

## MINUTES

### Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division May 20, 2009

#### **Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, May 20, 2009 at the Colleges 9 & 10 Multipurpose Room. With 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 additional changes, other than those submitted in writing, to the minutes of February 19, 2009 and March 6, 2009. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

#### **2. Announcements**

##### **a. Chair Quentin Williams**

Chair Williams began by stating that the state budget situation overshadows most issues, including a Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) report on the University of California Retirement System (UCRS), two reports from the Committee on Planning and Budget on budget cuts and the process, and a report from the Senate Executive Committee on faculty salaries. Related budget items include establishment of procedures for implementing budget cuts to ensure that curricular effects of the proposed cuts are characterized, and that these cuts do not affect the campus's ability to offer the majors that the campus has committed to. The Senate has also spent considerable time assessing a proposed Regental amendment to allow the University of California (UC) president to declare emergencies on the grounds of financial and/or natural disasters. Chair Williams added Senate committees do not endorse this proposal.

Chair Williams announced this is his last regular meeting as Senate Chair. When he became chair he identified three major areas for the Senate to be effectively deployed. First, general education (GE) reform which, through the boundless energy of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and CEP Chair Jaye Padgett, was enacted at the March 6, 2009 Senate meeting. Second was the possible development of professional schools at UCSC. Chair Williams thinks the Senate has developed a well reasoned stance on the possible different flavors of professional schools, and thinks that the administration will join the Senate's points of view shortly since the Senate does control the approval of such schools. Chair Williams third area of focus was faculty salaries. Where there is considerable evidence that UCSC ranked 10<sup>th</sup> among the UC's. As the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) report discusses, there are ways to improve UCSC's standing but the budget crisis has intervened. Nevertheless, the amount of work that SEC, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), CPB, CFW, and Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) have put into this topic has not been in vain. Chair Williams thinks the administration now firmly understands that this is a problem affecting faculty recruitment, retention, morale, overall educational and institutional quality and needs to be addressed when there is money in the system.

Chair Williams then introduced incoming Senate Chair Lori Kletzer. He stated that she has been a tremendous vice chair and will do the same as chair.

Finally Chair Williams announced the Excellence in Teaching Awards which are awarded by the Committee on Teaching (COT). This year's recipients are:

- Bettina Aptheker, Feminist Studies
- Robin King, Writing Program
- Herbie Lee, Applied Math and Statistics
- Pete Raimondi, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (who also won the Ron Ruby Award for Teaching Excellence in Physical and Biological Sciences)
- Alice Yang, History

Chair Williams closed by thanking the Senate staff for its hard work, and said it has been another outstanding year.

Next, the chair of the Committee on Research (COR), Phokion Kolaitis, announced the upcoming forum on intellectual property. The forum, co-sponsored by COR and the Office of Research, is May 27. Bruce Margon, Vice Chancellor for Research and Vanessa Toleffson, Acting Director of the Office for Management of Intellectual Property will discuss the structure of their office and guide faculty through the various categories of agreements, licenses, contracts, etc. There will be a presentation of case studies and a Q&A.

#### **b. Chancellor Blumenthal**

Chancellor Blumenthal began by thanking Chair Williams for his service to the Senate. He stated that the last two years have been very difficult for the campus, but they have been an important two years for shared governance. The chancellor also said that Chair Williams played an important role on this campus as well as system wide, and the chancellor extended his thanks and appreciation for all that Chair Williams has done for the Senate and the campus.

The chancellor then discussed current issues. He said times are difficult and we are all preoccupied with the enormous challenges in front of us. As commencement approaches Chancellor Blumenthal wants to remind the campus of all it has accomplished and share in our pride everything that has been achieved in the past year.

In academic achievements the chancellor announced several milestones. Faculty have received a number of significant awards.

- Professor Sandy Faber won the Bower Award from the Franklin Institute.
- The Astronomy and Astrophysics Department was named first in the nation for its impact this past year.
- UCSC has three new fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences; two new Sloan Fellows, a Packard Fellow and a Pew Fellow.

- Professor John Thompson won an international award for extraordinary contributions to the science of Ecology.
- UCSC Research made the covers of the journal *Nature*, *Science* and *Scientific American Magazine* during the past year.
- Poet Gary Young, a lecturer in literature, won the 2009 Shelley Memorial Award from the Poetry Society of America.
- Professor Nate Mackey's book, *Bass Cathedral*, was named one of the most notable of 2008.
- Tom Pettigrew received the Distinguished Emeriti Award for all of UC during 2008-09.
- Three faculty members were awarded the Chancellor's Achievement Award for Diversity, Professor Adriane Steinacker, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Professor Karen Yamashita, Literature and Gene Switkes, Chemistry.

The chancellor reported the campus has done well in grants and partnerships. UCSC landed a \$1.5 million grant from the Keck Foundation to establish a center for nanoscale optofluidics and a \$750k grant from the National Science Foundation, which will fund scholarships for students pursuing teaching careers in math and science. The campus also competed for and announced the NASA Research Partnership and is moving forward with a comprehensive fundraising campaign.

