ACADEMIC SENATE
FACULTY LEGISLATURE, SANTA BARBARA DIVISION

Thursday, October 26, 2017
3:30 p.m.
Library 1575

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others

4. Special Orders –
   Consent Calendar
   Approval of the minutes of the June 8, 2016 meeting (Attachment 1)

   In Memorium
   David Caldwell (1925-2016)
   Walter Mead (1921-2016)
   Ernest Sturm (1932-2016)
   Robert Murray Thomas (1921-2016)
   Ciel Bergman (1938-2017)
   Curtis B. Anderson (1932-2017)
   Sanford Gerber (1933-2017)
   David W. Brokensha (1923-2017)
   John Skalnik (1923-2017)
   Elliott Butler-Evans (1934-2017)
   Carlos Barron (1932-2017)
   John Sonquist (1931-2017)

2016-17 Annual Reports (Attachment 2)
   Bren School of Environmental Science & Management Faculty Executive Committee
   Charges Officer and Charges Advisory Committee
   College of Creative Studies Faculty Executive Committee
   College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee
   Committee on Academic Personnel
   Committee on Committees
   Committee on Diversity and Equity
   Committee on International Education
   Committee on Privilege and Tenure
   Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
   Council on Faculty Issues and Awards
   Council on Planning and Budget
   Council on Research and Instructional Resources
   Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Faculty Executive Committee
   Graduate Council

5. Reports of Special Committees

6. Reports of Standing Committees
   Action Item: Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections: Proposed Revisions to the Divisional Regulation 205(C)(2). General Education Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science (Engineering) (Attachment 3)

7. Petitions of Students None

8. Unfinished Business

9. University and Faculty Welfare

10. New Business
    Information/Discussion Item: Proposed UCSB Local Procedures for Reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of the UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (Attachment 4)
The Faculty Legislature of the Santa Barbara Division met in Library Conference Room 1575 at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 8, 2017, with Chair Henning Bohn presiding. The meeting was attended by 26 voting members, 3 ex officio members, and other interested parties.

Announcements by the Chancellor (from the slides presented)

Transitions on Campus
On May 5, we announced the appointment of Professor Joseph Incandela as our Vice Chancellor for Research

Admissions Update
Fall 2017 Admissions Update (based on SIRs)
- 81,824 freshman applicants
- 32% admission rate
- 4,617 accepted admittance to date
- Average GPA: 4.08 (up from 4.03 last year)
- Average SATR: 1916 (up from 1899 last year)
- 30% underrepresented minorities
- 40% first-generation four-year college students
- 81% California residents

Graduate Admissions Update
- 9,448 applicants
- 20% admissions rate (1,888 students)
- 829 accepted admittance to date
- Predicting a 20% increase in the size of our incoming class

On May 18, UC Regents approved an 18% cap on non-resident enrollment for most campuses. UCLA, UC Berkeley, UC San Diego, and UC Irvine, which already exceed 18%, will be allowed to keep but not increase their higher percentage.
Fall 2016 Undergraduate Non-Resident Enrollment Percentages on UC Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Percentage of Undergraduate Nonresidents</th>
<th>Number of Undergraduate Nonresidents</th>
<th>Total Undergraduate Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7,147</td>
<td>29,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>30,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6,432</td>
<td>28,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>27,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>29,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>21,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>16,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>19,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Merced</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus Updates & Highlights

Governor Brown has made four new appointments to the UC Board of Regents
- Maria Anguiano: CFO at Minerva Project; previously Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget at UC Riverside
- Howard “Peter” Guber: Chairman and CEO at Mandalay Entertainment Group
- Lark Park: Senior advisor to Governor Brown for policy; UC Berkeley alumna
- Ellen Pauscher: Former Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; Former U.S. Congresswoman for California’s 10th District

Top Colleges Doing the Most for the American Dream

Last month, the New York Times ranked UC Santa Barbara number two in its third annual College Access Index, which assesses commitment to economic diversity.

The Chronicle of Higher Education: “AAU Members with the Greatest Diversity Among Tenure-Track Hires on the Instructional Staff, Fall 2015” (April 30, 2017)
“Among the 60 U.S. members of the Association of American Universities, the University of California at Santa Barbara hired the highest percentage of women as full-time tenure-track faculty members whose primary role was instruction in the fall of 2015.”

Guardian Scholars receive 2017 President’s Award for Outstanding Student Leadership, which was presented May 17 at the UC Regents meeting.

Our 2017 Grad Slam Champion Leah Foltz from Biomolecular Science & Engineering won the People’s Choice award in the UC-wide competition.

Still Reforming Postmodern Dance, California Roots Intact
On May 31, the UC Santa Barbara Dance Company performed at Hunter College’s Kaye Playhouse in New York City to a sold-out audience. The performance and photo of one of our students were featured in the New York Times.

Professor of Psychological & Brain Sciences Gregory Ashby received the 2017 Howard Crosby Warren Medal from the Society of Experimental Psychologists.

Kavli Professor of Optoelectronics Larry Coldren received the 2017 Nick Holonyak Jr. Award for the Optical Society.
Heeger Professor of Interdisciplinary Science Craig Hawker received the Charles G. Overberger International Prize

Professor of Materials Omar Adel Saleh received the Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel Research Award

Budget Update
Recap of Governor’s January Proposal
• 4% base budget adjustment of $131.2 million in State General Funds
• $169 million in final one-time funds for the unfunded liability of UC Retirement Plan
• No projected funding of deferred maintenance
• Innovation and Entrepreneurship funding unlikely, which was anticipated as a three-year program
• Halt Middle Class Scholarship Program

Governor’s May Revise
Two revisions from January budget proposal:
(1) In response to the 2.5% tuition increase approved by the Regents in January, $4 million is redirected to Cal Grant. If UC raises tuition in the future, additional redirection of state funding to Cal Grant may be needed
(2) $50 million withheld until UC makes progress on state auditor’s recommendations:
• All campuses meet the 2:1 freshman-transfer ratio
• Three campuses to pilot new costing models (Riverside, Merced, Davis)

Isla Vista Update
On Tuesday, May 23, UC Santa Barbara commemorated the third anniversary of the Isla Vista tragedy with a candlelight vigil and other remembrance events. Thank you to all of our faculty who participated.

Happy Commencement!

Announcements by the Chair
Chair Bohn reported that Governor Brown has released the May budget revise. In the wake of the state audit of the UC Office of the President, the Governor has set aside $50 million for UC, with its release conditioned on several requirements. The Regents are investigating the manner in which the audit was handled by central administrators.

Last month the Regents approved a policy that caps nonresident enrollment at 18% for five of the campuses while allowing the four campuses (Berkeley, LA, Irvine, and San Diego) where the proportion of nonresidents already exceeds 18% to be capped at the proportion enrolled during the 2017-18 academic year. This has set a precedent for an uneven funding model that potentially advantages some campuses while restricting others. The policy will be reviewed after four years. The systemwide Senate has heavily engaged with this issue, as has our divisional Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools, which sets local admissions policy.

Eight of the campuses have been charged with achieving a 2:1 freshman to transfer student ratio. Our campus has just barely met this goal, and UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside have yet to succeed, thus having to reduce the size of their freshman classes as part of this effort.

The Academic Council has circulated for review a set of proposed APM revisions that pertain to the
Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. Some campuses use the working title of Teaching Professors for this series. The proposed changes include a revision of the job description for faculty in this series that mandates research in the area of pedagogy, which has been debated at length within our local Councils and Committees. We hire LSOEs because they are great teachers; to impose additional requirements on them is objectionable and denies academic freedom rights. Academic Council will continue discussing of this issue during its June meeting.

The Academic Assembly will meet via teleconference next week. Among the items to be addressed is a proposed draft policy that would allow the augmented review of admission applications, including the use of questionnaires and the solicitation of letters of recommendation and additional grades. This has been a controversial item as it has the potential to place a disproportionate burden on students with from various backgrounds. Augmented review would be allowed for up to 15% of the campus applicant pool. The Regents are hoping to enact a policy by July 1, 2017, which would affect the next admissions cycle.

The Academic Assembly will also be discussing changes to Bylaw 336 pertaining to disciplinary cases handled by Divisional Committees on Privilege and Tenure, as well as a revision to Bylaw 182, which governs the University Committee on International Education.

Chair Bohn reported that, on May 26, he attended a budget meeting with President Napolitano, Chancellor Yang, EVC Marshall, and Acting Assistant Chancellor Haines. They addressed UCSB campus achievements such as progress with female hires, our status as a Hispanic Serving Institution, and numerous others. There were several questions related to revenue sources, development efforts, and professional degree programs. Our campus has been more conservative with regard to these programs, while other campuses have been more aggressive.

**Consent Calendar**

Minutes of the April 27, 2017 meeting

**Motion:** To approve the minutes of the April 27, 2017 meeting with one revision.

The motion was seconded, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

**Proposed Revisions to the Bren School Bylaws**

Chair Bohn reported that the Bren School Faculty Executive Committee proposed a revision to the school’s bylaws. It has been reviewed by the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections and has been fully endorsed.

Arturo Keller, a representative for Bren, stated that the revisions will clarify the process for selecting academic personnel committees. The current process is to elect a chair ever three years, the revision would allow for the appointment of a vice chair to learn the process before becoming chair.

**Motion:** To approve the proposed revisions to the Bren School Bylaws

The motion was seconded, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

**Establishment of Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Neuroengineering**

Chair Bohn announced that there has been an establishment of an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphasis in Neuroengineering.

**Announcements from the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards (CFIA) - Stan Awramik, Chair**
CFIA has been concerned about the recording of faculty lectures by students, without consent of the instructors. The Council is aware of one instance in which a UCSB faculty member was harassed after the course lecture was recorded. There is currently no local policy on recording lectures. There is a UC policy, but it only addresses recordings that are sold. CFIA has been considering this issue for some time and has learned that UC Berkeley has developed a campus policy on recordings. CFIA met with Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Margaret Klawunn, and Dean of Student Life, Katya Armistead, to discuss a draft policy, and both were supportive. This issue will continue to be pursued by CFIA with the hope of distributing a draft policy for Senate review in the coming year.

When the Senate restructured years ago, matters related to academic freedom were placed within the charge of CFIA. A member of CFIA regularly serves as a representative to the University Committee on Academic Freedom and reports back to the Council. When the Regents proposed the UC Principles Against Intolerance, a number of issues regarding academic freedom were brought up. CFIA would like faculty to be aware that the Senate committee charged with addressing academic freedom concerns is housed within CFIA. This is appropriate as academic freedom and faculty welfare issues overlap in many ways. Members of the Faculty Legislature were advised that concerns pertaining to either area may be brought to CFIA. A representative of CFIA also serves on the University Committee on Faculty Welfare.

The Cybersecurity Working Group (CSWG), chaired by Keith Clark, is also housed within CFIA. This group was created by the Senate in response to various campus concerns pertaining to electronic information security. There was discussion among members of the Faculty Legislature regarding a draft policy prepared by CSWG, but Professor Clark was unavailable to answer the numerous questions that arose. The proposed policy (or a revised version) will therefore be further discussed at a later date.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
Attachment 2
2016-17 Annual Reports

Bren School Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Report 2016-2017

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

According to Academic Senate Divisional Bylaws and Regulations, Appendix II, D1.93, the Executive Committee of the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management 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.

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) for the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management met eight times during the academic year. The following is a list of the major issues addressed by the FEC:

1. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL. Following the faculty retreat on the Academic Personnel process last year, the FEC developed a guidance document based on the key discussion points at the retreat.

2. BUDGET. In the past, the Bren School has been able to use funds from open faculty lines to support many of its activities. Now that it has filled these positions, it faces a number of new budget challenges. The FEC spent a great deal of time this year analyzing current and prospective budgets, providing advice to the Dean on the prioritization of lecturer and staff positions and development activities, and exploring the potential adoption of a supplemental fee for the Master of Environmental Science and Management (MESM) program.

3. JUNIOR FACULTY MENTORING. The FEC designed a new mentoring process for new faculty. Under this process, a senior faculty member is assigned to a junior faculty member and is available to answer questions about procedures at the Bren School and to provide advice on the tenure and promotion process and other career matters.

4. STAFF AWARD. The FEC instituted a new award to recognize the accomplishments and contributions of the Bren School staff. The Staff Award will be given each year during our commencement ceremony to a distinguished staff person, complementing existing student and faculty teaching awards.

5. FTE PLANNING. The FEC led this year’s FTE planning process, producing the Bren School’s FTE Planning Report. As part of this process, the FEC led a faculty retreat on February 10, 2017, to prioritize future hires. The faculty agreed that its greatest need is in the area of Corporate Environmental Management and plans to search for a new faculty member in fall 2017. Other priority areas include environmental economics, conservation ecology, and several continuing lecturer positions.

6. CHANGES TO BY-LAWS. The FEC made changes to the Bren School By-Laws to allow the Dean to appoint a Chair and Vice-Chair of the Academic Personnel Committee, subject to approval of the FEC. Additional revisions were made to clarify the role of the FEC Chair.

7. RETREAT ON MESM SPECIALIZATIONS. The FEC worked with the MESM Program Committee to organize a faculty retreat on MESM specializations on May 5, 2017. All students in the MESM program must select a specialization and complete related coursework. The retreat focused on standardizing and streamlining the specialization requirements.
8. MEDS PROGRAM. The Bren School, in collaboration with other departments on campus, is pursuing a new graduate program called the Master of Environmental Data Science. The FEC provide input and guidance on the new program at various times during the year.

9. FEC MEMBERS + ELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS FOR 2017-18. The FEC conducted a secret ballot of the faculty to elect new members for next year.

Members of the Faculty Executive Committee: Andrew Plantinga, Chair, Arturo Keller, Jim Salzman (replacement for Sarah Anderson, who is on sabbatical during Spring 2017), Ben Halpern, and Steven Gaines, Dean and ex officio.

Andrew Plantinga, Chair

Arturo Keller

Sarah Anderson

Ben Halpern
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Purpose (per 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 2016-17, the Charges Officer responded to five new complaints and continued ongoing efforts in relation to three complaints that were filed with the Senate during the previous year. The Charges Advisory Committee was consulted regarding four of the newly submitted complaints.

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

In several instances, it was determined that the Charges Officer should pursue efforts to achieve informal resolution as a potential alternative to forming an ad hoc charges committee.

Members of the Charges Advisory Committee:
Oliver Chadwick
Elizabeth Digeser
Edward Telles
Charles Wolfe

Submitted by Andrew Teel, Charges Officer
COLLEGE OF CREATIVE STUDIES FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT, 2016-2017

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 2016-17 and addressed many issues. Prominent among these were:

• A new definition of the College of Creative Studies Faculty.
• Discussion of changes to the LSOE series and its impacts on CCS students and faculty.
• Responses to multiple external queries.

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

Redefining the CCS Faculty.
After extensive discussion within CCS in the 2015/16 academic year a proposal to change the definition of CCS 'Faculty' was submitted to the academic senate (By-law 125 and Appendix 1). This was approved by the Academic senate (09 Mar 17). The FEC continued discussion of items related to this change.

Divisional regulation 200.C.5
Following changes to degree names within CCS and a review of regulations and bylaws it was noted that the Divisional Regulation outlining general requirements for degrees within Colleges needed to be updated to reflect the current degree names (Chemistry changed to Chemistry and Biochemistry and Computer Science changed to Computing). This change was approved by the FEC and subsequently approved by the Faculty legislature.

Marine Science major
A proposal to establish a new major in Marine Science was sent to the Academic Senate for review. Regular updates were provided to the FEC about the feedback from other campus committees and departments. A revised proposal will be submitted in Fall, 2017.

50th Anniversary Planning
Regular updates and discussion took place concerning the forthcoming 50th Anniversary of the College. A website was produced and a conference is planned for November, 2017. Various other events are scheduled throughout the year.
RESPONSE TO OUTSIDE REQUESTS

Proposal to establish a BS degree in Bioengineering
The proposal was discussed and the committee submitted comments.

APM revisions to Lecturer SOE series
The FEC extensively discussed the proposed changes to APM 285, 210-3, 133-0-B and 740 affecting the LSOE series. Many of the faculty most involved with CCS, coordinating the programs, teaching classes and advising students are either LPSOE, LSOE or SLSOE’s and so will be affected by these changes. In addition the college itself has very successfully used this series and hired faculty based on the current regulations. Much concern was raised about how the changes would affect both the faculty and the College. Although faculty were broadly supportive of some of the changes to the series (a change to a less obscure name and a regularization of the salary scale and issues like sabbaticals) much concern was raised over the additional requirement of significant pedagogical research that was proposed. A letter was submitted outlining the concerns raised.

Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)
Although there were no direct concerns about the policy there were concerns that resources would not be available to support the changes. The proposed changes increase the amount of work required to allow external software to be used.

ITEMS OF NOTE

- A retreat for all faculty of the College of Creative Studies was held on November 19th.
- Following a departure, a search was carried out, and successfully completed, for a new Development Officer.
- CCS held its annual science week in early November, in conjunction with Parents Weekend, with a display of research posters provided by the recipients of the 2016 Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowships, as well as other CCS students who had undertaken research projects.
- A campus wide search committee held an international search for a new Dean of CCS. A recommendation was made to the Chancellor.
- A search for a new LSOE in Math (50% in CCS, 50% in the Department of Mathematics in L&S) was successfully carried out.
- A search for a new LSOE in Computing (50% in CCS, 50% in Computer Science in CoE) was successfully carried out.
- Following faculty input, the Interim Dean and staff held discussions with CAPS about reserving time and space within the CCS building for both workshops and walk-in appointments.
- Staff members Jen Johansen and Sara Sterphone were awarded Citation of Excellence awards from the UCSB staff assembly.
- A highly successful outreach event was held in coordination with the Neighborhood Academic Initiative program at USC.
- Four FEC Commendation of Excellence awards and one CCS Student Service Award were made.
- A CCS student, Daniel Spokoyny (Computing) was a recipient of the 2016 Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and a CCS Faculty member, Professor Stuart Feinstein (Biology), was recognized with the Chancellor’s Award for
Contributions to Undergraduate Research for his mentorship of undergraduates in the research laboratory.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

**John G. Latto, Chair,** Lecturer SOE, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, College of Creative Studies  
Tengiz Bibilashvili, Lecturer SOE, Physics, College of Creative Studies  
Kara M. Brown, Lecturer Potential SOE, College of Creative Studies, Writing Program  
Maria Isabel Bueno Cachadina, Senior Lecturer SOE, Mathematics, College of Creative Studies  
Omer Egecioglu, Professor, Computer Science  
Jeremy J. Haladyna, Senior Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies  
Leroy E. Laverman, Senior Lecturer SOE, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Creative Studies  
Jane L. Mulfinger, Professor, Art  
Raisa E. Feldman, At-Large Member, Assoc Professor, Statistics and Applied Probability  
Madeleine I. Sorapure, At-Large Member, Director, Writing Program  
Claudia M. Tyler, Non-Senate Academic Rep  
Kathleen R. Foltz, Ex Officio, Interim Dean CCS, Associate Professor, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology  
Sara C. Sterphone, Consultant, CCS Student Affairs Officer  
Jennifer R. Johansen, Advisor
Executive Summary 2016-17

On the UCSB campus, the College of Letters and Science comprises 93% of the undergraduate population on campus, 79% of the senate faculty, 80% of the academic departments, and 90% of the degree programs. For the most recent year in which full statistics are available, Letters and Science provided fully 98% of the lower division courses offered on campus (96% of lower division units), and 92% of all undergraduate instruction at UCSB. The Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) provides oversight on academic matters pertinent to departments, faculty, and students within the College of Letters and Science.

The committee, comprised of two elected faculty members from each division within the College, met 16 times during the year, typically five meetings per quarter, for 2 hours each.

Policy/Regulation/Guideline Review

With a variety of other committees, the FEC is offered the opportunity to review and provide perspective on systemwide policy revisions. The committee frequently engages these opportunities to comment, as the policies and regulations nearly always impact the FEC areas of focus, namely of the well-being of departments, faculty, and students within L&S. Among the policy revisions the FEC considered in 2016-2017 were the faculty code of conduct, the policy on information security, nondiscrimination and anti-harassment policies, proposed changes to the APM pertaining to LPSOE, and oversight of the university’s international activities.

Academic Program Reviews

Maintaining excellence in College departments, undergraduate programs, and graduate education is essential for the continued excellence of the University. As such, the FEC takes its role in Academic Program Review very seriously. This year the committee provided extensive comment during the reviews of the Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Sciences (IGPMS), the Chicana/Chicano Studies Department, and the History Department.

Curriculum adjustments

Due to volume and significance, curriculum adjustments occupy a considerable amount of the committee’s attention every year. Departments and programs are encouraged to actively monitor their academic programs, and disciplinary trends are balanced against program learning assessment data, enrollment pressures, faculty expertise, and available resources. From the FEC’s perspective, curriculum adjustments and proposals for new programs must have an academic rationale that places programs within the broader context of the College. This perspective allows the FEC’s review to safeguard against changes that negatively impact other departments or that impose undue barriers to enrollment (whether intentional or unintentional). The FEC has review authority over the modification of all undergraduate programs (majors and minors) in the College. Due to the sheer volume of changes that
occur on an annual basis, modifications are triaged into those that are considered to be of a housekeeping nature (e.g., typos, course title adjustments, numbering, etc.) and those that are of a significant nature. Housekeeping changes are reviewed by divisional subcommittees (three) made up of the FEC faculty members representing a specific division (e.g., HFA), divisional Dean (or designee), and College advisor. Major changes and those flagged by the subcommittees undergo full review by the entire FEC. The FEC review is then forwarded to UG Council for final approval to ensure equitable application of policies across the three colleges offering UG degrees (CCS, Engineering, Letters & Science). Over the course of 2016-17, the L&S FEC reviewed significant changes to 25 L&S majors and minors (from 14 departments), while the subcommittees endorsed lesser modifications to another 79 programs. The FEC considered establishment of 5 new minors within the College, and potential discontinuation of one minor.

In addition to reviewing curricular changes for face-to-face courses, the FEC also reviews proposals for online courses. Unlike face-to-face courses, online courses go through significant scrutiny of the syllabus, format, assignments, and security procedures. Some of this additional scrutiny is required due to the unique manner in which student evaluation is performed. During 2016-17, approval of online courses took a significant amount of committee effort, given that only seven online courses were reviewed (vs the 730 non-online L&S courses that were processed in the same timeframe). In the end, the FEC approved all 7 online courses, 5 for an initial offering and 2 for more permanent approval (Of these seven, 6 are sponsored by UCSB Summer Sessions and 1 by UCOP’s ILTI initiative). Partly triggered by the imbalance between the amount of FEC time spent on a small number of online courses (relative to the large number of other new or modified courses), but also because it has been four years since the review procedures were initially adopted, the FEC believes that it is time to review the online course approval process in the next academic year.

Additional Curricular Matters

The FEC also considered the calculation of major GPA, an issue that has been referred to the Undergraduate Council as it has cross-college implications; approved revision of the College Honors Program; clarified the FEC position on the permissibility of completing a double-major or a major and minor housed within the same department and reviewed and approved five petitions for exception; and ruled on two proposals for an individual major.

The FEC deliberated two undergraduate grade appeals, which prompted scrutiny of the existing process. This process will continue to be scrutinized in the coming year to ensure that the grade appeal process can be executed in a timely and fair manner. The committee endorsed a Mathematics proposal designed to enhance transfer student success by adjusting requirements for transfer students to enter Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences pre-majors. At the graduate level, the FEC endorsed a proposed PhD Emphasis in Neuroengineering.

Given the potential impact on L&S, the FEC was asked to review College of Engineering adjustments to its breadth requirements, a proposal to establish a Marine Sciences major in the College of Creative Studies, and a proposal to establish a BS in Bioengineering and an associated administrative unit within COE. Additionally, the committee weighed in in favor of Priority Registration for ROTC scholarship recipients.

Recent efforts have revealed local processes or policies that could benefit from review and revision. The FEC intends to work on these through the summer and over the course of the subsequent academic
year. These include: grade appeal process, regulations for calculation of major GPA, and the online course review and approval process.

Other Activities

The committee participated in interviews of short-list candidates for the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for the Office of Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Education in the College of Letters and Science.

The Chair of the FEC is a member of the campus General Catalog Committee, which met in spring 2017. The FEC oversees the selection of the Harold J. Plous Memorial Award, and was pleased to name Terence Keel (Black Studies, History) as the 2017-18 Plous Recipient. The committee also oversees selection of other awards within the college.

2016-17 FEC committee members:

Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval, Chicana/o Studies
Jordan Clark, Earth Science and Environmental Studies
Paige Digeser, Political Science
Barry Giesbrecht, Psychological and Brain Sciences
Nuha Khoury, History of Art and Architecture
Sherene Seikaly, History

Ex officio members:

Jeff Stopple, Co-Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education
Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

We express our appreciation to them both for their insights and attention to FEC matters.

