Executive Summary

Purpose of the Council: To study and make recommendations on any matter of interest and welfare of the campus community, and to reward excellence in research and teaching.

The concerns of the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards during the 2013-2014 academic year included the on-going issues of Academic Freedom, Faculty Awards, and Faculty Welfare, as well as the specific issues listed below.

LOCAL REVIEWS:

1. Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education
2. Proposed MOU with Chevrolet / Bonneville Environmental Foundation
3. ESCI Online Pilot Program
4. Faculty Code of Conduct – Campus Procedures
5. Academic Policies & Procedures (“Red Binder”) Revisions
6. Report of the Task Force on Utilizing Technology to Enhance Student Learning

SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES & REVIEWS:

1. Proposed revisions Academic Personnel Manual (APM)
   A. Senate revisions: APM 133, 210, 220, and 760
   B. APM 025, 670, and 671
   C. APM 035: Policy on Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence
   D. APM 190: Whistleblower
   E. APM Section IV (600 series): Salary Administration
2. Copyright and Fair Use Policy
3. Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs
4. Senate Bylaw 55
5. UC Care Health Plan

ACADEMIC SENATE AWARDS:

Four committees reviewed and deliberated over nominations for various Academic Senate awards for research, teaching, and mentoring:

1. Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship
2. Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards
3. Committee on Outstanding Graduate Mentorship
4. Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards
MEETINGS

During the 2013-14 academic year, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards convened for eight regularly scheduled meetings (three in fall, two in winter, and three in spring) and one special meeting (on September 25, to discuss changes in employee healthcare plans). Between formal meetings, when appropriate, CFIA conducted regular deliberations and consultations via email.

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi, Chair and UCFW Rep</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley M. Awramik, Vice Chair, UCAF Rep</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Brown</td>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teofilo Gonzalez</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sreenivasa Rao Jammalamadaka</td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Meadow</td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wiemann (Emeritus)</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adil Yaqub</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Young</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Harthorn</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mireille Miller-Young</td>
<td>Feminist Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Proulx</td>
<td>Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Marine Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celine Parreñas Shimizu</td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sven Spieker</td>
<td>Germanic, Slavic, &amp; Semitic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Van de Walle</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Paul, Non-Senate Academic Rep</td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson F. Maas, GSA Rep</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belen R. Verdugo, AS Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL ISSUES

1) Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education

In June, CFIA reviewed a proposal to create the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education / Dean of Undergraduate Education. After extensive discussion, CFIA expressed a number of concerns about the proposed position. In particular, CFIA raised questions about the following: the lack of a clear purpose or need that the position is meant to address; unclear organizational structure and reporting lines; ambiguous relationship that this position would have with the College of Engineering and the College of Creative Studies; and unclear effect on or benefit to the faculty. CFIA withheld support on this administrative reorganization.

Response: The proposal was reviewed broadly by the Academic Senate and Faculty Executive Committees. The Senate’s Divisional response was sent to the Interim EVC in July and included a number of wide-ranging thoughts and suggestions. Senate Councils and Committees felt, in general, that while a proposed reorganization within this administrative unit is welcome, the current plan would not achieve its intended goals of helping the university further enhance its undergraduate – and graduate – responsibilities.

2) Proposed MOU with Chevrolet / Bonneville Environmental Foundation

In November, CFIA reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Chevrolet and its Bonneville Environmental Foundation. CFIA had several questions and concerns about the document and was unable to offer an endorsement.

First, CFIA noted the lack of UCSB perspective in the agreement. While the document appeared to be circulated by the Director of Campus Sustainability, it seemed to CFIA that the document was generated by – and represented the perspective of – Chevrolet / the Bonneville Foundation. More importantly, CFIA found it difficult to assess the ramifications of such an agreement. In what ways might the campus better leverage its carbon credits? What are the opportunity costs of entering into this agreement? CFIA regretted the lack of discussion and analysis of the various available options, as well as of the costs and benefits of each. Finally, Council wondered whether this document had been vetted by the Chancellor’s Sustainability Committee and the Office of Research.

Response: The Academic Senate provided preliminary and informal feedback about the proposed MOU. Three Senate groups reviewed and commented on the documents: CFIA, the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), and the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR). No group was able to provide endorsement of the proposed MOU at the time and there were several areas of concern and numerous questions that each group raised.

