

Meeting Call for Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
Wednesday, May 20, 2009 at 2:30 p.m.
Colleges 9&10 Multipurpose Room
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes
Draft Minutes of February 18, 2009, previously distributed (AS/SCM/287)
Draft Minutes of March 6, 2009, previously distributed (AS/SCM/288)
2. Announcements
 - a. Chair Williams
 - b. Chancellor Blumenthal
 - c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger
3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)
4. Special Orders: Annual Reports
CONSENT CALENDAR:
 - a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1600) p. 1
5. Reports of Special Committees (none)
6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
 - i. Amendment to Chapter 13.12.1 – Change to Membership (AS/SCP/1601) p. 5
 - b. Committee on Committees
 - i. Amendment to Chapter 13 (AS/SCP/1608) p. 6
 - ii. 2009-10 Nominations (AS/SCP/1602) p. 8
 - c. Committee on Educational Policy
 - i. Amendment to Senate Regulation 6.5: Individual Study, Field Study, Internships, etc. (AS/SCP/1603) p. 14
 - ii. Amendment to Senate Regulation 10.2.2.3 (AS/SCP/1604) p. 22
 - d. Committee on Faculty Welfare
 - i. Report on the University of California Retirement Program (AS/SCP/1599) p. 24
 - ii. Resolution on the University of California Retirement Program (AS/SCP/1610) p. 36
 - e. Committee on Planning and Budget
 - i. Budget Report #1 (AS/SCP/1605) p. 41
 - ii. Budget Report #2: Assessing the Consultation Process (AS/SCP/1609) p. 44
 - f. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections
 - i. Amendment to Bylaw 11: Elections (AS/SCP/1606) p. 48
 - g. Senate Executive Committee
 - i. Recommendation on Faculty Salaries (AS/SCP/1607) p. 50
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 12, 2009

Members of the Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Colleagues,

The Spring Meeting of the Academic Senate will take place on May 20th in the College 9/10 Multi-purpose Room. This is, of course, the day following a special election—and, as with the vote on the preceding day, the budget will be the item of primary focus at this meeting. Our collective budget problems will manifest themselves at this meeting in several ways, which include: (1) our Committee on Faculty Welfare presenting a report and proposing resolutions relevant to the UC Retirement Program; (2) our Committee on Planning and Budget presenting a report on the Campus Budget and an Assessment of the Consultation Process relative to campus budget cuts; and (3) Senate Executive Committee Report and Recommendation on Faculty Salaries (for which, as many of you will recall, we recently had year 1 of a planned 4-year program to make UC faculty salaries competitive with our comparison institutions---with the following years being put on hold due to the budget crisis). While I certainly cannot promise good news on any of these fronts (Read the [Call](#)), I can assure you that you will very likely be better informed (and perhaps a lot better informed) about these issues if you attend the meeting.

On a different note, this is my last regular meeting as Chair of the Senate. Next year, you will have Lori Kletzer as Senate Chair—she’s been a great Vice-Chair, and as an economist, I can think of no better type of academic to preside over the Senate for the next couple years (except for perhaps a miracle-worker or a ridiculously wealthy philanthropist—but both of these are in short supply). There are certainly things that I’ll miss about being Chair: these include interacting with both the tremendous and hard-working Committee Chairs of the Senate, and the superlative Senate staff. In the interest of brevity and good sportsmanship, I’ll spare you the list of things that I won’t miss.

I do have one piece of **GOOD NEWS**: There will be a **RECEPTION** in the Multi-purpose Room following the Senate meeting---a chance to meet up with special guest Harry Powell, the Chair Designate of the system wide Senate and with both folks you perhaps haven’t seen in a while and perhaps even some new faces. I hope to see you all there!

Sincerely,



Quentin Williams
Chair, Academic Senate

**PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES
of the
Winter Quarter 2009 Meetings**

The draft minutes from the February 18, 2009 and March 6, 2009 Senate meetings were distributed via email on **May 12, 2009** and will be presented for approval at the next Senate Meeting on May 20, 2009. 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 p.m., Tuesday, May 19, 2009**. 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

May 12, 2009

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
February 18, 2009

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 18, 2009 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine and Secretary Judith Habicht-Mauche 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 changes to the minutes of November 12, 2008. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Quentin Williams

Chair Williams stated the main item of business is the proposed changes to the writing intensive requirement (W), incorporating the concept of disciplinary communications with the W. Chair Williams explained this represents the first chapter in bringing the extensive Senate work on general education reform to the faculty as a whole. The second chapter of the proposed revisions will come to the Senate during the second winter quarter Senate meeting.

Chair Williams announced that in system-wide news there is a new interim provost of the University of California (UC). Larry Pitts of UC San Francisco is replacing Bob Grey. Larry Pitts was the immediate predecessor of George Blumenthal as chair of the system-wide Senate, and has extensive experience with an appreciation of shared governance.

Chair Williams thanked Professor Patricia Zavella for a superb faculty research lecture and announced the addition of Stephanie Casher to the Academic Senate staff. Ms. Casher will staff the Committee on Research, Graduate Council and the Committee on International Education.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chair Williams noted that due to his travel schedule the Chancellor was unable to attend.

c. EVC Kliger

EVC Kliger provided an update on the budget. Currently the state has a projected shortfall of \$41 billion dollars through June 30, 2010. The state is almost out of cash, bills are not getting paid, tax refunds are not being mailed, construction work has stopped and bonds cannot be sold. A special session of the legislature was convened in December to develop an 18 month budget proposal to address additional shortfalls for the current year and develop new proposals for the 2009-10 fiscal year. Governor Schwarzenegger and four legislative leaders have agreed on a package of \$15.1 billion in spending reductions, \$14.4 billion in tax increase, and \$11.4 billion in borrowing. The legislature is at a standstill, and as of today the budget has not been passed.

In the current year the university has already implemented a \$33 million mid-year reduction approved as part of the final budget, which the legislature passed last September. President Yudof has reported to the Regents that if the budget currently under consideration in this special session is adopted, it would mean a \$450 million shortfall to the university. This consists of: \$115 million in new permanent cuts; a \$122 million in under funded enrollments; and an estimated \$213 million in mandatory cut increases over a two year period for utilities, employee health benefits, faculty merit adjustments, and other inflationary costs. President Yudof also notes that appropriately UC's needs are much greater given the state funding trends over time and that this \$450 million illustrates only the impact on the university since the most recent fiscal troubles began. In addition President Yudof pointed out two ongoing serious concerns: one, the continuing deterioration of the state's fiscal health causes speculation that additional reductions may be forthcoming. And two, the elimination of funding for restarting employer contributions to the retirement system puts the fiscal health of the system at great risk.

EVC Klinger said that it is difficult to anticipate exactly what the current financial crisis means for the university beyond two undisputed facts. The first, that state support to the university will be reduced dramatically. The second, that student and their families will be faced with significantly increased costs to attend UC.

At the system-wide level UC leadership has been taking action over the last several months to address the current year crisis, and is actively engaging in planning how to best manage its response to the expected multi-year financial turn down. To address budget cuts already enacted and in anticipation of further reductions, the office of the president (OP) has implemented a number of actions. The actions include: cost efficiencies and staff downsizing at OP, along with an FTE reduction of 500 people or 27 percent. The current year operating budget has been reduced \$60.4 million, which is a 21 percent savings over the prior year. OP has a goal of reducing its workforce by at least another 275 positions and \$25 million by the end of the 2009-10 fiscal year. This would result in a total OP workforce reduction of 43 percent. A freeze has been implemented on salaries of top administrators and compensation for a large group of senior leadership has been restricted significantly. Additional OP saving came from not filling vacant non-essential positions, curbing travel, consulting expenditures, and consolidating and reorganizing departments in their central administrative office. Those efforts will continue along with ongoing reviews of programs and services that could be better delivered through third party vendors or campuses.

Further, an effort has been launched by President Yudof to begin to considering the system's response to longer term impacts of this turndown. EVC Klinger has been asked by President Yudof to serve on the Budget Advisory Committee. The committee is co-chaired by OP Vice President Katie Lapp and UC Santa Barbara EVC Gene Lucas and will consider system-wide actions to reduce expenditures. EVC Klinger has also been asked to serve on an advisory committee to consider actions that should be taken with the retirement system.

EVC Klinger said that at the campus level he has asked all principal officers to implement a soft hiring freeze and only fill essential positions. Strict restrictions have been placed on entertainment, travel, consulting expenses, and that appropriate actions are taken to reduce expenses to the extent possible. The campus is implementing a mid year cut of approximately \$6 million in one time funds made necessary by the additional reductions proposed by the governor that were not included in the final 2008-09 budget.

For 2009-10 the EVC is attempting to estimate what the campus' share of the permanent reductions will be. At this time the EVC is projecting that UCSC may need to implement permanent budget reductions that could be more than twice the magnitude of the mid year cuts. The EVC's projections take into account, current information about state funding, expected increases in revenue due to fee increases for the system, and estimated costs of collective bargaining and other known mandatory increases, such as academic merits and utilities.

The EVC is certain that given the magnitude of the anticipated reductions, no area of the budget including direct instruction and research will be exempt from cuts. Despite the uncertainty of an actual number, the campus needs to establish target reductions for every division on campus. In December the EVC asked each principal officer to provide him with a brief summary of how he or she might manage a 10 percent budget reduction. The EVC has convened a small group of colleagues to help him review the submittals and try to understand the impacts of proposed actions on teaching and research activities. The EVC will soon put forward for Senate consultation a budget reduction proposal that will allocate proposed reductions by division.

The proposal will be reflective of the following: recognizing the magnitude of the cuts that must be realized in one year, the EVC believes the campus must allocate cuts strategically in order to maintain the ability to resume progress in the future. In order to achieve this, the campus must establish a framework to guide the action of principal officers as they make operational decisions to achieve the necessary budget savings. The framework that the EVC proposes identifies the following as the highest priorities: first, services and activities that directly affect instruction and research; next, required safety and compliance functions of the university; and activities that yield new revenue sources or increased revenue beyond the current level.

The EVC will ask the academic deans to bear in mind three general guidelines when they decide how to implement the budget reductions that are imposed on them.

1. Programs that show clear evidence of being highly ranked should be considered a higher priority than other academic programs.
2. Maintaining or enhancing the quality of graduate student programs is more important than the growth in the graduate student numbers.
3. Maintaining or enhancing the quality of instruction and research are critically important, but the EVC recognizes that the modes of delivery of instruction and research should be reviewed to identify opportunities for reducing the cost of delivery.

The EVC said the campus must also think about the long term and how to adjust to what could be further budget reductions. To do this the campus must look at activities that span multiple academic or support units and evaluate whether further potential exists to realize short or long term savings through reorganization, increased efficiency, or cost avoidance. The EVC has convened a number of work groups to propose ideas for further evaluation in the following areas: administrative restructuring, instruction, instructional support, undergraduate academic advising, residential student life programs, academic personnel process practices, institutional support, and auxiliaries.

The EVC closed by saying that the campus has survived and progressed despite previous budget reductions. The campus must cut less where cuts do irreparable harm to the institution. This will require involvement and sacrifice from faculty, staff, and students, as well as support from alumni. It is incumbent on the collective campus to ensure that UCSC remains positioned for future progress and competitive strength. It is essential to come together to make the necessary changes to sustain excellence in education, research, scholarship, creative activity, and public service.

Following the EVC's comments Chair Williams opened the floor to questions and comments.

Professor Kevin Karplus, Biomolecular Engineering, asked why, given the budget situation, is the campus paying for a security guard in an inactive parking lot. The EVC responded that he assumed Professor Karplus is talking about the future site of the biomedical building and the former site of the tree sit and the EVC does not want the fence torn down or any more destruction at the site. Professor Karplus asked if replacing a fence would cost less than security guards. The EVC said he will take that into consideration.

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

4. Special Order Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.1: Disciplinary Communication (AS/SCP/1592)

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair Jaye Padgett began by saying that CEP is asking faculty to vote on a legislative proposal that would replace the W by a requirement CEP is calling disciplinary communication (DC). CEP Chair Padgett then presented the following:

- Current writing requirements at UCSC
- Background on writing in the disciplines
- Problems with the W
- CEP's 2007 resolution on reforming the W

- Comparison of the current and proposed requirements

CEP Chair Padgett then discussed the committee's extensive interaction with departments. Departments provided their educational goals for majors in the area of DC, noting where they already met those goals in their curriculum and identified potential resource issues. CEP identified a common thread in the responses, which is the need for support (student-instructor ratio, TA training, peer tutoring).

CEP has called for:

- re-establishment of a strong peer tutoring program
- the hiring of a faculty member dedicated to writing in disciplines
- resources to deploy TAs where needed, and TA training
- staff support

In consultation with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), CEP has estimated a cost of \$250,000. The administration has assured CEP and CPB that, should this legislation pass, it will support allocating these resources.

CEP Chair Padgett then addressed whether or not this change will make upper division writing stronger or weaker.

He made the following case for weakening:

- The legislation allows for an overall reduction of five pages in writing (out of 25) for programs that incorporate significant oral or poster presentation.
- Spreading writing over 2-3 courses "dilutes" the training.

CEP Chair Padgett then made the following case for strengthening:

- An educational benefit of placing the requirement in a student's chosen discipline.
- Spreading writing over 2-3 courses reinforces the training.
- Departments will be asked by CEP to make their DC goals explicit and to connect these with their curriculum.
- All transfers will benefit from it.
- It will be sustainable: no orphaned students and petitions.
- It will be better supported than W.

CEP Chair Padgett provided CEP's expectations for DC curricula including: reach, substance, and instruction. The CEP chair closed his presentation by presenting the proposed legislation. He explained that the first change comes in Section E of the legislation, which mentions the W and clarifies that if this legislation goes through, starting next fall, students would no longer be subject to the W requirement.

CEP Chair Padgett said section F is the heart of the legislative proposal. Following CEP Chair Padgett's presentation Chair Williams opened the floor to questions and comments.

Professor Barbara Rogoff, Psychology, objected to the page limit for the smallest unit of writing. Professor Rogoff feels that for students to write well it is sometimes best for them to write short and asked if CEP is open to discussion on the issue. CEP Chair

Padgett responded that CEP is open to discussion, although it is not part of the legislation.

Professor Barry Bowman, Molecular, Cell and Developmental (MCD) Biology, stated that although he doesn't really like the legislation he will vote for it because he feels there is no viable alternative. Professor Bowman then asked if there is an academic assessment of the level of the problem (in the big majors) and if there is a way to measure whether things are going to get better or worse. CEP Chair Padgett responded that CEP has always approached this with the belief that certain majors are disproportionately faced with difficulty on this. CEP has always resisted the argument that if something like this is passed CEP just needs to count how many students every major has and allocate the money that way. There are some majors that are going to need much more help to fulfill the requirement and some that can provide it without further resources. CEP will have to look at a number of models and that will be challenging.

CEP Chair Padgett also responded that there is nothing in place that would allow CEP to say that writing got better because of this change. CEP Chair Padgett believes it will be up to faculty and departments at some point to be the ones to say how this is measured and with doing an assessment.

Professor Triloki Pandey, Anthropology, stated that last quarter he taught a W course, and was very disappointed. The professor could easily see from the start of the quarter what kind of problems the students were having, even though they were upper-division students. The students commented that nobody taught them what he was teaching, and now it is too late. Professor Pandey applauds what CEP is doing.

Professor Bill Ladusaw, Linguistics and vice provost of undergraduate education (VPDUE), said that for him one of the most attractive features of the implementation of this proposal is that for the first time the campus will have from the various departments a statement of what's important for their students to learn. VPDUE Ladusaw believes that will be very helpful and will lead to a more intelligent assessment of the effectiveness of the lower division writing requirement. Also, long term the campus ought to measure the contribution of the DC, and should be able to show year-to-year that it is bringing students closer to what the faculty expects of students in their majors.

Carolyn Martin-Shaw, Anthropology, asked what CEP has in mind as part of an assessment. CEP Chair Padgett responded that he sees that as evolving given the dialogue between CEP and departments.

Professor Kevin Karplus, Biomolecular Engineering, had the following three points and questions:

- This is the one of the best things he has seen come out of CEP in many years. Professor Karpuls is voting in favor of the legislation.
- Professor Karplus is confused about the graphs, it looks like four thousand seats a year in W courses are being offered and that there needs to be eight thousand.

CEP Chair Padgett clarified that the number is not new frosh, and CEP wanted something they could call a measure of the population of people that in some sense need a W.

- Professor Karplus does not think drafts should be counted as completing part of the page number requirement.

Professor Al Zahler, Molecular, Cell and Developmental (MCD) Biology, asked if it is possible to consider using a four unit lab, instead of a five unit lab, to satisfy the requirement. CEP member Loisa Nygaard responded that it is her view that a better way to deal with exceptional situations is for the department to make a full scale argument to CEP, and for CEP to grant an exception versus altering the legislation. CEP member Nygaard thinks the five units is a reasonable target, and knows there are concerns about weakening the requirement.

Professor Faye Crosby, Psychology, proposed a friendly amendment stipulating that CEP, under exceptional circumstances would think of modifying the rule for a department. Professor Richard Hughey, Computer Engineering, pointed out that is already in the legislation.

Matthew Palm, Student Union Assembly, stated that seven of the student governments endorse the legislation; two more would have but didn't have a quorum. SUA also endorses the legislation. Hundreds of students have trouble fulfilling the W requirement and it is important that students be able to fulfill their requirements so they can graduate.

Professor Susan Gillman, Literature and Chair of CPB, said that the Alumni Council also supports the legislation.

CEP member David Helmbold provided clarification on the response to Professor Zahler's comments about CEP granting exceptions. It is CEP member Helmbold's understanding that the five units would not necessarily be waivable by CEP, but that does not mean that departments couldn't work together with CEP for innovative solutions.

The proposed amendments to Santa Cruz Regulation 10.2.2.1 (AS/SCP/1592) were passed by a voice vote.

10.2.2 General Education Requirements.

10.2.2.1

Unchanged.

a. Introductions to disciplines.

Unchanged.

b. Topical courses.

Unchanged.

c. Quantitative course.

Unchanged.

d. Composition courses.

Unchanged.

e. Writing-intensive course. Students who entered the University of California, Santa Cruz, before fall 2009, are required to complete one five-credit hour course or the equivalent that provides instruction and substantial practice in writing within the context of any academic subject.

f. Disciplinary communication (DC) requirement. Students entering the University of California, Santa Cruz, in or after fall 2009, must have instruction and substantial practice in modes of communication appropriate to their major. The largest component of the DC curriculum must involve writing. The requirement must be satisfied either within one five-credit upper-division course or within a combination of up to three upper-division courses totaling at least five credits. Major program requirements must include disciplinary communication curricula that are approved and regularly assessed by the Committee on Educational Policy.

g. Arts course.

Unchanged.

h. Ethnic studies course.

Unchanged.

i. Unchanged.

10.2.2.2

Unchanged.

10.2.2.3 Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 except the Writing-intensive/disciplinary communication courses, which must be taken at UCSC. An eligible transferred course of 4.0 quarter units or 3.0 semester units may be considered one course with respect to campus general education requirements.

Responsibility for assessment of work completed at other campuses of the University of California or at other institutions is delegated to the Director of Admissions. In making such assessments, the Director consults with the Faculty when appropriate.

10.2.2.4-6

Unchanged

The amendment passed by voice vote.

ii. Amendment to Regulation 10.2 on Breadth and General Education Requirements

CEP Chair Padgett explained that the current regulation has two parallel statements on general education requirements. The first is called “breadth”, which is the statement of requirements that held for students roughly before 1986. CEP believes it is time to let go of the breadth standards that are only valid for students entering before 1986. The language is obsolete; it refers to requirements that do not exist any more. Also, CEP feels some of the language is subject to misinterpretation. CEP would like it clear that it is CEP or the Senate who decides whether a course gets a general education designation or not. CEP does consult with the deans, but does not think that the possible ambiguity about authority to approve is useful, so the proposed amendment removes that language.

Professor Carolyn Marin-Shaw, Anthropology, proposed an amendment removing the words “during the times described in SCR 10.2.2.1 from 10.2.2.3”.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

Professor Herbert Lee, Applied Math and Statistics, proposed an amendment striking the word breadth from 10.2.2.3.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

The proposed amendments to Santa Cruz Regulation 10.2 (AS/SCP/1595) passed by voice vote.

10.2 Campus General Education Requirements.

10.2.2 General Education Requirements.

10.2.2.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Science, or Music, are required to fulfill the following campus general education requirements. The courses used to satisfy these requirements must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.2.6). Only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

**a. Introductions to disciplines
Unchanged.**

**b. Topical courses.
Unchanged.**

**c. Quantitative course.
Unchanged.**

d. Composition courses.
Unchanged.

e. Writing-intensive course.
Unchanged.

f. Arts course.
Unchanged.

g. Ethnic studies course.
Unchanged.

h.
Unchanged.

10.2.2.2 Deleted

10.2.2.3 Renumbered to 10.2.2.2
Unchanged

10.2.2.4 Renumbered to 10.2.2.3
Students admitted with three or more quarters of advanced standing from another campus of the University of California are required to fulfill in their entirety the University of California, Santa Cruz, campus general education requirements (SCR 10.2.2.1). However, students who, at the time they enroll at the University of California, Santa Cruz, campus, have completed the general education requirements of another University of California campus will be deemed to have completed the University of California, Santa Cruz, general education requirements.

