

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
April 22, 2015

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, April 22, 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 February 18, 2015 were approved as written by voice vote.

2. Announcements (none)

- a. Chair Brenneis
- b. Chancellor Blumenthal
- c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

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 Educational Policy

i. Amendments to Senate Regulations 9 and 10 (AS/SCP/1783)

Committee Chair John Tamkun presented the amendments, explaining that currently at UCSC instructors can issue grades ranging from A+ to F. There is no minus option for a C grade, and grades lower than C cannot be modified by either a minus or a plus. He clarified that a grade of D or better confers academic credit, but will not earn credit towards the major or fulfill GE requirements, and also will not satisfy prerequisites. A GPA of 2.0 (a C grade) or better is required for major, GE, and prerequisite credit. A 2.0 GPA is also required in order to maintain eligibility for financial aid. For graduation eligibility, a student must earn at least 180 credits while maintaining a GPA of at least 2.0.

With the exception of UC San Diego, UCSC is currently the only campus in the UC system that does not allow C-, D+, or D- grades. This decision was explained by CEP when UCSC first adopted the letter-grading system in 2000. The committee stated that "C work by definition is work that is worthy of 2.0 grade points, work that

is of satisfactory quality for graduation from UC, and work that is of sufficient quality to satisfy major requirements and general education requirements. Work below that standard will be graded D.” This meant that for faculty assessing student work, if the work was at a level that would ordinarily be issued a C– grade, that work would instead receive a D grade.

When a student receives a D grade instead of a C–, they are much more likely to repeat the course. Without the possibility of a C– grade, it is also far more difficult to maintain a GPA of 2.0 or higher. This makes it much more likely for a student to lose their financial aid. Students who earn D grades are also less likely to achieve the academic progress necessary in order to graduate. Currently, UCSC issues over 1000 D grades per academic year, making this a significant problem for students on campus.

CEP is proposing to expand UCSC’s grading options to include the full range of grades used at the other UC campuses. This would include the C–, D+, and D– grading options. The C grade would still be the minimum grade required to satisfy, major requirements, GE requirements, and prerequisites. Students will also still earn academic credit for any grade above F.

The floor was opened for questions.

Responding to a question from Professor Ronnie Lipschutz of the politics department, Chair Tamkun reiterated that a C– grade would not confer major credit, and a course would need to be repeated for grade improvement in order for major credit to be received.

Literature professor Chris Connery asked for the committee’s comments on whether or not the C– grade would be a disincentive for students to repeat a course for a better grade.

Chair Tamkun responded that students often repeat courses for the purpose of removing a D grade from their transcripts. However, this is not the case with all students, so it isn’t possible to say whether or not this would be true.

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology professor Pete Raimondi expressed concern that this option may allow faculty to give out a C– grade to students who really deserve a D. This could set students up for failure by giving them credit when they are not prepared to move forward academically.

Chair Tamkun explained that if a student isn’t prepared to move forward, faculty would not be assisting them by giving them a C– when they really deserve a D. These cases would warrant course repetition for grade improvement, which would likely not happen if the higher grade was initially issued. Additionally, there is some confusion among faculty about what type of work is considered to be passing quality and what

is not. If the legislation passes, the committee would try to work with faculty on these issues to help establish criteria for identifying what would qualify as passing work.

The amendments were passed by a show of hands.

b. Graduate Council

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.21 (AS/SCP/1784)

Committee Chair Ken Kletzer explained that the proposed amendments focus on updating and clarifying four areas of the Graduate Council charge - the committee's plenary and advisory authority, the actions and authorities that the Council regularly undertakes, the areas where the Council works with and delegates to the Graduate Division, and the removal of obsolete language. These updates would clarify the charge and make it more consistent with system-wide policies.

The floor was opened for questions.

Sociology professor Debbie Gould asked whether the language regarding graduate academic programs included graduate professional programs. Chair Kletzer confirmed that this was correct.

Physics professor Onuttom Narayan proposed that the language in section 13.21.3 be retained as is, noting that the proposed changes would put this section in conflict with current UCSC bylaws regarding the Committee on Planning and Budget. Section 13.24.3 states that the Committee on Planning and Budget acts for the Santa Cruz division on all proposals for the initiation and abolition of academic programs, and on all proposals for their revision when a change of budget is involved. In its deliberations, the Committee on Planning and Budget works closely with the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Graduate Council, and may call upon them for advice. This indicates that the Graduate Council advises CPB, and the proposed new language makes it sound as though the opposite is true. The current language makes it clear that both CPB and Graduate Council need to approve the programs, whereas the proposed new language does not. Senate Bylaw 330 states that the Graduate Council shall make recommendations to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, and according to procedures adopted by the division concerning qualifications of departments and groups of departments for initiating new programs for graduate degrees, and thus there is no inconsistency in stating that CPB approval be required. Also, in the systemwide compendium, in matters where there are systemwide review of budgetary issues, CCGA and UCPB are given equal status when recommendations go to the Academic Council. Any weakening of the budgetary aspect of academic program reviews, such as that which the new language would propose, would be detrimental to the campus.

