

## MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
Wednesday, March 13, 2024, at 2:30 p.m.  
Location: Online via Zoom

### Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, March 13, 2024, via Zoom. Senate Chair Patty Gallagher, Professor of Performance, Play & Design, called the meeting to order at 2:31 pm, with David Brundage, Professor Emeritus of History, as Parliamentarian. Chair Gallagher reminded everyone that while the meeting was open to the public, only members of the Academic Senate may second or vote on motions. Non-Senate representatives to Senate committees and representatives of the College Academic Senates also have privilege of the floor. Legislation and any other formal actions will be distributed via a campus-wide electronic ballot post-meeting to ensure that only those with voting privileges vote on matters which impact Senate bylaws. All proposed legislative and formal items presented will be open to discussion and potential amendment prior to balloting. Parliamentary actions of the meeting would be conducted via voice vote and acclamation.

#### 1. Approval of Draft Minutes

- a. One edit had been previously submitted for the noticed November 29, 2023 minutes: a correction to the spelling of a participant's name. As no further corrections were submitted from the floor, Secretary Deborah Gould accepted the meeting minutes of November 29, 2023, as presented.

#### 2. Announcements

##### a. **Chair Patty Gallagher**

Chair Gallagher then invited Chancellor Larive to take the floor and asked that questions be held until after both the Chancellor and CPEVC had concluded their remarks.

##### b. **Chancellor Cynthia Larive**

The Chancellor expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to address the Academic Senate and then shared the following remarks:

#### **Reflections**

As many of you know I am an optimist by nature, and I started the year full of energy and positive hope for the future. Then on February 23, my normally positive outlook was devastated when one of our students succumbed to fatal injuries she received at Seabright State Beach. It is truly heartbreaking to lose one of our students, but especially so in such a violent way. My heart goes out to her family, friends, instructors and to all who knew her. The student's family has asked for privacy in this matter, and out of respect for them I will not be saying her name, but I ask you to join me in a moment of silence to reflect on this life taken from us much too soon.

#### **Budget update**

State budget outlook. Both the State and the campus find ourselves in a difficult budget period. As of February 24, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) now projects a \$73 billion budget deficit for FY25. This is nearly double the \$38 billion deficit that the Governor predicted in his January budget. The January budget Governor Newsom proposed postponed the 5 percent increase in state support associated with the Compact envisioned for FY25. In his January budget message, the Governor said that while the FY25 increase was being deferred, there would be a 10 percent

increase in our state funding in FY26. I am doubtful that the legislature will agree to this strategy. As a reminder, the state budget cycle has the Governor releasing in mid-May his revised budget; and at that time, we should have better information about this year's state tax revenues. I continue to advocate with legislators and the governor's office for our campus and for funding for the UC System. I urge you to also advocate for the UC and one of the most effective and simple ways to do so is to join the UC Advocacy Network also known as UCAN.

<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/get-involved/advocate>.

Our campus is also facing a deficit in our core funds budget. We will hear later in this meeting from Raphe Kudela on this topic, but I will also provide a high-level overview. The total budget for our campus is about \$1 billion and covers every aspect of the university including housing and dining, parking and other auxiliaries. Our core funds, which include student tuition and certain fees, state support, grant indirect costs, and investment income, is \$537 million, and our deficit is in our core funds budget.

Our current year core funds deficit is projected to be \$97M and we are working to address this gap by reducing spending, for example by slowing the pace of filling currently open positions and reducing discretionary spending in areas like travel and contracts that use core funds. CPEVC Kletzer and I are analyzing open commitments from central funds to remove or reduce some commitments and shift others to non-core fund sources, and we are asking the other principal officers to do the same. Return of uncommitted unit carryforward funds above a prudent reserve level is also a part of our strategy to close the FY24 deficit.

For FY25 we will need to address our structural deficit in ways that go beyond one-time reductions and carryforward return. Principal officers have been asked to provide scenarios as part of the FY25 budget development process that reflect various levels of spending reductions. These plans will be reviewed by a budget advisory committee led by Chief Financial Officer Ed Reiskin and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Herbie Lee. We have invited the chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget to be a member of the budget advisory committee. The committee will make recommendations to the chancellor and CP/EVC who will make the final decisions about reduction plans for each unit.

Just like each of our households, budgets match expenditures against revenue. Our overall budget is much more reliant on core funds than most of the UC campuses, especially those that have medical schools. In parallel to looking at ways to reduce expenditures, a task force led by Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Success Akirah Bradley-Armstrong and Associate Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs Biju Kamaleswaran is being established and charged with developing ideas to increase revenues and to solicit and review suggestions from the campus community. One area that has been successful is securing non-academic grants for infrastructure projects. Since this program started in January 2022, Biju and his small grants team have received \$15.7 million to fund a broad range of projects, including campus childcare operations, bicycle safety and education and wildfire prevention.

As we work to broaden and increase alternative revenue streams, I urge the Academic Senate to participate in ways that are under your control, such as being more flexible in approving online course offerings for summer session and approving XSC courses offered through University Extension. Both of these examples are important far beyond generating additional revenue because the increased flexibility they provide to students can have significant positive impacts on timely graduation and helping students in achieving their academic goals.

I have spoken to you before about summer session and how summer courses, especially those offered online, can help students meet prerequisite and graduation requirements, reducing their time to degree and the cost of their education. Also, when our students enroll in summer session courses those units count towards the enrollment targets we are required to meet - which means we need to enroll fewer incoming frosh.

### **Website Update/Accessibility**

I hope that you noticed that last fall we launched our new homepage and web platform. It truly was a major digital step forward, a more modern dynamic look and a responsive design for all our devices. Since last fall, ITS and University Advancement have been working to support campus colleagues in refreshing and migrating their website to WordPress. We have successfully launched 40 refreshed websites. Among them are some high-traffic and especially visible ones like our Teaching and Learning Center, Alumni Office, the strategic plan site, and the CPEVC's and Chancellor's Offices. Additionally, Baskin Engineering is now on WordPress, and our four other academic divisions are working on reimagining their digital presence. Work is underway on an additional 120 sites out of a total of more than 800 campus websites. We've also had over 160 staff complete training in digital accessibility and developing website goals, and more than 250 people have attended training and open labs to get help building their websites. You can learn more about this work by going to [websites.ucsc.edu](https://websites.ucsc.edu). University Advancement plans to launch a refreshed campus news site this summer, which will give us even more tools to share news about our exciting research and teaching excellence. I'm very pleased with the progress we've made and look forward to continued progress.

The campus is also developing a strategic plan to improve digital accessibility support and reduce the barriers that exist for individuals with disabilities. Late last month, Access4All was on campus to conduct listening sessions. We held 18 sessions over three days and had well over 150 attendees. One thing we heard was that people appreciate the accessibility training and the hands-on website review (which includes checking for accessibility) that is part of the new WordPress rollout. The digital accessibility working group is working now to compile a report with recommendations to become part of a larger strategic planning effort that will take place this spring or early summer. They hope to have a draft available in the fall for feedback from various stakeholders, including Academic Senate.

### **Housing update**

We continue in our efforts to deliver 40 percent more student housing by 2030.

- Our long-planned Childcare Center and Family Student Housing project on Hagar is currently in the bidding process. The project includes two-bedroom apartments for students with families, as well as a community room and a childcare center that will serve up to 140 children of faculty, staff and students, roughly double the capacity of our current facility. Construction should start this spring, with the new community hopefully opening for students with families in fall 2025.
- The Kresge Phase II construction project continues and as the weather improves, there should be more visible progress. In this second phase, the iconic Kresge architecture will be reconstructed and renovated, but with more durable and resilient materials. We'll be renovating and adding a third floor to seven of the 12 existing buildings for housing and constructing a new residential building at the south end of the college. The project is expected to wrap up in fall 2025 and will provide about 600 new student beds.
- An architectural firm, meanwhile, has been hired to update and advance our plan to house upper-division undergraduates and graduate students in new buildings on Heller, at the site of what is currently Family Student Housing. Those buildings will be removed once the new

FSH complex on Hagar opens. We are looking at ways to deliver the 3,000 planned beds as quickly as possible.

