

MINUTES

A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division March 6, 2002

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, March 6, 2002 in Classroom Unit II. With Secretary David Belanger and Parliamentarian Allen Van Gelder present, Chair George Blumenthal called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

Professor Joel Yellin proposed a change to the minutes of October 24, 2001 on page 7, to give an accurate account for the record of the Chair's response to a point of order adding the sentence: "The Senate has no power to change the words of a committee report." Chris Amico, Student Union Assembly, proposed a change on page 8, 6b to include: "We ask that faculty continue to write thorough evaluations." The minutes for October 24, 2001 were then approved with these modifications.

The minutes of the November 7, 2001 meeting were approved as written.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Blumenthal

Committee on Committees nominations are due next Tuesday, at 5:00 at the Senate office. Late nominations will not be accepted.

There is now a campus planning document from Campus Provost John Simpson. Chair Blumenthal commended the strong interaction between the campus administration and Senate committees. He gave particular thanks to those Senate committees that have worked very intensively in evaluating and discussing the campus academic plans.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood was unable to attend the meeting, as she was attending the Council of Chancellors meeting.

c) Campus Provost/EVC Simpson

Most of the Sinsheimer laboratories damaged by the fire have been reoccupied. The remaining severely damaged laboratories will take considerably longer to be occupied.

The State is in a very difficult fiscal situation. The Governor's budget is predicated on the notion that we have a 12 billion dollar deficit in our State budget. Recently, the legislative analyst has estimated this to be five billion short of the actual figure. The University is very vulnerable to a budgetary shortfall because it is not protected by initiative or legislative action as is K-12 and is not given automatic increases like various health and welfare programs. The governor supports higher education and supports the enrollment growth which we have been planning. However, we can perhaps at best anticipate a flat budget for the next couple of years.

There is a concurrent special session that is considering a number of budgetary issues, several of which are important to UCSC. The California Institute for Science and Innovation has been shifted from general obligation to lease revenue bonds. UCSC has over ten million dollars at stake in this. It will add an additional 21,000 square feet to the engineering building. It is hoped that this will pass without difficulty. The general obligation bond provides the primary funding for the University's capital expansion, and in the iteration of the GAO bond we have at stake our new humanities and social sciences building, as well as the expansion of McHenry Library. The session is also considering the governor's proposal for an economic stimulus package which contains an acceleration of the construction of our engineering building.

We will not know until considerably later in the year what our budget is going to be. EVC Simpson urged caution in thinking both about the central budget, as well as the budgets within the major academic and academic support divisions. The governor has not rescinded the hiring freeze and the parameters which govern it in the University of California are still in effect. Exceptions to hiring are given by principal administrative officers for cases in which a hire is essential for our educational mission. We must look more broadly at our resources, at the base we have, and about how we spend the funds we have. The current legislative audit is looking at the ways the University uses funds for educational purposes, considering such parameters as faculty/student ratios, the number of courses taught, and student credit hours taught by faculty.

In summary, we are being challenged by growth in a difficult environment for the budget. The campus still needs to move forward with the planning process so we are poised to take advantage of opportunities when they come along.

A summary document describing the status of campus planning, along with a number of propositions and questions that remain to be answered before the planning process is completed in June, was issued last week. Faculty, staff, students, and administrative, academic, and academic support divisions made valuable contributions. Academic priorities and plans must continue to lead and define the direction of the campus and UCSC should continue to pursue its unique assets and characteristics.

We must continue to push an agenda of growing and increasing our graduate programs. EVC Simpson is in favor of establishing a graduate college under the leadership of Graduate Dean Talamantes. The campus planning document gives boundary conditions for the size of the major academic divisions relative to one another and the faculty assets which are associated with those sizes at build-out in the year 2010. The management of enrollment is a critical issue. This includes not only the students coming to campus, but those students once they are here in terms of retention, course work, and the majors they pursue.

There is a considerable need to refocus our attention on the role of the colleges in the academic enterprise. There is a proposal from the Senate to begin considering a new relationship of the colleges to the academic and overall campus enterprise.