3) ESCI Online Pilot Program

In February, CFIA discussed the pilot program for the online delivery of ESCI teaching evaluations (Evaluation System for Courses & Instruction). CFIA became aware that several departments had been approached to be part of a voluntary trial of the program (including Sociology, Film & Media Studies, Art, and Statistics). Based on the information then available to the Council, CFIA opposed the full-scale adoption of online ESCI teaching evaluations. The
Council requested that implementation of the full program be suspended until the Academic Senate is able to provide a thoughtful evaluation and review.

CFIA reiterated concerns that were originally expressed in its June 2011 memo to Senate Division Chair Henning Bohn. The Council inquired to what extent its questions about ESCI were addressed in the pilot program. CFIA continued to hold several concerns about administering the ESCIs online, including the anticipation that the response rates for the evaluations may drop and the expected negative effect this would have on merit and promotion cases. Furthermore, CFIA was concerned that online surveys would allow more students who do not attend lectures to evaluate instructors’ teaching.

CFIA also requested that a description of the pilot program be made available for scrutiny to other Senate committees as soon as possible. CFIA noted that the Ad Hoc Committee report implied that online ESCI evaluation would be implemented campus wide, despite the fact that the report expressed doubts on the value of the plan and despite the fact that the Academic Senate had not endorsed the proposal. The Council requested an evaluation of the pilot program with data assessing its effectiveness. CFIA also requested clarification as to UCSB’s intent with regard to implementing this program and asked under what authority this decision was made.

Response: The December 2013 report by the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluation as well as CFIA’s memo of February 4, 2014 were distributed to various Senate committees in March for their review and comment. As of this writing, a Divisional response is not available.

4) Faculty Code of Conduct – Campus Procedures

In December, CFIA initiated its review of the proposed revision to the Campus Procedures for the Enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Before being able to offer its endorsement, the Council requested additional information and clarifications on the proposed changes. More specifically, CFIA wanted more details regarding the rationale that prompted the changes: what are the advantages of creating “a consultative process between the Charges Officer and the Charges Advisory Committee” and of providing “a distinction between an informal complaint and formal complaint/resolution”? CFIA also requested more detail about the “small, yet significant changes” that resulted in a complete re-write of the procedures.

CFIA finished its review of the proposed revision to the Campus Procedures for the Enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct in January. The Council appreciated the opportunity to meet with Carol Lansing (Charges Officer) and Stephanie Smagala (Academic Senate analyst) to have several questions clarified. CFIA had its concerns sufficiently addressed, and the Council had no objection to the revised policy.

Response: The proposal was widely reviewed by several Faculty Executive Committees and other groups in the Academic Senate. Suggestions from the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) and other groups were incorporated into the document, which was approved by the Faculty Legislature at its June meeting.
5) Academic Policies & Procedures (“Red Binder”) Revisions

In May, CFIA reviewed the proposed revisions to the UCSB Academic Policies & Procedures (“Red Binder”). CFIA saw no indication for concern and had no objections to the proposed changes.

Response: Following review by CFIA and the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), the Academic Senate Division had no objections to the proposed revisions.

6) Report of the Task Force on Utilizing Technology to Enhance Student Learning

In May, CFIA reviewed the report of the Task Force on Utilizing Technology to Enhance Student Learning. Overall, the Council supported the report and agreed with the recommendation for administrative coordination and oversight of technological endeavors as well as consultation with various campus units. CFIA also endorsed the conclusion that the most suitable model for UCSB would be to use technology in conjunction with face-to-face instruction. CFIA noted that addressing the issues identified in the document would require significant money and resources.

The Council also raised several concerns and questions regarding the following: the requirement that an online course would need to enroll a minimum number of UCSB students in order for a faculty member to receive course credit; how determinations would be made about which classes would have an in-person discussion section as opposed to an online section; the assertion that “fully online courses are most appropriate at the upper division level” and “are not appropriate at the lower division level”; potential impacts of online classes on TA workload; and the expression “UCSB brand,” which CFIA found to be unclear.

