

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
February 18, 2004

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 18, 2004 in the Kresge Town Hall. 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

The minutes were adopted as written.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Galloway

The campus faces a variety of issues including: the prospect of immediate budget cuts; the need to realize long-term savings from the Executive Budget Committee process; unfunded new enrollments; rising student fees; the unpredictability of the admissions yield for next year; and the use of carry-forwards and open provisions.

Interim Campus Provost Chemers will be informing the divisions about cuts to the academic programs in the next year. He has prudently mapped out a plan that will protect the established academic programs as much as possible, but departmental budgets will have to be trimmed substantially. In mid-March, he will forward the proposed budget cuts to the Senate for review.

Departments are also Senate committees and as such have a responsibility to the larger academic mission of the campus. Department chairs in particular have unique responsibilities at this time. They are beginning to meet as a group to find ways to cut expenses by streamlining and strengthening curricula across departments and divisions. Options include the cross-listing courses; accepting courses from other departments toward the major; staggering electives so that similar courses do not compete; and sequencing courses that deal with the same topic from different perspectives. The campus needs to develop procedures for planning as a unit rather than as separate, isolated departments.

In relation to other ongoing processes, the Senate this spring will be reviewing the report of the Strategic Futures Committee and will also provide input on the WASC accreditation essays.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood expressed her appreciation for the work of Chair Galloway and Vice Chair Delaney and thanked them for the productive and useful discussions they have all had over the past year. Observing that President Dynes was very impressed on his visit to UCSC, Chancellor Greenwood thanked the faculty who gave presentations for his benefit.

This is the fourth year of sequential budget cuts. There are very serious questions emerging from legislative analysts and from the governor's budget officers as to whether the state of California can afford the Master Plan and can afford a University that continues to accept the top 12.5 percent of students. We all need to work hard to make the case that the University of California is not just another state responsibility, not just another state subsidy. The current budget director for the state recently remarked, "Well, higher education in the State of California might be a bargain for the students in the State of California, but it's not a bargain for the State of California." This is a profoundly incorrect observation. The Regents recently released an analysis of the economic impact of the University of California on the state economy. If the university were flatlined for growth over the next decade, the state stands to lose over \$18 billion. Personal disposable income would drop by \$16 billion, and the employment level would drop by 62,000 from anticipated levels. The people who understand the value of the University of California need to mobilize the business community and students to make the case to the legislature that giving money to the University of California benefits the entire state. UC is not just a cost center; we are also a revenue generator and revenue center.

The state has a \$30 billion budget shortfall, and if Propositions 57 and 58 don't pass on March 2, the money will have to be found in the state budgets. Proposition 55 will provide facilities for higher education as well as K through 12. Locally, it is hard for people to understand authorizing more money to build schools at the same time we are closing schools. If Proposition 55 does not pass, UCSC will not receive \$60 million dollars worth of projected construction funding. That means that students who are already here will not get facilities we needed ten years ago. If this bond issue doesn't succeed, we will not be able to go forward with the McHenry project, the digital arts project, and a variety of other things. Faculty should also take a close look at Measure F on the local ballot, which would add a limited tax to help the city pay for its own very pressing financial needs. Chancellor Greenwood remarked, however, that she would not try to tell anyone how to vote.

The WASC visit to the campus was very positive. Chancellor Greenwood thanked the 120 faculty who came out for this event. She also thanked Michael Cowan, Lynda Goff, Alison Galloway, and Peggy Delaney for putting together discussion groups and organizing the visit. She expects a positive preliminary report. Jim Duderstadt, chair of the review team, remarked that he had never before encountered a group of faculty with whom he had such intellectually interesting discussions.

Student applicants to UCSC are of a very high quality and are increasing in number. We are rapidly returning to being a selective campus, and the faculty should be pleased with the quality of students in the classroom. We face challenging options as to what students

we take and why we take them. We will need the help of Senate committees as we start to look at these issues. The University will be fighting the 40 percent increase in graduate student fees. The University of California is committed to sustaining access and excellence, as well as its ability to produce the next generation of scholars.

c) Interim Campus Provost/EVC Chemers

Interim Provost Chemers, addressing the Academic Senate for the first time, stated that he is honored to serve this outstanding faculty. He said he did not seek his new position, but pledged to take his job seriously, to do his best, and to be as honest as he can possibly be.