The chancellor welcomed new Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE) Dean Art Ramirez and announced new Arts Dean David Yeager. Dean Yeager will arrive on campus July 1. Chancellor Blumenthal thanked the interim deans, Mike Isaacson in BSOE and David Evan-Jones and Carolyn Dean in the Arts, who did a fantastic job under difficult circumstances.

The chancellor informed the Senate that more than 3,000 students are about to graduate. 30 of the graduates have been profiled on the UCSC web site in a feature called "30 Grads in 30 Days." Next, Chancellor Blumenthal recognized athletics at UCSC. The UCSC men's tennis team is playing a Division 3 semifinal match against Emory University after beating Williams' College. Emory is coached by John Browning, who played for UCSC's first national championship team in 1989. UCSC has won six national titles including 2005 and 2007.

Chancellor Blumenthal and the EVC have been visiting departments around campus throughout this academic year. They have visited most departments and will complete the tour next year. The chancellor thanked the departments for welcoming him and the EVC and said they learned a lot about each department's strengths, opportunities and challenges.

The chancellor commended the Senate on its engagement, commitment and accomplishments this year. Passing GE was a major achievement, and the chancellor thinks the Senate should be proud of having worked so hard to get that done, including the disciplinary writing requirement. The chancellor also mentioned that the Senate has

been very involved in admissions' policies and has taken some principled stands, both for UCSC and system wide admissions issues, and acknowledged the Senate's work on the faculty salary issue.

Chancellor Blumenthal then moved on to the budget. The special election propositions failed and the chancellor provided some context for what that means for UC within a system wide perspective. The UC budget that was passed in the special session of the Legislature and signed by the governor several months ago included several things which the campus has been dealing with over the last few months: \$115 million in cuts to the UC system budget, effects of mandatory inflationary increases, utility costs, labor contracts, merit increases for faculty and the 11,000 unfunded students in the UC system. When corrected for the approved student fees increases by the Regents, the \$115 million permanent cut turns into a \$324 million net reduction. The governor's May revise turns the \$115 million cut into a \$322 million cut. Further, the net reduction, correcting for the effect of unfunded students and correcting for inflationary increases and increases in student fees, changes the number from \$322 million to \$531 million.

Two years of cutting the budget has affected every part of the campus. The chancellor said the campus will not be doing some of the things it used to. Students feel the effect in fee increases, larger class size and fewer classes offered. The campus set a new ceiling on new freshman enrollments to admit 350 fewer frosh this coming fall, which is considerably below the freshman class of last year. Now that the prospective students have submitted their intent to register, the freshman class next fall is approximately 650 students below what it was last fall. The campus appears to be on target for transfer students, but the deadline is not until June 1. There are currently 700 unfunded students on this campus, so decreasing the number of unfunded students will help mitigate some of the budget cuts.

Chancellor Blumenthal closed by saying that as the campus moves forward, he and the EVC are committed to an open process on the budget, consultation and transparency. They both take seriously the recommendations in the CPB report. The chancellor said that the campus is facing challenges, but by working together, will get through this and be prepared when things begin to turn around.

### **c. EVC Kliger**

The EVC began with an update on UCSC Extension (UNEX). UNEX has made considerable progress toward the goal of budgetary balance by reducing academic programs, facilities, services and staff by 50 percent. The Sunnyvale facility has been closed and operations have been closed at the University Towne Center in Santa Cruz. In August 2009 the Cupertino facility will close and move to a newer smaller facility along the 101 corridor. Significant program changes have been made, prompted by a desire to focus on professional development and training programs in Silicon Valley, reduce administrative and operating costs, and concentrate efforts on the largest revenue generating programs. Even with these budgetary and programmatic reductions, enrollment in remaining programs has increased and revenue in these courses is on the rise. In March 2009 the current academic departments exceeded their total enrollments

for last year. UNEX expects to submit a \$7 million, zero deficit operating budget for the 2009-10 year. This is equal to half of the budget prior to the reorganization. The administration will continue to monitor UNEX closely throughout the next year, and the EVC thanked Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Alison Galloway for her leadership in making the UNEX changes.

Next the EVC discussed employee housing and childcare. As of May 1, 2009 there are 177 price restricted units in the employee housing program. At Ranchview Terrace, phase one, 31 homes have been sold and 14 homes are yet to be completed. Approximately 18 units remain unassigned or have been purchased by the campus for resale at a later time. As of May 1, 2009, 71 percent of the homes were owned or assigned to faculty members, and 20 percent owned or assigned to staff or non-Senate academic employees. To deal with the childcare issues, the EVC reported that program staffing has been improved, facility improvements have been completed and there is a new program for toddlers. The EVC said this good news is tempered by the fact that the cost of supporting a quality program far exceeds what can be brought in through market competitive fee structure, resulting in an annual program deficit for next year of close to \$900k. The administration and CFW are working together to address the situation.

