ACADEMIC SENATE
FACULTY LEGISLATURE, SANTA BARBARA DIVISION

Thursday, October 20, 2022
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Via Zoom

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others
   Updates on Faculty Housing
   Chuck Haines, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Resource Management and Chief Financial Officer

4. Special Orders – Consent Calendar
   Approval of the minutes of the June 2, 2022 meeting (Attachment 1)

   In Memoriam
   David Bary, Spanish and Portuguese, 1924-2022
   Haru Fukui, Political Science, 1935-2021
   Noel C. MacDonald, Mechanical Engineering, and Materials, 1940-2022
   M. Stephen Weatherford, Political Science, 1946-2022
   Max Leslie Chase Weiss, Mathematics, 1933-2022
   Thomas M. Putnam III, Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology, 1945-2022
   Jules Zimmer, Dean of Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, 1930-2022

2021-22 Annual Reports (Attachment 2)
   Charges Officer and Charges Advisory Committee
   Committee on Academic Personnel
   Committee on Diversity and Equity
   Committee on International Education
   Committee on Privilege and Tenure
   Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
   Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards
   Council on Research and Instructional Resources
   Council on Planning and Budget
   Faculty Executive Committee - Bren School
   Faculty Executive Committee - Creative Studies
   Faculty Executive Committee - Engineering
   Faculty Executive Committee - Gevirtz School
   Faculty Executive Committee - Letters and Science
   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 2, 2022, with Chair Susannah Scott presiding. 27 voting members, 7 ex officio members, and other invited parties attended the meeting.

2021-22 Award Announcements

Congratulations to the recipients of the 2021-22 Academic Senate Awards.

**Faculty Research Lecturer**
Professor Shelly Lundberg, Economics

**Faculty Diversity Award**
Associate Professor Sherene Seikaly, History

Announcements by the Chancellor (from the slides presented)

Thank you to Chair Susannah Scott and all of our Senate colleagues for your leadership and dedication throughout another unprecedented year. Shared governance has been essential to meeting the challenges while continuing to build a strong foundation for the future.

Congratulations again to our award recipients:

**Faculty Research Lecturer**
Professor Shelly Lundberg, Economics
Leonard Broom Professor of Demography

**Faculty Diversity Award**
Associate Professor Sherene Seikaly, History

Responding to COVID-19
Indoor Masking

On May 26, in consultation with our campus medical experts, the Academic Senate, student leaders, Deans, members of the staff and administration, public health officials, and medical colleagues systemwide, we reinstated our previous indoor masking policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPRING WEEK</th>
<th>2022 Dates</th>
<th>Case Positivity ALL</th>
<th>Case Positivity SCREENING</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/27-4/2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/3-4/9</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/10-4/16</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/17-4/23</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/24-4/30</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/1-5/7</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/8-5/14</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/15-5/21</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5/22-5/28</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/29-6/1 (partial)</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Case positivity rates are calculated from campus testing, and do not include self-reported cases.

Last week (5/22 through 5/28): 369 (142 self-reported)
26 Employees
162 Housing Residents (44%)
6.05% Case Positivity Rate

This week (5/29 through 6/1):
2 days campus testing results)
213 (85 self-reported)
13 Employees
94 Housing Residents (44%)
7.23% Case Positivity Rate
to require masking in classrooms and other indoor campus shared spaces, through June 12, 2022.

Event Guideline Updates

Yesterday, our medical team sent a campus message with updated COVID-19 guidance for graduation ceremonies and other campus events.

We are grateful for everyone’s efforts on behalf of the safety of our campus community.

Thank you to our COVID-19 Working Group, Planning Group, Senate Chair, Deans, Return to Campus Working Group, and ALL of our dedicated colleagues contributing to our campus’s pandemic response throughout this past year.

Special thanks to our COVID Response and Medical Team, including:

Scott Grafton, M.D.
Campus COVID-Mitigation Program Manager and Professor of Psychological and Brain Sciences

Stuart Feinstein, Ph.D.
COVID-19 Response Team Coordinator and Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology

Vejas Skripkus, M.D.
Executive Director of Student Health and Campus Physician

Mary Ferris, M.D.
Campus COVID-19 Clinical Advisor

Reflections

Our campus community is profoundly saddened by another horrific shooting, at Robb Elementary School in Uvalde, Texas. We send our deepest condolences and heartfelt sympathy to the victims, their loved ones, and all those affected by this senseless tragedy.

Our hearts also are with the victims of the massacre in Buffalo and the shooting in Laguna Woods, and with their families, loved ones, and all those impacted by these tragic events.

I was grateful for the opportunity to join our students and colleagues at the May 20 campus vigil at Storke Plaza to honor the lives lost through the despicable acts in Buffalo and Laguna Woods, and to rededicate ourselves as a community that values
the richness of diversity and stands in solidarity against hatred, racism, intolerance, and violence.

As always, our greatest strength as a community is rooted in our collective respect and support for one another.

Update on the China Initiative

The Department of Justice announced on February 23 that it was effectively ending the controversial China Initiative, saying they had “concluded that this initiative is not the right approach.”

Many of our faculty colleagues had expressed concern about this initiative and about the potential for racial profiling and discrimination. I appreciate the message from VCR Incandela to our campus community on April 4, in support of faculty and international engagement.

We support our Chinese academic community, and we are committed to the fair and just treatment of all members of our academic community. We support international engagement and collaboration, and we value the vital contributions of our international students, postdocs, and visiting scholars. A free and open academic environment is essential to our mission as a public institution of higher education.

On Saturday, May 28, there was a fatal multi-vehicle traffic collision at El Colegio and Stadium Road.

The Coroner’s Bureau has released the names of the three who died, including UCSB student Sebastian Gil, 20 years old.
**Fall 2022 Preliminary SIR Data – Freshmen**

- 110,998 first-year applicants (105,647 last year)
- 28% admission rate (32% last year)
- 5,548 total SIRs (anticipating some summer “melt”)
- 5,195 expected Fall 2022 enrollment
- Average GPA: 4.28 (up from 4.24 last year)
- 30% underrepresented minorities (up from 26% last year)
- 34% first-generation four-year college students (up from 30% last year)
- 76% California residents, 10% domestic non-resident, 14% international

*All New Freshmen SIRS as of SIR Deadline*

Fall 2022 goal: 5,195

Typically, ~20% of admits sign Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs)
Fall 2022 Preliminary SIR Data – Transfers

- 17,604 transfer applicants (14% decrease from F21)
- 9,609 admits to date
  - SIRs running slightly behind F21
  - SIR deadline June 1
- Transfer enrollment target: 2,380
  - 2,050 California residents
  - 330 non-residents
### Non-Resident Enrollment Across UC

Percent of Undergraduate Enrollment 2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Total Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Barbara</strong></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Academy of Arts & Sciences

Three of our faculty were elected to the American Academy of Arts & Sciences:

- **Michael Doherty**, Mellichamp Chair in Process Systems Engineering; Professor of Chemical Engineering
- **Shelly Lundberg**, Broom Professor of Demography; Distinguished Professor of Economics
- **Joan-Emma Shea**, Professor of Chemistry & Biochemistry

---

National Academy of Sciences

Three of our faculty were elected to the National Academy of Sciences:

- **Alison Butler**, Distinguished Professor of Chemistry & Biochemistry
- **Richard Church**, Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Geography
- **Craig Hawker**, Heeger Chair in Interdisciplinary Science; Professor of Materials and Chemistry & Biochemistry; Clarke Professor and Director, California NanoSystems Institute
Guggenheim Fellows

Congratulations to our new Guggenheim Fellows:

• Professor Sylvester Okwunodu Ogbechie, History of Art and Architecture
• Distinguished Professor Toshiro Tanimoto, Earth Science

Wollaston Medal

Congratulations to Professor Emerita Tanya Atwater, Earth Science, for being honored with the Wollaston Medal, the highest award of the Geological Society of London, for her pioneering contributions to plate tectonics
Chancellor's Faculty Award for Undergraduate Research Mentoring

Congratulations to Assistant Professor Hannah Wohl, Sociology, for her distinctive record of mentoring undergraduates in research, honored with the 2022 Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research.

UCSB READS

Thank you to University Librarian Kristin Antelman and all of our faculty who participated in this year’s UCSB READS, including the presentation by author Ted Chiang on May 10.
New Classroom Building

- 2,000 seats; 4 floors; 51,000 ASF
- $97 million
- 35% total increase in campus classroom capacity
- First building devoted to teaching since 1967
- To be completed Spring 2023

Ocean Road Housing

- Approved by the UC Regents at the May meeting
- 540 new housing units, to be completed in two phases
- Mix of faculty and staff housing, for-sale and rental
- Campus effort led by former Interim Executive Vice Chancellor, Interim Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, and Academic Senate Chair Joel Michaelsen
2022-23 Proposed State Budget for UC

- Regents’ Budget Plan requested a base-budget increase of $422.1 million and one-time funds of $609 million.
- On 1/10, Governor Newsom released his 2022-23 state budget proposal with $307.3 million for UC (7.7% increase over last year) and one-time funds of $295 million.
- On 5/13, the Governor released the “May Revise,” which increased the proposed funding for UC to $322.5 million (8% increase over last year) and one-time funds of $607.9 million.

Proposal includes one-time investment of $185 million for UC climate resiliency efforts, including:

- $100 million for climate action research seed and matching grants available to researchers from UC and other institutions;
- $50 million for regional climate innovation incubators;
- $35 million to establish climate workforce development and training hubs.
- Governor’s budget reflects the first year of a multi-year Compact with the University for sustained ongoing funding.
- The multi-year Compact will provide UC with annual 5% base budget adjustments through 2026-27, as long as progress is made towards specified policy goals related to enrollment, accessibility and affordability, graduation rates, and more.
Salary Increases for 2022-23

On May 24, we announced that for 2022-23, the Office of the President is implementing a 4.5% general salary increase for non-represented staff and a 4% range adjustment for faculty salary scales.

A Special Salary Equity Program for faculty is also included.

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

Commencement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday, June 10</th>
<th>1:00 PM - 3:00 PM</th>
<th>Commencement Green Graduate Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, June 11</td>
<td>9:00 AM - 12:30 PM</td>
<td>Commencement Green College of Letters &amp; Science Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, June 11</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Commencement Green College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, June 12</td>
<td>9:00 AM - 12:30 PM</td>
<td>Commencement Green College of Letters &amp; Science Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, June 12</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>Commencement Green College of Letters &amp; Science Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- We are in the midst of voting on a Memorial to the UC Regents. The Memorial petitions the Regents to reduce the University’s Scope 1 greenhouse gas emissions significantly. Scope 1 greenhouse gas emissions originate from fossil fuels that are burned directly on the campus, the majority of which are from cogeneration plants (some of which are associated with UC health centers). UCSB does not have a cogeneration plant. The Systemwide Academic Senate feels strongly that this is an area in which the University of California can set an example. The voting period will end tomorrow. We would appreciate it if Faculty Legislature members would remind their colleagues to vote. Approximately 21% of eligible Academic Senate members have voted so far.
The most recent Academic Senate newsletter covered the newly convened review panel on the proposed Munger Hall project. I am grateful to the faculty and other stakeholders who are committing their time to participate. The panel will be meeting into the summer, and we expect to receive a set of recommendations within the next few months.

The Joint Senate-Administration Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group Final Report has been released by the Office of the President. The report was presented to the UC Regents, where the Academic Senate Chair and Vice Chair argued for supporting faculty in rebooting their research, as many were severely impacted by the research slowdown and shutdown during the pandemic and the level of scholarly activity has yet to fully recover.

The Academic Senate held a Town Hall Meeting on Faculty Housing in April. Thank you to Jean Beaman, Chair of the Committee on Diversity and Equity, and Lisa Parks, Chair of the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards for organizing the meeting, and for following up on the continuing issues of concern. Housing affordability and availability will continue to be an issue of discussion in the Academic Senate in the coming year.

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) has come to an agreement on a single general education transfer pathway for transfer from California Community Colleges to the University of California and California State University. State Assembly Bill (AB) 928 mandates that the three segments must come to an agreement by May 30, 2023, or else the authority for establishing the pathway will be shifted to the administration.

The Academic Senate has been taking part in an evaluation of the review process for the approval of master’s programs. The key question is whether to allow individual campuses to issue approvals or to retain systemwide oversight of the approval process. The Academic Planning Council (APC) Workgroup on the Review and Approval of Master’s Degree Programs, appointed by Provost Brown, has recommended that systemwide oversight should remain in place for now.

At its May meeting, the Academic Council continued its discussion of fully online undergraduate programs. This topic has not yet arisen at our campus, but there are active proposals from other campuses under consideration. The Academic Senate feels strongly that the review of fully online undergraduate programs be set up very carefully and with a great deal of oversight to ensure that all offerings are UC quality.

Update on the Learning Management System (LMS) Migration - Hector Villicana, Executive Director, Letters and Science IT

Over the past academic year, conversations have been taking place on campus about the future of GauchoSpace, the ecosystem of applications and services that help us to teach and learn. GauchoSpace is based on Moodle, and recent
changes to Moodle’s user experience will necessitate an update to GauchoSpace next year in order for the system to remain secure.

- The Next Generation Learning Management Committee was convened to consider how we might approach the update, i.e., whether to move to Moodle 4 or to a different system. All other UC campuses are using Canvas. The Committee ultimately recommended that our campus should sundown the Moodle-based LMS and adopt Canvas too.
- The migration to Canvas will be pursued in advance of the 2023-24 academic year. As of Summer Quarter 2023, all web-based course materials will be hosted by Canvas.
- Many of the components of LMS will not change, such as GauchoCast, GradeScope, Box, and Google. The user interface will look different, and will be more mobile friendly, but there is not expected to be a significant disruption in terms of how we use the system.
- UCSB is working with a vendor to assist with migrating courses from GauchoSpace to Canvas.
- Three courses were piloted in Canvas in the spring quarter of 2022, and the trial went very well. There will be an expanded pilot in the summer and fall terms of 2022.

Active Service Modified Duties - Melissa Morgan, Vice-Chair and Professor of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology

Chair Scott invited an update from Vice Chair Melissa Morgan, who has been working with a small group to ensure that Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD) serves all members of the campus equitably.

- ASMD is an invaluable resource for faculty, and impacts various types of parents differently.
- An average of approximately 19 faculty make use of ASMD on campus each year (based on data provided for 2019 and 2020 by Academic Personnel).
- There have been concerns about the uneven application of the policy across different categories of parenting (biological; adoptive; foster; same-sex) and across departments and divisions.
- There is a general lack of awareness about the policy’s provisions among department and divisional leadership.
- The Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (CACSW) has worked on the issue of faculty parental leave, including Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD).
  - Data, analysis, and recommendations appear in its three most recent (2016, 2018, and 2020) reports.
During this same time (AY 2017-2018), the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) also created recommendations for a more clear and just parental leave policy.

Senate committees have recently received inquiries and complaints related to ASMD.

Parental concerns are both a faculty recruitment and retention issue for the university: they have been seen to deeply affect morale and the ability of faculty to think of one’s career at UCSB as long-term.

Concerns are broad-ranging, from lack of clarity in process to inequities in application due to family make-up.

The purpose of the working group’s proposal is to clarify ASMD guidelines and revise the process to improve equity and better meet the needs of faculty parents.

Data indicating the need for this proposal:

ASMD records analysis across campus divisions reveals:

- APM/Red Binder language clearly indicates that a reduction in teaching duties is normative but only 86% of the records show that teaching duties were modified (around 14% of faculty on ASMD had no modification).
- Non-child-bearing faculty members (89%) are receiving teaching duty modifications to a greater extent than are child-bearing faculty members (79%) (note: the type of non-child-bearing parent is not tracked directly by the university).

Recommendations about ASMD:

- Develop clear workload expectations for a typical Professor-series faculty member’s modified duties on ASMD.
- Suggest language for presumption of full teaching relief during each quarter of ASMD (with the exception of dissertation advising and other graduate student mentoring, or comparable undergraduate student mentoring in those departments without a graduate program).
- Suggest presumption of relief from major departmental and university service during each quarter of childbearing leave/ASMD and a presumption of a reduction of professional activities. Faculty should request deviations from these typical or presumptive modifications as needed, consistent with the APM.
- Develop equivalent expectations (standards) for Lecturers, particularly with respect to teaching relief.
• Develop expectations about how ASMD should be used when births or child placements occur other than at the beginning of a quarter.
• Modify AP Leave Folio to provide more thorough policy information and collect key information for tracking and equity analysis purposes.

Consent Calendar
The minutes of the April 21 meeting were considered for approval.

Motion: To approve the consent calendar. The motion was seconded, and passed with 24 in favor, 0 against, and 3 abstentions.

Reports of Standing Committees

Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 140.B.

The Faculty Legislature considered a set of proposed changes to Senate Regulation 140.B. regarding Academic Minors. Recent changes to Senate Regulation 125.I regarding the Definition of a Major in the College of Letters and Science eliminated extra residence requirements beyond the systemwide requirements for students in the College of Letters and Science. However, the College pointed out that similar language remained in Senate Regulation 140. The proposed changes were designed to bring the regulation in line with the recent changes to Senate Regulation 125.I.

Motion: To approve the proposed changes to Senate Regulation 140.B. The motion was seconded and passed with 23 in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention.

Chair Scott adjourned the meeting at 4:37 p.m.
Charges Advisory Committee

2021-2022 Annual Report

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Per UC Academic Senate Bylaw 105,

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

During the 2021-2022 Senate cycle, the Charges Officer responded to 5 formal complaints. The Charges Advisory Committee was consulted regarding 4 of these complaints (the 5th complaint was placed on hold at the request of the Complainant). Based on recommendations of the Charges Advisory Committee, 3 ad hoc Charges Committees were formed to investigate allegations and determine whether there was probable cause for undertaking disciplinary action. 1 case was held in abeyance.

The results of the investigations were communicated to the appropriate parties as defined in the Campus Procedures for Enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Andrew Norris served as Charges Advisory Officer for the 2021-2022 Senate cycle.

2021-2022 Committee Members

Joao Hespanha
Jane Mulfinger
Susanne Stemmer

Shasta Delp, Advisor
Monica Solorzano, Advisor
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met a total of 58 times, for approximately 2-3 hours per session, during the 2021-22 term. All meetings were held in executive session, and all meetings were held via Zoom due to ongoing issues related to COVID-19. In addition, CAP leadership met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel from January through late June of the 2022 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 2021-22 academic year included the following:

- Reviewed 362 academic personnel cases (and, in addition, 43 post audits of Dean’s Authority cases), resulting in 405 personnel actions in 2021-22. At this writing, one case is still pending CAP review awaiting additional materials.
- CAP chair met monthly with the Academic Senate Executive Committee
- CAP chair and vice chair audited the Dean's equity adjustment proposals in Summer 2022
- CAP chair and vice-chair met with the Academic Senate Chair to discuss and finalize a reconfiguration of CAP
- 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 2021-22 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
- Meetings with the Committee on Diversity and Equity, and the Council on Faculty Welfare
- Completed a previously initiated analysis of personnel cases from 3 review cycles. The purpose was to probe possible systemic barriers to advancement relative to different disciplines. CAP leadership presented the finished study to two divisional deans and the AVC.
I. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, search waivers, retentions, expanded review merit advancements, promotions, and other career reviews. A total of 405 personnel actions were reviewed. A summary of the workload appears in Tables I and II, III, IV 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 a candidate. Pursuant to the revised RB I-30 (Dean’s Authority), the deans held approval authority for normative merit advancements, along with advancements at the Assistant and Associate level with up to ½ step increase in off-scale supplement (so long as the Dean agreed with the Department recommendation). The Deans also finalized appointments for Assistant Professor II and III. For cases in which a tentative decision differs from CAP's and/or the Dean's recommendation by 1 step/increment or more (in salary or step), it is sent back to that agency for further comment. CAP received 16 tentative decisions from the Associate Vice Chancellor. CAP conducted post audits of 43 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. CAP received no recommendation for a terminal appointment this review period. 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 four current CAP members.

III. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY ISSUES

A number of policy issues were notable in the course of the 2021-22 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 without adequate explanation in the coded list of external reviewers. Departures from the following passages within Red Binder I-46-IV were noted:

- “Letters should come from tenured faculty at distinguished institutions, preferably from full professors.”
- “two UC familiar letters for cases in which such letters are required.”
- “Half of the letters submitted with the case should come from references chosen by the Chair in consultation with the Department but independent of the candidate.”
- “The letters solicited by the Department should come from scholars who have not been closely associated with the candidate as collaborators in research, or as teachers, colleagues, or personal friends.”
- “An effort should also be made not to contact individuals who have contributed letters for prior reviews of the same candidate”
- “A minimum of six analytic letters is required.”

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 or publication venues. 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 section I-75-V: “Reviewing agencies will return cases to the Departments if they do not conform to these guidelines.”

F. Elimination of letters for advancement to Step VI
This personnel cycle was the first in which candidates advanced to Professor VI without external letters. From CAP’s perspective, the challenge was to evaluate such cases as career reviews (as directed by the Red Binder) without the information and perspective of external reviewers. For the most part, this was facilitated by thoughtful Departmental memos that provided comments about career achievements, along with inclusion of the candidate’s CV (which typically lists broad career activities) rather than just the bio-bib (which lists career activities narrowly, i.e., only
in research). Certain cases that lacked such information were difficult to review, and CAP hopes that future personnel packages for Step VI cases will contain appropriate departmental comments, along with a CV.

IV. COVID-19 and Merit and Promotion Reviews

Ongoing challenges resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and concern about the possible impact on the academic review process continued this review cycle. CAP recognizes that the pandemic will likely continue to have disparate and inequitable impacts (especially on scholarly productivity) across our faculty that could affect advancement decisions.

A. Optional COVID Impact Statements
CAP notes that 165 cases included a COVID-19 impact statements. These statements assisted in recognizing faculty who have experienced disruptions and/or hardship due to conditions related to COVID-19, helping place the record in context and assisted in understanding how these conditions have impacted the record. CAP encourages faculty to continue to document future disruptions.

B. Documenting Temporary Adjustments of Workload
CAP reminds Departments to provide explanations for any modification in workload obligations that were granted to assist faculty who experienced challenges stemming from COVID-19 (such as homeschooling, dependent-care responsibilities, etc.). Last year, it was recommended that any accommodations should be documented in a memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed by the faculty member, chair, and dean, and should be included in the case materials during the merit review. CAP would like to remind faculty members that the campus, in accordance with guidelines established by the AVC, supports official accommodations made due to the pandemic and reviewing agencies will consider any revised workload expectations in assessing the record.

C. Stopping or Extending the Tenure Clock for Non-Tenured Faculty
Under normal circumstances, the 8-year tenure clock may be extended twice 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.” This allows additional service pre-tenure beyond the 8-year limit. Due to ongoing complications related to COVID-19, upon request, a third, one-year extension for COVID-19 was automatically granted, without prejudice to those who requested it. CAP encouraged non-tenured faculty to utilize this opportunity if they have experienced complications due to COVID.
D. Teaching Evaluations & Optional Teaching Statements
The campus is awaiting a revision of the teaching evaluation process (as being studied currently by the Teaching Evaluation Workgroup); in the meantime, ESCIs are still a routine aspect of our review process. CAP continues to take care in evaluating ESCI scores, given known issues of bias. Notably, faculty will not be penalized if they received unfavorable evaluations and scores based on factors beyond their control due to the remote instructional context. Further, Teaching Self Assessments, although optional, are helpful in providing reviewing agencies with information about the particular challenges, accomplishments, and activities resulting from the transition to remote teaching. It is helpful if faculty 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 affective commitment for faculty, which should be recognized as a contribution to diversity if appropriate. CAP encourages faculty to utilize teaching statements to provide context for ESCI scores and any additional pandemic challenges.

V. CAMPUS ISSUES

A. Proposed Changes to Departmental Voting Bylaws
Per Bylaw 55, “the method by which personnel matters” are decided “must have the approval of the divisional Committee on Academic Personnel or its equivalent.” As part of this process, CAP reviewed the proposed changes to departmental voting procedures on personnel cases. The following Departments’ proposed changes were approved:

- Department of Art
- Department of Communication
- Department of Economics
- Department of Religious Studies
- Department of Sociology

B. Streamlining Process Proposal
The Associate Vice Chancellor consulted with CAP regarding a proposed overhaul to the AP process, in which both the number of review areas, and the number of potential outcomes, were reduced. The primary goal of this proposal (as stated by the AVC) was to reduce workload at all stages in the AP process, reduce complexity, and increase transparency. CAP discussed the proposal at length internally, and provided feedback to the AVC on the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the proposal.
C. **Salary Equity Adjustment**
As part of a UC-wide action, the AVC and Deans worked to address issues of salary inequity on our campus. A specific working procedure was developed, where 1) the AVC identified a list of faculty whose salary fell below expectations, based on a certain model; 2) The Deans were given a budget, and asked to nominate faculty from their division (usually from the AVC’s list) for salary increases; and 3) CAP leadership audited the Deans’ nominations to insure they fell in line with pre-stated criteria regarding the goals of the program. Along with the audit results, CAP leadership sent to the AVC a memo expressing opinions about the positives and negatives of various aspects of the process.

D. **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. All meetings were held remotely via Zoom.

E. **CAP FAQ**
CAP continued to update and make changes to the *frequently asked questions* (FAQ) page in order to address the academic review process at UCSB and the role of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) in the process. Questions and responses were grouped into three sections: A. About CAP; B. Academic Personnel Standards and Criteria; C. Information for Departments and Candidates. The Office of Academic Personnel was consulted in the implementation of posting all changes. Currently, the Academic Personnel website redirects viewers to the Academic Senate website to allow easy access to the FAQ. However, the information is available primarily via the Academic Senate website:

[https://senate.ucsb.edu/policies-and-procedures/frequently-asked-questions/personnel-cases/](https://senate.ucsb.edu/policies-and-procedures/frequently-asked-questions/personnel-cases/).

