

MINUTES  
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
February 18, 2015

**Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, February 18 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian David Brundage present, Chair Don Brenneis called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

The meeting minutes of November 7, 2015 were approved as written by voice vote.

**2. Announcements**

**a. Chair Brenneis**

After a brief greeting, Senate Chair Don Brenneis gave the floor to Chancellor Blumenthal.

**b. Chancellor Blumenthal**

Chancellor Blumenthal began with updates on UCSC's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary plans, noting some past and upcoming events that will be part of the celebrations. There will be an ongoing media campaign throughout the year to promote these events.

The Chancellor then gave updates on alumni relations. There will soon be major changes coming to the Alumni Council. UCSC now has over 100,000 alums, and the Alumni Council has decided that it will no longer charge membership dues. Every graduate from UCSC will now be able to join free of charge. This is consistent with trends across the country in higher education, and with most other UC campuses. This allows the Alumni Council to re-envision their programs, to find more ways to support personal and professional development networks for alumni, and to focus more on alumni engagement within the campus. There is a significant role for faculty in this as well, which could include mentoring with alumni, finding different ways to connect alumni to the classroom, and helping alumni to reach out to new graduates and help draw them in to UCSC's alumni organization.

Chancellor Blumenthal reported that UCSC's fundraising campaign, has raised approximately \$190 million of the \$300 million goal. The campus just established and endowed Symantec Presidential Chair in Storage and Security. Paperwork has also been signed for two additional endowed chairs – a Presidential Chair in Water Resources and Food System Sustainability, which will be located in Environmental Studies, and a University Librarian Presidential Chair. Both of these will be funded by the Helen and Will Webster Foundation, with matches from UC President Napolitano's office. Three of the eight Presidential Chairs have now been filled, and there are more in the works.

Chancellor Blumenthal reported on the campus budget, starting with the announcement that there are currently meetings taking place between UC President Janet Napolitano, and California

Governor Jerry Brown. The purpose of these meetings is to talk about budgetary matters in regards to the UC system. Some areas of focus include tuition, state support, other options, and the consequences of their decisions going forward. The Chancellor also remarked that there is a new proposed State Constitutional Amendment, written by Senator Ricardo Lara, which would remove constitutional autonomy from the UC system. This would be disastrous to the campus, and the Academic Senate is strongly opposed to these efforts. Significant advocacy will be needed soon for both the budget and UC autonomy in order to protect the campus. President Napolitano has asked faculty to get directly involved in this advocacy. Donna Blitzer will be the point person on campus working with faculty and finding ways that faculty can be effective in this advocacy in Sacramento.

The Chancellor gave updates on the search for a Dean of Engineering, stating that there could be as many as four finalists, and that they will be doing campus visits in March.

In more general campus news, the Chancellor noted that the University has gotten some significant new funding for work in genomics and climate change. UCSC has also received a record number of undergraduate applications this year, with nearly 55,000 students applying. This is up by 11% from the previous year, and it is the second-highest increase in the UC system. For graduate applications not all programs have closed yet, but UCSC is on track to exceed last year's record number of applications.

### **c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway**

EVC Galloway gave updates on her 5-for-2015 initiative. Student Success Steering Committee (SSSC) leader Jaye Padgett has assisted with the goal of increasing retention and reducing time-to-degree. UCSC has also hired an Assessment Consultant to help achieve this goal. Jaye Padgett has submitted an Innovation Award application, which compiles and iterates all campus efforts toward increasing student success. Because of these efforts, UCSC has received additional funding from the UC Office of the President (UCOP) to help increase student success. Another goal of the 5 for 2015 was to apply for status as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), which has been done through the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. UCSC is now recognized as an HSI. Toward the goal of increasing the non-resident population on campus, enrollments for this group have increased significantly, exceeding the goal for 2015, and UCSC is now working on selectivity as part of that goal. For the goal of financial stability, UCSC had achieved this for three years. However, this will be the last year free of budget cuts for the campus. With these goals in mind, UCSC undertook a project last year to create a strategic plan for the university. This plan, entitled Envision UCSC, was designed to encapsulate the vision of what UCSC should and should not be in years to come.

Envision UCSC consists of six goals. Three of these goals are mission-oriented, and three are infrastructure-based.