The committee was pleased to have graduate student Mary Okin join for winter and spring quarters as a representative of the GSA. Regrettably, Associated Students was unresponsive to our repeated requests for an undergraduate student representative.

FEC members serve three-year terms, in summer 2017 two senior members rotated off the committee: Nuha Khoury (HAA), who served 7 quarters as committee chair; and Jordan Clark (Earth Sci and Enviro Studies), who was committee secretary. In spring 2017 a call for nominations was sent to all L&S faculty and the following new members were elected to serve on the FEC for three-year terms:

Laurie Monahan (History of Art and Architecture) representing HFA
Bruce Lipshutz (Chemistry and Biochemistry) representing MLPS

This report is respectfully submitted by FEC Chair Barry Giesbrecht.
September 2017
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met a total of 47 times, 2 hours per session, during the 2016-17 term. All meetings were held in executive session. In addition, CAP leadership met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel throughout the 2016-17 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; promotes a fair and equitable review of such actions in accordance with campus and systemwide guidelines; and provides advice on UC and campus issues pertaining to academic personnel.

The 2016-17 academic year included the following:

- Reviewed 315 academic personnel cases (including 38 post audits of Dean’s Authority cases), resulting in 348 personnel actions in 2016-17
- Reviewed the biannual proposed revisions to the Red Binder
- Reviewed proposed changes to departmental bylaws with respect to departmental voting procedures
- 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, including proposed revisions to APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, 740 with regard to the Lecturer with Security of Employment series and suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses
- Met and consulted with the deans, the AVC, and the EVC on the academic personnel review process at both the beginning and end of the 2016-17 cycle
- Participated in orientations for department chairs and personnel analysts regarding the academic personnel review process
- Participated in Office of Academic Personnel (AP) workshops for junior faculty on the tenure evaluation process

I. Academic Personnel Actions
CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, expanded review merit advancements, and promotions. A total of 348 personnel actions were reviewed; a summary of the workload appears in Tables I and II attached to this report. CAP members recused themselves from cases from their own departments and in cases of conflict or the potential for perceived conflict of interest with the candidate. The deans continued the established practice of review of normative merit advancements and appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor Steps II and III at starting salaries within a defined range, when the recommendations of deans and departments agreed. In those cases in which salary recommendations between the respective dean and CAP differed by $4,000 or more, AVC Butler issued a Tentative Decision to one or both parties for comment. CAP conducted post audits of all Dean’s Authority merit cases and case deferrals of professors at the Assistant Professor or Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment ranks, subsequent to the actions of the deans. CAP also conducted a post audit review of all deans’ discretionary salary increases (equity, compression, and inversion), subsequent to the actions of the deans (total not included in number of personnel actions processed by CAP). Post audit reports are submitted to the AVC.

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

II. Review Committees

CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee for promotion to tenure cases in which both the dean and the department recommended tenure. In addition, CAP continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for other promotion and career reviews unless deemed necessary for fair and equitable judgment. (No such cases arose in 2016-17.) CAP convened a “Shadow CAP,” appointed by AVC Butler, to evaluate Expanded Review merit cases of current CAP members.

III. Academic Personnel Policy Issues

A number of policy issues were notable in the course of the 2016-17 academic year, some of longstanding concern. These included:

Solicitation of Extramural Letters for Appointments, Promotions, and Barrier Steps.
In a number of cases, CAP found the set of extramural letters to be inadequate. CAP (and other reviewing agencies) can and does request that additional letters be obtained in such cases, which can significantly delay case consideration. Departments are reminded to follow Red Binder guidelines in soliciting extramural letters, or to provide a compelling explanation when those guidelines cannot be followed.

Service.
As one of the four areas of review, CAP treats service (of scope appropriate to rank) as an integral component in making its recommendations. CAP thus 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

Accelerations.
Reviews conducted before normative time are an acceptable form of acceleration when accomplishments within the review period merit such consideration. Candidates and departments should note, however, there must be an accounting of all 4 review areas, including teaching and service, which are often shortchanged by an early review. Following discussions early in the 2016-17 cycle with the AVC and the deans, CAP this year evaluated
cases of acceleration to or within Above Scale rank somewhat more strictly in line with Red Binder I-43 criteria. Above Scale evaluation remains an ongoing point of discussion among the reviewing agencies.

**Salary Recommendations for New Appointments.**
CAP has a standard practice of making salary recommendations, but there has occasionally been wide divergence between CAP’s recommendations and those of departments and deans. CAP notes that Red Binder I-8-II requires that departmental recommendations for off-scale appointments include “documentation of the market conditions that justify” the proposed salary.

**Magnitude of Within Step Advancements.**
Accounting of achievements during an advancement within step, especially within the barrier steps of Associate Professor III and IV and Professor V and IX, continued to be a subject of discussion within CAP and between CAP and AP. Clarification of campus policy and practice in this regard would be useful.

### IV. Campus Issues

**Revisions to Departmental Bylaws.**
CAP received proposals from 5 departments to revise their bylaws in ways that would affect departmental voting procedures in personnel matters. As required by Senate Bylaw 55 (Divisional Bylaw 205), CAP reviewed these proposals and provided the departments with responses.

**Revisions to the Red Binder.**
The Office of Academic Personnel disseminates to all Senate Faculty and appropriate administrators and committees any proposed revisions to the Red Binder, typically biannually in the fall and spring. CAP reviewed and concurred with the proposed revisions in fall 2016 and spring 2017.

### V. Systemwide Issues

**UCAADE’s Suggestions for Future Faculty Salary Equity Analyses.**
CAP’s review of these suggestions was generally favorable but raised some concerns.

**Proposed Revised APM Sections - 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, 740.**
CAP reviewed these proposed revisions, concerning replacement of the Lecturer with Security of Employment series with a new Teaching Professor series, and recommended against their implementation.

**Informational Materials.**
CAP reviewed informational documents about ongoing systemwide discussions, as well as pertinent academic personnel approaches at other UC campuses. Informational materials included the following:

- Collective Excellence in Research at UC
- Independent Review Process (UCSD)
- Negotiated Salary Trial Program Annual Report for Year 3 (UCI, UCLA, UCSD)

### VI. Carry-over Issues for 2017-18

- Systemwide Review of Taskforce (Final) Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
- Continued discussion among reviewing agencies of areas of concern from Section III: extramural letters, Above Scale acceleration, within-step merit increases

### VII. Acknowledgments and Appreciation

UCSB’s process for reviewing faculty merit cases is complex and time-consuming, as it is designed to satisfy both UC’s tradition of shared governance and a strong desire on all sides to treat faculty across campus in an equitable and transparent fashion. The practice of having one faculty committee that looks across 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 department 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 to accommodate the rigorous demands of CAP service.

CAP thanks the Academic Senate staff, headed by Debra Blake, and its information technology staff, headed by Andy Satomi, for unfailing support, assistance, and advice in all matters. Most especially, CAP is grateful to Marlee Richter, the CAP Academic Senate staff analyst, who combines unflagging devotion to the committee's work, formidable attention to detail, and deep insight into academic personnel policy, and who manages somehow to keep a hardworking but occasionally unruly group of 13 senior faculty members happy and productive.

2016-17 Committee Members:

Cheryl J. Briggs, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology; Biomolecular Science and Engineering
James F. Brooks, History; Anthropology
Francis M. Dunn (beginning March 2017), Classics
Kimberly L. Foster, Mechanical Engineering
Sabine Fruhstuck, East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies
David A. Low, Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology; Biomolecular Science and Engineering
John W. Mohr, Sociology
Matthew Potoski, Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management
Benjamin E. Reese, Psychological and Brain Sciences
Douglas G. Steigerwald, Economics
Kim Yasuda (September 2016 - February 2017), Art
Francis Zok, Materials
Peter C. Sturman, History of Art and Architecture (ex officio, UCAP Representative)
Jon R. Snyder, French and Italian (Vice-Chair)

John R. Gilbert, Computer Science (Chair)
### Table I  Summary of All Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair and visiting professor appts)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review (Prof Above, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reviews/No Change (included in Merits total)</td>
<td>26/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II  Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees 2016-17

CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee in promotion to tenure cases in which both deans and departments recommended tenure. In addition, CAP continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for other promotion and career reviews unless deemed necessary for fair and equitable judgment (no such cases in 2016-17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</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><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of cases submitted to CAP covering 347 personnel actions: 315
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III 18-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments requiring CAP review</strong> (includes endowed chair appts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merits requiring CAP review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retentions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal appraisals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Equity Reviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Reviews/No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconsiderations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal Appointment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Waivers (prev. EOR’s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Audits of Dean’s Authority (prev. Routine) Cases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees | Variance from prior year |
|-----------------------------------------------------|
| **Number of ad hoc committees** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 6 | 16 | 18 | 21 | 29 | 37 | 52 | 52 | 46 | 46 | 67 |

Average number of cases per year based on 18-year data: 392
Committee on Committees
Annual Report 2016-17

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

This annual report is divided into four sections:

• An Introduction summarizing the scope of the Committee’s activities;
• A description of the Committee’s recruitment methods and their outcomes;
• Identification of Councils or Committees that have proven particularly difficult to fill, and;
• Recommendations for the 2017-18 academic year, including new recommendations regarding divisional committee chair and systemwide representative service.

I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE
The purpose of the Committee on Committees is to staff Senate councils and committees, and to recommend, when requested by the campus or systemwide administration, individuals or slates of individuals who might staff other committees. (Bylaw 90A.)

The Committee on Committees (CoC) conducted 18 face-to-face meetings during the 2016-17 academic year, which is typical. The Committee also conducted dozens of email exchanges throughout the year to address requests and concerns that arose between meetings. The Committee discharged its usual duties of appointing members to the Senate councils and standing committees, and recommending faculty to serve on administrative committees and specific search committees as summarized below. Based on this activity, the Committee offers several comments below regarding: i) the response to the annual Call for Volunteers and the character of the resultant volunteer pool; ii) the workloads of the various committees the CoC staffs; iii) recruitment methods and outcomes; iv) challenges; and v) recommendations for future activity.

THE VOLUNTEER POOL FOR UNIVERSITY SERVICE
As has been the case for the last twelve years, the Call for Volunteers was sent out via the Senate listserv to all Academic Senate faculty, who were invited to fill out an electronic form indicating the Academic Senate committees and councils on which they would like to serve during the 2017-18 academic year. In winter 2017, 145 Senate members responded to the call, which represents a slight increase relative to last year.1 The total number of volunteers represents only 16% of the 791 tenured, non-emeriti Senate faculty on campus. While CoC would like to see a greater percentage of faculty volunteering for Senate service and will strive to achieve this in the following years, it is not clear how to improve this beyond our current efforts, which include sending out two reminder memos, trying to better clarify the process (e.g., explain why not everyone can be placed, and even if a faculty is not placed in one year why they should volunteer again), and reaching out to deans and department chairs in divisions that are more poorly represented.

As part of its mandate, CoC tries to balance various faculty interests and personal attributes (discipline, gender, campus experience, Department/Division representation etc.). Given this the CoC found that the volunteer pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty volunteered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2017</td>
<td>145 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
<td>128 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2015</td>
<td>143 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2014</td>
<td>146 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>179 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2012</td>
<td>173 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Table of faculty who volunteered through the call since 2012
was insufficiently large and diverse, thus requiring that the CoC also solicit the participation of faculty who did not respond to the annual request for service. Details of the efforts of the Committee to fulfill its charge are as follows.

**COMMITTEE WORKLOAD**

**Senate Councils and Standing Committees.** The Committee undertook appointment of Senate members, Lecturers, Librarians, Staff, Emeriti, and Professional Researchers to the councils and standing committees as appropriate. The Committee also appointed replacements to councils and standing committees as needed throughout the year.

**Administrative Requests.** In response to 28 requests from the Chancellor’s Office, Administration and from UCOP, the Committee nominated or appointed Senate members to numerous joint Senate/Administrative committees and boards, including:

---

**Administrative Committees.** CoC recommended faculty nominees for the following administrative committees:

- Ad Hoc Charges Committee (2 requests)
- Career Development Awards Committee
- Committee on Campus Access (2 requests)
- Committee on Counseling and Psychological Services
- Committee on Faculty Grants
- Committee on Student and Faculty Conduct
- Cybersecurity Working Group (2 requests)
- Design Review Committee
- Healthy Campus Network Steering Committee
- Hellman Faculty Fellowship Committee
- Income and Recharge Committee
- Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Board
- Ocean Road Project Committee
- Program Review Panel (2 requests)
- Summer Sessions Faculty Advisory Board

---

**Search Committees.** CoC nominated Senate members for search committees, including the following:

- Design and Construction Director
- University Librarian

---

**UCOC Requests.** CoC nominated Senate members for the following UCOP systemwide appointments, including the following:

- Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ASCOLI)
- Committee on Code of Conduct for Trade Licensing
- Editorial Committee (2 requests)
- Laboratory Science Undergraduate Admissions, Area D
- Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)
- UC Santa Cruz and UC San Diego Chancellor Reviews

---

**University Committee on Committees.** The UCOC appoints the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of all system-wide Senate committees as well as the general membership of all other Senate committees that report to the Assembly. Professor Stuart Sweeney, who chaired CoC, also served as the Committee on Committee’s representative to the UCOC for the 2016-17 academic year. Professor Sweeney participated fully in UCOC activities and, with the assistance of CoC, nominees from UCSB are well represented on systemwide committees in the coming year.

---

**General recruitment activity.** The Committee was mindful to maintain—and when possible to increase—the diversity of the membership of standing and administrative committees. CoC was attentive to the balance of
various factors including the gender and ethnic representation of committee members, as well as to diversity in disciplinary and professional backgrounds. The Committee made a special effort to invite recently tenured faculty into university service, as well as those who had recently joined UCSB’s faculty. In addition, the Committee aimed to engage senior faculty whose service had lapsed or who were otherwise overdue to participate in UCSB’s governance.

**Divisional Election System to the Committee on Committees.** The CoC continues to endorse the divisional election system to the Committee on Committees, with positions delegated to the Sciences and Engineering, Humanities and Fine Arts and College of Creative Studies, and Social Sciences and Education. This structure serves the Committee and the campus well by ensuring that faculty who are familiar with each of these broad areas serve on the Committee.

**II. RECRUITMENT METHODS AND OUTCOMES**

During the 2016-17 academic year, CoC used the Call for Volunteers distributed by email to all UCSB faculty as the primary method to identify and to recruit faculty members who would be willing, qualified, and eligible to serve on Academic Senate councils and committees during the 2017-18 academic year.

Highlights of the major outcomes and considerations are as follows:

i. **A total of 135 faculty** are required to fill the minimum membership in all of the Academic Senate councils/committees. In any given year, however, the majority of members are continuing their service as the expected term on most councils and committees is three years.

ii. **For the 2017-18 academic year, the CoC filled 69 vacancies among the academic senate councils/committees;** on several committees, we provided more than the minimum number of members necessary when this was requested by a Chair and agreed upon by CoC.

iii. **A total of 145 faculty** responded to the Call for Volunteers solicited by UCSB’s Academic Senate, either offering their service on one or more particular committees or expressing a general interest in campus governance. This response was slightly increased from last year; during the prior year, for example, 128 faculty members volunteered.

iv. **Of the 145 faculty who volunteered, 51 were placed on committees, most often the committee or council listed as their first or second choice.** CoC could not place some volunteers because of the need to produce gender balance, ethnic diversity, disciplinary expertise and balance, professional background and/or Departmental or Divisional balance. In a few cases an initial appointment was made, but the timing of the committee meetings conflicted with faculty’s teaching schedule. Consequently, the *Committee needed to recruit 18 additional faculty members* who were not among those who volunteered to fill vacant positions.

**III. CHALLENGES:**

**Filling Committees**

The CoC tracked the percent of invitations to fill vacancies that were accepted on each of the Academic Senate committees and councils and took note of those that appeared to be the most difficult to fill. Often, these are committees that seem to have the reputation of requiring the greatest workload. In Table 1, below, for each council or committee we list the number of vacancies, requests for service, and the percent of requests accepted. In Table 2, we report by department the number of faculty available to serve, the number of volunteers and additional requests, and the number assigned to councils or committees. From those values we calculate what we term the *excess service burden* for each department. On average over the past five years approximately 20% of faculty serve on Senate committees or councils each year. As expected service level we use the integer part of 0.2*FTE; essentially the service burden expected if all departments chip in equally. *Excess service burden* is then calculated as the difference between the observed service level and expected service level. Positive values indicate departments providing more than 20% service, values near zero reflect service levels near expectations, and negative values reflect lack of service. We note two points of caution in interpreting the table. First, *excess service burden* = Number of faculty serving - floor (0.2* FTE).
burden is perhaps a misnomer. While departments with positive values are contributing more than 20% to service, it also means they are availing themselves of the opportunity to have more voice in Academic Senate governance. Those same departments likely promote a culture which views service as an opportunity not a burden. Second, the values in Table 2 only reflect part of the service commitment of a department since it only records Academic Senate service. There are many other ways in which faculty serve the campus and UC system beyond the Academic Senate committees and councils.

In Table 2, we provide the excess burden for the prior year and the average excess service burden over the past five years (2012-13 to 2016-17). The list of departments is sorted in order of highest excess burden to lowest excess burden. This provides a quick reference to see which departments are relatively service-minded and which departments seem to rely on other departments to carry their service load. In discussions with department chairs, the departments near the bottom of the list with negative averages should be encouraged to create a climate more willing to engage in academic senate service Table 3 summarizes the number of Faculty members serving in the Senate by College and Division.

The CoC encourages the Academic Senate to continue to track the rate at which invitations to join these committees are declined and to evaluate how best to recruit and fill positions on Senate committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th># of vacancies filled for 2016-17</th>
<th># of new members who volunteered through the call</th>
<th># of new members who were recruited independently</th>
<th># of requests to serve accepted</th>
<th># of requests to serve declined</th>
<th>% of requests accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFIA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (elected)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCGE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAERS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UgC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Department FTE (active, non-emeriti)</td>
<td>Number of faculty who volunteered through the call for volunteers</td>
<td>Number of faculty who declined CoC-initiated requests to serve</td>
<td>Number of faculty serving on Senate committees for 2017-18</td>
<td>Excess Service Burden</td>
<td>Mean Excess Service 2012-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German &amp; Slavic Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish &amp; Portuguese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Management Program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; Hearing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/a Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Clinical &amp; School Psychology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts &amp; Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bren School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomolecular Science and Engineering Program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology, Evolution &amp; Marine Biology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular, Cellular &amp; Developmental Biology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
Distribution among Colleges and Divisions for faculty serving on Senate committees for 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College and Divisions</th>
<th>Total eligible FTE (tenured, non-emeriti faculty)</th>
<th>Number of faculty serving in 2016-17</th>
<th>Percentage of Senate Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Creative Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical, Life &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gevirtz Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Clinical, &amp; School Psychology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Filling Committee Leadership Positions

In last year’s annual report, we noted that COC was dealing with the ongoing challenge of filling leadership positions. We suggested the reluctance to taking on chair academic senate committees/councils is a function of the growing workload burden especially the combined impact of chairing a local committee while also serving as the UCSB representative to the systemwide committee/council. The proposed partial solution was to consider decoupling the chairing and systemwide representation duties.

The COC reviewed the issue throughout the past year. The most extreme workload was the combination of CAP chair and UCAP representative. In consultation with current CAP leadership, past CAP leadership, and the Academic Senate President, COC created a new policy whereby in two-year cycles the immediate past chair of CAP will become the UCAP representative for two years. This means that every other year the CAP chair will rotate off with no further duties. The benefit of this plan is that the CAP chair can focus fully on managing the “firehouse” of academic personnel case reviews. The UCAP representative will have the experience of having managed that case load but will be able to fully engage and focus on policy issues discussed at UCAP. The UCAP representative will report on regular intervals to CAP and will also additionally engage as needed with the CAP chair. This plan also has the virtue that the system-wide expertise is not lost at the end of each year and this should provide UCSB with a stronger voice in policy discussions.

After reviewing other academic senate councils and committees, we did not find any similar basis to force a formal policy change. We did however approach the problem of finding chairs and system-wide representatives with more flexibility. This isn’t only a workload issue but also represents work-life balance issues for many faculty given the unique burden for UCSB faculty to attend system-wide meetings in Oakland. Overall, allowing greater flexibility and decoupling chair/system-wide representative when warranted should serve to increase the pool of available talent.

### Diversity

CoC actively recruited women and faculty of color to Senate committees in order to advance the Senate’s interest in ensuring diversity on its standing committees. The number of women and underrepresented minority faculty on campus, however, remains relatively small. As a result, fulfilling Senate diversity needs requires calling upon
women and minority faculty at rates often far higher than their proportional numbers on campus placing additional burdens and risks upon these faculty. These risks are compounded by the fact that in addition to Senate needs, faculty of color and women (especially in the sciences) also often experience higher service demands—both visible and invisible—in other domains in which higher than average demands are often placed on them for mentorship, letters of recommendation, and project participation with students and colleagues. The desire to balance the diversity needs of the Senate with the disproportionate demands already placed on minority and women faculty continues to be a challenge of great concern to CoC this year. Senate progress in responding to this challenge should continue to be actively monitored in future years.

A second concern regarding diversity and workload is focused on disciplinary diversity. Specifically, CoC seeks to staff committees and councils with approximately equal representation from HFA, Math and the Sciences, Engineering, and the Social Sciences. Faculty numbers in Engineering and the Social Sciences, however, are significantly smaller than those in MLPS and HFA (Table 3), rendering such balancing difficult without unduly burdening our Social Science and Engineering colleagues with Academic Senate service.

Workload Factors
CoC is mindful of differential teaching loads among the Divisions when it approaches faculty for requests to serve in the Senate. We understand that establishing a general system for course relief related to service on, at the very least, CAP, which is the most demanding Senate committee service, has been discussed and heartily support this move.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUED OR NEW PRACTICES
CoC suggests that the following practices be continued in 2017-18:

i. During the fall of each year, members of the CoC are each assigned one or two committees for which they assume the primary responsibility, following consultation and discussion with CoC members at the regular meetings.

ii. CoC members should contact the Chairs and the Staff Analysts of each council/committee for which they are responsible to help identify any special needs or concerns regarding current or future council/committee membership.

iii. Every year CoC members will initiate contact with Chairs from half of the departments. Departments that have particularly poor service records should be contacted every year. The chair and CoC member will have one or more conversations or meetings to identify faculty available and willing to serve on committees, particularly those who may not regularly respond to the Academic Senate’s online Call for Volunteers. Contact with Department Chairs will help CoC identify faculty members who, to their knowledge:
   • are ready or overdue for campus- or university-level service
   • are not at a critical point in their academic career (e.g., being considered for tenure) that would make service difficult
   • are available (not in a leave status) to serve during the academic year
   • are not expected to be heavily committed to campus service as Center Directors, incoming Department Chair, Program Directors, etc.
   • are eligible for service because they will not be engaged in high-level administration (e.g., service in the Offices of the Divisional Deans, EVC, Chancellor, etc.)

iv. Each year department Chairs will be requested to remind their faculty (e.g., at faculty meetings) of the importance and value of Academic Senate service, and service in general to the campus and to the University of California. The importance of service in relation to merit and personnel reviews will be emphasized to department faculty, department Chairs, and all reviewing bodies.
v. When necessary to achieve disciplinary balance on committees the Chair of CoC will contact individual Deans or departmental Chairs to request help in soliciting volunteers from the relevant unit.

vi. The Call for Volunteers should be evaluated on a regular basis in order to solicit responses that include faculty skills, interests, and preferences for council/committee service.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

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

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

Summary of CDE activities over 2016-17
There were a total of eight meetings of the Committee over the 2016-17 term. CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were: 1) Diversity training for faculty hiring committees; 2) Faculty Salary Equity Study; 3) Proposed Revisions to APM 015 and 016, and Conforming Amendments to Senate Bylaw 336; 4) Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM-015.

CDE discussed these topics at length (incorporating input from meetings with non-Committee campus stakeholders who made presentations to CDE) and shared its recommendations with Academic Senate Chair Henning Bohn when appropriate. Topics and recommendations are briefly described below.

Reviews of Systemwide UC Issues

Proposed Revisions to APM 015 and APM 016, and Conforming Amendments to Senate Bylaw 336 and Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 336 - Second Round Review
In October, CDE reviewed the proposed revisions to Sections 015 and 016 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and Senate Bylaw 336. While CDE had no objections to the changes, members voiced a few specific comments. With regard to APM 015, the committee supported the explicit addition of sexual violence and sexual harassment and agreed that there should be “no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation.” However, CDE suggested that it should be made explicit that the complainant need not still be at UCSB at the time a report is made. CDE also questioned the rationale of allowing the Chancellor up to three years to initiate disciplinary action after an allegation is officially reported (Part III-A-3). CDE wondered if the three-year allowance to initiate disciplinary action is too long a period of time.

