

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 2:30 p.m.
Stevenson Event Center
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
 - a. Draft Minutes of May 21, 2010
(as amended at the October 20, 2010 meeting) (AS/SCM/295) p. iv
 - b. Draft Minutes of October 20, 2010 (AS/SCM/296) p. xi
2. Announcements
 - a. Chair Gillman
 - b. Chancellor Blumenthal
 - c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway
3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)
4. Special Orders: Annual Reports
 CONSENT CALENDAR:
 - a. Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1664) p. 1
 - b. Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1666) p. 4
5. Reports of Special Committees (none)
6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Graduate Council
 - i. Amendment to Section IV Graduate Program
 Chapter 13 Grading and Transmission of Records (AS/SCP/1659) p. 12
 - b. Committee on Committees
 - i. Amendment to Bylaw 4.1 Senate Chair (AS/SCP/1662) p. 16
 - ii. Amendment to Chapter 11 Elections (AS/SCP/1665) p. 18
 - c. Committee on Educational Policy
 - i. Oral report on transition to new General Education and curricular planning
 - d. Committee on the Library
 - i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.23 (AS/SCP/1661) p. 21
 - e. Committee on Planning and Budget
 - i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.24 (AS/SCP/1663) p. 23
7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair
8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President
9. Petitions of Students (none)
10. Unfinished Business (none)
11. University and Faculty Welfare
12. New Business

March 3, 2011

Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues:

As Winter quarter ends and the budget reduction process intensifies, the time for faculty to gather our forces is more urgent than ever. We will hold our one and only Senate meeting this term on Wednesday, March 9, 2:30 PM, in the Stevenson Event Center. The agenda can be viewed at: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/meetings/11March9/A11March09.html>

Among the critical items for this meeting:

- We have major unfinished business in the form of the Graduate Council resolution on grades and narrative evaluations. This is the companion legislation to the changes in undergraduate assessment enacted at the end of last year, in May 2010, and as such represents the final step in the campus reform of narrative evaluations. Having failed to vote on it during the past two meetings, we must do so now.
- The Senate is working on a comprehensive proposal for restructuring of all academic-related undergraduate functions and activities, from admissions, recruitment and retention to advising, learning support services and graduation, under the academic oversight of the campus office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education. On the faculty side, Committee on Educational Policy Chair John Tamkun will present a potentially radical new mapping tool to help departments plan their curricula more comprehensively, in order to avoid duplication and enhance collaboration across departments and divisions. The aim: to concentrate faculty time and energy on courses that directly serve the teaching needs and research aims of the major or program.
- Both Chancellor Blumenthal and EVC Galloway will be at the meeting, available to answer any and all of your questions.

I urge everyone to come to the meeting on Wed., March 9 at the Stevenson Event Center. As usual, we try to structure the agenda so that key items won't come up for discussion until about 3:15 PM, to allow for the greatest possible participation. The budget "situation" is not the only game in town nor is it the only reason to care about our campus and the university.

Sincerely,



Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

**PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
of the May 21, 2010 Senate Meeting
(as amended by the Senate on October 20, 2010)
and of the October 20, 2010 Senate Meeting**

The draft minutes from the May 21, 2010 Senate Meeting as amended on October 20, 2010 were distributed via email on October 28, 2010. The draft minutes from the October 20, 2010 Senate Meeting were distributed via email on March 3, 2011. Both of these minutes will be presented for approval at the Senate Meeting on March 9, 2011. After being approved, these minutes will be posted on the Senate web site (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/meetings.html>).

Senators are asked to submit any proposed corrections or changes to these draft minutes to the Senate Office in advance of the next meeting, via EMAIL or in WRITING. All proposed changes will be compiled in standardized format into a single list for display at the next meeting.

This approach gives Senators an opportunity to read and review changes before being asked to vote on them, gives the Senate staff and the Secretary time to resolve any questions or inconsistencies that may arise, and minimizes time spent on routine matters during meetings. While proposed changes may be checked for consistency, they will not be altered without the proposer's approval. This approach complements, but does not limit in any way, the right of every Senator to propose further changes from the floor of the meeting.

To assist the Senate staff, proposed changes should specify:

1. The location of the proposed change (e.g. item, page, paragraph, sentence...)
2. The exact wording of existing text to be modified or deleted
3. The exact wording of replacement or additional text to be inserted
4. (Optional) The reason for the change if not obvious

Please submit all proposed changes to arrive in the Senate Office **no later than 5 p.m., March 8, 2011**, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to senate@ucsc.edu.

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary, Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

March 3, 2011

Draft MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
May 21, 2010

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 21, 2010 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine present, Chair Lori Kletzer called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Kletzer asked if there were any proposed changes to the minutes of February 10, 2010, other than those submitted in writing. Professor Joel Yellin (Physical and Biological Sciences) presented an updated version of the corrections he previously had submitted. The minutes were approved.

2. Announcements**a. Chair Lori Kletzer**

Chair Kletzer discussed budget challenges and uncertainty. She commented that it is deeply troubling and disturbing when a governor produces a budget that pits higher education against California's most vulnerable populations and noted that it has been a year of challenges, starting with furloughs and a walkout. Turning to the agenda, Chair Kletzer explained that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) started working on an amendment to the Narrative Evaluation System (NES) in the fall and by spring quarter the proposed amendments were approved.

Chair Kletzer recognized the following 2009-10 Excellence in Teaching Award Recipients:

Cyrus Bazeghi, Computer Engineering
Jennifer A. Gonzalez, History of Art and Visual Culture
Gey-Hong Gweon, Physics
Catherine Ramirez, American Studies
Susan Watrous, College Eight

Honorable Mentions:

Rodney Ogawa, Education
Frank "Paco" Ramirez, Language Program
Gustavo Vazquez, Film and Digital Media
Patricia Zavella, Latin American and Latino Studies

Chair Kletzer also recognized Chancellor Blumenthal, who was the recipient of the System-wide Senate's Oliver Johnson Award for Senate Service.

Chair Kletzer thanked EVC Klinger for his years of service and said EVC Klinger's dedication and loyalty are inspiring. She also thanked Senate Director Mary-Beth Harhen, Senate staff member Susanna Wrangell, and Senate committee chairs for all their hard work.

Professor Ólöf Einarsdóttir (Chemistry), rising on a point of privilege, moved the following resolution:

Whereas, this is Dave Kliger's final meeting of the Academic Senate as the Executive Vice Chancellor, and

Whereas, Dave Kliger will retire this fall after 39 years of distinguished service to UC as a Professor of Chemistry, Department Chair, Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel, Chair of the Academic Senate, Dean, and Vice Chancellor, and

Whereas, Dave Kliger's long commitment to teaching, research, and service has been recognized with the Outstanding Faculty Award of the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences and with his invitation to deliver the 34th annual Faculty Research Lecture,

We are therefore Resolved that this body should recognize Dave Kliger for his outstanding contributions to this Senate, this campus, and this University, and we wish him well in his retirement.

The resolution passed by acclamation.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

The chancellor began by recognizing Professor Gary Glatzmaier (Earth and Planetary Sciences), who was elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

Next Chancellor Blumenthal provided an update on the state budget. The May revise includes the restoration of \$305 million to the UC budget, \$51.3 million to support student access, and \$355 million for capital facility construction. The chancellor recognized that elected officials face terribly difficult choices this year and said that UC continues to convey to Sacramento that higher education is a uniquely powerful investment. The restoration of funding will help maintain access and course availability, protect financial aid for thousands of young Californians, and minimize further program cuts and layoffs.

Chancellor Blumenthal thanked Chair Kletzer for her work and commented that Chair Kletzer chaired more Senate meetings in one year than often take place in two years. Chair Kletzer accomplished much, including co-chairing the faculty salary workgroup, and is highly regarded both on campus and at the system wide level.

Chancellor Blumenthal closed by acknowledging Dave Kliger's years of service as EVC. EVC Kliger, he said, bore the job's responsibility with grace and has made lasting contributions that leave UCSC well-positioned for the future. EVC Kliger oversaw the development of the comprehensive academic plan and robust capital improvements, and fostered a climate that encouraged pursuit of external research

funding. EVC Kliger's students, postdocs, and former students describe him as patient, supportive, gentle, calm, good-humored, and encouraging. The EVC has guided the campus through some very difficult budget decisions. Chancellor Blumenthal said he is grateful to EVC Kliger for his leadership, his counsel, and his many contributions.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger

EVC Kliger thanked the chancellor for his remarks. EVC Kliger said that in each of his leadership roles, his primary goal has always been to support the university's mission of research, teaching, and service. This is why he pushed the campus to adopt a comprehensive academic plan – because he believes academic planning must drive all other planning at a major research university. Faculty scholarship shapes our research enterprise, which informs, for example, our capital needs. Before the campus had an academic plan, each division could dream but lacked the overall framework that would guide decision making and resource allocation.

EVC Kliger noted that as EVC he kept the interests of the entire campus at the forefront, supporting the Digital Arts Research Center building, the McHenry expansion, and now Biomedical Sciences. UCSC facilities have matured in step with the campus emergence as a research powerhouse, but it is the people who make UCSC. The campus today has an outstanding faculty and leadership team to match. The EVC said he is proud that the campus has assembled the best administrative leadership team in the history of the campus.

EVC Kliger acknowledged the great staff that has worked with him for 25 years, especially thanking Charlotte Moreno, who began working with the EVC on administering his grants in 1988, and has worked with the EVC in both the dean's and EVC's office. The EVC said she has been, in many ways, responsible for the successes he has enjoyed.

The EVC also said he has had the pleasure and honor of working with many talented students, postdocs, and researchers and thanked them for their hard work, their professionalism, and their friendship.

EVC Kliger stated that if there is one thing he hopes people will take away it is that UCSC's accomplishments far outweigh the disappointments and hardships the campus has experienced.

Following the remarks Chair Kletzer opened the floor to questions.

Professor Barry Bowman (MCD Biology) projected a chart which compared UCSC's off – scale faculty salaries to other UC campuses'. Professor Bowman asked where the EVC thought UCSC should be on this distribution and what the realistic time scale is for when the campus might get there.