10.2.2.6 Renumbered to 10.2.2.4
Unchanged

10.2.2.6 Renumbered to 10.2.2.5
When colleges, departments, and other agencies propose a course, they designate which of the general education requirements (SCR 10.2.2.1), if any, the course is presumed to meet. The Committee on Educational Policy approves or disapproves the designation.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

iii. Oral Report on General Education Reform

CEP Chair Padgett provided an update on CEP's general education (GE) reform efforts. CEP will present GE legislation at the second winter Senate meeting on March 6, 2009.

CEP Chair Padgett began by discussing the “design” principles stating that the

requirements should:

- Be easy to understand
- Be less burdensome than current requirements, if possible
- Be interesting (recruitment, retention)
- Reflect faculty and student feedback
- Reflect our campus's principles and identity

The objective of the reform is to encourage lifelong learning, and to prepare people to handle the complex and unexpected problems of the future with wisdom and resourcefulness.

Next CEP Chair Padgett compared the current requirements to the proposed system. The major differences from the current system are:

- Smaller
- Almost no overlap
- No topical versus introduction distinction
- Categories follow from educational goals, not administrative divisions
- Writing-intensive→Disciplinary Communication

CEP Chair Padgett then explained the specific objectives of the proposed requirements and some of the descriptions of the course categories.

Following the presentation Chair Williams opened the floor to questions and comments.

Professor Barry Bowman, MCD Biology, asked for more explanation on the textual analysis topic, and if reading and interpreting scientific journal is included. CEP Chair Padgett responded that it is a good thing to think about.

Professor Kevin Karplus, Biomolecular Engineering, asked for a distinction between cross-cultural analysis and ethnicity and race. CEP Chair Padgett said the two could overlap, but there are also ways that they won't. Having both requirements will entail that students will have some kind of experience dealing with issues of race and ethnicity. The cross cultural topic is explicitly stated to focus on cultures outside of the United States.

CEP member Nygaard added that ethnicity and race loom very large for issues in contemporary American culture for very important social and historical reasons. But she said there is a great deal to culture besides history and race.

Professor Richard Hughey, Computer Engineering, asked where rehabilitative technologies, and working with individuals with disabilities would fit. CEP Chair Padgett responded that those topics could fit in technology in society.

b. Committee on Committees

i. Amendment to Chapter 13 (AS/SCP/1591)

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Carolyn Martin-Shaw stated that COC has heard from various committees about two different things and COC is trying to combine them into one amendment. The first is about who is a voting member on Senate committees. The second is a provision for having an executive session of a committee meeting for members only.

Professor Carol Freeman, Writing, commented that this is not a totally insignificant change. In the past committees were thought of as having three kinds of people, two kinds of members, voting members and nonvoting members. It has always been very clear who the voting members were and who were the nonvoting members. The nonvoting members were also called “representatives” and those are undergraduate and graduate students, and then most recently non-senate faculty. The third kind is those who are invited to sit with the committee and those are often staff and administrators. Their purpose is to provide the committee with expertise and information about which the committee then deliberates.

Professor Freeman continued that there are certain committees on which there are no students or non-senate faculty members. Professor Freeman sees some possible losses in explicitly stating that the students and non-senate faculty now are not members, rather than to be considered as nonvoting members.

COC Chair Shaw responded that she hopes that in practice, in committee deliberations these distinctions are not played out. COC would like to be clear about who is a member, and who can vote or not so that when an executive session is needed it is very clear who can participate.

Professor Elizabeth Abrams, Writing, suggested defining executive session as voting members only.

Professor Kevin Karplus, Biomolecular Engineering, made a motion to send the legislation back to committee.

The motion to send the amendment back to committee passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

i. Divisional Legislative Interpretations 2008.2.A (AS/SCP/1593)

Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (RJ&E) member Carol Freeman presented RJ&E’s interpretation of the status quo in relation to voting members, nonvoting members, and people who are invited to sit with the committee.

The Senate voted on the Divisional Legislative Interpretations 2008.2.A (AS/SCP/1593).

2008.2.A Privileges of non-members of committees listed in the bylaws.

The Bylaws for the various standing committees list people as being “invited to sit with” the committee. The privileges of such people are not defined in the Bylaws. Sturgis’ Rules of Procedure recognizes three categories of attendees in

a meeting: voting members, non-voting members and invitees. Absent any other definition in the Bylaws, people invited to sit with a committee are interpreted as belonging to the third category in Sturgis. They are invited by default, with no committee vote being needed. However, as with all invitees, as per Sturgis the committee retains the right to rescind the invitation to these people for any meeting, either individually or as a group.

The Bylaws also list “representatives” for various standing committees. Again, their privileges are not given in the Bylaws, and therefore they have to be considered as belonging to one of the categories defined in Sturgis. It is not *a priori* clear whether representatives should be treated as invitees or as non-voting members. However, the phrase “non-voting member” was changed to “non-voting representative” in 1999 by CRJE. Since CRJE is only authorized to make non- substantive changes as per SCB 13.28.5, representatives are non-voting members. As per Sturgis, among other privileges, representatives cannot be excluded from a committee meeting.

The legislative interpretations were adopted by voice vote.

ii. Divisional Legislative Interpretations 2008.2.B (AS/SCP/1594)

RJ&E member Freeman explained that the interpretation is a conforming change in that this particular waiver of voting rights was an amendment to the Bylaws brought by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

The Senate voted on the Divisional Legislative Interpretations 2008.2.B (AS/SCP/1594).

SCB 13.4.5 states that members of the Division "may give up their right to vote on all actions." The Bylaw goes on to state what happens "if a member goes on leave, but chooses to participate in some personnel actions." To achieve consistency between the two, and from the fact that SCB 13.4.5 was brought to the Senate by the Committee on Academic Personnel whose charge only covers personnel actions, the first phrase should be interpreted as "may give up their right to vote on all personnel actions."

The legislative interpretations were adopted by voice vote.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

Matthew Palm, SUA’s Commissioner of Academic Affairs (CAA), provided an update on SUA issues. The SUA is very concerned about budget cuts. The governor’s proposed budget hikes student fees up 9.4 percent on top of last year’s 7.4 percent increase. This means that since 2001 student fees will have risen 80 percent. The SUA feels the Blue and Gold plan, to assure college affordability, is a step in the right direction. The plan covers the cost of a UC education for all students whose families make less than \$60,000 a year, but it is only going to be implemented for the coming year. It is not a permanent program and depends on a 10 percent increase in student fees to pay for it. The SUA

supports where OP is going and the idea of the Blue and Gold Plan, but the SUA points out that it is not a long term permanent solution to the problem.

The UC student association is working with allies in the state legislature to introduce the College Affordability Act of 2009, which will freeze UC and CSU student fees for five years. The shortfall in funding will be made up by taxing the top one percent of the California income bracket by one percent. In two days SUA got over a thousand students to sign postcards to critical swing senators and assembly members whose vote are needed to pass the legislation. CAA Palm asked the Senate to contact their representatives and encourage them to pass the College Affordability Act.

The SUA supports the GE reform. SUA especially appreciates the focus in the legislations on what students are suppose to get out of the requirements. CAA Palm said students pay \$24,000 a year to go here, deserve to know exactly what they are getting out of their education, what their GE's are for, and what skills or frames of knowledge they should expect to get out of it.

CAA Palm also said students strongly support that CEP has kept in the E requirement in the form of ethnicity and race. CEP consulted a group of students on the issue, and the students helped expand the wording of the requirement. That the list of GE's is smaller means that students will have more room in their schedule to fulfill either their major requirements or take classes that interest them. Students were excited about inclusion of service learning and collaborative learning in the creative process requirements and feel those skills are very useful in the working world.

CAA Palm thanked CEP and CEP Chair Padgett for including students in the process.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Graduate Student Association (GSA) President Travis Orloff provided an update on GSA activities. The GSA has been working to increase department representation by graduate students. The GSA has increased their representation from thirteen to twenty four; they are almost finished trying to get representatives from the last few departments.

The GSA held their annual Diversity Dinner. One of the main results of the dinner is that the GSA would like to institute a peer mentoring system. This will help inform new graduate students, keep them involved, and also build up relationship between the departments and their graduate students as well.

The GSA plans to revamp the current graduate student orientation. Currently the GSA is solely responsible for running the orientation that graduate students attend. The GSA plans to work with the graduate division to incorporate their ideas and expertise to develop an orientation that represents the faculty, staff and students and brings together the whole institution. The GSA hopes to bring a more inclusive feeling for the graduate students and aid with the mentoring idea by introducing students at an early point.

Professor Ethan Miller, Computer Science, commented that a large number of departments already hold their own graduate student orientations.

GSA President Orloff responded that the GSA would like the campus wide orientation to be a chance for graduate students to meet other student outside of their own departments.

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

March 23, 2009

DRAFT

DRAFT M I N U T E S
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
March 6, 2009

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, March 6, 2009 at the Colleges 9 & 10 Multipurpose Room. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine and Secretary Judith Habicht-Mauche present, Chair Quentin Williams called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes (none)

2. Announcements

a. Chair Quentin Williams

Chair Williams announced that the Senate will have the opportunity to consider a proposal from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) for general education (GE) reform. Additional agenda items include a housing report from the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and a proposed amendment to the undergraduate academic assessment grievance procedure.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal began by stating three points about the current economic crisis:

1. We face big challenges, but history suggests that we will emerge from this current economic situation stronger, if we plan now and act strategically.
2. Despite the challenges, we will continue to be a place of teaching and research excellence.
3. We are investing in a strategic opportunity in Silicon Valley.

The chancellor said the campus has some tough choices ahead, but will continue to look ahead and plan for the future. In doing so, the campus has to be guided by its vision to be a leading institution for educating student as well as a top ranked university.

The chancellor then announced the following faculty honors:

- Professor Sandy Faber, Astronomy and Astrophysics, won the Bower Award and prize for achievement in science. The Bower Award is one the nation's richest sciences award, it includes a gold medal and \$250,000 prize.
- Professors Samit Dasgupta, Mathematics, and Mark Krumholz, Astronomy and Astrophysics, are both winners of Sloan Research Fellowships. There are now 25 Sloan winners teaching at UCSC.
- Professors Phillip Crew, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Darrel Long, Computer Sciences and Pradip Mascharak, Chemistry and Biochemistry have been elected as fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Professor Alexander Gamburd, Mathematics, won a Presidential Early Career Award for scientists and engineers, the highest honor that a beginning scientist or engineer can receive in the United States.

The chancellor commented that achievements like these elevate UCSC's national and international reputation, help attract other stellar faculty and students; and remind alumni, donors, and potential supporters why we are worthy of their support. Also, eight UCSC students won Fullbright Fellowships. That is a higher success rate than any other UC campus. The 8th Annual Campus Earth Summit held last week showed broad student participation. The summit is an example of the kind of energy and leadership students can exemplify regarding issues they care about, such as sustainability. The chancellor also announced the recent addition of the Golden Key Honor Society to the campus.

Finally, the chancellor informed the Senate that on March 13, 2009 the campus will formally announce and celebrate its landmark partnership with NASA Ames Research Center that will also include several other educational partners. The partnership is a strategic collaboration dedicated to teaching and research initiatives, focusing on innovation, entrepreneurship and sustainability. The chancellor believes UCSC is ideally positioned as the UC of Silicon Valley (SV). UCSC's existing research contract with NASA at \$330 million over ten years is the largest single competitive grant NASA has ever given to a university. The partnership also provides a deepened presence in SV which offers UCSC the untapped opportunity for students and faculty to become involved. In the case of the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC), the NASA grant's indirect costs actually support the main campus in a number of ways, unrelated to UARC. In a time of diminishing support from the state, the campus must invest in strategic ventures that expand our national reputation, create new opportunities for faculty to address global challenges, provide new educational opportunities to students and attract critical private support.

c. EVC Klinger

EVC Klinger began by announcing that the state adopted a budget that reduces UC funding by \$115 million. Based on that, and associated assumptions about the share of that cut that will likely come to the campus, the EVC projects that the campus will need to permanently reduce its budget by \$13 million in 2009-10. That estimate takes into account current information regarding expected increases in revenue due to expected approval of increases in systemwide fees. It also takes into account the estimated costs of other mandatory increase such as academic merits and utilities. The \$13 million will be captured by distributing the reductions over two broad categories: administrative divisions \$8.5 million and academic divisions \$4.5 million.

The EVC said the magnitude of the reductions the campus will face will require that the campus reduce funding across all functions of the institution, including our core academic areas, information technology (IT) and student life operations. The EVC has initiated consultation with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and provided for their consideration his preliminary assignments of targeted reductions across the academic and academic support divisions. The EVC has also informed principal officers of the preliminary reduction target for their unit, and asked that they proceed now to plan for implementation of the actions that will be necessary to absorb the budgetary reductions by July 1, 2009.

The EVC's approach in assigning the divisional targets is shaped by the fact that he believes the current situation is not one from which the campus will recover quickly. The EVC also believes it is imperative that the campus keep moving forward and retain the ability to invest in essential areas of opportunity and development. To do this the campus must plan to reduce divisional budgets differentially.

In January the EVC asked principal officers to provide him with a summary of how they might implement a 10 percent reduction to their operation budget. This was done to determine how best to preserve the essential functions needed to support instruction and research. The EVC believes it was important to do this, because the campus must acknowledge that essential functions extend far beyond the immediate classroom and/or laboratory and take place within every division on campus. The assignment of reduction to the academic support units is based on review of those summaries, the proposed actions and the resulting impacts. The target reductions by division range from 2.38 percent up to almost 10 percent. For the academic divisions a similar review was done, but the EVC applied three additional factors:

1. First, it is not the EVC's intention at this time to modify the academic plan. The current crisis will require adjustment to the pace and sequencing of FTE allocations, without modifying our long term goals.
2. Second, in considering the distribution across academic divisions, these factors were foremost in the EVC's thinking regarding short term actions:
 - Reductions will be responsive to expected enrollment trends to ensure timely progress to degree.
 - We will consider how we can best leverage the national investments expected in the areas of health and energy independence.
 - We will support areas or programs that have a strong potential to make significant impacts in their field, or have a strong potential to attract private funding.
3. Third, a reduction of 10 percent of state funded budgets would inevitably result in negative impacts to undergraduate and graduate instructional programs, a substantial decline in graduate student support, and a reduction of research support. Therefore the resulting reductions to academic divisions are substantially less than 10 percent. They range from 3.8 percent to 5.3 percent.

The EVC stated that the UC system has experienced dramatic reductions of state support over the past two decades. Since 1990, when the EVC was appointed dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci), there has been a succession of budget cuts. Permanent cuts were made at the system wide and campus level in 1990-91 and every year forward through 1994-95. That happened again at the beginning of the decade, with UCSC experiencing permanent budget reductions totaling over \$25 million between 2001-02 and 2005-06. The EVC then asked the Senate to consider the following:

- The interest in UCSC from prospective students has increased significantly during the past five years, making us increasingly selective within the UC system.
- 55 percent of UCSC undergraduates report assisting faculty with research or creative activity, underscoring our commitment to undergraduate education.

- Our six year graduation rates have been steadily improving with our most recent rate reaching a campus high and a rate comparable to AAU institutions.
- When normalized for size, UCSC is second only to Berkeley among UC campuses in the ratio of alumni earning doctorates to the total number of baccalaureates awarded. When engineering doctorates are excluded, UCSC is first among the UC's.
- UCSC's core value of service is reflected in the campus's ranking as second in the country among universities of its size for the number of alumni serving in Peace Corps.
- During the past fifteen years, the campus has more than doubled the number of PhD. Programs as well as doubled the number of doctoral degrees awarded.
- UCSC's overall citation impact was higher than all but three of all AAU institutions in the most recent five year period (2003-07), when analysis narrows its focus to public institutions; UCSC's research impact is the highest.
- Research awards to UCSC, reflecting the quality of our faculty and their work, increased 44 percent in the past five years.
- UCSC faculty rank 9th among AAU institutions without medical schools in terms of federal research dollars per faculty member.
- International economics, environmental science, literature, linguistics, history of consciousness and astronomy/astrophysics are consistently ranked among top ten programs nationally.

The EVC said this is impressive progress during a time when state support per student was reduced by almost 40 percent. UCSC truly is a distinguished research university committed to high quality undergraduate and graduate education. Now UCSC is faced with further permanent budget reductions of approximately \$18 million over a two year period, \$4.5 in reductions this fiscal year and the additional \$13 million anticipated next year. The EVC is confident the campus will continue to progress, but it will require even more creativity and flexibility.

The EVC concluded his remarks with a recent comment from one of the divisional deans: "Our challenge then, is to imagine and plan for a strong, stable institution with a smaller state budget, and then to make the decisions necessary to move us towards that goal. We must think hard about what aspects of our programs are truly distinctive and are critical for us to preserve, and what we are willing to give up in order to protect the things we value. We must always focus on achieving excellence in those things that we choose to do and we must be prepared to compete successfully for those non state resources we need to build and sustain this excellence."

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

4. Special Order Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy and Academic Assessment Grievance Committee

i. Amendment to Appendix C: Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure (AS/SCP/1596)

Academic Assessment Grievance Committee (AAGC) Chair Campbell Leaper presented the proposed change. Currently, students have one year to file an academic grievance for a grade or a narrative evaluation and AAGC believes that is an unnecessarily long time period. If it is a class that is important for a student's major or graduation, it is in their best interest to resolve it sooner rather than later. Also, it is helpful for the faculty to not have to try and recall one year later what happened. AAGC proposes shortening the window to six months; nine months for a spring course to allow for summer session. AAGC believes that is enough time for students to go through the process, which includes approaching the faculty member, then the department chair or provost, and then filing a grievance with the committee. In addition, the committee always has the ability to extend the deadline if mitigating circumstances are present.

The proposed amendment to Appendix C; Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure (AS/SCP/1596) passed by voice vote.

Appendix C

I. Unchanged.

A. Unchanged.

B. Unchanged

II. Unchanged

III. Unchanged.

A. Unchanged.

B. Unchanged.

C. If the grievance is not resolved by steps A and B, the student may appeal to the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee. A formal appeal must be filed within six months for summer, fall, and winter quarter courses or nine months for spring quarter courses of the date on which the disputed grade or evaluation was made part of the student's permanent record by the Registrar.

D. Unchanged.

E. Unchanged.

b. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Regulation 10.2 on Campus Breadth and General Education Requirements (AS/SCP/1597)

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett presented the amendment and the committee's justification. CEP's goals are:

- To provide students with a base of knowledge. The crucial part is providing students with something to build on.

- To expose students to a broad range of disciplines and methodologies in order to prepare them for a world with complex problems and where things change quickly.
- To help students approach problems in analytical ways and impart tools for thinking about problems.
- To prepare students to function as responsible participants in life considering the many pressing societal issues they will face, and be able to do that from a variety of perspectives.

CEP had a set of design principles that they tried to keep in mind as they developed the proposal and thinks it should be easy to understand because there is not a widespread sentiment among students that the current system is completely transparent, easy to explain, navigate or remember. CEP has also tried to make the proposed requirements less burdensome than the current requirements. CEP believes doing this gives students the freedom to do things that they want to do outside of general education. CEP wants the GE requirements to reflect campus principles and identity and has always considered it important that the GE reform reflects feedback from faculty, students and other campus constituencies.

CEP Chair Padgett then went over the proposed amended requirement in detail.

Following CEP Chair Padgett's presentation Chair Williams opened the floor to comments.

In favor of the resolution: Matthew Palm, SUA, Barbara Rogoff, John Tamkun, Jennifer De La Torres, Ravi Rajan

Question or points about the resolutions include:

- The resolution is endorsed by the SUA and nine out of ten college student senates.
- Is it the case that Disciplinary Communication could overlap with one of the other designations? Perhaps courses could have multiple designations, but the students could only choose one of them per course. It might help the students to have more choice if they could decide which one counts for what instead of having a single course have only one designation.
- Was it the intent of the committee to specifically include courses in the social sciences that also would cover observation, hypothesis, experimentation and measurement?

Professor John Tamkun proposed a friendly amendment to delete the word natural from section 10.2.3.1 of the proposed legislation.

The friendly amendment was accepted.

Following the friendly amendment discussion was continued.

In opposition of the resolution: Paul Koch, Barry Bowman, Carolyn Martin Shaw, Susan Gillman and Jim Gill

Points raised against the legislation include:

- The proposed legislation has only been in front of Senate members for two weeks and two days; there is concern about capacity and an environmental assessment of what this does. Do we have the capacity to offer the courses as CEP is proposing?
- Concerned that a group of academics will find multiple interpretations for any category, and as today’s discussion on race and ethnicity vs. diversity illustrates. One possibility for the next round is to ask divisions to supply a list of 20 courses that they think would fit a GE requirement. This would allow us to see whether faculty are interpreting these categories in similar ways. Going through this exercise would clarify what these categories are.
- CEP might want to assess student learning outcomes. Is a passing grade sufficient to show that they meet the GE requirement, or will students need to compile a portfolio on the GE component of the class, or will they be asked to demonstrate competency in some other way. To satisfy institutional needs for assessment data, some people will modify their courses and their teaching to accommodate assessment methods and techniques. When we slice and dice our courses in this way, we leave ourselves open to piecemeal interference and to accountability for parts of what should be an integrative experience.
- If we had a little more information we’d have fewer questions, and it might make the proposal better.
- The effort to coax out examples would do us all good in predicting what the outcome will be, absent which, this becomes a faith based proposal where we’re being asked to make an up and down decision without the kind of information that we normally have.

