ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others
   Rita Raley, Co-Chair, Teaching Evaluation Workgroup
   Linda Adler-Kassner and Michael Gordon, Co-Chairs, WASC Thematic Pathway for Review
   Coordinating Committee

4. Special Orders – Consent Calendar
   Approval of the minutes of the June 3, 2021 meeting (Attachment 1)

   In Memoriam

   David Chapman, Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, 1939-2021
   William C. Kaska, Chemistry and Biochemistry, 1935-2021
   Robert Kent Trench, Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, 1940-2021
   David M. Messick, Psychology, 1937-2021
   Francis A. Dutra, History, 1938-2021
   Marta Gallo, Spanish and Portuguese, 1924-2021
   Melvyn Semmel, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, 1931-2021
   Barbara Prezelin, Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, 1948-2021
   Chi-Yun Chen, History, 1933-2020
   Norman Boyan, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, 1922-2020
   Irma Cavat, Art, 1926-2020
   George L. Matthaei, Electrical and Computer Engineering, 1923-2020
   Michael Arntz, Art, 1939-2020
   Donald Barton Johnson, Germanic and Slavic Studies, 1933-2020
   Carol Braun Pasternack, English, 1950-2020

2020-21 Annual Reports (Attachment 2)

   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 Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
   Council on Faculty Issues 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 - none

6. Reports of Standing Committees - none

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, June 3, 2021, with Chair Susannah Scott presiding. 29 voting members, 11 ex officio members, and other interested 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.

Responding to COVID-19

Vaccines for Students, Staff, Faculty
Collaborating with Santa Barbara County Public Health to provide vaccines to our students, staff, and faculty at weekly clinics on May 20, May 27, June 3, and June 10.

Student Vaccination Data

72% of our current students have been vaccinated in the state of California.
This does not include those living out of state, nor incoming freshmen and transfers.
COVID-19 Vaccine Policy
UCOP is reviewing comments and finalizing a policy that would require vaccination for students, employees, and academic appointees working, living, and/or learning on site, with limited exceptions and exemptions.

In the meantime, UC strongly encourages members of the UC community to obtain vaccinations now.

Small Group Campus Outdoor Gatherings
Last week, our COVID-19 Response Team issued guidelines for activities involving groups of 25 or fewer such as clubs, lab meetings, discussion groups, etc.

Details can be found at: www.ucsb.edu/COVID-19-information/small-group-outdoor-gatherings-guidelines

Fall 2021 Student Housing
● Goal is to prioritize newly admitted freshmen and transfers, as well as those who were admitted last year who have not yet had the opportunity for an on-campus housing experience
● Considering increasing undergraduate housing capacity from 7,273 to 8,624, an addition of 1,351 students – including triples
● Graduate and family housing capacities would remain the same, at 1,556
● Total student housing capacity would be 10,180
● Eight other UC campuses have planned for triple occupancy

Staff Return to Campus
● Return to Campus Working Group continues to meet regularly
● July 1-August 31: Staff who have been working remotely gradually transition back to campus
● Working Group to provide recommendations on formalizing future work arrangements

Governor’s May Budget Revise for the UC System
● Proposes $4.272 billion for UC for FY 2021-22
  ○ Restoration of $302.4-million cut from last year’s budget, and adding $173.2-million increase to ongoing base budget
  ○ $300.7 million in one-time funding
  ○ $150 million in one-time federal funding for deferred maintenance
  ○ Additional capital funding request from UC is still under consideration by the State

● While the State funding increase is good news, this increase impacts only about one-third of our core budget. This means two-thirds of our core budget, including tuition, nonresident supplemental tuition, and student services fees, will experience no increase (virtually flat for last 10 years). We expect budget challenges in the coming year.
Salary Increases for 2021-22
Last month, we announced that the Office of the President is implementing a 3% cost-of-living increase for non-represented staff and a 3% range adjustment for faculty salaries.

The regular peer-review merit advancement process for academic appointees will continue.

Student Updates

Fall 2021 Admissions Data (First-Year)
- 105,643 first-year applications (up 16% over last year)
- 29% admit rate (34% last year)
- Deadline for Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) was May 1 for first-year students; June 1 for transfers
  - 5,388 total SIRs (5,053 last year)
  - 3,392 (73%) SIR California students
  - 1,456 (27%) SIR non-residents
  - Expected enrollment:
    - 3,705 California students (75%)
    - 1,784 non-residents (25%)
    - Total first-year enrollment of 5,489
    - Avg. self-reported GPA is 4.24 (up from 4.20 from last year)
  - 28% URM (up from 27% last year)
  - 30% first-generation (down from 34% last year)

Fall 2021 Admissions Data (Transfers)
- 20,551 transfer applications (up 8% from last year)
- 48% admit rate (58% last year)
- Average GPA: 3.68 (3.51 last year)
- 27% URM (29% last year)
- 33% first-generation (37% last year)
- 2,339 total SIRS
  - 2,097 (90%) SIR California students
  - 242 (10%) SIR non-residents (will be using waitlist to increase this count)
- Expected transfer enrollment:
  - 1,865 (85%) California students
  - 325 (15%) non-resident students
  - 2,190 total transfer students
Commencement 2021

June 7-10 In-Person Grad Walk
June 12, 10-11am Live-streamed Online Commencement Ceremony, with keynote address by Oprah Winfrey

Commencement-Related Activities & Outdoor Receptions
Guidelines and Registration for Spring 2021 Outdoor Receptions can be found at: www.dia.ucsb.edu/event-management-protocol/spring-2021-outdoor-reception-guidelines

Campus Updates and Highlights

Arctic Data Center
The National Science Foundation will continue funding the Arctic Data Center, led by NCEAS, with $6 million for another five years.

Congratulations to PI Matthew Jones, director of informatics research at NCEAS, and to all of our NCEAS colleagues.

John Stewart Bell Prize
Professor of Physics John Martinis

2021-22 Berlin Prize Fellowship
Associate Professor of Global Studies Javiera Barandiarán

Mentoring Award for Undergraduate Research
The National Center for Women and Information Technology has awarded Associate Professor of Computer Science Diba Mirza

American Council of Learned Societies 2021 Digital Extension Grants
Assistant Professor of Film and Media Studies Laila Shereen Sakr for “Arab Data Bodies: Social Media in Mixed Reality”
Isla Vista

Isla Vista Remembrance

Due to the pandemic, we once again could not organize a community vigil on May 23, but we encouraged our community to visit the Isla Vista Love & Remembrance Garden to honor the lives that were lost.

Several virtual commemorations, including a digital display of these Memorial Boards, are available on the Associated Students website.

Announcements by the Chair

Chair Scott thanked Chancellor Henry Yang and Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall for their work during such a difficult time. She also expressed appreciation for the COVID-19 Task Force for taking the Senate’s concerns seriously throughout the year.

- The Academic Council responded to the Proposed Presidential COVID-19 Vaccination Policy, following a systemwide review. The systemwide Academic Senate and the Santa Barbara Division provided strong and pointed comments to the President on the Proposed Revisions to Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures. The Academic Senate also received a request for comments on the Presidential Campus Safety Plan on June 1, due June 22. Please provide feedback to the Senate, which will inform our comments.
- Chair Scott stated that the investigation into the Accellion Data breach is ongoing. She remarked that the codes posted on the UCSB website for faculty to register with Experian were retired. Employees and their dependents were promised a personal code, but some have not yet received them. If you have not received the codes, please visit the UCSB Information Technology website for more information.
- The Academic Senate held a Town Hall meeting on April 8 to discuss the campus reopening plan and fall instruction. The discussion was productive because it answered many faculty questions. A recording of the webinar is posted on the Senate’s COVID-19 website.
Based on current data, we know that our community has a low rate of COVID-19 infection. Thus, we are looking forward to reopening the university for the fall quarter. We have very robust policies and procedures for faculty and students who need medical accommodations. We are planning a Town Hall meeting for early September to provide an update on campus plans, which will be based on the pandemic conditions at that time.

COVID-19 Update: Scott Grafton, COVID-19 Coordinator, Professor, Psychological and Brain Sciences

Scott Grafton provided an update on the conditions of the pandemic, and noted that it is difficult to provide precise information for fall quarter given that it is still several months away. We are not finding any evidence of significant breakthrough cases in vaccinated individuals; the vaccine works quite well. The most compelling data in early May comes from Los Angeles County where they tracked 3.5 million people from February to April. During this period, there were 165 breakthrough cases. That is about one in every 20,000 cases. Our best tool is to examine the COVID-19 case rate in SB County, which, if the current trend continues, indicates very small risk in the fall.

UCSB 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)

Accreditation: Why?

Because as educators, it is our privilege and our responsibility to:

Create pathways for student learning: courses that help students learn to think, practice, and contribute to knowledge-making

Study and Learn: Are all groups of students meeting our expectations for learning? If not, why not?
Adjust accordingly

Accreditation: Why?
All institutions that receive ANY form of federal funding must be accredited.
Federal Funding includes:
● Student Financial aid
● Federal grants and contracts
Accreditation: Who?

Authorized by NACIQI/Federal government to ensure that institutions are:

- Providing high quality educations
- Engage in self-improvement
- Fiscally sound, responsibly governed, and transparent
- Also stand between colleges/universities and federal policies (Higher Education Act and engage in negotiated rule making

WASC Core Commitments

- Student learning and success: clear goals and outcomes, support all students, understand and improve success.
- Quality and improvement: high standards of quality and capacity to fulfill commitments and future needs/opportunities.
- Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability: sound business practices, institutional integrity and transparency, and institutional flexibility

From the Handbook of Accreditation:

Standards of Accreditation

- Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Outcomes
- Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
- Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability
- Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

UCSB Assessment/Accreditation Activities

Yearly to WASC: Annual reports that include information on enrollment, graduation rates, and financial indicators.

3-year cycle at UCSB: Undergraduate and graduate programs (majors) select PLOs for focused assessment.
UCSB assessment/accreditation activities

**Yearly to WASC:** Annual reports that include information on enrollment, graduation rates, and financial indicators.

**3-year cycle at UCSB:** Undergraduate and graduate programs (majors) select PICs for internal assessment.

**Every 7-10 years:** Institutional reaffirmation

---

**TPR Themes:**
- High level/relevant to the entire campus
- Established (and ultimately pursued) with broad consultation among campus stakeholders
- Represent areas of commitment for the campus (aligned with institutional mission)
  - Areas where work is underway; also areas where there is work to be done and where resources may be devoted

**Timeline/Process**
- Gather Input on possible themes: now-September 2021
- Senate/administrative review of themes: September-October 2021
- Themes due to WASC: November 2021
- WASC review: November 2021-February 2022
- UCSB work on themes: January-February 2022-Spring 2023
- Reaffirmation application (report on themes + additional material) due: Spring 2023
- Commission/peer visit: Fall 2023

**Possible themes?**
Leveraging and fulfilling our identity as a Minority Serving Institution (MSI). Potential areas of focus within the theme could include:
- **Belonging and establishing a sense of campus community**
- **Access, equity, and persistence**

Connecting admissions with enrollment management for completion. Possible areas of focus within the theme could include:
- **Student academic and co-curricular success**
- **Supporting all student cohorts**
Prioritizing in a landscape of limited resources. Possible areas of focus within the theme could include:

- *Using data to improve institutional effectiveness*
- *Revising evaluation of teaching effectiveness*

Other ideas. Other possible areas of focus…

**Themes Survey**
Senate members, committees, staff members will be asked to comment on possible/new themes from two perspectives:

- *Within the purview of your council/committee/cohort*
- *For the campus at large*

Please provide specifics:

- *Current initiatives or activities (including data collection)*
- *Activities/initiatives you’d like to see be addressed (and why)*

**Thank you!**
For questions:
Linda Adler-Kassner, Accreditation Liaison Officer (also Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education)
ladler@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 26 in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention.

**Committee on Academic Personnel, (Susannah Scott and Rita Raley on behalf of)**
Ruth Finkelstein, Chair, Professor, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology (from the slides presented)

**Primary Role of CAP: Case Processing**
Independent review of cases from all colleges and divisions
- Strive for consistent application of standards across diverse fields
- 300-400 cases per cycle (~360 this year)
- 8-20 cases per week at CAP meetings (continues through June)

**Communication with Campus Community**
- Goal: Improve transparency of process through participation in multiple information sessions and updating of CAP FAQs:
  https://senate.ucsb.edu/policies-and-procedures/frequently-asked-questions/tions/personnel-cases
Addressing COVID impacts:
- Participation in town hall to hear concerns of junior faculty
- Participation in policy discussions regarding how to evaluate cases with sufficient flexibility, in recognition of disproportionate impacts of COVID on caregiving responsibilities and loss of access to research facilities.
- Encouraging submission of COVID impact statements
- Suggest producing simplified mechanism for impact statements (questionnaire??)

Communication with other committees regarding COVID impacts, diversity issues in general, and revision of system for student evaluation of teaching (ESCI or other)

Teaching Evaluation Workgroup (S21)
- Senate-Administration committee; 17 members; charge was to make recommendations for revision or replacement of ESCI system
- Informed by Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) research, SET models from other campuses, ad hoc committee report (2019)
- Short-term and long-term approach

TEW: Short-term work (S21)
- Revised campus communication (student and instructor), from ESCI online landing page and emails to slides for classroom presentation
- Drafted memo for reviewing agencies with recommendations for contextualizing ESCI scores, possible amending of ESCI surveys, and use of secondary forms of evidence

TEW: Toward long-term work (S21)
- Drafting core principles that will inform revision of SET on campus
- Developing plan of work for AY 21-22: campus consultation on principles will occur before the drafting of new survey document

Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards – Key Accomplishments, Lisa Parks, Chair, Professor, Film and Media Studies (from the slides presented)

Covid-19 Impacts
- Participated in senate town hall meetings
- Followed up with social gatherings for early career faculty
- Met with CAP leadership to discuss impacts on faculty
- Advocated for faculty and suggested extraordinary efforts and workload be rewarded (e.g. universal course relief, research funding, reimbursement for tech costs, etc.)
- Contributed to systemwide UCFW-UCAADE memo on Covid-19 impacts
- Investigated building prep before return to in person instruction; conveyed faculty questions and concerns to facilities’ leadership

Childcare on Campus
- The pandemic put campus childcare issues and needs into bold relief
● Building on past CFW work on this issue, we participated in a series of meetings to encourage development of a long-term plan for childcare facilities and services on our campus

● Began working with EVC Robnett’s office to discuss childcare crisis and established goal to formulate recommendations

● Worked to ensure Chancellor’s infant care funding was distributed to Assistant Professors who applied

Policy Review Highlights
● UC claim to ownership of research data
● Gold Book / Policing policy revisions
● UC Mandatory Vaccination policy
● UC Policy to repatriate Native American Human Remains and Objects held by UC campuses

Other Issues in the Mix and in the Horizon
● Tracking fallout of UC data breach and holding UC accountable; mitigating future breaches
● Raising awareness about the role and contributions of Emeritus faculty on our campus
● Addressing Transportation and Parking issues; balancing sustainability goals with cost of living in our community (e.g. issues with the new TAP system)
● Assisting with the return to in-person instruction in the fall; ensuring faculty are aware of workplace accommodation options; conveying building safety concerns

Happy Summer!
● Thanks to all CFW members and former Chair, Denise Segura, as well as our incredible analyst, Casey Hankey, and Kum-Kum Bhavnani who consulted and worked with us
● Also big thanks to Susannah Scott and Shasta Delp for their strong and steady leadership during this difficult year
● If you have questions, ideas, or concerns, please email me: parks@ucsb.edu
Undergraduate Council – A Year in Review, Raya Feldman, Vice Chair, Associate Professor, Statistics and Applied Probability (from the slides presented)

% Undergraduate Council Activities – by Categories

Policy Issues
● 13 major policy documents considered and acted upon as appropriate

Changes to Undergraduate requirements
● UgC reviewed and approved total of 24 changes to course requirements, PLOs (program learning outcomes), departmental changes to degree requirements

PRP reviews
● UgC participated in PRP review for three departments
● Initial reviews to suggest questions for the charge letter to the External Review Committees
● Reviews of all reports to provide feedback and identify areas for ongoing consideration

UC Systemwide Reviews
UgC considered and took action on UC systemwide policy including:
● Definition of residency, senior residency
● Cross-campus enrollment
● Recognition of minors granted at other campuses
Chancellor’s Award for Undergraduate Research
• UgC subcommittee reviewed and made recommendations for the award

**Undergraduate Council Activities – Policy Issues 2020-21**
• Grading Flexibility for the Academic Year
  Extensive consultation with administrators, student advisors, Associated Students, etc.
• Fall Registration Pilot program
  Endorsed the pilot program
• Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force Report
  Offered comments and suggested reexamination in post-pandemic period
• Enrollment Strategies Report
  Endorsed the report, offered comments, welcomed continuation of the discussion
• Priority Registration Proposal
  Endorsed the proposal initiated by Dean Stopple after extensive discussions and consultations
• Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) review
  Considered report on ILTI and made recommendations for a number of initiatives
• University-wide policing policies and procedures
  Voiced number of questions and concerns
• (Covid-19) Vaccination draft policy
  Supported the policy while raising a number of concerns and questions
• Curtailment Program Proposal
  Focused on negative effects of the proposal on undergraduate education….and more

**Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS), Michael Gordon, Chair, Professor, Chemical Engineering (from the slides presented)**

**AY 20-21 Issues**
UC Switch to test-free policy (no SAT/ACT going forward)
• Required extensive revamp of admissions procedures
  ○ Modified Academic Decision Models and “Read” process extensively
  ○ Developed new Reader training and benchmarking
• Initial Forensics on old vs. new admissions process, DEI issues

**Admissions Audit**
• Total revamp of Athletics and Special Talent Admissions procedures, student tracking and compliance oversight
• Extensive efforts for audit response to UCOP and CSA (CSA ongoing)

**Collateral damage of COVID on Admissions**
• P/NP grades allowed in (a)-(g) requirements
• Lack of student extracurricular experiences
• Lack of quantitative info for selection
• More student support likely required in coming 1-2 yrs
Committee on Admissions, Enrollment & Relations with Schools (CAERS)

20-21 vs. 21-22 Admissions Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>No SAT = +16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Freshman Apps</td>
<td>90963</td>
<td>105643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>22296</td>
<td>17782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic NR</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>6132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>5249</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward to AY 21-22
- Most UC campuses transitioning to some form of “holistic review”
- Summer CAERS workgroup to consider “holistic review” aspects
- Fine-tuning of new Admissions process? Forensics and tracking success
- Switchover to new Admissions SLATE software system
- Potential switchover to all “undeclared” for L&S freshman admits
- TAG and pre-major requirements
- Enrollment management (major, division, college caps/targets?)
- Enhancing DEI outreach

Graduate Council Report, Tamara Afifi, Chair, Professor, Communication (from the slides presented)
Discussed/Addressed Challenges Affecting Graduate Students

- COVID-19 impacts on graduate students
e.g., mental health, financial challenges, visa issues, fees, remote teaching, extra time to complete degree, deferrals, COVID-19 testing, uncertainty/rules about research and office space, resuming in person activities, COVID relief funding
- International student pay issues due to COVID-19
- Right-sizing departments, graduate student funding, enrollment management, the use of online courses and workload effects on TAs

Name Change/New Program Approvals

- Approved the name change of the PhD in Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology to two PhDs: one in Counseling and Clinical Psychology and one in School Psychology
- Two new graduate programs were approved this year by the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs: a terminal MEd in School Psychology and a PhD in Biological Engineering

Other Reviews/Approvals

- Participated in the Academic Program Reviews for Chemistry and Biochemistry and Linguistics
- Reviewed 14 curricular changes for graduate programs
- Approved revisions to the Graduate Council Bylaws
- Commented on a wide variety of campus and system policy proposals (e.g., the Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program; Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures; Systemwide Review Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610: Defining Residency; SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy)
- Gathered feedback and refined graduate mentoring best practices

THANK YOU!

- Dean Leila Rupp and Assistant Dean Robert Hamm
- Kelly Rivera, GC Analyst
- Professor Adam Sabra, Vice Chair
- Alex LeBrun, Co-President of GSA
- Members of Graduate Council

Committee on Courses and General Education, William Davies King, Chair, Professor, Theater and Dance (from the slides presented)

CCGE approvals of online courses during this year and expectations for the future

The Senate reviews and approves proposals for online courses. Approvals go through FEC and CCGE.

- Any course in which 50% or more of the instruction is offered virtually on an on-going basis is considered to be an online course
- The 50% in-person instruction rule is applied from the perspective of the student
In 2020-2021, 10 new courses initially approved (two year trial) and 2 renewals (indefinite approval)
- Most were in process of development prior to COVID crisis
- Several made the case by topic or pedagogical advantage that on-line was the preferred modality
- Also courses intended for Summer Sessions
- Courses with a large amount of content that would have to be accessed on-line anyway, especially interactively

“Information for Faculty Regarding Fall 2021 Instructional Planning”: “At UC Santa Barbara, the default mode of instruction for all courses is in-person. It is required in Academic Senate regulations, and in our accreditation as an institution of higher education by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The Senate approves exceptions to the default mode of instruction for a relatively small number of classes that have been designed and are designated to be offered online. Neither instructors nor administrators (such as chairs and deans) have the authority to alter the mode of instruction for any instructor, course, or program, without the express consent of the Academic Senate.”

