

MINUTES

A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
May 30, 2001

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, May 30, 2001 in Kresge Town Hall. With Parliamentarian Don Potts and Secretary David Koo present, Chair Roger Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. Chair Anderson requested and received without objection, to add the following items to the agenda: 1) a minority report to the University Center Report (5a) and 2) two resolutions on faculty housing from the Committee on Committees (after 6b). Professor Jaye Padgett moved to re-order the agenda as follows: Item 6a. Committee on Teaching: Proposed change to Bylaw 13.28.1 be moved before 6a. The motion carried by a vote of 36 in favor and 6 opposed. Chair Anderson noted that many faculty in the room chose not to vote.

1. Approval of Minutes

Chair Anderson asked if there were any further corrections to the minutes from the meetings of February 23, 2000, November 9, 2000, November 27, 2000 and February 21, 2001 (with continuations on March 8, 2001). Professor Bob Meister rose to request that the URL be included in the minutes for the full text of speeches that were given in the presentation of the report from the Committee on Planning and Budget on February 21, 2001.

A motion to approve all four meeting minutes, with corrections, to be considered together was made and seconded. The minutes were all approved by unanimous voice vote.

2. Announcements**a) Chair Anderson**

Campus Provost Simpson will not be making announcements today, but Chancellor Greenwood will be using the time for her announcements. Chair Anderson commended the Senate on conclusively dealing with the issue of grading and student assessment this year by adopting mandatory grades and retaining mandatory evaluations. Grades have often been considered the common currency of the realm. What the Santa Cruz Senate has done is to set the exchange rate for this currency at a higher rate than that of the common currency. We've added value for both the students and for prospective readers of transcripts by instituting grades and keeping narrative evaluations.

Chair Anderson recognized the 2000-01 Excellence in Teaching Awardees: Frank Andrews (Chemistry), Jeremy Elkins (Legal Studies), Dana Frank (American Studies), Frank Galuszka (Art), Jody Greene (Literature), Conn Hallinan (Writing), Jorge Hankamer (Linguistics), Charles McDowell (Computer Science), Daniel Palleros (Chemistry), Robert Shepherd (Economics), Michael Urban (Politics), and Karen Yamashita (Literature).

Chair Anderson announced that in the past two years UCSC has reached the criteria to become a Carnegie I Research Institution and can now look to achieving AAU status. UCSC has achieved excellence in teaching with several new and exciting programs and research with new centers and institutes and internationally recognized accomplishments in the midst of enormous campus growth at about 7% per year. Factors such as revised eligibility criteria for UCSC admissions and the Dual Admissions program both assure that such growth will continue. Although many capital projects such as the Seymour Discovery Center, the Graduate Commons, and the new bookstore are at or near completion, capital projects cannot be completed fast enough to keep up with enrollment growth. Committee on Planning and Budget has emphasized this challenge in their reports this year.

For the next two years, the campus will have to grapple with the issues of improving faculty and staff housing and salaries; instituting state funded summer session; and developing the Silicon Valley Center and the Monterey Bay Education Science and Technology Center (MBEST). Other issues, some longer term, include moving toward selectivity in admissions; defining the role of the colleges; aiding recruitment and retention of faculty; enlarging graduate student enrollment, perhaps with new professional schools; and improving undergraduate advising and research opportunities. Chair Anderson expressed optimism in the Senate's ability to work with the administration on these and other issues and opportunities.

Rising on a question of privilege, Professor John Hay read the following statement: The Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate wishes to express its deep gratitude to Professor Roger Anderson for his unfailing commitment to the present and the future well-being of the Division, a commitment, as I can well attest being on Committee on Planning and Budget, that he has substantiated by unstinting efforts and remarkable patience during this tenure as Chair of the Division. In the period when growth presents as many dangers as opportunities, and when knowledge of UCSC's defining past has become critical in articulating our transition to an inevitably different future, Chair Anderson's

knowledge and sensitivity in matters of planning both large and small from the bottom upwards and from the top downwards have provided an invaluable center of gravity for the Senate as a whole and its committees in particular.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

On behalf of herself and Campus Provost Simpson, Chancellor Greenwood expressed grateful acknowledgement of Chair Anderson's helpful advice and guidance for the past two years. Chancellor Greenwood announced that Professor Hayden White was awarded the Constantine Panuzio Distinguished Emeriti Award that recognizes UC emeritus faculty for outstanding scholarship or education service.

