

**MINUTES**

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
Wednesday, February 19, 2020 at 2:30 p.m.  
Stevenson Event Center

**Meeting**

A regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 19th, at the Stevenson Event Center. Chair Kimberly Lau called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. with Vice Chair David Brundage serving as Parliamentarian. Chair Lau reminded the audience regarding privilege of the floor guidelines.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

a. Chair Lau noted two submitted corrections to the November 15, 2019 Senate meeting Minutes. The first correction was the spelling of CFW Chair McGuire's name, the second was a rephrasing of "reading week" to "reading period." There were no other proposed changes from the floor. A motion to approve the minutes was made and the motion passed by a show of hands, the Minutes were accepted.

**2. Announcements****a. Chair Kimberly Lau**

Chair Lau dispensed with making any remarks, and invited the Chancellor to speak.

**b. Chancellor Cynthia Larive**

The Chancellor thanked Chair Lau and Senate Members for the opportunity to address them. The Chancellor observed that her hope had been to bring forward initiatives and actions to solidify our status as a research leader, promote student success, streamline our organizations, and to cultivate an inclusive campus climate. Instead, we will be discussing strikes, policing, discipline, and behavior that is undermining the very mission of our campus.

In Santa Cruz we have an ongoing housing crisis, which preceded the Chancellor's appointment and has been an issue for the community of Santa Cruz for some time. The Chancellor noted that some data shows rents increasing by 1 percent, other data shows prices have gone down; additionally striking workers have seen a 3 percent increase in salary, per their negotiated contract. Suddenly, a group of graduate students are demanding an almost 60 percent increase in their pay. The Chancellor suggested that the timing of the strike was in response to new administration leadership. The chancellor acknowledged the current housing crisis in Santa Cruz. Rental prices are high and housing stock is low. Housing here is some of the most expensive in the UC system, yet UC Santa Cruz offers some of the lowest number of on campus graduate student housing units. The Chancellor's team had already been working to explore both short- and long-term solutions to address this crisis. In early-December programs were being considered to provide housing relief. But then graduate students chose, without warning, to strike — to withhold grades from vulnerable undergraduate students.

The Chancellor noted that this action is unsanctioned and not approved by the union. Wildcat strikes by their very nature undermine worker protections. Any quick win would come at the expense of every single union worker, not just on our campus but throughout the UC system by undermining the very foundation of collective bargaining. As President Napolitano made eminently clear last week, this is a step that neither she nor the Chancellor are prepared to take. The Chancellor clarified her position that she cannot and will not take action to open a negotiated systemwide contract, but would help provide relief through two new programs that commit the campus to dedicate \$7 million annually to help alleviate graduate student housing frustrations.

The first is a program that guarantees five-years of support for new and continuing doctoral students with a minimum level of support equivalent to that of a 50 percent teaching assistantship. The same level of support is being offered to our MFA students for two years.

The second, until more graduate student housing becomes available, provides an annual housing supplement of \$2,500 for doctoral and MFA students offered through a partnership between the Financial Aid Office and the Graduate Division.

Taken together, these programs provide doctoral and MFA students with greater financial security and a predictability that has been missing.

The Chancellor emphasized that graduate students contribute significantly to the success of UC Santa Cruz. We have graduate students across the campus who continue to help educate our undergraduates. These strikers are not representative of the majority of our graduate students by any means, but are, instead, a committed, vocal group. The Chancellor's team has met with graduate student leaders — not in the context of our labor contract but as students. To date the Chancellor's team has met four times with student leaders.

Regarding the police response to the strikes, it is not her preference to spend the limited budget on a large police presence on campus, however the Chancellor felt duty bound to provide a safe environment for our students, our community, and protestors — to ensure that we protect free expression while protecting our community as they attend classes, and on-campus residents have the ability to go to doctors' appointments, and take their children to school. Chancellor Larive mentioned that she is committed to our students, to our community and to our mission. Finding solutions to the challenges that we face requires partnership, creative thinking, and commitment.

The Chancellor announced that she, iCPEVC Lori Kletzer and Graduate Dean Quentin Williams, in consultation with the Graduate Council, have agreed to establish a working group that will develop an actionable plan for strengthening graduate education. The Chancellor also announced the creation of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Graduate Education — a standing group of graduate students and faculty representatives charged with examining and making recommendations related to graduate-student support.

To conclude her remarks, the Chancellor restated that she was deeply committed to UC Santa Cruz and that there are great things that can be accomplished together, inviting the Senate to join her in these future endeavors. The Chancellor yielded the floor to iCPEVC Kletzer.

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

To open her remarks iCPEVC Kletzer expressed her gratitude for Chair Lau and the Senate Leadership's consultation and communication throughout the strike. The ongoing grade and teaching strike requires the close attention of the administration and senate, despite the desire to work on previously identified campus priorities. Individual faculty and some administrators may disagree about tactics and the best approach to handling this strike, but the iCPEVC recognizes that all parties see that the motivating issues of housing hardship are real and felt by many. She stressed that everyone agrees that TAs are integral to the teaching and the research enterprises of the university. The iCPEVC has also heard from many students, and some parents, that they are concerned instruction is compromised during this strike. Difficulties with off-campus classes where transportation is limited, or with online classes with poor internet connections, have been reported. The iCPEVC stressed that this is a difficult moment, and thanked the staff of the registrar's office and advisors for their help in mitigating the impact of the strike on undergraduates where possible.

