

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
May 20, 2005 at 2:30 p.m.
Colleges Nine & Ten Multipurpose Room At the University Center
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
 - a. Draft Minutes of February 16, 2005 (AS/SCM/275)
2. Announcements
 - a. Chair Galloway
 - b. Chancellor Denton
 - c. Interim Campus Provost/EVC Kliger
3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCM/1453)
4. Special Orders: Annual Reports
CONSENT CALENDAR:
 - a. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections 2003 – 04 (AS/SCP/1450)
5. Reports of Special Committees (none)
6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Educational Policy
 - a. Review of Quantitative General Education Requirement-Interim Report (AS/SCP/1457)
 - b. Amendment to Appendix C, Undergraduate Student Grievance Procedure (AS/SCP/1456)
 - b. Committee on Committees:
 - a. Amendment to CEP Bylaw 13.17.8 (AS/SCP/1459)
 - b. Nominations 2004-05 (AS/SCP/1458)
 - c. Committee on Education Abroad Program
 - a. Catalog Statement on International Education (AS/SCP/1454)
 - d. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1452)
 - e. Committee on Faculty Welfare
 - a. Oral Report on Housing
 - f. Senate Executive Committee
 - a. Resolution on Faculty Housing and Campus Growth (AS/SCP/1462)
 - b. Report on Senate Tent University and Restructuring Emergency Response Procedures (AS/SCP/1461)
 - g. Committee on Library
 - a. Resolution on Scholarly Publishing (AS/SCP/1460)
 - h. Committee on Committee on Planning and Budget
Report on the Long Range Development Plan (AS/SCP/1451)
7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair
8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President
9. Petitions of Students
10. Unfinished Business
11. University and Faculty Welfare
12. New Business

May 12, 2005

MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Dear Colleagues,

After an eventful spring, we are facing our final Senate meeting of the year with a full agenda (<<http://senate.ucsc.edu/meetings/05may/A05may.htm>>). The meeting will be held in the Colleges Nine and Ten Multipurpose Room at the University Center and begins at 2:30 pm. As usual for the end of the year, the meeting will also be followed by a reception, this time at University House.

In addition to the votes on the slate of committee members and officers for next year and the Faculty Research Lecturer, we have additional bylaw amendments and resolutions that will require action. We will also be hearing from Chancellor Denton, Interim CPEVC Kliger, and the Student Union Assembly and Graduate Student Assembly representatives.

Among the issues coming to the floor are changes in the undergraduate student grievance procedures. These changes necessitate a change in Santa Cruz bylaw 13.17.8. The Committee on the Education Abroad Program is presenting a mission statement for the Catalog and requesting Senate approval. The Committee on the Library is presenting a resolution on scholarly publishing. Finally, the Senate Executive Committee is presenting a resolution linking the need for affordable faculty housing to the plans for campus growth.

Several committees have reports on issues of concern to the campus. The Committee on Educational Policy has spent much of the year reviewing the quantitative courses within the general education requirement. Their interim report is presented for the meeting and their work will continue through the coming year. The Committee on Faculty Welfare presents a follow-up to their winter meeting oral report with new information and issues on Ranchview Terrace and future building possibilities. The Committee on Planning and Budget reports on outstanding issues arising from the Long Range Development Plan, including faculty housing, parking and transportation, and academic space. CPB recommends that 1) the Environmental Impact Report must show means of achieving a workable solution to these issues before the campus growth passes the present limit and 2) annual growth must be limited by the corresponding accumulation of the support in housing, space and infrastructure. Finally, as Senate Chair, I am forming a task force to investigate the events leading to the confrontation at Tent University, Santa Cruz on April 18, 2005. This group is designed to provide an impartial look at the decision-making processes on many sides and provide recommendations on how we can work to improve the emergency response approach to this type of event. A short period for discussion will be available on this topic.

If you have corrections for the minutes, please send them via email to the Senate Office before the meeting.

Sincerely,



Alison Galloway, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
of the
Winter Quarter 2005 Meeting

The draft minutes from the February 16, 2005 Winter Quarter Senate meeting were distributed via email on May 4, 2005 and will be presented for approval at the next Senate Meeting on May 20, 2005. After being approved, these minutes will be posted on the Senate web site (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/meetings/index.htm>).

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 distribution as a handout 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 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2005**. They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to senate@ucsc.edu.

Loisa Nygaard
Secretary, Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

May 4, 2005

**Report of the Representative to the Assembly of the Academic Senate
March 9, 2005**

TO: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Assembly met by phone on March 9 from 10AM to 1 PM. First came the announcements of the chair, George Blumenthal. He reported that there will be an LRDP of sorts for the University, headed by Provost Greenwood and Executive Vice President Bruce Darling, who are working to bring into focus a vision of UC in 2020. Second, plans are being formulated to make the easier the articulation between community college and UC. Specifically, there will now be generic articulation agreements. Specific departments and specific campuses may still elect to opt-out of the generic templates. Blumenthal mentioned the launching of an advocacy program, intended to win the hearts and minds and pocketbooks of legislative friends. Faculty will be called to be involved. Third, Blumenthal noted that Senator Jack Scott (head of the California Senate committee on higher education) has introduced a bill that would allow California State Universities (CSU's) to mount doctoral programs. The CSU's cite delays in arranging joint Ed.D. programs as one reason that the state should grant them authority to give doctoral degrees. Fourth, UC has submitted a bid to manage Lawrence Livermore Labs, and has gone through the oral report stage. Fifth, UC has requested that the Regenerative Health Project, allowed by the passage of Prop 71 on the Stem Cell Initiative, make grantees agree to publish their findings on a publicly accessible web site within six months of notification of acceptance of publication. Finally, Blumenthal noted the crisis in graduate education in the UC system. Enrollments, especially of international students, are down and some programs are in jeopardy.

President Dynes' report included several items. First, in terms of the budget, there is good news from Sacramento (the Governor will honor his compact and there is bipartisan support for the university) but bad news from Washington. Second, senior personnel positions are being filled. Denice Denton has been hired. The UCSD chancellor was just inaugurated; and the UCB chancellor will soon be. The search has begun for a chancellor for UCI. Third, CSUs are trying to push for doctoral-degree granting privileges. President Dynes is opposed to that move. Fourth, he noted that the funding for the California Science and Math Initiative is kept separate from academic preparation programs. He is trying to put together a compelling program that he can sell to the governor. Fifth, he reiterated that he wants to increase the number of graduate students relative to undergraduates in the UC system.

The Assembly voted unanimously to elect John Oakley of Davis as the Vice Chair of the Assembly 2005-2006.

The meeting continued with a discussion, lead by Chair Blumenthal, of the establishment of a Senate at Merced. Changes in the bylaws may make it easier to establish the Senate there than might otherwise be true. At the core of the issue is the delegation of authority. Assembly voted in favor of a resolution to modify Senate Bylaw 116b.

Next came a discussion of a proposed change to the Bylaws concerning time limits on disciplinary hearings. The rule as it exists in the bylaws was created to protect administrators who might otherwise be exposed to sanctions if disciplinary proceedings extended longer than three years. The new wording is intended to clarify the bylaw and is consistent with the Faculty Code of Conduct. By a voice vote, the resolution clarifying the language was passed by Assembly.

