

**MINUTES****A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
October 24, 2003****Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, October 24, 2003 at the University Center. With Secretary Loisa Nygaard and Parliamentarian Steve Thorsett present, Chair Alison Galloway called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

Chair Galloway asked if there were any changes to the minutes of May 16, 2003, other than the one change that was submitted in writing which added "without opposition" to the recording of the vote on the transportation resolution so that it read as follows: "The resolution passed without opposition by voice vote." With this change, the minutes were adopted.

**2. Announcements****a) Chair Galloway**

Chair Galloway welcomed the new faculty joining the university this year. Higher education nationwide has been bearing the impact of the general fiscal recession. The University of California has not escaped this trend. In the current year, UCSC has cut \$17 million, of which \$5 million is coming in undesignated cuts. Other campuses have frozen or cut academic programs. Here at UCSC, Chancellor Greenwood and CPEVC Simpson have made a decision to locate and retrieve savings in a way that both protects the academic mission and improves the operations and efficiency of the campus. The Academic Senate has played a vital role in the analysis of this process. Senate committees, in particular the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), have reviewed the various options, assessed strategies, and made recommendations. The Office of the President (UCOP) is now preparing a budget to submit to the Governor Elect. Both UCOP and the Regents have been adamant that we must preserve the quality of the institution, access, and affordability. We must also address the issue of enrollment in the midst of this unsettled budgetary situation. The UC system must admit students for 2004-05 before it has a solid idea of how much money it will have to educate them. The Academic Senate faces a busy year as the consultation continues on the various aspects of the Executive Budget process. The Senate has been pleased to work with CPEVC John Simpson and welcomes his successor, Dean Martin Chemers.

UCSC is now going into the final phase of the West Coast Associations of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation process, which focuses on educational effectiveness. This phase is dependent upon faculty involvement because it deals with the goals the campus is setting for itself, which include increasing graduate enrollment, reconsidering the freshman experience, enhancing undergraduate involvement in research and internships, and improving the review process on campus. In addition to undergoing the WASC review, the campus is considering the acquisition of the Monterey Institute of

International Studies (MIIS). Should the campus decide to pursue this opportunity, the integration of MIIS will require extensive Senate involvement in the review of programs, faculty, admissions and degree requirements. The campus is also embarking on long-range development plans (LRDP) with parallel processes in which the academic mission is being addressed by the Strategic Futures Committee and other aspects by the LRDP Committee. Faculty involvement is critical, as the decisions reached will shape the future of the UCSC campus.

Chair Galloway summarized that this will be an extremely challenging year and that Senate involvement is crucial. She thanked CPEVC John Simpson for guiding the campus through very difficult times.

**b) Chancellor Greenwood**

Chancellor Greenwood thanked Senate Chair Alison Galloway for the providing an excellent overview of where UCSC currently stands and of the work before us in the coming year. Chancellor Greenwood is looking forward to working with Senate Chair Alison Galloway, Vice Chair Peggy Delaney, the Senate Executive Committee, and other members of Senate committees. She also thanked CPEVC John Simpson for assisting in moving the campus forward and wishes him well as President of the State University of New York, Buffalo. Social Sciences Dean Martin Chemers has been appointed Interim Executive Vice Chancellor. UCSC will run national searches for both the CPEVC position and that of Dean of Social Sciences.

The bond issue on the primary ballot in the fall includes funds for the UCSC library addition and other facilities. It is important that we help build the public support necessary to pass this bond. New programs have enabled us to bring in a wonderful new class for 2003-04. The Spring Fair hosted by the admissions office, called "Experience UC Santa Cruz", was a huge success. The admissions staff and many faculty members have been actively visiting high schools and colleges to make UCSC more visible. There was also an outreach telephone campaign in which over 1000 phone calls were made to admittees. Chancellor Greenwood thanked all the faculty and staff who participated. She also encouraged everyone to log onto the newly redesigned UCSC web site. As a result of these efforts, applications at UCSC increased by 6.1 percent, and there was a 30 percent increase in the statements of intent to register. The campus is getting more attention from qualified students, and it is very likely we will not be able to accept all who apply. Our research funding totaled over \$75 million this year. We are moving into the range of research funding that puts us in the upper ranks of research universities of our size without medical schools. The Kerr Symposium and the College 9/10 dedication were wonderful events. UCSC has started a new tradition of having an annual gala dinner to raise scholarship funds for graduate and undergraduate students. This year the event focused on undergraduate education and brought in \$500,000.