Due to the energy crisis and a downturn in state revenues, the projected \$6 billion surplus did not materialize. Consequently, it is expected that the state's Compac with Higher Education, which would have provided a 5 percent increase, including roughly 4 percent for salaries and 1 percent for libraries has been cut back to 2 percent total. The budget is currently in conference and the University is aggressively advocating to have funding for salaries partially restored. On the good news side, the University will receive funding for all budgeted enrollment. Also, the Governor's science initiatives are being funded and UCSC is involved in two of these. For QB III, UCSC expects to receive \$5M in state funds; \$1M for equipment, \$3.5M for an additional 5,000 square feet to the proposed engineering building and \$0.5M to upgrade the engineering wing of the physical science building. For CITRIS, UCSC expects to receive \$7M for an additional 15,000 square feet to the engineering building. Although we will need to raise an additional \$4M for this capital project, our capital budget did get a boost by participating in these Governor's initiatives.

There is the possibility of a bond issue for higher education. UC Office of the President has reached an agreement with CSU and the community colleges on a \$4.8 billion proposal that would provide each segment with \$333M. It will also set aside an additional \$200M for new off-campus joint use facilities. If the bond issue gets approved at that level and gets on the ballot, then it is important that all of us help in its support.

The Chancellor announced that the architects for the Inclusion Area D faculty housing project will be at the evening's strolling dinner with site location plans and drawings for the facilities. Faculty can see the projections for two plans in terms of possible density and types of rental and for-sale homes, square footage, etc. (another opportunity for faculty to examine the plans was announced for 8 June). The CEQA process and designing of the facilities will be on a parallel track. There is some amount of risk in this, but all factors indicate that the project will get through the CEQA process successfully. If nothing goes wrong, ground breaking can begin in the summer of 2002. Any delays are expected to be less than 9 months.

UCSC has made a \$1.5 million commitment to a childcare facility and has asked UC Office of the President for a matching allocation, creating a \$3M commitment to the facility. Campus will be fundraising with foundations for another \$3M. There should be significant progress on this facility in the next year. Some faculty have volunteered to assist with grant writing.

Besides mentioning several steps to improve communications between the faculty and administration, the Chancellor noted that undergraduate admissions for UCSC this coming year are about 4 percent over expected, although the numbers are not final until June. Admissions of underrepresented students are about 14 percent over predictions. UC Regent Sue Johnson is chairing the Commission on Support of Graduate Education. The report is expected in fall 2001 and should help to inform the campus discussion of advancing graduate education and research.

Responding to questions from the floor about the appropriate density for Inclusion Area D, Chancellor Greenwood said that the architects are looking at the feasibility of raising the density from 91 to 100. While Inclusion Area D is being developed as quickly and efficiently as possible, it is only the first in a series of housing projects. UCSC, with funding from UCOP, has already begun the site evaluation of the 400-acre area known as north campus. Professor Francisco Hernandez said that the gathering of the environmental baseline data-bio data, soils, geology, hydrology, etc. started about a year ago. The administration is already working with Sasaki Associates (architects) and Jones & Stokes (environmental design) to develop models for housing, future colleges, and other facilities. The project is about 18 months behind the schedule of Inclusion Area D.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly

Professor Susan Schwartz submitted the report of the Assembly in writing.

The Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California held two regular meetings on February 28 and May 23, 2001. Following are highlights from these meetings.

