

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
FRIDAY, March 7, 2008 at 2:30 p.m.
Colleges Nine and Ten Multipurpose Room
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
 - a. Draft Minutes of November 9, 2007, previously distributed p. 1 (AS/SCM/283)
2. Announcements
 - a. Chair Williams
 - b. Chancellor Blumenthal
 - c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger
3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1563) p. 15
4. Special Orders: Annual Reports (none)
5. Reports of Special Committees (none)
6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Educational Policy
Oral Report on General Education
 - b. Committee on Planning and Budget:
Report on Professional Schools (AS/SCP/1561) p. 17
Committee on Preparatory Education:
Amendment to Bylaw 13.25 (AS/SCP/1560) p. 20
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
 - a. Resolution on Conflict Management and Demonstration Response (AS/SCP/1562)
p. 22

February 27, 2008

MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Dear Colleagues,

This year's winter quarter Senate meeting will take place on Friday, March 7, 2007 at 2:30 p.m. in the Colleges 9 and 10 Multipurpose Room. [Click here to see the agenda](#). This is a turbulent time for UC as a whole: we are beginning the fiscal throes that accompany a state-wide budget crisis, with a notable reduction in state funding anticipated for UC next year; our system's President is a lame duck; and the Office of the President is facing a draconian reorganization. We can promise updates on these issues and problems at the meeting, but (I fear) no resolutions.

It is difficult to put a positive spin on a budget crisis. Of course, we need to proactively look forward and plan for better times ahead, so that we can emerge quickly and adeptly when fiscal currents shift. But we also need to pay close attention to the manner in which budget cutbacks are instituted. Indeed, there are areas in which it is incumbent on the Senate to exercise particular vigilance. One of these is to preserve faculty time for our core job responsibilities: teaching, research and service. In times of budgetary retrenchment, "efficiency" plans often emerge—and these plans may be launched (perhaps unintentionally) at the expense of faculty time. All of us have, I think, spent inordinate amounts of time grappling with software packages with cute names (CruzSplats, or whatever). In my view, it is *institutional personnel mismanagement* of the highest order to generate "efficiencies" that increase the clerical duties of faculty whose time (and bluntly, salaries) would be far better spent on what they were hired to do, and what they excel at—conveying and creating knowledge (incidentally, the missions of the institution). From a local perspective, such "efficiencies" might appear to work great—they can reduce the budget/workload of an office by off-loading duties on faculty. Interestingly, one of the main principles of our campus' draft Academic Plan involves the notion that we should plan our academic development from the perspective of "One Campus." It's an admirable idea—and a theme that shouldn't be confined solely to the academic side of the institution. So, my simple message here is to convey that the Senate, during this cycle of budgetary belt-tightening, will be paying particular attention to any shifts in demands on faculty time, as well as to impacts on the core missions of the institution: instruction and research. In short, faculty having the time (and resources) to teach well and successfully conduct their research is central to UCSC achieving the success to which we collectively aspire—and we cannot lose sight of this during the current round of budget cutting.

Now, having so cheerfully belabored the importance of faculty time, I ask for two hours of yours. This Senate meeting will include an update on our Professional School pre-proposal vetting process from our Committee on Planning and Budget and a progress report from the Committee on Educational Policy on their ongoing work towards a plan for General Education Reform. There is a Resolution on Conflict Management and Demonstration Response included in the Call for the consideration of the Senate. Finally, I fully anticipate that the meeting will provide faculty with an opportunity to discuss and hear updates on recent challenges to academic freedom and civil discourse, including very recent despicable actions targeting the homes of faculty and other members of UCSC's community of scholars—actions that strike directly at long-standing values of not only universities, but of civilized society as well.

Sincerely,



Quentin Williams, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

**PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
of the
Fall Quarter 2007 Meeting**

The draft minutes from the November 9, 2007 Senate meeting were distributed via email on February 25, 2008 and will be presented for approval at the next Senate Meeting on March 7, 2008. 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 distribution as a handout at the next meeting.

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

To assist the Senate staff, proposed changes should specify:

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

Please submit all proposed changes to arrive in the Senate Office **no later than 12:00 noon on Wednesday, March 5, 2008**. They should be addressed to the Secretary, c/o Academic Senate Office, 125 Kerr Hall or via email to senate@ucsc.edu.

Judith Habicht - Mauche
Secretary, Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

February 27, 2008

DRAFT MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
November 9, 2007

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, November 9, 2007 at the Colleges Nine & Ten Multipurpose Room. With Parliamentarian Bruce Bridgeman and Secretary Judith Habicht-Mauché present, Chair Quentin Williams called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Williams asked if there were any additional changes, other than those submitted in writing, to the minutes of May 30, 2007. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements**a. Chair Quentin Williams**

Chair Williams began with an update on system-wide issues. The search process for a new University of California (UC) president is proceeding. UCSC is being represented on the Advisory Committee to the Regents Search Committee by Professor Peggy Delaney of Ocean Sciences. The new UC president will face many challenges including: extensive internal re-organization, communication deficiencies between the Regents, the Office of the President (OP) and individual campuses, and the on-going process of system-wide academic planning. The Board on Admission and Relations with Schools (BOARS) is proposing dramatic changes to UC's current freshman eligibility policies for high school seniors. The BOARS' proposal is under campus review and the discussion of these proposed changes will be a topic of major discussion in the coming academic year.

Agenda items that the Senate chair expects will come to the Senate this academic year include: possible reform of the campus GE requirements, particularly in the area of offerings to fulfill the campus writing requirement (W); and addressing the issue of what subject areas and skill set should be included in other campus GE requirements. A proposal for a campus honors program is also expected this year. This is motivated by student retention studies which have been conducted over the last several years which show that UCSC retains its academically strongest entering students at a poorer rate that would be expected. UCSC is the only UC undergraduate campus without an honors program.

