of New Deal Era artistic production and as historical memorials important to the history of UCSF and the history of California. At a moment when we have all been reminded of the power of society’s monuments to reflect social values, the “History of Medicine in California” mural cycle represents an earlier era’s attempt to represent the history most relevant to UCSF. These murals have become, over time, a central piece of the University’s history and of the history of all Californians as well.

As students of Public History, Art History, and Black History in the United States, as well as concerned scholars from a variety of allied fields, we urge you to seize this moment and to preserve and make accessible this important artistic legacy. What you do here—or fail to do here—has implications for both the type of University community we build and the society which our graduates go on to serve. We urge you to do the right thing and keep the murals on the Parnassus Heights Campus at a location that makes this mural cycle accessible and available to the diverse communities that are UCSF’s future.

**Signatories to the Open Letter:**

*University of California, Santa Barbara*

**Ann Jensen Adams**, Professor
**Ralph Armbruster Sandoval**, Professor and Chair
**Ingrid Banks**, Assoc. Professor and Chair
**Randolph Bergstrom**, Associate Professor
**José Cabezon**, Dalai Lama Professor of Tibetan Buddhism and Cultural Studies

Hist. of Art & Architecture

Chicana/o Studies

Black Studies

History

Religious Studies
University of California, Santa Barbara (cont.)

Allison Caplan, Assistant Professor Chicana/o Studies
Sarah H. Case, Academic Coordinator Public History
Miroslava Chavez-Garcia, Professor History
Elizabeth Digeser, Professor History
William Elison, Associate Professor Religious Studies
Claudio Fogu, Associate Professor Italian
Diane Fujino, Professor Asian American Studies
Kip Fulbeck, Distinguished Professor Art
Mary Hancock, Acting Dean, Humanities/Fine Arts College of Letters & Sciences
Richard D. Hecht, Professor Religious Studies
Lisa Jacobson, Associate Professor History
Laura Kalman, Research Professor History
Carol Lansing, Professor History
John W. I. Lee, Associate Professor History
Ann-elise Iewallen, Associate Professor East Asian Studies
Harold Marcuse, Professor History
Kate McDonald, Associate Professor History
Stephan Miescher, Professor History
Laurie Monahan, Associate Professor Hist of Art & Architecture
Katie Moore, Assistant Professor History
Sylvester Okwunodo Ogbechie, Professor Hist of Art & Architecture
John S. W. Park, Professor Asian American Studies
Lisa S. Park, Professor Asian American Studies
Silvia Perea, Acting Director Art, Design & Architecture Museum
Elizabeth Pérez, Associate Professor Religious Studies
Giuliana Perrone, Assistant Professor History
Ann Marie Plane, Professor History
Fabio Rambelli, Professor and Chair East Asian Studies
Erika Rappaport, Professor and Chair History
Katherine Saltzman-Li, Associate Professor East Asian Studies
Daina Sanchez, Assistant Professor Chicana/o Studies
Sherene Seikaly, Associate Professor History
Jenni Sorkin, Associate Professor Hist of Art & Architecture
Paul Spickard, Distinguished Professor History
Jeffrey C. Stewart, Professor Black Studies
Sharon Tettegah, Professor Black Studies

Faculty across the University of California system:

Amir Alexander Assoc. Adj. Professor of History UCLA
Andrew Apter Professor of History UCLA
Rosie Bermudez UC President’s Postdoc Scholar UCLA
Catherine Ceniza Choy Professor of Ethnic Studies UC Berkeley
Ellen Dubois Distinguished Research Prof. of History UCLA
Leo Gonzalez UCLA Library Preservation UCLA
Talinn Grigor Prof. and Chair, Art History UC Davis
Faculty across the University of California system (cont.):

