ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others

4. Special Orders –
   Consent Calendar

   In Memoriam
   Waldo Tobler, Geography, (1954-2018)
   Homer D. Swander, Jr., English, (1956-2018)
   Garth St. Omer, English, (1931-2018)
   Adil M. Yaqub, Mathematics, (1928-2018)
   Michael Gordon, Political Science, (1939-2018)
   Hyung Il Pai, East Asian Languages and Culture, (1958-2018)
   Jacob Israelachvili, Chemical Engineering, (1944-2018)

5. Reports of Special Committees

6. Reports of Standing Committees

7. Petitions of Students None

8. Unfinished Business

9. University and Faculty Welfare

10. New Business
Bren School Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Report 2017-2018

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 Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of 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. 2018-2019 FTE Plan

   The FEC led the FTE planning process, producing the Bren School’s FTE Planning Report. As part of the FTE planning process, our faculty conducted thorough analyses of our current expertise, expected retirements, research strengths and trajectories, student demands, and linkages with other initiatives across campus. The faculty identified FTE priorities (in rank order) in the areas of (1) Business Sustainability, (2) Environmental Data Science 1, (3) Terrestrial Conservation Ecology, (4) Environmental Data Science 2, (5) Environmental Communication and (6) Global Change Ecology. We also have teaching and professional program needs in the areas of Eco-Entrepreneurship, Environmental Communication, Environmental Negotiation and Leadership, and Data Analysis and Visualization.

2. EDS and ecology positions defined

   After the FTE planning retreat, there was a need to define the Environmental Data Science and Ecology positions in more detail. A second retreat was used to gather faculty input and generate more specific definitions of these four positions.

3. EDS focus approved

   Some discussions related to our coverage of Environmental Data Science led to the definition of an “Environmental Data Science Focus”, which allows our MESM students to add this focus to their program of study and deepen their knowledge in this important area.

4. ESM 251/204 integration approved

   For several years we required our MESM students to take two courses in environmental economics as part of the core courses. However, there were frequent comments that there was too much duplicity and that the core had too many courses. Therefore, after a discussion with all the faculty it was decided to integrate the two courses into one, and reduce the core course requirement by one course.

5. 2017-2018 budget oversight

   The FEC reviewed the Bren School budget several times with the administrative staff, and provided feedback with regards to current levels of expenditure and the need to increase income through gifts, special fees and other means.
6. Expanded faculty meeting participation to lecturers

At the request of some lecturers, the faculty agreed to allow them to participate in faculty meetings, and to make sure they are invited when meeting topics are relevant.

7. Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition proposal to Planning and Budget

The Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition proposal, which had been developed by staff in 2016-17 and discussed by the faculty, was reviewed, modified and sent to Planning and Budget for comment. No written comments were received. Following consultation with the Graduate Division, the proposal will be revised in 2018-19 and resubmitted to Planning and Budget.

8. Reviewed committee appointment assignments for junior faculty

At the request of some faculty, the current committee appointment assignments for junior faculty were reduced, to allow them to focus on research and teaching.

9. Admissions pool

While the number of MESM students for 2018-2020 is within our expected range, there is a concern that the number of applicants has decreased consistently in the past few years. The FEC discussed with the Recruitment, Admissions and Support committee, as well as with staff, measures that could be taken to increase the number of applicants.

10. Mutual respect town hall

Due to an increased number of students indicating that micro-harassments occur at the Bren School, the FEC conducted two town halls on Mutual Respect, bringing experts from campus to help all of us address the issue. Feedback from students was positive, although there is a need to have a continuous conversation with all. Specific professional training on micro-aggression response was developed and tested with the MESM Class of 2018. The training will be modified for incoming students during orientation and will be added to new student orientation in September 2018.

Arturo Keller, Chair  
Andrew Plantinga

James Salzman  
Mark Buntaine
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 2017-18, the Charges Officer responded to eight new formal complaints, and continued ongoing efforts in relation to one complaint that was filed with the Senate during the previous year. An acting Charges Office, Lisa Hajjar, responded to one informal complaint. The Charges Advisory Committee was consulted regarding all eight of the newly submitted formal complaints.

Based on recommendations of the Charges Advisory Committee, five 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.

Along with other Senate groups, the Charges Office and the Charges Advisory Committee responded to proposed new local procedures for reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty violations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy. They also responded to proposed amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 - Conflict of Interest.

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, 2017-2018

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 2017-18 and addressed many issues internal to the College and also responded to numerous external enquiries.

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES FOR THE COLLEGE

50th Anniversary events
Numerous events were held to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the College including the first Research and Creative Activities Conference (RACA-CON) featuring presentations by students in all CCS majors and addresses by CCS alumni. Over 300 students, parents, faculty and alumni people attended the event on Nov 4th 2017.

General Education review
The goals of the CCS General Education requirements were examined. This began at the faculty retreat and continued at FEC meetings and at a special meeting held in January 2018. A document was produced with 6 goals of the CCS general education program.

Marine science major
A proposed 9th major in CCS, Marine Science, passed through various reviews and was approved by the Academic Senate

Changes to selection procedure for student speakers at graduation
A new procedure for selecting the student speakers at graduation was discussed and implemented in the 2017/18 year. There was a call for nominations and students were asked to audition their proposed speech. Those present made a recommendation to the FEC who selected the speakers.

RESPONSE TO OUTSIDE REQUESTS

Proposal to Revise Senate Regulation 240. Honors at Graduation
The proposal was discussed and the committee submitted comments and suggestions whilst endorsing the proposal.
Proposed Revision of SR 424.A.3 UC admissions area D requirement
The proposal was discussed and the committee endorsed the proposal.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 80 –Subject A Requirement
The proposal was discussed and the committee endorsed the proposal.

Systemwide Review of Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
Concerns were raised about increased salary gaps between disciplines and that the program may undermine the merit and promotions process.

Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy
The proposal was discussed and the committee endorsed the proposal.

Request for response to PRP documents for the Departments of English and Physics
The committee responded to both a request for questions for the external review committee and also comments on the ERC reports and department responses.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 25 in response to concerns raised by the Office for Civil Rights
The issue was discussed but the committee felt that there was not enough information to evaluate the effectiveness of current policy or need for revisions beyond counsel’s advice.

Proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants
This proposal was the subject of extensive discussion and, whilst broadly in support of the proposal the Committee also passed on a number of concerns.

The FEC extensively discussed the proposed changes to APM 285, 210-3, 133-0-B and 740 affecting the LSOE series. A letter was submitted in support of the revised changes.

Proposed Classroom Recording Policy
The proposal was discussed and the committee submitted comments and suggestions whilst endorsing the proposal.

Proposed Amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 -Conflict of Interest
The proposal was discussed and the committee submitted comments and suggestions whilst endorsing the proposal.

OTHER ITEMS OF NOTE

- A retreat for all faculty of the College of Creative Studies was held on 26th September 2017.
- A search for an Assistant Dean for the College was successfully carried out.
- A search for a new SAO I was successfully carried out.
- Three FEC Commendation of Excellence Awards were made.
A CCS student was a recipient of the Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research, a CCS student received a Goldwater Scholarships and six current CCS students and recent CCS graduates received NSF GRFP scholarships

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John G. Latto, Chair, Senior Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies Biology, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology,
Sathya Guruswamy, Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies Physics, Physics
Kara M. Brown, Lecturer potential SOE, College of Creative Studies Writing & Literature, Writing Program
Karel Kasteels, Lecturer potential SOE, College of Creative Studies Mathematics, Mathematics,
Richert K. Wang, Lecturer potential SOE, College of Creative Studies Computing, Computer Science
Jeremy J. Haladyna, Senior Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies Music Composition, Music
Leroy E. Laverman, Senior Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies Chemistry and Biochemistry, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Jane L. Mullinger, College of Creative Studies Art, Professor, Art,
Raisa E. Feldman, At-Large Member, Associate Professor, Statistics and Applied Probability
Madeleine I. Sorapure, At-Large Member, Senior Lecturer and Director, Writing Program
Claudia M. Tyler, Non-Senate Academic Representative, CCS Biology
Kathleen R. Foltz, Ex Officio, Interim Dean CCS, Associate Professor, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology
Sara C. Sterphone, Consultant, CCS Student Affairs Officer
Lynn Clark, Advisor, CCS Assistant Dean
Jennifer R. Johansen, Advisor. CCS Assistant to the Dean.
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The following summarizes the business of the College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) for 2017-2018.

Summary of Actions:

Courses, Curricular Matters and Program Reviews

1. College of Engineering Requirement Option 2 and Option 3 – committee approved proposal.
3. Proposal to Establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change – did not opine in this issue
4. Proposal to Establish a Master of Environmental Data Science – committee provided comments
5. Revised Proposal to Establish a BA Degree in Marine Science – committee approved proposal
6. Mechanical Engineering electives proposal (ME/MATRL 186A and 186B) – committee approved proposal
7. 2018 EVC Call for PRP member nominations – committee provided a nomination
8. Proposal to Modify College of Engineering General Education Requirements – committee approved proposal
9. 2018-23 Five-Year Planning Perspective – committee provided no comments on this issue
10. Chemical Engineering Elective (ChE 146) – committee approved proposal
11. Selection of Academic Units for 2019-20 Academic Program Review – committee provided a recommendation
12. Computer Science proposal (CS 174B and CS 196B) – committee approved proposal
13. Computer Engineering proposal (ECE 189ABC and ECE 130ABC) – committee approved proposal
14. Proposal to Modify the College of Engineering General Education Requirements – committee approved proposal
15. Council Review of Interim WSCUC Report – committee provided no comments on this issue
Review of Policies and Proposals

1. Revision of Divisional Regulation 80, Subject A Requirement – committee approved changes provided in the draft.
2. Proposed Revision of SR 424.A.3 – committee approved revisions provided in the draft.
3. Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of SVSH Policy – committee provided comments
5. Proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-students as Teaching Assistants – committee provided comments
6. Revision of Divisional Regulation 25 in response to concerns raised by the Office for Civil Rights – committee supported changes in the policy
7. Requesting Pre-Approval of UCEAP courses to meet General Education Requirements – committee provided comments
9. Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations – committee supported proposed policy
10. Proposed Amendment of Senate ByLaw 128, Conflict of Interest – committee supported proposed policy
11. Proposed Classroom Recording Policy – committee supported proposed policy
12. Proposed Divisional ByLaw 35.K on Conflict of Interest – committee approved the proposed language in the proposal

2017-2018 Committee Members

Rod Alferness, Dean
Glenn Beltz, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies
Dan Gianola, Materials (Chair)
Divy Agrawal, Computer Science
Stefano Tessaro, Computer Science
Barron Peters, Chemical Engineering
Siddharth Dey, Chemical Engineering
Clint Schow, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Upamanyu Madhow, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Susanne Stemmer, Materials
Irene Beyerlein, Mechanical Engineering (Vice-Chair)
Kimberly Foster, Mechanical Engineering
Natasha Shakouri, Undergraduate Representative
Simone Stewart, Graduate Representative
Tiffany Sabado, Staff Coordinator
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division

The charge of the College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) is defined in Part III, Appendix II, D1.93A of the Santa Barbara Division’s Bylaws and Regulations as follows: “Each FEC of the Faculty of a College, often abbreviated as ‘FEC of the College,’ is a committee of the Academic Senate. These Committees are authorized by the Bylaws of each Division of the Academic Senate as organizations through which the Faculty of each College can coordinate the academic affairs of their College.”

Professor Paige Digeser was elected FEC Chair at the meeting on 5 October 2017, and she offers this Annual Report for academic year 2017-18.

**Executive Summary**

The FEC is tasked with the academic oversight of 93% of the undergraduate population on campus and a corresponding 92% of the regular undergraduate courses, 83% of the academic departments, and 90% of the campus’s degree programs. Much of what was accomplished in 2017-18 involved what could be considered the day-to-day business of the College: reviewing systemwide policies, participating in programmatic reviews, overseeing major adjustments to the curriculum, approving majors and minors, and selecting award recipients. In performing these tasks it is clear that the College is healthy, vibrant and under continual renewal. However, in performing these tasks, it also is clear that the College faces a number of longstanding challenges: Our undergraduate numbers continue to rise while the number of graduate students remains stagnant; Questions of climate continue to impede the educational experiences of too many students; Some departments within the college are overwhelmed with majors while other departments are trying to attract majors as best they can; The physical infrastructure for some departments is not satisfactory; The challenges faced by transfer students need to be carefully monitored. None of these is a surprise. None of them has an easy answer. All of them affect the welfare of the L&S faculty, students and staff.

The FEC benefited greatly from the participation and insights of its ex-officio members, Executive Dean Pierre Wiltzius and AVC and Dean of Undergraduate Education Jeff Stopple. I also want to acknowledge the contributions of GSA representative Mary Okin from History of Art and Architecture and Associated Students Representative Brooke Kopel. Both of these students are dedicated to the welfare of the College and to UCSB as a whole. Both provided invaluable advice and input to the committee and served their constituencies well. The FEC is also indebted to the experience and wisdom of Barbara Gilkes, without whose guidance not much would happen. Finally, in addition to myself, two other
members will be stepping off the committee: Sherene Seikal and Barry Giesbrecht. Thank you for your service. It was a pleasure to work with you all.

Systemwide Policy and Regulation Review
As with other Senate committees, the FEC is offered the opportunity to review and comment on systemwide policy revisions. Because these revisions nearly always involve the well-being of departments, faculty, and students in L&S, the committee usually provides a response. Among the policy changes the FEC considered in 2017-18:

- A second Systemwide Review of Revisions to APM sections concerning Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) and series titles (APM 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, 235). The FEC was concerned that there be clarity in the review criteria for these Senate colleagues;
- A taskforce report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program. The FEC found no basis for continuation let alone expansion of the trial program;
- A consideration of whether and how the Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment would change Divisional Senate procedures (SR 424.A.3) for handling charges of sexual violence or harassment brought against Senate and Non-Senate Faculty. While the FEC found benefit in the stricter timeline and the regulation of updates to both complainants and respondents, the committee had serious reservations about the reduced role the proposed procedures would assign to the Senate;
- Additions to Systemwide and Divisional Senate Bylaws to address potential conflict of interest among standing committee members. The FEC provided its endorsement;
- A proposal from BOARS to change Area "d" (lab science) requirement for UC freshman admission to be in alignment with new State science standards, which the FEC endorsed;
- A proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations intended to mirror open access policies already developed for faculty and staff publications. While agreeing in principle, the FEC was concerned that the process did not adequately consider consequences for larger collaborative research environments.

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. In 2017-18 the committee provided extensive comment during the reviews of the Departments of English, Global Studies, and Physics. The FEC also commented on the Review of the Education Department and the Teacher Education Program within the Graduate School of Education, since those programs offer minors to L&S undergraduates.

As the other reviewing agencies, the FEC was troubled by climate issues reported primarily at the graduate student level. It fully supports the PRP Chair in stating, “Despite the University’s attempts to train and enlighten its faculty and staff, sexual harassment remains a persistent issue. Additional steps need to be taken to improve the climate for women at UCSB.”
FEC also provided comment on academic units that should undergo program review next and nominated candidates for the Program Review Panel.

Curriculum Adjustments

The College of Letters and Science offers 75 unique undergraduate majors and 46 minor academic programs. The majors include an additional 45 Emphases, which require their own major sheet/study list. Foundational courses for the remaining undergraduate majors on campus are also offered through L&S.

Given this volume and significance, curriculum adjustments occupy a considerable amount of the committee’s attention every year, comprising the bulk of FEC workload in the winter quarter. In 2017-18 the FEC reviewed 19 proposed significant curriculum changes (significant meaning they impact the major or minor program), including four proposed new minors and one proposed new Pre-Major. The FEC sub-committees endorsed lesser changes submitted by 28 academic units (lesser, or housekeeping changes, include such things as removing discontinued courses, updating to new course numbers, correcting typos). L&S Departments and programs are encouraged to actively monitor their curricula and courses and to propose updates as needed on an annual cycle.

The significant curriculum proposals submitted to the FEC in 2017-18 were:

Changes to Existing Majors and Minors – (Fully approved by the FEC and Undergraduate Council):
1. Anthropology Department – Changes to all 4 Anthropology Major Emphases
2. Art Department – Changes to all 3 Art Minors
3. Black Studies Department – Changes to Black Studies Major and Minor
4. Chicana/o Studies Department – Changes to Chicana/o Studies Major
5. EALCS Department – Changes to Japanese High Proficiency Major
6. EEMB-MCDB Departments – Changing the lower division Bio lab sequence from 3 quarters to two; impacted Biology Pre-Major and all ten biology majors. —FEC found this to be an innovative pedagogical approach that would improve the educational offering while simultaneously accommodating the increasing number of Bio and STEM majors despite limited campus lab space.
7. English Department – Changes to English Major
8. History Department – Changes to History Major
9. Mathematics Department – Changes to Mathematics BA Major & Teaching for Math Minor
10. MCDB – Changes to Pharmacology Major
11. Spanish & Portuguese Department – Changes to Spanish Major and Spanish Minor
   Note that the Department initially also proposed the establishment of two new emphases, but those were eliminated and consolidated into tracks within the existing major.

Proposed New Minors
12. History of Art & Architecture Department - New Minor in Museum Studies (endorsed by FEC and approved by UG Council)
13. History of Art & Architecture Department – New Minor in Architecture and Urban History (endorsed by FEC and still under review by UG Council)
14. History Department – New Minor in Poverty, Inequality, and Social Justice (endorsed by FEC and still under review by UG Council)

Proposed New Pre-Major

15. Film and Media Studies Department – New Film and Media Studies Pre-Major (endorsed by FEC and still under review by UG Council)

The following remain under consideration by FEC

16. Feminist Studies Department – Request to allow pursuit of major and minor within the Department
17. Religious Studies Department – Request to allow pursuit of major and minor within the Department
18. MCDB Department – Changes to Biochemistry, Molecular Bio Major (pending revisions from host department)
19. English Department – New Minor in Environmental Humanities with 3 Tracks (pending revisions from host department)

Other Academic Items Addressed

In addition, the committee approved three Majors proposed by individual undergraduates, endorsed revisions to the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for Psychological and Brain Sciences undergraduate degrees, and considered a request by the local EAP office for Pre-Approval of UCEAP Courses to meet General Education Requirements. The FEC ruled on one undergraduate grade appeal and provided comment on the re-opening of Graduate Admission to Chicana/o Studies.

Because of their potential effect on our college, the L&S FEC was invited to comment on a second round proposal to establish a BA in Marine Science within the College of Creative Studies, new modifications to the College of Engineering General Education Requirements, and a proposed MA in Environmental Data Science.

The FEC also spent some time considering appropriate oversight mechanisms for interdisciplinary majors and minors. The increase in such academic programs adds complexity to the FEC longstanding rule against students completing majors/minors housed in the same administrative unit (with established exceptions). During 2017-18 the FEC sought to develop guidelines for when a student may pursue a major and minor (or two majors) within the same academic unit and encouraged departments that house interdisciplinary majors and minors to review and update their course offerings and lists of participating faculty on a regular basis.

The FEC commented on local policies and procedures relating to academic issues, including: revision of the UCSB calculation of Honors at Graduation (SR 240), to provide more equitable opportunity for transfer students to earn Honors; revision of Divisional Senate Regulation 80 dealing with the Subject A entry level writing requirement; management review of a proposal to change eligibility requirements for teaching assistants; and approval of a classroom recording policy. The committee proposed changes to the grade appeal regulation (Divisional Senate Regulation 25), intended both to bring the regulation into alignment with a revised Policy 4105 (student grievance procedure) and to clarify the roles of the agents named in the regulation.
Course Adjustments
During the reporting year approximately 700 L&S courses were processed through the MCA. Over 20% of those were new courses. (Cf. roughly 55 COE courses went through the MCA, 3 CCS courses, and 3 GGSE UG courses.)

Online Courses
The FEC received nine requests for online courses: five were for new courses and four were petitions for renewed approval. The FEC chair reviewed an additional course and determined that it did not meet the campus threshold as an online course. The FEC endorsed eight of the nine course proposals. Notably, with one exception, all of these courses are designed for summer session offerings, and, with the same exception, all have pre-existing face-to-face courses. The exception was also the course that did not meet conditions for FEC endorsement.