Professor Dan Friedman moved that the amendments be referred back to the committee. The motion passed by a show of hands.

The amendments were referred back to the committee for further review.

c. Senate Executive Committee

i. Amendment to Bylaw 14.1 (AS/SCP/1785)

Senate Chair Brenneis explained that the proposed amendment would add the chairs of the Committee on International Education and the Committee on Teaching to the charge as members of the SEC.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

The amendment was approved by a show of hands.

6. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair (none)

7. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)

8. Petitions of Students (none)

9. Unfinished Business (none)

10. University and Faculty Welfare

11. New Business

a. UCSC Administration

i. UC Santa Cruz Silicon Valley Opportunities (AS/SCP/1786)

Chancellor Blumenthal stated that as Chancellor, it is his job to look for opportunities for UCSC to expand its impact, diversity, revenue, and community services. Silicon Valley is an area that is widely watched throughout the world, and being in this area would help UCSC to achieve these goals.

The proposal to allocate fourteen FTE to Silicon Valley-based programs is known as the Silicon Valley Initiative. This initiative is distinct from the UARC contract, which is ending, and is also distinct from the NAMS application, which is currently pending. The Silicon Valley questions that were submitted by faculty fell mostly into five categories – general inquiries about the process of the initiative, concerns that the FTE reserved for this initiative could be better utilized on the main campus, questions regarding faculty deployment and how these programs would align with UCSC's academic plan, concerns about the tech-heavy focus of proposals, and concerns that this initiative will siphon resources away from the main campus.

In regards to the concerns about process, the Administration decided to begin the Silicon Valley initiative. The decision was made to go forward with the request for pre-proposals after consultations with both Senate Leadership and CPB. The pre-proposal request was significantly modified due to these consultations. While this decision was not made in isolation from the Senate, it was a decision made by the Administration who see this project as a one-time opportunity for UCSC to make an impact in that area. After trying for years to build a presence in Silicon Valley, we have concluded that a bolder move is necessary. The use of these 14 FTE in Silicon Valley would be a more significant investment, and could give this initiative more staying power. Other campuses are also anxious to move into that area, making it imperative for UCSC to begin this initiative as soon as possible. Silicon Valley is a region that would offer opportunities to faculty in virtually every field of study, so it is important that the campus take advantage of that.

To the concern that this initiative shifts FTE away from the main campus, it should be noted that after years of unrelenting budget cuts, the campus does have new rebenching resources to use for six years. These funds have been allocated toward approximately 100 FTE. Backfilling every position on campus with these FTE is not practical, as it does not give the campus any opportunity for investment or growth. The campus has already expanded off of the main campus, with locations such as the Marine Science campus and the Lick Observatory. UCSC also has laboratory facilities located at NASA/AMES. Further expansion into Silicon Valley is a natural progression of this growth.

In regards to the issue of faculty deployment, all ladder-rank faculty in Silicon Valley will teach undergraduate courses regularly. Any new hires would be required to align with the priorities of UCSC's departments and divisions. The goal is to build on current successes, and to create new program areas by working with UCSC faculty. As such, the execution of this plan and the allocation of the fourteen FTE will not be top-down.

The concern that the Silicon Valley initiative will be too tech-heavy is also not completely warranted. The request for pre-proposals was open to all areas of focus. Many of the pre-proposals received were tech-focused. The Chancellor expressed disappointment that there were not more pre-proposals from other disciplines. However, there are opportunities in Silicon Valley for all areas of study. Strong tech programs and liberal arts programs are not mutually exclusive or necessarily conflicting. Both types of education have broad bases that require elements from differing areas of study. A strong presence for UCSC in Silicon Valley would reflect these connections and showcase the diversity of campus interests.

To the concern that this initiative is taking resources away from the main campus, the Administration strongly supports the idea that this initiative is right for the campus. UCSC has the opportunity to do something impactful in Silicon Valley, and this opportunity should not be squandered by being overly cautious.

Regardless of whether or not this initiative takes off, the resources set aside for it will not simply be used to backfill positions on campus. Rather, they will be reinvested into a different opportunity for growth at UCSC.

