

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
**Friday, May 27, 2011 at 2:30 p.m.**  
**Stevenson Event Center**  
**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
  - a. Draft Minutes of November 5, 2010 (AS/SCM/297) p.iv
  - b. Draft Minutes of March 9, 2011 (AS/SCM/298) 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 Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1669) p.21
5. Reports of Special Committees (none)
6. Reports of Standing Committees
  - a. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
    - i. Policy for Frosh Admission – Holistic Review (AS/SCP/1674) p.23
  - b. Committee on Committees
    - i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.17.1 – Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1667) p.26
    - ii. 2011-12 Nominations (AS/SCP/1670) p.27
  - c. Committee on Educational Policy
    - i. Report on Major Admissions and Disqualifications Policies (AS/SCP/1671) p.32
    - ii. Amendment to Regulation 9.1 – One year limit of grade change exceptions (AS/SCP/1668) p.39
  - d. Committee on Faculty Welfare
    - i. Oral Report on Child Care, Health Care, Housing, and Faculty Salaries.
  - e. Committee on Planning and Budget
    - i. Report on 2011-12 Budget and Budget Process (AS/SCP/1673) p.43
    - ii. Report on Impacts of the Unfunded Liability in the UC Retirement Plan on UCSC Budget (AS/SCP/1672) p.48
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

May 19, 2011

Academic Senate  
Santa Cruz Division

Dear colleagues,

The academic year 2010-11 is drawing to a close, and thanks to your Senate tax dollars, there is a lot to report at our last meeting of the year on Friday, May 27, 2:30-5 PM at the Stevenson Event Center. Reception immediately follows. The agenda can be viewed at: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/meetings/11May27/A11May27.html>

Several promissory notes in the form of uncompleted projects from the winter quarter are now about to come due. Among the highlights:

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has produced a short report on the relationship between our majors (pre-requisites and gateway courses, requirements, disqualification policies) and student retention rates. The [CEP report](#), one of the must-reads in the Call, demonstrates how the major-mapping tool, previewed by Chair John Tamkun at the winter Senate meeting, can help departments to assess the effectiveness and organization of their majors. The ultimate goal of developing a comprehensive campus retention plan will have to ensure that major requirements and pathways are best serving the needs of our students at all levels of academic preparation and achievement. [The Senate Executive Committee proposal to realign academic functions](#) is another critical piece of the retention plan that was promised at the winter Senate meeting and will be updated for you now.

Faculty salaries: EVC Galloway will report on the current three-year program to enhance faculty salaries on our campus. Both the Senate and the Administration have reviewed comparative data on the effects by rank and step of salary enhancements, and the results will be summarized along with a preview of personnel policies for the future.

Systemwide plans from the Office of the President for online education have recently received a lot of attention, much of it negative. You will get a report on how the Senate has responded to these developments, starting here with a [letter](#) written by the systemwide Academic Council expressing concerns about the budget and planning for the online proposal.

If you want to hear about faculty salaries and to see the second act of the CEP Chair's highly acclaimed major-mapping performance, please come to the May 27 meeting and stay for the reception at the end. I look very much forward to seeing you there!

Sincerely,



Susan Gillman, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Santa Cruz Division

**PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES**  
**November 5, 2010 Senate Meeting**  
**And**  
**March 9, 2011 Senate Meeting**

The draft minutes from the November 5, 2010 and March 9, 2011 Senate meetings were distributed via email on May 16, 2011 and will be presented for approval at the Senate Meeting on May 27, 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 12 p.m., Wednesday May 25, 2011**. They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to [senate@ucsc.edu](mailto:senate@ucsc.edu).

Judith Habicht-Mauche  
Secretary, Academic Senate  
Santa Cruz Division

May 16, 2011

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
November 5, 2010

**Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held on Friday, November 5, 2010 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian and Secretary Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

Chair Gillman asked for approval of the minutes from the May 21, 2010 Senate meeting. These minutes had been approved with one amendment at the October 20<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting, but following a request to reconsider on grounds that a second amendment had been proposed but was not considered, further consideration of the May 21, 2010 minutes had been tabled. After a call for a quorum established that a quorum was not present, Chair Gillman deferred consideration of the minutes until the next Senate meeting.

**2. Announcements**

**a. Chair Susan Gillman**

Chair Gillman introduced two new Academic Senate Analysts, Shari Skinner and Matthew Mednick. She also introduced Secretary and Parliamentarian Donald Potts.

Chair Gilman explained that the Senate is in the process of solving the Post Employment Benefits problem by organizing and communicating among the campuses. She stated that the principle of equity had been preserved and a two-tiered system prevented, and that President Yudof's draft recommendations were close to the Senate recommendations. His recommendations contained a skeleton finance plan to deal with the unfunded liability of the pension plan, with several suggestions involving debt restructuring, and borrowing from the short term investment pool (STIP). The Senate will continue to press for an improved finance plan, including rethinking capital investments across the campuses. Where this money will come from may shift due to the systemwide project of Rebenching (redistributing funding to campuses). The new methodology for returning educational fees to the campus that generated them is now in place. The next frontier is to readjust and equalize the per-student state funds that come to the campuses, and this should increase UCSC's per-student share of state general funds significantly.

On health care, Chair Gillman noted that UCSC had failed to get mitigations or offsets for those staying with the Palo Alto Medical Foundation who had Healthnet as the insurer, and that there was no movement on the request to return to a statewide averaging of employee fees. In concert with the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and UCSC's administration, the Senate will begin gathering data on who is switching from the Palo Alto Medical Foundation to the Physicians Medical Group, the choice of practices, whether they are open or closed to new patients, the time and distance required to get medical care, and the quality of services. A joint administrative/senate oversight committee will be created to ensure that the data are gathered and the results will be used to initiate conversations with Office of the President (OP). This is critical because negotiations for next year are starting immediately. UCSC will continue to coordinate with Berkeley and other affected campuses, and a UCSC member, Professor Barry Bowman, has been appointed to the

system-wide Health Care Task Force.

At UCSC, a joint Senate Executive Committee working group, consisting of representatives from CAP, CPB, and CFW, is being resurrected to work on increasing faculty salaries and to move UCSC salaries up to the system-wide median.

#### **b. Chancellor George Blumenthal**

Chancellor Blumenthal agreed with Senate Chair Gillman about pension benefits, stated his appreciation for the efforts of the Senate which he felt have paid off, expressed the need to think forward to next year about health care, and welcomed the idea of a joint task force to collect data. He then described meeting two days prior with President Yudof, Vice President for Business Affairs Nathan Brostrom, and UC's Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and Services Jack Stobo to talk about developing new health care alternatives for UCSC faculty and staff, and he suggested that the Health Care Task Force should work with these key people.

The Chancellor did not have any major budget updates because of the recent election of a new governor, but he expressed concerns about the legislature re-convening in midyear and how that might affect the budget. He recommended that, at the Regents meeting in two weeks, we should ask for what we need, rather than what we're able to get. The Chancellor said he looked forward to continuing to work with the Senate on re-benching and expressed confidence in its success, with his only concern being about time.

Chancellor Blumenthal indicated there will be a request to the Regents in November to raise student fees for next year, probably in the 6-9% range. While there is a desire to increase faculty and staff salaries, he didn't know by how much, when, or if it will happen. That will depend on the state budget which should be decided over the next two months.

The Chancellor noted that Founder's Week went extremely well with lectures, forums and a reception at the Cocoanut Grove, and he thanked all of those involved. During the year, UCSC faculty raised \$148 million dollars in research awards, a record for the campus, and UCSC continues to outpace other universities in the growth of research awards. The Chancellor concluded by congratulating UCSC Faculty member Enrico Ramirez-Ruiz in Astronomy and Astrophysics on his election to the National Academy of Sciences of Mexico.

#### **c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway**

EVC Alison Galloway began with the budget, commenting that the new governor has past experience of putting a budget together - but whether it will be good or bad for the University is unknown. She then expressed concerns about midyear cuts to state agencies, which would likely include UC. Because the 2010-11 budget is finalized, the campus is now planning for 2011-12. Priorities include limited but essential faculty hiring, part of which would be funded from the \$51.6 million given by the state to cover UC's unfunded enrollments and which will trickle down to the campuses. She also wants to give some funds to the divisions to allow for flexibility, and is

looking at restoring a few central funds. The Administration will start working with CPB on a broad scale, twenty year financial analysis looking at trends to determine strategic choices for increasing revenues to fund the core mission of the campus.

Commenting on health care, EVC Galloway noted that negotiations took place only between UCOP and Sutter Health, and not between individual campuses or the local PAMF.

Post Employment Benefits planning does not consider the unfunded liability, around \$12 billion, that will largely be funded out of employer contributions. Initial analysis suggested this would require a 20% increase over a relatively extended period from about 2017 – 2029, with high employer contributions. For UCSC the increased cost would be over \$26 million, and would affect such core functions and auxiliary units as Housing, Dining, the Bookstore, etc. UCOP is diligently trying to decrease this amount and has already reduced it to \$18.5 million. EVC Galloway added that she and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) chair have done a number of analyses regarding faculty salaries, and want to ensure checks and balances and maintain transparency.

Responding to a question about which universities UCSC outpaced in research funding, Chancellor Blumenthal replied that our percentage increase is one of the fastest growing in the country, and not only among other UC campuses.

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

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

##### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- a. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1644)**
- b. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1647)**

Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Olof Einarsson, expressed concern regarding the lack of an effective admissions policy for transfer students. Many arrive with few to no introductory science courses so they cannot complete a science degree in three years, making it extremely expensive for the campus and for students. This fall's influx of transfer students wishing to enter science programs pushed science departments to full capacity.

Professor Einarsson continued with some examples to illustrate her point. All transfer students into physical and biological sciences majors are expected to have the minimum math calculus series completed when they come to the campus, but analyses showed that 65% had not taken a full year of calculus before transferring. In chemistry, transfer students are expected to have had a minimum of a general chemistry series, yet 35% did not, and 72% had not taken organic chemistry. In biological sciences, transfer students are expected to have completed the introductory biology series, yet roughly half had not done that. In physics, 44% of transfers had not taken the expected introductory physics series with laboratories. These statistics show that the system is broken, and new admissions criteria are needed, because the current situation is a recipe for failure for students. Many transfer students now take a very long time to finish, many drop out of sciences and go into

other divisions, and some are eligible for financial aid only for a limited time. Department chairs in physical and biological sciences share a sense of urgency about changing our admissions policy before the campus accepts the 2010-11 cohort of students, and they need to know where CAFA and the administration stand on this issue.

Responding to Professor Einarsdóttir, CEP chair John Tamkun commented that CEP has discussed this issue, not in terms of admissions, but for the impact on students. When CEP receives requests to limit transfer students' access to majors, they are treated as a separate entity from our "native" students. CEP feels strongly that any policy applied to transfer students should also be applied to "native" students. CEP wants to encourage departments to consider this issue when formulating transfer policies, and to develop policies that apply to all students and avoid stigmatizing transfer students as second class citizens. As an example, Chair Tamkun described a transfer student who arrived without introductory biology, yet is now completing his MD/Ph.D. at UCLA: blind application of admissions criteria would have prevented him from coming to UCSC.