Under current campus procedures, online courses are initially approved for a 2-year period, after which they are submitted for re-approval based on documented improvements and evidence of student performance and satisfaction. After six years of engaging in the renewal process, the FEC decided to streamline it by delegating the renewals to the FEC Chair, unless he or she decides that a particular case requires full committee review. It was our experience that online courses submitted for re-approval are improved over the course of the initial period and are usually of sufficient academic quality that they get routinely renewed. This will free up a bit of the committee’s time for other duties.

Unit Value Changes
The FEC reviewed 14 requests (from eight departments) to revalue course units, most of which were endorsed. One department requested that ten of its undergraduate courses be re-valued. That proposal was returned to the department for additional consideration and revision.

Further, the L&S FEC and Committee on Courses and General Education (CCGE) engaged in a review and adjustment of the unit revaluation worksheet in an effort to demystify and facilitate the process. The revised worksheet will be utilized beginning Summer 2018 for course re-uniting requests.

Other Activities
The FEC weighed in on establishment of an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change as well as a non-ORU Climate Hazards Center, and reviewed the campus draft Interim Report to the WSCUC accreditation body.

FEC was pleased to be involved in the selection process for a new Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education and Dean of L&S Undergraduate Education. We were equally pleased by the Chancellor’s selection of Jeffrey Stopple to fill that role.

The FEC oversees selection of the Harold J. Plos Memorial Award recipient. The 2018-19 Plos recipient is Douglas McCauley, EEMB. The committee also oversees selection of other awards within the college.
Selection of New Members
In spring 2018 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:

    Amit Ahuja (Political Science)
    Dorota Dutsch (Classics)
    James Roney (Psychological and Brain Sciences)

In addition, Mahdi Abu-Omar (Chemistry and Biochemistry) was appointed by the Committee on Committees to a one-year term to fill a vacancy due to sabbatical leave.

2017-18 FEC committee members:
Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval, Chicana/o Studies
Paige Digeser, Political Science
Barry Giesbrecht, Psychological and Brain Sciences
Bruce Lipshutz, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Laurie Monahan, History of Art and Architecture
Sherene Seikaly, History

Ex officio members:
Jeff Stopple, AVC and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Student representatives:
Mary Okin of History of Art and Architecture represented the GSA for a second year.
Brooke Kopel served as the Associated Students undergraduate representative.
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met a total of 54 times, 2 hours per session, during the 2017-18 term. All meetings were held in executive session. In addition, CAP leadership met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel throughout the 2017-18 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; equitably evaluates and reports recommendations for such actions in accordance with campus and systemwide guidelines; and provides advice on UC and campus issues pertaining to academic personnel.

The 2017-18 academic year included the following:

- Reviewed 367 academic personnel cases (including 39 post audits of Dean’s Authority cases), resulting in 402 personnel actions in 2017-18—the second largest overall number of personnel actions in the past decade
- 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 review of the taskforce report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program, procedures for reported Senate and non-Senate faculty violations of the Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy, proposed further revisions to APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133-0-B, 740, 135-235 with regard to the Lecturer with Security of Employment series and suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses, and proposed amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 (Conflict of Interest), as well as other issues pertaining to academic salaries
- 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 2017-18 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 and the process for promotion to full professor
I. Academic Personnel Actions

CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, expanded review merit advancements, and promotions. A total of 402 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 of interest, or the potential for perceived conflict of interest, with the candidate. The deans continued the established practice of review of normative merit advancements (Dean’s Authority) and appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor Steps II and III at starting salaries within a defined range, whenever the recommendations of deans and departments agreed. In those cases in which salary recommendations between the respective dean and CAP differed by $4,000 or more, Associate Vice Chancellor 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. A Post Audit Report was submitted at the end of the cycle to the AVC of Academic Personnel.

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-assessments concerning teaching, research, and contributions to diversity, respectively. These optional documents often provide valuable information that assists reviewing agencies in making more informed evaluations of personnel cases.

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 2017-18.) CAP convened a “Shadow CAP,” appointed by AVC Butler, to evaluate Expanded Review merit cases and post audits of Dean’s Authority merit cases of current CAP members.

III. Academic Personnel Policy Issues

A number of policy issues were notable in the course of the 2017-18 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 submitted with the dossier to depart unduly from Red Binder guidelines. CAP (like other reviewing agencies) may request that additional letters be obtained in such cases, which can significantly delay case consideration. Departments are reminded to follow carefully Red Binder guidelines in soliciting extramural letters, or to provide a compelling explanation when those guidelines cannot be followed.
Service
As one of the 4 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 may be an appropriate form of acceleration when accomplishments within the review period merit such consideration; other forms of acceleration may be appropriate at the regularly scheduled time of review. 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 in the 2016-17 cycle with the AVC and the deans, in the 2017-18 cycle CAP evaluated cases of acceleration to or within Above Scale rank in accordance with Red Binder I-43 criteria. The evaluation of Above Scale cases remains an ongoing point of discussion among the reviewing agencies.

Providing Context
CAP at times finds it challenging to evaluate the diverse range of campus service, especially in connection with UCSB’s many research centers and ORUs. In addition, CAP sometimes has difficulty assessing achievements such as prizes or awards. CAP depends upon departments and deans to provide context for understanding the nature and scope of a candidate’s service or the importance of an award.

Meeting Red Binder I-34-VI, I-27, and I-75-V-2-b criteria for the evaluation of teaching and accounting for teaching load
CAP notes with concern that a number of departments did not fully respect Red Binder requirements for the evaluation and documentation of teaching performance. Because teaching is one of the 4 areas of evaluation established by Academic Personnel Manual and Red Binder, CAP places importance on adherence to the criteria detailed in the policy. For evaluating the teaching record, Red Binder I-34-VI states: “At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory.” Moreover, numerous departments failed to provide an accurate account of candidates’ teaching loads over the review period. Red Binder I-27 requires that “The bio-bib should also contain a statement of normal teaching workload for the department overall (e.g., 2-2-1) and a brief explanation of any deviations from this workload (e.g., sabbatical, administrative assignment).” Regarding evidence of teaching to be submitted with a case, Red Binder states in section I-75-V-2: “Reviewing agencies will return cases to the departments if they do not conform to these guidelines.” CAP hopes that the policy on criteria for the evaluation of teaching and accounting for the teaching load will be more closely followed in order that unnecessary delays in the processing of personnel cases may be avoided.

Salary Recommendations for New Appointments
CAP has a standard practice of making salary recommendations for new appointments, but there has occasionally been significant divergence between CAP’s recommendations and those of departments and deans. CAP notes that Red Binder I-8-II requires departmental recommendations for off-scale appointments to include “documentation of the market conditions that justify” the proposed salary. Salary recommendations for new appointments have been further complicated by the passage in 2017 of California State Legislation AB 168, which prohibits employers from inquiring about or relying upon salary history as a factor in determining pay.
Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD)
In cases of Active Service/Modified Duties, the evaluation of a personnel case may depend on the specifics of the modification approved by the Dean (Red Binder VI-5-D). CAP looks to departments to clarify the modification of duties.

IV. Campus Issues

Revisions to Departmental Bylaws
CAP received proposals from 2 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 these 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 the proposed revisions in Fall 2017 and concurred, with the following exception: the addition of Red Binder I-46-IV-1, which allows for solicitation wording to be combined in appointment cases where there is uncertainty regarding the rank or step of the candidate. CAP’s reasoning is based on the concern that if the wording is not clear regarding UC expectations for appointment at a specific rank and step, a department may very well receive a mix of letters -- some suitable and some unsuitable for the proposed appointment -- and perhaps not adequate for appointment at either level. CAP had no comment regarding proposed revisions disseminated in Spring 2018. CAP reviewed further revisions to the Red Binder in Summer 2018, which were aimed primarily at meeting UCPath needs.

V. Systemwide Issues

Systemwide Review of Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
After careful review, CAP could find no conclusive reason to oppose at present the expansion of the program to the UCSB campus on a trial basis. CAP’s support, however, was subject to the following conditions and observations: the extension of the NSTP to additional campuses must not be allowed to undermine UC’s merit-based personnel review process; there ought to be clarification of how reviewing agencies should be expected to evaluate the contributions of participating NSTP faculty, particularly those receiving significant salary augmentations; there is at present no transparent budgetary mechanism that would ensure an equitable redistribution across disciplines and divisions of suggested potential salary “savings” from NSTP; and the Committee is concerned that a permanent NSTP could mark a shift of the fiscal cost of maintaining competitive salaries toward a soft-money model in some disciplines, especially engineering.

Second Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, 235
The revisions to these sections of the APM concern the Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (LPSOE)/Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. CAP acknowledged that this most recent draft addressed several flaws in the previous proposal. CAP maintained, however, that the proposed revisions and their implementation present significant problems for the UC academic personnel review process in terms of both principle and practice. CAP’s consideration focused on three main concerns. Teaching excellence must be maintained as the primary evaluative criterion for this series and a clear hierarchical relationship between the three categories of review must be established. The proposed use of the title “Teaching Professor or equivalent” contravenes the important distinction between the LPSOE/LSOE and the Professor series and could allow for discrepancies between -- and even within -- campuses. Finally, UCOP’s proposed implementation of transfer to a step system based on years of experience rather than merit opposes the core principles of the UC academic personnel review process.
The “implementation plan and toolkit” has not to-date been provided by UCOP. CAP, therefore, recommended against endorsing the current proposed set of revisions to the APM concerning the LPSOE/LSOE series.

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:

- Addressing the UC Faculty Salary Gap for 2018-19 and thereafter
- Campus and ANR Reports on 1.5% Discretionary Salary Program for Academic Personnel 2017-18
- Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) Phase Two Basic Program and Implementation (July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2022)
- Regents Health Sciences Compensation Report December 2017
- Academic Council Statement in Support of Undocumented Students Enrolled in UC
- APM 330 Technical Revision
- NSTP Annual Report for Year Four (2016-17)
- Additional Compensation for Honoraria
- Academic Salary Plan Issuance 2018-19
- Faculty Salary Actions relative to Security of Employment (SOE) Faculty (2018)
- 2018 Academic General Salary Increase Plan Guidelines
- 2018 Academic Off-Scale Salary Increase Plan
- UCAF Concerns over Politicization of Science Research Funding

VI. Carry-over Issues for 2018-19

- Campuswide audit of all departments and colleges voting bylaws
- Query and Updating of Arts/Performance-based disciplines’ guidelines for evaluating research/creative activities
- Continued discussion among reviewing agencies of areas of concern from Section III: extramural letters, accelerations, service expectations
- Evaluation and documentation of teaching performance: adherence to Red Binder requirements
- Creation of a CAP website for dissemination of general information about CAP’s understanding of the academic personnel review process

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 at all campus cases grows from and upholds UCSB's unique culture of interdisciplinary collaboration and cooperation. The entire complex process works only because of the committed efforts of many different individuals and groups, too numerous to name here.

CAP deeply appreciates the enormous amount of labor that departmental chairs, personnel committees, and analysts expend each Fall in preparing cases for review. CAP also thanks the home departments of this year’s committee for allowing our members to rearrange their own departmental workloads in order to accommodate the rigorous demands of CAP service.
CAP thanks the Academic Senate staff, headed by Debra Blake, and its information technology staff, headed by Andy Satomi, for unfailing support, assistance, and advice in all matters.
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**Jon R. Snyder, French and Italian (Chair)**
### Table I - Summary of All Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP

**2017-18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Action</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair and visiting professor appts)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review (Prof Above, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reviews/No Change (included in Merits total)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series Transfers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>402</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**2017-18**

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 2017-18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Hoc Review Committee</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 402 personnel actions: 367
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III - 19-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance from prior year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes endowed chair appts)</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 (included in Merits total)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconsiderations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series Transfers</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP**

| 402 | 54 | 348 | 400 | 386 | 356 | 356 | 341 | 430 | 334 | 334 | 413 | 422 | 395 | 421 | 439 | 368 | 415 | 336 | 456 |

**Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance from prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of ad hoc committees</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average number of cases per year based on 19-year data:** 387
Committee on Committees  
Annual Report 2017-18  

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 2018-19 academic year, including new recommendations regarding divisional committee chair and systemwide representative service.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Committee on Committees (CoC) 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 CoC conducted 20 face-to-face meetings during the 2017-18 academic year, which is typical. The Committee also conducted numerous 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: 1) the response to the annual Call for Volunteers and the character of the resultant volunteer pool; 2) the workloads of the various committees and the CoC staffs; 3) recruitment methods and outcomes; 4) challenges; and 5) recommendations for future activity.

I. THE VOLUNTEER POOL FOR UNIVERSITY SERVICE

As has been the case for the last thirteen 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 2018-19 academic year. In winter 2018, 141 Senate members responded to the call, which represents a slight decrease relative to last year. The total number of volunteers represents only 15% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty Volunteered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
<td>141 faculty volunteered</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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.

II. 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 23 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 (6 requests)
- Building Committee
- Calendar Committee
- Campus Compliance and Responsibilities Committee
- Campus Elections Committee
- Career Development and Fellowship Awards Committee
- Chancellor’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Selection Committee
- College of Letters and Science, Faculty Executive Committee
- Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy (2 requests)
- ESCI Ad Hoc Committee
- Events Center Advisory Committee
- Faculty Grants Committee
- Five Year Review Committee for Carol Genetti, Dean of Graduate Division
- Five Year Review Committee for Pierre Wiltzius, Dean of MLPS
- Hellman Family Fellowship
- Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Board
- Policy Revision Committee
- Program Review Panel (2 requests)
- Public Art Committee
- Student Conduct Advisory Committee
- Student Fees Advisory Committee
- UC Education Abroad Program Advisory Committee
- UCEN Governance Board

Search Committees. CoC nominated Senate members for search committees, including the following:
- Director of Audit and Advisory Services
UCOC Requests. CoC nominated Senate members for the following UCOP systemwide appointments, including the following:

- American Australian Association Education Program
- California Council on Science and Technology
- Editorial, American/Ethnic Studies emphasis
- Editorial, Anthropology emphasis
- Editorial, Crime/Criminology emphasis
- Editorial, Environmental Studies emphasis
- Editorial, Pre-modern History emphasis
- Oliver Johnson Award
- Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (Standing Committee on Copyright Policies)
- UC Firearm Violence Research Center Advisory Board
- UC Office of the President, Academic Senate Vice Chair
- UC Riverside Chancellor Review
- UC Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

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 Jane Mulfinger, who chaired CoC for Fall quarter, also served as the Committee on Committee’s representative to the UCOC for Fall quarter. Professor Bassam Bamieh, who chaired COC for Winter and Spring quarters, served as the UCOC representative for the remainder of the 2017-18 academic year. Professors Mulfinger and Bamieh 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.

III. RECRUITMENT METHODS AND OUTCOMES
During the 2017-18 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 2018-19 academic year. CoC members also met with department chairs on campus to get their recommendation on faculty who would be good candidates to serve.

Highlights of the major outcomes and considerations are as follows:
i. A total of 173 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 2018-19 academic year, the CoC filled 59 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 141 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 decreased from last year; during the prior year, for example, 145 faculty members volunteered. Many of the respondents to the Call for Volunteers were continuing their terms of service on various Senate councils and committees, and those were typically (with some exceptions) not considered for current nominations.

iv. Of the 141 faculty who volunteered, 59 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 12 additional faculty members who were not among those who volunteered to fill vacant positions.

IV. 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. There are likely several factors that explain the variations by department. First, some departments likely promote a culture which views service as an opportunity not a burden. Second, the values 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 3, 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 1
Number of invitations offered to faculty but were declined, relative to the number of vacancies for each committee or council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th># of vacancies filled for 2018-19</th>
<th># of new members who volunteered through the call</th>
<th># of new members who were recruited independently</th>
<th># of invitations accepted</th>
<th># of invitations declined</th>
<th>Ratio of declined invitations/accepted invitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 elected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAERS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UgC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>45/59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
Number of faculty by department, number who volunteered, declined to serve, and total number of faculty serving from the department for 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department FTE (active, non-emeriti)</th>
<th>Total number of faculty who volunteered through the call for volunteers</th>
<th>Total number of faculty who declined to serve</th>
<th>Total number of faculty serving on Senate committees for 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bren School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/a Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Clinical &amp; School Psychology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology, Evolution &amp; Marine Biology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German &amp; Slavic Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts &amp; Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular, Cellular &amp; Developmental Biology</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Divisions</td>
<td>Total eligible FTE (tenured, non-emeriti faculty)</td>
<td>Number of faculty serving in 2018-19</td>
<td>Percentage of Senate Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Creative Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science Humanities &amp; Fine Arts Mathematical, Life &amp; Physical Sciences Social Sciences</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Counseling, Clinical, &amp; School Psychology Education</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Filling Committee Leadership Positions**

Of particular note, CoC continues to have difficulty filling leadership positions on many academic senate committees. The reluctance of faculty to participate in the Senate committee leadership is troubling as these committees are the primary means by which our faculty participate in the shared governance of the institution. From discussions with faculty, it appears that some of the reticence to serve in committee
leadership stems from the particularly vexing economic and workload challenges facing the campus and the UC overall these past few years. A perhaps compounding problem was the notably large number of searches to fill leadership vacancies on the campus this past year, efforts that left many senior level faculty quite busy. Unfortunately, there is no ready answer to address this issue. A final difficulty associated with committee leadership is the coupling of leadership of campus committees with an expectation for service on the equivalent systemwide committee, which places the further burden of serving as systemwide representative (with the associated work load and the non-trivial challenge of regularly traveling to Oakland) on our divisional chairs.

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.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUED OR NEW PRACTICES
CoC SUGGESTS THAT THE FOLLOWING PRACTICES BE CONTINUED IN 2018-19:

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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The CoC is extremely grateful to Stephanie Stokes, Staff Advisor to the Committee. We commend her large-data management skills, which are critical to the daunting task of tracking all of the varied activities and responsibilities of the committee, including her timely responses to all incoming requests from the Academic Senate. The CoC’s function and effectiveness is vastly improved due to the expert advise of Debra Blake, Executive Director of the Senate, whose extensive knowledge of Senate institutions and faculty provides the CoC with much needed context about Senate operations, both current and historical. The help and advise Senate staff provides CoC is indispensible, we simply could not functions without it. Their extensive knowledge of the Senate, the campus and its faculty greatly extends the collective knowledge of the committee members.

The committee also wishes to thank our Senate colleagues for their commitment to the campus and to their collective work in shared governance.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

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

Issues of General Concern to Faculty:

- The Committee approved 38 General Education (GE) course proposals.
- The Committee considered 8 proposals to create or renew online courses.

CCGE held 15 regularly scheduled 90-minute meetings during the 2017-18 academic year and consulted as needed with faculty executive committees, academic deans, and other campus administrators. The Committee also benefited from the participation of regular consultants from the Registrar’s Office, College of Letters and Science Advising, and College of Engineering Advising. The Chair of CCGE met periodically with the Chairs of the Undergraduate Council and the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools to discuss shared undergraduate concerns.

Recurring Business

Course Requests

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

CCGE approved 4 online course proposals, all of which were approved for two years. The offering departments may request renewed approval, based on assessment of the effectiveness of the initial offerings. CCGE approved the renewal of 4 online course proposals, 1 for two years, and the remaining 3 in perpetuity.

The Committee approved 38 General Education course proposals, 7 UCSB Extension proposals, and several requests for changes to the final exam schedule.

CCGE reviewed 7 proposals to re-unit existing undergraduate courses. The re-uniting procedures and worksheet were revised to improve the clarity of departmental proposals and efficiency of the review process.
Associate Appointment Proposals

CCGE reviewed 185 Associate appointment proposals, as compared to 185 in 2016-17 and 174 in 2015-16. CCGE approved all of the appointment proposals. In several instances, the Committee Chair contacted the chair of the proposing department to discuss concerns about below average performance in previous teaching assignments. In some cases, the Committee Chair requested additional evidence of the candidate’s qualifications and/or recommended individual faculty mentoring. In some cases, modifications of the proposed syllabuses were requested to conform with General Education requirements.

