ACADEMIC SENATE
FACULTY LEGISLATURE, SANTA BARBARA DIVISION

Thursday, January 13, 2022
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Via Zoom

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others
   COVID-19 Updates
   - Scott Grafton, M.D., Ph.D., COVID-Mitigation Program Coordinator and Professor of Psychological and Brain Sciences
   - Stu Feinstein, Ph.D., COVID-19 Response Team Coordinator and Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology
   - Vejas Skripkus, M.D., Executive Director of Student Health and Campus Physician
   - Mary Ferris, M.D., Campus COVID-19 Clinical Advisor

   Please be advised that this portion of the meeting will be recorded.

4. Special Orders – Consent Calendar
   - Approval of the minutes of the October 21, 2021 meeting (Attachment 1)
   - 2020-21 Annual Reports (Attachment 2)
     - Council on Planning and Budget
     - Committee on International Education
     - Committee on Privilege and Tenure

5. Reports of Special Committees - none

6. Reports of Standing Committees - none

   Undergraduate Council
   Residency Requirements in the College of Letters and Science - Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 125I (Attachment 3)

   Department of English - Proposal to Discontinue the B.A. in Renaissance Studies (Attachment 4)

7. Petitions of Students - none

8. Unfinished Business - none

9. University and Faculty Welfare

10. New Business
The Faculty Legislature of the Santa Barbara Division met via Zoom video conference at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 21, 2021, with Chair Susannah Scott presiding. 33 voting members, 7 ex officio members, and other invited parties attended the meeting.

Announcements by the Chancellor (from the slides presented)

Thank you to Chair Susannah Scott and all of our Senate colleagues for your devotion and commitment to shared governance, especially in navigating our recent return to on-campus instruction and more normal campus operations.

Transitions

Dean of Engineering
Dean of Engineering and Richard A. Auhll Professor Rod Alferness has retired, as of September 21.

Professor of Materials Tresa Pollock has graciously agreed to serve as our Interim Dean of Engineering.

Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Dean of Undergraduate Education in the College of Letters and Science and Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple has decided to return to teaching and research following a sabbatical leave in the fall.

Professor of Psychological & Brain Sciences Michael Miller has graciously agreed to serve as our Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education in the College of Letters and Science and Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, effective October 1.

AD&A Museum
Dr. Gabriel Ritter has been appointed as the new Director of our Art, Design & Architecture Museum. Dr. Ritter comes to us from the Minneapolis Institute of Art, where he has been Curator and Head of Contemporary Art since 2016.
Responding to COVID-19

Chancellor Yang shared a video with the Faculty Legislature regarding the return of students to the campus.

Vaccine Mandate Compliance
Undergraduate students: 97.78% vaccinated
Graduate students: 98.23% vaccinated
Total students: 97.83% vaccinated

Faculty: 93.38% vaccinated
Staff: 89.78% vaccinated
Total employees: 91.11%

Combined campus total: 96.93% vaccinated

Vaccine Exemptions and Deferrals
Students
- Medical: 55
- Religious: 398
- Pregnancy: 4
- Temporary: 220

Employees
- Medical: 37
- Religious: 123
- Pregnancy: 8

Total campus exemptions: 845
Minus temporary exemptions: 625

Campus COVID-19 Protocols
- All students, faculty, staff, and visitors are required to wear masks in shared indoor spaces.
- Daily symptom screening required before coming onto campus.
- Mandatory weekly testing for individuals who have received an approved vaccination exemption or deferral.
- Mandatory weekly random early-detection testing of 1,500 vaccinated students in order to gather additional data that could help us identify cases and address them before they spread. This program has detected zero positive cases to date.

Fall Quarter Campus COVID-19 Cases
- Since move-in began on September 12, there have been a total of 72 campus cases (64 students; 8 staff and faculty).
• 11 of the cases were from move-in screening testing of about 9,500 students in campus housing, which corresponds to a positivity rate of 0.1%.
• Among the cases that have developed since the fall quarter began, we have had no known classroom transmissions to date.

Flu Vaccination
On October 8, UC President Michael Drake issued an executive order requiring all covered students, faculty, other academic appointees, and staff to get vaccinated against influenza, or formally opt out after receiving information about the flu vaccine, no later than November 19.

Student Updates
Chancellor Yang shared a series of photos about the Virtual Student Convocation in September, and Move-In Week.

2021 Fall Enrollment Update
• 105,647 first-year applications; 126,210 totals
• First-year students: 4,898 enrolled
  ○ Enrolled statistics:
    ■ Average GPA: 4.24
    ■ Underrepresented minorities: 28%
    ■ First-generation: 30%
• Transfer students: 2,099 enrolled
  ○ Enrolled statistics:
    ■ Average GPA: 3.67
    ■ Underrepresented minorities: 28%
    ■ First-generation: 33%
• Total enrollment: 6,997 for fall + 100 expected in winter (target was 7,235)
• Among our incoming student body, 79% are from California, and 21% out of state and international.
• Among our total undergraduate student body, 82.5% are from California, and 17.5% out of state and international.
Student Housing Update
We have offered housing to every undergraduate and single graduate student who remained on our housing waiting list. As in previous years, there are still a handful of students waiting for family housing units to become available.

Munger Hall
- In July, our campus released a notice of preparation for our student housing project developed in partnership with philanthropist Charlie Munger.
- We soon plan to release the draft Environmental Impact Report.
- The development would fulfill our commitment to provide more student housing, increasing existing housing by 50% with single-occupancy rooms (5,000 beds).
- Munger Hall demonstrates our commitment to housing students in quality and cost-effective accommodations as a net benefit to our students, our campus, and the community.
- Chancellor Yang shared a series of photographs about the Munger House and the New Classroom Building.

Campus Updates and Highlights

2022 U.S. News & World Report, Best Colleges Rankings
UCSB ranked as # 5 Public National University
2022 U.S. News Ranking: Best Ethnic Diversity
UC Santa Barbara included among institutions with fifth highest diversity index rating

NICHE GRADE: 2022 Best Hispanic-Serving Institutions in America
UC Santa Barbara rated as the #1 Best Hispanic-Serving Institution in America
2021 Fundraising
UC Santa Barbara raised more than $100 million in new gifts and pledges in FY 2021.

2021 Research Funding

2021-22 Harold J. Plous Award
Assistant Professor of MCDB Carolina Arias has been selected for the 2021-22 Plous Award.

Mellon Foundation Grant
As part of a national consortium of 16 Hispanic-Serving Institutions formed last year, our first joint proposal on Latinx studies has been funded with $5 million over three years.

American Association for Advances in Functional Materials
Professor of Materials Steven DenBaars is selected to receive the 2021 AAFM-Nakamura Award, named for our own Professor Shuji Nakamura.

National Communication Association
Professor of Communication Tamara Afifi receives the 2021 Gerald M. Phillips Award for Distinguished Applied Communication Scholarship and is also named a Distinguished Scholar.

American Institute of Chemical Engineers
Professor of Chemical Engineering Michelle O'Malley has been named the recipient of the 2021 Allan P. Colburn Award.
National Science Foundation Grant
Congratulations to co-principal investigators Cherie Briggs, Roland Knapp, and Thomas Smith on their $12.5-million NSF grant for a new research collaboration with other institutions to study species’ resilience to infectious disease.