Regarding the google form emailed on February 7th, the iCPEVC stressed that this was intended to provide an outlet for commenting on cancelled classes and sections. The iCPEVC stated that she now recognized that the original form took a step too far in asking about class content. The form was amended and is no longer posted to CANVAS. She also noted that this form was meant to be an option, and was not required. However, the iCPEVC stressed she took responsibility for the google form's over reach.

The iCPEVC acknowledged rents are high and nearly impossible for many. The University's levels of support should and can be changed to reduce some of the financial burden graduate students are facing. She stressed that this can be done, despite underfunding and an over reliance on state funding. However, she also stressed that if

we prioritize graduate student support, we must also consider the opportunity costs of this decisions. If this is a priority, we will need to determine other activities that may be let go. As President Napalitano's letter from February 14th makes clear, there will be no reopening of the closed collective bargaining contract and no side agreement for UC Santa Cruz. A sentiment agreed to by Vice Provost Michael Brown during his conversation with the campus department chairs.

Finally, in words shared with graduate students, the iCPEVC stressed that this dispute is ours to solve. Full resolution of the housing crisis will take years; however, the programs introduced in January (representing an estimated cost of 7-8 million dollars, put in context equivalent to 38-43 faculty FTE) are one immediate action being taken to address the housing crisis. The iCPEVC has met with grad students multiple times to explore how a substantive conversation can proceed, but stressed that this can only happen once a pause or cease of the strike occurs. The announcement that graduate students who did not submit grades by February 21st would be dismissed was difficult to make, but this campus must be able to return to teaching. The strike interrupts the lives of undergraduates. The iCPEVC echoed her previous request that faculty encourage TAs to submit grades. The iCPEVC solicited the help of faculty in persuading graduate students to cease strike activities, and stressed that we have to get back to our teaching mission. Protracted disruption means we all lose. The iCPEVC is committed to find a way through this dispute and find common ground where possible.

*Question Period:*

Mayanthi Fernando (Associate Professor, Anthropology Dept.) Asked, regarding disciplinary actions, what incentive do striking graduate students have if there is no guarantee of immunity, even if they turn in grades by Friday? iCPEVC Kletzer responded that if graduate students turn in grades by Friday, they will keep a Spring 2020 appointment. Associate Professor Fernando followed up by asking if disciplinary action will be taken in Winter, or in the future, for having participated in the grading strike? iCPEVC Kletzer confirmed only that those who submit grades by deadline, no action will be taken in Spring. She said that she was unable to comment on future actions past the Spring quarter. Associate Professor Fernando also inquired if the administration would commit to expunging disciplinary letters if grades are submitted by February 21st? iCPEVC Kletzer replied that for deleting grades from CANVAS some students received student conduct summons letters, and that these letters will not be revoked because those letters were specifically for deletion of grades from CANVAS. Finally, Associate Professor Fernando asked would students be reinstated to their positions if they submit fall grades only, or is it also required that they end the work stoppage, how will it be determined when conditions are satisfied? iCPEVC Kletzer stated again that the opportunity to continue Spring appointment requires the submission of grades.

Gail Hershatter (Distinguished Professor of History) followed up on Associate Professor Fernando's questions by asking first if what the rest of Associate Professor Fernando has been asking about (revocation of letters and reinstatement) will be subsequently negotiable. In other words, no matter what action graduate students may take on Friday, will sanctions be set after Friday, or will they remain negotiable thereafter? iCPEVC Kletzer responded that, as letters of warning are the first stage of discipline as outlined by the labor contract terms, those letters of warning will stay in the graduate student's file. Professor Hershatter then stated that it would be helpful to hear where decision making is happening, and asked if UCOP was having substantial input. She also asked where the costs incurred for additional police on campus are coming from, the local budget or UCOP? Chancellor Larive then stepped in to stress that we have the opportunity to solve this conflict with our students. She clarified that UCOP negotiates the systemwide contract with student employees, not individual campuses. She stressed that President Napalitano's letter clearly shows that this system-wide contract will not be reopened. She also clarified that in terms of decision making, moving ahead with the opportunity to have students submit grades (with the understanding those who do not will be dismissed) was made by our campus, in consultation with UCOP. Regarding police presence and costs, the Chancellor stressed that the campus police force is small. She reiterated that for the safety of our students, community, and the protestors we had to augment our small police force with police from other campuses and other jurisdictions. She stressed that these expenses will impact our campus budget.

Karen Bassi (Professor, Literature) spoke to her observations of police action at the picket lines and asked who takes responsibility for the number of heavily armed police at the entrance to campus, which elicited a more intense protestor response? She asked what was the justification for this decision, as in her view the police presence set the tone for the exchange? She also asked about possible future rationale for police presence on campus during protests. Chancellor

Larive responded by affirming it was her decision, and that it was taken to establish a safe environment, and that she felt it was her responsibility to take those steps. She explained that concerns for crowd safety, particularly at the main intersection to campus with constant traffic flow, prompted the police response. She noted one unfortunate incident where a car at the west entrance was completely surrounded by the crowd which was disturbing to children inside the car. The police are there to ask that protestors stay on campus property for traffic safety reasons and to keep the roadways clear.