- We have begun to explore options for more student housing at Oakes College. Conceptually, we would increase bed counts by providing updates to the oldest residential buildings. We also want to deliver some new student-support spaces at Oakes. This work is in the very early concept stage, and we will share additional information once more formal planning gets underway.
- Finally, we continue our partnership with Cabrillo College on a housing project to support transfer and continuing students. The project, at Cabrillo's Aptos campus, would utilize a P3 partner and deliver student housing for both institutions. The current timeline, which is by no means set in stone, would see construction start in late 2025, with occupancy in fall 2027.

### **Dining update**

I have some great news to pass along regarding on-campus dining options.

- I'll start with the latest addition to campus, which more accurately is a return to campus. The Owl's Nest is back! The Kresge College spot had a soft opening March 1. They are currently offering grab-and-go food and drinks and expect to offer completely plant-based hot-food options starting in fall 2024.
- The University Center Bistro — the restaurant and cafe above the College Nine/John R. Lewis Dining Hall — opened in October. The cafe is open 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Friday, while the bistro is open 11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. Monday through Friday. The bistro has implemented a hybrid service model to speed service. You order and pay at the counter. Ticket times are now reduced to 12-15 minutes.
- Finally, on a side note, I can't promise you there will be clam chowder whenever you visit our dining facilities, but I think they should consider it! I want to give a special plug to our dining team, which entered the recent Santa Cruz Clam Chowder Cookoff at the Boardwalk and just cleaned house. Dining took home first place in People's Choice Manhattan Clam Chowder, second place in judged best Manhattan Clam Chowder; and third place in most tasted Boston Clam Chowder. Dining Services now holds 22 awards in this competition since first entering in 2004. Congratulations to them and lucky us!

### **Campaign update**

As many of you know, we are in the quiet phase of our next comprehensive campaign, doing the foundational work necessary before the public launch tentatively targeted for fall 2025. University Advancement has several projects underway this academic year in preparation of the launch. These include:

- Capacity building for deans and faculty — providing a series of advancement workshops to deepen the abilities of faculty to secure private philanthropic support.
- Campaign communications — working with a creative firm to highlight what is distinctive about UC Santa Cruz that can inform our campaign theme and visual identity, and to build a communications strategy for taking the campaign public.
- Divisional campaign priorities — developing a process to work with the academic divisions to identify divisional priorities and articulate those in compelling ways.
- Regional events to engage supporters — implementing a new event series called INSPIRE to reconnect with and engage our alumni, parents, and other friends across the U.S. INSPIRE lets us take UC Santa Cruz on the road to showcase the interdisciplinary work of our faculty. Thank you to those joining us for the first of these events — March 21 in L.A., April 18 in San Francisco, and May 30 in San Diego. We plan to visit other regions during the 2024-25 academic year.

### Award for Comprehensive Internationalization

Finally, I am proud to share the news that UC Santa Cruz was one of four institutions selected to receive this year's prestigious Senator Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization. The award, given by NAFSA: Association of International Educators, recognizes institutions that demonstrate innovative and creative internationalization efforts. It's a testament to the effectiveness of our collective efforts to offer students a wide range of global research opportunities and border-free learning experiences, and to make internationalization a part of our campus culture. Our five-year Strategic Plan for Internationalization guides us in this work. Three years into it, we have dramatically expanded globally focused research and study opportunities, as well as international partnerships. Our Global Classrooms, Global Internships, and the International Summer Research Program have all seen a surge of faculty and student engagement. Thanks to all involved in the plan's creation and implementation, especially Vice Provost and Dean Richard Hughey and Assistant Vice Provost of the Division of Global Engagement and the campus Senior International Officer Becky George. It's wonderful when hard work is recognized.

The floor was then given to CPEVC Lori Kletzer.

#### c. **Campus Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Lori Kletzer**

CPEVC Kletzer expressed her gratitude to the Senate and then provided the following remarks:

We are meeting again in difficult, anguishing, heartbreaking, and fearful times. Russia's invasion and war in Ukraine is now in its third year. The death of Alexei Navalny is our loss of a man and a life dedicated to resistance and freedom. I grieve and despair the horrendous loss of life in Gaza and in Israel. I firmly believe that the humanitarian crisis in Gaza must be addressed, and suffering reduced, that Hamas must free the remaining hostages taken during their devastating attack on Israel on October 7, and that (borrowing the words of Thomas Friedman in today's New York Times) Prime Minister Netanyahu and his far-right coalition are responsible for the humanitarian crisis caused by their conduct of this war.

The times we live in cause me to worry about an erosion of democratic principles and civil rights. Protection of minority and minoritized rights and civil rights and liberties are critical to our democracy. Resisting all the forces of bias, bigotry and discrimination are central to our democratic polity. And that resistance must be universal, not comparative.

At the November 2023 Regents meeting, President Drake announced \$7M in funding to the campuses to combat bias and bigotry. Our Santa Cruz campus share is \$500,000, and we have submitted spending plans for the funds, focusing on 3 areas: mental health and trauma support; educational programming; and leadership programming. I appreciate those of you who participated in our recent survey. One result from that survey was the strong agreement of respondents for programming on affected world regions and the histories of U.S. exclusion of immigrants from relevant regions. Faculty in particular emphasized the need for such programming to be led by scholars of these regions and diasporas and to build collaborations with existing centers on campus, such as the Centers for Jewish Studies, Middle East and North Africa, and South Asian Studies. I look forward to these opportunities.

A few words about the campus budget, following up on Chancellor Larive's remarks. A structural deficit happens when annual expenses outpace annual revenue on a recurring basis. This causes us to draw down our reserves, something that is unsustainable, and constrains us as those reserves are then unavailable for capital projects or as a cushion when unanticipated needs arise.

UC Santa Cruz has experienced structural deficits from time to time (early-mid 1990s, during the great recession) and we have used one-time savings and/or budget reduction strategies to cover. The current structural deficit in core funds began in 2020 and has escalated quickly. What is different this time is that (1) many services initiated using one-time federal Higher Education Emergency Relief (HEERF) funds, during the pandemic, are of an ongoing nature such as those necessary to support student success, remote work, and mitigate increasing cyber threat, and (2) employee costs are increasing at a faster pace than revenues (annual costs between FY20 and FY24 grew by \$100 million in core funds and by \$160 million across all funds) while core funds revenue increased only \$33M over the same time span.

In the interests of time, I'm opting to not repeat the high-level details Chancellor Larive shared. One detail I do want to be clear about: Faculty research accounts are not held to the cost reduction measures. In FY25, I've told the deans and CPB to anticipate a reduced pace of faculty hiring. We have added 40 faculty over the past couple of years, ahead of a "10 per year for 10 years" that we used to characterize the Faculty 100. We are ahead of that pace, and we now need to "slow our roll".

### **Housing**

Employee housing update - All 5 units are complete. The new Owners for 4 of the 5 have taken occupancy. The last unit is in escrow, closing on March 22.

### **Leading the Change - Interdisciplinary Proposals**

I am happy to share that eight proposals have been accepted for the first round of the Leading the Change Collaborative Series announced earlier this year. This series was launched in response to several goals and needs outlined in the campus's plan, Leading the Change. It aims to provide opportunities for cross-disciplinary and methodological collaborations to enhance the university's research strengths further and in ways that promote community. The events begin next quarter and continue through Spring '25. For Spring '24 the topics and partnerships include:

#### **Spring 2024:**

##### **Making the Most of Drone and Sensor Data: A Community Discussion**

- CITRIS Initiative for Drone Education and Research
- Division of Information Technology Services

##### **Reclaiming the lab coat: An immersive experience centering justice in research practices, processes, and policies**

- Departments of Biomolecular Engineering and Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology
- The Genomics Institute
- The Neurogenetics of Language Laboratory at Rockefeller University
- STEM Diversity Programs
- Science and Justice Research Center

In the interest of time, I won't detail the Fall '24, Winter '25 and Spring '25 events – stay tuned for information in other venues and on the Leading the Change website. I would like to thank everyone who submitted a proposal and I look forward to seeing everyone at the convenings.

I'll close with some faculty accolades. As always, this is a select sampling. No offense intended by omission, and I hope none taken.

**Roxanne Beltran and Jacqueline Kimmey** have been named 2024 Sloan Research Fellows. The fellowships honor exceptional U.S. and Canadian researchers whose creativity, innovation, and research accomplishments make them stand out as the next generation of leaders.