Chancellor Greenwood stated we have made great progress with the resources we have been given over the last five years. We will do our best to preserve the core mission and to gain as many resources as possible through improved efficiencies and reorganization. We must now commit to getting through the LRDP process, WASC, and the EBC

process. If we persevere through all this, the campus will be well positioned for growth when the normal upturn in the budget cycle of the university occurs.

Susan Gillman, Co-Vice Chair of CPB, asked Chancellor Greenwood for information about the timetable for the search for the new CPEVC. The Chancellor responded that the current plan is to have the Interim CPEVC serve for approximately 18 months. A search committee will be appointed in the early fall next year, and we will then begin a national search. It is expected that search will yield a candidate who is ready to take office in July 2005. The timing of the search for the Dean of Social Sciences has not been decided. An interim appointment will be made. Realistically, it will probably take 18 months to replace both these positions with permanent appointments.

### **c) Campus Provost/EVC Simpson**

Making his last speech to the Academic Senate, CPEVC Simpson said, was a bittersweet moment. His five years at UCSC have been an honor and a pleasure and he will miss the University of California immensely. During the past five years, UCSC has grown from 10,400 to 14,500 students. We have hired over 140 new faculty, launched 28 new degree programs, and created a variety of new research centers and institutes. Grant and contract income has increased from less than \$50 million to more than \$80 million. Hundreds of thousands of square feet of building space for academic, academic support, and housing purposes have been added to the campus.

We are now at a critical time in the history of the University of California and, in particular, in the history of UCSC. How the campus behaves and responds to the budget crisis over the next two years will shape the trajectory of its future. CPEVC Simpson stated that the EBC strategy will allow the campus to sustain the substantial budget cuts underway.

CPEVC Simpson thanked a number of different people he has worked with including the Senate Chairs, especially the Chairs of the Committee on Academic Personnel and of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB). He also thanked the membership on CPB for the last two years, with whom he worked to establish the process by which the campus is dealing with the budget crises.

### **3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1402)**

Representative to the Assembly, John Lynch, pointed out a misprint on page 14, number 5, paragraph one to be “clear majority”, not near majority.

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

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Chair Galloway introduced the consent calendar explaining that anyone wishing to pull a report from the consent calendar for discussion might do so. The reports of the Committee on Educational Policy and the Committee on Privilege and Tenure were pulled, and other items on the consent calendar were received.

#### **Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1399)**

James Sheldon, the student representative to the Committee on Teaching, asked what CEP has done to review the changes to mandatory grades, and what plans are in place for future evaluations of these changes. Former CEP Chair Carol Freeman stated that CEP has spent the last two years working very hard to implement the changes in the grading system to make them consistent and reasonable. There has been no formal evaluation of what these changes might mean.

#### **Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1403)**

To correct a factual error in the report, P&T Chair Martin Shaw stated the difference between the two policies regarding whistleblowers. The Locally Designated Official or “LDO” for the Santa Cruz campus is Assistant Chancellor Leslie Sunnell. Her responsibilities are defined in the new systemwide policy entitled: “University of California Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities” (Whistleblower Policy).

Professor Emeritus Richard Wasserstrom is the campus Retaliation Complaint Officer or “RCO”. His work is defined in the other new systemwide policy entitled “University of California Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints” (Whistleblower Protection Policy).

### **5. Reports of Special Committees**

#### **a.) Special Committee on the Colleges: Final Report (AS/SCP/1401)**

Bruce Schumm, Chair of the Graduate Council, read the following formal response from the Graduate Council:

“To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division, We have read the report of the Special Committee on the Colleges submitted to the Senate on October 6, 2003, with great interest. The Special Committee should be commended for the work they put in and for the quality of their advice on the campus. Nonetheless, there is one section of the report to which the Graduate Council (GC) would like to take strong exception. GC finds the language on the prospect of creating a Graduate College to be unduly negative. Quite generally, we feel it premature to weigh in on the merits of a Graduate College. GC sees a number of potential benefits, some of them considerable that might be provided by a Graduate College. When the issue of drawing in private and foundation support has been discussed by the Council, campus development officers have noted the particular difficulty of drawing support for graduate education. The Graduate College may provide a tangible target for such funding. The concept of the Graduate College also provides a number of possibilities for concentrating the activity of graduate scholarship on campus, and fostering creative interdisciplinary thought. The lack of a structured intellectual center for the graduate community is often cited by the students themselves as an impediment to cross-disciplinary disclosure. And then more specifically, the issue of course-sponsoring authority has arisen before, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs has determined that such authority does not reside in the Graduate Division. Thus, current needs for graduate division-wide curriculum, such as TA training and professional development courses, cannot be met within existing administrative structures. This issue remains unresolved. As we see it, the effort to propose and foster the development of a

Graduate College on the campus is a cause that should continue to be supported. In our view, this effort is still in its formative stages, and the functions of the proposed Graduate College have yet to be clearly related to and differentiated from those of the Graduate Division and the Division of Student Affairs. It seems quite likely that a Graduate College could further the cause of graduate education on our campus in ways that neither of these other divisions has the capability or mandate to undertake. Finally, it's not out of the realm of possibility that the formation of a Graduate College at UCSC would come to be viewed by our sister campuses as a leading and innovative undertaking. Respectfully submitted, the Graduate Council”

**Speaking on the report:**

Joe Bunnett

Shelly Errington

Lynda Goff

Brent Haddad

Margo Hendricks

Helene Moglen

Ashley Sue Morin

Triloki Pandey

James Sheldon

Roz Spafford

**Discussion**

The last sentence on page 71 states, “Any involvement of the ladder-rank faculty in college courses should be seen as displacing faculty effort elsewhere in the undergraduate or graduate programs.” Margo Hendricks, Provost representative to the Special Committee on the Colleges, clarified that this was a typo. The actual sentence should read, “Further, any involvement of ladder faculty in college courses should not be seen as displacing faculty effort elsewhere in the undergraduate or graduate programs.” Speaking to the Graduate Council response, Margo stated that the committee worked hard on the issue of the creation of a Graduate College. The committee agreed early on that the issue of the Graduate College should be dissociated to some degree from the charge with respect to the undergraduate colleges.

Some senators expressed disappointment that the report did not go further in its analysis and recommendations, suggesting that it essentially endorsed the status quo. The report, it was argued, leaves us with no sense of where the colleges should go in future and how they should get there. As in the movie Groundhog Day, we keep waking up and finding ourselves back where we were the day before. The wish was expressed that the committee had come up with a variety of models for how the colleges and their spaces could imaginatively be utilized. The colleges are built into the campus landscape, and we could think freshly about how to use them without necessarily throwing away all that we have now.

Senators indicated that several significant problems regarding the colleges still need to be addressed. They include the low level of faculty participation, the fact that there were no candidates for three provost positions last year, and the lack of clarity about the educational mission of the colleges. It was later explained that there were candidates for the open college provostships, and that one continued to serve on an interim basis for this year. In order for there to be viable and interested candidates, the searches must begin

early in the academic year. There was also discussion of the core courses, how they function and what they provide.

One part of the report that sparked debate was a sentence reading: "First, we do not think that involvement of faculty in the colleges should be thought of as a goal in itself." Some disagreed with this statement, seeing it as an indication that the committee had viewed the colleges as they are, not as they could be. The colleges at UCSC represent a tremendous opportunity for superior undergraduate education involving interaction of faculty members with students. It was suggested that we create incentives for departmental involvement in the freshman- year experience through a re-allocation of funding. While there was agreement that faculty affiliation with the colleges should remain voluntary, there was also concern that if faculty involvement in the colleges does not increase, we run the risk of losing this important part of our institution.

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

### **a. Committee on Committees: Additional Nominations 2003-04 (AS/SCP/1404)**

The report was received without comment.