Two oral reports were given, one by the Committee on Faculty Welfare and one by BOARS. UCFW reported that there may be a move away from a defined benefits program for retirement and toward defined contributions. Other topics of concern to UCFW were parking, eligibility for health care, and the sale of MOP plans. By working closely together, the system-wide administration (in the office of Steve Matthews) and UCFW were able to capture an extra 2.5 million dollars for the university from a credit union that bought the mortgages. BOARS reported on its opposition to UC use of the merit scholarships (PSATs). The PSATs have an adverse impact on ethnic minority applicants and have no proven predictive validity. According to ETS, they are not intended to be used as a gating mechanism for college entrance.

Respectfully Submitted;

REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY

Michael Isaacson

March 11, 2005

Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
Annual Report, 2003-04

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJE) met formally three times during the year, primarily to evaluate legislation, resolutions and other items submitted for inclusion in the agendas of regular meetings of the Santa Cruz Division, to provide editorial advice to the proposers about the wording of their proposals, and to provide advice about possible legal and legislative implications of proposals, should they be approved by the Division. Other requests for information or informal advice from the Executive Committee, Senate Officers, committee chairs, and individual senators of items were dealt with mainly by email or telephone conversations.

During Fall 2003, the most important issue was advising the Chair of the Graduate Council about the legality of temporary procedures for appointing and promoting faculty in the Department of Mathematics that would be consistent with divisional and systemwide Senate bylaws and regulations and the Regents' Standing Orders, and would allow rapid reinstatement of admissions to the mathematics Ph.D. program. The situation was not foreseen in the Standing Orders, bylaws and regulations; precedents at UCSC and on other campuses were poorly documented; and many ramifications touched on such complex areas as shared governance and academic freedom. Therefore a definitive opinion on the proposed procedures probably can only be reached at systemwide level, so RJE limited itself to providing informal opinions that emphasized the spirit of the most relevant principles, and urged wide consultation with Committee on Academic Personnel and other Senate committees.

RJE also considered the situation of a recently elected member of the Committee on Committees (COC) who was appointed as a department chair before the new COC took office. RJE agreed that a department chair serving on COC is not in conflict with SCB 13.4.2. RJE also agreed that a special election is not required to fill a COC vacancy created by a resignation before the next COC takes office on 1 September, because SCB 13.14.1 clearly calls for all COC vacancies to be filled by the annual election in winter quarter. Instead, RJE agreed that should a member resign before taking office, COC may nominate any person to fill the slot (subject to approval at next Senate meeting), including the candidate receiving the next highest vote in the COC election.

The members of RJE would particularly like thank Senate staffers Catherine Fong and Susanna Wrangell for their efficient and cheerful support throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION AND ELECTIONS

David Belanger (W,S)

David Brundage

Michael Dine (F)

Donald Wittman

Donald Potts (Chair)

March 17, 2005

Committee on Educational Policy
Review of the Quantitative General Education Requirement
Interim Report

During 2004-5, the Committee on Educational Policy has, among other issues, focused on two of our general education requirements: implementing the Composition (C1/C2) requirement approved last year, and undertaking the first comprehensive review of courses used to satisfy the Quantitative (Q) requirement since its adoption in 1985.

Since the narrow defeat of the proposed revision of the UCSC's general education (GE) requirements in 1999, CEP has reviewed various aspects of UCSC's GE requirements that were viewed then as needing review. CEP's reviews proceed with a call for information, typically in the fall quarter, followed by committee discussion, evaluation, determination of general education designations, consultation with course-sponsoring units, and issuance of a report. The Committee has completed reviews of the college core courses (2001-02), Ethnic Studies GE courses (2002-3), and the Composition/first-year writing curriculum (2003-4). This year, the Committee is developing a schedule for periodic review of all of the GE requirements akin to the 6-year review of departments and programs, which will aid both CEP and course-sponsoring units in planning for these upcoming reviews.

In this year's review of Quantitative GE courses, the Committee first considered the original policy on Quantitative GE courses: Senate regulation, CEP's 1984 policy implementing the regulation, and CEP's 1984-85 annual report (quoted below).

Santa Cruz Divisional regulation 10.2.2.1.C:

***Quantitative course.** One five-credit hour course or the equivalent that entails use of advanced algebra, statistics, or calculus is required. The course may be offered by any unit but should teach, not just evaluate, mathematical skill.*

The 1984 policy implementing the regulation:

This one-course requirement involves either acquisition of technical skill in mathematics, or practice in the ability to apply that skill in specific contexts, or both. The goal is courses which provide instruction in quantitative reasoning rather than merely courses which evaluate students' mathematical ability, but we have accommodated the latter out of necessity. All courses, regardless of division, in which students must use university-level quantitative skills in order to pass will meet this requirement. Use solely of quantitative skills which are considered remedial by the UC system will disqualify a course for a Q code, unless the course is organized around quantitative problem-solving rather than the mathematics alone.

The 1984-85 annual report:

Quantitative Courses should facilitate acquisition of technical skill in mathematics, or provide practice in applying such skill and specific context, or both. Calculus, statistics, or advanced algebra are required to be used regardless of the course-sponsoring agency. Only the first two courses in a quantitative sequence are coded, but any subsequent course satisfies the requirement.

Based on these materials and the precedent used in evaluating courses used to satisfy the Ethnic Studies GE requirement, CEP described a 50% threshold for the quantitative component of a course, meaning not simply the mathematics component, but the component of developing mathematical and quantitative problem-solving skills. CEP's initial call for information on Quantitative courses indicated that the 50% threshold would be used and, in an effort to complete the review in one-year, set an expiration date for the designation of all quantitative courses at the end of the year. CEP has since found that neither of these approaches was useful in achieving its objective: to insure that courses with the Q designation fulfill the educational objectives of the General Education regulations in meaningful ways.

Therefore, in its review of Quantitative courses, CEP has not used and will not be using a fixed percentage of quantitative content in courses. Instead, CEP has used the original policy and focused on the level of quantitative skill called for in a course, the integration of the quantitative component in the course as a whole, and verifiable individual assessment of quantitative skills. CEP regrets that, in its effort to complete the review in a timely manner, it introduced the concept of an automatic expiration of Q designations.

CEP's reviews of GE requirements encompass assessment of all of the courses campuswide that satisfy a particular aspect of the undergraduate curriculum requirements. Each Quantitative GE course is reviewed individually in the full committee. In order to allow more time for a comprehensive review of the integration of the quantitative component in courses and for consultation with departments, CEP has extended its review of Quantitative GE courses through next year, with the aim of completing its review for the 2006-07 catalog. In 2005-06, current Quantitative GE courses will retain that designation, and, in addition, CEP has approved 6 new courses.

Review Summary

In 2004-5, there were 64 courses designated as satisfying the Quantitative general education requirement. After its November call for course information, CEP received many early responses, and the Chair had discussions by e-mail and telephone with 11 (of 13) department chairs about the Quantitative course review. These discussions led to the observation that the Q designation for 8 of the current Quantitative courses (primarily calculus-based physics) was superfluous since Q courses were prerequisites for these courses.

To date, the Committee has reviewed 55 courses, of which 8 are new submissions as Q courses, and has 4 submitted courses awaiting review. The Committee has been particularly concerned with the level of mathematics (advanced algebra), integration of the development of mathematical skill in the course, and the evaluation of mathematical skill in a manner that distinguishes the skills of individual students (typically, but not always, with a final exam).