F. **CONSULTATION ON REVISIONS TO 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 2021 and January 2022. Consultations involved updates to several sections, including: Red Binder I-4, I-8, I-14, I-15, I-22, I-26, I-27, I-30, I-31, I-34, I-36, I-44, I-60, I-70, I-75, II-25, III-9, III-14, III-44, IV-6, VI-1, V-2, VI-3, VI-4, VI-5, VI-7, VI-8, VI-14, VII-4, VII-7, and I-75.
VI. 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. Draft Presidential Policy -- Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace
   b. Systemwide Review of Recommendations for Department Political Statements
   c. Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data
   d. Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial program Phase 2 Taskforce

2. CAP reviewed informational documents regarding ongoing systemwide discussions, as well as pertinent academic personnel approaches at other UC campuses, including:
      i. APM 710
      ii. APM 715
      iii. APM 720
      iv. APM 730
      v. APM 740
      vi. APM 750-752
      vii. APM 758-60
   b. Systemwide Review of Revisions to APM 025 and 671 - Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities
   c. Proposed Revisions to APM 210 to Recognize Mentorship Activities

VII. CARRY-OVER ISSUES FOR 2022-23

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. Clashes between departmental norms for external letters, and Red Binder guidelines
E. Clarity on dealing with cases with deficiencies in one or more categories, given lack of Red Binder guidance
F. Clarification of placement of public-facing writing (and related projects), and digital humanities.
VIII. 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.

2021-22 COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Divyakant Agrawal, Computer Science
Kevin Anderson, Sociology
Bassam Bamieh, Mechanical Engineering (Ended 2/17/22)
Eileen Boris, Feminist Studies
Barbara Herr Harthorn, Anthropology
Shane Jimerson, Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology
Mark Meadow, History of Art and Architecture
David Morrison, Mathematics and Physics (Ended 5/13/22)
Ben Olguin, English
James Roney, Psychological and Brain Sciences
Andrew Teel, Electrical and Computer Engineering (Started 2/18/22)
Yuedong Wang, Statistics and Applied Probability
Rich Wolski, Computer Science
Janet Walker, Film and Media Studies (Vice Chair)
Omar Saleh, Materials, Biomolecular Science and Engineering Program (Chair)
### TABLE I: Summary of All Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP 2021-22

<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>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review (Prof Above, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations/Appeals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment (Cases that resulted in terminal appointment)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAP REVIEWED CASES</strong></td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series Transfers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reviews (included in Merits and Promotions Totals)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change (included in Merits total)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS</strong></td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II: Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees 2021-22

*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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Action</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actions requiring Ad Hoc Review</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of Ad Hoc Review Committees</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of cases submitted to CAP covering 406 personnel actions:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III: 20-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merits requiring CAP review</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retentions</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Appraisals</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconsiderations</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Waivers (prev. EOR’s)</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Audits of Dean’s Authority (prev. Routine) Cases</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Initial Personnel Actions Reviewed By CAP</strong></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentatives</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVIEWED BY CAP</strong></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ACTIONS (INCLUDED IN MERIT TOTALS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal Appointment</strong></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>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Reviews (included in Merits total)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Equity Reviews (As part of another personnel action)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series Transfers (as part of merit or promotion case)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of ad hoc committees</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE IV - COMPARISON OF REVIEWING AGENCIES OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>The reviewing agency agreed with the departmental recommendation.</th>
<th>Pending Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>The reviewing agency did NOT agree with the departmental recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final - To Full 3</td>
<td>Final - To Above 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAP- To Full 1</td>
<td>Final -W/ Above 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean - To Full 1</td>
<td>Final - Visiting 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### If No, + or -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plus (+)</th>
<th>Recommendation above the departmental recommendation (+).</th>
<th>Minus (-)</th>
<th>Recommendation below the departmental recommendation (-).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reviewing Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPOINTMENTS</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>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Appointment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Security of Employment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL APPOINTMENTS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROMOTIONS

| Associate Professor/Lecture SOE | 36 | 23 | 13 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 23 | 10 | 13 | 0 |
| Professor/Sr Lecturer SOE      | 23 | 7  | 15 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 3  | 19 | 3  | 16 | 0 | 4  | 4 | 7  | 13 | 3  | 10 | 0 |
| TOTAL PROMOTIONS               | 59 | 30 | 28 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 43 | 13 | 31 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 20 | 36 | 13 | 23 | 0 |

### EXPANDED REVIEW MERITS

| To Professor VI | 16 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Appraisals      | 24 | 15 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 0 |
| To Professor Above | 22 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| Within Professor Above | 44 | 29 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 27 | 17 | 2 | 15 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 31 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 2 |
| Other Merits    | 152 | 61 | 91 | 46 | 45 | 6 | 46 | 106 | 49 | 57 | 3 | 50 | 6 | 58 | 95 | 40 | 45 | 3 |
| Reconsiderations | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| TOTAL MERITS    | 258 | 129 | 129 | 61 | 69 | 9 | 96 | 162 | 70 | 93 | 7 | 96 | 9 | 116 | 139 | 59 | 70 | 6 |

### SERIES TRANSFERS

| Professor Series to LSOE Series | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| LSOE Series to Professor Series | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| TOTAL SERIES TRANSFERS          | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |
### SEARCH WAIVERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SEARCH WAIVERS</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CERs

| Career Equity Review (CER) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### RETENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RETENTIONS</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALL CASES

|                  | 362 | 203 | 157 | 70  | 88  | 9  | 151 | 210 | 83  | 125 | 11  | 150 | 16  | 178 | 177 | 72  | 93  | 8  |

**ADDITIONAL NO TES:**

- One Appraisal case resulted in Continuing Candidacy with reservations.
- The dean does not weigh in on visiting appointments.
### TABLE V - PERSONNEL ACTIONS BY DIVISION/SCHOOL 2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BREAKDOWN BY PERSONNEL ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPOINTMENTS - TENURED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINTMENTS - NON-TENURED (CAP-reviewed only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINTMENTS - ENDOWED CHAIR/VISITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION TO TENURE/SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Division (Tenure/Security of Employment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR/SENIOR LECTURER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Division (Full/ Senior LSOE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERITS (Not including Career Reviews and Retentions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Division (Merits)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIT TO PROF VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIT TO PROF ABOVE SCALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIT WITHIN PROF ABOVE SCALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETENTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FORMAL APPRAISALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RECONSIDERATION

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

## SEARCH WAIVERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary Division (Search Waivers)**

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

## POST AUDITS OF ROUTINE CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BREAKDOWN OF ACTIONS CONDUCTED AS PART OF ABOVE REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 0.0% 14.6% 6.3% 6.3% 31.3% 16.7% 25.0% 100%

## TENTATIVES TO CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CAREER EQUITY REVIEWS

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

## MANDATORY REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRST</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>ESMS</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>HUFA</th>
<th>MLPS</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SERIES TRANSFERS

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

## TERMINAL APPOINTMENT

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

**Note:** CAP usually counts joint appointments as a single case. To give a breakdown by division, joint appointments are counted for each department. An additional section has been added to show the number of cases that cross divisions. Some division numbers may appear higher due to cases crossing divisions.

^Accelerations are those in time only.
Committee on Diversity and Equity
Annual Report 2021-22

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 pursuing 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 officio members of the committee. In addition, there is one non-Senate academic representative, one undergraduate student representative, and one graduate student representative.

Summary of CDE activities over 2021-22
There was a total of fifteen regularly scheduled meetings of the Committee over the 2021-22 term. All meetings were held via Zoom. CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were:

- Continuing work, in consultation with Academic Personnel and the Committee on Academic Personnel, on guidelines for faculty contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statements for merit review and tenure and promotion.
- Liaising with many campus constituents doing diversity work, including the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, the Divisional Senate Chair and Vice Chair, the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors, the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools, the Graduate Division, and the Disabled Students Program in order to better organize and coordinate DEI work on our campus.
- Reviewing systemwide and divisional policy proposals and revisions.
- In consultation with Council on Faculty Welfare, advocating for better transparency and access to housing for faculty, including both university and privately owned housing.
- Introduced resolution in Faculty Legislature defending Academic Freedom to Teach Race and Gender Justice.

CDE discussed 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 Revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC)
In October, the Committee discussed the addition of an Area 7 - Ethnic Studies to the UC IGETC requirements, thus revising Senate Regulation 478. CDE welcomed the addition, but members wondered how the different categories were chosen. Middle Eastern and North African (MENA) communities were not mentioned in the list. In January, CDE discussed the second systemwide review of revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC). Members noted that MENA populations were still not included.

Systemwide Review of the Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
In October, the Committee discussed the systemwide review of the Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. Ex Officio member and Director of Title IX and Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Alvarez provided some additional context for these proposed revisions. The newest piece in the proposed revisions relates to sexual exploitation being a part of prohibited contact, which would allow the Title IX office to explore charges in this area. SB 493 would end mutual no contact orders; the accused would have to abide by one, but the complainant could engage with the respondent. The new policies pertaining to patient care are most significant for campuses with medical centers, but would apply to UCSB’s Student Health and CAPS. Additional steps for how to address complaints have been taken already, and new training deployed. Members asked about the rationale in change to the no contact policy, and resources provided to students when they are abroad or the perpetrator is not a student.

Draft Presidential Policy – Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace
In November, CDE discussed the draft Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace. While members found it very beneficial to have this kind of policy, and norms of professional behavior are not always established, there were concerns. Members have seen behavior that just manages to skirt the rules and get around published policies. While “egregious” is used to cover one-time instances of some behaviors, it is not applied to all areas. Egregious, one-time actions should be applicable in all of the categories. Because of individuals’ different social locations, or positions within society, some people might be more likely to be targeted by bullying and abusive behaviors. Members discussed what the procedures currently are for dealing with anonymous reports, and how this could vary across campuses. People may be hesitant to report behavior if they fear retaliation. A corollary document could be created that lays out the processes and procedures for those who are accused of abusive conduct. The policy is not very specific about who will be conducting the investigation. There should be protections against false accusations. What happens when you make a case should be in the policy; this can be a deterrent to reporting if folks are not aware of the full process.

Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and APM 671
In November, the Committee discussed the proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and 671, pertaining to conflict of commitment and outside activities of faculty members. CDE focused on APM 025, as APM 671 covered health sciences compensation plan participants. The Committee found it concerning that foreign and domestic professional groups are treated differently, which seems odd as many professional organizations are international in nature. The amount of money faculty can make on top of what they earn from UC seems inequitable and needs more clarification on how it will be calculated. The revisions seemed strange if the motivation is to scrutinize faculty members’ sources of income, but understandable if it is to protect intellectual property. The potential for abuses of power was also raised; there could be conflicts of interest if a Chair does not want to approve a post-doc or a graduate student doing supplemental work.

Recommendations for Department Political Statements
In January, CDE discussed the Recommendations for Department Political Statements. What does it mean to post department political statements, and what options do faculty who do not agree with their department’s statement have? The document had two recommendations: to post a disclaimer with the statement that it should not be taken as a position of the UC or campus as a whole, and should indicate whose views in the department the statement represents, and give an opportunity for minority viewpoints to be stated. There is currently no existing policy around departments posting or distributing political statements. Members pointed out that who is eligible to vote in departmental matters will vary by each department’s bylaws; Non-Senate faculty may not be able to vote. If there is a list of names
attached to a department political statement, these people may be assumed to have not agreed with it, which could lead to adverse actions. Members also discussed power dynamics and if people who object to a statement would be intimidated to not voice their objections and that more definitions, such as for “political statement” and “dissent”, were needed in the document.

**Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3**
In January, the Committee reviewed the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3, which would create an A-G “Area H” ethnic studies admission requirement for California high school applicants to UC. While members found the new requirement promising, some wondered if this requirement was moot as every California high school student will be required to take an ethnic studies course for graduation. It would seem to add a layer of complexity to the undergraduate admissions process, as California high school applicants would have an additional requirement to complete that non-resident applicants would not. There was also concern that some non-traditional students might not have access to an ethnic studies course.

**Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data**
In March, CDE reviewed the second systemwide review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data. CDE commented on the first review last year, and pointed out concerns around power differentials between faculty and graduate students, who gets their name on work, and implicit biases affecting underrepresented minority students. Members thought that some of these suggestions that were not included in the revised draft should be stated again.

**Presidential Policy on Affiliations with Certain Healthcare Organizations**
In April, CDE discussed the Presidential Policy on Affiliations with Certain Healthcare Organizations. CDE reviewed a previous version of this policy last year. Members wanted to affirm that UC should not be working with healthcare facilities with discriminatory practices, and should align with organizations that do not have restrictions. There were questions about what the impacts of discontinuing current affiliations would be, how this would be enforced, and what “refer” and “access” actually mean. Can restrictive locations refer patients out to non-restrictive ones?

**Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce**
In May, the Committee discussed the Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce report. The NSTP, started in 2013, has been tried on some campuses (not UCSB). It is an additional way to fund faculty salary. Very few faculty have participated in it. Augmenting salary could have positive implications for faculty recruitment and retention, if campuses are seen as more competitive. It was suggested that language could be added about the disparity for faculty in disciplines that are less likely to access grants with large amounts of funding. The NSTP should also not be used as a way for campuses to ignore salary issues that will arise.

**Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Sections 715, Leave of Absence/Family and Medical Leave (APM – 715) and APM 760, Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing (APM – 760)**
In June, CDE reviewed proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Sections 715, Leaves of Absence/Family and Medical Leave and 760, Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing. Members thought these policy revisions complement work that the UCSB campus is undertaking to address inequities with leave accommodations and familial arrangements that were not considered when these policies were written, and applauded the increase in pay these revisions will provide faculty.
Reviews of Campus Issues

Faculty Diversity Award
In October, CDE reviewed the draft 2021-22 Faculty Diversity Award Guidelines, which had no substantive changes for this year. The award committee reviewed packets during winter quarter, and met virtually to select the winner. This year’s recipient was Sherene Seikaly, Associate Professor of History.

In May, CDE discussed ideas for potential revisions and improvements to the Faculty Diversity Award, such as letting nomination be valid for more than one year; having different categories and giving out more than one award; having co-winners or honorary mentions; reducing the number of required letters of support; advertising the award better; and changing the name of the award to make it less vague. In June, the Committee voted unanimously to allow Faculty Diversity Award nominations to roll over for two subsequent award cycles.

Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal – WASC
In October, CDE discussed the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal - WASC. Overall, members supported the campus theme and the three questions around degree pathways and bottlenecks that will be researched and examined over the next two years. Some departments have already done research on why students leave their majors, and this work should be leveraged and shared.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statements
CDE continued its work on guidelines for faculty contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statements for tenure and promotion. In October, Chair Beaman explained some of the work that occurred over the summer, including meeting with AVC of Academic Personnel Dana Mastro, and the incoming and outgoing chairs of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP suggested that it might be easiest to create a one-page overview of information about writing DEI statements. This would potentially lead to proposing more formal changes to the Red Binder. Members discussed the usefulness of using other UC DEI statement guidelines as examples, however, there is variation in what campuses can count diversity towards and if statements are mandated. There is tension in that some faculty do diversity work as part of their research, therefore it is not counted as “above and beyond”. There are also those who feel this is not something relevant to their work and they do not want to be penalized for not having DEI statements. The Committee also discussed having a website that could be gradually built. The focus should be on diversity work impacts, even if they do not “work” the way they are intended. Examples would be helpful to show faculty who might not think DEI statements apply to them the types of work they could be engaging in.

By late fall quarter, there was a draft guidelines document. In January, the Academic Personnel newsletter contained a section from AVC Mastro about contributions to diversity statements., which put CDE in a confusing place in terms of putting out their own guideline document. The Committee on Academic Personnel analyst provided Analyst Rivera with some suggestions on CDE’s faculty diversity statements guidelines document, and ideas about how to restructure it, including making it a more concise document. By April, Chair Beaman informed CDE that it had become much more complicated to post some general guidelines than originally thought. Members discussed other ideas such as taking examples of diversity work from past Faculty Diversity Award packets and trying to address issues with getting CAP and Academic Personnel to agree on changes and who approves them. During spring quarter, the Committee went back to their draft guidelines and made some more revisions. Professional Activities was added, and members discussed the UCAADE recommendations for DEI statements. This
document recommends that DEI statements should be used systemwide, but each campus needs to develop its own guidelines. There is tension between wanting a UC-wide response while not minimizing the authority of campuses.

Chair Beaman will work over the summer to see if more progress can be made toward having CAP review the final DEI statement guideline document that CDE put together.

**Discussion with Academic Senate Divisional Chair Susannah Scott**

In November, CDE was joined by Academic Senate Divisional Chair Susannah Scott. Divisional Chair Scott shared systemwide issues and campus issues that CDE might be interested in. There is a desire to increase UC enrollment by 20,000 and to limit non-resident enrollment. Increasing campus enrollments can be an opportunity to expand faculty and staff. Divisional Chair Scott expressed that UCSB needs to do a better job at hiring and making an impact on our diversity goals. The needle has not been moved much on diversity. There are big challenges in regards to retaining faculty of color, many of whom we have lost in the last few years. Mentoring in the merit review process as well as COVID impacts on faculty need to be looked into more. CDE could think about remote/hybrid work for staff, and its impact on faculty and students. The Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS) is concerned about the new test-blind admissions. UCSB also has an enormous issue with enrollment management. The Unit 18 lecturers union negotiations are top secret, but are in mediation. UCOP is making a request in next year’s budget for a 3% overall increase in faculty salary and merits and an extra 1% towards reducing the salary gap. URM faculty retention is a big concern. VC DEI Robnett is retiring, which is a tremendous blow to campus diversity efforts. Chair Scott urged CDE to think about what administrative structure would help the next VC DEI do a better job and make diversity work more seamless and effective across campus. We have a lot of different people and departments working independently on diversity issues. CDE should have a footprint in the search committee. Munger Hall is very complicated. The planning and negotiations with the donor have been going on for quite some time. There is definitely concern that the development of the project happened without broad consultation.

**Discussion with Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall**

In November, the Committee was joined by Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall. EVC Marshall presented an overview of diversity efforts and initiatives Academic Affairs has undertaken. EVC Marshall had hoped that the new Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion would help bring more coherence and coordination to campus diversity efforts, but VCDEI Robnett has now retired.

EVC Marshall is working closely with the Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors on faculty recruitment. This fall, there were 21 recruitments (6 from 2020-21 and 15 from previous recruitment cycles). There are seven Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows. It is anticipated that 47 FTE will be vacated this year. There has been a lot of hiring, which has brought in younger and more diverse faculty. Our faculty diversity data is complicated, as we have to use national, state, and/or UC categories. The numbers of unknowns can be large. For newly hired faculty, we are at less than half white and almost split between male and female. UCSB now require statements on diversity, equity, and inclusion for faculty recruitments. Other diversity initiatives include Faculty Diversity Enrichment Awards; MacArthur Foundation Chairs; and the Mellichamp Academic Initiative Professorships cluster being called in the area of racial justice. Academic Personnel has posted guidance on COVID issues in merit and promotion cases. EVC Marshall is working with the Office on the President on faculty and staff housing.

Chair Beaman asked EVC Marshall to think about how CDE can help coordinate DEI efforts across campus. EVC Marshall hopes that CDE could help with DEI guidance for faculty search committees. Chair
Beaman explained that CDE has been working with CAP and AP on DEI statement guidelines. There is concern that DEI statements are still only optional for merit and promotion cases. EVC Marshall wants to make affirmative action goals clear in workshop trainings. The campus needs to diversify its housing stock, and include rentals, to help with the housing crisis. More highly subsidized housing will be available in the future. There is a new program to help with down payments, the details of which are being finalized, that staff will be eligible for.

**Discussion with Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS) Chair Greg Mitchell**

In February, CDE was joined by Greg Mitchell, the Chair of the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools (CAERS). Chair Mitchell explained that CAERS sets standards for who gets into UCSB, and how applications are read. CAERS could use help in figuring out how to look at applicants as fairly as they can, and how to reduce bias in the admissions process, as well as diversifying their pool of readers. The admission reader pool does not represent the diversity of California. Last year there were 112,000 applications. This huge number makes the admissions process difficult.

Chair Mitchell explained the application review process, and discussed with members the implications of standardized tests no longer being considered. GPAs have also become less reliable during the pandemic, as students are taking many courses Pass/Fail, schools are not giving any failing grades, and many high school counselors (especially at wealthier schools) have learned how to “game the system”. CAERS is trying to adjust the admissions process in a time where the data is unreliable. Effects of these changes will be seen over the next few years. Readers are looking at an applicants’ activities, leadership, hardships, and how these relate to their academic interests. Readers are normalized fairly regularly, but there are many subjective features. The reading scores over the last few years have been geared more towards academics, which was what the faculty on CAERS at the time wanted.

**Resolution Defending Academic Freedom to Teach Race and Gender Justice**

In February, the Committee discussed a draft resolution on critical race theory and defending academic freedom. UCSB Senate leadership was contacted by Portland State University faculty about passing a resolution. Chair Beaman revised the provided draft language in places to appropriately represent the UCSB campus. This resolution would show solidarity with states that are passing anti-academic freedom laws. CDE, along with the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards, reviewed and approved the resolution language. The Faculty Legislature passed the resolution at its meeting of March 10, 2022. The resolution was posted on the Academic Senate webpage.

**Discussion with Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors**

In April, CDE was joined by Associate Dean Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs) Julie Carlson (Division of Humanities and Fine Arts, College of Letters and Science) and Joan-Emma Shea (Division of Math, Life, and Physical Sciences, College of Letters and Science). Professor Carlson is the point person for the FEAs. This year, the FEAs were trying to coordinate better with the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and were working with interim VCDEI Stewart and his initiatives. The FEAs have used last year and this year to reflect on DEI problems on the campus, and opportunities that have emerged, especially since previous VCDEI Robnett was appointed. Where do campus diversity initiatives go from here? How can we think about the dispersion of diversity work on this campus?

The FEAs were also looking into policy. Some policies impede attempts of departments to make diversity hires. It is very hard to do partner hires between two different departments, and we have lost female academics because of this. Many campus DEI entities want to transform the campus hiring/retention
pattern, but run up against resistance and budgetary realities. The Committee discussed with Professors Carlson and Shea the idea of designating an FEA point person to attend CDE meetings; bringing in the point person to the Senate/VCDEI diversity initiatives coordination meetings that have started to be held; and identifying during the summer some main issues that all groups could focus on next year. CDE members and the FEAs agreed that there is weight towards “not offending anyone” in the current merit and promotion process when it comes to rewarding diversity work. Perhaps the campus should be thinking about what barriers it is creating to prevent full inclusivity? Structurally we need to make changes.

Faculty Housing Townhall
On April 25, the Academic Senate held a townhall on faculty housing. Chancellor Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall, and Associate Chancellor Haines, among others, were in attendance to answer questions. CFW Chair Lisa Parks talked about the current state of the housing crisis in Santa Barbara, and CDE Chair Beaman discussed the impact of housing issues, especially on URM faculty. Faculty need more clarity around things such as the faculty housing waitlist and housing assistance programs. Even in subsidized housing, faculty are still paying a lot (such as for high HOA fees). The townhall started a much needed conversation, but a lot more work needs to be done.

Office of the Vice Chancellor of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Survey
In April, Ex Officio member and interim Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Jeffrey Stewart provided a preliminary update on the survey that his office sent to the campus. The objectives of the survey were to learn what diversity work is going on at the unit/department/individual level, see what types of programming and content are being offered, and identify target audiences and frequency of engagement. Unfortunately, the survey answered very few of these questions. Out of 143 responses, 78 did not provide any detail. Of the 80 who did provide detail, the College of Letters and Science was the largest campus body represented. The number one type of diversity activity being offered is trainings. Other types include committee work, curriculum and pedagogy, research, strategic planning, and alumni relations. There are lots of divergent forms of training going on, aimed at many audiences and covering a large list of topics. Many campus units are doing some sort of diversity work. Diversity work is pretty evenly spread across faculty, graduate and undergraduate programs, and a majority of these initiatives are not funded. Next steps will include following up with respondents, doing a gap analysis to find out what types of trainings are not being offered for what groups, and finding ways to facilitate collaboration among groups.

Discussion with Robert Hamm and Carlos Nash, Graduate Division Diversity Initiatives
In May, CDE was joined by Graduate Division’s Robert Hamm, Assistant Dean, and Carlos Nash, Director of Diversity Program, who updated the Committee on graduate student demographics and other interesting data. UCSB is starting to create gender parity in the graduate student population - the incoming class is 51% female. Underrepresented minority graduate students increased to 31%. There is a goal to match the undergraduate URM population, and mirror the population of California. There is concern that our URM numbers will not hold due to housing issues. Graduate Division has been polling departments to find out the effect the housing crisis has had on recruitment and acceptances. UCSB is looking at the biggest incoming class (900 SIRs and counting), but the lack of housing options could cause a large summer melt. In the department surveys, 86.6% said that yes, housing is causing issues. 96.6% of department respondents said that they heard concerns from students about the high cost of living here. 67.9% have had applicants decline admission because of a lack of housing. Housing is no longer guaranteed for graduate students.
**Discussion with Disabled Students Program Director Gary White**

In May, the Committee was joined by Gary White, Director of the Disabled Students Program and Jane Castillon, Associate Director. The total number of students enrolled in accommodations has been increasing, and is at 2500 in 2022. Cases have also been getting more complex. Remote instruction requests are taking up much of DSP’s time. In Fall 2021, the campus had an unsuccessful experiment with a testing center for exam accommodations; since that did not work out, DSP is now handling exam testing again. There are many conversations happening about remote instruction, but the number of requests are actually quite small. Access Ambassadors were created to help with this; they are students who are paid to bring a device and stream (not record) the class to the student with a remote accommodation.

There was a larger discussion about faculty concerns around classroom recording accommodations. Director White would love to see more disability training for faculty. The university could get sued if accommodations are not provided; it is the law and access cannot be denied. Some faculty say that remote accommodations are a fundamental alteration to the course, and are too hard to do. Members also asked if DSP accommodations, such as for remote accommodations, extend to students unable to find or afford housing in the area. Director White explained that DSP will advise Housing, and can help if a student has filed for a housing accommodation. Students will ask for remote accommodations, but unless they are disability related, DSP cannot provide them.