Professor Kevin Karplus, Biomolecular Engineering, stated that while he likes the proposal he does not like the description of scientific inquiry, but the basic notion of scientific inquiry as described currently in the legislation is fine. Professor Karplus also feels the race and ethnicity requirement is too narrow.

Professor Kevin Karplus then proposed an amendment to CEP’s proposed amendment changing words “ethnicity and race” to “diversity” to Section 10.2.3.1 D. The proposed amendment to the amendment was seconded.

Professor Richard Hughey, then proposed a friendly amendment to Professor Karplus’ amendment replacing the word “diversity” with “ethnicity, race and discrimination”. The proposed friendly amendment was accepted.

A number of faculty, administrators and students spoke out on Professor Karplus’ proposed amendment to the original amendment:

In Favor of	Opposed to	Commented on
-------------	------------	--------------

Ethan Miller	Donald Potts	Loisa Nygaard
	Matthew Palms	Richard Hughey
	Jose Ruiz	Maureen Callanan
	Kalwis Lo	
	Victor Sanchez	

Points in favor include:

- Issues of gender, gender orientation, issues of relations are huge issues as well and to simply leave them out because they are not ethnicity and race is a big problem.
- You want to open diversity to a wider range of diversity, not just those areas.

Points opposed include:

- Oppose changing the term to “diversity” because it is meaningless and means so many things that we lose the distinction between the cross-cultural analysis and ethnicity and race.
- I am very disturbed to hear ethnicity and race reduced to discrimination, inequities and oppression. There is another side to ethnicity and race where the society is one of enrichment and opportunity.
- I’d be very concerned that a student would go through their entire UC education and not study race, and then go work and live in California, which is one of the most diverse states in the country.
- We don’t have diversity on our campus. We are not accepting of students of color; it stays the same every year. We should increase the number of student and faculty of color. If courses of race and ethnicity are requirements, we should have diverse professors who teach those courses. If someone is teaching about Mexican history but they haven’t lived it, it’s hard to learn from that professor who is just reading from a text.
- Changing the word “diversity” would completely change the “E” requirement. Since it’s an important issue, maybe CEP can look into it and create a diversity requirement in the future. We are endlessly reinscribing patterns of victimization and oppression, and we need to offer positive models.
- The term “diversity” has been really watered down from what its original meaning is and where it came from.

Professor Nygaard made a friendly amendment to Professor Karplus’ amendment changing the word “discrimination” to “diversity”.

The friendly amendment to Professor Karplus’ amendment passed by voice vote.

Senate Chair Williams then called to a vote Professor Karplus’ motion to add to Section D the words “or diversity” in the first lines and the words “and/or diversity” in the fourth line.

The motion failed by a show of hands.

The Senate then returned to discussion of the original motion.

VPDUE Ladusaw commented that the next step will be some process for CEP to go back into dialog with all the departments, look at the current courses and take those comments as a rubric to begin talking about how the existing curriculum maps into this new GE model. VPDUE Ladusaw has devoted some thought to that, and despite CEP Chair Padgett's comment that we all have to start at the beginning; there are some quick and clean ways of understanding how the categories do relate.

There are some categories that will require discussion. Currently, many of his colleagues desperately want an estimate of how many seats we need in GE, and it is a complicated task that would be much simplified by the kind of thing we are doing here. VPDUE Ladusaw does not feel there is any forced capacity shift until we start looking at the particular rubrics and classes. These are doable tasks and much more doable under the proposed system than the current system.

Professor Ravi Rajan, Environmental Studies and Provost of College Eight commented that there are two recurrent issues with the current system; one concerns the lack of clarity about what GE's are. They are seen as unclear, onerous, purposeless and problematic. Students have mentioned the need for courses like the ones CEP has proposed. The second issue cannot be addressed by a GE course; that is ethnicity and race. Most minority students don't feel supported on this campus, both in terms of courses available to them, but particularly because of lack of mentorship. GE reform does not address that concern of mentorship; it is something we need to take seriously at a later time.

Professor Rajan continued that while we do not have a quantitative account of how many types and how many courses will actually be offered, it is reasonable to expect that given the range of departments and disciplines that this won't be a big stretch. Although there is concern about providing statistical reasoning; other than that, these things can be put together.

The proposition that we consult with other departments will be resolved in two or three months; we have to look at and evaluate the proposal and look for synergies. A better method to normatively vote on the proposal and if there is a spectacular crisis, we can meet a Senate and push the dates back. It is important to our students and constituencies in terms of communication to make the clarity of vision apparent that we are embracing some of the more interesting trends in GE reform that many other intuitions have already embraced.

Professor David Draper, Applied Math and Statistics (AMS) made the following comments. I have no concerns whatsoever about capacity in Statistical Reasoning. In 2001 there was a comprehensive review of all the teaching of statistics campuswide as part of the curriculum process. The department has been completely up to date on where statistics is taught. In additions to AMS, Statistical Reasoning is taught in Mathematics, Psychology, Economics, Sociology, Electrical Engineering, and Biomolecular

Engineering. We could start this requirement today. AMS will do its part to help, but we will only be a small part of the overall effort to help the students be instructed in this area. I strongly support a positive vote for this motion today; this is the culmination of two years of thoughtful deliberation and we risk doing nothing in an effort to do this perfectly.

Professor Barbara Rogoff, Psychology, then called the question.

The proposed amendments to Santa Cruz Regulation 10.2 on General Education Requirements passed by voice vote.

10.2.2 General Education Requirements for Students Entering before Fall Quarter 2010.

10.2.2.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Science, or Music either: (1) between fall quarter 1986 and spring quarter 2010, or (2) between fall quarter 1984 and spring quarter 1986 with fewer than 45 quarter units of transfer credit, are required to fulfill the following campus general education requirements. The courses used to satisfy these requirements must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.2.6). Only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

a. – i. Unchanged.

10.2.2.2 Unchanged

10.2.2.3 Unchanged.

10.2.2.4 Unchanged.

10.2.2.5 Unchanged.

10.2.3 General Education Requirements for Students Entering Fall Quarter 2010 or Later.

10.2.3.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, in fall quarter 2010 or later, as candidates for a Bachelor's degree, are required to fulfill the campus general education requirements given below. Courses used to satisfy these requirements are subject to the following restrictions: i) they must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.3.4); ii) each course may apply toward only one of the requirements, unless a specific exception is granted by the Committee on Educational Policy; iii) only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

a. Unchanged. [NOTE: 10.2.3.1a. Composition courses remains unchanged from 10.2.2.1.d.]

b. Unchanged. [NOTE: 10.2.3.1.b. Disciplinary communication remains unchanged from 10.2.2.1.f]

c. Cross-cultural analysis. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that emphasizes understanding of one or more cultures and societies outside the United States.

d. Ethnicity and race. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on issues of ethnicity and/or race.

e. Interpreting arts and media. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that

focuses on the practice, analysis, interpretation, and/or history of one or more artistic or mass media (media in which non-textual materials play primary roles).

f. Mathematical and formal reasoning. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that emphasizes university-level mathematics, computer programming, formal logic, or other material that stresses formal reasoning, formal model building, or application of formal systems.

g. Scientific inquiry. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on the essential roles of observation, hypothesis, experimentation and measurement in the sciences.

h. Statistical reasoning. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on developing skills in approaching quantitative data and statistical reasoning.

i. Textual analysis and interpretation. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that has as its primary methodology the interpretation or analysis of texts.

j. One additional five-credit course or equivalent is required in one of the following areas.

i) Environmental Awareness. Focuses on humankind's interactions with nature.

ii) Human behavior. Focuses on aspects of individual human behavior or the operation of human groups.

iii) Technology and society. Emphasizes issues raised by the prevalence of technology in society.

k. One additional course or equivalent, awarding a minimum of 2 credits, is required in one of the following areas.

i) Collaborative endeavor. Provides significant experience with collaboration on a project.

ii) Creative process. Teaches creative process and techniques in the arts (including creative writing), at an individual or a collaborative level.

iii) Service learning. Provides the opportunity for supervised campus or community service that contributes to a student's overall education.

10.2.3.2 Unchanged [NOTE: 10.2.3.2. on transfer credit remains unchanged from 10.2.2.2.]

10.2.3.3 Unchanged [NOTE: 10.2.3.3 on petitions for exceptions remains unchanged from 10.2.2.4 Composition]

10.2.3.4 Unchanged [NOTE: 10.2.3.4 on course approvals remains unchanged from 10.2.2.5]

Following the passage of CEP's amendment to the GE requirements, CEP Chair Padgett thanked the following:

- CEP members
 - Linda Burman-Hall
 - David Helbold
 - Loisa Nygaard
 - Donald Potts
 - Eileen Zurbriggen
 - Pam Hunt-Carter
 - Jon Ellis.

- Student reps
 - Matt Palm
 - Shawn Riley
 - Ravi Rajan
 - Elaine Kihara
 - Holly Cordova
 - Margie Claxton
 - Michael McCawley
 - Barbara Love
 - VPDUE Bill Ladusaw
 - Roxanne Monnet
 - Former CEP members
 - Heather Bullock
 - Russ Flegal
 - Anatole Leikin
 - Kip Tellez
 - Jack Vevea
 - Joel Ferguson
 - Sarah-Hope Parmeter
 - Stacey Sketo-Rosener
 - Students
 - Larissa Adams
 - Jamal Atiba
 - Flori Lima
 - George Zhang
 - Elizabeth Abrams
 - Carol Freeman
 - CPB and CPB Chair Gillman
 - Members of SEC
 - Senate Chair Quentin Williams
 - Members of the Administration
- c. Committee on Faculty Welfare**
- i. Report on Housing, March 2009 (AS/SCP/1598)**
The Senate accepted the report without comment.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

SUA Commission of Academic Affairs (CAA) Matthew Palm provided the report. CAA Palm began with the College Affordability Act which is currently moving through the state assembly. UCSC is in a competition with other UC's to get the highest number of signatures on petitions in support of the College Affordability Act. UCSC is currently in first place. The College Affordability Act proposes freezing student fees for five years and after the fifth year only allows fees to rise with the consumer index. It would place a one percent tax on those making a taxable income of over one million dollars per year. About \$160 million will go to the UC system and 40 percent will go to K-14 education.

The College Affordability Act will significantly increase accessibility and affordability to the UC system. According to CAA Palm the master plan for higher education states that college tuition should be free, and it is not. CAA Palm compared the cost of other universities to UCSC and found all are more affordable than UCSC. CAA Palm explained that this is not because of tuition but because of room and board. Cost of living is a problem in Santa Cruz.

SUA is also interested in Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7 which would amend provisions of proposition 209 and allow higher education institutions to outreach to underrepresented groups. CAA Palm quoted the UC Undergraduate Work Team Study Group on University Diversity Report, “Schools with higher percentages of underrepresented students offer less access to approved coursework than schools with lower percentages of these students.” CAA Palm said in communities where there are larger numbers of underrepresented students, the kinds of courses needed to get to UC are not offered as much. The UC needs money and resources to specifically go into communities and help students get those courses so they can attend UCSC. A recent California Post Secondary Education Commission study showed significant progress in college eligibility for underrepresented students coming out of high school, but this progress was not reflected in the numbers of these groups being admitted to the UC system. Students in underrepresented communities are more and more making the grades and test scores necessary to get into UC, but still are not applying. He added that Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7 will not bring racial quotas to UC, but will allow resources to be spent to outreach to underrepresented communities. The SUA supports the amendment and hope Senate members contact State Assembly member Bill Monning and State Senate member Joe Simitian to encourage their support.

Next CAA Palm provided an update on Engaging Education (E2). E2 is a student initiated outreach and retention center at UCSC. Over 50 percent of the student who come up through E2’s programs end up attending UCSC. In addition, E2’s retention program is completely student led and student run, it is a leadership space where its goals and principles help to retain students and develop their skills and leadership abilities. CAA Palm stated that UCSC is below the UC average in retention, so losing E2 will only aggravate that disparity. There is concern about the future of E2 and its funding.

CAA Palm discussed the recent Earth Summit and the Committee on Sustainability and Stewardship efforts to create a sustainability curriculum working group. The working group would like to bring more sustainability focused courses to UCSC. An example is Electrical Engineering and its Sustainability Engineering and Practice. SUA would like to see more interdisciplinary sustainability courses.

SUA is gathering information from students on issues in the classroom environment. SUA has the support of the Student Regent and the Student Regent Designate. SUA is hoping to host a forum for graduate students to gather input on this issue from the graduate side. This will be on April 10, and SUA is asking students what they feel they need more training and support in, and how SUA can work together to address these

issues. According to CAA Palm, if graduate students are overworked, under slept and not getting proper training it affects the quality of education for undergraduates.

Finally, CAA Palm said he has heard from some faculty members, staffers and a few student leaders that if things keep going as they are, a UC undergraduate education will not be worth the cost.

Professor Ethan Miller, Computer Science, commented that addressing the problem of cost by advocating for less money to go to the UC doesn't seem to help. At comparable institutions they have more money to do the job of teaching. Professor Miller encouraged people to think about that before signing SUA's petition.

Victor Sanchez, External Chair SUA, stated that although the mission is to teach, the number one mission is to provide the State of California and its residents with a quality education. In part, that is due to the accessibility problem. Student fees have risen over 100 percent since 2001 and many students are being pushed down. Rents are a big problem, but this is a state wide issue and SUA is trying to address the accessibility and affordability of UC schools. This legislation will not only benefit the UC, but the CSU and the California community colleges on top of K-12 education, receive revenues from this legislation.

CAA Palm added that one problem with fighting rent issues is during the summer the city council takes action on things like party ordinances. When students come back in the fall they find out what has been done, and spend the rest of the year organizing against it. The goal is to have the state pay for the university through taxing income above one million dollars by one percent. It is not that it will starve the UC, but SUA would like to shift who and how it is being paid for in a way that SUA finds to be more beneficial to society as a whole.

Robert Singleton, College Eight representative, commented that even though rents seem to be at the heart of the problem of accessibility, this does go in the right direction to make college more affordable. Mr. Singleton is currently a freshman and it costs him about \$25,000 to attend UCSC this year. He is dependent on a single parent who makes about \$60,000 a year. Mr. Singleton said this may not be a direct solution to the problem but it does help and does not cost the university. The money comes from taxation of the more affluent residents of California. Students and faculty alike are becoming increasingly aware that the cost of the UC may not be worth the education. Mr. Singleton lives next to Santa Rosa Junior College, but felt that a four year degree from UC is more valuable and a better experience as a whole to help him further develop the way he interacts with the world around him, not only academically but also socially.

Michelle Romero, College Ten representatives and student representative for the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, said the burden is on students in the form of increased student fees. Ms. Romero knows several students who are affected by this and are struggling. Middle income students are affected too. They don't receive financial aid and they depend solely on student loans. Ms. Romero asked if students can't

get funding from the state, per the master plan, then how can students fulfill their commitment to be at UCSC four years and graduate.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Graduate Student Association (GSA) President Travis Orloff provided an update on recent GSA activities. The GSA is now up to 23 out of a potential 28 department representatives. The GSA has almost doubled its department representation this quarter. Their next focus is to maintain those representatives. The GSA would like to keep graduate students involved by giving them responsibilities.

The GSA is also focusing on getting graduate students involved when they first come to campus. They are looking at revamping and reorganizing how the GSA does their orientation. The GSA is working with the administration and Graduate Council to coordinate efforts.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:00 pm.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

May 12, 2009

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE
Annual Report, 2008-09

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

I. Faculty Research Lecturer Nomination

The Senate Committee on the Faculty Research Lecturer (CFRL) enthusiastically nominates Daniel Friedman, Professor of Economics, to deliver the 2009-2010 lecture. Professor Friedman is one of the world's leading experts in experimental and behavioral economics. His experimental work has revealed important aspects of how humans actually behave in a market context as compared to what is predicted by classical game theory which assumes completely rational players. Some of Professor Friedman recent work gives insight into the phenomena of market bubbles and crashes, a very timely topic in light of the recent events in global financial markets.

Professor Friedman earned his PhD in Mathematics here at UCSC under the direction of Fields Medalist Professor Stephen Smale. He began his faculty career as Assistant Professor of Economics at UCLA, before joining the faculty of the UCSC Economics Department in 1985.

Professor Friedman is a prolific and highly influential researcher. He has authored or coauthored over 50 journal papers, with numerous articles in top journals such as *Econometrica*, *American Economic Review*, and *Games and Economic Behavior*. In 1996 he won the Royal Economic Society Prize for the best paper published in *The Economic Journal*. Professor Friedman has served on the editorial board of four prestigious economics journals including the *American Economic Review*, the premiere publication of it's discipline. Professor Friedman is especially noted for integrating ideas from other disciplines. As one very prominent reviewer of his work recently noted, "He reads widely outside traditional economics and theory and has enormous intellectual curiosity that causes him to work in new areas that are not driven by the traditional economics literature."

Professor Friedman's recent work touches on a number of important economic phenomena. For instance, Professor Friedman and coauthor Ralph Abraham study the phenomenon of market bubbles and crashes in the article, "Bubbles and crashes: Gradient dynamics in financial markets," which appears in *The Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*. In the article, the authors study the dynamic of asset prices rising as fund managers have seen that losses have been small for a long time and increase their leverage. Then a slight loss can trigger a crash as managers are forced to de-leverage.

Another of Professor Friedman's recent articles titled "Revealed Altruism", co-authored with James Cox and Vjollca Sadira, provides a foundation for revealed preference analysis for preferences that depend not only on the individual's own monetary payoffs but also on the payoffs of others. This article appeared in *Econometrica*, one of the top

economics journals. A related paper, “A tractable model of reciprocity and fairness,” appeared in *Games and Economic Behavior*. Both develop a parametric model of preferences that allows the effects of status and reciprocity to affect choices and use experimentally generated data sets to obtain structural estimates of the underlying model of preferences.

In a separate line of research, Professor Friedman, along with a colleague and former graduate students, investigates the market phenomena on eBay. In papers published in the *Journal of Electronic Commerce* and the *International Journal of Electronic Business*, Professor Friedman and his coauthors reveal a relationship between the size of the seller and whether the seller selects the use the “buy it now” option. They also show that larger sellers use more uniform strategies than smaller sellers.

In yet another line of recent work, Professor Friedman and colleague Professor Donald Wittman use game-theoretic analysis to study the process that determines which lawsuits are settled prior to going to trial. An article resulting from this study appears in the *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*.

Professor Friedman has authored or edited four books. His most recent book, *Morals and Markets* is written to appeal both to a popular and academic audience. *Morals and Markets* studies the co-evolution of moral codes and markets and argues that both of these are necessary for societies to function efficiently at larger scales. Yet, the book argues, the combination is fragile and can lead to spectacular break downs. To illustrate this, the book compellingly draws on a diverse range of examples throughout history. For example Friedman argues that the chaotic transition Russia underwent in the 1990s was largely due to a lack of a moral infrastructure. Conversely, Friedman argues that “too much morality” led to Japan’s economic stagnation in the 90s, as the country for too long propped up failed banks and “zombie companies.”

Professor Friedman has also authored or edited three other books. He co-wrote the book *Economics lab: an intensive course in experimental economics* with his former student Alessandra Cassar, and with contributions from other economists including Nobel Prize winner Reinhard Selten. The book explores both the history of experimental economics, as well as gives instruction on how to conduct experimental economics research. An earlier book by Friedman, *Experimental Methods: A Primer for Economists (Paperback)*, coauthored with Shyam Sunder in 1994, introduces the principles of experimental methods in economics, including the fundamentals of designing simple experiments that shed insights on key effects. Professor Friedman also co-edited with John Rust *The Double Auction Market: Institutions, Theory, and Evidence* which contains a collection of articles on both theory and experimental findings in double auction markets.

Professor Friedman’s research excellence has been recognized by the agencies that support his research. He has been a Principle Investigator or Co-Principle Investigator on eleven National Science Foundation grants, as well as numerous other grants.

He is also recognized as an outstanding teacher. In 1990-91 academic year he won the Favorite Professor Award from the Student Alumni Council. Professor Friedman has

supervised numerous PhD theses, and several of his students have gone on to faculty positions.

Professor Friedman is also a talented speaker. In the last three years he has given over 20 talks about his research at various universities. The CFRL is pleased to nominate this valuable researcher, teacher, and writer to present this important lecture.

II. Recommendations for Regents' Lecturers

Part of CFRL's charge is to review the applications for the Regents' Professors and Lecturers Program and make recommendations to Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education Bill Ladusaw. As a result, three nominations were recommended for appointment; two have thus far been accepted.