EVC Kliger provided an update on faculty salaries. In the fall the EVC and CAP came to an agreement on the approach to faculty merit reviews to take actions that will bring salaries on this campus more in line with other campuses. In addition, the task force recommendation that a onetime infusion of salary funds to give the strongest faculty more competitive salaries remains a goal but with the current budget crisis the implementation will be delayed.

In the area of capital projects, work has been completed on the Cowell College Commons, the Digital Arts Research Center is nearing completion, seismic work at McHenry Library and plans and funding have been approved in order to accommodate the move of math and education departments to this facility, and the project completion date is a year from this coming summer. Seismic work and renovations are under way on multiple projects at Porter College. The Porter College building will be LEED Certified, which makes Porter College the first college on campus to be officially green. If state funds are released the campus hopes to start construction in mid July for a new Biomedical Sciences facility with a target move in date of fall 2011. In July the Regents will review the project design for an East Campus student housing building that will house 594 student beds. Construction is anticipated to begin in September of 2009.

The EVC then discussed the budget. The magnitude of the cuts that UC has experienced, combined with those that are currently under consideration by the governor, will have a devastating effect on students, faculty and staff, and ultimately on the service that UC provides to the state. System wide, campuses have been cutting back on filling empty faculty position and staff positions, reducing travel and entertainment expenses, creating administrative efficiencies whenever possible, and seeking to reduce or eliminate non-essential services across the organization. UCOP has downsized its workforce substantially; frozen pay for senior leadership across the board and approved a 9.3

percent student fee increase that the legislature and governor assumed UC would adopt this year.

At UCSC, a \$13 million budget reduction was assigned across all units for the 2009-10 year. This followed a \$4.5 million cut in 2008-09, as well as a \$6 million onetime midyear cut. The approach in allocating the distribution of cuts across the divisions differed from past approaches in one significant way: activities that supported instruction and research occur across the organization, not just within the academic divisions were acknowledged. There was an attempt to evaluate what the impact of proposed cuts would be, and assign the reductions in a way that imposed the least harm to our instruction and research mission. The EVC said CPB is correct when they report that the process and implementation of this last round of budget reduction was flawed. The EVC has been working with CPB to establish a better process for moving forward.

In the end \$17.5 million in permanent reductions were assigned for 2008-2010. Academic support divisions have absorbed approximately 2/3 of the total at \$11.4 million and the academic divisions absorbed 1/3 of the total at \$5.5 million; the balance was taken from central funds. The division of reductions among academic divisions over two years results in a less than one percent differentiation, and an almost across the board approach. According to the EVC the smaller differential cuts that were made in the most recent reduction to BSOE and the Physical and Biological Science (PBSci) Division were made for two reasons; first, enrollment have historically shifted towards science and engineering during difficult economic times, so the EVC anticipates that increased enrollment in these areas might occur near the future; second, the federal government has stated that high priorities for investment in the coming years will be in the areas of health care and energy independence. The EVC continued to say that the engineering and science divisions have strong programs in these areas, and with some investments, they are in a good position to compete effectively for the increased federal funding that will be available to support their work in these areas.

The EVC then explained the reason for smaller cuts in the arts is that first, their new programs have strong potential to make significant impacts in their fields and second, there is a strong potential for private funding for arts that should enable these programs to excel.

In implementing the reductions, the EVC asked principle officers to take the following as high priorities:

1. Services and activities that directly affect instruction and research;
2. Required safety and compliance functions;
3. Activities that will yield new revenues or increase revenues.

For academic divisions, the EVC asked the deans to try to do the following:

1. Maintain, and where possible, enhance the quality of instruction and research while making the modes of delivery and instruction and supporting more intentional and efficient;
2. Maintain or enhance the quality and productivity of graduate programs rather than pursue growth in graduate student enrollments;

3. Establish as a priority academic programs that demonstrate clear evidence of being highly ranked over programs that have not shown such evidence.

EVC Kliger said that it is difficult for him to believe that any decision can be truly “right” in this situation. His efforts were focused on getting to decisions that would minimize the harm to our institution; fully recognizing that every decision would inevitably result in some level of harm. The EVC and administration will monitor the impacts of the decisions to ensure that the campus sustains its strength and quality. It is clear that no area of the campus will be spared from the impacts of these cuts. The cost to students is rising dramatically, services are being reduced, and jobs have been lost. Principle officers have been asked to report on how they will implement the 2009-10 assigned reductions and identify fund sources to be cut by May 22; the EVC will report the impact in more detail once he has the information. The administration will also be monitoring carefully the state budget situation and the additional reductions that are anticipated for 2009-10. The EVC continued to say that he will be working on a getting the process in place for moving forward, and ensure that there is clarity about the criteria the campus will apply to make the difficult choices ahead. The EVC will proceed with closer evaluation of function, and determine how to assess the impacts of reducing function on our ability to deliver high quality instruction and research.

The EVC closed by stating that this has been a challenging year, and there is another challenging year ahead. It is the time of year that the campus is visibility reminded that there is much to be proud of, and our work truly makes a difference in the lives of the students who have chosen to come to UCSC. The EVC then read a message from a campus staff member sent in response to the budget cuts.

