

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division February 18, 2009

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 18, 2009 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine and Secretary Judith Habicht-Mauche present, Chair Quentin Williams called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Williams asked if there were any changes to the minutes of November 12, 2008. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Quentin Williams

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

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

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

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

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

c. EVC Kliger

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Special Order Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy

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

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

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

- Comparison of the current and proposed requirements

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

CEP has called for:

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

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

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

He made the following case for weakening:

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

CEP Chair Padgett then made the following case for strengthening:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10.2.2 General Education Requirements.

10.2.2.1

Unchanged.

a. Introductions to disciplines.

Unchanged.

b. Topical courses.

Unchanged.

c. Quantitative course.

Unchanged.

d. Composition courses.

Unchanged.

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

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

g. Arts course.

Unchanged.

h. Ethnic studies course.

Unchanged.

i. Unchanged.

10.2.2.2

Unchanged.

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

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

10.2.2.4-6

Unchanged

The amendment passed by voice vote.

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

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

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

The amendment passed by voice vote.

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

The amendment passed by voice vote.

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

10.2 Campus General Education Requirements.

10.2.2 General Education Requirements.

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

**a. Introductions to disciplines
Unchanged.**

**b. Topical courses.
Unchanged.**

**c. Quantitative course.
Unchanged.**

d. Composition courses.
Unchanged.

e. Writing-intensive course.
Unchanged.

f. Arts course.
Unchanged.

g. Ethnic studies course.
Unchanged.

h.
Unchanged.

10.2.2.2 Deleted

10.2.2.3 Renumbered to 10.2.2.2
Unchanged

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

10.2.2.6 Renumbered to 10.2.2.4
Unchanged

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

The amendment passed by voice vote.

iii. Oral Report on General Education Reform

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

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

requirements should:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Committee on Committees

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The legislative interpretations were adopted by voice vote.

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

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

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

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

The legislative interpretations were adopted by voice vote.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

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

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

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

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

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

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 4:45 pm.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

March 23, 2009