

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
 Wednesday, May 22, 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, May 22, 2024, via Zoom. Senate Chair Patty Gallagher, Professor of Performance, Play & Design, called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm. 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. The meeting would be run in conformance with the system-wide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction's recommendations to restrict the use of chat. This will ensure that virtual meetings are conducted in a manner that promotes organized discourse and decision making in line with established parliamentary procedures. The raised-hand feature would be used to queue for the floor and to address the Senate.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

- a. No edits had been submitted for the March 13, 2024, minutes. Chair Gallagher asked if there were any corrections from the floor. Hearing none, Secretary Deborah Gould accepted the meeting minutes of March 13, 2024, 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

Soon after students erected the encampment in the Quarry Plaza on May 1, CP/EVC Kletzer and I began discussing with some of our team members how we might approach reaching a mutually agreeable resolution that would include a voluntary disbanding of the encampment. In response to the students' demands, our focus was not to reiterate the many reasons why we could not address their demands as proposed, but instead to affirm positive actions we could take.

Together, we developed a mutually agreed upon set of guidelines to govern our discussions and engaged in dialogue with students during the week of May 6th. During that week there was productive and what we felt was genuine dialogue. Unfortunately, on Friday, May 10th, the students rejected our proposal and posted on social media that our discussions were over. The ideas that we put forth remain a viable option should the encampment students choose that path.

Our response to the encampment has been to prioritize and support the safety of the students in the encampment and everyone else in our campus community. The campus fire marshal inspects the

encampment area daily. Initially, student demonstrators were somewhat responsive in addressing the most immediate safety concerns, such as maintaining a pathway through the encampment wide enough to allow emergency access and keeping staircases unobstructed. During the last week or so in its Quarry Plaza location, compliance with the recommendations of the fire marshal became more uneven, and that is deeply troubling because of the very real safety concerns raised.

On Monday the encampment moved to an area near the Barn Theater adjacent to the busy intersection at the entrance of our campus leaving behind a heavily graffitied and damaged Quarry Plaza. The fire marshal is continuing daily safety checks of the encampment at its new location and so far, the encampment has been mostly cooperative with their safety directives. Beyond fire, this new location adjacent to a busy public roadway presents a very different and even more concerning set of safety issues.

I am also deeply concerned about the ways in which others have tried to divide our campus community. There are many who want to undermine higher education by restricting our freedoms and they have increasingly been emboldened. It is all too easy to imagine, as we have already seen in other states, a national political climate in which universities are ordered to disband one or more of our student cultural resource centers or our Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. It is critical that our campus comes together in unity to fight against such attacks against our values and members of our community, regardless of whether we agree or disagree with the underlying politics driving the attack.

In the past few weeks there have been calls on social media for the university to end our relationships with Hillel and groups like the Koret Foundation. Hillel provides a supportive environment for students at UC Santa Cruz, similar to our campus-based cultural resource centers, and we are grateful for that collaboration. A grant from the Koret Foundation has been an important component of our student success efforts by providing financial support for our College Scholars program, including scholarships available to students from all backgrounds. Faced with such criticism about the ways in which we support our students, for me - there is only one response. We must reject such calls as a false narrative designed to divide our community and instead band together in unity.

There have also been recent threats related to collaborations with Israeli universities and against researchers who receive funding from U.S. defense department agencies. Academic freedom is a critical pillar of our campus and of the UC system and threats to the academic freedom of one group can only serve to undermine the broad rights all of our faculty enjoy. In case some of you are not aware, UC Santa Cruz does not allow classified research, which would be required for weapons research. Knowing the agency that provides the funding for a research project tells you nothing about the work, which might include studies that protect marine mammals from ship strikes or finding ways to advance human health. It is all too easy to imagine a future in which there are calls to stop funding of research on historically marginalized groups or to halt grants, like the HSI grants our campus receives, that support student success. Again, I call on you to reject this false narrative designed to divide our community and come together in support of the academic freedom of your colleagues, because that is the only response consistent with our collective values and, because we do not know who among us may be targeted next.

Budget update

State 2024-25 Budget. The State is facing the largest ever single-year budget shortfall for 2024-25. In the Governor's May Revision, the total budget shortfall grew by \$7 billion from the \$38 billion projected in his January Budget. With a portion of the 2024-25 deficit addressed by the early action budget, the May Revision is now solving a \$27.6 billion budget gap. The Governor is also projecting a \$28.4 billion deficit for 2025-26. To address this unprecedented challenge the

Governor is proposing additional reductions to State agency budgets, including the University of California.

The Governor's May Revision proposes a 7.9 percent base budget reduction for most state agencies beginning in 2024-25. By comparison, the 2024-25 reduction to the UC budget is more modest - a 2.9 percent cut of \$137 million, which includes a net decrease of \$12 million in ongoing funding and a \$125 million one-time base budget reduction. Although Compact restoration may be provided in 2025-26, a 7.9 percent cut is also proposed to impact UC in 2025-26. These cuts, though painful, are not unique to the University and reflect the difficult decisions the State is facing while trying to solve a major budget deficit.

Campus budget outlook

As I shared at the March Division meeting, like the state, our campus also has a projected 2023-2024 budget gap of \$96 million that we are working to address by slowing the pace of filling currently open positions, and reducing discretionary spending in areas like travel and contracts that use core funds. We are also 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 principal officers to do the same. We are exploring the return of uncommitted carryforward funds to help close our accumulated core funds deficit, but as these are one-time funds, carryforward returns are not sufficient to sustainably reduce spending to bring it in line with revenues.

As we look ahead to 2024-25, we need to take actions that address our structural deficit, which is created by ongoing spending that exceeds ongoing revenues. Principal officers have provided plans as part of the budget development process that reflect various levels of initial spending reductions. These plans are being reviewed by the budget advisory committee that will make recommendations to the CP/EVC and me. Following analysis of these recommendations, I hope to be able to release the final decisions about the 2024-25 budget, including reductions, in late June or early July.

It will likely take several years to bring our expenditures and revenues into alignment. Beginning this summer, we will work to generate and refine annual budget projections through 2029-30, noting the underlying assumptions so the projections can be adjusted as conditions change. To facilitate planning by campus units, these projections will be used by the budget advisory committee to recommend a multi-year approach. This recommended approach will be shared with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, whose Chair sits on the budget advisory committee. We are committed to transparency and will regularly share budget information with the campus through a variety of means including through presentations, webinars and through a new budget website (<https://foa.ucsc.edu/budget-updates/>).

Budget deficits arise when our spending outpaces the campus's revenues. To focus on the revenue side of that equation, we have established a revenue augmentation Task force to develop ideas that can increase revenues to the campus. While some of these ideas may involve new opportunities, we should also double down on tried-and-true opportunities to grow revenues and advance our mission. Summer session exemplifies this opportunity.

Summer Session Update.

I have spoken to you before about the importance of summer session to our campus, so I am pleased to provide you with a status update on summer enrollment courtesy of VPDUE Richard Hughey. Based on comparison to the same date last year, enrollment is on the rise, with currently 18% enrollment growth, possibly reaching up to 20%. We are anticipating an increase of 250 FTE students compared to the same date last year. If this trend continues, we could realize revenue growth in the range of \$6 to \$8 million through a combination of state funding, tuition, student fees and increased housing and dining revenues.