Elizabeth Abrams (Professor, Writing Program, Chair Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, Provost Merrill College) repeated a question previously asked in the recent Senate Executive Committee meeting: ultimately would TA's who are dismissed in Spring be allowed to teach in the future (if grades were turned in by May for example)? iCPEVC Kletzer advised that if TAs fail to turn in fall grades by the deadline, they will lose their Spring appointments. If Fall grades remain withheld after that, this would enter into any assessment of future employment. She stressed that a great deal is at stake for TAs, departments, and graduate education. Not turning in grades by the deadline can come at great personal and professional cost.

Debbie Gould (Associate Professor, Sociology) stated that she disagreed with the administration's framing of the strike. She observed that it is regular practice to reopen contracts and for side letters to address union contract problems, and that wildcat strikes are an important part of our noble labor history. She noted that History Professor Emeritus Dana Frank wrote a piece about this recently. Associate Professor Gould questioned if the administration had asked UCOP to reopen the contract and if not, why? Associate Professor Gould asserted that UC Santa Cruz is dependent on graduate labor for research and teaching, and many coastal campuses are also facing issues surrounding financial percarity for graduate students. She also noted that as this is a systemic problem, this needs to be resolved at a system level, and recognizing this may alleviate strain between different parties on campus. iCPEVC Kletzer responded that as a labor economist, she agrees, the history of wildcat strikes is an important one; however this circumstance is different. Graduate students come to us first as students, not labor; they are typically not solely supported with TAships, but often also receive GSRs and fellowships. We do have full authority to address them as students. Overall, she noted that graduate students are two years into a four year contract which was voted on and approved. The administration will honor the collective bargaining process that resulted in the contract. For these reasons, the administration has never thought it appropriate to request the contract be reopened, as the administration is pursuing solutions over which they have authority. Regarding system wide efforts, getting better funding for graduate studies is something UCOP is promoting to the state legislature and the regents. Finally, she reiterated that we must also acknowledge when you make decisions to fund something new, something else will go unfunded.

Laurie Palmer (Professor, Art Dept.) contended that this strike is not about a change in leadership, noting it may soon be systemwide, and that it is part of a larger crisis, which is the defunding of the public university. This financial trajectory is the greater risk to undergraduates, more significant than a quarter long strike. This is bigger than business as usual and requires a system wide solution that an activist administration could propose. She asked why our administration was not pushing back against OP in terms of not reopening a contract; what is needed is an approach that does not pit campuses against one another and meets the needs of grad students, undergrads, lecturers and staff. Professor Palmer then asked how departments would mount their programs without potentially fired TAs. Chancellor Larive answered that its very important administrators make the case for UC Santa Cruz, and that they are constantly doing this. However, as one of ten campuses, if we did open a side letter it is extremely unlikely that resources would come from the system to us alone, so costs would be entirely borne by UC Santa Cruz. Such an agreement would also make all other system wide contracts untenable. The legislature is focused on undergraduate education. She then noted the difficulty of obtaining funding for graduate vs. undergraduate programs; Michael Brown (Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs) has been advocating for the important role of grad students but as most letters and calls legislators receive come from parents concerned about their undergraduates, attention is often pulled away from graduate studies. However, now getting back to normal is the first important step toward arguing for any new funding. Without an influx of new funds from the legislature, it is often one campus against one another, even when we advocate for the system as a whole. iCPEVC Kletzer then added that a great effort will be made to encourage TA's to turn in grades by the deadline. After next week when we know more about the outcome, can consider implications for running courses. However she stressed that decisions regarding courses and instruction are the faculty's purview, however the iCPEVC will actively participate in those conversations.

Yulia Gilichinskaya (Phd. Candidate Film and Digital Media and Co-President GSA) stated that she observed serious injuries and traumas directly resulting from police violence at the protests, and that 18 people were arrested. Co-President Gilichinskaya noted that in a previous meeting iCPEVC Kletzer disclosed the cost of police on campus was \$300,000 per day. She asked if that figure could be confirmed, or if there was a different number regarding the police presence costs? iCPEVC Kletzer confirmed the prior conversation, and advised that as the Chancellor offered earlier, we will not know the total cost until this is all over.

Megan Thomas (Associate Professor, Politics Dept) stated that she appreciates the acknowledgment that faculty have authority over their instruction. She then followed up on the prior question and asked what was the estimated range authorized for police on campus? She also questioned how undergraduates will be able to enroll if classes sizes are reduced due to the lack of TAs? In response Chancellor Larive explained that the police cost estimate was based on prior experience, and that is where the estimate of \$300,000 per day comes from. iCPEVC Kletzer reaffirmed that she could not answer the question of class reduction without knowing the number of TAs that are available, and without significant faculty input. Associate Professor Thomas noted that faculty would like to hire the TAs they had chosen.

Tracy Larrabee (Associate Dean of Engineering for Undergraduate Affairs, Professor, Computer Science and Engineering) commented that not all faculty agree with much of the sentiment previously brought forward during the meeting. Professor Larrabee supports the administration's decision to dismiss TAs that have withheld grades, as it has negatively impacted many undergraduates. Professor Larrabee added that some staff are paid less than graduate students, in particular once costs of tuition remission are included, and that they are permanent full-time employees, unlike graduate students, who are here for a temporary period to obtain an advanced degree, which will likely enable them to make significantly more money after degree completion. She expressed her gratitude to the Chancellor and iCPEVC for their efforts in this matter.