The Senate held a forum on professional schools earlier in the fall quarter of presentations from proposers of several possible professional schools which include: education, environment, management, public health and public policy. During the next academic year the goal is to achieve clarity on which of the potential professional schools may move forward to full proposals, and on what time scale.

Next, Chair Williams addressed the issue of the protestors in the trees by Science Hill. He said that the entire campus, faculty, students and administration, need to work towards

ensuring that free speech and assembly rights are exercised in a safe, constructive manner on campus. It is critical for faculty to engage with students on this issue and take advantage of teachable aspects that may present themselves.

Chair Williams then welcomed the new faculty joining UCSC this year.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal began by emphasizing that virtually everything he is going to do will be consistent with the vision of UCSC as the campus strives to serve California as a top ranked research university and the leading institution for the education of students, fostering a culture of excellence, inquiry, creativity, diversity and public service, and developing solutions to the world's most critical challenges.

Next the chancellor recognized recent faculty honors. Two faculty won Guggenheim Fellowships: Gail Hershatter and Jim Clifford from History and History of Consciousness, respectively. Harry Noller from Molecular Biology won the Gairdner International Award, one of the most prestigious awards in biomedical sciences, and Nathaniel Dominy in Anthropology won a Packard Fellowship for Science and Engineering. In the Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) Division Tony Fink of Chemistry and Biochemistry won the Outstanding Faculty Award. In the Social Sciences (SocSci) Division the winners of the 2007 Distinguished Teaching Awards were Alan Richards, Andrea Steiner and Jack Vevea. The first winner of the SocSci award called the Martin Chemers Award for Outstanding Research in the Division of Social Sciences went to Bruce Bridgeman. The chancellor also recognized that of the 36 new faculty members 15 are woman and ten identify themselves as underrepresented minorities.

The chancellor then provided an update on the UC budget. For the current academic year the budget was passed about two and a half months late by the legislature. The budget funded the governor's compact with the university. It included \$19 million in academic preparation money. The budget also included money for the British Petroleum Building at Berkeley. What was not included in the budget was additional funding for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISI). That is particularly important to this campus because UCSC participates in two of the four Cal ISI's and that would have meant a significant augmentation to the campus budget. The governor was very supportive of Cal ISI and did include it in his budget but it did not get through the legislature. Next year's state budget will likely be less than this year's. Tax receipts are running well below projections and there is a prediction of a \$10 billion shortfall in the state budget.

The chancellor reported he is forming a Chancellor's Advisory Council on Diversity. This is the first ever such council on this campus and the council will report directly to the chancellor. The council's first charge will be to look at all the recommendations coming from the Regents Study Group and its task forces, and to look at the recommendations that came last year from the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD).

Chancellor Blumenthal provided an update on the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). There was a court hearing, and the results of the campus environmental impact report (EIR) was found not to be fully in compliance with the law. The campus is considering appealing that decision which was not a written decision. The campus is entering into mediation with the city, county and other parties to these lawsuits in an attempt to find a formal and complete resolution to the legal issues.

There are tree sitters protesting the LRDP and the building of a biomedical sciences building. In response to that the chancellor emphasized the following points:

1. It is our responsibility to ensure the health and safety of all our students and employees on this campus. Should we feel that there is a need to take action to protect health and safety, we will do so.
2. It is our obligation, to maintain university operations and to stop anything that impedes the university from operating as it must. Our job is to teach students and do research and we can not let something stop us from being able to do our job.
3. The biomedical building will ultimately move forward and be built. It faces a number of challenges, including legal ones, and the chancellor is confident the campus will overcome those legal challenges. The campus will take whatever actions are necessary to ensure that the building is constructed.

Next the chancellor reported on new students. The campus admitted 3,750 freshmen this year. The frosh class is the most diverse class ever. It has 26 percent underrepresented minorities and 25 percent Asian American students. There are also a significant number of transfer students; 825 transfer students entered the campus this year.

Lastly the chancellor discussed fundraising. Last year was the third highest year in campus history in terms of fundraising. The campus still needs to do better due to the continuing decline of the state budget. The first Founders' Day Event was held in October where Stan Woosley was honored as Outstanding Faculty Member. Congressman Sam Farr, former Chancellor Bob Sinsheimer and distinguished alumnus were also honored. The chancellor closed by urging faculty to get in touch with potential donors and help with the fundraising process.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger

Executive Vice Chancellor and Campus Provost (EVC/CP) Kliger addressed four issues: housing, childcare, academic planning and UNEX. The campus recently broke ground on Ranch View Terrace (RVT). The grading and infrastructure work on that project is about 90 percent complete and the project is on target for a fall 2008 delivery of Phase 1 which is 45 units. To date 40 faculty members have selected Phase 1 homes, and 19 of the 40 are assistant professors. Another 43 faculty members have deferred their selection of RVT units to Phase 11.

In childcare there are serious problems. Chancellor Blumenthal and the EVC are committed to the safety of children in campus care and providing a quality program for

the children and their families. The chancellor and EVC are working closely with Vice Chancellor Student Affairs McGinty and carefully reviewing the actions being taken to make more improvements. The EVC acknowledged that families are distressed and concerned about the situation. The first priority will be to stabilize the current program and improve the situation in order to meet to concerns of the licensing agency. Vice Chancellor McGinty has directed a number of immediate actions:

1. Increasing staffing
2. Work with a licensing consultant to identify program weaknesses, remedies for improvement and teacher training.
3. Increase teacher training to meet licensing standards
4. Increase and improve communication with parents

The EVC submitted a report on the current financial state of UNEX as well as a summary of management action that have taken place to date. The current approach, as summarized in the report, is a long term program that will need close and careful management over multiple years. The EVC believes that the best solution is to find a way to eliminate the annual deficit and then gradually reduce the cumulative deficit over the long term. As noted in the report the EVC established performance benchmarks for the coming year: first, to reduce the annual deficit by 1 million and second to increase enrollment by ten percent. If those performance measures are not met the EVC will advise the chancellor that he adopt a plan of action that is consistent with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) report of 2005.