While summer session revenue is important in helping the campus deliver the curriculum and student support services so vital to student success, the big win is in what summer session enrollment means for our students. Summer courses, especially those offered online, help students meet prerequisite and graduation requirements, reducing their time to degree and the cost of their education, from wherever they may be located.

Thanks to Richard Hughey, for his leadership, and the efforts of the whole summer session team, led by Director Jennifer Gallacher. Summer session's success is a great example of one of UC Santa Cruz's biggest strengths - our collegial relationships and facility in collaborating across offices, departments and colleges, global learning, admissions, financial aid, registrar, housing, and beyond.

Part of summer's success is due to the continuation of the Pay for Only 10 program introduced last year which allows students to take more classes but pay for only the first 10 credits of tuition. And despite all the FAFSA challenges this year, our financial aid director, Lorena Rodriguez, was able to adjust the summer grants and awards to help our students take advantage of our summer programs.

We are also seeing greater interest in the First Year and Transfer Edge programs. These summer edge programs give new students a head start on their coursework and ease the transition to UCSC through mentoring and the opportunity to establish relationships with instructors and other students during the relative calm of summer.

The most important driver for summer session enrollment is the availability of a suite of courses that students want or need to take in the modalities that meet their needs, like online courses for the many students who return home for the summer. I am especially grateful to our Teaching and Learning Center, the Senate Committee on Courses and Instruction (CCI) and summer session for their support for the development of new online courses.

Finally, for courses that are oversubscribed in fall, winter, and spring, summer offerings can provide a relief valve giving students the access to the courses they need to make progress toward their academic goals. I'd like to give a special shout out to the Department of Computer Science and Engineering for offering a more comprehensive summer curriculum and the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry for their efforts to identify a new Organic Chemistry Instructor, successful just days before summer enrollment opened.

Housing news

We continue in our efforts to deliver 40 percent more student housing by 2030. We have a number of projects underway or in the planning stages that will help us achieve ambitious goal, including Kresge phase 2, the Hagar family student housing and childcare project, our collaboration with Cabrillo College on a development that will house students for both our campuses, and the Heller development that will ultimately provide on-campus apartments for nearly 3000 UC Santa Cruz students.

The latest addition to our list of housing projects is a 161-unit apartment complex on Santa Cruz's Westside along Delaware Avenue that would serve up to 400 upper-division undergraduates and 62 employees. This project will be built by a developer as the first phase of a larger planned development that spans 20 acres. The Delaware development is within walking distance of retail and restaurants and just a ten-minute walk to three separate metro bus stops on routes that serve our main campus. A segment of the Coastal Rail Trail is directly adjacent to the Project site linking it to our Westside Research Park which is served by our campus shuttle loop.

Because of changes to the project since it was initially permitted, the developer sought the additional approvals needed from the Santa Cruz City Council, and I am very grateful for the Council's approval in their April 30 open meeting.

We are very excited that our Delaware project was approved last week by the Board of Regents at their May meeting, allowing this project to move forward. We are working now with the project owner on an aggressive project schedule with construction beginning in fall 2024 with delivery of the full project as soon as fall 2026.

Campaign update

Though we have challenges with the state and campus budgets that all of us are working through, we must not lose sight of the big picture and the need to push our university forward. Universities that remain future focused throughout difficult budget periods and use that time to develop a positive vision of what can be, find themselves well prepared to take advantage of better times when they arrive. Our Leading the Change strategic plan gives us a road map that can help to guide our shared efforts toward our campus goals.

We also have a tremendous opportunity to pave the way for the future of UC Santa Cruz as we work toward our next comprehensive fundraising campaign, which we expect to launch publicly in late 2025. Campaigns galvanize and inspire donors to raise their gift sights; strengthen the university's visibility and recognition; achieve new, higher, sustainable levels of financial support; and articulate why support for the university is important and how it can transform us.

This quiet phase is critical as we lay the foundation for a successful public campaign. We have expanded our regional and national engagement and programs including an INSPIRE series with alumni, parents and donors that highlights the inspirational work of our faculty across a range of interdisciplinary topics. This spring we held INSPIRE events in Los Angeles (on human health) and San Francisco (on AI), with another scheduled for the end of May in San Diego (on climate change resilience). We are working now on plans for six INSPIRE events next year with venues in California and across the country.

We have also provided advancement workshops for principal officers and a number of faculty, and we are engaging in conversations with many of the University's friends and supporters. During the course of these preliminary conversations, a number of potential Big Ideas have been suggested. These transformational gift possibilities include a policy institute (perhaps focused in the environmental space), a center to support experiential or transformative learning, and a four-year Honors program. As I am out in the community, over the past couple of years I have frequently been approached by folks who mention the healthcare challenges so many of us face and, increasingly, people ask about whether UC Santa Cruz should think about a future medical school or other health-focused programs that could help address the Central Coast's healthcare challenges. Certainly at this stage, these are all simply ideas.

Next academic year, we will begin honoring the 60th anniversary of the founding of UC Santa Cruz. This will be a perfect time to honor our past and recognize our future aspirations. At that time, we will invite our campus community to suggest ideas for the campaign including through a website.

Informed by our strategic plan, our campus goals, and with these new ideas in hand, we will identify the themes for the campaign effort. The campaign is intended to serve as a backdrop to conversations with donors and friends of the university in an effort to increase support across the campus. Keep in mind that every gift to the university is important, valued, and will count in the campaign. We imagine this campaign will go through 2030.

Finally, I would like to share with you some news about our new childcare center which we plan to open in the 2025-26 academic year. The design of the new center includes three adjacent play yards for preschool, two-year-olds and toddlers which we plan to name for Professor emerita Catherine Cooper. Catherine was a driving force for the design of the new childcare center and the

importance of including outdoor classrooms where children can learn through play. We are working to raise \$100,000 for this naming gift, which will go towards equipping the playgrounds. We have already secured pledges for more than half that amount, and welcome additional donations to the [Catherine Cooper Play Yard Fund](#) from her many friends and colleagues. What a meaningful and lasting way to acknowledge Catherine's many contributions to UC Santa Cruz, to education throughout our region, and to her field.

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:

At every meeting over the past few years, I have acknowledged that we are meeting again in difficult, anguishing, heartbreaking and fearful times.

I grieve and despair at the horrendous loss of life in Gaza. I firmly believe that the humanitarian crisis in Gaza must be addressed by the Israeli government facilitating not restricting the flow of food, water, medical supplies and fuel into Gaza. I also firmly believe that Hamas must free the remaining hostages taken during their devastating attack on Israel on October 7, and I join others in calling for an immediate and lasting ceasefire.