Department of Energy Grant
Assistant Professor of Chemistry Vojtech Vlcek receives a $28-million award to lead a DOE-funded team project to advance scientific discovery using supercomputers.

Other institutions include UC Berkeley, UCLA, Rutgers University, University of Michigan and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Dreyfus Foundation Award
Assistant Professor of Materials Chris Bates has been awarded a $100,000 Camille Dreyfus Teacher-Scholar Award.

American Council of Learned Societies
Assistant Professor of Film and Media Studies Laila Shereen Sakr and Associate Professor of English Rachael Scarborough King have received Digital Extension Grant Awards of about $150,000 each for their research projects.

Professor King’s project also received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities earlier this year.

UCOP Grant for Faculty Diversity
A team of our arts faculty and staff, led by Professor of Art Kim Yasuda, has received a $175,000 grant from UCOP to advance faculty diversity by setting up an arts “commons” that features an artists-in-residence program.

It is the first arts initiative in the UC system to receive this diversity grant since the program began five years ago.

Arts & Lectures
A&L has flipped the switches for the new academic year. Our 2021-22 programming initiative “Creating Hope” brings a return to live, in-person events.

Keep It Safe, Keep It Local - Halloween 2021 at UCSB
- In consultation with our campus medical experts and campus administrators, our students are planning to hold an outdoor Halloween concert on Saturday the 30th at Storke Plaza, contingent on the artist agreeing to an outside performance.
- Our students are working with campus medical experts and campus safety officials on logistics for the event.
- As in past years, the student-only, on-campus concert will draw students out of Isla Vista and hopefully keep out-of-towners from coming to IV.
Friday, November 5 & Saturday, November 6
We are planning a hybrid event that will offer both in-person and online activities for Parents and Family Weekend at UC Santa Barbara.

2022 All Gaucho Reunion

Announcements by the Divisional Senate Chair, Susannah Scott, Professor, Chemical Engineering, Chemistry and Biochemistry

- Welcome back to campus and thank you for your service. An important focus of 2021-22 will be to rebuild our community of scholars following the pandemic.
- The Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group has issued a set of recommendations focused on academic personnel review, research funding, and teaching relief. Pandemic recovery within the UC will be a multi-year process. The report will be made available via the Academic Senate website once it becomes available.
- Academic Council has requested a systemwide review of a proposal from the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) for changes to APM 210, which would establish a more formal mechanism for recognition of mentorship in personnel cases.
- Academic Council has endorsed a resolution from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) in support of new UC programs for faculty, staff, and students who have dependent care responsibilities. UCSB has established a new backup care program, effective October 1.
- The Chancellor’s Task Force on Childcare has been reinvigorated, and we are looking forward to reporting on the group’s progress this year.
The University is considering structural changes and a possible expansion of UC Online (formerly ILTI). The Senate approval process for online courses will be a topic of discussion this year. We are interested in hearing from faculty about their innovative teaching methods.

We encourage you to nominate your colleagues for the Faculty Research Lecturer Award. Nominations are due Friday, February 4, 2022 at 5:00 p.m.

Managing Student Illness
Students with new, unexpected, unexplained symptoms typical of COVID-19 (as described on the symptom screener) should not attend classes until their symptoms have resolved.

Anticipating Student Absences from Class:
Students should not be penalized. Instructors are encouraged to post clear instructions on Gauchospace, directing students to class materials (e.g. lecture recordings, readings) and any required or optional make-up work.

Possibilities for Students Who Miss Exams Due to Illness:
- Plan for make-up exams;
- If the course has multiple exams, consider dropping a student's lowest score.

Mode of Instruction in Winter 2022
- The default mode of instruction for all courses in winter quarter will be in person, regardless of class size.
  - Except for courses with Senate approval to be offered fully online (“W” designation).
Emergency Remote Teaching in Winter 2022
- Medical accommodation for an instructor* whose presence on campus poses an unacceptable medical risk due to COVID-19
  - Requests must be approved by the Workplace Accommodations team in Human Resources.
  - HR assesses whether other workplace accommodations are feasible
- Workplace adjustment for an instructor* due to cohabitation with a seriously immunocompromised person
  - Documentation must be submitted to the Dean of the College or Division.
- Brief, temporary periods of quarantine/isolation by an instructor* or a child for whom the instructor has care-giving responsibility
- Any public health orders requiring a suspension of in-person class meetings

*Instructors include faculty, teaching associates, and teaching assistants.

Hybrid In-Person/Online Teaching in Winter 2022
- Current Senate policy allowing partial online instruction without Senate approval will continue in winter, without need for further Senate approval, provided:
  - The instructor informs the department* of the amount and pedagogical value of the online portion of the instruction, and
  - The course is disclosed to students as a hybrid course in the schedule of classes (e.g. MW lectures 1-2 pm in Phelps 1203, F discussion section 1-2 pm online), and
  - The online portion of the course does not exceed 50% of the scheduled instructional time in a given week, from the perspective of the enrolled student.
- The instructor of record (faculty or teaching associate) is responsible for ensuring that online instruction for all course components (lectures, labs, discussion sections, etc.) does not exceed 50% overall.

*Departments will need to collect and report the amount of online instruction quarterly.

Teaching Evaluation Workgroup, Rita Raley, Senate Vice Chair, Professor, English
(from the slides presented)

Teaching Evaluation Workgroup: Briefing and Request for Comment
- Senate-Administration committee (S21): charge is to work toward revision or replacement of the ESCI system
- Informed by ad hoc committee report (2019), SET research, SET models from other campuses
Proposed Timeline
Fall 2021: campus consultation; review evaluation practices of peer institutions; devise framework that will inform drafting of new survey
- Winter 2022: redesign the survey
- Spring 2022: vetting; campus review

Ongoing Work for 2021-22
- Address impact of online evaluations
  - Decline in response rates
  - Diminished quality of responses
  - No context for extremes of vitriol and admiration
  - Informing principles: pedagogy rather than data collection
- Develop recommendations for secondary forms of evaluation
  - July 2021 memo for reviewing agencies with recommendations for contextualizing ESCI scores, possible amending of ESCI surveys, and use of secondary forms of evidence (e.g. teaching self-assessments)
  - Available on AP website

Vice Chair Raley provided samples of peer institutions’ models, from UC Davis, UNC Chapel Hill, UC Berkeley, and the University of Michigan.

- Common features: polling for quality of instructor and quality of course

- UC Davis: calculations for questions 8 & 9
### Course Characteristics

The course challenged me to think deeply about the subject matter.

The course material (e.g., coursepack, website, texts) helped me better understand the subject matter.

The course assignments helped me better understand the subject matter.

This course was very exciting to me intellectually.

Rate the grading standards of this course compared with others you have taken at UNC.