In the area of academic planning the EVC will continue to focus on two crucial priorities: first, expanding and renewing our world class faculty, and second, enhancing the education that this campus provides to its students. The EVC said the campus must engage in strategic thinking, coordinated planning and ensuring effective institutional processes in order to maximize campus success in this area. Together with the deans and the Senate the administration is working hard to support this goal. The EVC is also committed to enhancing the campus teaching and learning environment. The academic plan confirms that UCSC has great strengths that will result in faculty and students making transformative contributions to society across the disciplines and provides for us the guidance that the campus needs to make decisions about investments of resources.

The EVC closed by saying that during the past five years the campus has recruited 157 new faculty, grown the number of doctoral students by 200, and established several new graduate programs. The campus has also broken into new research areas, such as a renovation grant from the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine. In the last three years the campus has secured funding for over 250 million in new state funds to add over 230,000 new assignable square feet and renovate over 14,000 assignable square feet of space. The campus has either completed or has approvals to move forward with over 35 million in non state supported space. The campus is based on a number of principles that allows it to honor its past and build a future it can be proud of. These principles are:

1. A commitment to protect academic freedoms for all faculty, all staff, all students
2. A commitment to deliver on UCSC's academic promise and its academic plan
3. A commitment to fiscal responsibility

4. A commitment to shared governance.

Following the EVC's comments Chair Williams asked if there were any questions. Professor Onuttom Narayan, Physics, asked the chancellor if the campus has a plan for sufficient and affordable housing before admission offers are made this year, and in the event the campus does not, how does the chancellor visualize that admissions process playing out? This was a resolution that was previously passed by the Senate in response to student growth projections. The chancellor responded that RVT Phase I is well underway and that 90 percent of the units have already been assigned to faculty and almost half of the units have been assigned to assistant professors. The campus is working very hard on an employee housing master plan which should be delivered to the chancellor later this quarter and the chancellor will distribute the plan to the Senate for comment during the winter quarter. This has been one of the most successful recruitments years in UCSC's history and a large number of the new faculty are moving to RVT which suggest to the chancellor that the housing the campus is providing is affordable.

Professor Carolyn Martin Shaw, Anthropology, commented that she is not reassured by the chancellor's and provost's comments regarding student demonstration. She is not reassured that the safety of the children is in good hands. When she has seen the word "safety" used on this campus it is often followed by violence. Professor Martin Shaw believes that the campus has acted shamefully and dishonorably. She thinks the administration acted too early in response to student demonstrations. Professor Martin Shaw did not see the concerted effort for communication and negotiation that she had hoped would be a part of the campus interaction with students in the demonstration.

Professor Zack Schlesinger, Physics, expressed agreement with Professor Martin Shaw's comments on the protests. He said that civil disobedience has a long history in our country and on our campus. He hopes the administration will be thoughtful and respectful, and avoid escalating violence in its manner of dealing with protest and dissent, and the campus will show who it is in how it deals with this. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that he agrees in civil disobedience as long as things remain non violent

Professor Joe Konopelski, Chemistry, commented that he takes the opposite stance of Professor Martin Shaw. His building has been on lock down and his students are unable to get to his office hours or TA office hours. Professor Konopelski thinks that is it appalling those students who want to learn cannot come to his office hours. He has a class of 340 and feels very responsible for them and for their learning.

Grant Hartwell, College Ten, voiced a student opinion of the current protest. He said it is sad to hear the administration has already decided what its response will be and that they are determined to maintain the LRDP and current expansion. One important thing he'd like the administration to remember is the lack of diversity and how they are using money. There is a Vivisection Center and a lot of money goes towards science and math and in the last 27 years there has not been an Ethnic Studies Department. There is an inability to get into any classes besides math and science for one who does not have

priority enrollment. He added that students need to find off campus housing and it is nearly impossible. He commented on protestors being physically harmed by police and closed by saying that the increased amount of private funding seems to lead to corruption.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that not all the protestors are UCSC students and violence occurred after the protestors broke through the police barrier and an officer was thrown to the ground.

Professor Susan Gillman, Literature and CPB chair, commented on the EVC's UNEX report. CPB has received the report but has not had a chance to consult about it. CPB has a meeting with VPAA Galloway scheduled for the first week of December. She believes, before having a chance to discuss this with the committee, the actions taken by the administration are consonant, by and large, with at least some of the recommendations made by CPB, and that is the closing of unprofitable units within UNEX. Professor Gillman takes it as a good indicator that UNEX has been put under the aegis of VPAA Galloway, rather than searching for a new dean. That means the administration acknowledges that this is a transition period for UNEX. It would be difficult to find a good person given the current financial situation, and the administration has acknowledged that by putting UNEX under the portfolio of VPAA Galloway.

Professor Gillman expressed concern about the absence of an actual work out plan for the debt and the strategy to accept the running up of a deficit because of the possibilities of developing other areas in Silicon Valley. If this is adopted CPB will ask for a commitment from the administration for a timetable, benchmarks and conditions. Specifically if enrollments don't go up by at least ten percent and the deficit doesn't go down by at least \$1 million.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded to Professor Gillman's comments by saying that he is in complete agreement. The administration is doing some analysis to make sure that they can come up with criteria that are reasonable and achievable. They are also working on a number of other management issues for UNEX and will be bringing those to CPB very soon. Professor Gillman added that CPB will report on its data gathering efforts in relation to strategies for growth on what's happening with UNEX at the winter Senate meeting.