1) Nominated by Environmental Studies, Alejandro Polanco-Jaime is a consultant, author and professor of agroecology and food system sustainability in Mexico. As Regents' Lecturer, Dr. Polanco-Jaime will make a campus-wide presentation on agroecology and food policy in Mexico and presentations in courses and seminars on rural development, sustainability, and the future of food system interactions between California and Mexico. It is also expected that Dr. Polanco-Jaime will have many informal conversations with faculty and/or students in LALS, Sociology, CLRC, Community Studies, the Program in Community and Agroecology (PICA), the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems (CASFS), and others who are interested in partnering with and learning more about agroecology efforts in Mexico. Dr. Polanco-Jaime is expected on campus in spring quarter, 2009 and is awarded \$11,450 for a stipend and travel expenses.

2) Nominated by the Music Department, Jeong-Seung Kim is a virtuoso in *Daegeum* (Korean Bamboo flute). He is also Korean National Intangible Treasure Asset No. 83. He was the youngest member of *Jeong-Nong Akhoe*, the best traditional music ensemble in Korea, and a founding and active member in the *Contemporary Music Ensemble Korea*. As Regents' Lecturer, Jeong-Seung Kim visited UCSC in February 2009 for two weeks, giving workshops, lectures, and performances and working with faculty and graduate students to prepare for the UCSC Music Department's 2010 *Pacific Rim Music Festival*, a collaborative effort involving universities in Boston, Seoul, and Shanghai. Kim is awarded \$12,000 for a stipend and travel expenses.

3) Nominated by Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Randall Morgan, biologist and ecologist, is a noted local naturalist, scholar, collector, consultant, and author. He specializes in the Monterey Bay and San Francisco Bay regions, though known also for his work in California generally. Morgan was recently recognized by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County for his diligent efforts to study and protect the local area. The trust named the recently purchased sand hills habitat (formerly Geyer quarry) the Randy Morgan Preserve. If accepted, during a six-week tenure as Regents' Lecture, Dr. Morgan will give a public lecture on biodiversity in the Santa Cruz region, assist with the determinations of the flora within the UCSC Forest Ecology Plot, help grad students

involved in plant surveys in the Central Coast area, contribute to the Plant Systematics course during Spring quarter, and meet with faculty and students from the Environmental Studies and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology departments.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE
Daniel Costa
Kimberly Jannarone
John Musacchio
Barbara Rogoff
Donna Haraway, Chair

May 5, 2009

**COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
Amendment to Chapter 13.12.1 – Change to Membership**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

As the Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Director position has been eliminated on this campus, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) proposes removing the position from the committee’s non-Senate “sit with” membership. While CAAD understands that a new administrative position, the Chief Diversity Officer has been created, the committee does not feel this new administrative structure is the optimal interface for CAAD and the administration on issues of diversity, and affirmative action. CAAD will explore the best interface with administration on issues of diversity and affirmative action once the Chief Diversity Officer position has been filled.

Current wording

Proposed wording

<p>13.12.1 There are six Santa Cruz Division members. In addition, there are one graduate student representative and no more than three undergraduate student representatives. The Director of Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action is invited to sit with the Committee.</p>	<p>13.12.1 There are six Santa Cruz Division members. In addition, there are one graduate student representative and no more than three undergraduate student representatives. The Director of Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action is invited to sit with the Committee.</p>
---	--

Respectfully submitted;
 COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
 Rebecca Bernstein
 Sri Kurniawan
 Marcia Ochoa
 Reyna Ramirez
 Karen Yamashita
 Bettina Aptheker, Chair

May 6, 2009

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Amendment to Chapter 13**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

At its meeting in February 2009, the Senate voted to return to committee a proposed change to Chapter 13. The current version corrects for the criticisms expressed at that meeting while retaining the original intent to enable voting members to conduct an executive session. As per the Committee on Rules Jurisdiction and Election interpretation accepted by the Senate at its February 2009 meeting, representatives are non-voting members.

Representatives and other persons from many campus constituencies are on Senate committees and their skills and knowledge are an asset to committee deliberations. The Committee on Committees (COC) has noted that an unintended consequence of the Senate’s adoption of the “Sturgis Code of Parliamentary Procedure” in 2005 was the elimination of a readily available “executive session” mechanism for Senate committees. This amendment defines an executive session for committees which gives Senators, when necessary, the ability to deliberate and conduct business among voting members and seeks to clarify a committee’s ability to adopt, through a majority vote, an executive session if appropriate to issues that may arise.

The Senate Chair will not participate in a committee’s executive session (see Senate Bylaw 4.1 for rights of the Senate Chair to attend committee meetings).

Current wording

Proposed wording

<p>13.4.1 Membership. All voting members of all committees must be members of the Santa Cruz Division. Representatives who sit with Standing Committees as provided in these Bylaws are non-voting representatives and shall be appointed by such bodies as may be recognized by the Divisional Committee on Committees. Representatives include undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and non-senate teaching faculty. Persons who are not members of the Academic Senate may be invited to sit with Standing Committees as non-voting representatives as provided elsewhere in this Chapter.</p>	<p>13.4.1 Membership. All voting members of all committees must be members of the Santa Cruz Division. <u>Representatives are non-voting members of the committee. Other persons invited to sit with Standing Committees are not members of the committee.</u> Representatives who sit with Standing Committees as provided in these Bylaws are non-voting representatives and shall be appointed by such bodies as may be recognized by the Divisional Committee on Committees. Representatives include undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and non-senate teaching faculty. Persons who are not members of the Academic Senate may be invited to sit with Standing Committees as non-voting representatives as provided elsewhere in this Chapter.</p> <p><i>(after renumbering, insert the following)</i></p>
---	---

	<p>13.4.2 <u>Representatives.</u> Representatives who sit with on Standing Committees as provided in these Bylaws are non-voting representatives and shall be appointed by such bodies as may be recognized by the Divisional Committee on Committees. Representatives include undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and non-senate teaching faculty. Persons who are not members of the Academic Senate <u>Representatives have the right to participate in committee deliberations except as provided in Bylaw 13.4.4</u></p> <p>13.4.3 Invitees: As provided elsewhere in this Chapter, other persons may be invited to sit with Standing Committees. as non-voting representatives</p> <p><u>13.4.4 Executive Session: The voting members of committees in this chapter may call for an executive session by a majority vote, which is a session of the committee open only to voting members of the committee, the proceedings of which are confidential.</u></p>
--	---

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Junko Ito
Joseph Konopelski
Marc Mangel
Shelley Stamp
Carolyn Martin Shaw, Chair

May 6, 2009

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Nominations 2009-10

To: The Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

OFFICERS

Lori	Kletzer	Chair	Economics
Marc	Mangel	Vice-Chair	Applied Math and Statistics
Judith	Habicht Mauche	Secretary	Anthropology
Mark	Carr	Assembly Rep	EE Biology
Michael	Dine	Parliamentarian	Physics

ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATIVES

Marc	Mangel	Vice Chair	Applied Math and Statistics
Mark	Carr	Assembly Rep	EE Biology

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (for information only)

Lori	Kletzer	Chair	Economics
Marc	Mangel	Vice-Chair	Applied Math and Statistics
Judith	Habicht Mauche	Secretary	Anthropology
Mark	Carr	Assembly Rep	EE Biology
Maureen	Callanan	(CAP)	Psychology
Bettina	Aptheker	(CAAD) (<i>F</i>)	Feminist Studies
Carla	Freccero	(CAAD) (<i>W&S</i>)	Literature
Phokion	Kolaitis	(COR)	Computer Science
TBA		(COC)	
Brent	Haddad	(CPB)	Environmental Studies
Elizabeth	Abrams	(CFW)	Writing
Bruce	Cooperstein	(CAFA)	Mathematics
David	Brundage	(P&T)	Community Studies
Sue	Carter	(GC)	Physics
John	Tamkun	(CEP)	MCD Biology

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT GRIEVANCE HEARING CTE

Campbell	Leaper	Chair	Psychology
Adrian	Brasoveanu		Linguistics
Martha	Zuniga		MCD Biology

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mary Beth	Pudup	Chair & UCAF	Community Studies
David	Draper		Applied Math and Statistics
Lisbeth	Haas		History
Peter	Limbrick		Film and Digital Media
Raja	Guhathakurta		Astronomy & Astrophysics

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Maureen	Callanan	Chair & UCAP	Psychology
Yin-Wong	Cheung		Economics
TBA			
Donka	Farkas		Linguistics
Kristen	Gruesz		Literature
Glenn	Millhauser		Chemistry and Biochemistry
Bruce	Schumm		Physics
Dana	Takagi		Sociology
Manfred	Warmuth		Computer Science

ADMISSIONS & FINANCIAL AID

Bruce	Cooperstein	Chair	Mathematics
Juan	Poblete	BOARS Rep	Literature
Raoul	Birnbaum		History of Art and Visual Culture
Faye	Crosby		Psychology
Chris	Edwards		Ocean Sciences
Andy	Fisher		Earth and Planetary Sciences
Bakthan	Singaram		Chemistry
Donald	Wittman		Economics

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION & DIVERSITY

Bettina	Aptheker	Chair & UCAAD (<i>F</i>)	Feminist Studies
Carla	Freccero	Chair & UCAAD (<i>W&S</i>)	Literature
Vilashini	Coopan		Literature
Sri	Kurniawan		Computer Engineering
Marcia	Ochoa	(<i>F&W</i>)	Community Studies
Raquel	Prado	(<i>S</i>)	Applied Math and Statistics
Pradip	Mascharak		Chemistry
Renya	Ramirez		American Studies

CAREER ADVISING

Will remain unfilled for 2009-10

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - FOR INFORMATION ONLY (BY ELECTION)*Chair & UCOC (TBA)*

Ted	Holman		Chemistry and Biochemistry
Norman	Locks		Art
Loisa	Nygaard		Literature
David	Helmbold		Computer Science
Diane	Gifford-Gonzalez		Anthropology

COMPUTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Joel	Primack	Chair & UCCC	Physics
Matt	O'Hara		History
Charlie	McDowell		Computer Science
Jason	Prochaska		Astronomy and Astrophysics
Travis	Seymour		Psychology
Anujan	Varma		Computer Engineering
Ted	Warburton		Theater Arts

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

John	Tamkun	Chair & UCEP	MCD Biology
Cormac	Flanagan		Computer Science
Jimin	Lee		Art
Eric	Porter		American Studies
Peter	Young		Physics
Eileen	Zurbriggen		Psychology

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT GRIEVANCE HEARING CTE

Campbell	Leaper	Chair	Psychology
Adrian	Brasoveanu		Linguistics
Martha	Zuniga		MCD Biology

EMERITI RELATIONS

Isebill	Gruhn	Chair	Politics
Gary	Glatzmaier		Earth and Planetary Sciences
Helene	Moglen		Literature

FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE

Barbara	Rogoff	Chair	Psychology
Wlad	Godzich		Literature
Kimberly	Jannarone		Theater Arts
John	Musacchio		Information Systems Management
Mary	Silver		Ocean Sciences

FACULTY WELFARE

Elizabeth	Abrams	Chair	Writing
Irene	Gustafson		Film and Digital Media
Suresh	Lodha	UCFW rep	Computer Science
Peter	Raimondi		Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Abel	Rodriguez		Applied Math and Statistics
Trish	Stoddart		Education
Hiroataka	Tamanoi		Mathematics
Marilyn	Westerkamp	(F&W)	History
Maria Elena	Diaz	(S)	History

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Sue	Carter	Chair & CCGA	Physics
Margarita	Azmitia		Psychology
Scott	Brandt		Computer Science
Weixin	Cheng		Environmental Studies
Patricia	Gallagher	(F&S)	Theater Arts
Jorge	Hankamer		Linguistics
Robert	Johnson		Physics
Athanasios	Kottas		Applied Math and Statistics
Catherine	Ramirez		American Studies
Ted	Warburton		Theater Arts

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Debra	Lewis	Chair & UCIE	Mathematics
Giacomo	Bernardi		Biology
Karen	Holl		Environmental Studies
Armin	Mester		Linguistics

LIBRARY

Elise	Knittle	Chair & UCOLASC	Earth and Planetary Sciences
Pranav	Anand		Linguistics
Kent	Eaton		Politics
Boreth	Ly		History of Art and Visual Culture
Roberto	Manduchi		Computer Engineering

PLANNING & BUDGET

Brent	Haddad	Chair & UCPB	Environmental Studies
JJ	Garcia-Luna		Computer Engineering
Gildas	Hamel		History
Lori	Kletzer	<i>ex-officio</i>	Economics
Marc	Mangel	<i>ex-officio</i>	Applied Math and Statistics
Warren	Sack		Film and Digital Media
Gene	Switkes		Chemistry and Biochemistry
Piero	Madau		Astronomy and Astrophysics
Cindy	Pease-Alvarez		Education
Rob	Wilson		Literature

PREPARATORY EDUCATION

Mary-Kay	Gamel	Chair & UCOPE	Literature
David	Smith		Physics
Raquel	Prado	(F)	Applied Math and Statistics
Anna	Tsing	(W&S)	Anthropology

PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

David	Brundage	Chair & UCPT	Community Studies
David	Belanger		Physics
E.G.	Crichton	(F&W)	Art
Kathy	Foley	(S)	Theater Arts
David	Feldheim		MCD Biology
Michael	Loik		Environmental Studies
John	Vesecky	(F&W)	Electrical Engineering
TBA		(S)	
Karen	Yamashita		Literature

RESEARCH

Phokion	Kolaitis	Chair & UCORP	Computer Science
Jody	Greene	(W&S)	Literature
Qi	Gong	(F)	Applied Math and Statistics
Sharon	Kinoshita		Literature
Scott	Oliver		Chemistry
Holger	Schmidt		Electrical Engineering
Vanita	Seth		Politics
Meg	Wilson		Psychology
Fitnat	Yildiz		MCD Biology
Derek	Murray		Art

RULES, JURISDICTION & ELECTIONS

John	Jordan	Chair	Literature
Jean	Fox Tree		Psychology
K.C.	Fung	(W&S)	Economics
TBA		(F)	
Ira	Pohl		Computer Science
TBA			

TEACHING

Maria	Gonzalez-Pagani	Chair (F&W)	Languages
Hongyun	Wang	Chair (S) member W&S	Applied Math and Statistics
Dan	Selden	(S)	Literature
Kate	Edmunds		Theater Arts
Claire	Max		Astronomy and Astrophysics
Gordon	Wells		Education

Respectfully Submitted;

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Junko	Ito
Joseph	Konopelski
Marc	Mangel
Shelley	Stamp
Carolyn	Martin-Shaw, Chair

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

May 8, 2009

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Amendment to Regulation 6.5: Individual Study, Field Study, Internships, etc.

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is proposing to amend Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 6.5 regarding “special approval courses” (e.g., independent studies, field studies, etc.--see below). The most substantive changes that would result from these amendments are i) that students without declared majors could take up to 7 credits of special approval courses per quarter; ii) that students *with* declared majors could take more than 7 credit hours of such courses per quarter, given permission from their major-sponsoring authority; iii) that there would be no campuswide limit on the number of quarters over which a student could take (with permission) an unusual number of special approval credits. Current Regulation limits all students to 5 credits per quarter of special approval courses barring special permission, and strongly restricts exceeding this limit in a second quarter or beyond.

For other changes, see the discussion below.

In its own words, SCR 6.5 addresses courses that “include but are not limited to lower and upper division tutorials, lower and upper division field studies, independent field studies, internships, senior theses, senior projects, group tutorials[.]” The term for such courses at the systemwide level is “special study course”. Judging by its usage across UC campuses, “special study course” can be or has been interpreted to include at least the following:

- Independent study courses
- Group study courses
- Independent field study courses
- Supervised field study courses
- Internships
- Laboratory research courses
- Senior thesis or project courses

In CEP’s view, what these course categories have in common is that *they lack a curriculum that has been approved in advance by CEP*. Hence our term “special approval course”.

A likely exception is the supervised field study, by which we mean a field study where a faculty member is *on-site*. (Of course, all high-quality field study courses and internships involve supervision in the sense of having general faculty and staff oversight.) Such courses therefore should not be considered “special approval courses” at all. Since they are included in the systemwide definition of “special study course”, we have adopted a different term here. (The current term in SCR 6.5 is “individual studies course”, but this is also inappropriate, since some of the courses listed above involve groups.)

A minor goal of the proposed amendments is to clarify for our campus which courses count as “special approval courses” and should therefore be subject to the restrictions discussed below. There is a great deal of confusion on this point at both the systemwide and campus levels.

Systemwide Regulation (SR) 764 states that “Credit in special study courses for undergraduates is limited to five units per term”. UC Santa Cruz has an active variance to this Regulation that allows a student to take up to 15 credits of special study courses in one quarter, given permission. This variance also allows a student to take more than five credits of such courses in any *subsequent* quarters only “in special circumstances and for students of outstanding demonstrated ability”. The full text of the variance is given in an appendix here.

In response to a recent inquiry by our campus, the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) ruled that SR 764 applies to all of the course types listed on the previous page, while our campus variance (see below) applies only to courses numbered 199. It follows from the latter ruling that students may not take more than 5 credits of *any* special study course apart from a 199, under any circumstances.¹

CEP has several concerns about SCR 6.5, as well as SR 764 and the variance, especially the following:

- CEP does not support an inviolable limit of 5 credits per quarter of special approval courses.
- CEP does not support a restriction to only one quarter of extra special approval courses or credits.
- These restrictions are not followed on our campus. The most notable example of this involves the Community Studies major, whose *requirements* have for decades included two 15-credit quarters of field study.

The degree of presumption against special approval courses, implicit in both SR 764 and SCR 6.5, is arguably too restrictive for our current educational setting. (These Regulations are about 40 years old.) First, experiential learning opportunities are today more numerous and more prevalent than before, considered by many to be a “best practice” of undergraduate education. There are experiential learning curricula at UC campuses and sites that routinely require or allow more than 5 credits of academic credit per term, some for more than one quarter. Below we list some examples.

At UCSC, during the summer session 2008, 140 students took 10 credits (in one term) of special study courses. Of these, 117 were Community Studies internships, while the rest were divided among Economics, Biology, College 8, Philosophy, Chemistry, Latin American and Latino Studies, and Psychology. (Many more students, mostly Community Studies majors, took 15 credits of special study courses in a summer term.)

Psychology students at UCSC can take a 5-credit field study course (193), and they can also work in faculty-sponsored research groups through a 5-credit advanced research course (194). These sometimes overlap; in addition a field study course might easily overlap with a senior thesis course. Since the field study requires a 2-quarter commitment and many faculty also require a 2-quarter commitment for their research groups, overlap can go on for more than one quarter. This state of affairs in Psychology is no doubt mirrored in other majors.

¹ UCRJ’s finding that it is the course number 199 that matters rather than any properties of the course likely misses the original point of restrictions on special studies courses. It entails that the intent of Regulation could be circumvented by renumbering restricted courses to 199. There is in fact much inconsistency in the use of numbers for special study courses across UC campuses, and numbers change; it seems better for Regulation to avoid using them.

Looking to other campuses, UCLA has a variance to SR 764 allowing up to 8 credits of special study per quarter. Furthermore, UCLA interprets “special study” to include only courses number 195-199; other courses are even less restricted. For example, in the UCLA Nursing program, a course Clinical Internship: Integration (169) requires 36 hours of work per week and gives 12 credits.

In the year 2006-07 UC Davis recorded a total of 214 course enrollments of greater than 5 credits having the number 192, the number reserved there for field studies.

At UC Santa Barbara, twenty-four courses were counted in the 190-199 number series that have variable credits exceeding 5 credits. Some of these courses appear to be internships or field studies which are located off campus. Others appear to be similar to 198-199 courses (independent studies), though UCSB Regulation prohibits more than 5 credits per term of such courses. Also at UCSB, in the College of Creative Studies, any special study course can give up to 6 credits depending on the work accomplished.

Currently UCLA, UC San Diego, and UC Santa Cruz have active variances to SR 764. UC Davis and UC Irvine have variances that have expired.

Second, and in a similar vein, the University of California is currently devoting serious attention to the importance for undergraduates of research opportunities. The best of these opportunities are typically available by means of special approval courses such as independent studies. We see no compelling reason for a Regulation that sets a blanket limit on such experiences of 5 credits per term.

For the reasons given above, CEP finds current Regulation on special approval courses to be too restrictive.

On the other hand, when students attempt to take an unusual number of special approval courses (either within or across terms), it is prudent that a mechanism be in place that ensures reasonable oversight and good advising. Our proposed changes to Regulation reaffirm the importance of oversight, but are adapted to current advising structures.

The proposed amendments to SCR 6.5 would have the following specific effects:

- They would define “special approval” courses as those whose curricula are not approved in advance by CEP.
- While current Regulation requires that students obtain permission to take “two or more” special approval courses in a term (the number of credits is unclear in 6.5 but set at 5 by systemwide), the new Regulation would set the threshold at above 7 credits.
- The 7-credit threshold would be absolute for students without declared majors, because i) there is no realistic means to provide oversight and approve exceptions outside of departmental structures and ii) students who have not found a major should probably not take excessive amounts of special approval courses in any case.
- For students with declared majors, the 7-credit threshold could be exceeded given permission of a student’s major-sponsoring unit(s). Requiring approval ensures that students are using special approval courses prudently, making progress toward degree, etc.
- Approval for individual students to exceed the 7-credit limit would be waived when it follows from degree requirements already approved by CEP.