The two most important issues facing the campus are the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) process and the upcoming budget cuts. For the past two years the campus has been engaged in an investigation of areas where it can realize greater efficiency and increase capacity without serious loss of quality. The planning process for these reorganizations involves four steps: problem identification; solution design; implementation planning; and implementation.

Projects in the planning and implementation stages include: reducing the number of campus vehicles; administrative restructuring; and a bar code system to inventory supplies and equipment. One of the biggest projects is the business center transformation, which will consolidate 23 business centers into one. The campus will begin using an electronic time and attendance system and will implement a strategic purchasing operation. This is an electronic system that is expected to save between 20 to 30 percent in costs. Information technology (IT) units will be consolidated to improve the efficiency and overall functioning of IT delivery while still maintaining the high quality of service necessary to support research endeavors. The academic human resources review process will be streamlined and will move toward increasing use of electronic processes to reduce costs. All these changes are expected to save the campus \$3 million annually in permanent funding.

UCSC's portion of the UC budget cut will be \$17 million, which includes the \$5 million cut this year. Four areas of funding being looked at to deal with the cuts are: the central budget; carry-forwards; reductions in instruction; and returning 28 to 30 unfilled FTE. After covering some costs from these sources, the rest of the budget cut will be rolled down to the academic divisions and academic support services. Academic instructional programs will be cut about 5 percent, while academic support functions (which include everything in a department that is not teaching) will be cut about 13 percent.

Letters will soon go out to the principal officers of every academic and non-academic division that set a range for their budget cuts. These officers will develop scenarios for the assigned budget cuts. This is very tentative because we haven't had the May revised budget and the legislature hasn't met. We don't know if the budget is going to get better or worse. The budget scenarios will be distributed to the Senate, and consultation will take place with CPB and other Senate committees as needed. After the consultations, the Chancellor and the EVC will make the final budget designations. The level of service in

certain areas is going inevitably to be reduced. The faculty needs to think creatively about how we can achieve saving while minimizing the negative impact on core functions.

Academic planning is now done on a year-by-year, and sometimes even a quarter-by-quarter, basis. We are going to move to a system where we do academic planning on a three- to five-year cycle. We will identify core courses needed to maintain programs and will coordinate curricular and leave planning across departments and divisions in order to achieve efficiencies.

Professor Bob Ludwig asked how the cuts are going to be coupled to changes in the trajectory of student enrollments. Chancellor Greenwood replied that the enrollment target we have been assigned, cutting our freshman class by 350, will reduce the growth dollars coming to us. When we have a better idea of what the entering class looks like, we can adjust departmental and program offerings as well as plans for faculty leaves. CP/EVC Chemers stated that the campus will realize some saving because fewer students means fewer Core courses offered. He also mentioned that the administration will spend \$1.6 million to cover the increase in graduate student fees.

Professor Margaret Fitzsimmons commented that the fact that we will now be turning away qualified students should be a matter of grave concern for the Office of the President and the Regents. Many families have worked hard to send their children to UC. The University has given many, many individuals the opportunity to move forward.

In response to a question about how hiring will be affected by giving back FTE to UCOP, CP/EVC Chemers said the divisions will no longer have the same reserves of open FTE from which to draw. Positions will be added when we start to grow again and money comes back to the campus. The overall quality of the institution is not going to go down, and we will continue to hire faculty of high quality. Chancellor Greenwood said that we are not putting a hard freeze on our current recruitments.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Galloway removed the CPB Annual Report from the Consent Calendar. CPB Chair Meister proposed answering questions on the CPB Annual Report and the CPB Special Report simultaneously. As there were no objections, Chair Galloway moved the CPB annual report to accompany item number six on the agenda.