Professor Narayan commented on the EVC's UNEX report. He is pleased the administration has come up with categorical conditions for UNEX to achieve. If the three year forecast for this is correct, then it turns out that within three years the annual deficit will actually be less than the STIP (Short Term Interest Payment) interest. Professor Narayan, provided some data on slides, and pointed out that when UNEX has made money it has not made much, maybe \$100,000, but when UNEX has lost money it has lost huge amounts. UNEX is a reflection of the upturns and downturns of Silicon Valley. The campus may end up improving the number for one or two million dollars but in the long term the campus will cycle between small profits at economic crests and large deficits during economic troughs. Professor Narayan also pointed out that Stanford Continuing Education is offering 23 winter courses on business and professional

development and UNEX has 52 certificate programs in the same areas. He asked if the campus really has identified a market niche? Next he brought to the Senate's attention the reasons the administration give for continuing with UNEX: If the campus were to shut it down, it would have to start repaying a large sum of money, and UNEX positions the campus in Silicon Valley to do bigger and better things there. Professor Narayan stated that both reasons are under the assumption that UNEX is going to succeed and that all the troubles are temporary. He suggested working with other chancellors to approach OP for at least partial debt relief. Also, if it a financially successful UNEX harkens well for future program in Silicon Valley, the same thing can be flipped around that a financially failing UNEX will show the campus' inability to respond to the market reality.

The EVC responded that his plan is to look at the entire UNEX operation from management, planning, marketing, and curriculum. He has discovered a lot of poor management issues in UNEX and is correcting them. His hope is that a combination of fixing those things, having a much better market, and getting out of some expensive leases will turn UNEX around. Time will tell who is right and the appropriate action will be taken.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly

None.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

Chair Williams introduced the consent calendar, explaining that anyone wishing to pull a report from the consent calendar for discussion might do so. The report of the Committee on Academic Personnel was pulled. The remaining items on the consent calendar were received without comment.

b. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1553)

Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) Chair Bowman brought up three CAP issues. First, CAP had a reasonable amount of agreement with the administration in the past year in deciding personnel cases. The number of disagreements between CAP and the administration dropped and they had excellent consultation. Secondly, the major problem last year was that the files were very late. This is often perceived as a CAP problem but CAP reviews cases in a timely manner. Last year nearly 60 percent of all the cases did not arrive in CAP until the spring quarter and they received 93 cases in the last six weeks. They reviewed all of the cases. The problem seems to be at the departmental or division level. Thirdly, the major readjustment of the salary scales had a big effect on what CAP did last year. The readjustment made salaries more equitable and gave more money to the poorest components of the university, namely poor campuses, Santa Cruz, and poor departments and divisions. USCS benefited disproportionately. The real issue that CAP, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), CPB and the Senate are hoping to address is how to reward extraordinary performance while adjusting the scales. Many choices for a policy for setting step, rank and salary require a decision about trying to

maintain equitable, transparent scales versus letting the market forces decide who gets the money.

The CAP annual report was received without comment.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees: Additional Nominations (AS/SCP/1559)

The additional nominations were accepted without comment.

b. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Oral Report – Update on General Education

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair Jaye Padgett began by providing an update on the Writing Intensive Requirement (W). During the winter 2007 Senate meeting a resolution was passed that presupposed addressing the W problem on campus. The problems are both educational and logistical. Students are having trouble satisfying the W because there are not enough classes. CEP is thinking about the educational goals of the W and the student issues simultaneously. CEP's impression is that the very nature of the W and how it might be addressed would depend on the discipline, so their approach to the issue has been to go to individual departments, and they have been going to highly impacted departments. If the campus can solve the problem for those majors, it would go a long way toward solving the problem for the campus. CEP has been going to those departments and asking them to write a manifesto to articulate their own educational objectives in the realm of disciplinary communication for their majors. CEP has asked these departments to assess to what extent they think they are accomplishing their own goals, and then to propose how it might be done if they are not. To date CEP has received draft proposals from computer science, molecular, cell and developmental (MCD) biology, psychology, philosophy and politics and is talking to art. Chair Padgett hope this will lead to a joint proposal between CEP and CPB.

CEP also hopes to pass legislation on general education (GE) reform this spring. CEP would like to have a comprehensive proposal by the end of winter. There is an intellectual challenge of deciding what general education reform should look like and there is the political challenge of getting faculty involved. The difficult part is getting faculty to discuss this issue because it has to be a faculty wide discussion and decision and the only way is to go to the departments where faculty live. CEP members want to communicate proposed educational objectives and hear from faculty about what they think the campuses educational goals should be and do the same with specific design proposals for GE.

ii. Amendment to Regulation 11 on Honors Designations (AS/SCP/1552)

CEP Chair Padgett explained that one of the honors programs' goals is to attract and keep students and in particular, students who thrive on challenges and who would thrive even more if they felt like they were part of a community of other people who feel the same way. Another goal is to acknowledge the achievements of outstanding students and to reward that in some way. CEP's hope is that honors will reinforce achievement. UCSC is the only campus without an honors program. The campus does not have a dean's list. According to a previously conducted study UCSC retains students in the upper quintiles

by certain measures of academic performance less well than would be expected. For these reasons, an ad hoc committee on honors that convened about three years ago concluded that it would be good to have a university wide honors designation on campus. The ad hoc committee also concluded that the campus should have an honors program with curricular and extra curricular components.

The administration and the Senate leadership are committed to making this a reality. With this legislation, CEP is proposing specifically to add designations involving dean's list and university honors at graduation.

CEP Chair Padgett then answered questions on the proposed amendment.