Local Campus Issues

Proposed Divisional Bylaw 35.K on Conflict of Interest

The Academic Senate proposed a new Divisional Bylaw regarding conflict of interest in alignment with the recently approved Senate Bylaw 128. The Committee voiced no objections to the proposed language and unanimously endorsed the bylaw.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 80 – Subject A Requirement

The College of Letters and Science proposed that the wording of Divisional Senate Regulation 80 G. be amended to match the wording of Senate Regulation, 636 E. CCGE found the proposed changes to be appropriate and voted unanimously to endorse the revised language.

UCEAP Pre-Approval

CCGE was asked to consider a proposal for pre-approval of UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) courses for General Education (GE) credit. The Committee acknowledged that UCSB’s GE program differs significantly from those at other UC campuses, and that the changes proposed would constitute a significant shift in campus policies and procedures. In its role of monitoring the GE program, making recommendations to the Undergraduate Council regarding policy on GE, and exercising sole authority over GE course proposals, the Committee dedicated significant time to considering what changes might be made in order to accommodate EAP’s request, while maintaining the integrity of the GE program.

The current processes for GE course approval have been deemed the appropriate methods for ensuring that courses for which GE credit is granted consistently meet the approved program learning outcomes for specific areas and the overall GE program. CCGE felt strongly that in order to ensure that GE standards are upheld, EAP courses would also need to undergo individual review. The Committee discussed in detail how this task might be accomplished. Given the collective number of courses taken by students, and limited resources within the Academic Senate and the colleges, CCGE was reluctant to endorse a highly intensive process that would require ongoing maintenance. Additionally, in reviewing
the database of EAP courses that have previously been approved for GE, the Committee found that a large volume of courses were approved in only one instance, which does not seem a productive use of staff or faculty time. After much deliberation, the Committee could not support the proposal. CCGE was not convinced by the information provided that difficulty obtaining GE credit is a primary reason that students decide not to participate in education abroad, given other resource or logistical issues.

CCGE recognized the appreciable effort some students must undertake in order to receive GE credit for courses they enroll in during education abroad, particularly when their program of study changes unexpectedly. However, students are offered significant assistance by departmental and central advising staff when choosing their courses for education abroad and upon returning to request credit. The fact that this assistance is offered so generously should be seen as a benefit to them, not an obstacle, and we understand that the system runs well. A cumbersome pre-approval process is not likely to be as adept or consistent in the handling of this matter. CCGE is scrupulous in the overseeing of our campus GE courses and alert to shifts in learning outcomes. The Committee does not have the same oversight of courses in foreign universities, and with so many universities involved, CCGE foresees that it would be forever uncertain whether the pre-approved courses in several hundred universities have remained consistent. The recently developed database of previously approved courses could offer a helpful reference with regard to these efforts, but CCGE does not see it as an effective means for granting pre-approvals.

CCGE remains proud of UCSB’s high participation rate in UCEAP programs.

Proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants

CCGE was asked to review of the proposed changes to campus policy to allow undergraduate students and non-students as teaching assistants. The Committee found it difficult to examine all of the relevant issues associated with the proposed changes without information on remuneration, responsibilities, and union matters. Faculty considered the broad concepts through the lens of their disciplines, taking into account the needs and norms of their departments. This approach resulted in a divided opinion, with some members opposed to the proposed policy and others in favor under limited circumstances. The Committee’s preliminary thoughts are presented below.

Throughout the discussion, faculty referred to a number of existing departmental arrangements in which undergraduates assist in the classroom and receive academic credit. In these cases, they felt that the work of the undergraduates was beneficial to the course and the students. The practices mentioned varied considerably, and it is unclear whether there are situations in which undergraduates have assumed roles equivalent to that of a teaching assistant. While some members preferred that these arrangements remain informal, others cautioned that informality creates the conditions under which problems arise. The Committee recommends that the campus take stock of these activities in order to better understand campus needs and available options, and also to discourage ill-advised practices.
Several members of the Committee were in favor of the limited use of undergraduates as teaching assistants. A few faculty noted a severe shortage of instructional assistance in their departments, and expressed the need for undergraduate teaching assistants when qualified graduate students are not available. Presently, departments sometimes hire graduate students from outside the department who are minimally qualified, but feel that their top undergraduate majors possess a deeper knowledge of the course subject matter. These faculty assert that the teaching assistant position includes specific expectations such as developing a sub-syllabus, running a discussion section, advising, and grading, which gifted undergraduates could manage after thorough pedagogical training. As an example, a member suggested that students from the College of Creative Studies would make excellent teaching assistants, as these advanced students often take courses at the graduate level. The Committee discussed the importance of a high GPA threshold, while at the same time noting that excellent grades do not necessarily indicate teaching talent.

Other members expressed serious concern about the proposed policy, and referred to the widely held principle that proposed appointees for a teaching position should hold at least the degree being pursued by the students they will teach. Members voiced concern that allowing undergraduates to serve in this capacity would depreciate both the profession and the value of undergraduate education. Several faculty mentioned that the grading in their departments is not mathematical, and undergraduates do not possess the appropriate expertise to serve as teaching assistants. Further, members expressed unease about unintended consequences that might result from the policy, such as impacts on graduate student support and increased pressure to rely on undergraduate TAs as a form of inexpensive labor. The increasingly interdisciplinary aspect of graduate study, especially in the humanities, arguably makes it advantageous to hire and train grad students from other departments.

The Committee also raised a number of questions to be considered. Is it realistic for undergraduates to take on a TA appointment as part of their overall academic workload? What should be done to avoid possible conflicts of interest, as undergraduate TAs would be instructing students of their own degree level? Would students receive fee remission? How would students be held accountable if they did not perform well? For graduate TAs, evaluation of teaching is included in the overall assessment of their degree progress, which would not be the case for undergraduates. CCGE members routinely review associate appointments, and in that process we often observe that graduate students stumble at first in teaching then improve with experience. Undergraduates who undertake teaching would routinely be at that beginning stage.

With regard to non-student teaching assistants, CCGE posed a number of questions. Under what circumstances would a non-student be invited to serve as a teaching assistant? Would the appointment of non-students be taking away funding opportunities for graduate students? Would graduate students object to the policy, especially if it created a lower cost alternative to hiring graduates? What would the proposed salary structure be for non-students, and how would it differ from that of graduate student teaching assistants? CCGE suggests that the campus examine UC Davis policy and practices to learn more about non-student appointments.
After much discussion, CCGE was not opposed to the development of a draft policy for campus review, but emphasized the need for a comprehensive proposal that would detail all elements of undergraduate TA appointments and safeguard departments from potential dangers.

**Proposed Changes to the General Education Requirements for the College of Engineering**

The College of Engineering proposed several changes to their General Education (GE) requirements. The main revisions include a redistribution of the courses in Areas D (Social Sciences), E (Culture and Thought), F (Arts), and G (Literature). Area H (Foreign Language) was removed as a requirement. The changes to Areas D, E, F, and G bring the requirements further in line with the College of Letters and Science Bachelor of Science GE requirements.

In the Special Subject Areas, students were also given the opportunity to choose from World Cultures or European Traditions. The Depth requirement, which proved to be confusing and inflexible, was also removed. After several revisions, the Committee voted to support the College’s proposal.

**Supercourse Challenges and Options**

Several members of CAERS were invited to meet with the Registrar’s Office to discuss their recommendations regarding the Supercourse Challenges and Options report, and formulate plans for refining certain areas of the report. Members of the group were able to come to agreement on the various topics contained in the report, and the Registrar’s Office will develop a revised draft for Divisional Senate review.

**Proposed Changes to Introductory Biology Laboratory Requirements**

CCGE was asked to consider a proposal to modify the introductory biology laboratory course series. The Committee voiced no objections to the proposed change.

**Interim WASC Senior College and University Commission Report**

CCGE was invited to review the draft interim report to the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), which was designed to provide WASC with an overview of the campus’s assessment activities. The Committee issued preliminary comments on the report, but will revisit it at the beginning of the fall quarter.

CCGE truly appreciates the care the Assessment Research Group (ARG) has taken to assess the GE learning outcomes and to address the issues raised by WASC. CCGE recommended additional consultation with the Committee during the planning and implementation of assessment-related projects. In addition, CCGE members felt that most faculty know little about the GE program outcomes, even with the appointment of departmental assessment liaisons. The campus would benefit from the
dissemination of additional information regarding assessment activities, and the introduction of further activities to encourage faculty engagement.

**Systemwide Issues**

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

1. Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of the UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
2. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128 - Conflict of Interest
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Committee on Diversity & Equity
Annual Report 2017-18

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 representation, one undergraduate student, and one graduate student representative.

Summary of CDE activities over 2017-18
There were a total of ten meetings of the Committee over the 2017-18 term. CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were: 1) drafting guidelines for a new Faculty Diversity award; 2) Diversity training for faculty hiring committees; 3) reviewing systemwide and divisional policy proposals and revisions; and 4) deciding to meet more frequently (five times per quarter instead of three) in the 2018-19 academic year to better address the above goals.

CDE discussed all of these topics at length and shared its recommendations with Academic Senate Chair Henning Bohn when appropriate. Topics and recommendations are briefly described below.

Reviews of Systemwide UC Issues

Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of SVSH Policy
In October, CDE reviewed the Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy. CDE felt that the impact of UCOP procedures on the UCSB campus was unclear. CDE was hesitant to comment or endorse anything from UCOP that would so radically change the approach by this campus and change the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. CDE had various areas of concern within the document, including:

- How timing works for “Safety Measures and Accommodations”. How quickly can accommodations such as housing relocations or work scheduling be implemented for impacted individuals?
- References to “students” should specify undergraduate and graduate students.
- Clarifying “confidentiality requests will be considered by the Title IX Office...”- what does this mean in this context?
- Providing examples of “appropriate actions/measures”.
- How will these procedures be managed systemwide?

In February, CDE reviewed the second round of revisions for the APM – 285-210-3-133-740-135-235, regarding the Lecturer with Security/Potential Security of Employment series. Members felt that the subsequent revisions largely improved many of the problematic areas of the first proposal, specifically by including language emphasizing that excellence in teaching is an essential criterion for review, as well as adding “and/or” language to de-emphasize the importance of scholarly achievement outside of teaching. However, there were still concerns about aspects of the proposal.

CDE did not feel that the re-revised titles of the series were sufficient. CDE supported, from the first round of revisions, the addition of “Assistant” and “Associate” to the title series. The titles of “Teaching Professor” proposed in the first revisions would clarify, to campuses and to the wider community, the role that these faculty play. Members were also uneasy with the lack of information about how many faculty currently in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series were actually involved in drafting these revisions, and the lack of specifics around “grandfathering” current LSOE faculty under the old policy. Members felt that all faculty appointed under the 2002 policy should be able to be evaluated under those criteria if they wish. Concerns were also raised about how changing the parameters that LSOE faculty are hired under could ultimately affect recruitment, especially of diverse and under-represented populations. There could become a perception that the University of California requires much more of “teaching” faculty than do other peer institutions.

**Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay**

In March, CDE reviewed a proposed revised Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay. While CDE saw the proposed changes to be beneficial to those it covers, they wondered why active military service is not a reason to “stop the tenure clock”. Per APM -133-17-G, active military service is not a period of leave that can postpone review. CDE wondered what the rationale is for not including active military service as a “stop the clock” leave.

**University Committee on Affirmation Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) Topics**

**Recommendations for Enhancing Faculty Diversity:** UCAADE’s “Recommendations for Enhancing Faculty Diversity” document was prepared initially for the committee’s meeting with President Napolitano last spring. It was revised and used as background for UCAADE’s discussion with Provost Michael Brown in January, and for a joint meeting with the Chief Diversity Officers in April. The document describes the lack of diversity in UC’s ladder-rank faculty, and then offers a list of proven best practices for increasing faculty diversity, including strengthening Academic Senate-led initiatives, ensuring accountability, and providing resources for diversity-enhancing strategies.

**Statements on Contributions to Diversity:** UCAADE discussed statements on contributions to diversity throughout the year. The committee collected and reviewed information on campus practices on using contributions to diversity statements in job searches and in the promotion process and learned that that there is no general consensus.
Faculty Equity Advisors: Most, but not all, campuses have some sort of faculty equity advisor program, although they are implemented differently. UCAADE worked with the AA/EEO/Diversity Administrators group on joint recommendations for faculty equity advisor programs.

Joint Meeting with Chief Diversity Officers: In April, UCAADE met with the Chief Diversity Officers (CDO) group to discuss priorities and issues of common concern. The CDOs are the Vice Chancellors or Vice Provosts who are responsible for overseeing efforts related to equity, diversity and inclusion on the campuses. The CDOs expressed interest in reviewing UC’s policies on discrimination to make sure there is parity with UC policies on harassment. The CDOs were also interested in UCAADE’s input on how to help junior faculty with promotion beyond tenure. Both UCAADE members and Diversity Officers agreed that it would be productive to bring the two groups together periodically.

President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Initiative (PPFP): PPFP Executive Director Mark Lawson joined UCAADE’s October meeting to update the committee on the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program. Last year, there were 852 applications and 35 fellows selected. UCAADE was pleased to learn that earlier in the year President Napolitano lifted the cap on the number of PPFP hiring incentive awards, and shortly thereafter the Provost eliminated the eligibility restrictions for health science and professional schools.

Consultation with Academic Personnel and Programs: Throughout the year, UCAADE received regular reports from Academic Personnel Vice Provost Susan Carlson on various topics, including the $2 million provided by the state to support equal opportunity in faculty employment. For the second year, UC provided to funds to support faculty diversity efforts that were already planned or underway at campuses. Four new pilots were selected on campuses that did participate in the first year. UCAADE Chair Tanya Golash-Boza served on the project’s advisory group.

Reviews of Campus Issues

Faculty Diversity Award
Throughout the year, the Committee worked to craft guidelines for a new Faculty Diversity Award, to be implanted for the first time in academic year 2018-19.

In October, Chair Scott brought the Committee a proposal initiated by Divisional Senate Chair Henning Bohn and Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity & Academic Policy Maria Herrera-Sobek, for CDE to administer a new Faculty Diversity Award. The Committee supported the proposal to create and administer this new faculty award. Criteria and guidelines for the award would need to be created.

In November, CDE began their discussion about the possibility of administering the new Faculty Diversity Award. There were preliminary discussions between Divisional Chair Henning Bohn, AVC Maria Herrera-Sobek, CDE Chair Vickie Scott, Chair of the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards (who administer all other Senate awards) Patricia Fumerton, and Senate Executive Director Debra Blake. Associate Vice-Chancellor Herrera-Sobek expressed her desire that the award focus on faculty with a commitment to diversity who have made an impact across the
UCSB campus. She was in the process of securing award funds from the Chancellor and/or Executive Vice Chancellor. The Faculty Diversity Award would likely be similar to the Distinguished Teaching Award, albeit with different criteria. CDE was supportive of having the award be administered by this committee, seeing as their purpose is to work towards attaining the campus goals of diversity and equity and actively pursue the goals of affirmative action. CDE determined there was not enough time to craft a well-written award to be implemented this year, but would work throughout the year so that the award could be implemented in 2018-19.

During meetings in November, January, February, March, and April, CDE carefully reviewed current Senate awards and worked to create guidelines that would be appropriate for the Faculty Diversity Award. Eventually the Committee drafted a set of guidelines that would be reviewed by the Senate Chair and Executive Director before being implemented for the first time in academic year 2018-19.

Following lengthy discussions at their meetings, members determined specifics to be included in the Faculty Diversity Award guidelines. These are described below:

**Purpose of the Award**
The award recognizes exceptional contributions to the advancement of diversity and equality, including but not limited to the goals outlined in APM 210-1-d, the University of California Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty, the University of California Non-Discrimination Statement, and the Regents Policy 4400: Policy on University of California Diversity Statement. These APM guidelines are aimed toward advancing principles of social equality and justice. This award recognizes:

- Exceptional efforts to create a diverse and egalitarian campus.
- Exceptional efforts to advance equal access to education.
- Exceptional efforts to promote a just and egalitarian society.
- Exceptional efforts in public service that address the needs of California's diverse and/or historically excluded populations.
- Exceptional efforts in research that highlight and advance equality, diversity and social justice.
- Exceptional efforts to mentor and advise students, staff or faculty members which strategically support underrepresented and underserved populations.

Examples include:

- Promoting civil rights.
- Improving the diversity climate at the departmental/campus/societal level.
- Promoting the success of students from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds or of students from groups that are traditionally underrepresented in the particular field.
- Developing department or campus programs that encourage the enrollment and/or success of underrepresented undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral scholars, staff and/or faculty.
• Research within or outside of a scholar’s usual area of expertise that highlights inequalities and points to strategies to mitigate them or research that highlights and addresses historically excluded populations.

Selection Committee
The Faculty Diversity Award selection committee will be comprised of at least five members, at least two of whom will be drawn from the membership of the Committee on Diversity and Equity. The remainder will be drawn from previous award recipients.

Eligibility
All members of the faculty (Academic Senate and non-Senate) who have taught a minimum of nine academic quarters (through fall quarter 2018) at UCSB are eligible for nomination. Previous award recipients within the past five years and current members of the Committee on Diversity and Equity are not eligible.

Criteria Considered for Diversity Award
• Contribution of the project/initiative to the advancement of diversity and equity.
• Evidence of sustained commitment to project/initiative/contribution.
• Any adverse circumstance(s) the faculty member may have faced in undertaking the project/initiative/contribution.

Rubric/Nominee Packet
• Three letters of impact from individuals/organization representatives who know the impact of the diversity work or contribution. Do not submit more than three letters.
• A brief curriculum vitae (1 to 3 pages).
• A description of your diversity contributions. The statement should address your contribution thoroughly, including its impact, to whom your contribution is accessible, and why it is important to recognize. There is a 2-page maximum — document must be double-spaced using 11-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

Dates
• The award call should go out by Thanksgiving
• Nominations are online and usually due by the end of fall quarter or very beginning of winter quarter
• Nomination packets are due at the end of January or early February
• Senate award winners are recognized at the April Faculty Legislature meeting
Diversity Training for Faculty Hiring Committees

The topic of diversity training was discussed at multiple meetings throughout the year. The Committee decided that this topic would be one of their main priorities for the 2018-19 academic year.

In October, Director Ricardo Alcaíno, Ex-Officio member of CDE, described the form and functions of the current faculty diversity training provided by the Office of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention (EODP). Currently, the workshop leaders discuss with departments ways to have an organized methodology to sort candidates, and how to perform active outreach to women and under-represented minorities. His office invites departments to take part in the training but it is currently optional, however, all faculty search committees must work with EODP on parts of UC Recruit. Director Alcaíno explained that about half of the UC campuses have mandatory faculty search committee diversity training, and implicit bias is highlighted. Last year the EODP Office had around 30 requests for training. Some departments at UCSB have asked to make the optional diversity statement (APM 210-1-d) a mandatory part of their application, but Academic Personnel has not allowed it. Alternatively, UCOP has stated that campuses/departments can mandate inclusion of APM 210-1-d, so this needs to be reconciled.

Former CDE Chair Beth Gwinn presented a letter to Director Ricardo Alcaíno detailing feedback from the members who attended his office’s current diversity training workshop this past summer. Some suggestions for improving the training included limiting the number of presenters, focusing more on implicit bias, finding ways to better engage faculty, and simplifying some aspects of the workshop. Members discussed whether to propose that the training be required, but that it is not a good fit in its current form. There was a suggestion to solicit feedback from faculty who take the training, and Director Alcaíno suggested that CDE should be involved in creating and updating the training. CDE agreed that a revised training should be worked on, and CDE could act as a “trial run” for the revised training.

Members brought forth other ideas for adding to the current diversity training model, including linking training to FTE allocations; covering basic HR policies during the training; emphasizing illegal questions and hiring legalities; the feasibility of creating Faculty Equity Advisor positions on this campus; and finding ways to incentivize participation in the training.