EVC Kliger responded that the campus started to address the issue of low faculty salaries three years ago, and he believes the numbers will look even better next year. The administration agreed to track salaries for three years and then reevaluate. The campus is not going to catch up with UCB or UCLA, but could get to the middle of the pack.

Chancellor Blumenthal added that UC is going to have to face a hard question of whether or not it is married to the step system.

Professor Joel Yellin (PBSci) agreed with all that was said about EVC Kliger's service. He also appreciated Chancellor Blumenthal's responses during the Q&A at the last Senate meeting.

Referring to a comment made by Professor Yellin, the EVC concurred that faculty members may disagree on issues but must do so in a manner that does not become personal.

Professor Mark Carr (EEB), rising on a point of privilege, moved the following resolution:

Be it resolved:

That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate would like to express its deep gratitude to Professor Lori Kletzer for her exemplary leadership of the Division this year. Chair Kletzer has guided the Senate through many challenges to shared governance on issues of furlough, budget cutting, and the resultant programmatic changes. She has proven herself to be a driving force for enabling the Senate to tackle numerous challenging issues. Chair Kletzer skillfully kept order at an unprecedented number of senate meetings this year with unwavering tact, equanimity and a really big mallet.

For this service, the Senate thanks Professor Lori Kletzer.

The resolution passed by acclamation.

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

4. Special Order Annual Reports

a. Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1640)

Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL) Chair Barbara Rogoff announced the nomination of Professor Paul Whitworth to give the 2010-2011 Faculty Research Lecture. CRFL Chair Rogoff discussed a number of Professor Whitworth's accomplishments including his important works of theatrical literature and award-

winning directing, work which has earned him national and international recognition.

The nomination was accepted by acclamation.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees

i. 2010-11 Nominations (AS/SCP/1641)

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Loisa Nygaard thanked the faculty for past, present and future service. COC Chair Nygaard said UCSC has the highest percentage of Senate service in the UC system.

COC Chair Nygaard then presented the following changes and additions to the 2010-11 nominations: to add Marilyn Walker as Assembly Representative, Jonathan Fox to the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, Nathaniel Deutsch (*F*) and Eric Porter to the Committee on Educational Policy, and Matthew O'Hara to the Committee on Research and to remove Jennifer Poole (*F*) from the Committee on International Education.

All the nominations were approved by acclamation.

b. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Update on General Education Reform

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair John Tamkun provided a progress report on general education reform. Chair Tamkun discussed the total number of course proposals, the Disciplinary Communication (DC) proposals, the proposal review process, and the decisions as of May 20, 2010.

CEP Chair Tamkun said new GE courses will be offered this fall and can be found in the online schedule of classes. All departments will be notified of CEP's decisions regarding course proposals by the end of May.

Onuttom Narayan (Physics) asked if 800 seats are enough for the GE requirements. CEP Chair Tamkun responded that since the new GE's apply only to entering frosh, not continuing students, courses can be phased in over four years.

VPDUE Bill Ladusaw stated that the number of seats indicated in AIS reflects only the seats available for enrollment by current students. Since there are some seats reserved for entering students that do not appear in this tally, these numbers appear artificially low.

c. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Pension and Post-Retirements Health Benefits

Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) Chair Elizabeth Abrams and CFW members Suresh Lodha and Abel Rodriguez provided a recap of the report and information on how proposed changes would affect faculty members. Chair Abrams said the Post Employment Benefits (PEB) Task Force has been meeting for a year. There has been limited consultation with faculty, and there are concerns about the timeline for Regental approval to changes to the PEB system.

Onuttom Narayan (Physics) moved a resolution asking that campuses have more time to respond to the options.

Chair Kletzer noted that the meeting no longer had a quorum and the resolution could not be considered.

Professor Narayan then asked Chancellor Blumenthal what will be done to retain fairness in benefits as UC considers changes to the UCRS. The chancellor said the new pension benefits that are being discussed are not straight forward or clear cut. If there is a combined contribution of 17 percent by employer and employee to the pension plan, the system would become stable, but it is underfunded beyond that, so the overall problem would not be fixed. Because of confidentiality issues the chancellor is limited in what he can say about the proposed plans; however; the age factor will not depend on salary but the contribution level may be a function of salary.

Professor Yellin stated that the Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) produced a number of excellent reports, but he cannot find the list of pros and cons for the proposals which is referred to in documents from the Office of the President (OP). Professor Yellin also stated that he cannot find information on the indebtedness of the university, concerning bonds, at this point. Discussing a slide that he asked to have projected, Professor Yellin asked about the possibilities of increasing returns from investment helping with this problem. Should UC manage these funds in-house or get help from successful people in the investment business?

Chair Kletzer responded that Professor Yellin's question about the pros and cons is a good one, but only the pros are available at this point. The balanced argument is being considered by UC Chief Financial Officer Peter Taylor. The Academic Council has recently received more analysis, which Chair Kletzer will distribute. Chair Kletzer said there is an issue about debt capacity and how pension obligation bonds fit into the university economy, but the TFIR bond proposals are separate from the PEB Task Force's proposals which focus on the future configuration of the retirement system.

d. Committee on International Education

i. Department Survey on Student Participation in Education Abroad Program (AS/SCP/1643)

Committee on International Education (CIE) Chair Debra Lewis said 2/3 of departments with undergraduate programs responded to the survey. Students from almost all departments participate in the Education Abroad Program.

e. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections

i. Amendments to Bylaw 8.4.1 & 9.1 (AS/SCP/1637)

Since there was not quorum, this item was deferred to the next regular meeting.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Matthew Palm, Commissioner of Academic Affairs (CAA), stated that SUA hopes the governor will follow through on his commitment to support Cal Grants. CAA Palm reported that the SUA is lobbying for the Federal Dream Act, and that the SUA conducted a survey on class accessibility. The results indicate students continue to struggle to get into their required courses. CAA Palm thanked the Senate and administration for leadership and support.

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

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. New Business

a. "Enhanced Grading System" Proposal (AS/SCP/1645)

Since there was not quorum, this item was deferred to the next regular meeting.

Professor Carolyn Martin-Shaw (Anthropology), rising on a point of privilege, commented on the language used in Senate meetings and how faculty conducted themselves. Professor Martin-Shaw asked to hold open the opportunities of learning from all experiences and said it is worrisome if we cannot keep all conversations open and lively.

Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

Carol Freeman
Secretary

Draft MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
October 20, 2010

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, October 20, 2010 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Gillman asked if there were any additional changes to the minutes of April 23, 2010, other than those submitted in writing. An additional change to strike paragraph 1 on page 8 was submitted from the floor. With these two changes, the Minutes of April 23, 2010 were approved.

Two conflicting amendments to the minutes of the May 21, 2010 meeting were proposed. After discussion, a vote on the first amendment submitted passed by voice vote. The minutes were then approved as amended. Later in the meeting, Professor Joel Yellin rose to suggest that the second amendment had not been considered appropriately. Because of the possibility of a procedural error and because the facts were in dispute, a motion to table reconsideration of the May 21, 2010 minutes until the next meeting, was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Susan Gillman

Chair Gillman presented two large problems affecting the entire UCSC community – health care insurance plans and costs, and post-employment benefits.

Health Care: UCOP has created a new “Blue and Gold” health plan intended to keep the cost of health care low. It has a much smaller provider list, and the principle network used by UCSC employees covered by HealthNet, the Sutter/Palo Alto Medical Foundation, is not a provider under Blue and Gold. This change affects UC Berkeley and UCSC to a greater degree than other campuses, because they have fewer alternative providers available. At UCSC, 80% of employees currently covered by Health Net/Sutter (4600 individuals, including dependents) will face either a 60% increase (for those in the highest pay bands) to 163% increase in premiums (for those in the lowest pay bands) or the disruption of finding new providers. The lowest cost option for UCSC is the Physicians Medical Group (PMG), but it is unclear whether PMG has the capacity to accommodate those who change providers, or whether PMG can provide the same level of service. Negotiations are under way with UCOP and providers to gain equal access and cost for all UC employees.

The Academic Senate is actively seeking solutions. UCSC’s CFW Chair Suresh Lodha and UCFW are working to make UCOP aware of the inequality caused by these changes, and UCB and UCSC are coordinating letters from the administration and Senate to Vice President Dwaine Duckett and Vice Provost Larry Pitts asserting the principle of equal access and equal cost for all UC employees.

One reason for failure to recognize that UCSC and UCB are underserved by the Blue and Gold options, and for the late notice given to the effected campuses, appears to be lack of representation on the Health Care Task Force (HCTF), a system-wide task force that is consulted on university health care policy. UCSC’s Committee on Committees has confirmed that UCSC Professor Barry Bowman has agreed to serve on the HCTF, and UCB is working to place its own member on the task force.

Other suggestions for resolving these inequities are that UC should return to an earlier policy of statewide averaging of rates to spread costs over the whole system, and that UCOP should provide an offset to affected campuses.

Post Employment Benefits (PEB): CFW Chair Suresh Lodha will give a short version of the presentation from the Senate forum convened earlier in the quarter, and then present the CFW resolutions for discussion and a vote. UCSC is now in the campus consultation phase of decision making, a time when communication often breaks down and creates a homogenized and sub-product. Chair Gillman stated that she and Chair Lodha have been working internally and across UC to develop unified faculty comments that make better, more active use of Senate chairs to gauge faculty opinion through surveys and polls, and to exchange more information among campuses in real time about possible outcomes of the PEB proposals. The UCFW released a letter today that opposes the adoption of any integrated plan.

Chair Gillman stated cross-campus organizing is very important because several UCOP initiatives offer either great potential or great danger. One is “rebenching,” a mild redistribution of income among campuses. Chancellor Blumenthal was instrumental in changing the allocation of education fees, so that more of the education fees are returned to the campus that generated them. His arguments initiated a review by UCOP of the funding methodology of the university, particularly for state funding. Because many old decisions had unforeseen outcomes, there are large inequities in the distribution of state funds, and UCSC’s portion is particularly low, this initiative could correct arbitrary historical inequities.

When these initiatives conclude, UCSC can focus for the rest of the year on its own priorities of retention and diversity including admissions, an honors program initiative, faculty salaries and how to make academic and support structures work better.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

The Chancellor thanked the Senate Chair for working closely with the administration on the issues of health insurance and PEB. After welcoming Alison Galloway as our new Campus Provost/EVC, he then covered the following topics: state budget, post retirement benefits, Committee on the Future, NRC rankings and diversity of the freshman class.