The first of the mission-oriented goals is to allocate faculty resources strategically. This entails ensuring that each hire is best placed to serve the campus. This will require mapping out a process by which there are recognized calls and assessment points, and will be a collaborative effort with VC Planning and Budget Delaney, CPB, and the Senate. The other part of this goal is to plan for "steady-state" periods. UCSC has two more years of rebenching funds that will bring

new faculty lines, and after that the campus will probably only be able to afford one or two new faculty lines per year. UCSC needs to figure out how to address changing disciplines and emphases, and new areas of study during these times when funding is static.

The second of the mission-oriented goal is to increase research excellence. While UCSC is already very competitive when it comes to getting grants, the campus needs to figure out how to give faculty the support for the infrastructure that they require in order to best utilize these grants. The campus also needs to figure out how to get better grants, and how to make connections with new agencies that could showcase UCSC's research and create new grant opportunities. In order to do that, UCSC has already looked at some of the gaps that are present in the Office of Research, and has begun work on an Office for Research Development which will assist the campus in looking for potential industrial partnerships. Work has also started toward improving the coordination between research and support providers. There is also work being done toward streamlining grant processes to make the grant submission process more efficient.

The third mission-related goal is to advance student success. This includes improving student retention and time-to-degree. This also means strengthening mentorship and giving students the training and skills that they need to succeed in their careers after leaving UCSC. Improving campus climate is also part of this goal, which will require acknowledging the difficulties that students face, and fixing them. There will be assessments, help will be given to individual colleges, and faculty and grad student mentorship programs, as well as alumni mentorship programs, will be looked into in order to help with this. Some initiatives have already been instituted to assist the campus with this goal. The Student Success Steering Committee was created, new mentorship programs have been instituted and should be online by Fall of 2015, and academic advising in the colleges has been increased by 25% on a trial basis. There will be challenge programs in up to four of the colleges to help with the first to second year transition, the campus is piloting three summer academies this year, and the Black Experience Team (BET) is looking at how to grow the number and improve the campus climate for African American students.

The first of the infrastructure-based goals is to make UCSC an enjoyable workplace. This includes making programs that recognize faculty and staff contributions to the campus, and incorporating both faculty and staff into the campus decision-making process. It also includes handling employee issues before they become critical by emphasizing training for managers and supervisors, and reinstating the Campus Welfare Committee.

The second infrastructure-based goal is to "tell the world our story." This involves defining what our story is, and getting the word out about it. In order to do this, the campus has been making critical hires in University Relations, such as that of an Associate Vice Chancellor for Communications and Marketing. UCSC is also starting a formal research magazine, and has created the "Tuesday Newsday" news website that lists public relations information. The campus has created a mobile-optimized campus website, and the administration will also be working actively with the Academic Senate to develop a database for faculty to share their expertise.

The final infrastructure-based goal is to address and reduce the workload burden for faculty and staff at UCSC. The University has recently gone through a period of budget cuts, which resulted in employee reductions of 25-30% in almost every area on campus. This means that the remaining staff are having to do more work than they would have in the past. The two areas that need to be assessed for this goal are streamlining processes around campus, and addressing the pain points that hold up campus processes and reduce efficiency.

Each of these goals will be presented in a Tuesday Newsday letter. These letters will present action plans available for the projects that are going to be done, the leads associated with these projects, their timelines, and any plans for consultations with the Senate. The Advisory Committee will meet in the Fall to discuss the progress of these goals.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

### **Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)**

#### **3. Special Orders: Annual Reports**

##### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

##### **a. Committee on Academic Personnel**

#### **4. Reports of Special Committees (none)**

#### **5. Reports of Standing Committees**

##### **a. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid**

##### **i. Oral Report: Holistic Review: An Overview of Admissions Policy Changes and Current CAFA Goals**

CAFA Chair Minghui Hu explained that UCSC's policy for undergraduate admissions is called Holistic Review. This process was implemented in 2012 with a goal of admitting well-rounded students. To do this, the system-wide committee, BOARS, has instituted fourteen criteria for undergraduate admissions, which UCSC has adopted into the holistic review process. These criteria are input into a computer program that combines them and assigns each applicant a holistic review score that readers use to view each applicant in his or her own personal academic context. It also identifies any opportunities they might have to overcome their own obstacles, and how they could potentially achieve their goals. An additional criteria that UCSC uses also allows the readers to view the different strengths of each applicant, which are taken into consideration when deciding whether or not that applicant will be granted admission.