Catherine Gudis  Assoc. Professor of History  UC Riverside
Jessica Graham  Assoc. Professor of History  UC San Diego
Brian J. Griffith  Postdoctoral Scholar, Mod. European History  UCLA
Kevin Kim  Asst. Prof. of History  UCLA
Peter Loewenberg  Professor of History, Emeritus  UCLA
Carla Pestana  Professor of History  UCLA
Tony Platt  Distinguished Scholar, Law School  UC Berkeley
Theodore M. Porter  Distinguished Prof. of History  UCLA
Michelle Smith  Kress Asst. Conservator, Library  UCLA
Ula Taylor  Professor, African American Studies and African Diaspora Studies  UC Berkeley
Eric Van Young  Distinguished Prof. of Hist., Emeritus  UC San Diego
Robert S. Westman  Professor Emeritus of History  UC San Diego

Other Allies and Supporters:

Michele Bogart, Prof. Emerita Art History and Criticism  Stony Brook University

Marne L. Campbell, Assoc. Prof. and Chair, African American Studies  Loyola Marymount University
Robert Cherny, Professor Emeritus of History  San Francisco State University
Dewey Crumpler, Associate Prof. of Painting  San Francisco Art Institute
Leon Fine, MD, Prof. of Medicine, Cedars Sinai Medical Center  Los Angeles, California
Peyton Hall, FAIA, Adj. Prof. of Heritage Conservation School of Architecture  Univ. of Southern California
Kerri A. Inglis, Professor of History  Univ. of Hawaii, Hilo
Steve Kovacs, Professor of Cinema  San Francisco State University
Cecilia O’Leary, Professor Emerita of History  CSU Monterey Bay
Eduardo Pineda, Sr. Adjunct Professor, Critical Ethnic Studies  California College of the Arts
David A. Plane, Professor Emeritus of Geography  University of Arizona
Thomas Raffin, MD, Professor Emeritus of Medicine  Stanford University
Joanne Rondille, Asst. Professor of Sociology  San Jose State University
Rebecca de Schweinitz, Assoc. Prof. of History  Brigham Young University
Travis Seifman, Postdoctoral Scholar, Historiographical Inst.  
University of Tokyo

Michael Sernier, Professor Emeritus of Political Science  
Sacramento State University

Carol Sicherman, Professor Emerita of English  
Lehman College, CUNY

Peter D. L. Stansky, Professor Emeritus of History  
Stanford University

Tamara Venit-Shelton, Assoc. Professor of History  
Claremont-McKenna

Arisa White, Author of Biddy Mason Speaks Up

Richard Guy Wilson, Emeritus Professor of Architectural History  
University of Virginia

Walter W. Woodward, Assoc. Professor of History  
University of Connecticut

****
References and additional information:

(1) https://www.jweekly.com/2020/06/18/jewish-muralists-historic-work-faces-demolition-at-ucsf/
A Black Nurse Saved Lives. Today She May Save Art.

Once a slave, Biddy Mason went on to a life of extraordinary accomplishments. The fact that she figures in W.P.A. murals in San Francisco may save them from destruction.

A panel of Bernard Zakheim’s “History of Medicine in California” features Biddy Mason, center, an enslaved woman born in 1818 who became a nurse. Credit...Chris Carlsson

By Carol Pogash

Aug. 11, 2020Updated 6:07 p.m. ET

SAN FRANCISCO — In June, Laura Voisin George, a graduate student, was writing a scholarly article about a series of W.P.A. frescoes at the University of California, San Francisco.

The ten panels of “History of Medicine in California,” completed in 1938 by Bernard Zakheim, a Polish-born muralist, show such scenes as Native Americans offering herbs to doctors and a trapper inoculating someone with the smallpox vaccine.
Ms. Voisin George, recognized a central figure in one of the vivid social realist tableaus: Biddy Mason, a Black nurse, is depicted alongside a white doctor, as they treat a malaria patient. Mason, an enslaved woman born in 1818, went on to become a midwife, a nurse, a philanthropist and a founder of the First African Methodist Episcopal Church in Los Angeles.