The annual report of the Committee on Research remained on the Consent Calendar and was thereby accepted without discussion by unanimous consent.

5. Reports of Special Committees

a.) Special Committee on Non-Senate Teaching Faculty (AS/SCP/1409)

Special Committee Chair Carolyn Martin Shaw presented the report. Last year the Senate passed a resolution requesting the formation of a Special Committee on Non-Senate

Teaching Faculty. This committee was charged with looking at the contributions of non-senate teaching faculty and at gauging whether current practices are optimal for high quality instruction. The Special Committee now proposes a resolution which aims to do three things: 1. to affirm the importance of non-senate faculty; 2. to urge the wider implementation of best practices identified by the committee; and 3. to call for the inclusion of non-Senate faculty representatives on certain committees of the Academic Senate. The committees specified, which include Academic Freedom, Admissions and Financial Aid, Education Abroad, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Committee on Teaching, are those relevant to the work and professional lives of non-senate teaching faculty and those where their input would be valuable.

According to a survey done by the Special Committee, non-senate faculty are very interested in serving on Senate committees. In order to participate, many non-senate faculty members felt they would need some compensation. Compensation for lecturers on committees will need to be negotiated and should not be seen as an obstacle to their inclusion. The campus will need to develop a system for selecting non-senate faculty members to serve on committees.

The Special Committee reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in order to understand the relationship between non-senate and senate faculty. There are two places in the contract that provide non-senate teaching faculty members explicit Senate access. First, Article 2, Section B specifies that they abide by Senate principles of academic freedom and gives them access to the Committee on Academic Freedom. Secondly, when a non-senate faculty member receives a notice of intent to dismiss, she or he has the option of using a Senate grievance procedure.

There have been important changes in the union contract for non-senate faculty. For example, continuing appointments no longer have a set end date. (The appointment terms of non-senate faculty with less than six years of service remain the same as under the old contract.) Procedures for review are being standardized in accordance with the provisions of the contract. Also written into the contract is support for travel and professional development for non-senate faculty.

Special Committee Chair Martin Shaw reviewed the best practices outlined in Section 1, Part 2 of the report. Many of these best practices are already in use in some departments on campus.

Speaking on the report:

Sandra Faber	Ethan Miller	Brent Haddad
Quentin Williams	Jim Whitehead	Charlie McDowell
Carol Freeman	Don Rothman	Roz Spafford
Michael Cowan	Dave Kligler	
Karen McNally	Helene Moglen	

Discussion

There are currently no provisions in the bylaws for non-senate faculty to sit on Senate committees, and if we move forward, bylaws would need to be revised. One senator observed that the six percent response rate to the Special Committee's survey of non-senate faculty suggests that it does not offer a representative sample. Special Committee Chair Martin Shaw said that the survey was unfortunately done during finals week, and this may be a reason for the low response rate. She also stated that when you survey an entire population without relying upon some sort of stratification, you may take two percent as being representative. What is important is that those who did respond said inclusion in the life of the campus was important to them. A senator pointed out that the Millennium Committee had also recommended that the Senate move rapidly to find a mechanism for including lecturers on Senate committees.

The issue was raised whether the term "faculty" in the resolution was used informally, or whether the intent was to endorse a change in the definition of "faculty" formally in our bylaws. Chair Galloway responded that the use of "faculty" within the bylaws is normally capitalized, so in this resolution it is used informally.

It is unclear at this time how non-senate faculty would be compensated or from whose budget they would be paid. One compensation model being reviewed is already used by departments: non-senate faculty are given equivalencies of some fraction of a course for the performance of certain assigned tasks. It is specified in the union contract for non-senate faculty that assigned duties must be compensated.