Chancellor Blumenthal stated that diversity in the student body is a priority for our campus and that this year’s freshman admissions are very diverse, including 28% Asian Americans, 29% under-represented minorities and 44% who will be the first in their family to graduate from college.

Chancellor Blumenthal reported that the state passed a 2010-11 budget that included restoration of \$199 million in permanent funds, \$51 million for enrollment funding, \$106 million one time federal recovery money, and full funding of CalGrants. The legislature also removed language forbidding the state to fund University of California Retirement (UCR) contributions, but no UCR funding was provided by the state.

Students are paying a total of 32% in fee increases. The Chancellor stated he was shocked to learn that only 67% of student fees returned to our campus, and that he believed our students should benefit directly from all fees they pay. Following his representations to UCOP, UCSC should get back 90% of the fee increases this year; but this is only a partial victory because he has argued to get 100% back. There is now a commitment that any future fee increases will be returned to the campuses.

Chancellor Blumenthal emphasized the importance of rebenching. Each year UCOP adds to the base budget of each campus, but UCSC’s base budget is too low, reflecting a series of UCOP decisions made

over time using criteria that may no longer be relevant. The university needs to rethink how the campuses are funded, on the level of basic principles and in terms of fairness and transparency. The Chancellor acknowledged the strong faculty support on campus for this action. This year the system-wide Senate is looking at this issue, UCPB has provided a very good report, and a system-wide task force has been set up. However long it takes to “rebench,” it will be too long, but at least this process of consideration is happening.

It is likely the university will seriously consider Cost of Living increases for staff and faculty for this year. This isn't a promise but is especially important to offset rising costs of employment benefits.

The post employment benefit forums were well attended with good engagement by the campus community. The draft report by the Committee on the Future is not yet publicly available but will come out soon and be presented to the Regents, possibly on their January agenda. It contains a number of recommendations on enrollment, transfer issues, strategic sourcing and various financial issues. An Academic Council special committee on academic planning will follow up on the report findings.

The NRC Rankings are still being analyzed and understood by the campus. VPAA Lee is holding two campus forums for faculty to better understand NRC rankings.

Chancellor Blumenthal drew attention to this week's Founders Day celebration during which the campus will honor: Faculty Research Lecturer Paul Whitworth; Alum Richard Harris from NPR; Jean-Michelle Cousteau; and the Cowell Foundation, without which this campus would not exist. The comprehensive fundraising campaign is ramping up and needs faculty participation. Fundraising workshops have been very well received by faculty who have taken them.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway noted that the campus administration heard rumors of health care changes in September and contacted UCOP but did not understand the scale of the changes until the week before they were publically released. Attempts to reopen the negotiations may not be possible, because time is running out, and open enrollment begins on Monday. The campus is providing a number of workshops to assist people through the selection process and open enrollment. Staff Human Resources is looking at the capacity of the PMG. While changing providers may be inconvenient for individuals who only get an annual check-up, knowing how to transfer providers is critical for people receiving on-going care, or imminent births.

To provide some predictability for the year, UCSC will not be changing its budget for this year, 2010-11, and will not allocate further cuts. There are a lot of uncertainties for the 2011-12 year, especially about the priorities of the incoming governor. Also, next year will see a lot of mandated cuts and increased costs, such as salary increases for faculty and staff, pension benefits, and required infrastructure replacements. A rapid escalation of employer contributions to the post employment benefits will start ramping up soon. UCSC has already implemented many administrative efficiencies so the UCOP expectation of additional savings in this area may not be realistic for our campus.

UCSC is making some progress on faculty salaries. The plan to enhance faculty salaries begun two years ago has made assistant professor salaries comparable to those on other UC campuses (excluding UCB and UCLA), and salaries of incoming faculty are increasing. Associates are now doing better in relation to other UC campus (again excluding UCB and UCLA). Because only about two-thirds of Professors step I - IV have gone through the personnel cycle, we will have to wait to see how they align with other campuses. Professors V and above appear to be roughly comparable to the non-UCB and

UCLA comparison campuses. This program will continue for another year and then we will assess what to do in the future.

Heroic efforts of departments and instructors have enabled us to meet the enrollment capacity required this quarter. This is “incredible,” given the cuts in Temporary Academic Staffing, changing General Education requirements and streamlining the majors. CEP has studied GE capacity and found some redundancies that will enable departments to divert resources to help their students through the majors.

NRC rankings are available on the website. UCSC did well in the NRC rankings in those areas where the NRC could distinguish traditional fields and subfields, but since our scholarship is transformational, and often defines new fields, we may not be recognized by NRC for ten or twenty years after we have changed the direction of a given field.

The floor was then opened for questions and the following points were raised

Several questions concerned the campus allocation of student fees from UCOP, especially why UCSC only receives 90% of our student fees. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that the remainder probably goes to UCSF, which has a very large budget and relatively few students. He further explained that previously we only received 67%, now part of our base budget, that we receive in perpetuity. He emphasized how important it is to get UCSC’s return of student fees up to 100%, and that the system-wide “rebenching” project must go forward, so that the distributions are more equitable.

Asked which groups are included in the 29% defined as underrepresented minorities and the percentages of UCSC’s frosh yield, Chancellor Blumenthal responded that he would make that information available.

Several comments about health care emphasized that impacts to UCSC are disproportionate to the rest of the system, and suggested that decisions made at UCOP amounted to throwing UCSC “under the train”. It was pointed out that the Blue and Gold plan is the same service that we are getting already, and that employees will be paying more to get the same service. The UCSC administration was commended for coming to the Senate as soon as it was notified of the problem.

EVC Galloway responded that the standoff between UCOP (which does not want to include Sutter for the entire UC system), and Sutter (who does not want regional contracts) seems unlikely to be resolved for this enrollment period, and there is no information about future years. The Santa Cruz area has a limited number of providers, but UCOP looks to large regional providers like Kaiser to provide low cost options, although these are not available in our area.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Resolutions on Post Employment Benefits (AS/SCP/1646)

Senate Chair Gillman prefaced the CFW’s presentation by stating that the resolutions were crafted to

avoid endorsing any specific plan in favor of supporting or opposing characteristics or features of the plan. CFW aims for a statement of principle that supersedes any particular plan to avoid a sudden swerve by the administration to a new, unanticipated option that would render our response moot. CFW worked on language that was broad enough to avoid that, and also broad enough for other campuses to sign on.

CFW Chair Suresh Lodha explained that the timeline for response to the President has been accelerated to this week, so the process is really rushed. The Senate forum on Post Employment Benefits was well attended by faculty, and funding issues were discussed – especially whether any of the proposed options would fill the unfunded liability gap. CFW would like to refer such discussions to the Committee on Planning and Budget and has focused on the faculty welfare issues of the proposed options.

There are three sets of resolutions. The first two relate to the pension plan for new employees who will join the University after July 1, 2013. Current employees may be able to switch into this plan. Options A and B (proposed by the PEB Task Force) are integrated plans, meaning they are integrated with Social Security. Option C (proposed by dissenting opinion) has a flat age factor. The first resolution focuses on these three options. Some of the percentages associated with the various factors, (age factor, employee and employer contribution) may change, which is why CFW is focusing on the principles.

The first principle is to reject any integrated plan. Integrated plans are very complex and very rarely used. They have a high degree of uncertainty and make it difficult to predict or plan for retirement because they depend on Social Security Covered Compensation (SSCC) which changes with time. Integrated plans are inequitable since the age factor depends upon salary. So the lower income employees earn less in benefits than those with higher incomes, in terms of the replacement of income from UCRP. As salaries lag with SSCC, pension incomes will begin to slip. This is why Options A and B should be rejected.

The current UCRP structure has been working pretty well and should be retained. But other options are being considered due to the unfunded liability. The resolution requests that the employer contribution should be at least 9%. This is within the range that was deemed acceptable in the PEB Task Force Report. The employee contribution is left open for negotiation.

The floor was then open for discussion of the first Resolution on New Tier Post Employment Benefits

Speakers in favor of the resolution:
Onuttom Narayan
Faye Crosby
Joel Yellin

Speakers against the resolution:
(none)

Commenting on the resolution:
Ethan Miller

Points made in favor of the resolution:

One feature of integrated plans is inequity. Low wage workers will be asked to contribute disproportionately in both Options A and B. This is not part of the resolution, but it should be recognized from the President's office down that a pension plan subsidized by janitors is both politically indefensible and morally bankrupt. If the university decides on an integrated pension plan then, at the bare minimum, it should decrease the contribution of low wage employees to a level commensurate to the benefits they receive. This means a greater contribution by higher paid employees, possibly as high

as 11%. Option C, in which employees contribute 6.1%, has been agreed to by staff unions and negates the need for an integrated plan.

Option C has been embraced by a fragile coalition of staff who are barely able to pay 6.1% and faculty who want a 2.5% benefit. If the university reduces its contribution from 9% to 8% this coalition may split. The Task Force report refers to employer contributions as high as 20%, so it seems that the university can come up with the additional 1% which would make Option C viable.

The resolution does not address the issue of the unfunded liability.

Why can't there be graduated employee contributions based on income with those earning above \$60k paying a greater contribution? It seems that this was never considered by the PEB Task Force. The resolution does not preclude a later suggestion that this graduated scale be recommended.

Putting two systems together, UCRP and Social Security, which are managed by two completely different entities and expecting to achieve a dynamic equilibrium over a period of decades is a "fantastic proposal". There are no examples of institutions which have successfully done this.

It is difficult to get information relevant to the pension plan to engage in informed discussion with UCOP.

Comments about the resolution:

The theoretical rationale for an integrated plan with contributions based on income is that benefits from the pension plan plus Social Security will equal the same percentage replacement income for all employee groups. But, that objective has not been met. Twenty five years from now, Social Security may not exist, and this is a concern if our pension income is dependent up on it.

The Resolution on New Tier Post Employment Benefits passed by voice vote.