Interim Dean of Humanities, Bill Ladusaw, speaking as a former Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) and long-time collaborator with CEP, suggested that CAFA will want to talk about criteria for admission to the campus, and possibly create criteria not used before, namely how admission to the campus is related to eligibility to enter a program. If programs define lower division qualifications that are required by both "native" and transfer students for admission to the major, that will provide the information needed to implement such a policy. It will also provide the basis for following the Senate's direction on resource-impacted programs where more qualified students seek admission than can be accommodated.

Professor Triloki Pandey, Anthropology, stated that his department became aware of this problem in the 1980s and developed two courses to prepare new students. He suggested thinking about investing in some similar system for the sciences.

Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) Steve Thorsett commented that the sciences want transfer students and also want them to be successful, but it is impossible for transfer students to do so if they come in without the necessary introductory courses. While the Admissions Office has only been advising students to take the introductory courses before coming to UCSC, some UC campuses require core classes before admission. Community college advisors currently inform students that UCSC is one campus that will take students without these requirements. Dean Thorsett suggested UCSC is differentially gaining unprepared students and he proposed working with community college advisors to change their advice. He concluded that these questions need to be addressed by the Senate as a whole, not just by CAFA, who's purview does not cover admissions to majors.

Chair Tamkun replied that CEP would be happy to consider any proposal that prevented students from declaring majors that they cannot possibly complete in a reasonable amount of time, but that this is a different question from admission to the campus.

School of Engineering Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs, Charlie McDowell, commented that the School of Engineering already screens transfer students, and only allows those with the preparatory classes into the program.

CAFA Chair Bruce Cooperstein stated that CAFA will take up the issue this year, that a representative from PBSci is being consulted, and that they hope to work with CEP to come up with a recommendation that meets the needs of the campus as a whole about admissions to the campus and to the majors, and which requires transfer students to arrive adequately prepared.

Chair Gillman closed the topic by noting there is a larger system-wide move to homogenize requirements for transfers and make the whole UC system better able to absorb the transfer population. This makes it an opportune time to deal with these issues locally, and she encouraged CEP and CAFA to present legislation to the Senate for consideration.

- c. **Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AS/SCP/1648)**
- d. **Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1649)**
- e. **Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1651)**
- f. **Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1652)**
- g. **Committee on International Education (AS/SCP/1653)**
- h. **Committee on Preparatory Education (AS/SCP/1654)**
- i. **Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1655)**
- j. **Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1656)**
- k. **Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (AS/SCP/1657)**
- l. **Committee on the Teaching (AS/SCP/1660)**
- m. **Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1658)**

After comments, items on the consent calendar were received.

## **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)

Graduate Council Chair Sue Carter explained the proposed legislative changes in graduate grading policy which include five major changes. The first change adds the option of plus or minus in grades A through B and plus on grade C. The second provides an option for either letter grades or an S/U grade. The third enables official GPAs to be calculated for graduate courses. The fourth makes narrative evaluations optional. The fifth corrects problems of timeliness for grade changes in graduate courses. Reasons for proposing these changes include consistency of graduate and undergraduate grading policies, correcting unenforceable or inconsistent aspects of

current policies, and providing additional options for effectively evaluating performance in graduate courses.

Chair Carter then proposed an amendment to 13.2.1 to correct an error in the wording by adding “taking the course for credit” after “At the end of the term each instructor teaching a credit granting course shall have the option to prepare a written evaluation for any student.”

Dean Thorsett asked about the language concerning optional narrative evaluations which had not been considered in the PBSci Division during discussion of undergraduate optional narrative evaluations. Because one department is considering requiring faculty to provide narrative evaluations, he asked whether faculty could be required to do that by their own bylaw 55 unit, or did the proposed language exclude that?

Chair Carter replied this had not been discussed by GC and she does not know the answer.

Dean Ladusaw commented that when optional narratives were added to the undergraduate policy, conflict arose with the undergraduate regulation that no course can be used to satisfy a requirement unless it has been evaluated at the 2.0 level. Though a D grade is technically passing, for a course to qualify for a major or degree requirement it must be passed at the C level, which is why UCSC doesn't have a C minus. He asked whether there is an analogous issue for the graduate program, such as a 3.0?

Chair Carter replied that there is no GPA limit in the graduate policy, but only grades of A and B can be used to fulfill a requirement in a graduate course. Graduate students can pass with a C in a course that is not required.

After Dean Ladusaw asked if a B minus grade satisfies that requirement, since that would be a 2.7, not a 3.0. Chair Carter replied that a B minus is a B and is an acceptable grade.

Professor Einarsdóttir asked why we need minuses and pluses. Chair Carter replied that many faculty members feel strongly that, when evaluating graduate students, there is a considerable difference between, for instance, an A plus and an A minus, especially in classes where a significant fraction of the grades are A. There is nothing to stop faculty from ignoring the plus and minus designations if they wish.

Because of the lack of a quorum the Senate was unable to vote on the legislation, and consideration was deferred to the next Senate meeting.

- b.** Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (RJ&E)
  - i.** Amendment to Bylaw 8.4.1, 9.1, 13.28: Mail Ballots (AS/SCP/1637)

RJ&E chair, John Jordan outlined the proposed amendments to the manual. At the request of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), it is proposed to reduce the number of days for requesting a mail ballot from 21 to 14 days. This also changes the reference point of distribution of minutes, and ties it to the distribution of the Divisional Action Report. To correct inconsistencies in the manual about who runs elections, RJ&E is proposing that the Secretary should run mail ballots under the supervision of RJ&E, and that language should be consistent throughout the manual. RJ&E will continue to count the ballots.

Because of the lack of a quorum the Senate was unable to vote on the legislation, and consideration was deferred to the next Senate meeting.

### **7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair**

Student Union Assembly Chair Tiffany Dena Loftin began with an announcement about Rainbow Theater, a multi-cultural production troupe performing on campus. She then noted that UCSC is the only UC campus without an Ethnic Studies program, and that students are thinking about ways to use interdisciplinary courses to create a minor in Ethnic Studies. She continued that the SUA is discussing and researching ways to gather information for a holistic review, and that she had concluded after talking to other campus's representatives that those campuses saw true differences in shades and backgrounds on campus.

Chair Loftin reported that the SUA will take a bus full of students to the Regents meeting at UCSF and hopes to give a public address showing opposition to any and all student fee increases. There may also be an action about this topic at UCSC. The SUA is looking forward to seeing which programs, courses and majors will be sustained for next year and how available they will be to students.

Chair Loftin described the success of the recent "Get Out the Vote" campaign in which 50 volunteers registered 2,600 students, doubling previous efforts. On November 19-21, the SUA will take 80 representatives to the Students of Color conference at UCSB where workshops, presentations and guest speakers will cover issues that students of color are facing in higher education. SUA reps and other students on campus are also working on a system-wide survey of students feelings about transfer students, accessibility to classes, and time to graduation. Chair Loftin concluded by saying she is looking forward to student government and the Academic Senate supporting each other.

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

### **9. Petitions of Students (none)**

### **10. Unfinished Business (none)**

### **11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)**

### **12. New Business (none)**

Adjournment: 3:43 p.m.

ATTEST:  
Donald Potts, Secretary  
May 5, 2011

**MINUTES**  
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
March 9, 2011

**Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

Chair Gillman asked if there were any proposed substantive changes to the minutes of May 21, 2010 and October 20, 2010 commenting that typos in the October minutes have been identified and will be fixed. The May 21, 2010 minutes had been amended and approved at the October 20, 2010 meeting, were accepted then tabled. The minutes of May 21 and October 21, 2010 were approved.

**2. Announcements**

**a. Chair Susan Gillman**

Chair Gillman welcomed the Senate members and explained that the budget is a pressing matter for the Senate. She acknowledged the recent layoff of AVC Public Affairs and Communications Barry Shiller.

At the winter quarter budget forum for faculty there was a question about the mechanics of fee increases and how they affect this year's cuts. Where we used to get \$0.67 on the dollar we will now be getting 100%. At that forum it was explained that thanks to some new revenues, including these fees, as well as administrative foresight in not allocating some resources, the cut that will be allocated out to units is approximately \$18.7 million rather than the full \$30.9 million UCSC cut. Faculty also expressed concern about possible dis-proportionality in the allocation of the cuts between divisions over the last three years and EVC Galloway will speak to this issue as well as this distribution of cuts this year; 6% cuts to Academic Divisions and 16% cuts to Academic Support.

The UC Funding Streams Proposal is meant to provide transparency in budgeting and could potentially keep education fees on campus. All campus responses to the Funding Streams Proposal are on the Senate website. The second part of this project is ~~re~~benching". Rebenching is intended to provide a rational allocation system for state funds and will offset historical inequities, ensuring that all UC campuses receive adequate state funding. Chair Gillman and Chancellor Blumenthal will serve on a systemwide task force for Rebenching.

The Committee on Research (COR) FRG/SRG applications have gone out and the deadline is April 1st. Applicants can contact Senate Committee Analyst Liana Thompson directly with questions. She introduced Liana as the new Senate analyst and also Jason Greenberg, Assistant to the Senate Director.

On March 2 there was a student event on behalf of student participation in more transparent budgetary process, expansion of Ethnic Resource Centers, and creation of an Ethnic Studies major. There was no fallout although there was occupation of a facility overnight, with a quick cleanup.

A faculty letter requesting that firearms not be used in the context of campus policing of demonstrations was initiated by a Faculty Group on Campus (FOG) and signed by over 105 faculty from across campus. Gillman noted that the EVC had already ended regular photo surveillance of demonstrations.

With regard to Silicon Valley, the proposed School of Management has been removed from 5-year list. Educational activities in Silicon Valley have been consolidated in the UNEX building for lease relief. The Graduate Council and COR are working with Silicon Valley Initiatives Director, Gordon Ringold on the academic plan. The Office of the President (UCOP) did give the campus \$1.5M in permanent funding for development and research in Silicon Valley.

The Senate Executive Committee met with the Executive Committee of the Alumni Council, which is energizing the alumni for fund-raising and mobilizing as political advocates to support public education and the UC as well as recruiting of non-resident students. There is need for better, more systematic use of alumni in the admissions process, especially using the regional organizations. This year there is an effort to end the campus penalty of approximately \$1.7M from UCOP for not meeting our modest non-resident target.

An internal rebenching/reform to be initiated by the Senate includes a proposal to bring together undergraduate functions over which the Senate has plenary authority and that run the gamut of the student educational experience/life-cycle such as admissions, major and graduation requirements, assessment and grades. SEC will propose coordination of certain educational functions in a single office, under the direction and oversight of academic administrator. Advantages to this restructuring will include accountability to the Senate by an officer directly charged with academic authority; coordination of departments and Senate committees that rely on the administration for implementation. Also it will provide structural symmetry of undergraduate organization with the way that graduate and research are structured on campus. The Senate Executive Committee will be submitting a proposal to the Administration.

#### **b. Chancellor George Blumenthal**

The Chancellor noted that many students and faculty have attracted national attention and won an array of awards. Further, donors continue to support our educational mission such as the million dollar donation from the Baskins. We have much to preserve here and to make even better.

There were two budget forums last week on campus. The Governor's budget has assigned a \$500 million cut to the UC system. This is part of a \$1.4 billion cut to education and there is almost no likelihood that this figure will decrease. The danger is that the cuts could double if there is no June ballot measure or if there is one that does not pass.