“Changes never comes easily, and most of the time, it only occurs when there is no other choice. In that regard, we are just a reflection of what is happening in a larger context in the nation and worldwide, but this crisis bears in it many chances for improvement of our human relationships and how this university is operating. I hope we’ll be able to make the best of it.”

Chair Williams then opened the floor to questions.

Professor Onuttom Narayan, Physics, provided a chart showing the that at UCSC the growth in faculty has slightly lagged behind that of students; that there has been essentially no growth in clerical staff, and rising above them all is the increase in senior management group (SMG) and management and service professionals (MSP). The difference between the growth rate of the curves is six percent. Each data set is normalized to one at its lowest point, and plotted on a log scale. After explaining the chart Professor Narayan asked the chancellor to explain this apparent increase in amount of senior management on campus, and why, at a time of furloughs, salary reductions, laying off lecturers and staff, we should ignore such a number.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that he thinks the chart raises a good point, and one of the things he and the EVC are doing is trying to reduce the costs of the administration.

He does think that most of the growth is in MSP, and not senior management. Chancellor Blumenthal said that he is looking at ways to consolidate the positions within senior management and MSPs on this campus. A number of positions over the last year have remained unfilled at the senior level. If you look at current numbers it will be less.

Professor Narayan said the information came from UCOP data, which is available on the UCOP web site, and the two divisions (senior management and MSP) are listed together. Professor Narayan has no idea how to disentangle them, but would agree that probably the most growth has been in MSP.

EVC Kliger said the data should be looked at in more detail. He does not know whether this means a lot of clerical people were reclassified because of change in job duties, and the clerical and MSP people may need to be added together to make sense of the chart. The EVC also said there has been a huge increase in the reporting that the campus has to do; that brings up compliance issues, and that takes many people to get it done. The EVC added that if people look at the budget reductions web site, they will see that the biggest reduction in any unit on campus over the last two years has been in the EVC's office, and that has resulted in major changes in the way the campus does business. The EVC thinks it is important to note that the administration is leading from the top, and not just assuming that all the cuts need to be made at the lowest level.

Professor Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Anthropology, stated that one of the justifications for making asymmetrical cuts in academic divisions was the assertion that in times of economic hardships, students tend to enroll in science and engineering rather than other career courses at the undergraduate level. Professor Gifford-Gonzalez stated that as a member of the division that is heavily affected and currently has proportionately very high enrollments, she is faced with having to explain to students the rationale for the diminishment of programs in her division. It would help, she said, if we had citations from the data on which the EVC based his budgetary decisions and requested that he post the data on the budget web site. Professor Gifford-Gonzalez also requested that the EVC instruct the Office of Institutional Analysis to look at the previous economic downturns in the state and ask whether Santa Cruz' enrollments in science and engineering indeed did have upticks at those time. Those who are taking differentially greater cuts at this time would like to understand the evidentiary basis for the EVC's decision that some divisions can be cut more than others.

EVC Kliger stated that he thinks it is fascinating that he has taken two major criticisms for the cuts that were assigned to the academic divisions. First, that he made too differential of a cut by cutting the social sciences and humanities divisions too much relative to the other divisions. The second, from about an equal number of people, criticize the EVC for making cuts that are too much across the board and that he should have had a larger differentiation between academic division cuts. The EVC stated that when you make cuts of this magnitude, you can count on everyone being upset about them.

Mira Stern, Community Studies student, asked why the Ethnic Resource Centers, the African American Resource Center (AARC), Women’s Center directorships, Community Studies, Latin American and Latino Studies are seeing more materialized effects, and why there is a pattern of further marginalization of certain groups. Also, why isn’t the administration putting pressure on UCOP and other administrative positions to lower their salaries to save students?

The EVC responded that he assigned cuts to all principle officers on the campus for their particular divisions, and the specific ways in which the cuts were distributed were under the purviews of those officers. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Social Sciences Dean would know the specific reasons about the resource centers and particular departments. In terms of the Community Studies cuts, the Dean did present a plan to the VPAA who passed it on to CPB for recommendations.

The EVC also said that starting last fall, he made a recommendation to UCOP through the Council of Vice Chancellors, to cut the highest salaries in the UC system and was told this was not the right to time to do that.

Chancellor Blumenthal added that there are ongoing discussions about senior management pay through the UC system, and he anticipates that something will be done in the upcoming year. With regard to furloughs or pay cuts, it will come from the top levels, and that is a principle the chancellor thinks is important.

Professor Kirsten Gruesz, Literature, reiterated Professor Gifford-Gonzalez’ request that the EVC provide data on his assertion that recessions leads to enrollment increases in engineering and the sciences. Professor Gruesz stated that it is always important, when one is making important policy decisions based on past historical patterns, to be very precise about which conditions are similar to the past, and they don’t necessarily have to be conditions at UCSC or even within the UC system. It would be good to know if the overall pattern was one that obtained within the US higher education system as a whole, which is extremely diverse; within research universities; and then to think hard about what happens when we make policy based on historical patterns.