CEP has affirmed the appropriateness of the Q designation for 38 courses; 16 courses are pending more information and further consultation with the programs. Of the remaining 6 courses, CEP was informed that 4 will not be submitted for review, and 2 are being evaluated by the sponsoring unit as to whether they will be submitted.

2004-05 Quantitative GE course review:

64 courses currently listed

38 approved (6 new listings)

15 approved through 2005-06, consultation with department planned (1 new listing)

1 new listing pending more information

8 approved through 2005-06 (Pre-requisite of a Q course.)

6 approved through 2005-06 (Department is considering dropping the Q.)

4 approved through 2005-06 (To be reviewed.)

The Committee invites comments and questions at the Senate meeting and, as always, by electronic mail, telephone, or conversation.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Heather Bullock

Linda Burman-Hall

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Tracy Larrabee

Jaye Padgett

John Tamkun

Richard Hughey, Chair

Pedro Castillo, Provosts' rep

Fred Kuttner, Non-Senate faculty teaching rep

Reuben Barnes-Levering, Student rep

May 8, 2005

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Amendment to Appendix C, Undergraduate Student Grievance Procedure**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy is proposing an amendment of the undergraduate student grievance procedure to bring the name of the committee in conformity with the proposed name change by the Committee on Committees and to implement changes in the procedure recommended by the Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance Hearing Committee. The new procedures bring the language into conformity with UCSC’s grading system, clarify the criteria used for review of grievances, eliminate voluntary binding arbitration, which has never be used, and spell out actions that can be taken after a hearing at which no resolution has been reached.

Current wording

Proposed wording

Current wording	Proposed wording
<p align="center">Appendix C [DLR 1996.10A and 1996.10F] (En 23 May 78; Am 21 Feb 96; EC 31 Aug 99)</p> <p align="center">Undergraduate Student Grievance Procedure</p> <p>I. A grievance may be filed if the student is persuaded that the instructor has given a grade notation or narrative evaluation based on:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A. inappropriate criteria such as race, politics, religion, age, sex, or national origin;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B. capricious or arbitrary application of appropriate criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements.</p> <p>II. A grievance procedure must be initiated within one year from the date the evaluation becomes part of the student's academic record in the Registrar's Office.</p>	<p align="center">Appendix C [DLR 1996.10A and 1996.10F] (En 23 May 78; Am 21 Feb 96; EC 31 Aug 99)</p> <p align="center">Undergraduate <u>Academic Assessment</u> Student Grievance Procedure</p> <p>I. A grievance may be filed if the student <u>believes</u> is persuaded that the instructor has given a <u>course</u> grade notation or narrative evaluation based on <u>of the student’s work by criteria that were not clearly and directly related to the student’s performance in the course for which the grade or evaluation was assigned, as by the use of:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A. inappropriate <u>Non-academic</u> criteria such as race, politics, religion, age, sex, or national origin;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B. Capricious or arbitrary application of <u>academic</u> appropriate criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements.</p> <p>II. <u>The A</u> A grievance procedure must be <u>submitted to the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee</u> initiated within one year from the date the <u>grade or</u> evaluation becomes part of the student's academic record in the Registrar's Office.</p>

Current wording

III. Procedure for resolving a grievance should follow these steps:

A. A student who has a grievance concerning a written evaluation or grade notation should first approach the instructor who provided that evaluation to see if the difficulty surrounding it can be resolved at that level.

B. If the student is unable to obtain redress directly from the instructor, the student should present this matter in writing to the academic sponsoring body. The chair or executive officer will attempt to mediate the issue between the instructor and the student.

C. If the grievance cannot be resolved through mediation and both parties wish, the student and the faculty member may agree to voluntary binding arbitration, employing as arbiter a willing faculty member who is acceptable to both parties. Both parties agree in advance, in writing, to accept the decision of the arbiter. The student should meet with his or her College Provost to discuss this possibility, and may request the Provost to facilitate such an arrangement. (En 21 Feb 96)

D. If the grievance is not resolved as provided for in A through C, the student or faculty member may appeal to the Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance Hearing Committee. (Am 21 Feb 96; CC 20 May 81)

Proposed wording

III. **Resolution of** Procedure for resolving a grievance should follow these steps **in this sequence:**

A. A student who has a grievance concerning **an** ~~written~~ evaluation or grade ~~notation~~ should first approach the instructor ~~who provided that evaluation~~ to see if the **issue** difficulty surrounding it can be resolved at that level. **The initial contact must take place within one regular academic quarter from the issuance of the grade or evaluation.**

B. If the **matter is not resolved,** student is unable to obtain redress directly from the instructor, the student should **submit the grievance and documentation** present this matter in writing to the **executive officer of the** academic sponsoring **unit (department chair or college provost), who** body. The chair or executive officer will attempt to **resolve the matter** mediate the issue between the instructor and the student.

~~C. If the grievance cannot be resolved through mediation and both parties wish, the student and the faculty member may agree to voluntary binding arbitration, employing as arbiter a willing faculty member who is acceptable to both parties. Both parties agree in advance, in writing, to accept the decision of the arbiter. The student should meet with his or her College Provost to discuss this possibility, and may request the Provost to facilitate such an arrangement.~~

~~C~~ **D.** If the grievance is not resolved as provided for in **by steps A and B** through C, the student or faculty member may appeal to the **Academic Assessment** Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance ~~Hearing~~ Committee.

Current wording

E. The Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance Hearing Committee will review the grievance, and if it finds probable cause, hold a hearing at which the student and instructor can present evidence, and an acceptable resolution should be made. If no resolution can be reached, the Hearing Committee will vote on a decision and report to the [Chair of] the Committee on Educational Policy. The Hearing Committee's vote is final. A faculty member who disagrees with the Hearing Committee's decision may have, at his or her request, his or her name removed from the official version of the narrative evaluation. (Am 21 Feb 96; CC 20 May 81)

Proposed wording

~~D~~ E. The Academic Assessment Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance Hearing Committee will review the grievance **and consult with the appropriate chair(s).**, ~~and if it~~ **If the Committee** finds probable cause, **it will** hold a hearing at which the student and instructor can present evidence, ~~and an acceptable resolution should be made.~~

E. If no resolution ~~is~~ **can be** reached, the ~~Hearing~~ Committee will vote on a decision and report **the matter** to the [Chair of] the Committee on Educational Policy **for implementation. The decision may include: 1) no change, 2) removal of course from transcript, 3) removal of evaluation from transcript, or 4) change of grade to Pass, No Pass, or Withdraw. In the case of option 4, if the course was originally taken for a letter grade, the change to a Pass will not affect the student's ability to graduate under departmental or University letter grade requirements.** The ~~Hearing~~ Committee's vote is final. A faculty member ~~who disagrees with the Hearing Committee's decision~~ may have, at his or her request, his or her name **be** removed from the **course in the official transcript** ~~version of the narrative evaluation.~~

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Heather Bullock

Linda Burman-Hall

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Tracy Larrabee

Jaye Padgett

John Tamkun

Richard Hughey, Chair

Pedro Castillo, Provosts' rep

Fred Kuttner, Non-Senate faculty teaching rep

Reuben Barnes-Levering, Student rep

May 2, 2005

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Proposed Amendment to CEP Bylaw 13.17.8

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

This name change is to bring the committee’s name in conformance with UCSC’s current assessment practices.