There are considerable issues of infrastructure which have not been funded appropriately, such as information technology. EVC Simpson is proposing to establish a senior administrative officer,

likely a vice provost, to oversee campus policy and implementation of information technology as we grow.

With regard to the class that will be admitted in fall 2002, the campus had over 20,000 applicants, of which we admitted 16,000, which is a four percent increase of admits over last year. The mean grade point average of these admitted students is 3.63. The SAT I verbal score of 800 was achieved by 107 of these students, and the SAT I math score of 800 was achieved by 109. The SAT I total of greater than 1,400 was achieved by 1,136 of these admitted students. There was a 1.4 percent increase in the number of underrepresented students. Answering an inquiry from the floor, EVC Simpson stated the data on high scoring students are for the admittees, not the enrolled students.

Answering another inquiry EVC Simpson stated that UCOP has stated they are not considering VERIP's at this time.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid: Report on Enrollment Database (AS/SCP/1337)

CAFA Chair John Tamkun presented the report. Last Fall, the Senate recommended that CAFA formulate a plan for establishing a campus-wide database for creating, tracking, and comparing comprehensive admissions guidelines, including grading statistics, scores on admissions tests and high school grades. The Admissions Office, Student Affairs, and Institutional Research are now providing data for the database that has been developed. Professor Joel Yellin suggested that placement tests also be included in the data. Responding to an inquiry, Kevin Browne, Executive Director of Admissions and University Registrar stated that data of gender and ethnicity are from self-identified sources.

Professor Karen McNally, the campus representative to BOARS, provided an update on recent BOARS recommendations on UC's use of the SAT and other standardized tests. Detailed studies have been conducted to look at the test sets that UC now uses for admissions. BOARS has found that the SAT I and the SAT II are somewhat redundant. The SAT I is considered an aptitude test and the SAT II an achievement test. There is a desire on the part of BOARS that testing go in the direction away from aptitude, towards achievement. There has been discussion whether UC should abandon tests altogether for admission. By unanimous vote, BOARS concluded that admissions tests serve a useful purpose in helping both to determine UC eligibility and to select applicants for admission to campuses that cannot accommodate all UC eligible applicants. They endorse the ongoing use of tests as well as high school grade point average in determining which students being considered for admission will most likely succeed at UC.

BOARS has decided to step back from consideration of which particular tests we are using and instead look at the principles behind the testing. BOARS recommends the adoption of the following policy objectives regarding the purposes and properties of admissions tests used by the University of California: to assess academic preparation and achievement of UC applicants; to predict their success at UC beyond predictions based on high school GPA; to aid in establishing UC eligibility; and to aid in selecting students for admission at individual UC campuses.

Professor McNally introduced Jim Montoya, Vice President for the College Board, and Kris Zavoli, Director of Western Regional Initiatives.

Professor Karen McNally continued. One of the necessary properties of the admissions tests is that it be a reliable measurement that provides uniform assessment across demographic groups. It should also measure levels of mastery of content in UC approved high school preparatory coursework and provide information to students, parents and educators, enabling them to identify academic strengths and weaknesses. An admissions test should be demonstrably useful in predicting students' success at UC and provide information beyond that which is contained in other parts of the application. An admissions test should be useful in a way that justifies its social and monetary costs.

Speaking on the report:

Stanley Flatte
Karen McNally

Lynda Goff
Bob Meister

John Isbister
Joel Yellin

Discussion

A consequence of testing for achievement could be that teachers will of necessity teach to the test rather than the way that they determine is best. The original ideology behind testing, that it could identify talent rather than reinforce a class structure, has not proven to be functionally sound. BOARS shares both concerns. It is difficult to find any test that does not have intrinsic social differentials.

Concern was raised regarding the relationship between the information about testing now being received from BOARS and the current debate about the SAT I versus the SAT II. It was noted that research has shown that, for purposes of prediction, there is no difference between the SAT I and the SAT II, discrediting of the proposition that SAT I is an aptitude test and SAT II is an achievement test. They both measure the same thing and the data show that they are both equally biased in the same ways in relation to every socioeconomic factor. It was asked whether, in looking at testing options, we in a sense legitimize the status quo, the result of our current admissions process, while at the same time attempt to persuade people that we're improving it, or we attempt to correct the biases in the current admissions process, not by simply positing the existence of some perfect, unbiased, but unattainable ideal test, but by using the statistical tools that we currently have for measuring the biases in the tests we already have in order to admit students more equitably.