In April, CDE participated in a second round review of revisions to Senate Bylaw 336. CDE’s comments on the last round of revisions were sent to the Academic Senate and compiled as part of the UCSB Divisional Response. CDE was pleased that the three-year time frame for initiating disciplinary action was clarified to begin at the time the Chancellor is deemed to know about the alleged violation, not from the time of the alleged incident. The second concern CDE brought forth from the first round of review was not addressed. The Committee suggested that it be made explicit that the complainant need not still be at UCSB at the time a report is made.

Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities
In October, CDE reviewed the draft Presidential Policy on International Activities. Members of CDE voiced concerns around issues related to sexual harassment, sexual violence, and all other forms of harassment and discrimination. In particular, the committee sought clarification regarding the scope of the University’s jurisdiction over international activities covered under the policy. Members wondered whether UCSB faculty, students, and staff were subject to the University’s policies (i.e., Faculty Code of Conduct, Student Code of Conduct, etc.) while participating in these approved programs, and what happens if UC’s policies are in conflict with the host institution’s policies or local laws. The committee noted that the draft included language such as “All partners must work with faculty, students, and staff to ensure compliance with all applicable UC and partnering site policies, and all applicable statutes, regulations, standards, and guidelines in the U.S. and in the site country”. However, CDE was concerned that “applicable policies”, for example, was not sufficiently clear for issues surrounding harassment, discrimination, or sexual violence. Question 7 in the Frequently Asked Questions section might also partly address these issues, but the committee recommended further clarification.

Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM-015

In November, CDE reviewed proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action in the Workplace and Section 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 015). Overall, CDE supported the proposed changes, agreeing that they represent an appropriate expansion of the policy with improved language regarding harassment and increased compliance with Title VII (of the Civil Rights Act of 1964).

Members expressed concern about the lack of clarity regarding the corresponding campus implementation guidelines, although it was understood that each campus was to develop its own procedures. In addition, the committee recommended that the references to a “fair, timely, and thorough investigation” be more specific and should be uniform across all campuses. (For example, the Policy on Sexual Violence & Sexual Harassment specifies an investigation period of 60 working days.) CDE also sought clarification regarding the references to “medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics)” in Section III-A of the presidential policy and Section II-C-5 of the APM. It was not clear if this meant “including cancer-related or genetic characteristics” or if it applied only to these two situations. If the former, then CDE recommended the addition of the word “including,” and if the latter, CDE recommended striking the phrase “medical condition” and the parentheses.

Proposed Revised Regents Policy 3101 and 3104 Regarding Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)

In November, CDE reviewed the proposed revisions to Regents Policy 3103 & 3104 regarding Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. The proposed revised policy would incorporate Regents Policy 3104 (Principles Underlying the Determination of Fees for Students of Professional Degree Programs) into a revision of Regents Policy 3103 (Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition). The committee took particular note of Display 3: Percentage of Underrepresented Students Receiving Graduate Professional Degrees at UC and at Other AAU Public and Private Universities, 2013-14, which indicated that the UC compares favorably in several areas (education, medicine, health sciences) but appear to underperform in law and business. The committee had no objection to the proposed policy changes.

Proposed Revised Presidential Policy Business and Finance Bulletin (BFB) - G-28, Travel Regulations

In January, CDE reviewed and endorsed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Travel Regulations: Business & Financial Bulletin (BFB), Section G-28. The Committee supported the efforts to make the University of California more “family-friendly”. Committee members were concerned that the policy seemed to focus on University administrators and Athletics staff, and did not address faculty
members and travel for scholarly activities. Concern was also expressed regarding the reference to “clerical” support of a spouse or domestic partner, which sounded outdated.

**Proposed Revised APM Sections- 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, 740**
In May, CDE reviewed the proposed APM revisions concerning replacement of the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series with the Teaching Professor series. Members had concerns about equity for current LSOE, arising from the new emphasis on teaching innovation and the enhanced emphasis on scholarly activity and achievement proposed in the requirements for advancement within the Teaching Professor series (APM 285 and APM 210-3).
Members discussed the increased emphasis on scholarly activity and achievement and the new emphasis on teaching innovation in the Teaching Professor series risks imposing an undue, infeasible workload burden.

An additional concern was that in response to these new guidelines for merit advancement and promotion, outstanding and prolific teachers (in particular, current LSOE) may feel pressured into attempting counterproductive changes in teaching practices in order to demonstrate innovation and/or engage in counterproductive “check the box”-type scholarly activity. The policy does not explain how the increased course load would affect these faculty and their ability to carry out scholarly activity. CDE was also unsure how these changes would affect the academic personnel review process.

CDE also suggested that language paralleling APM 210-1-d on credit for efforts to promote diversity and equity should be added to APM 285, as such language is already present in the revised APM 210-3.

**Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)**
In June, CDE reviewed the revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3). The Committee found the proposal confusing, and were perplexed by the vacillation between sections that referenced very specific, technical policies and sections in which the policy was extremely vague. The Committee had overarching questions that pertained to the entire revised policy. Who would over-see the policy implementation on each campus, and within specific campus units? How would the policy be implemented and carried out? Who would represent the faculty? Members were concerned that faculty interests were at risk in the policy, specifically related to the responsibilities laid on research PIs. Who would ensure that faculty have the campus support they will require?

**University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) Free Speech Discussion**
Chair Gwinn attended the April UCAADE meeting, which centered on issues of free speech. The conversation was initiated by the graduate student representative, spurred by the Milo Yiannopoulos incident at UC Berkeley. There was conversation about free speech versus hate speech, and the underlying principle that hate speech is protected under the First Amendment. The Committee discussed ways that UC could enforce principles (like hate speech is an opportunity for more speech), not policy, as there is legally not a way to stop hate speech from happening on campuses. The Committee requested that more information be provided to employees about their rights when speakers demean groups of people during a speech, talk or protest on campuses. UCAADE also asked campus leaders to develop and disseminate more overarching information to students, faculty and staff about their rights amid free speech/hate speech concerns.

**University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) Meeting with UC President Napolitano Regarding Faculty Diversity**
Chair Gwinn attended the May UCAADE meeting which included a consultation with UC President Janet Napolitano. President Napolitano commented that UC is making some progress in hiring more diverse faculty, but that she has the responsibility to do more. The discussion between UCAADE and President Napolitano yielded suggestions for ways to improve faculty diversity, such as providing Deans and
Department Chairs incentives and rewards for diversity hiring; providing FTE for two positions when two candidates that are beneficial for diversity are found; and finding ways to reward schools and departments that meet their pipeline diversity goals ahead of schedule.

**Reviews of Campus Issues**

**Diversity Training for Faculty Hiring Committees**
The topic of diversity training, diversity self-assessments and diversity credit as part of academic personnel cases was discussed throughout the year. CDE had multiple consultations with campus constituents, and spent many meetings discussing the type of diversity training they wanted to recommend to the campus. A recommendation memo was created at the end of the year for distribution to administrators, and this topic will continue as an item of business for the 2017-18 year.

In October, the committee discussed two diversity-related issues regarding the hiring of academic personnel: diversity statements in faculty appointment advertisements and diversity training for faculty hiring committees. Regarding faculty hiring ads, UCSB’s statement was described as more “aspirational” as compared to other statements which use stronger language. Director of the Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention Office and Ex-Officio member of CDE Ricardo Alcaíno shared UC Irvine’s statement, which he believed is stronger. CDE wondered what the process would be at UCSB for changing this campus’ hiring statement.

With regard to training for faculty hiring committees, it was noted that some campuses require diversity training for faculty search committees (e.g. Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, and San Francisco). UCSB offers training, but does not require it. While the committee agreed that UCSB should require some type of diversity training for faculty hiring committees, it was also noted that training works best when the department requests it and when there is a higher level of “cultural literacy” to start with.

In November, Director Alcaíno shared a presentation from his office, comparable to the training that his office offers for department chairs and hiring committees. Following Mr. Alcaíno’s presentation, the committee discussed whether or not it wanted to recommend that this training be made mandatory for all faculty search committees. CDE questioned whether UCSB has the staff available to accommodate the need, should the training be required. It was noted that other campuses that require such training have greater office support to provide it. In particular, other campuses offer training through offices comparable to UCSB’s Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity Equity, & Academic Policy, but at UCSB this office has minimal support staff for the AVC. CDE also wondered whether the training should be mandatory for the entire committee, or only the committee chair or department chair. The committee agreed to revisit this issue for further discussion and action at a future meeting.

During the winter quarter, CDE held consultations with Marlee Richter, the Academic Senate analyst who staffs the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), and Professor John Gilbert, Chair of CAP. Ms. Richter was invited to meet with CDE to discuss CAP’s implementation of APM 210-1-d, which addresses assigning credit for diversity in privilege and tenure (P&T) cases. CDE was provided data over the last two years (2014-15 and 2015-16) showing how many P&T cases submitted the optional Diversity Self-Assessment, and how many were awarded credit for diversity in their review. CDE wondered how CAP determines whether diversity work is “above and beyond” faculty members’ regular responsibilities and deserving of extra credit in personnel cases. Additionally, members wondered about the numbers of faculty who applied for, but did not receive, credit for diversity work, as only information about those who received credit was in the report. It was suggested that CAP Chair John Gilbert be invited to discuss this further.
Chair Gilbert was invited to meet with CDE in order to delve deeper into how CAP implements APM 210-1-d. Chair Gilbert explained the CAP review process, and that CAP’s role is advisory only; the Committee cannot decide Academic Personnel decisions. CAP uses the Red Binder (UCSB Campus Policies & Procedures for Academic Personnel) as its guide as CAP reviews each case. Members assess each faculty dossier in terms of the four service areas: teaching; research; professional activity; and university and public service. CAP can only take into account information that is presented in the dossier; members cannot do any independent research, even for clarification.

CDE then proceeded with a discussion around the Diversity Assessment and CAP’s implementation of APM 210-1-d. Members had questions about what is considered “above-and-beyond” diversity work. Members discussed the idea of “hidden work” for faculty of color, and how a service a faculty member would provide for any student could potentially be emphasized as diversity work in the right context. Finally, CDE and Chair Gilbert discussed ways that departments and the university could help faculty members emphasize their work with diverse populations better, such as asking department chairs to write about specific instances a faculty member has gone above-and-beyond with diverse populations; emphasizing the importance of the diversity statement; and consulting Academic Personnel for possible changes to their policies in order to credit the various kinds and levels of diversity work that faculty do. Chair Gilbert was unable to provide numbers at that time on how many faculty applied for the diversity credit and did not receive it.

After these consultations, CDE further discussed the issue of whether training for faculty search committees should be made mandatory. The committee reviewed and approved a draft memo to Academic Senate Chair Henning Bohn. The committee recommended that diversity training be made mandatory for all faculty search committees, including chairs and members of the committees as well as the chairs of departments that have active searches underway. CDE noted that other campuses that require such training may have greater office staff support to provide it. CDE recommended further discussion about whether this training should be provided through the Office of Equal Opportunity & Prevention Discrimination or the Associate Vice Chancellor’s office. CDE also recommended consideration of various different models of training: for example town hall meetings vs. focused training for individual search committees.

In spring quarter, CDE continued to work on a final proposal recommending mandatory diversity training. One of Chair Gwinn’s priorities was to make sure the proposal contained exactly the recommendations the Committee wanted, and that the ideas were well developed, before distributing it to Deans, Vice Chancellors and other campus leadership. The Committee spent the spring quarter meetings discussing the aspects of training they felt were most important to include in the proposal.

The final recommendations in the memo included having the Office of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention lead the trainings; establishing a committee of faculty experts to oversee evaluation of the training and also work to develop Faculty Equity Advisors; recommending that faculty complete the training every three years; that different modes of delivering the training will be necessary, but to make them interactive and engaging; and that materials other UC campuses have already developed be consulted for best practices. The Committee decided to distribute the memo to campus leadership over the summer and solicit feedback and best practices that could be incorporated into the on-going discussion the 2017-18 Committee on Diversity and Equity Chair will lead.

Faculty Salary Equity Study
In September, CDE learned that in response to concerns and recommendations expressed by CDE last year, the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) David Marshall invited CDE member Kyle Lewis to join the Faculty Equity Study committee. In particular, concerns were expressed about the reliance on age (birth year) as a predictor variable in the analysis. The hope was that a more nuanced set of predictor variables (like that used in the Berkeley report) will provide a more useful analysis. Kyle Lewis would report back progress made in the Faculty Equity Study committee.

In January, members reviewed the recommendations from the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, & Equity (UCAADE) for best practices for future campus analyses of faculty salary equity on the basis of gender, sex, and ethnicity. Kyle Lewis presented a draft memo from CDE in response to UCAADE’s recommendations. CDE supported UCAADE’s recommendation that all campuses use the same methodologies regarding faculty salary equity reviews. In addition to answering UCAADE’s list of questions, CDE also agreed on several points and recommendations to include in the final memo.

CDE proposed that the University Office of the President (UCOP) retain professional experts to implement and further develop UCAADE’s distillation of current best campus practices; clarify the ways in which the outcome of analyses will be used to remedy salary inequities; that equity adjustments should not be limited to rank and step only; and that any analysis must recognize that service is far more holistic than participation on Academic Senate committees. Members also emphasized that underrepresented faculty, including women in the physical sciences and engineering, may experience disproportionately heavy service loads related to UC’s diversity and equal opportunity goals, which should be taken into account.

In response to questions put forth by UCOP, CDE highlighted that UCSB continues to operate with significantly reduced staff compared to before the 2007-8 financial crisis, an issue not unique to UCSB. Any new effort that requires additional staff or faculty time presents a new burden that will be difficult to accommodate without further diminishment of quality in core efforts. CDE also noted that a meaningful salary equity analysis is a complex undertaking. UC should engage leading experts to develop an equity analysis package for efficient use across UC campuses. This is not something to delegate to ad-hoc committees.

**Clare Boothe Luce Program**

In September, CDE discussed the possibility of UCSB participating in the Henry Luce Foundation’s Clare Boothe Luce Program. The program offers grants to universities to provide support for women faculty in science, mathematics, and engineering. Grants are made to four-year degree-granting institutions, and preference is given for support of women in the physical science and engineering fields in which women are the most underrepresented (e.g., physics, computer science, mathematics, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, etc.). CDE agreed to send a memo to the Executive Vice Chancellor as well as Barbara Walker, Director of Research Development in the Office of Research, who actively seeks out these types of grant opportunities. In addition, it was suggested that the committee also work with Beth Schneider, Director of the McNair Scholars Program to discuss other similar opportunities.

At its next meeting, CDE approved a memo to the Executive Vice Chancellor requesting an initiation of an application to this program. The memo was finalized on November 17, 2016, and sent to the Academic Senate leadership. After receiving no reply, Chair Gwinn made email inquiries in March 2017 and learned that the memo had not yet been sent. This oversight was corrected and the memo was sent on March 10, 2017, after the deadline for submission to the Clare Boothe Luce Program.
• Continuing the discussion about diversity training for faculty hiring committees. A final memo was approved in June 2017 to be distributed to senior level administrators for consultation.

• Continuing clarification on why faculty might apply for and not receive diversity credit in academic personnel reviews, and how above-and-beyond diversity work should be presented when this type of work is a faculty member’s area of emphasis.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

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

Executive Summary

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

During the 2016-2017 academic year, CIE

- Provided review of Memorandums of Understanding with international institutions
- Considered at length UCEAP’s Registrar’s Database project and how best to use this resource, including review of UCSB EAP Director Juan Campo’s proposal for pre-approval of General Education course credits (based on the UCSB Registrar’s Database) for courses taken abroad
- Reviewed Interim Co-Dean of Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple’s proposal for an international distinction through the Honors Program
- Implemented the 4th biennial survey of international undergraduate students; analysis of the results to be distributed in fall 2017; responses to results and committee recommendations considered for 2017-18
- Reviewed systemwide policy concerning UC international activities and policy concerning UCIE

International Agreements

Memorandum of Understanding – Universitat D’Alacant
CIE endorsed a new international agreement between the UCSB Department of Spanish and Portuguese and the Universitat D’Alacant’s ISIC-IVITRA that will also involve the UCSB Comparative Literature Program. The MOU proposes a collaboration in which the Department of Spanish and Portuguese will be able to offer five new courses taught by a member of the ISIC-IVITRA. These classes will focus on the language and culture of Catalan with an emphasis on Mediterranean and Transatlantic Studies. The Comparative Literature Program also supports the MOU as it will enhance the Program’s Translation Studies emphases.
Memorandum of Understanding – Oxford University (renewal)

The Committee reviewed and endorsed a renewal of the MOU between the UCSB Materials Department and its Cooperative International Science and Engineering Internships Program (CISEI) and Oxford University’s Department of Materials Science. The MOU has been in effect since 2006 and provides for an exchange of undergraduate students: two Oxford University students attend summer UCSB CISEI internships, two UCSB students receive a mentored research internship at Oxford University.

Survey of International Undergraduate Students

This year, CIE conducted its 4th biennial survey of international undergraduate students in February 2017. The survey was commissioned by the Academic Senate, carried out by the Office of Budget and Planning, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (IRPA), with support from the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor. The online questionnaire was distributed via email to 1,753 undergraduate international students, of which 457 completed the survey, resulting in a final response rate of 26.07%. The survey results were analyzed by a graduate student in the Communications Department and further comparative analysis continued over the summer. The final report will be distributed in fall 2017. Current overall findings are highlighted as follows:

- 58.5% were satisfied or very satisfied with their overall academic experience at UCSB, although comparative data indicates a significant decrease since 2011, when 84% reported they were satisfied or very satisfied.
- Undergraduate international student demographics were 76.5% Chinese, 2.6% Japanese, 2.4% Hong Kongers, 2.4% Taiwanese, 2.0 South Korean, 1.8 Indian, with all other nationalities being less than 1% each.
- 74.1% of respondents were admitted as freshman and 25.9% were admitted as transfers.
- Approximately two-thirds of students were enrolled in the College of Letters & Science: Division of Social Sciences (34.6%), Division of Mathematical, Life, and Physical Sciences (36.8%).
- 44.2% of international students reported being satisfied or very satisfied with their overall social experience at UCSB. Comparative data indicates a decline in this area. In 2011, 71.7% stated that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their opportunities to make friends. However, only 62.3%, 51.1%, and 44.6% of respondents in 2013, 2015, and 2017, respectively, were satisfied or very satisfied with their opportunities to make friends.
- 41.2% agreed or strongly agreed that students of their background are respected on campus, although 13.8% indicated they had been verbally insulted, physically threatened or received unequal treatment because of their race, ethnicity, nationality, or religion.
- The most common issues that respondents had difficulty getting help with were academic difficulties (36.5%), registering for classes (35%), English language skills (23%), and handling stress (20.6%).
- Although the 2015 and 2017 survey results varied slightly, only two of these differences were statistically significant. Between 2015 and 2017, the percentage of respondents who have participated at least once in a student club and organizations decreased from 47.4% in 2015 to 39.4% in 2017. Similarly, the percentage of respondents who have used Career Services decreased from 75.9% in 2015 to 58.7% in 2017.
- In addition, three primary factors emerged as significant, positive predictors of respondents’ satisfaction with their overall academic experience at UCSB: English language proficiency, the availability of general education courses needed to graduate, and the frequency with which the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) met their needs.

CIE will consider the findings and analysis of the survey in fall of 2017. The Committee will disseminate findings and will seek engagement from campus stakeholders to formulate a campus response.

Details of the survey results and Committee recommendations will be finalized in the Committee’s Report on International Undergraduate Students at UCSB 2017, which will be available upon request from the Academic Senate.
**Informational Items**

**UCEAP Updates**

In fall 2016, UCEAP Associate Dean Hsiu Zu Ho updated the CIE regarding UCEAP’s Academic Integration (AI) Project, which is broadly defined as the comprehensive integration of UCEAP programs and courses into the curricula of UC campuses. Two goals of AI are further engagement and investment of academic units in study abroad and reduction of barriers to participation in UCEAP for students in all disciplines. To this end, UCEAP developed individual searchable databases of courses previously taken abroad and the type of credit they received; the historical information of these databases offer a basis to consider pre-approvals for particular courses taken abroad. UCEAP AI and dissemination on campus of the UCSB Registrar’s Database has been the impetus for recent campus discussion regarding pre-approval of general education credits for courses taken abroad.

**UCSB Extension Report 2015-16**

UCSB Extension reported a strong decline in 2015-16 international enrollment in Open University. There was a notable decline in Brazilian and Norwegian enrollment due, respectively, to the closing of a program and the lack of desired course availability. Waning enrollment resulted in a 48% drop in revenue share for Open University to academic departments on campus. Continued decline in Open University international enrollment is expected in 2017-18.

**Local Issues**

**Proposal for Pre-Approval of UCEAP Courses at UCSB**

Juan Campo, Director of UCSB EAP, introduced a proposal advocating UCSB’s implementation of a UCEAP General Education (GE) course pre-approval process, using the UCEAP Registrar’s Database as a resource. The pre-approval process seeks to benefit students by removing uncertainty of GE credit and provide an improved Study Abroad experience. CIE was informed that several campuses including UC Davis, UC Santa Cruz, UC Berkeley, UCLA are participating in this initiative. CIE endorsed the proposal with the suggestion of a pilot program. This issue is currently under review by other Senate committees.

**UCSB EAP-Honors Program Joint Proposal for a Capstone Honors Program**

Interim Co-Dean of Undergraduate Education, Jeffrey Stopple, introduced a proposal for an EAP Capstone Honors Program, which would create a transcripted recognition of “International Distinction” for students who complete a yearlong study abroad. CIE holds continued interest in the possibility of such a program and in giving further input as appropriate. CIE’s response to the proposal noted the proposed “International Distinction” should require a significant additional academic component, comparable to that of other undergraduate Honors programs.

**Systemwide Issues**

**Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities.**

CIE reviewed the Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities that updates the 2005 Guidelines for the Establishment of Foreign Affiliate Organizations and Foreign Operations. The policy covers all international activities of UCSB faculty, staff, and students, not just those covered by agreement, and further expands its guidelines to include broad issues of ethics, risk, compliance, and campus autonomy as well as clarification regarding levels of approval authority. The Committee did note specific concerns about how issues might be addressed concerning legal and/or ethical guidance in the absence of international laws for any activities that might otherwise have been regulated within the US, which was included with the Divisional response.

**Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 182 – University Committee on International Education.**

CIE reviewed the proposed changes to the systemwide Senate Bylaw 182 that expands the charge of UCIE to a broader range of international topics and activities. UCIE’s current bylaws only cover faculty governance of student exchange programs associated with UCEAP, which is no longer the principal expression of international activity. The most notable change in the bylaws is the change of UCIE’s role from oversight to advisory. The Committee was in concurrence with the proposed changes but some concern was expressed about whether or not some ambiguous wording in the revisions could affect authority at the divisional level.
Coordination with Administration

Donna Coyne, Associate Director, UCSB Office of Admissions
The Associate Director was consulted regarding current practices for admissions language assessment of international students and related concerns of faculty.

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.

Hsiu-Zu Ho, Associate Dean, UC Education Abroad Program
The Associate Dean of UCEAP informed the Committee of UCEAP’s Academic Integration Project, and specifically, of the UCSB Registrar’s Database. The Database is a 5-year record of courses previously-taken abroad by EAP students and the type of credit they received. There are currently individual databases for seven out of the nine UC campuses.

David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor, UCSB
The Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor provided continued support for CIE’s biennial survey of international undergraduate students.

Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS)
The Director of OISS is a frequent attendee of meetings and is a valuable resource to inform CIE of current trends within the international community on campus.

Jeffrey Stopple, Interim Co-Dean of Undergraduate Education
The Interim Co-Dean of Undergraduate Education consulted with CIE regarding the creation of an international distinction (transcribed) through the UCSB Honors Program.

Carry-over Issues and Future Initiatives

- Survey results distribution
- International student housing (I-House)
- Campus resources for international students
- Future CIE Workshops, with a focus on discussing survey results with stakeholders
- Peer mentoring program in coordination with OISS
- Mental health needs of international students
- More engagement in academic oversight of EAP; invite UCEAP Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director to speak on operational and programmatic aspects of UCEAP
- Monitor needs of international scholars and visiting faculty
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

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

During 2016-17, P&T responded to 3 grievances. P&T members who served on the hearing committee for a disciplinary case that was heard at the end of the previous year finalized and submitted their recommendations to the Chancellor.

Along with other Senate groups, P&T responded to proposed changes to APM 015, APM 016 and Senate Bylaw 336.

P&T Chair Adebisi Agboola represented UCSB on the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

2016-17 Members:

Sarah Cline (Spring)
Nancy Collins
Michael Gurven (Spring)
Eckart Meiburg (Fall, Winter)
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Adebisi Agboola, Chair
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 Faculty staff processed the following proposals during 2016-17.