Academic freedom

At the Fall '23 Senate meeting, I talked about academic freedom, with a focus on teaching. Academic freedom and research are on my mind now, although I don't want to imply that there is a strict boundary between academic freedom in teaching and academic freedom in research. Both are exercised within professional competence and expertise. Academic freedom in teaching is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom; academic freedom in research is the freedom to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression and to publish the results of such work without interference from political figures, boards of trustees, donors or other entities.

Nationally and locally, recently we have heard calls against research funding that may be associated with military contractors or units in the Department of Defense. People have released lists of faculty who receive DoD related funding for basic and applied research. Blanket statements and demands to end any and all research funded by DoD units is not only misguided, but it also vilifies research that addresses climate change, strengthens biodiversity, advances our understanding of seismology, improves water quality, and it violates academic freedom. We live in a time when acquiescing to one violation of academic freedom in research strengthens the hand of those who will be coming for others' academic freedom.

UAW Strike

We are now in day three of the UAW 4811 strike. This is a systemwide strike where the UAW is calling up campuses to strike and our campus is the first and at this time the only campus called up to strike. The University of California [disagrees with the union's position and views this work stoppage as unlawful and in violation of the clear terms of the collective bargaining agreements](#) between the parties, which prohibits strikes, work stoppages, and any other concerted activities that interfere directly or indirectly with University operations during the life of the current collective bargaining agreements.

On Friday May 17 the University of California [filed an Unfair Labor Practice \(ULP\) with the state Public Employment Relations Board](#), asking the state to order UAW 4811 and its bargaining unit members to cease and desist strike activity. Yesterday, the University of California filed with PERB

for injunctive relief, requesting that PERB seek a court order enjoining UAW 4811 from engaging in strike activity.

UC and UC Santa Cruz both have a long tradition of respecting the civil expression of individual views. Individual graduate student employees are free to exercise their rights so long as such participation does not conflict or interfere with their work responsibilities and does not violate university policies.

With a strike, our primary goal is to minimize the disruptive impact, especially given the many educational and research disruptions that have affected students and researchers in recent years. Academic and operational continuity is essential to the University of California's education and research mission and a core responsibility to our students.

There are many points of disagreement about this strike. There is, however, one point where there is considerable agreement and that is that whether the strike is unlawful or lawful, workers are not entitled to pay for work not performed. The UAW 4811 website is very clear on this point, which is a fundamental one for the history of labor strikes. If any employee does not report to work as assigned, UC will presume - absent prior authorization or medical certification - that their work absence during a strike period is strike related. The employee's pay will be reduced for absences during the strike unless the employee is on authorized leave, making it critical that attendance is tracked and absences are reported accurately. Absences for labor withheld due to the strike should be reported as "leave without pay" in time and attendance systems. Instructors of Record, Principal Investigators, Chairs, Deans, and others with leave recording oversight duties should monitor and review all leave recording submissions to make sure they are accurate. The UAW 4811 website counsels that too—that striking workers accurately report their time struck. If leave recording submissions are not accurate, leave recording should be updated to align with the work performed. A communication has been sent by Systemwide Labor Relations to ASEs, GSRs, Postdocs, and Academic Researchers notifying them of the process for reporting any unexcused absences, and their obligation to report their absences accurately.

A few words about this week's remote instruction. We made these decisions working collaboratively with senate leadership and Chairs Cuthbert and Fisher and I am grateful to them for our discussions. We all know these modality switches are difficult. We sought to make decisions that provide predictability at an uncertain time.

Our decision on Monday to switch to remote instruction, first for that day and subsequently for Tuesday and Wednesday, and now Thursday and Friday, was driven by the intentionally intermittent access disruptions created by protestors at and inside our main and west entrances in the early morning hours of Monday and continuing into the afternoon through road closures at the main entrance intersection. We had no prior plans to switch to remote instruction. Switching to remote instruction was a mitigation to address the blocked campus entrances on Monday by the confluence of pro-Palestine student protestors and UAW picketers. We also sought to de-escalate confrontations with student protestors such as the classroom and academic event disruptions that occurred last week. Similarly, the decision to lock most academic buildings - to de-escalate. All these decisions have costs - there is no one solution that doesn't inconvenience or impose workload.

I have no obvious place to place this comment. As many know, the encampment that was in Quarry Plaza has relocated to the base of campus. I invite you to take a walk-through Quarry Plaza to take in for yourselves the extensive graffiti and damage left by the campers.

Senate faculty recruiting update:

Arts Division, 7 acceptances (and 1 in formal process completion); 6 were hired under the auspices of the UCOP Advancing Faculty Diversity grant and 2 are the first hires in the first online major in the UC system: Creative Technologies.

Baskin Engineering, 6 acceptances; 4 at accepted informal offer stage; 2 open negotiations

Humanities, 6 accepted offers; 2 extended offers and 1 in preparation.

PBSci, of 9 senate faculty searches, 3 offers accepted, 3 in negotiation, 1 in process

Social Sciences, 6 accepted; 1 declined; one in final offer stages (offer in process now).

Faculty accolades

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Robert Irion, and Beth Shapiro have been named 2023 fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

AAAS recognized Beth Shapiro, professor of ecology and evolutionary biology, for “distinguished contributions towards the understanding of how species and populations evolve, and for the ability to communicate science to the public.”

Robert Irion, director emeritus of UC Santa Cruz’s science communication master’s degree program, was honored for his “distinguished contributions to the development of professional science writers, both in the academic setting and through professional societies, and for excellence in popular communication of astronomy.”

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, distinguished research professor emerita of anthropology, was recognized for “distinguished contributions to the field of anthropological archaeology, particularly zooarchaeology as it relates to the origins and spread of pastoralism, and for professional leadership and undergraduate student mentoring.” Diane, long considered a prominent leader in zooarchaeology whose research has become foundational to the field, was also elected a National Academy of Sciences member.

Distinguished Professor of Computer Science and Jack Baskin Chair of Computer Engineering Lise Getoor, Professor Emerita of Literature and Creative Writing Karen Tei Yamashita, and Professor Emerita of Latin American and Latino Studies Patricia Zavella were elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, one of the nation’s oldest and most prestigious honorary societies.

Zavella taught in the Latin American and Latino Studies Department and is an anthropologist by training. Zavella was an early leader in the study of intersectionality for working Chicanas. Her research focuses on topics like reproductive justice, poverty, transnational migration and feminism.

Getoor holds the Jack Baskin Endowed Chair in Computer Engineering. Her research is in the areas of machine learning, artificial intelligence, and probabilistic reasoning – making decisions in situations of uncertainty.

Yamashita is a highly acclaimed writer. Her many recognitions include a 2021 Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Book Foundation. She has been a US Artists Ford Foundation Fellow and co-holder of the University of California Presidential Chair for Feminist & Critical Race & Ethnic Studies.

I conclude on a sad note - our colleague David Draper, professor of statistics, passed away on May 8, 2024. I encourage you to read the In Memoriam note on the news page of our website. May David’s memory be a blessing.

Chair Gallagher then opened the floor for questions.