**Roxanne Beltran**, assistant professor of ecology and evolutionary biology, leads elephant seal research that uses sensors attached to the animals to monitor the world's oceans for climate change impacts as they migrate. She also advances the movement toward research experiences that are more inclusive of students from historically marginalized backgrounds through the publication of widely used guidelines on topics such as field safety, anti-racism, and open data.

**Jacqueline Kimmey**, assistant professor of microbiology and environmental toxicology, focuses on circadian rhythms – the cellular timekeeping system that regulates sleeping, eating, and a variety of physiological responses – and how the clock is affected by microbes. She has pioneered several approaches to explore interactions between circadian rhythms and infectious disease. Including our two new awardees, 42 faculty from UC Santa Cruz have received a Sloan Research Fellowship.

**Joel Primack**, distinguished professor of physics emeritus, has been awarded the American Association for the Advancement of Science's 2024 Philip Hauge Abelson Prize. The honor celebrates his extraordinary career - pioneering work in shaping the field of astrophysics and being the key architect of the Cold Dark Matter theory and also his contributions to science policy.

**Nobuhiko (Nobby) Kobayashi**, professor of electrical and computer engineering, has been named a Fellow of the National Academy of Inventors. Kobayashi is an expert in energy conversion technology, semiconductors, and optoelectronics, and currently holds more than 20 U.S. patents. The NAI Fellows Program honors academic inventors who have demonstrated a spirit of innovation in creating or facilitating outstanding inventions that have made a tangible impact on the quality of life, economic development, and the welfare of society.

**Terrie Williams**, professor of ecology and evolutionary biology, was honored with the 2024 National Academy of Sciences Award in the Evolution of Earth and Life – Daniel Giraud Elliot Medal. Williams, a comparative ecophysiologicalist, is renowned for her groundbreaking work in the ecological physiology of large mammals and her fundamental contributions to understanding the functioning of large mammals within their varied habitats.

**Sir Isaac Julien**, distinguished Professor of the arts and history of consciousness, was named the fifth most influential artist in the 2023 ArtReview Power 100 list. ArtReview is one of the world's leading contemporary art magazines. Julien was praised for his “transgressive reworkings of history and time itself, which have expanded our potential to deal with the complexities of the present and paved the way for generations of artists to come.”

**Russell Rodríguez**, assistant professor of music, was awarded the Américo Paredes Prize by the American Folklore Society for his outstanding performance as a scholar, program manager, colleague, and mentor over the past twenty years. The award recognizes excellence in integrating scholarship and engagement with the people and communities one studies, or in teaching and encouraging scholars and practitioners to work in their own cultures or communities.

**Angela Davis**, distinguished professor emerita of the history of consciousness and feminist studies, received the 2024 Ada Louise Huxtable Prize for Contributions in Architecture. The W Awards selected Davis for developing the concept of the prison industrial complex which highlights the complicity of architecture as a tool of violence and encourages architects to advocate for spatial justice.

Chair Gallagher then opened the floor for questions.

Laurie Palmer, Professor of Art, was given the floor and asked about the budget situation. She stated that without a transparently clear and detailed budget for the campus, combined with the recent \$50–60 million miscalculation of the campus's structural deficit, it is difficult to trust the

numbers that have been provided and to engage in a real discussion about possible cuts. She mentioned the \$160 million carry forward that had existed for a long time without even the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) being aware. All of these add to the sense of a lack of transparency around the budget. She stated that the University of California System has an incredibly large investment portfolio of approximately \$164 billion, which grew by \$12 billion last year. Thus, UC has the capacity to bridge the current deficits on campuses, providing the needed support for us to carry out our mission while awaiting the 5 percent budget increases. Permanent cuts cause permanent damage. She asked whether the impetus for this budget cut is coming from the Office of the President (UCOP) or if it's a local administrative decision. She also asked if there were bridging funds and if this has been discussed with UCOP.

Chancellor Larive responded that the administration strives to be very transparent. The experience that Ed Reiskin, campus' new Chief Financial Officer, brings is helping to formulate the campus budget and communicate about it in a more structured and transparent way. The deficit has been projected, and they won't know the actual amount until the end of 2024 fiscal close. With the best projections they have, they are dealing with it in a timely way to close this year's structural deficit. The Council of Chancellors are taking part in the larger discussion, and all the undergraduate campuses have a structural deficit right now. She believes the President will be as helpful as he can be to the campuses, but the investment pool is not something that the UC System can use to help the campuses. The investment pool is controlled by the CIO who reports to the Regents, and it largely exists of the retirement accounts for the University—for all employees current and past—as well as the endowments of each campus, such as endowed professorships, which are targeted funds.

CPEVC Kletzer then took the floor and repeated that all of the UC campuses have structural deficits and face many of the same expense pressures and revenue constraints. UCSC has campus housing constraints connected to enrollment growth. Growing enrollment is a common way to bring in revenue, and we are not going to make decisions on enrollment growth which bring in students for whom we don't have housing. CPB is regularly informed about revenues, expenses and deficits every year, though deeply informing CPB is not the same as informing the campus. However, CPB has been regularly informed, and particularly when structural deficits were of a size of which some things could be covered by reserves. Expense pressures and the revenue constraints really have emerged over the last couple of years. Addressing the mentioned accounting error, she said that when work is done very quickly, mistakes can be made. When mistakes are discovered, ownership is taken for those mistakes, and though people are held responsible, the CPEVC does not want us to go to the place where we're completely unforgiving of mistakes, which would undermine trust.

Megan Thomas, Associate Professor of Politics and COT member asked about the \$160 million carry forward just referred to and why the campus cannot use that money to bridge this deficit with one-time funds. She asked where that money went, how much is left, and if the accounting is available to review.

The CPEVC responded that she was not able to recall either the point in time or the venue where that carry forward amount was discussed. She apologized, but said she had no knowledge of what was being referred to.

Associate Professor Thomas stated that this information was shared with some Senate bodies in 2019, to which the CPEVC replied that this didn't give enough specifics to enable her to recall it. Campus has a projected FY24 deficit of \$90 million and a projected FY25 deficit of \$122 million and can't keep drawing on one time money when expenses exceeding revenue are recurring. Over



time, more revenue can be brought in, particularly with nonresident enrollment. More on-campus housing will allow enrollment growth, but expense growth must be addressed. Salaries and benefits are an important part of that and slowing the growth can be done first through attrition and separations. It is not easy, and she does not welcome this, but it is what we need to do as a campus.

Camilla Hawthorne, Associate Professor of Sociology took the floor. Regarding the deficit, she stated that units on campus are being asked to propose permanent budget cuts of maybe five, ten or 15 percent and there is concern about the impact of permanent cuts on the ability to carry out our educational, mentoring and research missions on this campus. She questioned the impetus to make permanent cuts rather than try to bridge some of this deficit with one-time funds, especially as the governor has stated his intention to make up for the 5 percent deferred from the compact with increases in future years.

The CPEVC was thankful for this question and said that we all recognize the pain of having to make permanent cuts in order to protect the activities that we value first and foremost. We will need to establish our priorities in order to mitigate the costs of having to make these permanent reductions. One thing the budget advisory committee can do is to take in each of the units' recommendations, see the cross-campus implications, and then make recommendations about the cuts. Asking for five, ten, and 15 percent scenarios was not saying with certainty that these cuts will be made; but was for scenario planning. Asking for the planning does not mean that each unit will receive a 15 percent cut but was necessary to understand the campus-level implications. Regarding the state economy, California's unemployment rate is one percentage point higher than the national average. It's not as strong as we would like, particularly for tax receipts. We will have to be cautious, and because of the state budget, we can't expect or plan that the Governor will be able to give us the 5 percent deferred along with an additional 5 percent, even though he would like to.

Jessica Taft, Professor of Latin American & Latino Studies, was given the floor and expressed appreciation that the CPEVC pointed out that budgets are based on expenses and priorities, and that we need to assess priorities and the choices we're making at different times. However, she stated, it's hard to engage in those issues with administration because faculty don't actually see a transparent and detailed budget that shows exactly where funds are coming from and where they're going for each unit on campus—which would then show how we've arrived at this deficit. The previous bird's eye reports, which stopped in 2016, while not being fully transparent, gave more information than current reports on unit spending. She asked why the campus isn't providing that kind of level of budget detail publicly anymore, or why we don't have a flow of fund balance sheet, or information on carry forwards and the various assets and debts held by different units. With this information, they would be able to more productively engage in this conversation.