Council on Planning and Budget, Year End Summary, Anne H. Charity Hudley, Vice Chair, Professor, Linguistics (from the slides presented)

CPB during a time of pandemic and protest
- CPB attended to 45 issues including:
  Campus Reviews
  FTE reviews
  PRP reviews
  Systemwide proposals and reviews
  Search waivers: UC Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and Exceptional Opportunity

Work Toward a Campus-Wide Strategic Plan: Primary Goals
- Help CPB make effective strategic decisions across divisions, departments and programs
- Ensure that we are using both our own faculty expertise and policies and procedure that can ensure that all stakeholders concerns have been heard
- Ensure that decisions are being made consistently across CPB member rotations
Example: Focused Excellence

- “At an early point in each of the departments, a critical decision was made to emphasize one or a few selected area(s) in which to become recognized and expert.”
- Who made this decision and how does it impact a new generation of faculty?

Inclusion Must Be Planned

- “In the last 15 years under-represented minorities in the student population have grown from about 10% to 24%. However, it is anticipated that in the near future California will undergo a dramatic demographic change, with minorities quickly comprising a majority of the state population.
- This will require exceeding past successes at both the undergraduate and graduate level, and aligning campus goals with national efforts to provide a “diverse, globally oriented workforce” that is inclusive of women, minorities and persons with disabilities.”

--UC Santa Barbara Strategic Academic Plan
CPB Strategic Plan Action Plan & Timeline for AY 2021-2022

• **Fall Quarter:** Gather existing strategic plans from UCOP, Chancellor, EVC, faculty senate, UCSB, divisions, departments, and programs including non-senate organizations on campus (development, IT, housing).

• **Winter Quarter:** Decide what strategic planning questions CPB would like to see become part of presentations and documents presented to CPB.

• **Spring Quarter:** Create a model for broader strategic planning across faculty senate and on campus.

On Campus Strategic Planning is Underway

• The GGSE created their own strategic plan and that is a good model for how stakeholders can be involved in the process. We may want to start with divisions and schools first and build up to a larger campus plan.

CPB Revised Questions for the Deans: Move to Dynamic Discussions with Follow-Up

• Do you foresee significant changes in research foci in your division/college/school in the next 3-5 years?

• If UCSB had fewer constraints on growth, how would your planning process change? In what specific directions, if any, would you encourage departmental planning if constraints continue?
● What programmatic changes do you see across departments or research areas within your division?

**Strategic Questions for the Deans and Beyond**

**Strategic Planning**
● Is there a strategic plan for your division?
● What would be necessary for your division to realize this plan?
● What do you think the role of an academic strategic plan is, what is the function of both the plan and the process for each division and for UCSB as a whole?

**Diversity and Inclusion**
● The demographic mismatch between the UCSB student population and the faculty population is one of the greatest challenges we face. What plans do you have to address this issue and increase diversity for faculty, students, and staff?
● What have you done differently this year that has accomplished changes, or what they learned in the past year? (Compared to presentations and notes from previous years).
● What measures are you taking to address and monitor students’ concerns regarding climate in your departments?

**Grand Challenges and Budget**
● What are the most effective strategies that you have implemented to address the increasing enrollment of undergraduates given our limited staff and faculty resources?
● What is the single most important new initiative that you would like to pursue or press forward on in your division? What would you stop doing or cut back on in order to pursue this new initiative? We will follow up on both questions next year, asking where you are on the new initiative and how it is resourced.

**Student-Centered Questions**
● What are the most important (student) issues that you are facing, and what can be changed (we know everything is impacted, so take that as a given)?
● How effective has remote teaching/learning been in your Division? What data has been collected? Do you anticipate remote classes becoming permanent online classes?
Committee on Diversity and Equity, Melissa Morgan, Chair, Professor, Communication (from the slides presented)

Initiatives this year:
- Hidden Workload recommendations: suggestions for faculty on what to consider in writing up diversity work for APM 210d. Currently understanding of this is inconsistent. Will work with CAP/AP to ensure agreement across units.
- Communicating and collaborating with other diversity-related units on campus: Faculty Equity Advisors, Student Affairs, Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for DEI, other Senate committees.
- Responses to important issues such as: Native American Relic Rights on UC campuses, Police Personnel Manual (Goldbook)

Junior Faculty Townhall
Worked with Chair Scott and other committee chairs to create a forum for information and hearing concerns and ideas for solutions from junior faculty

It was quite well attended and several initiatives have resulted from information gathered there – thanks to all who participated!

Council on Research and Instructional Resources Overview 2020-2021, Forrest Brewer, Chair, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering (from the slides presented)

What is CRIR?
Council Composed of:
CRPP (Committee on Research Policy and Procedures) F. Brewer
- Oversight of Academic Research Policies on Campus
- Research Grant and Travel Grant Policies

CLIIR (Library, Information and Instructional Resources) K. Lunsford
- Library Consultation
- Instructional Resources: Capitol and Teaching Resources

CIT (Committee on Information Technology) J. Frew
- IT and Instructional Computing Policy

Actions
- Faculty Travel Grant Policy Changes – COVID-19
- Faculty Research Grant Policy Changes – COVID-19
- UCOP Policy Reviews:
  - Conflict of Interest Policy (Funding Agencies e.g. NIH)
  - Database Data Protection Policy (Unfunded Mandate)
  - Tangible Research Materials/Ownership
  - BUS – Small Business First Purchasing Policy
  - Classification of Gifts/Sponsored Projects
  - UCOP Vaccination Policy
  - Introduced Policy Action on Indemnity and Software Licensing

Actions – Cont’d

- CRPP Representative
  - Research Ramp-Up
  - Undergraduate Researchers on Campus
  - Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy (policy to mitigate budget shortfall)
- CLIIR
  - Library and Instructional Development Consultation
    - Advocacy for the California Digital Library and the HathiTrust
    - Support for Project Transform (new journal subscription contracts to enhance Open Access; resolved contract dispute with Elsevier)
    - Preparation for opening of new classroom building

Actions – Cont’d

- CIT Policy Recommendations
  - Innovative Learning Technology Initiative
    - Emphasize need for evaluating online learning effectiveness
- IT Recovery
  - Cautioned against unfunded mandate for data retention; unclear research impacts
COVID Curtailment
   ○ Emphasized importance of telecommunication and remote computing support
Online Undergraduate Degree
   ○ Strongly opposed the granting of pure-online UC degrees

Travel Grant Policy
● UCOP Travel Restrictions in place
   ○ Re-allocated funds to allow support for 2 virtual conferences for a total of $600 per faculty year
   ○ Allowed for Membership Dues related to conference presentation
      Formerly only reimbursable if required by host

Reports of Standing Committees

**Proposed Revisions to the Academic Senate Manual - Bylaw 50, 60, and 75: Executive Council; Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards; and Graduate Council**

The Faculty Legislature considered the proposed amendments to Bylaw 50 regarding Executive Council. Prior to Faculty Legislature consideration, the proposed amendments were reviewed and approved by the Executive Council and the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJE). The proposed changes were as follows, in addition to general edits for clarity:

1. Added to the membership of Executive Council the second Vice Chair, and the chairs of Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools, and Committee on Academic Personnel as ex-officio members
2. Under duties, adjusted the language regarding open positions for Divisional Representatives to the Assembly from “makes nominations” to “recommends potential nominees to the Committee on Committees.”

The Faculty Legislature considered the proposed revision to Bylaw 60 regarding the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW). Prior to Faculty Legislature consideration, the proposed amendments were reviewed and approved by CFW and RJE. The proposed changes were as follows, in addition to general edits for clarity:

1. Increased the Council’s membership from 10 to 15
2. Clarified that the Chair of the Council serves ex officio on the Faculty Legislature
3. Removed Executive Committee, thus reducing the number of standing subcommittees to two
4. Added to Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer a minimum of 5 members: 3 past recipients and 1 council member
5. Added to Committee on Distinguished Teaching a minimum of 5 members: 2 past recipients and 1 council member who serves as chair of the committee
6. Added the Committee on Graduate Mentor Awards, consisting of a minimum of 5 members: 2 past recipients and 1 council member who serves as chair of the committee, and 2 Graduate Council members.
7. Added the Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistants, consisting of a minimum of 5 members: 2 past recipients and 1 council members who serves as chair of the committee, and 2 Graduate Council members.

The Faculty Legislature considered the proposed revision to Bylaw 75 regarding Graduate Council. Prior to Faculty Legislature consideration, the proposed revisions were reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council (GC) and RJE. The changes were as follows, in addition to general edits for clarity:

1. Increased the Council’s membership from 15-18
2. Clarified that the Chair of the Council serves ex officio on the Faculty Legislature
3. Removed the standing subcommittees of the Council, as they are no longer operational
4. Under duties, added that the Council advises the Chancellor and the Division on matters pertaining to graduate education
5. Under duties, removed determination of the Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards

**Motion:** To approve the proposed revisions to Divisional Senate Regulation 50, 60, and 75. The motion was seconded, and passed with 30 in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention.

The floor was open for general comments and discussion. As there were no questions from the floor, Chair Scott adjourned the meeting at 5:16 p.m.
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 10 times during the academic year 2020-21 and addressed many issues related to the Covid-19 pandemic. All meetings were held remotely via Zoom due to the pandemic. Notable issues addressed included:

Priority registration reform
AVC Jeff Stopple presented a proposal to make changes to priority registration in order to address issues of equity. The FEC was supportive of the aims and felt that making an adjustment to class standing, as is done for EAP returnees, might work as a replacement for priority registration. Precise details would need to be worked out with the registrar’s office.

FEC response to request for comments on Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544-Cross-Campus Enrollments
The CCS FEC was supportive of the proposed revision.

FEC response to request for comments on Report of the online Undergraduate Degree Task Force
The CCS FEC was supportive of the UC-Quality Remote Degree option that supports development of fully remote degree programs although CCS itself is unlikely to be a place where remote degrees are offered.

FEC response to request for comments Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 630-Senior Residency
The CCS FEC was supportive of the proposed revision.

FEC response to request for input on proposed revisions to PRP process
It was generally felt that the current review process could not review the eight majors in CCS in any great depth. It was also felt that the departmental surveys of climate etc. should be done on a more frequent basis than once every 10-12 years.

FEC response to Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy
The FEC noted that CCS is in a unique position having already utilized some of the approaches suggested, particularly with regard to advising. The FEC agreed that advising is key to
student success but that long waitlists also need to be urgently addressed and several suggestions were made. It was also noted that resources for teaching classes do not necessarily flow to where the demand is and suggestions to improve this were also made.

**FEC response to proposed Presidential Policy on the SARSCoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program**
The committee supported there being a universal vaccination mandate across the UC system as being one of the best ways to return to normal operations safely. However a number of issues and concerns were raised.

**FEC response to Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency**
The FEC was supportive of this clarification.

**FEC response to Request for an Extension of the Fall Registration Pilot to 2021**
The FEC was supportive of this request

**FEC response to Social Science Major Proposal**
A proposal was received for a CCS social science major. Although the FEC was broadly supportive it was felt that the next step should be for the proponents to present their proposal to the College at an in person meeting.

**Open forum to discuss issues and concerns about Fall 2021**
An open forum was held for all faculty to discuss issues, concerns and opportunities related to the anticipated Fall 2021 return to campus.

**Name change for CCS Student Service Award**
The CCS Student Service Award was renamed to the College of Creative Studies Sara Sterphone Student Service Award in recognition of Sara’s contributions to the College.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

**John Latto**  
Chair (Started 1/12/21), Member (Ended 1/11/21)  
Senior Lecturer SOE, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, College of Creative Studies

**Tengiz Bibilashvili**  
Senior Lecturer SOE, Physics, College of Creative Studies

**Kara Brown**  
Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies, Writing Program

**Maribel Bueno Cachadina**  
Senior Lecturer SOE, Mathematics, College of Creative Studies

**Phill Conrad**  
Senior Lecturer SOE, Computer Science, College of Creative Studies

**Sarah Gibson**  
Lecturer Potential SOE, College of Creative Studies, Music

**Leroy Laverman**  
Senior Lecturer SOE, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Creative Studies

**Jane Mulfinger**  
Professor, Art

**Sharon Tettegah**  
At-Large Member  
Professor, Black Studies
Raisa Feldman  At-Large Member
Leslie Hogan  Non-Senate Academic Rep
Gerardo Aldana  Ex Officio

Dana Mastro,  Ex Officio
Savannah Parison,  Consultant
Lynn Clark,  Advisor
Jennifer Johansen,  Advisor

Associate Professor, Statistics and Applied Probability
Dean, College of Creative Studies; Professor, Chicana and Chicano Studies, Anthropology
Associate Dean, College of Creative Studies; Professor, Communication
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 15 times during this academic year, five meetings per quarter for two hours each.

Professor Sabine Frühstück was elected FEC Chair at the meeting on October 8, 2020, and offers this Annual Report for academic year 2020-21.

Executive Summary

Academic year 2020-21 saw the continuation of challenges surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, with plans building toward the potential return to campus in the near future as the year progressed and vaccination programs were carried out. The FEC engaged in discussions of many significant issues related to online instruction and the continued transition to business post-pandemic. This Executive Summary highlights recurring significant issues that the committee discussed in 2020-21.

- The most consistent issue in FEC discussions was the lack of campus level guidance regarding criteria for appropriate fully online courses. Careful and sustained FEC discussion resulted in the determination that online courses ought to have (a) a distinct academic or pedagogic rationale for being offered without an in-person element (beyond statements about efficiency or convenience), and (b) truly require 50% or more online instructional components to achieve course goals. For instructors hoping to use what they learned about online teaching during the pandemic in their return to regular instruction, the FEC repeatedly reinforced in its memos that courses utilizing 49% or less online/hybrid components do not require formal Senate review as “W” prefix online courses.
- A second important issue that took up a substantial portion of FEC discussion and will undoubtedly do so next year as well were strategies for how to solve the problem of particularly impacted majors. Positive trends have emerged and proposals discussed, including: (a) the creation of needed pre-majors recommended, for instance, by program reviews such as that of Statistics; (b) the attempt to reassess the validity of unit caps, restrictions designed to reduce major counts (Senate Regulation 130 regarding major
accessibility); and (c) the possibility to admit all students as undeclared freshmen in order
to de-emphasize majors and shift toward a more liberal arts model of
undergraduate education.

- The agony about how to replace the ESCIs that we know are ineffective and biased tools of
  assessing both students’ learning and instructors’ teaching continued. FEC disagrees with
  the Committee on Student Evaluation and Teaching and Instructional Development on two
counts: FEC’s perspective is that it is not sensible to separate teaching evaluation from the
question of learning gains. And, FEC does not believe that students are experts in their own
experiences (such a perspective would make bias in evaluations impossible). FEC continues
to favor a moratorium on the use of numerical ESCI scores in personnel evaluations.

- Securing equal access and success for a diverse student body continues to be a priority in
  FEC discussions and was brought up this past year particularly in the context of priority
registration and the reform of the L&S Honors Program.

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. I gratefully acknowledge also the
contributions of Associated Students representative Hayley Slater and GSA representative
Celine Day. The FEC is also indebted to Nick Alward-Saxon who ensured a smooth transition
from his predecessor, Barbara Gilkes, and provided expert guidance throughout the year.

Academic Program Reviews

Maintaining excellence in College departments, undergraduate programs, and graduate educationis
essential for the continued excellence of the University. As such, the FEC takes its role in
Academic Program Review very seriously. In 2020-21, the committee provided extensive
comment during the reviews of the Department of Linguistics and the Department of Chemistry
and Biochemistry.

FEC also nominated candidates for the Program Review Panel.

At the Graduate Level

The FEC provided input on a variety of matters relating to welfare of graduate students, but was not
consulted for review on any specific proposals for significant changes or additions to existing
graduate student programs.

Relating to individual course issues, the FEC requested input from Graduate Council (and other
committees) regarding matters of equity for Teaching Assistants in delivery of remote instruction
where the instructor teaches remotely but graduate students are expected to TA in a physical
capacity. Graduate Council’s feedback informed the FECs evaluation, discussion, and eventual
denial of a proposed fully online undergraduate course that would have utilized such a teaching
arrangement.

The FEC provided comment on one systemwide policy proposal exclusively relating to graduate
students, dealing with eligibility for in-absentia fee status. The full title of this proposal is listed in
the “Systemwide” section below.
At the Undergraduate Level

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 2020-21, the L&S FEC endorsed the following substantive curriculum changes while FEC subcommittees reviewed technical adjustments to 74 major and minor sheets, bearing in mind that the same adjustment could appear on multiple major or minor sheets, including emphases.

Significant curriculum proposals:
1. American Indian and Indigenous Studies Minor – Numerous curricular changes
2. Anthropology Department – Anthropology Major, Biological Emphasis – Eliminated ANTH 7 requirement
3. Black Studies Department – Black Studies Major & Minor – Seminar requirement changes
4. Classics Department – Classical Archaeology Emphasis – Revisions to UD Area A
5. Comm Department – Comm Major – Expanded limit of COMM 160AA-ZZ credit
6. East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies Department – Chinese Majors – Numerous curricular changes
7. Earth Science Department – Earth Science Major, Geophysics Emphasis – Numerous curricular changes
8. English Department – Renaissance Studies Major – Hibernated
9. History Department – Students can combine Poverty, Inequality, & Social Justice Minor with History Major, History of Public Policy and Law Major, or History Minor
10. French & Italian Department – Italian Studies Major, Transnational Emphasis – Established new emphasis
11. Linguistics Department – Language & Speech Technology Emphasis and Minor – Numerous curricular changes
12. Mathematics and Statistics Departments – Financial Math and Statistics Major – Change to pre-major requirements
13. Physics Department – Physics BA & BS Majors, Physics Minor, and Astronomy Minor – Numerous curricular changes in preparation for further changes effective for 2021-22 and 2022-23 in a staged roll-out
14. Psychological and Brain Sciences Department – Biopsychology Major and Psychological & Brain Sciences Major – Eliminated 144 pre-major unit cap
15. Spanish & Portuguese Department – Spanish Major and Minor – Changes to limits of courses taught in English
17. Theater and Dance Department – Dance BA Major – Numerous curricular changes

Other Undergraduate Academic Items Reviewed:
• Priority Registration Reform
• Request for an Extension of the Fall Registration Pilot to 2021
• Student Petition Concerning the European Traditions Requirement
• Proposed Changes to the College of Letters & Science Honors Program

At the Level of Individual Courses
The FEC reviewed the following online course proposals, either for an initial offering or renewal based on assessment data:

- ARTHI W 6R (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- COMM W 107 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- COMM W 146 (renewal, reviewed and approved)
- EEMB W 158 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- ESS W 131 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- ESS W 3 (renewal, reviewed and approved)
- FAMST W 151FA (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- GEOG W 115B (new online course, reviewed)
- GEOG W 148 (new online course, reviewed)
- INT W 120 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- INT W 22 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- LING W 12 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- LING W 140 (new online course, reviewed)
- LING W 141 (new online course, reviewed)
- SPAN W 2 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- THTR W 2B (new online course, reviewed and approved)

At the Campus Level
The FEC weighed in on:
- Report of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force
- Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy
- Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report
- Proposed Name Change of the Center for the Study of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology of Aging
- Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid

The FEC also coordinated the selection of the Plous Memorial Award recipient. The 2020-21 recipient is Carolina Arias (MCDB). The committee subsequently initiated a discussion and wrote a memo asking the Senate to consider in 2021-22 the possibility of Plous award administration being handled by a more appropriate campus-wide awards committee in the future, which could also potentially allow the award to be expanded in scope to campus faculty in eligible fields appointed outside our College.

The committee also endorsed the nominations for the 2021 Mochizuki Memorial Awards within the
College.

**Systemwide Policy and Regulation Review**

In 2020-21, the FEC responded to:

- Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544 - Cross-Campus Enrollments
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 630 - Senior Residency Requirement
- SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy
- Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program
- Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy – Fee Policy for Graduate Student in Absentia Registration
- Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency
- UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials
- Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures

**Selection of New Members**

In Spring 2021, a call for nominations was sent to all L&S faculty and an election was conducted under the regulations of the Senate, aiming to fill the vacancy created by Vice Chair James Roney stepping down from the FEC after three years of superb service.