Ms. Voisin George, who studies history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, learned that the frescoes were about to be destroyed while she was researching. The Jewish News of Northern California reported the news. Her reaction, she said, was “What? How could this be?”

U.C.S.F. had announced plans to demolish the building to make way for a state-of-the-art research center. The university had informed Zakheim’s son Nathan that if his family didn’t retrieve the frescoes, which weigh as much as 2,500 pounds, they would be destroyed.
Until Ms. Voisin George identified Mason, neither the artist’s family nor university officials knew about her presence in the frescoes. As news outlets have reported this discovery, Mason
has become a star of the murals and their potential savior. An assertion by the federal government that it owns the frescoes has further complicated matters.

Adam Gottstein, the artist’s grandson, said that the university’s placing responsibility on the family to save the artwork “boiled my blood.” It showed a “complete lack of respect and concern for historical art.” Mason’s presence, he said, “adds considerable pressure to U.C.S.F. to do the right thing.”

The frescoes were part of the W.P.A.’s Federal Art Project, which hired unemployed artists. Since their creation, the Zakheim murals have been praised, criticized and painted over because a professor said they distracted medical students attending lectures in the auditorium where they are on display. Because of concerns about earthquakes, that auditorium is no longer used.

In 2015, Polina Ilieva, U.C.S.F.’s archivist, wrote that the murals “remain the jewel of the university’s art collection.”

Zakheim was “one of the most prominent artists in Northern California with a national reputation,” said Robert Cherny, a history professor retired from San Francisco State and an expert on New Deal art. “These murals are his largest work,” he said. Zakheim, who also created other Depression-era murals for the project, died in 1985.

Nathan Zakheim, the artist’s son, an art conservator who in 1976 restored the murals, said he was shocked when he and other heirs received a letter from U.C.S.F.’s lawyers, dated June 4, giving them 90 days to produce a plan to remove the murals. If they failed to respond, the letter said, the university would “presume” it had their consent “to proceed with destruction.”

Nathan Zakheim told the university he could move the murals for less than $1 million. There was one hitch: The family lacked the funds.
The series depicts the progression of modern medicine, with this panel focusing on botulism research. Credit...UCSF Archives and Special Collections
The series has been criticized for distracting medical students over the years. Credit...Liz Hafalia/The San Francisco Chronicle, via Polaris

But the university said it would not spend public money on the move because money was tight during the pandemic. It described the murals as “fragile,” even though an analysis by Page & Turnbull, a historic preservation architecture firm the university hired, said they were “structurally sound.”

Then, on June 18, the university received a letter from the General Services Administration stating that “ownership of the murals resides with G.S.A., on behalf of the United States.” The federal agency wanted the murals to be preserved.

“We were surprised when the G.S.A. said, ‘We assert an ownership interest,’” said Brian Newman, U.C.S.F.’s vice chancellor for real estate. The university said it rejects the G.S.A.’s ownership claim.
Putting further pressure on the university, The Los Angeles Times published an op-ed piece on July 10 that was based in part on Ms. Voisin George’s research. Its headline read: “A monument to California’s Black history — and a great work of art — may soon be destroyed.”

Cheryl and Robynn Cox, sisters who are descendants of Biddy Mason, grew up knowing that their famous ancestor was painted on the frescoes, as had their mother and grandparents. She also was the subject of a 2015 young adult book illustrated with the mural.

Both women assumed the murals would always be available to the public, until they read the reports about plans to destroy them.

“It’s interesting, if you look through the lens of race and gender, this extraordinary Black woman and former slave is bringing attention to the destruction of these murals, but no one personally reached out to us,” said Robynn Cox, an assistant professor of social work at the University of Southern California.

“Across the country, everyone is talking about diversity, equity and inclusion,” said Cheryl Cox, who works in philanthropy. “To take down a mural of somebody who is showing diversity, equity and inclusion is kind of hard to swallow.”
The mural shows “a former slave who is on an equal footing, or maybe an even more than equal footing with white men at a time in which there was still slavery in this country,” she added. “I don’t know if there’s anything like it.”