The CPEVC agreed that this is not a topic anyone should be able to comfortably talk about without information. She said they have begun to put together a 'structural deficit website,' and that they do need to get more information out there. She said that we don't want to go back to the bird's eye view, as the current iteration is better. The Budget Analysis and Planning web pages have a lot of good information, including expenditures and budgets over the last 10 years. These campus web pages are being upgraded to emulate the UC Davis website, in order to provide more accessible information.

Christine Hong, Professor of Literature, was given the floor, addressing the Senate as the Director of the Center for Racial Justice. She described the Center's steering committee, which includes staff who are working in student services with historically marginalized student populations, faculty

who work in critical race studies, and a wide spectrum of people working alongside students, many of whom are in crisis. Students have repeatedly pointed out the precarity that they experience around housing. The housing lottery is also contributing to a feeling of extraordinary instability. Some have talked about only being able to afford one-meal-a-day meal plans and experiencing hunger. They've also been distressed about labor conditions and the death of the campus bus driver. Students have spoken about the difficult landscape that they're navigating, including a genocide taking place. She stated that all these things are galvanizing this generation of students in a way that the Vietnam war did for prior generations. She spoke of the Black Student Union call, *The Unrelenting Anti-Blackness of 2020*, and its demand for academic flexibility around finals, assignments, and attendance. Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS) was swift to echo this call; CEP and CCI both stepped forward and called for one-time exception in terms of flexibility around finals. The Center for Racial Justice is now issuing their own call for flexibility, and she asked for colleagues across the board to exercise flexibility right now, thus meeting students in their state of distress. She asked that flexibility be exercised where and when possible.

Gina Langhout, Professor of Psychology, asked the CPEVC about her statement regarding fewer searches, fewer lines, next year. She wondered if the CPEVC could say how many lines there might be, how they might be distributed, and what the decision-making process is for that distribution.

CPEVC Kletzer replied that she respected each aspect of the question but was not able to give a number yet. The deans had been given an extended period of time to submit; this deadline was closing at the end of the week. She has not seen the submissions yet from the deans, from which the decisions will be made. The submissions will go to CPB, who has a set time period for submitting feedback. She stated that the process itself is not changing from that which has been used now for several years. She is not calling this a hiring freeze; it will be significantly rolled back and could be a very small number but will still meet exigent, urgent, curricular or research needs. This is what was asked of the deans, paring down from a more aspirational faculty FTE call thinking to the curricular and research needs. It is going to be a small number, which could mean less than five, but she can't be held to a specific number at this time.

Chair Gallagher thanked everyone for the questions and comments and moved on to the Reports of Standing Committees.

**3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)**

**4. Special Orders: (none)**

**5. Reports of Special Committees (none)**

**6. Report of Standing Committees**

a. Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) – Amendment to SR 11.6, Dean's Honors (AS/SCP/2082)

David Lee Cuthbert, Professor of Performance, Play & Design and CEP Chair, was given the floor and provided remarks about CEP legislation to update Senate Regulation 11.6, Dean's Honors. He reported that CEP was initially encouraged to consider this alteration by VPDUE Hughey, and initial committee conversations were generally supportive of the idea. A draft went to the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (CRJE) for review and several issues were found regarding a relatively loose definition of what entails part time. CEP agreed that this was something worth getting correct, with the student representatives Jamie Hindery and Stephanie Sanchez Toscano making the most compelling arguments for it from firsthand awareness of their peers who would benefit from such a policy alteration. CEP doubled down in their efforts to get the policy correct, with significant assistance from University Registrar Tchad Sanger, who compiled

statistics of students' reasoning for being on the part-time program in the first place. The three most compelling of these being: their health and wellbeing, their financial considerations, and their senior standing, in which they simply didn't need the units to complete the degrees. It became clear to CEP that students were working towards degrees with more challenges than this policy allows for. The concept that full time students would somehow be shortchanged by honoring part-time students for achievement was quickly erased once CEP had a fuller picture of the statistical implications, and particularly given the student representatives' impassioned positions. CEP is proposing that the regulation be altered to first correct the number of units that full time is equivalent to, and second, to allow students on the part time program to qualify for Dean's honors with 10 or fewer graded credits when distinguished by their GPA.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for questions. Seeing none, she stated that the legislation requires a vote by ballot, which would be distributed electronically following the meeting. She thanked Chair Cuthbert and the CEP student representatives for this work on the legislation amendment. [Legislation later passed by electronic ballot.]

b. Committee on Committees – Updates to Committee Roster (AS/SCP/2083)

Updates to the current year Senate Committee Roster had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were projected on the screen. Dean Mathiowetz, Associate Professor of Politics and Committee on Committees (COC) Chair, remarked that, as it is midyear, the number of roster changes is relatively small, but that COC is hard at work filling committees for next year. As always, COC appreciates senators' quick responses to the committee's inquiries and invitations.

As there were no questions regarding the roster, a vote by Zoom was initiated. The updates to the COC roster were approved: 107 in favor, 1 opposed.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget – Oral Report – Systemwide and Campus Budget Update

Raphe Kudela, Distinguished Professor of Ocean Sciences and Chair of Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) began by reminding everyone that CPB is an advisory committee and does not have any actual authority over the budget. CPB provides guidance and recommendations to the Chancellor and CPEVC. Within CPB, he stated, we like to follow the idea that a budget is an expression of an institution's goals and values, so our advice is filtered through that lens. UCPB put out a best practices document for divisional CPBs and two of the items in there are that we should be more broadly disseminating information to the campuses about the budgets, and generally try to improve budget literacy. In response to some of the comments earlier, he understands that it's frustrating to feel like you're not seeing the data, and that information is not transparent, but from his view within UCPB and the best practices, Santa Cruz is doing remarkably well in terms of best practices for CPB. As CPEVC Kletzer said, there's actually quite a bit of publicly available data; it's just not always easy to find.

Chair Kudela presented slides and information on the overall UC and UCSC budgets. Core funding is 22 percent of the UC-wide budget. The UC Santa Cruz budget, a little over a billion dollars, includes core funding at about 50 percent, which makes us very susceptible and sensitive to changes in the amount of core funding from the State, whether they're honoring the compact or not, as well as changes in our enrollment. Part of that is that we don't have a medical center, but in comparison, UC Santa Barbara is at about 24 percent core funding, much closer to the UC average than our 50 percent. He discussed the deficit, explaining that UCSC has been running a structural deficit in the core funds since about FY21 and it has been getting steadily larger. The current projections are that we will be about \$96 million short next year, and then \$122 million if nothing is done.

The question is often asked where all that money is going. It is largely driven by salaries. Academic salaries are the top, then staff salaries, the combined benefits, down to other things that core funds are paying for. The easiest way to reduce the costs is to go after the biggest part of the budget, which is unfortunately academic and staff salaries. CPB recognizes that that is very impactful and can be very detrimental, so is focusing on how to deal with budget issues without gutting the staff and academic FTEs, which are the heart of the campus.

The next question asked is why we don't just cover it with our reserves. He explained that reserves and carry forwards are the same thing. Chair Kudela displayed a graph showing total core reserves by campus as of June 30, 2023, in months of expenditures, by committed and uncommitted reserves. UC Santa Cruz does not particularly stand out as either very low or very high in reserves in comparison to other UCs. There are not a lot of reserves on campuses. With that context, he explained that it's primarily the core deficit that's getting bigger and that there are no simple solutions other than either increasing revenues or decreasing expenditures. The campus is putting together a process to figure out what the next steps are going to be, which will almost certainly be a multiyear process. This is also true of many of the other UCs; several other campuses have already gone through this same process, and it's generally a minimum of 5 years to deal with these structural deficits.

There is an ongoing conversation between the Administration and the Senate about the core values and principles of the campus, and how we come up with those cost savings in a way that everybody can agree is an effective way to preserve the goals and values of the campus within this constrained budget. Some quick ways to do that would be to leave faculty and staff lines open, as is being proposed by some UCs, while some campuses proposals are stricter than UCSC. Instead of very few hires they're proposing no hires. Some ways to increase revenue that are on the table are to increase undergraduate enrollment, which directly increases revenue, but we would need housing for this. We could increase nonresident student tuition, which would give a big boost, but is being left off the table at the moment because of our NRST reductions on this campus. We could raise more funds from non-core sources, such as contracts and grants, or philanthropy.