In May, members agreed that the whole Committee should agree on requiring the training or not. Chair Scott broached a question of whether making a recommendation to the campus of mandatory faculty diversity training should come just from CDE, or if a larger task force should be created. Members could include Graduate Dean Genetti and departmental diversity officers, among others. Members discussed data that CDE could collect, such as initiating a study, or collecting and analyzing department level data. The group also discussed how a “resolution”, which was mentioned as an alternative course of action by Chair Bohn, would work. The discussion ended with the recommendation that CDE focus on more than just diversity training, but other concrete issues like implicit bias and institutional power that could target aspects of search committees.
In June, Chair Scott attended the current training put on by the EODP Office. She found it to be more succinct and specific than the previous version. Members concurred that diversity training should be a main task for the Committee in 2018-19. EODP Director Alcaíno could give the new version of the search committee training at one of the first CDE meetings fall quarter. Over the summer Chair Scott and Analyst Erland would research various avenues the Committee has available to them to make changes to faculty diversity training.

**Proposed Campus Recording Policy**

In February, CDE discussed the Proposed Classroom Recording Policy, put forth by the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom and Awards. While members were supportive of the rationale behind creating this policy, they had a variety of questions they advised be answered before the policy moved forward:

- What is the chain of command when faculty report violations of the policy?
- Is this policy going to be included in the Student Code of Conduct, and if so, in what section?
- Will faculty be able to record their own lectures without written consent from all students?
- How will this policy affect teaching assistants?

**Proposed revisions to existing policy on Dogs on Campus and new policy on Service and Support Animals**

In June, CDE discussed proposed policies for revisions to existing policy on Dogs on Campus and a new policy on Service and Support Animals. CDE thought the new policies more clearly define types of service and support animals, and regulations surrounding dogs on campus. The responsibilities of the animal’s owners were more clear, and the revised policies take into account the increase in human dependence on animals. CDE supported the polices.

**Pending Issues for CDE in 2018-19**

- Continuing discussion of diversity training for faculty hiring committees, with the goal to submit a proposal to campus leadership regarding strengthening training.
- Implementing the first year of the Faculty Diversity Award.
- Coordinating with other entities on campus who work with diversity issues.
- Continued discussion and understanding the role of APM 220 for faculty promotion and review. The exploration has been a pending issue for CDE since 2016-17.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) held two online meetings and 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 2017-18 academic year, the Committee

- Reviewed the complete data analysis of the fourth biennial survey of international undergraduate students (Winter 2017) and disseminated the survey findings to campus stakeholders
- Organized and held the faculty workshop, “International Students at UCSB: Facilitating Academic Success and Social Engagement,” in response to the survey findings (Spring 2018)
- Provided review of nine agreements with international institutions
- Met with Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director of UCEAP to learn more about UCEAP’s Strategic Plan and to discuss changes in UCEAP infrastructure
- Reviewed original and revised proposals from Professor Thomas Carlson to establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change
- Reviewed the revised proposal for pre-approval of UCEAP courses to meet General Education requirements
- Reviewed systemwide and divisional bylaws concerning conflict of interest
- Submitted to Senate leadership a request for the CIE Chair to become a member of the Executive Council
- Developed international agreement applicant prompts for consideration to include on the UCSB Global Engagement website
- Received the CIE Chair’s report after each UCIE meeting.
International Agreements

Memorandum of Understanding – Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenberg, Sweden
CIE endorsed a new international agreement between the UCSB Materials Research Laboratory (MRL) and Chalmers University for a duration of 5 years. The MOU proposes a collaboration in which the Department of Materials and Chalmers University will organize workshops and exchange students and faculty. This collaboration will focus on materials science and will be mutually beneficial to research at both universities. CIE noted there was no guarantee of funding and recommended a more detailed Collaboration Agreement be drafted. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Memorandum of Understanding – Dalian University of Technology (DUT), China
The Committee reviewed and endorsed a new international agreement between the UCSB Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Faculty of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering at Dalian University. The proposed collaboration provides for the exchange of scholars and graduate students for a duration of 5 years, focusing on the areas of automatic control, computer science, information technology, and related interdisciplinary applications. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Memorandum of Understanding – Seoul National University, South Korea
The Committee reviewed a new international agreement between the UCSB Department of Statistics and Applied Probability and Seoul National University (SNU) Department of Statistics. The proposed collaboration provides for the exchange of a single graduate student from SNU. CIE requested further information as to why this was proposed as an international agreement rather than a visiting scholar proposal, as well as clarification of discrepancies in the duration of the agreement. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Extended Memorandum of Understanding – Dalian University of Technology, China
The Committee reviewed the extended agreement between the UCSB Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Faculty of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering of Dalian University with a duration of 5 years. The extended MOU specifies collaboration on the International Cooperative Programs for Innovative Talents (ICPIT) of the China Scholarship Council (CSC). CIE requested further information regarding a summary of activities and the benefits of such to UCSB students, as well as clarification of the type of students described in the agreement and the number of incoming students. It was noted that a Collaboration Agreement would help to clarify many aspects of the MOU. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Proposal to Establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change
The Committee reviewed Professor Thomas Carlson’s proposal to establish the International Center for the Humanities and Social Change at UCSB. The Center would be part of an international network of centers funded by the International Foundation for the Humanities and Social Change. The purpose of the Center is to bring together a research team of graduate students, visiting scholars, public figures, and UCSB faculty to address social and cultural change both as an object of critical study and as a constructive project with immediate goals and objectives. A network Center has been established in Venice, Italy and Centers are under discussion at Oxford and Berlin. Two current goals identified in the proposal are to convene at least one major conference per year at UCSB and to participate in a summer institute in Venice, Italy. In addition, the Center will provide one to three fellowships for UCSB graduate students. Two postdoctoral scholars will be recruited as “faculty fellows” to teach up to three courses at UCSB. CIE endorsed the proposal while commenting on the following: 1) a reinforcement of the need for
academic freedom and the Center’s adherence to such a tenet; 2) a recommendation to consider the question of individual MOUs or Collaboration Agreements to govern exchanges between network Centers and UCSB; and 3) a lack of information regarding the donor. The Committee also expressed concerns regarding the date of establishment and UCSB’s budget contributions, but left these topics to more appropriate Senate committees. An initial four-year review was proposed moving to a five-year review cycle if outcomes are strong and funding is renewed. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Proposed Agreement between UCSB Teacher Education Program (TEP) and Zurich University of Teacher Education (PH Zurich)
CIE reviewed and endorsed the proposal for an exchange of graduate students between UCSB’s TEP and PH Zurich, with the clarification that this is an exchange of graduate students. The proposal provides for TEP student teachers to participate in an in-situ teaching experience at PH Zurich for one month and TEP will host PH Zurich student teachers and place them in K-12 classrooms. The goal of the exchange is to prepare teachers who are more culturally aware and global-minded. PH Zurich is a member in the TEP’s international teaching practicum program. Duration is for one year with the ability to renew annually. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Proposed Agreement between Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) Teacher Education Program (TEP) and the National Institute of Education (NIE), Singapore
The Committee reviewed and endorsed the proposal for an exchange of graduate students between UCSB’s TEP and NIE, Singapore. The proposal provides for TEP student teachers to participate in an in-situ teaching experience at NIE for one month and TEP will host NIE student teachers and place them in K-12 classrooms. NIE is a member in the TEP’s international teaching practicum program. Duration is for one year with the ability to renew annually. This agreement had a retroactive effective date.

Proposed Agreement between the Materials Research Lab (MRL) and the National University of Singapore
CIE reviewed and endorsed the proposal for an exchange of researchers and the facilitating of joint workshops between UCSB’s Materials Research Lab (MRL) and the National University of Singapore. The agreement is for a duration of 5 years.

Revised Proposal to Establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change
CIE reviewed the revised proposal, which addressed the Committee’s initial concerns regarding academic freedom, more detailed information about the donor, and the date of establishment. Both Executive Vice Chancellor Marshall and Dean Majewski further clarified points of original concern. The proposal was endorsed by the Committee, although it reiterated the importance of Senate consultation prior to putting a program into place.

Proposed Agreement between the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences and the Universidad del Desarrollo (UDD), Chile
CIE reviewed the proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences (and the Center for Evolutionary Psychology) and the Research Center for Social Complexity Sciences of the Universidad del Desarrollo in Chile. The agreement provides for the exchange of visiting scholars and graduate students, research collaboration, and the holding of conferences and/or symposia for a duration of five years. The Committee endorsed the proposal, noting the need for further clarification on the description of the goal of collaboration and the existing activities, as well as the identification of the commitment of UCSB resources and space.
Survey of International Undergraduate Students

Details of the survey results and Committee recommendations disseminated to campuswide stakeholders in February 2018: the Report on International Undergraduate Students at UCSB 2017 is available upon request from the Academic Senate.

Informational Items

UCEAP Updates
Dr. Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director of UCEAP, provided the Committee with comprehensive UCEAP statistics, some of which include:

- 981 total UCSB EAP students (19% of UCEAP students)
- 6% of UCEAP students study abroad for a full year (twice the national average)
- 15% of UC students participate in UCEAP

UCEAP has developed a Strategic Plan (2016-20) to maintain and increase participation. Its vision and mission statements were changed to better reflect the program. The Strategic Plan involves senior administration and faculty engagement; strengthening collaboration with campus partners; becoming the preeminent education abroad program in the UC system by redesigning online systems and the UCEAP business model, and creating the Arc of Engagement. The Arc of Engagement’s goal is to create processes that will encourage and assist students in choosing, experiencing, and maintaining valuable outcomes of study abroad. UCEAP is also focusing on underrepresented student outreach to diversify the program. Some underrepresented groups are male participants, student athletes, and honors students. There is future consideration of tiered cost programs, staff development, and innovative programs that include the possibility of a pre-arrival study abroad “gap” semester, post-acceptance of UC admission offer. In addition, the UCOP UC Go website (http://www.ucgo.org/) was created.

Local Issues

Revised Proposal Requesting Pre-Approval of UCEAP Courses to Meet General Education (GE) Requirements
The proposal seeks to offer pre-approval of GE credit for courses taken abroad through the UCEAP. Pre-approval would be based on courses listed in the UC Registrars Database for UCSB, which were previously approved for GE credit. The revised proposal provides information and clarification requested by the Committee on Courses and General Education (CCGE) and also addresses concerns raised by co-Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies Jeff Stopple. Concerns focus on course stability and availability, evaluation of course quality and learning outcomes, and making the UCSB Registrars Database accessible via the internet. The committee reviewed and endorsed the revised proposal.

Proposed Divisional Bylaw 35.K on conflict of Interest
UCSB’s Executive Council determined that following the systemwide adoption of Senate Bylaw 128.J, the Santa Barbara Division should adopt similar language for inclusion in its local Senate Manual. Divisional Bylaw 35.K governs conflict of interest. The Committee was in support of the proposed amendment to the Divisional Bylaw 35.
Proposal to include CIE Chair in Executive Council Membership
The Committee proposed to the Senate Chair that the chair of CIE become a standing member of the Executive Council starting the 2018-19 academic year. The Committee made this proposal in response to a growing international student body and increased globalization. In light of UCOP’s proposed restructuring that involves the move of UCEAP to UCSB, the Committee feels its involvement in the Executive Council would increase CIE’s perspective in relation to the rest of campus and further facilitate discussion about international affairs and their impact on students across campus.

Systemwide Issues

Proposed Amendment of Senate Bylaw 128.J – Conflict of Interest
The proposed systemwide amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 with the addition of Section J, which provides policy for addressing conflict of interest issues. CIE was in support of the proposed amendment.

Request for Senate Review of New UCEAP MOU
The Huron Consulting Group was asked by President Napolitano to assess UCOP’s organizational design, alignment, portfolio, and strategy. In this report, it was suggested that UCEAP could transition its entire operation to UCSB and maintain a reporting relationship with UCOP. At the beginning of April, President Napolitano announced, effective July 1, 2018, that “EAP will be operated by UCSB with oversight from the Chancellor and the UCOP Provost as specified in an updated charter and MOU.” CIE reviewed the new MOU and the new Charter. It was noted that the documents were still in a state of revision and review. The Committee’s main concerns addressed the change of the Governing Committee to an Advisory Committee, which CIE felt downgraded faculty/Senate involvement and could be potentially detrimental to the success and ongoing development of UCEAP as an academic enterprise. CIE also noted that the makeup of the Advisory Committee should have a broader representation of administrators and faculty, including those that have been EAP Study Center directors. The Committee expressed great dismay at the lack of Senate consultation in the process and felt strongly that it was not in line with UC’s commitment to shared governance.

Coordination with Administration (alphabetical listing)

Linda Adler-Kassner, Interim co-Dean of Undergraduate Education, College of Letters & Science
Interim Dean Adler-Kassner was invited as a speaker for the CIE spring faculty workshop and discussed correlations between the survey findings and undergraduate education at UCSB.

Juan Campo, Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program
The Director of EAP is an ex officio member of the Committee and acts as a valuable resource regarding information about EAP.

Jan Frodesen, Director, English for Multilingual Students (EMS) Program
Dr. Frodesen is a member of CIE and was invited as a speaker for the CIE spring faculty workshop in her role as director of the EMS Program. She discussed how the EMS Program is developing curriculum and initiatives for promoting international student success.

David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor, UCSB
The Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor consulted with the Committee regarding international agreements.
Mario Muñoz, Associate Director, University and Community Housing Services
Associate Director Muñoz was invited as a speaker for the CIE spring faculty workshop. He discussed common social issues for international students and emphasized the relation between a positive living environment and academic success.

Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, UC Education Abroad Program
Dr. Nyitray provided relevant updates regarding UCEAP’s new marketing and programming, as well as information regarding the transition of moving UCEAP operations to the UCSB campus while remaining a systemwide service.

Lisa Przekop, Director, Office of Admissions
Director Przekop was invited as a speaker for the CIE spring faculty workshop and discussed how international student admissions have been affected in a number of ways and how UCSB is working to ensure a diverse population of international students across divisions.

Simran Singh, Director, and Chryss Yost, Programming Coordinator, 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. Director Singh also provided an introduction for the CIE spring faculty workshop. Programming Coordinator Yost assisted with organizing student participation and acted as moderator for the student panel of the CIE spring faculty workshop.

Carry-over Issues and Future Initiatives
- International Agreement Applicant Prompts for Global Engagement Website
- Host Family Initiative
- Campus resources for international students
- Peer mentoring program in coordination with OISS
- Mental health needs of international students
- Monitor needs of international scholars and visiting faculty
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COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
2017-18 ANNUAL REPORT

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 2017-18, P&T responded to one new grievance and two new disciplinary cases. In addition, P&T continued ongoing efforts in relation to two grievances submitted during the previous year.

Along with other Senate groups, P&T responded to proposed new local procedures for reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty violations of UC's Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy. P&T also responded to proposed amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 - Conflict of Interest, as well as to proposed changes to Divisional Bylaw 35.K. on Conflict of Interest.

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

2017-18 Members:
Sarah Cline
Nancy Collins
Glenn Fredrickson
Michael Gurven
Constance Penley
Joan-Emma Shea
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 2017-18.

**Proposed Modification to Engineering Regulation 205(C)(2)**
RJE was asked to review proposed modifications to the College of Engineering Division Regulation 205(C)(2). The proposed revisions would update the regulation for consistency with the revised GE Depth Requirement that was approved by the Undergraduate Council. RJE supported the revisions. The Faculty Legislature approved these changes at its meeting of October 26, 2017.

**Procedures for Reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of SVSH Policy**
RJE reviewed a draft policy, Procedures for Reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy. RJE reviewed the draft policy very closely and suggested many editorial changes in order to bring more clarity and consistency to the document. RJE also questioned whether some of the proposed Code of Conduct revisions would fall under RJE purview, and what revisions would need to take place in the current UCSB Divisional Senate Bylaws and Regulations to bring the campus in line with UCOP procedures. RJE looks forward to reviewing a revised Procedures document.

**Proposed Revisions to Divisional Regulation 80 – Subject A Requirement**
RJE was asked to review revisions to Divisional Regulation 80 – Subject A Requirement. The revisions would align the Divisional Regulation with Senate Regulation 636, which was revised years ago. RJE supported these revisions. The Faculty Legislature approved these changes at its meeting of January 18, 2018.

**Proposed Revision to GGSE FEC Bylaws**
RJE was asked to review revisions to the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Bylaws. The first revision would eliminate the requirement that one of the members represent the Teacher Education Program; one voting member from TEP would still be required, but could come from Education, Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology (CCSP), or the Credential Advising Committee. The second revision eliminated the requirement that a non-Senate faculty representative must alternate between Education and CCSP each year. RJE suggested wording changes to the first proposed revision which were accepted, and then RJE approved that version. The Faculty Legislature approved the changes at its meeting of March 1, 2018.
Proposed CFIA and CFWAF Name Change and Bylaw Revision
RJE reviewed a proposal from the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards to change its name to the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW), and to change a standing committee name to the Committee on Academic Freedom. While RJE was supportive of the proposal, a memo was sent back to CFIA with some further editorial corrections committee members found. RJE then reviewed a revised proposal, which they fully supported. The Faculty Legislature approved the name changes at its meeting of March 1, 2018.

Proposed Amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 – Conflict of Interest
RJE reviewed a systemwide proposal to add section to Bylaw 128, regarding conflicts of interest. The Committee supported the amendment.

Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 240 – Honors at Graduation
RJE was asked to review proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 240, regarding honors at graduation. The proposed change would reduce the minimum number of units required for eligibility for Honors at Graduation from 76 to 60, which would bring honors eligibility in line with the total number of upper-division units required for graduation. RJE supported this revision. The Faculty Legislature approved the change at its meeting of April 19, 2018.

Proposed Revisions to Divisional Regulations Governing Master’s Plan II – Project Committees
RJE was asked to review proposed modifications to Regulations 300-B-1, 305-C and 305-C-2-ii, pertaining to Master’s Plan II Project Committees. Graduate Council sought clarification of the Plan II Project Committee language, as there were contradictory statements in the Regulations regarding committee membership, and proposed allowing two faculty members to serve as a Plan II Project Committee. RJE suggested minor wording changes, but supported the revisions. The Faculty Legislature approved the changes at its meeting of June 7, 2018.

Proposed Divisional Bylaw 35.K on Conflict of Interest
RJE reviewed a divisional proposal to add Bylaw 35.K regarding conflicts of interest, to bring the Divisional Manual in line with the recently approved systemwide Bylaw 128. RJE supported the new language, but suggested a few wording revisions which were accepted. The Faculty Legislature approved this Bylaw addition at its meeting of June 7, 2018.

Proposed Modifications to the College of Engineering General Education Requirements
RJE was asked to review proposed revisions to the College of Engineering General Education requirements. The revisions would streamline and clarify the COE General Education requirements, and bring them more in line with the College of Letters & Science requirements. RJE supported the GE changes. The Faculty Legislature approved the revisions at its meeting of June 7, 2018.

2017-18 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 a Divisional Chair, three Senate Assembly Representatives, and four members of the Committee on Committees.

**Divisional Chair**
Two Senate members were nominated for the position of Divisional Chair; one nomination was declined. The remaining candidate, Henning Bohn, of Economics, accepted the nomination and received the requisite five endorsements. As there was only one viable candidate for this position, a ballot was not conducted following the nomination process.

**Senate Assembly Representatives**
A total of four faculty members were nominated for the position of Senate Assembly Representative; one nomination was declined. As there were three open positions, a ballot was not conducted. Charles Akemann, of Mathematics; Eric Matthys, of Mechanical Engineering; and F Winddance Twine, of Sociology 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; one candidate declined to accept. Three candidates were nominated, accepted the nomination, and received the requisite number of endorsements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Lopez-Carr</strong>, Geography</td>
<td>Area A: College of Letters and Science Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences Division and Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Winddance Twine</strong>, Sociology</td>
<td>Area B: College of Letters and Science Social Science Division and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Sturman</strong>, History of Art and Architecture</td>
<td>Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One open position, listed below, was filled by Committee on Committees appointment, effective September 1, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bassam Bamieh</strong>, Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Area D: College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members, 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronald E. Rice, Chair</td>
<td>Professor, Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. Akemann</td>
<td>Professor, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi</td>
<td>Professor, Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. Gottfried</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Horowitz</td>
<td>Professor, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul M. Leonardi</td>
<td>Professor, Technology Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne J. Levine</td>
<td>Professor, Spanish and Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo A. Loaiciga</td>
<td>Professor, Geography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards
Annual Report: 2017-2018

Council Charge

Per bylaw 60, the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW) 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

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

- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay
- Proposed Amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 - Conflict of Interest
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations

After reviewing and discussing the proposed revisions, CFW voted in a majority decision to reject the revisions proposed by UCOP regarding current LSOEs in APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135, and 235. The vote was not unanimous, but the majority felt that despite the “tweaking” made to the proposal submitted last year, the revised document was still confusing and potentially detrimental, both to the current LSOEs and to ladder-rank professors. Listed below are the main concerns CFW members expressed.