**Discussion with Divisional Senate Vice Chair Melissa L. Morgan**

In May, the Committee was joined by Senate Vice Chair Melissa L. Morgan. Vice Chair Morgan serves as a second Senate Vice Chair for Diversity Issues. This VC position was created by Divisional Chair Scott. Vice Chair Morgan serves on many campus committees dealing with DEI issues, and takes on special projects. One project that VC Morgan is focusing on is parental leave, and Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD). Currently there is uneven application of this policy across departments and across different types of parenting, as well as a general lack of awareness of it.

The workgroup looking at ASMD wants to clarify the ASMD guidelines, address needs of other types of parents, and clarify the process. There are dramatic variations in workload modifications. 14% of faculty on ASMD do not have any teaching duty modifications, and non-child-bearing faculty members receive teaching duty modifications more than child-bearing faculty. The workgroup wants to make recommendations for policy and equity, for the campus and systemwide. Providing templates, streamlining approval processes, and collecting key information will all be helpful. CDE will see the proposal once it is ready for Senate review.

**CDE Chair Work**

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

- Served as the 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 the Academic Senate Executive Council
- Served on the Chancellor’s Advisory Task Force on Childcare
- Served on the ASMD (Active Service Modified Duties) Working group
- Served as Ex Officio for Faculty Legislature
Served on Mellichamp Academic Initiative Professorships advisory committee on Racial Justice (Cluster V)

Pending Issues for CDE in 2022-23

- Continuing discussions with Academic Personnel and the Committee on Academic Personnel about faculty DEI statements.
- Continuing to expand collaboration with other campus entities doing diversity work, and working with the Interim Vice Chancellor of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion on campus initiatives.
- Continuing to address the housing affordability and availability crisis.
- Dealing with the graduate student union contract negotiations and potential strike, as well as the larger COLA issue.
- Discussing the need for a better university policy on working with students facing hardships.
- Learning about DEI best practices from other UC campuses.

Members 2021-22

Jean Beaman, Chair, UCAADE Rep
Irene Beyerlein
Mhoze Chikowero
Laurie Freeman
Jason Marden
Elinor Mason
Peng Oh
Scott Price, Non-Senate Academic Rep
Ricardo Alcaino, Ex Officio
Ariana Alvarez, Ex Officio
Belinda Robnett, Ex Officio (ended 12/1/21)
Jeffrey Stewart, Ex Officio (started 1/3/22)
Jordan Tudisco, GSA Rep
Ryan Watanabe, Undergraduate Student Rep
Kelly Rivera, Advisor
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) held nine regularly scheduled meetings, approximately 1½-2 hours per session. All meetings were held via zoom due to the COVID-19. In addition, the CIE Chair attended UCIE meetings throughout the 2021-22 Academic Year.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

During the 2021-2022 academic year, CIE:

- Conducted a workshop based on data collected from a survey of international undergraduate and graduate students conducted in the prior year.
- Reviewed systemwide policies concerning UC international activities.
- Reviewed campus policies concerning UC international activities.

The 2021-22 academic year included the following:

Consultation with administration as needed, including:

- Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Associate Vice Chancellor for Global Engagement
- Juan Campo, Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program
- Erin Hakim, Global Engagement Specialist
- Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students
INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

CIE received one MOU in Winter 2022, a collaboration agreement with National Taiwan Normal University (NTNU). This agreement, also known under the project name, “UCSB-NTNU Mandarin Chinese Language Program” plans to promote Mandarin Chinese Language Instruction through academic exchange of visiting scholars and students through a collaboration with the UCSB Department of East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies (EALCS) and the National Taiwan Normal University (NTNU) Department of Chinese. The committee endorsed the MOU with suggestions that visiting students be properly oriented prior to departure to NTNU.

SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

CIE conducted a workshop based on information collected from its 6th biennial survey of international students. The workshop entitled, “The UCSB Community and International Students: Working to Provide Better Support and Experiences,” was held on May 13, 2022. The workshop featured presentations from the following:

1. Spencer Smith, CIE Chair (Intro)
2. Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS)
3. Juan Campo, Director, Education Abroad (EAP)
4. Karyn Kessler, Director, English for Multilingual Students (EMS)
5. Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Associate Vice Chancellor for Global Engagement
6. Jennifer Ja Birchim, Manager, Community Housing Services. University & Community Housing Services
7. Xin Sui, Counseling & Psychological Services
8. Vash Doshi, Career Services
9. Interactive Question and Answer Panel

The workshop consisted of each presenter focusing on two questions 1.) What do they do to support International students/What is their role? And 2.) What can faculty, staff, and the UCSB do to better support international students? Each presenter provided a detailed presentation with a minimum of 2 slides for 15-20 minutes. Following the question and answer panel, the workshop featured an international student panel to discuss their experiences:

1. Asish Ninan Chacko (Kerala, India)
   a. Second Year Graduate Student, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
   b. Bargaining Team Member (Graduate Student Union)
2. Moeka Taguchi (Japan)
   a. EAP Year-Long Undergraduate Student
   b. Tsuru university English Literature major
   c. UCSB Gender Studies Major

3. Ruiqi Yang (Guangzhou, China)
   a. Fourth Year Undergraduate Student
   b. Psychological and Brain Sciences Major
   c. CAPS Mental Health Peer

4. Rung Bui (Vietnam)
   a. Fourth Year Undergraduate Student
   b. Computer Science Major

5. Bea Vieira (Brazil)
   a. Third Year Undergraduate Student
   b. Political Science Major

6. Christine Wang (Taiwan)
   a. Fourth Year Undergraduate Student
   b. Global Studies and Political Science Major

From the survey, the previous year, it was noted that the following issues, some of which were exacerbated by COVID-19, were experienced by international students and thus, important to address as part of the workshop:

- Access to Classes
  - Improving numbers and transparency.

- Access To Housing
  - Particular challenge at UCSB.

- Access to Community
  - Student groups, academic help, medical/mental health resources.

- Feeling Valued
  - International students do not feel valued as part of the broader campus community
  - Domestic students should be educated on how international students enrich campus and the academic
  - Consider implementing initiatives to highlight the value of the international community.
Information Items

- MOU: UCSB-NTNU Mandarin Chinese Language Program
- Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures
- International Student Workshop Preparation

CAMPUS ISSUES

1. Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal - WASC

CIE reviewed the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR) Proposal, as part of the reaffirmation process of UCSB’s accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Senior College and University Commission in 2023. The committee focused on the context of its effects and impact on international students and international education. In response to the report, the committee noted that there was no mention of international education. It was unclear if the student data to be collected would include data from international students and study-abroad students. And if so, would the data be separately analyzed or pooled with the general student population? The committee raised a question, do international students face additional “bottlenecks” in access to particular majors or degree programs? Relatedly, UCSB’s Study Abroad students, are another group CIE had hoped could have been included due to unique “bottlenecks” they experience in pursuit of degrees at UCSB, depending on the programs they participate in. Does a decision to participate in Study Abroad preclude access to a particular major? CIE ended its response emphasizing its hope that the WASC TPR committee would consider how the presence of international students on campus enhance learning and help ensure success for domestic students and study abroad can enhance the experiences of domestic students as they pursue their degrees.

SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES

1. Draft Presidential Policy -- Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace

CIE reviewed the “Draft Presidential Policy -- Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace.” The committee raised concerns about the “Reasonable Person Test” on page 2, stating that the policy does not acknowledge that different cultures may interpret certain behaviors differently. It was suggested that the test be considered in the context of the individuals involved, including their cultural backgrounds. Considering that international students are often the target of mistreatment, the committee suggested that policies be made clearer to ensure international students have reasonable expectations and understand the policies and that “Country of Origin” and “Visa Status” be added to groups in which bullying is prohibited.
2. **Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and APM 671**

CIE reviewed the “Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and APM 671.” Since UC Santa Barbara does not have a School of Medicine, the committee chose not to discuss APM 671, which focused on “Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants.” Instead, the committee focused on APM 025 as it pertains to “General Academic Appointees” and how these revisions could affect international education. It was stated that the addition of the line, “This policy also seeks to clarify reporting and prior approval requirements related to outside professional activities involving foreign entities that may pose foreign risk,” due to its vagueness, could cultivate prejudice as the revisions do not indicate what constitutes a “foreign risk.” The committee felt that unclear definitions of “foreign risk,” would place undue burden upon faculty members and others and could negatively impact potential research collaborations with foreign universities and institutions.

3. **Systemwide Review of Recommendations for Department Political Statements.**

CIE reviewed the “Systemwide Review of Recommendations for Department Political Statements. In its current state, the document was considered to be vague and left to interpretation, which could lead to problematic situations for international education. The committee stated that departmental political statements, namely those that pertain to specific countries, could lead to some international students from certain countries feeling unwelcome or targeted. In addition, these students could face issues in their home countries due to affiliation with the departments. The committee expressed concern about departments taking strong stances against specific countries that are hosting UCSB students studying abroad.

**COORDINATION WITH ADMINISTRATION**

**Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Associate Vice Chancellor for Global Engagement**

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

**Juan Campo, Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program**

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

**Erin Hakim, Global Engagement Specialist**

Erin attended several meetings to provide updates on Global Engagement and presented the National Taiwan Normal University (NTNU) MOU.
Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS)

The Director of OISS is a valuable resource to inform CIE of current OISS initiatives, as well as news and policies that relate to the international community on campus. She is a consulting member of the committee.

**Carry-over Issues and Future Initiatives**

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

**MEMBERS:**

Spencer Smith, Chair, UCIE Representative, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Leon Balents, Professor, Physics (Started 11/15/21)
Antonio Cortijo, Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Xianzhe Dai, Professor, Mathematics
Adrienne Edgar, Professor, History
Erik Eyster, Professor, Economics
Jennifer Gibbs, Professor, Communication
Arturo Keller, Professor, Bren School of Environmental Science and Management
Elinor Mason, Professor, Philosophy (Ended 11/14/21)
Cyrus Safinya, Professor, Materials, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology
Juan E. Campo, EAP Campus Director, Ex Officio
Michael Veltri, GSA Rep
Jichen Zhang, AS Rep
Cristina M. Carney, OISS, Consultant
Sara A. Cook, Associate Registrar, Consultant
Simran Singh, Director of OISS, Consultant
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

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

During 2021-2022, P&T responded to 2 new grievances and continued processing 2 grievances that were initiated during previous Senate cycles. P&T also continued processing 1 disciplinary case that had been initiated during a previous Senate cycle.


P&T Chair Risa Brainin represented UC Santa Barbara on the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

2021-2022 Committee Members

Risa Brainin, Chair
Deborah Fygenson
Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi
Thuc-Quyen Nguyen
Todd Squires
Dick Startz

Adebisi Agboola, Pre-Grievance Advisor

Shasta Delp, Advisor
Monica Solorzano, Advisor
Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections  
Annual Report 2021-22  

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:  

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJE) provides clarification and interpretation of Senate legislation and Divisional procedures. It also exercises formal supervision over Senate elections and proposed modifications to the Senate manual, prior to action by the Faculty Legislature. Business is generally conducted via email. The committee and Senate staff processed the following proposals during 2021-22.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC)  
In October, RJE reviewed proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC), which would create an additional IGETC subject area for transfer students (Area 7- Ethnic Studies). RJE approved of the new regulation as written. In January, RJE reviewed a revised version of the proposal, and still approved the changes as written.

Draft Presidential Policy – Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace  
RJE reviewed the Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace. The Committee had questions and comments which included unclear language about complaints are to be handled; reference to a “Reasonable Person Test”, the definition of which is subject to interpretation; and the need to emphasize the importance that unpopular statements or statements supporting positions on controversial issues not be categorized as abuse or bullying.

Residency Requirements in the College of Letters and Science – Revision to Divisional Regulation 125.1  
RJE viewed the proposed revisions to the residency requirements in the College of Letters & Science. Additional requirements beyond what systemwide regulations require will be eliminated. RJE approves of the new regulation language as written. The Faculty Legislature approved the changes at its meeting of January 13, 2022.

Proposed Changes to Divisional Regulation 140.B  
RJE reviewed a proposed revision to UCSB Divisional Regulation 140.B. Recently approved changes to Regulation 125.1 eliminated extra residency requirements. This removed language was still found in Regulation 140.B, regarding academic minors; the revision eliminated this residency language, thus aligning the two regulations. RJE approved of this change. The Faculty Legislature approved the revision at its meeting of June 2, 2022.

Memorial to the Regents on Fossil Fuel Combustion  
RJE reported the results of the Fossil Fuel Combustion Memorial vote. There were 251 votes cast in favor, 63 votes cast against, and 1 abstention, for a total pf 315 votes of 1347 eligible voters (23.39%).

2021-22 Divisional Election  
In consultation with RJE, the Academic Senate Office conducted its annual nomination process in an effort to seek candidates for the election of one Academic Senate Divisional Chair, three Senate Assembly Representatives, and four members of the Committee on Committees.

Divisional Chair  
Eight Senate members were nominated for the position of Divisional Chair; seven declined to accept.
The remaining candidate, Susannah Scott of Chemical Engineering, accepted the nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. As there was only one viable candidate for this position, a ballot was not conducted following the nomination process.

**Senate Assembly Representatives**
A total of six Senate members were nominated for the position of Senate Assembly Representative; two nominations were declined. Four candidates accepted nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. A ballot was conducted from February 16 - March 2, 2022, with the following results:

Chuck Akemann (Mathematics) - 16.39% (69 votes)
Isabel Bayrakdarian (Music) - 24.70% (104 votes)
Cynthia Kaplan (Political Science) - 30.88% (130 votes)
Winddance Twine (Sociology) - 27.79% (117 votes)
Blank vote - 0.24% (1 vote)

Isabel Bayrakdarian, Cynthia Kaplan and Winddance Twine received the most votes for Senate Assembly Representative.

**Committee on Committees**
A total of nine Senate members were nominated to serve on the Committee on Committees; three candidates declined to accept.

A total of five 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; two declined to accept. Three candidates accepted nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. As there were three nominees for one available position, a ballot was conducted from February 16 - March 2, 2022, with the following results:

Bjorn Birnir (Mathematics) - 41.47% (26 votes)
Wendy Meiring (Statistics and Applied Probability) - 39.68% (25 votes)
Andrew Plantinga (Bren School) - 17.46% (11 votes)
Abstain - 1.59% (1 vote)

Bjorn Birnir 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 two candidates were nominated for Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies; one declined to accept. One candidate, Erika Rappaport from History, accepted the nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. Because there was only one nominee in Area C, a ballot was not conducted for this position.

A total of two candidates were nominated for Area D: College of Engineering; both accepted the nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. As there were two nominations for one available position, a ballot was conducted from February 16 - March 2, 2022, with the following results:

Brad Chmelka (Chemical Engineering) - 74.19% (23 votes)
Beth Pruitt (Mechanical Engineering) - 25.81% (8 votes)
Brad Chmelka received the most votes for Area D: College of Engineering.

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, 2021-22**

- **Don Marolf, Chair**  
  Professor, Physics

- **Hugo Loaiciga, Parliamentarian**  
  Professor, Geography

- **Glenn Fredrickson**  
  Professor, Chemical Engineering

- **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 multiple issues concerning faculty welfare, many of which resulted from or were amplified by the Covid-19 pandemic. Members participated in extensive outreach including town hall meetings and numerous consultations with other campus entities on issues including faculty housing, emeriti support, childcare, ASMD, vaccination policy, the Munger Hall project, a campus wellness proposal, and the campus response to the DOJ China Initiative.
- 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.
- CFW completed 11 reviews of system-wide policies/issues and addressed 7 local issues; the council also worked closely with the Committee on Diversity and Equity on the China Initiative, Housing, Critical Race Theory Resolution, and ASMD matters.

Council and Committee Meetings

CFW held eight regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year, all still conducted via Zoom per the previous year. The May meeting was canceled, per the preference of a majority of members, due to lack of a robust agenda and the busy time of year. General issues and concerns are summarized below.

Systemwide Issues and Reviews

All of the systemwide issues that CFW responded to are listed below.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Presidential Policy on Integrated Pest Management

Members were generally supportive of an integrated policy to manage pesticide use on UC campuses and feel that this policy is important to the health and safety of all members of the UC community. Some members were interested in more information about which chemicals would be included in the red tier and why, and examples of why the university would permit continued use of red tier materials.

Draft Presidential Policy -- Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace

Members had questions about the concept of “passive bullying” as well as microaggressions, and how the policy would deal with instances of this behavior. They wanted a clearer reporting structure and guidelines, including what kinds of evidence should be presented with a bullying complaint. Individual members had isolated comments about how certain phrasing was used or defined in the policy, including “misinformation,” “culture,” “repeated,” and “honors compliance.”
Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices
It was generally agreed by CFW that this proposed policy is a step in the right direction for the university, and members were supportive of its goals. The council offered some questions and observations related to enforcement of the policy, the evolving nature of the concept of sustainability, and details related to the sections on Food Services and Health and Well-Being.

Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 759 - Leaves of Absence/Other Leaves Without Pay
Generally, members were supportive of the revisions. Some members expressed feeling conflicted about whether a cap should be imposed to limit the total time that a faculty can go on leave, as is the practice at other institutions (e.g. Stanford.) On the one hand, they acknowledged the need to reward/facilitate ingenuity and find mechanisms to support and retain talented faculty; on the other, they noted it usually only takes a few years for a startup to establish itself and they were mindful of the possible additional burdens imposed (by gaps in teaching and mentorship) on the faculty that remain on campus. In this context, they acknowledged the university’s intent to grow enrollments in the near term and the compounded impacts that will have on departments that are short-handed. Ultimately, they supported a department’s ability to manage the decisions and to act in the interests of the university. Lastly, they hoped that this policy will allow for opportunities to be pursued by faculty across disciplines and not just STEM.

Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and APM 671
The council only considered APM 025; since APM 671 is about medical schools, they deemed it beyond the scope of their authority. They found some of the mandatory reporting and permissions required to be unnecessarily onerous and in need of additional clarification. They wanted the policy to provide information about training and education on these requirements, along with specifications about offices in charge. As a matter of principle, they objected to the UC requiring faculty to seek prior written approval for participation in foreign activities and were concerned that this policy change is due to more generalized federal concerns about foreign influence in the US. There is a need to maintain a balance between the reporting of conflicts of commitment and protection of academic freedom.

COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group Preliminary Report
Members expressed satisfaction with the thoroughness of the report. Generally, they were pleased that campuses had a range of options depending on funding, though they recognized the response could be widely variable accordingly, and lamented the financial disparity among the campuses in limiting how they would be able to respond.

Recommendations for Department Political Statements
CFW endorsed the recommendations for department political statements articulated by UCAF. They felt that a department has the right to post political statements, but they acknowledged the complications and challenges that may result. They support the suggested actions to clarify who is meant by “department,” as well as to provide a reasonable opportunity for expression to those with a minority viewpoint, so as not to impose a chilling effect or otherwise misrepresent its membership.

Draft Presidential Policy – Supplement to Military Pay
The council endorsed the draft policy of allowing the UC to supplement employees’ military pay when they are on leave. However, some members expressed reluctance at removing the intermittent review of the
program, given that U.S. military engagement is beyond the control of the UC, and may have impacts or motivations which do not have unanimous endorsement of the faculty. That said, given that policies regularly come under review, the council agreed this should move forward while they reserve their right to rescind support or otherwise offer comment in the future.

Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data
Generally, most CFW members approved of the revised policy, or at least acquiesced that they may have implicitly agreed to the terms upon their initial hire, given the reference to a standing UC policy from the 1950s. They acknowledged the importance of preserving research data so that such data can be accessed and used by future generations. That said, several members expressed concern over the inclusion of “notebooks” as research data and generally rejected the university’s broad claims of ownership over such material, absent more specifics. The members would therefore like to see additional clarification on the inclusion of “notebooks.” They also expressed concern about whether the university has adequate plans (and funding) to provide the appropriate infrastructure to facilitate the requisite data retention; they observed that other campuses have considerably more resources detailed in the policy than UCSB.

Presidential Policy on Affiliations with Certain Healthcare Organizations
Members support University efforts to preserve access to different kinds of care to constituents and to enforce adherence with UC values of inclusion and diversity, with regard to what is offered at its affiliate hospitals and medical centers. There were limited questions related to the oversight and reporting processes and exactly how an affiliate site that doesn't meet the requirements would be phased out, particularly if/when a large contingent of patients depend on it as their sole care option geographically.

Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce
Some CFW members expressed difficulty evaluating a program that is not operational on the Santa Barbara campus. Several members recognized the university’s need to pursue alternative avenues of compensation in order to recruit and retain faculty and keep the UC competitive, and they noted this program as a valuable tool for doing so. However, they had numerous concerns about the program including eligibility and functionality, and whether this program exacerbates inequities among disciplines which are already being countered by other measures, perhaps in a contradictory manner. They are also concerned about the potential impacts on staff who are already overextended.

Local Business

Health and Wellness Proposal Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Staff Health and Wellness
The Council hosted Professor Diane Fujino as a representative of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty and Staff Health and Wellness in fall quarter. CFW unanimously endorsed the committee’s proposal for a Health & Wellness Pandemic Transition strategy.

Housing Options/Resources
CFW received updates to and discussed the planning (and widespread concern over) Munger Hall. A townhall meeting was held 11/16/21 with over 200 faculty participants in which Chair Parks represented concerns from the faculty. Multiple special meetings were held and faculty were invited to visit a “mock up” of Munger Hall. The Chancellor convened a panel, with members from on and off campus, in spring quarter 2022 to provide input on the project.
David Brownstone, Chair of the systemwide Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFER) at UCOP, joined a CFW meeting to present information on Housing, the Second Choice Pension Option for new hires, and UC Pension finances. He covered common problems (high prices, the Mortgage Origination Program, and limitations of the Faculty Recruiting Allowance (FRA)), along with some existing alternatives.

CFW co-sponsored a townhall meeting with CDE on 4/15/22 to address faculty questions and concerns about housing, particularly affordability and availability. Chair Parks presented slides showing dramatic increases in housing purchase and rental/lease costs in the Santa Barbara area from 2019-2022. Following the townhall, faculty members sent emails to Chair Parks conveying concerns about UCSB raising prices of new faculty housing units, delayed construction, and increased interest rates, which combined to make faculty housing purchases much less affordable.

CFW hosted Giuliana Perrone, President of the Ocean Walk Housing Association, to hear faculty concerns. There has been a dramatic increase in costs to faculty through property assessments, including insurance and the land lease price, that are jeopardizing the notion of this being affordable housing. Additionally, she reported that CCBER has been using HOA water and refusing to pay $50k it owes; the HOA has had to cover this debt in order to remain in good standing with Goleta Water, but it is not able to continue to do so. This was subsequently brought up at the faculty legislature meeting where VC Mac Pherson promised resolution.

Chair Parks held multiple meetings and wrote a memo to the EVC regarding concerns about the illegal rental of a faculty housing unit. Ongoing issues include: duty of UCSB to notify buyers of such conditions; HOA enforcement of covenants; remedy for impacted faculty member (new owner); and possible violation of faculty code of ethics by prior faculty owner.

Teaching Modality
CFW discussed the campus decision to leave teaching modality to instructor choice in winter quarter. Members were conflicted between the desire to protect themselves and their students, and wanting to teach in person to be more effective. They lamented the ongoing lack of stability, and the severe disruption caused by sudden pivots in either direction. Concerns were also raised about pressure applied to instructors to provide certain accommodations by the DSP Office and a lack of communication with faculty to determine best practices.

Vaccine Mandates
Some CFW members were opposed to the renewal of the Flu Vaccine mandate, and questioned the expanded use of Executive Order by the Office of the President. This, as well as the Covid-19 vaccine mandate, was of ongoing concern to several members of the Council. In February of 2022, Chair Parks issued a minority statement expressing these concerns to Divisional Chair Susannah Scott. At the last meeting of the year, the members motioned for a resolution calling for a moratorium on mandatory vaccinations, however it did not receive majority support.

Critical Race Theory Resolution
CFW unanimously approved a resolution affirming support of faculty to determine teaching approaches and against any legislative attempts to restrict their pedagogical approaches, as a response to a growing trend of state legislatures to attempt to restrict the teaching of “Critical Race Theory” or other approaches to civil rights and related topics. This resolution was subsequently presented to the faculty legislature, as co-sponsored by CFW and CDE, where it passed with minor edits. It also became the model for a proposed
systemwide resolution.

Childcare
CFW continued to advocate for faculty who need Chancellors Infant Care Funds but could not find details about this program online or were deemed ineligible. CFW also assisted when faculty applied for the funds but did not receive them in a timely and helpful manner. Beyond this, Chair Parks served on the Chancellor’s Childcare Task Force and conveyed faculty welfare perspectives in this context. She also met with other constituents about childcare concerns, including those in the Office of DEI and from the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women.

ASMD Policy
Chair Parks served in a working group with Academic Senate Vice Chair Melissa Morgan, and professors Jean Beaman, Heather Stoll, and Sarah Anderson, to discuss and co-draft a memo related to ASMD policy. The memo encourages campus leadership to revisit the policy’s narrow definition of family/parenting, and to consider, for instance, conditions of adoptive parents, and to ensure more awareness of ASMD policy among department chairs and consistent and fair implementation across campus.

Committee on Academic Freedom
The Committee on Academic Freedom met once in Fall, but given the schedule of UCAF, the committee generally responded to issues by email and/or led discussion in the broader CFW meetings. This included the issue of recommendations for department political statements, vaccine mandates, and mandatory universal audio recording of courses as proposed by the UCLA disabled students’ association, which CAF framed as a need for more funding to accommodate this surge in requests for accommodations. They emphasized that instructors want to help facilitate DSP access, but the issues surrounding recording, as well as what constitutes a ‘reasonable accommodation,’ are nuanced; there are concerns about overreach into pedagogy and course structure, and breaches of academic freedom protections that cover instruction.

Early on, one of the members raised the issue of the “China Initiative,” a Department of Justice policy implemented by the Trump Administration, and its negative impacts on researchers with ties to China (and other Asian countries). CAF coordinated throughout the year with the Chairs of CFW and CDE to press the campus for a strong response condemning the policy and supporting faculty and graduate students. A meeting was held with members of the Office of Research on 1/31/22. A statement was issued to the campus by the Vice Chancellor of Research on 4/4/22 affirming support of the faculty research endeavors, and Chancellor Yang also mentioned the issue in the last faculty legislature meeting.