CPB is well aware that there's no good solution here but is keeping this front and center. CPB is concerned about the long-term impacts of freezing or slowing down hiring, and what the impacts of reducing staff support would be. There is ongoing conversation and consultation with the Administration to make sure that the Senate voice is heard and that our concerns about the potential options and the potential solutions are understood. He stated that, from the CPB point of view, the Administration has been responsive to concerns and there have been very fruitful discussions. With this context and background, he stated again that UCSC is not alone and all the campuses are dealing with similar issues. Where we are alone is that so much of our budget is reliant on that core funding that comes from the UC System tied to undergraduate enrollment.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for discussion.

Zac Zimmer, Associate Professor of Literature and Chair of Committee on Information Technology (CIT) directed a question to the Chancellor and CPEVC, stating that we've heard very little about the role that upper administrative positions have played in the current situation. He stated that there has been an ever-proliferating number of Vice Chancellors, Associate Campus Provosts, Associate Vice Chancellors, and Assistant Vice Chancellors, especially in the last 10 to 15 years. Stating that he represented a broader faculty sentiment, there is worry that the level of growth in upper administration is coming at the cost of hiring faculty and also staff who work most directly with students. He quoted UCAFT colleagues, "Staff and faculty working conditions *are* our students'

learning conditions.” He has heard from informal calculations and analysis that the Chancellor's office has grown from under 12 FTE in 2010 to 17 FTE in 2014, and to 41 FTE currently with a budget change from \$1.4 million to over \$6 million. As this information has been difficult to find in any one particular place, he asked if these numbers are correct and whether there are similar numbers for the EVC's office that can be made available. He also asked if there is a way to track the total number of VCs/AVCs, etc., compared to 10 or 15 years ago.

Chancellor Larive responded by addressing the questions raised about the Chancellor's office. Her immediate office is quite small but has taken in a number of units to provide administrative support for them. For example, Audit, which used to report to Vice Chancellor Latham, now reports to the Chancellor's office. Equity & Equal Protection, a unit that includes Title IX, ADA, EEO, and other operations that were once separate, now combines them to leverage both the capacity of the staff and the ability to be resilient when there are problems. Others include The Chief Campus Council Office, and Privacy and Information Services. They have expanded the Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, so there has been growth. Some of this has been true growth, for example adding positions to the Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODI), but much of it has been consolidation of staff in other functions that now come underneath the Chancellor's office. Part of the information that will be presented to the Budget Advisory Committee will include org. work charts for each of the units.

CPEVC Kletzer then added that the same is true for the CPEVC's office and this happens when the location of units changes within the organization. Her office now has Athletics and Recreation, which reported elsewhere previously. This is not growth, but reorganization. Reporting into the Office of the Provost also is IRAPs, Institutional Research, which came out of Planning and Budget during their reorganization. The Academic Senate Administrative Office also sits under the organizational structure of the Office of the Provost, for the purposes of budget review and oversight. It's important to compare apples to apples. She said that one of the things they are doing is taking campus data and verifying it against Office of the President data when a unit reorganizes, in order to take the reorg. back in time and look at genuine growth. She provided the example that Colleges, Housing & Educational Services (CHES) used to be in Finance, Operations and Administration (FOA) and is now in Division of Student Affairs and Success (DSAS). When comparing FOA, a huge unit, and DSAS, she said it must be 'apples to apples', which is what they are doing. When they have the data, it will be transparent so that groups such as Senior Management, MSP, and PSS can be looked at to see what the actual organization of work is and who's doing it.

Deborah Gould, Professor and Chair of Sociology took the floor and referred back to the Chancellor's comment regarding the UC investment portfolio, that the UCs can't spend that. She was curious, given the level of the deficits as well as the level of that investment portfolio, why some of that money couldn't be used to bridge the structural deficit in this moment, while still waiting for state funds. It would not be very much, compared to the whole fund; even setting aside all the pension payouts amount, there would still be billions in that portfolio.

The Chancellor explained that the person who manages the UC investments, Jagdeep Bachher, Chief Investment Officer, doesn't report to the President but to the Regents. The Regents are always very concerned about the level of UC Investments and the coverage of the pension. This is a part of the rationale that these funds are not utilized for operational costs. Like the UCSC campus having reserves already committed, she supposes the President does have some resources in endowments but that he doesn't have much in uncommitted funds either. She hopes that we can move ahead in a way that helps to minimize the impacts to the campus, but she doesn't want us to get too hung up

on the 5 percent of funding from the State that we're going to miss this year, which is probably around \$20 million. That's not enough to close our structural deficit. We will certainly miss it next year if we don't receive it, but she doesn't think that there is a mechanism for either the Office of the President or the Regents to help us out.

CPB Chair Kudela commented briefly on some more background from the UCOP side. The State has proposed that UC should borrow their way out of this. UC is very reluctant to do that, as our debt service is already going up quite rapidly from last year to this year due to the economy. The proposal that was put forward by the State is, if you need additional funding, just borrow some money. UCOP has thus far decided that's a bad idea.

d. Graduate Council – Report on 299 Syllabi (AS/SCP/2084)

Andrew Fisher, Distinguished Professor of Earth & Planetary Sciences and Chair of the Graduate Council (GC), then was given the floor to speak about a memo released by GC last year dealing with the use of syllabi for what they're calling 299 courses. These are graduate independent study courses having a number like 295, 297, 299. The issue that has come up over the last several years was brought to a head last year, and there were several reasons for this. There's been an increased recognition of the importance of mentoring for student success. There's increased recognition of the need for faculty to be credited for the work they do when they mentor well and their students are successful. And there's been confusion about how academic work and paid work might be distinct or might overlap in the scope of day-to-day activities. It's well known that thoughtful and focused mentoring is best practice. This includes discussion and clear articulation of goals, intentions, and expectations, both for academic productivity and for communication itself. Identifying these goals on a quarterly basis is often helpful. As we all know, the arc of a graduate career can be long and difficult at times. Therefore, a syllabus for independent study work can be valuable as a means of communication and to hold all participants accountable for student success. There has been concern that in many programs mentoring is not appreciated or it's not valued as part of the personnel process. And of course, some of this depends on disciplines and even approaches taken by programs or individual faculty. But another challenge is simply having a record in articulating goals and how they're to be achieved. A syllabus for independent study could help in those situations. With regard to implementation of contracts for GSRs, there has been concern about who has oversight for academic progress. The contracts focus on paid work and it's quite clearly the purview of faculty to oversee mentoring.

Faculty have the authority individually, as members of departments and programs, including as members of committees through the Senate, for oversight of academic progress of their students. We value this authority, and we need to exercise it. If we don't, then it may be frittered away or simply eroded over time because of ambiguity in terms of that responsibility. Therefore, whether or not a student is paid as a GSR, a TA, a GSI or for any other work, is irrelevant to academic progress. We as faculty and as mentors are responsible for helping our students to succeed; we are responsible for academic oversight. It is the realm of faculty advisors and programs. As noted in Appendix D of the UCSC Senate Manual, *the academic progress of each continuing graduate student shall be reviewed annually by the students' department or committee of studies by the end of the spring term*. So, this annual assessment is aided by having a more granular sense of what's planned, what's expected, what's done, and how everything turns out. Having quarterly assessment in a clear way is helpful for keeping students on track. This can be kind of a low stakes part of ensuring academic progress, and those in teaching know low stakes assessments are very helpful for encouraging and helping students to stay on track.

Based on recommendations that came in from the system-wide Academic Council and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), UCSC Graduate Council released recommendations last fall about developing syllabi for these independent study courses, which was the document included in the agenda. A syllabus can be thought of as a semi-formal social contract or agreement. Instructors for traditional classes prepare these and then hand them out. But with a 299, it makes sense for this to be a collaborative effort. It's a little bit of extra effort to work with grad students and initially develop these, but it gets easier after the first time because it can then just be updated for the next quarter. It's also helpful for the students to be empowered by helping to define their goals. GC has collected and has posted some examples of 299 syllabi that faculty have provided and would be delighted to receive other examples. These could be submitted already redacted or GC can redact them. As these are basically templates and every student and program is different, no one template will work but it's nice to look at examples to get ideas. He stated that he developed 299 syllabi this quarter with his grad students and each one said—unprompted—that they were glad they did it, it was helpful and took a burden off of their shoulders in understanding what their goals were. Chair Fisher said it helped him be better prepared to serve them.