The Cox sisters said they recently met over Zoom with U.C.S.F. officials, including a meeting on Aug. 10 attended by the chancellor, Sam Hawgood.

Last week, the school announced it was seeking bids to remove the 10 frescoes and place them in storage, at a price not to exceed $1.8 million. “We are hoping we can come up with a viable plan for the murals to preserve them,” Mr. Newman, the vice chancellor, said.

The federal government response, in an email from Pamela D. Pennington, a G.S.A. press secretary, said: “Until a new location for the murals is determined, their removal, preservation and storage by U.C.S.F. is supported by G.S.A.”

But the descendants of the artist and the famous nurse want the art to be seen.

Mr. Gottstein said, “If they are in storage and never see the light of day, then we will have lost, after all.”
June 18, 2020

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY

Charles R. Olson, Esq.
Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski, LLP
The Transamerica Pyramid
600 Montgomery Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

Dear Mr. Olson,

Thank you for your letter to GSA dated May 22, 2020 regarding the possible demolition of the Bernard Zakheim “History of Medicine in California” murals located at the University of California, San Francisco Parnassus Heights Campus. GSA’s Fine Arts professional staff has completed initial research regarding the artwork and has confirmed that the University of California Hospital, San Francisco received a loan of this artwork under the WPA, Federal Art Project (1935-1943) in 1937. Please see the attached documentation.

As outlined in our Legal Fact Sheet, in situations like this GSA “no longer maintains an ownership interest in the artwork, unless that ownership interest was preserved in the documents transferring custody of the artwork(s).” (P. 11, emphasis added.) In this case, the loan documentation indicates that an ownership interest was preserved and therefore ownership of the murals resides with GSA, on behalf of the United States.

We recognize that the nature of frescoes will render their safe removal and relocation both challenging and costly, but if possible we would like to develop a plan for their preservation in conjunction with UCSF. In the meantime, we wanted to alert you to their Federal ownership status as soon as possible. It is our understanding that you have made the Zakheim family aware of the University’s plans for the building; we believe opportunity exists for a resolution to this case that would be mutually satisfactory for all of the interested stakeholders. GSA looks forward to working with those individuals and entities to that end.

Additionally, we have documentation indicating that the Michael von Meyer wood carving located in Toland Hall was also a loan from the WPA and have included that documentation. We would like to ensure its preservation as well.
Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions. I look forward to working with you to come to an appropriate resolution for preserving the murals.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Gibson, Ph.D.
Director, Art in Architecture and Fine Arts
(202)501.0930
jennifer.gibson@gsa.gov

cc: Brian Newman, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, UCSF Real Estate / Vice President, UCSF Health (brian.newman@ucsf.edu)
Greta Schnetzler, Chief Campus Counsel – Associate General Counsel (gschnetzler@legal.ucsf.edu)
Kevin Beauchamp, Executive Director, Physical Planning (kevin.beauchamp@ucsf.edu)
Diane Wong, Principal Planner / Environmental Coordinator (diane.wong@ucsf.edu)

Attachments/hyperlink:

Loan documentation
www.gsa.gov/finearts [includes Legal Fact Sheet]
September 20, 1938

Mr. Thomas C. Parker
Assistant Director Federal Art Project
Works Progress Administration
Ouray Building
8th & "C" Streets
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Parker:

I am sending you herewith for your records the following:

1 - Approved FAP Form No. 1, dated July 29, 1937, covering request for loan of work of art ("History of Medicine in California" — Fresco) by Bernard Zakheim to the University of California Hospital, San Francisco, California.

2 - FAP Form No. 2, One (1) Record card.

3 - FAP Form No. 4, dated August 30, 1938, Receipt for loan of the work of art covered by the above FAP Form No. 1.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Joseph A. Danysz
Regional Adviser Federal Art Project

GENERAL FILES

Encl.