Through the years of budget cuts at UCSC, the Administration has tried to maintain an upward momentum for the campus. In recent years, this trajectory has slowed due to the growing lack of resources. This initiative is an opportunity to add energy to this trajectory. There is also widespread agreement from faculty across campus that UCSC should be more widely recognized for its contributions. The Silicon Valley initiative will give the campus the opportunity to better publicize these contributions and make UCSC more well-known.

EVC Galloway remarked on UCSC's past successes in Silicon Valley, stating that UCSC's University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) has brought the campus approximately \$4 million in revenue per year, along with additional research awards, in the twelve years since its inception. The University Extension provides for continuing and professional education, has a very successful program for H1-B workers and offers a wide range of specific programs with industry partners. University Extension now has approximately 14,000 students and is fiscally sound. The Games and Playable Media Masters Program which started Fall 2014, currently enrolls 22 students. This is a one-year intensive program, and is primarily attracting full-time students. UCSC also has a Senior Design Sponsorship program, where Silicon Valley companies sponsor design projects for teams of senior students. This program gives sponsored students access to the knowledge and expertise that these companies can provide, while simultaneously giving them the opportunity to show these companies their own academic excellence.

To be successful in Silicon Valley, UCSC will need to set aside resources. UCSC will need staff, faculty, and a facility in that area, which will require some form of financial support for this initiative. Currently, this support consists of fourteen FTE. This FTE reserve includes faculty lines as well as funding for administration of programs. Eight pre-proposals were submitted and are now being evaluated by both the Senate and the Administration. Feedback will be provided to the authors of these pre-proposals once these evaluations are complete. Market analysis for the top pre-proposals will also be done to ensure that these programs will be attractive to students and give them adequate opportunities for employment once they graduate. The hiring and proposal submission timelines will also be considered when evaluating the pre-proposals.

Overall, the Silicon Valley initiative would benefit the campus. It would attract more graduate and doctoral students, and it would bring extra funding to the campus for those students. It would also help promote the benefits that UCSC brings to the area.

Senate Chair Brenneis read some of the anonymous questions that were posted to the Senate website -

1. Is it correct that the NAMS proposal is completely separate from the Silicon Valley initiative?

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that this was correct.

2. Rebenching funds are intended for Ph.D. increases, and many of the proposals are primarily for Masters programs. Please clarify how these fit together.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that rebenching is not only used for Ph.D. increases, as it is a reallocation of resources within the UC system. The rebenching agreement included a minimum number of Ph.D. students for each campus to retain. While rebenching funds were allocated to help campuses reach this number, the funds are not absolutely required to be used for this. Nevertheless, UCSC needs to increase its Ph.D. population, and professional Masters programs, such as those that have been proposed for the Silicon Valley initiative, can help support these students.

3. There is a general concern that this initiative would ultimately be a drain on faculty resources that are already stretched very thin. Please comment on this.

EVC Galloway responded that it is correct that if some resources go to the Silicon Valley initiative, they will not be going toward other projects on the main campus. However, UCSC will need a facility in Silicon Valley regardless of whether or not this initiative moves forward. In order to make an impact with campus resources, UCSC needs to put them into a concentrated area. Fourteen FTE is a small percentage of the resources available and would not alleviate all of the issues on the main campus, and as such they would be better utilized in a project that may bring additional revenue to UCSC.

4. When faculty teach Ph.D. students, then the university, the students and faculty all benefit from their research, so the goals of the university and faculty are aligned. When faculty teach Masters in the Silicon Valley, they help the university make money but their positions as professors are demoted to lecturers. Please comment on this.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that the same argument could be made about professional schools throughout the UC system, such as medical schools and business schools, and it would be equally invalid in all of these situations as it would be in Silicon Valley.

5. Please comment on the extent to which departments are allowed to comment on and review proposals for this initiative.

EVC Galloway remarked that if the pre-proposals move forward, they will have to go through the existing proposal process at UCSC and will not be treated differently than any other program proposal.

6. What is faculty jurisdiction in Silicon Valley in terms of the Senate and governance?

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that Silicon Valley is not different from the main campus in terms of jurisdiction, and the Senate would have the same jurisdiction there.

7. Are you prepared to go forward with this project without broad support from UCSC faculty?

Chancellor Blumenthal remarked that while the Administration is receptive to faculty concerns, it is ultimately an administrative decision as to whether or not this project moves forward. The details of this initiative, however, will be decided in full consultation with the Academic Senate.

The floor was opened for questions.

Literature professor Chris Connery asked why UCSC would need a building in Silicon Valley regardless of whether this initiative moved forward. He also commented that Santa Cruz is seen by some as an extension of Silicon Valley, so the campus is already technically in that area. He then asked if there have been any studies that show that physical distance is an inhibiting factor in claiming a presence in Silicon Valley.