EVC Kliger said he understands the concept of data, and would point out that the data that he based this on was data that he saw over a 20-30 year period, which he looked at when he was the Dean of PBSci. The data reflected the enrollments at UCSC in the social sciences and humanities divisions relative to the science division as a function of the economic conditions in the country over that period of time. There was perfect tracking of the percentage of students that went to one division or another as a function of the economic conditions in the country. The EVC will try to find the data and agreed to post it on the budget web site.

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

#### **4. Special Order Annual Reports**

##### **a. Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1600)**

Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL) Chair Donna Haraway announced the 2009-10 CFRL nomination. She stated that CRFL has chosen an accomplished economist who has a deep understanding of the social, moral and ethical dimensions of that science. Professor Daniel Friedman is a world expert in experimental and behavioral economics; his experimental work has revealed important aspects of how human beings actually behave in market situations historically compared to what is predicted by classical game theory, which assumes completely rational players as opposed to people in markets. Some of Professor Friedman's recent work gives insight to the phenomena of market bubbles and crashes. Professor Friedman's Ph.D. in mathematics came from UCSC and he began his career as an assistant professor at UCLA before coming to UCSC in 1985. Professor Friedman is a prolific and influential writer and researcher. He has co-authored numerous papers and has an extraordinary publication record. CRFL Chair Haraway noted that Professor Friedman has authored or edited four books, and his most recent one, *Morals and Markets*, appeals to a popular and an academic audience, and foregrounds the need for public debate and public thinking about these crucial questions on the relationship of market and moral thinking and moral systems, and the evolution of moral codes and markets.

Professor Friedman's research excellence has been recognized by many agencies and awards. He has been a principle investigator, a co-principle investigator on many grants. Professor Friedman was recognized as an outstanding teacher and received the Favorite Professor Award from the Alumni Council in 1990-91. He supervised numerous Ph.D. theses and remains a very active and engaged teacher at all levels in the university.

CFRL's nomination was accepted by acclamation.

At the conclusion of CFRL Chair Haraway's remarks Senate member Jaye Padgett, Linguistics, rising on a point of privilege, moved the following resolution:

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate would like to express its deep gratitude to Quentin Williams for his leadership of the division these past two years. Chair Williams has approached his tasks with intelligence, an impressive mastery of complicated issues and a passion for the causes of our university. Every year is challenging, but meeting the current challenges for our campus has required extraordinary and ever increasing dedication. We are grateful for all that you have done.**

The resolution passed by acclamation.

#### **5. Reports of Special Committees (none)**

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

### **a. Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity**

#### **i. Amendment to Chapter 13.12.1. – Change to Membership (AS/SCP/ 1601)**

The Senate voted on the Amendment to Chapter 13.12.1.

**13.12.1 There are six Santa Cruz Division members. In addition, there are one graduate student representative and no more than three undergraduate student representatives.**

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

### **b. Committee on Committees**

#### **i. Amendment to Chapter 13 (AS/SCP/ 1608)**

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Carolyn Martin-Shaw explained the proposed change. Administrators and other officers of the university, by the committee's bylaw charge, are invited to sit with some committees. These are valuable contributors to the committees, but there are times when the committee would like to meet without the administrators or officers such as discussions of programs or policies that the committees are charged with making recommendations about. This amendment allows for three kinds of meetings: meetings of all constituents including voting and non-voting members as well as "sits with's;" meetings for members only which include voting and non-voting members, (the non-voting members are representatives that include non-Senate teaching faculty, graduate students, post doctoral students, and undergraduates) and meetings of voting members only. In regard to the meeting of voting members only, COC Chair Martin-Shaw stated that sessions of voting members only is analogous to departments when there is a personnel meeting, and only the voting members participate.

Professor Joel Yellin, BSOE, stated at some point the passive voice started to be used in our rules, and that it confuses people. The use of "are" as though it were a description instead of describing what it is that the rule demands is particularly confusing here, and is an example of the confusion that propagates in many of our rules.

COC Chair Martin-Shaw responded she thinks it is not passive in terms of the way that it is used and 13.4.2.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Chapter 13.

**13.4.1 Membership. All voting members of all committees must be members of the Santa Cruz Division. Representatives are non-voting members of the committee. Other persons invited to sit with Standing Committees are not members of the committee.**

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

**ii. 2009-10 Nominations (AS/SCP/1602)**

COC Chair Martin-Shaw discussed COC; that it is the only elected committee of the Senate, and it is the only committee that elects its own chair. COC appoints officers of the Senate as well as all of the members of the Senate committees. An election for COC has not been conducted in several years and COC feels it is important to do so in the coming year.

She added that the Committee on Career Advising will not be filled next year, but COC will try to fill the committee in the following year.

COC Chair Martin Shaw then presented the following changes and additions to the 2009-10 nominations: the removal of Judith Habicht-Mauche as Secretary, the addition of Norma Klahn for Secretary (*F&W*), and Raoul Birnbaum for Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (*W&S*).

All the nominations were approved by voice vote.