Professor Barry Bowman, MCD Biology, asked whether grade inflation, if it exists, affects this amendment. Specifically how the top two percent will be distinguished. CEP Chair Padgett responded that how the two percent gets modeled is still under discussion. According to CEP Chair Padgett the simplest thing would be to look at the cohort that you are determining honors for and rank them by grade point average (GPA) and pick the top two percent, but there are more complicated things that can be done which would involve taking averages over some period of time that would slow down variability a little bit. The one model that the registrar recently did suggested that the top two percent would include students with 4.0 or 3.99 GPA's.

Chelsea Juarez, President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), inquired as to how this amendment would affect graduate students. She also suggested giving awards to students who do work in the area of social justice. Chair Padgett responded that CEP is a committee for undergraduate students and that the amendment would not affect graduate students. He added that colleges give honors to students for service commitments and engagement and he hope that continues and grows.

Professor June Gordon, Education, expressed concern over students dropping classes they might fail. CEP Chair Padgett said that honors at graduation does not track progress. The dean's honors will require that students take 15 units a quarter and that ten of them be graded.

Professor Shelly Errington, Anthropology, commented that in principle she thinks the amendment is a good idea but is concerned about grade inflation. Professor Errington added that faculty are confused because they do not want to grade on a strict curve but need some sort of guidelines, not the kind that will interfere with academic freedom, but it would be good if there was a forum to discuss this issue. CEP Chair Padgett responded that CEP did notice that the use of the GPA could well bring this discussion to the campus. Academic freedom does make it a tough topic though.

Professor Ethan Miller, Computer Science, said that the School of Engineering does have policies about withdrawals and whether they count towards fails. He encouraged CEP to consider W's not just for the dean's list but for the graduation with honors. Chair Padgett responded that he would be happy to discuss it with CEP.

Vice Provost, Dean of Undergraduate Education, Bill Ladusaw commented that last year CEP brought tightened withdrawal restrictions and raised the minimum progress enforcement for these very reasons. Those were not in effect for all the students who will be judged under this system in the coming year necessarily, but he does think the campus needs to study it because it is a valid concern.

Professor Tyrus Miller, Graduate Council and co-Provost of Cowell College, is also concerned about grade inflation and the proliferation of types of honors and the potential for contradictions.

Professor Donald Potts, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology commented that if the criteria are rather similar for the different kinds of honors then the campus is violating the principle of academic reward that you don't get rewarded twice for the same work.

Professor Deanna Shemek, Literature and Co-Provost of Cowell College, believes it is a good thing. Honors programs are not overlapping, they measure different kinds of excellence. This proposal is obviously for honors across the board for a high GPA and everything a student does. Within the college there are different criteria for honors and some colleges include activism and civic service for honors.

Professor Richard Hughey, Computer Engineering, moved the question.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Regulation 11

11.4 For the purposes of interpreting SCR 11.5-6, honors eligibility for students whose degree program is in an established School shall be based upon the GPA thresholds calculated for their School. Honors eligibility for other students shall be based upon the GPA thresholds calculated for students whose degree program is not part of an established School. The term "group" refers to groups defined in this way.

11.5 University Honors at graduation shall be awarded by a student's college, subject only to criteria provided here and in 11.7. Students eligible for University Honors at graduation shall be those who have completed 70 or more units at the University of California and have attained in their group a UC GPA that places them in rankings as follows: summa cum laude, top 2%; magna cum laude, next 3%; cum laude, next 10%. Each year and for each group the Registrar shall calculate the GPA thresholds required for these levels of University Honors, based on the GPAs of recent graduates. These GPA thresholds shall be published and serve as criteria for University Honors at graduation during the next academic year. The notation "University Honors, (Summa/Magna) cum Laude" (as appropriate) shall appear on the diploma and on the transcript.

11.6 Students will be eligible for quarterly Dean's Honors if they have earned a minimum of 15 units that quarter, of which at least 10 are graded, with a term grade point average equal to or higher than that required for University Honors at graduation in their group for the current academic year. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts.

11.7 Any student who has a reportable disciplinary sanction for a violation of academic integrity policies may be ineligible for any honors designation, at the discretion of the agency that awards the designation.

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget

i. Report on Returns on Research Funding (AS/SCP/1544)

CPB's report on returns on research funding was presented orally at the spring Senate meeting. The full report is now in the call.

Professor Andy Fisher, Earth and Planetary Sciences, commended CPB for doing this analysis. It is quite unusual to get information on indirect cost and their magnitude. There is a distinct lack of transparency in how indirect costs are used which is an issue across UC. There are three primary issues Professor Fisher feels need to be raised. Professor Fisher served on the UC Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) last year and UCORP had some discussion with UC Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and the Office of Finance at OP and according to OP indirect costs are not sufficient to cover the costs of research. The indirect cost rate of the federal government is negotiated every few years and those numbers are publicly available. The disparity between what the university documents as the cost of research is typically nine to ten points higher than the rate that the federal government agrees to. The other issue is, although the federal rate is nominally 51 percent, the net indirect rate is closer to 25 percent, and that is because many agencies don't pay indirect costs at all, others negotiate the cost down.

The second point is the comparison is done with opportunity funds and as shown in the diagram, the opportunity funds go into four distinct pools: central sources, the divisions, the vice chancellor of research and the Committee on Research (COR). That pool is not called "Start-up and Recruiting Funds." It is called "Opportunity Funds." Start up and recruiting is intended to be one use of those funds. If in fact the entire allocation is used for start up and recruiting then there is a problem.

Finally, on an annual basis, most indirect costs are paid after expenses are encumbered. The campus uses resources and then files to get them reimbursed.