Response: The following groups commented on the report: CFIA, Council on Planning & Budget, Undergraduate Council (UgC), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Committee on Courses & General Education (CCGE), Committee on Diversity & Equity (D&E), and the Faculty Executive Committees from the Colleges of L&S, Engineering, and Creative Studies. Overall, most reviewing groups found the analysis and the recommendations in the report to be comprehensive and thought provoking. However, the Divisional response was mixed, and included support for several of the report’s ideas as well as skepticism about other aspects of the document.
SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS

1) Proposed revisions Academic Personnel Manual (APM)

A.) Senate revisions: APM 133, 210, 220, and 760

In June, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed a proposal to revise various sections of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) in response to recommendations that originated in the Academic Senate: APM 133-17-g-j, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles; APM 210-1-c & -d, Review and Appraisal Committees; APM 220-18-b, Professor Series; and APM 760-30-a, Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing. The Council’s primary discussion focused on the revisions to section 210, and CFIA had no objection to the revisions in the other sections.

CFIA agreed with the clarification in section 210-1-c of “stopping the clock for reasons as defined in APM -133-17-h.” However, CFIA had significant concerns about the clarity of section 210-1-d. In CFIA’s assessment, the revised language increased the ambiguity of this section. CFIA expressed appreciation for the efforts of the University to encourage and promote diversity. However, the Council felt a more thoughtful and precise statement of the University’s expectations was warranted.

B.) APM 025, 670, and 671

In February, CFIA discussed the proposed revisions and an addition to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), in response to campus administrator and faculty requests to clarify the purpose, scope, and compliance requirements concerning conflict of commitment policy for general campus faculty and for Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP or the Plan). The changes involved the following: revisions to APM section 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members; revisions to APM section 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan; and proposed new policy, APM section 671, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities of Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants. While noting that faculty who are receiving income from extramural sources may be impacted by these changes, CFIA did not object to the revisions.

Response: The Division received comments from the following Senate groups: CFIA, Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Engineering and Letters & Science. All groups either endorsed the proposed revisions to APM 025 or chose not to opine. All groups chose not to opine or had no objection to the proposed revisions to APM 670 and the proposed new version of APM 671 given that there are no Health Sciences faculty on the UCSB campus. Several groups noted that the revised versions have more clarity overall.

C.) APM 035: Policy on Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence

In January, CFIA reviewed the proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 035) regarding the policy on sexual harassment and sexual violence. CFIA understood that the changes were meant to bring the University into compliance with federal law (the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013).
CFIA found some incoherence in the way the new categories were defined and applied, and believed that the document lacked clarity and increased confusions. Several of the revisions appeared to be patched onto the document rather than organically integrated. One of the most outstanding problems was the conflation of sexual harassment with gender discrimination under the same APM.

CFIA agreed with the suggestion of the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF), which recommended that the “reasonable person” standard should be included in the policy, with the intent of reducing the likelihood of frivolous allegations. For example, CFIA suggested that the definition of “sexual harassment” under Section II (Definitions) should state that the behavior is such that a “reasonable person” would find it intimidating, hostile, or offensive.

CFIA also sought clarification on where this policy would apply (page 4 of the document, under section III A). This section did not seem to include university sponsored/funded off-campus locations (e.g., research cruises, field trips, etc.) unless these are to be covered under the term “auxiliary”.

Response: Three Senate groups at the UCSB Division provided commentary: CFIA, Committee on Diversity & Equity, and the Graduate Council. Graduate Council endorsed the proposed revisions. Two other groups offered substantive comments, and much of CFIA’s memo was quoted in the Divisional response.

D.) Revisions to APM 190, Appendix A-2: Whistleblower Policy

In April, CFIA reviewed a proposal to revise the Whistleblower Policy: Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 190, Appendix A-2. CFIA noted that the policy was meant to comply with a law (California Whistleblower Protection Act) that went into effect in 2011. The Council had one concern regarding the section on appeals (Section VIII under the existing policy, or Section A-I under the revised policy), and in particular the wording of the first two sentences regarding appeals based on the merit of a complaint. The Council suggested re-wording this section to improve clarity. Beyond this, CFIA had no further objections to the proposal.