**c. Committee on Educational Policy**

**i. Amendment to Senate Regulation 6.5: Individual Study, Field Study, Internships, etc. (AS/SCP/1603)**

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett provided background on the proposed Amendment. Regulation 6.5 addresses courses that at the system wide level are called “special study courses”, which could refer to the following courses: independent study courses; group study courses; independent field study courses; supervised field study courses; internships; laboratory research courses; senior thesis or project courses. CEP struggled with the concept of what unifies these courses, and decided that they are courses that lack a curriculum that has been approved in advance by CEP. CEP decided to try calling them “special approval courses” for that reason. The exception to this generalization is the supervised field study, and by that CEP means a normal UCSC course that is taught off campus but with the faculty at the site. For those courses, curriculum is approved by CEP, and so doesn’t belong in this category and can be interpreted to be subsumed by the system-wide term CEP Chair Padgett explained earlier. CEP has a current term for this group of courses and 6.5 uses “individual studies courses,” but CEP Chair Padgett said this is also inappropriate, since some of the courses listed above involve groups. A minor goal of the proposed amendment is to clarify for our campus which courses count as “special approval courses” and should therefore be subject to the restrictions that come from system wide and campus levels.

CEP Chair Padgett further explained that there is confusion around two facts. One is that system wide and local regulation tends to define things and restrict them, often referring to course numbers instead of trying to define the kind of courses. The problem is that the course numbers change and even when terms are used they are not used consistently from campus to campus or between system wide and campus. The second is that UC is currently devoting serious attention to the importance of research opportunities for undergraduates. The best of these opportunities are typically available by means of special approval courses such as independent study. CEP sees no compelling reason for a

regulation that sets a blanket limit on such experiences of five credits per term. For these reasons, CEP is proposing amendments to the current regulation, which would require a new variance if it were to pass.

CEP Chair Padgett added that when students attempt to take an unusual number of special approval courses (either within or across terms), it is prudent that a mechanism be in place that ensures reasonable oversight and good advising. CEP's proposed changes to the regulation reaffirm the importance of oversight, but are adapted to current advising structures. Specifically the changes that would be affected by these amendments are the following:

- They would define “special approval” courses as those whose curricula are not approved in advance by CEP.
- While current regulation requires that students obtain permission to take “two or more” special approval courses in a term (the number of credits is unclear in 6.5 but set at five system wide), the new regulation would set the threshold at seven credits.
- The seven credit threshold would be absolute for students without declared majors, for two reasons:
  - i. There is no realistic means to provide oversight and approve exceptions outside of departmental structures and
  - ii. CEP feels that students who have not found a major should probably not take excessive amounts of special approval courses in any case.
- For students with a declared major, the seven-credit threshold could be exceeded given permission of a student's major sponsoring unit. Requiring approval ensures that students are using special approval courses prudently, making progress toward degree, and so on.
- Approval for individual students to exceed the seven credit limit would be waived when it follows from degree requirements already approved by CEP.

Following CEP Chair Padgett's presentation, Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion.

Professor Deanna Shemek, Literature and Provost of Cowell College, asked about the crossing out of college and provost as the approving agency for these courses. It is the college that has the broadest overview of the students program of studies and Professor Shemek can imagine that a student might be undertaking this kind of special studies course as part of a minor or a set of electives that do not participate in the major, on the face of it, it does not look like the department, or even the sponsoring agency for that particular course, would be the best place to seek approval. Is that worth considering?

CEP Chair Padgett responded that CEP has a provost representative on the committee, and also a college preceptor, the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education sits with the committee, and all involved came around to the feeling that it would not be possible for the colleges to take on the burden of finding out when a student has decided to take more than the number of special study credits that s/he should. CEP Chair Padgett said we cannot stop students from doing things in advance, and that tracking what they do, especially given the current problems of workload in the colleges seemed impractical.

Professor Shemek said she is not really objecting, but is trying to imagine a student undertaking this kind of study but whose department advisor would also not be well equipped to take that overview, because it might be something that is actually different from what the student is doing in a major.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Regulation 6.5.

### **6.5 Special Approval Courses.**

**6.5.1 Special approval courses are courses whose curricula are not approved in advance by the Committee on Educational Policy. These include, but are not limited to, independent or group studies (or tutorials), independent field studies or internships, senior thesis or project courses, individual research project courses, and recital preparation courses, and are subject to the definitions and limitations of this section.**

**6.5.2 Determination of lower or upper division credit for special approval courses is based on the level of the work done and not on the class standing of the student. Upper division work is of truly advanced nature, and if upper division credit is requested, the application must provide evidence of competence in the subject-matter area within which the project lies.**

**6.5.3 Students wishing to take a special approval course of 2 or 5 credit hours should apply to the department, program of studies, or college sponsoring the course, outlining in reasonable detail the expected course of study. Deadlines for filing applications may be set by the sponsoring agency and included in the catalog description of that agency's course. Agencies may waive their own deadlines up to the final date for enrolling in courses. Applications must be approved by the instructor as proposing a worthwhile study which the instructor is capable of supervising and willing to supervise. The instructor must indicate on the application the number of credit hours to be granted upon successful completion of the work proposed. Applications also must be approved by the chair or provost (or senior curricular officer) of the agency sponsoring the course as being appropriate and in conformity with the educational policy of the agency.**