Jamie Hindery, Undergraduate Representative on the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) was given the floor and began by thanking Chancellor Larive for not calling the police or having the police come onto campus. They stated that this was recognized and appreciated, and then clarified that the encampment did not choose to end negotiations, but that the Administration said that language could not continue to change on their end. On Friday morning the encampment made a counteroffer and were told that no progress would be made on that. The encampment told the media that negotiations had failed when informed by the administration that they would not continue crafting language. They then referred to the Chancellor's statement that by 2030 we're hoping to have 40% more housing, curious as to what the expected enrollment growth would be by 2030, as UCSC is currently over capacity. They asked how a 40% increase would be viewed against the continuously increasing enrollment.

Chancellor Larive replied that it is complicated and that they are trying very hard not to increase enrollment, but to keep it more or less steady until we can bring more housing online. The admissions team is doing a great job managing the offers and enrollment. They don't have enrollment targets yet for 2030. These are worked on with the system and the State legislature to try to match the funding from the State, as well as the demands from the enrollment of students around the State. They envision a very modest enrollment growth, though she has no idea what will happen in 2030. The goal is not to build housing and fill every bed. UCSC will likely need some enrollment growth, because that's the direction that the legislature and the Governor want the State to move. There is information nationally that the number of students graduating high school and moving on to college will be going down, starting in about 2025. All she can provide presently is an explanation of the direction of their approach.

Megan Thomas, Associate Professor of Politics and COT member was then given the floor, saying that over the weekend she shared in advance with her students that, given the strike was beginning on Monday, they had the option of attending Tuesday's class by zoom if they wanted to. On Monday at 6pm instructors were told to pivot classes to remote instruction. However, that message indicated that there were some exceptions, including classes in which the instructor had previously made alternate arrangements and communicated with students. She took this to be herself, and on Tuesday showed up to her classroom along with a third of her students and was surprised that they were locked out of the classroom. So, they sat on the lawn outside the classroom and tried to connect to the other students by Zoom, which was clearly not ideal. On Monday, the chairs of CEP and GC sent a memo and she quoted from it: *Instructors are best situated to know how to adjust their curriculum to challenges, and as such we will not presume to give wide-ranging specific directions on how to adjust classes. We are authorizing emergency remote modes of instruction as an option for all spring quarter 2024 courses until such time as campus access is reasonably predictable.* As it was her understanding that they were authorizing the remote instruction option at the discretion of the instructor, she asked if remote instruction would continue until the end of the quarter or if it would indeed be left to instructors' discretion as stipulated in the CEP/GC memo. CPEVC Kletzer answered that she has been working with Senate leadership, CEP and GC chairs so that when there is an emergent or emergency need to adopt remote instruction, the administration can proceed. This was the background for the declaration about Monday's instruction, which extended to Tuesday and Wednesday and now to Thursday and Friday. She acknowledged the existence of the memos that underscore a longstanding instructor discretion over a choice of modality. Because the administration couldn't predict open access to the campus, they declared that instruction would be remote; she believes that students then expect instruction will be remote. She acknowledged and regretted the inconvenience caused to Professor Thomas and others who wanted to be in their classrooms, whether to record a lecture or for some other reason, explaining again why they had done it.

Andrew Fisher, Distinguished Professor of Earth & Planetary Sciences and Chair of the Graduate Council (GC) took the floor and commented that in the letter that he and Chair Cuthbert prepared, they authorized emergency remote access or emergency remote modes of instruction for spring quarter until such time as campus is reasonably accessible. This is a fairly vague statement; it's hard to tell when access will be predictable and when there may be blockage. The intent though, was to have a policy that could carry forward for the next few weeks without having to put out a new memo every day. This leaves some flexibility to answer the question. They did not discuss whether people should go remote for the whole quarter and can't predict if that would be necessary. The memo was to be used as a framing for making that determination for instruction according to whether people can get to campus or not, whether buildings are accessible, and that sort of thing.

Christine Hong, Professor of Literature, was given the floor and said that she was raising an issue involving faculty welfare, DEI, academic freedom, and the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid. She stated that she had been appointed by the UC to work on Area H. Ethnic Studies. And that this work placed her in the position of being harassed by faculty and organizations on campus. There was no recourse for her and the others who are appointed to do this work, others who have suffered far greater harm, including loss of work if they were lecturers. She said that Area H, the requirement in ethnic studies, is a new matriculation and has been made out to be a boogeyman. She spoke in 2023 to COC and asked them about best practices and the logic behind appointment of senate faculty to committees. She asked COC how people are appointed to committees and if there could be flexibility in meeting times to include, for example, CRES faculty who had a conflicting standing meeting. She learned that the committees have divisional representation, which she does not feel should be the primary way of understanding diversity for the Academic Senate. All five divisions are represented, and they try not to have two people from the same department on a committee. However, she pointed out that on CAFA, which this year weighed in on area H, there have been two economists for the past three years. This past year no CRES faculty member was consulted about Area H, which, she stated, has been bedeviled by anti-ethnic studies forces both within and outside the institution. It strikes her that best practices when it comes to curricular policy change must involve subject area experts. She asked if this is a process that needs to be addressed and if best practices need to be spelled out. She stated that the Senate skews whiter than the faculty body, the faculty skews whiter than the student body, and the Senate skews STEMmer than the faculty. She stated that this is a structural problem and that there is need for a conversation that involves CODEI, CFW and other parts of the Senate.

Chair Gallagher mentioned that she had been at UCOP that day, where there had been discussion about Area H and the need for bringing in subject experts. She then called Dean Mathiowetz, Associate Professor of Politics and Committee on Committees (COC) to the floor.

Chair Mathiowetz thanked Professor Hong and then reiterated that COC prioritizes broad divisional representation, and this year closely addressed the issue of multiple members from one department on Senate committees. This is reflected in the roster that will come forward for approval later. The roster is the outcome of a lengthy process in which, through COC's search for committee members, they often find a situation which will sound familiar to many people, especially women and people of color. COC seeks their participation on committees, while many others are also seeking their participation. The service requests that go to women and faculty of color are numerous. They are overburdened by service, and so they sometimes need to say no to COC, who then continues their search. He shared that this was a little bit of insight into COC's process, as well as a little bit of the larger structural issues that affect the outcome of the Senate committees. COC alone can't make that change. What we do need, over time, are many, many more faculty of color, and many, many more women faculty on this campus in order to bring that balance to where it needs to be.

Susan Gillman, Distinguished Professor of Literature and Co-Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) was given the floor and returned to the point Professor Thomas had brought up and that she had quoted the joint CEP/GC letter. Because information was not well communicated to the campus as a whole, in the effort to provide something predictable for the campus, unintentional chaos was created. Remote modality was declared, but the option was not left up to instructors. She believes that what the Senate is both hoping for and endorsing is in the service of predictability, and that there is still time to ensure that option is available to instructors.