- Unnecessary portions of the current legislation would be removed. These include especially current SCR 6.5.2, which defines field studies as opposed to “tutorials”, and current SCR 6.5.7 which states general policy on narrative evaluations that is adequately stated elsewhere.
- Many changes would be effected to improve clarity, update terms, and improve consistency.

It is inconsistent with SR 764 to allow more than 5 credits of special approval courses per term. The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) recently voted to propose to the Academic Council that SR 764 be rescinded. If that proposal fails and these amendments to SCR 6.5 pass, then our campus will seek a variance to SR 764, including a variance to the limit on amount of special approval courses beyond one quarter.

Current wording

Proposed wording

<p>6.5 Individual Study, Field Study, Internships, etc.</p> <p>6.5.1 Individual studies courses include but are not limited to lower and upper division tutorials, lower and upper division field studies, independent field studies, internships, senior theses, senior projects, group tutorials, and are subject to the definitions and limitations of this section.</p> <p>6.5.2 Lower and upper division tutorials (courses 99 and 199) have as their focus material that is a normal part of the academic resources of the campus (e.g., books, laboratories, instructors); lower and upper division field studies (courses 93 and 193) have other material as their focus.</p> <p>6.5.3 Independent field study (course 198) is the only course for which either: (a) the student's supervision is conducted by a regularly appointed officer of instruction by a means other than the usual supervision in person (e.g., the supervision is by correspondence), or (b) the student</p>	<p>6.5 Individual Study, Field Study, Internships, etc. <u>Special Approval Courses.</u></p> <p>6.5.1 Individual studies <u>Special approval courses are courses whose curricula are not approved in advance by the Committee on Educational Policy. These</u> include, but are not limited to, lower and upper division tutorials, lower and upper division field studies, independent field studies, internships, senior theses, senior projects, group tutorials <u>independent or group studies (or tutorials), independent field studies or internships, senior thesis or project courses, individual research project courses, and recital preparation courses,</u> and are subject to the definitions and limitations of this section.</p> <p>6.5.2 Lower and upper division tutorials (courses 99 and 199) have as their focus material that is a normal part of the academic resources of the campus (e.g., books, laboratories, instructors); lower and upper division field studies (courses 93 and 193) have other material as their focus.</p> <p>6.5.3 [Renumbered to 6.5.5]</p>
--	--

is doing all or most of his or her course work off campus. The student must show on application for course 198 evidence of having had suitable preparation for the field study and facility and competence in the subject-matter area. Before credit may be assigned for course 198, the student must file a written report (or paper) with the department, program of studies, or college sponsoring the course. Students taking course 198 will be officially registered and pay regular University of California fees. Course 198 is not ordinarily available to freshmen. Course 198 is not available for course credit by petition.

6.5.4 Determination of lower or upper division credit is based on the level of the work done and not on the class standing of the student. Upper division work is of truly advanced nature, and if upper division credit is requested, the application must provide evidence of competence in the subject-matter area within which the project lies.

6.5.5 Students wishing to take an individual studies course of 2 or 5 credit hours should apply to the department, program of studies, or college sponsoring the course, outlining in reasonable detail the expected course of study. Deadlines for filing applications may be set by the sponsoring agency and included in the catalog description of that agency's course. Agencies may waive their own deadlines up to the final date for enrolling in courses. Applications must be approved by the instructor as proposing a worthwhile study which the instructor is capable of supervising and willing to supervise. The instructor must indicate on the application the number of credit hours to be granted upon successful completion of the work proposed. Applications also must be approved by the chair or provost (or senior curricular officer) of the agency sponsoring the course as being appropriate and in conformity with the educational policy of the agency.

~~6.5.4~~ **6.5.2** Determination of lower or upper division credit **for special approval courses** is based on the level of the work done and not on the class standing of the student. Upper division work is of truly advanced nature, and if upper division credit is requested, the application must provide evidence of competence in the subject-matter area within which the project lies.

~~6.5.5~~ **6.5.3** Students wishing to take ~~an individual studies~~ **a special approval** course of 2 or 5 credit hours should apply to the department, program of studies, or college sponsoring the course, outlining in reasonable detail the expected course of study. Deadlines for filing applications may be set by the sponsoring agency and included in the catalog description of that agency's course. Agencies may waive their own deadlines up to the final date for enrolling in courses. Applications must be approved by the instructor as proposing a worthwhile study which the instructor is capable of supervising and willing to supervise. The instructor must indicate on the application the number of credit hours to be granted upon successful completion of the work proposed. Applications also must be approved by the chair or provost (or senior curricular officer) of the agency sponsoring the course as being appropriate and in conformity with the educational policy of the agency.

6.5.6 Students must receive authorization from their college to take two or more individual studies courses in a given quarter. Before the authorization may be granted, the student must present to the college the signatures of all instructors and chairs (or provosts) who approved the individual course applications, showing that they know that their course is part of an extended use of individual studies courses by the student. Authorization by the college indicates that the above signatures have been obtained and that the courses are appropriate to the educational needs of the student. If this permission is granted more than once during a student's undergraduate career, it implies also that the circumstances are special.

~~6.5.6~~ **6.5.4 Students without declared majors may not take more than seven credit hours of special approval courses in a given quarter.** Students **with declared majors** must receive authorization from ~~their college~~ **their major-sponsoring unit(s)** to take **more than seven credit hours of special approval courses** ~~two or more individual studies courses~~ in a given quarter. Before the authorization may be granted, the student must present to the college **major-sponsoring unit(s)** the signatures of all instructors and chairs (~~or provosts~~) who approved the individual course applications, showing that they know that their course is part of an extended use of individual studies courses by the student. Authorization ~~by the college~~ indicates that the above signatures have been obtained and that the courses are appropriate to the educational needs of the student. **Authorization as described in this section is not needed if the seven or more credits of special approval courses are part of a regular curriculum that has been approved by the Committee on Educational Policy.** If this permission is granted more than once during a student's undergraduate career, it implies also that the circumstances are special.

[renumbered from 6.5.3]

6.5.5 Independent field study (course 198) is the only course **studies or internships are courses** for which either: (a) the student's supervision is conducted by a regularly appointed officer of instruction by a means other than the usual supervision in person (e.g., the supervision is by ~~correspondence~~ **email**), or (b) the student ~~is doing~~ **does** all or most of his ~~or her~~ **the** course work off campus. The **application for field studies courses must show evidence of suitable preparation and competence in the subject matter.** ~~student must show on application for course 198 evidence of having had suitable preparation for the field study and facility and competence in the subject matter area.~~ Before credit may be assigned for **the** course 198, the student must file a written report (or paper) with the department, program of studies, or college

<p>6.5.7 The written evaluation by the instructor for an individual studies course shall include a description of the work done by the student, as well as an evaluation of the quality and characteristics of the student's performance. One copy of the written evaluation shall be kept by the chair or provost of the sponsoring agency who will file it with the original application for the course. These documents shall be available to appropriate Santa Cruz Division and Santa Cruz Administrative officers for at least five years.</p>	<p>sponsoring the course. Students taking course 198 <u>independent field studies or internships</u> will be officially registered and pay regular University of California fees. Course 198 is <u>Such courses are</u> not ordinarily available to freshmen <u>first-year students</u>. Course 198 is not <u>and are not</u> available for course credit by petition.</p> <p>6.5.7 The written evaluation by the instructor for an individual studies course shall include a description of the work done by the student, as well as an evaluation of the quality and characteristics of the student's performance. One copy of the written evaluation shall be kept by the chair or provost of the sponsoring agency who will file it with the original application for the course. These documents shall be available to appropriate Santa Cruz Division and Santa Cruz Administrative officers for at least five years.</p>
---	---

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Linda Burman-Hall

David Helmbold

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Loisa Nygaard

Donald Potts

Eileen Zurbriggen

Jaye Padgett, Chair

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NSTF Representative

Matthew Palm, Student Representative (SUA)

Ravi Rajan, Provost Representative

Shawn Riley, Student Representative (SUA)

May 6, 2009

Appendix: UCSC Variance to SR 764

“A.6.5.4. Ordinarily a student may include no more than one course 49 or 199 in his program in any term. But with the permission of their College or Board of Studies, students in good [sic] standing may undertake an independent study project 199 equivalent to two or three courses in one quarter under one, two or three instructors. Except in special circumstances and for students of outstanding demonstrated ability, only one such augmented (block of two) or full-time (block of three) 199 may be taken during a student's undergraduate career. Such augmented or full-time 199s are available in two ways: (a) in such courses as may be offered by Boards of Studies where permission to take will be obtained by the student from his advisor, instructor(s), and the Board of Studies, and (b) in such courses as may be offered by Colleges, where permission to take will be obtained by the student from his advisor, instructor(s) and Provost. The use of such 199s in the University shall be reviewed by the Committee on Educational Policy.”

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Proposal to Amend Santa Cruz Regulation 10.2.2.3

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Summary

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is proposing to amend Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 10.2.2.3 on general education requirements and transfer credit. The change would insert language that allows transfer students to be exempted from up to three Topical general education courses based solely on the number of credits they transfer in with. This change repeals a portion of a legislative change that came into effect in 2007, and is proposed in order to avoid forcing a great deal of Admissions staff time to be devoted to articulating courses to meet the Topical requirement, a requirement that goes out of effect as of fall 2010.

Further Details

Before fall 2007 SCR 10.2.2.3 prohibited the articulation of transfer courses to meet the Topical general education requirement. The full text of 10.2.2.3 before fall 2007 is given here, with the relevant portion bolded:

Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 [i.e., general education requirements, CEP] except the Topical and Writing-intensive courses. Writing-intensive courses must be taken at UCSC. **Because it is difficult to judge whether courses passed elsewhere meet the spirit of the topical course requirement, transfer students shall be exempted from up to three of these courses depending on the amount of credit transferred at the time of entrance.** In partial satisfaction of the University of California, Santa Cruz campus general education requirements (as distinct from courses required for graduation), a transfer student is permitted to count an eligible transferred course of 4.0 quarter units (or three semester units) in advanced standing as equivalent to a five-credit hours course at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Responsibility for assessment of work completed at other campuses of the University of California or at other institutions is delegated to the Director of Admissions. In making such assessments, the Director consults with the Faculty when appropriate.

In the fall of 2006 the Senate amended this legislation, among other things removing all text specific to the Topical requirement. (See below under “Current wording”.) The change was justified by the Senate’s judgment that individual transfer courses *can* be evaluated as satisfying (or not) the Topical requirement. Hence Topicals were to be treated like any other general education course (except the Writing-Intensive requirement). Since then the Admissions Office has been working to identify Community College courses that can be articulated to specific Topical courses at UCSC.

Last quarter our campus passed comprehensive general education reform, to go into effect fall 2010. The Topical requirement will cease to exist as of that time, though some students will continue to satisfy it for several years due to catalog rights. The question arises whether the Admissions Office should continue devoting significant time to finding and articulating courses to satisfy this requirement. We do not think it should, since Admissions will have to begin identifying courses to satisfy all of our *new* general education requirements.

The proposed change re-establishes a transfer student's right to be exempted from one to three Topical courses based on credits transferred in, as existed for students before fall 2007.¹ Departing from the earlier legislation, however, it will not *prohibit* the transfer of courses to satisfy Topical requirements. Both students and the Admissions Office can therefore continue to benefit from the work that has already been done toward identifying courses for articulation and applying them toward requirements.

Given catalog rights beyond the 2010 date of the general education change, this proposed legislative change could affect a significant number of students for about 3 more years.

Current wording

Proposed wording

<p>10.2.2.3 Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 except the Writing-intensive courses. Writing-intensive courses must be taken at UCSC. An eligible transferred course of 4.0 quarter units or 3.0 semester units may be considered one course with respect to campus general education requirements. Responsibility for assessment of work completed at other campuses of the University of California or at other institutions is delegated to the Director of Admissions. In making such assessments, the Director consults with the Faculty when appropriate.</p>	<p>10.2.2.3 Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 except the Writing-intensive courses. Writing-intensive courses must be taken at UCSC. <u>Transfer students may be exempted from up to three Topical courses depending on the amount of credit transferred at the time of entrance.</u> An eligible transferred course of 4.0 quarter <u>credits</u> units or 3.0 semester <u>credits</u> units may be considered one course with respect to campus general education requirements. Responsibility for assessment of work completed at other campuses of the University of California or at other institutions is delegated to the Director of Admissions. In making such assessments, the Director consults with the Faculty when appropriate.</p>
---	--

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Linda Burman-Hall

David Helmbold

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Loisa Nygaard

Donald Potts

Eileen Zurbriggen

Jaye Padgett, Chair

Holly Gritsch de Cordova, NSTF Representative

Matthew Palm, Student Representative (SUA)

Ravi Rajan, Provost Representative

Shawn Riley, Student Representative (SUA)

May 6, 2009

¹ Details, quoting from the relevant general catalog text: "...topical courses are waived at entrance according to the following formula: 45–83.9 transferable quarter credits, one course waived; 84–104.9 transferable quarter credits, two courses waived; 105 or more transferable quarter credits, all three courses waived. If one topical course is required in residence at UCSC, it may be chosen from any of the three academic areas (humanities and arts, natural sciences and engineering, and social sciences). If two are required, they must be from two different areas."

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Report on the University of California Retirement Program

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Introduction

Recent losses in the UC Retirement Program (UCRP) have emerged as one of the Committee on Faculty Welfare's (CFW) most urgent concerns this year. Assets in the UCRP, like investment portfolios generally, have decreased significantly in response to the recent downturn in global and national markets. At the same time, the UCRP has also been affected because neither UC employees nor UC itself have contributed to UCRP since 1990.¹ In the meantime, liabilities have continued to increase. These three factors--losses due to market forces, suspension of member contributions to UCRP (scheduled to restart in early 2010), and increase in liabilities--have had a powerful effect: ***UCRP liabilities now well exceed assets.***

In the face of this news, two assumptions have been made by UC's Office of the President (UCOP) to project the future UCRP funding situation: first, investment returns on UCRP are projected at 3.75% from January 1, 2009, to June 30, 2009, and at 7.5% every year for the following four years; second, total scheduled employer-employee contributions to UCRP will rise gradually to 16% of covered payroll in the next 4 years.² Even using these promising assumptions, however, ***UCOP has projected that the UCRP funding ratio***—that is, the ratio of assets to liabilities—***will decline to 61%*** (from well above 100% through mid-2008) ***by 2013***—a remarkable drop in a program once so robust that it ceased requiring member contributions at all.³

Health benefits for retirees are handled separately from the UCRP and are another area of serious concern. ***The ratio of assets to liabilities for retiree health benefits is a meager 0.4%***, with a current unfilled liability (liability minus assets) of \$13.3 billion that is projected to grow to \$18 billion by 2013 (see the section on “restructuring retirement health benefits” later in this document). Thus two cornerstones of post-retirement benefits—the UC Retirement Program and retiree health benefits—are both in serious financial jeopardy.

This document has several interlocking purposes, all of them intended to enable UCSC Senate members to understand and participate meaningfully in major decisions about the UCRP and UC itself, currently being considered systemwide. CFW aims:

1. To inform our UCSC colleagues about the status of UCRP by highlighting key questions that UCRP's current and projected funding ratio and investment returns raise, and presenting and explaining the publicly available but difficult-to-

¹ Cessation of contributions began as a result of the excellent health of the UCRP.

² Proposal to Reinstate Contributions to UCRP presented to the UC Regents, February 2009.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/feb09/j3pp.pdf>

³ This 61% estimate is an estimate of the projected “ARatio,” or Actuarial Value Funding Ratio, which smoothes out market fluctuations over the previous five-year period. See “Current Status of UC Retirement System,” later in this document, for an explanation.

decipher information that gave rise to these questions. The bulk of the report focuses on these facts;

2. To provide information as context for a set of Resolutions that will be introduced at the May 20 Academic Senate meeting. These Resolutions, if endorsed, should enable UC employees to make informed decisions about their retirement futures and we hope to participate in the direction UC itself will take in the coming years;
3. To raise the important question of whether the state and the Regents recognize the UCRP as an obligation that must be honored in its current form;
4. To bring to Senate attention the larger context in which the strategy for restructuring post-retirement benefits is being formulated: because of the major, permanent budget reductions UC is undergoing, this larger context is nothing less than the shape of the UC system itself. In particular, CFW wishes to flag two important questions: (a) UC is launching several new initiatives even as some programs are being eliminated or merged with others. In this context, we ask whether UC has the capacity to meet existing obligations towards its personnel; (b) UC is already engaged in developing decentralization strategies. We ask whether UC has sufficiently employed its existing process for consulting on these issues with the Academic Senate, both at the systemwide and the individual campus levels, and whether it has communicated these processes effectively to its constituents.

CFW hopes that in providing information about UCRP and retiree health benefits to the Senate, faculty members will be sufficiently informed both to make individual retirement decisions and participate effectively in decisions about such potential changes.

Definitions

Defined Benefit vs. Defined Contribution

UCRP is a defined benefit pension plan, where benefits are determined not by contributions to the plan but by defined formulas that vary according to the types of benefits payable (for example, retirement or survivor benefits). The formulas are based on such factors as a member's age, years of service credit, and salary. UC's defined benefit plan has historically been its finest employee benefit.

In contrast, 403(b) plans, 457(b) deferred compensation plans, and DC plans are defined contribution plans, where the employee and/or employer contribute to the plan following the appropriate Internal Revenue Code guidelines. *This document is about UCRP defined benefit plan* and not about any of the defined contribution plans mentioned above.

Vesting

Vesting refers to a member's non-forfeitable right to receive UCRP retirement benefits upon leaving the University and reaching retirement age. A vested member is one who has earned five or more years of service credit (employees who became UCRP members on or before July 1, 1989, are vested regardless of service credit if they leave University employment after reaching age 62). Existing vestment refers to the benefits that a

member is already eligible for under the UCRP defined benefit plan, based on current formulas that take into account a member's age, years of service credit, and salary. For example, a 60-year-old member (with Social Security) and 20 years of service credit is eligible for a monthly retirement income of 50% of the highest average plan compensation (HAPC) less \$133. For details, please refer to the UCOP benefits website.

Future vestment can be changed by changing the current formulas.

Cost Of Living Adjustment (COLA)

After receiving UCRP benefits for one year, UCRP members are eligible to receive an annual cost-of-living adjustment paid each July 1. COLA is based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and is designed to increase the benefit payments with increase in CPI. Please refer to the UCOP benefits website for further details and the formula used to determine the amount of COLA to be paid.⁴

California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS)

CalPERS is analogous to but separate from UCRP. CalPERS provides retirement benefits to California state and school employees, and to employees of contracting local public agencies. UCRP provides retirement benefits to retirees of the UC system only.

Presidential Steering Committee

The Presidential Steering Committee was appointed by UC President Mark Yudof to make recommendations on restructuring post-retirement benefits—most notably to UCRP and retiree health benefits.

Presidential Task Force on Post-Retirement Benefits

The Presidential Task Force on Post-Retirement Benefits was appointed by UC President Yudof to evaluate alternative options for restructuring post-retirement benefits and present the findings to the Presidential Steering Committee.

Current Issues for Individual Employees

The most pressing question for individual UC employees has to do with the reliability of their expectations about their UC retirement benefits. Bluntly: ***Will UC employees receive the benefits they expect when they retire?*** This breaks down into three more nuanced sub-questions related to: (a) the status of individual employees' already vested monies—for example, an individual's already vested 12 years of service credit; (b) the status of their future anticipated monies—for example, an additional 10 years of anticipated service prior to retirement; and (c) the status of vestment options for future employees—for example, possibly a new set of rules for future employees. UC President Yudof has publicly indicated that some restructuring of expected benefits must take place.⁵

In order to address the post-retirement benefits (UCRP and health), UC President Yudof has set up a Presidential Steering Committee charged with recommending a strategy

⁴ http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/retirees/retirement_savings/ucrp.html

⁵ James P. Sweeney, UC Pension System Faces Economic Reality, *San Diego Union-Tribune*. February 6, 2009. <http://www3.signonsandiego.com/stories/2009/feb/06/1n6pension235823-uc-pension-system-faces-economic-/?uniontrib>

based on the analysis and evaluation of various options developed by the Presidential Task Force on Post-Retirement Benefits. These committees are likely to address at least the two key issues noted below, about which CFW poses the following questions:

A. Restructuring Retirement Financial Benefits

1. Will the existing vestment of current and retired employees be honored?
2. Will future vestment of current employees be changed or redefined?
3. Will future UC employees receive the same benefit guarantees as current employees? What are the implications for hiring and retention, especially given UC salaries and California's cost of living?
4. How much will UC employees be asked to contribute to the UCRP, starting when? What sum will UC match? What sum will the state of California match? What expectations should we have for future contributions by UC? By California?
5. How effective will the projected contributions (by employees, by UC, by state) be in bringing the UCRP to healthy levels (defined as a funding ratio of 95-110%)? If the funding ratio remains low, how will the gap be covered? What percentage of covered payroll will be needed to return UCRP to a healthy funding ratio? Is this likely to be substantially more than 20% of covered payroll over an extended period of time? (On this point, the most worrisome scenario is one in which members start contributions but are denied the anticipated benefits or awarded reduced benefits at the time of their retirement.)
6. Will COLAs continue to be paid to retirees in the future? Are COLAs a contractual obligation of the UC Regents? Are they protected by law?