**6.5.4 Students without declared majors may not take more than seven credit hours of special approval courses in a given quarter. Students with declared majors must receive authorization from their major-sponsoring unit(s) to take more than seven credit hours of special approval courses in a given quarter. Before the authorization may be granted, the student must present to the major-sponsoring unit(s) the signatures of all instructors and chairs who approved the individual course applications, showing that they know that their course is part of an extended use of individual studies courses by the student. Authorization indicates that the above signatures have been obtained and that**

**the courses are appropriate to the educational needs of the student. Authorization as described in this section is not needed if the seven or more credits of special approval courses are part of a regular curriculum that has been approved by the Committee on Educational Policy.**

**6.5.5 Independent field studies or internships are courses for which either: (a) the student's supervision is conducted by a regularly appointed officer of instruction by a means other than the usual supervision in person (e.g., the supervision is by email), or (b) the student does all or most of the course work off campus. The application for field studies courses must show evidence of suitable preparation and competence in the subject matter. Before credit may be assigned for the course, the student must file a written report (or paper) with the department, program of studies, or college sponsoring the course. Students taking independent field studies or internships will be officially registered and pay regular University of California fees. Such courses are not ordinarily available to first-year students and are not available for course credit by petition.**

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

**ii. Amendment to Senate Regulation 10.2.2.3 (AS/SCP/1604)**

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett explained that the amendment would allow transfer students to have topical GE requirements waived in a way that would be formulaic depending on the number of credits they transfer in. This reverts in part to the way things used to be about three years ago, when our regulation required that neither topical nor the “W” be articulated from other colleges. They had to be satisfied here at UCSC. According to Chair Padgett the Senate then voted to treat topical courses just like all GE requirements, but the problem is that now it takes a lot of work to articulate individual courses from community colleges around the state. The admissions office has been steadily doing that, but CEP knows that this requirement has a limited life because of the changed GE requirements, and would prefer that the admissions office spend its time thinking about articulating courses for the GE requirements that are coming.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.3.

**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 courses. Writing-intensive courses must be taken at UCSC. Transfer students may be exempted from up to three Topical courses depending on the amount of credit transferred at the time of entrance. An eligible transferred course of 4.0 quarter credits or 3.0 semester credits 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.**

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

**d. Committee on Faculty Welfare**

**i. Report on the University of California Retirement Program (AS/SCP/1599)**

CFW Chair Elizabeth Abrams and CFW member Suresh Lodha presented the report. CFW member Lodha began by thanking the following subcommittee members who worked on report: Maria-Elena Diaz, Jennifer Reardon and Roger Anderson. He also thanked CFW Chair Abrams and Academic Senate Staff Analyst Pam Edwards for their hard work.

CFW member Lodha then addressed following issues concerning the University of California Retirement Program (UCRP).

- What is post retirement?
  - UCRP – your pension based on service credits and salary
  - Retiree Health
- Status of post retirement
  - UCRP
    - Assets/Liabilities = 28.9B/44.5B = ratio of assets to liabilities is 65% (March 31, 2009)
    - Current unfilled liability = \$15.5B
    - “Smoothed Assets”/Liabilities <<<.95 (“unhealthy”)
    - Smoothed funding ratio will gradually deteriorate over the next four years as UCRP absorbs \$12.3 billion dollar loss incurred this year.
  - Retiree Health:
    - Assets/Liabilities = 0.4 percent = .004
    - Pay as you go approach
    - Current unfilled liability = \$13.3 billion; projected to increase
- Current approach to solutions
  - Contributions  
(Employee five percent + employer 11 percent for a total of 16 percent of covered payroll (approx. 3.2 percent of assets) over next five years)
  - Challenges
    - The funding situation has tipped to such a low point that full recovery is unlikely without a “bailout” (current solution too little too late).
    - Furthermore there are challenges to even the proposed contributions by:
      - Faculty (reluctance, worried, but not opposed)
      - Staff
      - Union
      - State (Currently opposed, future?)
      - UC Regents (“inability” to follow this solution but no backup plan)
- Future approach to solutions

- UC Regents, Presidential Steering Committee on Post Retirement, Presidential Task Force on Post Retirement, System wide Academic Council, System wide UCFW (UC Committee on Faculty Welfare), Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR), Task Force on Health Benefits, Campus Academic Senate, Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), Senator
- Assets
- Liabilities
- Contributions
- Recommendations of CFW
  - Seek immediate commitment of UC to post retirement benefits
  - Facilitate development of effective strategies to bring UCRP back to healthy levels:
    - “Data Availability” to public in easy access, transparent, and timely manner
    - “Shared Engagement” at both the Senate and administrative level (invite and welcome democratic input from all UCRP members)
    - “Commitment” by UC Regents/UC President/UC Faculty as highest priority to post retirement benefits by developing an immediate plan

**ii. Resolution on the University of California Retirement Program (AS/SCP/1610)**

CFW Chair Abrams stated that the goal of the resolution is to receive easy, accessible data in order to participate fully in the decision making process regarding UCRP.