President Atkinson's Remarks

- 2001-2002 Budget- The Governor's May revision to the budget includes \$100M in new funds for energy costs and \$12.8M for increased enrollments; however, due to the slowing economy and the reduction in 2001-2002 revenues, it cuts Partnership funds to UC by \$90M. The Senate and Assembly versions of the budget differ a bit from the Governor's budget and from each other; the conference committee will begin to resolve these differences. Restoration of the Partnership funds is among the University's highest priorities.
- California Institutes for Science and Innovation- Three institutes are moving forward with the first of four \$75M annual State appropriations approved by the Governor and the legislature. The California Institute for Bioengineering, Biotechnology, and Quantitative Biomedicine, is a collaboration between UCSF, UCB and UCSC. \$33M of initial funding for a fourth Institute, The Center for Information Technology Research and the Interest of Society a collaboration between UCB, UCD, UCM, and UCSC) was approved by the Governor and the legislature.
- Fall 2001 Admissions- UC had an 8% increase in freshmen applications with gains in freshman admissions from all ethnic groups. The number of admissions systemwide increased by 18.5% among Chicanos, 17.2% among Latinos, 13.6% among African Americans, 6.3% among American Indians and 5.2% among students of other ethnic groups.
- Housing Task Force- To address the housing crisis facing the University, a housing task force co-chaired by Regent Sue Johnson and Senior Vice President Mullinix and consisting of representatives from The Regents, campuses, the Academic Senate, students, and community members has been appointed.
- UC Merced- Professor David Ashley was appointed as executive vice chancellor for UC Merced. Interviews for major administrative positions are underway.

Academic Senate Chair Cowan's Announcements

Chair Cowan intends to establish a committee to deal with the academic component of year round operation. He also mentioned that faculty consultation on the effects on admissions of rescinding SP-1 and SP-2 would be required over the summer and that faculty participation would be compensated.

The Variance to Senate Regulations regarding UCSC's grading system was unanimously approved at the February 28, 2001 meeting.

Dual Admissions Policy (DAP)

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Chair Dorothy Perry made a presentation to the Assembly on the Dual Admissions Policy. This policy was first proposed by President Atkinson and endorsed with modification by BOARS. The Dual Admissions Policy allows non-UC eligible high school seniors in the top 12.5% of their graduating class to apply for admission to UC and guarantees admission after successful completion of a course of study at a California community college. The goal of this program is to increase the number of community college graduates that transfer to UC campuses. The Assembly approved in principle the DAP with the understanding that the program will be instituted only with adequate funding for counseling and a formal review of the program after 5 years. After numerous concerns were expressed, the Assembly passed a change in Senate Regulation 476 to add this fourth eligibility path to UC.

Senate Bylaws Changes Governing Privilege & Tenure Standards

The University Committee on Privilege & Tenure presented modifications to the Universitywide Senate Bylaws governing the standards and procedures used by P&T committees to be approved by the Assembly. The modifications separate a single bylaw into three bylaws describing each of the main procedures that P&T deals with (discipline, grievance, and early termination) and clarify regulations to protect faculty rights and expedite the dealings of P&T. After two small amendments the revisions were approved unanimously.

Amendment to Senate Regulation 630

The University Committee on Educational Policy presented an amendment of Senate Regulation 630 for approval by the Assembly. This amendment removes the restriction on the number of quarters or semesters a student can complete in summer session. This amendment passed.

Report from UC Faculty Welfare

Chair Judith Gruber reported on: 1) the Regent's approval of significant improvements to the UC Retirement System; 2) the availability of UCOP matching funds for construction of childcare facilities; 3) the reduction of UC Partnership Funds not permitting salary parity with our comparison Universities but allowing merit increases and a 0.5% COLA for faculty; 4) the unfavorable UC budget climate putting on hold the domestic-partner, benefit-equalization initiative.