Committee on Emeriti and Retirement
The Committee on Emeriti and Retirement met once in fall. Emeriti and retirees face ongoing challenges related to the consolidation of support mechanisms throughout the UC, including significantly delayed distribution of benefits and a lack of planning resources to assist people through the retirement process. They worked with the leadership of the Emeriti Association and CFW to develop a proposal encouraging the administration to develop a high-level vision for emeriti on campus and to augment staff support and provide additional organizational clarity. The proposal was submitted 11/17/21 and a meeting was held with the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, and representatives from Academic Personnel and Human Resources. The Chancellor agreed to convene a task force to study these issues further although it was not formally convened by the end of the academic year. The committee did not meet in winter or spring quarter, since all issues were reported in their proposal which was escalated to other administrative offices.
Senate Awards

CFW made no significant changes to the awards guidelines for the 2021-22 year. A minor change included modifying the nomination packets to include the initial letter of nomination (which has not been included in recent years).

CFW discussed proposed changes to the Graduate Mentor Award including: 1) whether to specify an emphasis on doctoral student mentorship, 2) whether to restrict eligibility to Associate and Full professors, and 3) whether letters from former students should be limited to those “established in their field.” None of these changes were implemented.

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.

Valid packet submissions were down in the Distinguished Teaching and Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award categories, however the Graduate Mentor Award nominations held steady. The Faculty Research Lecturer initially yielded no new nominations by the original deadline, but 4 new nominees came through after additional outreach and an extended deadline. Lower totals were generally attributed to pandemic-related burnout on campus, although they are not an anomaly over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DTA</th>
<th>DTA Total</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Non-Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 21, 2022 (via Zoom). They are as follows:

**Distinguished Teaching Award (DTA)** – Gordon Abra (Communication); Ken Hiltner (English); Jennifer King (Geography); Jen Martin (Environmental Studies); Danielle Whitaker (Education);
Vanessa Woods (Psychological & Brain Sciences)

Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award (OTA) – Stephanie Arguera (Education); Trevor Auldridge (Sociology); Janeva Chung (Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology); Hannah Garibaldi (Film and Media Studies)

Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award (GMA) – Bhaskar Sarkar (Film and Media Studies); Jill Sharkey (Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology); M. Scott Shell (Chemical Engineering)

Faculty Research Lecturer (FRL) – Shelly Lundberg (Economics)

Carry-Over Issues
Faculty Housing
Childcare
Emeriti Support
Covid-19 Impacts & Policy
Council Members
Leila Carvalho
Alenda Chang, UCAF Representative
Sharon Conley
Sam Daly
Michael Furlong
Ruth Hellier
John W.I. Lee
Hunter Lenihan, Vice Chair
Paul Leonardi
Andreas Ludwig
William Robinson
Beth Schneider
Roberto Strongman
Subhash Suri
Chris Van de Walle
Guofang Wei
Bryanna Sylvestre, Non-Senate Academic Representative
Jordan Tudisco, GSA Representative
Casey Hankey, Advisor
Lisa Parks, Chair, UCFW Representative

Committee on Academic Freedom
Ruth Hellier
William Robinson
Roberto Strongman
Guofang Wei
Alenda Chang, Chair, UCAF Representative

Committee on Emeriti and Retirement
Sharon Conley
Hunter Lenihan (Fall quarter only)
Andreas Ludwig (Winter and Spring quarter only)
Beth Schneider
Mike Furlong, Chair

Award Committee Membership

Distinguished Teaching Award
Walid Afifi, 20-21 recipient (Communication)
Yogananda Isukapalli, 20-21 recipient (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
Claudia Moser, 19-20 recipient (History of Art and Architecture)
Madeleine I. Sorapure, 20-21 recipient (Writing Program)
Chris Van de Walle, CFW Representative (Materials)
Hunter Lenihan, Chair & CFW Representative (Environmental Science & Management)

Outstanding Teaching Assistant
Donna Anderson, 20-21 recipient (History)
Gary Charness, Graduate Council representative (Economics)
Aracely Garcia Gonzalez, 20-21 recipient (Chicana and Chicano Studies)
Ruth Hellier, CFW representative (Music)
Shabnam Larimian, 20-21 recipient (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
Jordan Tudisco, 19-20 recipient (Comparative Literature)
Cenke Xu, Graduate Council representative (Physics)
Subhash Suri, Chair & CFW Rep (Computer Science)

Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award
Karen Gibson, 2018-19 recipient (Education)
Paul Leonardi, CFW representative (Technology Management Program)
Carlos Levi, Graduate Council representative (Materials, Mechanical Engineering)
Yasamin Mostofi, Graduate Council representative (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
Timothy Sherwood, 20-21 recipient (Computer Science)
Beth Schneider, Chair & CFW Rep (Sociology)

Faculty Research Lecturer
Richard Mayer, 20-21 recipient (Psychological & Brain Sciences)
Lisa Parks, CFW Representative (Film and Media Studies)
Andreas Ludwig, CFW Representative (Physics)
Nelson Lichtenstein, 18-19 recipient (History)
Alison Butler, Chair, 19-20 recipient (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
*Professors Umesh Mishra and Linda Putnam, both past FRL recipients, were originally appointed to the committee but ultimately unable to serve due to personal commitments.
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 to provide advice in a manner that fosters quality and diversity of research and instructional programs.

Highlights:

- The Council continued to be responsive to many issues that either resulted from or were amplified by the COVID-19 pandemic, including adjustments to grants policies, monitoring of sponsored research travel, and overall campus response to impacts.
- The Committee on Faculty Grants awarded $944,607 to 80 proposals submitted for the Faculty Research Grant and $38,272 to four proposals for the Pearl Chase Research Grant. Proposal submission fell for the second year, with 90 total proposals compared to 110 in the previous cycle.

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, and CLIIR and CIT both met six times, respectively.

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.

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.


CRPP discussed this report several times. The members appreciated efforts to give more weight to teaching and other responsibilities in merit cases, and the long-term view of the report. While members praised the use of Covid impact statements in merit reviews, they also reported varying levels of adoption/emphasis in their departments. Some members lamented the lack of money available for teaching buyouts and acknowledged the continually evolving landscape - what was or
would have been helpful in the early stages of the pandemic was likely different from what may be helpful for impacts felt several years from now. Members were enthusiastic about maintaining access to remote opportunities in teaching, research, and senate service.

CRPP considered several times whether a survey should be disseminated to faculty about pandemic impacts. Overall, they could not agree on the scope and goals of this effort.

**Implementation of UC Chemicals**

CRPP reviewed a whitepaper for Environmental Health & Safety on the implementation of UC Chemicals, a systemwide tool designed to provide a user-friendly system for scanning chemicals and maintaining lab inventory. The committee was hesitant about whether the tool would be more problematic than helpful. Significant feedback was provided by the professional researcher representative who already had user experience with the system. Ultimately, the committee wanted more information about how the implementation would be carried out on campus. The committee recommended that EHS take an active role in deployment, as the value of the system greatly depends on initial setup and appropriate training for ongoing maintenance.

**Draft Presidential Policy – Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace**

The three subcommittees of CRIR reviewed the draft policy separately. Generally, CRPP and CIT members felt the policy draft was reasonable, with minor notes for more specificity or justification. CLIIR members, however, were staunchly opposed to this new policy being implemented without substantive justification about why it is needed and which scenarios are not already covered by existing policies. They found it to be oppressive in its expansion of administrative control and, despite its language to the contrary, that it did not appear to offer adequate protection of academic freedom. Some committee members expressed appreciation for an emphasis on early, local resolution within a department, but others had reservations for scenarios in which a person might not be comfortable reporting internally (such as a graduate student who is reluctant to notify the department chair about bullying by their advisor). All groups were concerned about the extent to which this is redundant with existing policy(ies), and they wanted more detailed information about who would be responsible for implementation and enforcement on campus (while recognizing the different campus hierarchies of the UC system).

**Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Data Science and a New Academic Unit in Data Science**

CLIIR reviewed the Data Science degree and unit proposal and ultimately registered mixed feelings. Some members were neutral, while others were generally in support of the proposal. However, the members had concerns about whether the proposed resources were adequate with regard to staff, and realistic with regard to new faculty FTE. There was particular concern over the backend computing support that would be necessary and whether that had been fully considered. The library, which is already short-staffed and resource constrained, is likewise essential for delivery of the curriculum. Some members were also concerned about enrollment and whether there would be adequate class space, TA support, and teachers available to support the program. There were lingering concerns about housing the program in the College of Engineering and what that might mean for students interested in transferring to the program; it also was not clear to the committee why the program would not work within the College of Letters & Science. The committee was intrigued and interested to see such a program go forward, but stopped short of endorsement; they acknowledge that the campus needs new programs like this in order to stay competitive but caution that the administration needs to fully dedicate the appropriate resources.
Recommendations for Department Political Statements
CRIR discussed these recommendations at its winter quarter meeting. Members were conflicted about the recommendations, and whether the recommendations simultaneously go too far without going far enough. Some members, whose departments had recently participated in political statements, felt that the recommendations provided no real additional clarity in terms of the conflicts they experienced. Not all members felt that departments should post political statements at all, but a majority felt that departments should retain the right because to take that away would violate faculty academic freedom. That said, some members felt that the act of posting such statements discouraged the discourse that is a hallmark of the university and would bring unnecessary politicization to academics. Members pointed out that the issue of signing is fraught for a number of reasons, and that certain issues will have real, political consequences (possibly abroad) for certain communities. Many people would be comfortable with the description of simply “a majority,” but they acknowledged the complication in how to identify the constituencies involved. Some would support a recommendation to require named signatories specifically to deter the act of declaring a statement at all. Some members felt that providing a minority viewpoint rendered the initial departmental statement a moot point. Some questioned how far a department needed to go in providing space for a minority point of view; they wouldn’t want to provide equal space for someone to disagree, for instance, with a statement condemning hateful acts toward a specific ethnic group. People were mixed about the possibility of having individual signatories named. Some people indicated they would be willing to sign such a statement but would not want their name identified. Others felt that people should be accountable for making such statements. People also considered those who would theoretically support the statement but for whatever reasons may choose not to sign, and there was concern this would leave non-signatories vulnerable to adverse consequences and ugly political fallout.

Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data
CRIR reviewed the revised proposal through its respective subcommittees. Neither CIT nor CRPP registered particular objections to the policy; they generally viewed the revision as an improvement on the previous draft, despite questions about local implementation. CLIIR, however, identified several concerns with the revised policy, the principle concern being how the policy defines research data. This conflict over what data the policy actually covers was also observed in the initial draft policy that was reviewed last year. Members would like to see more detail provided as to the definition of “research data,” perhaps with qualifiers that reserve judgment on the part of the PI as to what is appropriate to save. They also would like to see the policy establish guidance on matters of university/author ownership in cases of inter-university collaboration.

Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce
The Chair of the Council on Research and Instructional Resources delegated the review of this report to CRPP. CRPP members recognized this program has been an effective tool for addressing compensation and retention issues for faculty at the UC; some members found this worrisome, although others thought bringing market incentives to UCSB could be a good thing. Concerns existed as to how this program would exacerbate existing funding gaps between the disciplines, i.e., STEM vs. humanities and fine arts. More information should be outlined for how campuses can make strategic decisions to guide use of funds so that the program is beneficial for all rather
than select fields, and that it is not a burden to administer. Because the program does not exist at UCSB, it was difficult for members to fully comprehend the scope of the NSTP program were it to be enacted on this campus, who would be able to access the program, and what impacts there would be. Members were wary of the tone of the report and the indication that it would be “too disruptive” to end the program, which made the concept of a trial seem disingenuous. Moreover, the program seemed to institutionalize the notion that the state will not adequately support the mission of the UC and that other fund sources are necessary to retain world class faculty. The members questioned whether this program would have impacts related to academic freedom, and harm the research mission by incentivizing people toward more lucrative topics.

Local Business

Office of Research Updates

Funding Opportunities
The Office of Research (OR) launched a Research Assistance Program this past year to support junior faculty researchers. Awards were made to 51 faculty, totaling $403,930. Additionally, the Senate worked with the Chancellor to create an Early Career Faculty Acceleration Program that distributed grants of $7k to all junior faculty, and OR contributed $200k to that effort. OR also committed $300k to an effort with the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion to support research projects that tackle systemic injustice; over 3 years, 10 grants of $10k will be distributed, totaling $100k annually.

Space on Campus
The Vice Chancellor’s primary concern, looking forward, is space on campus. The campus attracts top young researchers, for whom space and infrastructure are critical to their research goals. Renovations are expensive and time consuming; often buildings need significant work to bring them up to code. Alternative space may potentially be more accessible due to increased remote work, and due to Facilities or other admin services moving off campus. VCR Incandela is proposing to carry out an exercise to see what is achievable -- could 10% of every building be repurposed? OR will begin to work on this with the Deans.

The China Initiative
The China Initiative was a policy implemented by the Trump Administration Department of Justice in 2018, that targeted China, and those involved in working relationships with China, for investigations of espionage and trade secret theft threats. This caused significant concern among faculty as numerous reports emerged of professors being targeted at universities. UCSB faculty sought reassurance from the campus that they would be protected and supported if targeted, and expressed the many ways in which this disrupted or compromised their research. Faculty lobbied for the university to make a statement denouncing the policy and affirming its support for academic freedom and international engagement. VCR Incandela directed the Office of Research to develop and disseminate guidance, and provide one-on-one support. The office completed a comprehensive review and outreach to faculty identified as potentially at risk to help them maintain compliance. VCR Incandela issued additional communication to the campus to assure OR support. The DOJ announced a strategic review that called for a broader approach in February 2022, effectively ending the China Initiative.
**Library Updates**

**UC Library Search**
UC Library Search launched, which enables all UC collections to be searchable and request-able (approximately 40M volumes). The platform, which is integrated with WorldCat, will facilitate increased collaboration between campuses.

**Expanding Data Science Infrastructure**
The library has been increasing its activities in the landscape of research data and data science, with expanded training and community building, including training in data management practices and digital humanities methods. It co-sponsored the Data Science Summit in Fall 2021 and is continuing to work with the organizing committee to coordinate data science activities across campus, including hosting a monthly get-together and exploring the idea of a shared campus calendar. The Interdisciplinary Research Collaboratory at UCSB Library was rebranded as DREAM Lab.

**Updates to Library Service**
Hathi Trust emergency access has concluded. The library has experienced a significant change in usage since before the pandemic; there is an indication that some changes originally conceived of as temporary will persist. Use of physical course reserves is way down, for example; this is not surprising. People found other ways to access course material (increased licensing of e-books, for example). Use of desktop computers is another change and therefore the number of fixed computer stations will probably decrease. Requests have gone up for virtual consultation. These changes are viewed positively.

**Open Access Updates**
There are 10 transformative agreements in place with publishers, resulting in over 30% of UC articles being eligible for Open Access publishing. Wiley is the 3rd largest commercial publisher, and has implemented a 1-year pilot program, enabling Open Access for UCSB authors. ACS (American Chemical Society) and SAGE publishers are both in negotiation.

The library’s initial data show that only 40-50% of authors are taking advantage of OA options and the balance continue to publish under the traditional subscription model. This results in less OA UC content available. This presents a core challenge to the model - if the opt-out rate stays high, the model will collapse financially. Elsevier and Springer Nature are surveying people who are opting out; the publishers have an interest in the program being sustainable and renewed. The library is working with UCOLASC to prepare wording in the publisher’s workflows that signals faculty support for the choice to publish Open Access work. People seem to be confused about what is being offered.

**Instructional Development Updates**

**Online ESCIs**
As of Spring quarter 2020, every department is using ESCI Online to collect end of quarter surveys. Over summer 2021, the campus started talking about moving test scanning over to the Testing
Center. Due to a change in personnel in the Testing Center, discussions of moving test scanning to the Center were put on hold in early Fall 2021. Test scanning for paper exams is still being managed in the ESCI office.

**New Website and Infrastructure**
ID launched a new website in Spring 2022. ID and Collaborate deployed a combination helpdesk which so far has maintained a high user satisfaction rate. The Shoreline platform is successfully being used to advertise and manage registration for Faculty and TA workshops.

**Classroom Building**
Construction on the new classroom building is still on time for a Winter 2023 opening. Installation of AV equipment is projected to begin in mid-late September.

**Information Technology Updates**

**Multi-Factor Authentication Expansion**
The University continued its campaign to broadly implement Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) using Duo. Program requirements were added as follows: Campus VPN (August 2021); Kronos Timekeeping (September 2021); ServiceNow (December 2021); Student Health Patient Portal (January 2022); DocuSign (July 2022); Google Workspace (August 2022).

**Learning Management System (LMS) Transition**
GauchoSpace has been running on the Moodle 3 platform, but with its end of service life approaching in Spring of 2023, the campus must either migrate the system to Moodle 4, or another platform altogether. The alternative already in place at the majority of UC campuses, and all CSU’s and community colleges, is Canvas. 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. The current version of Moodle has allowed for significant tailoring to the needs of UCSB faculty, adding an unseen cost to run the platform. Canvas is vendor-hosted, which is not necessarily cheaper but the responsibility is redirected. A workgroup was convened this year to weigh the impacts of migrating to either platform; the changes in Moodle 4 were considered extensive enough that it might make sense to switch to Canvas, especially considering financial incentives from the state government to do so. Both CLIIR and CIT hosted Hector Villicana, Executive Director, Letters & Science Information Technology (LSIT) for discussion.

**Financial Management Modernization Implementation**
On 2/2/22, the Financial Management Modernization implementation phase commenced, with 90 members on the project team. This effort will help the campus to deploy the UC common chart of accounts as required systemwide. This effort will create a singular central financial management platform rather than have multiple systems i.e. the PeopleSoft finance system, GUS, etc. The system is scheduled to go live 7/1/2024.

**Faculty Grants**
Faculty Research Grants

- Consistency among proposals, budgets, and corresponding awards was identified as in need of improvement, but no significant changes were ultimately made to the Faculty Research Grants program.
- A new abstract requirement was implemented to attempt to distill proposal details further for non-experts, as well as more explicit language in the financial reporting component of the proposal.
- CRPP considered adopting a budget template, but this was abandoned due to the complexity and variation by discipline. Instead, a selection of past successful proposals was posted to the senate website for reference.
- CRPP considered whether to include a COVID impact statement but ultimately decided against doing so.
- There remains confusion with how to appropriately fund widely disparate requests for subvention, particularly in the growing field of e-books. Minor adjustments were made to clarify this in the policy. The CRIR Chair and Vice Chair met with EVC Marshall near the end of the grant cycle to discuss the issue of subventions and the possibility of carving out a separate process for publication grants. No immediate course of action was decided, but the parties agreed to continue discussion next year.
- Four additional states have been added to the Attorney General’s AB 1887 travel ban for use of state funds, effective the following dates:
  o July 1, 2022: Indiana and Utah
  o August 1, 2022: Louisiana
  o September 28, 2022: Arizona
This brings the total to 22 states that are restricted from faculty travel for research.

Travel Grants

- No changes were made to the faculty travel grants program policy in 2021-22; virtual conference attendance, established in 2020-21, was maintained as an optional category for funding.

At the start of the 2019-20 fiscal year, the travel grant account was in danger of being overdrawn. But after several years of pandemic-related impacts to travel, the account has recovered and ends the 2022 fiscal year with a healthy balance of $373,269.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Virtual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>306 $286,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$166,807</td>
<td>$119,500</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$286,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>239 $227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$122,700</td>
<td>$104,300</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77 $45,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$34,800</td>
<td>$45,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>143 $129,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$70,650</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$7,850</td>
<td>$129,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Grant Applications and Awards

The Faculty Research Grant (FRG) budget allocation for the 2022-2023 cycle remained at $1,000,000 and the Pearl Chase Research Grant (PC) budget allocation was $52,000. During this cycle, 90 completed applications were reviewed by the Committee on Faculty Grants; 84 proposals were fully or partially funded and 6 proposals received no funding.
The total amount of FRG funds awarded was $944,607.00. PC funds awarded totaled $38,272.00.

## Faculty Research Grants Funding Amounts and Rates by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Number of Proposals</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>$2,758</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>$76,826</td>
<td>$50,560</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMS</td>
<td>$19,889</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$80,280</td>
<td>$66,490</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>$350,480</td>
<td>$238,387</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$611,808</td>
<td>$457,785</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$138,188</td>
<td>$121,385</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,280,229</strong></td>
<td><strong>$944,607</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>74%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This number includes one extra proposal funded. There were 86 proposals submitted for FRG funding. However, of four proposals that received Pearl Chase funding, one is represented in this table, as it received some FRG general funds in excess of the $10,000 cap on Pearl Chase.*

## Carry forward Issues
- Subvention & Publication Preparation grant requests
- Covid-19 Impacts and Policy
- LMS Transition
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Highlights:

- Participated in the academic program review of five academic units;
- Developed a new process for evaluating Deans’ FTE plans and made recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor about new FTE allocations;
- CPB Committees innovated and promoted strategic academic planning processes on campus and helped drafting revised calls for strategic FTE plans;
- Reviewed campus-specific reports and proposals, including a pilot academic review process and new academic degree programs;
- Considered 21 requests for Academic search waivers;
- Met with Design, Facilities & Safety Services (DFSS) and Facilities Management (FM) to understand and improve relations between academic planning and facilities maintenance and renovation;
- Sought to reconnect planning to budgeting by increasing the availability and circulation of budget data. Invited the Vice Chancellor for Finance & Resource Management to make presentations of the campus income statement to the Council; and
- CPB Committees reviewed Facilities & Maintenance procedures and recharge rates;
- CPB Committees reviewed summer sessions, developed algorithms for merging distributed financial and enrollment databases, and conducted a cost-revenue-profits analysis of summer classes.
I. Overview

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

CPB’s agendas typically included the following items:

- Academic program reviews
- Review of campus issues (proposed centers, policies, procedures, reports, etc.)
- Review of systemwide issues (reports, proposals, etc.)
- Review of departmental and college / division FTE plans
- Consultations with Deans and other University administrators
- Requests for faculty recruitment Search Waivers

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

II. Academic Program Reviews

CPB participated in the academic program review of five academic departments:

1. Anthropology
2. Computer Science
3. Economics
4. Music
5. Philosophy

Reviews of these units were led by CPB’s respective area subcommittees: Engineering (Computer Science); Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Music and Philosophy); and Social Sciences/ Education (Anthropology and Economics). There were no academic program reviews in Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren. Under a pilot program for academic reviews, this year CPB did not have an opportunity in fall quarter to submit a list of suggested questions to the Program Review Panel (PRP) for consideration by the respective External Review Committee (ERC). Instead, all program reviews used the same charge letter from PRP. During winter quarter, the CPB chair (or designate) attended a meeting with the External Review Committee. During spring quarter, CPB reviewed each of the External Review Committee (ERC) reports and department responses and provided further comments to the Program Review Panel (PRP) before it submitted its final reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC).

The Academic Senate was also asked by the Executive Vice Chancellor to provide recommendations for review by PRP in 2023-24. CPB’s recommendations consisted of: College of Creative Studies; Department of Materials (grad program); Technology Management
Program; and the departments of Art; Classics; Film & Media Studies; Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology; and Feminist Studies. CPB’s priorities were primarily based on two factors: (1) time since last review; and (2) extraordinary changes in programs that necessitate review. In particular, CPB reiterated its suggestion from last year to review the College of Creative Studies and the Technology Management Program.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Unit</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Creative Studies</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Clinical, &amp; School Psychology</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five units had previously been selected for review in 2022-23: Asian American Studies; Earth Science; East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies; Environmental Studies; and Sociology.

III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

At the start of the 2021-22 academic year, there were 22 new faculty appointments, seven from the 2020-21 recruitment cycle, and 15 from previous recruitment cycles, and six new appointments were confirmed to begin on July 1, 2022. During the 2021-22 year, CPB reviewed 21 requests for search waivers from the following units:

- Anthropology
- Asian American Studies
- Biomolecular Science & Engineering Program (BMSE)
- Bren
- Chemical Engineering
- Chemistry & Biochemistry
- Chicana & Chicano Studies
- Computer Science
- Education
- Environmental Studies
- Film & Media Studies
- Global Studies
- History
- Materials
- Linguistics
- Political Science
- Sociology
- Spanish & Portuguese

Of these, five were for exceptional opportunities, nine were for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows (PPFs), and seven were for partner hires. CPB followed the guidance of the Policy on Open Recruitment (UCSB Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures, Section VII-1-III) in making its recommendations to the EVC.
CPB offered a full endorsement in 12 cases, endorsed one case in a split vote, and offered qualified endorsements for the other two.

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

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB’s Policy on Endowed Chairs (Section VIII-11 of UCSB’s Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures, “Red Binder”), CPB is to be consulted on endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the conformity with the academic mission of our campus. During the 2021-22 academic year, CPB reviewed and endorsed three proposals:

1. **Virgil Elings Chair in Quantum Science.** This position will be endowed by a $1 million gift from Betty Elings Wells to establish the chair within the Department of Physics, to “…provide the Chairholder with funds to support teaching, public service and research, and may also be used for the salary of the Chairholder as needed.”

2. **Roy & Janet Hardiman Interdisciplinary Chair in Molecular Biology.** This position will be endowed by a $1 million gift to establish the chair whose goal is to “ensure strong faculty with an interdisciplinary approach within the department of Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology (MCDB).”

3. **Cliff R. Scholle Chair in Chemical Engineering.** This position will be endowed by a $1 million gift from Mr. Scholle to establish the chairship to support the work of a faculty member in the Department of Chemical Engineering. As described in the proposal and the donor letter, “The primary purpose of the Chair is to advance the research excellence of an exceptional senior or junior faculty member in chemical engineering. Selection of the Chair holder will be focused on retaining or attracting a leading-edge senior or junior scientist working in cutting-edge research areas that help the University prepare for the future. For those potential Chair holders who are junior scientists, the goal is to identify, recruit, and nurture a junior scholar who will emerge as one of the next generation of leaders.”

V. Campus Issues

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2021-22 academic year.