### **b. Committee on Library: Resolution on Ties with Elsevier Journals (AS/SCP/1405)**

Ben Crow, Chair of the Committee on the Library, said the resolution is asking tenured faculty to consider carefully cutting their ties with Elsevier journals. The academic community has gotten itself into a very difficult position by giving a few big publishers the rights to publish papers, which they then sell back to us in their journals and on-line services. The prices they charge have been rising much faster than the Consumer Price Index. Elsevier's profits were up 41% over the period from 2000 to 2002. The cost of Elsevier journals alone takes up 50% of the budget for online journals and runs more than six times the industry-wide average for such charges. The budget crisis of California and the UC system has made this situation particularly pressing. Elsevier is the largest publisher with which we contract for journals. The UC system pays \$8 million to Elsevier for access to its online journals, which is one-seventh of the library's total materials budget. The Elsevier contract is up for re-negotiation, and UC decided to try to limit the rate at which Elsevier increases their prices.

UCSC is the first campus to bring a resolution of this sort to a Senate vote. Many other campuses have also started working on this pressing issue. In the negotiations, UC system wide set out to establish a reasonable, sustainable contract with Elsevier. UC proposed that if Elsevier was willing to limit their price increases to something closer to the rate of inflation, then the university system would provide extra services in the form of archives and possibly other facilities as well. Elsevier's response was to require the university to pay another \$8 million over the next five years to maintain access to online journals. At the time this resolution was written, negotiation between Elsevier and the UC system had broken down. There is a very serious risk that the whole of the Science Direct Online journal access could end on January 1, 2004. After hearing Elsevier's proposal, the Committee of Chancellors hardened their negotiating position by saying that individual campuses would not bargain separately with Elsevier if the central negotiations broke down. Elsevier has learned of this proposed UCSC resolution and has

come back to the negotiating table. The Committee on the Library wants the faculty to support this resolution in order to sustain pressure on Elsevier.

George Blumenthal, Vice Chair of the Academic Council, noted that as a campus UCSC has one of the smallest libraries in the UC system. We should be committed to the concept of one university, one library. The news of the introduction of this resolution has reached not only the publisher, but also the highest levels within the UC Office of the President. He offered a friendly amendment to page 74, at the bottom of the second paragraph of the resolution, which is to add the words, "should the UC Elsevier negotiations prove unsuccessful." The friendly amendment was accepted.

Professor Avril Thorne rose to encourage colleagues to send emails to colleagues across the country alerting them to the actions taken at UCSC.

## **COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY**

### **Resolution on Ties with Elsevier Journals**

#### **Facing a challenge to scholarly communication**

**The University of California system faces a challenge in relation to the costs of online journal subscriptions. This challenge has two elements. First, in the immediate future, there is a real possibility that negotiations with one of the largest journal publishers, Elsevier (pronounced: El-Suh-Veer), will not be successful and the University may lose access to many of the 1,100 journal titles represented in Elsevier's Science Direct Online (SDOL) database. Second, these difficult negotiations are symptomatic of an underlying issue in scholarly communications: many faculty publish their papers in journals whose publishers are selling access to these papers at prices that are increasing much faster than inflation.**

#### **The immediate crisis: Elsevier**

**Elsevier's Science Direct Online is one of the largest online journal packages, and the University of California is one of Elsevier's largest customers. For several years, the UC system has negotiated collectively to gain access to Science Direct Online. There have been large savings from the use of the system's collective buying power. UC Santa Cruz has been a particular beneficiary from this arrangement, gaining access to a broader range of journals than it would otherwise have been able to afford.**

**Online journal charges have, however, been rising much faster than comparable prices, and Elsevier prices have been in the lead. Library acquisition budgets are increasingly being driven by unsustainable increases in journal prices. Elsevier's revenues and profits have been rising fast in recent years. Their profits were up 26% in the last year. Elsevier's prices are not proportional to the use of these journals made by UC faculty. Access to Elsevier journals costs the UC system 50% of its online budget, and use of these journals is only 25% of total online journal use.**

**UC Faculty members are important players in Elsevier's journals. 10-15% of the content is written by UC faculty, 1000 faculty are on the boards of Elsevier journals, and about 150 faculty are senior editors for those journals.**

**The University of California started negotiation with Elsevier seven months ago, seeking to establish a sustainable relationship with Elsevier. Those negotiations have not yet concluded but there is a chance they will break down if Elsevier is unwilling to price its product in an affordable way that avoids punishing annual price increases that are 2 or 3 times the Consumer Price Index rate of inflation.**