Response: The following groups were asked to comment on the proposed revision to APM 190, Appendix A-2: CFIA, Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committee from Letters & Science. The Graduate Council and the L&S FEC endorsed the proposed revisions, CPB had no objections, and CFIA and CRIR had significant concerns. Overall, the UCSB Division offered qualified support for the policy revision. Issues regarding the appeal of a decision, and including “alleged” in the appropriate location were significant requested changes.

E.) APM 600 Series: Salary Administration (Final review)

The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the updated revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) regarding salary administration at their November 6 meeting. CFIA had no additional comments.

Response: The Divisional response included comments by the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) and the Committee on International Education (CIE); most groups declined to opine. CIE suggested that international education be added to the list of Regents' Lecturer's
achievements in agriculture, labor, law, medicine, and also commented on section 650-18.a.2 (Salary Administration – Technical Assistance Projects).

2) Copyright and Fair Use Policy

In May, The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reviewed the proposed revision to the Presidential policy on Copyright and Fair Use. CFIA agreed that the revision is necessary due to changes in law, technology, and academic practices. The Council encouraged UC to alert faculty members about the legal implications of the policy, and it supported the inclusion and distribution of resources for faculty to make informed decisions with regard to copyright and fair use.

Response: The UCSB Division’s response included review by CFIA, Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Letters & Science and the College of Creative Studies. For the most part, all groups regarded the Policy as a necessary revision given changes in law, technology and academic practices. The Division endorsed the Policy as written with a few minor suggestions.

3) Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs

In January, CFIA discussed the proposed policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs. While the Council did not object to the policy, CFIA expressed its apprehension about further privatization of the University, which may result in declining academic standards and increasing costs to students. Additionally, CFIA worried that as campuses will be able to charge different program fees, this may result in increasing already existing system-wide inequities.

In June, CFIA continued its review of the revised policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs. The Council was concerned that the development of such programs could potentially divert attention and valuable resources away from the core academic mission of the University. Moving forward, CFIA encouraged as much transparency as possible with such programs, particularly with regard to open fiscal reporting.

Response: The UCSB Division’s response included review by CFIA, Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Graduate Council (GC), Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Bren and Education. UCSB had recently received approval (Spring 2013) for its first professional degree program, and thus considered itself to be in an especially unique position to comment on the draft policy. During the initial review, the Division agreed with Graduate Council’s concern about the “lack of stated principles for determining whether a program should be offered as a state-supported professional program or a self-supporting graduate professional degree program (SSGPDP)” and urged that the documents be revised and distributed for a second review. During the follow-up review, the Division was overall supportive of the revised policy, but offered the some suggestions and comments.

4) Senate Bylaw 55

In January, CFIA reviewed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 that would allow non-Senate faculty in the health sciences to participate in departmental personnel votes. In CFIA’s estimate the revision was an inclusive measure that would allow for more involvement and
shared governance with affected constituents. The Council approved the limited extension of voting rights to such personnel. Council noted and supported the safeguards included in the proposal. In particular, CFIA favored the extension of voting privileges to only those adjunct and health sciences clinical professors who hold an appointment of more than 50% (“career”) in the department, as well as the allowance that the decision to extend voting rights may be reconsidered annually.

In April, CFIA reviewed a revised proposal to amend Senate Bylaw 55. CFIA continued to agree with the proposed extension of voting rights to health sciences faculty members, and therefore supported the first version of the proposal. CFIA felt that the proposal to extend the scope of the amendment beyond the health sciences was unwarranted at the moment.

Response: The proposal was reviewed broadly by UCSB Senate groups, including: CFIA, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), the Committee on Diversity & Equity (D&E), and the Faculty Executive Committees from College of Creative Studies, Engineering, and the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE). The majority of reviewing groups (with the exception of CFIA and CPB) were against the proposed changes.

5) UC Care Health Plan

On September 25, the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards held a special meeting to discuss changes to the UC employee healthcare. In August, an announcement appeared on the UC “At your service” website regarding changes to UC healthcare plans for 2014. In response, the Council sent a memo to UCSB Divisional Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani detailing serious concerns about the changes.