UCSC has received a roughly \$31 million cut. The good news is that with additional income from the 8% increase of student fees and permanent budget cuts made last year, we are actually facing an approximate \$19 million dollar cut. If the tax measure doesn't pass, this figure could more than double - \$19 million plus another \$31 million making a \$50 million cut. It is important that we reach out to our elected representatives, particularly Sam Blakesly. Tom Barryhill, Bill Emerson, Tom Harman and Anthony Canella are also key Senators to contact.

The Chancellor met with UC President Mark Yudof along with Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway and Vice Chancellor Planning and Budget (VCPB) Peggy Delaney to discuss the impact of cuts on our campus. Additionally UC Day in Sacramento had UC Alumni and faculty representatives, such as Joe Konopelski, lobbying on the issue of the ballot measure.

Next week, Chancellor Blumenthal will be one of the 3 chancellors making a presentation to the Regents about the impact of the cuts. Blumenthal commented that UCSC is a very administratively lean campus.

There will be a fee increase this fall. Traditionally, this campus has been allocated fee money based on the percentage we are assigned from UCOP (roughly 6% of systemwide). The fee money was allocated out based on the budget - we were only getting 67 cents back on every dollar students were paying in fees. Beginning next year, we will be getting back 100% of our fees. But this doesn't mean that the fee increases from the past three years will be recovered—they are now part of the permanent budget—this is why there is a necessity for rebenching.

Chancellor Blumenthal acknowledged the Senate as an ally in getting Rebenching started. The job will take some time to complete - it took 2 years for the Funding Streams Proposal, which was too long. UCSC should move forward on rebenching as quickly as possible. It will not have an effect next year, but the “mindless budgeting” that has taken place at UC in the past must stop.

There is a need to increase the number of non-resident students. It is important for cultural diversity as well as for budgetary reasons.

The campus may be facing a budget situation that is the “new normal”. Governor Brown's proposal is a balanced budget. We cannot expect more next year, but we can hope that there will not be more cuts, as the situation normalizes. We need to think about what things are worth preserving on campus and crucial to the identity of UCSC.

**c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway.**

EVC Galloway made a presentation about assumptions that are being made regarding the budget cuts. The presentation also outlined new resources for revenues and showed that campuses will be paying an assessment to support UCOP as part of the Funding Streams Proposal.

She explained the university's obligations and cuts. The overall cut will be approximately \$39.7 million. Roughly \$20 million was not allocated out from last year and will be applied to our campus cut so the campus shortfall is \$18.7 million. If the tax extension is not passed, then the shortfall could be just under \$50 million.

EVC Galloway explained that funds which campuses manage do not only include educational fees but also a number of other fees such as non-resident tuition, overhead on contracts and grants, patent income, interest on campus funds, gifts and endowments, auxiliary sales, and research. One thing that is taken out is undergraduate financial aid. There are some campuses that have large amounts of students who need financial aid and others with less. Simply returning financial aid proportionally to each campus enrollments would mean some campuses would be giving out extremely rich financial aid packages while others would be giving out a pittance. So these funds are redistributed based upon the needs of the students on the different campuses.

The remaining funds are primarily from student fees, from state funding, and other UC sources, including payouts on endowments. The important thing is how the state fees are allocated out to the campuses and this is the Rebenching issue. Currently those distributions are uneven and UCSC is at a disadvantage. Rebenching would give UCSC a more equitable compensation from state budget and from the fees.

EVC Galloway then outlined how UCSC is going to distribute the cuts that came to our campus. Initial targets for units composed of institutional support and academic support was 15.5% of their total budgets. For the academic divisions this kind of cut could not be made because the core purpose of the university is the academic mission and because we have tenured faculty who cannot be released. So 15.5% cuts were to come out of remaining budgets of academic divisions, which is the equivalent of a 5.9% cut to the divisions. Unfortunately this means that lay-offs are inevitable, and their impacts will be significant. The administration is looking at ways to increase revenue – including non-resident enrollments and summer session income.

The Demonstration Advisory Group which represents the campus community, not a group of administrators, has had its first meeting and is looking at policies governing protest management, surveillance, and judicial affairs.

The Child Care Task Force is underway as is the Health Care Task Force which has transmitted a letter to Office of the President regarding health care options at UCSC.

Some administrative recruitments have started including the VPDUE, Dean of Humanities, VPAA, and the Dean of Extension.

Responding to a question about how the UCOP tax will be calculated, EVC Galloway stated that we have not gotten that far yet but that initial estimates are based on all expenditures on the campus.

Asked if Assembly member Fong's 2302 bill for streamlined transfers from community colleges to UC would help our funding, Chancellor Blumenthal replied that streamlined transfer is very important, the ASSIST program needs to be updated, and that there is a need for more uniformity

in undergraduate requirements throughout the system. From a state perspective it is a good thing but from a university point of view the extent that we educate more upper division students, it may be more expensive for us and would need more funding. From a university financial perspective it is less clear cut.

When told that many students are completely unaware of the summer ballot tax extensions a request was made that the Chancellor send a message to every UCSC alumni, student, faculty and staff member about the issue and how they can contact the legislature. Chancellor Blumenthal agreed that it was a good suggestion.

Asked how they plan on protecting non-revenue generating majors, such as the Social Sciences, EVC Galloway replied that cuts are allocated evenly across campus, so revenue streams have not been considered. Most departments are in the same boat and unfortunately we cannot completely protect every part of the educational mission.

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

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

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- a. Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1664)**
- b. Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1666)**

Professor Margret Fitzsimmons from Environmental Studies requested that the annual report be removed from the consent calendar. She agrees with the analysis and conclusions, but was concerned about losing some of the most unique and remarkable things that have been accomplished at UCSC. The Environmental Studies Department works to build inter-divisional contact. We need to consider the impact of budget cuts to enterprises that do not reside in a single division. One example of a well established and internationally known program that may be in jeopardy is the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems because it lies within four or five divisions.

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

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

#### **a. Graduate Council (GC)**

- i. Amendment to Section IV Graduate Program Chapter 13 Grading and Transmission of Records (AS/SCP/1659):**

Chair of Graduate Council (GC) Sue Carter, presented the five legislative changes based on letter grades on graduate courses, optional evaluations, and grading change limit, which brings these regulations in line with the undergraduate polices on grading students. Senate Chair Gillman established that there was quorum.

<b>Spoke in favor of the amendments</b>	<b>Spoke against the amendments</b>	<b>Comments about the amendments</b>
	Jeff Sanceri, GSA President	Justin Reardon, SUA(CEP):
	Erik Green, GSA (CPB)	
	Onuttom Narayan, Physics	
	Carla Freccero, Literature	

Points Made against the amendments

- Graduate Students feel that narrative evaluations are very important for their coursework and for employment opportunities.
- Departments are allowed to require certain courses for grades.
- The choice is up to the instructor and the department cannot decide to override an individual instructor’s preference.
- Distinguishing between a B- and a B in a class with only 10 students is wishful thinking.
- It is inappropriate given the scope of graduate education which should be research.

Comments about the Amendments

- There was a request that the Senate require instructors to put in the course syllabi that students have an option of narrative evaluations, providing a deadline for the request to be submitted.

Responding to comments from the floor GC Chair Carter replied that it is the instructors’ option to offer grades or narrative evaluations but it is hoped that if a student requests a narrative evaluation that the instructor would comply. The current norm is to not assign grades, however the department can require letter grades for any course. It is fine to have a course that is only graded as A, B, C, etc. if the instructor wishes to not use the + and – designations. The goal of the proposed legislation is to provide faculty with the flexibility to employ the best methods for evaluating graduate students, rather than mandating any one practice over another.

The motion to amend the legislation was passed by voice vote.

**b. Committee on Committees**

**i. Amendment to Bylaw 4.1 Senate Chair (AS/SCP/1662)**

Committee on Committee (COC) Chair Loisa Nygaard announced that COC had two amendments that attempt to problem solve and improve the functioning of the Senate. The amendment to 4.1 would allow the term of a current chair to be extended by a year. The previous Senate Chair resigned her position in June 2010 when the current chair stepped in for a one year term following regulations. Based on current regulations COC is faced with two alternatives for the coming year. One is to reappoint the current chair for a full two year term which is problematic because it is a lot to ask of one person. The other is to appoint a new chair but that is problematic because it would mean three years in a row with a first year chair which is not an attractive option. The change in legislation would allow COC, in these situations, to extend the term of the current chair by one additional year. At this point Senate Chair Gillman recused herself from conducting the meeting and Senate Vice Chair Joe Konopelski took the podium.

Commenting on the amendment Richard Hughey, Biomolecular Engineering, offered the following alternate wording; ~~in~~ cases where the interim Chair serves for one year or less (Comma) the committee may extend the term for an additional year”.

COC Chair Nygaard replied to the comment that COC considered the alternate phrasing but found that it could pose significant technical difficulties.

The motion to amend the legislation was passed by voice vote.

#### **ii. Amendment to Chapter 11 Elections (AS/SCP/1665)**

With Chair Gillman presiding, COC Chair Nygaard presented a long-term ongoing problem with the senate bylaws. In the absence of nominations for the Committee on Committees coming from the faculty at large, the COC must act very quickly to get nominees. When a COC member does not fulfill their two year term, the replacement one year term can be very problematic and can produce a COC that consists entirely of new members. If this proposed change passes, then any nominees necessary to fill out COC will be selected thoughtfully by the entire COC rather than allocated at the last moment. The senate will have the opportunity to review, and approve or not-approve the nominees that the COC generates. The practices used to re-staff COC will be open and transparent.

Professor Carl Walsh, Economics, inquired about the lack of faculty willingness to be nominated. COC Chair Nygaard replied that there is no firm answer but that this has been a longstanding problem.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

#### **c. Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)**

##### **i. Oral report on transition to new General Education and curricular planning.**

CEP Chair John Tamkun presented a mapping tool to display course requirements for majors. This analysis can be used to look at one’s own curriculum, compare across departments for interdisciplinary issues, to look at impactation, department sizes, course flows, and reasons for program suspension/disestablishment. The curriculum mapping tool can also be used to analyze many aspects of curricular planning including General Education Requirements (GE), course capacity, course and major prerequisites, effects of the curriculum on retention, cross-departmental impacts, admissions, and disqualifications policies. CEP is working on revising major admissions and disqualification policies to improve the student experience and retention. This mapping tool has proven to be an extremely useful guide to visually clarify many complex factors. A graphical representation of each major can be easily generated, clearly showing what classes can be taken with regards to prerequisites, and reveals complex relationships between departments, divisions and majors. This tool will facilitate planning and promote efficiency.

Looking at the results of these charts made it evident that we need to implement early admissions policies and focus advising in the gateways to help with student success. Goals include

graphically displaying data on maps (such as enrollments, pass rates, offerings per year), develop fully automated methods for generating and updating maps, generating full divisional and campus maps, current and revised maps can be analyzed for proposed changes to majors, and these maps can also become available to students.

Professor Shelly Errington, Anthropology, suggested mapping units and entities that serve our students which are an intrinsic part of research - such as the Agroecology program and the Social Sciences Media Lab - to help us decide when cuts need to be made and what the academic costs are of those cuts.