**Proposed Amendments to College of Letters & Science Faculty Executive Committee Bylaws**
RJE was asked to review proposed amendments to the College of Letters & Science Faculty Executive Committee Bylaws. The proposed changes would ensure broadest representation of the faculty, by allowing no two members from the same division of the college to be from the same department to serve on the Faculty Executive Committee, and would codify the three-year term of service. RJE agreed that the amendment provided clarity, and had no objections. At its meeting of October 20, 2016, the Faculty Legislature approved the changes to the College of Letters & Science Faculty Executive Committee Bylaws.

**Proposed Revision to College of Creative Studies Bylaw 125**
RJE was asked to review proposed revisions to the College of Creative Studies Bylaw 125, to redefine the faculty of the College to better represent its actual composition. RJE asked for some slightly revised wording. RJE reviewed and supported the revised changes to the College of Creative Studies Bylaw 125 and Appendix I. The Faculty Legislature approved these changes at its meeting of March 9, 2017.

**Proposed Modification to College of Creative Studies Divisional Regulation 200.C.5**
RJE was asked to review proposed modifications to the College of Creative Studies Divisional Regulation 200.C.5, updating details regarding the majors in the College. Specifically, the name of the department of Chemistry and Biochemistry was not correct, and the name of the Computing major in the College of Creative Studies had not been updated. RJE unanimously voted to approve the revisions. At its meeting of March 9, 2017 the Faculty Legislature approved the changes to the College of Creative Studies Divisional Regulation 200.C.5.

**Proposed Revisions to the Bren School Bylaws**
RJE was asked to review proposed changes to the Bren School Bylaws. There were extensive revisions proposed, to make editorial changes and the terminology used consistent. Substantive changes including voting procedures, graduate student representatives, and the role of the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee were also proposed. The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviewed and approved the proposed changes to the personnel committee voting procedures. RJE provided the Bren School with recommendations for clarifications and edits. The Bren School revised their Bylaw changes according to RJE’s suggestions. RJE reviewed and approved the revised modifications to the Bren School Bylaws. The Faculty Legislature approved the Bren School Bylaw changes at its meeting of June 8, 2017.

**2016-17 Divisional Election**
In consultation with RJE, the Academic Senate Office conducted its annual nomination process in an effort to seek candidates for the election of three Senate Assembly Representatives, and four members of the Committee on Committees.
Senate Assembly Representatives
A total of six faculty members were nominated for the position of Senate Assembly Representative; three nominations were declined or did not receive the requisite number of endorsements. As there were three open positions, a ballot was not conducted. Professor Bjorn Birnir, of Mathematics; Susan Cassels, of Geography; and Eric Matthys, of Mechanical Engineering received the requisite number of endorsements and were appointed to serve as Senate Assembly Representatives.

Committee on Committees
A total of four faculty members were nominated to serve on the Committee on Committees; two nominations were declined or did not receive the requisite number of endorsements. Two candidates were nominated, accepted the nomination, and received the requisite number of endorsements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thuc-Quyen T. Nguyen, Chemistry and Biochemistry</th>
<th>Area A: College of Letters and Science Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences Division and Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudio Fogu, French and Italian</td>
<td>Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two open positions, listed below, were filled by Committee on Committees appointment, effective September 1, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David E. Berenstein, Physics</th>
<th>Area A: College of Letters and Science Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences Division and Donald Bren School of Environmental Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivier Deschenes, Economics</td>
<td>Area B: College of Letters and Science Social Sciences Division and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members, 2016-17
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Paul M. Leonardi  Professor, Technology Management Program
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Hugo A. Loaiciga  Professor, Geography
Executive Summary

Per bylaw 60, the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards (CFIA) is tasked with studying and making recommendations on any matter of interest and welfare of the campus community, and rewarding excellence in research and teaching.

Meetings

CFIA held nine regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year, and consulted with relevant campus administrators regarding issues within its purview. General issues and concerns are summarized below.

System-Wide Issues and Reviews

All system-wide issues CFIA responded to are listed below. Issues that CFIA reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included. Summaries are included for issues that CFIA was especially concerned about or played a central role in shaping the Senate’s response.

- Draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Policy
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy Business and Finance Bulletin (BFB) -- G-28, Travel Regulations
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM - 015
- Proposed revisions to Bylaw 182. University Committee on International Education
- Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 190, Appendix G, Program Description: Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary (APM -190, Appendix G)
- Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)

After reviewing and discussing the IS-3 revisions, CFIA members agreed that the policy is difficult to follow due to the highly technical language and the heavy use of acronyms. This combined with an insufficient glossary rendered the document inaccessible for most nontechnical readers. The council also found the policy to be overly broad, and it was unclear how it would impact campus members on a daily basis. While CFIA agreed that it is important that the UC have a strong electronic security policy in place, the Council did not support this draft of the Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3).

The Cybersecurity Working Group (CSWG), which is housed under CFIA, was also asked to review the IS-3 revisions. CSWG expressed concerns similar to CFIA, and was also wary of how the policy would impact specific types of data and data protection such as research data related to the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. While the group expressed the concerns noted above, overall CSWG supported the Revised Presidential Policy of Electronic Information Security (IS-3).
• **Proposed Revisions to APM 015, The Faculty Code of Conduct; and APM 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline; and Conforming Amendments to Senate Bylaw 336, Privilege and Tenure—Disciplinary Cases**

The Council reviewed the proposed revisions, which specifically add sexual violence and sexual harassment to the Faculty Code of Conduct as an unacceptable form of conduct. Overall, the council supported the revisions and amendments. However, there were some concerns about the three-year timeline for the Chancellor to deliver notice of disciplinary action, as it seems prolonged. Some CFIA members were also concerned that the proposed revision stated: “There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation,” as it may leave an opening for an accusation that occurred many years ago and evidence would potentially become more difficult to gather over time. Other members noted there are cases in which victims needed a longer amount of time to recover from trauma and act on reporting a violation, and were not concerned with the lack of a time limit. Finally, the council noted that existing policies on sexual violence and harassment may not have been followed in the past. Some council members suggested that it may be helpful to provide additional education on these issues to faculty beyond the mandatory Sexual Harassment Prevention course, and that the existing training course may need to be modified to reflect the proposed revisions.

• **Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities**

The Council reviewed the draft of the Presidential Policy on International Activities, and suggested that certain terms and areas needed clarification. CFIA noted that it was unclear how “risk” and “political unrest” (p. 15/53, Section V.C) would be defined or determined. Overall the Council was unsure what social, cultural, or political backgrounds led to this policy draft, but they were not opposed to the existence of such a document. However, the Council felt that if there are certain activities that are a concern to the UC then they should be explicitly stated in the policy. In addition, CFIA noted that some faculty conduct research on social and political unrest and were concerned that this policy would interfere with their academic freedom.

• **Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, and 740**

CFIA reviewed the proposed revisions and found a few revisions to the APM to be positive. However, overall, the Council did not support the proposed revisions for several reasons.

First, CFIA felt that the proposed revisions to change the title Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) to “Teaching Professor” creates a blurring of the distinction between Teaching Professor and the Professor Series (ladder faculty), and the professional responsibilities of each group. While the Council agreed that the title of “Teaching Professor” lends a degree of dignity and recognition to LSOEs, it does so at a cost.

The Council was concerned that, if approved, the new revisions will automatically transfer current LSOEs to the new Teaching Professor series. That moves the goalposts. LSOEs are currently hired primarily to teach undergraduate courses, and they carry a significantly heavier teaching load than ladder faculty because they are expected to focus on teaching. Currently, APM 285-10, cites teaching, professional achievement and activity, and University and public service as criteria for appointment and advancement. The proposed revision adds a requirement for scholarly achievement (research). This places an unnecessary burden on the current group that would have potentially negative ramifications on their ability to be promoted. Some LSOEs may not be interested in conducting research or publishing in their fields, but wish to focus on teaching. The Council found it unreasonable to suddenly impose scholarly achievement (research) on LSOEs in the interest of streamlining practices across UC campuses.

If the revisions to the APM were adopted, the Council strongly recommended that current LSOEs have the option to opt-out of the title change, and that the changes would be required only for newly hired...
“Teaching Professors.” Alternatively, with the transfer, the Council recommended that current LSOEs have an MOU with all reviewing agencies that the criteria for their advancement and promotion will follow the current criteria, not the new criteria. This MOU would be included with all merits and promotions.

In addition to the concerns on how these changes may negatively impact LSOEs, CFIA was also apprehensive about the long-term impact these changes would have on the ability of the university to acquire funds to hire ladder faculty and the danger that poses to the research mission of the university. By changing the title of LSOEs to “Teaching Professor” it would appear that the UC has suddenly gained many new professors, and would be able to hire more “professors” to carry heavier teaching loads at lower salaries than ladder faculty. With continued pressures to cut state funds to higher education, and increasing numbers of undergraduate students that the UC is required to enroll each year, it would be very tempting to hire more “Teaching Professors” to address these demands. The Council was not convinced that the Chancellor’s ability to place a quota on the number of “Teaching Professors” would be enough to counter the economic and political demands to hire more “professors” at lower salaries.

CFIA felt that the push, if real, to hire more “Teaching Professors” due to economic and political pressures would be further exacerbated by a lack of understanding of the distinction between ladder faculty and “Teaching Professors.” The general public, and most of our own students, would likely not understand the difference between the two titles, but would simply recognize the professorial title. UC is a system of research universities, and ladder faculty are expected to conduct innovative research and make significant contributions to their fields in addition to their teaching and service commitments. The likelihood of decreasing numbers of ladder faculty, and increasing numbers of “Teaching Professors” would erode the research mission of our university.

While CFIA did not support the revisions overall, the Council did find positive aspects in a few of the revisions. One positive would be the dignity that the new title would carry, and the ability of people outside of the UC system to recognize the role of LSOEs (Teaching Professors). The Council also supported the idea of allowing LSOEs (Teaching Professors) to take sabbaticals for the purpose of teaching development and catching up on publications to help them remain current in their field. However, some council members felt it was unclear why these periods needed to be classified as “sabbaticals” rather than the current language of “leave with pay.”

Local Business

- Faculty Housing

CFIA continued to discuss faculty housing issues during 2016-2017, a topic that was also addressed during the 2015-2016 year. CFIA’s concerns focused on waitlist procedures, waitlist transparency, and affordability (buying and renting) of university-owned housing. During the December 2016 meeting John Gaffney (Faculty Housing Coordinator, Faculty Housing) and Liana Decierdo (Financial Analyst, Residential Services) met with CFIA to discuss the availability of rental housing on campus. They noted that there are two locations where faculty can choose to rent: West Campus Family Housing and Sierra Madre. The Sierra Madre complex has 36 total units, and at the time of the meeting, 12 were currently available for faculty rental. While there are a few units in the West Campus Family Housing complex that are set aside for faculty rental, using those units for faculty means there are fewer units for students with families. Many faculty choose to rent in West Campus Family Housing because the rental prices are significantly lower than Sierra Madre.

Housing waitlist procedures were addressed during the February 2017 meeting when Cindy Doherty (Director of Academic Personal) provided CFIA with faculty housing waitlist procedures. Director Doherty gave some historical background on how waitlist priorities and procedures have been handled in the past. By the time of Phase II development, the Housing Authority shifted to a new waitlist model in which interests, priorities, and desired price range were surveyed among the people on the waitlist.
Subsequently, a pre-approval process was conducted, and offers were made only to those whose needs and priorities were congruent with the available units. Faculty on the waitlist may receive a maximum of two offers, which are based on survey results. The intention of this approach was to be more effective in making offers. Unfortunately, many faculty were confused as to why offers were not based on waitlist number order.

The Council expressed concerns about the transparency and clarity of the waitlist, and made two suggestions. First, a public document should be created that outlines waitlist protocols and makes the waitlist available to everyone, with the understanding that it is a living document that will change based on numerous variables. CFIA requested that if the Housing Authority creates such a document that CFIA be given the opportunity to review the draft before it is released to the campus community. Second, at the time of recruitment offers the Housing Authority should provide pricing estimates so recipients know what to expect.

Finally, CFIA continued looking into the availability of 40-year Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) loans. MOP loans are offered by the UC Office of the President (UCOP), and the availability of the loans on individual campuses is at the discretion of the Chancellor. Currently, UCSB does not offer 40-year MOP loans. However, after looking into the potential risk and liability involved with the 40-year loans, it was determined that the risks are not as substantial as previously thought. The Council agreed that 40-year MOP loans would benefit junior faculty and their financial well-being. Chair Awramik conveyed CFIA’s recommendation to Senate Chair Bohn, Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall, and Chancellor Yang during a Senate Faculty Legislature meeting.

- Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom met three times during the 2016-2017 academic year, with one meeting per quarter. The campus experienced a number of academic freedom issues including student groups inviting controversial speakers to campus, and threatening calls and emails directed at faculty members in the Feminist Studies, Political Science, and History departments.

In addition to local events, the Ad Hoc Committee also discussed system-wide issues including a course on Palestine at UC Berkeley that was cancelled and subsequently re-opened. Milo Yiannopoulos’ visit to UC Berkeley led to wide-spread protests, and some rioting (broken windows, etc.). The Committee discussed best practices for how our campus should handle these types of speakers and how we can support our students. The Committee suggested that it would be helpful to hold alternative events during these times and to provide additional education for our students regarding academic freedom and what constitutes free speech vs. hate speech. They also reviewed UC Academic Freedom’s Statement on the Free Exchange of Information, which addresses the recent incidents, the importance of free speech for all community members, and how to best handle these visits.

The committee also reviewed the UC Academic Freedom Committee’s response to the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, which refers to an act passed by the United States Senate in December 2016 that encourages the Department of Education to use the definition of “anti-Semitism” found in the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism of the Department of State. This definition is extremely vague and would be used in any Title VI investigations at educational institutions that receive federal money. This act would pose a serious threat to academic freedom and free speech as any discussion or debate related to topics including, but not limited to, Palestine, Israel, and Zionism could easily be labeled as anti-Semitic. The committee also reviewed and endorsed the UC Academic Council’s Statement on the Free Exchange of Information, which addresses the recent incidents, the importance of free speech for all community members, and how to best handle these visits.

Finally, given the number of academic freedom concerns during the 2016-2017 year, and the anticipation that these will increase in the future, CFIA and the Ad Hoc Committee agreed that the standing Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (CFWAF), a subcommittee of CFIA,
should be re-established for the 2017-2018 year. CFWAF will replace the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom. CFIA’s incoming Chair for 2017-2018 has put a strong group together to populate this committee.

- **Childcare Availability and Affordability on Campus**

During the 2014-2015 academic year CFIA began to address concerns about childcare on campus. Specifically, the Council focused on the need for more childcare for young children, the exorbitant cost of childcare relative to faculty salaries, and the affects these factors have on faculty recruitment and retention. CFIA completed a comprehensive report with recommendations in June 2015, which was given to Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall for review. EVC Marshall gave a positive response to the report, however, progress on the issue has been slow. As of June 2017, the latest updates were that the Chancellor had tasked Development to work on raising funds for a new center. EVC David Marshall is also expected to put together a joint Senate/Administration Task Force on Childcare as CFIA requested in their June 2015 report, but the group has yet to be established. Finally, the Director of the Children’s Center has agreed to give some thought to how the waitlist functions for the centers. Concerns regarding childcare availability and accessibility on campus is an ongoing issue for CFIA that will continue in 2017-2018.

- **Policy on Recording of Courses**

CFIA became aware of concerns that there is not a policy on campus related to the recording of courses and lectures on campus. Faculty have been encouraged to include statements on course syllabi regarding the recording of their courses; however, without a policy in place those statements are difficult to enforce. In consultation with Senate Chair Bohn, CFIA drafted a policy, which is modeled on an existing policy at UC Berkeley. Representatives from CFIA met with Margaret Klawunn (Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs) and Katya Armistead (Dean of Student Life and Activities) to discuss the draft and how to move forward in making the draft a campus policy. Vice Chancellor Klawunn was supportive of the draft and wanted to consult with the Office of Judicial Affairs as they would be responsible for enforcing any policies related to student conduct. The Council will continue to work on this issue in 2017-2018 as there are many steps left in the process including review by Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Office of Judicial Affairs, Nancy Hamill (campus attorney), Faculty Legislature, and Executive Council. Additional reviews by other entities may also be necessary.

- **Campus Video Camera Surveillance**

In fall 2016 Administrative Services established an ad hoc group to create policy addressing privacy, management, signage, and storage issues related to video surveillance cameras on campus. Vice Chair Fumerton represented CFIA on the ad hoc group. There are currently 314 surveillance cameras on campus installed by numerous parties including Administrative Services, the Library, convenience stores, housing, the Art Museum, and individual departments. However, there is no way to monitor who is putting cameras up, why they are putting them up, how the cameras are maintained, and who has access to the data collected. The ad hoc group is working to formulate a policy to address those concerns and to create an application that would need to be filled out prior to installing a camera.

CFIA is concerned about over-surveillance on campus and the current lack of oversight in this area. In addition to the issues outlined about, the Council also noted that signage needs to readily visible with all cameras so people are aware they are under video surveillance. CFIA will continue to follow this issue during the next academic year.

- **Cybersecurity Working Group**
The newly formulated Cybersecurity Working Group met four times during the 2016-2017 academic year. They have discussed issues including the campus email migration, campus video surveillance, ransomware, and how to effectively maintain the security of UCSB’s network when infected and vulnerable devices are identified. In addition, they looked into ways the Cybersecurity Group could better educate the campus community about cybersecurity and maintaining security on their devices. The group decided that two-factor authentication (2FA) and using a password manager were the most critical areas where education was needed on campus. Chair Clarke and committee member Giovanni Vigna planned to collaborate over the summer to create a two-minute google video focused on 2FA. Chair Clarke plans to draft an email to send out to faculty and students during the first week of fall quarter that will stress the importance of security check-ups and 2FA. The email will also include the google video on 2FA.

- **Senate Awards**

Four committees reviewed nomination packets for Academic Senate awards for research, teaching, and mentoring. Award guidelines were updated in 2015-2016, and the changes included that the teaching and mentoring awards would require a 200-500 word statement be submitted with the initial nomination. This change led to a considerable reduction in nominations during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 award cycles. The table below outlines the number of nominations for each award per academic year. The awards process is an ongoing issue for CFIA and the Council will continue discussing ways to make the awards process more effective during the 2017-2018 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DTA Senate</th>
<th>DTA Non-Senate</th>
<th>DTA Total</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- **DTA** - Distinguished Teaching Awards
- **OTA** - Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards
- **GMA** - Graduate Mentor Awards
- **FRL** - Faculty Research Lecturer (beginning in 2010, nominations were held on file for two additional years)

**Carry-Over Issues**

- **Senate Award Nomination Processes**

CFIA will review the nomination processes during fall quarter and assess whether further updates are needed.

- **Policy on the Recording of Courses**
There are a number of steps that the draft policy will need to go through before it can be put into place at UCSB. The Council will continue working on moving the draft through the approval process.

- **Campus Childcare Accessibility and Affordability**

  Although CFIA produced its report on childcare in June of 2015, EVC Marshall has yet to establish a taskforce to address the issue. The Council will continue to follow this issue during the 2017-2018 term.

- **Understaffing in Academic Departments**

  Academic departments experienced a significant reduction in staff during the 2008 recession, and many departments have not recovered from the reduction. As a result, some faculty are taking on administrative tasks that would typically be covered by staff. Concerns about understaffing were brought up in 2016-2017, and CFIA may look into the issue next year.

- **Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (CFWAF)**

  Members of CFWAF have been selected and it will replace the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom. CFWAF will likely seek a formal name change to remove the “faculty welfare” portion of the name as this is already in CFIA’s title. The committee, and CFIA, want to change the title to Committee on Academic Freedom.

- **Step/Merit Increases**

  Current policy allows faculty to receive only two merit (salary) increases per step. This is a relatively recent change to the Red Binder, and penalizes faculty by preventing salary increases (beyond two increases) unless they move up a step. CFIA would like to look into changing this policy.

- **Active Service - Modified Duties**

  The policy is unclear and there is minimal information available in the Red Binder. The policy needs to be standardized, readily available, and consistently applied across all departments. CFIA would like to see guidelines established and is interested in working with Academic Personal to help write the guidelines.
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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:

- Council participated in the academic program review of four academic units.
- Council studied FTE plans from each department and college / division, met with the Deans about their unit’s FTE needs, and made recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor about new FTE allocations.
- Council reviewed several campus-specific proposals, including proposals to establish new centers and new degree programs.
- Council considered 13 requests for Academic search waivers (formerly, Exceptions to Open Recruitment) and one request for an interdepartmental FTE transfer.
- Council reviewed eight proposals to establish endowed chairs.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 21 regularly scheduled sessions (six in fall, seven in winter, and eight in spring).

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

II. Academic Program Reviews

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

1. Department of Chicana & Chicano Studies
2. Department of History
3. Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Science
4. Department of Mechanical Engineering

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Engineering (Mechanical Engineering); Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (History); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Marine Science); and Social Sciences / Education (Chicana/Chicano Studies). As per the review procedures, in fall quarter CPB reviewed the data notebooks and submitted a list of suggested questions to the Program Review Panel (PRP) for consideration by the respective External Review Committee (ERC). In winter quarter the CPB chair (or designate) attended a luncheon with the External Review Committee. In spring quarter, CPB reviewed each of the ERC reports and department responses and provided further comments.

When asked to provide recommendations for the PRP reviews for 2018-19, CPB suggested the following units for review (in priority order):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Unit</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Writing Program</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economics</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mathematics</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cluster review:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• German &amp; Slavic Studies</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• French &amp; Italian</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparative Literature</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, CPB also recommended that the following units be considered for an internal review:
- Latin American & Iberian Studies
- Exercise & Sport Studies
- Military Science

Response: Five academic units were selected to be reviewed for the 2018-19 cycle: Department of Chemical Engineering; Department of Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology (EEMB); Media Arts & Technology Program; Department of Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology (MCDB); and the Writing Program. Four units had previously been selected for review in 2017-18: Education; English; Global Studies; and Physics.
III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

In November 2015, a revision of UCSB’s *Campus Policies & Procedures on Academic Personnel* (section VII-1 of the “Red Binder”) changed “Exceptions to Open Recruitment” (EORs) to “Search Waivers.” Under the current policy, departments may request an open recruitment search waiver for three reasons, in the absence of an approved FTE or an existing open search: 1) the hire of a spouse or domestic partner in order to hire or retain a Senate faculty member; 2) an “exceptional opportunity” to hire “an individual who has qualifications that are so uniquely outstanding as to justify the waiver...” or 3) for a President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship recipient.

CPB reviewed 13 requests for search waivers from the following departments: Black Studies / Feminist Studies, Economics, English, Chemical Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Environmental Studies, Mathematics, Mechanical Engineering, and Physics. The Council supported 11 of the requests, offered its qualified support of the joint request from Feminist Studies / Black Studies, and withheld its support for the request from Mathematics. Of these, five were for partner hires, four were based on exceptional opportunities, one was for a President’s Postdoctoral Fellow, and three were to make a second offer from one open search. The EVC approved all of the requests except the one from Mathematics. Requests for a second offer from an open search were considered an administrative review when the department or Dean already had another FTE that had been approved to use for the appointment; and in those instances, CPB was notified but not consulted.

CPB reviewed one request for an interdepartmental FTE transfer, to permanently transfer .25 FTE from the Department of Black Studies to the Department of Sociology. CPB endorsed the request.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB’s *Policy on Endowed Chairs*, CPB was consulted on eight endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the conformity with the academic mission of our campus. Council reviewed the eight endowed chair proposals and submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Office of Academic Personnel:

1. **Feinberg Chair in Theoretical Physics**: The Carl P. Feinberg Endowed Chair in the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP) would be established through a gift of $1.2 million and would be administered by the Director of KITP to support a faculty position in order to promote “scholarly activities including, but not limited to, new initiatives and programs, public outreach and research that will enhance the reputation and stature of KITP....”

2. **Gerngross Chair in Computer Science**: The John & Eileen Gerngross Endowed Chair in Computer Science would be established by a gift of $250,000 from Mr. John E. Gerngross, with a matching gift of $250,000 from Klaus Schauser, for a total of $500,000.

3. **La Kretz Center Administrative Endowed Chair**: The La Kretz Chair at Sedgwick Reserve is an administrative endowed chair to be established by a gift of $1 million from Linda Duttenhaver and her father, Morton La Kretz.

4. **Mehrabian Chair in Engineering**: The Mehrabian Endowed Chair in Engineering would be endowed by a generous gift of $500,000 from Robert and Victoria Mehrabian. The Mehrabian Chair would support a faculty position with a majority appointment within the College of Engineering and be administered by the Dean of the College of Engineering, with a term of the appointment for a five year period.

5. **Mehrabian Chair in Materials**: The Mehrabian Endowed Chair in Materials would be endowed by a generous gift of $500,000 from Robert and Victoria Mehrabian.

6. **Norris Presidential Chair in Earth Science**: The Robert M. Norris Presidential Chair in Earth Science would be established with a combination of gifts from the Helen & Will Webster Foundation, Professor Doug Burbank, and other donors to the UC Santa Barbara Foundation in the amount of $500,000, and
matched in an equal amount by the Presidential Match for Endowed Chairs fund.