Lora Bartlett (Associate Professor, Education) asked for clarification of a specific scenario, asking if graduate students lose their positions for Spring quarter, and apply for leave of absence (LOA) for financial reasons, will the graduate division grant those requests? And if graduate students want to come back after the leave, will the Graduate Division approve it? iCPEVC Kletzer directed this question to the Acting Graduate Dean Quentin Williams who advised that if a credible reason is given for LOA, it is almost always granted. Not having funding is a credible reason. Associate Professor Bartlett followed up asking administrators if punitive action would also be applied to GSRs with external funding, for example students written into national science foundation grants? The iCPEVC confirmed that disciplinary action taken would not apply to Spring GSRs. Associate Professor Bartlett then described her experience at the picket line, as a neutral faculty witness. She stated that she observed police move into riot formation with batons out and masks on and block the street for 30 minutes. Associate Professor Bartlett was grateful that the police presence has since been reduced.

Mark Anderson (Associate Professor and Chair Anthropology Dept.) returned to Elizabeth Abrams' question about future appointments, and what future consequences might persist past Spring quarter, as it was important that graduate students be made aware of the consequences of withholding Fall grades past the deadline. iCPEVC Kletzer apologized if the prior answer had been confusing. Should TAs not turn in Fall grades by the deadline, they will be dismissed from any Spring appointment. iCPEVC Kletzer could not specific provide information beyond Spring quarter. However, she said that as long as Fall grades are withheld, this would enter into any future hiring decisions.

Steve McKay (Associate Professor, Sociology) noted that high enrollment departments, which rely on TA's to teach a number of courses, may choose to reduce the number of classes offered to continue to provide quality instruction, which would be problematic for enrollment. He asked how these concerns would be addressed? iCPEVC Kletzer reasserted that a conversation would occur after the deadline, led by department chairs, as it is their purview. Without firm details regarding the number of TAs dismissed, iCPEVC Kletzer could not answer that question more fully. Associate Professor McKay was pleased to hear that new working groups will help facilitate communication between graduates and the administration; however, he stated that the offer to graduate students of a \$2,500 stipend is woefully inadequate. Can a range be provided that campus is willing to consider to fund them more appropriately? iCPEVC Kletzer stated that the administration has made a good faith offer to discuss resources, including possibly increase of resources, in a cooperative setting once a significant pause or cease of strike occurs. Associate Professor McKay also asked to clarify, if disciplinary

retaliation is possible if graduate students submit grades by the deadline? iCPEVC Kletzer replied that if students have deleted grades from CANVAS, the disciplinary letter referred to in earlier questions will still remain in their file. If they did not turn in grades by February 2nd, a progressive discipline letter, as mandated by the current contract, will also remain in their file.

Ben Carson (Associate Professor Music Dept., Kresge Provost) expressed thanks for the changes that had been made to the Google Form, and for the reduction in police on campus. He asserted that the police brought in had shown they were not sufficiently educated in the rights of protestors. Associate Professor Carson also contended that the Google form was more than an over step, as it infringed on academic freedom, in particular portions asking about deviation from syllabi. Associate Professor Carson asked what assurance could be given that this would not occur again in the future? The iCPEVC agreed that Associate Professor Carson was right to further elaborate on concerns regarding the form; she reassured that the goal of the form was to give students a voice about impacts on their education, but again that she now realized the overreach. She noted there would be time to speak to academic freedom encroachment later in this agenda.

Bruce Schumm (Professor, Physics and Chair Senate Committee on Planning and Budget) mentioned that students are welcome to join the conversation by participating as student representatives on Senate committees that currently have representative vacancies, where their voices are needed.

Karen Holl (Professor, Environmental Studies) requested the administration explain where resources would come from for the additional graduate support plans announced in January, as they seem like an unfunded mandate.

iCPEVC Kletzer, pointed out that some departments, like Environmental Studies, already provide 5 year funding guarantees. Such funding is a partnership through departments, division and center. It is not possible for the center to be responsible for all of it. She clarified that our vision for the \$2500 fellowship is that it would be a central campus responsibility, because we have not yet built sufficient on campus housing. Each program and carrying capacity will be addressed by the Office of Planning and Budget and Graduate Division, and that this plan was inspired by something similar done at UC San Diego.

Chair Lau advised that only those currently in line would be recognized as it was past time to move on to the remaining agenda.

Audun Dahl (Associate Professor, Psychology Dept. and Dept. Vice Chair) asked that given the lack of dialogue during this crisis, what is the strategy for communication in the next few days? What can be done to improve morale, particularly if the graduate students relent? iCPEVC Kletzer responded that there is hope that they will submit grades, however her strategy has been to be in regular dialog. That she reached out to students to meet, and she will continue to make herself available.

Gina Langhout (Professor, Psychology Dept.) commended Tchad Sanger and the staff of the Office of the Registrar for their work during this strike. Professor Langhout asked about the reasoning for a delay in having substantive talks? iCPEVC Kletzer explained that the administration can meet with graduate students only in their capacity as students, not as union members for bargaining or negotiation. Negotiating would subject UC to a charge of direct dealing, An unfair labor practice charge. Professor Langhout inquired why would a discussion with graduate students, as students, could not be informed by the UAW letters authorizing discussion? iCPEVC Kletzer responded that, as the ongoing action is unsanctioned and imposes significant cost on campus, a condition of any discussion involving resources, is that the strike pauses. Professor Langhout then asked the administrators to explain the letters sent to international graduate students participating in the strike, which imply they may face deportation, if they are unable to pay tuition previously waived under their TA appointments. iCPEVC Kletzer acknowledged that international students face restrictions others do not. The communications with international grad students were meant to explain the possible risks very plainly, for the sake of transparency.