Turning to the Resolution on Current Employees' Contribution to Continue with the Current Employment Benefits, CFW Chair Lodha explained that the resolution requests that the contributions of continuing employees in the current UCRP plan should not rise above 7%. The university will then be contributing 10.6%, which will be slightly higher than for new employees. If the current employee contribution goes higher than 7%, then compensation for current employees quickly becomes uncompetitive.

Commenting on the Resolution:

Sue Carter
Gina Langhout
John Faulkner
Megan Thomas
Onuttom Narayan

Comments about the resolution:

If current employees choose the new plan they would contribute 6.1%, but if a current employee stays with the current plan then they will pay 7%, so employees would switch, which would create a hole in funding the retirement plan. Assuming that current employees have a choice, if they go to a new plan, they will give up the features contained in the old plan. None of these plans address the unfunded

liability gap, so whether or not current employees choose to go into the new plan, liability would not be affected.

Some senators view this resolution as rather greedy because it favors current employees who are paying 7% while the university is paying for the unfunded liability.

After several friendly amendments from the floor were accepted, the resolution read:

Resolution on Contributions from Current Employees Who Continue with the Current UCRP Plan

Whereas; raising employee contributions above 7% fundamentally alters the terms of the current UCRP pension plan and has the effect of making the total remuneration highly uncompetitive for current employees;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate calls on President Yudof to recommend that the employee contributions not exceed 7% for employees who continue in the current UCRP plan.

The resolution as amended passed by voice vote.

CFW Chair Lodha explained the Resolution on Retiree Health. This affects all retirees. The university has decided to decrease its contribution for retiree health care from roughly 90% down to roughly 70% in graduated steps of 3% every year for the next seven years or so. Over the next 10 years, even with 0% inflation, the contribution for two Medicare retirees will be \$250 per month, but that is “reduced to dust” in view of the health care premium increases introduced this year. The resolution requests that at the very least, information about the size of the increased premiums projected for the next seven to ten years should be provided by UCOP. Even though the enrollment period opens in just a few days, retirees have not yet been provided this information for this year, despite many requests. This resolution highlights a process issue - that retirees should have this information before a decision is made at the UCOP level.

The floor was then open for discussion on the Resolution on Retiree Health.

Commenting on the Resolution:

Joel Yellin
Roger Anderson

Comments on the resolution:

To what extent are these percentages of the employee or employer contributions set in stone? How do you do a projection if you don't know what the percentages will be in the future due to the internal financial situation of the university?

It is difficult to draw conclusions from very little information. There is little guidance in the Task Force report about what the implications are for retirees. The PEB report estimates for next year, assuming no increases in the premiums, are that a retired couple with HealthNet and Medicare would pay an additional \$36 per month. We now know that increases in premiums are likely, and that is the first 3% increment; if there is no inflation, there should be an additional \$36 per month for each year after that.

At the end of 7 years the cumulative increase would approximate an additional \$300 per month. If inflation is included, that same couple would be paying about \$600 per month for their health premiums. At an inflation rate of 15% which is not unreasonable, the premium would be \$800 per month. This means that a large part of retiree incomes will go toward health care premiums. The resolution calls for information that will allow for a coherent and comprehensive way to discuss this problem.

The university is thinking in terms of percentages rather than gross dollars. There is no stated ceiling on the amount that the university will pay for retiree health care, but there are constraints on the increases that enrollees can pay. So if this treatment of employee premiums is combined with the uncertainties of an integrated retirement plan, there is no way to estimate what people will face in the future.

The resolution on Retiree Health Benefits passed by voice vote.

Onuttom Narayan moved a resolution on the unfunded liability of the UCRP, stating that none of the Options A, B, or C ultimately makes a difference to the maximum contribution that will be required of the university to fund the liability. For all options, the maximum rises to 20-22%, and the only difference is how long that 20% will continue. The PEB Task Force report does not seriously consider closing the gap, and the university has not presented a credible plan for how it will cover that level of university contribution in seven years. The PEB Task Force suggests selling property or privatization but ultimately leaves it to the campuses. A problem of this magnitude needs better substantiation. The resolution requests that Committee on Planning and Budget work with UCPB and talk to the administration to see what the cost savings could possibly be. For the state to pay 10% of the cost would be about \$800 million per year, which is comparable to the enormous cuts we have taken in recent years. It does not seem plausible that the state will pay this.

The motion was seconded.

The floor was then opened for discussion on the Resolution on Addressing the Unfunded Liability of UCRP.

Speaking in favor of the resolution:
Shelley Errington
Roger Anderson
Brent Haddad

Commenting on the resolution:
Joel Yellin

Comments in favor of the resolution

None of the Options address the issue that prompted the reconsideration of Post Employment Benefit contributions in the first place, namely the unfunded liability. A huge amount of intellectual power at UCOP has been focused on creating PEB Options that are inequitable, untried and uncertain. UCOP needs to figure out how to fund this liability. The resolution is mild in its wording but does register the fact that the efforts to date do not address the issue.

The state-funded employees represent only about one third of the UCRP liability. The remainder comes from enterprise operations like medical schools, and from sponsored research endeavors. We will be better off if we can move to get similar contributions from all three of these segments. Grants would be assessed an additional 10%, which will outrage some, but we need to move toward this to backfill the liability hole.

UCPB needs to take this up. The Senate has raised the issue of the unfunded liability for years, and this resolution is consistent with previous system-wide Senate work, reports and resolutions directed at the administration.

Comments on the resolution:

Can the question of the unfunded liability for the retirement system be separated from general question of the university's budget gap? The numbers are huge. Should the problem be dealt with in its entirety? The resolution only speaks to part of the problem.

Professor Narayan responded to this comment by saying that a resolution on the entire budget would not be appropriate but this resolution does not distort the question of the overall budget problem.

Resolution on Addressing the Unfunded Liability of UCRP

Whereas; a credible plan that provides the long-term funding necessary for the University of California Retirement Program is essential for the general welfare of the University, and

Whereas; all the proposals for pension plan reform (Options A, B and C) anticipate that the employer contribution to the pension plan will have to be 20% of covered payroll in less than a decade, which is described in the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force Report as a “frightening challenge”;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate requests that the Committee on Planning and Budget work with its university wide counterpart to have the employer contribution to the pension plan be increased as rapidly as possible without endangering the critical functioning of the University, so as to reduce the huge employer contributions that will otherwise be needed in the next decade. CPB is requested to report on the results of their efforts at the first meeting of the Academic Senate in Spring 2011.

The Resolution on addressing the Unfunded Liability of UCRP passed by voice vote.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

The report of the SUA chair was read by the Commissioner for Affairs Alma de Castro.

The SUA has recruited representatives for Academic Senate committees. The United States Student Association hosted an electoral action training on campus to help train our students in how to do electoral campaigns and how to recruit students to vote, and UCSC successfully registered 2,600 students. The UCSC Executive Vice Chair was elected President of the UC Student Association, so Santa Cruz is still heading the student body for UC. UCSC also has four student representatives on the Board of Directors for the United States Student Association congress, and are working on new outreach tactics to communicate with more students across on campus.

Continuing from last year, SUA will work on the budget facts survey so that it can be taken by student system-wide and then take the results to the Regents meeting in the spring, as well as using it for future lobbying efforts with congress. Students are not discouraged but are getting tired from the expected additional fee increase, no institutional support for undocumented students, crowded classes,

leaving UC with \$26,000 to \$27,000 debt, and few faculty of color, yet they continue to support the student organizations and better the climate and leadership on campus.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

GSA President Jeff Sanceri updated the assembly on union negotiations.

Funding for graduate students are drying up, with fewer funds available for conference travel and research, fewer completion-year fellowships and 1-quarter TA sabbaticals, and fewer faculty to mentor them. The TA union is negotiating for a new contract with UC, which continues to refuse recognition for TA work. The union is currently negotiating on appointment notification, child care reimbursement, wages and health care. UC is unwilling to increase the child care reimbursements. The cost of these improvements is \$75,000, a number dwarfed by the recent awards of executive compensation.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. New Business

Professor Barbara Rogoff (Psychology) and Deanna Shemek (Literature) presented an information item. They were not able to present their Enhanced Grading Proposal at the May Senate meeting due to a lack of quorum, and are now working with the Committee on Educational Policy on their proposal. The aim of the Shemek/Rogoff proposal is to clarify for the public, alumni, students and faculty that UCSC still offers evaluations as a campus system that expands on simple letter grades, with the instructor option that the Senate adopted last year. This proposal may be handled through the revision of the CEP Guidelines for writing evaluations and through efforts to publicize the value of our system.

Adjournment: 5:10 p.m.

ATTEST:
Donald Potts
Secretary

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM
Annual Report, 2009 - 10**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) met during fall and winter quarters to complete its main business of the year. CAF reviewed and discussed the Report of the Humanities Division Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution and the Policy Review of Establishment, Disestablishment and Change of Academic Programs and Units.

Report of the Humanities Division Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution

The committee expressed its appreciation for the fact that then-Humanities Dean Van Den Abbeele convened the task force and thereby created a forum for participation and commentary by rank and file divisional faculty. CAF focused on the potential academic freedom implications of merging certain humanities departments. We were guided by our understanding that a central focus of the task force's report was the advisability and/or possibility of such a merger taking place. While such dilemmas are not inevitable, CAF recommended that careful attention be paid to establishing clear evaluation practices in the newly merged units to avoid confusion about the norms and/or expectations in the once discrete departments. This is especially important because all three of the departments proposed as possible merger candidates are themselves interdisciplinary departments.

CAF members were unanimous on the more general matter that any and all institutional reorganization(s) should have a clear and demonstrable curricular rationale and be driven by curriculum. Curriculum, in turn, must be driven by faculty research and pedagogies associated with it. By this logic, CAF believes that the planning and implementation of department mergers must be guided by faculty in the relevant departments. Finally, CAF members were unanimous in their concern about the vital need to retain the History of Consciousness program because of its central role in the intellectual vitality, to say nothing of the intellectual reputation, of UCSC.

Policy Review of Establishment, Disestablishment and Change of Academic Programs and Units.