The report was accepted without further comment.

d. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Report on "Quality of Life"

Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) Chair Ted Holman reported that the committee has posted a report on their website on about the key issues CFW is focusing on: salaries, housing and childcare. This will be a big year for all three. For salaries, in terms of the raise implementation and the future planned raises, it is a great move by UC but the details still need to be worked out. Regarding housing, CFW is working with the administration to come up with a master housing plan and that be very delicate in terms of figuring out what is needed for the campus. There are a lot of childcare issues which are detailed in CFW's report.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Jamal Atiba, the Student Union Assembly's (SUA) Commissioner on Academic Affairs provided an update on SUA activities. The SUA external vice chair has been engaged in an extensive voter registration campaign to increase participation amongst students. This campaign has included a dance, extensive tabling and several other small scale events aimed at enticing students to get out and vote. Commissioner Atiba hopes the Senate and greater UCSC community will help and continue to support his endeavor as participation from students in voting will not only help the campus but better our stance in society.

Another project, the Students of Color Conference spearheaded by the SUA Commissioner of Diversity is planned from November 10 -12. This is a UC system wide conference which will be hosted at and by UCSC for the first time. The conference theme is "In Solidarity and Struggle: The Fight for Our Rights" and brings together undergraduate, graduate and high school students of color and their allies from all across the state to discuss, education, society and culture. The conference will feature workshops, caucuses, and special guest speaker Elaine Brown. The students involved in planning this event have put in a tremendous amount of time and effort, and as a testament to their efforts, the conference has attracted so much interest that the attendee limit was capped. The conference promises to be a great experience which will hopefully be shared by the greater UCSC community.

Commissioner Atiba also reported many students are finding it increasingly difficult to get into the classes they need for their majors in a timely fashion. Some areas of study that students feel are greatly lacking in courses and class availability are the arts, language, and film. Commissioner Atiba would like to see the Senate be proactive in working with students, on developing committees to seek proactive and feasible solutions, and/or steps that can be taken to rectify this growing problem.

He also reported that there are a significant number of students who would like journalism brought back to UCSC and ethnic studies developed on this campus and asked that if and when proposals for the aforementioned come forward to keep an open mind and not make judgmental decisions.

Another issue Commissioner Atiba discussed is the growing student concerns with the environment in their classes. Some students feel that biases, political, racial, and otherwise dominate the educational experience, making for an uncomfortable environment that is unwelcoming and not conducive to learning. He asked the Senate

for help in working with students to ensure the classrooms are safe spaces for all parties involved.

Commissioner Atiba shared information about an upcoming event called “Focus the Nation” which is happening at colleges across the country on January 31. This is an environmental group (www.focusthenation.org) concerned with finding solutions for global warming. During this time he asked faculty to take the opportunity to discuss more broadly the environment and the conservation of resources if they feel so inclined.

Commissioner Atiba closed by saying that recently there has been great disconnect between students, faculty and administration. He urged for better collaboration between the three groups and for them to get together and share issues that affect each group, not only in the hopes of educating them regarding your perspective but in hopes of finding mutual intersections that we can build from and use as a starting point to tackle differences.

Dean of Graduate Studies and Professor of Earth Sciences Lisa Sloan commented that she is working with people from the chancellor’s office, faculty, students and staff on the “Focus the Nation” event.

VPDUE Ladusaw asked Commissioner Atiba if he had any specific statistics concerning voter registration. Commissioner Atiba responded that he did not have the specific numbers with him but amongst the UC campuses UCSC is the lowest.

CEP Chair Padgett brought attention to CEP’s annual report, which is in the current call and contains information about class size and changes in class size at the undergraduate level and workload over the past five years.

Professor Elizabeth Stephens, Chair of the Art Department, informed the Senate of a May conference called “Interrupt, Intervene: Rethinking Art as Social Practice.” The keynote speakers are Newton Harrison and Helen Mayer-Harrison who invented environmental Art. The conference is scheduled for May 15-17.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Chelsea Juarez, GSA President, addressed some issues that have been a concern to GSA and have favorable outcomes. The GSA is teaming with the SUA for the Students of Color Conference. This is the first time there is a graduate component. She thanked the chancellor and administration for their support concerning diversity and the Education and Ecology Departments for help with funding. There is several diversity events planned this year. One of the events is a Diversity Dinner planned which is a round table with the chancellor. The GSA has also been working on voter registration and while not as successful as the undergraduates they are trying.

An issue raised by GSA to Graduate Dean Sloan is the maternity/paternity leave policy. President Juarez reported that Dean Sloan has been working hard on this issue and called

for more support for students and their families. GSA is working on security and parking issues as well.

President Juarez expressed concern over the administrator's lack of communication concerning the student protesters. The absence of communication made it very difficult for the GSA to develop a position on the issue. She encouraged the administration to work with the GSA and SUA to try and be on the same page and develop a united front. Everyone does not have to say the same thing but they at least need to be informed.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 4:45 pm.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

DRAFT

**Assembly Representative Report:
Regular Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate
Wednesday, February 20, 2008**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