At that time, the University was in the process of rolling out its new healthcare plans, which would be available for the open enrollment period in November. The Anthem plans (Blue Cross PLUS, Blue Cross PPO, and Lumenos PPO) were being discontinued and were to be replaced with a self-insured plan, called UC Care. Under UC Care, there would be three tiers: Tier 1 (UC Select), Tier 2 (Blue Shield Preferred), and Tier 3. The three tiers would have varying monthly costs, deductibles, and maximum out-of-pocket limits. Tiers 1 and 2 would encourage utilization of in-network care providers, which would rely heavily on the UC medical centers. For campuses without medical schools, agreements would be made with local hospitals and healthcare providers. Tier 3 would allow a person to see any medical provider, but would have the highest deductible as well as the highest out-of-pocket costs.

The problem for the UCSB campus was that there were no in-network healthcare providers for Tier 1 in the immediate Santa Barbara / Goleta area. The closest in-network providers were in Ventura, Lompoc, and Santa Maria. Other campuses without medical centers had had healthcare providers added and were not as impacted as the Santa Barbara campus.

CFIA sent a memo to UCSB Divisional Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani in August communicating its concerns about the discrepancy and inequity between UCSB and its sister campuses. In response, the Academic Senate organized a Town Hall meeting on October 3 to share information and discuss this issue. In addition, the UC Office of the President scheduled two town hall meetings at UCSB on November 7th in which administrators from UCOP gave a presentation and took questions about the plans.
Response: In November, UC President Napolitano announced that under her directive, negotiations between UCOP and Sansum Clinic were successfully completed. As a result, Sansum would become a Tier One (Select Tier) provider in the 2014 UC Care plan. Because of the extensive changes, the systemwide Human Resources and Benefits group offered UC Santa Barbara employees the opportunity to make enrollment choices and changes through February 2014 and later extended the deadline to the end of March for all UC campuses.
ACADEMIC SENATE AWARDS

This year, most of the award categories saw a significant increase in the number of nominations submitted. This created additional work for some of the committees, as there were more candidate packets to review. The reason for this precipitous increase is unclear, but it is speculated that a switch to online submission of nominations may be at least partially responsible.

Number of Award Nominations by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DTA Senate</th>
<th>DTA Non-Senate</th>
<th>DTA Total</th>
<th>GMA</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DTA = Distinguished Teaching Awards  
GMA = Graduate Mentor Awards  
OTA = Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards  
FRL = Faculty Research Lecturer

*Beginning in 2010, nominations for the Faculty Research Lecturer were held on file for two additional years.

Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship

The Faculty Research Lecturer is the highest honor bestowed upon a faculty member by his/her peers at UCSB. The Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship is traditionally chaired by the previous year’s recipient, with the remainder of the committee comprised of other former recipients. The make-up of this year’s committee was as follows:

1. John Bowers, Chair (Electrical & Computer Engineering) 2013 recipient  
2. Leda Cosmides, Co-Chair (Psychological & Brain Sciences) 2012 co-recipient
3. John Tooby, Co-Chair (Anthropology) 2012 co-recipient
4. Toshi Hasegawa (History) 2010 recipient
5. Linda Petzold (Computer Science & Mechanical Engineering) 2011 recipient

The committee was given four weeks to review the files of the award nominees. The award guidelines were revised in 2010 to allow for candidate nominations to be reviewed for a period of three years (during which time they could be appended or withdrawn). The committee received two new submissions in addition to five previous nominations (including one resubmission). The committee met in February to make its final decisions on this year’s recipient: Joseph Polchinski (Physics). Professor Polchinski was honored at the May 8th meeting of the Faculty Legislature; he was given an honorarium of $5,000 and a framed certificate. He will present his campus lecture in fall quarter; the date of the lecture is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, November 6.

**Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards**

The Distinguished Teaching Awards acknowledge the efforts of up to five Senate faculty members and (usually) one non-Senate faculty who have successfully united excellence in teaching with their creative and scholarly work. The award is intended to recognize the distinguished teaching accomplishments of the faculty, which may be exhibited at any time during a faculty member’s career.