B. Restructuring Retirement Health Benefits

UC has taken a different approach to retiree health benefits than it has to retirement benefits generally. Instead of aiming for a robust funding ratio such as that previously enjoyed by UCRP, the plan for retiree health benefits has all along hinged on a "pay-as-we-go" approach. The viability of this approach is being called into question for the first time in view of rapidly rising retiree health costs. The current funding ratio for health benefits is 0.4%, with a current unfilled liability of about \$13.3 billion, which is expected to grow to \$18 billion by 2013 (Exhibit D).⁶

1. How will the shortfall between the assets and liabilities of expected retirement health benefits be covered? Is the pay-as-we-go basis for these health benefits viable? Will premiums significantly rise? Will retirees' health benefits be reduced/modified? Will there be different responses to this question for current retirees and future retirees?

⁶ Retiree Health Benefits Report presented to the UC Regents on November 19, 2008.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov08/f11.pdf>

2. Is there a contractual obligation on the part of the UC Regents to honor the anticipated retiree health benefits? Are retiree health benefits protected by law? Currently, after 20 years of service credit, Senate members are fully vested in retiree health benefits--that is, UC will cover the same premium for retirees as for current employees. Can this vesting period or accrual rate be changed for current or future employees? Can health benefits be modified for younger retirees such as those who are retiring at age 55?

Current Issues for the UC System

Responses to the key questions above about the potential restructuring of retirement financial and health benefits must take place in the larger context of the UC budget. In light of the significant underfunding of the UCRP and retirement health benefits, and of permanent reductions in the UC budget, structures we have come to see as unassailable suddenly appear less certain. Two in particular come up for scrutiny:

A. Is UCRP a state obligation?

UCRP is unquestionably an obligation of the UC Regents, a position reinforced in the Academic Council's January 2009 statement about the lump-sum cashout option, which asserts that "UC has a legal obligation to provide funding for UCRP", and that "Courts have consistently found that...public entities like UC cannot renege on those promises."⁷ In view of the deteriorating situation of UCRP funding and the current budgetary climate, however, it is natural to ask whether UCRP is also an obligation of the state. This is an important question in part because of the impending return to employee and employer contributions to UCRP. Prior to the cessation of these contributions in 1990, fully a third of UC's 12% contribution came from the state.

During the recent state budget deadlock, the California legislative analyst's office recommended eliminating even the nominal \$20 million allocation for UCRP in the state budget (UC's original request was for a \$228 million allocation).⁸ This recommendation raises doubt about whether UCRP is indeed a state obligation, and further challenges the UC budget by laying the burden of funding retirement largely on UC alone.

B. Will UC restructure?

Although the restructuring of UC is being considered, apparently, primarily due to reductions in UC's permanent budget, this restructuring is taking place alongside a serious decline in the UCRP funding ratio and the significant challenge of meeting retiree

⁷ Academic Council Statement on Lump Sum Cashout, January 22, 2009.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/Lump%20Sum%20Cashouts%2022JAN09%20Final.pdf>

Note that this statement is an assertion of the Academic Council, not UCRP or the UC Regents, and that it refers to court decisions about public institutions "like UC" (emphasis added). By contrast, several CalPERS informational webpages unequivocally state that employees' benefits are "protected by law" or "guaranteed by law." (See

<http://www.calpers.ca.gov/index.jsp?bc=/about/press/news/invest-corp/faqs.xml> and

<http://www.calpers.ca.gov/index.jsp?bc=/about/press/news/invest-corp/responds-financial-crisis.xml>)

⁸ 2009-10 Budget Analysis Series: Higher Education, January 29, 2009.

http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2009/highered/highered_an109.pdf

health costs. The official position presented in the recent UCOP “Report on Campus Budget Reduction Strategies” is that all campuses are eliminating or curtailing programs that no longer serve the identified priorities of the campus, and each campus is setting priorities to advance and launch new initiatives that continue to be important to the development of the institution.⁹ This report appears implicitly to assume a decentralization strategy on many but not necessarily all of the following issues: differential budget cuts, layoffs, hiring freezes, salary cuts, furloughs, and student fees. However, no public dialogue or consultation with the Academic Senate seems to have taken place on the far-reaching consequences of decentralization on UC. The key questions are: (a) whether UC has the capacity to meet obligations towards its current and future personnel in launching several new initiatives currently being undertaken even when several programs are being eliminated or merged; (b) even when UC is engaged in developing decentralization strategies, whether UC has developed an engagement process to consult the Academic Senate both at the systemwide and the individual campus level on these issues and has communicated these processes effectively to its constituents.

Current Status of UC Retirement Program

To understand the impact UCRP is having on the UC system itself, it is helpful to understand how UCRP works and what its current and projected status is.

UCRP has three main components: assets, liabilities, and contributions.

A. Funding Ratio (assets/liabilities)

The status of the UCRP is commonly discussed in terms of the funding ratio, the ratio of assets to liabilities. For more than two decades, this funding ratio has been above 100%. However, the funding ratio has now dropped well below 100%.

We first define a few terms and introduce some abbreviations:

MVA= Market Value of Assets

AVA = Actuarial Value of Assets

AAL = Actuarial Accrued Liabilities

Market Value Funding Ratio (MRatio) = MVA/AAL

Actuarial Value Funding Ratio (ARatio) = AVA/AAL

MVA is reported quarterly by the UC Treasurer.

In the computation of AVA, only 20% (or 1/5th) of the current year returns are taken into account; the remaining 80% are distributed over the next four years, 20% each. For example, a loss of \$6 billion this year will contribute a loss of only \$1.2 billion to AVA in the current year, and the remaining \$4.8 billion loss will be attributed to the AVA in the next four years. AVA smoothes out the fluctuations in assets by attributing 1/5th of investment returns of the past five years.

⁹ Report on Campus Budget Reduction Strategies. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/mar09/f5.pdf>

Computation of AAL is complex, taking into account several factors including potential salary increases, service credit, demographics, actuarial tables, probability of lump-sum cashouts, and an assumption of a 7.5% rate of return. Computation of AAL is done annually by the UC's actuary, Segal Company.¹⁰

The data below were reported as of July 1 of the corresponding year.¹¹
 MVA, AVA, and AAL are all reported below in millions of dollars.

	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	Dec 31/08
MVA	42,071	38,870	34,442	35,327	39,216	41,858	43,362	48,105	42,023	31,708
AVA	37,026	40,554	41,649	41,429	41,293	41,085	41,972	43,434	43,840	
AAL	24,067	27,451	30,100	32,955	35,034	37,252	40,302	41,437	42,577	43,854*
MRatio	1.75	1.42	1.14	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.16	0.99	0.72
ARatio	1.54	1.48	1.38	1.26	1.18	1.10	1.04	1.05	1.03	

*AAL estimated to increase 3% in 6 months

The actuarial funding ratio gradually decreased from 1.54 (54% surplus) in 2000 to 1.03 (3% surplus) on June 30, 2008. There has been a significant deterioration in the actuarial funding ratio since then. Reflecting the recent sharp drop in the market, as of December 31, 2008, the MRatio was 0.72, and as of the same date, there was an unfilled liability (i.e., liability minus assets) of more than \$12 billion. Due to the five-year smoothing explained above, the ARatio changes more slowly than the MRatio. (The ARatio is typically used in most official communications and for planning purposes.)

The assets and liabilities data above are for all of UCRP including all of the five segments: campus and medical centers, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan. The latter plan, not related to CalPERS, is a frozen plan covering a closed group of members, all of whom are in retirement status, and no additional benefits will accrue for these members in the future. This plan is a very small percentage of the total UCRP plan. The five segments each have different funding ratios. Thus it would be useful to have separate tables for each segment, as well as having information on yearly benefit payments broken out separately. Although some data are available in graphical form for some segments,¹² overall this information has been difficult to obtain.

¹⁰ Segal Company, UCRP Actuarial Valuation Report as of July 1 2008, <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov08/f10attach2.pdf>

¹¹ Treasurer of the Regents, Quarterly Investment Information. http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/invinfo/investment_info.html. Data for MVA, AVA, and AAL used in this were obtained from a report presented to UC Regents (Annual Actuarial Valuation Report presented to UC Regents on November 19, 2008. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov08/f10.pdf>). December 31, 2008, data were obtained from UC Treasurer's Quarterly Investment Report (http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/invinfo/investment_info.html). MRatio and ARatio were computed based on these numbers.

¹² Office of the Treasurer of the Regents, UCRP and GEP Quarterly Investment Risk Report, presented to Committee on Investments/Investment Advisory Group on February 24, 2009. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/feb09/i1attach2.pdf>

B. Investment Returns on UCRP

The percent return below is reported for the one-year period from July 1 of the preceding year through June 30 of the corresponding year.¹³

	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	Dec 31, 08
% return	-5.5	-9.0	5.6	14.5	10.3	7.2	19.0	-5.6	-22.83
Annualized return starting 00	-5.5	-7.3	-3.3	0.98	2.78	3.50	5.58	4.11	1.11*

* The annualized return has been computed with the assumption of a one-year return of -20% (that is, assuming a slight recovery between January 1 to June 30, 2009). Please note the sharp drop between July 1, 2008 and December 31, 2008 due to global market turmoil.

The annualized return on UCRP assets as of June 30, 2008, has been 4.11% for a period of eight years. However, due to hefty losses in the current fiscal year, the annualized return on UCRP assets is projected to drop to 1.11% over a period of nine years.

CFW employs the year 2000 as a starting point for computing investment returns as there were major structural changes in managing UCRP assets starting late 2000. In 2000 the UC Treasurer of 28 years resigned. At the same time, the UC Regents created new structures for managing UCRP assets (both decision-making and advisory committees). The routine comparisons of UCRP performance with those of other pension plan funds in the Treasurer’s report that appeared prior to 2002 were eliminated.¹⁴ The UC Treasurer’s Office has issued a statement stating the pitfalls of such comparisons.¹⁵ That said, the Master Trust Report shows that as of September 30, 2008, the UCRP performance has been consistently in the bottom 25 percentile of all public funds with greater than \$1

¹³ Data used in the table for investment returns are taken from a report presented to the UC Regents on November 19, 2008 (p.4) [<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov08/f10.pdf>]. This rate of return data is slightly different from the data reported in the UC Treasurer’s report, where these returns are reported after the administrative expenses. The rate of return data for the years ending 2001, 2002, and 2003 (available from the respective annual UC Treasurer’s reports) and from 2004 to 2008 (from the annual Treasurer’s report ending June 30, 2008) is listed below (Annual Investment Report ending June 30, 2008, by the UC Treasurer Office. http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/publications/UCTreasurer_AnnualReport_2008.pdf).

Further information can be obtained from the quarterly (http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/invinfo/investment_info.html) and annual investment reports by the Office of the UC Treasurer. Annualized returns (the bottom row of the table in section B, Investment Returns on UCRP) have been computed from the yearly returns shown in the previous row. Since some of the returns are listed with only one decimal digit accuracy, the annualized returns may be slightly off numerically. Using the data reported in the UC Treasurer’s reports, the annualized rate of return since July 1, 2000, for a period of more than eight years (with the assumption of -20% return during the current year) is 1.02%.

Computation of investment returns is somewhat complicated due to cash flows in and out. Returns are computed using a standard methodology as mentioned in the UC Treasurer’s report. As such, the annualized returns shown display a return on a dollar invested in UCRP that has never been taken out.

¹⁴ UC Treasurer’s Office. “Annual Investment Report ending June 30, 2002” <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov02/601attach.pdf>

¹⁵ UCRP Peer Comparison by the UC Treasurer Office, February 13, 2009. http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/updates/Peer_Comparison.pdf

billion for all time frames including 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years, and 7 years [see Exhibit A].¹⁶

	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09*
% return (regents' presentation)	-5.5	-9.0	5.6	14.5	10.3	7.20	19.0	-5.6	-20.0
% return (treasurer)	-5.6	-9.2	5.63	14.34	10.3	7.10	18.83	-5.74	-20.0
\$100 on July 1, 2000 (following treasurer)	94.40	85.71	90.54	103.52	114.18	122.29	145.32	136.98	109.58
\$100 on July 1, 2000 (following regents' presentation)	94.50	86.00	90.81	103.98	114.69	122.95	146.31	138.11	110.49

* assumption of -20% return during the current year

C. Expenses

Though it would be useful to include data on administrative expenses and service fees (to external managers) incurred in managing UCRP assets—indeed, this information is routinely provided for CalPERS, California's other major public employees' retirement system¹⁷--it is not provided for UCRP. Similarly useful would be data on the performance of external managers, which is compiled by State Street (the bank used by UC), and is available through the Office of UC Treasurer upon submitting a request each quarter.¹⁸

D. Contributions

UCRP members (faculty and staff) and UC have made no contributions to UCRP since November 1990.

Percentages are reported as covered payroll (more on this below).

Prior to November 1990, UCRP received contributions from both members and employer (UC) as follows:

- Members: 2.4 %
- UC: 12.0 %

The employee-to-employer ratio of contributions to UCRP was 1:5. UC's 12% contribution was made up approximately as follows: 36 % from the state of California, 24% from the Department of Energy Labs, and 40% from Contracts and Grants.

¹⁶ UC Master Trust Report. September 30, 2008. Available from the UC Treasurer Office.

¹⁷ CalPERS Annual Investment and Financial Reports, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report ending June 30, 2008. <http://www.calpers.ca.gov/index.jsp?bc=investments/reports/home.xml&rns=99>
 See pages 72-81 for expenses (administrative, investment, consultant, and professional services).

¹⁸ External Managers Performance Summary Report, September 30, 2008. Available from the UC Treasurer Office.

The current proposal is for members (employees) to contribute 2% starting April 15, 2010 and continuing through June 30, 2011.¹⁹ These contributions are expected to increase 1% each subsequent year until they reach 5%. The suggested contribution by UC is twice the annual contribution by employees--thus 4% from April 15, 2010 through June 30, 2011 and increasing by 2% in subsequent years to 6%, 8%, and 10%, and then, finally to 11% annually. A total contribution of 16% (5 % by employees and 11% by employers) of covered payroll is being suggested after five years.

This employee-to-employer contribution ratio of roughly 1:2 is similar to the ratio currently being used in CalPERS. In the current budgetary climate, it is difficult to expect the employer to contribute at a higher ratio. However, if UCRP remains chronically underfunded over a long period of time, a higher contribution from the employer may be needed. The UC Academic Council has supported the return of member contributions to UCRP for several years.²⁰

Contributions are reported as a percentage of covered payroll. Currently, the covered payroll is \$7.47 billion,²¹ while assets (as of September 30, 2008) are approximately \$37.3 billion. That is, the ratio of covered payroll to UCRP assets is approximately 1:5. ***Therefore, at the current level, a contribution of 2% by employees will add about \$150 million and make a difference of .4% (1/5th of 2%) in the assets.*** A contribution of 16% of covered payroll will provide for about 3.2% of UCRP assets at current levels. In other words, the proposed new contributions will provide only a very small percentage of UCRP assets, and certainly not enough to restore UCRP to a healthy funding ratio. Nevertheless, it is a beginning.

The total benefit payment to retirees of UCRP campus and medical center segments in the past 3 years, during 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08, has been approximately \$1.4, \$1.7, and \$1.8 billion respectively.²² The reasons for the sharp benefit payment increase from 2005-06 to 2007-08 is not clear. In any case, the proposed 2% contribution by employees represents roughly 8.3% of annual benefit payments; a full employer-employee contribution of 16% after five years is roughly 67% of total current benefit payments. This will still fall short of the total benefit payments, and will thereby contribute to the increasing gap between liabilities and assets.

¹⁹ Proposal to Reinstate Contributions to UCRP, presented to UC Regents, February 2009.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/feb09/j3pp.pdf>

²⁰ Academic Council Memorandum on Resumption of Contributions, May 25, 2006.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/ucrp.0506.pdf>

²¹ Annual Actuarial Valuation Report presented to UC Regents on November 19, 2008.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov08/f10.pdf>

²² Estimated from the bar graph data presented in "UCRP and GEP Quarterly Investment Risk Report," presented to Committee on Investments/Investment Advisory Group on February 24, 2009.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/feb09/i1attach2.pdf>

E. Projections

The projection of the funding ratio as presented to the UC Regents in February 2009 (Exhibit B) shows that the funding ratio (ARatio) will decline to 61% by 2013.²³ This decline will create an unfilled liability of \$18 billion, assuming (a) a negative investment return of -20% during the current year (an assumption that has been met so far), (b) a return to positive returns of 7.5% annually during the subsequent four years,²⁴ and (c) employer and employee contributions increasing to 16% of covered payroll by 2013 as has been suggested above. This analysis also shows that the level of contributions required to bring UCRP back to 100% funding will exceed 35% of covered payroll by 2013 (Exhibit C). Therefore, even under promising assumptions, the level of contributions required to bring UCRP back to full funding seems both extraordinarily high and unsustainable.

F. Emerging Issues regarding UCRP

The above scenario raises serious questions regarding several underlying assumptions that have been taken for granted so far. These assumptions must be questioned and investigated afresh and an open democratic dialogue needs to be supported surrounding these issues. The issues include:

1. Asset Management Strategies (asset protection, investment allocation, governance structure for managing UCRP assets, internal benchmarking, and comparison of UCRP with other pension plan funds):

Are UCRP assets protected in a protracted downturn or long-term sideways movement of stock market? How do UCRP investment returns compare with those of other pension plan funds? Is UCRP moving towards higher-risk highly-specialized privatized investing?²⁵ Who should be making the investment decisions?

2. Liabilities Computation:

Are UCRP liabilities growing more rapidly relative to other pension plans? If so, why? Are there demographic reasons? Are the actuarial tables used reasonable?

3. Accounting and Planning Issues:

Is a 7.5% rate of return reasonable? What are the implications of using a different rate of return? Is there a tipping point on the funding ratio below which the contributions will have to be chronically overwhelming, such as 33% of payroll over an extended period of time?

²³ "Proposal to Reinstate Contributions to UCRP", presented to the UC Regents, February 2009.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/feb09/j3pp.pdf>

²⁴ In 2007, the Academic Council stated that "the assumption of a 7.5% rate of return in reasonable and slightly conservative" (Academic Council Statement on UCRP, July 25, 2007
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/council/ac.ucrp.0707.pdf>). Although the view from 2007 is clearly different from the view in 2009, current investment projections, including the project ARatio of 61% for 2013, still employ the 7.5% projected return rate.

²⁵ Discussion on Revised Asset Allocation for UCRP at Committee on Investments, September 17, 2008.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/minutes/2008/invest9.pdf>

Conclusion

The UCRP funding situation has deteriorated significantly in the past year, raising anxiety and concern among UCRP members and retirees.

Some of the key concerns include whether the current, retired, and the newly hired UC employees will receive the expected UCRP and health benefits when they retire. Additional questions include the size of expected member contributions in the next five years—with or without salary increases, freezes, or even cuts—and whether these contributions will be sufficient to bring the UCRP back to sustainable levels.

Although the Presidential Steering Committee and Presidential Task Force on Post-Retirement Benefits have begun to look into these questions, it is important that the UC Regents adopt the best practices of the industry and strive to provide UCRP-related data in an easily accessible, transparent, and timely manner to all UCRP members so that members can take well-informed decisions, provide meaningful input to these committees, and have a better understanding of the decisions advocated later by the UC Regents.

Reductions in UC's permanent budget combined with the significant unmet obligations of the UCRP and retirement health benefits program is the backdrop against which UC has started formulating and implementing major structural changes at UC. These changes apparently include decentralization without sufficient engagement, consultation, or communication with the Senate, bypassing the processes already in place for such consultation, and evidently without creating new processes in their stead.

CFW hopes the UC Regents will assert their commitment to current employees to honor post-retirement benefits (UCRP and health) before campuses begin launching new initiatives and hiring new personnel associated with them. Such a statement will reassure current employees, help UC recruit and retain top quality faculty and staff, and preserve the integrity of our institution.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Maria-Elena Diaz
Isebill Gruhn *ex officio*
Joel Kubby
Suresh Lodha
Pete Raimondi (W, S)
Jennifer Reardon
Trish Stoddard (S)
Marilyn Westerkamp (S)
Elizabeth Abrams, Chair

April 17, 2009

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
University of California Retirement Program Resolution

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) would like to submit this short set of paired documents explaining (Background to Resolution) and proposing (Resolutions) actions we recommend that the UCSC Academic Senate adopt.

Background Information on CFW Resolutions

As described in the Committee on Faculty Welfare's "Report on the University of California Retirement Program" (April 2009), UCRP's funding has deteriorated significantly in the past year, raising anxiety and concern among current UC employees and retirees. Some of the key concerns include whether current, retired, and newly hired UC employees will receive the financial and health benefits our retirement programs have promised when they retire. Additional concerns include the return of member contributions in the next five years regardless of salary increases, freezes, or even cuts, and whether these contributions will be sufficient to bring UCRP back to sustainable levels. Although the UC Presidential Steering Committee and UC Presidential Task Force have begun to look into these questions, CFW believes the key data related to these questions should be made available to UCRP members in an easily accessible, transparent, and timely manner so that members can meaningfully make individual decisions such as whether to take a lump sum cash-out upon retirement or not. CFW believes that UC employees will have a better understanding of the decisions the UC Presidential committees and the UC Regents will make, and will engage more effectively in decisions about their retirements, if they have appropriate data easily available.