The following members were elected to serve on the FEC through August 2024:

Trisalyn Nelson, Geography

**2020-21 FEC Committee Membership**

Walid Afifi, Communication  
Peter Ford, Chemistry and Biochemistry  
Sabine Frühstück, East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies (Chair)  
David Paul, Music  
James Roney, Psychological and Brain Sciences (Vice-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:*

Hayley Slater, Associated Students (from January 2021)  
Celine Day, Graduate Student Association (through December 2021)
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 2020-21 term. All meetings were held in executive session; all meetings were held via Zoom due to the COVID-19 campus closure. In addition, CAP leadership met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel from January through July of the 2021 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 2020-21 academic year included the following:

- Reviewed 331 academic personnel cases (and, in addition, 41 post audits of Dean’s Authority cases), resulting in 372 personnel actions in 2020-21
- 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 2020-21 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
- Participated in an Academic Senate Junior Faculty Town Hall
- Meetings with the Committee on Diversity and Equity, and the Council on Faculty Welfare
- Conducted review of personnel cases from 3 review cycles to analyze possible systematic barriers to advancement in different disciplines
I. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, expanded review merit advancements, and promotions. A total of 372 personnel actions were initiated with one search waiver canceled mid review, resulting in a total of 371 cases 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 considered 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, contributions to diversity, and COVID-19 impacts on any of these activities. These optional documents often provide valuable information that assists reviewing agencies in making more informed evaluations of personnel cases. Recommendations for useful information have been added to the CAP FAQs on the Academic Senate website.

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. However, CAP received one recommendation for a terminal appointment. Following guidelines in Red Binder I-60, two ad hoc committees were formed for that case. 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. Three cases included CERs, and therefore contained ad hoc review reports. CAP convened a “Shadow CAP,” appointed by the CAP chair, to evaluate expanded review merit cases for five current CAP members.

III. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY ISSUES

A number of policy issues were notable in the course of the 2020-21 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, departments sometimes 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
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 as described in Red Binder I-43.

IV. **CAMPUS ISSUES**

A. **Recommendations for Preparing a Self-Assessment**

In conjunction with AP, CAP provided recommendations on formulating self-assessment statements, explaining that the purpose of the optional self-assessment, noted in Red Binder I-75, is to provide context for the significance and effort involved in items listed on the Bio-bibliography. CAP explained that statements should be written for a broad audience and that the Bio-bibliography is the official record of all activities; the self-assessment is an opportunity to provide additional information about those activities, not introduce new ones. CAP recommended that Candidates should limit their self-assessments to no more than three to four pages in length. Suggestions were provided for how candidates could cover the following areas as appropriate: Research, Teaching, Professional Activities, Service, and Diversity.

B. **Change in methodology for Above Scale and within Step IX increases**

CAP reviewed the proposed changes on salary increases during merit cycles for Professor Above Scale and merit within Professor IX. CAP provided comments to Academic Personnel and the AVC regarding a change to an increment-based increase from percent increases.

C. **Elimination of letters for advancement to Step VI**

CAP met with all the deans, the EVC, and AVC to discuss the use of external letters in advancement to Professor VI merit cases. CAP noted that UCSB is unusual, even within the UC system, in requiring outside letters for advancement to Professor Step VI. Consequently, many outside reviewers don’t understand what they are being asked to evaluate. Furthermore, this results in a large number of deferrals, within step and mandatory reviews at Professor V. In winter quarter, Academic Personnel sought consultation on proposed changes related to the removal of external letters for advancement to Professor VI. CAP reviewed the proposed changes and agreed that internal documents and analysis were sufficient to assess advancement to step VI, but also noted that some cases are significantly enhanced by context provided in letters from outside reviewers. The elimination of external letters for advancement to Professor VI will preserve a larger pool of potential new writers for advancement to Above Scale reviews.

D. **COVID-19 and Merit and Promotion Reviews**

CAP contributed to a memo for faculty regarding ongoing challenges resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to concerns about the possible impact on the academic review process, CAP, in consultation with the deans, the AVC, and the Academic Senate, provided guidance on policy and procedures for academic
evaluation and advancement in the context of these unprecedented circumstances. Recognizing that the pandemic was likely to have disparate and inequitable impacts (especially on scholarly productivity) across our faculty that could affect advancement decisions, the memo proposed several ways that our current policies could address faculty needs in the context of these emergency conditions:

1. **Optional COVID Impact Statements**
   Faculty who have experienced disruptions and/or hardship due to conditions related to COVID-19 were encouraged to include a COVID Impact Statement in their merit cases to help place the record in context and assist departments and reviewing agencies in understanding how these conditions have impacted the record. Department chairs were also encouraged to explain and contextualize a candidate’s record in each review area in all merit reviews.

2. **Documenting Temporary Adjustments of Workload**
   In order to assist faculty who are experiencing challenges stemming from COVID-19 (such as homeschooling, dependent-care responsibilities, etc.), reviewing agencies jointly recommended that some workload obligations may be modified or excused in consultation with department chairs and deans. This could include: a release from or shift in service expectations, changes in course assignments and/or scheduling of courses, or co-teaching. It was noted that in some cases, a modification might take place in a year following the pandemic. It was advised that any accommodations be documented in a memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed by the faculty member, chair, and dean, and included in the case materials during the merit review. Faculty members will not be penalized for these accommodations, and reviewing agencies will consider any revised workload expectations in assessing the record.

3. **Stopping or Extending the Tenure Clock**
   Non-tenured senate faculty have an eight-year tenure clock. Policies allow that clock to be extended for personal reasons including “childbearing, childrearing, serious health condition, disability, bereavement, or significant circumstance or event that disrupts a faculty member’s ability to pursue his or her duties.” The extension of the clock provides a possibility for additional service pre-tenure beyond the 8-year limit. Due to ongoing complications related to COVID-19, upon request, a one-year extension for COVID-19 would be automatically granted, without prejudice. It was explained that stopping the clock does not change advancement eligibility. However, faculty may request a deferral of the next review based on the extension of the clock if they choose to do so. These deferrals can also be applied to Formal Appraisals.

4. **Teaching Evaluations & Optional Teaching Statements**
   The memo detailed that although ESCIs are still a routine aspect of our review process, faculty would not be penalized if they received unfavorable evaluations and scores based on factors beyond their control due to the remote instructional context. Further, it was also explained that
Teaching Self Assessments, although optional, were critical in providing reviewing agencies with information about the particular challenges, accomplishments, and activities resulting from the transition to remote teaching. Teaching assessments provide the specific background, details, and explanations of challenges alongside efforts to address them, strategies to enrich educational experiences for students by adapting pedagogical or curricular goals, and efforts to support students and ensure their success. Faculty should also utilize teaching assessments to describe work providing personal and other support for students needing assistance due to the pandemic. Such labor can represent a significant time and emotional commitment for faculty, which should be recognized as a contribution to diversity if appropriate.

E. **COVID-19 Impact and use of the ‘special steps’**
   CAP consulted with the AVC regarding COVID-19 and its impact on faculty. As a result, the AVC and CAP Chair jointly sent out a memo to all ladder faculty discussing the existing practice regarding use of the “special steps” of Assistant Professor/Lecturer PSOE V and Associate Professor/LSOE IV. Per Red Binder I-37, one justification for use of the special steps in advancement cases is “when a member of the faculty shows evidence of work that is likely to lead to promotion in the near future when completed, but whose established record of accomplishment has not yet attained sufficient strength to warrant promotion.” Impacts of the pandemic that have slowed the progress of a faculty member’s otherwise successful and promising research trajectory may also justify advancement to a special step. Special steps overlap with the first step of the next rank and have nearly the same salary. Use of such a step would allow faculty members to continue to earn full step advances, when appropriate, if they need more time before a career review or promotion. The use of special steps does not imply a deficiency in the record. These steps allow faculty to maintain their forward trajectory in step and salary, as they finalize work that is likely to lead to promotion in the near future. If advanced to the special step, the expectations regarding time at step, as stated in Red Binder I-37, would apply.

F. **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.

G. **COVID-19 and CAP Practice**
   Due to the implications of COVID-19 for the campus environment, CAP continued a number of necessary adjustments from the previous review cycle to ensure the timely completion of personnel cases, maintaining the highest standards of review. This led to requiring electronic submission of all materials for review cycles. All meetings were held remotely via Zoom.

H. **CAP FAQ**
   CAP updated and worked with Academic Personnel to implement posting of the updated 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.

I. **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 September 2020 and March 2021. Additionally, CAP made recommendations for revisions to Red Binder I-15, I-27, I-31, I-34, I-51, II-14, II-25, III-7, III-9, V-2, I-8, I-43, and I-75, requiring faculty to submit materials electronically. 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 Scott, CAP reviewed reports, recommendations, and analyses pertaining to:
   a. Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program
   b. Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report
   c. UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials
   d. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy

2. CAP reviewed informational documents regarding ongoing systemwide discussions, as well as pertinent academic personnel approaches at other UC campuses, including:

VI. **CARRY-OVER ISSUES FOR 2021-22**

A. Campuswide review of teaching evaluations and ongoing use of ESCIs
B. Evaluation of diversity statements and contributions to diversity
C. Continuation of COVID statements in the review process
D. Barriers to Advancements Study

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 review 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 Shasta Delp, its Analyst Jackie Grossberg, and its information technology staff, headed by Andy Satomi, for unfailing support, assistance, and advice in all matters.

2020-21 COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Ann J. Adams, History of Art and Architecture
Divyakant Agrawal, Computer Science
Kevin Anderson, Sociology (Started 3/25/21)
Eileen Boris, Feminist Studies
Jose Cabezon, Religious Studies
John Foran, Sociology (until 4/19/21)
Rodney Garratt, Economics
Benjamin Reese, Psychological and Brain Sciences
Dar Roberts, Geography
Sven Spieker, Germanic and Slavic Studies
Janet Walker, Film and Media Studies
Rich Wolski, Computer Science

Omar Saleh, Materials, Biomolecular Science and Engineering Program (Vice Chair)
Ruth Finkelstein, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology (Chair)
# APPOINTMENTS AND SEARCH WAIVERS, 2020-21

Joint appointments are usually treated as a single case by CAP.

## Non-Tenured Appointments Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE appointments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Tenured Appointments</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tentative Reports to CAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Tenured Appointments Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor Appointments</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE Series Appointments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appointments with Tenure</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tentative Reports to CAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Number of Appointments

14

## Endowed Chair Appointments Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair Appointments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Search Waivers Summary:

| Total Search Waivers            | 16     |

## Totals by Rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE Series</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Totals by Type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner Hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Opportunity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Recipients</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Appointments (Including Endowed Chair)

| Totals                             | 33     |

* One search waiver was cancelled before CAP completed its review.
## MERITS, 2020-21

Joint appointments are usually treated as a single case by CAP.

### MERITS TO PROFESSOR VI SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Merits to Professor VI:</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Accelerations in Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tentative Reports to CAP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MERITS TO PROFESSOR ABOVE SCALE SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Merits to Above Scale:</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Accelerations in Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tentative Reports to CAP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MERITS WITHIN PROFESSOR ABOVE SCALE SUMMARY:

| Total Accelerations in Time (+): |    |
| Total Accels in increment Increase, incl accels in time >1 increment): |    |
| Total Mandatory* Reviews (Within Above Scale): | 3  |
| No Change within Above Scale | 1  |
| Total Tentative Reports to CAP: | 3  |
| **Total Merits Within Above Scale:** | **21** |

### MERITS

#### Appraisals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Formal Appraisals With Merit</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisal Only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPRAISALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TYPES OF MERITS SUMMARY:

| Total Assistant Professor Merits: | 48 |
| Total Associate Professor Merits: | 38 |
| Total Professor Merits: | 71 |
| **TOTALS** | **157** |

| Total Mandatory Reviews: | 7  |
| Total Mandatory with No Change: | 4  |
| Total with No Change: | 4  |
| Total Accelerations in Time: |    |

| **TOTAL MERITS (Merit Only--Appraisal/Merit Not incl)** | **203** |
**OTHER PERSONNEL CASES, 2020-21**

*Joint appointments are usually treated as a single case by CAP.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RETENTIONS SUMMARY:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assistant Professor Retentions:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associate Professor Retentions:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professor Retentions:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pending:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Retentions Reviewed by CAP:</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tentative Reports to CAP:</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RECONSIDERATIONS SUMMARY:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Reconsiderations:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CAREER EQUITY REVIEW SUMMARY:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total with Promotion to Full:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with Merit:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CERs</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CER Breakdown:**

- **CER 1**: The department recommended a merit from Professor II to Professor IV. The CER accompanying the merit case recommended an advancement to Professor V. The dean recommended a merit to Professor III with an additional 1 step in offscale and concurred with the advancement to Professor V as part of the CER. CAP agreed with Department for a 1 step acceleration in merit, 1 additional step due to CER.

- **CER 2**: The department recommended a merit from Professor V to Professor VII. In addition to the merit, the CER recommended advancement to Professor VIII. The dean concurred with the recommendation. CAP proposed an additional offscale supplement as part of the merit recommendation, and agreed with the CER recommendation of advancement to Professor VIII. AVC agreed with CAP.

- **CER 3**: The department recommended an accelerated promotion from Associate Professor III to Professor I with an additional 1/2 step in offscale. For the review period, CAP recommended a 1/2 step within Associate Professor III and for the CER recommended promotion to Professor II. The AVC agreed with CAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SERIES TRANSFER SUMMARY:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Lecturer SOE to Professor Series</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Professor to Lecturer SOE Series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Series Transfer Cases</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**POST-AUDITS, 2020-21**

*Note regarding deferral post audits: CAP only conducts a deferral post audit if it is a promotion to tenure deferral.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST AUDITS OF DEAN'S AUTHORITY CASES SUMMARY:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Deferral Post Audits:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assistant Professor Merit Post Audits:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associate Professor Merit Post Audits:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professor Merit Post Audits:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE Series:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment Post Audit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Security of Employment Post Audit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer with Employment Post Audit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Post Audits by CAP:</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROMOTIONS, 2020-21

Joint appointments are usually treated as a single case by CAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTIONS TO TENURE SUMMARY:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Promotions to Tenure:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tentative Reports to CAP:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTIONS TO FULL SUMMARY:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Promotion Cases:</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tentative Reports to CAP:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROMOTIONS</td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND TENTATIVE REPORTS, 2020-21

*Joint appointments are usually treated as a single case by CAP.*

### REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cases with Requests:</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request Reasons:</td>
<td>8/372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(some requests may be for more than 1 type of information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 addtl letters</td>
<td>1 bio-bib or CV clarification/revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voting method</td>
<td>0 outside offer clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dept/dean recommendation</td>
<td>1 clarification of fulfilling teaching load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 proof of in-press</td>
<td>0 proof of publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Case Types with Requests: | |
|--------------------------| |
| 2 Appointment with Tenure Retention |
| 5 Promotion |
| 1 Accel Merit |
| Merit within Above |

### TENTATIVES TO CAP SUMMARY:

| Total Tentatives for Appointments: | 1 |
| Total Tentatives for Appeals/Reconsideration | 2 |
| Total Tentatives for Promotions: | 3 |
| Total Tentatives for Merits: | 20 |
| **Total Tentatives:** | **26** |

**Pending:**

| Total Tentatives for Accelerations in Time: | 26 |

### SUMMARY of TENTATIVE AGREEMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Further Comment by CAP</th>
<th>CAP Stood by Original Recommendation</th>
<th>CAP Provided Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table I - Summary of All Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP

<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>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review (Prof Above, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations/Appeals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment (Cases that resulted in terminal appointment)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAP REVIEWED CASES</strong></td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Series Transfers                                                                 | 1     |
| Career Equity Reviews                                                            | 3     |
| Mandatory Reviews (included in Merits total)                                     | 12    |
| No Change (included in Merits total)                                             | 9     |
| Tentatives                                                                       | 26    |

**TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS** 398

### Table II - Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Appointments requiring Ad Hoc Review                                      | 0     |
| Promotions requiring Ad Hoc Review                                        | 1     |
| Merits requiring Ad Hoc Review                                            | 0     |
| Other Actions requiring Ad Hoc Review                                      | 0     |
| **Total number of Ad Hoc Review Committees**                             | 1     |

**Total number of cases submitted to CAP covering 406 personnel actions:** 398
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III - 19-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair appts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers (prev. EOR's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regular CAP Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audit of Dean's Authority (prev. Routine) Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Initial Personnel Actions Reviewed By CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Actions (Included in Merit Totals)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reviews/No Change (Included in Merit total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews (As part of another personnel action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series Transfers (Transfer completed as part of merit/promotion case)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agreement between Reviewing Agencies | Cases Submitted - No of Cases | Dean Yes Agencies | Dean + | Dean + | Ad Hoc Yes | Ad Hoc No | Ad Hoc + | Ad Hoc - | CAP Yes | CAP No | CAP + | Final Yes | Final No | Final + |
| <strong>APPOINTMENTS</strong> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Endowed Chair | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Tenured | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tenured | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| TOTAL APPOINTMENTS | 16 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 12 |
| <strong>PROMOTIONS</strong> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Associate Professor/Lecture SOE | 32 | 31 | 1 | 31 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 32 | 0 | 32 |
| Professor/Sr Lecturer SOE | 23 | 23 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| TOTAL PROMOTIONS | 55 | 54 | 1 | 43 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 55 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 55 | 0 | 35 |
| <strong>EXPANDED REVIEW (PREV. NON-Routine) MERITS</strong> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to Professor VI | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 25 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 28 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>24</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to or within Professor Above</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</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>157</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MERITS</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>118</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>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>0</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>16</td>
<td>16</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>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SEARCH WAIVERS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</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>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERs</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>Career Equity Review (CER)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</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>3</td>
<td>0</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>6</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>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RETENTIONS</td>
<td>6</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>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL CASES</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
### TABLE IV Personnel Actions by Division/School, 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown by Personnel Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### APPOINTMENTS - TENURED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### APPOINTMENTS - NON-TENURED (CAP reviewed only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

#### APPOINTMENTS - ENDOWED CHAIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROMOTION TO TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR/SENIOR LECTURER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MERITS (Not including Career Reviews and Retentions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MERIT TO PROF V1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MERIT WITHIN OR ADVANCEMENT TO PROF ABOVE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RETENIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FORMAL APPRAISALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CAREER EQUITY REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MANDATORY REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SERIES TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RECONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TERMINAL APPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SEARCH WAIVERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POST AUDITS OF ROUTINE CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TENTATIVES TO CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>GSED</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Total may be higher or lower than number of personnel actions in Table 1 due to joint appointments in the same division or crossing divisions. CAP usually counts joint appointments as a single case. To give a breakdown by division, joint appointments are counted for each department.

*Accelerations are those in time only.*
Committee on Courses and General Education
Annual Report 2020-2021

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Executive Summary

Purpose (per Bylaw 92): To authorize, supervise, and regulate all undergraduate courses and monitor the General Education Program.

Issues of General Concern to Faculty:

1. CCGE approved 27 General Education (GE) course proposals.
2. CCGE approved 220 associate appointment proposals.
3. CCGE considered 12 proposals to create or renew online courses.

CCGE held 15 regularly scheduled 90-minute meetings during the 2020-21 academic year and consulted as needed with faculty executive committees, academic deans, and other campus administrators. The Committee also benefited from the participation of regular consultants from the Office of the Registrar, the College of Letters and Science Advising office, and the College of Engineering Advising office. The Chair of CCGE met periodically with the Chair of the Undergraduate Council to discuss shared undergraduate concerns.

Recurring Business

Course Requests

CCGE has final approval authority over the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of all undergraduate courses. Individual members are delegated the authority to review and act on course requests via the Master Course Approval (MCA) System, and forward any requests about which they are uncertain for full committee review and final action by the Committee Chair. Several hundred requests are reviewed each year.

CCGE approved 10 online course proposals, all of which were approved for a period of two years. The offering departments may request renewed approval, based on assessment of the effectiveness of the initial offerings. CCGE approved the renewal of 2 online course proposals in perpetuity.

The Committee approved 27 General Education course proposals, denied 1 proposal, and asked for more information from 1 proposal. CCGE also approved 1 course for the UC-wide American History and Institutions requirement.

CCGE reviewed 1 proposal to re-unit an existing undergraduate course.

Associate Appointment Proposals

CCGE reviewed 220 Associate appointment proposals. CCGE approved all of the appointment proposals. In several instances, the Committee Chair contacted the chair of the proposing department to discuss concerns about below-average performance in previous teaching assignments. In some cases, the
Committee Chair requested additional evidence of the candidate’s qualifications and/or recommended individual faculty mentoring.

Campus Proposals and Initiatives

Chemistry and Biochemistry - Proposal for Writing Requirement Clause Retraction
CCGE considered a proposal from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry requesting that the clause “lab reports from chemistry courses will not be considered” be removed from the Writing Requirement Credit Information Sheet. By removing the clause, lab courses offered by the department would be eligible for the Special Subject Writing general education requirement. The Committee unanimously approved the proposal and strongly urged the department to submit general education course proposals for all applicable lab courses.

Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy
CCGE reviewed the Enrollment Task Force Report, which addressed the issue of impacted majors at UCSB and other campus constraints. CCGE recommended that the campus ensure adequate offering and access to General Education courses for students. The Committee also suggested that the Task Force consider ways to incentivizethe development of additional GE courses. CCGE acknowledged the need for enhancements to campus advising resources and supports steps being taken to increase coordination among all campus advising units. CCGE discussed its role in the course approval process, with special attention to online course proposals. The Committee determined that it would be appropriate to revisit the new online course proposal process and consider whether the process could be streamlined. However, it was highlighted that the current guidelines were put in place to promote close examination and ensure that there is a pedagogical advantage to offering the course in an online format. CCGE does not believe that an increased number of online courses will ultimately solve the current impaction issues. Members also voiced concern that an increase in lecturer appointments could promote a two-tier system of faculty. The Committee noted that an expansion of summer sessions could end up being less accessible to students who must work in order to support themselves. Lastly, CCGE was surprised to see little consideration given to thinking about the enrollment problem in terms of its impact on equity, diversity, and inclusion. Members recommended that any proposed changes going forward for implementation be reviewed in terms of EDIA impact.

Priority Registration Reform
CCGE considered a proposal for priority registration reform submitted by Associate Vice Chancellor Jeffrey Stopple and Vice Chancellor Belinda Robnett. The proposal called for the following changes effective Fall quarter 2021:

1. Priority registration will only apply to the first registration pass time.
2. Students matriculating to UCSB as College of Letters & Science Honors and College of Engineering Honors, and continuing students joining those programs will no longer have priority registration. Honors students who belong to a state-mandated priority registration group will retain their registration privileges.
3. Regents Scholars will no longer automatically be awarded priority registration. Regent Scholars who belong to a state-mandated priority registration group will retain their registration privileges.
4. Continuing College of Letters & Science Honors, College of Engineering Honors, and Regents Scholars will retain their priority registration privileges as long as they remain in that designation.
5. Students entering the College of Creative Studies will be granted a version of priority registration analogous to that of returning EAP students.
Members were largely in favor of the report’s recommendations to significantly scale back UCSB’s use of priority registration. They agreed that the current system is inequitable and disproportionately disadvantages underrepresented and first-generation students. However, there was some concern among members that the proposed recommendations would disincentivize talented students from choosing to attend UCSB. The Committee’s vote to approve the priority registration reform was passed with 8 in favor and 1 abstention.

Proposal for Modification to General Education (GE) Program for the College of Engineering
CCGE considered a proposal from the College of Engineering to significantly expand the list of applicable courses that can be used to fulfill the Area A2-English Reading and Composition general education requirement. The Committee fully supported the request and agreed that the change would help reduce enrollment and graduation issues for College of Engineering undergraduate students. CCGE voted unanimously to approve the proposed modification effective Fall quarter 2021. Per the College’s request, the modification also retroactively applied to students pursuing degree programs between the 2015-16 and 2020-2021 catalog years.

**GEOG W 115B Proposal**
CCGE was asked by the College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee to comment on the request to establish GEOG W 115B, a new hybrid course. The L&S FEC noted two significant concerns with the proposal:
1. The instructor’s living situation was listed as a reason for the lecture portion of the course being offered in an online format.
2. While the instructor would teach remotely the teaching assistants would be responsible for the in-person portion of instruction. This could place an undue burden on them.

The Committee agreed that the motive for creating an online course is an important factor that should be considered. Based on the information provided, members called into question the benefit of creating a hybrid version of GEOG 115B. Members were largely under the impression that the request was being made to accommodate an instructor’s particular situation rather than to address a pedagogical issue. CCGE does not feel that the online course approval process should be viewed as an accommodation system.

The Committee also noted concerns about requiring graduate students to teach in-person while the instructor would teach in a fully remote capacity. Chair King highlighted that recent discussions have shown that graduate students have had major workload (and expense) issues associated with instruction during the past year. Considering that graduate student concerns about equity and compensation were already coming to a head prior to the beginning of the pandemic period, CCGE feels that UCSB governing bodies should be particularly careful to give close attention to their issues.

Ultimately, CCGE did not find the proposal acceptable and stated that a more thorough assessment by the department should be conducted. CCGE was also reluctant to set a precedent in which it is approving online courses that follow a model of online distance learning in an emergency situation.

Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity regulation for Title IV Financial Aid
CCGE reviewed a request from an Office of the Registrar and Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships workgroup regarding compliance with the Title IV financial aid regulations. The regulations state that institutions must document that students commenced academic activity in their courses early in the term and adjust financial aid eligibility for those that do not meet the requirements. Therefore, UCOP has requested that all campuses develop a plan that will comply with these financial aid regulations. The report provided examples of models currently being used by UC Davis and UC Merced. The Committee supported the workgroup’s recommendation to implement a system following the model used at UC
Davis, which would require students to complete a low-stakes assignment in GOLD by the census date for each of their courses.

CCGE also took the opportunity to express their support for the creation of a Senate regulation that would require a syllabus be provided in every UCSB course. This would allow the compliance process to be tied to students completing a syllabus assignment for each of their courses. CCGE felt that this type of change would make the task more strongly tied to a true academic assignment.

**Student Petition Concerning the European Traditions Requirement**

CCGE considered a student petition to reimagine the European Traditions Special Subject Area requirement. The proposal calls for the European Traditions requirement to be absorbed by the current World Cultures Special Subject requirement. The Committee submitted a response to UgC that suggested an amendment to the wording of the proposed requirement. However, it was ultimately determined that the proposal was incomplete as it was missing memos from departments that house courses approved for the European Traditions requirement. Therefore, CCGE will revisit the request during the 2021-22 academic year.

**Systemwide Issues**

Along with other Senate councils and committees, members of CCGE were invited to review materials pertaining to the following systemwide issues:

1. Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program
2. Systemwide Review of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force Report
3. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative - Recommendations for Future State
4. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency

**Committee on Courses and General Education Members**

William Davies King, Chair  
Alicia Cast  
Karel Casteels  
Sam Daly  
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Juan Lupi  
Viola Miglio  
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Cheng-Zhong Qin  
Gordon Abra (Non-Senate Academic Representative)  
Rachel Feldman (Graduate Student Representative)

Consultants:  
Scott Kassner, College of Letters and Science  
Haley Orton, College of Engineering  
Anthony Schmid, Office of the Registrar

Analysts:  
Shasta Delp and Vincent Rodriguez
Committee on Diversity and Equity
Annual Report 2020-21

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 Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, 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 2020-21
There were a total of thirteen regularly scheduled meetings of the Committee over the 2020-21 term. Meetings were held via Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic. CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were: 1) working with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel on guidelines for faculty contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statements for tenure and promotion, 2) continuing to liaise with the new Faculty Equity Advisors, 3) building more open lines of communication with Student Affairs and the Graduate Division, 4) maintaining open lines of communication with the Executive Vice Chancellor to help keep DEI issues at the forefront of university initiatives, 5) developing a relationship with and supporting the new Vice Chancellor for DEI (who also serves as ex officio on the committee), 6) continued discussion of faculty search committee diversity training, 7) reviewing systemwide and divisional policy proposals and revisions, 8) discussion of faculty needs in response to the COVID 19 pandemic and related DEI issues and endorsement of UCAADE and UCFW committee letter on this, and 9) continuing the third 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 Susannah Scott. Topics and recommendations are briefly described below.

Reviews of Systemwide UC Issues

Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program
In October, the Committee discussed the proposed systemwide Curtailment Program. Members found many ways this program could have differential, inequitable impacts on campus constituents, many of whom are already underrepresented groups on this campus. Reduced salary would erode retention efforts for faculty members where there is already inequity in pay and morale issues, especially for faculty of color and female faculty members. This program would have substantial impact on both lecturers, who are primarily female and are doing the bulk of the teaching, and new faculty members who have minimal means to offset such pay cuts through accrued vacation time or sabbatical credits. They would essentially receive a pay cut while not being able to reduce their workload. Employees on visas, of which many lecturers are, cannot supplement their income with other work. Finally, staff members who may have used most or all of their accrued vacation time due to COVID-related time off would be forced to take unpaid time off.
The Committee thought that differential tiers should be based on income, not on job title. Employees could be asked to volunteer to give up a portion of salary or time to offset others, and employees could potentially borrow money from the university to help cover expenses, and pay back with a low interest rate. There were concerns that this way of addressing the systemwide and campus deficits would be setting a precedent which does not call for systemwide approval and could easily be used in the future.

In November, the Committee reviewed the proposed revisions to the 700 series of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), covering leave-related policies. These revisions were not meant to address COVID-related issues, but members thought they could help. The general impression was that the policies were being broadened and becoming more inclusive, such as redefining caretakers as more than the child bearers, expanding to gender neutral language, etc.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State
In January, the Committee discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State report. Members thought that it was interesting to be reviewing the report at the time, as UC is discovering how problematic online learning can be, especially for students who do not have access to the necessary resources. It was also expressed that high-demand courses are not a good fit for cross-campus, online instruction; there is no substitute for in-person instruction for introductory courses. Members were generally reluctant to support offering high-demand courses through the online platform, but acknowledged that students would be highly interested in that option. It could be important to get data on the quality of the courses being offered. If high quality, online courses could help supplement student’s education.

Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report
In February, CDE reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report. Members thought that normalizing salary scales to be more equitable and consistent is a good idea in theory, but there were concerns. New salary scales could help prevent equity gaps in pay, but eliminating off-scale salary would remove an important recruitment and retention tool, especially for underrepresented faculty. Less transparent, “back-door” deals would likely start occurring to try to recruit or retain exceptional faculty. The Committee thought that calibrating salaries could be done, but perhaps with off-scale kept as a tool in certain situations. Cost of living and housing costs should be explicitly addressed in salary scales, as current scales are quite disproportionate with high living expenses in many areas with UC campuses. Salary scales should not be uniform across all campuses. This disproportion also impacts some faculty more than others, with the most impacted being early career faculty, those with children and childcare needs, and underrepresented faculty or anyone who may have more debt and less wealth, which limits where they can accept a position and afford to live.

UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials
In February, CDE discussed the draft UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials policy, viewing it through the lens of possible diversity and equity concerns. Members stated that there is a need for protections for experiments with communities of color so that subjects feel comfortable, and human research protocols should be stated within the policy. There were concerns about power differentials, especially between graduate and postdoctoral students and faculty members. It should be made more clear what it means that data stays at UCSB until the student leaves. Implicit biases can
influence these decisions, affecting underrepresented minority students at a greater rate, so this should be explicitly spelled out.

**Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures**
In April, CDE discussed the Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures. Members appreciated the distribution of these “Gold Book” revisions, but did not feel like they had nearly enough context and background information. CDE was very concerned that these policy revisions seem to be in direct conflict with previous UC President Napolitano’s recommendations to substantially defund UC police. Some of the questions and concerns that arose included why retired officers are allowed to conceal carry; if UCSB is considered a public space in regards to policing; what are specific local policies; and what public accountability measures are there? There is a lack of discussion about officer training, especially around diversity issues and implicit bias. The Committee found it concerning that turning body worn cameras on and off is at the discretion of the police officer. Nothing seemed obligatory in the policy.

**Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency**
In April, the Committee discussed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency. The revision allows for taking courses to mean more than physical presence on a campus. Members found this would allow for more flexibility, and allow for more remote learning options in the future. Some members did not think the proposed language actually clarifies what the Regulation is trying to say and suggested that saying no physical presence required would be more straightforward.

**Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation**
In April, CDE discussed the systemwide review of proposed Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation. The Committee saw a prior version of this policy last year. Members found that the lack of background information made it difficult to provide relevant comments. Members wanted to know which tribes have been asked for input, what objects and remains UCSB specifically has, what the process for repatriating human remains will be, and who our campus contacts are.

**SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy**
In May, the Committee reviewed the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy. Members wondered who would be responsible for enforcing the vaccination mandate and other guidelines such as face coverings or social distancing, and what system would be in place to report vaccination records. There was concern that faculty and graduate students would have to trust that students in their classes have been vaccinated, especially if records are to be kept confidential. There were concerns that the exception policy seems vague, and could open the door for exceptions to be granted for almost any reason. Members also thought that there could be negative impacts of the mandate on communities of color, which have been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19, and that profiling could occur regarding perceptions of who may have received the vaccine or not. There was also the concern about biases against international students, especially from countries that are experiencing high levels of COVID-19. What accommodations there will be for students who do not receive the vaccine were not explained.

**UC Health Participation in Activities Under the End of Life Option Act**
In June, CDE discussed the proposed UC Health Participation in Activities under the End of Life Option Act. Members supported the inclusivity of UC Health’s option to not “opt out.” Members had questions
about the legality of this act, the larger context with faculty members’ own health providers, and choice, especially in smaller communities with less health care options. There are potential access issues if all employees at a certain provider location individually opt out of participating in the End of Life Option. Members also discussed wanting to see more information about the broader context for this policy.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy - Fee Policy for Graduate Student In Absentia Registration
The Committee electronically reviewed the Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy - Fee Policy for Graduate Student in Absentia Registration. Members saw this change as opening up accessibility and flexibility for students, especially given the high cost of living in the Santa Barbara area. This change would also help students grappling with delayed research due to COVID-19.

Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan
The Committee received the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan too late to include on the agenda for its final meeting of the year. Members received the draft plan electronically and were given the opportunity to submit comments. Members requested more information to justify this particular configuration of a safety plan, as well as more details about oversight and accountability to prevent potential abuses of response services. Members questioned how the proposed plan reflects what has been or has not been done at UC. Members also suggested that a historical perspective, such as a transparent timeline, on previous and current practices at UC could provide insight into the significance of this proposal.

Reviews of Campus Issues

Faculty Diversity Award
In Fall quarter, the Committee reviewed the Faculty Diversity Award, which was entering its third year. The past two awards cycles, CDE members have encouraged having more than one award. Chair Morgan met with Senate Chair Susannah Scott, who was supportive of creating two awards with separate criteria (for example, early career and later career; or community work and campus work, etc.). However, the Committee was unable to draft a proposal in time for this year’s award cycle; this can be re-visited next year. Members discussed publicizing the award more, and asking VC DEI Robnett’s office for assistance. The selection committee would review the scoring rubric before nominee packets are submitted in the Winter quarter. The committee decided to address this proposal early next year, circumstances permitting.

Committee on Diversity and Equity Bylaws Revision
In October, the Committee reviewed a revision to the CDE Bylaw, adding the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as an ex-officio member. Members voted unanimously to approve this addition.

Discussions with Divisional Senate Chair Susannah Scott
In October, Divisional Chair Susannah Scott joined CDE for a discussion about diversity issues. Chair Morgan has also been appointed a Senate Vice Chair with a portfolio of diversity and equity issues. Chair Scott feels like it is a transitional time for the Senate and that there are important course corrections to be made. CDE may not have been heard enough in the past, and it is time for that to change. While there are many pockets of people doing diversity work on campus, there is very little coordination of efforts which complicates the work. Hopefully the new Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, in collaboration with CDE, can lead this coordination.
The campus is facing many challenges around diversity and equity. With the elimination of standardized test scores, a new review process for undergraduate admissions has to be created. ESCIs and the entire merit and promotion system need to be re-designed. Faculty hiring will be slow for some time due to the budget, and initiatives to hire more broadly across campus should be pursued. There is much discussion about what role campus police should have. The pandemic is having a disproportionate impact on different economic and racial populations; the effects of this will be with us for years. Chair Scott and the Committee also discussed the budget and the proposed curtailment program.

Chair Scott returned to the Committee in May. The Committee asked what had happened with the proposed revisions to the UC Police Gold Book. President Drake is not in favor of abolishing UC Police, as it would then push external police forces onto campuses much more. UC Police should be reformed. The Committee discussed the campus Police Advisory Board, and that it does not have decision-making power or a budget, and wondered if the UC Police union had been involved in discussions. The Committee also asked about the curtailment program, which did not materialize. Chair Scott stated that the Senate thinks that decentralization has gone too far. Chair Scott wanted to know what impacts the new diversity trainings that the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are having, and how much intent faculty have in seeing the administration put resources behind these. Chair Scott also mentioned that she would like this Committee to think of one big issue it would like to pursue next year. The Committee responded to Chair Scott that diversity training for faculty search committees would be one, as well as continued work on DEI statements for faculty tenure and promotion statements.

Discussion with Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Belinda Robnett
In November, the Committee was joined by Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Belinda Robnett, who also now serves ex officio on CDE. AVC Robnett discussed various initiatives she is undertaking and issues she is addressing, such as the devastating impact of COVID-19 on women. Productivity is plummeting for women academics. A primary reason is due to the disproportionate burden of caregiving women face, whether it is childcare or elder care. Stop the Clock and parental leave policies can actually exacerbate inequalities. There is also a childcare crisis on the UCSB campus. VC Robnett is convening a gender and COVID-19 faculty task force which will work closely with other campus constituents such as the Senate and new AVC for Academic Personnel. The task force will look at what other campuses do and come up with ways to combat gender equity pay and childcare issues, with a goal to dispense this information to Deans and units.

VC Robnett is planning to hire a team on a workshop-by-workshop basis to work with individual departments on anti-bias, racism and equity training. Department diversity, equity and inclusion committees (where they exist) will work with this team, as well as Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors and department diversity officers. VC Robnett is hoping to get her Thriving in the Academy programs off the ground. There will be programs for underrepresented minority and first generation faculty, staff and graduate students. The goal of these programs is to create a cohort effect and sense of community for these populations. VC Robnett has all of the individuals who will serve on the Campus Climate Survey Committee. The members will break into groups based on population (faculty, staff, graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, and undergraduate students) to work on questions for the survey.

Discussion with Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall
In November, the Committee was joined by Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall. EVC Marshall gave an overview of diversity efforts in Academic Affairs and across the campus. Faculty recruitment efforts
are a work in progress. UCPath does not provide great data, and it is difficult to determine
underrepresented minority applicants, so results might be better than they look. Female faculty
numbers are getting better, and there is an opportunity for renewal as younger faculty are recruited.
The EVC’s Faculty Diversity Enrichment Awards, which provide extra start-up funds, have greatly
increased; there were 20 this year, and all Deans were able to present candidates. It is going to be tough
to make progress with faculty diversity hiring with the current budget restraints and fewer positions.

Diversity statements are now required for hiring for faculty positions. It is important that search
committees and departments have time to think about how to read and interpret the statements. The
Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors are working to design the overall components, and the VC DEI is
trying to get more staff to help with training. The goal is to create consistency and best practices. Other
continuing efforts include interdisciplinary approaches to and conversations about anti-Black racism,
Advancing Faculty Diversity grants with funding from UCOP, and Student Success grants, focusing on the
most vulnerable students. The EVC is consulting about using the next cluster of Mellichamp Chairs
around diversity efforts. The EVC sent a memo in October about taking COVID impacts into account for
merit case reviews. A task force is being appointed to follow up on the Senate report on ESCIs, which
highlights the implicit biases of teaching evaluations in their current form. The impact of COVID on
research has been great, and female faculty have been disproportionately affected, especially as
childcare falls more heavily on this population.

Chair Morgan explained the Committee’s idea for creating one large group that would be appraised of
all diversity efforts happening on campus. EVC Marshall agreed that there needs to be more coherence
and leveraging of efforts going on. EVC Marshall is also concerned about reduction in graduate student
support. Some departments will likely be admitting fewer graduate students, which will lead to less
teaching assistants.

**Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy**
In November, CDE discussed the Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment
Strategy. Members agreed that there are a lot of recommendations in a wide swath of areas, such as
curriculum, advising, technology and policy. Many of these recommendations would be specific to
underrepresented minority and first generation students. Many inefficiencies occur because these
students do not understand university policies and practices. Members supported the bootcamp idea,
and suggested that it would be helpful to have data on the race and ethnicity makeup of overenrolled
programs. Over-enrollment issues seem to be disproportionately affecting first generation students.
Multiple members expressed concern about the ability to implement any of these proposed actions due
to the current state of the university finances.

**Discussion with Student Affairs**
In November, CDE was joined by Assistant Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Life Katya Armistead,
and Coordinator of Equity and Inclusion Enn Burke, to provide the Committee updates on activities
happening in Student Affairs. The Campus Community Council is working on areas of diversity, equity
and inclusion. Armenian students have been asking how the university is responding to the
Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict. Student Affairs was prepared for the 2020 presidential election; since the
outcome was not determined right away, any immediate action was diffused. Mental health is still a big
concern for students. All incoming first year students now need to complete an online module on
mental health. The search for a new Director of the Multicultural Center is underway. There have been
conversations with Chinese international students, who are experiencing increased xenophobia. Student
Affairs is working on assessing bias reporting so that students feel more comfortable. There is increasing
knowledge around anti-Black racism. GauchoFYI has a revised diversity, equity and inclusion component, and anti-Black racism is used for examples of institutional and systemic racism. AVC Armistead is working with VC DEI Robnett on the climate survey. Members had a variety of questions, including how student engagement in activities is gauged while remote and what students need from faculty.