Professor Joel Yellin asked about the impact of the Dual Admissions Program (DAP) on the Santa Cruz campus. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid Chair John Tamkun stated that the DAP formalizes a pathway for

admission that already exists, so the hope is that it will increase the number of transfers to the system. It does not change any of the admissions requirements for this campus and will provide additional funding for counseling transfer students. CAFA did discuss DAP and feedback from the campus was forwarded by the BOARS representative.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a) Committee on Emeriti Relations: Annual Report (AS/SCP/1307)

CER Chair William Domhoff encouraged those faculty considering emeriti status in the next five years to begin now on working with their departments to establish regulations regarding emeriti status. It will be particularly important in terms of teaching since emeriti will be needed during the campus' growth phase and the implementation of state funded summer sessions. The report was received without comment.

5. Reports of Special Committees

a) University Center (AS/SCP/1300)

Chair Anderson relinquished the Chair to Senate Vice Chair Carla Freccero. The report was presented by Professor Chris Connery, Co-Chair of the committee. The University Center will be opening as part of Colleges 9 and 10 dining commons in Fall of 2002 with facilities for events such as lectures, colloquia and meetings. Of the \$400,000 required in gifts to fund the Center, \$267,000 has already been raised. The tasks for the future will include establishing operational aspects of the Center such as drafting bylaws and setting membership. Professor Joel Yellin presented a minority report as an addition. Both reports were received without comment.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Teaching: Proposed Changes to Bylaw 13.28.1 (AS/SCP/1299)

With Senate Chair Roger Anderson presiding, COT Chair Jaye Padgett moved the legislation. Responding to a question from the floor, Chair Padgett clarified the voting rights for the committee as follows. Those non-Senate members sitting with the committee have no voting rights. The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Committee on Academic Freedom: Proposed Change to Bylaw 13.9.1 (AS/SCP/1301)

Chair Joel Yellin moved the legislation stating that the current wording did not provide for graduate student representation. Chair of the Committee on Rules Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E) Stanley Williamson stated that RJ&E has reviewed the proposed change and previously recommended to the Committee on Academic Freedom that the last eight words "who shall not have the right to vote" of the legislation be struck, since it is redundant with Bylaw 13.4.1 which defines voting membership to only divisional members. RJ&E also found the proposed change does not conform with the language of all the equivalent bylaws that are the charges of the other Senate committees with student representation.

Chair Yellin responded with the following points. The decision to repeat in a Bylaw words already present elsewhere in the Bylaws is a policy decision not within the purview of RJ&E. The wording is exactly the same as the charge to CAF in the Bylaws of UC San Diego and many campuses in the system. Many committees do not realize that students and others who do not have the right to vote cannot sign annual reports. UCSC is out of compliance with the practice observed all over the UC system. UCSC has the responsibility to act consistently with the statewide bylaws.

Chair Anderson called for and received a second on the motion.

Professor John Isbister moved that the last eight words of the legislation be struck so that it reads:

13.9.1 There shall be four Santa Cruz Division members. The Committee shall also have one undergraduate student representative and one graduate student representative.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Speaking for the amendment:

Carol Freeman

Geoffrey Pullum

James Sheldon (student representative to CAF)

Points made for the amendment:

Signature on a report does not necessarily indicate that people voted on the content. Including the final phrase as a special case for one committee would imply that something different was true for the other committees. The final phrase that would be omitted by the amendment was unanimously opposed in a recent vote by the Student Union Association. Furthermore, the Bylaws of the UC Berkeley Division, Committee on Academic Freedom, Title 4, Section 29-A says

that the committee has five senate members and two student members, and there is an asterisk down at the bottom of the page which says: see Bylaw 13-C. Bylaw 13-C, Part 4, on voting procedures reads: “on all formal votes in committees attended by student members, the student opinions will be recorded separately and so reported whenever the recommendations of the committee is presented to the Division or other Academic Senate bodies and to administrative officers advised by such committee.”

Speaking against the amendment:
Joel Yellin

Points made against the amendment:

Names do not appear on reports simply for identification, but to indicate that the signators have read the report and agree with its contents. An example of the underlying problem is that on the report of CAP, under discussion here, the student representative opposed the proposal, and has no vote, yet his name appears on the document as though he can vote and agrees to the proposal.