Principally, CFW recommends that key financial reports be made available on a single UC website, the UC Treasurer's Office site, and that certain reports currently not made available to the public be released, at minimum, to the UCSC Academic Senate. What follows is information that explains CFW's reasons for encouraging the UCSC Academic Senate to request the data identified in our Resolutions:

1. Annual investment reports by the UC Treasurer are public documents, but only the latest annual investment report is available on the UC Treasurer's website. Although these annual reports are available for the past few years at the UC Regents' website, they are very difficult to find. Since investment performance data for the last 10 years are often used as standards in the industry, **we recommend that the UCSC Senate request that these reports be posted at the UC Treasurer's website so that they are easily accessible to UCRP members.** The Treasurer's Office should be able to meet this request easily.
2. Monthly and quarterly investment reports are routinely prepared by the Treasurer's office and sent to the UC Regents Committee on Investments on the 25th day of the following month. Currently, monthly reports are not posted on the website, and

quarterly reports are sometimes posted with significant delay. While it is true that with investments one is well advised to take a long view of performance over time, nevertheless **this information should be accessible to interested members, and CFW recommends that the UCSC Senate request it.** The Treasurer's Office should be able to meet this request easily.

3. The information on administrative fees and expenses (including external managers' fees) is provided routinely for most public pension plan funds including CalPERS, as described in CFW's report on UCRP. But this is not the case for UCRP. Current estimates for these expenditures can only be vaguely inferred from associated statements in the Treasurer's quarterly and annual investment reports. In general discussions, estimates for these fees vary widely. Although the cost of managing UCRP funds may be a small percentage of the total UCRP assets, this amount may be a significant percentage of the contributions UC employees will soon begin to make. **This information will be helpful in determining what percentage of employee contributions goes towards the cost of managing the UCRP funds.**
4. Prior to 2000, the performance of UCRP funds was routinely compared with that of other pension plan funds in the annual investment reports by the UC Treasurer. However, after structural changes in the governance of UCRP, this comparison no longer appeared in these reports. The UC Academic Council and the systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) have taken the position that such comparisons are not appropriate. The UC Treasurer's office has also recently reaffirmed that peer comparisons are not appropriate—this despite the fact that the Treasurer's Office routinely reviews the Master UCRP Trust Report, which compares the performance of UCRP with all other public pension plan funds. The argument against releasing these comparisons is that investment return comparisons of plans that have significantly different asset allocations will likely be misleading. CFW recognizes this challenge. However, we also recognize that the public and the media routinely make such comparisons—comparisons incorporating both the investment returns and the asset allocation policy. We suggest there is a need for simpler comparison metrics.

CFW feels that UCFW, Academic Council, and UC Treasurer's Office opposition to these comparisons is not sound, nor that it is in the interest of UC's public image. However, since UCFW, the Academic Council, and the UC Treasurer's Office remain steadfast in opposing comparisons between the performances of UCRP and other public pension plan funds, CFW encourages the UCSC Academic Senate to compromise with a request for this information to be provided to its membership. The information CFW asks the Senate to request—the Master UCRP Trust Report mentioned above, and the External Managers Performance Report prepared quarterly by State Street (the bank used by UC)—is already reported to the UC Treasurer's Office but is no longer reported to the public. **While CFW believes both the Master Trust Report and the External Managers Performance Report should be provided to the public routinely in the annual report, given opposition to this suggestion we suggest the compromise position described above.**

5. UCRP currently manages the retirement funds of five different segments—Campus and Medical Centers, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL), Los Alamos National Lab (LANL), Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL), and UC-Public Employee Retirement System (UC-PERS). Assets for all five segments are held jointly, but different segments have different liabilities and funding ratios. Some of the numbers (for example, assets and liabilities) associated with each segment are computed annually and reported to the UC Regents by the Regents’ actuary, Segal Company. However, other UCRP numbers (for example, assets, investment returns, contributions) are reported only for the whole UCRP and not segment-by-segment by the UC Treasurer in its annual investment report. Often the numbers (for example, assets) detailed in the Segal Company’s Annual Report and the UC Treasurer’s Annual Investment Report—numbers one would expect to be identical, because describing the same fund—are off by a small amount. Though the mismatches are small and not particularly concerning, they make comparisons of data from these two sources difficult. Furthermore, additional UCRP data such as annual benefit payments, investment returns and fees attributed to various segments, although computed annually, are also unavailable to the public. Having all this data together separately for each of the 5 segments and for the whole UCRP will make the information transparent to UCRP members. **This will help to answer questions as to why UCRP members belonging to different segments make different contributions.**
6. Segal Company has estimated AAL (actuarial accrued liabilities) for the next five years for planning purposes and has presented this information to the UC Regents in graphical form. The actual underlying data is not available to the public. **These data are needed to estimate the future funding ratio and comprehend the future health of UCRP.** The Segal Company should be able to provide this information easily.
7. CFW also recommends the UCSC Academic Senate request a 10-year projection of expected annual benefit payments. **As UCRP is likely to need a more pay-as-we-go approach in the future, the 10-year horizon for expected payments would greatly help UCRP members understand UCRP’s ability to bear benefit payments to UCRP members for the next ten years.** This projection is particularly important in view of remarks by UCOP representatives that there are currently enough funds in UCRP to pay off the members for the next several years. The Segal Company, in all likelihood, computes these projections and it is worthwhile to have these numbers publicly available to UCRP members.

RESOLUTION

Whereas certainty about the commitment of the UC Regents to the UC Retirement Program is essential to the morale of UC faculty and other employees, and critical to UC’s success in recruiting and retaining excellent faculty,

Whereas certainty about the commitment of the UC Regents to retirees' health benefits is likewise critical to morale, recruitment, and retention,

Whereas timely information about the current and projected funding status, cost, and returns of our retirement system, and its relative performance and health in comparison to other public employees' retirement systems, is essential to members' ability to participate meaningfully in decisions regarding our financial futures,

Therefore be it resolved that we urgently request the UC President to issue and post on the Office of the President's website statements assuring UC's commitment to honor UCRP employee benefits, and post-retirement health benefits, and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate of the Santa Cruz Division urges:

(1) the UC President to

(a) direct the UC Treasurer to

- post the annual investment reports for the last ten years on the Treasurer's website,
- post the monthly and quarterly investment reports on the Treasurer's website by the end of the following month,
- provide the information on fees, expenses, and compensations to external managers incurred in managing UCRP funds in the Treasurer's annual report,
- provide a copy of the UCRP Master Trust Report and the External Managers' Performance Report on a quarterly basis, as soon as it is available, to UCSC, to allow interested members to examine the performance of UCRP investment returns in comparison to other public trust funds; and

(b) direct the UC Treasurer and UC's actuary Segal Company to

- provide the annual UCRP funding numbers (benefit payments, contributions, investment returns, and fees and expenses along with assets and liability-related information) annually in dollar amounts in one consistent table for each of its five different segments—UCRP Campus and Medical Center, LBNL, LLNL, LANL, and UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan, and for the whole UCRP; and

(c) direct UC's actuary Segal Company to

- provide projections of the total AAL (actuarial accrued liabilities) for the next five years in the annual actuarial report, and
- provide projections of expected annual benefit payments for the next ten years in the annual actuarial report;

(2) the UC Academic Council to pursue the matters listed above with the systemwide UC administration; and

(3) the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division and the Santa Cruz UCFW Representative to pursue the matters listed above with the UC Academic Council and UCFW.

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Maria-Elena Diaz

Isebil Gruhn *ex officio*

Joel Kubby

Suresh Lodha

Pete Raimondi (W, S)

Jennifer Reardon

Trish Stoddard (S)

Marilyn Westerkamp (S)

Elizabeth Abrams, Chair

May 8, 2009

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
2009-10 Budget Report

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Over the next several weeks, the Senate will provide the campus with a series of reports about the ongoing budget cuts. This memo from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) is the first of several that aim to inform faculty and staff about the budgetary numbers and the rationale (principles and justification) underlying the budget-reduction process. The next, more extended CPB report will address the processes of decision-making and consultation as well as the outcomes. Laying out the budgetary context, we believe, will help us to grasp the magnitude of the cuts to our campus. In turn, that information will allow for the transparency essential to greater faculty participation in the process and more considered assessment of the impacts.

The total UCSC operating budget for 2008-09 is \$540 million (M). Because we have already taken two cuts this year (\$4.5M in permanent reductions when the 08-09 budget was allocated and then \$6M more as a mid-year cut), the current budget is already smaller than in 2007-08, despite the fact that our enrollment remains approximately constant. We will need to make another projected reduction of \$13 million in 2009-10.

There is astonishingly little room in the budget to make a cut of this magnitude. The total "operating" budget of \$540M includes restricted funds, committed by source or mandated policy (for example, contracts and grants, designated student fees). Only a portion of this, \$290M, is state funds, used for our "core" operations, the fundamental, everyday Instruction and Research (I&R) functions and core academic support functions of the campus. The key point is that cuts in state funds are cuts to the "core" budget. Of the core budget, approximately \$220M is used to fund salaries and benefits for faculty, teaching assistants, librarians and staff. This means that over 75% of the core budget is devoted to salaries and benefits. UC has always made the protection and preservation of salaries and personnel a system wide and campus priority, for both ethical and budgetary reasons. The result: there is very little flexibility in the funds and functions that can be cut.

This basic situation is compounded by recent history. In 2008-09, the campus chose to locate the largest cuts in the areas farthest from instruction and research: in the central administration, in administrative and business functions within the academic support units, and, last, in the administrative functions within the academic divisions. Having already followed this preferred route in the 2008-09 cuts, we are now facing a significantly reduced core budget with even less room to maneuver.

We are at the point when the impact on the 2009-10 budget will be far more dramatic and far closer than previously to our core priorities of instruction, research and graduate support. Measuring and assessing those impacts are the critical next step from the Senate perspective. Indeed, CPB views it as a requirement of the budget-cutting process that we understand the effects of our budget cuts, at a minimum, on the core missions of the university.

The 2009-10 budget reduction assignments have just been finalized and announced by CP/EVC Kliger. These cuts are summarized in the following table:

BUDGET REDUCTIONS
 Fiscal year 2009-10

	2008-09 Core*	2009-10 Permanent Reduction	Estimated %
Arts Division	\$11,097,000	\$450,000	4.06%
Humanities Division	\$18,896,000	\$1,000,000	5.29%
Physical & Biological Sciences	\$30,032,000	\$1,150,000	3.83%
Social Sciences Division	\$24,496,000	\$1,300,000	5.31%
Jack Baskin School of Engineering	\$14,229,000	\$600,000	4.22%
UCO Lick Observatory	\$623,000	\$40,000	6.42%
Division of Graduate Studies	\$842,000	\$65,000	7.72%
Vice Chancellor Research	\$2,260,000	\$140,000	6.19%
Library	\$11,013,000	\$1,100,000	9.99%
Business & Administrative Svcs	26,972,000	\$1,100,000	4.08%
Chancellor's Office	\$1,508,000	\$50,000	3.32%
Campus Provost/EVC Office	\$1,442,000	\$144,000	9.99%
Academic Senate	\$1,186,000 **	\$80,000	6.75%
UG Education, SS, and Colleges	\$5,020,000	\$315,000	6.27%
Academic Personnel Office	\$921,000	\$90,000	9.77%
Planning and Budget	\$2,304,000	\$140,000	6.08%
Information Technology Services Div	\$23,424,000	\$1,800,000	7.68%
Student Affairs	\$22,378,000	\$1,500,000	6.70%
University Relations	\$6,001,000	\$500,000	8.33%
Auxiliary Enterprises (CUHS)	63,000,000 ***	\$1,500,000	2.38%
Total Permanent Reduction		\$13,064,000	

* The core budget is the permanent budget. Funds included: General Fund, Lottery Fund, UOF, OTT, Ed Fd, BTP, ITTP, IU, academic preparation funds, registration fees, and endowment cost recovery funds. Funds excluded: purchased utility budget in BAS, endowment income, recharge and self-supporting income, campus mandatory fees, user fees, and miscellaneous other funds such as "Be Smart About Safety".

**The core budget includes senate course relief (\$272K) which is provided centrally.

*** Estimated budget, excluding debt service and major maintenance.

Where are we now?

The reductions distributed by the EVC are final. No further adjustment, either to the overall split between academic and administrative cuts, or to the percentages among the academic or support divisions, will be made. Because the impact of the cuts on instruction is as yet unknown to CPB, we have formulated [a list of questions for the deans](#) as they plan for implementation of the cuts, to aid the administration in understanding these impacts. The EVC has indicated to CPB that mitigations may be made, at the margins, to compensate for major harm. An assessment process to determine the impacts of the reductions on the delivery of the curriculum is now critical.

Where are we going?

Damaging changes induced by the budget crisis are surely inevitable—and we recognize this, as does the rest of the campus. It is also inevitable that budget cuts will continue, given the reduction in state revenues and the likelihood that, as current polling shows, voters may not pass the special May ballot initiatives designed to address the budget crisis. It is difficult to forecast the cuts that will have to be allocated to the UC but the best estimates place them at an order of magnitude far greater than the two-year total of \$17.5 million that we will have thus far sustained.

In anticipation of these cuts, the Office of the President (OP) is developing a systemwide policy specifying the procedures and guidelines for implementing furloughs and salary cuts. Although there is at the present time no specific plan to implement either furloughs or pay cuts, President Yudof has requested Senate consultation on the broad legal framework to allow for both systemwide and campus-by-campus furloughs and salary reductions, should deteriorating financial conditions so require. Both OP and the Senate are on record as stating that furloughs and salary cuts would be used only as options of last resort. ([Click here for President Yudof's statement](#))

We conclude by asking you to stand by for further information. Helping the campus to pull together, both by making the process of budget reduction more transparent and administration-faculty consultation more meaningful, is CPB's first priority.

If you have any immediate comments or questions, please send them to CPB at senate@ucsc.edu. To view CPB's recent correspondence on the budget cuts go to <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/index.html>.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Amy Beal
Gildas Hamel
Herbert Lee
David Marriott
Piero Madau
Cindy Pease-Alvarez
Grant Pogson
Quentin Williams
Lori Kletzer
Susan Gillman, Chair

Kevin Schlaufman, GSA

April 29, 2009

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Budget Report #2
Assessing the Consultation Process

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

As part of the Senate review of the campus-wide consultation on the budget-reduction process this year, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) will report on how consultation occurred with the office of the CP/EVC and other campus administrators. Our focus is on the adequacy of the budget materials presented for review, their timeliness, and the overall significance of our role in the process. To that end, we will start with a timeline of the major decision-making points this year, addressing the following questions: How have the cuts been determined, and how will their impact be assessed? How has information been provided to the campus as a whole, and how has consultation between faculty and administration been conducted at all campus levels? We ask these questions both to address the present moment and the immediate future, when more cuts to an already vulnerable institution are sure to occur. Budget cuts, like investments, reflect our priorities. The campus must address these projected budget reductions from a long-term perspective that takes into explicit account our institutional values and the directions in which we want to develop as a campus.

Timeline of the 2008-09 budget process

A brief backward glance: this year's reductions took place in the context of smaller cuts that had been planned for in 2007-08 and taken in late summer 2008. In this process, the cuts were carefully and differentially assigned, ranging from approximately 1% to 10%, with all the academic divisions at the lowest end and the academic support units at the higher end. Across all units, including the academic divisions, cuts were made wherever possible to administrative functions and services, in order to spare as much as possible direct instruction and research. ([Click here for CPB letter, June 25, 2008](#)). These cuts form a key part of the current reductions, and we will address their cumulative impact at the end of the report, where the overall impacts will be assessed.

December 2008

The budget process started formally at the end of the fall quarter, before the campus was apprised of the exact cut for 2009-10, with what EVC Kliger characterized as an initial information gathering and planning exercise. Each of the principal officers, including the deans as heads of the academic divisions and the vice-chancellors in the administrative or support units (such as Student Affairs and Business and Administrative Services) were asked to present two alternative scenarios for how they would accommodate a 10% cut in their current budget. Due in early January, affording the principal officers approximately one month during the quarter break to respond, the responses were not expected to be detailed but rather very high-level. At the same time, they were assumed to be confidential. The EVC planned to use the results of this exercise to develop one or more "straw-man" proposals, to be discussed at CPB and with the administration, which he would then use to develop the reduction figures.

January-February 2009

While all campus units submitted their plans for a 10% cut by January 9, the submissions were not circulated to CPB until late February, just prior to the EVC's distribution of preliminary reduction targets to all unit heads on March 4. The delay was attributed to the confidentiality of

the information in the plans. Instead of receiving the plans, CPB reviewed three possible approaches for academic unit cuts (uniform cuts or differential cuts based either on the unit's progress to ultimate FTE target in the campus plan or on the unit's potential for advancing campus goals). When the plans were finally released to CPB, they included only those of the administrative units.

Concurrent with this planning for 2009-10 reductions, the EVC announced the mid-year cuts for 2008-09. CPB questioned the apparent shift from the principle of differential cuts on which we had all agreed for 2008-09 to a new principle of equity (designed to compensate the support units that had taken the larger percentage in the initial round of cuts.) ([Click here for CPB letter, February 5, 2009](#)).

In parallel with these developments, the EVC established a small Budget Advisory Group. A series of workgroups were also established to explore areas across campus with the potential for cost-savings and/or efficiencies; these cross-functional teams were to define core functions in a variety of areas (academic organization, academic personnel, institutional support, instruction, instructional support, undergraduate academic advising, and residential and student life programs), addressing whether and how they could be delivered more efficiently. The reports of each of these workgroups will be vetted by the relevant Senate committees. (To date, there are reports on academic personnel, undergraduate advising, and TAPS.)

March 2009

In his letter of March 4, the EVC released 2009-10 preliminary budget reduction assignments. No straw man proposals had been considered, as originally planned. Instead, these targets were based on the high-level reduction plans, which had been produced in the early winter on such a short timeline that little or no consultation had been allowed in the academic divisions. The EVC's letter contained no direct explanation of how he had arrived at the numbers, but instead provided two different justifications for the differential cuts among the academic divisions. Both justifications were based on predictions about the potential for increased fund-raising and enrollment shifts in Arts, Engineering and Physical and Biological Sciences. ([With permission from the EVC, we include his March 4, 2009 letter – Click here](#).)

CPB learned (at our February 26 meeting) only how the EVC had determined the overall split in assigned cuts between the academic (\$4.5 million) and academic support units (\$8.5 million). He examined the plans of the support units and identified what were defined as acceptable impacts, used those totals to determine their percent of the cuts, and then assigned the remainder to the academic divisions.

Feedback on these reduction targets was requested, to be provided to the EVC within two weeks. CPB submitted a written response, questioning the principles used to justify the differential cuts among the academic divisions, which relied on undocumented predictions of enrollment shifts, federal funds and fundraising. ([Click here for CPB letter, March 23, 2009](#).) When the responses from the academic and administrative units were submitted, CPB received only the submissions from the academic divisions, whereas in the winter we had received only the administrative submissions.

April 2009

The preliminary targets become 2009-10 permanent budget reductions.

2 Year View of Permanent Budget Cuts

	A	B	C	D	E
				B+C=D	D / (A+B) = E
	08-09 Core (i)	08-09 Permanent Reduction	09-10 Permanent Reduction	2 Year Total	% of 08-09 Core (ii)
Arts Division	\$11,097,000	\$133,000	\$450,000	\$583,000	5.19%
Humanities Division	\$18,896,000	\$109,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,109,000	5.84%
Physical & Biological Sciences	\$30,032,000	\$372,000	\$1,150,000	\$1,522,000	5.01%
Social Sciences Division	\$24,496,000	\$184,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,484,000	6.01%
Jack Baskin School of Engineering	\$14,229,000	\$147,000	\$600,000	\$747,000	5.20%
UCO Lick Observatory	\$623,000	\$59,000	\$40,000	\$99,000	14.52%
Division of Graduate Studies	\$842,000	\$22,000	\$65,000	\$87,000	10.07%
Vice Chancellor Research	\$2,260,000	\$97,000	\$140,000	\$237,000	10.06%
Library	\$11,013,000	\$364,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,464,000	12.87%
Business & Administrative Svcs	26,972,000	1,681,000	\$1,100,000	\$2,781,000	9.71%
Chancellor's Office	\$1,508,000	\$64,000	\$50,000	\$114,000	7.25%
Campus Provost/EVC Office	\$1,442,000	\$100,000	\$144,000	\$244,000	15.82%
Academic Senate	\$1,186,000 (iii)	\$0	\$80,000	\$80,000	6.75%
UG Education, SS, and Colleges	\$5,020,000	\$0	\$315,000	\$315,000	6.27%
Academic Personnel Office	\$921,000	\$0	\$90,000	\$90,000	9.77%
Planning and Budget	\$2,304,000	\$108,000	\$140,000	\$248,000	10.28%
Information Technology Services	\$23,424,000	\$191,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,991,000	8.43%
Student Affairs	\$22,378,000	\$224,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,724,000	7.63%
University Relations	\$6,001,000	\$44,000	\$500,000	\$544,000	9.00%
Auxiliary Enterprises (CUHS) (iv)	63,000,000 (v)	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	2.38%
Central Reduction		\$626,200		\$626,200	
Total Permanent Reduction		\$4,525,200	\$13,064,000	\$17,589,200	

(i) The core budget is the permanent budget. Funds included: General Fund, Lottery Fund, UOF, OTT, Ed Fd, BTP, ITTP, IU, academic preparation funds, registration fees, and endowment cost recovery funds. Funds excluded: purchased utility budget in BAS, endowment income, recharge and self-supporting income, campus mandatory fees, user fees, and miscellaneous other funds such as "Be Smart About Safety" or continuing funds from OP.