7. **North Hall Chair III in Linguistics:** The North Hall Chair III in Linguistics would be endowed with a campus commitment of $500,000 along with the potential for additional gift funds for naming rights to the endowed chair. This is the third of four North Hall Chairs created “to acknowledge the crucial role that Black students played through the very effective takeover of North Hall in 1968 that led to the establishment of the Black Studies Department and the Center for Black Studies.”

8. **Troxel Family Chair in Theoretical Physics:** The Troxel Family Chair in Theoretical Physics would be endowed by an extremely generous gift of $1 million from Douglas and Deborah Troxel, and support UCSB’s program in Theoretical Physics.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2016-17 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). In an attempt to receive consistent information from the Deans to help facilitate the FTE review process, CPB submitted a memo in November to Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall with suggestions for information to be included in FTE plans. The EVC’s call for academic FTE plans was sent to the Deans in December, and it included an appended list of guidelines which incorporated feedback from CPB. Departmental and Deans’ FTE plans were made available to CPB in spring quarter. CPB spent a great deal of time in winter and spring quarters consulting with Deans regarding their visions for their college / division. CPB reviewed the departmental and Deans’ FTE plans from the three divisions of the College of Letters & Science; the College of Creative Studies; the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; the College of Engineering; and the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management.

Specific recommendations resulted from extensive discussions over spring quarter, beginning with the various subcommittees, and then moving into integrated discussions of the whole Council. The Council considered individual requests from the departments and programs, the recommendations of the Deans, and the collective knowledge base of the members of CPB (in which members were careful not to advocate for individual departments and divisions). CPB’s deliberations culminated in recommendations to the EVC of ranked lists of FTEs within each college/division (see memo of June 23, 2017), although CPB did not offer a ranking across the divisions. Based upon either compelling department requests and/ or synergies across programs, and in some cases overwhelming student demand, in a handful of cases council’s recommendations moderately revised the order of Deans’ recommendations. Keeping in mind that each field has different research and teaching practices, CPB seeks to balance the support of our research excellence with the strengths of our liberal arts program for our students across all areas of campus.

**Bioengineering B.S. Degree and Administrative Program**

In February, CPB reviewed a proposal to create a B.S. degree in Bioengineering and establish an associated administrative program. CPB acknowledged numerous benefits to the campus that would result from the creation of this Program, including the educational benefits of the major as well as the nucleation of our broader bioengineering efforts toward the formation of a Department. CPB recognizes the many positive aspects of the proposal that leverage existing campus resources such as broad faculty interest, the new Bioengineering building, and the Center for Bioengineering (CBE). Members of the Council also recognize that the formalization
of the Bioengineering Program might also eventually help to resolve long-standing issues with the BioMolecular Science & Engineering Program (BMSE) that were brought up in its latest external review.

Overall CPB found the proposal well-justified and bioengineering an important area for expanding scholarship and instruction for the campus. While CPB was excited by the potential of campus and programmatic growth, the resource intensiveness of the proposal raised a host of planning and budgetary issues that require consideration prior to a campus investment of this magnitude. CPB recognized that many of these considerations are beyond the control of the proponents and as such structured its response so as to identify the audience to the comments were targeted: EVC, Dean of the College of Engineering, Dean of Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences (MLPS), or the proponents of the proposal.

College of Creative Studies BA degree in Marine Science

In March, CPB reviewed a proposal from the College of Creative Studies (CCS) to establish a BA Degree in Marine Science. CPB initially discussed this proposal in January, at which point the Council had questions about the teaching load of the lecturers in CCS. CPB has completed its review after receiving more information from Interim Dean Foltz. CPB supported the creation of the new major, but expressed concerns regarding the issue of resources.

CPB found the proposal to be academically sound and congruent with the academic plan of the college. The proposed major is solid and will be attractive, especially given the strength of UCSB in Marine Science. Based upon the requirements and advising approach of other CCS majors, this comprehensive plan is well thought-out. Making available an “interdisciplinary oceanic education” comes at a very opportune moment and will enhance our campus’ profile in this critical area. The resource request seemed in line with the CCS norm; and CPB agreed that as long as the campus has the resources to expand CCS, this is a great direction to move.

While Council supported this proposal, CPB offered several comments and concerns which should be addressed before the major is given its final approval by the campus. First, given the proposal’s very strong emphasis on oceans and the environment, CPB questioned why Bren and the Environmental Studies Program did not figure more prominently in participation in the proposed major. CPB agreed with the recommendation of Dean Wiltzius that these two units should be asked to comment on the proposal, either offering their endorsement or not. Second, CPB noted that the cognate department for the second half of the proposed lecturer (LPSOE) is undetermined; presumably, this is because of the need for flexibility in hiring. However, CPB suggested the workload should be examined carefully at the outset to make sure that the demands of the cognate department on the 50% time do not overwhelm the new hire. Lastly, Council expressed concerns regarding the potential for impacted courses (particularly computer science) within other departments and suggested that it would be worth exploring whether it would be possible to organize the hire in a way that the LPSOE would teach some IGPMS linked classes on a regular basis in the cognate department.

Draft 2016 Climate Action Plan (CAP)

In November, CPB reviewed the draft 2016 Climate Action Plan (revised November 8, 2016). CPB was pleased to see that UCSB would be making a substantive effort to reduce greenhouse gases through its implementation of the revised Climate Action Plan (CAP). The update of the 2012 plan to meet President Napolitano’s 2014 commitment that UC will become carbon neutral by 2025 is a challenging goal that will require all UCSB stakeholders to collaborate closely in the planning process and in implementation.

CPB recognized that the Climate Action Plan is only a framework upon which to build and that further details need to be developed. However, there were several areas where CPB felt that the current lack of specificity is quite problematic and needs to be made explicit before the CAP details can be developed. In addition, the process by which decisions are made and the metrics that will be used need to be open, thoroughly vetted by all constituents, and more fully researched. In particular, CPB expressed concern about the following three aspects of the financial plan: 1) the plan’s financing and the proposed Green Revolving Fund (GRF); 2) the possible “carbon tax” that could be levied on departments and other financial units; and 3) the purchase of carbon
offsets which could potentially represent 50% of UCSB’s greenhouse gas reduction. The Council also proposed a number of suggestions for consideration by those who prepare the next details for CAP implementation.

Review of Campus Design & Construction Services

In October, CPB was pleased to learn that an external review of UCSB’s Campus Design & Construction Services would be taking place. Council wrote to Marc Fisher, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, requesting participation in the review by including a member of CPB appointed to the Campus Review Team. In response, members of CPB and other faculty were invited to participate in a faculty panel to meet with the external reviewers.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2016-17 term:

Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and Senate Bylaws

1. **APM 015 & 016 and Senate Bylaw 336.** In October, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to Sections 015 and 016 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) regarding the Faculty Code of Conduct, and Senate Bylaw 336, regarding privilege and tenure hearings. CPB had no objections to the proposed changes. CPB did not opine during the second round of review of Bylaw 336 in spring quarter.

2. **APM 190, Appendix G Retirement.** In October, the Council also reviewed the proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), Section 190, Appendix G on retirement contributions for summer salaries. CPB reiterated the reservations about the changes to the retirement system for new hires that were voiced last year. However, given these changes, CPB had no concerns about the proposed revisions to APM – 190, Appendix G.

3. **Proposed revisions to LSOE series in APM.** In spring quarter, CPB reviewed proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) which would make changes to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. The proposed revisions are in the following sections: 285; 210-3; 133-O-B; and 740. CPB fully supported the proposed changes in title to the “Teaching Professor” series, agreeing that this would be a desirable improvement to the nomenclature, thereby making it easier to recruit excellent lecturers. However, CPB was firmly against the proposed changes to APM 210-3-d-2, which would revise the Professional Achievement and Activity criteria for evaluating lecturers in privilege and tenure cases. In CPB’s estimate, the proposed changes were incompatible with the shared understanding (by current lecturers as well as the overall faculty) of the role and responsibilities of Senate lecturers, and CPB asked that the current language in APM 210-3-d-2 be retained.

4. **Senate Bylaw 182: International Education.** In October, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182. CPB had no objections to the proposed changes.

International Activities Policy

In October, CPB reviewed the draft Presidential Policy on International Activities. CPB had no objections to the proposed policy.

Regents Policy 3103 & 3104: Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)

In January, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to Regents Policy 3103 & 3104 regarding Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). The proposed revised policy would incorporate Regents Policy 3104 (Principles Underlying the Determination of Fees for Students of Professional Degree Programs) into a revision of Regents Policy 3103 (Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition).
Since our campus has only one program covered by this policy, CPB felt this would have little to no impact on UCSB’s financial picture. Nonetheless, CPB commented that PDST programs are critical to all of UC’s professional schools (medical, dental, nursing, law, business, etc.) and have a significant financial impact the UC system as a whole. CPB believed this policy change is by-and-large a good one with reasonable expectations/protections for return-to-aid for lower income students. While CPB also agreed with the allowance for Regental approval of a multi-year plan for graduate professional degree programs charging PDST, the Council suggested that the time frame for “multi-year plan” should be more specific.

Travel Regulations: Business & Financial Bulletin, Section G-28

In January, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on travel regulations: Business & Financial Bulletin, Section G-28. CPB had no objections to the proposed changes.

VII. Committees

The Council has three standing committees:

- Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
- Committee on Development & Community Relations
- Committee on Capital & Space Planning

Committee business was conducted primarily by email. Issues were delegated to the appropriate committees for prior review, and recommendations were then forwarded to the full Council for deliberation.

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

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

- Social Sciences and Education
- MLPS and Bren
- HFA and Creative Studies
- Engineering

The area subcommittees primarily were 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 and a recommendation to the full Council. Finally, the subcommittees took the lead in developing the respective parts of the overall FTE recommendations for 2016-18, 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 as a member of the Risk Assessment/ Audit Committee. The CPB chair along with a designate of the Committee on Development & Community Relations served as Trustees of the UCSB Foundation.

CPB Chair also participated in a number of interviews of candidates for Deanships; CPB Vice-Chair participated in the search for a new campus Budget Director. CPB Chair made a presentation to the Undergraduate Council concerning the decision-making process of FTE allocation. A CPB member served on the Ad Astra Platinum Analytics Steering Committee organized by the Registrar concerning implementation of the new system. A representative of the Committee on Capital & Space Planning was invited to attend meetings of the Campus Planning Committee.

IX. CPB Relationship with University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)
CPB Chair served as the UCSB representative on UCPB and regularly reported on UCPB business conducted at the monthly meetings in Oakland, soliciting comments from council members on pending UCPB issues.

X. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning & Budget consulted with several members of the Administration during the 2016-17 term, including: the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Director of Capital Development; Associate Vice Chancellor for Development; the Deans of the College of Letters & Science; Interim Co-Deans of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; Dean of the College of Creative Studies; and Dean of the College of Engineering.

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

The Council engaged in several informative discussions with Acting Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Planning Chuck Haines concerning UCSB’s budget, and particularly the assessment and distribution of the Facilities and Administrative (overhead) fees to grants.

Capital Planning

The CPB Chair served as a Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC), which reviewed or discussed several issues and projects this year:

- A 10-Year Capital Financial Plan has not been reviewed by CPB in several years, although a presentation of the plan was shared at the January meeting of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC). Capital projects presentations by the Deans will be made to CPC over the course of next year:
  - September: Student Affairs and HFA
  - October: College of Creative Studies and Administrative Services
  - November: Engineering and Intercollegiate Athletics
  - January: MLPS and Social Sciences
  - February: Gevirtz Graduate School of Education and Bren School of Environmental Management
- In October, Acting Vice Chancellor for Budget Chuck Haines gave a presentation on the new recharge rate proposal of Design & Construction Services.
- CPC discussed a Preliminary Project Proposal (PPP) for the Classroom Building/Music Seismic Correction Project and recommended to the Chancellor to approve and proceed to architecture selection and Detailed Project Programming (DPP) phase. The project will address seismic deficiencies in the Music Building by demolishing the 2-story north wing and 1-story east wing of the complex, and construct a new Classroom Building within the Music Building complex.
- The Chancellor’s Sustainability Committee reported to CPC on the Climate Action Plan in January.
- In May, CPC received and approved the Photovoltaic Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) Update. Three of the original six solar sites included in the project have been built and commissioned (Robertson Gym, San Clemente Parking Structure, Parking Lot 3B). One site is currently under construction (Mesa Parking Structure). Another site will commence construction this summer (Parking Structure II/Lot 10), and a sixth site was removed from the project due to structural limitations (Events Center). Several replacement sites for the Events Center are under evaluation.
- In July, CPC recommended moving forward with the detailed project proposal for the Physics Building, which includes 64,000 ASF and underground labs at an estimated cost of $150 million, sited to the northwest of Brioda Hall with a basement that extends under the campus green.
- Also in July, CPC discussed the schematic designs for Henley Hall (Institute for Energy Efficiency), to be sited on the eastern portion of Parking Lot 12, north of Phelps Hall, and west of Building 451 (Military Science).

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB and UCPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:
• The role of the professional researcher series (and whether they should be Academic Senate members)
• Campus-wide academic strategic plan
• Classroom building
• Employee pensions and retiree health benefits
• State-mandated enrollment surge
• Non-resident enrollment
• State audit of the UC and follow-up measures
• Allocation of Facilities and Administration assessments on grants

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann Jensen Adams</th>
<th>CPB Chair and UCPB Rep</th>
<th>History of Art &amp; Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. S. Manjunath</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Afifi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bruhn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Pierre Fouque</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry (Ted) Frech</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstadinos (Kostas) Goulias</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songi Han</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tobias Hollerer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William (Bill) Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Major</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jeffrey Moehlis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marko Peljhan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media Arts &amp; Technology Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina (Naomi) Tague</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Taves</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Valentine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert L. Koegel</strong></td>
<td>(fall only)</td>
<td>Counseling, Clinical, &amp; School Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final note from the Chair

CPB has worked together well and collegially as we have discussed and made recommendations on a wide variety of campus issues, with those concerning the student surge and FTE this academic year. This year we provided input to the EVC about the kinds of information which would facilitate our role in FTE planning, and we look forward to further conversations on this subject. We appreciate the Senate and Administration’s openness to discussion, and responsiveness to our input.

In the CPB Annual Report of September 2015, and again September 2016, CPB Chair Joshua Schimel noted CPB’s concern that the Council participate in a larger campus-wide discussion about both planning, and budget. The Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy on which the Chair of CPB sits is one such positive development. We look forward to more extensive Senate discussions of these issues, particularly as we struggle with increasing enrollments and diminished state resources. One sub-area about which he have started discussions with the administration is in the allocation of Facilities and Administration rates and assessments (grant overhead); this is an area which we will continue to investigate this coming academic year.
Executive Summary

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

Council and Committee Meetings

CRIR consists of two standing committees: Committee on Research Policy and Procedure (CRPP) and Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources (CLIIR). CRPP met nine times and CLIIR met eight times during the 2016-2017 academic year, and the Chairs communicated any issues of mutual concern as needed. The Committee on Faculty Grants (CFG) met independently of CRPP and CLIIR as the committee’s function is to review and make decisions on faculty research grant proposals. As a result, CFG met three times during the spring quarter; one meeting was for orientation and the other two meetings were for grant decision discussions.

System-Wide Issues and Reviews

All system-wide issues that CRIR responded to are listed below. Issues that CRIR reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included. Summaries are provided for issues that CRIR was especially concerned about or played a central role in shaping the Senate’s response.

- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy Business and Finance Bulletin (BFB) – G-28, Travel Regulations
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM – 015
- Proposed Revisions to APM 015 and APM 016, and Conforming Amendments to Senate Bylaw 336
- Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities
- Proposed Revised APM Sections – 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, 740

CRPP reviewed the revisions and outlined multiple reasons why they strongly opposed the proposed revisions. The committee noted that it was unclear what problems the proposed revisions was attempting to solve, and without a clearly defined problem it was difficult for them to provide informed comments. Despite this lack of clarity, CRPP proceeded to review the document from the perspective that the problems being addressed might be that LSOEs felt that they were disadvantaged in securing research funds because of their title or that departments felt they were disadvantaged in hiring LSOEs without a better title.

If the policy was attempting to address the two issues listed above, CRPP noted that such a dramatic change in the LSOE series would be unwise and unwarranted. The use of LSOEs varies a great deal by departments and the professional goals and interests of LSOEs varies widely as well. CRPP felt that to impose uniform guideless on a complex and local situation would likely create problems where none existed previously. In addition, the committee was wary of the heavy focus on the idea of “innovation” in education. CRPP maintained that excellence in teaching is best determined at the department level,
and that it is quite possible to be an excellent teacher without necessarily being “innovative” in the sense implied in the proposal.

CRPP was also very concerned about the potential threat this proposal posed to the research mission of the university. If LSOEs were to be renamed “Teaching Professors” then the UC would appear to gain a large number of “Professors” overnight, which would create the artificial appearance of improved teacher-to-student ratios. CRPP noted that there would almost certainly be a push to hire more “Teaching Professors” over ladder faculty because they could be hired at lower salaries, and would, by definition, teach a much larger number of undergraduate courses. CRPP stressed that as a research university, we must assure that our graduate training and research mission is not compromised. Ladder faculty with strong research objectives are critical to that mission.

Given the potential for real harm to the system and lack of a clear problem, CRPP recommended exploring alternative solutions. One suggestion was that if departments want to hire LSOEs who wish to do research then they could hire them partially as LSOEs and partially as “Professional Researcher.” Another suggestion was that in lieu of using the LPSOE title in advertising jobs for lecturers, departments could use the title “Tenure Track Lecturer,” which makes the intent clearer.

CRPP adamantly opposed the proposed revisions to the LSOE series.

- **Proposed Policy on Export Controls**

CRPP took a careful look at the proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls. The policy aims to establish uniform guidelines on how each campus must organize locally to ensure compliance with federal regulations on ITAR and other export control laws. The committee found it difficult to make specific comments because it was unclear what problems the proposal was trying to solve and whether any campuses were out of compliance. The committee agreed with the overall recommendations in the proposed policy. However, they noted that UCSB is already handling this problem as the Vice Chancellor for Research was conducting a small pilot program on Export Controls with the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department the previous year. As such, the committee hoped that this policy was drawn after consultation with local campuses that have already implemented specific policies. CRPP also noted that the proposal mentions that there will be one further document on “Openness in Research”. Since this is critical to how the Fundamental Research Exclusion (FRE) clause is applied, CRPP felt that it would have been more appropriate to review both documents at the same time. Finally, the committee noted that UCOP might better serve the campuses by dealing with these types of issues when there is a clear lack of knowledge among the faculty (and this is likely common across many campuses).

- **Draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Policy**

CRPP reviewed the proposed policy on unmanned aircraft systems as it affects many researchers at UCSB. From an overall policy perspective, the committee did not find any serious flaws in the documents. However, as far as CRPP was been able to determine, UCSB researchers already follow federal regulations, and all applicable UC guidelines, and there has been no untoward incident reported so far. Therefore, CRPP questioned the basis for this bureaucratic over-reach.

In order to get a more informed view of the document, CRPP obtained the opinions of three faculty members and one graduate student who had been in charge of getting all relevant clearances. The one major complaint that stood out in all of the responses was that this policy created an extra bureaucratic burden imposed by UC by creating restrictions that unnecessarily exceeded the federally mandated requirements.

As UAVs become an important part of the research efforts of many faculty at UCSB, CRPP argued that it is absolutely essential that UC should not create any additional bureaucratic barriers above and beyond those already mandated by federal regulations. Furthermore, it was not clear from the document
whether existing federal guidelines already "minimize risk." CRPP strongly recommended that any UAV policy document must address three fundamental concerns:

1. Analyze federal regulations to see if they already satisfy our desired level of risk tolerance. [If they do, then UC policy should merely implement those regulations.]

2. If federal guidelines allow some flexibility in the approval process, ensure that this flexibility is passed down to the local authority and onto the campus researchers. [That seems not to be the case presently.]

3. In case federal guidelines are found to be weak in some specific cases, enunciate this clearly to stakeholders and form a reasonable policy that balances risk and flexibility. [There is no such distinction or reasoning in this document.]

CRPP noted that the complete absence of any type of summary of the existing federal guidelines in this document significantly complicates the review process, and that without this information a proper review of the proposed policy was impractical. The committee echoed faculty responses in recommending that the best way that UC can help them deal with the bureaucracy already imposed by federal regulations is to maintain a website that brings together all relevant federal regulations in a timely manner. Finally, CRPP also noted that UAVs bring additional privacy concerns into play. The committee noted that there was already a separate working group concerned with video surveillance, and they hope that privacy concerns induced by UAVs would be analyzed there.

Local Issues

- **Music Building Seismic Renovation and New Instructional Space**

CLIIR members were enthusiastic about the prospects for seismic renovation of the North wing of the Music building and the potential of new general assignment classrooms in additional floors of the new building. The committee found the addition of new general assignment classrooms created with interactive space designs to be especially exciting as it addresses concerns that CLIIR has been expressing for the past several years regarding a critical need for more general assignment classroom that would seat 75-100 students. The committee noted that the demand for large general assignment classrooms has increased dramatically over the past 20 years, while the availability of such classrooms has decreased during that time. With innovations in technology and pedagogical practices, new up-to-date classrooms are essential for UCSB to be able to continue to fulfill its instructional mission. CLIIR also nominated Professor John Du Bois to represent CLIIR on the Building Advisory Committee. Finally, they also expressed the hope that CLIIR’s consultant on instructional support, Dr. George Michaels (Executive Director, Instructional Development), would be invited to serve on any planning or advisory committees created to support this project.

- **College of Creative Studies Proposal to Establish a BA Degree in Marine Science**

CLIIR reviewed the proposal and supported the establishment of an undergraduate degree in Marine Science; however, the committee was unclear why the degree would be Bachelor of Arts rather than Bachelor of Science. CLIIR noted that given the low projected enrollment for the major, there should be no significant impacts on classroom space and that a subject librarian is already available on campus.

- **Proposal to Establish a BS Degree in Bioengineering and an Associated Administrative Program**

Both CLIIR and CRPP reviewed the proposal. Overall, both committees were very supportive of the efforts to develop a Bachelor of Science degree in Bioengineering; however, they were concerned about the limitations of campus resources to support the program. Campus impacts would expand beyond the College of Engineering, and the committees recommended that the campus address the needs for
additional instructional resources in order to successfully deploy and sustain the new program. The main concerns CRIR expressed about the impact on campus resources are listed below.

1) How would a new Bioengineering program affect the number of undergraduates admitted into the College of Engineering?

2) There is a larger campus concern regarding heavily impacted undergraduate courses in Math, Biology, Physics, and MCDB. Student enrollment in Bioengineering would further impact these courses. Would there be increased support from the Administration to remedy this issue?

3) The proposed Bioengineering program is designed to be distinct from a biomedical program; nevertheless, it raised concerns about job placements for students.

4) There is concern that with current enrollment pressures and growing needs, a new Bioengineering program would have a ripple effect on Instructional Development’s ability to effectively support the instructional mission of the campus.

5) While the library has a strong collection of biology and engineering materials to support current programs, there is a potential gap in the collection in the area of clinical medicine. In addition, there is not currently a subject librarian with the capacities to take on the responsibility of supporting a bioengineering program.

• Data Curation and Data Storage

CLIIR looked into the challenges of research data storage and curation, which is an ongoing problem for faculty on campus. The issues are further complicated because the storage and curation are must be managed in tandem. While there are multiple options for storage (e.g., cloud-based storage of various types), these options prove to be inadequate because the data must also be retrievable in the future. The rapidly changing formats for data storage and systems creates a serious challenge for retrieval and archiving of data. The library reported that faculty frequently request assistance with data storage, but the library is not equipped to handle this issue. Data storage and curation is a carry-over issue for CLIIR. The committee agreed that CRIR should meet as a group in the fall and invite Matt Hall (Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer) and Joseph Incandela (Vice Chancellor for Research) to discuss the issue.

• Funding for Faculty Travel Grants

CRPP discussed concerns over the limited budget of the Faculty Travel Grants (FTG). Funding for the grants needs to increase as the current rate is unsustainable and does not meet the demands for funds. The committee drafted a memo concerning this issue, which was submitted to Senate Chair Bohn. In the memo they noted that conference presentations are critical for faculty’s academic careers both for networking purposes and raising their research profiles. CRPP also noted that faculty in the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts, as well as junior faculty, are especially hard-hit due to the lack of funding available and potentially lower salaries. Given the growing popularity of the FTG, and the increasing reliance on these funds by junior faculty and faculty in the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts, CRPP requested an increased budget for 2017-2018 and subsequent years.