Faye Crosby (Professor Emeritus, Psychology Dept.) requested that iCPEVC Kletzer elaborate on what sanctions UC would face if UC Santa Cruz administrators break the current contract? She asked specifically, if UC decided to negotiate, what possible harm could the UAW do to UC? iCPEVC Kletzer advised that only Labor relations at Office of

the President and UAW can participate in the bargaining process. The UC Santa Cruz administration is not a party to the contract, and cannot go outside it. The Chancellor and iCPEVC have authority to respond to the strikers only capacity as students. Professor Crosby offered her thanks to Chancellor Larive for her statement that she was committed to UC Santa Cruz for the long term.

Karen Ottomann (Professor and Chair, Microbiology and Environmental Toxicology) related details of a recruitment event at which a COLA-related poster was presented and voted as the favorite. She suggested that this and the strike actions both affirm how engaged our students are. She suggested that this moment is therefore an opportunity to work together, and contact the Regents to initiate change. The high cost of living and rent burden are real concerns. Professor Ottomann called for guidance about navigating within the UCOP system, to ultimately change that system. Chancellor Larive observed that collaboration allows us to accomplish more. In efforts to establish communication a microsite is being set up to advise on strike related activity.

Sylvanna M. Falcón (Associate Professor, Latin American and Latino/a Studies) Professor Falcón stated that existing methods for undergraduates to communicate their concerns regarding classes are already in place, and the Google form should be removed in its entirety. She stated that the letter international graduate students received was particularly alarming and tone deaf, given the current political climate, and asked who takes responsibility for that letter? iCPEVC Kletzer acknowledged the letter did not have the kind of sensitivity needed and administrators take responsibility for all communications they send out. She reiterated that it was an attempt at straightforward communication. Professor Falcón advised in future there should be faculty consultation on these kinds of communications. She then asked if administrators could elaborate on what is meant by substantive conversations (which could take place after a pause in the strike)? She asked if there might be a more formal option such as a 30-day work plan to help bring this to a satisfactory close? iCPEVC Kletzer replied that “substantive” means budgets and resources would be discussed. Professor Falcon also noted that financial struggles during summer are a continuing graduate student issue.

Chair Lau thanked the senate members for their questions and advised the next point of business is the consent calendar.

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

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

#### CONSENT CALENDAR:

- a. Committee on Academic Personnel 18-19 Annual Report (AS/SCP/1963)

Chair Lau advised there was one editorial change to the CAP annual report, the department of “Sociology” was referenced and it should have read as the division of “Social Sciences”. Chair Lau opened the floor to questions. As there were no questions from the floor, the CAP annual report was considered approved.

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

### **6. Reports of Standing Committees**

- a. Committee on Planning and Budget and Committee on Educational Policy
  - i. [Report from the CEP/CPB Program Impaction Working Group](#) (AS/SCP/1964)

Chair Lau welcomed CPB Chair Schumm to the podium and advised that he would be condensing his presentation to save time.

Committee on Planning and Budget Chair Schumm opened his presentation of the Report from CEP/CPB Program Impaction Working Group, by observing it was a strange day when impaction reports provide some comic relief. Chair Schumm thanked IRAPS and Vice Chancellor Planning and Budget Delaney and CPB Vice-Chair and member of the Earth and Planetary Sciences Dept. Matthew Clapham for their work to complete this report. As background for the motivation behind this working group, Chair Schumm highlighted issues of concern such as: worsening student: faculty ratios, strains on faculty working environment, and fewer opportunities to form close one on one student to faculty relationships, and the degradation of student experience. The Computer Science program had applied for and was granted

impaction status (2018) by the Senate and administration, which allowed them to restrict access to that major. Gaining impaction status is an arduous process and demands much from the department.

In 2018-2019 the working group proposed to make use of institutional data to develop and evaluate indicators of programmatic impaction on the UC Santa Cruz campus that would require little input from or burden on individual programs and departments. The report establishes both local campus indices and comparative or systemwide indices for evaluating a quantitative assessment of possible impaction. Ten candidate programs were included in the study (Art, Art and Design: Games and Playable Media, Film and Digital Media, Computer Science, Technology and Information Management, Business Management Economics, Psychology, Sociology, MCD Biology, and Philosophy), along with five additional programs, one from each division, not generally considered to be impacted (Electrical Engineering, Physics, Anthropology, History, and History of Art and Visual Culture).

Computer Science consistently and notably rises above all other studied programs in its overall degree of impaction by metrics used. Of the remaining four programs that consistently score higher than other candidate programs, MCD Biology also rises very noticeably above its UC comparators. Psychology does as well, although to a lesser extent than Computer Science or MCD Biology. Philosophy also rises above its UC comparators, although if the question regarding campus climate is removed from the survey, it is very similar to the other eight campuses. Chair Schumm noted that a final thing to consider would be asking IRAPS for their time to institutionalize this study, if this is seen as needed. The Chair opened the floor to any urgent questions and also noted that Chair Schumm could be reached by email with questions as well. There were no questions from the floor.