FTE Planning

The Council on Planning & Budget was consulted by the Executive Vice Chancellor for its recommendations on academic positions (“FTEs” = Full-Time Equivalent appointments). CPB leadership met with the EVC and the Deans of the seven academic divisions in December, and
this was followed up by a call for FTE plans which was revised from previous years, with the goal to incentivize innovation and strategic planning. The EVC’s FTE memo was sent to the Deans in January, and it included FTE templates that called for requested authorizations to recruit new faculty during the upcoming recruitment cycle. The EVC indicated that he was planning for another year of moderate recruitment, with the understanding that he would not be able to determine the exact number of recruitments to be launched in 2022-23 until the end of the current academic year when more is known about the budget, the number of new appointments (including search waivers), the number of recruitments in progress, and the expected number of retirements and separations. According to the EVC, he sought to reframe some of the questions that departments and deans are asked to address as they formulate their recruitment plans. The change was meant to encourage dialogue between and among deans and chairs in order to facilitate more strategic decisions that respond to individual department needs in the context of more comprehensive plans.

CPB received the Deans’ FTE plans in April. Data was also received from the EVC’s Office regarding the following:

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

Additional planning data was also provided to the Council:
1. Year-average undergraduate enrollment by department
2. Undergraduate student FTE by Department
3. Year-average Graduate enrollment by department
4. Masters student enrollment by department
5. PhD student enrollment by department
6. Status of search waivers
7. FTE (total allocated and permanent) by department

CPB spent a great deal of time during spring quarter deliberating over the FTE plans. CPB’s final FTE recommendations were sent to the EVC in July. CPB’s evaluation addressed several questions that were posed in the EVC’s call from January. Because this year’s FTE call was different from previous years, CPB developed a new evaluation procedure. The following were the most important changes in CPB’s review and evaluation procedures:

1. Vertical evaluations: Every individual CPB member (17 members in total) carefully studied each of the seven FTE plans and subsequently responded to 30 standardized questions covering the five evaluation dimensions.
2. Horizontal evaluations: After the vertical evaluations and following the EVC’s request, CPB members were asked to evaluate FTE plans against each other, providing a first assessment of where council members see opportunities and challenges for investments in particular divisions and positions, with strategic planning guidelines in mind.
3. Meetings & Discussions: CPB then developed a detailed report that provided a baseline of the Council’s sentiments and shaped the subsequent recommendations.

A comparison or even a ranking of divisional FTE plans proved to be very challenging if not impossible for CPB given the large differences among the divisions. CPB recommended that for next year’s strategic planning, the EVC should request separate FTE plans for subunits within
MLPS, SS, and HFA. For instance, CPB would like to see the MLPS Dean submit three separate FTE plans for Mathematical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Physical Sciences, or even opt for another, more cohesive grouping of areas within MLPS. Moreover, CCS is different from all the other divisions as CCS primarily pursues a teaching mission on campus. CPB recommended that the EVC’s general FTE call next year should not include CCS, but rather that the EVC should oversee a separate evaluation and review of CCS’ requested positions.

**Academic Program Review Streamlining Pilot Program**

In May CPB discussed the Academic Program Review (APR) Streamlining Pilot Program which was enacted for the current academic year. CPB strongly supported all of the Program Review Panel’s proposed recommendations. However, the Council also pointed out one overall issue that was not addressed in the streamlining proposal. Given recent experience with department reviews, CPB noticed a pattern that the same major problems have been identified in two successive reviews (ten years apart). Thus, CPB concluded that the follow-up procedures for addressing identified problems require attention, and CPB recommended that the broken follow-up procedure be addressed. Without an effective follow-up procedure, many hours of faculty and administration time are wasted repeatedly discovering and documenting the same departmental problems, while the UCSB student experience suffers injury over decades.

**Data Science B.S. Degree**

In January CPB reviewed the proposal for a B.S. degree and new academic unit in Data Science. CPB viewed the proposed new program/major as excellent and badly needed. However, CPB expressed several concerns about the proposal as written, particularly regarding (1) the arrangements for ensuring student access to the program; (2) the personnel resources required and requested; and (3) the physical resources required and requested. CPB agreed that a Data Science major would be a good investment for the campus and likely in high demand, and thus, CPB supported the establishment of a Data Science major. At the same time, CPB found many concerns with the resources required and requested for the proposed Data Science program, and with the arrangements for ensuring these resources are made available to the campus at large.

**B.A. Degree in Human Services & Education Sciences**

In October CPB reviewed a proposal from the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) to establish a B.A. degree in Human Services & Education Sciences (HSES). Although Council did not see a convincing argument for the requested allocation of FTEs, it was impressed by the multi-year strategic planning that gave rise to the proposal. In sum, CPB felt that the investment in this new major needed to be supported by a more rigorous assessment of demand. This should also be accompanied by a clear campus vision of where the resources will come from (e.g. should there be a redistribution from the humanities or humanistic social sciences to support this program, both from a viewpoint regarding teaching social justice and from investments in FTE corresponding in part to undergraduate student enrollment).
Ocean Road Faculty & Staff Housing Project

In February, the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) received a report on the Ocean Road Campus Housing project from Joel Michaelsen, faculty advisor to Chancellor Yang in matters of finance and resource management. CPB acknowledged the importance and urgency of affordable, functional, and convenient housing for UCSB faculty and staff. Overall, CPB strongly supported the Ocean Road project as part of UCSB’s Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP). There are many additional benefits of the Ocean Road project beyond below-market housing prices for faculty and staff, including environmental benefits (fewer commuters) and a more diverse local population. At the same time, CPB members raised a few important concerns to share regarding the following: Student Health Center relocation; guaranteed access for faculty and staff at below-market prices; issues with current UCSB homeowners association; and future public-private partnerships.

CPB understood that third-party agreements to construct and manage the facilities are being considered in part because UCSB is not permitted to raise the debt funds required to develop the housing. CPB was concerned that costs of such agreements may outweigh their long-term benefits and encouraged UCSB to advocate with UCOP and/or the legislature for the alternative option to raise debt funds for future housing projects.

On April 28, CPB sent a memo to Divisional Chair Susannah Scott expressing its concerns regarding the Ocean Road project. CPB’s memo was forwarded to the Executive Vice Chancellor the following day. At the time of this report, a response has not yet been received from the EVC.

Technology Management Program – Change in Name & Status

In March CPB reviewed and supported the proposal to change the name and status of the Technology Management Program (TMP) in the College of Engineering to the Department of Technology Management. The TMP currently functions as a department, offering an undergraduate certificate in Technology Management, a 9-month Master’s degree, and a four-year research-focused doctoral degree. CPB supported this change with the understanding that this change in status would not require additional resources from either UCSB or the College of Engineering.

WASC proposal regarding Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation

In October CPB reviewed the proposal for the Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC) regarding Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation of UCSB’s accreditation. The Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR) is an alternative path to reaccreditation approved by WASC for UCSB. The theme chosen by UCSB is Designing for Access, Designing for Success. The proposal identifies the following three major issues to be investigated: access to resources when students enter their programs, pathways and bottlenecks to graduation, and student perception of the relevance of their academic experience to their goals. Six departments have been chosen for detailed gathering of quantitative and qualitative data: Economics, Biology (EEMB/MCDB), and Chemistry/ Biochemistry as representative departments from which there is an “outflow” of majors, and Religious Studies, Global Studies, and Sociology as representative departments which see an “inflow” of majors.
Overall, CPB was highly supportive of the TPR project in its broad conception, but suggested further consideration of a number of questions and concerns regarding both the resources allocated to the project and the approach that it takes: a possible underestimation of the resources required for data gathering and processing, and the burden that it places on already overworked staff; potential unrealistic assumptions regarding our campus; and a recommendation to solicit feedback from our alumni of part of the TPR process.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2021-22 term:

APM 715 & 760: Family & Medical Leave and Accommodations for Childbearing/Childrearing

In June CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to Sections 715 and 760 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) regarding Family & Medical Leave and Family Accommodations for Childbearing/Childrearing. The Council supported revising the policies to provide a better work environment and support employees who need additional time for health and family reasons. The key change was to increase the PFCB (Pay for Family Care and Bonding) option from 70% of an employee’s eligible earnings to 100%. The Council believed that the change would make the University more attractive for future employees. In implementing the policies, CPB noted that UC and campus administrations should provide necessary funds to departments and other units to cover employees on such paid leaves.

Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce

In June CPB reviewed the report of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) Phase 2 Taskforce. The report proposed principles for making the program permanent, becoming a Negotiated Salary Program (NSP), and implementing it on all UC campuses. It would be governed by draft APM section 668. The proposed draft of APM 668 would give Chancellors the authority to determine whether their campus will participate in the NSP after consultation with the Academic Senate and the Executive Vice Chancellor. CPB concluded that the benefits of the NSP to UCSB would probably be smaller than its costs. Furthermore, CPB recommended several actions that the campus should consider if it decides to proceed with the NSP over these concerns.

Recommendations on Department Political Statements

In April CPB reviewed recommendations from the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) regarding the ability of academic departments on campus to issue or endorse statements on political issues in the name of the department. CPB chose not to opine.

UC Research Data Policy

In March CPB reviewed the proposed revision to the Presidential Policy on UC Research Data. CPB agreed that the proposed revision is much improved from the previous draft. In the revision, the definition of Research Data is more restricted and no longer covers scholarly works or other research products that are subject to copyright. CPB found the revision to be a
non-controversial, bare-bones UC Policy statement deferring all of the implementation policy creation to the campuses.

Although compliance with federal and state regulations and funding agency requirements regarding Research Data is important, CPB expressed concerns about the excessive costs of compliance at the expense of the University’s primary mission of teaching and research. CPB urged the administration to create policies and systems that lead to compliance at minimal time cost to the university researchers so that their time can be effectively spent on the University’s primary mission.

Sustainable Practices Policy

In October CPB reviewed the systemwide proposal for updates to the Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices. The proposal updated the University's sustainability policies in several key areas (Green Building Design, Climate Protection, Transportation, Water Systems, and UC Health). It also added a section (Health and Well-being) recognizing the need to address the health inequities that arise from climate change and unequal access to healthy food. While CPB acknowledged that the proposal identified new benchmarks, it did not outline a plan for reaching them. The Council felt it would be helpful to share best practices among campuses, with an eye toward continued innovation and improvement.

CPB noted that several gaps remain that represent a lost opportunity to provide useful guidance to campuses. Most notably, the Systemwide Sustainable Practices policy did not address California’s lack of affordable housing, especially in locales near UC campuses. CPB saw this as a conspicuous omission since the University’s sustainable transportation and health equity goals cannot be achieved if students, faculty, and staff cannot access affordable housing near the universities where they work. The new section on Health and Well-being was vague and failed to articulate the issues or provide guidelines for future policies. Finally, the University’s sustainable practices policies did not address travel commonly required for professional activities (such as conferences, program reviews, workshops, etc.).

VII. Committees

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

1. Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (Academic Committee)
   Chair: James Rawlings
2. Committee on Development & Community Relations (Budget & Development Committee)
   Chair: Cristina Marchetti
3. Committee on Capital & Space Planning (Infrastructure Committee)
   Chair: Dawn Holmes

Most of the business of these committees was conducted by email; all of CPB’s meetings were held electronically via Zoom. Issues were delegated to the subcommittees for prior review, and recommendations were then forwarded to the full Council for deliberation.
The principal issues under review by CPB were spearheaded by the Academic Committee. These included systemwide reports and reviews, as well as many of the local issues under review.

The Budget & Development Committee typically conducted a preliminary review of endowed chair proposals. This committee also examined Summer Sessions, and their report is attached (Appendix A).


The Council also continued a tradition of four ad hoc “area subcommittees,” based on Colleges and Divisions:
- Division of Social Sciences and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education
- Division of MLPS and Bren School of Environmental Science & Management
- Division of HFA and College of Creative Studies
- College of Engineering

The area subcommittees were primarily tasked with conducting preliminary analyses of the academic program reviews. In addition, Academic search waiver requests were first sent to the respective area subcommittee for initial consideration before review by the full Council. Finally, the subcommittees took the lead in reviewing Deans’ FTE plans and developing the respective parts of the overall FTE recommendations for 2022-23, presenting recommendations for full Council discussion.

VIII. Council Representation

The Council Chair served as a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, as Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee, as a member of the Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy, and consulted with staff from Design, Facilities, & Safety Services. The CPB Chair, along with the Chair of the Committee on Development & Community Relations, served as Trustees of the UCSB Foundation.

IX. CPB Relationship with University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)

The CPB Chair served as the UCSB representative on UCPB and regularly reported on UCPB business conducted at the monthly systemwide meetings, soliciting comments from Council members on pending UCPB issues. Due to COVID-19, the meetings of UCPB were held entirely remotely via Zoom, and each meeting was about 7-8 hours.

X. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning & Budget consulted with several members of the Administration during the 2021-22 term, including: the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; and staff and faculty leadership of the Program Review Panel.
The Council Chair and Vice Chair held regular consultations with EVC David Marshall. These meetings provided an opportunity to discuss issues and concerns informally and play an effective role in shared governance.

While the Council engaged in informative discussions with the Assistant Chancellor for Finance & Resource Management, more information and interactions were sought. CPB continues to desire more budgetary information to better understand campus finances and help fulfill its planning role.

The Council notes that it regrettably had no involvement of any kind in decisions made regarding the “Munger Hall” project. No review or other form of input was requested from the Council regarding the “Munger Hall” project.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB and UCPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:
- Academic Strategic Planning
- COVID-19 response
- UCSB Budget transparency, communication, and deliberation
- Accounting of FTEs and Deans’ discretionary budgets
- Campus-wide Capital Planning priorities
- Campus facilities, deferred maintenance, and recharge rates
- Summer Sessions

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Douglas Steigerwald</th>
<th>Chair/UCPB Rep (Fall)</th>
<th>Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rene Weber</td>
<td>Chair/UCPB Rep (Winter/ Spring/Summer)</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James (Jim) Rawlings</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Begley</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice Erickson</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Goodearl</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Holmes</td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Jacobson</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Kloetzel</td>
<td>Winter/ Spring</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamanyu Madhow</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Marchetti</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Mazer</td>
<td>Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Marine Biology (EEMB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aashish Mehta</td>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Penley</td>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram Seshadri</td>
<td>Materials; Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In January, incoming CPB Chair Rene Weber appointed Doug Steigerwald as a budgetary advisor for the remainder of the academic year.

XII. Final Comments from the Chair

UCSB is one campus in the UC system. As such, UCSB cannot fully control the policies that create its revenues and expenses. The past three rounds of funding cuts since 1990, and lingering uncertainty about future funding, combined with a still underfunded influx of undergraduates students create major challenges for UCSB.

Within UCSB, numerous stakeholders need to work together and negotiate individual interests for an optimized outcome for all. Here, the campus controls administrative practice. As in previous years, and stated by previous chairs, the Council and its Chair witnessed a persisting difficulty, in almost all administrative units we spoke with, to freely and systematically share financial and other information, and to engage in data-driven, collaborative problem solving across unit boundaries. UCSB’s many challenges cannot be addressed by any unit operating in isolation and by keeping planning relevant data hidden from other committees. This can lead to low quality of decisions, sub-optimal outcomes, (quiet and open) resignation of faculty and staff, and the permanent iteration of problems that remain unresolved for years or even decades. Examples we encountered this year echo the ones of previous years and include chronically unmaintained facilities, understaffing of instructional programs so severe as to damage their reputations with their own majors, and the ad hoc filling of revenue shortfalls in divisional temporary sub-0 budgets, the latter being one example of opaque budgeting that impairs academic planning. The fast turnover of AS Councils’ and Committees’ leadership, with the consequence of lost expertise and collective memory, also does not help in addressing these problems.

None of these structural problems can be solved overnight, and despite the systemic challenges at UCSB, I believe that the Council - in collaboration with UCSB’s executive administration - has made significant progress on at least three major priorities: The Council assisted in the development of a campus-wide, strategic planning process. The Council innovated its FTE plan evaluations with the goal to (a) evaluate FTE plans both vertically (i.e within colleges and academic units) and horizontally (across colleges and academic units), and (b) increase transparency and consistency of FTE plan evaluations across years and Council membership. The Council also reviewed facility management and summer sessions. The Council provided a data-driven analysis of summer sessions profitability with the goal of optimizing summer sessions’ potential as a revenue source and to address UCSB’s strong enrollment pressure. Addressing these issues required the collaboration of many UCSB administrators, faculty, and staff, who I would like to praise for their tireless effort to fulfill their ambitions with fewer resources than most would deserve. These individual efforts, especially during the challenges
during the ongoing COVID pandemic, have been impressive. The same goes for every member of CPB, who contributed with great wisdom, care, and an unbreakable work-ethic to the many tasks and responsibilities outlined in this annual report. I like to note that CPB work is in addition to each member’s primary, demanding job, which is being a scholar and teacher on campus. Working with every individual CPB member this year and to learn more about the many fascinating programs on campus has been a great privilege for me. The support of all members, the smart advice of an always critical-supportive Vice-Chair (James Rawlings), the experience and advice of CPB’s immediate Past-Chair (Doug Steigerwald), and the countless contributions of CPB’s excellent staff (Kyle Richards) meant a lot to me, and has helped me to believe that UCSB’s future, despite all challenges, is bright.
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The CPB Committee on Development & Community Relations (Budget & Development Committee) has been charged with examining how UCSB selects and runs Summer Sessions, with the goal of assessing whether summer courses could provide both relief from enrollment pressure and a source of revenue. The subcommittee plus CPB’s Chair Rene Weber engaged in in-person and email discussions and met with Leesa Beck, Director of Summer Sessions on March 3, 2022. In addition, the subcommittee obtained two separate databases: summer school’s financial database and summer school’s enrollment database. The subcommittee developed a tailored algorithm which enabled both the committee and Summer Sessions administrators to merge the two databases accurately and efficiently. The present document summarizes the issues discussed and the results of a first, integrated analysis of Summer Sessions’ financial and enrollment data.

The subcommittee started with the premise that demand for summer courses has increased and will continue to increase due to enrollment pressure, as enrollment pressures have created a situation in which there is too much demand. Students cannot take classes they need to graduate (e.g., intro biology) during the academic year due to too high demand. This also means that many students end up taking 5 years (or more) to complete their degree (or even leave UCSB without a degree). Therefore the subcommittee wishes to determine whether expanding the summer offerings can relieve the above pressure while at the same time providing substantial revenue for the University. In addition, the subcommittee is interested in reviewing Summer Sessions’ planning of course offerings with the goal to provide recommendations that may have the potential to further increase Summer Sessions’ revenue and profit potential. The meetings with Leesa Beck were very illuminating, especially regarding how the summer curriculum is planned. The subcommittee and CPB Chair Rene Weber would like to commend Leesa Beck for all the information she has shared with the subcommittee and especially for providing the subcommittee with the databases that are needed for a data driven review.
Conclusions and Key Recommendations

On the basis of the information and findings summarized below, the Subcommittee puts forward the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Improved communication is needed between departments and OSS to make it clear that the budget proposed annually from OSS is not fixed, but merely a first suggestion, and that in fact OSS is keen on receiving input from departments and on running any course that it deems needed and profitable.

- More data are needed to assess how much revenue summer courses generate and more transparency is recommended in communicating these findings and how the profits generated by summer sessions are used.

- The analyses presented in this report show that the majority of all summer courses are highly profitable. The Subcommittee recommends an increase of the return (currently very small) of revenue from summer sessions to departments to incentivize more course offerings by faculty. OSS strongly supports this recommendation.

- Departments should be encouraged to rethink how they approach summer quarter, and provide more opportunities for those faculty who want to teach in summer. While departments can choose to prioritize junior colleagues in granting summer teaching opportunities, the higher salaries of senior faculty should not be used to exclude them from teaching opportunities. The analyses presented here show that most summer courses are profitable even at low(er) enrollment numbers and higher instructor salaries. Departments should be focused on offering all courses that address important teaching needs to alleviate enrollment pressure and for which a qualified instructor is available.

- While remote teaching leads to the highest profits for summer courses, and students’ demand for remote courses during the summer term seems to be increasing, more data and analyses are needed across disciplines before shifting more courses from in-person to remote teaching. Summer course profitability should be evaluated in the context of teaching quality and outcomes. The Subcommittee believes that it is too early to conclude that remote teaching is appropriate for all courses.

Background

Leesa Beck, UCSB Summer Sessions Director, provided very helpful background information to the committee. The following information covers the 5 year period between 2017 and 2022:
● About 10,000 students enroll in summer courses annually. These are mostly upper division students.

● The courses that most appeal to students are: (1) Courses that fill Major or GE requirements (especially those that fill multiple requirements) and are impacted by high enrollment during the regular academic year; (2) interdisciplinary courses; (3) courses with perceived value on the job market (e.g., programming, data science).

● Strong increase in summer enrollment during the Covid pandemic, unclear if it will last (recent enrollment data from 2022 shows a downward trend in enrollment).

● Students pay on a per-unit basis, which tends to disadvantage lower income students; some financial aid is available but much less than during the academic year.

● Summer course revenues are listed in UCSB’s budget under tuition and fees. In 2021 the Summer courses revenue was approximately $29M out of a total tuition and fees revenue of $455M (or 6.4% of total tuition and fees).

**Summer Curriculum Planning and Revenue**

Despite contrary information shared with the subcommittee from department chairs, departments do not get a fixed budget from the Office of Summer Sessions (OSS). OSS is in fact very keen on offering any course that it deems profitable (based on historical enrollment and demand data), and for which a good instructor can be identified. The process of preparing the summer curriculum is iterative: OSS proposes a set of courses and associated budget to each department and makes it clear that this is a proposal, not a budget set in stone! The department is then encouraged to suggest changes and additional courses, regardless of the initially proposed budget. As the subcommittee has received contrary information from department chairs, it is quite possible that some departments incorrectly interpret the OSS proposal and the proposed budget therein as a fixed budget. There are a few issues here where OSS, CPB, and the larger UCSB administrative body may be able to play role:

● There is a need for improved communication between departments and OSS to make it clear that the budget is not fixed and in fact merely a first, proposed budget.

● OSS would strongly support an increase of the return (currently very small) of revenue from summer courses to departments to incentivize more course offerings by faculty.
OSS has provided financial and enrollment databases that will allow the subcommittee (and subsequently OSS) to better quantify profit margins from summer courses and study their relationship to individual programs, session time, etc. This may provide concrete recommendations for expanded (or reduced) summer course offerings in individual programs.

**Summer Courses Staffing**

The subcommittee has identified and discussed a few issues concerning the staffing of summer courses:

- The availability of instructors for summer courses varies greatly among disciplines. It seems that in some units, especially in the humanities and social sciences, faculty are very keen on teaching summer courses for additional income and to address enrollment pressure, and the prospect of summer teaching is used as a tool for recruitment of junior faculty. The incorrect perception of a fixed budget for summer courses (determined by OSS) that some departments seem to have resulted in unhealthy competition and sometimes the denial of opportunity for faculty to teach summer courses. This highlights the urgent need for OSS to clarify to all departments that the budget for summer courses is not fixed. Summer Sessions’ Director Leesa Beck, reiterated this point to the committee multiple times. Moreover, in science and engineering departments, where faculty receive summer salaries on research grants at a higher proportion, and graduate students are often supported as research assistants over the summer or secure industry internships, the situation differs greatly from the humanities and social sciences. Consequently, it can be more challenging to staff summer courses in science and engineering, which are typically taught by lecturers or graduate students. The committee’s quantitative analyses of financial and enrollment data (see below) can provide further insights on this issue.

- The compensation scale for summer teaching is available online: The remuneration is 8.5% (about 1/12th) of the annual base salary for each 3-5 quarter-unit course. At UC semester campuses, the pay rate is 11% (1/9th) for each 3-5 semester-unit course. There was some discussion of the merits of a fixed amount versus a percentage, but the committee agreed that a percentage is preferable because a fixed amount would be a disincentive for more experienced instructors. The percentage was reduced from 1/9 to 1/12 in 2008 for quarter-unit courses due to the financial crisis and to reflect the different amount of contact hours between quarter- and semester-unit courses. Given the substantial revenue associated with quarter-summer courses, the committee recommends the return to 1/9th per 3-5 quarter-unit course to increase the incentive for course offerings. The committee’s quantitative analyses of financial and enrollment data (see below) can provide information on quarter summer
courses’ profitability that may justify a return to a 1/9th compensation for each 3-5 units course.

- Summer graduate teaching associates (GSAs) are paid only 60% of their academic year pay. The committee and OSS could not identify a reasonable explanation for why this is the case. The current pay rate is limited by the tenets of the union contract, but an increase in pay should easily receive union support.

Modes of Summer Instruction

The majority of summer courses are currently offered as traditional in-person courses (remote instruction was only possible during the peak of the Covid-19 pandemic). Thus, students are required to be in residence during summer sessions, which is expensive. The committee recommends thinking creatively about modes of summer instruction:

- Summer courses provide opportunities to reimagine and develop new modes of instruction, which could include virtual and hybrid teaching. Summer courses offer the opportunity to introduce new courses, perhaps bootcamp-style courses.

- Currently space is more easily available in summer session. This could ease the pressure on high-enrollment required laboratory courses in the sciences.

- Smaller enrollments can provide students with a richer experience.

The campus could benefit from the establishment of a formal approval process for online or hybrid summer courses. Since the pandemic, the appeal of remote/online courses appears to have increased with many students favoring them over in-person courses. In fact, instructors who offered courses remotely/online experienced, overall, fuller classes and over-enrollment, while instructors who complied with UCSB’s directives saw their enrollment decline. The committee recommends the establishment of some remotely taught courses for instructors who are interested in teaching remotely. However, this would require balancing the demands of increased enrollment with the desire to provide a more rewarding experience for students. More thought will need to be given by various departments as to how to define quality given that larger course enrollments could eliminate some of the pre-pandemic benefits of teaching in the summer. The challenge of measuring teaching quality for remotely offered summer courses (e.g., specifying the quantity and type of exams) will have to be carefully addressed.