(ii) Percentage was calculated as follows: 2008-09 cuts plus 2009-10 cuts divided into 2008-09 core before the 2008-09 cuts.

(iii) The core budget includes senate course relief (\$272K) which is provided centrally.

(iv) Auxiliary Enterprises are non-instructional support services provided primarily to students in return for specified charges. Services include residence and dining services, parking, and the bookstore. No State funds are provided for auxiliary enterprises. Auxiliaries receive a range of services from core-funded academic support units, such as police, fire, general accounting, payroll, staff HR, labor relations, etc. As self-supporting entities, auxiliaries pay an auxiliary assessment (akin to an overhead assessment) for these core-funded services. In 2008-09, a portion of the auxiliary assessment (\$250,000) was applied to the campus's mid-year temporary budget cut. In 2009-10, \$1.5 million will be applied to the campus cut.

(v) Estimated budget, excluding debt service and major maintenance.

Where are we now?

We have concluded a process of decision-making and consultation that CPB believes was fundamentally flawed. The process has fallen short on several key fronts. The data from the campus units were uneven in scope and level of detail, and were provided irregularly, often not in a timely fashion. The timing of key decision points shifted, and ultimately the process came to a foreshortened conclusion in which preliminary figures became permanent ones without

adequate explanation, from the CPB perspective, of how the conclusions were drawn from the materials provided. As a result, the consultation process this year has left an impression of arbitrariness and lack of planning. We are currently working with the EVC to design a better process for the coming year.

Looking to the future, we have turned to assessing the impacts of two years of budget cuts. (See above table, "2-Year View of Permanent Budget Cuts.") The major principle of the budget reduction process has always been to cut differentially, in order to protect to the greatest extent possible, our number one priority, the core mission of instruction and research. (Across-the-board cuts are often viewed negatively, as an unthinking approach that, in the name of a false egalitarianism, disregards uneven impacts and unintended consequences, and assumes that base budgets are appropriate.)

But if such a differential process was the intent, the outcome for the academic divisions, based on two-year cumulative impact, is closer to a uniform cut. The range is from 5.01% (PBS) to 6.01% (Social Sciences). Despite this, the impacts, as measured by the effects on the curriculum and instructional delivery, which are not yet fully known, appear to be disproportionately distributed across the divisions and do not consistently line up with or reflect the different percentages of the cuts. Divisions are cutting TAS, reducing TA/graduate student support, and eliminating courses at different levels of the curriculum. At the same time, consultation processes are now underway for elements of the divisional plans that require formal Senate review, such as elimination of degrees, minors, and changes in administrative oversight of departments and programs.

Consultations scheduled with all the deans will allow CPB to assess the impact of these curricular reductions both for the short term and their implications for the future. CPB will report orally on the outcomes at the next Senate meeting.

We will issue one more written report this year, outlining the budget consultation process for 2009-10 on which we are now working with the EVC. The aim is to design a process that corrects for the specific problems and breakdowns in communication encountered this year.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Amy Beal
Gildas Hamel
Herbert Lee
David Marriott
Piero Madau
Cindy Pease-Alvarez
Grant Pogson
Quentin Williams
Lori Kletzer
Susan Gillman, Chair

Kevin Schlaufman, GSA

May 8, 2009

**COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION AND ELECTIONS
Amendment to Bylaw 11: Elections**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (CRJE) is proposing changes to Santa Cruz Division Bylaw (SCB) Chapter 11, in order to make the procedure for elections and balloting clearer.

The first change is to allow secret votes to be held in Divisional Senate meetings, as has been a long-standing practice of the Santa Cruz Division. The existing language of SCB 11.1 would imply that such votes are not permitted, since a ballot vote can only be conducted by mail, and as per Sturgis all secret votes are ballot votes.

The second change is to provide some flexibility in the deadline for nominating petitions. Under Academic Senate Bylaws 340.A-B which SCB Chapter 11 refers to, this deadline must be exactly fourteen days from the Notice of Election. A deadline of “no less than fourteen and no more than twenty eight calendar days” will ensure that sufficient time is given to file nominations while allowing for situations when a slightly longer deadline is more practical.

The third change is to deal with a situation the Bylaws do not address at present, and which occurred this year: when the number of nominees is less than the number of vacancies. In such a situation, one could a) declare the nominees elected and hold a new election for the remaining vacancies b) declare the nominees elected and treat the remaining vacancies as mid-year vacancies to be filled by appointment or c) extend the deadline for nominating petitions. To avoid controversy, CRJE feels that the bylaws should clearly specify the procedure to be followed; following the recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee and Committee on Committees, we have chosen the second option.

Current wording

Proposed wording

Chapter 11. Elections	Chapter 11. Elections
<p>11.1 All elections and all balloting in the Santa Cruz Division are by mail and are conducted by the Secretary under the direction of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections in accordance with SB 340A-B.</p>	<p>11.1 All elections and all balloting in the Santa Cruz Division are <u>is either</u> by mail and are conducted by the Secretary under the direction of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections in accordance with SB 340A-B. <u>or, if arising from a motion in a meeting of the Divisional Senate, conducted in the meeting.</u></p> <p><u>11.2 All elections in the Santa Cruz Division are by mail and are conducted by the Secretary under the direction of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections in accordance with SB 340A-B.</u></p>
<p>11.2 The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction,</p>	<p>11.23 Unchanged.</p>

<p>and Elections determines the dates on which Divisional elections should be held, counts or appoints tellers to count the ballots, and certifies the results to the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division.</p> <p>11.3 Each nominating petition for an office must be signed by five voting members and must contain certification of acceptance by the nominee or nominees. Each nominating petition may include as many nominees as there are places to be filled.</p> <p>11.4 A voter may cast one and only one vote for each place to be filled in an election. Candidates receiving the highest plurality of votes cast are elected. If there is a tie vote for the last place to be filled, the selection shall be by lot, conducted by the Secretary.</p>	<p><u>11.34</u> <u>Nominating petitions shall be filed with the Secretary by the deadline specified in the Notice of Election, which will be no less than fourteen and no more than twenty eight calendar days following the mailing or electronic distribution of the Notice.</u> Each nominating petition for an office must be signed by five voting members and must contain certification of acceptance by the nominee or nominees. Each nominating petition may include as many nominees as there are places to be filled.</p> <p><u>If the number of nominees is equal to the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected. If the number of nominees is less than the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected and the remaining vacancies remaining will be treated as mid-year vacancies to be filled in accordance with SCB 13.14.2.</u></p> <p>11.45 <u>Unchanged.</u></p>
---	--

Respectfully submitted;
COMMITTEE ON RULES, JURISDICTION AND ELECTIONS
Jean Fox Tree
Carol Freeman
K.C. Fung
David Koo
Onuttom Narayan, Chair

March 10, 2009

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Recommendation on Faculty Salaries

To: The Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Attached is the follow-up report of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on the work of the Joint Administrative/Senate Task Force on Faculty Salaries. The Task Force recommended a targeted salary competitiveness increase. The Senate was asked by CP/EVC Klinger to make a formal recommendation for a one-time salary infusion, based on an updated analysis of the comparative salary data.

The Senate Executive Committee understands that this report, with its recommendation for a modest increase in salaries, has coincided with a budget crisis of such magnitude that implementing the recommendations may be put on hold while the campus addresses the current budget reductions. But as CP/EVC Klinger and Chancellor Blumenthal have noted on many occasions, faculty salaries remain a campus priority of great urgency. So we transmitted this report to the CP/EVC with the caveat that its financial recommendation of a one-time salary infusion be reconsidered annually, until such time as the campus budget permits implementation. This will require monitoring our relative position in the system and making the necessary adjustments to determine the amount of infusion, should our relative position in the system change. For this reason, the data-gathering used to produce the recommendations should be continued from this point forward. The recommendations of tracking data to monitor UCSC's position do not have budgetary implications that would justify delaying their implementation.

Respectfully Submitted;
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Elizabeth Abrams
Bettina Aptheker
Maureen Callanan
Mark Carr
Sandra Faber
Susan Gillman
Judith Habicht-Mauche
Richard Hughey
Lori Kletzer
Phokion Kolaitis
Jaye Padgett
Carolyn Martin Shaw
Cathy Soussloff
Quentin Williams, Chair

May 5, 2009

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Recommendation on Faculty Salaries

Preamble

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Faculty Salary Subcommittee with analyzing data on comparative salaries for ladder-rank faculty across the UC system gathered by the Academic Personnel Office (APO). The subcommittee presented to SEC an analysis of options for rectifying the low status of UCSC salaries compared to the other UC campuses. This report is the recommendation of the SEC based on that analysis.

The initial goal of this analysis was defined in the Joint Task Force Report: an immediate infusion of funds to bring UCSC salaries in line with the next lowest campus from the bottom, which is UC Davis, ideally by July 1, 2009. Our subcommittee took this modest goal as our main focus. The Joint Task Force report can be viewed at: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/Faculty%20Salaries/FacultySalary%20TaskForce%20Final%20ReportwCharts.pdf>

The Joint Task Force Report also discussed a second, more ambitious goal of reaching the median of the nine mature campuses (including UCB and UCLA) as well as a series of longer-term changes in our personnel practices that would ensure we continue to close the gap between UCSC salaries and those on the other UC campuses. These measures range from recommendations and decisions at the departmental, divisional, CAP and EVC levels, to accountability through an annual review of data used throughout the process. We do not address these longer-term goals here. We enumerate only some of the potential issues to be addressed.

Our report first lays out some principles that guided our work. Next we list some of the potential long-term issues that will need to be addressed. We then turn to the task at hand, describing the nature of the problem, the methodology we used to identify salary gaps and “top performers.” Finally we present our suggested approach.

Principles

One principle that emerged from the work of the Joint Salary Task Force was to consider our highest performing faculty for a one-time salary increase. The data suggest that UCSC faculty who are at the median for their rank and step have salaries comparable to faculty at the median UC-wide. The Task Force focused on the gap in off-scale salaries and argued that it is faculty with merit-based off-scale salaries who are most likely to be underpaid relative to other campuses.

A second principle is in seeking an equitable solution to the salary problem, to recognize that even for those at the median faculty morale is low. Our longstanding position at the bottom end of the salary comparisons, in conjunction with the high cost of living in the Santa Cruz area, has intensified the salary disparities between our campus and the rest of the system. Thus the problem of low salaries in the UC system as a whole has particular local intensities. To this end, the solution proposed is a differentiated salary increase for all ladder-rank faculty.

What is the nature of the problem?

The Joint Task Force report demonstrates that UCSC faculty are the lowest paid in the UC system. The report argues that this gap is best represented by the average size of off-scale salaries. With further analysis and breakdown down of the data, our subcommittee has both confirmed and refined that conclusion.

To address the initial goal of the Joint Task Force report, to equate the UCSC median off-scale dollar amount with that of the next lowest campus by July 1, 2009, we chose UC Davis as the target. UC Davis is the next lowest campus on a number of measures. We focused on the gap between UC Davis and UC Santa Cruz in the salaries at the 75th percentile.

Our focus on the salary gap between UC Davis and UC Santa Cruz, at the 75th percentile, is in line with the Joint Salary Task Force report’s emphasis on off-scale salary gaps, and on the evidence that the salary gap is primarily a problem for the highest performing faculty. In order to identify a target group of high performers, however, off-scale salary is not the best marker. This is because many of our “high performers” are actually on scale (having been accelerated to an on-scale salary). Likewise, some of our faculty are off-scale because of a merit review where they received less than one step of salary. Hence, we focused on salaries at the 75th percentile.

The tables below show last year’s comparison of total salaries (salaries effective 10/1/07) between UCSC and UC Davis at both the median and the 75th percentile for those faculty on the regular scale. Positive numbers indicate that Davis salaries are higher, whereas negative numbers indicate that UCSC salaries are higher.

	AS2	AS3	AS4	AS5	Avg AS	AC1	AC2	AC3	AC4	Avg AC
median	1730	-1438	1755	0	512	-1600	0	0	0	-400
75th	5613	2144	4400	3491	3912	2550	-2332	409	0	157

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	Avg P1-5	P6	P7	P8	P9	Avg P6-9
median	0	0	0	-200	0	-40	-600	905	524	397	307
75th	595	1731 4	439 8	-1950	-163	4039	426 4	655 6	779 8	294 8	5392

These data show that UCSC and UCD median salaries are comparable at many ranks, and the average median gap across ranks is \$105. However, the 75th percentile salaries are considerably higher at UCD for most ranks.

The overall average gap between UCSC and UCD (across ranks) in 75th percentile salary = \$3375

The next tables show an update of the same comparisons with this year's (effective 10/1/08) data:

	AS2	AS3	AS4	AS5	Avg AS	AC1	AC2	AC3	AC4	Avg AC
median	3600	-1985	1400	-3100	21	-1172	0	0	0	-293
75th	3400	500	2894	1314	2027	1836	894	727	3849	1827

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	Avg P1-5	P6	P7	P8	P9	Avg P6-9
median	0	0	-200	-400	-2100	-675	-1850	905	524	397	-6
75th	295	12258	4800	-3500	-1314	2508	9478	4691	8892	5258	7080

With regard to the median salary gap, there seems to be slight improvement in one year: UCSC is actually higher than Davis on average across ranks by \$238. But in terms of the 75th percentile, UC Davis continues to maintain a significant advantage.

Using these data, UCSC is behind Davis by an average of \$3361.

Based on these two sets of data, we conclude that while faculty with salaries at the median are not disadvantaged relative to the next lowest paid campus, there is an estimated average gap of approximately \$3400 for the “high performers” at given ranks. Although the actual salary gap varies across steps and ranks, some of these figures are based on very small numbers of cases, and the gaps at given ranks shift from year to year. We argue, then, that it makes more sense to use the overall average as a basis for our recommended strategies for salary infusion.

The numbers provided above are from the “regular” scale, but analyses of the Economics and Engineering salaries indicate that there are similar gaps between UCSC and the other campuses for the faculty paid on the Business, Economics and Engineering (BEE) scale. Hence, we followed the same strategy described above to determine the “gap” between UCSC and UC Davis for that scale.

With salaries as of 10/1/07, the salary gaps between UCSC and UC Davis in Economics and Engineering are:

	AS2	AS3	AS4	AS5	Avg AS	AC1	AC2	AC3	AC4	Avg AC
median	-9546	-4203	-3200	359	-4147	3791	3431	0	1345	2142
75th	-9487	-2577	-2385	997	-3363	16768	11050	97	10000	9479
count	6	13	7	8		3	6	8	4	

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	Avg P1-5	P6	P7	P8	P9	Avg P6-9
median		0	0	0	0	0	-5300	-2150	-3100	-4650	-3800
75th		-2142	0	0	2901	190	1693	-5421	-6250	-11300	-5319
count	0	8	7	6	2		1	6	4	8	

The analogous numbers for Economics and Engineering salaries as of 10/1/08 are:

	AS2	AS3	AS4	AS5	Avg AS	AC1	AC2	AC3	AC4	Avg AC
median	3700	-5977	-3476	-1800	-1888	-486	791	6791	795	1973
75th	1400	-2150	-2227	-4300	-1819	6358	10668	16430	9700	10789
count	4	12	8	5		3	8	7	4	

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	Avg P1-5	P6	P7	P8	P9	Avg P6-9
median	-700	0	0	0	0	-140		-2900	-1750	-7950	-4200
75th	-1303	3988	0	0	-2200	97		-5421	-4000	-3266	-4229
count	2	9	6	6	4		0	5	4	10	

At the median, the average gap shows that we are ahead by \$810, whereas at the 75th percentile, we are behind overall by \$1480 on average. The counts are very small, and thus the numbers are quite unstable, heavily dependent on the salaries of individual faculty. Note that there was only a single full Professor Step 6, and no full Professors Step 1 at UCSC, so the idea of computing a median or a 75th percentile is rather suspect. Also note that the range of the numbers is much larger (compared to the regular scale) in both positive and negative directions, further indicating the instability of the small counts. Thus we recommend using the salary gap figures from the rest of campus and applying those to all faculty, including economics/engineering faculty.

The Recommended Solution

We take the suggestion from the Joint Salary Task Force report to identify high performers based on the history of greater-than-normal advancements and accelerations. Looking back over the last three actions for each faculty member, we can identify those who have had at least one greater-than-normal or accelerated action in the past three actions. For those who have had only two actions (such as Assistant Professors or those who are new to campus), we consider those with at least one greater-than-normal or accelerated action in the past two actions.

We recommend that all faculty with at least one greater-than-normal action be identified as “high performers.”

The subcommittee considered an alternative (higher) threshold for defining “high performer,” such as two out of three greater-than-normal actions. Our current analysis of the data leaves us uncomfortable with the possibility of uneven awarding of greater-than-normal across disciplines. While there is no clear pattern, we note that there is some evidence that faculty in disciplines where books are the primary outlet of publication are likely to have an acceleration bracketed by a number of normal one-step merits, whereas those who publish mostly in journals have more opportunities to exceed publishing expectations in several actions in a row.

Using the criterion of at least one greater-than-normal advancement or acceleration in the last three actions, there are 224 faculty on the regular scale who can be identified as high

performers. There are an additional 50 faculty on the BEE scale who are high performers by the criteria above, for a total of 274 faculty.

We recommend a plan that combines targeted salary increases for high performers with an across-the-board increase for all faculty.

Taking the UCD-UCSC gap of approximately \$3400 calculated in the last section, we recommend an infusion of \$3400 to every high performer (those with at least one greater-than-normal advancement or acceleration in the last three actions). We also recommend a salary increase of \$1000 to all other ladder-rank faculty. Our estimate is that the total campus cost for this would be roughly \$1.2 million.

Long Term Issues

In its discussions, the Salary Subcommittee identified a number of additional areas for longer-term consideration. Without priority, we suggest that the Senate work with the administration to define a process and address these issues, in the spirit of the Joint Salary Task Force's recommendation that an annual comprehensive review should be conducted of salary data at UCSC in comparison to other UC campuses. We believe that each of the following issues may have had an impact on salaries at UCSC.

- Our base salaries may be lower because prior to the 10/1/07 adjustment, COLA was calculated only on the on-scale portion, not on the full salary (as is done on other UC campuses).
- Faculty generally take longer to reach a given step than at other campuses, as measured by time since degree.
- Starting salaries and starting ranks may be lower than at other UC campuses.
- UCSC may be less likely to make exceptions to off-scale limits than are other UC campuses.
- Typical off-scale amounts recommended in personnel reviews may be lower than that of the other campuses.
- Disciplinary differences in time to publication may affect merits.
- Divisional inconsistencies and unevenness may affect merits.

Conclusion

This report provides an analysis of current salary data, as background and justification for a proposed one-time salary infusion, using the gap between the UCSC and UC Davis salaries at the 75th percentile for their rank and step. We also describe a methodology for identifying high performing faculty, using the history of greater-than-normal and accelerated merits.

It is important to note that this infusion would be a very small step toward parity, using as its target the next lowest paid campus. UC Davis has recently written a report on UC salaries similar to our Joint Task Force report, indicating that they hope to increase their salaries relative to the UC averages. Hence, this is a moving target, and it will be crucial to follow the task force recommendation to monitor the salary comparisons every year, reviewing existing policies and determining new strategies each year to continue our upward progress.

The subcommittee's charge is a relatively narrow one: identify options for implementing a one-time infusion that would have (1) the greatest effect in raising total faculty salaries

on our campus and (2) the greatest equity and least subjectivity as a process. Our recommended solution reflects these requirements by seeking a targeted formula by which to review and compensate faculty and to move us further toward the nine-campus median, the second goal of the Joint Task Force report.

Remaining Questions

- 1) The report only addresses ladder-rank faculty and leaves aside the problem that Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) are members of the faculty whose salaries have not been adjusted in the recent salary adjustments. We intend to take the next step of analyzing the relevant data for the LSOE in order to determine whether there is a salary gap, and if so, recommend solutions. We will request that the campus take action on our findings.
- 2) We have not addressed more subtle issues such as how to account for differences in merit over a recent period among the faculty, and the need to systemically address special cases, such as active service/modified duty or family/medical leave that may have affected the rate of advance.
- 3) It is important to recognize that by our proposed adjustment, all ladder-rank faculty will be off-scale, and our median off-scales will consequently go down. In monitoring our progress under those conditions, it will be necessary to look at total salaries rather than off-scale amounts.