#### **7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair (none)**

#### **8. Report of the Graduate Student Association Co -Presidents and Vice President of Shared Governance**

Yulia Gilichinskaya, GSA Co-President provided a brief statement as context for the current strike actions. She stated that there had been hopes that with new leadership, there would in fact be a new opportunity to be heard on the issue of cost of living, something that had been a concern, and the subject of ongoing requests for at least four years. After engaging with administrators through proper channels for the past year, including visits last spring with Chancellor Larive and iCPEVC Kletzer where graduate students only request has been a cost of living adjustment, the lack of any action on the issue made the students feel that a strike was necessary. She noted that while salaries differ somewhat between divisions, many graduate students make under \$20,000 a year. Graduate students in Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences make \$2,300 a month before taxes, and are paid only 9 months out of the year. On campus shared housing is very limited, but even this option costs \$1,200 per month, and many graduate students pay more if they are living off campus. This situation is untenable. The \$2,500 stipend the administration has offered will not bring us out of rent burden, and those struggling now cannot wait until fall, as many graduate students are living in poverty now. She emphasized that graduate students cannot return to teaching if they cannot afford to live here. Student strikers believe that withholding grades is a labor action, not negligent behavior. Dismissal from their positions is therefore not for graduate students being bad at their jobs, because they are excellent at their jobs. She closed by emphasizing that graduate students deserve to be paid a living wage, and that graduate students believe that staff and lecturers deserve that too. If this problem is ours to solve, then let's solve it.

The Chair opened the floor to questions for GSA

#### *Question Period:*

Faye Crosby (Professor Emeritus, Psychology) inquired if graduate students would be willing to leave the union, and perhaps organize more locally, as given the approved contract, the UAW apparently did not act vigorously on their behalf? She noted that doing this would alleviate fear of UAW recrimination against the larger UC system. In response Sarah Mason (GSA Co-Vice President of Shared Governance and former Unit Chair UAW65, Sociology) advised the GSA has not been discussing this option (she noted this is called a “de-certification campaign.”). She also noted that since UC Santa Cruz strike activity, the UAW has now launched a statewide COLA campaign on every campus. She stated that current strike actions are now reforming the UAW.

Vice Co-President Mason then read from a letter written by UCAFT President Mia L. McIver, Ph.D:

*In her February 14, 2020, letter threatening to fire striking UC Santa Cruz academic student employees, UC President Janet Napolitano claims that “The University of California respects its labor unions and its unionized workers,” specifically pointing to “lecturers in our classrooms” as an example of these supposedly respected workers. Our experiences as UC-AFT lecturers tell a different story. An employer that uses part-time appointments to avoid providing health insurance is not respectful. An employer that uses short-term, temporary contracts to force 1600 teaching faculty out of the classroom annually is not respectful. An employer that commits wage theft against an entire bargaining unit is not respectful. An employer that collectively bargains with what the president of the Council of UC Faculty Associations called “snideness and condescension, snark and disdain,” is not respectful. UC admin’s hostility to its workers and unions is not a secret. Nor is it an accident.*

Gina Langhout (Professor, Psychology) asked for an update regarding COLA actions on other campuses. GSA Co-President Anthony Boardman answered that while it is a rapidly changing situation, COLA campaigns are currently active on all campuses except San Francisco. Co-Vice President Mason added that currently planned actions include a general assembly at UC Davis and UC Berkeley, and a coordinated UC Los Angeles sick out. Co-President Gilichinskaya also noted that there is also a pledge to withhold grades if any UC Santa Cruz TAs are fired.

A.M. Darke (Assistant Professor, Art & Design: Games & Playable Media) referenced her own experience as a new member of the Santa Cruz community, and the difficulties that result from the high cost of living. She asked if there was any communication from the administration about choices that might allow TAs to return to normal, or any support or studies that would make their current funding level more sustainable? The GSA Co-President Anthony Boardman responded that there has been no such communication or direction, and that while there may be the impression the striking graduate students are an unruly mob, they are actually committed and hardworking, but simply unable to afford living here.

Chair Lau advised the floor was open for those currently in line to expedite time.

Roxi Power (Lecturer in the Writing Program) noted that there were not very many lecturers at the senate meeting, and stated that they have to be more aware of consequences (of the strike). Lecturer Powers thanked GSA Vice President Mason for reading the letter from UCAFT. She added that similar to graduate students, lectures without security of employment face financial hardships and also financial unpredictability. Almost half the credit hours for undergraduates are currently taught by lecturers and graduate students. Teaching Faculty appreciate and wish to expand their role in shared governance within UC Santa Cruz, for example allowing them to serve on more committees, such as CPB. Lecturer Powers pointed to the irony that her current role does not permit her privilege of floor. She perceives solidarity between the lecturers and graduate students in their attempts to bargain with UCOP. She stated that lecturers stand with graduate students.

Micha Cardenas (Assistant Professor, Art & Design: Games & Playable Media) inquired if the GSA is aware of the email from Unit Recording Secretary 2865 which says that UC Santa Cruz is in receipt of 80 union grievances brought by graduate students. She stated that if you are a TA who has been promised a spring appointment, the letter from Janet Napolitano clearly violates your union rights. She also asked the GSA perspective on what accountability might look like for police violence? The GSA Vice President Mason advised their union is currently grieving the letters. GSA Co-President Gilichinskaya added that police should be removed from campus, and the money spent on them should go to COLA.