Rate the workload required in this course compared with others you have taken at UNC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Disagree/Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree, Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Department customizable evaluation templates** (with items supplied from Course Evaluations Question Bank$^\copyright$ as well as departmental custom items).
- **Instructor personalized questions** which can be added to evaluations with responses only visible by instructors.
- Automated reports provided: descriptive stats, distributions, aggregate student comments.
  - Instructor/course Report: Web accessible or PDF downloadable aggregation of student responses for each question item on the survey:
    - Department aggregate = Average computed for each question compared to departmental average.
  - Raw Data Report: Spreadsheet which provides all raw score data all courses evaluated for a department in the current term.
  - Department Summary Sheet: Spreadsheet which provides average scores for all instructors evaluated in a given semester within a department for university required items as well as response rate data.
Eight new university-wide core questions

- This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter. Q1631
- My interest in the subject has increased because of this course. Q1632
- I knew what was expected of me in this course. Q1633
- I had a strong desire to take this course. Q4
- As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (Much Lighter, Lighter, Typical, Heavier, Much Heavier). Q891
- The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. Q230
- The instructor explained material clearly. Q199
- The instructor treated students with respect. Q217

Eight Questions (Mandatory)

Twelve Department Selected Questions**

Questions can be selected from the question catalog. Any combination of quantitative (ranking) questions and qualitative (comment) questions is allowed. Email ro.evaluations@umich.edu with requests for new questions or templates.

12 Questions (Optional)

Five Instructor Added Questions

Instructors have the choice of entering existing questions from our catalog or creating their own questions. *** They can add up to 3 quantitative questions and up to 2 qualitative questions.

5 Questions (Optional)

Teaching Award Recommendation

The instructor was one of the best I have had at Carolina, fully deserving of a teaching award.

Approximately how many hours per week do you spend working on homework, reading, and projects for this course?

Approximately how many hours per week did you spend working on homework, reading, and projects for this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per Week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (14)

Other Information

What grade do you think you will get in this course?

Is this a required course for you?
Guiding Principles (S21 discussions)
● Specificity & Validity
  ○ Guard against reviews of popularity, personality, and perceived language competency
● Simplicity
  ○ Survey fatigue
  ○ Do not add to faculty & reviewing agency labor
● Accountability
  ○ Students should be asked to account for their investment in the course
● Adaptability
  ○ Core questions + customization by unit or division

Request for Comment
senate-esci-revisions@ucsb.edu

WASC Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation: Linda Adler-Kassner, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education/Accreditation Liaison Officer, TPR Co-Chair; and Michael Gordon, TPR Co-Chair, Professor, Chemical Engineering (from the slides presented)

UCSB Current Accreditation: 2013-2023

Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR): Current Reaffirmation Pathway
● Pathway available (by application to WASC) for institutions at low risk of not being reaccredited
● UCSB approved because of a robust, ongoing 3-year cycle of PLO assessment (among other things)

TPR: Benefits
● Deep dive into themes selected by the institution and approved by WASC (Also requires evidence of compliance with WASC standards)

TPR: Themes
● High level/relevant to the campus
● Established/pursued with broad consultation
● Aligned with institutional mission and commitments
● Aspirational, but not too aspirational

You Might Ask:
“Does this mean that PLO assessment is suspended?”
No. :-)
● All programs will continue to undertake regular PLO assessment (3 year cycle; mid-cycle progress reports).
● Reminder:
Group 1 PLO assessment kickoff workshop: October 28, 1-3pm.

New Assessment Website
https://www.assessment.ucsb.edu/

Proposed Theme: Designing for Access, Designing for Success
- March-September, 2021: Theme developed with broad consultation (faculty/Senate; staff; students)
- September 2021: Thematic proposal forwarded to Senate for review
- October 2021: Thematic proposal forwarded for EVC/Chancellor approval
- November 1: Thematic proposal due to WASC

Key Terms: Access and Success
- Access = entrance into and navigation through program
- Success = completion; student's experience of relevance of program/completion for their commitments

### Designing for Access, Designing for Success

Two types of data to answer several questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional data</td>
<td>Interviews/focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus dept data</td>
<td>Textual analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Designing for Access
1. As students enter majors (UG) or prepare for qualifying exams (G) and navigate programs (UG/G):
   - What are pathways to and bottlenecks impeding successful access?
   - Are qualitative and quantitative perceptions aligned?

#### Designing for Success
2. Near the time students are completing majors (UG) or PhDs:(G)
Can we see trends in quantitative data that indicate more/less successful pathways to degrees? Are these trends aligned with qualitative data?

How have students found that their majors/degrees have been relevant for their commitments/goals?

Quantitative: Institution-wide Questions
Over the last 8 years (2013-2021), what patterns do we see in disaggregated institutional data at three different points in time:

- Admissions
- Just before entrance into majors [first year/transfer]/just prior to qualifying exams (grad)
- Graduation

Institutional Data to be Gathered/Analyzed
- Admission rates; changes in applicant/accept pools
- Enrollment patterns
- Degree pathways
- Student influx/efflux for declared/premajor students
- Pathways for undeclared students
- Probation rates
- Completion rates

Quantitative: Case Studies
Selected departments with programs that are illustrative of larger campus phenomena:

- Departments that have higher rates of students leaving sequence/major after initial declaration:
  - Biology [MCDB/EEMB]; Economics; Chem/Biochem
- Departments that have overall higher rates of students entering the major from other majors:
  - Global Studies; Religious Studies; Sociology

Quantitative: Case Study Questions
1. Over the last 8 years (2013-2021), looking at year-to-year flow, what patterns do we see in disaggregated quantitative data associated with access and movement through majors:

   - Undergraduates (first year, transfer)
     - Entrance into major
     - Movement into/out of major
     - Probation rates
     - Completion rates
   - Graduate students
     - Entrance into/movement out of program
     - Success at candidacy
2. Same as (1), but 2014-2019 (pre-COVID) looking at flow quarter by quarter
3. Same as (1), but last 2 years (2019-2021)

Qualitative: Interviews/Focus groups
Access:
Near the time students are entering degree programs (UG)/time of qualifying exams:
- What do students, faculty, and staff perceive as pathways and bottlenecks associated with successful entrance into/navigation through programs?

Qualitative: Interviews/Focus groups
Success:
Near the time students are completing degree programs:
- What do students, faculty, and staff perceive as pathways and bottlenecks associated with degree completion?
- How do students perceive the relevance of their degrees for their goals, especially:
  - Courses, (co)curriculum, instruction, advising (“learning environment”)
  - Requirements and policies (“institutional structures and practices”)?

Qualitative: Textual Analysis
What trends/patterns can be identified regarding access/success in textual materials?
- PRP/PLO reports
- DEI plans/activities
- Student-facing department, division, college materials (websites, advising information, program manuals, etc.)
- Policies (department, division, college, Senate)

Primary Data Wranglers
Linda Adler-Kassner (Writing/CITRAL) * co-chair
Mike Gordon (Chemical Engineering) * co-chair
Amanda Brey (Academic Program Review) * co-chair
In the weeds: Who/how we’ll do it

Faculty/staff teams to gather data/conduct research

Regular consultation with administration, Senate, AS, GSA, case study departments

Less Weedy: When We’ll Do it
- Data collection: now-June 2022
- Drafting: Summer 2022-Fall 2022
- Draft to reviewing agencies: Late 2022-spring 2023
- Draft due to WASC: sometime spring/summer 2023

WASC Review Team Visit: Fall 2023
Questions? Want to learn more?
Linda Adler-Kassner * Co-chair/ALO/Prof. Writing
dlader@ucsb.edu

Consent Calendar
The minutes of the June 3, 2021 meeting were considered for approval.

Motion: To approve the consent calendar. The motion was seconded, and passed with 32 in favor, 0 against, and 2 abstentions.