Deborah Gould, Professor and Chair of the Sociology department and Senate Secretary stated that she was in a recent Senate meeting where the question came up whether this was the first time that the campus had preemptively moved to remote instruction and whether this is what we should be expecting from here on out. She has been in many meetings where it seems that there is quite a good solution to the desire for predictability on the one hand, and the reality of faculty having purview over how they mount the curriculum on the other. It seems that faculty should be given discretion. They can be urged to move to remote instruction under conditions of uncertainty, and those who want predictability can move to remote. However, faculty who don't want to do that, who don't like teaching on Zoom and who want to meet their students in the classroom if the campus is accessible, should have the right to do so. It's their purview. She thinks that we can create a policy with clarity that would ensure that instruction remains at faculty's discretion. Professor Gould asked if faculty are to expect that the campus will preemptively move to remote, even when not yet inaccessible. She suggested that this should not be the practice and that faculty should maintain discretion on instruction.

CPEVC Kletzer agreed that they could all benefit from coming together and thinking through what they will do when access to the campus becomes uncertain. Administration did not create the chaos that happened when people couldn't get on campus on Monday, when it was unknown whether and how campus would be open for access. The call for remote was—and should always be—motivated by the fact that access to campus is not possible. Thus, they should move to remote instruction if access to campus is uncertain. If it is uncertain, the most predictable of the choices is to go remote. She said that instructors who want to exercise some authority over modality will also need to recognize that students may have an expectation about remote instruction when the message goes out from the campus.

Chair Gallagher stated that at the UCOP meeting there was discussion about this same sort of disclarity around consultation structures and policies for guiding remote instruction. It's been unclear at all levels. She knew this conversation was coming today, and that we would come out with a more acute sense of what we need to figure out and how we need to figure it out on both sides together. She was grateful to hear that some of the things surfacing are regarding instructor discretion and access. We have not finished figuring out these decisions in this shifting moment. It was incredibly difficult to make the correct decision and some things were lost in the translation. They made the decision reluctantly, grudgingly, and after long conversation together. She stated that they had work to do for faculty, and from the Senate side, they also hear and acknowledge the difficulties.

Kathy Foley, Distinguished Professor of Performance, Play & Design and Chair of the Committee on Emeriti Relations (CER) rose to a point of personal privilege and proposed the following resolution:

Be it Resolved:

That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate would like to express its deep gratitude to Professor Patty Gallagher, who has once again just shown her ability to respond civilly and gracefully in times of turmoil and to the X factor that being within the University of California implies. She's shown her leadership as Senate Chair over the past two years. Patty Gallagher is a

stand-out leader of the Academic Senate, taking only two years off from Senate service since 2005. Patty started her Senate service with Career Advising, Graduate Council, and the Committee on Planning and Budget. She helmed the Divisional Committee on Committees and chaired the systemwide Committee on Committees thereafter.

She has served the campus as representative to the Academic Assembly, Academic Council, as Vice-Chair, and now as Divisional Chair. This latest set of roles overlap with seeing the campus' through the COVID-19 pandemic, responding to the "MeToo" movement through our Beyond Compliance efforts, and in forging a path given emerging challenges to higher education.

Chair Gallagher leads her peers with poise, an unshakable desire for equity, and disarming charm.

When Patty first relocated to the Bay Area, I and an Indian colleague created a performance on the women of the Theosophical Society. I played Madam Blavatsky and Patty was Annie Besant, the early 20th century crusader for the 8-hour day, women's rights, birth control, the first President of the Indian National Congress, and designer and sewer of the first Indian national flag while imprisoned in Ooty for agitating for Indian Home Rule. During a rehearsal break, Patty moaned that the gargantuan woman we were playing "changed the world before lunch," while we were mere mortals peeping out beneath the legs of gargantuan Colossi.

Yet, in saying yes to Senate work, and chairing the Academic Senate, she has repeatedly revealed her inner Annie Besant. She uses her gift of improvisation and shows us how useful clown-training can be—the clown is, after all, the one who gets slapped yet rises gracefully from the chaos. Patty Gallagher has shown that not only can she portray Annie Besant, Susan B. Anthony, and do a one-woman Trojan Wars. She can out-zoom Covid, make space for divergent views in the occasional mosh pit of a Senate meeting, and can show wisdom, civility, with the gift of laughter and all of the features that good shared governance and our university reality demand.

Chair Gallagher has been a champion for the Senate, and has many times related to colleagues and new hires how her personal experience serving on Senate committees has been the portal through which she has forged interdivisional friendships among the faculty and become deeply educated about the campus we all love.

For this service, the Senate thanks Professor Patty Gallagher. I propose we vote by acclamation. I hope to see your applause on video and using zoom-emojis.

Chair Gallagher responded that she was so grateful and so humbled by this. She thanked the Senate for their faith in her. She then moved on to the Reports of Standing Committees.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

- a. Committee on Academic Personnel, Annual Report Addendum 2022-23 (AS/SCP/2087)

As there were no questions or concerns about the report, it was accepted as submitted.

- b. Committee on Committees, Carol Freeman Senate Service Award 2023-24 (AS/SCP/2088)

COC Chair Mathiowetz was given the floor and acknowledged that it was a great day to celebrate amazing leaders in the Senate. He announced that the COC was proud to nominate Professor of Literature Kimberly Lau for the Carol Freeman Award for leadership in the Academic Senate. The Carol Freeman award is the UC Santa Cruz campus award for outstanding mid-career Senate service, and in choosing Professor Lau for this award, the committee noted her extensive service

record and her exemplary leadership style. As an esteemed Senate leader once said about Professor Lau, she has helped engineer a sea change in the culture of university service. Under her leadership, the awareness of and respect for shared governance has risen greatly. She inspires and mentors Senate members toward proactive and rigorous engagement with complex university issues, and she models a deeply respectful manner of partnering with our colleagues and campus administration. We've rarely seen anybody get as much work done with as light a touch as hers. Her piercing intellect, broad perspective, compassion and wit make her a peerless leader, a tireless faculty advocate, and a generous mentor. Professor Lau's service has spanned a wide array of committee and service types, including—and most notably: two years as Vice Chair and two years as Chair of the Senate; nine years on the Senate Executive Committee; and many other appointments spanning almost every committee, both at divisional and system-wide levels. Professor Lau co-chaired the Beyond Compliance working group when she was vice chair and chair of the Academic Senate and demonstrated immensely important leadership in establishing that group. As another notable accomplishment, Professor Lau was the Co-Chair of the most recent 2040 Long Range Development planning committee, and in her work on that she made social justice central to the committee's planning process. For example, she invited the chairman of the Amah Mutsun tribal band to come and educate the committee about local indigenous land use and management, including historical practices on the land now occupied by the University. These are just a couple of examples of the many things that could be said about Kim Lau's amazing leadership. The Academic Senate enthusiastically thanks Professor Lau for her willingness to show up, to contribute, and to lead through practically continuous service. Aside from one Sabbatical year taken, she has served every year since 2010 and every quarter since then. He invited the division to accept the nomination of Professor Kimberly Lau for the Carol Freeman award by zoom acclamation.

Professor Lau was given the floor and thanked the Senate, giving the following remarks: Thank you so much for that extremely generous, perhaps exaggerated, set of comments. I feel like I've cut in line here, as there are clearly many people deserving of this award. My most meaningful service experiences have been with the Senate, and I thank all of you that I've worked with. My favorite thing about Senate service is getting to work with colleagues across the campus, all doing our part in shared governance and ensuring that shared governance remains a key principle and value on our campus.