Bruce Schumm (Professor, Physics and Chair Senate Committee on Planning and Budget) noted that CPB is working on calculations regarding the costs of graduate student attendance at UC Santa Cruz.

Felicity Schaeffer (Assistant Professor, Feminist Studies) read a recent tweet from Senator Bernie Sanders: “*UC grad students are fighting to have their labor rights acknowledged. I strongly urge the president of the UC system to stop threatening them, especially immigrant students for organizing, I stand with #payusmoreucsc.*”

**9. Petitions of Students (none)****10. Unfinished Business (none)****11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)****12. New Business****a. Senate Resolution regarding Reporting Form (AS/SCP/1965)**

A resolution regarding the google form distributed February 7th, 2020 was circulated with the CALL “Notification of Class and Section Disruption.” Chair Lau invited Distinguished Professor Gail Hershatter to discuss the resolution.

Distinguished Professor of History Hershatter provided background for the creation of the resolution. Public affairs sent an email that included a google form link that invited students to record cancelled classes, which also included a question requesting reporting of class material that differed from the syllabus. Students also saw the link on their CANVASs Dashboard. In response to this form 231 faculty signed a petition requesting the link be taken down and the data collected not be used. The form was revised and removed from CANVAS. Students have referred to the form as the “tattlebot.” The resolution is out of date as the form has subsequently been removed from CANVAS, but she noted that the form remains in email. Professor Hershatter noted that attempts to use classrooms as an instrument of surveillance, overseeing faculty or teaching assistants, impinges on a safe environment for discussion. It is therefore within our purview to respond. As the Senate was not consulted regarding this form or its contents, an academic freedom grievance will be pursued if it is not taken down. She emphasized that any sign that freedom can be incrementally eroded is of concern.

Chair Lau invited CAF member Nathan Altice (Teaching Professor, Computational Media) to speak regarding the form.

Teaching Professor Altice summarized CAF’s response to the google form, contained in a CAF memo to Senate Chair Lau to express what they saw as a deeply alarming and clear abridgement of academic freedom. The form unfairly calls on students to police their teachers, and implies faculty do not have the right to change their syllabus. The form conflicts with UC policy on academic freedom, specifically APM 010, which upholds the principles that protect academic freedom. APM 015 further states that faculty maintain the right to present controversial material where relevant. The form deployed is intrusive, and without proper vetting could be used to harass specific Faculty and TAs. It inhibits the free exchange of ideas. Removing the most troubling clause is not sufficient. The form contributes to an atmosphere that threatens and undermines faculty authority or their pedagogy. CAF proposes the google form be removed and data not used for any purpose.

Quentin Williams (Distinguished Professor, Earth and Planetary Sciences and Acting Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies) spoke against the resolution as drafted, stating that academic freedom is not equivalent to first amendment speech rights. He stated a concern that the resolution does not encompass any faculty responsibilities in regard to academic freedom. He noted that APM 010 goes on to state it must be read in tandem with the academic freedom statement of 1970 and APM 015 - which prohibits use of classes for political indoctrination or purpose other than material relevant to what the course intended. He noted APM 015 also outlines unacceptable behaviors, such as not holding section or class. He emphasized that academic freedom is not absolute, but has constraints.

Professor Hershatter responded that no one has alleged that the faculty is acting irresponsibly, and thus that section was not addressed in the resolution. However, there are concerns that faculty rights to conduct classes as they see fit were infringed upon by the form. Professor Hershatter, former CAF chair, observed that this type of surveillance demeans the entire University enterprise.

Chair Lau added that APM 015 as many know, is broken into two parts, an articulation of ethical principles and examples of behaviors subject to discipline. To clarify, the principles section says the very “cornerstone of the university is the pedagogical relationship between teacher and student.” This google form impinges on that cornerstone, by putting

pressure on that relationship. She noted that the regent's policy on course content and on academic freedom also both say this, both also from 1970.

Professor Quentin Williams called for a Point of Order, asking if the Chair was engaging in advocacy? He noted practice as a past Senate Chair, being able to speak as Chair to clarify points on resolutions. However, Professor Williams indicated if the Chair was instead speaking in support or against a resolution, it would be appropriate to participate in the same way as other faculty, by speaking from the microphone, as opposed to speaking in her role as Chair from the podium. Professor Williams finally reminded the Senate that we have 16,000 undergraduates paying to get educated, and stated that this resolution as written dodges faculty responsibility for educating those students.

Megan Thomas (Associate Professor, Politics) thanked CAF for their letter and asserted that the very basic need to preserve the classroom as an open space for conversations, is particularly important in the current political moment. Professor Thomas stated she was in favor of the resolution and grateful for the timely manner in which it was produced.

Amanda Smith (Assistant Professor, Literature) stated that the language of the resolution does not disregard faculty responsibilities within academic freedom. Instead, the Google form puts undergraduates in a position to decide what is an acceptable subject matter to teach, and that this is not appropriate.

Ólóf Einarsson (Professor, Chemistry & Biochemistry) spoke to return to some of the issues discussed earlier in the meeting, pointing out that individual departments have taken steps to raise GSR salaries, and to increase pay for TAs in summer. Professor Einarsson stated that she was not in favor of the strike, as undergraduate education is suffering as a result of it. Regarding the Google form, she felt that the form has already been modified sufficiently. She also noted that there are faculty who feel their rights have been infringed upon by the protests, and some faculty have been heckled for not supporting the strike. These faculty are not being allowed to teach as they feel is appropriate specifically because of strike actions.