Chair Scott adjourned the meeting at 5:13 p.m.
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:

- Participated in the academic program review of three 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 campus-specific reports, including a report on enrollment strategy;
- Considered fifteen requests for Academic search waivers;
- 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. Initiated regular presentations of the campus income statement to the Council; and
- Initiated a framework for the development of a campus Academic Strategic Plan
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 31 regularly scheduled sessions (nine in fall, eleven in winter, and eleven in spring). All meetings were held electronically via Zoom due to COVID-19 restrictions.

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

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 three academic units:

1. Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
2. Computer Engineering Program
3. Department of Linguistics

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Chemistry & Biochemistry); Engineering (Computer Engineering); and Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Linguistics); There were no academic program reviews in Social Sciences/Education. 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 meeting 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).

The Academic Senate was asked by the Executive Vice Chancellor to provide recommendations for the review by PRP in 2022-23. CPB’s recommendations, which were based on the length of time since the last review and changes in leadership, consisted of: College of Creative Studies; Technology Management Program; and the Department of Sociology. CPB also noted that there are a number of programs within the Division of Humanities & Fine Arts that have either never been reviewed or have not been reviewed for some time. The Council
recommended that the new dean strongly consider review of these programs to see how they fit with the future teaching and research activities of the university.

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>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Languages &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies Program</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five units had previously been selected for review in 2021-22: Anthropology, Computer Science, Economics, Music, and Philosophy.

III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

At the start of the 2020-21 academic year, there were 21 pending searches; and the EVC authorized 11 new searches for 2020-21, and pre-authorized two searches for 2021-22. These were in addition to 57 searches that were carried forward but were on hold. There were 54 new faculty appointments that began in 2020 and 41 separations/retirements during the 2020-21 year.

CPB reviewed 15 requests for search waivers from the following units:
- Asian American Studies
- Black Studies
- Chemical Engineering
- Chicana & Chicano Studies
- Computer Science
- English
- Global Studies
- History
- Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP)
- Linguistics
- Physics
- Political Science
- Psychological & Brain Sciences
- Theater & Dance

Of these, six were for exceptional opportunities, and nine were for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows (PPFs). (An additional ‘partner hire’ search waiver was originally requested by the Department of Spanish & Portuguese, but the candidate withdrew before CPB finalized its review.) 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 a full endorsement in 12 cases, endorsed one case in a split vote, and offered qualified endorsements for the other two.
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 is to be consulted on endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the conformity with the academic mission of our campus. However, there were no requests to review endowed chair proposals for the 2020-21 academic year.

V. Campus Issues

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2020-21 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.

CPB received FTE plans from the Deans and their departments on a staggered schedule: Social Sciences and the College of Creative Studies were due in March; Engineering, Bren, and GGSE were due in April; and MLPS and HFA were due in May. Data was also received from the EVC’s Office regarding the following:

1. Student FTE and faculty FTE ratios
2. Student headcount and faculty headcount ratios
3. Faculty hires and separations (since 2014-15)
4. Approved new faculty searches (since 2014-15)

Additional planning data was also provided to the Council:

1. Year-average undergraduate enrollment by department
2. Undergraduate student FTE by Department
3. Year-average Graduate enrollment by department
4. Masters student enrollment by department
5. PhD student enrollment by department
6. Status of search waivers
7. FTE (total allocated and permanent) by department

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.
CPB provided the EVC with its final FTE recommendations on a rolling basis by college/division as they were available.

Overall, CPB did not receive 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 has 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). CPB needs the systemic budget data described above to do its job properly.

Phase 1 Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy

In January CPB reviewed the Phase 1 Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy. CPB’s comments were provided in the context of Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM), generally understood to mean a set of goals and strategies to plan enrollments through recruiting, retaining, and graduating specific cohorts of students followed by targeted practices to build a lifelong affinity with the institution among alums.

While commending campus leaders for their visionary work around the Long Range Development Plan (LRD) and the Academic Strategic plan to increase student enrollment from 20,000 to 25,000, the campus experienced a large and unplanned growth, with the brunt occurring in several popular STEM majors. The student population reached 25,000 in 2020, five years ahead of schedule, and the post-2008 recession and UC budget reduction caused a decrease of 5-7 percent in faculty and staff numbers.
In response to the Phase 1 report, CPB offered comments addressing the following: capping of impacted majors; consideration of moving to the semester system; student advising; student enrollment budget modeling; and reconsideration of the budget model for summer sessions.

**Compliance Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid**

The Council reviewed the proposed regulation for Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity for Title IV Financial Aid in June. CPB supported the conclusions of the UCSB workgroup that the (centralized) model implemented at UC Davis is the best course of action to comply with the Education Department’s mandate. CPB also concurred that this approach might place the campus at more risk for an adverse review from the Education Department in the future and that continued effort by the workgroup to identify centralized mechanisms to certify attendance with Faculty involvement might be worthwhile.

**Input into the Academic Program Review Process**

In November CPB was asked to review and respond to questions from the Program Review Panel (PRP) regarding possible changes to the academic program review process. One of CPB's main concerns was with regard to the frequency of the reviews. CPB found little support for the idea of making the existing reviews more frequent, as the administrative burden placed on departments would be excessive. The Council proposed consideration of a bifurcated review process in which a short-cycle “State of the Department” campus review would happen more frequently while a more intensive, but less frequent, external review would occur similar to the current timeline but be more focused on the direction of the field moving forward.

In response to the specific questions posed, CPB: did not support shortening the review cycle; supported a process that incorporated internal reviews; suggested focusing its review on resources issues relating to FTE allocations; and recommended that PRP continue to provide the complete data notebooks for the reviews.

**COVID-19 Vaccination Program Policy**

In May CPB was invited to comment on the proposed campus COVID-19 vaccination program, but it chose not to opine.

**VI. Systemwide Reviews**

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2020-21 term:

**APM 700**

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.

**BFB-BUS-43 Purchase of Goods & Services**

In March CPB reviewed the Proposed UC Presidential Policy on the Purchase of Goods and Services and Supply Chain Management (BFB-BUS-43). The aim of the policy update was to add UC’s new Small Business First Program into BUS-43. Small Business First requires that all applicable purchases for UC campuses (excluding UC Health and Design & Construction) with the annual value of $10,000-$250,000 be awarded to a certified Small Business or Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise wherever practicable.

While CPB welcomed the initiative to update this policy, it expressed concerns that the implementation of the policy updates will place an additional workload on staff, who are already overburdened, without additional pay. Furthermore, the policy’s anticipated effects were unclear. While it is true that the majority of small businesses are minority-owned, this policy seemed to unintentionally shift focus away from minority-owned, or woman-owned, businesses in favor of small businesses in general; and away from California-owned businesses (removed as a location requirement). Before giving definitive approval, CPB would need to see a cost-benefit analysis, details of the provisions for adequate staffing to allow for training and the additional workload, and clarification of the time schedule.

**Police Policies & Administrative Procedures**

CPB reviewed proposed revisions to the Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures (the “Gold Book”) in March. Specifically, CPB was asked to review four revisions: the “Use of Force” policy; the “Body Worn Video” policy; the “Systemwide Response Teams” policy; and the “Concealed Carry Weapons” policy.