CEP Charge:

Current	Proposed
<p>13.17.8 The Committee oversees the grading and Narrative Evaluation System (NES) including all matters pertaining to the faculty's participation in the NES. The Committee periodically will review the status of the NES and recommend appropriate changes to the Santa Cruz Division. The Committee will explain and answer questions concerning grading and evaluations, and inform the Registrar's Office about Committee interpretations of Academic Senate policies. The Committee on Committees, in accordance with Appendix C of these Bylaws and Regulations, and with the guidance of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), will select a Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance Hearing Committee, comprised of three Senate members and one non-voting undergraduate student representative. CEP receives the reports of the Hearing Committee.</p>	<p>13.17.8 The Committee oversees the grading and Narrative Evaluation System (NES) including all matters pertaining to the faculty's participation in the NES. The Committee periodically will review the status of the NES and recommend appropriate changes to the Santa Cruz Division. The Committee will explain and answer questions concerning grading and evaluations, and inform the Registrar's Office about Committee interpretations of Academic Senate policies. The Committee on Committees, in accordance with Appendix C of these Bylaws and Regulations, and with the guidance of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), will select an Narrative Evaluations Student Academic Assessment Grievance Committee Hearing Committee, comprised of three Senate members and one non-voting undergraduate student representative. CEP receives the reports of the Hearing Committee.</p>

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Joel Ferguson
 Nancy Stoller
 Gene Switkes
 Candace West
 Carol Freeman, Chair

May 2, 2005

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS, 2005-06

TO: The Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

OFFICERS

Faye	Crosby	Chair	Psychology
Quentin	Williams	Vice Chair	Earth Sciences
Deborah	Letourneau	Secretary	Environmental Studies
John	Isbister	Parliamentarian	Economics

ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATIVES

Quentin	Williams	Vice Chair	Earth Sciences
George	Blumenthal	Assembly Rep	Astronomy and Astrophysics

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Faye	Crosby	Chair	Psychology
Quentin	Williams	Vice Chair	Earth Sciences
Deb	Letourneau	Secretary	Environmental Studies
George	Blumenthal	Assembly Rep	Astronomy and Astrophysics
George	Lipsitz	(CAAD)	American Studies
Robert	Coe	(CAFA)	Earth Sciences
Craig	Haney	(CAP)	Psychology
Richard	Hughey	(CEP)	Computer Engineering
Ted	Holman (F)	(CFW)	Chemistry
Paul	Ortiz (W&S)	(CFW)	Community Studies
Carol	Freeman	(COC)	Writing
Judith	Aissen	(COR)	Linguistics
Paul	Koch	(CPB)	Earth Sciences
Bruce	Schumm	(GC)	Physics
Al	Zahler	(P&T)	MCD Biology

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Bettina	Aptheker	Chair & UCAF Rep	Women's Studies
Leta	Miller (F)		Music
Fred	Lieberman (W&S)		Music
Ira	Pohl		Computer Science
Aida	Hurtado		Psychology
Bruce	Cooperstein		Mathematics

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Craig	Haney	Chair & UCAP Rep	Psychology
Martin	Abadi		Computer Science
Kathy	Foley		Theater Arts
Susan	Gillman		Literature
Bruce	Levine		History
Piero	Madau		Astronomy and Astrophysics
Nirvikar	Singh		Economics
Peter	Young		Physics

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS, 2005-06

ADMISSIONS & FINANCIAL AID

Robert	Coe	Chair	Earth Sciences
David	Anthony		History
Chongying	Dong		Mathematics
David	Kaun		Economics
Paul	Nauert		Music
Juan	Poblete		Literature
Zack	Schlesinger		Physics
Trish	Stoddart	BOARS Rep	Education
Jim	Whitehead		Computer Science

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION & DIVERSITY

George	Lipsitz	Chair & UCAAD Rep	American Studies
Sue	Carter		Physics
Gina	Dent (F&W)		Women's Studies
Sriram	Shastri (S)		Physics
Hiroshi	Fukurai		Sociology
Herbie	Lee		Applied Math & Statistics
Manuel	Pastor		LALS

CAREER ADVISING

Carolyn	Martin-Shaw	Chair	Anthropology
Olof	Einarsdottir		Chemistry
Gabriel	Elkaim		Computer Engineering
Patty	Gallagher (F&S)		Theater Arts
Paul	Roth		Philosophy

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - FOR INFORMATION ONLY (ELECTED)

Carol	Freeman	Chair & UCOC Rep	Writing
Joel	Ferguson		Computer Engineering
Nancy	Stoller		Community Studies
Gene	Switkes		Chemistry
Candace	West		Sociology

COMPUTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Ethan	Miller	Chair & UCITTP Rep	Computer Science
Josh	Deutsch		Physics
Shelly	Errington		Anthropology
Armin	Mester		Linguistics
Claire	Max		Astronomy and Astrophysics
David	Cope		Music
Luca	deAlfaro		Computer Engineering
TBD			

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS, 2005-06

EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

Casey	Moore	Chair & UCEAP Rep	Earth Sciences
Junko	Ito		Linguistics
Danny	Scheie		Theater Arts
Rebecca	Braslau		Chemistry

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Richard	Hughey	Chair	Computer Engineering
Heather	Bullock		Psychology
Jaye	Padgett	UCEP Rep	Linguistics
John	Tamkun		MCD Biology
Anatole	Leikin		Music
Tracy	Larrabee		Computer Engineering

EMERITI RELATIONS

Michael	Warren	Chair	Literature
Bill	Friedland		Community Studies
Nate	Mackey (F)		Literature
Susan	Harding (W&S)		Anthropology

FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE

Sandy	Faber	Chair	Astronomy and Astrophysics
Baktan	Singaram		Chemistry
Raoul	Birnbaum		HAVC
Barbara	Rogoff		Psychology
Jonathan	Beecher		History

FACULTY WELFARE

Ted	Holman (F)	Chair & UCFW Rep	Chemistry
Paul	Ortiz (W&S)	Chair & UCFW Rep	Community Studies
Greta	Gibson		Anthropology
Ted	Holman (W&S)		Chemistry
David	Marriott		History of Consciousness
Alex	Pang		Computer Science
Slawek	Tulaczyk		Earth Sciences
Hongyun	Wang		Computer Science

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Bruce	Schumm	Chair & CCGA Rep	Physics
Ram	Akella		Electrical Engineering
Robert	Boltje		Mathematics
Don	Brenneis		Anthropology
David	Brundage		Community Studies
Teresa	De Lauretis		History of Consciousness
Donna	Hunter		HAVC
Norma	Klan		Literature
Ronnie	Lipschutz		Politics
Pradip	Maschrak		Chemistry

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS, 2005-06

LAND & BUILDING DEVELOPMENT

unfilled

LIBRARY

William	Sullivan	Chair & UCOL Rep	MCD Biology
Melissa	Caldwell		Anthropology
David	Helmbold		Computer Science
Forrest	Robinson (F&W)		American Studies
Anna	Tsing (S)		Anthropology
Nicole	Paient		Music