**d. Committee on the Library**

**i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.23 (AS/SCP/1661)**

Robert Manduchi, Chair of COL, announced the bylaw changes to the name and charge of the Committee on the Library. Bylaw 13.23 would enable greater involvement of COL in advising on budget. The Library does not have a protected budget. In the budget crisis it is important that that changes to the Library budget are carefully considered. Chair Manduchi invited Librarian Ginny Steel to address the issues.

Librarian Steel supports and welcomes the proposed changes to the bylaws. The current budget crisis is forcing the Library to cut even more of its subscriptions and functions on top of the effects of previous years’ budget cuts. After the sunset of the student-initiated fee to extend library hours, the library is going to face significant problems with keeping the library open.

Chair Manduchi presented the second portion of the legislation which proposes to change the name of the Committee on the Library to the Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication reflecting the Library’s modernization with regards to publishing research and supporting teaching.

<b>Spoke in favor of the amendments</b>	<b>Spoke against the amendments</b>	<b>Comments about the amendments</b>
Brent Haddad, CPB Chair		John Jordan, RJ&E Chair
Michael Laird, SUA (COL)		
Jessica Greenstreet, SUA (CAFA)		

Points made in favor of the amendments

- Budget issues facing the library are very important right now and it is good that this is explicit in the charge.
- The importance of keeping the library open for study space was stressed.

Comments about the amendments

- Friendly amendments were offered and accepted to change –Assists” to –Advises” and to add –The Committee”
- This will go into effect April 1<sup>st</sup> instead of September.

An incidental motion that if this legislation passes it would go into effect on April 1<sup>st</sup>, was passed by voice vote.

The legislation passed by voice vote.

**e. Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB)**  
**i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.24 (AS/SCP/1663)**

Brent Haddad, Chair of CPB presented an efficiency measure to go into effect on April 1<sup>st</sup> inviting the Academic Senate Director to sit on CPB in order to take advantage of the broad array of information that the Senate Director can provide to the committee.

Spoke in favor of the amendments	Spoke against the amendments	Comments about the amendments
Quentin Williams, COR Chair		
		Richard Hughey, Biomolecular Engineering

Points made in favor of the amendments

- This places the Senate Director in a position to support one of the most crucial committees of the Senate.

Comments about the amendments

- The Senate office has already figured out which staff members sit with the committees.

Chair Haddad responded that the Director does assign support staff for each committee, but because the Director has so much information from both systemwide senate and from UCSC staff, it is particularly valuable to have the Director sit with CPB.

An incidental motion that if this legislation passes it would go into effect on April 1<sup>st</sup>, was passed by voice vote.

The legislation passed by voice vote.

**7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair**

Tiffany Dena Loftin, the Student Union Assembly (SUA) Chair, reported on the following points:

- SUA has conducted outreach asking students to attend Senate meetings for informational purposes.
- A few weeks ago they brought 40 students to Sacramento for a lobbying field trip garnering support for the Dream Act, CA student Aid, and Cal Grants. Over 400 students from all UC campuses were there.
- Asked that curricular maps be integrated into the course catalog.
- SUA succeeded in getting 2% tax removed from student referendums.

- Students are experiencing issues with course availability, diversity, campus climate, and priority enrollment criteria.
- Students are still advocating for an Ethnic Studies Program.
- SUA is organizing students to vote and lobby for tax extensions on the June ballot.
- May 13-15 is annual Women of Color Conference.
- SUA is working on bringing Cornell West here on May 6<sup>th</sup>.
- SUA is planning an event in Sacramento on April 14<sup>th</sup>.

### **8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President**

Jeff Sanceri, the Graduate Student Association (GSA) Chair, reported on the following points:

- GSA is very concerned about the proposed cuts to the Library and doesn't understand why it is getting categorized as a non-academic entity when it is so essential to graduate research.
- Regarding narrative evaluations many graduate students are in favor of it as long as they live up to their potential. If the system is broken we should fix it instead of eliminating it.
- GSA voted unanimously to co-sign the letter prohibiting the use of weapons in dealing with student activism.
- GSA is concerned about the improvement of living conditions in Family Student Housing and affordable rent rates for on campus housing.
- GSA is concerned about child care.
- GSA is looking for faculty support in challenging the "18-quarter rule"
- GSA is sending a group of graduate students to an Ethnic Studies conference at UC Riverside. The hope is that the ambassadors to this conference will be able to come back to UCSC armed with strategies to launch the Ethnic Studies movement here on campus.

### **9. Petitions of Students (none)**

### **10. Unfinished Business (none)**

### **11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)**

### **11. New Business (none)**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20p.m.

ATTEST:  
Judith Habicht Mauche  
Secretary

May 9, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE**  
**Annual Report, 2010-2011**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Senate Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL) enthusiastically nominates Professor Steven S. Vogt of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics and the University of California Observatories to deliver the 2011 - 12 Lecture.

Steve Vogt is an astronomer and a builder of instruments who has greatly expanded our view of the inhabitable universe. During his 33 years of affiliation with UCSC, including 23 years as Professor and 5 as Distinguished Professor, he has designed, built, and used high precision spectrometers to find new worlds outside our solar system. Indeed he, his instruments, and his students have discovered more of the over 500 known extra-solar planets than anyone else.

Vogt received his Bachelor's Degree in Physics and Astronomy from the University of California Berkeley in 1972, and his Master of Science and PhD degrees from the University of Texas, Austin in 1975 and 1978 respectively. He then joined the faculty of UCSC and the Lick Observatory in 1978, straight out of graduate school.

In the 80's, he was responsible for building the Hamilton spectrometer at Lick Observatory with which many of the first extra-solar planets were discovered. His first graduate student, Geoff Marcy (PhD UCSC, 1982) was instrumental in many of these discoveries and went on to become a well-known planet finder himself. In 1994, Vogt further optimized the Hamilton spectrometer to the point where it could detect stellar "wobbles", variations in a star's speed towards or away from us induced by its orbiting planets, with a precision of only 3 meters per second. For comparison, Jupiter induces a wobble in our own sun's motion of about 12 meters per second. With this more precise spectrometer, many new planets were found.

Finding extra-solar *planets* was a great accomplishment, but Vogt's goal has always been extra-solar *Earths*, not Jupiters. This required greater precision - a bigger telescope and a better spectrograph. Jupiter's mass is 318 times that of the earth and the smaller planets cause smaller wobbles. So, in the 90's, Vogt's primary focus moved to the giant Keck telescopes in Hawaii. Using the new High Resolution Echelle Spectrograph (HIRES) that he developed, he was able to achieve a precision of 1 meter per second, about the speed at which we walk. This increased precision led to the discovery of a number of rocky planets with masses of only 5 – 10 earth masses. That's better, far smaller than Jupiter, but to induce a significant wobble and be detected in a short time, these planets had to be situated so close to their parent stars that there could be no liquid water. Vogt wanted to find watery earths like the one we live on, but the search was slow due to the scarcity of valuable Keck telescope time. Finding planets takes continued observations of the same star, sometimes for years, with an uncertain outcome.

And so, starting in 2003, Vogt moved much of his research back to Mt. Hamilton where he became Principal Investigator for a new telescope, indeed a new *kind* of telescope, the Automated Planet Finder (APF). At a cost of \$10 million, the APF began operation last year. The APF is capable of studying radial stellar speeds of just 1 meter per second, like HIRES, but on a continual basis. True to its name, the APF is actually a computer at heart. It *automatically* observes a set of candidate stars all night, every clear night, searching for evidence of planets in the 1 to 20 earth mass range. The initial search list includes 1000 stars which will be narrowed to 100 for careful follow-up studies. The APF is the only telescope of its kind and its survey will go on for years. It is just getting started. Meanwhile Vogt has also continued to use HIRES.

An important breakthrough came in 2010 when, using HIRES, Vogt's team discovered Gliese 581g. With a radius only about 50% larger than the earth and a mass about three times the earth, Gliese 581g, one of six planets orbiting the star Gliese 581, was in the "Goldilock's zone", not too hot, not too cold, not too big and not too small. Water would be a liquid on its surface and its gravity would not be very different from the Earth. Having two Earth-like planets (one being the Earth itself) within a region only 30 light years across, and poorly sampled so far, would have far reaching implications for the probability of life elsewhere. There would be billions of potentially habitable planets in the Milky Way galaxy alone (and we know of billions of other galaxies).

Unfortunately, in just the last few months, the discovery of Gliese 581g has become controversial. A team of Swiss astronomers who think they should see the planet in their data, if it's there, don't see it. So today, the community is divided on its existence. Such is science. With time, the planet will either become a certainty and Vogt will be very famous, or, if not, others like it will be discovered, quite probably by Vogt himself using the APF.

For many years, Vogt has also been a very popular instructor in Astronomy 2, the Astronomy Department's largest enrollment undergraduate class. He has also received numerous outside awards for his research, among them the Tinsley Prize of the American Astronomical Society (2002) and the Carl Sagan Memorial Award of the Planetary Society (shared with Marcy and Butler, 2002). He also shared the Prix Andre Lallemand of the Academie des Sciences de France with Nelson (1998) and received the Muhlmann Award of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific (1995). In 2004 he was selected Alumnus of the year by the University of Texas at Austin.

Therefore, in recognition of Professor Vogt's extraordinary research accomplishments, the Committee recommends that he be invited to deliver the 2010-11 Faculty Research lecture to the UCSC and Santa Cruz communities.

Respectfully submitted;

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE**

Wlad Godzich  
Anatole Leikin  
Stan Woosley  
Barbara Rogoff, Chair

April 27, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS & FINANCIAL AID**  
**Policy for Frosh Admission – Holistic Review**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

During the 2010-11 academic year, the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) has reviewed UCSC's frosh admissions and selection policy. While CAFA believes that the current quantitative method of selection has been responsive to the needs of the UCSC campus, as a whole UCSC would be better served if we reoriented our admissions selection process towards a holistic review approach starting Fall 2012. Holistic review uses multiple measures to assess whether potential students exhibit the qualities necessary to succeed academically and graduate in a timely fashion as well as demonstrate the promise of making a positive contribution to the UCSC community. The differences are not drastic but significant. UCSC will continue to review frosh applicants based on their qualifications and accomplishments using the 14 UC faculty-approved criteria; however, these criteria will no longer carry individual fixed weights. The holistic approach employs a thorough review of each application by professionally trained readers who determine a single score that is reflective of an applicant's full spectrum of achievement, viewed in the context of his/her academic and personal opportunities. CAFA thinks that this shift in policy will have an overall salutary effect. The consideration of additional profile information for each applicant will provide a greater opportunity for readers to consider a more complete set of indicators of academic excellence and promise, and to account for outstanding achievement in particular areas. The proposed policy roughly maintains the weight of the GPA and completion of „a-g“ courses as is currently used in UCSC's frosh selection process.

**Scoring Frosh Applicants**

The UCSC holistic score will be guided by two broad areas of evaluation. Half of the score will be determined by GPA and „a-g“ courses completed, planned, and in-progress and the other half of the score will be determined by test score performance, personal qualities, potential for positive contributions, achievement in educational preparatory programs, and accomplishments within life experiences. Readers will all be required to undergo intensive training, and norming of score outcomes will be ongoing throughout the reading phase of the Admissions process to eliminate any variances.