In past admission cycles, UCSC has encountered some challenges with Holistic Review, as it is a fairly new process. The campus has made updates to the process as it encountered these challenges. The first update is that UCSC now divides its

applicants into three separate pools - resident, non-resident, and international. Another is that when applicants end up sharing the same score, predicted first-year GPA is used as the tie-breaker. This year, UCSC will also no longer be using the Berkeley and UCLA computer programs to assign Holistic Review scores. The campus will instead use a new program from UC Davis that will determine these scores and give consistent readings for the entire applicant pool. This new computer program also allows UCSC to do adjudication review, a process that will flag an applicant for senior officers in the Office of Admissions to review if a serious difference is found between that applicant's score of academic performance and their predicted first-year GPA. This allows UCSC to find and create a student body that will be prepared for our courses and curriculum.

There are still issues and challenges with this process. UCSC's campus population grew tremendously from 2007 to 2014. During that same time frame, the population of non-resident students was reduced dramatically from 2.8% to 1.6%. In 2014, however, non-resident enrollment was bolstered to 4.6%. While this is a good increase, UCSC is still well below the top three campuses with the highest non-resident enrollments, all three of which are at approximately 20%. UCSC is also still well below the system-wide average of 11.3%. UCSC's selectivity continues to increase due to the rise in the number of applications received by the campus. Because of this, the admission rate for California residents has gone down to 49.5%. CAFA's goals are now to continue to increase academic preparedness, to work with different units on campus to build pipelines to enlarge the pool of international and non-resident applicants, and to support President Napolitano's initiative to streamline the transfer process.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

**b. Committee on Educational Policy**

**i. Report on Expanding Grade Options at UC Santa Cruz (AS/SCP/1776)**

CEP Chair John Tamkun explained that the Committee on Educational Policy has been looking into adding a C- grading option to our campus. UCSC is currently the only UC campus that does not allow faculty to issue a C- grade to students.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

**ii. Retention and Graduation Rates: Student Success Faculty Assistant, Professor Jaye Padgett Report (AS/SCP/1777)**

Professor Jaye Padgett reported that the primary goals of student success are increased graduation rates and shorter times-to-degree. The main reasons for this are financial. California's funding is based on enrollments, but Governor Brown's funding proposal separates funding from enrollments. While this proposal doesn't tie funding directly to output measures, the language suggests that this is a possibility in the near future. President Napolitano has also shown particular interest in four-year graduation rates and time-to-degree. In a letter to UCSC, she noted that "only 57% of all freshmen, 47% of underrepresented minorities, and

50% of low-income students graduate in four years.” She also stated that she believes that “there is considerable room to improve these rates across the board, and to close the gap between underrepresented minority students and the overall student population.”

Currently, UCSC’s four-year graduation rate for entering frosh is 51.5%, and 76.9% six-year for entering frosh. For transfer students, the two-year graduation rate is 52.6%, and the four-year graduation rate is 82.9%. Looking at these trends, the six-year rates for frosh and the four-year rates for transfer students are going up, but the four-year rates for frosh and the two-year rates for transfers are going down. Since enrollments are up, this is not so much an issue of having fewer students as it is a time-to-degree issue. Compared with other UC campuses, UCSC falls somewhere within the lower third when it comes to four-year graduation rates. The graduation gaps for underrepresented minorities are also somewhat high, with the gap at the six-year mark for African American frosh at 8.5%, and at 5% for Hispanic and Latino frosh. The four-year gaps for these groups is larger, indicating that there are gaps in not only who graduates but also how long it takes them to graduate. The gaps for the transfer students in these minorities groups also have similar rates.

While much of this data looks negative, UCSC’s gaps for underrepresented minorities actually place the campus in a better position than most other UC campuses. UCSC’s predicted graduation rates are also higher than many comparable institutions across the country. Data also shows that many students who don’t graduate from UCSC often go on to transfer to other institutions, and many graduate within six years of their enrollment at UCSC. Only 9% of incoming frosh who do not graduate from UCSC are completely unaccounted for. This number is similar for transfer students who do not graduate, with only 6% being unaccounted for. The goals recommended by the SSSC are to increase overall graduation rates for four-year frosh and six-year frosh to 85%. For transfer students, the goal is to increase both the two-year and four-year rates to 65%. The committee also seeks to eliminate graduation gaps for Hispanic and African American students.