The first thing is to establish principles by which tests are constructed. Boars is contemplating using the achievement test as they currently exist in writing and mathematics, but creating a new test that adds assessment of reading.

Currently the number of exams a student may be required to take for application to both University of California and the Cal State system is as high as eighteen. BOARS is considering articulation of these exams with the Cal State system, with the community colleges, and with high school standard assessment exams, so that they are transportable to Cal State and other universities.

The evidence that the math achievement test is biased is not clear. The predictive analysis of test scores, high school GPA and college performance does not account for students' interaction with the college curriculum. College performance is currently measured by freshman grades, not graduation grades. For greater accuracy, analysis should be widened to include post first-year grades and placement exam scores.

b. Committee on Committees and Committee on Planning and Budget: Resolution to Establish Special Committee on the Colleges (AS/SCP/1338)

The Committee on Committees and The Committee on Planning and Budget are jointly sponsoring a resolution to form a special committee on the colleges to examine possible models to organize and house our programs as the University expands.

Professor Shelly Errington moved the resolution as it appears in the CALL. Professor Susan Schwartz offered a friendly amendment to extend the committee's existence to August 31, 2003 so that the resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

A Special Committee on the Colleges be formed with the following charge.

There will be six members of the Santa Cruz Division representing a broad sector of faculty constituencies, including those involved in the colleges as they currently exist and those who are not. One non-voting provost's representative selected by the Council of Provosts as well as one graduate and one undergraduate student representative shall be invited to sit with the committee.

In consultation with a broad range of campus constituents, including relevant senate committees, the committee will explore a range of models for the colleges. The committee will be established in Spring 2002 and make an initial report in Winter 2003. The committee's term shall be through August 31, 2003.

COC Chair Shelly Errington noted that it is the intent that the six members be mostly younger faculty with whom the future of this university lies. The charge of the committee is to consult widely with all relevant constituencies and stakeholders, including relevant Senate committees, the Council of Provosts, divisional deans, heads of institutes and programs that cross departments and divisions and faculty at large who have opinions that they would like to express. The committee will draw up models of possible arrangements and uses of the colleges, and will present them to the Senate for discussion and vote. This committee will not determine policy. Members from CPB, CEP, and Graduate Council will provide continuous input and act as liaison

to their committees. The Special Committee does not overlap the charges of those three committees as Bylaw 13.3 states: "No special committees shall be established to perform any duty assigned by these bylaws to a standing committee".

Professor Paul Koch, of CPB, reported that CPB has recently reviewed a number of documents which have raised important questions about the academic mission of the colleges at UCSC and what role faculty are going to play in that mission. Currently, many faculty do not have college affiliations. It is important for the future of this university that all the faculty, especially those who are going to be teaching here in the next ten to twenty years, have a say in the academic life of the colleges. The administration has recognized the stresses growth is putting on the colleges and they plan to explore ways to build on the intellectual and physical assets that the colleges provide. EVC Simpson has asked faculty for input on that mission. The special committee on the colleges is viewed as an important conduit for information from the faculty to the administration. CPB has been discussing how UCSC can accommodate growth of programs that don't fit within our current divisional structure. One issue is a graduate college, which does not fit within any current academic division. CPB is considering the possibility of housing professional schools or multi-disciplinary programs within colleges. This special committee would have three specific tasks; first, to evaluate the feasibility of different models for how colleges might work as academic and organizational structures; second, to gather information, inform and get feed back from faculty, alumni and students about how they want the colleges to work; and third, to propose a limited set of models for how the colleges might work. It will then be up to the faculty to decide which model or models to choose.

Speaking on the motion

George Brown
Joseph Bunnett

Paul Koch
Karen McNally

John Simpson
Joel Yellin

Discussion

When UCSC was founded with the college system, no additional funding to operate them was allocated although it takes extra funding to run them. It was noted that the proposed resolution needs a clearer reporting line and a clear charge. The resolution is vague on these points and maybe objectionable on the grounds that it is not consistent with the Senate manual.