Two commonly heard FAQ questions are: 1) Do you need to submit a 299 syllabus to the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI)? No; this is not a typical course. It is being called a syllabus but can be thought of as a short-term mentoring agreement, and we don't send mentoring agreements to CCI. This is something that's intended to be helpful but is not something that needs to go through the syllabus review process. 2) Is it a requirement? No, but GC thinks it's a good idea. He said they have seen concerns over the purview of faculty and the purview of programs vis-à-vis. the contracts. The best way to distinguish between these different elements is to define clearly what our role is and to codify that, so that's the reason that GC encourages this.

The floor was opened to questions and Luca de Alfaro, Professor of Computer Science and Engineering and member of Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid (CAFA) asked about using the tool for those courses engaging students in research where the starting point is known but not necessarily where the end will be and where the research will take them. In that case, using this tool seems a bit difficult. He asked what Chair Fisher would advise.

Chair Fisher replied that GC did address this in the memo, noting that research is often meandering, and there can be dead ends. There can be areas that don't work out. And in a way, the benefit of having a syllabus that acknowledges that is part of its value. A syllabus of this kind can be very functional in terms of what kinds of approaches a student might attempt, what tracks they might follow, what archives they might look at. It could include goals for making presentations at meetings, goals for developing outlines, and even goals for planning to plan for a research project. It is up to the advisor to develop—in collaboration with their students—the appropriate form for this. It can be very hard to identify exactly what will happen in a quarter and we need to be ready for things to turn out differently than we intended, but the syllabus can allow for that.

Chair Gallagher then stated that due to the high volume of business before the Senate that day, she proposed the following change to the agenda: the two resolutions should be moved up in the agenda. She apologized for the change but wanted to make sure there was enough time for needful discussion. A vote by Zoom was initiated. The change to the order of business, advancing New Business to the next item was approved: 112 in favor, 5 opposed.

## 7. New Business

- a. Resolution to Defend Academic Freedom and Shared Governance (AS/SCP/2085)

Muriam Haleh Davis, Associate Professor of History was given the floor and presented the resolution, which had the support of almost 200 colleagues at UCSC. She gave the following remarks: The most recent war between Israel and Palestine, which began on October 7, has had a chilling effect on academic freedom across the country. Scholars, teachers, and students who have shown solidarity with Palestine, or who conduct research that questions official Israeli narratives have come under attack. The Middle East Studies Association, the AAUP, the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) as well as CUCFA and even the New York Times have documented the myriad ways that academic freedom is being systematically undermined. They have detailed how scholars who defend Palestinian lives have been disproportionately silenced, harassed, and censored. Here in the UC, colleagues have also faced intimidation and doxxing (often by well-funded organizations like Canary Mission, which was the subject of a 2019 senate resolution). But the threats to academic freedom do not only come from organizations or individuals outside UC. Indeed, we bring forward this resolution because we are worried about the activities of the Regents and their recent attempts to curtail academic freedom. To offer one example, this past November, UC President Drake called for a “viewpoint neutral” history of the Middle East. This led to a collective outcry as 150 scholars from across the UC signed a letter denouncing this initiative. To offer another example: in January, the Regents planned to review the procedure for the dismissal of faculty, a discussion that is now slated to occur later this month. Perhaps most disturbing is the fact that in the past few months, the UC administration and the UC Regents have directly attacked faculty for taking positions that criticize Israel’s continued occupation and the structural violence that has been perpetrated against Palestinians. These developments illustrate how the Regents are actively undermining our academic freedom as well as the principles of shared governance. In light of this, we ask you, our colleagues, to pass this resolution calling on our campus administration to defend academic freedom in concrete and material ways. As defined by the AAUP, academic freedom means that we should be able to do our research and teaching “without interference from political figures, boards of trustees, donors, or other entities.” The AAUP also notes that academic freedom protects the right “to address the larger community with regard to any matter of social, political, economic, or other interest.” In order to do our job as educators, researchers, and public intellectuals, our collective freedom to critique and debate vital political issues must be safeguarded. This resolution is motivated by the deteriorating conditions for scholarly expression following the violence in the Middle East, yet the upcoming Presidential elections makes this a vital moment to ensure that our voice as scholars and—at times as dissidents—is protected. This resolution aims to safeguard academic freedom so that we may carry out the university’s stated mission of advancing social justice and creating a more equitable society. We fear that the question of Palestine is not the only controversial issue that we will face in the upcoming years; scholars in the UC will need protection from powerful political interests, whether that is on the local or national level, going forward.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for discussion and questions.

Ethan Miller, Professor Emeritus of Computer Science and Engineering, was given the floor and provided comments. Free speech and academic freedom, he stated, are precious and must be protected. We are fortunate that current UC policy and practices already give our communities the tools to do so. He then said that the organization promoting this particular resolution seems to be somewhat more than a disinterested proponent of free speech and academic freedom. Given what appears to be its complex political agenda and backing, he stated it was not advisable to sign on to such a statement. Four or five years ago he introduced the Chicago Principles on free speech to the Academic Senate, which were voted down by about 90 percent of the faculty. He reminded the faculty that if you stand for academic freedom, you stand for academic freedom for everyone. He pointed out that he is the victim of an anti-Semitic hate crime filed with the police on campus. He



is concerned that academic freedom does come with some responsibility. He stated that academic freedom means you are entitled to your own opinions, but not entitled to your own facts. He cautioned senators to bear that in mind when considering whether to approve this resolution. He repeated that this is not about academic freedom. If it were, we would have approved the Chicago Principles five years ago and wouldn't be in this position today.

Ilan Benjamin, Distinguished Professor of Chemistry & Biochemistry was given the floor, saying that he wanted to point out what he claimed was hypocrisy by one of the signers of the resolution. The UCSC Faculty for Justice in Palestine are, he said, demanding the University protect their academic freedom and, on the other hand, calling for a boycott which tramples the academic freedom of their own students and colleagues who want to study in or about Israel. He says their reasoning is because Israel is an apartheid settler-colonial state. He said that this is not true and that more than 50 percent of Israeli Jews are descendants of people who are indigenous to the Middle East and North Africa and are fully represented in all parts of Israeli society. 20 percent of Israeli society consists of Arabs who have more freedom than Arabs living in any other Middle Eastern countries and are members of the Israeli Parliament, Judiciary, etc.

Associate Professor Haleh Davis took the floor and encouraged colleagues to look at the actual resolution before the Senate. She denounces any acts of anti-Semitism that have occurred, but that is not being debated. The debate is that faculty should be the ones to decide how they implement their departmental websites and not the Regents. She agreed with Professor Miller that these principles should be applied across the board. The problem is that they are not being applied across the board but are being applied selectively. She stated that there is evidence that scholars who protect Palestinian lives are being disproportionately doxed and have been the subject of aggressive and quite unprofessional commentaries by the Regents. A colleague at UCSF, who wrote on and is a specialist on health care, received doxing from Canary Mission and was also defamed by the UCSF Administration. She stated that she was neither going to go back through the Chicago Principles nor discuss the history of Israel/Palestine.

Jennifer Derr, Associate Professor of History and founding director, Center for the Middle East and North Africa, and also member of the Academic Freedom Committee, was given the floor. She began by emphasizing that the sole purpose of this resolution is what is printed in the text of it. She noted that while these questions of academic freedom might seem remote for some, to scholars of the modern Middle East and North Africa, these issues belong to the 'bread and butter' of their classrooms, determining whether or not they can do their work. As a historian of the modern Middle East, who teaches a survey class on the region each year, her teaching always engages issues that sit at the center of political debates. Did the Bush administration possess credible evidence that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction in 2003? Was there a plan to deliberately expel Palestinians from their lands and villages during the 1948 war? These are not simply political questions, she stated, these are historical questions, and the answers to these questions lie at the very center of proven research methodologies that include deliberate archival research, careful ethnography, and historical argumentation. They also have the potential to produce considerable disagreement in our classroom, and as such our platform needs to be protected. She stated that she was protesting in the strongest of terms the potential that the UC Regents might further insert themselves into the procedures regarding faculty discipline and dismissal. The intent of that, she stated, would be to intimidate those who research and teach on political topics that are central to our democracy. There was a strong argument to be made for the role that academic freedom and vibrant debate play in the promotion of a democratic society. On campus there are a range of positions about whether, for example, departments should issue political statements. These are debates that we should have with one another. They are also debates that we, as individuals, should be prepared to lose without

resorting to the intervention of some authority on high. This is the only way to protect the independence and vibrancy of scholarly life on our campus and within our system.