The SSSC is recommending to the EVC that UCSC invest in three different systems to help reach these goals. The first is a case management system for advisor-to-advisor and advisor-to-student communication and coordination. The second is an early alert system for students at risk. The third is a predictive analytics system to detect students at risk and for data exploration.

SSSC is also taking actions to achieve these goals. There will be a Summer Academy at UCSC this year. This will be a seven-week, ten-credit program that will focus on math preparation, writing for STEM, and student success skills for navigating a research university. SSSC is also looking into non-cognitive interventions, as a joint effort with the College Transition Collaborative, which will be researching “mindset” interventions. Experimental results show robust and

long-lasting effects from these interventions on student success, and this Fall an online intervention will be delivered to the entire frosh entering class in a randomized, controlled trial design experiment. UCSC will also soon be piloting an exit survey for all students who apply to withdraw or apply for a leave of absence. There are reports on graduation and time-to-degree by department available for viewing on the institutional research website retention page. In addition, UCSC has hired a student success researcher who will be designing and carrying out assessments of different campus programs.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

**c. Committee on Faculty Welfare**

**i. Oral Report on Quality of Life at UCSC**

Committee Chair Jim Zachos gave an update on faculty salaries. After UCSC's merit boost program was instituted in 2008, the campus went from having the lowest faculty salaries in the UC System to ranking in 6th place as of 2013. The campus has not quite reached the nine campus median yet, but overall salaries have improved relative to the other UC campuses. The large disparities between campuses are largely to do with off-scale salaries. For UCSC, the off-scales are fairly uniform over rank. This is different from most UC campuses because each campus has its own strategy and formula for applying the off-scales. For UCSC, this could mean that the off-scales for lower ranks are due to more aggressive hiring and retention practices for junior faculty. For the off-scales at higher ranks, this could mean that off-scales are making up for a dysfunctional scale system. Data for this is still being analyzed, and a clearer explanation will not be available until this analysis is completed in the Spring. For total remuneration, UCSC has made progress in its faculty compensation based on the merit boost plan, but our position within system-wide analysis remains unchanged. There are efforts going on at UCOP to try and improve this. CFW recommends that the merit boost program be continued at least at its current level. They also recommend that stronger measures be considered at the higher ranks to close the gap with other coastal campuses such as UCSB and UCSD.

On campus housing, Chair Zachos reported that real estate pricing in Santa Cruz is currently close to the level it was at in 2006, with the median home price being unaffordable for an Assistant Professor. Currently, 135 Senate faculty live in on-campus housing, with home prices ranging from \$300k to \$650k. The equivalent price for an off-campus home ranges from \$400k to \$950k. The on-campus pricing is affordable for an Assistant Professor, step three. CFW is currently looking into UCSC's re-pricing program, which has been in effect for approximately six years and has been mostly successful. However, there are concerns about continuing price increases. CFW is working with housing to see what can be done to remedy this issue. There is also the issue of off-campus pricing increases. As prices off campus go up, it lessens the ability of those who live on campus to affordably transition to an off-campus home. This creates a bottleneck in the system and makes fewer homes available to purchase on

campus, resulting in longer wait lists. Currently wait lists are short, but if prices continue to increase, this will likely change. Given market pressure, CFW is currently working with Campus Housing to consider increasing housing allowances and make them more broadly available across divisions. The committee will also be working to increase on-campus inventory by accelerating housing turnover and/or expanding existing housing.

Health care has become a big issue for the campus recently. The Blue Shield/Sutter (PAMF) crisis was averted, but there could have been a number of resulting problems had the two companies not come to an agreement. There are approximately 1,600 UCSC employees enrolled in Blue Shield plans, and for many of those employees, access to PAMF as a “tier one” provider is a deciding factor when it comes to plan selection. In the event that negotiations were not settled, these employees would have had to find new primary care physicians. These physicians would likely have been part of the only other major medical network in Santa Cruz, Physicians Medical Group (PMG), which CFW found probably does not have enough primary care doctors available to cover the number of people who would be switching to them. If they did, the time to get care from one of these physicians would likely increase as their patient numbers would be higher. This issue is somewhat unique to UCSC as we are one of the only UC campuses that does not have an on-campus medical center. UCSC needs to be prepared for these issues in the future.