In Summer 2022, summer sessions conducted a survey of students’ experiences in courses that were remotely taught due to the COVID pandemic. According to the preliminary results (source: Leesa Beck, Director of Summer Sessions), 80% of students said they felt they learned as much or more in their remote/online class as they would have in a similar in-person class. On a five-point scale, they rated their overall learning as a 4.1, and about 40% said they would probably not have taken the course had it not been online.
Quantitative Analyses of Summer School’s Financial and Enrollment Data

The committee has requested the following information from OSS for summer classes offered within the past five years: (1) class identifiers (year, department, course number/title, lower/upper division, units, session); (2) actual and maximum enrollment numbers; (3) revenues & costs (instructor salary, administrative fees, other costs). At the present time, the requested information is not stored in one cohesive database that would allow a comprehensive cost-revenue-profit analysis across years, departments, sessions, and individual courses. In fact, according to OSS’s information, the relevant information is currently only available across multiple databases on campus without a common “key variable” that would allow a simple joining of databases (e.g. a common key for individual courses). As a further complication, retrieving data from the various databases requires a substantial amount of manual work, which is prone to errors and involves the collaboration of UCSB staff across administrative units. Nevertheless, OSS has obtained the data and made them available to the committee in two separate, non-joined databases; one containing all financial information for summer courses, and one containing all enrollment data for individual summer courses. Subsequently, the committee was able to use advanced string-matching and data joining algorithms via a custom made and easy to apply Python script, which enabled the committee to join the relevant data for 95% of individual summer courses in the years 2017 to 2021. The Python script will be made available to OSS and will allow for easy, fast, reliable, and accurate joining of planning data in the future.

The committee also requested the questions and data of OSS’s “Student Interest Survey,” which OSS conducts ahead of summer school budgeting and planning in some years. This data is a great source of information for departments’ planning and allows OSS to make informed recommendations to departments some time ahead of scheduling summer courses. In particular, results from the “Student Interest Survey” would be relevant for analyzing the a-posteriori enrollment and financial data together with the a-priori student interest data. This would allow for the development of models using student interest (and other information) to predict enrollment and the resulting financial performance of summer classes. At this time, the committee has neither received the survey questions nor the data from the “Student Interest Survey”. The committee recommends sharing this data. Should the available data not provide relevant data for analysis and planning purposes at this time, then the committee recommends a revision of the “Student Interest Survey”, so that the resulting data can indeed be used for predictive models and planning purposes. In the following, the committee provides a first analysis of break-even points and profit margins of summer courses and their association with course characteristics. This first analysis is merely a selection of possible analyses with relevance for planning purposes. CPB and the Subcommittee on Development & Budget welcomes suggestions and further advice from OSS and the EVC regarding additional analyses that might be of relevance.
Total Enrollment, Costs, Revenues, and Profits 2017-2021

After joining the enrollment and financial data, 3223 individual summer courses from 2017 to 2021 were available for analysis. A total of 119,191 students were enrolled in these classes generating revenues in the amount of $115,288,564 (Estimated Gross Unit Fees) and total course costs of $26,618,990. During this time, the summer courses available for analysis led to profits in the amount of $88,669,573. Of the 3,223 courses offered, only 172 courses (5.3%) made no profits. However, OSS informed the committee that the campus returns a substantial amount of the tuition revenues to “student aid”. The exact amount of “return to student aid” is difficult to determine, but OSS uses an estimate of 33% as “return to student aid”. This means that after the adjustment, generated profits available to UCSB are reduced to $50,240,045 and the number of courses that made no profit increases to 349 (10.8%).

Overall Statistics Per Summer Course

On average, summer courses from 2017-2021 enrolled 37 students with an average maximum capacity of 49 students. At the same time, on average 13 students ended up on waitlists. After waitlists were resolved, summer classes filled on average to 76% of capacity. Average course costs were $8,259, revenues were $35,770, and profits were $27,511 per course. On average, the revenues of courses were 4.5 times higher than their costs and 63% of a course’s revenues were profits. Considering return to student aid, the average profit per class decreased to $15,587 and the profit to revenue ratio (profit margin) to 30%. The average break-even point per student was 8.8. This means that it took on average only 9 students enrolled in a summer course to reach profitability. Had all summer courses filled to their maximum capacity, then overall course profits would have increased 47%. These statistics suggest that a vast majority of summer courses filled well, and were highly profitable. The analyses also showed no evidence that smaller classes (below 10 students) are generally not profitable and thus should not be scheduled. The analyses support OSS’ and the EVC’s recommendation that all summer courses that break-even and are taught by an available instructor should be scheduled, even if projected enrollment numbers might be low (but not below a course’s student break-even). At the same time, the analyses demonstrate that summer school has additional potential to increase profits by increasing enrollment. This said, “cannibalizing enrollment”, which is primarily an issue in units with comparably low student demand (most units experience high student demand), should also be considered in course planning. As stated earlier, the sub-committee recommends a revision and optimization of the “Student Interest Survey”, so that the resulting data can indeed be used for predictive models and planning purposes.

Profits by Year, Session, College, and Division

Profits gradually increased from 2017 ($14,120,534) to 2019 ($16,749,746), and peaked in 2020 ($23,473,753), which was during the peak time of the Covid-19 pandemic. In 2021 profits declined to $18,374,466, which was still higher than during the pre-pandemic years. Not surprisingly, most profits were generated in sessions A ($36,927,267) and B ($43,556,844), which offer required, large lower division courses.
Across the other sessions (D-G), profits distributed approximately uniformly. Breaking down profits by colleges it becomes clear that summer enrollment is primarily driven by the College of Letters & Sciences. Of the $88,669,573 total profits, 93.5% ($82,906,041) was generated in L&S. Breaking profits further down into divisions shows that Social Sciences (SS) contributed $23,284,262 (26.2%), MLPS $31,994,717 (36.1%), and H&F $24,985,375 (28.18%). In contrast, only $2,280,607 (2.6%) of the profits were generated in the College of Engineering and $3,435,211 (3.9%) in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education.

**Profits by Departments and Units**

The breakdown of profits by departments and units on campus largely mirrors the breakdown by college and division. As table 1 below reveals, online instruction contributed a large share of summer quarter profits (see the committee’s recommendation regarding online and remote courses above). The “top 10 departments” are all within MLPS, SS, or HFA. The “bottom 10 departments/units” are mostly within the College of Engineering. The Department of Chemical Engineering is the only department on campus that generated no profits (losses) for the campus. The reasons for this observation are comparably small summer classes combined with the highest instructor salaries on campus. It should be noted, however, that this department is an anomaly. All other departments generated substantial profits for the campus, and this mostly independent of instructor salaries (given the high revenues and profit to revenue ratios of most classes, instructor salaries are mostly a negligible driver of summer courses’ profitability).
Table 1: Summer Quarter Profits by Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT/PROGRAMS (RANKED FROM HIGH TO LOW PROFITS)</th>
<th>PROFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Instruction</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Mathematics</td>
<td>$5,902,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences</td>
<td>$5,004,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics</td>
<td>$4,507,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Economics</td>
<td>$4,250,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Communication</td>
<td>$4,153,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Sociology</td>
<td>$3,877,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology</td>
<td>$3,624,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Statistics and Applied Probability</td>
<td>$3,311,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of History</td>
<td>$2,818,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies Program</td>
<td>$2,648,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program</td>
<td>$2,592,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>$2,490,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>$2,279,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology</td>
<td>$2,088,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Classics</td>
<td>$2,001,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Anthropology</td>
<td>$1,983,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Film and Media Studies</td>
<td>$1,954,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Political Science</td>
<td>$1,711,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the History of Art and Architecture</td>
<td>$1,681,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Philosophy</td>
<td>$1,623,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>$1,561,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Computer Science</td>
<td>$1,550,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology</td>
<td>$1,527,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Music</td>
<td>$1,382,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Asian American Studies</td>
<td>$1,239,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Chicano/a Studies</td>
<td>$1,105,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Global Studies</td>
<td>$1,088,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Religious Studies</td>
<td>$1,032,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>$1,025,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature Program</td>
<td>$1,023,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Black Studies</td>
<td>$885,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Art</td>
<td>$666,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of French and Italian</td>
<td>$643,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Geography</td>
<td>$624,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>$617,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td>$546,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Mentorship Program</td>
<td>$537,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Linguistics</td>
<td>$501,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profits by Individual Courses
The 3,223 courses offered from 2017 to 2021 at UCSB originate from 857 different summer class titles. Of these 857 different classes, only 52 (6.1%) did not generate profits. Among this small group of courses are those that either can not be taught to a large group of students (e.g. dance and theater courses with individualized instruction) or only attract a very small, select group of students. In contrast, at the top of profitability are large courses that provide required courses within departments in which enrollment pressure is particularly high (e.g. MCDB 1A; Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology, which alone generated $1,193,660 in profits for the campus from 2017 to 2021). It is important to note that profitability of courses must not be the only consideration in deciding which courses are offered and which are not. In fact, the overall high profitability of summer enrollment should allow departments to schedule classes that may not be profitable, but are deemed important to address relevant content in a curriculum, experiment with new content and teaching formats, require individualized modes of instruction (e.g. courses in arts, acting, and music), and address the teaching needs of smaller segments of the student body within a department. Ultimately, the overall profitability of departments should be considered. Departments with high profitability should receive relatively more degrees of freedom in scheduling courses - even special content courses with lower enrollment numbers - than departments with low profitability. A complete list of all classes sorted by profits, revenues, or costs can be provided upon request.

Conclusion
One of the main challenges for Summer Sessions is to address the lack of detailed information about how much revenue summer courses generate and how the profits generated by summer enrollment is used. The Subcommittee recommends increased transparency and clarity about the revenue stream provided by summer courses. Departments should be encouraged to rethink how they approach summer, and provide
more opportunities for those faculty who want to teach in summer, regardless of which teaching modality they adopt (in-person, remote, online) and the seniority (i.e. salaries) of instructors. While remote teaching leads to the highest profits for summer courses, and students’ demand for remote courses during the summer term seems to be increasing, more data and analyses are needed across disciplines before shifting more courses from in-person to remote teaching. Summer course profitability should be evaluated in the context of teaching quality and outcomes. The subcommittee believes that it is too early to conclude that remote teaching is appropriate for all courses; more financial resources should be directed towards faculty and departments interested in developing new courses for summer since the demand for them will likely increase.
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INTRODUCTION
The CPB Committee on Capital & Space Planning (Infrastructure Committee) offers CPB the following:

* Facilities Management Recharge Rates, budget, deferred maintenance
* Proposal for Design, Facilities, & Safety Services (DFSS) Recruitment Support for lab remodeling
* DFSS Estimated Departmental Operating Budgets

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO DFSS
For comprehensive background on DFSS, the Council is referred to the DFSS web site: https://www.dfss.ucsb.edu/business-financial-planning/overview
AVC Renee Bahl is the Director of DFSS which is comprised of 4 sections as follows:

1. Facilities Management: Director David McHale heads a team of approximately 260 full time employees.
2. Design and Construction Services: Director & Campus Architect Julie Hendricks heads a team comprised of 32 employees.
4. Environmental Health & Safety: Director Megan Sandy, comprises a group of 45 employees.

A full set of org charts for DFSS is available at:
https://www.dfss.ucsb.edu/sites/default/files/docs/DFSS%20Org%20Charts%20ALL.pdf

Facilities Management Recharge Rates
Deans and Faculty complain about how much it costs to get things done.
Examples of costs are posted on the FM Service Estimate guide. Response times are posted on the FM website. FM employees’ time is fully occupied with urgent work and in working through a backlog of non-emergency requests. A quicker service could be provided if more maintenance people were employed.
**Does UCSB pay better than outside firms?**
No. UCSB's recharge rates (hourly technician rate) are less than outside union shops. Additionally, outside contractors add 15% for markup/profit on both labor and material, whereas UCSB recharge is simply direct cost. UCSB recharge rates are composed of 2 components: hourly wage plus 15% overhead cost.

**Does UCSB pay more for materials? Who decides where the materials are to be sourced?**
No. The UC system procurement operates on a system-wide basis wherever possible to obtain strategic/favorable pricing. UCSB campus procurement also works with local/regional supply companies to ensure competitive pricing for goods/materials being purchased.

**Who decides on the time a small job will take?**
Each "job" has its own unique conditions/considerations. The service guide reflects an average cost / time estimate for customers. Once a work request has been initiated, the technician performs the assigned work (time starts when tech leaves the shop for the job and is logged in 15-minute increments) and upon completion, the Trade Superintendent (supervisor) reviews the work ticket details. If the Superintendent notices an anomaly (excessive amount of time to complete work, quantity of material/parts needed), they will follow up with the technician and document any unforeseen conditions that may have arisen in completing the task.

**Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES MANAGEMENT – recharge service under $1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang one picture (20&quot; x 20&quot; or smaller) - minimum cost for one unit. Unit price may decrease depending on amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install a customer supplied key board tray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget**
UCSB DCS recharge rates are at the lower end compared to other UCs (UCSC and UCR lower)
The Income & Recharge Advisory Committee is responsible for advising and recommending the functional, financial, and compliance viability of the income and recharge activities that represent a higher level of risk to the campus.

There is a Rate Proposal Form and Rate Calculation Template that departments fill out to propose rates that will cover costs.
Campus budget office: [https://bap.ucsb.edu/budget/income-and-recharge](https://bap.ucsb.edu/budget/income-and-recharge)

Typical recharge rates, such as for Design and Construction Services (DCS) project managers, inspectors and analysts, are reviewed by the Income and Recharge Advisory Committee. The committee and ultimately the Finance and Resource Management Department, headed by Associate Chancellor Chuck Haines, adjust rates and make the final decision.

DCS had a formal recharge rate approved in 2012. The department submitted new packages in January 2015, May 2016 and July 2016. In January 2017 and September 2017 an interim rate increase was levied, but the recharge packages were not formally approved. DCS submitted new
recharge packages in April 2019 and June 2019 and new rates were approved in November 2020. As requested by the Income and Recharge Committee, DCS submitted a new multi-year rate package in March 2021. A revised multi-year rate package was approved in August 2021.

Deferred Maintenance (DM)

UCSB Audit and Advisory Services Internal Audit Report: April 30, 2018, pdf
UCSB FM Funding: Crisis Management (0.81% of CRV): $33.3M ($29.8M Ops + $3.5M DM).
State DM funding fluctuates year-to-year and there is a more detailed explanation below.
UCSB CRV (2018): $4.1B Current Replacement Value

Deferred maintenance was audited in 2017-18. The report stated:
Facilities Management has not received adequate funding to address the backlog of capital renewal and deferred maintenance nor an amount of annual funding to stop the accumulation. Annual increases in accumulated deferred maintenance exceed annual budget allocations.

According to best practices identified in this audit, an adequate annual investment for deferred maintenance is 1.5% to 2.5% of the CRV, which represents at least $60M annually. Currently, funding from the Campus allocation is $3.5M annually, or 0.08% of the CRV.
Source: https://auditreports.ucop.edu//index.php?action=public_search&type=search&msg=2
Office of Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services

The campus deferred maintenance needs exceed $600 million. Campus funding comes from the campus budget office and is allocated to DFSS on an annual basis; in other words it is not part of the DFSS base budget. Generally it is $3.5M. However, in FY 21-22, UCSB received a very high allocation: $31 million from one-time funds and $3M from AB94 for deferred maintenance. Other years DFSS has received nothing from the state depending on economic conditions, so it is difficult to plan.

When was the last APPA Association of Physical Plant Administrators report?
The last DCS report was August 2017. The last FM report was April 2015.

The APPA Maintenance Matrix (The full APPA Maintenance Matrix can be viewed here)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance</td>
<td>Showpiece Facility</td>
<td>Comprehensive Stewardship</td>
<td>Managed Care</td>
<td>Reactive Management</td>
<td>Crisis Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget as % of CRV</td>
<td>&gt; 4.0</td>
<td>3.5 - 4.0</td>
<td>3.0 - 3.4</td>
<td>2.5 – 2.9</td>
<td>&lt;2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Showpiece Facility:** Maintenance activities are highly focused. Equipment and building components are fully functional and in excellent operating condition.

**Comprehensive Stewardship:** Maintenance activities are organized and planned in a systematic manner. Equipment and building components are functional and in good operating condition.
**Managed Care:** Maintenance activities are somewhat organized, but they remain people dependent. Equipment and building components are mostly functional but suffer occasional breakdowns.

**Reactive Management:** Maintenance activities are in response to client/customer request. Equipment and building component repair or replacement are heavily dependent on the availability of funding.

**Crisis Response:** Maintenance activities appear chaotic and without direction. Equipment and building components are routinely broken and inoperative.

**CRV =** Current Replacement Value (UCSB CRV=$4.1B; UCSB funding is at the Crisis Response Level)

**Work Orders (Examples attached)**

If a campus department would like to receive an estimate for services (office painting, new electrical outlet added, carpets cleaned, etc.) a work request is submitted at:

[https://www.workrequests.ucsb.edu/](https://www.workrequests.ucsb.edu/)

Once received, the trade superintendent contacts the requestor to discuss the project in greater detail: project scope, desired timing (daytime hours versus overtime and desired completion date) and budget. If the project can be completed by in-house staff, the superintendent will prepare a quote and FM Central Dispatch will send the requestor an email with the estimated cost. If the project requires an outside contractor, the trade superintendent works with an outside contractor to obtain an estimate and will provide the estimate to the requestor. If the client would like to proceed with the work, FM Central Dispatch will create a work ticket and issue to the trade shop or in the event that an outside contractor is completing the project, issue a contract for the work to be completed.

**FM Recharge Rate**

Facilities Management recently conducted a survey among UC campuses to determine their respective recharge rates. All UC campuses (with the exception of UCSB) incorporate a 3rd component of the recharge rate to include employee composite benefit cost.

The following table reflects UCSB’s recharge cost versus UC systemwide average recharge rates per trade class:

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>UCSB</th>
<th>UCI</th>
<th>UCSD*</th>
<th>UCLA*</th>
<th>UCR</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>UCSF</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td><em>46.80</em></td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>$102.94</td>
<td>$90.38</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$74.43</td>
<td>$124.00</td>
<td>$123.86</td>
<td>$130.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td><em>45.70</em></td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$101.39</td>
<td>$89.70</td>
<td>$85.55</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$73.72</td>
<td>$124.00</td>
<td>$111.41</td>
<td>$130.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** LAB REMODELING **

**Background**

In AY 2019-20, Christopher Newfield, then vice-chair of CPB, forwarded a proposal from Renee Bahl and Julie Hendricks to CPB chair Doug Steigerwald, regarding **recruitment support** from DFSS. Chris wrote:

_I ran your general idea for a fixed-cost package by a half-dozen people involved in the process. The response was uniformly positive._

With Chris leaving UCSB for a new position in London at the end of AY 2020, and the ongoing Covid crisis, the suggestion was taken no further until this year.

**DFSS Estimated Departmental Operating Budgets for 2021-2022**

What is the fiscal model for DFSS and FM? More specifically, how much of your budget comes from central campus funds?

![Design, Facilities & Safety Services (DFSS)](image)

### Facilities Management (FM)

- **Total Funding:** $32.6M
- **Total FTEs:** 266.0

#### CORE Funding (91%)

- $29.8M Salaries/Benefits/Expenses
- 239.0 FTEs

#### RECHARGE Funding (9%)

- $2.8M Salaries/Benefits/Expenses
- 27.0 FTEs

### Design & Construction Services (DCS)

- **Total Funding:** $3.7M
- **Total FTEs:** 27.5

#### CORE Funding (17%)

- $633K Salaries/Benefits 3.5 FTEs

#### RECHARGE Funding (83%)

- $3.1M Salaries/Benefits/Expenses
- 24.0 FTEs

---

* UCSD and UCLA recharge rates are not posted on their respective website. Hover for links for other campuses.

** HVAC: Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning  
*** STM: Skilled Trades Mechanic  
**** BMW: Building Maintenance Worker (semi-skilled)
Determining lab costs. Who creates the budget? Why is it expensive and slow?
Generally, during the Schematic Design phase of the project the Design Professional (architect) provides the construction cost estimate to the PM who then creates the project budget estimate that includes construction plus all soft costs. As the project progresses into the Design Development and Construction Documents phases the estimates are refined as the project design and associated details are finalized. Ultimately the construction cost is determined by contractor bids once the project goes out to bid. The Project Delivery Handbook was developed by DCS for clients to understand scope development and cost and time impacts on University projects.

How many labs?

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES (DCS) ACTIVE PROJECTS MARCH 2022.
TOTAL OPEN PROJECTS = 111
TOTAL OPEN LAB PROJECTS = 13

Project initiation form
PIF’s are submitted to DCS by the Assistant Dean after the faculty appointment. This is often the first engagement of DCS and the PIF generally includes a very basic description of the needs. At this point it is too early to determine if the original department budget allocation does not cover the requested or anticipated scope of work. This will be determined as the project moves into the Schematic Design phase if a redesign is required, which adds time and further cost to the project.

Funding Approval Authority
An email survey with the FM directors’ group on all the campuses, resulted in the table below. At UCSB, projects $35,000 and above require approval from the Chancellor. Other UCs have different thresholds. This puts an extra burden on the Chancellors time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Campus</th>
<th>Project $Amount Requiring Chancellor Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSF</td>
<td>$1M; designated official can sign up to $10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>$1M; designated official can sign up to $25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>$750k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>$35k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>$35k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations to EVC Marshall and Executive Dean Wiltzius

1. Labs to be costed and scheduled on a ‘most important requirements’ basis. New faculty encouraged to determine what they need initially, not what they want.
2. Start-up package review. Informative.
3. Design and Construction Services (DCS) to develop project scope. More efficient for the faculty and saves architect redesign time and money.
4. Improve relationship between interested parties.
5. Fair expectations to new Faculty members in terms of time and budget. What can be offered to the Faculty member in a reasonable period – rather than the entire request. This would be a good point to discuss with DFSS. Prioritize their requests.

6. CPB is concerned that a new Faculty member should be given a genuine timeline for when they will get their lab facilities.


8. As part of their recruitment packages, assistant professors are often promised that certain renovations will be completed in a shorter time than DCS is able to deliver.

9. At UCSB, projects $35,000 and above require approval from the Chancellor. This puts an extra burden on the Chancellor’s time. Recommend increasing this to be comparable with other UC’s of similar standing.

**DCS Recruitment Support Proposal**

The goal is to have Design and Construction Services (DCS) assist with advanced planning for project initiation for new faculty and their facility needs.

After the allocation memo has been distributed DCS will work with the Assistant Dean to perform the following tasks: **4-8 hours**

- Review inventory of all proposed spaces for renovations
- Conduct a preliminary site walk of proposed spaces
- Confirm the facility needs and priorities of the new faculty position(s) and help determine if there are options for meeting the goal in an alternative manner and if there are opportunities for combining projects to gain efficiencies
- Confirm the desired timeline including basic milestones and critical deadlines
- Confirm the desired project budget
- Obtain information on proprietary equipment or other major equipment procured either separately or within construction contract.

Once this information is obtained, DCS will perform the following work to further refine project information: **12 - 16 hours**

- Conduct further field investigation and document
- Pull record drawings to review building infrastructure systems supporting the identified space(s)
- Identify any known associated incomplete deferred maintenance work
- Confirm the project approval process (Minor Cap, Major Cap) and associated reviews and approvals by CPC, DRC and/or Small Projects
- Review proposed project with Facilities Management and Environmental Health & Safety staff for input
- Review proposed project with Contracting Services to identify most effective contracting method for consultants, vendors and contractors
- Identify any potential long lead items
- Identify potentially disruptive work (shutdowns, excessive noise or dust, odors, etc.) to other building occupants or instruction
- Identify any impacts from regulatory requirements such as California Building Code, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), UC policy, Public Contracting Code, etc.
- Confirm Seismic Performance Level rating of associated campus building(s)
DCS will prepare an initial project plan and review with the Assistant Dean. Project plan will include: 8-12 hours
- Project narrative including constraints and opportunities
- Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) project cost estimate including soft and hard costs and based on an average cost category (office, dry lab and wet lab) per square foot.
  ROM for construction (hard) costs to be prepared by a professional Cost Estimator.
- Preliminary project schedule
- Sketches or marked up floor plans (optional)
- Photos (optional)

Estimated DCS time: 36 hours
DCS Project Manager Hourly Rates:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan. 2022</th>
<th>July 2022</th>
<th>July 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Cost Estimator (up to)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (per project) ~</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs shown are estimates and will vary depending on project specific variables.

**Pre-lab Renovation Strategy**
To reduce lab renovation project time and cost to the department, the following three step approach is proposed, which can be implemented prior to a PI being identified once the room has been vacated.
1. Clean/Demo/Abate
2. Assess and Repair Lateral Connections (Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing)
3. Pre-design Assessment

**Clean/Demo/Abate**
This work would be coordinated by existing DSC staff. DCS will coordinate all activities to:
- Assess and dispose of hazardous material through Environmental Health and Safety. It is preferred that lab decommissioning begin while the current occupant is still in the space.
- Demolish the room’s interior (i.e. shelving, cabinets, racks, floor tiles) and dispose of or salvage materials as appropriate.
- Abate as needed (lead paint, asbestos)

Cost is for the contractor work and DCS time. The Lab Decommissioning is covered through indirect cost and recovery.

**Assess and Repair Lateral Connections (Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing)**
- The FM Building Asset Manager will coordinate an initial evaluation of the existing MEP systems and equipment and identify any known problems.
- The FM Building Asset Manager will coordinate with existing DCS staff to develop a scope-of-work of what needs to be addressed from the corridor connection points to the lab.
- DSC staff will hire consultants and/or sub-contractors specializing in appropriate areas to make the required repairs from the lab’s lateral connections to the building’s MEP systems connection points.
- Funding would pay for DCS staff time, contractors and equipment. FM staff are currently funded through core funding.
Pre-design Assessment
- Information identified during the Assess and Repair MEP phase, will be used to assess lab functionality (wet/dry/fume hood etc.)
- This assessment will result in a report developed by FM identifying available system capacity for systems such as airflow, normal/emergency electrical power, availability of Metasys controls, water (DI), compressed air etc..
- FM will evaluate access control availability and oversee installation, if feasible.
- DCS staff work would include locating and verifying as-built drawings, and testing and inspection reports:
  - verifying if there are any building code issues especially for accessibility, fire/life safety or environmental health and safety code compliance
  - identifying any other planned/funded/ongoing projects in the vicinity.
This information would be provided to the lab design consultants.
Cost is DCS staff time and cost of access control installation.
Date:       June 3, 2022
To:         Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division
From:       Bren School Faculty Executive Committee
RE:         Bren School of Environmental Science & Management Faculty Executive Committee Annual Report, 2021-22

The 2020-2021 FEC membership consisted of Kelsey Jack (chair), Kelly Caylor, Scott Jasechko and Eric Masanet. In this report, we identify the primary activities and accomplishments over the academic year and identify ongoing activities and priorities. The FEC had three major priorities for the year: retirements and teaching gaps, FTE planning, and integrating a new Masters Program (the Masters in Environmental Data Science, or MEDS) into the School. In addition to these major priorities, the FEC dealt with a number of additional issues including improving communications between Bren committees, and supporting the development of a joint PhD program between Bren and Environmental Studies.