On the positive side, many CFW members (and certainly the LSOEs, as reported by CFW’s Unit-18 Lecturer representative and other faculty on the Council) appreciated some aspects of the proposed reforms, especially the systemwide sabbatical opportunities and the synchronization of the salary scales. According to the faculty who consulted with LSOEs in their departments many LSOEs appreciated the raise in their status to Teaching Professor, though they were equally confused by what “working title” meant. Repeated was the concern that the change of the “official” naming from LSOE to SOE series would result in a perceived demotion from those outside the university of the LSOEs who had attained the title of “Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment.” The new proposed title would be simply “Lecturer with Security of Employment.” This is a problem because at many universities globally “lecturer” is a lower
position than “Senior Lecturer.” The senior lecturers would thus like to retain the word “Senior” in their official titles.

On the negative side regarding the proposed revisions, CFW members noted many concerns. These fall generally into those who felt the changes worked to raise lecturers to positions that would be perceived by the public and students as on a par with those of tenure-track professors, given the use of the term “professor” in the working title and the other alignments being suggested with the professorial review and step process. This raising of the position of lecturer in this way, many felt, would weaken the position of professor, especially when it came to ranking evaluations of campuses which had many faculty in the SOE series, since as “working” teaching professors, they could be folded into our total faculty, and yet their productivity, due to their heavy teaching load, is lower than that of professors. Rankings would thus decline. Others worried that the changes raised the bar for LSOEs in ways that could create obstacles to advancement. Thus, on the whole, the majority of the Council felt the changes created a lose/lose situation.

More specific points are:

1) A worry that the revisions raised the bar for LSOE faculty on advancement. It was remarked that despite the subtle change in evaluation of the research from the first draft of proposed changes, now to make equivalent professional and scholarly achievement and activity, the fact remains that this category of work associated with the professorial ranks is still elevated vis-a-vis instruction and service in the proposed reforms. In the past the prime focus for evaluating those in the LSOE series has been primarily on teaching.

2) Several CFW members also noted that with the proposed alignment of the SOE series with the professorial steps, means that those who attain Lecturer with Security of Employment are denied coming up for merit increases every two years – they must wait 3 years now instead. Also, like many professors, they are in danger of becoming stuck at the Professor IV or V step and thus having their salary stagnate.

3) Of major concern expressed by many was confusion over what “working title” means and in what context it might be allowed. No examples or specifics are offered in the document. If the working title would be in everyday use, then it would simply accomplish the renaming proposed by the first version of this document, wherein lecturers are at all times called “Assistant Teaching Professor,” “Associate Teaching Professor,” and “Teaching Professor.” If the working title is allowed to be so universally used that the SOE titles only appear in merit and rank documents seen by the inner circle of the university, then public and student perception of the lecturers will be in a major way changed and conflation of lecturer and professor ensue.

The Council understood that there might be special circumstances wherein a working title of “Teaching Professor” might need to be used—as in applying for grants wherein only professors might apply—but the APM provisions could make an exception specifically for such instances, not across the board.

In sum, the majority of the Council found the proposed changes to the long-time UCSB use of the LSOE series to be unjustified and questionable in its goals. It would seem designed to raise the status of lecturers (even in the face of, in other ways, harming them in the course of their
merit reviews by adding to their workload) and also lowering the status of professors, who would now likely be confused with lecturers by students, the general public, and ranking agencies. The worst case and darkest scenario is that tenure-track professors, with high research demands, among their service and teaching demands, would be seen as replaceable by those who teach more at the same cost. This scenario, if fulfilled, would undermine the UC-system as a top-tier research system and lower it to the level of community colleges (who perform an important and necessary service, but are by no means innovative, cutting edge, research institutions).

CFW encouraged minor changes to the APM to allow our hard-working lecturers systemwide to earn sabbaticals, salaries on a par with the professorial series (without having to jump through the same hoops since they are evaluated primarily on their extensive teaching), and, when necessary for performance of their research work (to the extent they engage in such research), campuses to employ the working title of “teaching professor.” But CFW saw no need to otherwise change the LSOE name and procedures, which has served us and the lecturers well for decades.

- **Procedures for Reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of SVSH Policy**

  CFW reviewed the document and while one member thought the document “fairly reasonable, given a once over,” that person and the Council as a whole found many problems with the document. These issues fall into three main concerns. First, there is too much power of decision given throughout the document to individual persons, particularly the Title IX officer and the Chancellor/Chancellor’s Designee. Second, there are too many unclarified and contradictory statements throughout the document. Third, CFW recommended that the document undergo review by a lawyer given its legalistic style and potential to carry quasi-legal force.

- **Systemwide Review of Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program**

  Upon review of the report, CFW recognized that the Negotiated Salary Program might well be one way to retain high-performing faculty in the sciences who might be lured away from UCSB by better-funded universities (though the data does not yet support the claim made by chairs of participating departments that the NSP is effective on this score).

  Like the reviewers, CFW recognized that any full and fair assessment of the program needs more and better data, which justifies renewal of it on a trial basis. On the other hand, the Council also noted that, with such a renewal, the program will become further entrenched, which will make it harder to terminate, if later on the data shows that it is unsatisfactory or even detrimental.

  Especially of concern to the Council was the negative impact the program might have on funding for the university as a whole, particularly for the arts and humanities, since the NSP exacerbates already existing salary inequities and could thus lower morale. The Council suggested that some of the increased funds (via more overhead the university will reap from increased research grants brought in) be dispersed across the campus’s disciplines and departments so everyone benefits from the program.
Local Business

- **Council Name Change**

  During the 2017-18 year the Council proposed that the name of the Council of Faculty Issues and Awards (CFIA) should be changed to the Council of Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW). The Council was aware that the full initials should be CFWAFA, but they preferred the shortened abbreviation of CFW. It was also proposed to change the name of one of its sub-committees from the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (CFWAF) to the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF). In the spirit of the new name changes, the Council also proposed that Bylaw 60 be changed to include Academic Freedom, so the “purpose” of the Council would state: “To study and make recommendations on any matter of faculty or broader campus community welfare and academic freedom, and to reward excellence in research and teaching.”

  The proposal received Senate review and the name and Bylaw change were approved by the Faculty Legislature during their meeting on March 1, 2018.

- **Accounting Issues**

  In response to widespread complaints from faculty and staff, CFW began addressing concerns with UCSB Accounting during fall 2017. The main issues that were widely reported included inconsistent and capricious application of policies, extremely long delays in reimbursements, very poor customer service, and intimidation and retaliatory behavior toward department staff. After gathering feedback and examples from staff in numerous departments across campus, CFW wrote a memo laying out these concerns and sent it to Chuck Haines (then Acting Assistant Chancellor of Finance and Resource Management, now no longer Acting), who was then invited and agreed to attend a CFW meeting to discuss these concerns. CFW met with Chuck Haines twice (once during winter and once during spring of 2018) and has also been working with UC AMP and Associate Dean Mary Lum (who is representing the Deans of the College of Letters and Science) to help resolve the problems with accounting. During these meetings, then Acting AC Haines agreed to work with accounting staff to improve customer service and ensure that staff are applying policies evenly and correctly. He also suggested ways to improve the reimbursement process and place more authority in the hands of departmental staff.

  Unfortunately, there has not been much further progress on this front. UC AMP was scheduled to meet with Acting AC Haines in spring 2018, when he was going to present his proposed reforms to UC AMP, but he was apparently unable to attend the meeting and sent, Jim Corkill (Controller, Business and Financial Services) in his place. The AMP staff described the meeting as unproductive and pointed out that none of the planned changes that Chuck Haines was planning to propose were addressed by Mr. Corkill. However, now appointed AC Haines and accounting are aware of the problems reported on campus and CFW plans to continue to pursue this issue in 2018-19. The launch of UC Path has delayed action from AC Haines and accounting. CFW plans to set up a meeting during fall quarter that includes CFW, UC AMP, Mary Lum, Senate Divisional Chair Bohn, Chuck Haines, and key accounting staff.
• Policy on the Recording of Courses

The Council continued their work to establish a policy on the recording of courses. During the 2016-17 academic year a draft of the policy was developed in consultation with Divisional Chair Bohn and representatives from CFW met with Margaret Klawunn (Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs) and Katya Armistead (Dean of Student Life and Activities) to discuss the draft, which VC Klawunn supported. During 2017-18 CFW submitted the proposed draft for full Senate review. Once Senate review was completed, Jennifer Lofthus (Campus Policy Coordinator) also reviewed the draft policy and suggested that CFW have one policy focused exclusively on students that would go into the Student Code of Conduct and another broader policy that would include visitors, both staff and faculty, and would become a campus policy. CFW discussed whether or not they wanted to take this route and the Council agreed that the critical issue is having a clear student policy in the Student Code of Conduct. The Council decided to pursue the dual-policy approach with priority on establishing the student policy. This work will continue in the 2018-19 year as CFW works with Student Affairs and Jennifer Lofthus to finalize the policies.

• Campus Childcare Accessibility and Affordability

CFW has been addressing concerns about childcare on campus since the 2014-15 academic year. Specifically, the Council focused on the need for more childcare for infants and toddlers, the exorbitant cost of childcare relative to faculty salaries, and the effects these factors have on faculty recruitment and retention. CFW completed a comprehensive report with recommendations in June 2015, which was given to Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall for review. Progress on the issue was very slow until the summer and fall of 2017. Developments during the 2017-18 year included the Chancellor tasking Development to work on raising funds for a new center and the creation of the Chancellor’s Advisory Task Force on Childcare in December 2018, after CFW wrote an additional memo in fall 2017 calling for the creation of such a task force.

As of June 2018 the task force has made significant progress on this issue. There is a short-term and long-term plan envisioned for increasing capacity, especially for infants. In the short-term there is a plan to convert some of the existing preschool classrooms into infant classrooms because there are many children in the preschool classes who are from community families (i.e., not a child of a student, staff, or faculty member of UCSB). Preschool class space is also widely available in Santa Barbara while the availability of infant care is minimal. Long-term they hope to at least double the current infant capacity by adding between 200-250 new spaces in a facility either on or at the edge of main campus, but this will likely take 5-10 years to complete. There is also the potential to convert some of the Devereux buildings into childcare classrooms and to work with community child care providers to increase capacity in the medium term. The main contentious issue continues to be how to establish priority for available spaces. CFW sent a letter to Senate Chair Bohn recommending that faculty and staff be prioritized for the new spaces to balance the current longstanding policy of privileging students in existing facilities.

Finally, part of CFW’s recommendation was for the campus to maintain a central website for family-related policies and resources. A “one-stop shopping” website for these policies and resources was developed over the course of 2017-18 (led by CFW vice chair Stoll, in consultation with Academic Personnel, Graduate Division, Human Resources, and the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women). CFW reviewed proposed content, and the mock-up site
was sent out for Senate review in winter 2018. Content and style revisions were made in response to feedback in spring and summer 2018. The site is now live as of September 2018. HR will maintain the site with CFW occasionally reviewing it and making recommendations for updates as needed.

- **Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD)**

  In response to the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (CACSW) report on childcare on campus, CFW agreed to write a memo to Alison Butler (AVC of Academic Personnel), requesting that the Red Binder be updated to make ASMD and Childbearing leave policies clearer and make the information regarding these policies more readily accessible. The vagueness of current policy, and the lack of reliable information on the policy, has led to a great deal of inequity and resentment as individual departments and department chairs interpret the policy on their own, leading to significant differences in the type of leave provided to individual faculty members. CFW recommended some language for the Red Binder that would help to clarify the policy. During August 2018 the outgoing Chair and Vice Chair and the incoming Chair and Vice Chair of CFW met with AVC Butler and Cindy Doherty (Director, Academic Personnel) to discuss this issue along with other Academic Personnel concerns. AVC Butler and Director Doherty agreed to put together some guiding language on the policy that they would include, among other places, in the Chair’s Handbook beginning this fall. They also discussed the potential of having a staff member and a faculty member who would be designated as contacts for faculty who have questions about ASMD and childbearing policies.

  In a related update, APM 760 was revised during August 2018 to address an existing inequity between semester-based and quarter-based campuses. Previously, APM 760 allowed for two quarters or two semesters of combined childbearing and ASMD leave for birthmothers. This formulation allowed those on semester systems to have a full academic year of leave where quarter-based campuses allowed leave for only 2/3 of the year. CFW brought this issue to UCFW’s attention several years ago, and the administration agreed to update the language at UCFW’s request. However, the change had yet to be made by the beginning of 2017-2018. Chair Fumerton once again brought the issue to UCFW this year, and UCFW pushed for the APM to be updated immediately. The administration fulfilled its promise to update the language during the summer of 2018. APM 760 now states that combined childbearing and ASMD leave is for three quarters (or two semesters).

- **Two-Merit per Step Limitation**

  Five years ago the Red Binder was updated to state: “A Faculty member may receive no more than two within-step increases in the off-scale supplement. Additional off-scale increases may not be granted unless accompanied by advancement in rank or step” (Red Binder I-8 III). CFW looked into this change in policy due to concerns that this limitation has created a problem for some faculty who are stuck at barrier steps. CFW voted to write a memo to Academic Personnel recommending that the limit be removed from the Red Binder. CFW leadership discussed this issue during their August 2018 meeting with AVC Butler and Cindy Doherty. According to AVC Butler and Cindy Doherty, the policy change has been very effective in encouraging faculty to push over barrier steps, and there are very few faculty that have continued to remain stuck at a step after two merit increases. It was suggested that Deans and Department Chairs work with
faculty who might be stuck due to issues such as the lengthy research and writing process to publish a book in the humanities.

• Chair’s Bonus

CFW received a memo from the Political Science department outlining concerns about the inequities in the distribution of bonuses and the lack of guidance in the Red Binder. There is an oral tradition in CAP that a chair receives a ½ step bonus at the completion of their service as Chair. Council members discussed whether CFW should write a memo to AP requesting that the Red Binder be updated to clarify this issue. While the Council agreed to discuss this further during the 2018-19 year, the topic was brought up with AVC Butler and Cindy Doherty when CFW leadership met with them in August. They agreed that this is an issue that the Deans and Department Chairs need to be aware of and address, and they will bring it up with them this year.

• Campus Events Calendar

During June 2018 CFW began discussing UCSB’s lack of an effective system to publicize and organize events on campus. There is currently an “events” calendar and a “campus calendar,” both of which are not well maintained though the events calendar has more information than the campus calendar. With these calendars in place it appears that the campus has the infrastructure to have a calendar with extensive information on campus events. The Council agreed to reach out to AVC John Longbrake to inquire about the calendars and ways to improve our calendaring system. AVC Longbrake was very receptive to CFW’s inquiry and agreed to work with the Council on this issue in 2018-19.

• Committee on Academic Freedom

The Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) met four times during the 2017-18 year. CAF devoted a significant amount of time to researching academic freedom and outlining the scope of their committee’s purpose. This was necessary as CAF has not been an active committee for years, though an ad hoc Academic Freedom Committee did meet during 2015-16 and 2016-17. Other issues that CAF addressed during the year included: the potential impact at UCSB of new political screening processes for federal grants; a papering incident at UC Berkeley that labeled specific faculty members as “terrorist supporters”; and supporting UCAF’s work in response to the reintroduction of the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act.

• Cyber Security Working Group

The Cyber Security Work Group (CSWG) met seven times during the 2017-18 academic year. CSWG is housed under CFW and was created in response to concerns about cyber security, electronic monitoring, and faculty privacy that arose during the 2015-16 academic year. During 2017-18, CFW appointed one council member, Jim Buckwalter, to join CSWG and report back to CFW. CSWG’s main focus during 2017-18 has been on updating the Electronics Communication Policy (ECP) to bring it into compliance with the Systemwide Electronic Communications Policy. CSWG has been working with Jennifer Lofthus, Campus Policy Coordinator, in its work to update and revise the ECP. CSWG plans to meet with Jennifer Lofthus during summer 2018 to finalize updates to the ECP. Once the document is final they will present it to the Senate for review in
2018-19. The ECP will also include a method for managing vulnerable systems on campus, and this procedure will also be presented to the Senate during 2018-19.

- **Senate Awards**

Four committees reviewed nomination packets for Academic Senate awards for research, teaching, and mentoring. Award guidelines were updated to provide clearer guidelines for required materials in an effort to make award applications more uniform. The table below outlines the number of nominations for each award per academic year. The awards process is an ongoing issue for CFW and the Council will continue discussing ways to make the awards process more effective during the 2018-19 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DTA</th>
<th>DTA Total</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Non-Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</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**

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

- **Classroom Recording Policy**
CFW will continue working with Student Affairs to have the policy included in the Student Code of Conduct. The Council will also continue working with Jennifer Lofthus to establish a campus policy. CFW hopes to have these policies finalized and in place by the end of 2018-19.

- **Campus Events Calendar**

  CFW reached out to AVC Longbrake to discuss ways the campus “events” calendar and “campus calendar” could be better utilized as a source for the many events that take place at UCSB. AVC Longbrake was very receptive to the inquiry and CFW will invite him to a fall meeting to discuss this issue.

- **Campus Childcare Accessibility and Affordability**

  The Childcare Task Force has made good progress on this issue, but there is still a long way to go before a final plan is in place to improve access and affordability. CFW will continue to monitor this issue and periodically check in with the Task Force for updates.

- **Parking Concerns**

  CFW has been contacted by faculty who are concerned about the lack of parking on campus, especially the lack of spaces devoted to faculty and staff that are centrally located. CFW will consider looking into this issue in the 2018-19 year.

**Council Members**
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Heather Stoll, Vice Chair  
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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 17 requests for Academic search waivers (formerly, Exceptions to Open Recruitment) and two requests for appointment conversions.
- Council reviewed seven proposals to establish endowed chairs.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 20 regularly scheduled sessions (six in fall, six 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 Education
2. Department of English
3. Department of Global Studies
4. Department of Physics

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (English); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Physics); and Social Sciences / Education (Education and Global 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.

The Academic Senate was asked by the Executive Vice Chancellor to provide recommendations for the PRP reviews for 2019-20, but CPB was inadvertently excluded from this review. The six academic units that were ultimately chosen were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Unit</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature Program</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic &amp; Slavic</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five units had previously been selected for review in 2018-19: Chemical Engineering; Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology; Media Arts & Technology Program; Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology; and the Writing Program.

III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

CPB reviewed 17 requests for search waivers from the following departments:

- Anthropology
- Black Studies
- Bren
- Earth Science
- Economics
- Global Studies
- History
- Mathematics
- Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology
- Physics
- Psychological & Brain Sciences
- Sociology

Of these, seven were for partner hires, four were to make an additional hire from an open search, four were for exceptional opportunities, and two were for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows (PPFs). CPB offered either a full or qualified endorsement in 14 cases; for the remaining three cases, CPB could not offer its support.

In addition, Theater & Dance submitted a request to convert a Visiting Associate Professor appointment to a Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Senior LSOE), and Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology requested to convert an LSOE appointment to a full Professor. CPB endorsed the former but withheld its support of the latter.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

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

1. **Dangermond Chair in Conservation**: The Jack and Laura Dangermond Endowed Chair in Conservation will be endowed by a $1 million gift to “support a preeminent faculty member conducting interdisciplinary conservation scholarship and research...” The Chair will support a full professor “... who will further enhance UC Santa Barbara’s reputation for interdisciplinary research and teaching in conservation and ecological research, leveraging spatial perspective.”
2. **Founder's Chairs in Chemical Engineering:** The John “Jack” Myers Chair and the Robert G. Rinker Chair will be funded by matching gifts from Duncan and Suzanne Mellichamp, consisting of $500,000 in addition to $250,000 raised on behalf of each of the namesake honorees, for a total of $1 million. Both of the Chairs would support an outstanding scholar in Chemical Engineering at the rank of either associate professor or full professor, and would be for renewable two-year terms. CPB supported the proposal but offered some input concerning the renewal process vis-à-vis conformity with the University Policy on Endowed Chairs.