Chair Gallagher acknowledged the Senate's hearty acclamation of the COC's nomination.

c. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture, Annual Report 2023-24 (AS/SCP/2089)

Barbara Rogoff, Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL) took the floor and reported that the committee enthusiastically nominates Natalie Batalha, Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, as the 2024-25 faculty research lecturer. Professor Batalha's research reveals the universe to us, helping us better understand Earth's origins and the possible future. Her research includes the detection and characterization of exoplanets and the study of exoplanet demographics. With the launch of the James Webb Space Telescope. Professor Batalha has been leading international collaborations of hundreds of scientists to investigate what these exoplanets are composed of and how they formed. These are groundbreaking observations. and her work has been reported to the Congress. She testified to Congress on the success of the JWST Mission, to update lawmakers on some of the results. Professor Batalha has received numerous awards, among which: she's been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, she's been awarded the University of California Presidential Chair and elected as a Legacy Fellow of the American Astronomical Society. She currently serves as the director of the UCSC Astrobiology Initiative, with its goal of understanding the development of life through the intersecting areas of astronomy, chemistry, biology and beyond. In recognition of these efforts,

Professor Batalha was awarded as PI a \$5M NASA Interdisciplinary Consortia for Astrobiology Research program in 2021. A dedicated campus community member, she has participated in many campus events, including hosting the wonderful April 2022 interdisciplinary event: *The Universe in Verse*, which brought together scientists, poets, and artists for a celebration of cosmos. In honor of her significant research contributions, resulting in many publications, media appearances, grants, and awards; we are proud to nominate our esteemed colleague to present her research to the University and to the larger community as faculty research lecturer. We look forward to her lecture bringing the scope of her research to our campus and local community.

The nomination was approved by acclamation and Chair Gallagher congratulated Professor Batalha.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Report of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees – Senate Committee Roster 2024-25 (AS/SCP/2090)

COC Chair Mathiowetz presented the Senate committee roster for 2024-25 for approval, noting several highlighted names, which were additions since the roster sent with the call. He expressed gratitude to all who responded and agreed to serve, whether out of recognition of the high value of the work or a simple sense of duty. He stated that although the roster was mostly complete, and despite the ceaseless efforts of the COC, there were still critical vacancies on several committees, notably GC, CEP, and CPB. He referred back to his earlier comments about the importance of diversity to the functioning of the Senate and the structural factors that affect how that diversity shows up on the roster.

As there were no questions from the floor, a vote was taken by Zoom poll and the COC Roster was approved.

b. Committee on Courses of Instruction – Undergraduate TA Approval Policy (AS/SCP/2091)

Amanda Rysling, Assistant Professor of Linguistics and Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) presented information on the new CCI policy for approving undergraduate TAs, beginning AY 24-25. She stated that the change was prompted by a 66% increase in undergraduate TA requests this year from last and she didn't anticipate that trend changing anytime soon. Departments usually reach for the lever of appointing an undergraduate TA when they cannot find a graduate TA; in fact, they must attest to having tried before they can appoint an undergraduate TA. Given the difficulties in finding graduate TAs for various reasons, CCI wanted to make sure that the TA approval policy was clarified. In crafting this policy, CCI went through multiple rounds of consultation with—and is very grateful to—the Committee on Teaching, the Committee on Educational Policy, Graduate Council, and the Academic Personnel Office. To highlight what is changing: CCI found that some plurality of undergraduate TA requests did not include a mention of the academic preparedness of the proposed TA. This now is explicitly asked for. They also noted that undergraduate TAs, unlike graduate TAs, had not before this been required to complete the Teaching as an Ethical Practice: A Guide for Teaching Assistants (TA Ethics) course, which is an online course that takes approximately 8 hours to complete. TAs are paid for their time to complete the course. This requirement will bring undergraduate TAs into parity with graduate TAs and allow them to come into their roles at least that much more informed. She also noted that mention of academic preparedness is not necessarily due to a grade earned in the specific course that someone will TA, but it can be that the instructor utilizing the TA deems the undergrad to have gained that preparedness. These changes will be reflected in the undergraduate TA request form and the CCI website following the meeting.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for discussion.

Marcia Ochoa, Associate Professor of Performance, Play and Design, asked about the distinction between undergraduate TAs and Undergraduate Course Assistants. At Oakes College they have a system by which undergraduates serve as Course Assistants, which are quite different from TAs. She wanted to know if there is any overlap or if these should now be called TAs. Course Assistants do not grade; they facilitate conversations and are available to students who want to talk about the core course texts and find their way.

Chair Rysling replied that Course Assistants are not overseen by CCI and that she can't speak about the requirements for appointing them. Their work and employment status are different, so if an undergrad is wanted to do the full duties of a TA, come to CCI and if something less than that, this role is approved elsewhere.

Jody Greene, Associate Campus Provost for Academic Success, commended CCI for bringing this forward and for making sure that our undergraduate TAs have access to the ethics course. ACP Greene hoped that this would be the beginning of a conversation and not the end of it, stating they've worked hard for nine years to make sure that graduate teaching assistants have pedagogical preparation. The ethical preparation of the 8-hour online course is not the pedagogical preparation that is given in each department and discipline for graduate student TAs, thus they anticipate some unevenness in the preparation of the TAs. We will see more undergrad TAs, in part because of the shifting needs of the campus in terms of its instructional support workforce, but if faculty are heavily using undergraduate TAs, there is a need to figure out how to include them in some further pedagogical support beyond just the ethical 8-hour course.

Chair Rysling stated that she was grateful for that comment and the opportunity to add something that didn't make it into the policy but is a worthwhile consideration. This was something that CCI felt they couldn't legislate, which is how to prepare undergrads when they can't even tell faculty how to prepare their grads. Corresponding agencies have that discretion. One thing that CCI thought about including was some kind of encouragement to consider, for example, drawing from LSS tutors those who have had previous pedagogical support and experience and who may be slightly more prepared to manage discussion sessions. There was a lot of discussion among the consultations with CEP, GC and APO about identifying, supporting and preparing appropriate undergrads which did not make it into the policy.

c. Committee on Emeriti Relations –Senate In Memoriam 2023-24 (AS/SCP/2092)

CER Chair Foley was given the floor and presented the Senate In Memoriam, listing the names of recently deceased colleagues who were Senate members at the time of death. While a brief presentation with photos of these colleagues was displayed, the Senate was asked to join together in a moment of silence. Deepest condolences were extended to their families, colleagues, and friends.

Chair Gallagher thanked Chair Foley for helping the Senate remember and memorialize these colleagues, stating, “May their memories be a blessing.”

d. Committee on Faculty Welfare – Oral Report – Annual Faculty Salary Analysis

Alexander Sher, Professor of Physics and Chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) took the floor to present the committee's current version of the faculty salary analysis, using the most recent data available, which was from 2022. This yearly analysis is conducted with the purpose of assessing the effects of the special salary practice (SSP), introduced in 2008 with the goal of making UCSC salaries equitable relative to those of other campuses. Slides were presented detailing Relative Difference in Median Salary Between UCSC and 9 Campuses for REG and BEE.