EVC Galloway responded that UCSC needs a building in Silicon Valley to house the University Extension, UARC, and the Games and Playable Media Masters program. The faculty for these programs also need a physical building in that area. Building costs in Silicon Valley would not be likely to surpass those of building a space on campus. UCSC is also not well known in Silicon Valley. The campus is competing with other better-known campuses in the area, such as UC Berkeley and the University of Santa Clara, and having a physical presence could help UCSC become more well-known. This would also help to encourage partnerships and collaborations with industry leaders and policymakers in Silicon Valley.

Chancellor Blumenthal remarked that the building UCSC currently occupies in Silicon Valley is a rental. He also stated that having a physical presence in Silicon Valley does make a difference for the campus. The University Extension in Santa Cruz was closed due to lack of demand, whereas the University Extension in Silicon Valley has almost as many students as UCSC has on its main campus. The campus needs to expand to areas where there is demand for its services, and currently this demand is coming from Silicon Valley.

History professor Gail Hershatter asked what this initiative would cost under various scenarios, what revenue this initiative would bring to the campus, and what programs or other necessities are being set aside so their resources can go toward the Silicon Valley project.

EVC Galloway responded that the actual costs of the project cannot be determined until the pre-proposals are analyzed and the needs for each program are specified. The decisions as to whether or not each program will go forward will partly be made based on costs. Return to investment is not something that is always looked at when discussing new programs because there cannot be certainty where these projections are made. Instead, a program's benefits are analyzed based on aspects such as academic and intellectual benefits for students, and whether or not a certain program would align with UCSC's academic mission. However, the Silicon Valley initiative will bring money back to the campus through financial aid packets that the campus will then be able to use to support doctoral students.

Chancellor Blumenthal commented that in recent years, UCSC's budget has been flat. This coming year and in years to come, the budget will be in a deficit, even with the 4% state funding increases and with the tuition increases that were approved at the Regents office. It will thus be important to look at possible alternate revenue sources, such as the Silicon Valley initiative.

Computational Media Chair Michael Mateas commented that the Computational Media Department runs the Games and Playable Media Masters program in Silicon Valley. There have been many benefits from being in that area, but there have also been some difficulties. However, the difficulties are similar to those that any new program would face regardless of location. One benefit of this program is that it has encouraged collaboration between Ph.D. research students and professional Masters students. Each of these groups of students benefit from the knowledge and experience that the other group brings. The reasons for hosting this program in Silicon Valley are twofold. One is to be closer to significant leaders and players in the gaming industry, which allows students and faculty to have more opportunities for collaboration and access to professional expertise. Second, there is no space for this program on the main campus. It should also be noted that if the Silicon Valley initiative moves forward, it needs to be fully supported by the campus, as half-hearted efforts will not likely succeed in that area.

Games and Playable Media Masters program Director Brenda Romero commented that one of the difficulties for the Games and Playable Media Masters program is that students are charged for programs and fees that they don't have access to because they aren't on the main campus. Students and faculty also feel cut off from the sense of community experienced on the main campus. There are no student services, such as healthcare, career assistance, disability resources, etc.

for this program at the Silicon Valley facility. There is also no housing for faculty or students in that area, and the campus itself is somewhat empty aside from the UCSC students and faculty working in the program. UCSC needs to improve the student and faculty experience in Silicon Valley in order for this initiative to succeed.

Politics Chair Ronnie Lipschutz commented that UCSC needs to be sure that it has the resources to support any new initiative during the initial stages while it is losing money, as all new initiatives usually do. He then asked where the resources to support Silicon Valley would come from. He also commented that faculty would like to see a business plan before this initiative moves forward. He then introduced a resolution:

“Whereas; the UC Santa Cruz administration proposes to establish a presence in Silicon Valley, including a commitment of faculty FTE

And whereas; the Senate Executive Committee criticized the academic plan for this venture on December 17, 2013, calling for "a clearly articulated vision for what UCSC is striving to accomplish" and "a business plan that allows us to assess the benefits and opportunity costs",

And whereas; the Administration has failed to provide such a business plan,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate

CALLS on the Administration to provide a business plan for UCSC’s Silicon Valley venture that a) provides evidence demonstrating that it will be self-sufficient or revenue generating, and details the estimated time and costs required to reach this state; or if it is not presumed to be self-sufficient or revenue generating, then b) documents the resources needed, the resultant opportunity costs, and benefits to campus academic programs.