Given the nationwide discourse regarding the institution of policing and possible restructuring, CPB opined that it did not seem like an appropriate time for the Council to weigh in on planning and budgetary matters related to UC policing. CPB opined that it could more usefully comment in the future on proposals for redistributing campus policing funds to those new institutions of public safety. In the midst of both reformist and abolitionist discussions to reimagine public safety that are taking place across California and the nation, CPB stated that it could not reasonably respond to minor or major tweaks to UCPD policies as currently conceived.

**Presidential Campus Safety Plan**

In June the Council was asked to review the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan on a very short timeline. This abridged timeline was unfortunate given the scope of structural changes the new Campus Safety Plan proposes: to lay “a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected, and protected from harm.”

CPB’s brief assessment revealed that implementing the plan would involve many areas of the university and its personnel, the state and federal governments, the Regents, the Governor’s
office, and represented labor, including the police union. Given the Plan's abstraction, even with what looked like a robust multi-stage timeline for implementation, CPB could not offer any concrete or substantive responses to its planning and budget components. CPB welcomed the wide-ranging discussion needed to achieve the profound structural changes touted by the Plan, which would position UC as a national leader in reimagining public safety.

**Curtailment Program**

CPB reviewed a brief memo outlining a proposed Curtailment Program in October. The Council recognized that the entire UC system faces significant budgetary challenges and that addressing these challenges will require a shared sacrifice from our community. However, the memo failed to provide the expected clarity and transparency from the UC leadership on the magnitude of the problems faced by the University and the options being explored to address them.

CPB found the proposal described in the memo to be much too vague. Further, the proposal lacked a clear rationale for the decision to impose salary cuts rather than furloughs. Finally, the Council had several specific comments about implementation of a salary cut program, if that were needed.

**Faculty Salaries Task Force Report**

In January CPB reviewed the report of the Faculty Salaries Task Force, which addressed problems with, and made recommendations for, UC's faculty compensation salary scales. The Council identified structural problems with the model and financial / budgetary relations with the market. CPB endorsed the Task Force's recommendation (B) for an Annual adjustment and agreed with the principle of (C), that Salary scales should be sensitive to disciplinary differences. Moreover, CPB opined that salary scales may need to account for cost-of-living differences across campuses, as well as disciplinary differences. CPB disagreed with the Task Force’s view that off-scale compensation is a problem. Off-scale provides a needed flexibility to the salary system, allowing rewards for a wide variety of activities and incentives for retention.

While the Task Force was not mandated to address diversity, equity, and inclusion, CPB requested that any discussion of UC’s faculty salary scales consider effects on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

**Classification of Gifts & Sponsored Awards**

CPB reviewed the proposed revised Policy on the Classification of Gifts & Sponsored Awards in March. The aim of the changes to the Presidential Policy was to update and provide greater clarity for properly classifying private support in contemporary circumstances. CPB welcomed the University initiative to update this policy, particularly since there had been a substantial increase over the past decade in both the number of grants to the university and the diversity of foundations making grants, especially from private foundations and individuals.

CPB noted the policy’s statement that a foundation's or individual's policy toward indirect costs should not be a consideration for determining the classification of an award as a gift or sponsored award. While the distinction is clear, CPB pointed out that there is some contention on campus regarding whether campuses should expect private foundation grants to include
indirect cost levels comparable to negotiated government rates, but the document did not provide guidance on this issue which would be useful.

**Presidential Fee Policy for Graduate Student *In Absentia* Registration**

In May the Council reviewed the proposed Presidential Fee Policy for Graduate Student *In Absentia* Registration. In general CPB found the policy beneficial to both the University and graduate students in reducing the number of students with status lapse. The Policy aimed at eliminating both requests and processing of “reinstate” petitions and thus simplifying administrative workflows.

While the Council was generally supportive of this policy, there were several points that needed further consideration. First, the draft did not include a fiscal analysis which could have given a clear justification of the revised policy. Second, the reduced cost was only for the tuition and student services fees, but it may not be equitable to ask the students to pay campus-based fees in full given that the students were not expected to be on campus. Third, there was no clear justification for why the policy did not allow students to study or to collaborate in-person with UC faculty in any UC campus. Finally, the Policy was intended to take effect roughly 9 months before it was reviewed, the result of either a typo or an indication that the reviews of these proposed policy changes are not being executed in a timely fashion.

**Innovative Learning Technology Initiative**

In December CPB reviewed the Proposed Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. The October 2020 update of the 2018 report acknowledged the new reality regarding online teaching due to the forced switch to emergency remote instruction.

CPB had some particular concerns, especially regarding the need for a more robust funding scheme and viable business model for online teaching/remote instruction. The Council also had concerns for a more explicit policy for the ownership of the instructional content. In sum, CPB suggested that a fuller budget be presented to allow a more complete analysis of the educational and budget model. CPB requested to learn more about the newly constituted online remote learning initiatives with respect to the Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives before a full review of these initiatives alone could take place.

**Information Technology (IT) Recovery Policy, Business & Finance Bulletin, IS-12**

CPB reviewed the proposed Presidential Policy on Information Technology (IT) Recovery, Business & Finance Bulletin, IS-12, in December. The aim of the policy was to provide an iterative model for IT Disaster Recovery. IS-12 is based on the policy IS-3 /CSF, which is concerned with data security and storage but not specifically with disaster recovery. CPB supported the proposed policy, and particularly welcomed the measures to enable the provision of cloud-based data back-up but is concerned that the policy contains no language focused on faculty research and archiving.

**Report of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force**
In October the Council reviewed the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force’s Report. Generally, the Council felt that understanding how to best incorporate online/remote elements into undergraduate education is a timely issue, especially in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. CPB found all three options presented by the Task Force to be problematic without a great deal of further research and emphatically rejected any option that involved an online degree program taught by separate non-UC faculty and not equivalent to a UC degree. CPB agreed with the report’s conclusion that a great deal more research is needed and also that we must have the chance to learn from our experience with emergency remote instruction. CPB also concurred that no matter how or what percentage of remote instruction we end up adopting, the Academic Senate must be fully consulted on every aspect.

Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials

CPB reviewed the proposed Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials in January. The proposed policy originated from the Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC) unit within the Department of Research and Innovation at UC Office of the President as an effort to harmonize the treatment of these materials and/or items under a single UC policy. Previously, individual campuses were left to develop ad-hoc policies.

In its response, the Council made several recommendations with regard to the following: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and how HIPAA data is handled on campus information systems outside of a clinical environment; electronic storage of research data; the cost and time required to identify potentially valuable research material; the cost of maintaining research archives; maintaining space or archives for research materials developed by researchers who have retired/ separated; safeguards to prevent catastrophic loss of information; efforts to create data open access; and the establishment of an expiration date for information archive and retrieval.

In summary, CPB stated that while a policy need was identified and several potential uses for the policy exist, the proposed policy left the campus VCR and PIs to interpret the policy without sufficient funding or information resources.