Premiums for UC Care are also on the rise, increasing costs for UCSC employees. Some possibilities that are being considered to remedy these issues are to expand UC Care to include an HMO and/or to add a different provider option. For both of these options, the providers would need to be aware of the necessity of having both PAMF and PMG defined as tier one providers in their plans.

The other issue that arose during the PAMF/Blue Shield negotiations was that a lack of accurate plan information was presented during open enrollment. UCSC employees were not notified or aware that the Blue Shield/PAMF contract had not been renewed, and this affected the decisions of many employees when choosing their plans. Other types of information have also been omitted in past years, which has caused similar issues. CFW is currently looking into how to remedy this.

On child care, Chair Zachos reported that a few years ago \$750k was committed by the administration and the EVC for the purpose of creating some form of child care program for UCSC employees. Some of that money was used to create a detailed plan to convert the Granary into a potential child care facility, but this was ultimately determined to be too costly. There are currently no other suitable locations for a child care center on campus. Another option would be to find a facility off campus for UCSC to run as its child care center. CFW is recommending that this option be further explored in the next year. CFW is also



recommending that child care vouchers be an option in the interim. There would be a limited number of these vouchers which would be allocated partially on the basis of need, with junior faculty getting priority, and they would be distributed via a lottery system. Further details of this plan still need to be discussed.

The floor was opened for questions.

CFW member Noriko Aso stated that the reconstitution of the Child Care Advisory Committee would be helpful, as it was made up of faculty, staff, and administration members. This committee could help to keep the conversation about child care consistent and ongoing, and could consolidate the different child care efforts that have gone on over the years since the committee was disbanded.

Senate Vice Chair Ólöf Einarsdóttir asked what was meant when it was stated that the Granary would be too costly to renovate. She then asked if it would be more expensive to renovate the Granary than it would be to demolish it and build a completely new facility.

EVC Galloway responded that the Granary is a historic building, and as such there are restrictions as to what can and can't be done to it. Under those restrictions, there is no way to make it into an acceptable child care facility. An off-campus facility may be the best recourse that UCSC has if nothing can be built on-campus.

**d. Senate Executive Committee**

**i. SEC Criteria for Silicon Valley Pre-proposals (AS/SCP/1782)**

The floor was immediately opened for questions.

Professor Megan Thomas commented that the Senate needs to have an open discussion about the plan for Silicon Valley in general before discussion specific proposals.

Professor Gail Hershatter asked how this Silicon Valley project came to be and how it is different from previous Silicon Valley initiatives.

Emeritus Professor Roger Anderson asked when there will be a report detailing the results and future plans for UCSC's contract with NASA/AMES.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that the Senate should have a general discussion about the Silicon Valley project. He commented that the NASA/AMES contract, which brought UCSC \$300million over ten years, is now officially expired. With the income from that contract, the University was able to make financial gains in Silicon Valley. The campus is currently in the process of submitting a new proposal for a contract with NASA/AMES that would be more extensive, and that would not only involve the initiatives under the previous contract, but would also involve a research institute operated jointly with UC

Berkeley and UC San Diego. This new contract is one of the reasons for moving forward with Silicon Valley now. Another reason is that UCSC is now in negotiations to develop a NASA research park in collaboration with DeAnza-Foothill College. UCSC has also been developing significant new interactions with companies in Silicon Valley that have supported research on campus and who are interested in a greater presence by the campus in Silicon Valley. Finally, there has been enhanced interest in that area both by UCOP and other campuses, which means that UCSC should act now if the campus is going to do anything significant in Silicon Valley.

Professor Shelly Errington commented that the Senate would like to see UCSC's business plan and academic plan for Silicon Valley. Faculty are already feeling overburdened, so it would be useful to know how this proposal would impact the campus both academically and financially.