The starting point in CAF's analysis is the central role of *trust* within the system of shared governance that so admirably has served the University of California system and, since its founding, the Santa Cruz campus, within the Master Plan for Higher Education. This trust has three key aspects. First is the trust invested *in* faculty to develop, maintain, and continually improve the university's curricular offerings. Second is the trust invested *in* faculty to establish and maintain clear standards of professional competency and excellence and to hold each other to rigorous standards in a thorough yet fair system of periodic peer review. Third is the trust *of* faculty in campus and systemwide administrators to provide and manage resources in a consultative process to support the university's core missions in the production and dissemination of knowledge and the provision of public service to the people of California. Academic freedom depends crucially on all three pillars of trust.

The proposed policy document is unequivocal in retaining for senate faculty the primary role in creating undergraduate and graduate curricula (of any sort according to the array of definitions contained in the document).

Section IV of the document raised the most concern and questions within CAF because the proposed policies threaten and, in some instances, violate shared governance principles of trust *in faculty* to manage curriculum and program excellence and *of faculty* that campus administration would manage resources in a consultative manner to support core missions. Our concerns included the creation of a new authority for divisional deans to initiate transfer, consolidation, and disestablishment (TCD) of academic programs and units (i.e., departments and interdisciplinary units) which replaces the existing policy.

CAF is concerned that the policy document is entirely silent (in this section and in every other section) on the subject of resource enhancements. We believe resource enhancements can be a very important component of academic program and unit change. The policy enumerates reasons why an academic program may lose resources, but does not state how and under what conditions academic programs may be augmented, either with new-to-campus resources or through intra-campus resource transfers. This lends the document's discussion of program maintenance and change a curious asymmetry. To the extent that the stated aim of the policy document is to guide program change, CAF recommends that the subject of procedures for resource enhancements be incorporated into the final policy.

CAF's grave reservations about the proposed policy document arise from the fact that deans' traditional short-term budget authority over annual resource allocations and routine change concatenate with new powers over program TCD. As the policy document indicates, "routine" changes are the exclusive domain of divisional deans and are exempt from higher level administrative review and academic senate consultation. Such changes can be "absorbed without undermining program viability," can enhance operating efficiency and, in the best case scenarios, can create new intellectual synergies. But such changes also can have consequences and impacts that undermine program viability. This means divisional deans can unilaterally implement program changes of a routine nature that have a cumulative, negative impact on program viability, and use the new powers created in the policy document to unilaterally initiate TCD procedures for program weaknesses resulting from ostensible routine changes. *CAF believes TCD procedures must be established that do not concentrate such wide-ranging unilateral authority in any single administrative officer.*

The slippery slope from routine change to permanent change of the campus academic landscape prompts a second, related conclusion having to do with shared governance at UCSC. As construed on page one of the policy document, shared governance consists of the fact that the University has "assigned responsibility for courses, curricula, and degrees to the faculty, and responsibility for academic units and budgets to the administration."

It is CAF's sober assessment that the severity and sustained nature of the budget crisis in California has completely undercut the viability of this longstanding model of shared governance. Political and economic changes have advanced well beyond the point where anyone believes our current situation is that of a cyclical trough out of which, in due time, we will emerge to regain lost ground and gain new public resources. Instead, we are experiencing a (we demur from saying "the") result of a secular decline in public sector support for the public sector of higher education.

At the level of campus academic planning, this ongoing secular decline, compounded by a deep and stubborn cyclical recession, means there are few, if any, programmatic resource allocation decisions that do not have a curricular impact, i.e., routine budget decisions are *de facto* curricular decisions. Current academic planning is preoccupied with planned shrinkage around reduced circumstances. In such an environment, which we believe represents the new status quo, the curricular prerogatives and responsibilities of faculty are clearly on a collision course with the budgetary prerogatives and responsibilities of the administration.

CAF asserts that it no longer realistic to make policy, as this document does, premised on the established division of labor of shared governance and calls for a new model to take its place. In a very real sense, the circumstances calling for clarification of TCD processes have already overtaken the policy document, so bleak are the state and campus budget forecasts.

The urgent task before the campus is defining a new model of shared governance, premised on emergent realities, that expands the role of faculty in determining the campus future. Given the collective brain power and management acumen of campus faculty, administrators, and staff, this project could be realized with alacrity—which is important, because time is of the essence. Despite our grave concerns, CAF remains hopeful that campus faculty and administrators will be able to move forward with developing a new model of shared governance.

Finally, members of the Committee on Academic Freedom believe CAF must participate in crafting a new model of shared governance that would include any and all TCD procedures covered by the policy document under review. Currently CAF is not represented in the procedures described in this document. The committee is the guardian of a core institutional value. As such, it must be included within all policy discussions affecting shared governance and in whatever TCD procedures are eventually adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

David Draper

Raja Guha Thakurta

Peter Limbrick

Ellen Newberry

Rhys Corral-Ribordy

Mary Beth Pudup, Chair

August 31, 2010

**Committee on Educational Policy
Annual Report 2009 -10**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy's (CEP) responsibilities include the review of campus programs, program statements, new courses and revisions to courses; consultation with other committees and administrative units; and the consideration of student petitions. In addition to these routine activities, the committee spent considerable time dealing with problems resulting from the steep decline in state support for higher education. The major focus of our work this year was to prepare for the transition to the new general education (GE) requirements, which go into effect in the fall of 2010. We begin our report with a discussion of this topic.

I. General Education Reform

In the spring of 2009, the Senate approved significant changes to UCSC's GE requirements. The old requirements – which were designed to ensure disciplinary breadth – were replaced by new requirements with defined educational objectives (Table 1). Unlike the old requirements, the new requirements are not constrained by disciplinary or divisional boundaries. They can be satisfied by both lower- and upper-division courses, including major requirements and electives. For additional information about the new GE requirements, please refer to the 2010-12 general

Table 1: New General Education Requirements (effective fall 2010)			
Cross-Cultural Analysis		CC	one 5 credit course from each of these categories
Ethnicity and Race		ER	
Interpreting Arts and Media		IM	
Mathematical and Formal Reasoning		MF	
Scientific Inquiry		SI	
Statistical Reasoning		SR	
Textual Analysis and Interpretation		TA	
Perspectives (choose one)	Environmental Awareness	PE-E	one 5 credit course from only one of these categories
	Human Behavior	PE-H	
	Technology and Society	PE-T	
Practice (choose one)	Creative Process	PR-C	one 2 credit course from only one of these categories
	Collaborative Endeavor	PR-E	
	Service Learning	PR-S	
Writing	Composition	C1 & C2	two 5 credit courses (unchanged from current requirements)
	Disciplinary Communication	DC	1 to 3 upper-division major requirements (at least 5 total credits)

catalog or the CEP web page (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep>).

The new GE requirements go into effect for new students in the fall of 2010. Continuing students will be allowed to follow either the old or new requirements. To protect students' catalog rights, programs were encouraged to maintain old GE designations carried by their courses for at least three to four years.

Colleges and departments were asked to submit proposals for courses that satisfy the new GE requirements by December 1, 2009. In October and November, the CEP chair attended meetings with the Dean and department chairs of each division to answer questions about the new requirements and encourage the submission of GE course proposals. Departments were given the opportunity to submit written feedback on the draft guidelines for new GE courses. CEP used this feedback to develop a revised set of guidelines for the new requirements. The revised guidelines and answers to frequently asked questions about the new requirements can be viewed at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/GenEdDeptGuideindex.html>.

“Double-counting” of New GE Requirements

According to the new GE Regulations approved by the Senate last year, only one GE designation can be placed on a single course unless a specific exception is granted by CEP. By preventing overlap between GE designations, each GE course can focus on a single educational objective. Preventing overlap between GE designations also encourages students to choose courses based on their interests and educational goals, as opposed to a desire to satisfy as many requirements as possible.

In response to requests from several departments, CEP revisited the “double-counting” issue. CEP appreciates the difficulty of assigning only one GE designation to certain courses, including those dealing with ethnicity, race, or cross-cultural issues in the context of visual or performing arts. After much discussion, the committee found the original arguments against “double-counting” compelling. Rare exceptions to this policy will be considered for college core courses that satisfy the C1 or C2 requirement and upper-division courses that partially satisfy a major's disciplinary communication (DC) requirement.

Review of GE Course Proposals

The response to the call for proposals for new GE courses was overwhelming; more than seven hundred proposals were submitted before the end of the fall term. CEP adopted the following approach to review the proposals. For each GE designation, several proposals were discussed by the full committee. This allowed us to identify additional issues in need of clarification and establish consistent standards for the review of the remaining proposals. At least two committee members independently reviewed each of the remaining course proposals using criteria approved by the committee. The reviewers' comments and recommendations were imported into a database of GE course proposals maintained by the committee. Additional information – including a course syllabus or a stronger justification for the requested GE designation – was required to evaluate many of the course proposals. Proposals were immediately approved if both reviews were positive. If the reviewers' recommendations differed, the proposal was flagged for referral to the full committee or a third review. Between January and June, each member of the committee reviewed a minimum of 250 GE course proposals.

Review of Disciplinary Communication (DC) Proposals

In response to numerous inquiries from departments, CEP clarified the minimum amount of writing needed to satisfy the DC requirement as follows. Students must complete 25 pages of individual writing (including drafts) with no single assignment less than two pages in length. 25 pages of writing corresponds to ~6,000 words in 12 point Times New Roman font, with double-spaced lines and 1.25 inch page margins. The formal writing requirement may be reduced to 18 pages if students receive instruction in alternative forms of disciplinary communication approved by CEP.

The DC proposal for each major was reviewed and discussed by the full committee during the winter quarter. CEP solicited feedback about each of the DC proposals from Carol Freeman, who directed the Writing Program for 25 years and served two terms as Chair of CEP. Surprisingly, relatively few of the DC proposals were contingent on the availability of supplemental funding. The majority of DC proposals were approved with little or no modification. Overall, the transition from the old Writing-Intensive (W) requirement to the new DC requirement proved to be smoother than anticipated.

Use of AP and IB Exam Scores to Satisfy GE Requirements

Each year, about 1,700 incoming students satisfy one or more of the old GE requirements based on their performance on specific Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) exams. To preserve this mechanism for satisfying GE requirements, CEP compared the content and educational objectives of each AP and IB courses to those of the new GE requirements. Since each AP and IB course has clearly defined educational objectives, it was fairly easy to determine whether credit for one of the new GE requirements should be awarded based on a strong performance on one of the AP or IB exams. A list of CEP's decisions can be found on pages 29 and 30 of the 2010-12 General Catalog.