VII. Committees

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

1. Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
   Chair: Anne Charity-Hudley
2. Committee on Development & Community Relations
   Chair: Shelly Gable
3. Committee on Capital & Space Planning
   Chair: Dawn Holmes
Most of the business of these committees was conducted by email; all of CPB’s meetings were held electronically via Zoom. Issues were delegated to the subcommittees 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 2021-22, 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 staff from Design, Facilities, & Safety Services. 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 systemwide meetings, 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 2020-21 term, including: the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion; Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services; 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 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.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB and UCPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:
- Academic Strategic Plan
- COVID-19 response
- 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>Douglas Steigerwald</th>
<th>Chair/UCPB Rep</th>
<th>Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Charity-Hudley</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James (Jim) Buckwalter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swati Chattopadhyay</td>
<td></td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Coggins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Goodearl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Jimerson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling, Clinical, &amp; School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Legrady</td>
<td>Fall/Winter only</td>
<td>Media Arts &amp; Technology Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamanyu Madhow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Marchetti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Miescher</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Gable Nayak</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Penley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James (Jim) Rawlings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram Seshadri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials; Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianwen Su</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Academic Senate invited participation of representatives from Associated Students and the Graduate Students Association but did not receive a designated appointee from AS.
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) held nine regularly scheduled meetings, approximately 1 ½-2 hours per session. All meetings were held via zoom due to the COVID-19 campus closure. In addition, the CIE Chair attended UCIE meetings throughout the 2020-21 Academic Year.

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 2020-2021 academic year, CIE:

- Conducted survey of international undergraduate and graduate students.
  - Analysis of the results will be distributed in Fall 2021.
- Reviewed systemwide policies concerning UC international activities.
- Reviewed campus policies concerning UC international activities.

The 2020-21 academic year included the following:

Consultation with administration as needed, including:

- Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Associate Vice Chancellor for Global Engagement
- Juan Campo, Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program
- Erin Hakim, Global Engagement Specialist
- Hannah Lawrence, Assist. Director, Professional Development, Graduate Student Resource Center
- David Marshall Executive Vice Chancellor
- Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students
- Laurel Wilder, Assoc. Director, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment
INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Due to ongoing closures abroad related to the on-going COVID-19 crises, CIE did not receive or endorse any proposed MOUs between UCSB and any universities or research institutes abroad. During the time, CIE worked with the Office of Global Engagement on a template for future MOUs.

SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

CIE conducted its 6th biennial survey of international students between May and June 2021. The survey was commissioned by the Academic Senate and carried out by the Office of Budget and Planning, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (IRPA) via Qualtrics with support from the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor. The online questionnaire was distributed via email to 3,227 undergraduate and graduate international students, of which 647 completed the survey in full or partial form. This year’s response rate was 20%, down from 21.8% in 2019. Over half of respondents (61%) who completed the survey were undergraduate students, the remainder (39%) were graduate students. Over half of students were male (54.5%), and over half (59.4%) reported that their country of origin is China.

Of the students who responded, almost half of students (44.2%) reported that they accomplished less during the COVID-19 pandemic, compared to pre-pandemic times. CIE acknowledges COVID-19 impacts may have resulted in some students not being able to complete the survey or being unable to access it and thus a lower response rate than the previous survey. It was noted in the survey that 45.6% respondents reported that their current place of residence was outside of California and 42.8% of respondents reported being outside of the United States. The survey results will be analyzed by Melissa Janson, a graduate student in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education. Over the summer, she will be working on a comparative analysis and detailed report to be completed over the summer.

Information Items

- Phase One Report of the Chancellor's Task Force on Enrollment Strategy
- Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures
- Global Engagement - MOU Template Review

CAMPUS ISSUES

1. Priority Registration Reform

CIE reviewed the memo on Priority Registration Reform. Per the report, the committee discussed the process of registration at UCSB and a proposal to reduce priority registration numbers. Reviewing the memo through the lens of any potential unintended effect on international students, CIE concluded that there should be no negative effect on international students. In fact, CIE believed the proposal may help international students, along with domestic students at UCSB and allow better access to the courses they need.
2. Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures

CIE reviewed the Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures. Per the 52-page report, CIE discussed each of the six sections: Body Worn Audio/Video Systems, Retired Officers - Carry Concealed Weapons, Systemwide Response Team policy, Use of Force 2021, Letter from UCOP Human Resources, and the Systemwide Senate Review - Request for Comment, as the components pertain to international students. In response to the memo, the committee noted that cultural awareness and language barriers were not among the subjects discussed in any section of the report. With an ever-increasing population of international students on campus, the committee highly encouraged UCPD to consider training and policies that address the needs of international students. In particular, the section “Use of Force” did not discuss language barriers, which could impede an international student’s ability to understand verbal warnings. Further, visual warnings may not be culturally understood by international students who may have different forms of policing in their home country. Under stress, international students tend to revert to their native language as it is the language they feel most comfortable with, which could cause further stress and misunderstanding to interactions with UCPD. CIE hopes that as the draft becomes finalized the consideration of these language barriers and cultural differences in the student body be included.

SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES

1. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

CIE reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State report. The committee was supportive of the recommendations to streamline the existing online education infrastructure and to create a new UC Online and appreciated the attention to international students in the memo and recommendations. The recommendation to create a new UC Online to Manage Cross-Campus Enrollments and Operations (CCES) has a benefit to all undergraduate students, but may also be appreciated especially by international students. International students must navigate a lot of systems, and the manual entry of grades with the delay that may cause can affect their visa status (see point on p.22). Thus, CIE felt that a streamlined system could have added benefits to international students.

2. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency

CIE reviewed the Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency. In response to the memo, the committee appreciates the effort to clarify language regarding how students are credited for tuition purposes, including online course work approved by UCSB.

3. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy

CIE reviewed the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy. The committee was supportive of a policy that requires all “University of California Personnel, Trainees, and Students accessing University Facilities and Programs in person
to receive the COVID-19 vaccine, subject to limited exceptions and exemptions, beginning before the start of the Fall 2021 term.” It was noted that the vaccine must have FDA approval, which raised questions about international students who had access to different vaccines in their home countries. CIE suggested that the policy should have specific guidance in the main document or in the Frequently Asked Questions section that could help address the questions international students might have. For example, specify if an international student would be required to be re-vaccinated with an FDA-approved vaccine upon return to the U.S if they were vaccinated in their home country with a non-FDA approved vaccine. CIE also noted that the policy did not address if the university will accept vaccination cards in other languages.

4. Do Not Wish to Opine

CIE did not provide comment on the following issues forwarded to them:

- Faculty Salary Task Force Report
- Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy – Fee Policy for Graduate Student In Absentia Registration

COORDINATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Associate Vice Chancellor for Global Engagement

The Associate Vice Chancellor of the newly formed Global Engagement, based in the Office of Research, which provides support to “UCSB faculty, staff and students in their teaching, research and service missions around the globe.” She attended several meetings this year to begin a collaborative relationship with CIE.

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.

Erin Hakim, Global Engagement Specialist

Erin attended several meetings to provide updates on Global Engagement and presented the new MOU template.

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 ensure COVID-19 related questions were added to the survey.

Hannah Lawrence, Assist. Director, Professional Development, Graduate Student Resource Center

The Assistant Director was consulted on previous surveys of international graduate students.
Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS)

The Director of OISS 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. She is a consulting member of the committee.

Laurel Wilder, Assoc. Director, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment

The Associate Director was consulted regarding UCUES, a systemwide survey of all UC undergraduates, focusing on UCSB’s data. She assisted with important data related to international undergraduate students as well as questions and data pertaining to COVID-19. In addition, Laurel helped coordinate the rollout of the survey and provided valuable feedback and assistance in ensuring the survey was successful.