Professor Mark Anderson asked if it would really be the best use of campus funds to allocate FTE to Silicon Valley since faculty are already having a difficult time serving student needs on the main campus, and when more budget cuts are likely coming in the future.

Professor Manfred Warmuth commented that it may be better to have one main area of focus in Silicon Valley, rather than splintering the FTE allocated for that project while trying to cover several areas of focus.

EVC Galloway responded that the administration understands that this project will be a risk for the campus, and that careful assessments will need to be made as the project moves forward. Part of what the administration is currently working on is assessing what support would be necessary for programs in Silicon Valley, and what the budgets for those support systems would look like. As proposals come in, the administration will look more closely at whether or not the campus could attract the types of students that any particular program would require, and if UCSC would be able to help place those students once they graduated. The benefit of using campus rebenching funds for faculty in Silicon Valley is that the faculty and programs involved will be operated solely by UCSC. Graduate students will also have better chances of being placed into research positions in that area.

Professor Dean Mathiowetz commented that part of the Senate discussion on Silicon Valley should include both whether this initiative should happen now, and if so, how it should happen.

**ii. Proposal for a Framework for International Engagement (AS/SCP/1781)**

CIE Chair Ben Crow introduced the report, stating that the campus is currently working to increase the population of international students at UCSC. Toward this goal, international undergraduate enrollments have already increased, and a

Senior International Officer and a Special Advisor to the Chancellor have been appointed. The International Education Office is also being rebuilt. The Senate Executive Committee has created a framework to help shift the internationalization initiative from something that has been revenue driven, to something more driven by research, pedagogy, and social responsibility.

CIE drew results from three different faculty surveys of what the campus should be doing. From these surveys, faculty have implied that international engagement should be led by research. Some of the top priorities include research travel funds and general research funding support, with collaboration, reduction of non-resident tuition, language training, and visa assistance falling closely behind. Support from administration, ensuring international students are well prepared, broadly framing internationalization, and simplifying procedures for hosting faculty were also listed as priorities.

SEC has made some recommendations toward building a better framework for international engagement. The first is to build an Office of International Engagement that would report directly to the EVC, and would facilitate international initiatives such as research support, enabling agreements for international collaboration, and supporting international conferences and visitors. All other UC campuses have offices like this, which seem to be crucial in enabling international engagement. Funding will need to be identified to back any sort of international growth initiative. There also need to be “regional faculty work groups” on campus, which would be made up of faculty in different areas of expertise relating to internationalization. These work groups would advise campus leaders on choices of strategic partners and the creation of research led “collaboration pipelines,” which would enable research collaboration and the recruitment of both graduate and undergraduate international students.

The benefits of having an internationalization framework are twofold. First, the creation of global research and educational partnerships will bring innovative faculty and well qualified international students to campus. And by selectively admitting highly qualified international students to UCSC, this will create greater student success, significantly reduce resources currently used for academic support programs, and increase retention and decrease time-to-degree. Increased selectivity will also become easier when the goal of a large and diverse pool of international students is accomplished.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

**e. Committee on International Education**

**i. Oral Report: Facilitating International Research Collaborations: Making the Campus MOU Process Swift, Easy and Open**

CIE Chair Ben Crow began the report by stating that CIE has been working to figure out how to improve the system for creating international research

collaboration agreements. These agreements are called Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), and the committee set out to learn what the process currently is for establishing these agreements, what best practices exist from other institutions, and what UCSC should do.

CIE found that the current process for this does not seem to be working. There are guidelines for this process on the IEO webpage, but the guidelines refer to an office where MOUs are supposed to be recorded and deposited, and that office does not exist. There is a different office where these MOUs should go, but this process is not working well in that office either. In practice the campus has no way of knowing what MOUs exist, and even recent MOUs have gotten lost.

CIE found that UCSC's process for MOUs has two levels. The first is top down, with the Chancellor and Special Assistant beginning to establish broad ranging strategic partnerships with selected overseas universities. The second is bottom up, with members of faculty establishing a wide range of agreements around research, exchanges, teaching, and other questions. Problems then arise as the records of the faculty-created partnership records are incomplete, and there are limited connections between the faculty-created and Administration-created partnerships.