Major Priorities

Retirements, departures and teaching gaps

The Bren School is in the process of substantial faculty and lecturer turn over, due to both retirements and hiring. In addition, the addition of a new master’s degree program (MEDS) added considerable new course offerings this year. Together, these changes have led to a number of urgent and longer term teaching gaps. The FEC worked with Associate Dean Satie Airame to identify current and upcoming teaching gaps, and appointed FEC members to meet with relevant faculty to identify potential short and medium term solutions. These proposals were discussed by the FEC and adopted where feasible. They also generated discussion of potential curricular adjustments to be made in future years and informed the FTE planning process undertaken at the winter faculty retreat.

We anticipate that this will continue to be a priority for AY 2022-23.

FTE planning

The FEC led the faculty in a modified FTE planning process. The process served as an opportunity to make all faculty aware of current and upcoming teaching and research gaps due to retirements and departures, as discussed under the previous priority item. The FEC considered the new guidelines from the Executive Vice Chancellor in structuring a winter faculty retreat to decide on a FTE proposal for AY2022-23. Following the faculty retreat, the FEC drafted the School’s FTE plan. In addition to the specific FTE proposal advanced to the EVC, the retreat and planning process also raised considerations for longer term planning at the Bren School and potential governance changes to ensure a long and strategic planning window.
We anticipate that longer term FTE planning will continue to be a priority for AY 2022-23.

**Incorporating MEDS into the Bren School**

AY 2021-22 saw a 50 percent increase in the number of degrees offered by the Bren School. The addition of the MEDS program expanded the number of students, course offerings, staff and administrative concerns. The FEC led a process of reflection and planning to ensure that the new program and its growth implications are well accounted for across all aspects of the Bren School. Integration of the MEDS program and School growth were the focus of the spring faculty retreat. The discussion at the retreat led to a number of proposals that will be taken forward into AY 2022-23.

*We anticipate that issues raised at the spring retreat will be carried forward in AY 2022-23.*

**Other Activities**

*Communications between Bren committees:* To ensure that the full faculty is aware of the discussions and decisions undertaken across committees, the FEC proposed that the last faculty meeting of the year be devoted to brief updates from each committee chair. These will commence in the June 2022 final faculty meeting.

*Joint ES-Bren PhD program:* The FEC continued to work with the Environmental Studies department on the development of a joint PhD program and responded to a number of logistical and governance questions that arose. The planning for the program continues and will extend into AY 2022-23.

*Bren Seminars:* The FEC proposed a change to how the Bren Seminars are run, to increase faculty participation and ensure that the seminars support the School’s strategic goals, while also continuing the intellectual contributions currently offered. Starting at the end of AY 2021-22, a faculty member will be appointed to the committee, which currently includes students and staff.

*Signaling in the FEC nominations process:* To streamline the voting process for new FEC members each year, the FEC proposed and the faculty adopted a signaling process to communicate interest or conflicts in serving on the FEC for a coming two-year term.

*Change to the MESM minimum core class grade:* To align grading requirements across masters programs at Bren and with the graduate division guidelines, the faculty voted to remove the minimum B grade and establish a minimum C grade for MESM core classes. The change was approved by the Graduate Council.

**Possible Priorities for AY 2022-2023**

The FEC noted that some priorities remain or were pending at the end of the year. As a result, some possible priorities for AY 2022-23 FEC are:

- Streamlining course offerings/specializations
• Revising the MESM core curriculum
• Streamlining events and aligning expectations around attendance (by faculty, staff and students)
• Adjusting Bren governance to allow for a longer planning horizon
• Updating PhD admissions and advising
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 9 times during the academic year 2021-2022. All meetings were held remotely via Zoom due to the pandemic.

Notable Issues

Social Studies Major Proposal
The CCS FEC received and further discussed a proposal for a Social Studies Major in the College of Creative Studies.

CCS General Education Requirements
Part 1 of a draft revision proposed in February 2018 was approved by the CCS FEC. The revision redefines the goals of CCS GE requirements. Part 2 of the revision involves the implementation of these goals and is likely to be discussed in the 2022-2023 academic year.

The CCS General Education (GE) program offers opportunities for personal and intellectual growth through experiences outside of the student’s chosen discipline.

What are the goals of the CCS General Education Requirements?

CCS provides students the flexibility to create a General Education experience in consultation with their advisor. The goals of this program are:

1. To promote intellectual curiosity and the discovery of unexpected new passions.
2. To initiate dialogue across academic specialties.
3. To foster community in the College, on campus, and in students’ broader academic and civic communities.
4. To inspire a commitment to equity and respect for all.

So that students can:

1. Explore and develop respect for different ways of knowing in a wide range of disciplines.
2. Acquire and practice different methods of communication.
3. Cultivate a diverse intellectual toolkit.
Changes in Priority Registration for CCS Students
Following a presentation by Jeff Stopple in the 2020-2021 Academic Year, the CCS FEC proposed a modification to priority registration for CCS students whereby CCS Seniors would have priority Senior access and all other CCS students have priority Junior access. The rationale is that CCS students are often ahead of the "standard curriculum", and need access to upper division classes during their first two years of study. The proposal was accepted.

Admissions
On April 5, 2022, Lisa Przekop, Director of Admissions, was invited to give a presentation to the CCS FEC addressing two issues: 1) if there is a quota for in-state vs out-of-state students and 2) whether individual majors in the college could opt out of direct admission. The presentation was part of an ongoing discussion of the workload around direct admissions and whether there are ways of mitigating that. Members of the FEC have no clear consensus about the way forward.

Responses

FEC response to request for comments on “UCSB Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal - WASC”

The CCS FEC was broadly supportive of the three themes chosen and supported the effort to pursue an alternative path to WASC accreditation.

FEC response to request for comments on “Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC)”

From the minutes to the October 5, 2021 FEC meeting: IGETC needs to be modified to be in line with the agreement between the CSUs and the California community colleges that was driven by an act of the legislature. In L&S there is considerable problem with students who come in with partial IGETC, and it is not always clear what requirements need to be fulfilled once the student arrives on campus. About half of CCS transfer students have IGETC. Observation that the listing of courses on offer from departments is not the same as the ones listed in the proposal ... what would that mean in the future?

FEC response to request for comments “Systemwide Review of Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment”

The CCS FEC thanked them for doing the work to update UC’s policy on sexual harassment to be in line with current laws. It’s important and hard work, and we are grateful for their efforts.

FEC response to request for comments on “Systemwide Review of the Proposed Presidential Policy on Integrated Pest Management”

CCS FEC members with expertise in the field opined that it seemed reasonable, with reasonable carve-outs for research, however, as it did not directly affect CCS, we declined to offer a formal opinion.

FEC response to “Draft Presidential Policy – Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace”

The CCS FEC thanked the committee for their work, but had no specific input to the draft policy.

FEC response to “Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM)025 and (APM)671”
The CCS FEC thanked the committee for their work, but had no specific comments.

**FEC response to “Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.3”**

In responding to this proposed revision, the CCS FEC noted that if it is important to add an Area H [Ethnic Studies] requirement for California residents, it is surely important for out-of-state and international students as well, suggesting that if matriculating students lacked adequate preparation, campuses might require them to take additional coursework. We encouraged the relevant UC authorities to work with K-12 districts on a timeline for implementation to ensure that districts have sufficient time to put the relevant coursework in place before it becomes a UC requirement.

**FEC response to “Recommendations for Department Political Statements”**

With no further comments, the CCS FEC thanked the authors of this recommendation for their thoughtful approach to a difficult issue.

**FEC response to “Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data”**

The CCS FEC had no specific comments.

**FEC response to “Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce”**

*From the minutes for the May 17 meeting:* While the proposal isn’t generally applicable to CCS, FEC members had strong concerns. FEC members expressed concern that wider application would exacerbate divisions between STEM and Arts/Humanities. Another member was strongly against, not just for the inequity between STEM and Arts/Humanities, but because there are great disparities even within STEM programs. Another member disagreed with a fundamental idea behind the proposal, that we must compete with private universities in order to offer a first-rate education.

**Committee Members**

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

- **Leslie Hogan**
  - Senior Continuing Lecturer, Music Composition, College of Creative Studies
  - Unit 18 Representative, FEC Secretary

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

- **Jim Donelan**
  - Continuing Lecturer, Writing and Literature, College of Creative Studies

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

- **Sathya Guruswamy**
  - Senior Lecturer SOE, Physics, College of Creative Studies

- **John Latto**
  - Senior Lecturer SOE, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, College of Creative Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Laverman</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer SOE, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Mulfinger</td>
<td>Professor, Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Tettegah</td>
<td>Professor, Black Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omer Blaes</td>
<td>Professor, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo Aldana</td>
<td>Dean, College of Creative Studies; Professor, Chicana and Chicano Studies, Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swati Chattopadhyay</td>
<td>Associate Dean, College of Creative Studies; Professor, Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Clark, Advisor</td>
<td>Assistant Dean for Administration, College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Johansen, Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Personnel Manager, College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Parison, Consultant</td>
<td>Student Affairs Manager, College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The following summarizes the business of the College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) for 2021-2022. The COE FEC provides feedback and oversight on matters relevant to the College faculty, students, and departments as part of the shared governance of the university.

The FEC held 16 meetings during the academic year. Each meeting was regularly scheduled for one-hour and held via Zoom due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Chair of the Committee, Professor Tobias Hollerer, offers the following annual report for academic year 2021-2022.

Executive Summary
In 2021-2022 the committee grappled with the increasing pressure to offer more computer science and data science related instruction both from students and industry.

The committee reviewed and responded to both the Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Data Science and a New Academic Unit in Data Science and the Academic Program Review of the Department of Computer Science. The committee emphasized support for the Department of Computer Science to grow but has significant concerns about the resources required to do so. The committee voiced strong support for the Data Science proposal and sees the establishment of a Data Science degree program as a necessary and overdue development.

In both issues, the committee urges the university to fully fund required FTE and staff positions requested in the proposals. Further they note that the Department of Computer Science will need to grow past its current building and laboratory capacity to meet its goals. The committee noted the difficulty in hiring quality faculty and high turnover rates as another issue that the College of Engineering and university at-large must address.

The committee urges the administration to fully fund the requested FTE and staff positions and crucial investment for the future. Underfunding a program with this kind of societal importance would be shortsighted and risky. They note that the College of Engineering cannot provide these resources alone.

The committee strongly supports initiatives to increase students’ access to this type of curriculum. However, in doing so, they stress that the College of Engineering cannot support these initiatives alone. The campus as a whole must provide support. Underfunding and/or growing too rapidly would come at a steep cost to students, faculty, and staff.

COE Department Curriculum and Course Changes
In 2021-2022 the committee reviewed and responded to the following proposals for curriculum amendments.

Significant curriculum proposals:
Both the Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering curriculums were approved for significant changes beginning in the 2022-2023 academic year. These changes were deemed necessary to modernize the curriculums.

- The Electrical Engineering Undergraduate Program Curriculum Reform Proposal
- Computer Engineering Program Curriculum Proposal

Minor curriculum proposals:
- Memo to add ECE 133 to the Electrical Engineering Senior Electives List
- Memo to add ECE 133 to the Computer Engineering Senior Electives List

Academic Program Review
The only department in the College of Engineering to receive a program review in the 2021-2022 academic year was the Computer Science Department. Further discussion of this topic is addressed in the Executive Summary above.

The committee also nominated two COE faculty with backgrounds in committee and department leadership to serve on the PRP committee.

Campus-wide Changes
The committee reviewed and responded to the Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Data Science and a New Academic Unit in Data Science. Further discussion of this issue is addressed in the Executive Summary above.

In 2021-2022 the committee also responded to:

- Academic Program Review Streamlining Process
- Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal – WASC
- Proposal to Change the Name of the Technology Management Program to the Department of Technology Management
- Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 140.B (L&S Minors)
- Guidelines for Online Course Design and Abbreviated Summer 2022 Application

UC Systemwide Changes
The committee reviewed and responded to the Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data. Extensive discussion arose on the topic of the feasibility of storing research data as outlined. It is clearly impossible to store all research materials in some disciplines that create millions of gigabytes of data for one sample. The committee feels that some language in the policy proposal, notably the determination of “appropriate” use and maintenance of data is still too obscure and PIs cannot make informed decisions based on this policy.
In 2021-2022 the also committee responded to:

- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC)
- Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 025 and 671, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members and Designated Other Academic Appointees
- Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce
- Request for 5-year Planning Perspectives for 2022-2027
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Integrated Pest Management
- Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- Draft Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace
- Recommendations for Department Political Statements
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (A-G Admissions Requirements)

2021-2022 College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee Members

- Tresa Pollock, Dean (Ex-Officio)
- Glenn Beltz, Associate Dean (Ex-Officio)
- Sara Sorenson and Haley Orton, Staff Coordinators
- Michelle O’Malley (ChemE)
- Glenn Fredrickson (ChemE)
- Xifeng Yan (CS)
- Peng Li (ECE)
- Chris Palmstrom (ECE)
- Anton Van der Ven (MATRL)
- Paolo Luzzatto-Fegiz (ME)
- Alban Sauret (ME)
- Steven DenBaars (MATRL, Vice-Chair)
- **Tobias Hollerer (CS, Chair)**
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Executive Committee Annual Report: 2021-2022

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

2021-2022 Members

Ty Vernon, Chair – Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology Representative
Tarek Azzam - Department of Education Representative
Natalie Holdren, Non-Senate Faculty Representative
Maryam Kia-Keating - Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology Representative
Amber Moran – Education, Credential Committee and TEP
Erin Dowdy – Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology Representative
Laura Romo - Department of Education Representative
Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj - Department of Education Representative
Jeffrey Milem, Dean
Mary Franitza, Student Representative - Department of Education
Melissa Janson, Student Representative - Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Daisy Martinez, Advisor
Briana Villasenor, Advisor

Executive Summary
The Faculty Executive Committee met eight times during the 21-22 academic year and addressed policy matters, curricular and academic matters, and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) matters presented by the Academic Senate and members of the GGSE.
Policy Matters:
- Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal – WASC
  - The FEC suggested that the Coordinating Committee ensures they have a diverse representation in the interview sample and to account for the various primary and secondary impacts of Covid on students’ major pathways.

- Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy Regarding Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
  - The FEC expressed that they do not wish to opine on this issue.

  - The FEC did not have an opinion on the policy.

- Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and APM 671
  - The FEC does not wish to opine on this issue.

- Presidential Policy Draft – Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace
  - The FEC is in support of the proposed draft of the Presidential Policy.

- Recommendations for the Departmental Political Statements
  - The FEC expressed the need for recommendation and consideration in addressing potential safety concerns and personal threats that are tied to politically charged social issues that may result in including individual names in a department statement. The language should lead to no perceived coercion to be included as a signatory. Overall, the FEC recommends that the best practices and guidelines for inviting and including staff and student opinions be crafted, as these voices are often overlooked.

- Academic Program Review Streamlining Proposal
  - The GGSE FEC is in support of the proposed streamlining of the Academic Program Review process.
• Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data  
  o The GGSE FEC supports the drafted changes.

• Nominations for Program Review Panel 2022-23  
  o The GGSE FEC recommends the following faculty members to serve in the Program Review Panel: Maryam Kia-Keating from CCSP and Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj from Education.

• Request for Five-Year Planning Perspectives for 2022-2027  
  o The Faculty Executive Committee - Gevirtz School does not wish to opine on this issue.

• Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce  
  o The GGSE FEC agrees with the majority of the taskforce recommendations.

Curricular and Academic Matters:
• Blackwell MCA Proposal – Add Course as Elective on Updated Minor Tracking Card  
  o The GGSE Faculty Executive Committee is in support of the proposed summer online course: Framework for Teaching and Learning in K-12 Public School Classrooms and voted to approve the course and approves the revision to the Education Studies minor to include the proposed course as an elective.

• Equity and Diversity – New Course Proposal – Lower Division GGSE HSES  
  o The GGSE Faculty Executive Committee is in support of the proposed lower division courses: Statistical Foundations for Human Services and Education Sciences; The Role of Research in Society; Current Trends in Learning and Human Development; and Equity and Diversity in School Community Settings that will be offered as part of the proposed undergraduate major in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education.

• Proposed courses for Applied Psychology Minor, CCSP  
  o The GGSE Faculty Executive Committee is in support of the proposed courses: School Based Mental Health and Psychology of Flourishing, to be added as electives offered for the Applied Psychology minor in Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology.
• ED 121 Proposal to Change Course from 3 to 4 Units
  o The GGSE FEC agrees with the proposal to change course ED 121 from 3 to 4 units.

• Changes to ED Courses
  o ED faculty voted to approve new online course proposed by Katie Blackwell to be offered during Summer Sessions (course development was funded by a Summer Sessions grant).

• Academic Program Review Streamlining Proposal
  o GGSE FEC is in support of the proposed streamlining of the Academic Program Review process.
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 September 30, 2021, and offers this Annual Report for academic year 2021-22.

Executive Summary

Academic year 2021-22 saw the continuation of challenges surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly around the transition back to regular in-person campus instruction in Winter and Spring. The FEC engaged in discussions of many significant issues related to online instruction and the transition to business post-pandemic. This Executive Summary highlights recurring significant issues that the committee discussed in 2021-22.

- Securing access to impacted majors is an ongoing concern. Progress was made through the removal of several unit caps for declaring a full major by Dean proposal for Sociology and Communication. FEC and UgC agreed that the unit caps were in violation of Senate Regulation 125, designed to secure access to any major in the College for which a student is academically prepared. Debate continues on the equity of other pre-major and full major requirements such as minimum GPAs in pre-major work for access to full majors.
- Optimizing the online course approval process was a focus of 2021-22 efforts. Progress was made in terms of better routing and consultation with staff experts in online instruction for new proposals. Undergraduate Council has not yet released the full revised online course proposal guidelines that were under review as of this writing, but it is hoped that these documents will soon replace the outdated existing supplemental questionnaire and provide better guidance to faculty considering a fully online course proposal.
- Evaluation of the pilot process for streamlining ARP is ongoing, as discussed in the next section.
- The FEC signaled the pronounced severity of UCSB staffing issues (salary equity, cost of living, remote/hybrid work flexibility, and retention) in a memo to the Academic Senate chair, and hopes to hear more regarding Senate advocacy on this issue in the coming year.
- The FEC discussed concerns about the general housing situation and, in particular, the Munger Hall student housing plan, although no formal memo was circulated. The status of the Munger Hall project is not presently clear.
The FEC acknowledges the contributions of its ex officio members, Executive Dean Pierre Wiltzius and AVC and Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education Michael Miller. Their perspectives and extensive background knowledge of campus issues provided important context and greatly facilitated the productivity of the committee’s discussions. FEC also acknowledges the contributions of Associated Students representative Jessy Gonzalez, and GSA representatives Marcel Strobel (Fall 2021) and Courtney Durdle (Winter/Spring 2022). Above all, the FEC is indebted to Nick Alward-Saxon who provided expert guidance throughout the year.

Academic Program Reviews

Maintaining excellence in College departments, undergraduate programs, and graduate education is essential for the continued excellence of the University. As such, the FEC takes its role in Academic Program Reviews very seriously.

This year, a pilot process for streamlining ARP was implemented by the administration. This resulted in significant changes to reviewing agency involvement, namely that agencies were not required to comment until the ERC Report and Department Response for each review had been produced in Spring quarter. As such, in 2021-22, the FEC did not provide input on the ARP process in Fall quarter, and instead commented only during review of the ERC Report and Department Response in Spring for the following Letters & Science departments under review:

- Anthropology
- Economics
- Music
- Philosophy

The committee was given an opportunity to provide input on the broad scope of changes incorporated in the streamlining proposal, and did so on May 20, 2022, focusing its comments on the need for follow-up and enforcement, the benefit of in-person ERC visits, and the potential value of an “internal” department review cycle staggered with external reviews. We look forward to hearing more in 2022-23 and beyond from the EVC and PRP regarding the shape of the ARP process in the years to come.

FEC also nominated candidates for future service in the Program Review Panel.

At the Graduate Level

The FEC provided input on a variety of matters generally relating to welfare of graduate students, but was consulted specifically for review on the following proposals for changes to existing graduate student programs:

- Proposal for a Simple Name Change of the Master of Arts in Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology (MA to MS)
- Proposal for a Simple Name Change of the Master of Arts in Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology (MA to MS)

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 2021-22, the full L&S FEC reviewed and endorsed the following substantive curriculum changes, while FEC subcommittees reviewed technical adjustments to 91 individual major and minor sheets (bearing in mind that some changes impacted multiple requirement sheets).

Significant Curriculum Proposals:

1. Spanish & Portuguese Department - Changes to Spanish Major & Minor
2. Global Studies Department - Changes to Global Studies Major
3. Psychological & Brain Sciences Department - Changes to Biopsychology Major
4. Mathematics Department - Changes to Applied Mathematics Major
5. History Department - Changes to History Major & History of Public Policy and Law Major
6. Communication Department - Changes to Communication Major
7. Classics Department - Establishment of New Classics Major Emphasis in Ancient Greek Philosophy
8. Feminist Studies Department - Change to Feminist Studies Major
9. Economics Department - Changes to Economics and Economics and Accounting Majors
10. Environmental Studies Program - Changes to Hydrologic Sciences and Policy Majors (All 3 Emphases)
11. Mathematics & Statistics Departments - Reduction of UD Units for 1.) FMS Major & 2.) All Statistics Department Majors
12. History of Art & Architecture Department - Establishment of New Minor in Games Studies
13. Film & Media Studies Department - 1.) Major Changes, 2.) Re-Uniting Courses
14. Theater & Dance Department - Changes to Dance BFA Major
15. East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies Department - Reduction of UD Units for all EALCS Department Majors
16. Earth Science Department - Changes to All 6 Earth Science Majors
17. Media Arts and Technology Program - Establishment of New “Summer Minor” in Creative Computing

Other Undergraduate Academic Items Reviewed:

- Proposal from UG Dean - SR 130 and Major Sheets in Communication, Political Science, and Sociology
- Residency Requirements in the College of Letters & Science
- Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 140.B
- Comparative Literature Major, Foreign Language Emphasis Simple Name Change Proposed 2022-23
- Biology Undergraduate Program-Transfer Requirements for Prebiology Majors
- Individual Major Proposal for Advika Verma (Integrated Studies in Human Development B.S.)
- Proposal to Modify Classics BA Greek and Roman Culture Emphasis PLOs
- Re-uniting of Chem 163
- Proposal to Modify PLOs for Biochemistry BS
- Re-uniting Proposal for INT 95A-B-C
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:

- AS AM W 1 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- COMM W 188 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- ENV S W 125B (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- ENV S W 50 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- ENV S W 60 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- HIST W 121A (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- JAPAN W 120ABC (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- JAPAN W 5-6 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- LING W 3C (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- SOC W 130SG (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- SOC W 155 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- SPAN W 3 (new online course, reviewed and approved)
- HIST W 2A (renewal, reviewed and approved)
- HIST W 4B (renewal, reviewed and approved)
- SPAN W 2 (renewal, reviewed and approved)

At the Campus Level

The FEC weighed in on:

- Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal – WASC
- Academic Program Review Streamlining Proposal
- Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) - Proposal for Bachelor of Arts in Human Services and Education Sciences
- Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Data Science and a New Academic Unit in Data Science
- Guidelines for Online Course Design & Abbreviated Summer 2022 Application
- Staffing Issues at UCSB (FEC Authored Memo to Senate Chair)

The FEC also coordinated the selection of the Plous Memorial Award recipient. The 2021-22 recipient is Daniel Conroy-Beam (Psychological & Brain Sciences). In response to the FEC memo requesting such change, Academic Senate staff have communicated that the Plous award administration will be handled by a more appropriate campus-wide awards committee in 2022-23 and beyond, allowing for potential expansion in scope to campus faculty in eligible fields appointed outside Letters & Science. As such, 2021-22 marks the final year that the L&S FEC will manage Plous award selection and related processes.

The committee also endorsed the nominations for the 2022 Mochizuki Memorial Awards within the College.

Systemwide Policy and Regulation Review

In 2021-22, the FEC responded to:

- Systemwide Review of the Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- Systemwide Review of the Proposed Presidential Policy on Integrated Pest Management
- Draft Presidential Policy -- Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace
• Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 025 and APM 671
• Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 478 (IGETC)
• Recommendations for Department Political Statements
• Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3
• Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data
• Report from the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce
• Request for Five-Year Planning Perspectives for 2022-2027

Selection of New Members

In Spring 2022, 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 five vacancies across MLPS, HFA, and Social Science Positions.

The following members were elected to serve on the FEC through August 2025:

- Amy Gonzalez, Communication (SS)
- Jennifer Sorkin, History of Art and Architecture (HFA)
- Jeffrey Stopple, Mathematics (MLPS)
- Jennifer Tyburczy, Feminist Studies (SS)
- Naoki Yamamoto, Film & Media Studies (HFA)

In addition, the FEC discussed and determined that, moving forward, officer elections for its two positions (Chair, Secretary/Vice Chair) will be carried out at the end of spring prior to the elected term, rather than the original practice of electing officers at the beginning of the first FEC meeting of Fall Quarter. This procedural change adheres to FEC bylaw language around officer elections. A nomination and election process was thus conducted via email outreach by the FEC Staff Advisor, directed to the coming year’s membership and copying the current Chair and Secretary/Vice Chair. This revised process will ensure that committee leadership is in place by the start of the next committee’s term, September 1.