MUST BE TUPED IN WITHIN THREE DAYS TO GENERAL FILES REPRESENTATIVE.
November 22, 1938

Mr. Thomas C. Parker
Assistant Director Federal Art Project
Works Progress Administration
Quaray Building, 8th & "G" Streets
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Parker:

I am sending you herewith for your records the following:

1 - Approved FAP Form No. 1, dated August 25, 1937, covering request for loan of work of art ("Carved Frame" - Oak) by Michael Von Meyer, and James Warrender to the University of California Hospital, San Francisco, California.

2 - One (1) Record card, FAP Form No. 2.

3 - FAP Form No. 4, dated November 18, 1938, Receipt for loan of the work of art covered by the above FAP Form No. 1.

Very sincerely yours,

Joseph A. Danysh
Regional Adviser Federal Art Project

JAD:AB
Encl.

GENERAL FILES
MUST BE TURNED IN WITHIN THREE DAYS TO
GENERAL FILES REPRESENTATIVE
Principle Fresco Panels
From: Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“The story told by the murals begins with the domestic life and hygiene of the California Indians. A young Indian, symbolizing his race, reaches out in greeting to the sun as he dries himself after and sweat bath and cold plunge in the river. Two sweat houses, or temescals, appear near him used for ceremonial as well as healing purposes, and a mother and child sun themselves in the foreground”.

“With his back to his ship [Golden Hind], he [Sir Francis Drake] grimly supervises an autopsy, which the ship’s surgeon is performing upon Drakes’ younger brother, thus proving his death due to natural causes rather than to the vengeance of a wrathful deity. To the right, four sailors finish burying those of their comrades who perished of the same disease, while to the left, the chaplain prayer book in hand but manacled, and wearing a humiliating badge,
suffers the displeasure of the captain for spreading superstition among the crew”.

“Completing this panel, three Indians offer to Padre Junipero Serra the three most important herbs contributed by California to modern medicine: yerba santa (criodictyon glutinosum), cascara sagrada rhamnus purshiana) and grindelia robusta”.

Father Junipero Serra Receiving Native Medicinal Herbs
Sir Francis Drake, Spanish Commander, Supervising Autopsy of Brother Proving Death by Natural Causes; Nearby Priest Praying

From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“...Pioneer courage of ‘Peg-Leg’ [Tom] Smith, famous trapper and prospector of the pioneer west, who is painted in the act of severing his own leg after being wounded in a fight with Indians. Tied near him, and acting as support to
the edge of the panel is his pack burro, loaded with traps and skins. In the rock on which Smith supports himself is carved the old proverb: *‘De medico, poeta y loco, Todos temenos un poco’* (of medicine, poetry and insanity, we all have a little).

From: Description by Phyllis Wrightson

“...Invasion of California by a strange people, a new religion and the foreign diseases that almost exterminated the native population. Heading the band of soldiers in the background is Juan Bautista de Anze, leader of the expedition of 1775 bearing his name. The central figure of the main group is a bewildered Indian, standing helplessly between a padre who baptizes him and a soldier who offers him an acquaintance with alcohol. Half hidden behind the priest is a soldier who had roped the Indian woman in the foreground”.

187
From: Description by Phyllis Wrightson
...Native Indians in ceremonial dance during birthing of child... Midwives push bulging uterus to express afterbirth, mother clutches rope above, assistant expresses afterbirth...

From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“A young Indian, symbolizing his race, reaches out in greeting to the sun as he dries himself after and sweat bath and cold plunge in the river”. To the left, a warrior sucks a wound, a shaman or medicine man mixes blood mud and herbs for a poultice, another digs bulbs used in making magic against snake bites.
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson

“The third and last panel on this side of the central division is devoted to doctors of the ‘Gold Rush’ period. The first incident is an illustration of the type of adventure often met in the gold fields. Dr. Edward Willis is shown shooting the quack doctor Hullings, his predecessor at Placerville, in a duel after Hullings had torn up Willis’s diplomas in a drunken rage at having a rival appear in his territory. A glimpse of the doctors surgery is shown beside hm, including the bottled monstrosities that are being examined by two curious miners.”