NARRATIVE EVAL /STUDENT GRIEVANCES HEARING CTE

Dan	Wirls	Chair	Politics
Wally	Goldfrank (F&S)		Sociology
Catherine	Soussloff		HAVC

PLANNING & BUDGET

Paul	Koch	Chair & UCPB Rep	Earth Sciences
Onuttom	Narayan	Vice Chair	Physics
Faye	Crosby	<i>ex-officio</i>	Psychology
Ray	Gibbs		Psychology
Emily	Honig		Women's Studies
David Evan	Jones		Music
Wentai	Liu		Computer Science
Ravi	Rajan		Environmental Studies
Don	Rothman		Writing
Quentin	Williams	<i>ex-officio</i>	Earth Sciences

PREPARATORY EDUCATION

Judith	Habicht-Mauche	Chair & UCPE Rep	Anthropology
Elizabeth	Abrams		Writing
Judith	Scott		Education

PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Al	Zahler	Chair & UCPT Rep	MCD Biology
Lisbeth	Haas		History
Ken	Kletzer		Economics
Lourdes	Martinez-Echazabal		Literature
Olga	Najera-Ramirez		Anthropology
Ken	Pedrotti		Electrical Engineering
Tom	Schleich		Chemistry

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS, 2005-06

RESEARCH

Judith	Aissen	Chair & UCORP Rep	Linguistics
E.G.	Crichton (W&S)		Art
Andrew	Fisher		Earth Sciences
Dan	Friedman		Economics
Darell	Long		Computer Science
Jerry	Neu		Humanities
Abe	Seiden (F)		Physics
Ali	Shakouri (W&S)		Electrical Engineering
Avril	Thorne		Psychology
Jin	Zhang		Chemistry

RULES, JURISDICTION & ELECTIONS

David	Belanger	Chair	Physics
Eric	Asphaug		Earth Sciences
Melanie	DuPuis		Sociology
David	Hoy (W&S)		Philosophy

TEACHING

Charles	McDowell	Chair	Computer Science
John	Borrego		LALS
Mary Kay	Gamel		Literature
Lindsay	Hinck		MCD Biology
Beth	Stephens (F&W)		Art
Cynthia	Polecritti (S)		History

Respectfully Submitted:

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Joel Ferguson

Nancy Stoller

Gene Switkes

Candace West

Carol Freeman, Chair

9-May-05

For more information on Senate Committees see: <http://senate.ucsc.edu>

Committee on the Education Abroad Program Catalog Statement on International Education

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on the Education Abroad Program (CEAP) would like the importance of International Education to be acknowledged by the Academic Senate. Accordingly CEAP has drafted a "Mission Statement" on International Education for which it is seeking Academic Senate approval. If approval is given, the statement would appear, in future years, in the General Catalog in the section on International Education, along with a statement that it was approved by the UCSC Academic Senate.

The motivation for submitting this request to the Academic Senate is that CEAP feels that an understanding of other countries and cultures is even more important in the present world situation than it was before. Indeed, a recent report by NAFSA, the National Association of International Educators, argues that Americans' ignorance of the world is a "national liability" and that "we are unnecessarily putting ourselves at risk because of our stubborn monolingualism and ignorance of the world".

CEAP requests that the Academic Senate recognize the importance of International Education by approving the following mission statement:

Mission Statement on International Education

In our global age, understanding other countries and cultures is essential. The University of California Santa Cruz believes students should effectively prepare themselves for global citizenship through their on-campus coursework, through interaction with foreign students, and through travel and study abroad. A course of study in a foreign country can also prepare students for a career which transcends national and cultural boundaries.

To encourage students to study abroad, the University of California Education Abroad Program provides a wide choice of programs in many countries. UC Santa Cruz also encourages students from other countries to enroll here through the Education Abroad Program and other international study options.

Respectfully submitted,

THE COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

Casey Moore

Cynthia Polecristi

Marcia Millman

John Isbister, ex officio

Peter Young, Chair

SUA Representative: Elizabeth Eastman

SUA Representative: Edris Rodriguez

NSTF Representative: Brian Fulfrost

April 11, 2005

COMMITTEE ON THE FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE
Annual Report, 2004-05

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Senate Committee on the Faculty Research Lecturer enthusiastically nominates Professor Nathaniel Mackey of the Literature Department to deliver the 2005-06 lecture.

Nathaniel Mackey is a creative writer and a critical scholar of rare breadth and distinction. During his twenty-six years at UCSC he has produced a corpus of seminal work—including cultural criticism, literary analysis, journal editing, lyric poetry and prose-poetry—that has earned him national and international recognition.

Mackey graduated with High Honors in English from Princeton University in 1969. After completing his PhD at Stanford, he taught at the University of Wisconsin and at USC, where he directed the Black Studies Program. In 1979 he joined the UCSC faculty.

Mackey's honors include the selection of his book of poems, *Eroding Witness*, for publication in the prestigious National Poetry Series; a Whiting Writer's Award in 1993; and—perhaps the highest honor in the poetry field—election to the Board of Chancellors of the Academy of American Poets in 2001.

He is the author of two volumes of literary/cultural criticism: *Discrepant Engagement: Dissonance, Cross-Culturality, and Experimental Writing* (Cambridge University Press, 1993) and *Paracritical Hinge* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2005). A notable feature of these wide-ranging books is their engagement with the work of major Caribbean authors such as Kamau Brathwaite and Wilson Harris, authors Mackey has labored to bring into the mainstream of American literary critical discourse.

Eight books of poetry, including *Four for Trane*, *Septet for the End of Time*, *Outlantish*, and *Song of the Andoumboulou*, are widely regarded as among the most innovative examples of contemporary American experimental writing. *From A Broken Bottle Traces of Perfume Still Emanate*, an ongoing prose composition of which three volumes have been published, is perhaps Mackey's most original textual experiment. It displays a characteristically austere lyricism, speculative imagination, and profound musical sensitivity.

Mackey is probably best known as an authority on the relations of African and African-American music and writing. He has edited an influential anthology, *Moment's Notice: Jazz in Poetry and Prose* (1993), and has produced a poetry CD in collaboration with contemporary jazz musicians. A fine ear for the musicality of language and a jazz aesthetic of improvisation within constraints permeate everything he writes.

Mackey's innovations in prose and poetry have drawn widespread attention from scholars, writers, and musicians. He was the "Featured Poet" in the "Conversations with Poets" series at the 2002 Modern Language Association. He is frequently sought for interviews and is the subject of PhD dissertations. *Callaloo*, the premier African and African-American literary journal, devoted an entire issue to his work.

Nathaniel Mackey's distinctive range is reflected in the teaching he has sustained over more than two decades for the UCSC Literature Department: courses on The Harlem Renaissance, Introduction to

African American Literature, Open Field Poetry, Caribbean Literature, New World Poetics, Literature and Jazz, William Carlos Williams. . .

Here, and throughout his work, Mackey is always attentive to the larger, interactive contexts within which African and African-American traditions are sustained and made new. Mackey never assumes a unitary racially- or ethnically-defined identity. Rooted in cosmopolitan Black cultural traditions, he opens out these living currents, cross culturally and internationally. His writing, whether poetic or academic, engages with a wide range of contrapuntal influences from cultural history, anthropology, musicology and most crucially from the rich vein of modernist American poetry associated with Ezra Pound, HD, William Carlos Williams, Charles Olson, Robert Duncan, Robert Creeley, Susan Howe, and Rachel Du Plessis, among many others.