**Discussion with Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors**
In January, CDE was joined by Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs) Sarah Anderson (Bren School), Julie Carlson (Division of Humanities and Fine Arts), Diane Fujino (Division of Social Sciences), Leroy Laverman (College of Creative Studies), and Joan-Emma Shea (Division of Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences). The FEAs meet every other week as a group. They collectively work on documents, policies and shared initiatives. They meet monthly with the Deans and are hoping to also have monthly meetings with VC DEI Robnett. The work could be better done if coordinated.

Last year, the FEAs spent a lot of time discussing faculty recruitment, such as best practices and getting people on board with requiring diversity statements, then working on how to write and evaluate these. Since this past spring, the focus has been more on student issues due to the effects of COVID-19 and the Black Lives Matter movement. There has been a lot of movement in campus leadership positions affecting diversity work. Each Division has its own needs that the FEAs focus on. The FEAs are looking forward to getting results from consistent climate surveys; the campus will be able to see the places where there are common problems. CDE shared their efforts in the area of faculty DEI statements.

**Discussion with Committee on Academic Personnel Chair Ruth Finkelstein**
In January, CDE was joined by Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) Chair Ruth Finkelstein and Analyst Jackie Grossberg. Chair Finkelstein explained that diversity is not its own criteria in the academic personnel review process, but can span all four criteria. CAP will give an enhancement to a specific area if diversity work is shown, or an overall enhancement if achievement is found throughout a record. Nothing can be taken away from a personnel review if diversity work is not found. Examples of exceptional diversity work could include extensive mentoring of first generation students or developing programs and outreach activities for underrepresented minority students. CDE shared that it has been concerned about hidden workload, specifically for women and underrepresented faculty members, and worked with the previous CAP chair to expand Red Binder language about the optional diversity statements.

Inequities among faculty members are being exacerbated by COVID-19, particularly impacting female, underrepresented and junior faculty. By the end of this past summer, administration said that impact statements would be allowed with academic personnel cases. Department chairs have been encouraged to be proactive in finding ways they can rearrange workloads for those hit the hardest, and not to penalize faculty needing some release time. CDE members expressed concern about the power differential inherent in junior faculty asking chairs for accommodations, and that impact statements may actually cause more of a burden for already heavily impacted faculty.

Chair Finkelstein explained that the new Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, Dana Mastro, is trying to come up with creative solutions and ways to create flexibility within the personnel review process. All junior faculty are allowed to defer one year of the tenure clock due to COVID, without having to explain their situation in detail. However, there are salary and career trajectory implications with stopping the clock. ESCIs have been found to be deeply flawed, and a committee is being formed to overhaul them. CAP is trying to deemphasize them as much as possible. CDE will
continue working on improving suggestions and language for DEI considerations in merit and promotion cases, to expand upon what was done last year with then CAP Chair Mastro.

**Priority Registration Reform**
In February, the Committee discussed the proposal for priority registration reform. AVC Stopple met with CDE last year to discuss this planned proposal, and has been working on reforms to the registration process for some time. AVC Stopple also met with Deans and VCDEI Robnett, who co-authored the proposal. Members recognize that the current priority registration system has resulted in inequities, specifically for underrepresented and first-generation students, many of whom face an inability to register for needed courses causing some to drop out of UCSB.

Members questioned what impacts on recruitment these changes will have; if there are any planned changes to DSP students who receive accommodations; and why College of Creative Studies (CCS) students would still retain priority registration, when College of Engineering and College of Letters and Science honors students would not. Overall, the Committee thought these changes make sense from an equity standpoint, and would have a positive impact on underrepresented and first-generation populations. Members would like to see more data on the priority registration process at the other UC campuses, and worried this proposal would get pushback from other corners.

**Diversity Statements/Hidden Workload**
Throughout the year, CDE discussed faculty hiring diversity statements as well as hidden workload by minoritized faculty as a huge DEI issue that needs to be addressed on campus. In November, the Committee reviewed the Statements of Inclusive Excellence webpage. Much of the language on this website was taken from existing Academic Personnel policy. CDE has had ongoing discussions with the EVC, as well as the Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs), about the need for this type of information. However, the Senate was not asked to formally review this webpage. Ideas for additional information included defining diversity and explaining which groups are underrepresented; using “marginalized” instead of “underrepresented”; putting more emphasis on plans for the future in diversity statements; what being a land-grant institution really means for hiring and retention of specific populations; and ways for assistant professor applicants to show diversity experiences outside of academia.

Also in November, CDE discussed the possible creation of a diversity, equity and inclusion executive committee. This committee could act as a clearinghouse for all diversity efforts on campus. The committee would not necessarily be a decision-making body, but used to inform the campus of diversity efforts. The Committee also examined the idea of separating the three aspects of DEI (diversity, equity and inclusion) and having groups that focus on each specific area. Some DEI issues, like salary equity, are not being discussed as much. There is also concern that another group would just involve more talking and no action. In consultation with AVC Robnett, Chair Morgan found out she was organizing such a committee.

At February meetings, the Committee continued discussing diversity statements for personnel cases. A recurring issue that CDE keeps coming back to is the idea that if something is within a faculty member’s area of study, they do not receive diversity credit, and thus faculty are not being recognized for this important work. However, faculty members engaged in this work are disproportionately working and mentoring underrepresented and first-generation students. There are mixed messages across divisions and departments about how to present diversity work in personnel cases. Faculty are unsure how to represent the work they are doing, and do not know if it will be recognized or not. Examples could help
clarify the types of work CAP is looking for. Deans should play a critical role; having no “teeth” to diversity contributions or a lack thereof has always been problematic when seeking reward for this work.

The Committee also examined hidden workload. Research shows that female faculty and faculty of color are called on more for emotional labor and to serve as mentors for underrepresented students. This hidden workload is beginning to be recognized more by other universities as part of what takes faculty members time and how they make contributions. CDE had the go-ahead from AVC of Academic Personnel Mastro to draft a proposal about diversity statements. Chair Morgan circulated a Berkeley letter regarding diversity statements. UC Berkeley concluded that a rubric would not be the best idea, and examples should come in a more narrative form. Members agreed that faculty are often unsure of what to include in their statements, and liked the idea of breaking out research, teaching and service as far as guidance for diversity contributions as well as providing short scenarios or examples for each category (though not a template). Members provided examples of service work such as serving as a mentor for the McNair Scholars Program, working with ONDAS, EOP, Educational Partnerships or affinity groups, participating in Faculty Nights, and UCSB-HBCU partnerships.

Members are still frustrated that they cannot get data from CAP about how many faculty are awarded diversity credit in promotions, and for what, and who submits a diversity statement and does not receive any monetary reward for diversity-related endeavors. Since diversity work is not its own category, the system cannot currently track this kind of information. Members wondered if there could be a way to ask for redacted DEI statements for promotion cases with the consent of the authors. More guidance is needed for departments (chairs and deans) so that faculty have more help with what to write. It was also suggested to try to get a sense of what students think is good diversity work; students can definitely hold departments accountable. A multi-pronged approach to provide information to faculty members and Deans, along with a more formal policy on diversity statements for CAP to implement, might work best.

Spring quarter, the Committee continued working on their draft letter addressing these issues. Members discussed wanting to also highlight diversity of thought (which has always been allowed in the UC system), and diversity, especially as it relates to historically oppressed groups. Members discussed defining diversity, equity and inclusion, and saying more forcefully that the Committee thinks that DEI statements should be required as part of personnel cases. This letter was sent to Academic Personnel as a potential start of a conversation about a more formal revision process.

**Discussion with Graduate Division**

In April, CDE was joined by Robert Hamm, Assistant Graduate Dean and Carlos Nash, Director of Diversity Programs, from Graduate Division. Director Nash presented slides on the myriad diversity initiatives Graduate Division has undertaken. A diversity strategic plan was drafted in 2016 by former Graduate Dean Carol Genetti, which laid out ways to support diversity in graduate education by: providing information and resources; starting discussions with Graduate Council and the Committee on Academic Personnel about mentoring; establishing graduate diversity officers; holding annual information sessions with Graduate Program advisors and diversity officers; increasing resources for recruitment; and establishing the Graduate Scholars Program. Virtual recruitment this past fall was a great way to reach demographics that Graduate Division was unable to reach before. A diversity and inclusion GauchoSpace site is open to all faculty. Graduate Division Academic Counselor Ryan Sims helps students with time management, conflicts, imposter syndrome, and counseling and psychological services. There is also financial support such as the Social Justice Fellowship, which is a top-off
fellowship for students whose research is around, or they are active in, social justice issues, as well as the diversity augment block grant.

Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid
In June, the Committee discussed the Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid. Members found the UC Davis model to perhaps be a bit too superficial, but the most practical. Members suggested that perhaps students could indicate that they had read the course syllabus rather than the student code of conduct, or that attendance could potentially be taken for every course, if discussion section attendance could be taken for large lectures. This will also be one more thing that students have to do, which could be a burden especially for students facing a hardship during the beginning of the quarter. All students do not have their schedules finalized within the first 15 days; what happens if a student is added to or drops a course after 15 days?

Student Petition Concerning the European Traditions Requirement
In June, CDE discussed the student petition requesting elimination of the European Traditions Requirement. Many faculty and students see this requirement as outdated and many graduate students support this proposed change. Members offered their support in eliminating this requirement to change this Eurocentric centering of history and not force students to take a course in European traditions. However, the Committee found the proposed language change unclear, as it appeared that there are two possible ways to change the requirement: have students take any two courses within the World Cultures area or have students take courses from two different cultures. The first option seems like it would make it possible for some students to take two European focused courses and never take a course in a different culture. The second option would require “different” cultures to be defined, and would be difficult to administer.

CDE Chair Work
Chair Morgan was involved with numerous campus initiatives, which supported the work of the committee, including:

- Served as UCSB Representative on the systemwide University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE)
- Met with Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors around their current initiatives
- Served on UCSB Action Collaborative Task Force
- Served on the Academic Senate Executive Council
- Served on Gender and COVID Committee organized by VC Robnett
- Served on VC Robnett’s advisory DEI Executive Board
- Served on “Ramping Up Research” committee
- Attended Crossing Latinidades Consortium meetings
- Served on Mellichamp Award Selection Committee (this year focused on race issues)

Pending Issues for CDE in 2021-22
- Continuing discussions with Academic Personnel about faculty diversity statements and hidden workload resulting in better guidance and recognition for faculty.
- Continue examining the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty, especially underrepresented individuals, women, and caregivers.
- Continuing to expand collaboration with other campus entities doing diversity work, and working with VC of DEI Robnett on campus initiatives.
• Working with UCSB’s Faculty Welfare committee and Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (CACSW) to address disparities in leave policies for child bearing and parenting (which has a great impact on faculty retention).

Members 2020-21
Melissa L. Morgan, Chair, UCAADE Rep Professor, Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology
Jean Beaman Associate Professor, Sociology
Irene Beyerlein Professor, Mechanical Engineering/Materials
Miroslava Chavez-Garcia Professor, History
Mhoze Chikowero Associate Professor, History
Laurie Freeman Associate Professor, Political Science
Philip Lubin Professor, Physics
Jason Marden Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Christopher McAuley Associate Professor, Black Studies
Peng Oh Professor, Physics
Tara Tober, Non-Senate Sociology
Academic Rep
Ricardo Alcaino, Ex Officio Director, Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention Office
Ariana Alvarez, Ex Officio Director, Title IX & Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Office
Belinda Robnett, Ex Officio Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Jordan Tudisco, GSA Rep
Jocelyn Tapia, Undergraduate Student Rep
Kelly Rivera, Advisor
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, but this year there were three committee meetings held via Zoom. The committee and Senate staff processed the following proposals during 2020-21.

**Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544 - Cross-Campus Enrollment**
RJE discussed proposed revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544 – Cross-Campus Enrollments, which would facilitate student access to courses on other UC campuses. RJE approved of the changes, but suggested that the his/her language be changed to gender neutral terminology.

**Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 630 - Senior Residency Requirement**
RJE discussed the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 630 – Senior Residency Requirement, which has been confusing and interpreted differently across campuses. The proposed changes would simplify the regulation and clarify that students need to satisfy the majority of their upper division coursework through their home campus. RJE approved of the changes.

**Divisional Bylaw 95: Committee on Diversity and Equity**
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. The Committee on Diversity and Equity unanimously approved this change. RJE approved of this ex officio addition. The Faculty Legislature approved the revision at its meeting of October 22, 2020.

**Divisional Bylaw 100: Committee on International Education**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Bylaw 100: Committee on International Education (CIE), which had been approved by CIE. Changes included adding the Director of the Education Abroad Program as an ex officio member (this has been practice for years but has not been in the bylaw), removing the last line of the Membership section, as this is not in practice, and removing the line about Graduate and Undergraduate Councils in C-3. RJE approved of these changes. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of March 11, 2021.

**Divisional Regulation 335: Requirements for the Master of Environmental Data Science (M.E.D.S.)**
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 M.E.D.S. degree was not reviewed and approved at that time. RJE found the new Regulation 335 to be similar to and in compliance with the other Master’s degree regulations, and approved its addition to Santa Barbara Division Regulations. The Faculty Legislature approved the new regulation at its meeting of October 22, 2020.

**Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 610 – Defining Residency, which would codify a more liberal interpretation of campus residency by not restricting residency to mean physical...
presence on a campus. RJE supported these changes

**Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Bylaw 336.F.3**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336.F.3, which would add language about now required hearings at the Title IX phase for cases involving SVSH. RJE found the changes to be consistent with the UC principles of shared governance. RJE did find some of the wording in the proposed language confusing, and provided suggested re-wording.

**SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy**
RJE reviewed the proposed SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy. Overall, RJE supported the vaccination policy, but questioned how compliance would be verified. In addition, some members of the committee expressed concern that the possibility of requiring repeat vaccinations or boosters into the indefinite future may be too far reaching, and that it might be better to formulate the current proposal as being of finite duration. Such a policy could be amended or extended at a later time.

**Student Petition Concerning the European Traditions Requirement**
RJE reviewed the student petition concerning the European Traditions requirement. Some members voiced their support for the change, while one member stated that they could not support the change without a principled reason for it. RJE did think that the current wording seemed ambiguous. In particular, it should be made very clear whether the new version of Divisional Senate Regulation 185 will require one course or two in the history, thought, and practices of one or more world cultures, and whether there will be a requirement to include two different cultures or whether one will suffice.

**Undergraduate Academic Policy During COVID-19**
RJE was asked to weigh in on undergraduate academic policy during COVID-19. The Undergraduate Council put policies in place for winter, spring, and summer 2021 to support students struggling with the conditions of the pandemic. These policy adjustments included extending the grading option deadline, allowing departments to offer major and pre-major courses with optional grading, exempting passed units earned during this time period to count towards the University Letter Grade Requirement, and permitting students on academic probation to take courses Passed/Not Passed (P/NP).

Divisional Regulation 35 details provisions of P/NP grading. Last spring, RJE agreed that one-time waivers to Regulation 35 restrictions could be made. RJE suggested that emergency actions could be taken for winter 2021, but that actions for further quarters should be taken to the Faculty Legislature to discuss and vote upon.

**Senate Manual Revisions**
RJE held two meetings with the Senate staff policy workgroup to discuss 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. Some Bylaw revisions were to be sent to Faculty Legislature for final approval, including:

**Divisional Bylaw 35: Councils and Committees**
RJE reviewed a proposed modification to Divisional Bylaw 35:F: Councils and Committees. Language would be added to state that Senate council and committee members cannot “hold any administrative appointment of department chair or higher”. RJE saw no conflicts between this proposed change and other bylaws. The committee members supported codifying long-standing practices and specifically supported the principle of avoiding conflicts of interest
between agents of the administration and agents of the faculty. However, some RJE members wondered whether department chairs should occasionally be allowed to serve. The Faculty Legislature approved the revision at its meeting of April 29, 2021.

**Divisional Bylaw 50: Executive Council**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Bylaw 50: Executive Council, which had been approved by the Council. Changes included updating the Purpose, making Membership consistent with other Council bylaws, and having Duties more accurately reflect current practice. RJE approved of these changes. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of June 3, 2021.

**Divisional Bylaw 60: Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Bylaw 60: Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards, which had been approved by CFW. Changes included making Membership consistent with other Council bylaws, removing the Executive Committee which is not an active subcommittee, updating and adding all Senate Award subcommittees which have been operating for many years, and having Duties more accurately reflect current practice. RJE approved of these changes. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of June 3, 2021.

**Divisional Bylaw 75: Graduate Council**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Bylaw 75: Graduate Council, which had been approved by GC. Changes included making Membership consistent with other Council bylaws, removing all standing subcommittees which have not met for at least the previous decade, and having Duties more accurately reflect current practice. RJE approved of these changes. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of June 3, 2021.

**Divisional Bylaw 170: Meetings of the Division and Divisional Bylaw 180: Order of Business**
RJE reviewed the proposed revisions to Bylaw 170: Meetings of the Division and Bylaw 180: Order of Business. Changes included clarifying the procedures for special and emergency meetings, removing the word “disability” and simply stating “absence” for when the Senate Chair is not present, and bringing Bylaw 180:B:1 in line with current practice for approving minutes. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of January 14, 2021.

**2020-21 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 three Senate Assembly Representatives, and three members of the Committee on Committees.

*Senate Assembly Representatives*
A total of three 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. Chuck Akemann of Mathematics and Elizabeth Perez of Religious Studies received the requisite number of endorsements and were appointed to serve as Senate Assembly Representatives. The Committee on Committees filled the remaining open position.

*Committee on Committees*
A total of thirteen Senate members were nominated to serve on the Committee on Committees; seven candidates declined to accept.
A total of two candidates were nominated for Area A: College of Letters and Science Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences Division and Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management. As there were two nominees for one available position, a ballot was conducted from February 17 - March 3, 2021, with the following results:

Alison Butler (Chemistry and Biochemistry) - 51.92% (54 votes)
Patricia Holden (Bren School of Environmental Science and Management) - 47.12% (49 votes)

Alison Butler received the most votes for Area A: College of Letters and Science Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences Division and Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management.

A total of four candidates were nominated for Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies. As there were four nominees for one available position, a ballot was conducted from February 17 - March 3, 2021, with the following results:

Anthony Barbieri (History) - 10.78% (11 votes)
Antonio Cortijo (Spanish and Portuguese) - 10.78% (11 votes)
Kate L. McDonald (History) - 49.02% (50 votes)
Greg Siegel (Film and Media Studies) - 29.41% (30 votes)

Kate L. McDonald received the most votes for Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies.

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

**RJE Members, 2020-21**

**Don Marolf, Chair**
Professor, Physics

**Hugo Loaiciga, Parliamentarian**
Professor, Geography

**Glenn Fredrickson**
Professor, Chemical Engineering

**Ruth Hellier**
Professor, Music

**Ross Melnick**
Associate Professor, Film & Media Studies

**David Sherman**
Professor, Psychological & Brain Sciences

**Eric Smith**
Professor, Political Science

**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 responded to many issues concerning faculty welfare, many of which resulted from or were amplified by the Covid-19 pandemic. Members participated in extensive faculty outreach including town hall meetings and remote social hours and consultations.
- The Committee on Academic Freedom created a document, to be shared online, for UCSB faculty with links to resources for navigating issues of academic freedom.
- CFW subcommittees presented 14 awards in recognition of outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and mentorship; awards were presented remotely for the second consecutive year due to the pandemic.

Council and Committee Meetings

CFW held ten regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year, all 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.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program

CFW members did not feel they received sufficient information to adequately assess the proposed curtailment program and consequently could not determine whether to support it. They commended the tiered approach that required larger sacrifices from those at higher pay levels, but had questions about how the proposed actions would impact health and retirement benefits. They also wanted additional details related to the systemwide budget shortfall, plans for revenue sharing across the campuses and UCOP, and whether other approaches to address the shortfall had been considered.


The Council appreciated efforts to revise language and policies related to reproductive health and family formation in ways that are more equitable and inclusive, though they recommended more generous periods of leave for Childbearing and Childrearing, consistent with norms in other countries. They identified various questions about definitions related to “leave.”

Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

CFW members appreciated the Report’s call for greater transparency in salary scales, but they wanted more detail about how new salary scales would be implemented. They felt the report did not adequately address issues related to retention offers that would inevitably distort the new scales. They had questions about perceived penalties or rewards related to “loyalty,” and also sought further clarification of “market rates,” in particular whether their emphasis in determining salary scales might work to undermine efforts to remedy structural inequalities. The council also felt that further discussions of housing, and cost of living inequity across the UC system were warranted, and that these issues constitute a higher priority than dismantling the off-scale system.
UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials
CFW members emphasized the significant infrastructure required to support the requirements outlined in the Tangible Research Materials proposal, and the lack of designated university responsibility, potentially resulting in unreasonable burdens for research faculty. They noted the potential conflicts that this proposal poses for privacy controls inherent in human subject populations and in general rejected this policy as being inappropriate for application in the humanities and social sciences. They wanted greater clarification of “ownership” and protections against restrictions to data access and use, as well as use of personal devices.

Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures
CFW found the proposed police policy amendments deeply flawed and out of step with current trends of considering non-armed, non-police services to address issues of safety and security. They found many aspects of the proposed policies to be disturbing, including but not limited to the lengthy exceptions to body worn video cameras, concealed carry ability for retired UCPD officers, the existence of a UC police Systemwide Response Team, and various aspects of the Use of Force prescriptions. They had significant concerns about the trajectory of the policy, including the transparency in its development and whether adequate stakeholder consultation occurred.

Revisions to SVSH Frameworks for Faculty
CFW filed a response that not enough time was given for adequate review.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Bylaw 336.F.3
Although CFW members found the proposed revision understandable in its goal of reducing redundancy, they ultimately opined that Title IX and Privilege and Tenure hearings serve different purposes and thus should continue to be conducted separately. They affirmed the right of accused faculty to receive a hearing before their peers.

SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy
Most CFW members supported the proposed mandatory vaccination policy and expressed that they would not be comfortable teaching or working on campus without it. However, a few members had significant concerns or objected to the mandate outright, due to the possibility of possible stigmatization or discriminatory effects and the unknown long term effects of vaccines that currently only have emergency approval status from the FDA. Members had questions about enforcement, boosters, and tracking/reporting of adverse events.

UC Health Participation in Activities under the End of Life Option Act
Members unanimously agreed that people in all areas should have access to the appropriate resources to exercise their rights under the End of Life Option Act. They emphasized the policy should ensure that patients do not face undue burdens or costs associated with this decision, which should be guaranteed by the University of California.

Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan
CFW had difficulty assessing the draft plan in the absence of a Presidential response to its earlier comments on Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures. Many of the proposed revisions in the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan seemingly contradict the earlier policy, which was firmly rejected by the council. Although members generally found this plan preferable in its emphasis on social services and mental health, they were still concerned by vague language obscuring whether the intent is to expand or reduce police presence, as well as plans to seemingly deputize existing non-police staff, with no mention of additional resources other than a new position at UCOP to coordinate among the campuses. Moreover, the review request was received on the day of the last council meeting, robbing the council of an opportunity for robust discussion; the Council reiterated its request for an appropriate review period.

Local Business

Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy
Members commented on the report via email due to the cancelation of the monthly meeting on January 6,
2021 at some members’ request, due to troubling events in Washington DC. There were questions about what constitutes optimum enrollment on campus and whether UCSB has the financial resources to meet the recommended advisor to student ratios. The council expressed concerns about consistency across departments and disciplines with regard to capping certain majors, as well as how the report’s results/recommendations would hold up in light of the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.

**Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid**

CFW agreed with the recommendation of the workgroup to emulate the model adopted by UC Davis. This will require students to indicate acceptance of the Code of Conduct for each of their courses electronically, which will be recorded and reported to the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships for the purpose of verifying aid eligibility.

**Committee on Academic Freedom**

The Committee on Academic Freedom met once in both Fall and Spring quarters. They focused on defining the identity and goals of the committee, and investigated possible collaborations or overlaps with the Senate’s Privilege and Tenure Committee. In fall quarter, they identified goals of creating a Senate email address as well as a resource document to be disseminated for faculty use.

The committee discussed the university’s use of Zoom and other corporate platforms, and resultant concerns regarding the platforms’ limitations of use, including canceling events, and encroachment upon academic freedom protections. A resource document was created to provide guidance on common academic freedom questions, based on a template produced by UC Davis, and approved by CFW for publication on the Senate website.

**Committee on Emeriti and Retirement**

The Committee on Emeriti and Retirement met in Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters. Additionally, the Chair and Analyst met several times with the President and Vice President of the Emeriti Association, as well as other university leadership to discuss ongoing challenges faced by emeriti and the lack of support they receive on campus navigating the retirement process. The members reviewed the different structures of emeriti resources on the other UC campuses; while all campuses appear to provide minimal campus-based support in favor of systemwide resources, such as RASC and UCRAYS, UCSB ranks near the bottom in terms of providing information and contacts. The committee identified several possibilities for increasing support and CFW is escalating the issue with EVC Marshall.

**Senate Awards**

CFW made no significant changes to the awards guidelines for the 2020-21 year.

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

Notably, nearly every category received more nominations this year than the year prior (except the Faculty Research Lecturer, which received no new nominations). Additional advertising was done to preempt a potential drop in nominations related to pandemic burnout. The Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer recommends expanded outreach early in the coming year to department chairs to promote nominations for FRL in conjunction with the submission of merit review packets, based on the rationale that the content of these packets has the potential for significant overlap, thus minimizing the burden of submitting a FRL nomination.
No new nominations were received for FRL in 2020-21; nominations carried forward from previous years.

The winners were announced at the Faculty Legislature meeting of April 29, 2021 (via Zoom). They are as follows:

**Distinguished Teaching Award (DTA)** – Walid Afifi (Communication); Summer Gray (Environmental Studies); Yogananda Isukapalli (Electrical & Computer Engineering); Andy Merolla (Communication); Madeleine Sorapure (Writing Program); David Walker (Religious Studies)

**Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award (OTA)** – Donna Anderson (History); Aracely Garcia Gonzalez (Chicana and Chicano Studies); Shabnam Larimian (Electrical & Computer Engineering); Mika Thornburg (History)

**Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award (GMA)** – Peter Ford (Chemistry and Biochemistry); Tim Sherwood (Computer Science); Frank Zok (Materials)

**Faculty Research Lecturer (FRL)** – Richard Mayer (Psychological and Brain Sciences)

**Carry-Over Issues**

Parking/Campus Accessibility
Childcare
Campus Policing
Emeriti Support
Faculty Housing
Covid-19 Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Non-Senate</th>
<th>DTA Total</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</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>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No new nominations were received for FRL in 2020-21; nominations carried forward from previous years.*
Council Members
Paul Amar, UCAF Representative
Leila Carvalho
Alenda Chang
Sharon Conley
Leda Cosmides, UCAF Representative
Michael Furlong
Hunter Lenihan, Vice Chair
W. Patrick McCray
William Robinson
Beth Schneider
Cynthia Skenazi
Roberto Strongman
Chris Van de Walle
Guofang Wei
Bryanna Sylvester, Non-Senate Academic Representative
Raphael Chinchilla, GSA Representative
Casey Hankey, Advisor
Lisa Parks, Chair, UCFW Representative (1/4/21-9/30/21)
Denise Segura, Chair, UCFW Representative (9/1/20-1/3/21)

Committee on Academic Freedom
Leda Cosmides
William Robinson
Roberto Strongman
Guofang Wei
Paul Amar, Chair, UCAF Representative

Committee on Emeriti and Retirement
Sharon Conley
Beth Schneider
Cynthia Skenazi
Mike Furlong, Chair

Award Committee Membership

Distinguished Teaching Award
Claudia Moser, 19-20 recipient (History of Art and Architecture)
Scott Price, 17-18 recipient – non-Senate (Chemistry)
Matt Rioux, 19-20 recipient (Earth Science)
Sherene Seikal, 17-18 recipient (History)
Mike Wilton, 19-20 recipient (Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology)
Hunter Lenihan, Chair & CFW Representative (Environmental Science & Management)

Outstanding Teaching Assistant
An Bui, 19-20 recipient (Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology)
Phil Christopher - Graduate Council Representative (Chemical Engineering)
Jonathan Schooler - Graduate Council Representative (Psychological and Brain Sciences)
Bryanna Sylvester - CFW Representative (Chemistry)
Jordan Tudisco, 19-20 recipient (Comparative Literature)
Daniel Tybjerg, 19-20 recipient (Comparative Literature)
Alenda Chang, Chair & CFW Rep (Film and Media Studies)

Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award
Mike Bowers, Graduate Council Representative and 16-17 recipient (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
Jin Sook Lee, 19-20 recipient (Education)
Carlos Levi - Graduate Council Representative (Materials, Mechanical Engineering)
Stuart Sweeney, 19-20 recipient (Geography)
Beth Schneider, Chair & CFW Rep (Sociology)

Faculty Research Lecturer
Alison Butler, 19-20 recipient (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
Umesh Mishra, 17-18 recipient (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
Linda Putnam, 14-15 recipient (Communication)
W. Patrick McCray, CFW Representative (History)
Lisa Parks, CFW Representative (Film and Media Studies)
Cynthia Skenazi, CFW Representative (French and Italian)
Nelson Lichtenstein, Chair & 18-19 recipient (History)
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

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:

- The Council responded to many issues that either resulted from or were amplified by the COVID-19 pandemic, including salary curtailment, vaccination mandate, and various aspects of online learning and data management. Additional efforts were devoted to disseminating information via faculty Town Hall meetings.
- The Committee on Faculty Grants awarded $927,515 to 94 proposals submitted for the Faculty Research Grant and $35,857 to four proposals for the Pearl Chase Research Grant. Proposal submission was down 13% from last year, with 110 total proposals compared to 126 in the previous cycle. Subsequently, Early Career Faculty Acceleration Grants awarded $7,000 to 198 junior faculty on campus.

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. CRPP met seven times, CLIIR met four times, and CIT met five times.

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

All meetings were conducted via Zoom due to the pandemic.

Systemwide Issues and Reviews

All systemwide issues that CRIR (or select subcommittees) responded to are listed below. Issues that CRIR reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included.

Proposed Curtailment Program

Members of CRIR found the proposed curtailment program to be more egalitarian than the most recent furlough, particularly its stated intent to minimize impacts for the lowest paid employees, but ultimately concluded its result would be less pay for more work. CIT encouraged the university to consider certain exemptions or prioritization for IT staff, given the critical nature of telecommunications and remote computing under pandemic circumstances. Additional exceptions were mentioned for pre-6 Unit 18 lecturers.

Report of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force

CLIIR and CIT members resoundingly rejected the possibility of the UC offering online undergraduate degrees. They did not feel that online degrees could deliver anything close to the campus experience.
Although the report of the task force was completed prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, members of CLIIR felt that their recent remote teaching experience reinforced the shortcomings of online teaching platforms. There were concerns about faculty workload and discrepancies between departments, particularly those that require physical contact, such as the arts. Members also expressed concerns about the impacts to staff, which they felt were underestimated in the report, as well as the necessary reallocation of resources to deliver online modules, a likely consequence of which would be the diminished availability of in-person options.

CIT felt there was not sufficient need to justify the consideration of an online degree program at this time. Members expressed concern that the online environment teaches students to “find answers,” rather than build their capacity for scientific thinking. Although the task force attempted to identify Characteristics of Educational Quality at the UC to assess their ability to be delivered in various modules, members criticized this approach, questioning whether some of the characteristics could actually be isolated from one another. They noted the challenges of scaling various campus computing systems required to support such an endeavor, such as higher licensing fees, expanded network capacity, and greater need for support staff/resources; they also expressed concern about potential impacts to disadvantaged populations in terms of their ability to access remote content.

Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report
The Council lauded the goal of promoting salary equity and transparency, but saw significant problems with the notion of eliminating off-scale salary increments and implementing new salary levels consistently across the 10 UC campuses. They felt that the criticism of off-scale salaries was fundamentally flawed in that it did not take into account numerous legitimate reasons that justify differences in pay among faculty at the same step or rank. They noted that parts of the personnel system at present are heavily organized around the concept of off-scale pay and that a fundamental revision of the personnel process would be necessary (and difficult) if the mechanism were to be eliminated. They also did not see how a revised scale would help to solve the need for off-scale pay in retention offers. Moreover, they found that additional information was necessary in order to consider the logistical issues for existing faculty and whether potential problems could be addressed or avoided within the proposed framework. The members rejected the notion that salaries should be uniform across campuses given the vast differences in cost of living; they argued that a change in the flat scale wouldn’t solve inequities in the system, and would likely create new problems in stymying the current apparatus for rewarding excellence.

Proposed Presidential Policy - Business and Finance Bulletin, IS-12 IT Recovery
CRPP and CIT reviewed the proposed policy on IT-12 IT Recovery. Both groups felt the policy left out significant variables including the amount of unprotected data on campus and the appropriate recovery level. They felt more information was needed to produce a rigorous cost benefit analysis. They agreed the policy was jargon heavy and therefore difficult to assess for its potential impacts to faculty. They were concerned that this is a sizable unfunded mandate for campuses although they appreciated that the policy outlined a process for exceptions due to cost-benefit justification. They wanted to see clearer leadership designations, including participation from the campus CIO.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State
CIT reviewed the ILTI and agreed that the initiative is ripe for reorganization. However, they expressed that the recommendations seemed to assume that online learning is necessarily better or cheaper, and stressed that the motivation must be pedagogical rather than merely presumed financial savings, which are not a given. They questioned whether block grants are still appropriate given the bottom-up innovations currently taking place in online education. They felt there was a need for a better assessment of online courses beyond completion rates, and that any expansion of online learning should be based on the course’s ability to successfully deliver its stated learning outcomes.

UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials Policy
CRIR members felt they didn’t entirely grasp the goals and motivation for this policy, and overall they opined that it presented an enormous burden for researchers with providing sufficient guidance or resources to execute the requirements. They also were concerned about how the policy might
represent a massive change in the relationship between researchers and the UC; they disputed the distinctions presented by the policy between intellectual property, data, and "scholarly works." They felt the policy would be more palatable if broken into separate issues specific to the vastly different disciplines at the university; for example, there were significant concerns about how the policy relates to human subjects/interview material, as it seems to contradict standard IRB data retention rules. The council questioned how this policy overlaps with efforts already underway to preserve digital research through the library, which is not remotely equipped to undertake the scale mandated here.

**Proposed Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-43 Purchases of Goods and Services; Supply Chain Management**

The Council reviewed the proposed policy in its respective subcommittees and invited feedback from Jacob Godfrey, Chief Procurement Officer, and Heather Perry, Sustainable Procurement Program Manager. The policy seemed well-motivated by evidence of direct gain to California finances from investments in local businesses, and some members were interested in supporting the goal of harnessing the power of UC investment to help small businesses. However, members found several flaws in the current iteration, both as an unfunded policy mandate and the rapid adoption schedule (prior to any Academic Senate response).

The Council had concerns about the strict certification requirements and time delays involved for a business to become certified. While there are already thousands of small businesses listed in the recommended databases, the ability of the tools to search for specific expertise or instrumentation is extremely limited. Also, there are few opportunities for small businesses to create advanced instruments or services competitively; bids from certified small or disadvantaged companies are likely to be difficult to solicit and less cost effective. The Council questioned the decision to exclude capital expenditures from these requirements. Construction spending is heavily controlled by purchasing contracts and partnerships with smaller local contractors who could offer the university tangible savings in the procurement of furniture, fixtures, and construction.

Members were also concerned that there are already concessions in place to prioritize these businesses and thus this requirement will likely reduce the existing investment in strategic suppliers and result in artificially high pricing by small businesses. There were concerns about the extra time required to file additional forms, and thus the potential for greatly increased lead time (much of which will fall on junior PIs and overextended staff), making purchasing even more onerous and potentially jeopardizing recruitment and retention by the UC.

**Classification of Gifts and Sponsored Awards Policy Draft**

CRPP reviewed this policy and invited comments from Vice Chancellor for Research Joe Incandela (Ex Officio) as well as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Jean Jones. Based on their feedback that the Office of Research does not perceive negative impacts as a result of this policy, the committee supported the draft in its current form. The committee commends the expanded toolkit for campuses to determine the best classification to serve the needs of both funders and the respective campus.

**Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation**

CLIIR reviewed the proposed revisions and solicited feedback from Professor Douglas Kennett, Curator of UCSB’s Repository of Archaeological and Ethnographic Collections. While committee members recognized the need for the policy to align with legal imperatives, they expressed concerns that meeting the deadlines (beginning with January 1, 2022) for the preliminary Inventory and Summary of materials (described in C.5) may no longer be possible given the pandemic induced limited access to campus. In addition, they noted the substantial amount of additional work that the policy will require, apparently with no additional funding granted by UCOP.

Professor Kennett confirmed that UCSB and the Chumash community together curate an extensive Repository of Human Remains and Cultural Items. Although the Repository already keeps excellent records, the entire inventory will need to be re-inventoried in order to be updated to align with the
revised—and expanded—definitions of Cultural Items included in AB 275 and the proposed policy. Moreover, the process of repatriating the Human Remains and Cultural Items will require negotiation, time, protected land (for reburials), and funds. Professor Kennett confirmed that meeting the deadlines under pandemic conditions will be difficult. In addition, each campus’s Chancellor is responsible for funding the implementation of the policy, as there were no funds allocated by UCOP. Although the required Repatriation Coordinator has been appointed, funds still need to be allocated for the requirements to be completed.

Proposed Presidential Policy SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program
Members agreed that a policy defining a vaccination requirement for campus access is important to speed the return to on-campus research and teaching. While this policy has less “teeth” than the standard student immunization policy, they felt it was reasonable given the unique landscape presented by COVID-19. Members found that rapid implementation of such a policy was appropriate given the social and political constraints currently at play. Members are curious as to how this policy will evolve and future requirements for booster shots. While not likely a concern for the policy’s implementation in Fall 2021, more guidelines may be necessary in the future regarding being “up-to-date,” rather than being vaccinated. Members have questions about local campus plans for enforcement of this policy. Given that UCSB is an open campus, discussion is urgently needed regarding policy enforcement with respect to building access. Even if student, staff and faculty vaccination statuses are known, it is not clear how the campus can rigorously control building accessibility. Reliable means for verifying vaccination, i.e. spot checks on campus, are likely needed to ensure policy compliance and protect the campus community from visitors and the public.

Local Business

Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid
CLIIR and CIT members reviewed this topic and unanimously supported the recommendation of the workgroup, to emulate the UC Davis model for recording student participation in coursework for the purposes of federal reporting. Members were unanimously in favor of avoiding extra administrative tasks for instructors, despite the apparent silliness of requesting students to perform the same assignment for all courses. CLIIR members questioned whether the effort would be considered sufficient and if the campus would inevitably run into problems of compliance similar to those experienced by UC Merced. Some individuals suggested that the exercise be limited to those that are actively receiving federal financial aid, and that it makes clear the exercise is for verification purposes only and does not supplant any course-specific attendance requirements set by the instructor.

Gauchospace/Canvas Assessment
In March, CLIIR welcomed Hector Villicana, Executive Director, Letters & Science Information Technology (LSIT) for a discussion of the campus online learning platform. He presented the impending decision faced by the campus of whether to upgrade its current version of Moodle (Gauchospace) or switch to Canvas. Moodle 3.9 will be supported until Spring 2023, after which only Version 4.0 will be serviced. Moodle 4.0 has a dramatically different user interface; if the campus plans early, steps can be taken to potentially limit disruption and improve the experience. Many students have complained about Moodle (Gauchospace) being clunky; transfer students have used Canvas at their community college and report that it is a superior product. Nearly all other UC campuses have transitioned to Canvas already. The current version of Moodle has allowed for significant tailoring to the needs of UCSB faculty, adding to an unseen cost to run the platform. Canvas is vendor-hosted, which is not necessarily cheaper but the responsibility is redirected. At the time, faculty members did not feel equipped to opine without comparative experience and the issue will be revisited in the coming year.

Research Updates
UCSB performed extremely well with grant awards this year, surpassing the amount received in FY19-20 and up 40% since 2016. The UC lobbied congress for funding to aid in research recovery expenses.

Research was gradually ramped up over the year, with labs designated essential space and deemed a priority by the state and the county since the work cannot be done elsewhere, and selected undergraduate designated essential workers. Transmission of COVID-19 was kept well under control due to strict mitigation procedures.

New Federal Conflict of Interest policies were issued concerning engagement with other countries and export control.

OR launched RAP (Research Assistance Program) to offer up to $8k grants in flexible research assistance funding to qualifying faculty whose research was severely impacted by the pandemic.

Library Updates

Open Access
The UC finalized Open Access contracts with Springer and Elsevier publishers this year. The deal with Elsevier includes reading access to 2019 and 2020 issues when the contract was suspended, which were not previously available. It is predicted that Nature journals will also adopt an open access agreement in the near future.

Reopening and Budget
The library staff pivoted in the year to offer remote services through strengthened collaboration with Instructional Development. They began a pickup and delivery service for access to circulating collections open three days a week, and offered appointment-based access to special collections along with study rooms available for classes or office hours.

In March, the library received approval on its initial plans to begin a phased reopening beginning Spring quarter. This plan included various safety mechanisms such as limited hours, seat reservations, Covid test badge reading, etc. The phased process worked well although it prompted concerns that some procedures will not be sustainable as access scales up its reopening. For example, library staff will not be able to continue the level of COVID-19 badge screening, with more entrances open and higher traffic, as was feasible when access was more limited.