Score of 1 – Emphatically Recommended for Admissions (should be reserved for approximately 10% of all applicants)

Score of 2 – Strongly Recommended for Admissions (should be reserved for approximately the next 15% of all applicants)

Score of 3 – Recommended for Admissions (should be reserved for approximately the next 25% of all applicants)

Score of 4 – Qualified for Admissions

Score of 5 – Recommended Denial of Admission

*NOTE: All scores align with UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles score ranges.*

**Use of UCLA and UCB Holistic Scores**

Students who have applied to both UCSC and either UCB or UCLA will not be read again by UCSC readers, saving substantial resources that would be considered duplicative in nature. UCSC would accept the read from UCB/UCLA to be equal to our own campus score. In the case where an applicant has both a UCB and a UCLA score, those two scores would be averaged. By adopting this method of using other campus’ holistic scores, the work load for the Admissions staff will be reduced. More importantly, UCSC reviewers will then be able to concentrate on reading applicants who either did not apply to UCB/UCLA, or those who received a UCB/UCLA score that requires a UCSC tie-break review.

Once UCSC’s admission target is set (this is the number of offers of admission needed to achieve the campus’s enrollment target for any given term), a UCB holistic score and a UCLA holistic score would be considered exactly the same as the UCSC holistic score. UCSC readers will read all applications which will not be read at UCB or UCLA. The lower the holistic score, the higher the chance for admission. When the holistic scoring band would yield too many admits, UCSC will employ tie-breaking procedures (see below) that weight certain factors more heavily. These factors embody criteria that are highly valued by UCSC’s faculty.

The chart below shows the basis of CAFA’s assertion that the use of UCB/UCLA scores correlates with both our past admissions offers and the future admissions goals for our campus. The data shows how many students in each UCB/UCLA scoring range were admitted to UCSC last year. UCSC admitted almost 93% of the overlapping applicants even at a score of 4.0.

		UCLA Read Scores													
		Not App		1.0-1.99		2.0-2.99		3.0-3.99		4.00		4.25		4.5	
		App	Adm UCSC	App	Adm UCSC	App	Adm UCSC	App	Adm UCSC	App	Adm UCSC	App	Adm UCSC	App	Adm UCSC
UCB Read Scores	Not App	11,144	5,336	14	14	242	239	532	499	764	688	720	546	1091	613
	1.0-1.99	25	25	38	38	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2.0-2.99	271	268	71	69	561	554	144	142	13	12	4	4	2	2
	3.0-3.99	393	373	6	6	361	357	440	433	211	200	71	70	35	25
	4.00	3201	2550	2	2	305	298	1049	1011	1553	1442	1047	868	1258	811

Fall 2010 data prepared by UCOP IR,TC, 1/25/2011

**Tie-break Criteria**

One of the scenarios which CAFA has spent a great deal of time considering is how to select from within the cohort of applicants who have like scores (at our current level of selectivity, between 3.5-4.25), when the entire cohort with that score cannot be admitted because it is too large. Holistic scoring will not align evenly at this “break point,” so tie-break criteria have been established. Since the holistic review has already been conducted on these students, the tie-break criteria are not a rescoring of applicants. Tie-break criteria are meant to give Admissions staff the best possible tools to produce a frosh class which closely reflects the expectations and values of the faculty.

CAFA is recommending that at the point at which too many applicants have the same holistic score, the Admissions staff use a composite of criteria to select for admission. These criteria are as follows:

- Demonstrated success and preparedness in writing
- Demonstrated success and preparedness in math
- Students that have qualified for Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) and how they compare to other ELC students from their high school
- Students that would be considered “first-generation” to achieve a 4-year degree
- Students coming from low-performing high schools (low API or similar characteristics for out-of-state high schools)
- Potential for broader campus impact, including but not limited to residency status, tribal affiliation for American Indian applicants, and low-socioeconomic status.

During the UCSC holistic review, Admissions readers will populate an electronic checklist of the above criteria for later use in tie-breaking. For applicants that have been read by UCB and/or UCLA, and whose score is also within the tie-break band, Admissions readers will review those applications to also populate the electronic checklist.

### **Evaluating Effectiveness of Holistic Review**

CAFA and the Office of Admissions, as well as the UC Office of the President, will conduct annual assessments of UCSC’s selection process and holistic scoring. Traditional outcomes such as GPA, test scores, total „a-g“ courses, etc. will be compared to previous admitted/enrolled frosh cohorts, ensuring that UCSC continues to admit excellent students who will succeed and graduate in a timely fashion. Ongoing analyses will ensure that UCSC’s selection criteria and implementation of this holistic approach will not negatively impact specific populations of students.

Respectfully submitted,

### **COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID**

Raoul Birnbaum

Chris Edwards

Andy Fisher

Jonathan Fox

Hiroshi Fukurai

June Gordon

Juan Poblete, BOARS Rep

Susan Strome

Bruce Cooperstein, Chair

Candace Calsoyas, NSTF Rep

Jessica Greenstreet, SUA Rep

James Ramsey, SUA Rep

May 13, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**  
**Amendment to Bylaw 13.17.1 – Committee on Educational Policy**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The workload of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has increased radically over the years and promises to remain heavy into the future. The very small size of CEP is not congruent with the amount of routine business the committee handles and leaves little room for major initiatives (like General Education reform). Further, other major Senate committees with equivalent levels of responsibility are much larger: CPB, for example, has 9 members, the Graduate Council 10, CAFA 7-9, and the Committee on Research 9. Hence the Committee on Committees (COC) proposes to increase the size of CEP by as many as three members. For academic year 2011- 12 COC will nominate two additional members should this legislation pass. COC will then assess the necessity of adding an additional (ninth) member the following year.

**Current wording**

**Proposed wording**

<p><b>13.17 Committee on Educational Policy</b>  <b>13.17.1</b> There are six Santa Cruz Division members plus the Registrar serving <i>ex officio</i>. In addition, there are one non-senate teaching faculty representative, one non-voting provosts' representative selected by the Council of Provosts, and no more than two student representatives.</p>	<p><b>13.17 Committee on Educational Policy</b>  <b>13.17.1</b> There are <u>no fewer than six and no more than nine</u> Santa Cruz Division members plus the Registrar serving <i>ex officio</i>. In addition, there are one non-senate teaching faculty representative, one non-voting provosts' representative selected by the Council of Provosts, and no more than two student representatives.</p>
---	--

Respectfully submitted,

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

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

May 3, 2011

**Committee on Committees**

Nominations 2011-12

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

**OFFICERS**

Susan	Gillman	Chair	Literature
Joseph	Konopelski	Vice Chair	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Judith	Habicht-Mauche	Secretary	Anthropology
Donald	Potts	Parliamentarian	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

**ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATIVES**

Joseph	Konopelski	Vice Chair	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Marilyn	Walker		Computer Science

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (SEC)**

Susan	Gillman	Chair	Literature
Joseph	Konopelski	Vice Chair	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Judith	Habicht-Mauche	Secretary	Anthropology
Marilyn	Walker	Assembly Rep.	Computer Science
Suresh	Lodha	(CFW)	Computer Science
Onuttom	Narayan	(P&T)	Physics
Bruce	Schumm	(GC)	Physics
Lynn	Westerkamp	(CPB)	History
Scott	Oliver	(COR)	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Dana	Takagi	(CAP)	Sociology
Kimberly	Lau	(CAAD)	American Studies
Eileen	Zurbriggen	(CEP)	Psychology
June	Gordon	(CAFA)	Education
TBA		(COC)	

**ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT GRIEVANCE (AAGC)**

Campbell	Leaper	Chair	Psychology
Lourdes	Martínez-Echazábal		Literature
Richard	Hughey		Computer Engineering

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM (CAF)**

Jean	Brodie	Chair/UCAF ( <i>F</i> )	Astronomy & Astrophysics
Ira	Pohl	Chair/UCAF ( <i>W&amp;S</i> )	Computer Science
G.S.	Sahota		Literature
Jean E.	Fox Tree		Psychology
Ben	Friedlander ( <i>F</i> )		Electrical Engineering
Jean	Brodie ( <i>W&amp;S</i> )		Astronomy & Astrophysics
Elizabeth	Stephens		Art

**ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (CAP)**

Dana	Takagi	Chair/UCAP	Sociology
Nirvikar	Singh		Economics
Carla	Freccero		Literature
Shelley	Stamp		Film & Digital Media
Claire	Gu		Electrical Engineering
Charles	Hedrick		History
Rodney	Ogawa		Education
Christina	Ravelo		Ocean Sciences
Piero	Madau		Astronomy & Astrophysics

**ADMISSIONS & FINANCIAL AID (CAFA)**

June	Gordon	Chair/BOARS	Education
L.S.	Kim		Film & Digital Media
Chris	Edwards		Ocean Sciences
Andy	Fisher		Earth & Planetary Sciences
Hiroshi	Fukurai		Sociology
Tracy	Larrabee		Computer Engineering
Susan	Strome		MCD Biology
Renya	Ramirez		Anthropology
Victoria	González-Pagani		Language Program

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION & DIVERSITY (CAAD)**

Kimberly	Lau	Chair/UCAAD	American Studies
Miriam	Greenberg		Sociology
Claire	Max		Astronomy & Astrophysics
Derek	Murray ( <i>F</i> )		History of Art & Visual Culture
Lewis	Watts ( <i>W&amp;S</i> )		Art
Raquel	Prado		Applied Math & Statistics
Christine	Hong ( <i>F&amp;W</i> )		Literature

**CAREER ADVISING (CCA)**

Will remain unfilled for 2011-12

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (COC) *For Information Only - By Election***

Elizabeth	Abrams		Writing
Pradip	Mascharak		Chemistry & Biochemistry
Paul	Roth		Philosophy
Bruce	Cooperstein		Mathematics
Norman	Locks		Art

**COMPUTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS (CCT)**

Greg	Laughlin	Chair/UCCC	Astronomy & Astrophysics
Scott	Lokey		Chemistry & Biochemistry
Anujan	Varma		Computer Engineering
Jose	Renau		Computer Engineering
Matt	Wagers		Linguistics
Ted	Warburton		Theatre Arts
Martin	Weissman		Mathematics
Chris	Wilmers		Environmental Studies

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY (CEP)**

Eileen	Zurbruggen	Chair & UCEP	Psychology
Melissa	Gwyn		Art
Peter	Young		Physics
William	Dunbar		Computer Engineering
James	Wilson		Writing
Mark	Anderson		Anthropology

**EMERITI RELATIONS (CER)**

Helene	Moglen	Chair	Literature
Nancy	Chen		Anthropology
Suresh	Lodha	CFW chair <i>ex officio</i>	Computer Science
Mary	Silver		Ocean Sciences

**FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE (CFRL)**

Wlad	Godzich	Chair	Literature
Adrienne	Zihlman		Anthropology
Anatole	Leikin		Music
Stan	Woosley		Astronomy & Astrophysics
JJ	Garcia-Luna-Aceves		Computer Engineering

**FACULTY WELFARE (CFW)**

Suresh	Lodha	Chair/UCFW	Computer Science
Thorne	Lay		Earth & Planetary Sciences
Carlos	Dobkin		Economics
Gina	Langhout		Psychology
Gustavo	Vazquez		Film & Digital Media
Abel	Rodriguez		Applied Math & Statistics
Noriko	Aso		History
Matthew	Wolf-Meyer		Anthropology
Helene	Moglen	<i>Chair CER ex officio</i>	Literature

**GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**

Bruce	Schumm	Chair/CCGA	Physics
Scott	Brandt		Computer Science
Donald	Smith		METOX
Jorge	Hankamer		Linguistics
Kimberly	Jannarone		Theater Arts
Raphael	Kudela		Ocean Sciences
Bettina	Aptheker		Feminist Studies
Carol	Shennan		Environmental Studies
Megan	Thomas		Politics

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (CIE)**

Giacomo	Bernardi	Chair/UCIE	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Jorge	Aladro Font ( <i>F&amp;W</i> )		Literature
Lora	Bartlett ( <i>S</i> )		Education
Ben	Crow		Sociology
Margaret	Morse		Film & Digital Media

**LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION (COLASC)**

Roberto	Manduchi	Chair/UCOLASC	Computer Engineering
Erik	Asphaug		Earth & Planetary Sciences
David	Anthony ( <i>F</i> )		History
Murray	Baumgarten ( <i>W &amp; S</i> )		Literature
Stacy	Kamehiro		History of Art & Visual Culture
Andrew	Mathews		Anthropology

**PLANNING & BUDGET (CPB)**

Lynn	Westerkamp	Chair/UCPB	History
Robert	Boltje		Mathematics
Patty	Gallagher		Theater Arts
Susan	Gillman	<i>ex officio</i>	Literature
Joeseeph	Konopelski	<i>ex officio</i>	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Sriram	Shastry		Physics
Deanna	Shemek		Literature
Andy	Szasz		Sociology
David	Helmbold		Computer Science
David	Draper		Applied Math & Statistics
Daniel	Friedman		Economics

**PREPARATORY EDUCATION (CPE)**

David	Smith	Chair/UCOPE	Physics
Gabriel	Elkaim		Computer Engineering
Donna	Hunter ( <i>F&amp;W</i> )		History of Art & Visual Culture
TBA ( <i>S</i> )			

**PRIVILEGE & TENURE (P&T)**

Onuttom	Narayan	Chair/UCPT	Physics
Lindsay	Hinck		MCD Biology
Michael	Loik		Environmental Studies
Triloki	Pandey		Anthropology
Todd	Lowe		Biomolecular Engineering
Gina	Dent		Feminist Studies
Leta	Miller ( <i>W&amp;S</i> )		Music

**RESEARCH (COR)**

Scott	Oliver	Chair/UCORP	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Nathaniel	Deutsch		Literature
Deborah	LeTourneau		Environmental Studies
Elisabeth	Cameron		History of Art & Visual Culture
Sri	Kurniawan		Computer Engineering
David	Koo		Astronomy & Astrophysics
Hamid	Sadjadpour		Electrical Engineering
Debra	Lewis		Mathematics
Barbara	Rogoff		Psychology

**RULES, JURISDICTION & ELECTIONS (RJ&E)**

Anthony	Aguirre	Chair	Physics
TBA	( <i>F</i> )		
Dave	Belanger ( <i>W&amp;S</i> )		Physics
Allen	Van Gelder		Computer Science
Abraham	Stone		Philosophy
TBA			

**TEACHING (COT)**

Daniel	Selden	Chair	Literature
Pascale	Garaud		Applied Math & Statistics
Maria	Schonbek		Mathematics
Graeme	Smith		Astronomy & Astrophysics
Dee	Hibbert-Jones ( <i>W&amp;S</i> )		Art
Brandin	Baron-Nusbaum ( <i>F</i> )		Theater Arts

Respectfully Submitted:  
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

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

May 10, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**  
**REPORT ON MAJOR ADMISSIONS AND DISQUALIFICATION**  
**POLICIES**

To the Academic Senate Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has received an increasing number of proposals to restrict the access of students to majors, including both major admissions policies and major disqualification policies. Major admissions policies establish the conditions that must be met before a student is allowed to declare a specific major. Examples of such conditions include performance in one or more foundational courses; a portfolio review; or other academic criteria approved by CEP. Major disqualification policies are conceptually similar to major admissions policies, but are applied after a student has been admitted to a major.

Academic advising has long been the primary mechanism for directing students to majors compatible with their interests and abilities. Although major admissions policies remain relatively rare outside the School of Engineering, the number of major disqualification policies has increased significantly during the past decade<sup>1</sup>. With the approval of our committee, disqualification policies have been adopted for all SOE majors, the majority of Social Sciences and Physical and Biological Sciences majors, and two Humanities majors. The situation at UCSC is markedly different from other UC campuses, where major admissions policies are common but major disqualification policies are rare.

CEP has grown increasingly concerned about the prevalence of major disqualification policies in the absence of data concerning their impact on retention, graduation rates or diversity. These concerns prompted us to consider whether the continued use of major disqualification policies is appropriate.

*The relationship between major disqualification policies and graduation requirements*

Guidelines for major disqualification policies were drafted by CEP in 1997 and amended in 2008. Departments may adopt policies (with CEP approval) that permit the disqualification of students based on their performance in a pre-determined list of courses that are essential for success in the major. CEP has approved policies that permit the disqualification of students who receive grades of NP, D, F or W twice in a single course or in two courses from a pre-determined list.

CEP's guidelines stress that the disqualification of a student from a major "should happen early in the student's major career rather than later" to ensure "that the student has time to find a more suitable major and succeed at it". Accordingly, CEP will only approve major disqualification policies that are based on performance in lower-division major requirements or (in rare cases) upper-division requirements that must be taken early in a student's career.

The following overview of campus graduation requirements illustrates the challenges faced by

---

<sup>1</sup> A complete list of undergraduate programs with major admissions or disqualification policies may be found at the end of this report.

students who are disqualified from a major during their junior or senior year. To receive an undergraduate degree, a student must complete at least 180 credits of coursework, including both major requirements and campus general education (GE) requirements<sup>2</sup>. A major must require at least 45 credits of coursework, including 40 credits associated with upper-division courses. Major requirements range from roughly 50 credits to 200 credits depending on the discipline. Differences in lower-division major requirements account for much of this variability.

It is difficult for a typical student to satisfy the requirements of any major in less than two years; most majors in the Physical and Biological Sciences and the School of Engineering take much longer to complete. Students are therefore encouraged to choose a major as early as possible and major declaration deadlines are strictly enforced<sup>3</sup>. Upper-division students may change their major, but only with the permission of the new department.

When a student is disqualified from their major after their sophomore year, they must identify a program that can be completed in less than two years and is willing to accept them. For many students, these challenges will prove insurmountable.

#### *Concerns about existing major disqualification policies.*

CEP's approval of major disqualification policies was based on the reasonable assumption that lower-division major requirements must be taken during the freshman or sophomore year. The committee also assumed that these courses provide the foundation required for the successful completion of upper-division major requirements.

CEP recently began to utilize computer-generated curriculum maps to better understand and evaluate the organization and requirements of undergraduate programs. These maps revealed significant problems with many of the major disqualification policies approved by our committee. We are particularly concerned about programs that can disqualify majors based on their performance in courses:

- that are not required for the major
- that are not pre-requisites for any upper-division major requirement or elective
- that can be taken during the junior or senior year, including the quarter immediately prior to graduation.

Thus, many of the major disqualification policies approved by our committee can lead to the inappropriate disqualification of students in their junior or senior year.

#### *Relationship between major disqualification policies and other Senate regulations.*

CEP understands the desire to prevent students who repeatedly fail upper-division courses from continuing in a major. Major disqualification policies are not required to achieve this goal due to the existence of the following Senate regulations:

SCR A9.1.8 prevents students from repeating a course more than once without the approval

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://senate.ucsc.edu/senatemanual/ManualAug10/scrAug10.pdf> Chapter 10.

<sup>3</sup> Students who enter as freshman must declare a major before they complete 90 units of coursework; junior transfer students must declare a major no later than their second quarter of residency.

of their college<sup>4</sup>

SCR 12.1.2 subjects undergraduates to disqualification from the University if their GPA for the term is less than 1.5 or they are already on academic probation and their cumulative GPA is less than 2.0<sup>5</sup>

SR 634 sets a GPA of 2.0 in all attempted courses as a minimum graduation requirement<sup>6</sup>

Finally, it appears that many of our major disqualification policies are not in compliance with SR 900.0.2, which states that undergraduate students cannot be subjected to academic probation and disqualification policies more stringent than those described above without the approval of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate<sup>7</sup>.

### *Summary*

CEP does not support the continued use of major disqualification policies as a mechanism for restricting the access of students to majors. Departments should anticipate the need to delete all references to major disqualification policies from program statements.

As an alternative, we encourage all undergraduate programs to articulate the foundational or “gateway” courses that are essential for success in their majors; students who encounter difficulties in these courses should be discouraged from entering the major. CEP will consider formal proposals to restrict admission to a major based on a student’s performance in gateway courses taken in the freshmen or sophomore year or other academic criteria. These proposals should be supported by evidence that the criteria used are a reliable predictor of a student’s future success in the program.

Updated guidelines for major admissions policies – together with examples of major admissions policies that were recently approved by our committee - will be posted on the CEP web page in the near future, <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/>. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

Cormac Flanagan

Melissa Gwyn

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Eric Porter

Peter Young

Lourdes Martínez-Echazábal, Provost Representative

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NTSF Representative

Alma Natalia De Castro, Student Representative (SUA)

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://senate.ucsc.edu/senatemanual/ManualAug10/scrAug10.pdf> Chapter 9.

<sup>5</sup> <http://senate.ucsc.edu/senatemanual/ManualAug10/scrAug10.pdf> Chapter 12.

<sup>6</sup> **634.** *Minimum Standards for Graduation. Except as provided in [Senate Regulation 782](#) for the grade of Passed/Not Passed, to receive a Bachelor's degree a student must obtain a grade-point average of at least 2.00 for all courses attempted in the University. (EC 3 Nov 69) (Rev 4 May 1995)*

<sup>7</sup> **900.C.2** *Undergraduate students in particular schools or colleges may be subject to more stringent norms with respect to academic probation or disqualification, but only on the basis of regulations adopted by a Division of the Senate and approved by the Assembly of the Senate.*

Eileen Zurbriggen  
John Tamkun, Chair

Justin Riordan, Student Representative (SUA)

May 11, 2011

(Enclosure)

### Arts DQ Policy

Art	No
Film and Digital Media	No
History of Art and Visual Culture	No
Music	Yes
Theater Arts	No

### Humanities DQ Policy

American Studies	No
Classical Studies	No
Feminist Studies	No
German Studies	No
History	No
Italian Studies	No
Jewish Studies	No
Language Studies	Yes
Linguistics	Yes
Literature	No
Philosophy	No

### Physical & Biological Sciences DQ

Applied Physics	No
Biochemistry and Biology	Yes
Ecology and Evolution	Yes
Human Biology	Yes
Marine Biology	Yes
MCD Biology	Yes
Neuroscience	Yes
Plant Sciences	Yes
Chemistry	Yes
Earth Sciences	Yes
Earth Sciences/ Anthropology Combined Major	Yes
Mathematics	Yes
Physics	No
Physics (Astrophysics)	No
Physics Education	No

**Social Sciences DQ Policy**

Anthropology	No
Business Management	Yes
Economics	
Cognitive Science	No
Economics	Yes
Economics/ Mathematics Combined Major	Yes
Environmental Studies	Yes
Environmental Studies/ Biology Combined Major	Yes
Environmental Studies/ Earth Sciences Combined Major	Yes
Environmental Studies/ Economics Combined Major	Yes
Global Economics	Yes
Latin American and Latino Studies	No
Latin American and Latino Studies/ Global Economics Combined Major	Yes
Latin American and Latino Studies/ Literature Combined Major	No
Latin American and Latino Studies/ Sociology Combined Major	Yes
Legal Studies	No
Politics	No
Psychology	Yes
Sociology	Yes

### **School of Engineering DQ**

School of Engineering Disqualification Policy	Yes
BioEngineering	Yes
Bioinformatics	Yes
Computer Engineering	Yes
Computer Science	Yes
Computer Science: Game Design	Yes
Electrical Engineering	Yes
Information Systems Management	Yes

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
Amendment to Regulation 9.1  
One Year Limit of Grade Change Exceptions**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is proposing to amend Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 9.1 which allows changing a final grade within one year of the original submission, upon written request from an instructor based on clerical or procedural error.