ADVISES all Senate committees to refrain from endorsing UCSC's growth in Silicon Valley until such a business plan has been discussed as an agenda item in a meeting of the Division.

REQUESTS the UCSC Administration not to commit permanent resources such as faculty FTE to Silicon Valley until Senate consultation in the manner outlined above has occurred.”

The motion was seconded and the floor opened for debate.

Speaking for the motion:
Meghan Thomas
Onuttom Narayan

Speaking Against the motion:
Brent Haddad
Faye Crosby

Debbie Gould
Regina Langhout
Chris Connery
Megan Moodie
Ruby Rich

Marilyn Walker
Yi Zhang

Comments on the motion:

Julia Zatyko (Stevenson Student Representative)
Susan Gillman

Alison Galloway
George Blumenthal

Points for the motion:

Faculty are also being told that this initiative would be a way to address some of the current funding issues on campus, and if this is the case, faculty need to understand how this would be true, what the risks involved would be, and when the return to investment would likely be seen.

This resolution does not take a stand either for or against activities in Silicon Valley. Faculty have been told that the status of this initiative is still pending, but have also been told that fourteen FTE have been committed to the project. Faculty are concerned that these FTE have been committed before the projects and programs associated with it have been decided upon. The resolution asks for clarification on these inconsistencies and also asks for specification as to the roles of both the divisions and the Senate in regards to decision-making. The Senate should be able to express an informed opinion before the Administration goes forward with the Silicon Valley initiative.

One of the main points in favor of the Silicon Valley initiative is that it would be revenue-generating for the campus. If there were a business plan that showed this as well as the costs and how the campus plans on addressing student and faculty support issues in that area, it is likely that more faculty would support this project.

The Senate should not be asked to support an essentially piecemeal plan without a clearly articulated vision. This is what the Administration is asking for, as was the case when this same issue was brought up in 2013, and this is what the resolution opposes.

The resolution is not asking that the initiative show that it is revenue-generating or self-sufficient, it is only asking for a plan that articulates whether or not this is true. What this resolution states is that there is a need for further Senate consultation after a business plan is put forth.

Points against the motion:

While faculty can advise the Administration on how they think campus resources should be used, it is ultimately the Administration's job to make the final decisions regarding these resources.

It is not just a business plan that is needed for this initiative. There also needs to be a broader discussion on the project itself. This initiative is not a start-up project, as the word "venture" in the resolution would suggest. The initiative involves research, expansion of graduate degrees, and more. There are also many committees that could provide input on this project without the need for a business plan. Also, other programs that were approved for the campus were not required to show a positive return to investment for UCSC, so it doesn't make sense to put the Silicon Valley initiative under such scrutiny.

There is no benefit to shutting down all conversation in regards to this initiative until a business plan is produced. All of the pre-proposals were submitted under the idea that a full proposal with a budget plan would need to be submitted later on. Discussion around the initiative should be open in the meantime, and the resolution would stop these discussions from happening.

The Silicon Valley initiative is not just a business matter. The intellectual merit of the plan must also be considered. In addition to a business plan, the Senate also needs to know about the academic and intellectual potential in Silicon Valley. This need is not articulated in the resolution.

Comments on the motion:

It is too early to create a business plan. Pre-proposals have only just been submitted, and a more concrete business plan cannot be created until decisions have been made as to which of the proposals will be going forward. Once the pre-proposals have been thoroughly analyzed, a business plan will be created for the initiative. It would be otherwise irresponsible to move the initiative forward without a business plan.

Students are concerned that the business plan won't contain measures to ensure that the revenue from the initiative will go toward improving the quality of graduate and undergraduate student life. Once a business plan has been put together, students would like to see it detail how revenue from the initiative would be reinvested into graduate and undergraduate education.

Students are also concerned that while there is no solid business plan yet, there are still discussions happening as if this initiative will definitely be moving forward.

The planning for Silicon Valley seems like it is being done in isolation from plans for graduate growth on campus. In addition to a clearly articulated business plan, more collaboration on these two fronts needs to happen.

The Academic Senate has always been consulted on issues regarding what is happening on campus, and will continue to be consulted on these matters, including the Silicon Valley initiative as a more thorough business plan is created.

Even without a business plan, it was necessary to reserve FTE for this project while pre-proposals were being submitted. Once decisions are made on these proposals, it will be necessary to have resources set aside for the ones that go forward. This is why the fourteen FTE were designated for this initiative. The entire process for this will take time, but it will be done in full consultation with the Senate.

A motion to table the resolution was proposed and seconded. The motion failed by a show of hands.

The resolution passed by a show of hands.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ATTEST:
Junko Ito
Secretary

May 12, 2015