Intellectual freedom is important for this committee and the hands of the committee should not be tied by advance instructions on what exactly they are being asked to do. In constituting the special committee, an effort should be made to include several people whose undergraduate experience was in an American liberal arts college or perhaps colleges like those at Oxford or Cambridge.

The colleges are an extraordinary asset which are not currently being well utilized. As the Special committee goes forward there must be considerable consultation with the administration. Should there be a joint Administrative/Senate committee task force on the colleges? A task force could lay out some specific questions about the administrative side of the colleges and the role they play as student service entities. The main concern of the Senate committee will be with the curricular and academic program issues.

It is important that the cost benefit ratios of the colleges be examined so that we can start with the real and then see what we can do that's ideal. It was suggested that the charge add that the course equivalencies of the colleges be met with respect to transferability of credits between institutions. However, the committee can not review programs or look into course equivalencies as that is CEP's purview. There will be a continuous presence of Graduate Council, CEP, and the administration working with the committee. It will be looking at administrative structures, financial arrangements and programs vis-à-vis the divisions. This committee will have a non-voting member from the Council of Provosts because there are complex financial and administrative arrangements familiar to a provost

The committee should review the extent to which graduate students can obtain more value from and contribute to the colleges. UCSC will be accommodating approximately 2,000 more undergraduate students in the next four years. Urgent questions regarding accommodation of this growth in the colleges need to be addressed.

The question was called to end debate. Professor Joel Yellin raised a point of order that the resolution has no reporting line in it and therefore is not in order with the bylaws. Chair Blumenthal ruled that the resolution will stand, that there is reporting back to the Senate and it is therefore consistent with the system-wide bylaws. A vote to end debate passed by voice vote.

The resolution was approved by voice vote.

**c. Committee on Planning and Budget: Resolution on Enrollment Management
(AS/SCP/1336)**

Professor Susan Gillman moved the resolution on enrollment management (AS/SCP/1336). The resolution asks that the Senate endorse the goal of growing to at least 15 percent graduate students. This will require a plan that outlines all the inter-dependencies and trade-offs to be adjudicated in meeting that goal, as well as a plan that assesses the impact of our current campus planning in achieving or deferring that goal. The draft plan will be ready for review in the spring.

Professor Roger Anderson endorses the idea of the 15 percent level, yet he is concerned about the space, faculty resources, graduate student support, affordable housing, library facilities, and laboratories that will have to be considered in order to accommodate this kind of growth.

CPB member Professor Brent Haddad clarified the reason that this resolution has two parts. It would be meaningless to state a goal without explicitly recognizing the importance of planning for it. There is no end date for achieving the 15 percent level in order to maintain our commitment to excellence while increasing our graduate enrollment.

Professor Joel Yellin asked if the existing trajectory planned for undergraduate enrollment makes it possible to achieve the 15 percent goal or whether the given trajectory for the undergraduate enrollment would have to be changed in order to achieve the 15 percent. Professor Susan Gillman clarified the need to separate the endorsement of the goal from its implementation because support is necessary in order to produce the set of models in which we should address

such things as at what rate might we adjust undergraduate growth to be versus graduate growth. It is important not to put in the 2010 date because that is most likely an unrealistic timeline.

Professor John Isbister spoke for the resolution but called attention to the subject of resources. It used to be that in the UC system resources were received differentially. We received more resources for a graduate student than a freshman, and so forth. This is no longer the case. While it is true that in some respects an increase in the number and quality of graduate students will enhance the undergraduate program, there are other respects in which the undergraduate program might deteriorate as a consequence of an increase in the number of graduate students. It takes more faculty to teach the graduate students. They teach small classes and this means that the undergraduates will have larger classes. As we change the ratio of undergraduates to graduates, we need to plan how to preserve the quality of undergraduate education.

The question was moved.

The resolution was passed by a voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

ATTEST:

Dave Belanger
Secretary
April 30, 2002