Chair Gallagher opened the floor for discussion.

Laura Giuliano, Professor of Economics and Chair of Admissions & Financial Aid (CAFA) asked about why the associate rank is different.

Chair Sher responded that in his understanding people stay at the associate level longer on our campus before progressing to full professor, which contributes to this problem.

Regina Langhout, Professor of Psychology was given the floor, appreciating that CFW drew attention to the salary equity practice which Santa Cruz Faculty Association (SCFA) did a lot of work on, and asked if the committee will continue to request that equity practice in the future.

Chair Sher replied that this was a one-time program that occurred and as far as he knew, there is no plan to do it again. At the same time, there is work happening to develop an ongoing salary equity program, which would be continued over time. This is not yet established, though the administration is working in consultation with the Senate. He also took this opportunity to note that we do not know how successful or not this one-time equity program was. Measuring it is not easy. In order to inform campus about what we want to do in the future, it would behoove us to figure out how successful this program was; perhaps APO would be willing to do that.

Luca de Alfaro, Professor of Computer Science and Engineering took the floor and asked if there would be a salary adjustment for inflation this year, as in the previous year.

Chair Sher referred to a recent email that campus should expect a 4% increase this year, stating he didn't know if that was guaranteed.

Professor Lau was given the floor, and speaking to Professor Langhout's point, reported that SCFA had just met with APO and Labor Relations. The Administration has agreed with SCFA's recommendation to have a regular salary equity review of the sort that was done in 2020 or 2022. They have agreed to that in lieu of an individual salary equity process. This increases equity across the board and removes the complicated pressures on individuals, departments, Deans, CAP and up to make determinations about salary. She stated that this will, in an ongoing way, be good for everybody, and that SCFA is very pleased.

CPEVC Kletzer was given the floor and thanked Professor Lau for summarizing their agreement. She also noted that the funding of a salary equity program must be conditional. The CPEVC then pointed out to Chair Sher that the data shared doesn't reflect the most recent salary equity program, which was much more recent, in 2023. Lastly, she stated that there is a 4.2% range adjustment mandated by the office of the President, which will be to scale and to the off scale, which means that it includes our above scale faculty. This has been introduced over the last few months as being conditional on the budget environment. It is their expectation that this will move forward and is important for retention, for morale and for recruiting. She asked if the CFW study could be updated to use the most recent and complete faculty salary data.

Chair Sher replied that he believed that 2022 is when this one-time equity increase was implemented, which is the year that was shown. This is also the latest data that CFW has for all of UC.

7. **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:

Hi, everybody! I am here discussing similar pressing matters; this will be my last Academic Senate meeting. Seven months have passed since the fall quarter Academic Senate meeting. Within this time, students and workers have expressed their free speech through protest, walkouts, encampments, etc. Students have also continued to suffer through food insecurities, homelessness, academic repression,

and lack of safe transportation. But today I am also honored to share space with Kyle Vergara, Vice Chair of the Student Union Governance Board (SUGB), who will be speaking to you on a critical issue that students are experiencing.

Kyle Vergara, VC SUGB, then took the floor and provided the following remarks. I'm here to talk to you a little bit about Transportation & Parking Services (TAPS) today. TAPS has been an issue that students are contentious on, to say the least, for the past few years, and has consistently been a problem; an opinion poll run by SUGB last year confirms this. SUGB began to write a referendum for the ballot in the spring elections this year that would be an amendment to the current transportation fee that students pay, as response to the crisis that students have been facing. This was a fee amendment to ensure TAPS could not recklessly use 10 million in student funds without student consultation. Current consultation (ACCTP, focus groups) is not sufficient and not acted on. The measure had the endorsement and consultation of the SUA, GSA, all 10 College Senates, Big 5 Organizations, Student Media Council, Engaging Education Board of Directors, and CADrc Board of Directors, among others. This got sent to UCOP, changes were made to ensure everything was above board, so as to not challenge delegations of authority and to be in compliance fully with PACAOS. UCOP asked for TAPS and Campus Legal Counsel feedback out of turn, and their feedback stripped everything substantive from this measure. SUGB sent the measure back, rejecting these edits without legal or policy basis, and then UCOP never got back to us, preventing us from running this measure at all. This is a violation of university policy, a violation of fair elections process, and a violation of student trust. SUGB is now running an opinion poll describing what happened to the campus and to gather feedback and endorsements for a letter to campus to sit down, figure out why this violation happened, and how we move forward. I come today to share this information and to ask for support from and engage the Academic Senate as part of this conversation, as TAPS's operations not only negatively impact students but staff and faculty.

SUA VPAA Sanchez Toscano took the floor and added the following remarks: As you can see, we are living in the style of environment where we can see what UC's priorities are. It's visibly not students, because of the lack of prioritizing students—not only within our campus, but across the UC system. Students and workers have been expressing their free speech through protests, walkouts, encampments, etc. However, in the process there have been words such as discipline being used to try to incite fear in students. This is truly showing the Administration's true colors regarding peaceful movements that involve our money, which pays for salaries. What needs to be considered is why students are doing this, which is a calling for investment in the student body and not companies benefiting from genocide. Throughout decades, student movements and student collectivity have accomplished changes in universities. Students deserve the right to truly express themselves without academic repression. I created a petition to protect students from academic repression, and over 1,000 UCSC students agreed that students should be protected. This petition was added to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) agenda on May 15th. Unfortunately, there is only so much CEP can do, which is where the Academic Senate as a whole comes in. This is why the SUA officers are in support of these actions by students and workers, including the United Auto Workers union Local 4811 strike that began on May twentieth. If the university wants us to academically succeed, it must take all of our barriers into consideration. I encourage all of you to do the same, and intentionally listen to the reasoning of why all of this is happening on our campus. If you feel tired of watching students fight for what they believe in, imagine how students feel, constantly being neglected. I call upon all of you to reflect and be considerate about everything that is preventing us from succeeding academically, emotionally, and physically, because it most certainly did not start with the encampment that is happening right now. Contemplate the current state of this institution and your choices to censor and discipline students. Our students must be protected against academic repression and administration must be held to the same standards of discipline that students are held to. It was an honor to serve as a representative for the undergraduate students here at UC Santa Cruz. I certainly won't be the last student to challenge you all. I leave you with the quote from Assata Shakur that guides student leaders

in difficult times: “It is our duty to fight for our freedom. It is our duty to win. We must love and support one another. We have nothing to lose but our chains.” Don't be responsible for shackling more students and help us be free. Thank you.