The current regulation does not take into account grade change requests made after an instructor has left the University or is deceased. This amendment gives CEP the authority to grant exceptions to the one year limit.

CEP guidelines for implementing this change:

In cases in which the instructor is deceased, has left the university, or cannot be contacted for other reasons, the Registrar may approve exceptions to the one-year limit on grade changes based on clerical or procedural error if:

1. The request satisfies all other conditions required for approval; and
2. The failure to meet the one-year deadline was due to factors outside the student’s control; and
3. The department or other course-sponsoring unit supports the request.

<b>Current wording</b>	<b>Proposed wording</b>
<p><b>9.1 General.</b></p> <p><b>A9.1.1</b> Grades A-F, shall be awarded for undergraduate 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 of C may only be modified by a plus (+) suffix. The grade of I shall be awarded as specified in SCR 9.1.6. The grade of IP shall be awarded as an interim mark in multi-term courses described in SCR 9.1.7. The grade of W denotes the formal withdrawal of the student from the course. (Am 26 May 71 EW, 29 May 96, effective 1 Sept 97; 25 May 77, 23 Feb 00; 9 Nov 00, 21 May 04; CC 31 Aug 98; EC 1 Aug 76)</p> <p><b>9.1.2</b> A Pass/Not passed option is available to a student in good standing in the manner provided for by SR 782. A grade of Passed shall be awarded only for work which would otherwise receive a grade of C (2.0) or better. A</p>	<p><b>9.1</b> No change</p> <p><b>A9.1.1</b> No Change</p> <p><b>9.1.2</b> No Change</p>

<p>department may require that any course or courses applied toward credit in a major be taken on a letter grade basis. The P/NP option must be exercised no later than the last day to add a course and may not be subsequently changed. (En 23 Feb 00; Am 9 Nov 00)</p> <p><b>9.1.3</b> All grades, except I and IP, are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, 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. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination, or with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. (En 25 May 77; Am 29 May 91, 23 Feb 00)</p> <p><b>A9.1.4</b> 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. (En 23 Feb 00; EC 31 Aug 09)</p> <p><b>9.1.5</b> With the approval of the Committee on Educational Policy, course sponsoring agencies may offer courses as "P/NP only." The designation of courses as "P/NP only" shall be made by the Committee on Educational Policy</p>	<p><b>9.1.3</b> All grades, except I and IP, are final when filed by an instructor in the end of term course report. However, 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, <b><u>which are governed by 9.1.6</u></b>) must be submitted to the Registrar within one year from the close of the quarter for which the original grade was submitted. <b><u>Late requests for grade changes based on clerical or procedural error are subject to the approval of CEP.</u></b> No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination, or with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. (En 25 May 77; Am 29 May 91, 23 Feb 00)</p> <p><b>A9.1.4</b> No Change</p> <p><b>9.1.5</b> No Change</p>
--	---

<p>during the spring term to have effect for all of the following academic year, beginning with the following fall term, and shall remain in effect until changed by request of the course sponsoring agency, with the approval of the Committee on Educational Policy. During the academic year, agencies may request the "P/NP only" designation for new courses to be offered for winter, spring, or summer terms. (Am 26 May 71 EW, 29 May 96, effective 1 Sept 97, 23 Feb 00; CC 31 Aug 98; EC 1 Aug 76, 1 Aug 85)</p>	
<p><b>9.1.6</b> The grade of I may be assigned only when a student's work is of passing quality but is incomplete. The student must make arrangements in advance with the instructor in charge of the course in order to receive an I. In order to replace the I with a passing grade and to receive credit, a student must petition by the deadline imposed by the Registrar and complete the work of the course by the end of the finals week of the next term, unless the instructor specifies an earlier date. If the instructor fails to submit a passing grade for any reason by the deadline for submitting grades in the next succeeding term after the I was awarded, the student receives an NP or F depending on the grading option selected. The deadline imposed herein shall not be extended. (However, see SCR 6.7.) (Am 22 Oct 69 EI, 26 May 71 EW, 25 May 77, 28 May 80, 29 May 96, effective 1 Sept 97, 23 Feb 00; CC 31 Aug 98; EC 31 Aug 09)</p>	<p><b>9.1.6</b> No Change</p>
<p><b>9.1.7</b> A grade in a single course extending over two or three terms of an academic year may be awarded at the end of the course. The grade shall 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 shall be given grades for those</p>	<p><b>9.1.7</b> No Change</p>

<p>terms. The grading option selected for the first term of a multiple term course applies to each subsequent term. [SCR 10.1.4] (Am 19 Apr 72, 25 May 77, 29 May 96, effective 1 Sept 97, 23 Feb 00; CC 31 Aug 98)</p> <p><b>A9.1.8</b> Students who receive a grade of D or F may retake the course, subject to the following guidelines: Courses in which the student has received a letter grade may not be repeated on a P/NP basis. Credits shall not be awarded more than once for the same course, but the grade assigned each time must be permanently recorded on the student's transcript. Repetition of a course more than once requires approval of the student's college. (For computation of GPAs involving repeated courses, see SCR A9.4.1.) Courses originally taken on a P/NP basis but not passed may be repeated either on the same basis or for a letter grade. (En 29 May 96, effective 1 Sept 97; Am 23 Feb 00, 9 Nov 00)</p> <p><b>9.1.9</b> With the exception of this sub-section, the regulations of this chapter do not apply to University Extension courses. University Extension courses shall be graded in accordance with SR 780 (including provisions with regard to grade points and credits) and SR 810(A). (Am 23 Feb 00; CC 29 May 96, 31 Aug 98, 31 Aug 99, 31 Aug 09)</p>	<p><b>A9.1.8</b> No Change</p> <p><b>9.1.9</b> No Change</p>
--	--

Respectfully submitted,

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

Cormac Flanagan

Melissa Gwyn

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Eric Porter

Peter Young

Eileen Zurbriggen

John Tamkun, Chair

Lourdes Martínez-Echazábal, Provost Representative

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NTSF Representative

Alma Natalia De Castro, Student Representative (SUA)

Justin Riordan, Student Representative (SUA)

April 13, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Report on 2011-12 Budget and Budget Process**

**To: The Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:**

In January EVC Galloway informed the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) of the magnitude and strategy for managing the 2011-12 budget reduction. The EVC's strategy for allocating the approximately \$19 million in cuts assigned to UC Santa Cruz was essentially an across-the-board 15.5% cut to all units with a notable exception. However, for the academic divisions, the salaries of filled ladder rank FTE were removed from the units' budget total before assigning the percentage cuts. This resulted in an effective 6% reduction for academic division (or 15.5% of the remaining budget after the salary extraction).

Before receiving budget-reduction proposals from principal officers, CPB communicated four general principles to the EVC. These principles embrace a much longer term view of handling our new budget reality than the immediate exercise of next year's budget cuts.

**Administrative Changes Accompany Budget Changes**

A budget cut of this size on the heels of three years of budget cuts suggests that reformed and consolidated administrative and academic structures will be needed to help us achieve our core goals. These changes could occur in the academic, academic support, and institutional support areas. The dialogue on budget cuts must be accompanied by a dialogue on restructuring around agreed-upon goals. One such goal is optimizing the student intellectual experience, ranging from the classroom experience to advising and learning support. We would like to see improvements in these areas regardless of the budget climate. They can be achieved if we broadly consider how we deliver core services and take actions that better align targets, data, and resources.

**Loss or Diminution of Services**

A loss of services or service quality is inevitable in a multi-year budget-cutting scenario. Such losses should occur as far away as possible from our core missions. This is a trade-off the faculty is willing to make.

**Look at Total Cost to Students**

In addition to fees (tuition), students also pay for housing, dining, and many other assessments. All of the dollars spent by students to get a UCSC education should be evaluated for their impact on achieving our core missions of teaching and research. The connection between teaching and the student experience is obvious, but we also recognize the importance of a vibrant research program to learning and career opportunities for students, both undergraduate and graduate students. We therefore look forward to working with the Administration and with students to carefully evaluate the

overall cost of a UCSC education. Our goals will include reducing the overall cost while also re-allocating what is paid to optimize the educational experience.

### **Distinguish Within Budget Units Between More and Less Fundamental Activities**

The currently proposed reductions call for approximately 6% cuts to academic divisions and 15.5% to academic and administrative support units. Within the support units are some functions essential to our core research and teaching missions, and other functions less so. In assigning unit cuts, the Administration should distinguish between more and less essential areas and protect what is essential. In order for the cuts to align with the EVC's principles for cutting, it may be necessary to separate out essential functions from support functions and direct principal officers to cut in those support areas while protecting the core areas. The remaining funds need to maximize the efficiency of all the functions.

### **Budget Reduction Planning and CPB's role**

This year confidential budget reduction proposals were distributed to CPB as well as to all principal officers. CPB commends EVC Galloway for creating a more open process of review that enabled the principal officers to understand the challenges of other units and, more importantly, to identify proposed cuts that would directly affect the operations of their own units. In this way, coordination of shifting services and elimination of services can be carefully planned.

CPB's analysis of the budget reduction submissions for 2011-12 was informed by units' proposals from previous years, CPB documentation on budget cuts, as well as other campus documents such as the Bird's Eye View. CPB's examination of budget cutting proposals was hampered by a lack of time for analysis, including the ability to consult with principal officers about their submissions and the lack of information (in some cases) about the entire budget of the unit, not solely what the principal officer presented for cuts. Over several years CPB has persistently pointed to the problem of reviewing budget cuts outside of the context of whole budgets. Again this year CPB was partially information-constrained in the cases where some units did not submit explanatory letters or only discussed proposed cuts and not the larger context of their unit's budget.

### **CPB's Review of Budget Documents Resulted in the Following Additional Principles**

*Instruction and Research* – These are the core missions of UCSC and must be preserved. The closer a function is to directly supporting the I&R mission, the more its budget should be protected.

*Bridge Funds* –

- Bridge funds should be provided to activities that can only change slowly, such as curricular obligations as specified in the catalog.
- They should NOT be used to postpone layoffs or delay implementing operational changes.