- I. The Assembly was called to order at 10 AM and the roll call was taken.
- II. Minutes of the May 9, 2007 Assembly meeting were approved.
- III. Announcements by President: President Robert C. Dynes spoke briefly and his comments were supplemented by Katherine N. Lapp, Vice-President of Business and Accounting.
 - a. President Dynes noted there was a moral, legal, and intellectual responsibility to keep enrollment promises to eligible students. He stated there will be no over enrollment funds so individual campuses should take care to be on target in admissions. He warned of the tight budget and lack of over enrollment funds.
 - b. Vice-President Katherine Lapp noted that the budget looks increasingly grim as the year progresses. Though \$400 million in increases for faculty compensation, enrollment growth, graduate student support, mental health, and other issues were hoped for, there will instead be a budget cut. The Regents will be considering the alternatives. It is possible that a fee hike of 7-10% could be implemented. If the economy continues to weaken even more budget cuts will be required (perhaps an additional 100 million).
 - c. President Dynes noted that CSU, the California Community Colleges, and UC will be meeting together at the end of February and he is hopeful the groups will be able to present a united message about higher education in a coordinated and strategic way.
 - d. During the question and answer period Dynes discussed why cuts of the early 1990s will be different from now (due to the lack of healthy funding in the retirement system there will be no VERIP). The usefulness of warning students about the likelihood of fee hikes was noted and the fact that \$28 million is likely to be cut from the Office of the President and \$40 million from the campuses were discussed. Dynes noted that the WASC report had been made and the WASC board would be meeting on it. The call is to better delineate the role of the UC President, that of the Regents, and that of the campuses. This will allow for clarification of roles in governance.
- IV. Announcements by the Chair: Chair Michael T. Brown.
 - a. Assembly Chair Michael Brown noted the March 12 Assembly meeting may be cancelled depending on the recommendation of the Academic Council at their Feb. 27 meeting.
 - b. In June the Assembly will hold another face-to-face meeting and Brown also noted that the Presidential search is continuing.
- V. Reports of the Standing Committees
 - a. Academic Council

- i. Henry “Harry” Powell, Professor and Head of the division of Anatomic and Neuropathology at the UCSD Medical Center, was nominated to Vice-Chair of the Assembly for 2008-09 (the Vice Chair then will become Chair of the Assembly and Academic Council in 2009-10). The Assembly unanimously accepted this nomination.
- ii. The Assembly discussed the proposed repeal of Senate Regulation 458, which had been sent by BOARS to the Assembly. The wording allowed schools in China and Japan to do specified substitutions of language and literature classes. The geographical specificity makes the regulation unduly narrow and has led to inconsistency and confusion across campuses and BOARS recommended for repeal. The Assembly voted unanimously to repeal.

VI. There was no new business and the meeting adjourned at 11:45 AM

Respectfully Submitted;
REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY

Kathy Foley
27 February 2008

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Professional Schools at UCSC in the context of Growth & Enrollment Management

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Professional schools at UCSC: a brief history

The deep past

The campus has debated the question of whether and how to develop one or more professional schools at UCSC since well before the establishment of the Baskin School of Engineering in 1997. Indeed, the possibility of professional schools was present in the original 1962 Provisional Academic Plan for the campus. In the latest phase of this discussion, the campus has considered the option of professional schools in the context of rapid enrollment growth (“Tidal Wave II”) and its consequences, positive and negative, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Seeking to ensure that growth is coherently planned as well as systematically monitored (a position not against growth *per se* but for *smart* growth), the Academic Senate has endorsed the principle of conditions for growth (see [Campus Enrollment Growth and Infrastructure, January 2003, AS/SCP/1373](#)). The ultimate objective was to make future growth *conditional* on whether it would improve the campus. Of the conditions put in place, the campus has most vigorously pursued the goal of increasing graduate rather than undergraduate growth. This goal reflected a very rapid increase in freshman enrollments over a relatively short period of time to which the campus responded by working to increase the percentage of graduate enrollments (from 8.7 percent in 2003, the year when these conditions were put in place, to at least 15 percent).

The recent past

Most recently, at the Academic Senate meeting of May 30, 2007, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) recommended that the campus focus on developing metrics to assess the quality of undergraduate education and to address whether and to what extent educational quality is being maintained and improved, through two key measures: enrollment management and instructional capacity. ([Conditions & Strategies for Growth, May 2007, AS/SCP/1531](#)). As reported at the meeting, we need to make widely available data, gathered by program, department and division, in order to develop the precise mix of graduate students and programs (Ph.D. and M.A. /M.S., academic and professional) that will work best for the campus. A related, enrollment-management issue is that of graduate support in the form of increased Teaching Assistantships in order to protect the quality of undergraduate education while enhancing the graduate presence. Finally, given the overall trend of slower, more limited growth in UC enrollment as well as the local fact that UCSC has not met its enrollment targets for the past three years, we note that the increase to 15 percent graduate enrollment will not be on top of increases in freshman enrollment but rather in lieu of it.

Simultaneously, CPB was asked by the Administration to participate in campus planning for professional schools, which had, up to that point, largely taken place on an ad hoc basis (with a proposed School of Management receiving the greatest level of support

from the Administration and several other smaller efforts provided more limited support). CPB agreed, intending to ensure that any and all faculty interest in professional education would be considered on a level playing field with a comprehensive and transparent review process.

The present

Why professional schools now? We posed this question in an Academic Senate forum on professional schools in the fall (October 10, 2007) and offered a few preliminary responses. Professional schools are:

- A means of increasing graduate growth outside traditional academic M.A. /M.S. and Ph.D. programs.
- In the last five years of focus on graduate growth, we have seen the number of new graduate programs increase, but neither the total number of graduate students nor the rate at which graduate programs have been brought online has kept pace with increases in undergraduate numbers. Professional schools provide access to another, different pool of students, in addition to those who enroll in academic programs.
- A means of linking undergraduate and graduate programs (in targeted areas such as Public Health and Business Economics).
 - A means of building on and enhancing areas of campus strength.
 - A means of meeting state needs for well-trained professionals in a variety of areas currently not covered by UCSC.
 - A means of developing community ties around the region (including Monterey Bay area institutions and Silicon Valley).
 - A means of responding to the systemwide priority of strengthening graduate education at UC ([see 2020 Enrollment Projections](#)).

At the October Senate forum, which was held in response to requests of both committees and members of the Senate and the Administration, presentations were made by several faculty groups, who described proposals at very different stages of development. A formal call was issued for pre-proposals from all faculty groups interested in developing professional schools. CPB established a timeline for the review of the pre-proposals and a set of criteria for evaluating them (see [CPB Guidelines/Principles/Criteria for review of professional school pre-proposals, December 19, 2007](#)).