Library Updates
**Library Budget and Acquisitions**

The library’s budget is a continual problem that the campus will need to address. The library is almost entirely reliant on a university block grant for its budget. This funding source is inadequate, and the library has been engaged in conversations over the past year with the EVC’s and Chancellor’s Office about rethinking how the library is funded considering that it is a core resource for the campus. The library has been able to create a budget buffer over the last few years and has benefited from additional funding during that time; however, the 2017-2018 year will be the last year those funds are available. Thus, things will come to a head in 2018-2019 unless the campus reframes the funding structure for library acquisitions. The library has been making cuts for years to meet their budget constraints. The only thing left to cut are core resources. The area that is at highest risk is acquisitions: books, journals, and data-bases. There is no easy or cheap solution, and the new University Librarian will have to address the problem.

**Music Library**

There are currently plans to move the Music Library into the space previously occupied by Special Collections in the main library. The move is occurring as a result of the seismic retrofitting of the Music building. The campus will hear more about the move once fund-raising begins. The move is expected to occur once funds are available, and will not wait for the retrofitting to begin.

**Instructional Development Updates**

**Classrooms and Facilities**

Working with the Disabled Students Program (DSP), Instructional Development secured a $52,544 grant to replace existing assisted listening devices and expand their availability to rooms that should have these devices according to ADA regulations. Additional rooms will be brought up-to-date during 2017-2018.

The Classroom Management Committee decided to upgrade a number of lecture halls with new lecture equipment (Gen 5 Lecterns). Upgrades are completed for most of the designated classrooms. Three additional classrooms will be upgraded over the summer and will be ready for fall quarter. The new bio-engineering building classrooms will be built over the summer and into the fall quarter. They will have Gen 5 Lecterns and will be general assignment rooms.

Facilities has also completed a number of updates over the past year, mainly related to air conditioning and lighting. Air conditioning was replaced in Campbell Hall and newly installed in IV Theaters 1 and 2. The lighting control system for Embarcadero Hall has been put on the maintenance list for 2017-2018 and new LED lighting fixtures for hall lighting in Campbell Hall will likely occur in August 2017.

**Faculty Grants Committee**

**Faculty Research Grants Policy and Procedures Updates**

In the 2015-2016 application cycle the Senate began using an online application system for Faculty Research Grants (FRG) and Pearl Chase Research Grants (PCRG). The system was created by Senate IT, and was used during the 2016-2017 application period as well. The system worked well and helps to simplify the multifaceted process of application, review, and award.

CRPP addressed several grant policy issues including how to fund applications from junior faculty who may have start-up funds, as the availability of these funds varies widely between disciplines. The
committee also discussed how to evaluate and fund proposals for arts and performance-based projects. They consulted with Lisa Jevbratt, Professor, Art Studio, who provided a list of questions for reviewers to consider when evaluating proposals. Some committee members were wary of having a separate set of questions for one area of research proposals; however, ultimately, CRPP decided to include the questions as a supplemental resource for reviewers who evaluate art and performance-based proposals. Finally, CRPP discussed grant extension request protocol for first and second extensions. The committee agreed that requests for second extensions would be approved only under extenuating circumstances.

- **Summary of Grant Applications and Awards**

Faculty Research Grant and Pearl Chase Research Grant maximum funding limit was set at $20,000, maintaining the same limit used during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 cycles. The Senate FRG budget allocation for the 2016-2017 cycle was $860,000 and the PCRG budget allocation was $40,000. During this cycle 133 completed applications were submitted and reviewed for the Faculty Research Grants. 110 of the proposals were fully or partially funded. Additional details on the funding amounts and rates are available in the table below.

Three applications were submitted and reviewed for Pearl Chase Research Grants during the 2016-2017 review cycle. All three Pearl Chase Grant proposals were fully funded, with a total of $29,127 awarded.

**Faculty Research Grants Funding Amounts and Rates by Division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>$137,679.38</td>
<td>$70,460.00</td>
<td>54.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$116,423.54</td>
<td>$75,540.00</td>
<td>65.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>$447,299.92</td>
<td>$262,575.00</td>
<td>64.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$389,776.16</td>
<td>$247,600.00</td>
<td>63.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$500,871.67</td>
<td>$203,817.00</td>
<td>42.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,592,050.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>$859,992.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carry-Over Issues**

- **Data Storage and Curation**

Data storage and curation is an ongoing issue for CRIR and they will continue to discuss this issue and consult with relevant campus administrators, faculty, and staff as needed.

- **Faculty Research Grant Policy**

There is a strong desire to clarify and update the existing grant policy. A few of the areas that will be reviewed include start-up funds disclosure and availability, student researchers and how they should be funded, and grant term length and extensions.

- **Faculty Grant Review Criteria**

Best practices in reviewing Faculty Research Grants and Pearl Chase Research Grants is an ongoing discussion that will continue during the 2017-2018 academic year.
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Executive Summary
The Faculty Executive Committee met eight times during the 16-17 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:
• The FEC of the GGSE reviewed and affirmed the changes of APM-015 though it noted that the term “workplace” could be better defined.
• Regarding the proposed Revised Regents Policy 3103 and 3104 about professional degree supplemental tuition, the FEC:
  o supported the revisions,
  o liked to underscore support for equity and access for underrepresented students,
  o added support to confirming that UC PDST fees remain lower than private university fees, and
  o asked that Professional Degree Programs continue to track to the success rates of students who earn diplomas and go on to work in their respective fields.
• The FEC supported revisions to the presidential policy on travel regulations – G28 of the Business and Finance Bulletin.
• The FEC also unanimously voted that no GGSE departments undergo Academic Program Review in 2018-2019.
• The FEC provided feedback to the Academic Senate regarding the proposed Teaching Professor title and associated changes to the LSOE position.

Curricular and Academic Matters:
• The FEC unanimously voted to approve changing the registration restrictions for ED 20 from “Freshmen Only” to “Freshmen or Sophomores without transfer work”
• The FEC unanimously voted to approve revisions to CNCSP 101 and 110.
• The FEC unanimously voted to approve revisions to minors in Educational Studies and Science and Mathematics Education requirements.
• The FEC unanimously voted to approve the Department of CCSP’s request to add “Sex, Gender, and Related Constructs in Applied Psychology” and “Qualitative Methods in Applied Psychology.”

**GGSE Matters:**
The FEC discussed:
• ideas related to housing an undergraduate major within the GGSE,
• working groups focused on adding graduate degree programs,
• FTE planning with the Dean,
• the upcoming PRP for the Department of Education, and TEP
• changes in the Teacher Education Program and visions for the future, and
• GGSE workload policy and unanimously approved a revised version for adoption
• Streamlining paperwork process for faculty and staff

**FEC Membership and Elections**
Department Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology elected new members to the FEC at their June Faculty Meeting. Department of Education will elect new members to the FEC to ensure compliance with bylaws. FEC also exploring changing the bylaws to allow more flexibility of the non-senate member as well as to ensure Teacher Education Program representation while not limiting Department of Education representation.
Graduate Council
Annual Report 2016-17

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Graduate Council met for thirteen regularly scheduled two-hour sessions during the 2016-17 term.

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

The Graduate Council discussed and took action on a variety of key issues during the 2016-17 term, among them:
• Proposal to Establish an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Neuroengineering
• Removal of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) as an admission requirement for the Five-Year B.S./M.S. Program in Electrical & Computer Engineering
• Revising the Academic Senate Doctoral Student Travel Grant Policy
• Commenting on various systemwide draft policy documents including: the proposed revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 190, Appendix G; the Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities; proposed revisions to Regents Policy 3101 and 3104 Regarding Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST); proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmation Action; proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) sections 285, 210-3, 133, and 740, pertaining to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) title series; and the Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3).

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 7/1/2016 and 6/30/2017, Council processed a total of 213 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 2016-17 term: Chicana and Chicano Studies, History, Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Science, and Mechanical Engineering.

Graduate Council recommended five departments and one program for Academic Program Review in 2018-19.

III. Proposals to Establish Programs, Emphases, Academic Units and Research Units
• Approved the proposal to establish an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Neuroengineering
• Informal review of the proposal to establish a Master of Environmental Data Science
• Reviewed the proposal to establish a College of Creative Studies B.A. in Marine Science, with an eye to the potential impact on graduate programs
• Reviewed the proposal to establish a B.S. in Bioengineering and an Associated Administrative Program, with an eye to the potential impact on graduate programs

IV. Name Changes

Graduate Council did not receive any name change proposals for 2016-17.

V. Changes to Existing Programs

• Approved the proposed changes to the degree requirements for the M.A. and Ph.D. in Classics
• Approved the proposal to remove the production proficiency requirement for the M.A. and Ph.D. in Film and Media Studies
• Approved the proposed curricular changes for the M.S. and Ph.D. in the Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Science
• Approved the proposed time-to-degree changes for the Ph.D. in Economics
• Approved the proposed curricular changes for the Master of Technology Management
• Approved the establishment of an Environmental Politics field in Political Science
• Approved the addition of the Department of East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Global Studies
• Approved the addition of the Department of Theater & Dance to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Global Studies
• Approved the proposed changes to the degree requirements for the M.S. and Ph.D. in Earth Science
• Approved the proposed curricular changes for the M.A. and Ph.D. in Education
• Approved the addition of the Department of Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Quantitative Methods in Social Science
• Approved the proposed grading option change for a core course for the Ph.D. in Education
• Approved the proposed change in admission requirements for the Five-Year B.S./M.S. Program in Electrical & Computer Engineering
• Approved the proposed curricular changes for the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Global Studies
• Approved the proposed changes to the technical elective requirements for the Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering
• Approved course changes in the Teacher Education Program
• Disapproved a proposal to establish a new M.A. strand in Quantitative Research Methods in the
Department of Education

- Approved the proposed changes to the degree requirements for the M.A. in Statistics & Applied Probability
- Approved a new M.A. track in Data Science in Statistics & Applied Probability
- Approved the proposed core requirements for the Environmental Politics Field in Political Science
- Approved the addition of the Department of Political Science to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Black Studies
- Approved the addition of the Department of Communication to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Black Studies
- Approved the proposed change to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the Ph.D. in Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology

VI. Student Petitions

The Graduate Council received one request for the appeal of admission revocation, which was denied.

VII. Local Business

Graduate Mentorship
Graduate Council discussed, over multiple meetings, creating campus guidelines for the evaluation of graduate mentoring for use in academic personnel cases. GC reviewed recommendations from the Dean of Graduate Division and a set of sample guidelines from UC Berkeley. Members raised questions about how data on mentoring would be collected and used, how to disentangle poor mentorship from poorly received mentorship, and how to maintain the anonymity of student surveys. Overall, GC felt that the establishment of campus standards for mentoring would be beneficial to faculty and students, and voted to support the Dean of Graduate Division’s proposal. GC also decided to create a committee to work on these guidelines.

After some discussion, GC decided to form a subcommittee, and specified that its membership should include representation from each of the academic areas of the campus, and ideally include those with experience as department chairs or members of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The subcommittee would be asked to develop draft guidelines for consideration by the full Council. A draft of the Graduate Student Mentorship Subcommittee charge was written. The intended audience for the guidelines would be department chairs, members of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), and faculty who could use the guidelines as a resource. Crafting mentorship guidelines will continue in the 2017-18 year.

Graduate Council Delegation of Authority: Retroactive Changes in Student Transcripts
Graduate Council considered a proposal to modify the 2016-17 Delegation of Authority, which stated that the Chair and Vice-Chair had approval authority for retroactive changes in student transcripts. In practice, however, the Graduate Division had been handling retroactive changes in student transcripts for a number of years, due to the large number of requests. GC felt that it was appropriate to align policy with practice, and voted unanimously to modify the Delegation of Authority to delegate retroactive changes in student transcripts to the Dean of Graduate Division.
Policy on Incomplete Grades: 597, 598, 599 Courses
Graduate Council considered a proposal from Graduate Division to rescind a policy allowing 597, 598 and 599 courses to be assigned an incomplete grade without a student petition. In 2011, the Graduate Division and Office of the Registrar looked into why instructors were allowed to assign incomplete grades for 597, 598 and 599 courses without a student petition. Since no documentation was found at the time, ‘e-grades’ was re-programmed to treat these courses the same as all others in regards to incomplete grades. A 1994 memo from Graduate Council approved this different policy for 597, 598 and 599 courses; however, the policy was never included in the General Catalog. Members discussed the merits of having the ability to assign an incomplete grade, but determined that there are other grading options that can be used for students not meeting academic progress or expectations. GC unanimously voted to rescind the 1994 memo and have 597, 598 and 599 courses follow the same incomplete policy as all other courses.

Nominations for Program Review Panel
Graduate Council submitted the names of eight Senate faculty members to the Committee on Committees for consideration for service on the Program Review Panel (PRP) beginning in 2017-18.

Academic Senate Doctoral Student Travel Grant Policy
Graduate Council discussed the current policy regarding the Academic Senate Doctoral Student Travel Grant. Senate staff consulted with Academic Senate Chair Bohn about ways to increase the number or amounts of awards given each year. GC was presented with a proposal to increase the amount of the awards (determined by world region) for the 2017-18 academic year to bring the Doctoral Student Travel Grant in line with the Faculty Research Travel Grant. Members were supportive of this idea, but there was discussion about the reasons why more doctoral students are not applying for this grant. Members suggested that the award amounts are not enough to cover all travel; requiring that doctoral students be advanced to candidacy is reducing the number of eligible applicants; and that students may strategically wait for a “best” conference to use the grant towards, and ultimately not end up applying.

Members suggested other ways to increase applicants or to increase the amount of funding spent, including increasing the award amounts even more; using carryforward funds to award additional grants; allowing pre-advancement students to be eligible; and allowing students to receive the grant more than once (the current policy does not allow students to receive the grant more than one time in their academic career).

GC concluded that increasing the award amounts to match the Faculty Research Travel Grants would be an acceptable change for 2017-18, but that the policy should be revisited in 2017-18.

VIII. Systemwide Business

Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 190, Appendix G, Program Description: Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary (APM-190, Appendix G)
Graduate Council discussed the proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 190, Appendix G: Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary. The Council voted to unanimously endorse the updated policy, but expressed unease with the lack of justification and supporting documentation and the short turn-around time for comment. Furthermore, in the wake of the UCRP 2016 Tier implementation, members wondered whether there are any other
forthcoming adjustments that will impact academic appointees under the preceding retirement plans.

Proposed Revisions to APM 015 and APM 016, and Conforming Amendments to Senate Bylaw 336
Graduate Council discussed the Proposed Revisions to APM 015 and 016, and Conforming Amendments to Senate Bylaw 336, regarding updating language in the Faculty Code of Conduct surrounding sexual violence and sexual harassment. GC agreed that the revisions addressed the concerns that the Council communicated during the previous round of review, and had no further comments.

Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities
Graduate Council discussed the Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities. Members expressed concern that the draft policy placed collaborations between UC faculty and peers overseas under the approval authority of the Executive Officer while the first point under the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) stated that such collaborations were routine low-risk activities that did not require approval. GC recommended that the Office of the President better define risk throughout the policy, and clarify the types of activities that do and do not require Executive Officer approval.

Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 182, University Committee on International Education
Graduate Council discussed the Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 182: University Committee on International Education, to expand the charge of the committee into a broader range of international activities. GC voted to endorse the proposal.

Proposed Revised Regents Policy 3101 and 3104 Regarding Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)
Graduate Council discussed the Proposed Revised Regents Policy 3103 and 3104 Regarding Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). Overall, GC felt that the proposed revised policy was an improvement over the current policy in that it clarified the distribution of financial support and the roles of the President and Provost. GC voted to endorse the proposed revisions to the policy.

Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM-015
Graduate Council discussed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination, Harassment and Affirmative Action in the Workplace, and the corresponding change to APM -015. GC voted to endorse the proposal.

Proposed Revised APM Sections- 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, 740
Graduate Council discussed the proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) sections 285, 210-3, 133, and 740, pertaining to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) title series. While members had various questions and comments about the details and implementation of this change, overall, GC was in favor of the proposal, and felt that the Teaching Professor title and academic expectation changes were more indicative of the work that current LSOE do. However, GC did question one element of APM 210 in the proposed revision, which was the decision to place service on thesis and dissertation committees under “University and Public Service”, and not in “Teaching Excellence and Innovation”. This revision would bring the Teaching Professor series in line with current review criteria for ladder rank faculty.

Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)
Graduate Council discussed the revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3). Members were confused by the general tone of the policy, which veered from very specific in certain sections to overly vague in others. GC had many questions and concerns about the revised policy, including questioning the meaning of “institutional information” and what is an “institutional resource”. The definitions provided seemed far too broad. Members also thought that the human resource requirements needed to ensure compliance with this policy seemed unwieldy, and who would be responsible for compliance was unclear. There was also general concern that unit heads and PIs will now bear the cost of an incident. Members remarked that the delegation of financial risk to unit heads and PIs could prove catastrophic for some departments and faculty members, and emphasized that the policy should be protective of faculty, rather than punitive.

IX. Committees

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

X. Carry Over Issues for 2017-18

- Graduate student mentorship
- Doctoral Student Travel Grant policy
- Graduate Council Delegation of Authority: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
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To: Henning Bohn, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Ronald E. Rice, Chair
       Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections

Re: Response to the Proposed Modification to the College of Engineering Division Regulation 205(C)(2)

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections (RJ&E) reviewed the proposed modification and supports the revised College of Engineering Division Regulation 200(C)(2).

CC: Debra Blake, Executive Director, Academic Senate
July 24, 2017

To: Ronald Rice, Chair  
   Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

From: Stephan Miescher, Chair  
       Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposal for Changes to Santa Barbara Regulation 205(C)(2)

Earlier in the academic year, the Undergraduate Council (UgC) approved a proposal from the College of Engineering to modify the Depth Requirement for their General Education program. UgC subsequently advised the College to revise Santa Barbara Regulation SBR 205(C)(2) for consistency; the Council approved these changes at their meeting of June 8, 2017.

The full package of documents is attached for your consideration.

CC: Henning Bohn, Chair, Academic Senate  
    Debra Blake, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
    Kelly Erland, Analyst, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
May 17, 2017

To: Matthew Begley, Chair
College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee

From: Glenn Beltz
Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, College of Engineering

Proposal to update Santa Barbara Regulation 205(C)(2) for consistency with the revised Depth Requirement

The Undergraduate Council (UgC) approved a revision to the College of Engineering Depth Requirement on May 15, 2017. This proposal seeks to update Santa Barbara Regulation 205(C)(2) for consistency with the revised Depth Requirement.

Current regulation:
At least two upper-division courses from two separate departments, in each of which a student has already successfully completed on course. Alternatively, this entire Depth Requirement may be satisfied by completion of an approved three-course sequence or an approved minor or double major in the disciplines encompassed by areas D, E, F, G, or H, as posed in the annual College of Engineering General University and General Education Requirements publication.

We propose the following language replace the existing language:
Completion of two classes in each of two departments (four classes total). At least one course in each department must be upper division - the other course may be upper or lower division. Only courses from American History and Institutions, General Subject Areas D, E, F, or G, or Special Subject Areas (Writing, Ethnicity, or European Traditions) may be used to meet the depth requirement. Alternatively, this entire Depth Requirement may be satisfied by completion of an approved three-course sequence or an approved minor or double major in the disciplines encompassed by areas D, E, F, G, or H, as posed in the annual College of Engineering General University and General Education Requirements publication.
Date: May 15, 2017

To: Glenn Beltz, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education  
    College of Engineering

From: Stephan Miescher, Chair  
    Undergraduate Council

Re: Change in the College of Engineering Depth Requirement

Thank you for the revised proposal for changes to the Depth Requirement in the College of Engineering. The Undergraduate Council (UgC) consulted with the Committee on Courses and General Education and the Letters and Science Executive Committee, and both groups agreed that the revised language improved the clarity of the requirement.

Based on the rationale provided in the proposal and the support of the Engineering Executive Committee, the Council has unanimously approved the proposed changes, effective Fall 2017. The Council recommends that the College promptly propose updates to Santa Barbara Regulation 205(C)(2), for consistency with the revised Depth Requirement.

CC: Rod Alferness, Dean, College of Engineering  
    Matthew Begley, Chair, Engineering Executive Committee  
    Tiffany Sabado, Financial and Operations Officer, College of Engineering  
    Haley Orton, Director of Academic Advising, College of Engineering  
    Sara Cook, Assistant Registrar, Academic Services  
    Rosa Lomeli, Degree Analyst Supervisor, Office of the Registrar
February 13, 2017

To: Matthew Begley, Chair
College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee

From: Glenn Beltz
Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, College of Engineering

Proposal

The College of Engineering General Education program’s “depth requirement” requires students to complete one of the following options:

1. Completion of at least two upper-division courses from two separate departments, in which a student has already successfully completed one General Education course. Only courses from General Subject Areas D, E, F, G, or H may be used to meet the depth requirement.


3. Completion of an approved minor or double major in the disciplines encompassed by areas D, E, F, G, or H, as posted in the annual College of Engineering General University and General Education Requirements publication

The College proposes a slight modification to the first, most common, option (Option #1 above):

Completion of two classes in each of two departments (four classes total). At least one course in each department must be upper division - the other course may be upper or lower division. Only courses from American History and Institutions, General Subject Areas D, E, F, G, or H, or Special Subject Areas (Writing, Ethnicity, or European Traditions) may be used to meet the depth requirement.

Rationale

This modification serves two purposes:

1. Clarification of a confusing requirement.
Students sometimes have a difficult time understanding the depth requirement. Based on the feedback from the Undergraduate Council, Committee on Courses and General Education, and the College of Letters and Science FEC, we have rewritten the requirement to provide additional detail and clarity.

It may also be noted that students are encouraged to seek advising from the College Undergraduate Studies Office and are presented with a General Education checklist (Appendix A) when they attend Orientation, which also available online or in the undergraduate office.

2. Expansion of the number of courses that fulfill the requirement, increasing flexibility for students.

The general education requirements for engineering students are very constrained. Students must take at least six courses from an extensive list that is published in the UCSB catalog as general elective courses (Appendix B). These six courses must satisfy many different requirements including specific requirements in general subject areas (A, D, E, F, G and H), and special subject areas (writing requirement, ethnicity requirement, European traditions requirement, and the depth requirement).

Currently only courses in General Subject Areas D, E, F, G, or H may be used to meet the depth requirement. The proposed change is simply to expand the list to include courses in Special Subject Areas (Writing, Ethnicity, or European Traditions) and American History and Institutions.

Expanding the number of approved courses also gives students more flexibility to tailor their General Education program to their interests.

3. In consultation with the five undergraduate major chairs, it has been determined that this change will not have an impact on ABET accreditation. Further, all five departments support this change.

**Effective Quarter**

The new requirement is proposed to be effective Fall 2017.
205. General Education Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science (Engineering)

To be recommended for the degree of Bachelor of Science, a student in the College of Engineering must satisfy the following requirements.

A. **Area A: English Reading and Composition**
   Two courses must be completed in this area, and taken for letter grades. Writing 2 or 2E, and Writing 50, 50E, 107T or 109ST are required. (Am 9 Mar 06; Am 26 Jan 12)

B. **Areas D, E, F, G, and H: Social Sciences (Area D), Culture and Thought (Area E), Arts (Area F), Literature (Area G), and Foreign Language (Area H)**
   A minimum of six courses must be completed in these areas. Students must follow the pattern of distribution shown below.
   1. **Areas D and E:** a minimum of two courses must be completed in these combined areas.
   2. **Areas F and G:** a minimum of two courses must be completed in these combined areas.

C. **In the process of fulfilling the General Education Area Requirements, students must include the following:**
   1. At least four courses, each of which requires the writing of one or more papers totaling at least 1,800 words. In addition to those indicated courses, Engineering 101 and Engineering 103 may be used toward satisfaction of the writing requirements, although they will not satisfy the General Education Requirement. Once a student has matriculated at UCSB, the writing requirement may be met only with designated UCSB courses.
      Computer engineering, electrical engineering, and computer science students for whom Engineering 101 is required MAY use it toward fulfillment of the writing requirement.
   2. At least two upper-division courses from two separate departments, in each of which a student has already successfully completed one course. Alternatively, this entire Depth Requirement may be satisfied by completion of an approved three-course sequence or an approved minor or double major in the disciplines encompassed by areas, D, E, F or G, as posted in the annual College of Engineering General University and General Education Requirements publication. Completion of two classes in each of two departments (four classes total). At least one course in each department must be upper division – the other course may be upper or lower division. Only courses from American History and Institutions, General Subject Areas D, E, F, or G, or Special Subject Areas (Writing, Ethnicity, or European Traditions) may be used to meet the depth requirement. Alternatively, this entire Depth Requirement may be satisfied by completion of an approved three-course sequence or an approved minor or double major in the disciplines encompassed by areas D, E, F, G, or H, as posed in the annual
College of Engineering General University and General Education Requirements publication.
(Am 9 Mar 06; Am 26 Jan 12)

3. One course that satisfies the Ethnicity Requirement. Courses satisfying this requirement may also be used in satisfaction of the University American History and Institutions Requirement if so designated.