- They should NOT be provided when there is no proposed restructuring of operations.

*Total Cost to Students* - Cuts should not be implemented in a way that directly increases the total cost to students. Every effort should be made to *decrease* the cost of a UCSC education to students without compromising its quality.

*Transferring Costs* - Costs should not be transferred from one unit to another without agreement of all involved units and a sound rationale. Transferring costs between units does not decrease the overall campus budget. The unit that is transferring an activity and its cost must find additional reductions of equal amount within their unit to meet their target.

*Shifting Funding Streams* – Careful scrutiny should be given when cuts are achieved by transferring a budget to a non-state fund source. There are some situations where this fund shift is appropriate, but consideration must be toward strategically aligning the function with the funding source.

*Evaluating Full Budget Proposals* – Budgets should be reviewed in their full context so that the choices to protect certain budgeted activities can be compared to the activities selected for cuts. *Note: this did not uniformly occur this year since for some units, the Administration and CPB only reviewed proposed cuts, not full budgets.*

*Employment of Students* – Restructured units and new initiatives should maximize the use of student workers, especially students qualifying for federal work-study and graduate students.

*Small Units* – Small units have a threshold budget below which the necessary activities cannot be performed. Cutting small-unit budgets may require either consolidation of small units or smaller budget cuts.

*Units Running a Deficit* – A deficit-elimination plan should be part of the budget cut proposal. That is, revenues should exceed budget so that the deficit is erased in a foreseeable time frame.

*Recharge Units* – Units funded by recharge or user fees should take a budget cut similar to other units. The net result should be cost savings to the units that pay for the service through recharge.

*Cumulative Impacts* – Careful scrutiny should be given to activities that have decentralized funding, such as support for research and for diversity. A review of the overall impacts of individual, uncoordinated budget decisions should be undertaken when it appears that cumulative impacts will not enable the campus to meet its goals in a certain area.

*Research Restoration* – A comprehensive plan for restoration of support to the research enterprise using multiple funding sources is a crucial part of CPB's budget-cutting recommendation. Since research activities can recover more quickly than instructional activities, research budgets can be cut more than instruction. Acting on this principle requires creating and implementing a plan for reinvestment in research as soon as possible. The research reinvestment plan should cover a 3-5 year period.

*Supplemental Stipends for Senior Management* - CPB does not support supplemental stipends for senior staff in difficult budget such as these. We all are taking on additional responsibilities.

### **Principles for Fund Restoration**

The overall budget situation is still in flux. Budget cuts at UCOP could return as much as \$4.8 million in permanent funds to the campus. Overall, CPB recommends that no restoration funding be allocated until details are known about the actual budget for 2011-12 and, if more cuts are necessitated, a ‘Plan B’ for further reductions is developed. Should the cuts be less or there be a partial restoration of funds it will likely happen over the summer when CPB does not convene. In the event additional funding is made available, CPB recommends they be allocated by the following priorities. CPB should be further consulted when it reconvenes in Fall 2011.

In addition to the specific restoration of funds to high priority activities that CPB noted in its confidential unit budget reviews to the EVC, we also present the following general principles. CPB recommends funds be restored in this order of priority: research (1-2), instruction (3-5) and finally, essential support functions (6-7).

1. Restoring faculty FTE lines.
2. Restoring research funding to the Vice Chancellor of Research office and COR research grant programs.
3. Supporting the reorganization of admissions and retention activities under academic oversight as described by the SEC proposal of April 22, 2011:  
<http://senate.ucsc.edu/sec/SEC-Proposal-to-Restructure.pdf>
4. Restoring Teaching Assistant budgets.
5. Restoring Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) budgets.
6. Restoring staff support to the Development Office to continue campus fundraising efforts.
7. Improving research infrastructure, including electricity reliability and internet capacity.

### **Improving the Budgeting Process**

Our campus’s budgeting process has for several years been fraught with uncertainty about levels of funding to be received and the timing of when we know what budget we will actually have. These uncertainties have impeded campus planning efforts and Administration-Senate consultation on budget. To proceed with full and effective consultation we first propose continuing the successful process of sharing confidential, pre-decisional budget correspondence between CPB and the Administration. We further suggest that the formal budget consultation process start at the beginning of Fall Quarter so that CPB can review the outcomes from the previous year's consultation. This post hoc reporting has been lacking from previous budget cycles. We suggest that future budget submissions from units provide and justify for *all* unit activities: what is being cut, what is being preserved of that same budget, and what is being augmented. The combination of sufficient time, sharing of confidential materials (already in place), and comprehensive budget proposals that provide a full budgetary picture of a unit, its current budget, proposed changes, and rationale, will enable CPB to fulfill its mission as advisor on this crucial issue of annual campus budgeting.

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:

Max Perry

Jessica Greenstreet

May 13, 2011

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Report on Impacts of the Unfunded Liability**  
**in the UC Retirement Plan on UCSC's Budget**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

At the October 20, 2010 Faculty Senate meeting, a resolution passed by voice vote that included the following:

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.

AS/SCP/1646 CFW Resolution on the Unfunded Liability of UCRP: CPB Report

**Summary**

Employer and employee contributions to UCRP have resumed and are being ramped up year-by-year. Total contributions do not yet equal ongoing fund “normal” cost or the increment needed to restore the fund deficit. A plan has been developed in consultation with the Senate to restore the pension plan to 100% funding. The plan’s implementation will take several years. Important factors largely beyond UC control include any future state contributions to UCRP and performance of the retirement portfolio. UCSC has budgeted \$5 million (\$1.4 million in 2009-10 and an additional \$3.6 million in 2010-11) to cover the general fund cost of restarting UCRP contributions. Another \$4 million will be budgeted in 2011-12, bringing the total employer costs to \$9 million per year. In addition to contributions from general funds, units with employees paid from other fund sources must also contribute to UCRP.

**Report**

The university wide counterpart to CPB is the University Committee on Planning and Budget, or UCPB. CPB Chair Brent Haddad is a member of UCPB. Chair Haddad initiated and participated in several UCPB discussions on the employer contribution to the pension plan. This response focuses on the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) only, and not the retiree health plan, another important part of UC’s post-employment benefits.

Money entering a pension fund needs to cover money leaving the fund as well as any fund deficit. UCRP has a “normal cost” of 17.6% of covered payroll, or \$1.4 billion per year. (Following phase-in of approved revisions to UCRP, the plan will have a normal cost of 15.1%.) UCRP also currently is underfunded (as of July 1, 2010) by \$13.5 billion. The total value of the fund is \$35-40 billion, depending on valuation method.

The goal of UC, endorsed by the Senate, is to restore the retirement plan for full funding and meet the annual normal cost on an ongoing basis. This cannot be done immediately because the deficit is too large. Instead, a multi-year plan has been developed to steadily increase contributions to the pension fund until they are higher than the normal cost (2018), maintain the higher contributions until the fund recovers, and then lower the contributions to the necessary level. This should restore the pension to 100% funding over the next roughly 25 years. The following steps are being taken:

1. Increasing employee contributions. The following schedule has been approved by the Regents:

Current contribution:	2% (redirection of the CAP – revenue neutral to employees)
As of July, 2011:	3.5%
As of July, 2012:	5%
Thereafter:	additional 1% per year (not yet approved)

The plan is for employee contributions to be half of employer contributions. The Faculty Senate has made clear its position that employee contributions should not rise higher than 7%. The UC Administration has not agreed to this cap on employee contributions.

2. Increase employer contributions. The following schedule has been approved by the Regents:

Current contribution:	4% of covered payroll
As of July, 2011:	7%
As of July, 2012:	10%
Thereafter:	additional 2% per year (not yet approved)

Models show the employer contribution reaching a maximum of approximately 18.6% per year in 2018. The employer contribution remains at this level for roughly 17 years, and then lowers over several years to roughly 10%. The peak employer contribution plus the employee contribution will exceed the normal cost and will be used to replenish the fund.

The current UCSC employer contribution based on 4% of its own covered payroll is over \$5 million. (2010-11). UCSC will need to budget an additional \$4 million per year to increase employer contributions to 7% of payroll in 2011-12. There will be additional contributions to the retirement plan from other fund sources, such as researchers paid from federal grants. The overall contribution from all funds will be \$15.5 million at the 7% (July, 2011) level.

Allocating funds to the retirement plan is prudent and mandatory, but it also represents a “new” cost to the campus budget. By way of comparison, the current expected state funds budget cut to UCSC for 2011-12 is roughly \$15 million. So at the same time the campus is budgeting for increased contributions to UCRP, it is also budgeting for cuts in the state contribution to UC.

Both trends reduce the flexibility of campus budgets.

Funding for the employer contribution comes from campus central funds and is a mandatory cost. The growing cost over time is included in campus budget projections in the item “Required Cuts and Obligations.”

The anticipated 18.6% maximum employer contribution could be increased or decreased by any of the following:

- Better or worse than expected performance of the fund portfolio. Some portfolio growth is expected and built in to planning models (7.5% per year). A risk profile of the portfolio is also specified. The existing risk profile is generally conservative and has not been adjusted in an effort to increase returns. There is wide fluctuation in annual return on the portfolio. Since the portfolio is not as large as it should be (currently roughly three-quarters as large), years with strong return don't have as large an influence as they might, and vice versa. The rebound in the stock market since 2009 has contributed enough surplus funding to stop the growth in the funding gap as contributions have ramped up, but has not appreciably narrowed the gap. For details, see pp. 8-9 of the *UCRP and GEP Quarterly Investment Risk Report*, Feb. 22, 2011. Available at:

[http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/invinfo/investment\\_info.html](http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/invinfo/investment_info.html)

- Low-interest loans to the portfolio that generate higher investment returns. This strategy is being pursued with the lending of \$2.1 billion to UCRP, some from other UC fund sources (STIP) and some from commercial lending markets. It is expected to reduce the maximum employer contribution by roughly 1.4% (from 20% to 18.6%). This is because the interest rate on the borrowed money is expected to be significantly lower than the rate of return the funds will have in the retirement portfolio.
- Restarting of state contributions to the retirement plan. This is a major point of UC budget advocacy with the state legislature. There has been no state contribution since the early 1990s.
- Reduction or increases in the cost of benefits. This can occur due to plan changes or employee demographic changes (average age at hire or at retirement). Plan changes have occurred that will slightly reduce the long-term “normal cost” of the pension plan. The Academic Senate has argued that pension reductions should be viewed in the context of overall compensation, which currently lag behind competitor institutions.
- Change to expected ratio of active employees to retired employees. Currently the ratio is lowering as retired employees increase in number relative to working employees.
- Changes to the level of employee contribution.
- Faster ramp-up of employer and employee contributions. Employer contributions have resumed and are ramping up year-by-year at roughly 2% per year plus 1% per year increases in employee contributions. A faster ramp-up would reduce the ultimate maximum contribution but would further compromise current university budgets and employee take-home pay.

Additional information can be found at:

- Website on the future of UC Retirement Benefits (March 23, 2011 posting)  
<http://universityofcalifornia.edu/sites/ucrpfuture/>
  - o Note: “Read the complete details of the Regents action” that focuses on Item F12 (March 15, 2011)

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:

Max Perry

Jessica Greenstreet

May 13, 2011