Four pre-proposals were submitted at the beginning of this quarter for Schools of Education, Environment, Management, and Public Health. The CPB review process was designed to recognize the evident variability in the development of the proposals, their unevenness in funding and administrative support as well as in their stage of development. CPB will assess each proposal individually rather than competitively. Timelines for the development of the proposals will reflect their different stages of development as well as their potential benefits and risks. CPB's recommendations are advisory only; our assumption is that armed with this information, the faculty proposers will decide whether and how to move forward with their proposals.

The future

CPB is currently completing the review process, and the pre-proposals have been circulated to all Senate committees for comment. By the end of this quarter, our goal is to assess the viability and desirability of each proposal, to outline a timeline for next steps (short and long term) and the resources needed to support them. We are focusing on the risks and opportunities of the proposals we received, considering them individually and in the context of campus planning as a whole. The professional school option(s) cannot be a mere add-on, but rather must reflect and be incorporated into the overall direction of research and instruction at UCSC.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Karen Ottemann
Michael Brown
Emily Honig
Lori Kletzer, *ex officio*
Tracy Larrabee
Herbert Lee
Grant Pogson
Olga Najera-Ramirez
Quentin Williams, *ex officio*
Susan Gillman, Chair

February 22, 2008

**COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
Amendment to Bylaw 13.25 (CPE Charge)**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

CPE proposes an amendment to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.25, the Committee charge, regarding Committee membership. Under Bylaw 13.25.1, membership is described as including “three Santa Cruz Division members” and “one non-senate teaching faculty representative.” CPE proposes to add one person by inviting the UCSC Coordinator of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) to sit with the Committee.

Efficiency and common sense suggest inviting the ELWR Coordinator to sit with the Committee, as references to the Committee’s close oversight of the ELWR—the requirement, the instruction, and the attendant exam—and its close consultation with the Writing Program are thoroughly woven into the Committee’s charge. In Bylaw 13.25.2, the Committee’s charge states that the “Committee may consider any issue regarding undergraduate preparatory and remedial education and its administration. It supervises the Analytical Writing Placement Exam.... In consultation with the Writing Program, it proposes the means by which students may satisfy the University Entry Level Writing Requirement and it oversees Entry Level Writing Requirement instruction.”

The ELWR Coordinator is the Writing Program’s designated expert on the ELWR; in addition, UCSC ELWR Coordinators have regularly consulted with the systemwide ELWR administration on crafting and norming Writing Placement Exams, and have sat on UCOPE’s Advisory Committee on English as a Second Language. CPE believes it will benefit considerably from the expertise and institutional memory of a sitting member whose service to the Committee will be enriched by his or her ongoing administrative role as campus ELWR Coordinator.

Current wording	Proposed wording
<p>13.25 Committee on Preparatory Education (En 10 Nov 66; Am 6 June 84; CC 1 Aug 91, 21 Feb 96)</p>	<p>13.25 Unchanged</p>
<p>13.25.1 There are three Santa Cruz Division members. In addition, there is one non-senate teaching faculty representative. (Am 3 Dec 69, 6 June 84, 21 May 04; CC 1 Aug 91, 31 Aug 98; EC 18 Oct 91, 31 Aug 04)</p>	<p>13.25.1 There are three Santa Cruz Division members. <u>The Coordinator of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) at UC Santa Cruz is invited to sit with the Committee.</u> In addition, there is one non-senate teaching faculty representative. (Am 3 Dec 69, 6 June 84, 21 May 04; CC 1 Aug 91, 31 Aug 98; EC 18 Oct 91, 31 Aug 04)</p>
<p>13.25.2 The Committee may consider any issue regarding undergraduate preparatory and remedial education and its administration. It supervises the Analytical Writing Placement Exam and mathematics placement examinations. In consultation with the Writing</p>	<p>13.25.2 Unchanged</p>

<p>Program, it proposes the means by which students may satisfy the University Entry Level Writing Requirement and it oversees Entry Level Writing Requirement instruction. In consultation with the Committee on Educational Policy, it maintains a continuing study of preparatory and remedial programs at Santa Cruz . It performs such other functions concerning preparatory and remedial education as may be assigned to it by the Academic Senate or by the Santa Cruz Division. (Am 6 June 84; CC 1 Aug 77, 28 Jan 81, 31 Aug 98, 31 Aug 06)</p>	
---	--

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

Judith Scott
Anthony Tromba
Elizabeth Abrams, Chair

Ellen Newberry, NSTF Representative

February 15, 2008

Resolution on Conflict Management and Demonstration Response

Preamble The campus has a Demonstration Planning Team Report ([March 2007](#), compiled by a committee of faculty, police, staff, and administrators) with significant responses from the Council of Provosts (May 2007) and other campus constituencies. This report calls for specific resources and procedures for managing campus demonstrations, which could alleviate disproportionate use of police, force, and arrests. The procedures include training a demonstration observers group and implementing a demonstration advocacy group. These procedures and others that could mitigate the use of force have not been put in place.

Whereas initial response of police force and arrests have escalated confrontations between students and the university administration, and

Whereas the campus demonstration response program has not effectively met the challenge of conflict management,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate calls on the Executive Vice Chancellor/Campus Provost to ensure that the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administration, which is responsible for risk assessment and management of demonstration operations; and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, which coordinates responses to student demonstrations, implement an effective demonstration response program that uses the Demonstration Planning Team Report of March 2007 and other pertinent campus resources and that this demonstration response program reflect the University's commitment to dialogue and social justice.

Therefore be it further resolved that, in the spirit of service to the Senate and the campus community, the Academic Senate calls on faculty to participate actively in a demonstration response process that takes seriously the goals of the University to analyze and understand conflict.

Submitted by
Carolyn Martin Shaw
Professor of Anthropology