“A solitary figure in this composition is that of Dr. Hugh Toland, founder of the Toland Medical School which was later absorbed by the university of California. He appears on a lively mustang, as he might have looked on his arrival in 1852, after crossing the plains. In his hand he holds a drawing of the quartz mill he brought with him, by which he no doubt expected to become wealthy.”

“Lightening the central background and supporting the upper part of the composition, is a group of covered wagons, drawn by red oxen. The center foreground below this is devoted to the courageous Dr. Fayette Clappe, who in 151 at Rich Bar on the feather River risked his professional reputation to save the life of a young miner whose leg he successfully amputated after the case had been pronounced hopeless. One of the two miners watching the operation is pouring out the whiskey that was used instead of an anesthetic”. 
Early Medical History San Francisco;
Dr. Hugh Toland, Surgeon, Rides Mustang
Dr. Clapp’s Office; Patient With Injured Leg

Dr. Hugh Toland on Mustang Horse
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“The most distinguished of the Spanish Surgeon-Generals, Dr. Don Pablo Soler, appears in the center of this panel, attending an Indian that had been badly
gored by a bull (about 1898). The patient’s recovery added to his name for humanity and kindness to all in need of his services. The bull appears behind him, held by two Indians, and illustrates the artist’s intention of having each incident as self-explanatory as possible. The bull with bloody horns accounts for the disemboweled Indian in the foreground, Spanish and English flags identify the nationality of figures in other scenes, while some characters are explained by the presence of books diplomas, or other articles appropriate to their functions in the scene.

“Slightly to the left of this central group is. The uniformed figure of General Castro, who is shown persuading the famous Indian doctor, Petronio, to cure a wounded soldier. Although Petronio’s reputation was that of curing his friends and killing his enemies, there were few doctors to choose from in 1844.

Abdominal Surgery Without Anesthesia Indian Gored by Bull; Foreign Military Campaign
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“The last third of the panel is occupied with early San Francisco doctors. The first group consists of three figures, that of Dr. Victor j. Fourgeaud and his wife and little boy, who came to California in 1847. He holds the title page of his monograph on diphtheria, a notable contribution to. The study of the disease, which he wrote after the epidemic of 1856. Beneath this paper is another, which lists some of his other achievements as a citizen and physician”.
“Three more figures fill the remaining space. Dr. John Townsend is shown hanging up his sign in 1846 announcing the first medical office in San Francisco. In front of him is one of the typical oddities of this period, ‘Dr.’ Elbert P. Jones, for whom Jones Street was named. He was a jack of all trades, including medicine, law and newspaper publishing, but his consuming passion was for gold, in which he would literally wallow. In the upper left hand corner, Dr. Felix P. Wierzbicki, a native of Poland, is painted writing the book that made him famous, “California As It Is And As It May be”, published in 1849.”

Dr. Hugh Toland on Mustang Horse; Examination Sick Child
UCSF Medical Alumni Class 1963 Witnessing Toland Hall Frescos

Lucy Wanzer, MD, First Woman Medical Class of 1876
Scene UCSF, Medical Staff, Hooper Foundation Research
Lucy Wanzer - First Woman Physician Graduate
UCSF Class 1876

From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“In the corner corresponding to that occupied by the Barbary Coast figure is a portrait of Lucy Wanzer, the first woman to enter the U.C. Medical School, who dared to sacrifice her feminine dignity in order to obtain entrance to what was then an exclusively masculine career”.
Dr. Lucy Wanzer Holding Bull’s Testicles and Ovaries
Karl Meyer, MD, Hooper Foundation UCSF
Examining Rodent for Fleas With Plague

San Francisco Mayor Adolf Sutro Donates 26-Acre Mt. Sutro
Gifted to UCSF For New Campus Site, Parnassus Heights
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“Holding a map of the present University of California Medical Center is [San Francisco Mayor] Adolph Sutro] donor of the group upon which this group of buildings stands”.