Nick Mitchel (Associate Professor, Feminist Studies) spoke to provide historical context for The 1970 Regents statute, which was passed during a campaign against a black female graduate student, who was alleged to be a communist by an FBI plant. In wake of that student's dismissal, then governor Reagan said that student would never be allowed to teach at UC again. Angela Davis retired from UC Santa Cruz in 2008. Surveillance of classrooms, such as placing undercover police in the classroom to identify leftist faculty, was also brought to litigation in *White vs. Davis*, and this surveillance practice was found to be an infringement of rights.

Chris Connery (Professor, Literature) noted that Distinguished Professor Quentin Williams makes an important point, that there are constraints on academic freedom. Professor Connery stated that resolution was not in violation of this principle. Rather it is a response to a current situation, a concerning surveillance mechanism put in place with no consultation with the senate.

Marybeth Pudup (Associate Professor and Program, Director, Social Sciences Division) referenced an earlier part of Professor Hershatter's remarks to remind the Senate that it is not necessary to go as far as China to see examples of harassment and surveillance of faculty. She noted that conservative activist David Horowitz claimed UC Santa Cruz was the "one of the worst schools in America" and used the mechanism of online petitions to encourage students to report on so-called "political indoctrination" putting faculty at risk of unfounded harassment.

Chair Lau advised we will move on to distribute paper ballots on which voters should write their name and resolution #1. She noted the time was 5:20 and there has been a request for one more resolution. She asked if Senators were willing to stay and entertain an additional resolution. Those assembled indicated they would be willing to stay.

Chair Lau then asked if there was any New Business and Karen Bassi (Professor, Literature) and Fernando Leiva (Associate Professor, Latin American & Latino/a Studies) introduced a resolution from the floor on behalf of a group of faculty.

**The following resolution was moved from the floor (support for graduate students)**

Associate Professor Leiva explained that this resolution demonstrates the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate's support for graduate students and lecturers call for a COLA. It also requests that the administration withdraw sanctions against graduate students. Then added that the authors are hopeful that the resolution will also help mend the broken trust between the parties.

The resolution text is as follows:

**(text appears as edited from the floor)**

*Whereas the University of California, as a leading public university in the world, has secured its reputation for delivering high-quality undergraduate education in no small part through the underpaid labor of graduate students and lecturers;*

*Whereas the University of California's increasing reliance on casualized teaching is unsustainable given escalating housing and living costs throughout the state;*

*Whereas the UC Santa Cruz Chancellor's proposed support packages and need-based, annual housing supplement do not offer a substantive and lasting solution to the issue of graduate student precarity;*

*Whereas the university administration has chosen to deploy police from other UC campuses and municipalities who have arrested student protestors who were peacefully assembling;*

*Whereas the university has employed practices of surveillance by implementing reporting mechanisms that encourage undergraduates to inform on their instructors and has responded to striking graduate students and student protestors with disciplinary summonses, suspensions, and threats of dismissal;*

*Whereas these threats violate departmental jurisdiction in the assignment of teaching duties and contravene the principles of shared governance;*

*Whereas the United Auto Workers Union (UAW) has repeatedly indicated its readiness under the collective bargaining agreement to meet with the UC Santa Cruz administration and UCOP; and striking graduate students have expressed their willingness to pause the work stoppage, provided that progress is made in substantive discussions with the UC Santa Cruz administration;*

*Whereas graduate student precarity is not unique to UC Santa Cruz but is a structural issue that afflicts the entire UC system and therefore requires an ethical system-wide solution;*

**Be it resolved that the UC Santa Cruz Academic Senate:**

1. Supports the graduate students' and lecturers' and staff need for higher wages commensurate with local cost-of-living increases,
2. Calls for the withdrawal of sanctions against striking and arrested students,
3. Affirms departmental autonomy in the assignment of TAships,
4. And urges the UC Santa Cruz administration and UCOP--in dialogue with striking graduate students and lecturers whose contract ended on January 31, 2020--to work swiftly to find fair and lasting solutions that honor each of these units' indispensable contributions to teaching and research at the University of California.

Chair Lau advised this resolution requires a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority to pass, because the resolution came from the floor and was not noticed with the CALL. As there were two presenters, however, no second was needed. The Chair opened the floor for questions on the second resolution.

Elizabeth Abrams (Professor, Writing Program, Chair Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, Provost Merrill College) requested a factual clarification. The lecturers union has not made a salary demand with the Office of the

President. Is this resolution a general show of support and not a specific call to provide the \$1,400.00 monthly COLA? Professor Abrams noted that the staff population does not receive a COLA as a component of salary increases.

In response, Professor Bassi confirmed the resolution was a general show of support for graduate students and lecturers, and not a request for a specific dollar amount. Professor Abrams then moved to make a friendly amendment to the resolution that item 1. include staff in addition to students and lecturers. She also proposed that the text emphasize “need”. The amendments were seconded and accepted.

Chair Lau advised ballot 2 would be distributed. Ballots were collected and counted by Senate Secretary McCarthy and acting Parliamentarian Brundage.

Chair Lau concluded the meeting by advising that the results of the referenda would be communicated in future, as counting the results from the physical ballots would take additional time.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

ATTEST: Matt McCarthy Secretary

April 6, 2020