Professor Ethan Miller moved a substitute amendment to read:

13.9.1 There shall be four Santa Cruz Division members. The Committee shall also have one undergraduate student representative and one graduate student representative, neither of whom shall have the right to vote.

The substitute motion was defeated by a show of hands 22 in favor, 26 opposed.

After further debate, the amendment to strike the last eight words of the main motion passed by a voice vote. With no further debate, the amended main motion was called to question and passed unanimously by voice vote.

c. Committee on Committees: Proposed Change to Bylaw 4.2 (AS/SCP/1301)

COC Chair Shelly Errington moved adoption of the legislation and explained that the intent of this bylaw change to shorten the term of office for the Senate Vice Chair to one year is to create a small pool of experienced Senate leaders from which a Senate chair may be chosen. The motion was seconded.

Professor Joel Yellin offered a friendly amendment that, instead of “is appointed”, the bylaw will read, “shall be appointed”. The friendly amendment was accepted so that the bylaw read:

4.2 Vice Chair

A Vice Chair of the Santa Cruz Division shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees for a term of one year and serves as a Divisional Representative to the Assembly of the Academic Senate. Should the office become vacant before the completion of a term, the Committee on Committees shall appoint a Vice Chair to fill the remainder of the term. The Vice Chair carries out all of the duties of the Chair in the absence or incapacity of the Chair, or such duties as are delegated by the Chair.

With no further debate, the amended bylaw passed by unanimous voice vote.

d. Committee on Committees: Resolution for Special Advisory Committee On Affordable Housing for New Faculty (AS/SCP/1314)

COC Chair Shelly Errington moved the resolution with two minor changes in the text.

First, that the second paragraph be changed as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: we propose the creation of a new Special Committee of the Academic Senate be created as follows:

Second, that the final paragraph be changed so as to strike the words “at least one from each division”.

The motion was seconded.

The COC Chair explained that the special committee is being established to address the housing crisis that has adversely affected recruitment, retention, and morale of faculty. It will report to the Committee on Faculty Welfare; the Committee on Land and Building Development; and the Senate as a whole.

Discussion:

Considerable discussion among several faculty focused mainly on the connotations of using the phrase “new faculty” for the name of the committee. A number of points were raised. The resolution is unclear on the relationship between new faculty and junior faculty, since there are examples of new faculty who are not untenured or junior and yet have the same housing problems. This issue is pressing across faculty ranks, not just new faculty. Retention issues affect the campus as a whole, not just untenured faculty. Concerns were raised on the impact on the faculty participating in this committee. Many faculty have come through the ranks and are now associate professors and yet they still have not had their housing problems solved. The breadth and depth of this problem throughout the ranks has to be recognized in the composition of the committee. Proposals for faculty housing will have to be integrated with the broader campus plans for all housing, particularly staff housing. If we began by integrating staff housing issues into the focus of this committee, there would be a smoother transition to implementation in the future. Broadening the charge could also slow the process down.

Chair Errington clarified that if the charge of the Special Committee were broadened in this way, it would overlap with the charge of the Committee on Faculty Welfare. COC carefully chose the word “new” and admittedly left the designation vague. That the Special Committee was not established as a subcommittee of Faculty Welfare or Land and Building Development was intended to make it more visible and to give the Committee the ability to report to the Senate as a whole. Also, this method does not require changing the bylaws or charge of any standing committee. A subcommittee can only consist of members of that committee and cannot have additional (at large) members. So it would not be possible to add extra manpower to the effort of addressing the housing issue.

Professor Scott Brandt suggested that the definition of “new” be understood to apply to anybody who has not yet found permanent housing. COC Chair Errington expressed approval of this suggestion. Professor Joel Yellin offered a friendly amendment to strike the word “New” from the Committee’s title. This was rejected on the grounds that it might create an overlap of the special committee’s charges with the charge of the Committee on Faculty Welfare.