Impact of GE Reform on Transfer Students

CEP discussed several issues pertaining to the impact of the new GE requirements on transfer students. Roughly half the students who transfer from community colleges have completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) - a set of courses that satisfy lower-division UC and CSU GE requirements. CEP supported the continued use of IGETC to satisfy all GE requirements with the exception of the DC, which must be satisfied by upper-division UCSC major requirements.

Many transfer students who do not complete IGETC can receive GE credit for specific courses covered by articulation agreements. The linkage of the old GE requirements to the disciplinary content of courses simplifies the articulation of transfer credit; any student who receives transfer credit for a UCSC course automatically receives credit for the old GE requirement(s) satisfied by the course. The committee supported the continuation of this policy for new GE requirements that have educational objectives that are tightly related to disciplinary course content, including the SR and MF requirements. The approach that will be used to articulate transfer credit for new GE requirements that are not inherently disciplinary in nature will be discussed next year.

II. Initial Projections of the Capacity of New GE Courses.

By mid-summer, CEP approved placing new GE designations on more than 500 new and existing courses. We anticipate that many of the remaining 200 proposals will be approved

once additional information is provided. Preliminary information about 2010-11 course offerings allowed us to generate a rough estimate of the GE course capacity (Table 2).

Table 2: Projected capacity of 2010-11 GE course offerings (as of 9/2010; based on preliminary Curriculum and Leave Plan data provided by Interim VPDAA Herbert Lee and Principal Analyst Betsy Moses)			
<i>GE requirement</i>	<i>Number of courses¹</i>		<i>Estimated capacity</i>
CC	121		7624
ER	32		2763
IM	31		3600
PR-C	74	1910	2891
PR-E	31	981	
PR-S	<5 ²	?	
PE-T	11	2352	8786
PE-H	17	4290	
PE-E	15	2144	
SI	42		8208
TA	37		3538
SR	20		3265
MF	73		10336
All GE courses	504		51011
All courses	3435		164392
¹ number of courses to be offered in 2010-11, as opposed to total number of courses approved by CEP; includes multiple offerings of the same course ² the projected capacity of most of these new courses was not available at the time this report was prepared.			

Continuing students have the option of following either the new or old GE requirements; the transition to the new requirements will therefore occur over roughly three years. Assuming a total enrollment of approximately 16,000 undergraduates, the campus must offer roughly 4,000 seats per year in courses fulfilling each of the new requirements by the end of the transition period. This estimate is conservative since it assumes that no students will satisfy the new requirements via transfer courses, IGETC or other mechanisms.

In some cases, departments placed GE designations on courses with pre-requisites that satisfy the same requirement; although this practice was discouraged by CEP, it may have inflated apparent capacity of GE courses. The above estimates are preliminary and may prove to be unrealistically optimistic, but our initial projections of GE course capacity for the first year of the transition period are encouraging. One of seven courses offered in 2010-11 (one in three

seats overall) will satisfy one of the new GE requirements. Almost 4,000 seats in IM and TA courses will be offered in 2010-11, and the capacity of CC, PE, SI and MF courses is even higher. Although the projected capacity of SR courses is higher than anticipated, there is a clear need for additional courses that satisfy this requirement. We also encourage departments to develop additional GE courses, with an emphasis on courses that satisfy the PR-C, PR-E, PR-S, and ER requirements. CEP will post updated information on GE course capacity as it becomes available.

III. Enforcement of Senate Regulation A9.1.8 - Repetition of Courses.

During the past year, several departments expressed concerns about students who make repeated, unsuccessful attempts to pass a course required for their major. Anecdotal information also suggests that some students retake classes they previously passed to meet a GPA threshold required for admission to the major. These students fail to make academic progress while placing additional pressure on the limited capacity of courses.

CEP therefore strongly recommends the strict enforcement of SCR A9.1.8, which states that the “repetition of a course more than once requires approval of the student's college”. The committee believes that exceptions to this policy should be extremely rare. We encourage the colleges to consult with the relevant departments before granting approvals to repeat a class more than once.

IV. Narrative Evaluations of Student Performance

CEP discussed SEC's proposal to make written evaluations of student performance instructor-optional. Current policies place few restrictions on the length or content of written evaluations. Some written evaluations provide detailed feedback on student performance while others merely state “see letter grade”. CEP endorsed the proposed change because it will bring Regulation 9.2 in line with current policies, while eliminating the need for the labor-intensive accountability measures required by Campus Academic Personnel Manual 006.000.

V. Suspension of the Community Studies Major

In the spring of 2009, Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs (VPDAA) Alison Galloway asked Community Studies to present a plan for maintaining the viability of their major during a period of declining resources. After a year's time, the department was unable to develop a satisfactory plan for supporting their major with the resources at their disposal. Instead, different groups of faculty within the department submitted separate proposals describing “teach-out” plans that would lead to the eventual discontinuation of the major. Out of concern for the welfare of current and prospective students, CEP suspended the Community Studies major for a period of no more than two years.

CEP urged the administration to inform prospective students of the suspension of the major before they accepted offers of admission to our campus. We asked the department to develop a teach-out plan that protects the quality of the undergraduate program while allowing proposed and declared majors to complete their degrees in a reasonable amount of time. CEP reviewed and approved the teach-out plan developed in response to this request in June.

We hope that our decision to suspend the Community Studies major will not be misconstrued as the first step toward its inevitable discontinuation. We remain hopeful that the problems facing the major can be resolved so that we can reverse our decision. In the meantime, we urge the Dean of Social Sciences, the Academic Senate and administration to work together to ensure that students who are unable to pursue a degree in Community Studies can declare another major that fulfills at least some of their aspirations.

VI. External Reviews

The Committee read and responded to four external reviews and participated in the related closure meetings (Feminist Studies, Film and Digital Media, History, and Legal Studies). CEP also commented on the charges for seven external review committees: Linguistics, Education, Applied Mathematics & Statistics, Biomolecular Engineering, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Digital Arts/New Media, and Earth and Planetary Sciences.

VII. Miscellaneous Responses

In addition to the usual review of undergraduate classes and program statements, CEP was asked to provide feedback on an unusually large number of reports and proposals. Many of these reports were motivated by the University's worsening financial situation. During the past year, CEP read and commented on:

- a proposal to broaden the charge of the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP) to include undergraduate student welfare;
- a UCEP On-line Education Initiative proposal;
- a draft of the revised campus policies and procedures for the establishment; disestablishment and change of academic programs and units;
- a proposal from UCOP to introduce differential fees for certain programs including engineering and business;
- a white paper on differential fees and non-resident tuition from the UC Committee on Planning on Budget;
- a proposal from UCEP and the Academic Council to repeal SR 764 on special studies;
- a report from the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force (UEETF);
- the final report of the joint Senate-Administration Task Force on the Education Abroad Program (EAP);
- a report from the Academic Senate Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency;
- several reports from Community Studies describing their response to recent budget cuts;
- the Community Studies teach-out plan developed in response to the suspension of the major;
- a proposal from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to modify SCR 9.2 on Narrative Evaluations;
- a letter from VPDUE Ladusaw on reading days and other options for non-podium instructional days;
- the report of the Humanities Advisory Task Force on Reconstitution;
- the recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future;

- three proposals to transfer FTE to other departments or divisions;
- a proposal from OPERS to move all physical education courses out of the normal course scheduling process and general catalog;
- the revised Compendium, the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units and Research Units.

VIII. Programs

CEP reviews all proposals to modify the requirements or policies of undergraduate programs that appear in the general catalog. CEP reviewed and approved several new degree programs, including:

- a new major in Jewish Studies;
- a new major in Cognitive Sciences (administered by Psychology);
- a new major in Applied Math and Statistics;
- the undergraduate component of a combined B.A./M.A. program in Linguistics.

CEP also approved modifications of three existing degree programs, including:

- the elimination of the Neuroscience and Behavior B.A. program;
- the conversion of the Neuroscience and Behavior B.S. program to a Neuroscience B.S. program;
- changing the name of the Health Sciences B.S. program to the Human Biology B.S. program.

CEP approved changes to the admissions policies of the Computer Sciences (CMPE); Information Systems Management (ISM); Earth Sciences (EART); and Theater Arts (THEA) majors. Requests to modify the disqualification policies of several other majors were denied because the changes proposed could lead to the disqualification of a student during their senior year. A request to modify the Bioengineering major admissions policy was deferred to next fall, 2010.

CEP reviews proposals for new University Extension certificate programs and periodically reviews existing ones. CEP reviewed and re-approved revised University Extension certificate programs in Ecological Horticulture, Advanced Ecological Horticulture, Marketing and Management, Business Administration. A proposal for a new certificate program in Web Content and Marketing Management was also approved.

In response to a request from CEP, VPDA Alison Galloway agreed to include a Senate faculty member on the advisory board of all University Extension programs. This individual will participate in the review process, be available for consultation with CEP, and review changes to courses and curricula together with the relevant department chair(s).

IX. Other Actions

In addition to general education course proposals, CEP members reviewed 105 new courses, 1144 course revisions (including cancellations, suspensions and re-numberings), 46 program statements, and 12 individual majors.

The Chair reviewed another 585 petitions, including:

- 184 Writing-Intensive course substitutions;
- 116 other general education substitutions;
- 28 requests to retroactively change the grade option (letter grade vs. pass/no pass) of a class. Approximately 12 of the requests were approved so that a student could meet the graduation requirement that 75 percent of credits be letter graded. In such cases, all grades earned during the student's last quarter were changed to letter grades (with the exception of P/NP only courses);
- 69 requests for retroactive grade changes. All of the requests involved late withdrawals from a course, usually for medical reasons, leading to the grade W. Approximately 22 of the requests were denied due to the lack of supporting documentation;
- 138 requests for the retroactive addition or removal of a class. Most of these requests of were based on purported AIS errors; 24 were denied due to the lack of evidence that the student attempted to change their schedule prior to the deadline;
- 50 other miscellaneous petitions

CEP benefited from the expertise of an impressive group of invited guests, including Associate Registrar Margie Claxton; Academic Preceptor Elaine Kihara; former Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bill Ladusaw; Articulation Officer Barbara Love; and Associate Director of Admissions Michael McCawley. We thank them for their important contributions to the committee's work this year. We would also like to thank Carol Freeman for her contributions to the implementation of the DC requirement; we sincerely appreciate Carol's willingness to share her considerable expertise with departments and our committee.