**Loss of access to Elsevier journals will have differential disciplinary impact. Some disciplines, such as biology and health sciences, make greater use of their journals.**

#### **Tackling the longer term issue**

**Alternative forms of scholarly communication need to be considered. The California Digital Library (CDL) has been pioneering new forms of publication including the eScholarship Repository. Through the CDL, the University of California also provides tangible support for new scholarly publishing initiatives that promise high-quality, peer-reviewed content at affordable prices, including the Public Library of Science and BioMED Central.**

**Faculty action to retain intellectual property rights would also contribute to meeting the challenge. Authors can negotiate to retain certain rights, including the right to post their work in an institutional repository or distribute copies to their classes.**

#### **Resolution**

**Online access to scholarly papers is increasingly important to scholarly research. Such access would be jeopardized by a breakdown in negotiations between the University of California and Elsevier (Science Direct Online). Successful resolution of the negotiations is threatened by Elsevier's insistence on increasing its charges at a rate far exceeding inflation and to a level not justified by its relative utility compared with other online journal services,**

**Therefore, the UCSC Academic Senate resolves to call upon its tenured members to give serious and careful consideration to cutting their ties with Elsevier: no longer submitting papers to Elsevier journals, refusing to referee the submissions of others, and relinquishing editorial posts should the UC/Elsevier negotiations prove unsuccessful.**

**The Senate also calls upon its Committee on Academic Personnel to recognize that some faculty may choose not to submit papers to Elsevier**

**journals even when those journals are highly ranked. Faculty choosing to follow the advice of this resolution should not be penalized.**

The resolution was passed without opposition by voice vote.

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

Angela Rosales, the external vice chair of the Student Union Assembly (SUA), presented the report because the SUA Chair, Mateo Reyes, was out of town. She reported on the activities and involvement of SUA in the following issues: academic affairs officer description; developing internship opportunities; the eligibility, finances and timeline for the business manager position; maintenance for the SUA communication grade; the new SUA pamphlet; and the web site (sua.ucsc.edu). Over the summer, SUA met with many administrators and several student groups. They also attended the USSA Congress conference that addresses the various issues facing students across the nation. Many of the line items voted on were authored, co-authored, and/or co-sponsored by UCSC students. This year's action items are the higher education act reauthorization, the immigrant rights/permanent partner immigration act, and get-out-the-vote outreach. SUA also attended the UCSA Congress conference at UC Davis. UCSA action items for the year include education not incarceration, student-initiated outreach, and campus sustainability. The two summer campaigns were voter registration and Stop 54. SUA sponsored the SUA soiree and co-sponsored the Jesse Jackson Speaks on Community and Social Justice event.

SUA has signed onto the SOAR resolution encouraging Student Affairs accountability to students, shared governance, and student participation in a transparent process in the reorganization of SOAR. This unit helps increase student retention and also provides a space where students can make practical application of what they have learned in the classroom. Ms. Rosales observed that the SOAR resolution did not pass unanimously; the College 9 representative was opposed to it on the basis of its wording.

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

Emily Moberg-Robinson, President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), thanked former Graduate Dean Frank Talamantes and said that the GSA is looking forward to working with the new Graduate Dean, Bob Miller. The top two issues facing the GSA are strengthening the graduate student health insurance plan and securing affordable housing for graduate students. GSA would like to work with other GSA's, Chancellor Greenwood, and Dean Miller to establish a UC-wide health insurance plan. GSA would like to institutionalize a graduate student advisory board that would have input into health plan negotiations. They would also like to obtain a negotiator to represent their interests with the insurance brokers. GSA will work with VC Hernandez and Dean Miller to come up with an affordable housing plan for graduate students. Graduate students have almost been priced out of on-campus housing, which currently costs almost three quarters of a TA salary. Possible solutions include finding lower-cost, off-campus housing for graduate students or decoupling graduate housing rent from other on-campus housing rates.

- 9. Petitions of Students (none)**  
**10. Unfinished Business (none)**  
**11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)**  
**12. New Business (none)**

Adjournment: 4:21 pm.

ATTEST:

Loisa Nygaard  
Secretary  
December 2, 2003