Access to many library holdings was maintained through the Hathi Trust through the academic year; however this digital access will cease once libraries reopen more broadly near Fall 2021 and physical holdings become accessible again. The smaller campuses that lack large physical holdings greatly benefited from this online access.

The Library continuously prepared for budget cuts over the last year. They saved money during the last fiscal year having been closed and not having to pay for Elsevier. However, the operations budget remains significantly underfunded; the allocation is $1.6 million but the ongoing cost is closer to $4.5 million.

The California Digital Library, which has operated in essence as an 11th library in the UC system, was asked to plan to move its centrally-managed library acquisition budget, totaling $11.1 million, to UCSD with the expectation that each campus will contribute to its ongoing costs in the future. CLIIR, via UCOLASC, submitted a letter to the Academic Council urging support of the library’s funding and to lobby that CDL funds not be drawn from existing library budgets. The potential budget transfer has been postponed until at least FY2023.

Instructional Development Updates

Sustainable Funding Plan
Instructional Development created a sustainable funding plan based on core services, Summer
Sessions workload allocation, and recharge operations. Costs are going up despite no increase in funding over the past 10 years, and services cover a far greater number of faculty and students. Demands for TA development and class support services exceed budget appropriations. CLIIR issued a memo in support of Instructional Development’s requests.

**Infrastructure for Remote Instruction**
ID continued to partner with the library to provide rooms to graduate students for remote instruction. Rooms also continued to be available in HSSB, along with equipment available for instructors to check out (headset, webcams, etc.).

ID and CITRAL offered the very successful program RISE (Reimagining Instruction for the Student Experience) Institute in Summer 2020 to 80 participants over 3 weeks. This program sought to assist instructors in the redesign of classes for remote or hybrid delivery. It was offered again in Summer 2021.

**Planning for Fall**
Multiple General Assignment classrooms were equipped for simultaneous synchronous instruction this year, along with major AV upgrades, funded by ID in conjunction with the EVC, Collaborate, and Facilities Management. The 10 largest lecture halls were able to receive equipment upgrades and major technical deferred maintenance. Outdoor wireless capacity has also been expanded. Faculty mini grants were made available up to $1k for instructional support.

Construction is on schedule for the new classroom building. As of April, all subterranean work and major concrete pours were completed. The building remains scheduled to be open in Winter of 2023.

**Information Technology Updates**

**Multi-Factor Authentication Expansion**
The University has undertaken a campaign to encourage broader usage of Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) within the scientific community. This security system is encouraged for critical infrastructure, servers, routers, etc. The campus rolled out the Duo MFA system for access to UCPath effective December 3, 2020. UCSF paid $1.14 million last year in a ransomware attack and it was felt this could have been avoided had MFA security been in place.

**Campus VPN**
UCSB received anecdotal feedback during the year about users in China experiencing problems accessing Gauchospace and Zoom and other performance/connectivity issues. This was due to limited fiber capacity connecting China to North America with limited options for a solution, though the campus briefly engaged with Berkeley to explore some cost-shared options.

**Amazon Web Services**
Work is being done to migrate Gauchospace to Amazon Web Services. The North Hall data center is not a highly available data facility. The campus has experienced connectivity problems due to fires so this move will mitigate regional disruption. There are only 3 major players in this space (Microsoft, Google, and Amazon), and they all have problematic aspects.

**Accellion Data Breach**
In April, UCOP announced that a major data breach occurred in December 2020 in which students, employees and their dependents, and retirees all had their personal information compromised when its Accellion file transfer appliance was subject to a cybersecurity attack. UCOP is heading up the investigation with the FBI. There was minimal action for individual campuses to take, although UCSB’s security team hosted workshops for the campus on the protection of personal data, available at [security.ucsb.edu](http://security.ucsb.edu).
Faculty Grants

Faculty Research Grants

- CRPP considered how the faculty research grant guidelines might be modified in order to specifically address the challenges researchers faced in the COVID-19 landscape, but ultimately the committee felt things should be left as is, considering the major limitations imposed due to the grant source being state funds.
- CLIIR discussed the challenges and confusion related to the subvention category, including the cap of $2k and the lack of a clear tracking mechanism for faculty royalties for repayment. More publishers are bundling services under a subvention umbrella to include things faculty could potentially do themselves such as indexing, copy editing, image copyrights, etc. Ultimately the cap was removed from the policy as was the requirement for repayment. The PI is still required to provide a contract with the proposal for any subvention request, but ultimate funding decisions will be at the discretion of the Faculty Grants Committee.
- 5 states were added to the Attorney General’s AB 1887 travel ban using state funds effective on the following dates:
  - July 1, 2021: Florida and Montana
  - July 8, 2021: West Virginia
  - July 29, 2021: Arkansas
  - August 1, 2021: North Dakota

Travel Grants

- In Fall quarter, CRPP discussed various mechanisms to continue to support faculty with travel grant funds despite the university policy to restrict in person travel for non-essential reasons. The committee approved a policy to fund up to 2 virtual conferences, capped at $600 per year per person. They also loosened the current policy to allow for the inclusion of membership dues, which previously were only funded if the conference required them. All eligibility criteria were maintained.
- Just prior to the start of the new fiscal year, CRPP moved to reopen travel grants for in-person conferences due to UCOP rescinding its restriction on non-essential travel. The committee restructured the funding tiers to allow for a permanent choice of virtual travel, to be available once per year similar to other domestic categories. International travel remains available only every other year. Funding rates were also consolidated to fewer tiers and changes are as follows:
  - California rate increased from $400 to $450
  - Virtual tier established at $250
  - All other U.S. locations, Canada, Mexico and Puerto Rico $900
  - All other overseas locations $1500

Summary of Grant Applications and Awards

The Faculty Research Grant (FRG) budget allocation for the 2021-2022 cycle remained at $1,000,000 and the Pearl Chase Research Grant (PC) budget allocation was $61,000. During this cycle, 110 completed applications were reviewed by the Committee on Faculty Grants; 98 proposals were fully or partially funded and 12 proposals received no funding.

The total amount of FRG funds awarded was $927,515.00. PC funds awarded totaled $35,857.00.

Faculty Research Grants Funding Amounts and Rates by Division

<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>$79,319</td>
<td>$20,639</td>
<td>26.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td>$57,042</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>68.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$119,181</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>67.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>$415,111</td>
<td>$254,260</td>
<td>61.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$669,136</td>
<td>$410,522</td>
<td>61.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$178,315</td>
<td>$122,094</td>
<td>68.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,518,103</td>
<td>$927,515</td>
<td>61.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Career Faculty Acceleration Grants Program**
After the proposal review cycle, Divisional Chair Scott approached CRIR Chair Brewer with a proposal to create an Early Career Faculty Acceleration Grants Program to give extra assistance to all junior faculty on campus, in light of Covid-19 impacts to research, using carry-forward funds from Academic Senate Faculty Research Grants. In July, grants of $7,000 were distributed to 198 early career faculty for use through December 31, 2022. The Academic Senate contributed $593,000; this amount was matched by the Chancellor’s office, with additional funds contributed by the Office of Research.

**Carry forward Issues**
- Subvention requests for e-books
- Funding for the California Digital Libraries
- UCSB Online Learning Platform Transition
- Native American Repatriation
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Graduate Council
Annual Report 2020-21

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Graduate Council met for fifteen regularly scheduled two-hour sessions during the 2020-21 term. All meetings were held via Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 2020-21 term, among them:

● Continuing to respond to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on graduate students by discussing problems and taking actions related to: international students not receiving their visas; UCPATH and international students not receiving paychecks in a timely fashion; teaching remotely and having adequate teaching technology and spaces; graduate students’ inability to conduct research; extending the time to degree by one year; making grading options more flexible; graduate student deferrals; uncertainty regarding admittance of new graduate cohorts; and COVID-19 testing and immunization regulations, among other topics.

● Discussing right-sizing and funding of graduate programs.

● Revising the Graduate Council bylaw to more accurately reflect current practice.

● Commenting on various divisional and systemwide draft policy documents including: the Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy; the Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency, which would not link physical presence to campus coursework; the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy; and the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan, concerning campus policing.

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 7/1/2020 and 6/30/2021, Council processed a total of 321 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 2020-21 term: Linguistics and Chemistry and Biochemistry.

Graduate Council recommended four departments and one college for Academic Program Review in 2022-23, and suggested discussing the possibility of reviewing two additional departments due to extensive changes in those programs.

III. Proposals to Establish Programs, Emphases, Academic Units and Research Units
None were received this year.
IV. Name Changes
● Approved the name change of the graduate program in “Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology” to two distinct Ph.D. programs: one in “Counseling and Clinical Psychology” and one in “School Psychology”.
● Reviewed and offered support for the name change of the Center for the Study of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology of Aging.

V. Changes to Existing Programs
● Approved request from the Department of Anthropology to suspend graduate admissions for one year.
● Approved revisions to the interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphasis in Climate Sciences and Climate Change.
● Approved changes to the Education graduate program.
● Approved the addition of the Department of Global Studies to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Black Studies.
● Approved Program Learning Outcomes for the Master of Environmental Data Science (MEDS).
● Approved the creation of a new Master’s Plan I for the Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Dynamical Neuroscience.
● Approved curricular changes to the M.A. degrees in Anthropology.
● Approved the addition of the Comparative Literature Program to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Environment and Society.
● Approved curricular changes to the Master of Fine Arts.
● Approved removing the language requirement for the doctoral degree in Feminist Studies.
● Approved Program Learning Outcomes for the Ph.D. in Biological Engineering.
● Approved revisions to the Program Learning Outcomes for the doctoral program in Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology.
● Approved extensive revisions to the graduate programs in the Department of Linguistics.
● Approved changes to the Department of Film and Media Studies Ph.D. foreign language requirement.
● Approved the addition of the Department of English to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Black Studies.
● Approved an increase in required units for the M.A. in Chicana and Chicano Studies.
● Approved revisions to the core curriculum of the Master of Environmental Data Science.
● Approved revisions to Ph.D. general examinations and advancement to candidacy for the Ph.D. in History.

VI. Student Petitions
Graduate Council responded to one student appeal of academic disqualification.

VII. Local Business
COVID-19 Impacts on Graduate Students
Graduate Council continued to discuss the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on graduate students over the course of the year.

Fall quarter, Graduate Student Association Representative Alex LeBrun shared the most pressing graduate student concerns. Short-term concerns included international student issues and the new testing policy for students in campus housing. Long-term concerns included funding, mental health, and what departments are doing to ensure that students complete their requirements in a shorter period of time. In Spring 2020, GC extended time-to-degree for all graduate students by one year; however,
departments and the campus do not necessarily have the money to keep funding students. GC members shared mental health concerns that they had seen in students, such as having limited access to labs, discouragement due to the lack of jobs, time differences for international students, and anxiety in not being able to move forward with research. There were also issues of students not being able to travel to do research, internet connectivity issues affecting students’ ability to do their work, and the large number of student deferrals.

In November, Graduate Council was joined by Divisional Senate Chair Susannah Scott. The campus has made facilities available for graduate students to use for teaching and the research ramp-up, mostly for STEM fields, has allowed considerable access for graduate students. Budget constraints may lead to fewer TA lines, which would create a higher workload that faculty would need to take on. Too much TAing also hinders graduate students’ progress. GC members brought up that some graduate students have expressed concern about some faculty not following COVID-19 protocols and not wearing masks. Members asked if the campus budget shortfall has taken into account the increased costs due to testing and other COVID-19 related expenses. Members also asked how international students residing in their respective countries will be affected. It was unclear if they could continue to work as TAs in winter. Members also discussed their concern about students delaying graduation because of a lack of jobs, or because they cannot do research. These students will likely not have funding for their extra time. Many departments are likely to reduce graduate admissions to counteract students staying on.

Also in November, GC discussed the one-year time-to-degree extension that it approved for all graduate students enrolled as of spring quarter 2020. There had been questions about whether students entering graduate programs in fall 2020 should be allowed this extension as well. The blanket time-to-degree extension cost Graduate Division a large amount of money in reduced non-resident tuition paid for doctoral students who have advanced to candidacy. The justification during spring quarter for the time-to-degree extension was that students were unable to travel, do fieldwork, access labs, and make timely progress. Members agreed that most incoming students should have sufficient time and opportunity to complete fieldwork during their time at UCSB. There are likely to be distinctions among graduate programs, and time-to-degree extensions should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The Council agreed to not extend the one-year time-to-degree extension to students who matriculated fall 2020.

Winter quarter, the Council discussed a concerning issue that was brought to Chair Afifi’s attention. Some international graduate students, living abroad and working as teaching assistants, had yet to receive any paycheck for work performed this academic year. Some students unable to open U.S. bank accounts and who had been sent paper checks were either not receiving the checks or did not have a way to cash them. There were some students in immediate financial distress after three months of non-payment. Graduate Division sent a survey to departments to find out how many students were affected. UCPath, which has authority over paychecks, was apparently aware of the situation but was not trying to implement any kind of fix as the number of students affected was so low. Graduate Division was able to wire fellowship funds, but Graduate Division does not control paychecks. Members expressed that it is unethical and in violation of the TA contract to withhold payment, and the union could submit grievances.

The Council decided upon two courses of action. The first was to write a memo authorizing Graduate Division to determine 1) what funds are available at UCSB to temporarily pay these students, 2) whether UCSB has the authority to send these payments, and 3) how UCSB would eventually be reimbursed by these students. The Council was also extremely disturbed by the lack of accountability of UCPath. While UCPath answers to the UC President, there have been such a large number of problems since its
adoption, some members called for the need for a complete reform. Members determined that Graduate Council needed to write to campus administration (Chancellor, EVC, Senate Chair and Deans) explaining the circumstances, protesting the inaction of UCPath, and asking the system to address these problems immediately. The Council voted unanimously to send forward a memo to Graduate Division authorizing them to look into sending funds to the affected students, and to send forward a memo to campus administration detailing the situation and calling for action. By February, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) had discussed the issues and been in coordination with UCOP, UCSB and UCPath. UCSB was to be used as a pilot program for wire transfers. If successful, other UCs could engage in wire transfers for other transactions. It appeared that all affected students were eventually able to access their paychecks.

Also in February, Vice Chancellor of Research Joe Incandela joined Graduate Council to discuss the progress of the campus research ramp-up. Research funding was significantly up, which has caused an interesting situation in that there are limited opportunities to do research but there is a lot of money to conduct it. Buildings were being reviewed and credentialed by the Office of Research and the Executive Vice Chancellor’s office. Some offices do not have adequate ventilation, and it is not fully understood how air circulates from office to office or from hallways to offices. There was an assumption the campus would restart once vaccinations are widespread. VC Incandela explained that there are different committees approving different types of research, such as the Off-Site Research Committee reviewing field research and the Participant Safety Committee which is coordinating with IRB on human subject research. Proposals for research need to be submitted to building committees.

The Council also decided winter quarter not to create another blanket policy change for Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) grading, as faculty can work with students who need more flexibility, as well as the necessity for international students to have an in-person component of a course.

At the end of winter quarter and during spring quarter, GC discussed what was currently being planned for fall instruction. President Drake announced that all UC campuses would be in-person fall term. The COVID-19 contingency group was planning for some in person and some remote courses. The rate of vaccination by fall was unknown, and campus did not want departments to have to redo the fall course planning they had put so much work into. The EVC was awaiting more information and guidance from the county. Members discussed the possibility of hybrid instruction, where half of students in a course are in-person one day, the other half the next, and the course is automatically recorded. Members raised concerns about graduate students potentially having to do more work to adapt courses, and the lack of space to split up large classes. Many graduate students would be uncomfortable coming back to campus and finding housing will be difficult.

In April, Graduate Council was joined by Turi Honegger, Clinical Director of Counseling and Psychological Services, who has a focus on graduate students and very distressed students. The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated challenges that students were already facing. There is a delicate balance between academic rigor and student wellness. The pandemic is delaying their progress. It has been harder to tell when students are struggling during this time of remote work. Dr. Honegger’s advice is to leave academic standards where they are, but listen to students and be empathetic.

In June, the Council discussed the lack of communication regarding campus research ramp-up. Members felt that the campus had been overly cautious in its safety protocols and restrictions for building use, which was negatively impacting research. There has also been mixed messaging regarding safety measures, and UCSB’s protocols seem to be more restrictive than those that the county has in place.
The Council voted to send a memo to senior leadership stating that UCSB’s protocols should be in line with the county and state, there needs to be clear lines of communication, and that it is imperative that faculty and graduate students be able to conduct research to the fullest extent possible this fall.

**Graduate Admissions and Enrollment**

Over the year, Graduate Council discussed issues around graduate admissions, enrollment, and rightsizing of graduate programs. In October, Interim Graduate Dean Rupp shared information about graduate student admissions and enrollment; enrollment was down. There were many deferrals, and it is impossible to know how many of those students will ever actually enroll.

In January, Dean Rupp introduced the topic of rightsizing graduate programs. There is a long-term question about how to deal with the graduate student population. The idea has been to go by the Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP), however, the undergraduate student population has grown much faster than planned. Dean Rupp wants departments to begin an exercise of thinking about the appropriate size of their graduate population. UCSB is currently one of only a few UC campuses that does not guarantee funding for five years for incoming doctoral students. Some campuses actually have cohort sizes assigned to departments. Graduate Division also needs to think about the block grant formula.

GC members were concerned that the population of graduate students has gone down, while there has been no control over undergraduate enrollment. Graduate students are not just here to serve as TAs; they need to be able to conduct research. Current enrollment management is not done in a strategic way, and it is managed differently across disciplines. There are unintended consequences for faculty as they are not able to properly mentor or teach graduate students, which leads to retention problems. Members also questioned the minimum course enrollment requirement of four students for graduate courses. This makes it difficult to offer courses when there are small cohorts and small departmental programs. There may be cuts to TA lines next year due to the budget crisis. Departments will need to think strategically about how to offer the needed undergraduate courses with possibly fewer TAs. Some of these issues are bigger than individual campuses, and members would like to see a systemwide discussion. The Regents do not seem to recognize the value of graduate education. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs is sending a representative to speak to the Regents about the value of graduate education.

In February, GC discussed the minimum course size policy. There is a 1973 presidential memo stipulating minimum course sizes; graduate courses are required to have four students enrolled. This could become more problematic as departments admit fewer graduate students. The Office of the Registrar does not strictly enforce this policy. The Council thought that there should be clarification of this policy sent to departments; perhaps more flexibility could be allowed for smaller class sizes. Members also discussed making it easier for top undergraduate students to enroll in graduate courses, which could help with enrollments.

Also in February, Dean Rupp led a discussion about graduate student support. While most departments plan out how many students they can support, there are some departments that admit too many students and do not have enough TAships or other forms of support to fund them. Some financial support comes from Graduate Division, such as grants, and forms such as TAships come from the Deans. Departments receive block grant allocations every three years; fellowships vary year to year. One option would be to ask departments to provide a memo each year with their plan for funding students: how many students are expected, how much funding is needed, how many TA and GSR allocations they have,
etc. Some departments already do this. Graduate student admission and funding varies greatly by discipline. Many STEM departments have no limits if there is funding and the faculty members are willing to take on students. Graduate student enrollment needs to be viewed in the context of undergraduate enrollment, and the campus does not have a strategic enrollment management plan. It seems unwise to tell graduate programs how many students they can enroll while simultaneously saying they have no control over their undergraduate student enrollments.

**Doctoral Student Travel Grant Program**

Over the year, Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the Academic Senate Doctoral Student Travel Grant program. This past summer, the previous Graduate Council approved allowing up to $400 for virtual conference registration, and allowing students who receive a grant for a virtual conference to still be able to receive another grant for an in-person conference. Members agreed that there are likely no in-person conferences occurring in the 2020-21 academic year, and the application for the 2020-21 grant should indicate that only virtual conferences would be funded.

During spring quarter, the Council approved adding in-person locations back to the policy for 2021-22, and keeping the virtual conference category. There were changes to the funding amounts for the Faculty Travel Grants, and the Council approved bringing the doctoral travel grant amounts in line. The Council was adamant that that funding should not be lowered for doctoral grants, and suggested ways that some of the large carryover funds could be better utilized, such as re-appropriating to fellowships or graduate support.

**Leave of Absence Policy**

In October, Graduate Division Interim Dean Rupp went over a proposal to make revisions to the graduate student Leave of Absence Policy. Graduate Division proposed allowing for more flexibility for leaves outside of medical/emergency/military/parenting reasons. These changes would be in line with many other UC graduate leave policies. Members agreed that language should be added to clarify that a student needs to consult with their faculty advisor/PI before requesting a leave so that both parties can discuss the implications of the decision.