Langley Porter, MD; Herbert Moffitt, MD
Future Medicine: Research, Surgery With Sophisticated Anesthesia; Vaccinations; Advanced Dental Care

Sponge Case Death and Trial: Drs. Nuttall, Cole, Toland & Griffin
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“...Dishonesty in the medical profession is demonstrated in the section immediately above the figure of the doctor, where dr. Albert Abrams is shown operating one of his many machines for curing all ailments. In the design only a suggestion of the actual appearance of the machine is given. /also shown is the Ionoco Belt of Dr. Wilshire”.
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson
“The constructive side of San Francisco’s medical development is represented by the row of buildings tilting away from the center of the design, the first medical schools and hospitals in the city. An old-fashioned yellow building in the center bears the name of Toland Medical School, the germ of the present U.C. Medical School; to the right is an imaginary likeness of the old County Hospital; at the left are the two buildings associated with the Stanford Medical Department - the Gothic angles of the Cooper Medical School which stands at Sacramento and Webster Streets, and the more modern red brick of the Lane Hospital. These provide the background for the likenesses of Dr. Elias Samuel Cooper and his nephew, Dr. Levi Cooper Lane, who are shown with a shelf of medical books written by pioneer San Francisco physicians.
Scourge - Plague Epidemic - San Francisco “Cover Up”

Casey Killing Fraudulent Dr. Hullings, San Francisco
San Francisco Prominent Physician Dr. Felix P. Wierzbicki

Modern Founders UCSF Faculty - Herbert Moffitt, MD; Langley Porter, MD
Herbert C. Moffitt, MD

Herbert Moffitt, MD and Langley Porter, MD
Honoring UCSF Public Health Nursing School

Chauncey Leake, PhD - Dean UCSF School Pharmacy; Brickling In Residence to thwart plague carrying rats.
Sciences of the Future

UCSF New Medical Technologies and Quacks
From Description by Phyllis Wrightson

“Above the door, and to the right of the screen is the last panel of the series, symbolizing the entire field of science, past, present and future. The circular motif of the previous panel has been developed, with the addition of more circles, into the more spacious pattern of a spiral, which carries the eye through the painting in more generous lines suggesting the perpetual
development and change characteristic of all organic activity. This is in contrast to the design of the Hooper panel, where the circular shape returns upon itself indicating one isolated cycle or generation of science viewed separately from its place in the whole sweep of scientific history”.

“The wheel in the center revolving on its huge bearings, symbolizes the early development of modern science, called into existence by the necessity of the troubled humans in the foreground. The muscular figure representing human energy provides the power by which tis body f science is caused to revolve.”

“The bearings upon. Which this massive structure moves are engraved with the names of those men who laid the foundation for present scientific knowledge; Galileo, the celestial physicist; Newton, physicist; Lavoisier, who discovered the fundamental laws of modern chemistry; Einstein, physical astronomer who contributed the theory of relativity; roentgen discoverer of X-rays; Pasteur, who opened up the world of microbiology; Hegel, father of modern scientific philosophy; and Darwin, whose concept of change in the world of biology was one of indefinite progress or evolution.”

“This first wheel is not complete in itself. It is connected by a belt to another smaller wheel, which revolves upon the same axis on which a huge wheel in the distance is slowly turning; and the rhythm of the picture suggests that these turns are spiraling into the future endlessly”.

“The revolutions of the small wheel, intermediate between the past and the immensity of the future, are spinning out consequences remote from the intention of those whose names are lettered on the bearings. Laboratory chemists have produced poisonous gases; engineer have developed bombing planes; destruction as well as benefit has been produced from the labors of scientists. Thus, the physician must repair the damages which the destructive forces of misapplied principles have produced. His future task is that of guiding new discoveries along constructive and beneficent channels”. 