In looking at the best practices of other UC campuses for these agreements, CIE found that the bigger UC campuses have multiple agreements with other countries, and their process for these agreements is extremely bureaucratic, with UCLA requiring six levels of signatures for each agreement. The smaller, newer UC campuses, such as Irvine and Davis, along with Harvard University, seem to have more flexible and open processes, which CIE is looking to try to mimic at UCSC.

CIE recommends that UCSC create a newer, better process for these international agreements. This would involve combining the two levels of the current process, and creating a single template that combines the best practices of UC Irvine, UC Davis, and Harvard. This template would be designed to make the process as swift, flexible, easy, and open as possible. It would have the bureaucracy necessary for the process to function, but would be much simpler than what is in place now, with only one or two signatures being required for each agreement. These elements should make it easier to see what agreements already exist, and to create new agreements for the campus.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

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

SUA Chair Justin Lardinois began by giving updates on undergraduate affairs. The approval of President Napolitano's proposed tuition increases has sparked some groups of students across campus to discuss possible disruptive actions against the fee hikes. The SUA has not been part of

these discussions, but wanted to inform the Senate that these protests may occur the week of March 2nd.

Campus elections are coming up soon, and there will be four referenda that will be on the undergraduate ballot. OPERS is running an athletics referendum, and the health center will be putting forth a referendum that would be mandatory for all students to replace CruzCare. Each of these would cost approximately \$100. Learning Support Services has added a referendum to increase their fee to \$12 to expand their services, and there is an SUA constitutional amendment.

Chair Lardinois then addressed the course lecture and availability survey. For the past five years, SUA has put out a survey asking undergraduates for their perspectives on course availability. Once collected, the data from this year's survey will be compiled into a report and submitted to the Academic Senate.

### **7. Report of the Graduate Student Association President**

GSA Co-President Jennifer Teschler began with the GSA's comments on the Envision UCSC project. She reported that the GSA is concerned that the plan is vague, lacks direction, and does not put specific action items in place to support graduate students. Specifically, the GSA noted that the unspecific bullet points under "Student Success" fail to make meaningful distinctions between undergraduate and graduate experience, and they ultimately fall short of addressing the issues currently impacting graduate student life.

The graduate-specific goals that are promised under "Student Success" articulate only the most obvious objectives. By not providing more specific goals, the plan overlooks some of the more important issues that students are facing, and it fails to outline the obstacles that hinder student success.

While the importance of improving staff morale is prioritized in the plan, the GSA is concerned that the absence of any commitment to overcoming structural obstacles minimizes the hardships experienced by graduate students. This omission suggests an unwillingness on behalf of the administration to respond to an environment that is already not ideal for graduate student success.

The GSA recommends several modifications to Envision UCSC. A plan should be included for locating sources and structures for sustainable financing of research in departments who cannot or do not receive outside funding. There should also be a study plan that allows for the timely completion of degrees. This could be done by analyzing the best practices of other schools in the UC system, such as UC Irvine, whose model includes guaranteed funding packages for the duration of normative time-to-degree. It is also recommended to include an initiative that would work toward raising the quality of student life through affordable housing, food, and transportation.

The GSA noted that there was nothing in the plan that addressed other obstacles such as discrimination, micro aggression, ageism, sexism, and sexual orientation discrimination. One possible action to help remedy this would be to prioritize the hiring of faculty that would support these demographics within the student population. This would also have to include a

reassessment of the current hiring practice, which marginalizes adjunct professors and the undergraduate students and graduate students who will soon be in those same positions. The campus should also develop and reward good teaching in both faculty and teaching assistants, and work toward smaller class sizes to give greater attention to student needs.

Currently, underrepresented graduate students are feeling aggression from undergraduate students, and faculty have reported that they feel unprepared with respect to this issue. As such, the GSA recommend that the discrimination and harassment of minority students at UCSC be addressed. Concrete actions and goals for improving the campus climate for minority students needs to be a priority. The GSA has had productive discussions on this topic and are working toward specific suggestions for steps to support underrepresented graduates, including the implementation of trainings and workshops for students and faculty, and the institution of a GSR that works with the ODEI office and the graduate study body.

**8. Petitions of Students (none)**

**9. Unfinished Business (none)**

**10. University and Faculty Welfare**

**11. New Business**

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

ATTEST:  
Junko Ito  
Secretary

March 16, 2015