The vibrant legacy of this complex tradition is most visible in the literary journal, *Hambone*, which Mackey has edited, single-handedly, for thirty years. *Hambone* brings together very diverse strands of innovative writing from established and emerging writers, in a venue that has become legendary for its rigorous selectivity, critical openness, and sureness of taste.

Finally, no evocation of Nathaniel Mackey's contributions to scholarship, poetry, and the university would be complete without mention of his long-running, and much admired radio program on KUSP. "Tanganyika Strut" has brought an incomparable musical mix to the Santa Cruz airwaves: sounds from country and city, church and mosque, recording studio, radio, and street; from experimental jazz, popular song and Sufi rituals... Not just the music of Africa, but the African musics of the world.

Therefore, in recognition of Nathaniel Mackey's extraordinary accomplishments in many fields of scholarly and creative activity, the Committee recommends that he be invited to deliver the 2005-06 Faculty Research lecture to the UCSC and Santa Cruz communities.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON THE FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE

James Clifford
David Kliger
Barbara Rogoff
Deanna Shemek
Sandra Faber, Chair

April 25, 2005

**Senate Executive Committee
Resolution on Faculty Housing and Campus Growth**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

WHEREAS our ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty depends, in part, on their ability to obtain adequate and affordable housing, and

WHEREAS the cost of housing in the Santa Cruz area has risen dramatically over the last decade, and

WHEREAS the campus cannot support an increase in the student population without a corresponding increase in the number of faculty,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, if UCSC plans to grow beyond 15,000, then it must offer plans for sufficient and affordable faculty and staff housing. The Senate calls on the administration to provide plans by October 1, 2005.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Senate Executive Committee

Judith Aissen

Rob Coe

Faye Crosby

Carol Freeman

Craig Haney

Richard Hughey

Michael Issacson

Paul Koch

Loisa Nygaard

Paul Ortiz

Triloki Pandey

Bruce Schumm

Al Zahler

Alison Galloway, Chair

May 9, 2005

**Senate Executive Committee
Report on Senate Tent University and Restructuring Emergency Response Procedures**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Introduction

As Senate Chair and following long discussions with the Senate Executive Committee, I have decided to form a task force to review the decision-making processes leading to the events of Monday, April 18 in connection with Tent University Santa Cruz (TUSC). The goal of this group is to provide guidance to the campus as a whole to better respond to similar events in the future. The task force is envisioned as impartial and open to input from many perspectives involved with Tent University. The charge has been reviewed and approved by the Senate Executive Committee. While I would like this group to begin meeting as soon as possible, a full report is expected in Fall 2005.

Senate Tent University and Restructuring Emergency Response Procedures Task Force

Charge: The aim of the task force is to learn from our experiences to better shape future responses to related events. This group will conduct an open-minded, impartial investigation and analysis of recent events surrounding the establishment of Tent University Santa Cruz (TUSC) with the aim of guiding the restructuring of campus emergency planning to respond to similar events in the future. The task force will:

- investigate the facts surrounding the initiation of Tent University Santa Cruz (TUSC), the negotiations between TUSC and UCSC Administration, and the events leading to the confrontation on April 18, 2005;
- identify the best strategies and structures for achieving conflict resolution and maintaining campus safety in similar situations in the future.

To maintain impartiality, members will not include those directly involved with Tent University nor the Administration response to its formation. The task force will interview widely to hear the many viewpoints on this event.

Membership:

Senate Faculty – 3 (one to act as Chair)
Non-Senate Teaching Faculty – 1
Administrator – 1
Undergraduate Students – 2
Graduate Student – 1
Staff - 1

**Advisor to the Committee
Staff**

Laurie McCann
Kenneth Christopher

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Senate Executive Committee

Judith Aissen
Rob Coe
Faye Crosby
Carol Freeman
Craig Haney
Richard Hughey
Michael Issacson

Paul Koch
Loisa Nygaard
Paul Ortiz
Triloki Pandey
Bruce Schumm
Al Zahler
Alison Galloway, Chair

May 9, 2005

Committee on the Library Resolutions on Scholarly Publishing

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

A great change in scholarly communication is underway. The growth of online, open access publishing brings the promise of better, faster and more open research and stronger links between research, teaching and the community. Fiat Lux, the motto of our university, is an appropriate goal for the changes that have begun.

The challenge for scholarly publishing

Two years ago the UCSC Senate made a significant contribution to negotiations between the UC system and the largest publisher of online journals, Elsevier. We passed a resolution threatening that senior faculty would refuse to submit papers to, refuse to review papers for, and resign from the boards of Elsevier journals if a reasonable contract for UC access could not be concluded. Partly as a result of that resolution, Elsevier agreed to a contract which was several million dollars less than they had initially demanded.

While that victory resolved an immediate crisis, the longer-term challenge for scholarly publication remains. The business models for both journal and monograph publication are not sustainable.

Journals: At present, many faculty give exclusive copyright on their papers to publishers who then charge large, and rapidly rising, fees to our libraries to allow faculty and students to make use of those papers. This system poses a threat to our libraries and a constraint on the availability of our scholarly work. To the extent that publication in prestige journals is used as a mark of scholarly achievement, we have also made the process of academic personnel review a hostage held by commercial publishers.

Monographs: At the same time, the market for monographs has been rapidly shrinking in recent years. An important driver of market shrinkage has been rising expenditure on online journal access. Libraries are forced to buy fewer monographs and, in response, publishers are producing ever smaller numbers of titles. This presents an unacceptable constraint for those disciplines where monograph publication is the principal or only viable means of scholarly communication and an important mark of academic achievement.

The bottom line is that universities are paying more for a declining portion of scholarly knowledge.

Collective action building on the work of others

Throughout the UC system and in many other universities initiatives are being taken to address this threat to scholarly publishing. A set of resolutions (summarized in the attached document from UCOP) has been passed by the Senates of several UC divisions, by the UC systemwide Senate, and by a range of other universities. The Special Committee of the UC Academic Senate on Scholarly

Communication has been examining the issues over the last year. The UC Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC) has been undertaking research and analysis on a range of issues. The University of California libraries have made changing the economics of scholarly publishing one of the five aims that collectively anchor their systemwide strategic development. At UCSC, the Committees on the Library and on Research have been discussing ways to make progress on these issues. Earlier this month the two committees jointly sponsored a UCSC Senate Forum addressed by Daniel Greenstein, Associate Vice President & University Librarian, California Digital Library (CDL), and Vivian Segal, Executive Editor of Public Library of Science (PLoS).

This resolution seeks to consolidate best practice emerging from these different sources and to identify solutions where the faculty can act collectively rather than individually. In the spirit of our divisional aspiration of ‘thinking at the edge,’ the resolution proposes four initiatives which will take the discussion and scholarly communication forward.

The most difficult and possibly contentious of these initiatives concerns our proposal that the UCSC Senate work with others to examine how best to assert a collective right which can be used to limit publishers claims to ownership of our work. As preface to this initiative we quote the UC Academic Senate resolution coming out of the work of the UC Provost's Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) which ‘calls upon the University's faculty to continue and extend their efforts to:

- seize every opportunity to regain control of and maximize the impact of their scholarly communication;
- manage their intellectual property in ways that allow retention of critical rights, in order to ensure the widest dissemination of UC's scholarship and its unfettered use within the University to support teaching and research.’