The resolution to establish the Special Advisory Committee was approved by unanimous voice vote.

e. Committee on Committees: Resolution on the Faculty Housing Allocation Policy (AS/SCP/1315)

COC Chair Errington moved the following resolution:

Resolution:

WHEREAS the current allocation policy for on-campus purchased housing is based on obsolete assumptions about the housing market in Santa Cruz and no longer adequately addresses the needs of the faculty, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED:

that new faculty members, having been told that they will be given priority in the allocation of housing on campus, must not lose priority to faculty members hired after them without ever having been given the opportunity to purchase an adequate house on campus; AND

that the housing allocation policy as it applies to all faculty members must be revised to provide a fair and straightforward policy that best addresses the current needs of the faculty.

The motion was seconded. This resolution from COC was co-sponsored with two people from the floor.

Speakers during the discussion of the resolution:

Robert Boltje	Carla Freccero
Scott Brandt (co-sponsor)	Brent Haddad
Maureen Callanan	Geoffrey Pullum
Shelly Errington	Mark Traugott (CFW Chair)
Margaret Fitzsimmons	

Points made during the discussion:

The resolution will address the gross problems with the current allocation policy. In particular, the current system for allocating housing on campus is based on the assumption that everyone on the list will have the opportunity to buy a house within two years. After two years, faculty now lose their priority to new faculty, even though the earlier faculty never had a chance to exercise their priority. The proposed resolution supports the principle that people who were made housing promises earlier do not lose priority to people who come later. The resolution will not solve the problem of

housing, but should encourage the administration to rewrite the policy to that it is transparent and just. Each person's priority should be clear.

The proposed resolution's use of the word "new" is ambiguous, and a friendly amendment was proposed (but not accepted) that any changes to the priority system would not apply to faculty hired through July 2001. The proposed resolution would interfere with the existing system of priorities and there would be losers, some of whom, because of financial decision changes, could have possible grounds for a lawsuit. The current version is vague and what it would do is unclear. The administration sets up the priority policy. The resolution would actually hurt short-term recruitment. The main problem is not the priority system but a large mismatch between demand and the availability of new housing.

The resolution on faculty housing allocation policy passed by a voice vote.

f. Committee on Committees (COC) Nominations (AS/SCP/1311)

Professor Joel Yellin asked the Senate Chair to consider going into Executive Session to discuss specific aspects of the COC nominations. Second, he questioned whether the procedures now used for undergraduate and graduate student grade appeals are consistent with academic due process for faculty. Thus, those nominations are for a committee whose operations may be out of compliance with Senate Bylaws. Chair Anderson ruled not to go to executive session.

For the current Spring quarter, Chair Errington nominated the following:

Narrative Evaluations Student Grievance Hearing Committee:

Bill Ladusaw as Chair, Richard Hughey, Judith Habicht-Mauche

In addition to the 2001-02 committee nominations listed in the CALL, Chair Errington nominated the following:

Emeriti Relations: Don Osterbrock for Fall quarter

Land and Building Development: Amelie Hastie

Special Committee on Merit Equity Review: Katherine Metz, Maria Schonbek

Special Committee on Affordable Housing: Pat Mantey As Chair, Scott Brandt

As Vice Chair, Bill Sullivan, Ken Kletzer.

In the discussion that followed, three issues were raised by CAF Chair Joel Yellin.

First, a member of the Administration, who might have a conflict of interest, is being appointed to Chair the NE Student Grievance Hearing Committee. Second, he questioned if the procedure that is now used for undergraduate and graduate student grade appeals is consistent with academic due process for faculty. Finally, those nominations are for a committee that may be out of compliance with the Bylaws. P&T Chair George Blumenthal stated that P&T had reviewed the issue as raised by CAF and had recommended that this committee continue so that there would be an appeals procedure in place for students.