Carry-over Issues and Future Initiatives

- Distribution of International Student Survey for 2020-21 Results
- Preparation for International Student Workshop
- Addressing lingering COVID-19 impacts on International Students
- Campus resources for international students
- Monitor needs of international scholars and visiting faculty
MEMBERS:

Erika D. Felix, Chair, UCIE Representative, Associate Professor, Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology
Maurizia Boscagli, Professor, English
Xianzhe Dai, Professor, Mathematics
Jennifer Gibbs, Professor, Communication
Arturo Keller, Professor, Bren School of Environmental Science and Management
Cyrus Safinya, Professor, Materials, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology
Spencer Smith, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Thomas Weimbs, Professor, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology
Juan E. Campo, EAP Campus Director, Ex Officio
Pedro Craveiro, GSA Rep
Cristina M. Carney, OISS, Consultant
Sara A. Cook, Assistant Registrar, Consultant
Simran Singh, Director of 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 that come before it.

During 2020-2021, P&T responded to two new grievances and continued processing two grievance cases initiated the previous year. P&T also continued processing one disciplinary case initiated the previous year.


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

2020-2021 Members:
Risa Brainin
Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi
Kip Fulbeck
Deborah Fygenson
Barbara Herr Harthorn
Thuc-Quyen Nguyen
Matthew Potoski
Todd Squires
Dick Startz
Toshiro Tanimoto
Vesna Wallace
Nancy Collins
Eckart Meiburg, Chair
January 3, 2022

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
Academic Senate

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

Re: Residency Requirements in the College of Letters & Science

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections (RJE) reviewed the proposed revisions to the residency requirements in the College of Letters & Science. Additional requirements beyond what systemwide regulations require will be eliminated. RJE approves of the new regulation language as written.

Cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
December 13, 2021

To: Michael Miller, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Education
   College of Letters and Science

From: David Paul, Chair
   Undergraduate Council

Re: Residency requirements in the College of Letters and Science

Undergraduate Council reviewed the request from former Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple to change the residency requirements for College of Letters and Science students. The revision will reduce the current College of Letters and Science residency requirements to the system-wide requirements (UC Senate Regulations 612 & 630). This change will assist nontraditional students in their efforts to graduate and bring the College of Letters and Science in line with the College of Engineering as well as other UC campuses.

Undergraduate Council unanimously supports the request.

CC: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair, Academic Senate
    Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Jeffrey Stopple, Former Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education
    Joe O’Brien, Assistant Dean/Director of Advising, College of Letters and Science
    Scott Kassner, Assistant Dean/Director of Advising Operations, College of Letters and Science
November 22, 2021

To: Susannah Scott  
Chair, Divisional Academic Senate

From: Sabine Frühstück  
Chair, L&S Faculty Executive Committee

Re: Proposal from Undergraduate Dean for Changes to College Policy for Undergraduate Residency Requirements (SR 125.I)

At its meeting on November 18, 2021, the Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science (FEC) reviewed a proposal from former Undergraduate Dean Stopple, now sponsored by Interim Undergraduate Dean Miller, for changes to college policy relating to Undergraduate Residency Requirements under Senate Regulation SR 125.I. This policy addresses a variety of specific residency requirements unique to UCSB, including those dealing with cross-UC residency applicability, limits on Summer Session unit applicability to residency, and additional residency requirements within both majors and upper division.

The proposal asserts that these specific requirements, which go beyond UC systemwide residency requirements and are unique to our campus, were established based on conditions that no longer apply and represent an unnecessary barrier to students in completing their degrees at the present time. In particular, the proposal identifies that the campus no longer has a Ventura or Santa Maria venue, nor is it receiving a large number of junior/senior UC transfers, both identified as factors in the previous establishment of these additional requirements based on former Dean Stopple’s research.

The committee endorses the above view, and appreciates that this proposal will bring College residency requirements in line with the UC systemwide expectations, make residency requirements more streamlined and easier for students to understand, and increase the accessibility of completing a UC Santa Barbara degree for students who are missing a small number of units in residence and no longer reside in Santa Barbara.

The committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

cc: Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College and Dean of Science  
Michael Miller, Interim AVC and Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education  
Mary Hancock, Acting Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts  
Charlie Hale, Dean of Social Sciences
May 20, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeffrey Stopple, Dean of Undergraduate Education, Letters & Science

Re: Residency requirements in the College of Letters & Science

UC system-wide Academic Senate regulations specify residency requirements for a Bachelor’s degree:

612. Except as provided in SRs 614 and 694, the minimum residence at the University of California required for a degree is three quarters (or two semesters).

630. A. Except as otherwise provided in this section and SR 614, 35 (or 24 semester) of the final 45 (or 30 semester) units completed by each candidate for the Bachelor’s degree must be earned in residence in the college or school of the University of California in which the degree is to be taken. (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 23 May 01)

The College of Letters & Science at UC Santa Barbara, over many years, has imposed additional requirements beyond the systemwide ones. At the time there were valid reasons for these, but they have outlived their usefulness and now serve as a barrier to graduation. I am proposing here a change to Senate regulation 125 I, which by deleting the text in strikethrough below which reduces the L&S residency requirement to the systemwide one:

All students in the College of Letters and Science must meet the Residence Requirement specified in Senate Regulation 612 [see Divisional Regulation 75] and, except as provided in Senate Regulation 630(D) [see Divisional Regulation 75], must complete 35 of the final 45 units in residence, with no more than 18 of the 35 units completed in summer session [see Divisional Regulation 75]. Units taken at another UC campus concurrent with UCSB enrollment will not count toward the required 35 units. All students in the College must have completed in residence, although not necessarily within the 35 units specified above, 27 upper-division units, including at least 20 upper-division units in the major, or, in the case of double majors, 20 in each major for a total of 40 units. Units taken at another UC campus concurrent with UCSB enrollment will not count toward the upper division or upper division major requirements. The Executive Committee [see-Divisional Legislative Ruling 1.93.A, Appendix II] shall have the authority to reduce this requirement in the case of students transferring from a College of Letters and Science within the University. For students who meet the Residence Requirements as provided in Senate Regulation 614
I have reviewed the 6Mb history of scanned memos regarding residency requirements for Letters & Science going as far back as 1967, which indicate that these supplementary requirements were introduced in an *ad hoc* manner to address concerns we no longer face. In the 1970s L&S had a Liberal Studies option that allowed students to graduate without a major, taking courses at the Ventura and Santa Maria centers which no longer exist. And, we had such low enrollment UCSB was accepting a large number of senior level students as transfers.

But for many years now, our extra residency requirements have been an obstacle to graduation for students who might need only a few courses to graduate, available at community college. These are typically students who have struggled earlier in their academic career, and now may be categorized as nontraditional students. They often have obligations to care for a family member, or employment which prevents them from returning to Santa Barbara. *Our residency requirements have, tragically, denied them degrees.* Students who fall in this category are disproportionately first generation, URM, and Pell eligible, contributing to our graduation rate gaps for these students.

The covid emergency was a blessing in disguise for this population, as they could take UCSB classes remotely. We did have students graduate as a result who otherwise had no option to move forward.