In support of these objectives, we propose that the UCSC Senate examine how to assert a collective right of open dissemination. This non-exclusive right could enlarge the options for, and bargaining power of, faculty in the face of publishers wanting to sustain their highly profitable uses of our work.

Thinking at the edge: four initiatives

In this resolution, the Committee on the Library proposes four initiatives. The first initiative sets guidelines for periodic negotiations of contracts for access to online journals. We propose that all systemwide negotiations where the publisher seeks a price increase significantly above the prevailing rate of inflation should be referred to the UC Academic Senate's Committee on the Library (UCOL) for comment. The second initiative concerns academic promotion and the review of scholarly work. We ask the UCSC Senate to establish a task force, including past chairs of CAP, to find ways to circumvent the stranglehold publishers exert on academic evaluation through their ownership of prestige journals and their control of the peer review process of those journals. The third initiative concerns copyright. We ask that the UCSC Senate work with the systemwide Senate and the UC administration to develop legal and administrative procedures establishing a collective right for the distribution of faculty work that would assist the retention of copyright. The fourth

initiative tasks the UCSC administration to explore their responsibilities for the stewardship and the support of new forms of publication and performance.

The Committee on Research supports the goals of this resolution:

The Committee on Research strongly supports the goals of the Resolution on Scholarly Publishing. The four points it addresses are of critical importance to the future of production, dissemination, and archiving of faculty research at UCSC. We urge the Academic Senate to debate the issues raised by this resolution, and to move expeditiously to effective action.

Resolutions

We resolve the following:

1. Prices for online access to journals. The UCSC Senate proposes the following principle be conveyed to UC negotiators to use in their negotiations with journal publishers. Where publishers submit systemwide contracts for access to online content with prices which exceed the consumer price index by more than 1.5% in any one year then that contract should be referred to the Committee on the Library of the UC Academic Senate (UCOL) for comment.

Justification: We support the UC Libraries' efforts to curtail unsustainable pricing for access to scholarly information. This resolution supports UC's California Digital Library (CDL) negotiations with journal publishers by providing an automatic referral to faculty of all those contracts which substantially exceed the prevailing rate of inflation. The margin above inflation that triggers referral to UCOL should be reviewed periodically by UCOL and CDL's Director of Licensed Content, particularly when there are significant changes in the rate of inflation or in library budgets.

2. Academic promotion and the evaluation of scholarly work. We propose that the UCSC Senate establish a task force including former chairs of CAP to explore ways to meet the challenge of academic evaluation in an era when publication and performance possibilities are changing.

Justification: The intertwining of the evaluation of scholarly work with the authority of particular publication and performance outlets raises difficult issues which the academic community cannot expect the various committees and individuals concerned with academic evaluation and promotion (including the Committee on Academic Personnel, Ad Hoc Committees and search committees, Deans, Departmental Chairs and others) to solve without collective guidance. It is hard for academic evaluations to avoid using the prestige of particular outlets, from journals to performance venues, as a metric for quality. By so doing, however, the power of some publishers and some performance venues, and their ability to charge high and rising prices, is maintained. This resolution proposes that an appropriate group of faculty be asked to find ways of circumventing this problem.

3. We assert a collective right to make our work widely available. We propose that the UCSC Academic Senate, in collaboration with the UC Academic Senate and the UC Administration, take urgent steps to explore the restructuring of the University's copyright policy to assert a collective right, under the direction of individual faculty, to distribute faculty work for research and teaching.

Justification: Our intention is that scholarly work would remain the property of individual faculty, but faculty members would no longer have to struggle individually with publishers to retain the right to disseminate their work. This collective assertion of rights by the UC Academic Senate would provide backing for the free flow of information as the foundation of intellectual innovation. Toward this end we ask the Senate to work with appropriate committees and the UCSC administration so that a resolution can be brought to Senate in Fall, 2005 detailing the administrative processes and legal formulations through which this collective right can be established.

4. University stewardship of all forms of publishing. We propose the UCSC administration explore the establishment of an Office of Scholarly Communication or similar administrative unit to take responsibility for the persistent stewardship of all forms of scholarly communication.

Justification: This resolution tasks the UCSC administration to take responsibility for ensuring the persistent availability of university scholarship regardless of its form. New forms of academic publishing, from web pages to online data sets to online performance, are adding new opportunities for teaching, for the dissemination of scholarly work, and for artistic expression. These new forms have no steward and the task of ensuring their persistence is daunting. With this resolution, the Senate asks the administration to examine what arrangements will enable the challenge to be explored and met. As in other parts of this resolution, Senate expects that this university rise to the challenge of thinking at the edge.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

David Helmbold

Fredric Lieberman

Gildas Hamel (F)

Peter Kenez (W, S)

William Sullivan

Robert White, *ex officio*

Ben Crow, Chair

LAUC Rep. Ken Lyons

LAUC Rep. Lucia Orland

SUA Rep. Cole Akers

May 9, 2005

University Resolutions on Scholarly Communication

UC-based

SLASAC. UC systemwide administrative resolution, endorsed March '05. Calls upon the university and its faculty to foster positive change in scholarly communication through a set of specific actions.

(http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/SLASAC_Resolution_I.html) .

UC Berkeley. Senate resolution, endorsed March '05. Four item resolution covering retention of copyrights, non-discrimination in promotion and tenure toward alternative forms of dissemination, faculty incentives to use alternative scholarly outlets, and support for library actions in the marketplace. (http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/news/statement_of_prin_for_web.pdf)

UC Davis. Senate Committee on Library draft resolution, under discussion by UCD assembly Spring '05. Preamble and five item resolution covering need for raised awareness, retention of copyrights, supporting journals/publishers who display "reasonable" pricing, flexibility in promotion and tenure, and supporting library actions in the marketplace.

UC Irvine. Senate resolution, endorsed Summer '04: 3 pages; focus on copyright; offers "guidelines" for action. (http://www.lib.uci.edu/scamp/joint_resolution.html).

Other universities

Columbia. University Senate, adopted unanimously on April 1, '05. Focus on support for the "principle of open access," retention of copyrights, advancement of new models, resisting digital rights management regimes that limit open access, and remaining alert to efforts by publishers to impose barriers on access.

(<https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/1812.html>).

Kansas. Faculty Senate, endorsed unanimously March 10, '05. Notable for its call to all faculty to seek amendments to publisher's copyright transfer forms to permit the deposition of a digital copy of every article accepted by a peer-reviewed journal into the KU ScholarWorks repository, or a similar open access venue.

(http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/scholarly_information/scholarly_resolution.htm).

Stanford. Senate resolution, endorsed February '04. Focus on supporting library actions in the marketplace on faculty severing ties to publishers and journals that engage in exploitive or exorbitant pricing (<http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2004/february25/minutes-225.html>)

Indiana. Faculty "Resolution on Journals, Databases, and Threats to Scholarly Publishing" March '04.

(<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B39-2004.htm>)

Connecticut. "Faculty Resolution on The Crisis in Scholarly Communication" February '04.

(<http://www.arl.org/scomm/resolutions/conn.html>)

CIC (Big Ten). Report of the October '04 Summit on Scholarly Communication: Access to Journal Literature.