The nominations were approved by voice vote.

g. Committee on Educational Policy: Amendments to Regulations (AS/SCP/1309)

CEP Chair Carol Freeman moved the amendments. She summarized them by stating that a vast majority of students do not have GPAs and that academic progress toward degree and academic standing is monitored by counting the number of courses passed per quarter. The proposed amendments are intended to address several issues. First, they will add an effective tool for monitoring performance so that students in academic trouble can be identified more quickly for advising and support. Second, they will bring UCSC into compliance with federal guidelines for awarding financial aid. Finally, the amendments will ensure that all regulations are consistent in indicating that the grade "No Pass" will appear permanently on a student's official transcript. The motion was seconded.

Professor Joel Yellin rose to a point of inquiry asking for assurance that the majority of CEP was in favor of the legislation. CEP Chair Freeman stated that this was the case; although no vote was taken, there was clear consensus in the meeting.

The Amendments passed by unanimous voice vote.

h. Committee on Educational Policy: Draft Advisory Guidelines for Writing Performance (Narrative) Evaluations (AS/SCP/1310)

CEP Chair Carol Freeman introduced the Draft Guidelines stating that it was submitted not for discussion, but to solicit input in writing about the draft.

i. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture Nomination (AS/SCP/1306)

Professor Shelley Stamp reported the nomination of Professor David Haussler of the Department of Computer Science as the Faculty Research Lecturer for 2001-2002. The nomination was approved by acclamation.

j. Committee on Planning and Budget: Report #5 on the Silicon Valley Center (AS/SCP/1312)

The report was presented by CPB Chair John Hay. A question from the floor pointed to the report's description of year-round operations being adopted by the Administration in the face of expressed reservations of the Graduate Council, the Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Committee on Academic Personnel, and CPB. CPB Chair Hay stated that the response of the Senate committees was concerned with when implementation of year round operations would occur. Campus Provost John Simpson rose to clarify that the Administration was asked with a very rapid turnaround by the Office of the President if UCSC would be interested in going to state-funded summer session during summer 2002. Senate committees were consulted and responded they had reservations, which were no different than those of the Administration.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly

Chair Matt Becker presented the Student Union report. Beginning with the December 3, 1999 Special meeting and continuing through the events of last year surrounding the narrative evaluation discussion, students have felt that they were shut out of the Senate process. This year there has been increased cooperation and discussion between the faculty and the students. Students would like to address the issue of increased student participation in the decision making process in several different areas.

Regarding the issue of mandatory grades, once they are implemented, students would like to see an evaluation of their effect on retention, academic dishonesty, and improvement of the quality of students who choose to attend UCSC. By evaluating these, we will be able to determine the realization of the promised benefits and/or the possible detriments that the opponents of mandatory grades have raised.

Students ask that the Academic Senate seriously consider supporting the move of the Student Center to the soon-to-be vacated Bay Tree Bookstore location and the entire package of that move, including the Learning Center moving into the current student center location. Students spent a year and a half of time and a large amount of student money in preparing for this move with the understanding that it would occur according to the plans developed with the Administration. Unfortunately, these plans have recently come into question and there is doubt as to whether they will actually end up going through. Students ask that the Senate look into this and consider supporting the plans of student governance Board regarding the swap of space.

Students would like to thank the faculty for their support in requesting the repeal of the Regents' ban on affirmative action, SP1 and SP2, and look forward to working with faculty over the coming months to develop a new admissions process in the aftermath of the repeal.

Finally, over the past two years, the disparity in voice between the Senate and the students has become increasingly apparent. Students ask for the support of the Senate in their attempts to establish a shared governance process whereby students will have their voice considered in the decisions of the University. We are not attempting to take any power or authority away from the Senate but would simply like to make sure that all voices are heard in any actions of policy.

This report from the Student Union Assembly is the first that has occurred at the Senate since winter of last year. SUA Chair asked that the Senate Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, & Elections look into the possibility of amending the agenda so that the reports of student organizations are reordered to follow the announcements of the Chancellor and Campus Provost.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

ATTEST:

David Koo
Secretary
September 27, 2001

Recording Secretary: Mary-Beth Harhen