The FEC also discussed potential changes to its membership size from the current six elected faculty/two from each L&S division, but determined that there was no strong rationale for such a change at this time.

2021-22 FEC Committee Membership

Walid Afifi, Communication
Peter Ford, Chemistry and Biochemistry (Vice-Chair)
Sabine Frühstück, East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies (Chair)
Trisalyn Nelson, Geography
Anthony Barbieri, History
Kevin Whitehead, Sociology

*Ex officio* members:
Michael Miller, Interim AVC and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science

Student Representatives:
Jessy Gonzales, Associated Students
Marcel Strobel, Graduate Student Association (Fall 2021)
Courtney Durdle, Graduate Student Association (Winter and Spring 2022)
Graduate Council
Annual Report 2021-22

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Graduate Council met for fifteen regularly scheduled two-hour sessions during the 2021-22 term. All meetings were held via Zoom.

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 2021-22 term, among them:

- Discussing concerns from graduate students and faculty regarding return-to-campus plans. Many issues came up over the year as the COVID-19 situation was constantly changing. Graduate students were concerned about inequities and safety when TAs were forced to teach in person; the housing availability and affordability crisis; a lack of flexibility in allowing TAs to teach remotely in certain circumstances; and a TA shortage. The Council provided a forum for these concerns to be raised, and Chair Sabra communicated them to Divisional Senate Chair Susannah Scott and the administration in meetings of the Executive Council and the Contingency Planning Group. GC recognized the graduate students’ valid concerns and urged the administration to address these concerns promptly.
- Approving a best practices for faculty mentoring of graduate students document.
- Participating in a pilot Program Review Panel process, which made clear the importance of Graduate Council input in Academic Program Reviews at an early stage.
- Affirming the need to hold academic departments accountable for poor Academic Program Reviews, especially when students report mistreatment by faculty.
- Discussing the proposed Munger Hall in the context of the ongoing housing shortage.
- Discussing childcare (cost and lack of availability), which is a major concern for both faculty and graduate students.
- Approving the departments of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology and Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology changing their M.A. degrees to M.S. degrees.
- Commenting on various divisional and systemwide draft policy documents including: the campus WASC Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal; a draft Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace; Recommendations for Department Political Statements; and an Academic Program Review Streamlining Proposal.

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 7/1/2021 and 6/30/2022, Council processed a total of 182 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 2021-22 term: Anthropology, Computer Science, Economics, Music, and Philosophy.

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
- Reviewed and sent comments on a proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Human Services and Education Sciences in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE).
- Reviewed and sent comments on a proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Data Science and new academic unit in Data Science.

IV. Name Changes
- Reviewed and offered support for the name change of the Technology Management Program to the Department of Technology Management.
- Approved the name change of the Master of Arts in Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology to a Master of Science.
- Approved the name change of the Master of Arts in Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology to a Master of Science.

V. Changes to Existing Programs
- Reviewed a new Teacher Education Program Bilingual Authorization in Spanish.
- Approved curricular changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. in Global Studies.
- Approved the discontinuation of the terminal M.A. in North American Archaeology in the Department of Anthropology.
- Approved changes to course grading options and course unit amounts in the Teacher Education Program.
- Approved curricular changes to the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Translation Studies.
- Approved changes to the graduate program curriculum in Religious Studies.
- Approved the addition of the Department of Education to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Climate Sciences and Climate Change.
- Approved changes to the objective codes for education specialist credentials in the Teacher Education Program.
- Approved revisions to the Ph.D. in the Department of Sociology.
- Approved changes to the Ph.D. in School Psychology in the Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology.
- Denied a request from the Department of Physics to allow optional submission of GRE test scores.
- Approved revisions to the Ph.D. curriculum in Biological Engineering.
- Approved changes to the Ph.D. qualifying exam in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology.
- Approved the addition of the Department of Philosophy to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Feminist Studies.
- Approved changes to the Ph.D. qualifying exam in the Department of Feminist Studies.
Approved revisions to the curriculum of the Master of Environmental Data Science in the Bren School.

Approved the addition of the Media Arts and Technology Program to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Cognitive Science.

Approved revisions to the Program Learning Outcomes in the Department of Classics.

Approved changes to the qualifying exam writing requirement in the Department of Earth Science.

Approved changing the minimum grade requirement for the Master of Environmental Science and Management in the Bren School.

Approved the removal of undergraduate courses for the Portuguese and Brazilian Literature M.A. and Ph.D. requirements in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.

Approved removal of the Ph.D. only application option for Department of Economics’ admission.

Approved curricular changes to the M.Ed. in School Psychology in the Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology.

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

VII. Local Business

Returning to Campus/Accommodations/Graduate Student Issues
Over the 2021-22 academic year, Graduate Council discussed and addressed the ever-evolving landscape of COVID-19 and its impact on graduate education, as well as other issues that graduate students faced. Chair Sabra relayed many of these concerns to Academic Senate Chair Scott and the administration.

In Fall, the Executive Council considered a proposal from the Graduate Student Association to give flexibility to TAs to teach remotely. While Executive Council had sympathy for the graduate students facing housing issues, there was a concern that the proposal was too broad and would allow any TA to teach online. This might be better handled by negotiations with departments. This issue was brought up at the Coordinating Committee of Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and a letter was sent to the Chair of the Academic Senate to consider whether there should be a system-wide policy. There were concerns about equity and the TA union contract. Many members advocated for increased flexibility for faculty and graduate student instructors. Chair Sabra reminded the Council that the exemption from WASC to allow for online instruction would end after fall quarter; UCSB could get in a lot of trouble if any program goes to more than 50% online. By November, it was seen that different campuses were pursuing different policies with regard to remote instruction; there are even large differences between some units on the same campus. UCSB was on the relatively strict end of the spectrum in requiring in-person instruction, but students seemed to be happy to be back in person. However, it looked likely that there would be a TA shortage in the winter quarter, as many programs took on fewer graduate students, some vulnerable students would not teach in person, and still others did not have housing in the area. Students doing fieldwork or research somewhere else might be willing to teach remotely, if that was an option.

Early Winter quarter, Academic Council endorsed a letter by CCGA with recommendations for responding to requests to allow remote teaching options for TAs for reasons other than medical accommodations. CCGA made changes to their original statement, with prompting and suggestions from Chair Sabra, including adding some materials and acknowledging that graduate students are disproportionately affected by housing shortages around campuses. Graduate students should not bear the burden of in-person instruction. The GSA emphasized that asking TAs to teach in person and offer an
online option (dual modalities) would be a union violation. Dean Rupp worked to get this messaging clarified so that graduate students knew they would have a choice in teaching modality. The GSA also had many concerns about campus COVID protocols not being followed, such as false negative test results being sent, campus cases being underreported, insufficient quarantine housing, a lack of testing and booster appointment, and a rise in cases in graduate students and TAs.

There was an overall sense of confusion among graduate students about instruction policies. Other concerns that came up were around providing accommodations to students with COVID, faculty refusing to teach in person but forcing their TAs to, a disparity in the availability of personal protective equipment, no timely notifications about positive COVID cases in classrooms, and a general sense of a lack of consideration for graduate students. Chair Sabra emphasized that the instruction policies were about as clear as they could be, but the problem was with enforcement. Departments were applying policies differently. Also discussed was the policy where instructors with children under five were allowed to teach remotely, and if this would remain in effect for spring quarter. Some members thought that allowances for older children should also be made, and that a general policy for faculty, TAs and GSRs should be established. Santa Barbara County has a shortage of childcare spaces, especially ones that are affordable. At the beginning of Spring quarter, there was increased COVID transmission within classrooms with the lifting of the mask mandate. Graduate students advocated for the mask mandate to be reinstated.

The housing crisis was a predominant issue all year as well. Graduate students felt that the campus was very upfront about the shortage of housing for undergraduate students, but less public about the shortage for graduate students. There were graduate students who deferred, and who did not take TA assignments because they could not find or afford housing in the area. Some graduate students had to live in hotels. There was also likely an undercount of graduate students without housing, as some simply left the housing waitlist. The GSA continued to raise the need to allow for graduate student instructor flexibility due to some students not being able to find or afford housing in the local area. GC ultimately drafted a memo to the Chancellor with concerns about Munger Hall and the housing crisis’s effects on graduate students. Towards the end of the year, staff graduate advisors were reporting that some admitted students were deciding to go elsewhere when they found out the cost of housing. By early May, graduate student housing was already full; 450 spaces were reserved in San Clemente for incoming graduate students.

Graduate students were also extremely concerned about a large increase in insurance costs. UC was forced to decouple undergraduate and graduate student rates, which would raise graduate rates by about 30% in the first year, with future increases expected. This will be a serious problem for recruitment, as departments may be required to pay more in their financial packages, or graduate students themselves will have to pay more.

Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal – WASC
In October, the Council reviewed the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Proposal – WASC. Members asked what the consequences of these exercises would be, and if the six departments being studied within the College of Letters and Science would be representative enough. There was an implication that there needs to be less structure and increased flexibility in programs. Members also wondered what the implications for Program Learning Outcomes might be.

Proposed Revisions to SB Regulation 280
In October, GC reviewed a proposal from Graduate Division to revise Santa Barbara Regulation 280C, which states that graduate students may not earn credit for more than 12 units of graduate work or 16 units of upper division work in a quarter. This was outdated, as many graduate programs require more than 12 units of work a quarter, and graduate students on average take 12.5 units. The proposal would change UCSB’s language to match the system-wide language, which qualifies the language with “ordinarily”, so is less restrictive.

The members agreed to approve changing the language to match the system-wide regulation. The Academic Senate Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections and Faculty Legislature ultimately approved this regulation change.

**Proposal for Continued Use of At-Home Versions of Language Exams**
In November, Graduate Council reviewed a proposal for Graduate Division to continue to accept at-home versions of language proficiency exams, such as TOEFL and IELTS, for graduate admissions requirements. Some members expressed concern about the rise in cheating observed with at-home exams. Members agreed that with the ongoing pandemic and the fact that all other UC campuses will continue to accept at-home versions of these exams, UCSB should also continue to accept them.

**Guidelines for Online Course Design and Abbreviated Summer 2022 Application and Online Course Concerns**
The Council discussed proposed changes to the current online course approval process for undergraduate courses, and an abbreviated process for summer courses. The current approval process forms have many questions, some of which seemed restrictive and do not seem based on pedagogical reasoning. Faculty have now all learned how to teach remotely, and new and effective methods have been learned. The current forms also did not take into account all of the new modes of instruction that faculty have learned. These taxonomies should be indicated in the approval process.

The Council had no concerns about the abbreviated summer 2022 policy. Members were encouraged by some of the changes to the regular academic year process, such as adding that faculty should meet with Instructional Development or CITRAL as a pre-approval step of the approval process, and including more varied modes of instruction. However, members did not think that faculty should be required to take courses from CITRAL in order to teach online courses.

In May, GC discussed two memos sent from Committee on Courses and General Education (CCGE) Chair William Davies King concerning the online course approval process and online course education policy. Chair King and CCGE have many misgivings about ramping up UCSB online course offerings. There has been a lot of pressure to increase the number and expedite the approval process of online courses for this summer. This has been necessitated by accessibility concerns, but also so the campus can meet its enrollment responsibilities. There have yet to be any requests for fully online graduate courses.

Members thought it would be helpful to collect data on the 64 newly approved summer online courses, and for some surveys to be done to assess the effects of online courses. Members discussed having to lower grading standards and a lack of engagement during remote teaching. The impacts on TAs should also be reviewed. Oftentimes they are the instructor of record during summer courses; would online courses increase their workload? Equity issues were also raised, such as students who do not have reliable WiFi or appropriate equipment for online courses.

**Discussion with Academic Senate Divisional Chair Susannah Scott**
In February, Divisional Senate Chair Susannah Scott joined Graduate Council for a discussion on a wide range of topics. Chair Scott briefed the Council on the unexpected decision by Santa Barbara County to lift indoor mask mandates. Santa Barbara County does not regulate UCSB; UCSB can have stricter guidelines than the County (but not weaker). CAL-OSHA also regulates employees. There are many questions about what kind of university the campus community wants to come back to. We will not be the same university as we were two years ago; so many things have changed, and the community needs re-building. A big concern at the moment is the balancing of undergraduate and graduate education at UCSB. UCSB is supposed to be a R1 university, but pressure from the state has forced the campus to use the largest fraction of its Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) enrollment for undergraduate students. Visibility of research and the ability to attract and retain quality faculty depends on vibrant programs.

Some members agreed that UCSB needs to look at a new work model. Virtual works for many things, such as committee meetings and scheduling colloquiums for guests who will then not have to travel. However, people do not know each other, and hybrid meetings have distinct advantages and disadvantages. There is concern about the financial packages UCSB can offer graduate students; they are not making enough to live here. The COLA strike went away because of COVID, but the union will be bargaining starting in March. We are competing for the best students, but we are paying them below the poverty line. The Regents and the state legislature need to appreciate the value of graduate education. President Drake does want to expand graduate education. It is also concerning that graduate students in many departments are complaining about mentorship. Many of the Academic Program Review department surveys this year have a theme of graduate student complaints. It is important for the Senate to try to correct these problems, and the PRP process tends to be slow to respond to bad situations.

Members brought up the issue of childcare and its effect on faculty and graduate students with dependents. UCSB’s daycare had to shut down often due to COVID protocols. Chair Scott replied that childcare issues are not just acute on our campus. A few months ago, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare sent a plea to President Drake to implement more childcare solutions, but no actions have been taken. They would like a study done to see where resources are. Members also asked how the campus should shift priorities in terms of its budget. Chair Scott said that the amount of research money brought in is now similar to the amount of tuition. The state has a new proposal for cohort tuition, which involves predictable tuition increases for undergraduate students. Chair Scott explained how the campus decision-making process works. The Chancellor meets four mornings a week with the COVID response team, which includes Chair Scott, the EVC, Vice Chancellors, and medical experts. There is also the contingency planning group which includes Chair Scott, the EVC, and some Senate council chairs. This group meets weekly or bi-weekly and discusses the impacts of campus decisions on instruction.

**Discussion with Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall**

In February, Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall joined the Graduate Council. One of the main topics GC wanted to discuss was campus enrollment management, or a lack thereof. UCSB has a Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) that was stalled during recent political and budget crises. The campus originally planned to increase enrollment from 20,000 to 25,000 over fifteen years. This slow, incremental increase would have also been accompanied by an increase in resources (faculty, staff and TAs.) Many of the planning parameters around the LRDP when it was approved are no longer in effect. UCSB was also forced by then-Governor Brown and the state to increase California resident enrollment at the undergraduate level. Our campus was always conservative with non-resident enrollment, but was forced to rely on this population more due to state funding cuts. National trends steering students into
STEM areas also changed the distribution of enrollments. Many international and first-generation students especially wanted to go into the professional and STEM areas. The LRDP intended for much growth to be at the graduate level. UCSB has traditionally not had as many graduate students as many research universities of our size do, and we are disadvantaged by funding models. As we were forced to take more undergraduates, departments did not have enough TAs. Some departments have been discouraging faculty from pursuing grants so that their graduate students could serve as TAs instead of GSRs. We do not have adequate funding for graduate students, which disadvantages us as we compete with the best graduate programs in the country.

The housing situation has gotten worse. Part of the goal to build out undergraduate housing is to make more space available in current housing stock for graduate students. Ideally, we will create more subsidized graduate housing. All campus EVCs want to provide adequate compensation to graduate students and provide better funding packages. EVC Marshall would like to look at how to deliver quality education without extracting more labor from the people that we have. There are some innovative models to deploy graduate instruction in different ways. Are there ways to reorganize sections and the work grad students need to get done? Can we deploy lecturers differently, look at team-teaching, hybrid models, utilizing advanced undergraduate students, or creating more masters programs?

Chair Sabra stated that there is a desire for the campus to have a large strategic plan. EVC Marshall explained that we do strategic planning through the FTE recruitment plans. There are opportunities for inter-departmental planning, and we have had success over the years with initiatives that are more interdisciplinary. We should emphasize the areas that we want to grow and leverage the resources that we have. EVC Marshall said that we nurture faculty well and while we do lose people for personal and professional reasons, we do very well with retention cases. A lot of money in retention packages goes to graduate student support.

UCSB Mentoring Guidelines
In March, Chair Sabra went through a brief history of Graduate Council’s work on crafting best practices for faculty mentoring of graduate students. This is the fourth Graduate Council to work on these; there have been several iterations of the guidelines, and the document has been reviewed by many different faculty across campus disciplines. Last year GC voted unanimously to approve a version of the best practices. This year, Senate Chair Scott asked that there be more feedback from STEM faculty. The guidelines were distributed to some various STEM faculty, and no negative feedback was received. Chair Scott then asked to get feedback from the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). Some objections and concerns were raised, but most of these were already addressed in the document. There is discussion systemwide about adding mentoring to the APM, but this proposal has not yet come to campuses, so it will be some time until changes are made. There was some concern from CAP that these best practices would become a baseline for campus mentoring. Graduate Division would like to post the guidelines on their website, with an annotation that they have been approved by GC.

There was discussion about mentoring not being voluntary, and that it needs to be taken more seriously. What kind of “stick” can be used so that there are consequences for bad mentoring? It would be great if mentorship was a part of tenure and promotion cases. This can be used to amplify the need to change how we view mentoring. Mentoring is a fundamental part of graduate student education. The Council fully supported making some small wording changes and unanimously voted to approve the mentoring guidelines with minor revisions.

UCSB Residency Regulations – Revisions to Regulations 275 and 300
In March, GC discussed a proposal from Graduate Division to revise UCSB Divisional Regulations 275.C and 300.E, concerning graduate student residency. Minimum program residence, or academic residency, during summer sessions for master’s degrees is defined differently in the two divisional regulations. The proposed solution is to change the language in both Regulation 275 and Regulation 300 to match Systemwide Regulation 690. Systemwide Regulation 690 more clearly defines the differences between master’s and doctoral program residency, and provides more flexibility than our current regulations, as it allows for one eight-week summer session to count towards residency for both doctoral and master’s students. Member Jackson asked why there are different rules for master’s students. While GC supported the proposed revisions, the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections had some concerns, so the issue is pending.

**Foreign Graduate Applicant English Language Requirements**

In March, Chair Sabra explained that he was asked by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to consult with his campus Graduate Council and report back about foreign graduate applicant English language requirements. The graduate deans had a wide variety of opinions about this. Some thought that there should be no requirements at all, or they should be left up to departments. The inclination is to allow departments to make decisions. Many members were in support of departments autonomously making decisions about applicants’ English language skills. This could help departments increase diversity and get more applicants from other countries. However, different departments may have different standards of English proficiency that students need to meet, and that being able to communicate in academic language is different from what the TOEFL tests for. The timing of English language exams is also poor, as TAs are assessed in September, when departments have already allocated incoming students to TA certain classes. If the student does not pass the proficiency exam, the department has to scramble to find a replacement TA. The TA exam should be done much earlier.

**GRE Discussion**

In April, Graduate Council discussed a request from the Department of Physics to make the GRE optional for applicants. In 2019, Graduate Council voted to allow departments to decide if they wanted to require the GRE for graduate admissions or not; however, all applicants had to be held to the same requirements, although GC’s memo at the time did not explicitly state this. Physics’ argument was that their different tracks (Astrophysics and Physics) should have different requirements if they want to. Competing departments are also making admissions test-optional. While current rules allow a given department to implement different rules for different programs, all applicants to a given program must follow the same rules. For a that reason, the GRE cannot be made optional.

If the GRE is optional, how can departments be fair in their decisions? Vice Chair O’Malley said that her department has done a data-driven deep dive on the GRE - it was not shown to be a predictor for any outcome of their graduate programs (grades, papers published, etc.). Faculty are also often not adequately trained to interpret the GRE. The GRE has also been shown to be culturally biased, and costs money for students to take. There is also the issue of some international students not having access to the test. Most members agreed that departments should keep the GRE for all applicants or none.

It was suggested that there would be two memos: one telling Physics GC’s decision, and one clarifying GC’s 2019 decision. GC voted to leave in place the 2019 decision to allow departments to require the GRE or not, but hold all applicants to a given program to the same requirements.

**Department of Economics – Three-Year Follow-Up Report on Curricular Changes**
In April, Graduate Council reviewed a three-year follow-up report, which they requested in November 2018, from the Department of Economics. In 2018, GC approved significant changes to the Economics graduate curriculum, and wanted a chance to review how the changes were working a few years in. Overall, the main changes seem to be working well for the department. These included creating many 2-unit courses, having students attend research groups beginning in their second year, and requiring a second-year paper. GC was pleased with the outcomes and the progress that the department has made in revising its curriculum.

**Graduate Division Deferral Policy**
At multiple meetings spring quarter, GC discussed the current graduate admissions deferral policy. During COVID, Graduate Division allowed students to defer for any reason. Current policy requires admitted students to have circumstances that fall into four categories (medical/family issues; difficulty obtaining a visa; a compelling educational opportunity; or another compelling, unexpected reason, such as military call to duty). The unique educational opportunities category can be interpreted in different ways. GC originally thought it would make sense to allow departments to manage their own deferrals. However, after Graduate Division staff presented an extensive list of reasons why this would be a problematic change, the Council voted unanimously to keep the current deferral policy in place, while suggesting that the “unexpected and/or compelling rationale” category be clarified.

**Academic Program Review Streamlining Proposal**
In May, Council discussed the Academic Program Review Streamlining Proposal. One reason to streamline the process would be to increase the number of reviews done each year, to perhaps eight. The current Graduate Council structure could not manage this workload. There would need to be additional members and likely additional meetings, in fall and spring, added in order to review all of the ERC reports. This would require a larger discussion within the Academic Senate to make changes of this magnitude to GC. GC also did not gain anything by not being required to send forward comments in Fall quarter on the Data Notebooks, as the Council decided that there were urgent issues that they wanted to address in four of the programs.

There was a suggestion that programs could be prioritized not based on length of time between reviews, but on things such as severity of issues found in the last review or the departments’ impacts on the overall campus. There was also a suggestion that there might be a way to coordinate some programs’ Academic Program Reviews with other certification processes, such as ABET. This could cut down on departmental workload in preparing documents for each review. There also needs to be a larger discussion about integrating PLO assessment into the Academic Program Review. PLO assessment is a time-intensive process that could use streamlining as well. Members agreed that student feedback is important, and we should have that even more frequently.

**2022-23 Academic Senate Doctoral Student Travel Grant Policy**
In May, Graduate Council reviewed the current Academic Senate Doctoral Student Travel Grant policy. Members suggested clarifying in the policy what “joint programs” means, and voted to approve eliminating the Department Chair signature on the application, as students already get a letter of support and signature from their advisor.

**Five-Year Funding for Graduate Programs**
In May, Interim Dean Rupp explained that UC is trying to move towards providing all incoming Ph.D. students with five years of funding at the level of TA pay. Most campuses have made this a mandate. UCOP is asking campuses that have not implemented this to provide a timeline for when they will.
Graduate Division has been encouraging departments to provide five-year funding. Full support means that all tuition and fees are paid, and students receive a stipend equivalent to a TAship (currently around $24,000, but that is likely to go up). Summer funding is not included. There are some programs that will have difficulty doing this, and some individual departments also do not provide a full five years of funding. Members discussed that for some programs, full funding costs a lot more than these numbers. Many students take longer than five years to complete a Ph.D. Dean Rupp said that this is an initial guarantee of funding, and students usually do find funding in later years. It was also discussed that the current TA salary is barely sufficient to live in a place as expensive as UCSB, and graduate students are going into debt. UCSB needs more resources, including more institutional support and more subsidized graduate housing. We are not able to attract the best graduate students as our peer institutions are offering more, and we are not competitive. There are also increased insurance and other costs that are limiting what funding Graduate Division can provide.

Proposal to Change Admissions Requirements: Personal Achievements and Contributions Statement (PACS)
In June, the Council discussed a proposal from Graduate Division to make changes to the Personal Achievements and Contributions Statement, a required essay that all graduate program applicants must submit with their application. Many students currently do not know what to write for this statement. Changes include changing the name to “Personal History and Diversity Statement”; requiring that the statement be written in narrative form; and including a minimum word count of 250 words. The Council supported these changes.

VIII. Systemwide Business

Draft Presidential Policy – Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace
In November, the Council reviewed the Draft Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct/Bullying in the Workplace. Members suggested a few possible wording changes, and that the section on “circulating inappropriate or embarrassing photos, videos, or information via email, social media, or other means” goes where no policy has gone before. The policy also leaves unclear who the photos, etc., are embarrassing to.

Recommendations for Department Political Statements
In January, GC discussed the Recommendations for Department Political Statements, from the Council on Academic Freedom. The document had two recommendations: to post a disclaimer with the statement that it should not be taken as a position of the UC or campus as a whole, and that the statement should indicate whose views in the department the statement represents, and give an opportunity for minority viewpoints to be stated. Some members thought that the way departments put out statements now should remain; having people write dissents would not be helpful. Others thought that there should not be a central directive, and that dissenters already have an opportunity to put out their own statement. Still others would not want to explain their reasoning for not signing onto a statement. Some members thought that departments should not be making statements at all, and that any statements from a department would be perceived as made on behalf of the University. However, UC cannot forbid freedom of speech, and faculty have a right to voice their opinions on political matters. Listing the names of faculty who agree with a statement could cause an unpleasant atmosphere for students; on the other hand, seeing faculty signing onto statements could make a department more welcoming to other students. Both of these situations will be present.

Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy on University of California Research Data
In February, Graduate Council discussed the second systemwide review of the proposed presidential policy on University of California Research data. GC reviewed the first draft last year, and stated that it was vehemently opposed to any new regulations that put more work on faculty. The revised policy did not address the extra burden that would be placed on faculty. Members thought that the revised policy was still very vague, and penalties for not following these rules are not defined. The policy would be unnecessary duplicity of work. There was also frustration that GC’s prior suggestion that a cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken was ignored. Some members thought it may serve better as a “best practices” document, especially for newer faculty members.

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.

X. Carry Over Issues for 2022-23
● Continuing to deal with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and addressing its impacts on graduate students, as well as faculty and staff.
● The need for a permanent Dean of Graduate Division.
● The rising cost of graduate student healthcare premiums.
● 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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