4. One course that satisfies the European Traditions requirement.

D. General provisions relating to these General Education Requirements:
   1. No more than two courses from the same department may apply to the General Education Requirements (except if the student completes one of the approved three course sequences or an approved minor or double major). (Am 9 Mar 06; Am 26 Jan 12)
   2. A course listed in more than one area can be applied to only one area.
   3. Some courses taken to satisfy the General Education Requirements may also be applied simultaneously to the American History and Institutions Requirement. (Am 19 Nov 09)
October 10, 2017

To: Henning Bohn, Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: David Marshall  
   Executive Vice Chancellor

Re: University of California’s Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

In January 2014, University of California President Napolitano convened a Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, which included faculty, staff and student feedback. The President’s Task Force worked to develop a new UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, and systemwide standards for investigating and resolving complaints of sexual violence and sexual harassment alleged to have been committed by faculty, staff and students.

In January 2016, the University of California’s Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment and the local procedures for students were issued (https://oeosh.ucsb.edu/titleix/policies/). The President’s Task Force continued its work on the implementation procedures for faculty, staff and non-faculty academic personnel. The President’s Task Force submitted their recommendations to the President who accepted the recommendations and later incorporated them into the systemwide frameworks for faculty (Senate and non-Senate) and staff/non-faculty academic personnel.

UCOP has requested that each campus update its local response procedures in the context of these new frameworks. In response to UCOP’s request, we are asking the Senate to consider any necessary revisions to its bylaws and procedures in order to make them consistent with UCOP mandates. Title IX Officer and Director Ariana Alvarez has prepared a draft that indicates possible revisions to current procedures for the Senate’s review and consideration. (See attached documents).

If you have questions about these draft procedures or the policy, please contact the Title IX Office, and copy me. As you know, we are under some pressure to finalize these procedures and report back to the Office of the President.

Thank you.

cc: Alison Butler  
    Cindy Doherty  
    Ariana Alvarez  
    Toby Lazarowitz  
    Debra Blake  
    Nancy Hamill
The University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) is committed to creating and maintaining a community dedicated to the advancement, application and transmission of knowledge and creative endeavors through academic excellence, where all individuals who participate in UCSB programs and activities can work and learn together in an atmosphere free of harassment, exploitation, or intimidation. Every member of the community should be aware that the University prohibits sexual violence and sexual harassment, retaliation, and other prohibited behavior (“Prohibited Conduct”) that violates law and/or University policy.

I. Introduction

UCSB will respond promptly and effectively to reports of Prohibited Conduct and will take appropriate action to prevent, to correct, and when necessary, to discipline behavior that violates the UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH Policy). Consistent with the SVSH Policy, the following describes the University’s process for investigating and adjudicating alleged violations of the SVSH Policy in instances where the respondent is a UCSB faculty member whose conduct is governed by Section 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM-015), The Faculty Code of Conduct (“Code of Conduct”). A flow chart illustrating the process for complaints against Academic Senate faculty can be found in Appendix A, and a flow chart illustrating the process for complaints against non-Senate faculty can be found in Appendix B.

These documents should be read in conjunction with the SVSH Policy last issued January 1, 2016, as well as applicable APM provisions, including APM-015, APM-016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline), and APM-150 (Non-Senate Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal), and applicable Senate Bylaws, including Senate Bylaw 336 (procedures for disciplinary hearings) and Senate Bylaw 335 (procedures for considering grievances). The documents also incorporate recommendations issued by the Joint Committee of the Administration and the Senate, as accepted by President Napolitano. To the extent these procedures may be inconsistent or in conflict with other campus procedures or bylaws, these procedures shall prevail.

If the Respondent is a University of California employee at a different location, the Title IX Officer will forward the report to the Title IX Officer at the Respondent’s location of employment. As appropriate, accommodations and resources will still be offered by UCSB to the Complainant.

If the Respondent is not affiliated with UCSB or the UC system in any way, the University’s role may be limited to support and resources for the Complainant. On occasion, the Title IX Office may initiate an investigation to support further safety remedies.
Definitions
Applicable definitions can be found in the SVSH Policy and are incorporated herein. Other definitions are found in the applicable APMs and Senate Bylaws and are incorporated herein.

- The SVSH Policy is available at http://policy.ucop.edu/doc/4000385/SVSH.
- The Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015) is available at http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-015.pdf.
- APM-150 is available at http://ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-150.pdf.
- All provisions of the APM are accessible at http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/general-university-policy-regarding-academic-appointees/index.html.

Chancellor’s Designee
The Chancellor’s designee for matters involving UCSB Senate and non-Senate faculty is Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall (david.marshall@ucsb.edu).

UCSB’s Title IX Officer is Ariana Alvarez (ariana.alvarez@ucsb.edu).
II. Support Resources, Safety Measures and Accommodations for Individuals Impacted by Sexual Violence, Sexual Harassment and Other Prohibited Behavior

Confidential campus and community resources are available to anyone impacted by sexual violence, sexual harassment and other prohibited behaviors. Confidential resources provide a private space for an impacted party to discuss the incident, reporting options, and/or campus and legal processes without initiating an investigation or action by the University or law enforcement. See Appendix C for a complete list of local confidential and non-confidential resources located on campus and in our local community.

Confidential Resources
UCSB offers access to confidential resources for individuals who have experienced Prohibited Conduct and are seeking counseling, emotional support, or confidential information about how to make a report to the University. University Confidential Resources are defined pursuant to the SVSH Policy and include individuals who receive reports in their confidential capacity such as advocates in the Campus Advocacy Resources & Education (CARE) Office, as well as licensed clinicians in the Academic and Staff Assistance Program (ASAP) and the Office of the Ombuds. CARE serves students, faculty and staff. See Appendix A for their contact information.

These individuals can provide confidential advice and counseling without disclosure to the to the Title IX Office or law enforcement, unless there is a threat of serious harm to the individual or others or a legal obligation that requires disclosures (such as suspected abuse of a minor).

While the services of CARE are exclusively for complainants, the other noted resources are available to any individual impacted by sexual violence, sexual harassment or other SVSH prohibited behavior, including respondents, witnesses, reporting parties and support providers.

Safety Measures and Accommodations
Interim measures and support are available regardless of whether or not the incident is formally reported. Interim measures include, but are not limited to, the following: no contact orders or emergency protective orders; housing assistance; academic support; work accommodations; and counseling. Some suggested courses of action are:

- **Work accommodations.** To enhance their safety and wellness, an impacted individual has the right to request an accommodation to alter the individual’s schedule, location or to access leave balances to cover absences that relate to matters covered by the SVSH Policy. This request should be made to the individual’s direct supervisor and may be coordinated through a CARE advocate or the Title IX Office regardless of whether or not a formal report is made to the University or law enforcement. CARE advocates will make every attempt to protect the complainant’s privacy to avoid any required reports from supervisory staff to the Title IX Office.

- **Housing relocation options.** If the impacted individual(s) live in University-owned housing, they have the right to request relocation options, which the University will review with them. Reasonable requests, space permitting, will be accommodated to the best of Housing, Dining, & Auxiliary Enterprises’ abilities. This can be coordinated through the Title IX Office or a CARE advocate with Housing, Dining and Auxiliary Enterprises.
In addition, the impacted party has the right to seek an emergency protective order if a police report has been filed.

- **Emergency protective orders.** An impacted party facing an immediate threat to safety has the right to seek an Emergency Protective Order (valid for 10 court days) from the UCSB Police Department, Isla Vista Foot Patrol, or a local law enforcement agency if a police report has been taken. At the expiration of the Emergency Protective Order, or in all other situations in which a protective order is needed, a temporary restraining order should be obtained through the Santa Barbara Superior Court. A CARE advocate can assist a survivor in navigating this process and in submitting a request for financial assistance to the UCSB Employee Survivor Fund.
III. Reporting Options and Resources (Stage 0)

Any member of the University community may report Prohibited Conduct by a UCSB Senate and non-Senate Faculty to the Title IX Office or to UCSB’s Title IX Officer, Ariana Alvarez (805-893.2546; ariana.alvarez@ucsb.edu).

Faculty, supervisors and responsible employees who receive reports of sexual violence or sexual harassment that involves a student must promptly forward the information to the Title IX Officer or other staff member in the Title IX Office charged with reviewing and investigating sexual violence, sexual harassment or other prohibited behavior complaints. Further to this requirement, faculty and supervisors must also forward to the Title IX Office any report of sexual violence or sexual harassment that involves any person affiliated with the University.

Reporting one’s own personal experience with sexual violence or sexual harassment to the Title IX Office, the Title IX Officer, or law enforcement is the decision of the impacted party. Understanding that reporting is an intensely personal process, UCSB respects the right of the impacted party to decide whether to report. However, if an act of sexual violence, sexual harassment or other prohibited behavior is reported to a Responsible Employee, they must notify the Title IX Officer or designee in accordance with the SVSH Policy. The Title IX Office will consider requests for confidentiality and will make a determination as to whether or not a formal University investigation may be necessary to address the concerns reported.

The University encourages early reporting of incidents to either law enforcement or the Title IX Office. While there is no time limit on the reporting of incidents to the University, the University encourages early reporting as timeliness increases the likelihood of substantiating claims and adjudicating charges.

Even if the impacted party has not decided whether or to whom to report, it is important for the impacted party to preserve evidence for indications of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and/or stalking. This includes writing down details about the incident(s), refraining from eating, drinking, washing, showering, using the bathroom, brushing teeth, or cleaning up the scene of an incident, and saving any communications (electronic, voice, text, or otherwise) to and from involved parties. Deleted text messages may sometimes be retrieved within the same billing period depending on the cellular carrier. Clothing or other evidence should be stored in a paper bag to preserve physical evidence.

Understanding that reporting is an intensely personal process, UCSB respects the right of the impacted party to decide whether to report. Impacted parties who choose to report may pursue one or more of the following reporting options, any of which may be coordinated, if desired, with the assistance of a CARE advocate:

- **Report to law enforcement and request prosecution.** Impacted parties have the right to report incidents of sexual violence to law enforcement.
  - **If the incident happened on University property:** a report may be made to the UCSB Police Department.
    - If the report is filed with the UCSB Police Department, the officer will provide a business card with the case number on it, and will also offer the services of a campus CARE
advocate or a community resource card (if in the local area). Please see Appendix A for contact information.

- **If the incident happened off campus:** a report may be made to the Santa Barbara Sheriff’s Office (for Isla Vista or Santa Barbara) or the corresponding local law enforcement agency (if out of the area). Please see Appendix A for contact information.

- **Regardless of where the incident took place, it is important to note:**
  - If the impacted party was under the influence of alcohol or drugs, this may be relevant to the case and should be disclosed to the police.
  - In order to protect privacy, California law allows complainants to request that the police not release personal identifying information - name, address, phone numbers and date of birth—in publicly available recordkeeping. This will ensure a degree of confidentiality, but does not guarantee complete anonymity. Per the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, UCSB Police will not release identifying information in Timely Warnings or Campus Alerts that go out to the campus community, nor in information released to the media.

- **Report to law enforcement without requesting prosecution.** In some cases, reports to law enforcement may be made for documentation purposes only. Typically, the decision to prosecute is made by the District Attorney, although the cooperation of the complainant is considered necessary.

- **File a complaint with the UCSB Title IX Office.** Any report of sexual violence, sexual harassment or other prohibited behavior made to a faculty member, supervisor, responsible employee and/or Title IX Office places the University “on notice” to take action to remedy the situation and mitigate its effects. A report to these identified resources will initiate a University review with possible investigation by Title IX Office.
  - Upon reporting to the Title IX Office, the complainant will be provided with a written explanation of their rights and options. If a complaint is investigated by Title IX Office, the respondent will also be provided with a written explanation of their rights and options.

- **Report to both law enforcement and Title IX Office.** Because of privacy laws and jurisdictional issues, law enforcement is not always able to share reports of sexual violence with the University. Therefore, if the complainant has reported to law enforcement and desires University review of the case for investigation and possible adjudication, the complainant is encouraged to report their complaint to Title IX Office.

- **Make an anonymous report.** Reports can be made to UCSB without any names included. However, the response may be limited without any identifying information and unable to respond fully to the reported incident, including pursuing disciplinary action against the alleged Respondent.
IV. UCSB’s Alternative Response and Investigation Process (Stage 1)

Upon receipt of a report of or information about alleged Prohibited Conduct, the Title IX Officer will make an initial assessment in accordance with the SVSH Policy, which will include making an immediate assessment concerning the health and safety of the complainant and the campus community.

The Title IX Officer oversees the University’s response to reports of sexual violence, sexual harassment or other behavior prohibited by the SVSH Policy to ensure the prompt, fair and impartial from the initial report to the final outcome. Investigations and adjudication will be conducted by UCSB officials who receive annual training on issues related to sexual violence, sexual harassment or other SVSH prohibited behavior that promotes fairness, protects the safety of Complainants and promotes accountability.

A. Jurisdiction
Consistent with the SVSH Policy, any person who experiences sexual violence, sexual harassment, or other prohibited behavior by a UCSB Senate or non-Senate faculty member on University property or at an official University function, activity or program may file a complaint with the Title IX Office for review, possible investigation and possible adjudication by the administrative authority who has authority over the respondent’s employment status or department.

Every case is considered individually and a determination of whether to investigate is done on a case-by-case basis. Sexual violence, sexual harassment or other prohibited behavior, occurring off University property may also be considered for University investigation and adjudication if the alleged respondent is a UCSB employee and the safety of the community may be impacted.

B. Initial Assessment
Upon receipt of a report, the Title IX Office takes several steps within its assessment, including:

Initial Review and Inquiry
Upon receipt, the Title IX Office will contact the complainant to offer the services of the Title IX Office and provide them with a written explanation of their rights, options and resources. The Campus & Community Resources (Appendix A) and Rights of the Parties (Appendix D) documents are included in this email outreach.

Upon completion of an interview with the complainant, the Title IX Office will research the history of the involved individuals to identify any recurring behavior or systemic issues within a specific area or among specific individuals. With this information, the Title IX Office, in consultation with the Employee Case Management Team (CMT), will determine the most appropriate response and any necessary interim protections.

The Title IX Office will identify the policy (or policies) applicable to the report based on the date of the incident or reported behavior. The entire timeframe of the reported incident or behavior will be considered and the Title IX Office’s assessment may include multiple versions of the University’s policy on sexual violence, sexual harassment and other prohibited behavior, as applicable. However, the response procedures for all reports will follow the terms of the current policy (01/01/16) and these procedures.
The Title IX Officer will ensure that the complainant, if their identity is known, is provided a written explanation of rights and available options as outlined in the SVSH Policy, including:

- How and to whom to report alleged violations;
- Options for reporting to and/or notifying law enforcement and campus authorities;
- Information regarding confidential resources;
- The rights of complainants regarding orders of protection, no contact orders, restraining orders, or similar lawful orders issued by criminal or civil courts;
- The importance of preserving evidence that may assist in proving that a criminal offense occurred or in obtaining a protection order;
- Counseling, health, mental health, victim advocacy, legal assistance, visa and immigration assistance, financial aid assistance and other services available both within the institution and the community; and
- Options for, and available assistance to, a change to academic, living, transportation, and working situations if the complainant requests and if such options are reasonably available—regardless of whether the complainant chooses to report the crime to law enforcement.

The University will strive to honor the stated wishes of the complainant concerning whether to move forward with an investigation and any safety concerns for any involved individuals. There may be circumstances, however, in which the University may need to move forward against the complainant’s wishes, or in which the University may determine that an investigation will not occur despite the complainant’s wish to pursue an investigation. In such cases, the Title IX Officer, or their designee, will make this determination after completing an initial inquiry into the facts.

If the complainant declines to respond, the Title IX Office will determine how best to respond to the matter based on the available information. The Title IX Office will advise the complainant in writing via email of the final response decision with rationale for that determination and proceed accordingly thereafter.

**Consideration of Interim and Protective Measures**

The Title IX Officer, in consultation with the Employee CMT, will assess the situation and determine the appropriate interim measures to ensure the safety, well-being and equal access to UCSB programs and activities, its students and employees.

**Involuntary Leave of a Senate Faculty Respondent**

Involuntary leave of a Senate faculty respondent may be imposed in accordance with APM-016. Investigatory leave of a non-Senate faculty respondent may be imposed in accordance with APM-150.

The Title IX Office, in consultation with the Employee CMT, will also determine if any additional interim measures are warranted or required to protect the involved individuals and the campus community.

Title IX will strive to protect privacy with respect to any interim or protective measures provided to the parties, to the extent it does not impair Title IX’s ability to provide the interim or protective measures. In some cases, Title IX may need to disclose some information about a Complainant to a third party to provide necessary accommodations or protective measures.
C. UCSB’s Response to Prohibited Conduct (Stage 1)
Once the Title IX Office receives a report of alleged sexual violence, sexual harassment or other SVSH prohibited behavior, they will determine if the issues presented rise to a potential policy violation, and if so, determine the most appropriate process to address the issues presented. Provided the University has sufficient information to respond, and in accordance with the SVSH Policy, UCSB may resolve reports of Prohibited Conduct through Alternative Resolution or Formal Investigation.

The Title IX Officer oversees the University’s response to reports of sexual violence, sexual harassment or other SVSH prohibited behavior to ensure the proceedings are prompt, fair and impartial from the initial report to the final outcome.

Investigations and adjudication will be conducted by UCSB officials who receive annual training on issues related to sexual violence, sexual harassment or other SVSH prohibited behavior.

In any response, the complainant and the respondent have the right to an advisor and a support person of their choosing at all stages of the process. UCSB may restrict the extent to which the advisor can participate in the investigation or adjudication process.

In addition, UCSB will offer to provide support services for complainants and for respondents as noted in Section II.

**Alternative Resolution**
After a preliminary inquiry into the facts, the Title IX Officer may initiate an Alternative Resolution in accordance with the SVSH Policy. Such a response may include:
- mediation (except in cases of sexual violence);
- separating the parties;
- providing for safety;
- referring the parties to counseling;
- referral for disciplinary action;
- a settlement agreement;
- conducting targeted preventive educational and training programs; and
- conducting a follow-up review to ensure that the resolution has been implemented effectively.

**Formal Investigation**
In cases where Alternative Resolution is inappropriate or unsuccessful, the Title IX Officer may conduct a Formal Investigation as contemplated in the SVSH Policy. Generally, the formal investigation follows these steps:

1. **Notification to Chancellor**
   When a formal investigation is commenced against a faculty respondent, the Title IX Officer will notify the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s designee. The Title IX Officer will be sensitive in their communication to protect the neutrality of the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s designee, as well as the privacy of the complainant and respondent.
Thereafter, the Title IX Officer will ensure that the Chancellor and/or Department Chair or other appropriate administrative authorities are regularly updated regarding the status of the Formal Investigation.

2. Notice of Charges
   When a Formal Investigation will be conducted, the Title IX Office will simultaneously send written notice of the charges to the complainant and the respondent. The written notice will include:
   a. A summary of the allegations and potential violations of the SVSH Policy;
   b. The purpose of the investigation;
   c. A statement that the investigative report, when issued, will make factual findings and a determination whether there has been a violation of the SVSH Policy;
   d. A statement that the findings under the SVSH Policy will be based on the preponderance of the evidence standard;
   e. A statement that a finding of sexual violence or sexual harassment violations will constitute probable cause of violation of faculty code of conduct;
   f. A summary of the investigation and discipline processes, including the expected timeline;
   g. A summary of the rights of the complainant and respondent, including the right to an advisor and a support person;
   h. A description of the resources available to the complainant and respondent; and
   i. An admonition against intimidation or retaliation.

   If a Title IX investigator discovers new facts that could form the basis for additional policy violations or sanctions, the Title IX Office will simultaneously provide the parties with an amended Notice of Charges, which will include both the original and new allegations and charges.

3. Investigative Process
   The Title IX Officer will designate an investigator to conduct a fair, thorough, and impartial investigation.

   a. Overview:
      The Title IX Officer will oversees the University investigation and will designate an investigator to conduct a fair, thorough, and impartial investigation. During the investigation, the complainant and respondent will be provided an equal opportunity to meet with the investigator, submit information, and identify witnesses who may have relevant information.

      The investigator will meet separately with the complainant, the respondent, and any witnesses who may have relevant information, and will gather other available and relevant information. The investigator may follow up with the complainant or the respondent as needed to clarify any inconsistencies or new information gathered during the course of the investigation.

   b. Confidentiality

---

\(^1\) Regardless of the Title IX finding, the Senate may follow its normal charges process to determine if there is probable cause that faculty conduct other than sexual violence or sexual harassment may warrant possible disciplinary action.
Disclosure of facts to persons interviewed will be limited to what is reasonably necessary to conduct a fair and thorough investigation. Participants in an investigation may be asked to maintain confidentiality when essential to protect the integrity of the investigation.

c. **Advisor and Support Persons**
The complainant or the respondent may have one advisor and one support person, if desired, present when interviewed and at any related meeting. Other witnesses may have a support person present at the discretion of the investigator or as required by University policy.

d. **Participation in Investigation**
Neither the Complainant nor the Respondent is required to participate in the investigation. The University will not draw any adverse inferences from a Complainant or Respondent’s decision not to participate or to remain silent during the process. An investigator will reach findings and conclusions based on the information available and may draw adverse inferences when a party selectively participates in the process, such as choosing to answer some, but not all questions posed.

e. **Investigation Timeframe**
The investigation shall be completed within sixty (60) University business days of its initiation, which is when the notice of charges is sent to the Complainant and Respondent. If there is a need to extend investigation beyond this 60-business day timeframe, the Title IX Officer may grant an extension after a finding of and the Complainant and Respondent shall be notified in writing along with an explanation of the reasons for the extension consistent with the SVSH Policy. The Title IX Officer or designee will keep the complainant and respondent regularly informed concerning the status of the investigation.

f. **Coordination with Law Enforcement**
When a law enforcement agency is conducting its own investigation into the alleged conduct, the Title IX investigator will make every effort to coordinate their fact-finding efforts with the law enforcement investigation. At the request of law enforcement, the investigation may be delayed temporarily to meet specific needs of the criminal investigation.

4. **Investigation Report and Finding**
Following the conclusion of the investigation, the Title IX investigator will prepare a written report. The written investigation report will include a statement of the allegations and issues, the positions of the parties, a summary of the evidence, findings of fact and analysis and a determination regarding whether, applying the preponderance of the evidence standard, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that respondent violated the SVSH Policy. The investigative report will be final upon approval of the Title IX Officer and delivery to the Chancellor’s designee.

If the complainant or the respondent offered witnesses or other evidence that was not relied upon by the investigator, the investigation report will explain why it was not relied upon.

A finding that the respondent violated the SVSH Policy will establish probable cause as defined in the Code of Conduct. (APM-015 at III.A.4.)
5. **Notice of Investigation Outcome**

Upon completion of the Title IX investigation report, the Title IX Officer or designee will simultaneously send to the complainant and the respondent a written notice of investigation outcome regarding whether a violation of the **SVSH Policy** was found. The notice of investigation outcome will be accompanied by a copy of the investigation report, which may be redacted as necessary to protect privacy rights.

The Title IX Officer or designee will also send the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee.

The notice of investigation outcome will include:

a. A statement of whether a preponderance of the evidence demonstrated that respondent violated the **SVSH Policy**;

b. An admonition against intimidation or retaliation;

c. An explanation of any interim measures that will remain in place;

d. A statement that the complainant and respondent have an opportunity to respond in writing to the Chancellor’s designee and Department Chair or other appropriate administrative authority; and

e. A statement indicating whether it appears that further investigation by another appropriate body may be necessary to determine whether violations of other policies occurred, separate from any allegations of Prohibited Conduct that were investigated under the **SVSH Policy**.

In addition, if the investigation determined that the respondent violated the SVSH Policy, the notice of investigation outcome will also include:

a. A statement that the finding that the respondent violated the **SVSH Policy** constitutes a finding of probable cause as defined in APM-015;

b. For matters involving Senate faculty respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline to impose, including a statement that the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the Peer Review Committee (PRC; See Section V.B.) to advise on appropriate resolution, which may include pursuing discipline in accordance with APM-016;

c. For matters involving non-Senate faculty respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline to impose, including a statement that the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the PRC or consult with the Academic Personnel Office to advise on appropriate resolution, which may include corrective action or termination in accordance APM-150;

d. A statement of the anticipated timeline and a statement that both the complainant and respondent will be informed of the final resolution of the matter, including any discipline imposed.
V. UCSB’s Assessment and Consultation (Stage 2)

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee has the authority and responsibility to decide what action to take in response to the findings of the Title IX investigation report. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may determine that additional investigation is required to determine whether other Code of Conduct violations occurred, but will not reinvestigate the allegations of Prohibited Conduct investigated by the Title IX Office. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may consult with the Title IX Office, the Academic Personnel Office or other appropriate entities at any time during the decision-making process.