3. **Mehrabian Interdisciplinary Endowed Chair:** This Chair will be funded by a gift of $500,000 from Robert and Victoria Mehrabian. As noted in the proposal, the Chair will “support a faculty position with a joint appointment in both the Materials Department and the Department of Mechanical Engineering within the College of Engineering and will be administered by the Dean of the College of Engineering.”

4. **Mellichamp Endowed Chair in Systems Engineering:** This Chair will be endowed by a $600,000 gift from Duncan and Suzanne Mellichamp, consisting of $500,000 in addition to $100,000 previously donated. The Chair will support a senior faculty position in the Department of Chemical Engineering.

5. **Stansbury Endowed Chair in Computer Science:** This endowed chair would be established by a gift of $250,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Tayloe and Cynthia Stansbury and a matching gift from Klaus Schauser, for a total of $500,000.

6. **Wilcox Family Chair in Entrepreneurial Economics:** This endowed chair would reside in the Department of Economics within the Division of Social Sciences, and it would be established by a gift of $500,000 from Gary & Sue Wilcox.

7. **Zhu Chair in Computer Science:** Zhu Chair in Computer Science will be funded by a gift of $125,000 from the Anne Jie Foundation (which was created by Jing Wang and Hongjun Zhu), $62,500 from Huican Zhu and the Zhu Family Foundation, and $312,500 from two anonymous donors, totaling $500,000. The Chair will support a faculty position in the Department of Computer Science and be administered by the Dean of Engineering, with the goal “to identify, recruit and nurture a junior scholar that will emerge as one of the next generation of leaders.”

The Council also sent a memo to EVC David Marshall (dated June 25, 2018) sharing concerns and feedback regarding the review and approval process for endowed chair proposals. In particular, CPB questioned the role of the Academic Senate in reviewing and commenting on proposals when most – if not all – have already been finalized by the time CPB receives them.

V. **Campus Issues**

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2017-18 academic year.
FTE Planning

The Council on Planning & Budget was consulted by the Executive Vice Chancellor for its recommendations on academic positions (“FTEs” = Full-Time Equivalent appointments). The EVC’s call for academic FTE plans was sent to the Deans in November, and it included FTE templates that were revised based on last year’s feedback from CPB. This year’s call for FTE plans asked Deans for updates to previous year’s plans instead of full, detailed plans as in the prior year. Departmental and Deans’ FTE plans were made available to CPB in winter quarter, on a schedule that was earlier than in previous years. CPB spent a great deal of time in winter and spring quarters consulting with Deans regarding their visions for their college / division. To the extent possible, CPB took into account additional information concerning separations, retirements, or other events that may have taken place since department plans were submitted at the end of February.

The earlier deadlines for CPB’s receipt of FTE plans gave CPB subcommittees the time to digest the department requests prior to receiving the Deans’ plans. CPB then used the Deans’ recommendations as a guide for deliberations and had time to request additional information if needed. With subcommittee work finished earlier this year, deliberations by the whole Council began on May 2. This process allowed for more time for deliberations, and in many cases followed the Deans’ requests more closely than in previous years.

CPB provided the EVC with insights about what factors were considered in making its FTE recommendations and offered several recommendations for steps that would improve the FTE planning process in the future.

Divisional Bylaw 35.K: Conflicts of Interest

In May, CPB reviewed a proposal to amend the UCSB Divisional Senate Bylaw 35 to add a new section (K) regarding Conflicts of Interest. This change corresponded to a systemwide amendment to Bylaw 128.J which CPB reviewed in February. CPB agreed with the importance of this addition and supported the proposed revision.

Proposal for Climate Hazards Center

In June, CPB reviewed a proposal by Stuart Sweeney to establish the Climate Hazards Center. CPB supported the interdisciplinary work of the collaborating faculty and had no objections to the establishment of the center.

Proposal for International Center for the Humanities & Social Change

In December, CPB reviewed a proposal by Professor Thomas Carlson from the Department of Religious Studies to establish the International Center for the Humanities & Social Change. CPB agreed that the Center fits well with the academic mission of the University and strongly supported the proposal.

CPB altogether commented highly positively about the aim, scope, and international connections of the proposed center and supported the retroactive (July 2017) approval of the Center. However, CPB noted that the example budget in the proposal was very simplistic (and
not entirely complete) in nature. Furthermore, additional points were raised regarding the composition of the steering board and CPB’s late receipt of the proposal.

At its June meeting, CPB reviewed a revised proposal, was satisfied that previous concerns were addressed, and continued to support the establishment of the center.

Proposal for a BA degree in Marine Science

In January, CPB reviewed and endorsed a revised proposal from the College of Creative Studies (CCS) to establish a BA degree in Marine Science. Council reviewed the original proposal last year and gave feedback that was generally supportive but noted concerns about: the absence of letters of support from Bren and Environmental Studies; the workload of a proposed 50% Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE); and the issue of impacted courses. CPB was satisfied that the original concerns were appropriately addressed.

Proposal for a Master of Environmental Data Science

In December, CPB reviewed a proposal from the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management and the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS) to establish a Program of Graduate Studies in pursuit of the degree of Master of Environmental Data Science (MEDS). CPB agreed with the proposal sentiment that environmental data science is a very important area and has tremendous potential to foster interdisciplinary research and cross-departmental collaborations. However, the Council found the proposal’s request for eight faculty (and eight staff FTEs, albeit partially supported by the professional fee) out of line with the budgetary realities on this campus and unreasonably large with regard to the proposed program scope. CPB also notes that none of the requested FTE appear among the top three priorities on the Dean’s FTE plan for 2017-2020.

The creation of a program in environmental data management in the absence of a larger campus-wide initiative on data science was met with mixed reactions from CPB. Council members expressed the opinion that a specific program in Environmental Data Science could well benefit both the school and campus, and acknowledged the potential of the supplementary tuition for this program to potentially provide revenue that offsets some or most of the costs beyond the eight FTE requested from the campus. However, many members felt that a MEDS-like program would be appropriate and resource-effective only if coordinated with other courses, programs, and resources in data science currently in existence, in development, or in the future, across our campus as a whole.

Campus Procedures for Faculty Violations of the Sexual Violence / Sexual Harassment Policy

In November, CPB reviewed the proposed UCSB campus procedures for the systemwide Policy on Sexual Violence & Sexual Harassment. CPB expressed a number of concerns and suggestions regarding the proposed procedures. In particular, Council felt that current policies should remain in place until inconsistencies were worked out of the proposed changes. Furthermore, CPB was alarmed by the proposed removal of the ad hoc Charges Committee and that the judgment of a single individual could determine whether or not a charge would go forward, outside of any Senate participation.
Interdepartmental Faculty Hiring Proposal

In June, CPB developed a proposal for consideration by the Executive Vice Chancellor regarding interdepartmental faculty appointments. With the proliferation of non-departmental initiatives at UCSB, various hiring processes have been developed and implemented across campus. The lack of communication and transparency in some cases has caused dissatisfaction among faculty in prospective home Departments. At the same time, faculty involved in these initiatives have faced growing dissatisfaction from subsets of faculty in participating Departments due to competing priorities, and Departmental placement/acceptance has become more challenging.

CPB’s proposal addressed two of the major issues with the existing hiring initiatives – incentive structure and process. For cross-departmental hiring to be successful, departments need appropriate incentives to ensure that they are engaged in the process and ultimately willing to consider hiring top ranked candidates. The department ‘buy in’ must occur early enough in the process to ensure that there is a likely ‘home’ for a ‘top choice’ candidate. Furthermore, there is a need to ensure that the process is transparent, efficient and likely to be effective. Ambiguity around the hiring process can lead to dissatisfaction with the process and may ultimately lead to poor decision making.

The Council offered several specific actions by the EVC and relevant Deans to improve the initiative hiring process.

Proposed MOU regarding UC Education Abroad Program

At its June meeting, CPB reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) and the UCSB campus regarding the administration and budget of the UC Education Abroad Program. CPB had no objections to the proposal.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2017-18 term:

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

1. Bylaw 128-J: Conflicts of Interest. In February, CPB reviewed a systemwide proposal to amend Senate Bylaw 128 to add a new section (J) regarding Conflicts of Interest. CPB agreed with the importance of this addition and supported the proposed revision.

2. Changes to LSOE series. In January, CPB reviewed the revised proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) which would make changes to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. CPB continued to have serious objections to the proposed changes, which were originally introduced in spring 2017. The current LSOE series provides the University with a mechanism to hire, retain, and reward excellence in teaching. While the LSOE series may also fill other needs that are not addressed by the professor series, as stated in the APM description the series is “designed to meet
the long-term instructional needs of the University that cannot be best fulfilled by an appointee in the professorial series.”

The proposed changes would add two additional criteria beyond teaching: university service and “professional and/ or scholarly achievement and activity” (understood to include creative activities). CPB continued to strongly oppose the addition of these criteria for advancement as described in the proposal. The addition of the two additional criteria risked interpretation as their holding substantial or even equal weight with the primary teaching criteria.

CPB reiterated its prior support of the proposed change in title of the positions to Assistant, Associate and Full Teaching Professor instead of the current LSOE titles. CPB felt that this change in title would be consistent with ongoing changes at other universities, and would facilitate the recruitment of excellent faculty who are primarily interested in teaching. CPB did not support the latest revision, which would maintain the LSOE titles.

3. **APM-028: Financial Disclosures.** In April, the Council was given an opportunity to comment on a proposed revision to APM-028: Disclosure of Financial Interests in Private Sponsors of Research. CPB did not opine.

**Negotiated Salary Trial Program**

In October, CPB reviewed the four-year report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) and discussed the report’s recommendations to: (1) extend the trial program for an additional four years, (2) expand it to other campuses whose administration faculty agree that it meets campus needs, and (3) collect additional information on the program at the end of the second term period.

Members of CPB expressed mixed opinions ranging from opposition to the program to qualified and full support of a second trial period. The full CPB agreed on the following points: the last review process was overly narrow, with the majority of respondents limited to participants; enthusiasm for the program seemed to increase up the administrative ladder; if the program is continued, the subsequent assessment must be comprehensive, and include a much broader base of faculty respondents; and self-governance, peer-review, and the UC merit-based processes must be preserved.

**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 2018-20, 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. 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 2017-18 term, including: the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Director of Capital Development; Associate Vice Chancellor for Development;
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. A list of questions were developed in advance of his meetings to help facilitate the discussions. The conversations addressed a number of budget-related issues: budget overview of the campus; income & expenditures; new initiatives; research; unfunded mandates; undergraduate enrollment surge; and staff support.

Capital Planning

The CPB Chair served as a Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC), which reviewed or discussed several issues and campus projects. A 10-Year Capital Financial Plan has not been reviewed by CPB in several years, although Capital projects presentations by the Deans were made to CPC over the past year.

In April, the Council, with the support of Senate Chair Henning Bohn, sent a memo to David Alcocer, Associate Vice President and Director of the Operating Budget at the UC Office of the President. The memo described the deplorable state of many of our campus classrooms, offices, and facilities and expressed that the situation on our campus has become dire. The memo included several photos illustrating the state of many of our systems and offered an invitation to visit UCSB and discuss how these issues might be addressed.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB and UCPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:

- Campus-wide academic strategic plan
- Campus-wide Capital Planning priorities
- Campus facilities and deferred maintenance
- State-mandated enrollment surge
- Non-resident enrollment
- State audit of the UC and follow-up measures

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann Jensen Adams</th>
<th>Chair / UCPB rep</th>
<th>History of Art &amp; Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tobias Hollerer</td>
<td>Vice Chair (Fall)</td>
<td>Computer Science; Media Arts &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina (Naomi) Tague</td>
<td>Vice Chair (Winter/Spring)</td>
<td>Bren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara (Tammy) Afifi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen (Kate) Bruhn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A final note from the Chair

I have very much appreciated the thoughtful, and well-informed, discussions engaged by every one of our CPB colleagues this year. I also value the efforts of Analyst Kyle Richards for his experienced advice, memo-writing, and good work. The earlier deadline for receipt of FTE requests from departments and deans, made a big differences to our deliberation as it provided us with the time to more thoughtfully consider FTE planning for the campus as a whole. In addition to our usual activities, we examined and drafted recommendations for several additional areas which had come to our attention over the course of our work. These included how searches for joint appointments might be more smoothly run, and appointments themselves negotiated between departments; the question of lack of gender diversity in some departments in MLPS; collecting information about the deplorable state of some of our facilities to forward to UCOP; and intensive discussions about how to bring together and foster Data Science on our campus. Senate leadership, and the Administration, has been open and responsive to our concerns, for which we are grateful.
Council on Research and Instructional Resources
Annual Report: 2017-2018

Council Charge

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 thirteen times and CLIIR met eleven times during the 2017-18 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 four times during the spring quarter; one meeting was for orientation and the other three 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 Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations**

  CRPP was generally supportive of the goals of this policy and appreciated that the optional two-year embargo period would meet the needs of students in the sciences and engineering. However, the committee observed that the policy as written could potentially cause harm to the careers of Ph.D. students in the humanities.

  For faculty in the humanities, the Ph.D. thesis often serves as a first draft for a larger body of work which the faculty member will produce early in their career. Portions of the thesis will be polished and subsequently published as journal articles, and the thesis itself may well become the core of the first book which the faculty member writes. A successful academic career depends not only on writing that book but on getting it published, and completely open online access of the first draft is likely to make it very difficult to obtain a book contract.

  CRPP made several suggestions for adjusting the proposed policy. First, students should be given the option of either a two-year embargo or a five-year embargo, with the provision that the embargo period could be renewed once upon request. Any renewals beyond the first would require “compelling circumstances.” A five-year once-renewable embargo should meet the
needs of future academics in the humanities. Second, CRPP recommended that graduate students should be required to indicate whether they wish no embargo, a two-year embargo, or a five-year embargo at the moment they are submitting the dissertation. Third, CRPP anticipated that the California Digital Library (CDL) would maintain a database of thesis titles and abstracts online even for those theses that are embargoed. The committee suggested that for embargoed theses, members of the public could request access through CDL, and that those access requests would be forwarded to the thesis authors for action.

CLIIR also reviewed the policy and noted that the proposed policy would benefit UCSB graduates who often choose to publish their theses and/or dissertation in an open access format during the filing process. Currently graduates must pay a fee to do so, and this would take that burden off of graduates. There was some concern that this policy could make it difficult for recent graduates to publish their dissertation as a book, but most CLIIR members agreed that it is extremely unlikely that a publisher would want to publish an unrevised dissertation. Overall, CLIIR endorsed the Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations.

- **Systemwide Review of Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program**

CRPP members had a wide range of opinions on the Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program and the committee was unable to reach consensus on the program. Many committee members felt that the program was a very bad idea that would tend to increase the inequities already present in faculty salaries. There was also a concern that there might be encroachments on academic freedom by having portions of a faculty member’s salary derived from outside entities (who might wish the faculty member to adopt their own agendas). On the other hand, many committee members (particularly in the sciences and engineering) saw this as a potentially useful tool for attracting and retaining faculty.


In reviewing the proposed revisions CRPP returned to the two central concerns they discussed during the first systemwide review held in spring 2017. First, what problem is this new title system and related APM changes attempting to fix? Second, what does this change do to the research mission of the university? During this second systemwide review, the committee discussed whether the updated version addressed those concerns and agreed that although there were superficial changes, the underlying problems were not fixed. It was still unclear what exactly the revised policy was attempting to fix. In the committee’s view, no existing problems were solved by the revised proposal and new problems were created.

The committee was concerned about the proposal to put the two categories of faculty on a common salary scale. It was pointed out that inequities could quickly develop. For example, in the “book disciplines” in the humanities, a faculty member could remain at one of the barrier steps for a long period of time until the next book is written and published. By contrast, their LSOE colleagues in the same department could sail past the barrier step since there is no comparable “barrier” in the evaluation of a teaching-only professor. In order to avoid this problem, clear metrics for determining eligibility for the next step or rank would need to be supplied for the LSOE series, but they were not supplied in the proposal.
Another serious issue was the suggested change of the official title of our current Senior Lecturers to “Lecturer,” which sounded like a demotion (and will so appear to those on the outside reviewing the CV of such a person). Finally, the revised policy continued to use the phrase “Teaching Professor” (although not as the official title) and still included the requirement that LSOEs conduct research, though the requirement was broadened. Some committee members felt that institutionalizing a “Teaching Professor” series would endanger the research mission of the University by making it easier to increase the number of teaching-only faculty at the expense of research faculty. CRPP did not support the proposed revisions.

Local Business

- **Proposal to Establish a Master of Environmental Data Science**

  CRPP found several positive aspects of the Proposal to Establish a Master of Environmental Data Science including the opportunity for UCSB to be the first to offer this type of program and the opportunity to increase the graduate student population on campus. The committee also had a number of concerns about the proposal. The main concern was what this program would do for the research mission of the university. While the proposal included some faculty hires, the program would rely much more heavily on hiring lecturers to teach the required courses. There was also concern that the proposal lacked support letters from the Statistics and Applied Probability Department and from the Computer Science Department. It was also noted that there was not an attempt to reach out to faculty across campus to see if they were interested in the program or would have something to offer it, especially faculty in the humanities and arts. Some committee members were uncomfortable with the short time-frame of the program and thought it seemed more like a credentialing program than a graduate program. However, other members noted that this is typical of professional degree programs of this type and were not uncomfortable with having this degree program on campus.

- **Proposal to Establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change**

  CRPP discussed the Proposal to Establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change at its December 1st meeting. The committee identified a number of serious issues during its discussion of the proposal. After consultation with Divisional Chair Bohn, the committee invited Professor Tom Carlson (Religious Studies) to its meeting on January 19th in order to clarify some aspects of the proposal. The Chair of CRPP was able to review reports from other Senate committees about this proposal prior to the January meeting, and these provided additional input to the discussion with Professor Carlson.

  During the meeting with Professor Carlson he was asked to address six main areas of concern: (1) to provide more information on the International Foundation for the Humanities and Social Change; (2) to confirm whether there would be a formal Memoranda of Understanding or Collaboration Agreements between the Foundation, the Foundation network centers, and UCSB; (3) to distinguish the role this Center would play from other existing Centers in the humanities on campus; (4) to provide clarifying information on the Center’s budget and the duration of the Foundation’s financial commitment to UCSB; (5) to confirm whether the Center is already operational, and if so, when its activities began; and (6) to clarify whether the Center would follow the normal five-year review cycle for Centers.
After discussing the central issues with Prof. Carlson, CRPP requested that he submit a revised proposal. The committee felt that the original proposal itself had a number of defects and that Professor Carlson should be required to submit a revised proposal prior to formal approval. CRPP expected the revisions to include a more detailed and realistic budget that states true costs and clarifies the nature of the UCSB financial commitment to this Center. The five-year commitment from the Foundation should also be described. While the committee was very concerned that the Center was operational prior to receiving approval, CRPP was willing to move forward with the approval process pending the submission of a satisfactory revised proposal.

CRPP received the Revised Proposal to Establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change, and discussed it during its June 1st meeting. The committee agreed that many of the concerns raised by the Senate during its review of the original proposal in January 2018 were addressed. The revised budget was an improvement over the original budget though there were still areas that lacked clarity. Specifically, the committee was unclear who would provide stipends for UCSB dissertation fellowships (the proposal indicates in-state tuition and fees would be paid by Graduate Division). In addition, the revised proposal states that 1 – 3 of the dissertation fellowships would go to a UCSB graduate student each year. The committee agreed that it is important for the Center to fulfill this commitment to UCSB graduate students and ensure that at least one fellowship is allocated to a UCSB graduate student each year and that they are paid a salary/stipend equal to non-UCSB fellowship recipients. Finally, the original proposal indicated a start date of July 1, 2017, but the revised proposal lists July 1, 2018 as a start date. Both proposals indicate an initial four year review followed by a regular five-year review cycle. CRPP would support either the 2017 or 2018 as the start date, and the committee acknowledged that as a non-ORU center, the review cycle will be determined by the Dean. While CRPP still found areas that needed clarification in the revised proposal, overall the committee supported the proposal and the establishment of an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change.