Jamie Hindery, Undergraduate Representative on the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) was given the floor and presented these remarks: It's a very important issue that the SUGB has been working on so hard all year, and it's frustrating to see the student voice channeled through institutional channels. The UC is clearly choosing not to prioritize students right now, and students are clearly seeing that. This will also be my sixth and last academic Senate meeting and it's the first time that 3 undergraduates have spoken at a single meeting. This speaks to the energy that students across our system have and the discontent that we feel with our campus—and more specifically—system wide administration. From my perspective it is the Regents and UCOP who are destroying all our campuses and sowing division between administration, faculty, and students (graduate students and undergrads alike). The Regents and the University Office of the President are intentionally dividing our campus to protect themselves. I call on everybody here in this meeting to find ways to work across the lines, for the betterment of the people in this community. The Regents and UCOP are not our community. We are the University of California at Santa Cruz. and that means undergraduates. That means graduate students. That means staff who do all kinds of labor, which really is the backbone of this institution. It means faculty. It means Administrators. We as a group are the community, and it deeply saddens me in my last quarter to see all of us fighting against each other when we really should be finding the willingness to be uncomfortable, which is what it will take to build difficult unity and to challenge oppression and repression. I love the Academic Senate and have enjoyed being a part of it. I think you are all fierce advocates for knowledge, for the institution of higher education, and for your students. It's sad when it all falls apart in the face of antagonism on the part of all of our bosses. We are all workers, and we are all oppressed. We will not win until we realize that.

Chair Gallagher did not take any more comments, saying that she preferred to just let the three student voices resonate with the Senate.

8. **Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)**
9. **Petitions of the Students (none)**
10. **Unfinished Business (none)**
11. **University and Faculty Welfare**
12. **New Business**

Chair Gallagher announced that there was an item of new business and called Ben Carson, Professor of Music, and Laurie Palmer, Professor of Art to take the floor and provide framing marks regarding the *Resolution Against Police Deployment Against Student Demonstrations*. Professor Palmer explained that the resolution was being brought forward by some SCFA members, as well as other concerned faculty. They are acutely aware that bringing police onto campus to address political demonstrations does not make the campus safer but leads to violence and long-term damage to our community relations. Professor Carson stated that the resolution was being brought in the context of their appreciation for the fact that this campus has had the longest running encampment, and that the university has not brought in the police. They echo the appreciation of that expressed earlier in the meeting, and appreciate the labor of staff and administration, whose work is tireless and exceptionally challenged in these circumstances, to keep us safe without police intervention.

They then read aloud the following resolution:

Be it Resolved: that the UC Santa Cruz Senate Faculty calls on our Administration to refrain from bringing police to campus to break up, disperse, or arrest participants in the Gaza Solidarity Encampment or related demonstrations. Painful lessons from campuses across the country, including at UCLA, UC Irvine, and UC San Diego, have shown clearly that bringing police force to bear on political demonstrations has led to increased violence, and considerable harm to members of our

community. Political protest is a valued tradition at the University of California, and the protection of this freedom, and of the health and well-being of members of our community, is all of our responsibility. We call on our administrators to commit to peace and dialogue when engaging with demonstrators, and to refrain from bringing armed law enforcement personnel to demonstration sites.

Professor Palmer stated that there are already over 140 signatures and that they hope the resolution will be brought to a vote by the Senate.

The floor was opened for questions and Marisol Lebron, Associate Professor of Feminist Studies voiced her support for the resolution, stating that she is a scholar of policing and studies contemporary policing. In her research, she constantly sees that bringing the police in on these situations causes greater violence. Having studied the police intervention used during the strikes at the University of Puerto Rico, it was seen that this led to incredible student distrust, which has still not been repaired in the ensuing decades. She also encouraged campus administration to exercise extreme caution with the ways in which they discuss the protests on campus and the students that are engaging in protest. Much of the language about chaos, destruction and graffiti are all forms of language used to discredit the protests and distract from the messaging and the demands of the protesters. These are also meant to instill fear in both students, faculty and staff. As someone who has been at the encampment and who has brought her 2-year-old daughter repeatedly to the encampment, she has never felt safer around our students. She has only been impressed with the behavior, respect, dedication and passion of the students. This discourse that these are destructive actions, and that we should be locking up our valuables are all pretext to justifying police violence. She voiced again support for this resolution, and also asked all of campus, but especially administration, to please exercise extreme caution with the ways in which they discuss these protests and the student's engagement in these protests.

Associate Professor Megan Thomas was given the floor and spoke in favor of the resolution, stating that she's been teaching at UCSC for 20 years and has seen that on more than one occasion when police are called in, it often goes horribly wrong in ways that she hopes the administrators did not intend. In the most recent example of this, students were quite hurt physically, and it does nothing to move us forward with goodwill. Like others, she appreciates that we haven't seen that response on this campus in the past 21 days and hopes that we can continue to not be like UCLA in this one moment. There are many times when we wish we were more like UCLA, but let's cling to this one wonderful moment when we are not like UCLA.

Felicity Schaeffer, Professor of Feminist Studies took the floor to register support for this resolution, saying it's important for us to say that our campus hasn't brought in police repression and violence against our students, but the constant referral to the encampment and the strike in negative language, claiming these acts of peaceful protest as illegal is a constant reminder that there is the threat of police repression and violence. That's part of the context of violence and unsafety that our students are immersed within, while they watch the ease with which other campuses bring in such brutal responses to freedom of speech. This freedom we have constantly identified is something that we value and respect as a campus. She encouraged faculty to visit the encampment, and note the quality of the speakers, the education taking place, and the camaraderie and coming together of students. The students are likely learning more than in many of the classes that they've taken at UCSC. They are learning about surviving and living together, things they may not have ever learned otherwise. This is an incredibly moving space and without need of police intervention.

Professor Carson then stated that this resolution was a collaborative effort, and expressed appreciation for the articulate support heard, all of which is in the spirit of our collaborations with extraordinary student activists. This resolution was written and designed to be focused on the issue of opposing

police action and therefore also to unify us. It was written in a spirit of unifying campus across a wide variety of potential perspectives on the issues at hand.

Professor Hong was given the floor, echoing that the encampment has been an incredible creation of a peoples' university, with many people coming to share their knowledge. One of those was a parent of one of the encamped students, who both posted on social media and published an article. He is faculty at a local university, and he himself came from a family that lost members in the holocaust and subsequently settled in Palestine and participated in the Nakba and the mass expulsion of Palestinians from their homeland. He stated, "For the first time in my life my daughter and the thousands of others engaged in the campus uprisings are showing us a way to end Israel's occupation. They are learning the successes and limits of the anti-apartheid movement in the seventies and eighties, that for some governments, universities, and corporations to divest from South Africa, beginning in 1963, cultural boycotts, embargos, and sanctions on arms and oil and sanctions by the UN and two dozen countries had to cut off all business from South Africa. Likewise, this is what they're showing us as possible right now. They're recalling that as a historical example." He called upon this administration not to deploy police violence against his child and the children of many other parents who are watching very closely what this administration is going to do.

Chair Gallagher asked that all would hang on to that idea of possibility, the idea of the way that Santa Cruz is doing this differently from other campuses. This way that we are engaging in community is, to some degree and in many ways, improving our community, and we hope to continue that. She stated that this legislation requires a vote, which will be distributed by electronic ballot following the meeting.

Chair Gallagher expressed gratitude to the Senate and as there was no other new business, adjourned the meeting at 4:54 pm.

ATTEST: Deborah Gould, Secretary