**Review of Academic Program Review Process**

In November, the Council held a discussion about the Academic Program Review Process, prompted by an informal request from Program Review Panel Chair Francesco Bullo. Members agreed that Data Notebooks in their current form are massive documents, and a burden on everyone involved. GC wondered if there are ways to streamline the data within; much that is asked of the departments is repetitive. While the student surveys are an extremely important component, they should be conducted at a more frequent rate. Members discussed creating a committee, possibly composed of representatives from all reviewing agencies, that would be responsible for reviewing and commenting on the Data Notebooks and ERC reports. This could allow for one response on graduate issues, one on undergraduate issues, etc. Reviewing agencies could also be asked to only focus on three important questions in order to pare down the length of comments.

Graduate Council also discussed what the actual goals of the Academic Program Review process should be. Departments should be evaluated on where they currently stand and where they are going in the future. Comparisons to other universities should be made, and there needs to be an upward trajectory of performance indicators. PRP should act as a strategic planning tool, not as an arm of accreditation.
The Academic Senate and the administration need to work together on strategic planning. A Council on Strategic Planning could be created that spans all councils and committees. This could be a separate, advisory group that looks at the overall vision of the university and how departments fit into that.

**Discussions with Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall**

Twice this year, Graduate Council was joined by Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall. In November, EVC Marshall talked about ongoing discussions about strategies for graduate funding, especially in light of COVID-19. There will be significant budgetary challenges. International graduate students are being affected by national restrictions to immigration. Graduate students are also facing the challenges of remote learning as well as remote teaching. The time-to-degree extension was helpful, but unfortunately there is not money to fund students for longer times. Some departments are going to be conservative with admissions next year. There needs to be better information from departments about non-academic job options, TA training and workload, and mentorship.

The Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy began meeting in 2019-20. UCSB has a smaller percentage of graduate students than most research universities. The number of doctoral students is more on par, but other universities have many more master’s programs and professional schools. There has been a long-standing goal to increase the percentage of graduate students, as laid out in the Long-Range Development Plan. If the campus is capped at 25,000 enrollment, some redistribution will need to happen in order to grow graduate enrollment. EVC Marshall wants departments to get creative about how to deliver instruction, review curriculum and assignments, and see if there are models where lecturers can teach courses and some sections. Departments need to think carefully about their expectations for graduate students. Five-year packages should be the campus norm, and graduate students should not be used as the solution for enrollment management.

In May, EVC Marshall returned to discuss the campus budget, specifically its effects on graduate students. The tremendous reduction made to the UC budget in 2020 was devastating. Before that reduction, UCSB had a funding shortfall, due partially to reaching maximum non-resident enrollment numbers and hitting a ceiling on revenues. As more information became known about the various rounds of federal stimulus funding, it became clear that UCSB could apply some of those funds to lost revenues. The campus will try to put some of the newest round of federal stimulus funding to graduate students who have had to take additional time to finish their degrees. Funding TA lines is a priority, and there will be pressure for more TAs from the increase in undergraduate enrollment. Members discussed the negative effects seen in PRP reviews due to graduate students needing to TA too much, and the need to coordinate undergraduate enrollment and do strategic planning. EVC Marshall does not want to see graduate students sacrifice research because we need them to TA.

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

In November, Graduate Council discussed the Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy. A big omission in the report is that it assumes no cuts in resources, which is not realistic. The effects on non-impacted departments when impacted departments do not manage enrollments needs to be discussed and dealt with more. Some members agreed that the Chancellor should be the leader on the campus enrollment management strategy. Other Council ideas included separating the Divisions into Colleges, allowing departments to have control over some enrollment, being transparent with the campus budget, looking at the models of other UC campuses, re-thinking course sections, and the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts creating funded, terminal MA programs. GC wanted its response to be forceful, stating that there needs to be a stronger stance taken, especially concerning graduate students. Graduate student growth is an important component of enrollment
management, and this report says nothing about it. The graduate student population should increase along with the undergraduate student population, but graduate students cannot be used just for labor.

**Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphases**
In February, the Council began a discussion about interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases. Over the last few years, GC has been concerned about the lack of requirements and guidelines for creating new interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases. Members agreed that there should be minimum standards for these emphases, and an ability to review current ones. A proposal was made to ask emphasis directors for a report every five years, which would comment on student numbers, courses offered, faculty involved, and provide a self-reflection. This report would be presented to Graduate Council and there would be an opportunity for feedback.

**Proposal to Eliminate Committee Extension Requests**
In February, Graduate Council reviewed a proposal from Graduate Division to eliminate committee extension requests for faculty members who leave or retire from the university. GC supported the proposal to streamline this process and eliminate the extra labor. Approvals would now be left up to the discretion of departments.

**Graduate Council Bylaw Proposed Revisions**
In March, Graduate Council unanimously approved some proposed changes to the Graduate Council bylaw, including increasing the membership to “at least 18”, updating some of the duties to more accurately reflect current practice, and removing subcommittees that have not been active for many years.

**Proposal for new online course from Geography - GEOG W 115B**
In April, the Council reviewed a proposal for a new online course from the Department of Geography. These requests do not normally come to Graduate Council, but the College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee had concerns, and asked GC, Undergraduate Council and the Committee on Courses and General Education to weigh in. Overall, GC does not want the allowance of remote instruction during the pandemic and policies around offering online courses to be conflated. Some courses may have to continue to be offered remotely in fall quarter due to public health guidelines. It is also wrong to ask graduate students, acting as TAs, to be the face of the course. If some larger lectures are required to be taught remotely, however, some graduate students may be coerced to teach in person. Overall, this situation should be handled as an accommodations request between the faculty member and the campus, not by creating a permanent online course.

**Request for an Extension of the Fall Registration Pilot to Fall 2021**
In April, the Council reviewed the request for an extension of the fall registration pilot to 2021. GC appreciated the need to gather more data, and offered their support.

**Proposal to Eliminate Exception Request for Emeriti Faculty to Serve on Committees**
In May, Graduate Council discussed a proposal from Graduate Division to eliminate committee exception requests for emeriti to serve on graduate student committees. Members were in full support of eliminating bureaucratic time and paperwork, and leaving these decisions up to department chairs.

**Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid**
In June, the Council discussed the Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity Regulation for Title IV Financial Aid. Members indicated that the UC Davis model seemed more practical, but there
were some concerns. Graduate students are generally easier to track than undergraduate students, and faculty members will know if a graduate student is missing from their course. However, some members were against faculty having to police student attendance, and indicated that there could be issues with the power differential between students and faculty members. There was a suggestion that students receiving Title IV Financial Aid sign an affidavit that they will follow all rules of receiving financial aid, in lieu of making all students and faculty members comply with a new regulation.

VIII. **Systemwide Business**

**Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program**

In October, the Council discussed the proposed Curtailment Program. Overall, GC felt that the lack of specificity in the proposal was unacceptable. Members wanted to see actual budget numbers, information about the targeted savings, and what actions UC had already taken to address the shortfall. GC had a number of concerns they wanted addressed, including how the plan would affect graduate students, TAs and GSRs; what tiers were being proposed; if faculty could use grants to offset cuts in pay; if employees could work for other entities while on curtailment; if future layoffs or furloughs were a possibility; and how departmental staff would be able to fulfill their work obligations during winter break.

**Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) – Recommendations for Future State**

In January, Graduate Council discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State report. UC, and especially UCSB, have traditionally pushed back against online courses. Members were concerned that the report did not mention graduate courses at all. UCSB has never offered a graduate course through ILTI, and offers few undergraduate courses. Support, coordination and budget for TAs for undergraduate courses taught online needs to be explained in more detail.

**Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report**

In January, the Council discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report. Overall, the Graduate Council thought there was insufficient detail about what the two proposed options would look like if implemented. UC does not exist in a vacuum, and is constantly fighting to retain faculty. Many faculty are not actually getting recruited to other institutions, but initiate offers as they are tired of the sluggishness of advancement. Members agreed that the state needs to start viewing UC as a research university system and fund accordingly. Younger faculty members will continue to be disappointed with their compensation and the sluggishness of advancement, and will become harder to retain.

The Council also discussed the current personnel system, which is complex, time-consuming, and quite subjective. A simplified process could be advantageous if it takes into account the full record and is equitable. Graduate student mentoring should be a part of the academic personnel process, as it is an extremely important aspect of faculty responsibilities. Overall, members were not in favor of eliminating off-scale salary, as it is an important tool to use to reward faculty going above and beyond what is expected. The Council did not see how either of the options presented would reduce the loyalty penalty, and wanted to caution instituting a change that could actually exacerbate the salary equity problem.

**UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials**

In February, the Council discussed the UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials proposal. Members pointed out that federal funding agencies already have their own criteria for storing and posting data, etc., that are extremely complex to keep track of. UC’s proposal would create even more burdensome regulations that faculty would have to track. The Council agreed that UC should be trying to
reduce the number of regulations. GC’s response strongly urged UC to not move forward with this policy, and to consider the goals of the university as well as undertake a careful cost benefit analysis for all proposed policies that will add undue burdens to faculty member’s workloads.

Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures
In April, Graduate Council discussed the Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures. Members were appreciative of the spirit of transparency in distributing these proposed changes widely, but felt they did not have adequate context to review them. GC felt that there should be mention of the types of training UC police undertake. There also should be an explanation of the relationship between UC Police and county and city law enforcement agencies. An organizational chart with information about reporting authority would provide clarification. The Council was also concerned that pepper spray was the only chemical agent that does not need higher level approval for officers to use. Pepper spray has been used in the past on campus student protesters.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency
In April, the Council discussed the Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency. There has been confusion as to whether residency has meant being physically present on a campus, which has been exacerbated by the shift to remote learning over the past year. In 2011, UCRJ concurred with a more liberal interpretation of Regulation 610, not linking physical presence to campus coursework. The revisions to Regulation 610 would codify this interpretation.

Members were very concerned about removing a physical requirement for residency. Although technology has changed so much and online learning is becoming more prevalent, members see graduate education as being influenced greatly by in person interactions. Collaborative research is necessary, and graduate students contribute to the overall intellectual life of the campus. Overall, the Council decided that having physical presence linked to residency is a necessary component of a UC education. GC disagreed with the 2011 UCRJ ruling, and would like the current masters and doctoral residency requirements to still be linked to physical presence on a UC campus.

SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy
In May, Graduate Council discussed the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy. Concerns members brought up included the inability to ask others if they have received the vaccination; how faculty would know if students in their classes have received the vaccine; how the university will balance HIPAA and the needs of immunocompromised individuals who cannot receive the vaccine; what system will be put in place for faculty, students and staff to indicate they have been vaccinated; and who will enforce campus guidelines. Graduate student concerns were also raised, including trepidation about returning to campus, dealing with undergraduate students who will not follow campus guidelines, and international students’ ability to get back by fall.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy - Fee Policy for Graduate Student In Absentia Registration
In May, Graduate Council reviewed the Proposed Presidential Policy - Fee Policy for Graduate Student In Absentia Registration. This has already been in place on campuses as the UC Council of Deans proposed this last year, but it was not sent out for formal Senate review. For UCSB, the local campus region is Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties. Anywhere else students are eligible for in absentia. Graduate Council was in unanimous support of the proposed policy.
Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan
In June, the Council reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. While the Council was very pleased to see proposed changes that would deal with the current climate around policing, many aspects seemed vague. A report with data about campus incidents and questionable police actions should be provided. This plan is also very different from the Gold Book revisions that the Council reviewed a few months ago. Members appreciated the inclusion of mental health. The consequences for reprimands should be made more transparent, with details about what happens to an officer and exactly what transpired in a given situation. This plan pushes the decision to potentially defund or abolish police forces down to the campus level, and will require large amounts of resources that many campuses likely do not have. Addressing structural and institutional problems is necessary.

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. This year, GC reviewed and approved changes to the Graduate Council Bylaw, to remove the four standing subcommittees that have not met for at least the past decade. The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections approved of this change, and the Faculty Legislature approved the revision at its meeting of June 3, 2021.

X. Carry Over Issues for 2021-22
● Continuing to deal with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and addressing its impacts on graduate students, as well as faculty and staff.
● Developing an online course approval process for graduate courses.
● Conducting a review of the policies and procedures for establishing new interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases.
● Discussing challenges related to COLA (cost of living adjustment). The COLA strike of 2020 was interrupted by COVID-19, but the issues still remain.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Executive Summary

Purpose (per Bylaw 80): To set standards for and policy on undergraduate education and to provide advice and consent on all matters of policy, planning, and practice that impact the quality of undergraduate programs and undergraduate students’ education experiences at UCSB.

Issues of General Concern to Faculty:

- UgC worked with campus administrators to extend undergraduate grading option flexibilities to the Winter, Spring, and Summer 2021 terms.
- UgC actioned on 22 academic proposals involving the establishment, discontinuation, or curricular modification of undergraduate programs.

UgC held 16 regularly scheduled meetings and consulted with relevant Senate committees and campus administrators regarding topics of concern within its purview. The Council met with Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple, Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Belinda Robnett, and other campus administrators.

Local Business

Academic Program Reviews

In cooperation with the Program Review Panel, UgC participated in the academic program review of the following academic units/programs.

1. Chemistry & Biochemistry
2. Computer Engineering
3. Linguistics

UgC responded to a request from the Executive Vice Chancellor regarding the membership of the Program Review Panel and the departments to be reviewed during the 2022-23 program review cycle.

Academic Proposals

UgC granted preliminary approval of the following actions and recommended final approval by the Faculty Legislature:

1. Discontinuation of the B.A. in Renaissance Studies

UgC granted final approval for the following actions, effective Fall Quarter 2021:

1. Establishment of the B.A. in Italian Studies, Transnational Emphasis
3. Revision of curricular requirements for completion of the following undergraduate programs:
   B.A. in Anthropology, Biological Emphasis
   B.A. in Black Studies
   B.S. in Chemical Engineering
   B.A. in Classics, Archaeology Emphasis
   B.A. in Communication
   B.A. in Chinese
   B.A. in Chinese, High Proficiency Track
   B.S. in Earth Science, Geophysics Emphasis
   B.S. in Financial Mathematics and Statistics
   B.A. in Linguistics, Language and Speech Technologies Emphasis
   B.S. in Mechanical Engineering
   B.A. in Physics
   B.S. in Physics (upper-division revisions effective Fall 2022)
   B.S. in Psychological and Brain Sciences
   B.A. in Spanish
   B.A. in Dance
   Minor in American Indian and Indigenous Studies
   Minor in Black Studies
   Minor in Language and Speech Technologies
   Minor in Physics
   Minor in Spanish

4. Revision of program learning outcomes for the following undergraduate programs:
   B.S. in Computer Engineering
   B.S. in Computer Science
   B.S. in Electrical Engineering
   B.A. in History of Public Policy
   B.A. or B.S. in Mathematics or Mathematical Science
   B.S. in Mechanical Engineering

Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Research Mentoring

UgC members Paul Atzberger, Katie Byl, and Elisabeth Weber served as the selection committee for the 2020-21 Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Research Mentoring. They selected four undergraduate winners and one faculty winner.

Campus Proposals and Initiatives

Phase One Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Enrollment Strategy
UgC reviewed the Enrollment Task Force Report, which addressed the issue of impacted majors at UCSB and other campus constraints. UgC supported the recommendation to increase the number of advising staff on the campus as well as the idea of the “boot camp” approach for orientation. UgC voiced concern regarding the establishment of “semi-STEM majors” and noted that these tracks could be misleading to students. UgC recommended the re-examination of classroom utilization, in order to use classroom space more effectively. UgC recommended that the campus ensure adequate offering and access to General Education courses for students. The Council unanimously endorsed the report and noted that it provides a satisfactory foundation for moving toward a resolution of the enrollment issues that UCSB is currently facing.

Undergraduate Grading Option Flexibilities
UgC worked with Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies Glen Beltz to extend undergraduate grading option flexibilities to the Winter 2021, Spring 2021, and Summer 2021 terms. Extensive input was received from student petitions, review of other UC campus policies, and communication with academic student advisors throughout the campus. The flexibilities included pushing back the grading option deadline, allowing the Colleges to exercise leniency when considering grading option petitions beyond the deadline, allowing students on probation to take courses for passed not passed, and providing academic departments with the option to allow passed/not passed grades in major, pre-major and minor applicable courses.

Priority Registration Reform
UgC considered a proposal for priority registration reform submitted by Associate Vice Chancellor Jeffrey Stopple and Vice Chancellor Belinda Robnett. The Council’s discussion was informed by various Academic Senate committees and College Faculty Executive Committees. The proposal called for the following changes effective Fall quarter 2021:

1. Priority registration will only apply to the first registration pass time.
2. Students matriculating to UCSB as College of Letters & Science Honors and College of Engineering Honors, and continuing students joining those programs will no longer have priority registration. Honors students who belong to a state-mandated priority registration group will retain their registration privileges.
3. Regents Scholars will no longer automatically be awarded priority registration. Regent Scholars who belong to a state-mandated priority registration group will retain their registration privileges.
4. Continuing College of Letters & Science Honors, College of Engineering Honors, and Regents Scholars will retain their priority registration privileges as long as they remain in that designation.
5. Students entering the College of Creative Studies will be granted a version of priority registration analogous to that of returning EAP students.

The Council’s discussion included a diversity of opinions and the vote to approve the priority registration reform was split and passed 7 in favor, 3 against, and 3 abstentions.

While the Council agreed that the current system is inequitable, several members felt strongly that these recommendations would harm UCSB’s ability to recruit and retain talented students. This group of members noted their support of UCSB rewarding excellence and feel that these changes will disincentivize student participation in College Honors Programs.

Request for Extension of the Fall Registration Pilot to 2021
UgC considered a request from the Office of the Registrar to continue a previously approved Registration Timeline Pilot to Fall quarter 2021. The pilot shifted registration pass times for continuing students in a way that would allow new students to have a more equitable opportunity to enroll in courses. The first registration pass for continuing students was also extended beyond the spring grading deadline. The Undergraduate Council fully supported this request and noted its appreciation of the efforts of all those involved to help improve the registration process.

GEOG W 115B Proposal
UgC was asked by the College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee to comment on the request to establish GEOG W 115B, a new hybrid course. The L&S FEC noted two significant concerns with the proposal:

1. The instructor’s living situation was listed as a reason for the lecture portion of the course being offered in an online format.
2. While the instructor would teach remotely the teaching assistants would be responsible for the in-person portion of instruction. This could place an undue burden on them.

Taking into account these specific concerns UgC posed the following questions and concerns:

1. Why is teaching this course online better than the more common in-person lecture format?
2. Should more justification be given for why particular tools (e.g. Nectir) are being used, although it was good to see that the instructor gave consideration to improving inter-person communication?
3. Are there reasonable requests of students’ time to master this course in an online format?
4. Due to the fact that online courses do not belong to a single faculty member, is this request solely being made to accommodate a particular instructor’s living situation? Online teaching should be for academic reasons, not the convenience of an individual instructor.
5. The Council also noted concerns about requiring graduate students to teach in-person while the instructor would teach in a fully remote capacity. Does this place a larger burden on TAs? How would TAs be trained for this kind of course?
6. Was consideration given to possible cheating on exams?

Moving forward, the Council supports the creation of a clear set of standards that will help determine which courses are best suited for an online or hybrid format.

**Compliance with the Commencement of Academic Activity regulation for Title IV Financial Aid**

UgC reviewed a request from an Office of the Registrar and Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships workgroup regarding compliance with the Title IV financial aid regulations. The regulations state that institutions must document that students commenced academic activity in their courses early in the term and adjust financial aid eligibility for those that do not meet the requirements. Therefore, UCOP has requested that all campuses develop a plan that will comply with these financial aid regulations. The report provided examples of models currently being used by UC Davis and UC Merced. The Council unanimously supported the work group's recommendation to implement a system following the model used at UC Davis, which would require students to complete a low-stakes assignment in GOLD by the census date for each of their courses. UgC also raised the following question and suggestion:

1. What is the work group’s backup plan if an attempt to implement a system based on the UC Davis model is rejected by a reviewer?
2. The Council recommends that students who have not completed the compliance activity a week before the deadline receive a reminder via GOLD.

**Student Petition Concerning the European Traditions Requirement**

UgC began to consider a student petition to reimagine the European Traditions Special Subject Area requirement. The proposal calls for the European Traditions requirement to be absorbed by the current World Cultures Special Subject requirement. However, it was ultimately determined that the proposal was incomplete as it was missing memos from departments that house courses approved for the European Traditions requirement. Therefore, UgC felt that they could not make a fully formed decision and determined that it was best for the issue to be picked up again in the 2021-22 academic year.

**Systemwide Business**

As UCSB’s representative on the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), Mary Betsy Brenner reported to and consulted with the Council regarding issues under discussion by UCEP.
Elisabeth Weber represented UCSB on the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) and reported to the Council on items addressed by the committee.

Along with other Senate councils and committees, members of UgC were invited to review materials pertaining to the following systemwide issues:

1. Systemwide Review of Proposed Curtailment Program
2. Systemwide Review of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force Report
3. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 544 - Cross Campus Enrollments
4. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 630 - Senior Residency Requirement
5. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative - Recommendations for Future State
6. Universitywide Police Policies and Procedures
7. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency
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