Patty Gallagher thanked Jennifer and reminded the Senate that even if there was not time to speak in the meeting, their vote is their say, and to please make sure to vote on this resolution.

Professor de Alfaro was given the floor and stated that this resolution is oddly mixed with something he supports, academic freedom, and something oddly worked into it in asymmetric way, which is a reference to Palestine in particular. He wondered why the resolution could not be cleaned up by removing any reference to particular countries and situations, in order to have a clean resolution on academic freedom that faculty could support without hesitation.

Chair Gallagher reminded the Senate that all resolutions can entertain friendly amendments.

micha cárdenas, Associate Professor of Critical Race and Ethnic Studies and Performance, Play & Design, and International Education (CIE) member was given the floor and expressed her strong support for the resolution and its importance for academic freedom. They stated that at the most recent Regent's meeting in which they discussed their proposed J3 policy, they demonstrated a lack of understanding of what constitutes a website and concluded that discussion by saying that only political speech should be restricted. Associate Professor cárdenas stated that this should be alarming, as everything that is done is political, whether it's genetics or AI, video games or Palestine being researched. The ability to communicate with anyone outside of our campus is in peril.

Jenny Kelly, Associate Professor of Feminist Studies and GC member then spoke, echoing Professor Davis's directive to look at the actual text of the resolution, and to take note of the over 200 signatories to the resolution, which demonstrates the robust support of our colleagues. She noted the particular language of the resolution and read it aloud. She stated that she is a scholar of Palestine and in critical race and ethnic studies on campus, both of which have come under attack. This is a far-reaching resolution, she stated, that has important implications and protection for all of us. She wanted to honor the specificity by those who drafted it and their attention to the particular position of faculty who work on Palestine and organize for Palestine on campus.

Associate Professor Camilla Hawthorne took the floor and expressed full support for the resolution, as she has seen her own colleagues doxed, harassed, and reported for even mentioning Palestine, along with basic indisputable facts. She has witnessed firsthand the chilling effects, such that colleagues now fear what they can teach and say, due to the fear of being subjected to harassment campaigns that threaten their professional reputations, their lives, and their safety. This resolution is about protecting academic freedom but is also about protecting the lives of undergraduate and graduate students and all of the instructors on campus. She noted an imbalance between what is seen as neutral versus political, what is considered the domain of academic freedom versus indoctrination. Those contradictions reveal the need for this resolution. Why is a condemnation of the Russian invasion of Ukraine seen as a neutral statement of care, but a condemnation of the slaughter of Palestinian civilians is seen as political? This should be a concern to all who teach supposedly controversial topics, even beyond those who teach on the SWANA region. She teaches classes on policing. If she's foregrounding black feminist abolitionist scholarship, does this mean that her teaching will be subject to surveillance? She related that in fact she had been subject to a California public record request from a right-wing news organization related to her abolition class. Attacks on pro-Palestinian scholarship are part of a broader right-wing attack on higher education, she stated. Faculty are told that it is their job to connect their teaching to the broader world, to

prepare students to respond to the challenges that are facing this planet today. This is the kind of resolution that allows faculty at a most fundamental level to continue doing their jobs.

Savannah Shange, Associate Professor of Anthropology and principal faculty in Critical Race & Ethnic Studies took the floor and affirmed support for the resolution to be voted on 'as is' and for her colleagues who have valiantly spoken out in defense of Palestinian self-determination and Palestinian lives. No one deserves to be doxed, harassed, or otherwise put in danger for trying to keep others out of danger. She also reaffirmed that these kinds of attacks are not limited to this particular moment, which is why it's so important for this resolution on academic freedom to be instantiated. As a scholar of community activism and community-engaged scholarship, she often works directly with communities on political issues. As campus has recently encouraged and promoted community engaged research, should we not be working with Palestinian communities? What does it mean for us to be able to be in deep partnership with the diversity of communities that we serve and to research in ways that are not surveilled or harassed, but rather lifted up as modes of deep partnership with those universities? She said it is crucial that we allow those partnerships to flourish. She spoke to the need for departments and academic units to be able to post statements, to engage in substantive principled debate over these issues, and to be in direct dialogue with our colleagues as a faculty-run university, as opposed to having those conversations shut off from up on high.

Chair Gallagher thanked everyone for the discussion and reminded the Senate that this legislation requires a vote, and it will be distributed by electronic ballot following this meeting. [The resolution later passed by electronic ballot.]

b. Resolution to Create a Standing Committee on Climate Change (AS/SCP/2086)

Sandra Faber Professor Emeritus of Astronomy & Astrophysics took the floor to discuss the proposal to start a new Senate committee, the Standing Committee on the Climate Crisis. Speaking on behalf of UCSC Climate Action Now (CAN), a group of roughly 60 faculty and Unit 18 lecturers, she presented background on the current climate emergency, which is going to, she stated, reshape life as we know it on Earth. Her presentation detailed global surface air and ocean temperatures in 2023, the hottest year on record. Some theories as to why this is happening predict that the end of this century will see increases of 4 or 5 degrees Centigrade, which is almost twice as large as Fahrenheit. If the temperature goes up 4 degrees, much of the tropics, India, all of Northern Australia and Indonesia will become uninhabitable. Two billion people will simply not be able to survive there and will die of hyperthermia. When crops and water supplies fail, these people will move. She mentioned the consternation and paralysis in our national government caused by one million people on our Southern border wanting access and asked what life in the United States is going to be like if we are confronted with a billion people wanting to cross the border. She submitted to the Senate that this is something we should anticipate as a real possibility. She stated that the problem is urgent, and that the university needs to move faster than it has.

Professor Faber described the two committees being discussed to deal with the climate crisis. One is a joint committee developed by the Administration with three subcommittees on education, research, and operations. It has rudimentary charges based on a previous report on sustainability and resilience. None of the members are yet appointed, the charges not yet final, and there is no timeline yet as to when it is going to start up and begin operating. This joint committee was first suggested two years ago, but paused for the strategic plan. The plan was completed a year ago but the committee is still not yet operating. In order to move things along, the proposed resolution was drafted, outlining a new standing committee in the Senate with a focus on research and teaching in particular. This would provide a forum that reflects faculty priorities and viewpoints, a forum to

facilitate holistic planning of research and education together, which things are split in the Administration's plan. This would enable rapid movement on matters where the Senate can take the lead and not need to wait for the administration to provide input. Four other campuses already have separate standing committees or task forces on climate or sustainability. Though the resolution was going to be discussed in the Senate meeting that day, in the past week the Administration shared draft charges of its joint committee with CAN and also requested that COC provide faculty names to serve on the joint committee. The Chancellor clarified her position and said she would support the efforts of the Senate if the resolution to create a standing committee passed, but that would mean not moving forward with plans for the Joint Senate Administration Committee. This was a surprise to CAN, who had not envisioned joint planning. They reconvened and drafted the following statement, which Professor Faber then read: We thank the Administration for sending draft charges for the Joint Committees and for initiating the process with CoC to appoint faculty members. Joint leadership in climate planning is essential. If a single committee is the most expeditious way to make progress on meeting our combined goals, we offer to table the Resolution for a Standing Committee. Time is of the essence. Members of the Joint Committee are not yet appointed, and the draft charges for the Education and Research Subcommittees are rudimentary. Going forward, we expect to see these issues tackled with alacrity. The names of co-chairs, committee members, charges, and a timeline for action should be presented as soon as possible, in any case before the May Senate meeting. To expedite matters, we will shortly provide to CoC the names of CAN members who are willing to serve, including Unit 18 Lecturers. We are also happy to assist with framing the Joint Committee charges. Two of our reasons for having a Standing Senate Committee will not be met by having a single Joint Committee. They are: 1) the need for a separate forum to formulate the faculty's point of view, and 2) the need to treat research and education holistically. The concept of a Standing Senate Committee can always be rekindled if these or other aspects of the enterprise prove problematic. In the meantime, CAN is planning a series of seminars, meetings, and other events to educate the campus about climate change. We invite all faculty and Unit 18 Lecturers to join our mailing list by emailing [clifacstaff@gmail.com](mailto:clifacstaff@gmail.com), or by sending a blank email to [ucsc-can+subscribe@googlegroups.com](mailto:ucsc-can+subscribe@googlegroups.com).