A. Opportunity to Respond

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will offer the complainant and the respondent an opportunity to respond to the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report, either through an in-person meeting with the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee, a written statement to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee, or both.

The purpose of this response is not to challenge the factual findings in the Title IX investigation report or present new evidence, but to provide the complainant and the respondent with an opportunity to express their perspectives and address what outcome they wish to see.

B. Peer Review Committee (PRC) for Senate Faculty

In the event that the Title IX investigation finds a Senate faculty respondent responsible for violating the SVSH Policy, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the campus Peer Review Committee (PRC) to advise on appropriate resolution.

The PRC will advise the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee regarding how to resolve the matter, including whether the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee should pursue a formal charge for violation of the Code of Conduct or pursue an early resolution. The PRC should provide advice on the appropriate discipline or other corrective or remedial measures.

The PRC will be trained annually by the Title IX Office on the SVSH policy and local procedures, the application of a trauma-informed approach and how to analyze the elements of a SVSH policy violation. The PRC will be engaged in all cases where the Title IX investigation has found a Senate faculty respondent has violated the SVSH Policy.

C. Consultation with the PRC or Academic Personnel for Non-Senate Faculty

In the event that the Title IX investigation finds a non-Senate faculty respondent responsible for violating the SVSH Policy, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may engage the PRC and in all cases will consult with the Academic Personnel Office. Such consultation will occur in all cases where the Title IX investigation has found that the non-Senate faculty respondent has violated the SVSH Policy. The advisory role of the PRC is described in Section V.B above.
VI. UCSB’s Decision on Sanctions for Senate Faculty (Stage 3)

UCSB will take prompt and effective steps reasonably calculated to stop any violation of the UC SVSH Policy, prevent its reoccurrence and, as appropriate, remedy its effects. To the extent that the remedy has not already been provided, the Title IX Officer, in consultation with appropriate administrators, will oversee the implementation of this remedy.

A. Decision by Chancellor or Chancellor’s Designee

Following consultation with the Peer Review Committee, in accordance with APM-016, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will decide what action to take to resolve the matter.

As stated in APM-015, “The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation.” As further stated in APM-015, “[f]or an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment, the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when the allegation is first reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or the campus Title IX Officer.” (APM-015, Part III, A.3.)

1. No Formal Discipline
   In the event the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee determines to resolve the matter without taking any formal disciplinary action, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly and simultaneously communicate this decision and its rationale to both the complainant and the respondent.

2. Early Resolution
   The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can enter into an early resolution with the respondent in accordance with APM 016. An early resolution can be achieved at any time prior to the final imposition of discipline.

   Subsequent to the respondent agreeing to the terms of the early resolution, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly and simultaneously inform the complainant of those terms, including any discipline or other corrective or remedial measures, and the rationale for these terms.

3. Charge Filed with Academic Senate Privilege & Tenure Committee
   The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can take steps to propose discipline and file a charge with the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee without first pursuing early resolution, or if the respondent does not agree to early resolution.

   The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly inform the complainant that the charge has been filed.

B. Timeframe for Decision; Extension for Good Cause

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee should implement their decision promptly, typically within 40 business days of receipt of the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report. If the matter has not been otherwise resolved within forty (40) business days, a charge will be
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filed with the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee. A charge will not be held in abeyance or suspended while an early resolution is being pursued or finalized.

Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor for good cause with written notice to the complainant and respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

C. Process Following the Filing of a Senate Charge

The procedures following the filing of a charge with the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee are set forth in the APM-015 and APM-016, Senate Bylaw 336 and other applicable Senate bylaws, as well as divisional bylaws on each campus.

The Title IX investigation report will be accepted as evidence in the Privilege & Tenure hearing.

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will ensure that the complainant and respondent receive regular updates regarding the status of the proceedings.

Following receipt of the recommendation from the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee, in accordance with APM-016 and other applicable procedures, the Chancellor will make a final decision regarding discipline, unless the decision involves dismissal for a faculty member who has tenure or security of employment or denial of emeriti status. As stated in APM-016, “Authority for dismissal of a faculty member who has tenure or security of employment rests with The Regents, on recommendation of the President, following consultation with the Chancellor.” (APM-016, Section II.6.) Authority for the denial or curtailment of emeritus status of a faculty member rests with the President, on recommendation of the Chancellor.” (APM-016, Section II.5)

The complainant and the respondent will be promptly and simultaneously informed of the decision regarding discipline and its rationale.
VII. UCSB’s Decision on Sanctions for Non-Senate Faculty (Stage 3)

A. Decision by Chancellor or Chancellor’s Designee
Following consultation with the Peer Review Committee or Academic Personnel Office, and in accordance with APM-150, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee shall decide what action to take to resolve the matter.

As stated in APM-015, “The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation.” As further stated in APM-015, “[f]or an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment, the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when the allegation is first reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or the campus Title IX Officer.” (APM-015, Part III, A.3.)

1. No Disciplinary Action
In the event the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee determines to resolve the matter without taking any disciplinary or corrective action, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly and simultaneously communicate this decision and its rationale to both the complainant and respondent.

2. Informal Resolution
The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can pursue an informal resolution in accordance with APM-150, which may include discipline and/or other corrective or remedial measures. Informal resolution can be achieved at any time prior to the final imposition of dismissal or corrective action.

Subsequent to the respondent agreeing to the terms of an informal resolution, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly and simultaneously inform the complainant of those terms, including any discipline or other corrective or remedial measures, and the rationale for these terms.

3. Notice of Intent
The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can issue a notice of intent instituting dismissal or other corrective action in accordance with APM-150.

B. Timeframe for Decision; Extension for Good Cause
The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee should implement their decision promptly and simultaneously, typically within forty (40) business days of receipt of the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report. If the matter has not been otherwise resolved within forty (40) business days, a notice of intent shall be issued.

Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor for good cause with written notice to the complainant and respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

C. Process Following the Provision of a Written Notice of Intent.
The procedures following the provision of a notice of intent are set forth in APM-150.
Should the respondent submit a grievance under APM-140 alleging a violation of APM-150 or otherwise challenging an administrative decision described in this process, the Chancellor’s designee will ensure that both the complainant and respondent receive regular updates regarding the status of the grievance.

As stated in APM-140, “When a non-Senate faculty member receives notice of termination before the expiration of his or her appointment, he or she may select as a grievance mechanism either APM-140, as described in this policy, or Section 103.9 of the Standing Orders of The Regents (S.O. 103.9), the procedures of which are described in Academic Senate Bylaw 337. In selecting either APM-140 or S.O. 103.9, the non-Senate faculty member waives the right to invoke the other mechanism to review the same grievance.” (APM-140-14e.)

Subsequent to any final decision, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly and simultaneously inform the complainant and the respondent of the decision, including any final decision on discipline and its rationale.
VIII. Appendix
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Following hearing, Privilege & Tenure Committee makes recommendation to Chancellor regarding discipline

No formal discipline; outcome communicated to complainant and respondent

Chancellor makes final decision; outcome communicated to complainant & respondent

Respondent refuses early resolution

Proposes early resolution, which may include discipline & other measures

Respondent accepts early resolution; outcome communicated to complainant & respondent

END

END

END

END

END

END

END

END

END

END

END

END

END*

Complainant and respondent have opportunity to submit written response and/or request meeting with the Chancellor/designee

Title IX report, applying preponderance of evidence standard, finds a violation of UC SVSH Policy, which establishes probable cause under APM-015

Title IX report, applying preponderance of evidence standard, does not find a violation of UC SVSH Policy

Chancellor/designee engages Peer Review Committee to advise on discipline or other actions to resolve

Complainant and respondent have opportunity to submit written response and/or request meeting with the Chancellor/designee

Notice of charges with proposed discipline filed with Senate Charges Officer

60 BUSINESS DAYS FOR INVESTIGATION

40 BUSINESS DAYS TO FILE ANY CHARGES

APPENDIX A: Senate Faculty Adjudication Model - Process Flow Chart

*See APM-016 regarding dismissal of faculty respondent with tenure or security of employment
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
NON-SENATE (NON-REPRESENTED) FACULTY ADJUDICATION MODEL – PROCESS FLOW CHART

Stage 0: Resources and Report
- Insufficient information to proceed
- Allegation received by Title IX
- Outreach and preliminary inquiry conducted
- Alternative resolution; no formal investigation

Stage 1: Investigation and Findings
- Formal investigation by Title IX under UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment;
  Title IX informs Chancellor
  - Title IX report, applying preponderance of evidence standard, does not find a violation of UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
  - Title IX report, applying preponderance of evidence standard, finds a violation of UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, which establishes probable cause under APM-015

Stage 2: Assessment and Consultation
- Complainant and respondent have opportunity to submit written response and/or request meeting with the Chancellor/designee

Stage 3: Corrective Action in Accordance with APM-150
- Chancellor/designee makes determination
- Respondent refuses informal resolution
- Respondent accepts informal resolution; outcome communicated to complainant and respondent
- No further action; outcome communicated to complainant and respondent
- Following consideration of reply (if any), notice of action issued; outcome communicated to complainant and respondent

*Respondent may grieve decision pursuant to APM-140

Notice of any proposed disciplinary action must be delivered no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation.

Support and interim measures available throughout the process.

Attachment 2: Non-Senate Faculty Adjudication Model - Process Flow Chart
RIGHTS OF INVOLVED PARTIES

According to university policies, both the complainant and respondent have outlined rights and responsibilities throughout the investigation and adjudication processes. They include the following:

The Rights of the Complainant

a. To be treated with dignity and respect.
b. To anticipate a timely resolution after charges have been filed, (60 business days for investigation and adjudication, 120 business days if appeals are filed), and to be notified if the case will exceed the 60 or 120 business days.
c. To receive written notification of existing counseling, health, mental health, victim advocacy, legal assistance, and other services available to complainants both on-campus and in the community. Please see Resource Sheet for specific resource information in these areas.
d. To receive this written notification of available assistance with changing academic, living, transportation, and working situations, if requested and if reasonable, regardless of whether or not campus police or local law enforcement are notified.
e. To be accompanied to any investigatory meetings and/or an appeal hearing by a CARE advocate and/or advisor and/or a person (or persons) of support, of their choice, with the limit being two (2) people.
f. To be present for the duration of and produce questions for any witnesses in advance of an appeal hearing.
g. To have the opportunity to make statements, produce witnesses or evidence regarding the incident and/or personal impact.
h. To opt out of the process at any time and continue to be notified of any outcomes or resolution.
i. To be informed as soon as possible, and simultaneously with the respondent, of:
   a. the outcome of the investigation, sanctioning, and appeal hearing;
   b. the procedures for appealing the results of the investigation, sanctioning, or appeal hearing;
   c. any change to the results that occur prior to the time that such results become final; and
   d. when such results become final.
j. Right to receive the redacted report.

The Rights of the Respondent

a. To be treated with dignity and respect.
b. The right to written notice of the charges and instigation of an investigation, a timely resolution after charges have been filed (60 business days for investigation and adjudication, 120 business days if appeals are filed), and to be notified if the case will exceed the 60 or 120 business days.
c. To receive this written notification of existing counseling, health, mental health, respondent support, legal assistance, and other services available to respondents both on-campus and in the community.
d. To be accompanied to any investigatory meetings and/or appeal hearing by an advisor and/or person(s) of support of the respondent’s choice, with the limit being two (2) people.
e. To be present for the duration of and produce questions for any witnesses in advance of an appeal hearing.
f. To have the opportunity to make statements; produce witnesses or evidence pertaining to the case; and respond to and question the evidence presented.
g. To simultaneously with the complainant, be informed in writing of:
   a. the outcome of any University investigation, sanctioning, appeal hearing;
   b. the procedures for appealing the results of the investigation, sanctioning, or appeal hearing; and
   c. any change to the results that occur prior to the time that such results become final.
h. To opt out of the process at any time and continue to be notified of any outcomes or resolution.
i. Right to receive the redacted report.
### Campus and Community Resources for Individuals Impacted by Sexual Violence, Sexual Harassment, or Other Prohibited Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELIGIBLE FOR SERVICES</th>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>RESOURCE NAME</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFIDENTIAL ADVOCACY &amp; SUPPORT RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Campus Advocacy, Resources &amp; Education (CARE)</td>
<td>(805) 893-4613 (24-hour advocacy line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students primarily (some services for Employees) Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)</td>
<td>(805) 893-4411 (24-hour confidential crisis counseling available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Office of the Ombuds</td>
<td>(805) 893-3285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Staff Assistance Program (ASAP)</td>
<td>(805) 893-3318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Rape Crisis Center (SBRCC)</td>
<td>(805) 564-3696 (24-hour crisis line)/ (805) 963-6832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Solutions for Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>(805) 964-5245 (24-hour crisis line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTING OFFICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Title IX &amp; Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Office (Title IX Office)</td>
<td>(805) 893-2701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>UCSB Police Department (UCPD)</td>
<td>(805) 893-3446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Isla Vista Foot Patrol (IVFP)</td>
<td>(805) 681-4179/(805) 681-4100 (after hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH &amp; MEDICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Student Health</td>
<td>(805) 893-5361 (information)/ (805) 893-7129 (advice nurse)/ (805) 893-3371 (appointments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Student Mental Health Coordination Services</td>
<td>(805) 893-3030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Response Team (SART)</td>
<td>Referrals made by CARE, SBRCC, UCPD, IVFP, or other law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Cottage Hospital Emergency Medicine &amp; Trauma Services</td>
<td>(805) 682-7111 (24 hour, main phone line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL AID, IMMIGRATION, &amp; VISA SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Office of Financial Aid &amp; Scholarships</td>
<td>(805) 893-2432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Federal Student Aid</td>
<td>(800) 433-3243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Office of International Students &amp; Scholars</td>
<td>(805) 893-2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>(805) 963-6754 (SB Main Office) (805) 922-9909 (Santa Maria Main Office) (805) 736-6582 (Lompoc Main Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CAMPUS &amp; COMMUNITY RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Office of Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>(805) 893-5016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Housing, Dining, &amp; Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>(805) 893-3281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Respondent Services Program</td>
<td>(805) 893-5012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Associated Students Legal Resource Center</td>
<td>(805) 893-4246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Resource Center for Sexual &amp; Gender Diversity (RCSGD)</td>
<td>(805) 893-5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>(805) 893-3166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>(805) 893-8332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Campus</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>(805) 893-3179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Transgender Advocacy Network</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@sbtan.org">info@sbtan.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIONAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>RAINN (Rape, Abuse &amp; Incest National Network)</td>
<td>(800) 656-HOPE (4673) (National Sexual Assault Hotline - confidential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC)</td>
<td>(877) 739-3895 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>It’s On Us</td>
<td><a href="http://www.itsonus.org/">http://www.itsonus.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Not Alone, Center for Changing Our Campus Culture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@changingourcampus.org">info@changingourcampus.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCSB CARE and Respondent Services can provide impacted parties with the names and contact information for individuals handling requests for protected measures and accommodations.
Confidential Advocacy & Support Services

Campus Advocacy Resources & Education (CARE) - Located in the Student Resource Building, CARE provides confidential 24-hour advocacy services for survivors, support, information about reporting options, accompaniment to evidence examinations or meetings with law enforcement, and support services for friends, family members, or significant others of impacted parties. http://wgse.sa.ucsb.edu/care/home

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) - Located in Building 599, CAPS provides UCSB students with confidential individual counseling, as well as support groups, information, and 24-hour crisis phone counseling at no charge. CAPS also provides professional consultation to faculty, staff, and families. http://caps.sa.ucsb.edu/

Office of the Ombuds – Located in Girvetz Hall, the Office of the Ombuds acts as a confidential resource for the UCSB community to discuss concerns with a trained mediator. It is a safe place to discuss workplace issues, interpersonal conflict, academic concerns, and many other problems. They serve faculty, staff, students, parents, or anyone else with a campus-related concern. https://ombs.ucsb.edu/

Academic & Staff Assistance Program (ASAP) – Located on the 3rd floor of the Student Affairs & Administrative Services Building (SAASB). The Academic & Staff Assistance Program (ASAP) counselors promote the emotional health and well-being of academic personnel, faculty, staff, and eligible family members in a confidential, cost-free setting. ASAP in managing and minimizing organizational and individual impacts by providing high quality consultation, counseling, psychological wellness training, and violence prevention & mitigation services. http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/asap

Santa Barbara Rape Crisis Center (SBRCC) – Located in downtown Santa Barbara, SBRCC provides advocacy and support for survivors of sexual violence, including referral and support for medical and legal options. http://www.sbrapecrisiscenter.org/

Domestic Violence Solutions for Santa Barbara County – Located in Santa Barbara, this resource provides emergency shelter, support groups, 24-hour crisis line, and transitional housing. https://www.dvsolutions.org/en/

Reporting Offices

Survivors may report to one or more of the following, or not report at all.

Title IX & Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Office (Title IX Office) – Located in Phelps Hall, the Title IX Office coordinates responses to reports of sexual violence, sexual harassment, and other prohibited behavior affecting the campus community, and reviews matters to determine if an official University investigation is required. The Title IX Office investigates Title IX complaints, oversees campus Title IX resolution efforts, and offers referrals to relevant campus resources. https://oeos.ucsb.edu/titleix/

UCSB Police Department (UCPD) - Located in the Public Safety Building, UCPD provides reporting, investigation, and forwarding of reports to the District Attorney for legal action for crimes committed on campus property. Also provides information about restraining orders and referrals for forensic exams. https://www.police.ucsb.edu/

Isla Vista Foot Patrol (IVFP) – Located in Isla Vista, IVFP provides reporting, investigation, and forwarding of reports to the District Attorney for legal action, information about restraining orders, and referrals for forensic exams for crimes committed in Isla Vista. This substation utilizes bike patrol and officers from the CHP and UCSB Police to provide safety and enforcement for the community of Isla Vista. http://www.sbsheriff.org/ivfp.html

Health & Medical Resources

Student Health - Located between the Events Center and Isla Vista, this resource provides medical examinations, referrals, and treatment, as well as psychiatry and social work. Visits for students are covered with Gaucho Health Insurance. This resource does not provide medical examinations for evidence collection (such as forensic medical examinations through SART). http://studenthealth.sa.ucsb.edu/home

Student Mental Health Coordination Services – Located in the Student Resource Building, Student Mental Health Coordination Services is a readily accessible single point of contact for individuals concerned about a student in distress. The coordinators will consult about a student, provide referrals to campus departments, develop action plans, and follow up with students, staff, and faculty, as appropriate. SMHCS can provide a coordinated university response to a student in distress. http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/responding-to-distressed-students/safety-net/coordinators
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Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) - SART is a countywide program providing care to individuals who have been sexually assaulted or sexually abused. An interagency program, SART coordinates with law enforcement, Rape Crisis Centers, Victim Witness Assistance, Child Welfare Services, Child Abuse Listening and Mediation (CALM) and a medical team of trained professionals, nurses, and physicians. Referrals for forensic medical examinations come from CARE, law enforcement, child welfare services, or Santa Barbara Rape Crisis Center. Together, the partners determine the need for a medical exam and/or an interview based on SART protocol.

Cottage Hospital Emergency Medicine & Trauma Services – Located in Santa Barbara, Goleta, and Santa Ynez, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital is verified as a Level II Trauma Center for adults and for pediatrics by the American College of Surgeons and Santa Barbara County Emergency Medical Services Agency. The trauma center responds to trauma emergencies throughout Santa Barbara County, as well as parts of Ventura and San Luis Obispo counties. http://www.cottagehealth.org/services/emergency-medicine-trauma-services/

Financial Aid, Immigration, and Visa Services

Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships - The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships can assist UCSB students with financial aid related needs. They also provide UCSB families with the services necessary to achieve their educational goals. They are committed to providing accurate, user-friendly, responsive, and respectful service to students and their families. https://www.finaid.ucsb.edu/

Federal Student Aid – Federal Student Aid, a part of the U.S. Department of Education, is the largest provider of student financial aid in the nation. Federal Student Aid is responsible for managing the student financial assistance programs authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. These programs provide grants, loans, and work-study funds to students attending college or career school. https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/

Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) - OISS serves UCSB's international students and scholars as well as departments who work with the international population. OISS provides immigration support for the UCSB community, advising for international students, and cultural programming. http://oiss.sa.ucsb.edu/

Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County - The mission of the Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County is to provide high-quality legal services in order to ensure that low-income persons and seniors have access to the civil justice system in times of crisis – to secure safe, habitable shelter, adequate income, and protection from domestic violence and elder abuse. The Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County can also provide information related to immigration and visa services. http://www.lafsbc.org/

Other Campus & Community Resources

Office of Judicial Affairs – Located in the Office of Student Life in the Student Resource Building, this resource issues and enforces no contact orders and the adjudication process following a Title IX investigation. http://judicialaffairs.sa.ucsb.edu/

Housing, Dining, & Auxiliary Enterprises – Located in the trailers between the College of Creative Studies and Santa Rosa Hall, this resource provides housing accommodations, such as room or building changes, or cancellation of contracts, as available, to student resident survivors of sexual violence or stalking. http://www.housing.ucsb.edu/

Respondent Services Program – Respondent Services Program provides a neutral contact for any student or employee responding to a Title IX investigation to receive information about navigating the Title IX process. Furthermore, the Respondent Services Program provides referrals to campus and community resources for emotional or mental health support and assists respondents with any logistical issues related to interim measures that may have been put in place. http://sexualviolence.ucsb.edu/accused/

Associated Students Legal Resource Center – Located in The Pardall Center in Isla Vista, this resource provides education, facilitation, and self-help services to assist students with legal issues. https://legal.as.ucsb.edu/

Resource Center for Sexual & Gender Diversity (RCSGD) – The RCSGD, located on the 3rd floor of the Student Resource Building, works with students, staff and faculty to ensure that LGBTQ identities, experiences and concerns are represented and addressed at UCSB. The center aims to create a vibrant and engaging environment through social and educational programming, volunteer and leadership opportunities, a comfortable and welcoming social and study space and professional and student staff members for support and advocacy. http://wgse.sa.ucsb.edu/RCSGD/home

Human Resources – Located in the Student Affairs and Administrative Services Building (SAASB), Human Resources at UCSB provides prospective and current employees with information and resources related to ASAP, benefits, career management, compensation, disability, employee services, employment, labor relations, and training. http://www.hr.ucsb.edu/
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**Academic Senate** – The Senate enables the faculty, through shared governance, to exercise its right to participate in the University's governance. To that end, faculty and administrators depend on a high level of consultation, trust, mutual respect and a tradition of collegial collaboration. [https://senate.ucsb.edu/](https://senate.ucsb.edu/)

**Academic Personnel** - The Office of Academic Personnel is a service organization whose mission is to facilitate the recruitment, appointment, advancement, and development of outstanding and diverse faculty and academic appointees. The Office of Academic Personnel interacts with the Office of the President, the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor, Colleges, Departments, and academic employees to develop, analyze, interpret and implement academic personnel policies and procedures. [https://ap.ucsb.edu/](https://ap.ucsb.edu/)

**Santa Barbara Transgender Advocacy Network** - The Santa Barbara Transgender Advocacy Network educates individuals and organizations on best practices for transgender & gender expansive clients, patients, students, congregants and families; creates and develops spaces, actions, and policies that advance the welfare of transgender and diverse gender non-conforming individuals, their families, and allies in California's Central Coast communities. [https://www.sbtan.org/](https://www.sbtan.org/)

### National Resources

**RAINN (Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network)** – RAINN is the nation’s largest anti-sexual violence organization. RAINN created and operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline, a confidential service, in partnership with more than 1,000 local sexual assault service providers across the country and operates the DoD Safe Helpline for the Department of Defense. RAINN also carries out programs to prevent sexual violence and help survivors. [https://www.rainn.org/](https://www.rainn.org/)

**National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC)** - The NSVRC’s Mission is to provide leadership in preventing and responding to sexual violence through collaboration, sharing and creating resources, and promoting research. The NSVRC staff collects and disseminates a wide range of resources on sexual violence including statistics, research, position statements, statutes, training curricula, prevention initiatives and program information. With these resources, the NSVRC assists coalitions, advocates and others interested in understanding and eliminating sexual violence. [http://www.nsvrc.org/](http://www.nsvrc.org/)

**It's On Us** - Launched in September 2014, It's On Us is a national movement to end sexual assault. The campaign was launched following recommendations from the White House Task Force to Prevent Sexual Assault that noted the importance of engaging everyone in the conversation to end sexual violence. The campaign combines innovative creative content and grassroots organizing techniques to spark conversation on a national and local level. [http://www.itsonus.org/](http://www.itsonus.org/)

**Not Alone, Center for Changing our Campus Culture** - The Center is supported by the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women in collaboration with its designated Campus Program Technical Assistance Provider Team. The Center has worked collaboratively and sought guidance from experts to provide important resources for colleges and universities on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Not Alone was launched in connection with the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. [http://changingourcampus.org/about-us/not-alone/](http://changingourcampus.org/about-us/not-alone/)