Finally, we thank Roxanne Monnet, for her outstanding work as CEP's analyst. Although the transition to the new GE requirements led to a massive increase in Roxanne's workload, she carried out her responsibilities without complaint. It would have been impossible for the committee to function without her encyclopedic knowledge of our campus's undergraduate programs, policies and procedures.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Cormac Flanagan

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Jimin Lee

Eric Porter

Peter Young

Eileen Zurbriggen

John Tamkun, Chair

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NSTF Representative

Matthew Palm, Student Representative (SUA)

Justin Riordan, Student Representative (SUA)

Deanna Shemek, Provost Representative

October 22, 2010

GRADUATE COUNCIL
Amendment to Section IV Graduate Program
Chapter 13 Grading and Transmission of Records

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Graduate Council is proposing amendments to Section IV, Chapter 13, that covers graduate grading and transmission of records. The five changes include adding the option of +/- on grades A and B and + on grade C for graduate courses; giving graduate programs the option of requiring S/U or letter grades for any of their graduate courses; enabling official GPAs to be calculated for students who have letter grades for at least 25-units of graduate courses; making narrative evaluations instructor optional for graduate courses; and fixing a timeliness issue with regard to grade changes for graduate courses. All of these changes bring graduate grading policy more in-line with undergraduate grading policy, fix existing policy that is unenforceable and/or inconsistent, and provide additional options for graduate programs to effectively evaluate student performance in graduate courses.

Current wording

Proposed wording

<p>13.1 Grading. A13.1.1 Graduate students in graduate or undergraduate courses shall be graded S, U, or I. The quality of work awarded a grade of S shall clearly merit certification of satisfactory progress towards the Master's or Ph.D. degrees.</p> <p>13.1.2 All preliminary, qualifying and/or comprehensive graduate examinations shall be graded Honors (H), Pass (P), or Fail (F). Papers of students receiving H or F grades will be read by at least two readers.</p> <p>13.1.3 Graduate students have the option of receiving a letter grade of A, B, C, D or F instead of S or U in any graduate course or any undergraduate course for which undergraduate students have the letter grade option. The grades A or B shall be awarded for satisfactory work. A graduate student receiving a grade of C or D will not be able to use the credit for that course to satisfy any course requirement for a graduate degree in the Santa Cruz Division.</p>	<p>13.1 Grading. A13.1.1 No Change</p> <p>13.1.2 No Change</p> <p>13.1.3 Graduate students have the option of receiving a letter grade of A, B, C, D or F instead of S or U in any graduate course or any undergraduate course for which undergraduate students have that has the letter grade option. The grades A or B shall be awarded for satisfactory work. A graduate student receiving a grade of C or D will not be able to use the credit for that course to satisfy any course requirement for a graduate degree in the Santa Cruz Division. <u>Letter grades A-F, shall be awarded for graduate students in the manner and with the meanings prescribed in SR 780, except that the grades A and B may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes and the grade C may be modified by plus (+). A graduate student receiving a grade of C+, C, D, or F will not be able to</u></p>
---	---

<p>13.1.4 The grade of I may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality but is incomplete. A student may not repeat a course in which a grade of I has been received, except after approval of a petition by the Graduate Council. The student is entitled to replace this I grade by a passing grade and to receive credit</p>	<p><u>use the credit for that course to satisfy any course requirement for a graduate degree in the Santa Cruz Division. A graduate program has the option of requiring letter grades or S/U grades for any graduate course offered by the graduate program.</u></p> <p><u>13.1.3B Grade points per credit shall be assigned by the Registrar as follows: A = 4; B = 3; C = 2; D = 1; F=0. I, W, or IP = none. "Minus" grades shall be assigned three-tenths grade point less per credit than unsuffixed grades, and "plus" grades (except A+) shall be assigned three-tenths grade point more per credit. The grade of A+ shall be assigned 4.0 grade points per credit, the same as for an unsuffixed A, but when A+ is reported it represents extraordinary achievement. The grade point average (GPA) for graduate students is determined by dividing the number of grade points earned by the number of credits attempted for a letter grade. The number of grade points earned for a course equals the number of grade points assigned multiplied by the number of course credits. Only letter grades are used for computing a graduate student's grade point average. Graduate students must have taken at least 25 credits of their graduate courses as letter grades in order to receive an official GPA for their degree.</u></p> <p><u>13.1.3C The Registrar is authorized to change a final grade upon written request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change. Grade changes (except for I and IP) must be submitted to the Registrar within one year from the close of the quarter for which the original grade was submitted.</u></p> <p>13.1.4 No Change</p>
---	--

<p>provided he or she completes the work of the course by the end of the third quarter following that in which the grade I was received unless the instructor or department specifies an earlier date. Under extenuating circumstances, a petition for extension of this time may be granted by the chair of the department concerned upon recommendation of the instructor.</p> <p>13.1.5 A grade in a single course extending over two or three terms of an academic year may be given at the end of the course. This grade will then be recorded as applying to each of the terms of the course. A student satisfactorily completing only one or two terms of a course extending over two or three terms of an academic year for reasons of illness or transfer, shall be given grades for those terms. In this context, SCR A9.1.7 shall apply to graduate courses.</p> <p>A13.1.6 Graduate students may repeat courses in which they received a grade of C, D, F or U. If a student repeats a course in which he or she received a grade of C or D, the credits are only counted once. The most recently earned grade will determine whether a degree requirement has been met. No course may be repeated more than once without prior written approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies.</p> <p>13.2 Evaluations.</p> <p>13.2.1 Each instructor in a graduate course shall prepare a written evaluation at the end of the term for each graduate student in his or her class, who takes the course for credit. A written evaluation of a preliminary, qualifying, or comprehensive examination may be provided by the relevant department. Non-credit seminar courses do not require written evaluations.</p>	<p>13.1.5 No Change</p> <p>A13.1.6 No Change</p> <p>13.2 Evaluations.</p> <p>13.2.1 Each instructor in a graduate course shall prepare a written evaluation at the end of the term for each graduate student in his or her class, who takes the course for credit. <u>At the end of the term, each instructor teaching a course shall have the option to prepare a written evaluation for any student taking the course for credit.</u> A written evaluation of a preliminary, qualifying, or comprehensive examination may be provided by the relevant department. Non-credit seminar courses do not require written evaluations.</p>
--	---

<p>13.2.2 The Registrar shall send student transcripts outside the institution only as requested by the student concerned. Only courses and grades will be sent unless the student expressly requests that narrative evaluations be included, in which event the Registrar must send all evaluations. (Am 1 Aug 84)</p>	<p>13.2.2 No Change</p>

Respectfully submitted,

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Rob Fairlie
Julie Guthman
Jorge Hankamer
Kimberly Jannarone
Robert Johnson
Athanasios Kottas
Neoklis Polyzotis
Catherine Ramirez
Carol Shennan
Megan Thomas
Sue Carter, Chair

Tyrus Miller, *ex officio*
Paul Machlis, LAUC Representative
Jeff Sanceri, GSA Representative

January 24, 2011

**COMMITTEE on COMMITTEES
Amendment to Bylaw 4.1 Senate Chair**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Currently, the bylaws do not provide an adequate mechanism for stabilizing the Senate Chair term when a Chair resigns after one year. The intent of this bylaw change is to provide Committee on Committees (COC) the flexibility to initiate, when appropriate, another two year term. The consequence of the current bylaw is that the Senate either has a choppy leadership sequence of one year chairs or will be asking an individual to serve the remaining one year and then take on a two-year term, for a total of three years. This change will enable COC to effectively “reset the clock” to a two year term. Effective April 1, 2011.

Current wording

Proposed wording

<p>4.1 Chair. A Chair of the Santa Cruz Division is appointed by the Committee on Committees for a term of two years. Should the office become vacant before the completion of a term, the Committee on Committees appoints a Chair to fill the remainder of the term. The Chair presides at meetings of the Santa Cruz Division and serves <i>ex officio</i> as a member of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Academic Council of the Assembly, and the Divisional Committee on Planning and Budget. The Chair maintains effective coordination between the Santa Cruz Division and the Santa Cruz Administration, the Santa Cruz Division and its committees, and between Divisional committees. The Chair may participate in a non-voting capacity in the deliberations of any committee of the Division unless the matter under consideration is not to be reported directly to the Division. The Chair may refer matters to committees of the Division. The Chair of the Division submits an annual budget request to the Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, for the work of the Division, its committees, and the office of the Division. The Chair of the Division determines initially what legislation is solely of Divisional concern. Such decision may be appealed to the Division.</p>	<p>4.1 Chair. A Chair of the Santa Cruz Division is appointed by the Committee on Committees for a term of two years. Should the office become vacant before the completion of a term, the Committee on Committees appoints a Chair to fill the remainder of the term; the Committee on Committees may then extend this appointment for an additional year. The Chair presides at meetings of the Santa Cruz Division and serves <i>ex officio</i> as a member of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Academic Council of the Assembly, and the Divisional Committee on Planning and Budget. The Chair maintains effective coordination between the Santa Cruz Division and the Santa Cruz Administration, the Santa Cruz Division and its committees, and between Divisional committees. The Chair may participate in a non-voting capacity in the deliberations of any committee of the Division unless the matter under consideration is not to be reported directly to the Division. The Chair may refer matters to committees of the Division. The Chair of the Division submits an annual budget request to the Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, for the work of the Division, its committees, and the office of the Division. The Chair of the Division determines initially what legislation is solely of Divisional concern. Such decision may be appealed to the Division.</p>
--	--

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Joel Ferguson

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez

Ted Holman

Norman Locks

Loisa Nygaard, Chair

January 27, 2011

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Amendment to Chapter 11 Elections

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Committees (COC) is the only elected body in the UCSC Senate. COC nominates all divisional officers, all Senate committee members and chairs, and recommends UCSC representatives to system-wide committees. This amendment to the elections bylaw is intended to resolve problems that arise when an insufficient number of nominees to fill the Committee on Committees is put forward during the regular nomination process. The amendment will change the method by which any remaining vacant slots on the committee are filled.