- **Proposal for the Establishment of a Non-ORU Climate Hazards Center**

CRPP discussed the proposal and the committee was supportive of the center overall, but would like to know the standing of Dr. Chris Funk who was identified as the inaugural director. The proposal indicated that Dr. Funk would be ineligible to receive a stipend because he is a federal employee with US Geological Survey. It was unclear to the committee whether Dr. Funk is employed in any way by UCSB and whether he would be allowed to serve as Director if he is not connected to UCSB. The committee also suggested that the center be reviewed again in three years if a new director is hired using UCSB funds. CLIIR also discussed the proposal, and the committee agreed with and endorsed CRPP’s response. Overall, CRIP was supportive of the establishment of the Climate Hazards Center, but would like clarification on Dr. Chris Funk’s standing.

- **Data Curation and Data Storage**

During spring 2017 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 storage and curation 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.

To learn more about plans for data storage and curation at UCSB, CRIR invited Matt Hall (Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer) and Joseph Incandela (Vice Chancellor for Research) to attend a meeting and discuss the issue. The discussion was guided by five central questions: (1) how do plans for data management fit in with the growing requirements on the part of federal agencies to make federally-funded research data available, and how will the campus research community be informed about this?; (2) what are current plans for making campus research data available?; (3) how do UCSB’s efforts relate to contexts such as eScholarship, CDL, ADRL; (4) what options are being considered for data curation and metadata generation?; (5) are there plans to increase access for other research objects besides text data, such as images, maps, audio, and specimens?

VC Incandela and AVC Hall noted that the campus and Office of Research recognize that the increasing data requirements for federally-funded research grants, such as NSF grants, is one of the primary issues that needs to be addressed. Additional needs include the ability to create large data sets with shared-editing capabilities as well as the need to ensure protection of sensitive and critical business data. Data storage needs and capabilities vary a great deal by discipline. As of fall 2018, there were five petabytes of storage at UCSB. All of it was in use, so capacity is extremely limited.

When it comes to data management, various research centers on campus handle their data needs in different ways. Increasingly, NSF and other funding agencies are moving toward requiring the use of data repositories. An example of one is NCEAS, which maintains a repository where working groups from across the country can share data sets. The repository makes it possible to collate extensive amounts of data, archive research projects, and make the data public in national project archives. However, there is an ongoing question of how much and what type of data must or should be made publically available and preserved.

The question of discoverability was also addressed. Alan Grosenheider (Associate University Librarian) noted that two years ago the Library did a pilot project on data curation. The Library now has several data curators who are available to assist faculty on data storage, though the Library’s main focus is on the curation aspect of the data management issue. There is also a pilot project with the Earth Research Institute (ERI).

VC Incandela and AVC Hall also discussed the challenges of long-term archiving. One of the main problems is how to store data in a way that will be retrievable despite rapidly changing technology. One option that Stanford University, and others, are looking into is “containers” that store data sets and all computational aspects, which would allow data to be taken forward despite changes in operating systems and technology (to a point). At UCSB, the College of Engineering and the College of Letters and Science have been looking into “Open Stack Containers” for use at UCSB. Another related issue is how to protect long-term storage from corruption. Typically at least three copies of equal quality would be needed, which creates even greater demands for storage.

Finally, CRIR members inquired about how the campus community would be informed about changing data management and storage needs and availability. It was noted that the Library’s
website has a great deal of information, and that faculty should be working with the Office of Research when writing grant applications, especially when there are data requirement tied to the grants. Some council members felt that there need to be better guidelines available to faculty and better training of departmental staff on these issues. Finally, the Library offers data management workshops on behalf of the Office of Research.

Library Updates

- **Meeting with Candidates for University Librarian**

  During December 2017 CLIIR had the opportunity to meet with all the final candidates for University Librarian during their campus visits. Kristin Antelman accepted the position and joined UCSB as the University Librarian in spring 2018.

- **Library Space Initiatives and UCSB Library Annex 1**

  Upcoming space initiatives for the Library include significant reductions in the Current Serials Area and relocation of reference books to open up the Reference Library space. Reductions will likely occur through eliminating duplicate materials, utilizing online serials resources, and relocating reference books to the stacks. These reductions will make available significant areas of space, which could be used for student study space. Additional changes for the main library include keeping the entire library open until 2:00 am and increasing the 24-hour footprint to include the first two floors of both wings of the library.

  During 2017-18 the Library began the process to close library annex 1, which involves moving all relevant materials to the shared UC Southern Regional Library Facility in Los Angeles (SRLF). Annex 1 is a local storage facility with no climate control that houses mainly back-runs of journals that are available upon request in pdf from RLF. Overall, there would not no loss of materials or money, as UCSB is already paying into the shared facility and there would be no additional charge for moving the materials there. There would be a cost-savings by closing annex 1 because UCSB currently pays to rent the space. The process was expected to take two-three years, but due to the high-cost of rent, the timeline was accelerated. The Library now expects to have the process finished by July 31, 2019, which is the earliest date the Library can end their lease.

- **Open Access/Journal Offsetting Agreements**

  During 2017-18 there has been a UC-wide push toward shifting journal publication and subscription models toward an open access model. One way the issue has come forward is in the current UC negotiations for renewals of several journal subscription packages that are set to expire in 2019. Almost all journal subscriptions in UCSB's library are available across UC campuses via California Digital Library (CDL). Via CDL, the plan is to negotiate for a proposed new model for UC journal authors that would require journals to make all UC authored articles open access. There are three main goals in this proposed off-setting model: make UC-authored articles open access, contain the rapidly rising costs of UC Systemwide journal packages, and, in the long-term, transition subscription journals from major commercial publishers to full and sustainable open access. As part of this model, all articles published by UC authors would be made publicly available, and any article processing charges (APC) would be paid either by the
author (via the faculty’s research grants) or by a central open-access fund (for faculty who do not have grant money to pay APCs). This new model has been approved and endorsed by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC).

In May 2018 University Librarian Antelman brought to CLIIR’s attention the Library’s interest in having UCSB join Open Access 2020 (OA2020). OA2020 is an international initiative coordinated by the Max Planck Digital Library to expand open access and convert scholarly journals from subscription-based models to open-access models. Each UC campus has been asked to sign the OA2020 Expression of Interest, and the UC has created a “pathways” plan for all UC libraries. If UCSB signs the OA2020 Expression of Interest, it would use the “pathways” document to develop its own roadmap toward achieving open access. So far six UC campuses have signed on, and this initiative directly relates to the CDL’s off-setting agreements that are central to their current journal subscription negotiations. All UC campuses are expected to eventually sign the Expression of Interest. Discussions regarding UCSB’s commitment to OA2020 will continue in fall 2018 when relevant Senate councils and committees will review the issue.

- **Music Library**

Plans for relocating the Music Library to the main library continued this year. Once the move is complete, the music collection will be located in the area formerly occupied by Special Collections. The music collection initiative is dependent on raising $5 million, all of which has to be done via fundraising. One million has already been raised, and once the half-way mark is reached the library will hire an architect to draft plans. As the plans stand now, the new music collection would be a significant increase in space for the music collection. Closed stacks housing music materials and the map collection would also occupy that space. In addition to additional seating and a seminar room, the music collection would also have a minimum of two listening rooms, but ideally more than two. These listening rooms would be multi-purpose with high-tech production capabilities for music, video, editing, etc. Since these would be used by people for reasons other than music, several rooms would be needed.

**Instructional Development Updates**

- **Classroom Design Standards**

Instructional Development has created a set of classroom design standards for general assignment classrooms. The standards would be used by architects and contractors when building any new general assignment classrooms on campus. CLIIR reviewed and endorsed the set of classroom design standards.

- **ESCI, Classrooms, and Facilities**

The ESCI online pilot has expanded to new departments this year, and there are now 17 departments participating. A survey of students regarding online ESCIs showed that students overwhelmingly want to move to the online format. There are several updates regarding classrooms and facilities. A survey of faculty showed that there is a lot of interest among faculty in transforming existing classrooms into flexible classrooms, and much of this could be done simply by replacing the furniture that is currently in those rooms. Additional classroom updates include the status of Campbell Hall and other lecture halls on campus. There is no replacement
equivalent for Campbell Hall, but a new engineering building (Henley Hall) is planned, and it would go in the area where the mobile structures (ROTC, Arts and Lectures) are located near Campbell Hall, between the Chemistry Building and Ocean Road. Originally, a lecture hall with at least a 100 student capacity was planned to be included in the building, but it is unclear if the classroom will still be included. Finally, the 10 largest lecture halls on campus are slated to be upgraded to Gen 5 lecterns. Updates should occur during summer 2018.

Faculty Grants Committee

- Faculty Research Grants Policy and Procedures Updates

CRPP reviewed the current Faculty Research Grant application and decided to change some of the wording in the application. Included in the changes was adding a request for start-up funds information. The committee also removed the request for a minimum viable amount of grant funding due to concern that the review committee will often use it as a default funding amount when applicants supply the information.

CRPP also made updates to the research grants policy. Given the rapidly changing landscape of academic publishing, and the elimination of the library’s Open Access Fund (the only other campus resource for assistance with open access fees), the committee decided to change the policy criteria for publication subventions. The policy was updated to allow subvention funds to be used to pay for open access fees for monographs.

The committee also updated the grant policy to allow use of funds to pay for digitization of archival documents, in lieu of the researcher traveling to an archive to obtain the same documents. These types of digitized copies are typically restricted to individual use, so the faculty member would not be required to give them to the Library when they are no longer needed. While most faculty will still prefer to travel to archives, this change allows more flexibility and potential cost savings for those whose research needs would be met by ordering digitized archival documents.

- Summary of Grant Applications and Awards

Faculty Research Grant (FRG) maximum funding limit was set at $20,000, and Pearl Chase Research Grant (PCRG) maximum funding limit was set at $10,000, which maintains the same limit used during previous grant cycles. The Senate FRG budget allocation for the 2017-2018 cycle was $920,000 and the PCRG budget allocation was $70,000. During this cycle 125 completed applications were submitted and reviewed for the Faculty Research Grants. 113 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 PCRG during the 2017-2018 review cycle. Two of the proposals were funded, one partially funded and one fully funded. The total amount of PCRG funds awarded was $17,000.
Faculty Research Grants Funding Amounts and Rates by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>$112,710.00</td>
<td>$59,300.00</td>
<td>52.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMA</td>
<td>$74,241.60</td>
<td>$45,148.50</td>
<td>60.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$138,845.79</td>
<td>$83,149.50</td>
<td>59.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>$427,321.02</td>
<td>$236,925.00</td>
<td>55.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$512,436.00</td>
<td>$321,254.00</td>
<td>62.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$261,353.80</td>
<td>$174,212.00</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,526,908.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>$919,989.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.68%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carry-Over Issues**

- **Open Access 2020 (OA2020)**

  Discussions regarding whether UCSB will join OA2020 will continue in 2018-19. Relevant Senate councils and committees will be asked to review the issue in fall 2018.

- **Faculty Research Grant Policy**

  There is a strong desire to continue to clarify and update the existing grant policy. A few of the policy areas that will be reviewed include requests for faculty summer salaries, subvention criteria and open access fees, and the need to clarify the policy to limit faculty to only one proposal per year to prevent dual proposals (one to FRG and one to PCRG per grant cycle).

- **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 2018-2019 academic year.

**Membership**

**Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR): Membership Organized by Committee**

- **Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP)**

  David R. Morrison (Chair of CRIR and CRPP)
  Hilary J. Bernstein
  Lisa Jevbratt
  Arturo A. Keller
  Shelly J. Lundberg
  Wendy Meiring
  Yasamin C. Mostofi
  Harry N. Nelson, UCORP Representative
  Jianwen Su, UCACC Representative
  Joseph R. Incandela, Ex Officio
Mary A. Raven, Professional Researcher

- **Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources (CLIIR)**
  
  Werner Kuhn (Vice Chair of CRIR and Chair of CLIIR)
  Paul M. Berkowitz
  Wolf D. Kittler
  Peter C. Sturman
  Rene Weber
  Liming Zhang
  Miriam Wattles
  John W. Du Bois, UCOLASC Representative
  Sherri L. Barnes, Non-Senate Academic Representative
  Magda Campo, Non-Senate Academic Representative
  Kristin A. Antelman, Ex Officio
  Alan A. Grosenheider, Ex Officio
  George Michaels, Consultant

- **Committee on Faculty Grants (CFG)**
  
  David Morrison, Co-Chair
  Werner Kuhn, Co-Chair
  Mahdi Abu-Omar
  Lalaie Ameeriar
  Omer M. Blaes
  Forrest Brewer
  Julie A. Carlson
  Gary B. Charness
  Moses Chikowero
  Ruth Finkelstein
  Kip Fulbeck
  Michael J. Furlong
  Barbara H. Harthorn
  Lisa Jevbratt
  Robert J. Koenig
  David A. Low
  Sumita Pennathur
  Matthew Potoski
  Laura F. Romo
  Karen K. Szumlinski
  William B. Warner
  Volker M. Welter
  Liming Zhang

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

**2017-2018 Members**

Jill Sharkey, Chair – GGSE Credential Leadership Committee Representative (Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology)
Andrew Fedders, Vice-Chair – Teacher Education Program Representative
Tim Dewar – Department of Education Representative
Richard Duran – Department of Education Representative
Maryam Kia-Keating – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Matthew Quirk – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Elissa Ross – Non-Senate Faculty Representative (Teacher Education Program)
Chunyan Yang – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Noreen Balos, Student Representative - Department of Education
Ida Taghavi, Student Representative - Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Jeff Milem, Dean
Aaron Ballett, Advisor
Briana Villasenor, Advisor

**Executive Summary**

The Faculty Executive Committee met eight times during the 17-18 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:**

- Systemwide review of Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
  - The GGSE FEC supported the expansion of the NSTP with more rigorous study of the effects on wider campus climate, specifically regarding pay disparities and equity
- Proposed changes to Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy
  - The FEC supported the efforts to align the campus with UC policy but thought there needs to be more education on the current and proposed processes. The FEC also expressed concern for respondent’s due process.
- Proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergrads and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants
The FEC approved the proposal with the stipulation that every effort must be made to hire graduate students first, followed by undergrads, with the last option being non-students. The FEC also thought non-student hiring lacked clarity in terms of compensation, union representation and recruitment.

- Revision of Divisional Regulation 25
  - The FEC unanimously approved the proposed changes – with the caveat that there is apparently no ability to appeal the Vice Chancellor’s decision. The FEC also advocates for people first language (e.g. “the student with a grievance” as oppose to the “aggrieved student”)

- Proposal to Establish International Center for the Humanities and Social Change
  - The FEC supported the creation of this center but has concerns regarding measuring outcomes and feels the center can be better served by more specificity and measurability in their proposed outcomes
  - The FEC Chair reviewed the revised proposal and further detailed concerns about the program evaluation goals, metrics, and plan.

  - The FEC appreciates the concern and effort that has gone into the revisions, however the FEC still supports the use of Teaching Professor as the SOE titles are confusing to audiences unfamiliar with the UC system

- Proposed Classroom Recording Policy
  - The FEC supports the proposed policy so long as faculty are aware of accommodations that may need to be made for students with disabilities

- Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations
  - Research conducted at the University of California is ultimately for the public good and thus should be accessible as quickly as possible

- Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128
  - The FEC would like a clear definition of conflict of interest, or provide examples

**Curricular and Academic Matters:**

- As part of the Program Review of the Department of Education and Teacher Education Program, the FEC reviewed the materials and provided feedback for the External Review Committee. The FEC also reviewed and provided feedback on the final report
- Change to course descriptions ED-20 and ED-120
- WSCUC Interim Report
  - The FEC provided feedback on the interim report to WSCUC

**GGSE Matters:**

- Committee on Diversity and Equity Bylaws
  - The FEC provided feedback and approved the proposed bylaws of the GGSE CDE
- Syllabus language
In reviewing the copyright policy distributed by the Senate, the FEC decided to draft standardized language for use in all GGSE course syllabi.

The FEC identified key topics to standardize and drafted language for each topic – the departments will vote and provide any feedback prior to adoption.

**FEC Membership and Elections**

- The FEC updated their bylaws:
  - Any voting member from Department of Education; Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology; or the Credential Advising Committee can serve as representative from the Teacher Education Program as opposed to requiring that member be a representative from the Department of Education.
  - The Non-senate faculty member is no longer required to alternate annually between CCSP and Education.
Graduate Council
Annual Report 2017-18

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Graduate Council met for fourteen regularly scheduled two-hour sessions during the 2017-18 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 2017-18 term, among them:

- Clarifying and revising the Divisional Regulations pertaining to Master’s Degree Plan II: Project Committees
- Approving revisions to the Graduate Division Expanded Time-to-Degree for Parenting Demands policy
- Reviewing the original and then modified (but not yet acceptable) proposal to establish a Master of Environmental Data Science
- Responding to the federal government proposal, H.R. 1: The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which would have eliminated the ability for graduate students to deduct from their taxable income fee remission of mandatory student fees and tuition
- Commenting on various divisional and systemwide draft policy documents including: a proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants; a proposed Classroom Recording Policy; the Systemwide Review of Taskforce on Negotiated Salary Trial Program; the Procedures for Reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy; and a proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations

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 7/1/2017 and 6/30/2018, Council processed a total of 204 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 2017-18 term: Education and the Teacher Education Program, English, Global Studies and Physics.
Graduate Council recommended six departments and one program for Academic Program Review in 2019-20.

III. Proposals to Establish Programs, Emphases, Academic Units and Research Units
- Reviewed the proposal to establish an International Center for the Humanities and Social Change
- Reviewed the revised proposal to establish a B.A. in Marine Science
- Reviewed and did not approve the proposal to establish a Master of Environmental Data Science
- Reviewed the proposal to establish a non-ORU Climate Hazards Center
- Reviewed and approved the establishment of the Education Specialist Credential for Teaching Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities in the Teacher Education Program

IV. Name Changes
Graduate Council did not receive any name change proposals for 2017-18.

V. Changes to Existing Programs
- Approved the proposed change to admission requirements for the five-year B.S./M.S. in Actuarial Science
- Approved the change to admission requirements to the M.M. degree
- Approved the Program Learning Outcomes for the M.A. Research Strand and M.A. Professional Strand in Education
- Approved the proposed curricular changes for the Ph.D. in Political Science
- Approved the proposed changes to the Ph.D. minor exam in the History of Art and Architecture
- Approved the addition of a core course option to the M.S. and Ph.D. in Biomolecular Science and Engineering
- Approved a change to a core course for the Ph.D. in Environmental Science and Management
- Approved changes to the core course units for the M.A. and Ph.D. in Geography
- Approved the proposed time-to-degree changes for the Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering
- Approved course changes in the Teacher Education Program
- Approved the proposed time-to-degree changes for the Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering
- Approved the addition of the Department of Global Studies to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Demography
- Approved the addition of the Department of English to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Cognitive Science
- Approved the proposed curricular changes for the M.A. and Ph.D. in Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
- Approved the addition of a qualifying field for the M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science
- Approved, with conditions, the re-opening of admissions to the M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Chicana and Chicano Studies
- Approved the revision to degree requirements for the M.A. in Chicana and Chicano Studies
- Approved the proposed changes to the degree requirements for the M.A. in Classics
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the MESM
- Approved the addition of the Technology Management Program to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Information Technology and Society
- Approved the addition of the Department of Global Studies to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Information Technology and Society
- Approved the addition of the Comparative Literature Program to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in European Medieval Studies
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. in Communication
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the M.S. and Ph.D. in Media Arts and Technology
- Approved the proposed time-to-degree changes for the Ph.D. in Media Arts and Technology
- Approved the addition of the Department of Religious Studies to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Writing Studies
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the Ph.D. Emphasis in Quantitative Social Sciences Methods
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the M.M. – String Emphasis and Woodwinds-Brass Emphasis in Music
- Approved the proposed changes to the Ph.D. qualifying exams for Ethnomusicology in Music
- Disapproved changes to the D.M.A. requirements in Music
- Approved the addition of the Department of Music (except the D.M.A. degree) to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Cognitive Science

VI. Student Petitions
Graduate Council did not receive any student petitions for 2017-18.

VII. Local Business

Changes to the Program Review Panel Graduate Student Survey
Graduate Council reviewed proposed changes to the Program Review Panel Graduate Student Survey, which is included as part of the Program Review Panel departmental Data Notebook. GC did not support the proposed changes to the climate section of the graduate student survey, which would have reduced the expanded answers around climate. Members felt that it is important for departments to hear from graduate students what they are doing well in terms of climate, not just where they need to improve. GC recommended that survey takers be asked to explain why they ranked “climate” as they did for every item rather than only for those items that receive a low score. GC also recommended some language changes in the climate section of the survey, to use more
inclusive terms. The vote was unanimous to keep the graduate student survey climate section as it currently is along with some suggested changes.

Proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants
Graduate Council discussed a proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants. Members had a wide range of questions and concerns about the proposal which reflected an uneasiness about whether sufficiently strong safeguards and standards would be in place. Concerns included:

- Lack of information in the proposal about the overarching guidelines that undergraduate students serving as TAs would need to follow.
- What constitutes an “appropriate” training course? Who will ensure that the undergraduate TA is behaving ethically?
- In the appointment process, what criteria will be applied to ascertain whether the undergraduate TA is psychologically mature enough to handle the range of student issues and problematic situations that can occur in the classroom?
- What oversight will there be to ensure that the undergraduate TAs are not being exploited?
- Are the GPA and seniority requirements sufficiently strong?
- Which Academic Senate council or committee will be expected to review requests?
- Would appointments be limited to a total of three quarters in the student’s entire undergraduate career or would that limit only apply to each appointment?

Allowing non-students to serve as TAs received little support from the Council. There were concerns about the disparity between compensation, and limited information provided in the proposal explaining in what situations a non-student would be the most qualified candidate for a TA position. GC sent forward a memo outlining all of their concerns.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 25 in response to concerns raised by the Office for Civil Rights
Graduate Council reviewed a Resolution Agreement with the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) concerning Contested Grade Regulation 25, together with the redlined version of the Student Grievance Procedure for Alleged Discrimination (Policy 4105). This review stemmed from a 2009 complaint submitted to OCR, and the subsequent issues OCR had with UCSB’s Student Grade Appeals and Student Grievance Procedure for Alleged Discrimination. UCSB agreed to modify its procedures to address the inadequacies. Graduate Council felt that the additional safeguards and policy transparency strengthened the procedures, and voted to endorse the changes.

Proposed Classroom Recording Policy
Graduate Council discussed a proposed Classroom Recording Policy. GC understood the rationale behind creating a policy to curtail unauthorized classroom recording, but had a number of questions and concerns they wished to see addressed. These included:
• What constitutes a “visual recording”? Does this pertain only to video, or would this apply to students taking pictures of slides as well?
• Where will this policy be housed? What will be the complaint procedures? How will this be enforced? What are the consequences for students found in violation of this policy?
• Is there any way this policy can be enforced for non-students? What will be the consequences for a non-student found in violation?
• Is there a way to have a disclaimer that students can electronically sign? While faculty may be able to give blanket recording approval, they cannot give consent for any of their students. Therefore, there is still the issue of every student who may appear in a recording needing to give their approval.
• The policy should be tied to the Student Code of Conduct.
• Instructors and teaching assistants are often recorded for instructional purposes. Recording for an instructional component should be allowed and written into the policy.
• There should be explicit language stating when recordings are appropriate, like for ADA compliance.

GC sent forward a memo outlining all of their concerns.

Nominations for Program Review Panel
Graduate Council submitted the names of fifteen Senate faculty members to the Committee on Committees for consideration for service on the Program Review Panel (PRP) beginning in 2018-19.

Clarifications of Master’s Project Committee Requirements
Graduate Council discussed a proposal to clarify the Master’s Degree Plan II – Project committees. The language in SB Regulations 300 and 305 regulating Plan II – Project committees was unclear, and had caused confusion within departments as to whether project committees must include two or three faculty members. The Regulations were updated in 2002 but no language was added to differentiate between the Plan II options, Comprehensive Examination and Project. Members felt that requiring departments with large programs who have been operating with two Senate faculty members per committee to add a third could place a large burden on them, and that they have been seemingly successfully operating with two member committees for quite some time. GC agreed that the language should be revised to clearly state that two or more faculty are required for Plan II – Project committees. Language was drafted which was unanimously approved by Graduate Council. The proposed revisions were submitted to the Faculty Legislature and approved at its meeting of June 7, 2018.

Expanded Time-to-Degree for Parenting Demands
Graduate Council discussed a proposal to revise the Graduate Division policy on Expanded Academic Time-to-Degree Provisions for Extraordinary Parenting Demands. The current policy was sent to the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (CACSW), who suggested removing the wording “extraordinary” (as this has been confusing to some
students), clarifying who the policy is intended for, and extending the benefits to parents with children ages 5 or younger. Members were overall supportive of these changes to the policy, however, there was a request to make more clear how many years a graduate student can request this extension. GC also requested that the policy apply to all graduate students, not just doctoral students. The policy was revised to include these suggested changes, and GC then endorsed the revised proposal.

Proposed Divisional Bylaw 35.K on Conflict of Interest
Graduate Council reviewed the proposal to add section K to divisional Bylaw 35, regarding conflicts of interest. This would bring the divisional bylaw in line with recent systemwide conflict of interest language that was included in Bylaw 128. GC endorsed the amendment.

GRAD Code Course Review
Graduate Council completed a two-year review of the pilot GRAD course code, as stipulated in the subject code approval in 2016. In Winter and Spring 2016, Graduate Council reviewed a request from Graduate Division to create a new subject code (GRAD) for courses offered by the Graduate Division. GC approved the request as a pilot program that was to be evaluated at the end of a two-year period. One course, GRDIV 210: College and University Teaching – From Theory to Practice, has been offered once a year for the past two years. GC reviewed the course syllabi, ESCIs, and instructor CV and found them to be very good. Members suggested that if resources could be found, Humanities and STEM students should be separated into different sections of this course. A second course geared towards first-generation students has been discussed but not formally created. The 2016 approval memo also stated that all new courses proposed for the GRAD subject code would be considered by the full Graduate Council. GC agreed that this task should be delegated to the Chair of Graduate Council, who always has the authority to bring a course for full GC review.

Review of Interim WASC Report
Graduate Council was asked to review the Interim WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) report. GC noted that in the last section, “Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution”, there was no mention of graduate student issues. GC thought this would be the place to expand upon the University’s steps taken to enhance the graduate student experience and include the graduate student population in discussions about student body growth. GC recommended including information and data about graduate students, not just the undergraduate population. It was also unclear to GC whether or not postdoctorals fall under the rubric of the WSCUC.

VIII. Systemwide Business

Systemwide Review of Taskforce on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
Graduate Council discussed the Systemwide Review of the Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP). Members expressed a number of concerns relevant to the program in general as well as its applicability to UCSB. These included
concerns about the possibility that continuation and expansion of the program could decrease Graduate Student Research support, heighten the disparity between STEM and non-STEM faculty, and encourage the growing privatization of the University of California system. Members also wondered whether participating in the NSTP might cause faculty to focus their research in areas primarily “where the money is” in order to ensure their salaries, and how the program would be implemented at UCSB if a decision to do so was made. Members suggested that if the trial program were continued, it would be wise to solicit input from graduate students in research groups of participating faculty. Members also stressed that safeguards should be included to limit the potential influence of outside entities on faculty and their research.

**Procedures for Reported Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of SVSH Policy**

Graduate Council reviewed the Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy. Overall, GC felt that having allegations of faculty violations of sexual harassment and sexual violence be received by a specialist in the Title IX Office, instead of a faculty member who may not be as knowledgeable, was a positive change. GC did want clarified what safeguards are in place for non-represented non-Senate faculty. It was also not clear if the investigation by the Title IX Office includes a hearing, as it should. GC unanimously voted to endorse the proposed changes, but did not want to have UCOP procedures override the normal Academic Senate review process.


Graduate Council discussed the second systemwide review of the Proposed Revised APM 285-210-3-133-740-135-235, pertaining to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) title series. GC felt that many of the issues from the first version were addressed, and supported the “loosening” of the non-teaching criteria that faculty in this series would be evaluated under. GC also supported the addition of “assistant” and “associate” into the proposed title series. GC was unclear on how the working title of “Teaching Professor” is meant to be used by the campus administration and faculty, but overall supported these APM revisions. In the first review, GC recommended that “service on thesis and dissertation committees or on student-faculty committees” be moved from 3) University and Public Service to 1) Teaching Excellence and Innovation, to match review criteria for ladder rank faculty. GC reiterated their recommendation for this change.

**Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations**

Graduate Council reviewed the proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations. GC considered the proposal as well as an analysis on the administrative processing of theses and dissertations provided by Graduate Division. Overall, GC felt that the proposed policy closely mirrors the current UCSB campus policy, and did not see any significant issues for graduate students. Members unanimously offered their support for the proposal as it was written.
Proposed Amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 – Conflict of Interest
Graduate Council reviewed the systemwide proposal to add section J to Bylaw 128, regarding conflicts of interest. GC voted to endorse this amendment.

Proposed Revisions to Appendix E: Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Student Adjudication Framework and Section 100.00: Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline
Graduate Council discussed the proposed revisions to Appendix E: Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Student Adjudication Framework and Section 100.00: Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline. Overall, members did not feel that they had enough expertise or background knowledge to provide adequate comments on these important policies. However, GC did find some language problematic. Members thought that not allowing a support person or advisor the opportunity to speak at all was odd and could potentially lead to procedural issues. This is separate from the University’s “right to exclude an advisor or support person who does not abide by these procedures”. However, when these two provisions are placed alongside one another, as they are now, the result can be excessively intimidating. GC also did not feel they had the experience to opine authoritatively on Section VI, dealing with the Appeal Process, but wondered whether the Appeal Body was sufficiently well-defined. GC did want to emphasize that systemwide and campus policies need to be aligned with one another; the student and faculty codes of conduct should be aligned as well.

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 2018-19
- Graduate student mentorship
- Proposal to establish a Master of Environmental Data Science
- Reviewing Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) training
- Following up on the conditions for re-opening graduate admissions to the Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Executive Summary

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

Issues of General Concern to Faculty:

- The Undergraduate Council registered its concern to the Executive Council regarding the Evaluation System for Courses and Instruction (ESCI), particularly the campus’s reliance on ESCIs for gauging teaching performance, and the evidence that such evaluations display bias against women and people of color. The Academic Senate agreed to form an ad hoc committee to explore this issue in the 2018-19 academic year.
- The Undergraduate Council analyzed the results of its 2017 Survey on Classroom Protocol and Academic Engagement and developed a report to the Academic Senate.

The UgC held 15 regularly scheduled meetings and consulted with relevant Senate committees and campus administrators regarding topics of concern within its purview.

Local Business

Academic Program Reviews

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

1. Education
2. English
3. Global Studies
4. Physics

UgC responded to requests from the Executive Vice Chancellor regarding membership on the Program Review Panel and departments to be reviewed during the 2019-20 program review cycle.

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

1. Establishment of a B.A. in Marine Science in the College of Creative Studies
2. Revision of Divisional Senate Regulation 205. General Education Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science (Engineering)
3. Revision of Divisional Senate Regulation 80. Subject A Requirement
4. Revision of Divisional Regulation 240: Honors at Graduation

UgC granted final approval for the following actions, effective Fall Quarter 2018:

1. Establishment of a Minor in Museum Studies
2. Revision of curricular requirements for completion of the following undergraduate programs:
   - B.A. in Anthropology
   - B.A. in Black Studies
   - B.A. in Chicana and Chicano Studies
   - B.A. in English
   - B.A. History
   - B.A. in Japanese (High-Proficiency Track)
   - B.A. in Spanish
   - B.S. in Chemical Engineering
   - B.S. in Mechanical Engineering
   - B.S. in Pharmacology
   - Minor in Applied Psychology
   - Minor in Art
   - Minor in Black Studies
   - Minor in Spanish
3. Establishment or revision of program learning outcomes for the following undergraduate programs:
   - B.S. in Psychological and Brain Sciences
   - B.A. in Writing and Literature
   - B.A. in Marine Science
4. Revision of the Introductory Biology Laboratory Series
5. Implementation of Political Science 15 as a prerequisite for additional upper-division courses

UgC reviewed two proposals to establish minors, but the Council was unable to offer its approval. The departments were asked to resubmit revised proposals in the coming year. UgC also reviewed a proposal to establish a professional master’s program, and responded regarding the proposed program’s potential impacts on undergraduate education at UCSB.

**Campus Proposals and Initiatives**

*Evaluation System for Courses and Instruction*
The UgC held many discussions throughout the year regarding the Evaluation System for Courses and Instruction (ESCI), which resulted in a memorandum of concern to the Executive Council. The UgC’s main concerns were the statistical limitations of ESCIs, misunderstandings about what they measure, and the body of empirical evidence that student evaluations like the ESCI display biases against faculty of color, female faculty, and faculty from other underrepresented groups. The Academic Senate agreed to form an ad hoc committee to explore this issue in the 2018-19 academic year.

Proposal to Allow the Appointment of Undergraduates and Non-Students as Teaching Assistants
The UgC was asked to informally review a potential change to campus policy to allow undergraduate students and non-students as teaching assistants. Faculty opinions of the proposal were split, based primarily on different disciplinary perspectives.

There is a clear imbalance in some departments between the number of graduate students qualified to serve as teaching assistants and the number of instructional personnel needed to meet undergraduate teaching demands. The situation is particularly dire given the current state of over-enrollment and impaction in some areas of the campus. Departments look to other disciplines to hire teaching assistants when they cannot find qualified internal candidates. While the external students are minimally qualified, the arrangement is not ideal. Faculty assert that the top senior undergraduates in their programs have better disciplinary knowledge, and that departments need the flexibility to allow undergraduate teaching assistants under limited circumstances.

Other faculty feel that the use of undergraduate teaching assistants in their departments would be pedagogically unsound, and stress that undergraduates lack the expertise and experience to serve in this capacity. They suggest, for example, that undergraduates would not be well suited to serve as teaching assistants for courses in the Humanities that require the evaluation of critical writing assignments. Members drew a clear distinction between this type of instruction and students assisting in laboratories, running problem sets, and generally serving a resource for their peers. Additional areas of concern included the potential for negative public perception of the policy, graduate student objection, and the need for adequate resources to address over-enrollment and impaction.

A fair amount of the Council’s discussion centered on the ways in which undergraduate students participate in instruction via informal departmental arrangements. UgC recommended that the campus study existing practices to form a better understanding of campus needs and available options, and to discourage ill-advised practices. The Council also suggested an examination of the policies used at other institutions.

Undergraduate Council did not discuss the specific case of non-students serving as TAs. The Council’s main concern was with the ramifications of undergraduate students serving in that capacity.

Overall, the Council was not opposed to further exploration, as members indicated a clear need for flexibility in some disciplines. However, UgC felt strongly that any future consideration of this issue
must include a clear statement of the policy’s limitations and robust safeguards to avoid negative consequences.

Results of the Undergraduate Council’s 2016-17 Survey on Classroom Protocol and Academic Engagement

In 2017 the Undergraduate Council distributed a survey to the teaching faculty to assess the existence of systemic pedagogical concerns at UCSB in need of further evaluation and possible action. Three general categories were considered: electronics in the classroom, pedagogical problems as they apply to the student body as a whole, and pedagogical concerns that may be particularly pronounced for transfer students and/or international students. Five hundred and seventy faculty responded to this survey with representation from all divisions/colleges/schools.

According to the survey responses, the large majority of faculty did not consider electronics in the classroom to be a problem of sufficient magnitude to warrant university wide action at this time. Nevertheless, the Council will continue to monitor the national discourse, as this issue is examined at other institutions of higher education. The survey did identify several other concerns that may warrant further evaluation. There seemed to be at least a modest mandate for the University to explore faculty perceptions that that students’ limited proficiency in writing is problematic. Most importantly, the survey suggested a clear mandate to address faculty perceptions that International students are facing a host of unique difficulties that are deserving of further evaluation and potential action.

UCEAP Pre-Approval

The UgC considered a proposal requesting pre-approval of UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) courses for General Education (GE) credit. The Council’s deliberations were informed by comments from other reviewing agencies involved in undergraduate education.

While the Council felt that EAP’s goal to streamline the system for GE course approval was laudable, the arguments for pre-approval were not compelling enough to convince the the UgC that the campus should invest in a new, labor-intensive review process.

The UgC felt that the current processes for GE review and approval serve their purpose to maintain UCSB’s standards of academic quality. Further, these have been deemed the appropriate methods for ensuring that courses for which GE credit is granted consistently meet the approved program learning outcomes for the specific subject areas and the overall GE program.

Several groups expressed concern about the oversight of courses from foreign universities, the consistency in course material over the proposed five-year pre-approval period, and the lack of detail regarding course articulation and the resources that would be necessary to implement a new review process. In addition, many were not convinced that difficulty obtaining GE credit is a significant barrier to student participation in education abroad given other resource or logistical issues. Departmental and central staff dedicate significant time to assist students before and after their trip abroad.
The UgC was unable to support the proposal at this time.

Proposed Classroom Recording Policy
The UgC reviewed a proposed policy to regulate audio and video recordings the the classroom. Although UgC agreed with the intent of the policy, members identified a number of issues in need of consideration or resolution. As such, the Council was unable to offer its endorsement. UgC found the wording of the policy to be confusing.

UgC believed that the policy would benefit from guiding language, similar to that of UC Berkeley. The Council recommended that the document identify the consequences for violation of the policy, for both enrolled students and visitors to the campus. In light of events at UC San Diego, members wondered whether it might be useful to establish a separate policy for campus visitors. UgC also suggested that the guiding language include a statement on who is affected by the policy, and felt strongly that teaching assistants should be afforded protection equal to that of faculty. Finally, though it was clear that the initiators of the proposal had consulted the Disabled Students Program, UgC recommended that the document include an explicit statement regarding accommodations for disabled students.

The Council also considered that the creation of unauthorized recordings of class lectures or discussions might be a potential recourse for students who witness discrimination or other inappropriate conduct in the classroom.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 25 in Response to Concerns Raised by the Office for Civil Rights
The Undergraduate Council was asked to review a memorandum from Campus General Counsel regarding the process for student grade appeals when the complainant also alleges discrimination. The Council reviewed the proposed revised procedures and found the language to be unclear and ambiguous. The Council requested a number of clarifications in its written response.

Proposed Divisional Bylaw 35.K on Conflict of Interest
The Academic Senate proposed a new Divisional Bylaw regarding conflict of interest, in alignment with the recently approved Senate Bylaw 128. The Undergraduate Council raised no objections to the proposed language and unanimously endorsed the bylaw.

Proposed Revisions to Appendix E: Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Student Student Adjudication Framework and Section 100.00: Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline
The Council was asked to respond to proposed revisions to Appendix E: Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Student Adjudication Framework and Section 100.00: Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline. While the Council recognized the need to cultivate a campus culture of zero tolerance, members found several elements of the document to be troubling, including the exclusion of several basic allowances of due process for the respondent, and the whether the framework would provide a fair and impartial fact-finding and a fair and impartial hearing. The Council recommended that the
University examine adjudication framework models from other institutions to determine best practices and return with further revisions.

**Council Review of Interim WSCUC Report**
The UgC was asked to respond to the draft Interim Report to the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), which was designed to provide WASC with an overview of the campus’s assessment activities. The Council made several recommendations regarding tone, but otherwise found the report to be satisfactory.

**Undergraduate Research Awards**
A select group of UgC members reviewed nomination materials and chose three student recipients and one faculty recipient of the Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research.

**Systemwide Business**

As UCSB’s representative on the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), David Paul reported to and consulted with the Council regarding issues under discussion by UCEP.

Trevor Hayton represented UCSB on the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) and reported to the Council on items addressed by the committee.

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

1. Systemwide Review of Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program
2. Procedures for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty Violations of SVSH Policy
4. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)
5. Proposed Amendment of Senate Bylaw 128 – Conflict of Interest
6. Proposed Changes to Senate Regulation 424A.3 – Area D Laboratory Science
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