(<http://www.cic.uiuc.edu/groups/CICMembers/archive/Report/SCSreportJan2005.pdf>)

Other. A number of resolutions around the country focus on support of their libraries resistance to escalating journal prices. Several focus on Elsevier. See

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/lists.htm#actions>. Queensland Univ. in Australia and Southampton University in the UK are mandating deposit of research into their institutional repositories.

Common Elements

Action is mission critical
Provide leadership to academy
Inform/educate ourselves
Manage copyrights
Evolve tenure & reward system

Encourage/Support library efforts to change marketplace
Support affordable journals (or Resist involvement with high-priced journals)
Use alternative forms of publication

*University of California Office of the President
Office of Scholarly Communication
February 18, 2005; rev. 4/25/05*

Use/support “open access” venues/models
Provide incentives/subventions for change
Use influence as authors
Use influence as editors
Use influence as society members
Educate students & new scholars on the issues
Partner across the university for change

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Report on the Long Range Development Plan

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

CPB welcomes the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) draft as an opportunity to reflect on how growth may affect both the infrastructure and the exceptional environmental setting of UC Santa Cruz. We appreciate the efforts of the many people who have labored to produce this detailed, thoughtful document. The LRDP is a tool for aligning projects that accommodate growth, in part mandated by our mission to the state, with goals, means, and mutually desirable limits that have been determined internally during the LRDP process and through external consultation with the city of Santa Cruz. This planning document also contributes to the development of a new vision for UCSC that reaches well beyond the current campus perimeter.

CPB is very concerned that there are important issues associated with the LRDP that have not yet been addressed adequately. This report highlights the questions that CPB would like to see answered by the end of the LRDP process, either in the LRDP, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or outside the main LRDP documents. Furthermore, many determinations about future land use and infrastructural needs in the LRDP would benefit from the guidance of a more detailed, prioritized academic plan that establishes parameters and constraints for growth of existing and new departments and programs.

Here are our three main areas of concern:

1. Faculty Housing:

Adequate and affordable housing is critical for our efforts to attract the best faculty to UCSC. It is likely that we will have to hire about 600 tenure-track faculty over the next 15 years for the planned growth in student FTE and for replacement of retiring faculty. The administration took a welcome step to increase the availability of for-sale housing with the purchase of Laureate Court in 2003. The imminent construction of Ranch View Terrace will increase the housing stock available to Senate faculty from 80 to 180 units. More units will be needed in the future as median housing prices rise.

Our concerns with the draft LRDP with regard to housing are:

- a) The 27 acres designated for new employee housing in the LRDP draft may be inadequate.

According to the draft LRDP, we currently have 42 acres of housing (including Ranch View Terrace but excluding Laureate Court). This consists of 210 housing units. For 27 acres, the prorated result is 135 housing units, of which 80% at

present Housing Allocation Percentages would go to Senate faculty. The CFW's response to the first draft LRDP estimates that 375 units will be needed. The current draft LRDP aims at accommodating 300 new housing units. How well will 375 units fit on 27 acres? The land designated as Campus Resource Land (CRL) might be reassigned to employee housing, subject to an additional, certainly contested EIR, and some CRL land is off limits for development. As an outer envelope for future growth, the LRDP should set aside sufficient land for employee housing from the outset.

- b) The location of the planned employee housing in the proposed North Campus may make the houses unaffordable.

As explained in CPB's response to the first draft of the LRDP, there is a strong possibility that no academic buildings will be built on the North Campus during the planning period, even though land will be set aside for them. Thus most or all of the infrastructural costs for the North Campus are liable to be charged to housing projects (both student and employee housing).

- c) Even if employee housing does not have to bear infrastructural costs, it could still be too expensive.

Ranch View Terrace, which is presently being developed, is already at the higher end of what faculty can afford, and is out of reach of most assistant professors. Reasonable projections of construction costs and faculty salaries suggest that this situation could grow worse. Thus our present model, in which the university builds and sells employee housing at below market rates, could soon become unworkable. Concrete alternatives to this model should be developed as part of the LRDP process.

2. Parking and Traffic

While the campus has been remarkably successful at developing a comprehensive approach to parking and traffic, vehicular traffic will inevitably increase with campus growth. Our concerns in this regard are stated below:

- a) Parking fees may have to increase substantially as new parking facilities are built.

New parking lots will be needed for the additional vehicles coming to campus and to replace existing parking lots that will be expropriated when buildings are constructed on them. CPB would also like greater clarity on whether expenditures that can be treated as part of the university's road and transportation infrastructure will be charged to the parking budget. Furthermore, without an analysis of what one could reasonably expect the increase in parking fees to be, we are unable to assess whether this would be a worthwhile price to pay for campus growth. CPB expects the EVC's plan to create a comprehensive list of projects, with an analysis of costs, repayment schedules, and the impact of fees on

debt capacity targets, which will provide the means for distinguishing parking from other costs. Perhaps it can also provide the overall estimate of parking costs.

- b) A clear calculation of traffic impacts inside and outside the campus due to proposed growth should be provided as part of the EIR.

It is reasonable to expect that the impact of increased traffic on Bay and High Streets will be severe, especially during peak travel times. While the number of exterior roads leading into campus remains constant, the internal campus road network is supposed to expand substantially under the LRDP. It is not clear that this will be sufficient.

3. Academic Space

CPB is concerned about how much academic space we can realistically hope to add in the present budgetary climate. The available academic space at UCSC is projected to be approximately 80% of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) guidelines in Fall 2005. The University of California's average is about 90%. How feasible is the LRDP plan to bring us to 100% of CPEC guidelines for 21,000 students?

In summary, while it is undesirable, even impossible, to specify every detail of future growth, a sufficiently flexible LRDP and EIR should address the issues discussed in this report. The affordability of student housing should also be analyzed as part of long-term campus planning.

Therefore, CPB recommends the following:

1. With respect to housing, traffic, parking, and academic space, further analysis, clarification and exploration of the plans is needed; in some cases, alternatives should be considered.
 - a) Other models that ensure affordable housing options for entry-level faculty over the planning period need to be explored.
 - b) The administration should continue to analyze the programmatic requirements for campus infrastructure (including on-campus parking and transportation as well as on- and off-campus traffic impacts).
 - c) Finally, academic facilities need to be evaluated using the CPEC standards as a basic indicator of progress.
2. Assurances should be incorporated in the LRDP/EIR documents that, as implementation of the LRDP occurs, enrollment growth will be suspended if suitable predetermined criteria for each of the three items listed above cannot be met: for instance, if academic space falls below some fraction of CPEC guidelines. Including these assurances in the LRDP is consistent with the UCOP Facilities Manual, which suggests Implementation Guidelines as part of the LRDP (in addition to the Land Use Plan).
3. When decisions about growth are made annually during the lifetime of the LRDP,

they should take into consideration

- a) the available resources and
- b) the impact on fees etc., with regard to the items listed above.

Respectfully submitted,
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Faye Crosby, ex officio
Margaret Fitzsimmons
Alison Galloway, ex officio
Ray Gibbs
Wentai Liu
John Lynch
Margaret Morse
Onuttom Narayan
Don Rothman
Paul Koch, Chair

GSA: Marina Sarran

April 14, 2005