For filling vacancies due to insufficient nominations, the bylaw now invokes the mechanism in COC's committee charge (**13.14.2**) for replacing members who step down before completing their two-year terms.

13.14.1 There are five Santa Cruz Division members. Vacancies are filled by election in the winter quarter by mail ballot in accordance with Chapter 11 of these Bylaws.

13.14.2 Each year either two or three seats on the Committee fall vacant. Members are elected to two-year terms running from September 1 following election. If an elected member fails to serve or fails to complete any year of a term, the Committee submits a nomination for replacement to the Division. The new member shall serve with authority only after confirmation by the Santa Cruz Division, and serves for the remainder of the year. An election will be held, in accordance with SCB 13.14.1, to fill the vacancy for the second year of the term.

The unintended consequence of using this method, which essentially creates a single-year term for any member brought to the committee using 13.14.2, is that the staggered sequence of alternately electing either two or three members per year is disrupted. In recent years, due to members being "elected" by this method and/or appointed to fill the second year of a term, COC has either completely turned over (had all new members in a single year) or had only one continuing and four new members. The result is a loss of continuity in committee membership that can have a negative impact on the functioning of this committee.

COC is extremely careful in appointing Senate committees so that only approximately half of the membership of any given committee changes each year. Continuity on Senate committees is very important to their effective functioning. Yet, due to the workings of the current bylaw, COC itself has been plagued by a disruptive series of replacements.

The proposed amendment aims to stabilize the staggered replacement schedule for COC while leaving in place the opportunity for nominations to the committee to come from the faculty at large as well as the authority of the Senate to ratify any nominees the committee itself puts forward.

Current wording	Proposed wording
<p>Chapter 11. Elections</p> <p>11.1 All balloting in the Santa Cruz Division is either by mail or, if arising from a motion in a meeting of the Divisional Senate, conducted in the meeting.</p> <p>11.2 All elections in the Santa Cruz Division are conducted by the Secretary under the direction of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections in accordance with SB 340A-B.</p> <p>11.3 The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections determines the dates on which Divisional elections should be held, counts or appoints tellers to count the ballots, and certifies the results to the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division.</p> <p>11.4 Nominating petitions shall be filed with the Secretary by the deadline specified in the Notice of Election, which will be no less than fourteen and no more than twenty eight calendar days following the mailing or electronic distribution of the Notice. Each nominating petition for an office must be signed by five voting members and must contain certification of acceptance by the nominee or nominees. Each nominating petition may include as many nominees as there are places to be filled.</p> <p>If the number of nominees is equal to the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected. If the number of nominees is less than the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected and the remaining vacancies remaining</p>	<p>Chapter 11. Elections</p> <p>11.1 No change</p> <p>11.2 No change</p> <p>11.3 No change</p> <p>11.4 Nominating petitions shall be filed with the Secretary by the deadline specified in the Notice of Election, which will be no less than fourteen and no more than twenty eight calendar days following the mailing or electronic distribution of the Notice. Each nominating petition for an office must be signed by five voting members and must contain certification of acceptance by the nominee or nominees. Each nominating petition may include as many nominees as there are places to be filled.</p> <p>If the number of nominees is equal to the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected. If the number of nominees is less than the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected and the remaining vacancies remaining</p>

<p>will be treated as mid-year vacancies to be filled in accordance with SCB 13.14.2.</p> <p>11.5 A voter may cast one and only one vote for each place to be filled in an election. Candidates receiving the highest plurality of votes cast are elected. If there is a tie vote for the last place to be filled, the selection shall be by lot, conducted by the Secretary.</p>	<p>will be treated as mid-year vacancies to be filled in accordance with SCB 13.14.2.<u>will be filled by the Committee on Committees. The nominees selected by the Committee on Committees will serve with authority only after confirmation by the Santa Cruz Division.</u></p> <p>11.5 No change</p>
--	--

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Joel Ferguson
Diane Gifford-Gonzalez
Ted Holman
Norman Locks
Loisa Nygaard, Chair

February 13, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY
Amendment to Bylaw 13.23**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Due to the increasing importance of scholarly communication with respect to publishing, research, and teaching at UCSC and the University Library’s vested interest in supporting those ventures, the Committee on the Library (COL) seeks to instate the following amendments to Bylaw 13.23. COL proposes these amendments so that its name and charge will reflect the current reality of the expanded role of the library in the publication and dissemination of both print and electronic resources. The committee believes this change will underscore COL’s interest in maintaining a role in this process of modernization. COL also seeks to update Bylaw 13.23 in recognition of the change of the systemwide committee (UCOLASC) to include scholarly communication. COL also acknowledges that the library no longer has a protected budget, and the committee seeks to create awareness about where the library budget is situated with respect to campus priorities. Effective April 1, 2011.

Current wording

Proposed wording

Current wording	Proposed wording
<p>13.23 Committee on the Library</p> <p>13.23.1 There are five Santa Cruz Division members, plus the University Librarian at Santa Cruz serving <i>ex officio</i>. In addition, there are no more than two student representatives. The Chair and Chair-elect of the UCSC Librarians Association are invited to sit with the Committee. The University Librarian does not serve as Chair. (Am 3 Dec 69, 6 Nov 91, 25 May 94; CC 31 Aug 98; EC 31 Aug 99, 31 Aug 04, 31 Aug 06)</p> <p>13.23.2 The Committee advises the President of the University and the Chancellor at Santa Cruz regarding the administration of the libraries at Santa Cruz, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents. It consults with campus and library administration on matters of local and Universitywide policy. Whenever appropriate, it joins the library administration in providing representation at Universitywide discussions of library policy. It assists the library administration in determining the effect on accession policy of new or changing programs, changing patterns of faculty and student use of the library, and the varied needs of the different disciplines. (Am 22 May 74; EC 31 Aug 06)</p>	<p>13.23 Committee on the Library <u>and Scholarly Communication</u></p> <p>13.23.1 There are five Santa Cruz Division members, plus the University Librarian at Santa Cruz serving <i>ex officio</i>. In addition, there are no more than two student representatives. The Chair and Chair-elect of the UCSC Librarians Association are invited to sit with the Committee. The University Librarian does not serve as Chair. (Am 3 Dec 69, 6 Nov 91, 25 May 94; CC 31 Aug 98; EC 31 Aug 99, 31 Aug 04, 31 Aug 06)</p> <p>13.23.2 The Committee advises the President of the University and the Chancellor at Santa Cruz regarding the administration of the libraries at Santa Cruz, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents. It consults with campus and library administration on matters of local and Universitywide <u>library and scholarly communication policies.</u> policy. <u>Scholarly communication refers to the modalities by which research and creative work are made public, as described in 13.23.4.</u> Whenever appropriate, it <u>the Committee</u> joins the library administration in providing representation at Universitywide discussions of library policy. It assists the library administration in determining the effect</p>

	<p>on accession policy of new or changing programs, acquisition and management policies for collections, considering changing patterns of faculty and student use of the library, and the varied needs of the different disciplines.</p> <p><u>13.23.3 In consultation with the University Librarian, the Committee advises the Chancellor and the Committee on Planning and Budget on the library budget, apportionment of funds, allocation of space, and other matters concerning the library. Advises and consults with the Chancellor on administrative reviews of the library.</u></p> <p><u>13.23.4 The Committee studies and reports on issues of scholarly communication, including technology, publishing, teaching, archiving, and copyright. The Committee promotes education and advocacy for matters concerning the library and scholarly communication.</u></p>
--	---

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Erik Asphaug
Murray Baumgarten
Shelly Errington
Daniela Sandler
Roberto Manduchi, Chair

Virginia Steel, University Librarian, *ex officio*
Nicole Lawson, LAUC Chair
Annette Marines, LAUC Vice-Chair
Jeff Sanceri, GSA
Michael Laird, SUA
Aviv Spillinger, SUA

February 16, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Amendment to Bylaw 13.24**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) proposes to codify the participation of the Senate Director on the committee to ensure the Director continues to act as a resource for the Committee in coordinating CPB’s work with other committees, as well as informing the Committee of current issues both on campus and systemwide. Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.4.3 allows for individuals to be invited to sit with standing committees. Committee on Committees concurs with this proposed change. Effective April 1, 2011.

Current wording

Proposed wording

Current wording	Proposed wording
<p>13.24 Committee on Planning and Budget</p> <p>13.24.1 There are nine Santa Cruz Division members, plus the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Santa Cruz Division serving <i>ex officio</i>. In addition, there are one graduate student representative and no more than two undergraduate student representatives.</p> <p>13.24.2 The Committee confers with the Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, concerning the budget and budget policy for the Santa Cruz campus. It makes recommendations to the Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and acts for the Santa Cruz Division on all matters concerning planning, including the organization of, and relations among divisions, schools, colleges, departments, and programs of study, Organized Research Units, and the University Library.</p> <p>13.24.3 The Committee acts for the Santa Cruz Division on all proposals for the initiation and abolition of academic programs and on all proposals for their revision when a change of budget is involved. In its deliberations the Committee works closely with the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Graduate Council, and may call upon them for advice. In deliberations</p>	<p>13.24 Committee on Planning and Budget</p> <p>13.24.1 There are nine Santa Cruz Division members, plus the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Santa Cruz Division serving <i>ex officio</i>. In addition, there are one graduate student representative and no more than two undergraduate student representatives. <u>The Director of the Academic Senate is invited to sit with the Committee.</u></p> <p>13.24.2 no change</p> <p>13.24.3 no change</p>

<p>concerning academic resource allocation the Committee has responsibility to ensure appropriate consideration of campus affirmative action policies.</p>	
--	--

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Robert Boltje

Patty Gallagher

Susan Gillman, *ex officio*

Joseph Konopelski, *ex officio*

Sriram Shastry

Gene Switkes

Andy Szasz

Marilyn Westerkamp

Brent Haddad, Chair

Graduate Student Representative:

Erik Green

Student Representative:

Alma Natalia DeCastro

February 16, 2011