Now, post-covid, we are seeing a surge of requests from students for online classes – students who have moved out of the area, and now have employment and family obligations. Unless we are willing to provide remote options for these students, many will not graduate without a restructure of residency.

UC Santa Cruz, UC San Diego, and UC Irvine have no additional residency requirements beyond the systemwide ones. Our College of Creative Studies adds to the systemwide regulation only that students complete six quarters of study in CCS. Our College of Engineering adds no additional requirements beyond the systemwide one.

I am aware that the wording of SR 630A is under review systemwide, roughly speaking replacing ‘35 of the final 45 units’ with ‘any 45 upper division units’. Should those changes be approved systemwide, I expect they would apply to Letters & Science in 125 I as well.
January 3, 2022

To: Susannah Scott, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Henry T. Yang
    Chancellor

Re: Proposal to Discontinue the B.A. in Renaissance Studies

Per policy, the Academic Senate has requested an administrative review of a proposal from the Department of English and the College of Letters & Science for the discontinuation of the B.A of Renaissance Studies administratively located in the Department of English.

The English Department initiated the request for discontinuation based on several factors: no department faculty were currently involved with the major; the single course in the English Department curriculum related to the major has not been offered in over ten years; College-wide, no student has graduated in the major in more than five years; and finally there is no current Director. The department noted that while there is currently one first-year student enrolled in the major, the department expects the student to change to English, but will provide a pathway to allow the student to graduate with the Renaissance Studies major if the student prefers.

Senate leadership decided, given the current state of the program and current circumstances, to coordinate a simplified review process. In this simplified process, the proposal was reviewed and endorsed by the L&S Faculty Executive Committee. Undergraduate Council of the Senate, after having received comments supporting the discontinuation from Mary Hancock, Acting Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts, and from Jeffrey Stopple, the then Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education, unanimously endorsed the proposal.

Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall has reviewed the proposal and supporting materials, noting that all reviewers agreed with the department’s rationale for discontinuation. The Executive Vice Chancellor concurs with the decision of Undergraduate Council to discontinue the B.A. degree in Renaissance Studies. He recommends that I also endorse the proposal. I have reviewed all of the material and concur with the Executive Vice Chancellor and offer final administrative endorsement of the proposed action.

After receiving final administrative endorsement, the Senate will place the proposal for the discontinuation on the Agenda of the January 13, 2022, meeting of the Faculty Legislature for final legislative action.

cc: David Marshall
    Toby Lazarowitz
    Shasta Delp
    Kelly Erland Rivera
June 1, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Mary Betsy Brenner, Chair
      Undergraduate Council

Re: **Department of English – Request to Discontinue the Renaissance Studies Major**

Undergraduate Council has reviewed the Department of English’s request to discontinue the Renaissance Studies Major. The department notes that no current English faculty are involved with the major and the single major related course housed in the department has not been offered in over ten years. They also provided evidence that verifies a lack of student interest in the program. The request is supported by AVC Jeffrey Stopple and Acting Dean of the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts Mary Hancock.

The Council voted unanimously to approve the discontinuation of the Renaissance Studies major.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
May 12, 2021

To: Mary Betsy Brenner
   Chair, Undergraduate Council

From: Sabine Frühstück
       Chair, L&S Faculty Executive Committee

Re: Request from Department of English to Discontinue the Renaissance Studies Major

At its meeting on April 29, 2021, the Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science (FEC) reviewed the Department of English’s request to discontinue the Renaissance Studies Major. The unfortunate status of this program is clear from the documentation provided, with a record of declining faculty participation and only a single undergraduate student currently pursuing the major, whom the department pledges to support in earning the degree regardless of future discontinuation status.

Finding the proposal to be well supported and reasonable, the committee voted unanimously to endorse it.

cc: Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College and Dean of Science
    Jeffrey Stopple, Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Undergraduate Education
    Mary Hancock, Acting Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts
May 3, 2021

SUSANNAH SCOTT, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC SENATE — SANTA BARBARA DIVISION  

Re: Department of English - Request to Discontinue the Renaissance Studies Major  

The Graduate Council does not wish to opine on this issue.

Sincerely,

Tamara Afifi, Chair  
Graduate Council  

cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director  
    Academic Senate
Re: Proposal to Discontinue the Major in Renaissance Studies

jstopple@tsc.ucsb.edu <jstopple@tsc.ucsb.edu>
To: Shasta Delp <shasta@ucsb.edu>  Wed, Apr 14, 2021 at 2:52 PM

I have no objection.

Jeffrey Stopple
Associate Vice Chancellor
Office of Undergraduate Education

On Apr 14, 2021, at 1:55 PM, Shasta Delp <shasta@ucsb.edu> wrote:

Good Afternoon AVC Stopple and Dean Hancock,

Please find attached a proposal from the Department of English to discontinue the undergraduate major in Renaissance Studies.

Per the Policy and Procedures for Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuance of an Undergraduate Program Leading to a Degree, your comments will inform the Undergraduate Council's action to approve or disapprove the proposal.

I kindly request that you return your comments to Betsy Brenner, Chair of the Undergraduate Council, via myself at shasta.delp@senate.ucsb.edu, by Wednesday, May 14.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or if I can provide you with additional information.

Best regards,
Shasta Delp

Shasta Delp
Executive Director
Academic Senate
she, her, hers
Office: (805) 893-3179
Email: shasta.delp@senate.ucsb.edu
May 13, 2021

TO: Betsy Brenner, Chair
    Undergraduate Council

FR: Mary Hancock, Acting Dean
    Division of Humanities and Fine Arts

RE: Discontinuation of Renaissance Studies Major

I have reviewed the request from the Department of English to discontinue the Renaissance Studies major, which it currently administers. With the dearth of student demand, the lack of departmental faculty able to offer instruction, the loss of the major’s Director, and the absence of plans to recruit new faculty in this area, I see no compelling reason to continue this major. Assuming that the one student presently enrolled in the major will be able to graduate with the major through the use of petitions and exceptions, I am in favor of the major’s immediate discontinuation.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
October 15, 2020

To: Mary Betsy Brenner, Chair
    Undergraduate Council

From: E. Heckendorn Cook, Chair

Re: Request to Suspend Admission to the Renaissance Studies Major

The Department of English requests that admission to the Renaissance Studies major be suspended at the close of the 2020-21 academic year and that the major be discontinued. There are no plans to re-open the major at any point.

On October 14, the faculty of the Department of English voted on this matter. The vote was as follows: 17 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain.

The rationale for this request is as follows: although English technically hosts this interdisciplinary major, no English Department faculty are now involved with the major. In the last five years, College-wide, a total of five students signed up for the major; only one completed the major. The single course in the English Department curriculum that is related to the major is Renaissance Studies 100, and this course has not been offered in over ten years. College-wide, no student has graduated in the major in more than five years. Finally, there is no current Director; the position has remained vacant since the unexpected death of the last Director two years ago.

Currently, one first-year student is enrolled in the major but is likely to change to English. If the student chooses to remain enrolled, the English Department will provide exceptions and petitions to allow the student to graduate with the Renaissance Studies major.
### Major in Renaissance Studies - Enrollment and Degrees Awarded 2011-2022

#### Students

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</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>English</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</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>English</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Undergraduate Degrees by Year

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Studies</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>Renaissance Studies Freshman</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>Renaissance Studies Transfer</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>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>