Professor Faber closed, stating that CAN is deeply worried, not simply about the future of UCSC, but the future of the world. Without diminishing what was previously discussed in the meeting, she said that those issues are small in comparison; climate crisis is just the tip of the spear of a much larger suite of problems, including the end of cheap energy, the destruction of the environment, spiraling debt, and the end of economic growth. Changes and cooperation between the Senate and the Administration will be needed. She quoted James Hansen, the first person to testify about global warming in front of Congress, "Wishful thinking as a policy approach must be replaced by transparent climate analysis, knowledge of the forcings that drive climate change, and realistic assessment of policy options... We owe young people the knowledge and the tools to continually assess the situation and devise and adjust the course of action." She thanked the Senate and stated that CAN is not asking for a vote at this time.

Chair Gallagher opened the discussion for comment and Sikina Jinnah, Professor of Environmental Studies and member of the Committee on Development and Fundraising was given the floor and said that she would speak in her capacity as co-chair of the Strategic Planning Pillar Committee on Climate Change, Sustainability and Resilience. She stated that she wholeheartedly shared Professor Faber's sense of urgency and joined her call for an acceleration of implementation efforts of the climate goals in the strategic plan. However, she had fairly serious concerns about the proposed resolution for a new standing Senate committee as currently drafted. Understanding it has been tabled, she offered constructive feedback that she hoped would be considered if it is rekindled in future for return to the Senate floor. First, there's no mention at all in the proposed resolution of the

strategic plan and its implementation, nor how this proposed new committee would engage with the specific goals and recommendations outlined in the Strategic Plan Climate Committee's 28-page report. She underscored that the committee was made up of 27 faculty, staff, and students, across 5 academic divisions and several other campus units. They met at least 4 times a month during the last academic year, in committee and subcommittees to work on that report, providing 21 separate opportunities for campus community engagement on the work. These efforts successfully engaged and incorporated feedback from 778 faculty, staff and students across campus. While some of the proposed duties outlined in the resolution do indeed align with her committee's recommendations, others propose to redo or duplicate their work, and in one case directly conflict with their recommendations. The proposed resolution as written at best circumvents and at worst erases the hundreds of hours of work, based on broad community, that the committee put into developing a plan for campus to address climate change. Although there are some recommendations in the strategic plan that are squarely within the purview of the Senate to evaluate and, if appropriate, to implement, including that relating to curriculum requirements, there are others that simply cannot move forward without the support and partnership of the Administration. She closed by underscoring that creating new institutions and committees does not always solve the real or perceived failures of existing ones, and in some cases can actually exacerbate existing problems especially related to social and procedural justice. She is not convinced that a new committee is actually needed; much of the work can be done within existing standing Senate committees which have relevant mandates. If in the future one is created to address climate change, in its charge should be implementation of those elements of the strategic plan that are within the Senate's decision-making authority, and it should not circumvent or erase the work already put into designing a roadmap for addressing climate change on our campus.

Karen Holl, Professor of Environmental Studies, was given the floor, and supported Professor Faber's concern about the urgency surrounding climate change as well as the frustration of those in CAN that it has been 2 years since this was proposed. Action does need to happen quickly. She also spoke in support of Professor Jinnah's statement. The majority of the things that need to be done on this campus will require a combination of people, not Senate members alone, but also those across campus with relative expertise. She hopes the joint committee can move forward within the spring quarter.

Chair Gallagher said that it was exciting to see how much passion, expertise, and determination there is across campus for this kind of work and advocacy to happen.

#### **8. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair**

SUA Vice President of Academic Affairs Stephanie Sanchez Toscano, was given the floor and provided the following remarks:

Five months have passed since last quarter's Academic Senate meeting, and the Palestinian people have continued to be massacred. Recently the Student Union Assembly successively passed a resolution divesting our Assembly budget from companies on the BDS list that are taking part in the genocide of Palestinian people. The Student Union Assembly officers stand with the Palestinian people in demanding an immediate cease fire and an end to the occupation. We also stand with the students and faculty who are expressing their worries about their academic freedom. How can the University claim to be a safe place for learning when many of us are being silenced because of a certain scholarship, a certain experience, or a certain identity? How can the university ignore students who lead the way and call for divestment from genocide? Students demand that the university take immediate steps to protect academic freedom, freedom of political speech, and to divest itself from an ongoing genocide. It is cruel for the university to force students to watch a genocide happen in which

the university invests its student funds in. We're all human beings, before we are students. and protecting life will always take precedence over classroom learning. If the university claims to be supportive of our academics, then it would let students study without the burden of guilt that comes with funding genocide. If the university truly wants to support our students, it will protect us and our professors through freedom of political speech, so that we can all engage in difficult topics which the UC system is so famous for talking about. If the university truly wants us to succeed academically, then money would be invested in the different barriers that have prevented us from succeeding, like an ongoing housing crisis, unreliable transportation, food insecurity, and many other things. Clearly, there are things that can be done to support undergraduate learning on our campus. But the easiest way to give us something that we are asking for is to divest the university from genocide. So, what I am asking today is to invest in things that will support our students for the thousands of dollars that we are paying, and please support today's resolution to defend academic freedom and shared governance with solidarity.

**9. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)**

**10. Petitions of the Students (none)**

**11. Unfinished Business (none)**

**12. University and Faculty Welfare**

**13. Reports of Standing Committees (continued)**

- c. Senate Executive Committee – Oral Report – Classrooms and Modalities Advisory Committee Co-Chair Matthew McCarthy

Matthew McCarthy, Professor of Ocean Sciences and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate then presented an update on the new joint Senate-Administrative committee, the Classroom Modalities Advisory Committee (CMAC), co-chaired by Associate Provost Academic Success Jody Green and himself. The rationale for this committee is the classroom space crunch. Space limitations for classrooms have now become so severe that it's potentially limiting approving new programs—both traditional and new innovative programs. New classroom space is coming on the horizon, but still down the road. The second rationale for the committee is the rise of online and other potential teaching modalities. One of the big changes since the pandemic has been increased online use adopted both by UC and nationwide as well. These technologies are evolving quickly, as are hybrid and online teaching approaches. This is a joint Senate and Administrative Committee, charged by the CPEVC and the Senate. The year one goals were to look at a few things: 1) Study utilization rates for classroom space, 2) Consider impact of Hybrid and online Course Modalities, 3) Consider novel approaches to Classroom use/scheduling, 4) Consider hybrid and online impact on campus space. They've met bi-weekly since the fall, focused on information gathering around these topics: understanding classroom space use and any unused potential; online modalities: current use at UCSC and targeted future potential. Three themes have been talked about: more fully using what we have, rethinking how we use classrooms, and whether there are ways we can effectively generate more space. This could include learning off campus, internships, study abroad and outdoor or other novel space learning for selected classes. Regarding online modalities, the information gathering themes and questions have been: How has online instruction at UCSC shifted since the pandemic? What fraction of our current courses/de-facto seats are now online? What divisions/disciplines use online most? What kinds/levels/sizes of classes have adopted online most? What can we learn from adoption so far? Are there specific criteria which may suggest a more targeted approach? Professor McCarthy reported that the deliverable at the end of this year is a draft report on what they've learned this year, which will circulate to relevant Senate committees for feedback. The committee has been charged for two years, so using this Senate and leadership

feedback, the second year will address and recommend principles for determining course modalities and distributing access to instructional space.

Chair Gallagher thanked Vice Chair McCarthy and as there was no more time for questions, reminded the Senate that questions or comments about any of the discussed issues could be sent to [senate@ucsc.edu](mailto:senate@ucsc.edu).

Chair Gallagher expressed gratitude to the Senate and adjourned the meeting at 5:02 pm.

ATTEST: Deborah Gould, Secretary

DRAFT