Brent Haddad moved to send the report and the resolution back to the committee for revisions. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1408)

b. Committee on Planning and Budget Annual Report (AS/SCP/1406)

CPB Chair Bob Meister and Vice Chairs Susan Gillman and Don Smith presented the annual report and the midyear report. Last year's CPB wrote a report on growth-related budgeting, the ten-year planning process, and the EBC process. The key element was the use of a metric for analyzing the ways in which changes in state funding are passed through to the core campus mission of instruction and research. Previous CPBs have demonstrated that in the 1990s the academic mission bore a disproportionately large share of every dollar cut in bad years and may have received a disproportionately small share of every dollar restored in good years. However, the Senate and Administration have worked together successfully to halt those trends and to direct a larger proportion of resources into academic research and instruction, primarily into developing graduate programs, a top campus priority.

With the help of the management consultants hired by the CP/EVC, CPB was able to really get a handle on costs outside of research and instruction. We were able to look at these costs from the standpoint of the campus as a whole rather than viewing them separately as they appeared within the base budget of various existing units. This enabled us to ascertain how high these costs are in comparison with other institutions that manage

business functions centrally. This information will make it possible for the campus to manage budget cuts better than it did in the 1990s and to target them in a way that allows it to continue building programs and even to hire some new faculty.

CPB is operating with an even broader base of information than in previous years. The campus is on the brink of moving toward a new budget model that will encompass management of non-academic resources, planning of academic programs, and uses of available campus cash reserves to cushion financial changes. The first phase of the EBC process identified how much the campus spends on core business functions and compared the total campus expenditure to that of other institutions. The second phase involves designing new central processes to deliver campus business functions more efficiently.

All universities maintain reserves both centrally and spread across various units in the form of unfilled FTE and carry-forwards or year-end balances. CPB believes it is important to conduct a systematic review of those carry-forwards across all units. It is important to recognize that we have choices about how this process proceeds and how these resources will be redeployed. CPB highlights two principles that should guide the budget process. First, the process should be transparent. Secondly, cuts should be made to the least extent possible in the instructional mission and with the highest regard for both instructional integrity and academic priorities.

Professor Jerry Neu asked CPB to elaborate on administrative accountability and the process of getting justification for divisional base budgets. CPB Chair Meister stated that the overarching themes of both CPB reports is the disconnect between campus plans and budgets. CPB's goal is to create a different process that gets the plans into the budgets. He mentioned carry-forwards as a particularly murky area. If the campus adopts a base increment budget model, there will be more transparency with greater administrative and divisional accountability.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Angela Rosales, the External Vice Chair for the Student Union Assembly, and Nicolas Javier, an Oakes College student, presented the report. As a result of current budget priorities, students, faculty and staff are being mandated to pay more while receiving less. Where does higher education, specifically UC, rank on the governor's priorities? In response to the massive budget cuts, the SUA, in collaboration with the United States Student Association, state-wide student associations, campus resource centers and community student organizations is working on educational campaigns addressing sustainability, education not incarceration, and the effects of the budget on the campus community. The campus-wide student government passed a resolution last quarter which called for adequate staffing at the Student Organization and Advising Resources (SOAR) office. SOAR has not been fully staffed for two years. This is not due to a lack of available funds, but rather to a lack of administrative commitment to this office and to serving student organizations. There are only two staff people supporting over 125 active student organizations. The student voice is essential in designing services that will fit the needs of new generations. We need courageous leadership to ensure a qualified SOAR staff is hired through a democratic process with student involvement. SUA distributed

information sheets with contact information to the faculty, whose support they are seeking.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Emily Moberg-Robinson, President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), presented the report. GSA is meeting with the housing office to discuss affordable alternatives and a new graduate student-housing plan. They are also meeting with the Health Center to preserve the current standards for the Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan (GSHIP). They are trying to form a coalition with other GSAs across the system to work for a UC-wide health plan. Regarding the proposed 40 percent fee increase, the GSA appreciates efforts by Dean Miller, the EVC, and the Chancellor to fund this potential increase. This will only cover the students who are on TA-ships and GSRs. The GSA will be sending a letter to the governor and key legislators and to the Regents, asking them not to include this fee increase in the budget. They will also be meeting with key politicians to discuss this important issue.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5: 00 pm.

ATTEST:

Loisa Nygaard
Secretary
April 23, 2004