This committee was chaired by CFIA’s Vice Chair and was otherwise composed of former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award:

1. Stanley Awramik, Chair (Earth Science); Vice Chair of CFIA
2. John Foran (Sociology) 2013 recipient
3. Howard Giles (Communication) 2013 recipient
4. Janet Kayfetz (Computer Science and Bren) 2013 recipient, non-Senate lecturer
5. Laurie Monahan (History of Art & Architecture) 2011 recipient
6. Stefanie Tcharos (Music) 2011 recipient

The committee spent four weeks reviewing the files of the award nominees. The committee met the first week of March to make its final decisions on this year’s recipients:

1. Andrew Flanagin (Communication)
2. Tsuyoshi Hasegawa (History)
3. Gaye Theresa Johnson (Black Studies)
4. M. Scott Shell (Chemical Engineering)
5. Amber VanDerwarker (Anthropology)

Non-Senate recipients:

6. Claudia Tyler (College of Creative Studies / EEMB)
7. Evelyn Wade (Germanic, Slavic, & Semitic Studies)

This year, there were an extraordinarily high number of stellar candidates – far more than in the recent past. While this award is often very competitive, this year it was particularly so. In light of this, the committee had a very difficult time selecting five Senate recipients, and it was simply unable to select just one non-Senate awardee. The committee requested and received an
additional $1,000 in honorarium funding from the Academic Senate to offer an additional award to a non-Senate lecturer.

The recipients were honored at the May 8th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of $1,000.

**Committee on Graduate Mentor Awards**

This award was initiated in 2005 by the Academic Senate Graduate Council to encourage and reward excellence in mentoring graduate students on the Santa Barbara campus. The honor recognizes up to three faculty members annually who meet the highest standards in graduate mentoring.

The Committee on Graduate Mentor Awards was chaired by Kimberly Turner from the Department of Mechanical Engineering. Other committee members included former award recipients as well as representatives from the Graduate Council and CFIA.

1. Kimberly Turner, Chair (Mechanical Engineering) 2013 recipient
2. Julie Bianchini (Education) Graduate Council rep
3. Aaron Ettenberg (Psychological & Brain Sciences) 2011 recipient
4. Sabine Fruhstuck (East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies) Graduate Council rep
5. Barbara Harthorn (Anthropology) CFIA rep
6. Katharina Schreiber (Anthropology) 2009 recipient
7. Paul Spickard (History) 2008 recipient

The committee was given four weeks to review the files of each of the award nominees. The committee met the first week of March to make its final decisions on this year's honorees:

1. Sally Holbrook (Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology)
2. Sara Poot-Herrera (Spanish & Portuguese)
3. Ram Seshadri (Materials)

The awardees were honored at the May 8th meeting of the Faculty Legislature. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of $1,000.

**Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistants**

The Committee on Outstanding Teaching Assistants was chaired by Graduate Council member Chandra Krintz (Computer Science). Committee members included four graduate students who were former award recipients as well as two faculty representatives from the Graduate Council:

1. Chandra Krintz, Chair (Computer Science) Chair) Graduate Council rep
2. Cynthia Brown (French & Italian) Graduate Council rep
3. Quentin Gee (Philosophy) grad student recipient 2012
4. Katherine Kelp-Stebbins (Comparative Literature) grad student recipient 2013
5. Elijah Quetin (Physics) grad student recipient 2013
6. Sharalyn Sanders (Comparative Literature) grad student recipient 2012

The Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards recognize the contributions of graduate students to the teaching and learning process of UC Santa Barbara. The committee was given four weeks to
review the files of each of the award nominees. Each year, four recipients are honored. The committee met the first week of March to make its final decisions on this year’s recipients:

1. Meghan Corella Morales (Education)
2. Steven Osuna (Sociology)
3. Britney Pennington (Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology)
4. Alison Reed (English)

The awardees were honored at a Chancellor’s awards dinner on June 2. Award recipients were given a framed certificate and an honorarium of $1,000.

**Important Issues for 2014-15**

Issues that are likely to be important for the following academic year include:

- **Healthcare plans.**

- **Faculty Salaries.** Salary equity issues will continue to be a concern of the council, including benchmarking to “Comparison 8” institutions. In addition, incentives / pressure for faculty to secure external funding will continue to be an issue.

- **Online instruction and Online teaching evaluations**

**Committees**

Committee on Faculty Welfare & Academic Freedom
Committee on Emeriti(ae) and Retirement
Committee on Distinguished Teaching