Senate Chair Williams opened the floor to comments.

Professor Bruce Schumm, Physics, asked if CFW has approached the system wide CFW (UCFW). He stated that it seems they would be in a better position to advocate through the Academic Council directly to UCOP rather than coming from a campus.

CFW Chair Abrams responded that CFW has repeatedly asked for this information, specific aspects of the information in particular, especially the Master Trust Report that compares the details of public pension plans. The position of UCFW has been that it is not good to make that information publicly available because it is easily misinterpreted. CFW respectfully differs so they are asking on behalf of UCSC that this information be made available.

CFW member Roger Anderson stated he thinks it is essential the Senate adopt these resolutions. He said CFW is asking for some daylight put on what the state of the retirement plan actually is. How much do we pay people to manage the money? How much are we getting for that payment? Those questions are important.

Professor Yellin asked the following three questions: 1. what is the status of this commitment? 2. Can we change the wording so that the documents CFW is requesting match what is available? 3. What can we do so that it really says what the liability is in the long run.

After some discussion Professor Yellin then suggested a friendly amendment suggesting wording changes to clarify what is being requested and make it consistent with what is available on UCOP's web site. CFW Abrams accepted the friendly amendment.

The Senate then voted on the amended Resolution on the UCRP.

***Whereas* certainty about the commitment of the UC Regents to the UC Retirement Program is essential to the morale of UC faculty and other employees, and critical to UC's success in recruiting and retaining excellent faculty,**

***Whereas* certainty about the commitment of the UC Regents to retirees' health benefits is likewise critical to morale, recruitment, and retention,**

***Whereas* timely information about the current and projected funding status, cost, and returns of our retirement system, and its relative performance and health in comparison to other public employees' retirement systems, is essential to members' ability to participate meaningfully in decisions regarding our financial futures,**

***Therefore be it resolved that we urgently request the UC President to issue and post on the Office of the President's website statements assuring UC's commitment to honor UCRP employee benefits, and post-retirement health benefits, and***

***Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate of the Santa Cruz Division urges:***

***(1) the UC President to***

***(a) direct the UC Treasurer to***

- **post the annual fiscal reports and annual UCRP holdings for the last ten years on the Treasurer's website,**
- **post the monthly and quarterly investment performance summaries on the Treasurer's website by the end of the following month,**
- **provide the information on fees, expenses, and compensations to external managers incurred in managing UCRP funds in the Treasurer's annual report,**
- **provide a copy of the UCRP Master Trust Report and the External Managers' Performance Report on a quarterly basis, as soon as it is available, to divisional offices of the Senate, to allow interested members to examine the performance of UCRP investment returns in comparison to other public trust funds; and**

***(b) direct the UC Treasurer and UC's actuary Segal Company to***

- **provide the annual UCRP funding numbers (benefit payments, contributions, investment returns, and fees and expenses along with assets and liability-related information) annually in dollar amounts in one consistent table for each of its five different segments—UCRP Campus and Medical Center, LBNL, LLNL, LANL, and UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan, and for the whole UCRP; and**

*(c) direct UC's actuary Segal Company to*

- **provide projections of the total AAL (actuarial accrued liabilities) for the next five years in the annual actuarial report, and**
- **provide projections of expected annual benefit payments for the next ten years in the annual actuarial report;**

**(2) the UC Academic Council to pursue the matters listed above with the systemwide UC administration; and**

**(3) the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division and the Santa Cruz UCFW Representative to pursue the matters listed above with the UC Academic Council and UCFW.**

The amended Resolution passed by voice vote.

**e. Committee on Planning and Budget**

**i. Budget Report #1 (AS/SCP/1605)**

**ii. Budget Report #2 (AS/SCP/1609)**

CPB Chair Susan Gillman discussed the two CPB reports. She began by saying that the second report contains an update on CPB's consultations with the deans on the impacts of the cuts on the divisions, departments and programs. The consultation process is still ongoing, but Chair Gillman provided an assessment of the present moment.

As CPB explained in its first report, over 75 percent of operating budgets on the campus are in salaries, and sometimes called a "fixed cost." Due to the compressed time period to implement the budget cuts, the budget categories CPB considered were fairly conventional, using those that were immediately available. With more time CPB could have considered how to use another index, one that provided more nuance on what is available in terms of flexible and inflexible funds. An example is a precedent in a non-academic division, the Business and Administrative Services Unit, where purchased utilities are often removed from the operating budget because they have to be paid for no matter what. They would be called a fixed cost. An analog in the academic divisions could be salaries, for filled, tenured FTE. This would help the campus to gauge the academic support units and the cuts to those in relation to cross academic divisions cuts, providing a broader budgetary context.

CPB's second point is that its preliminary assessment of the impact on the divisions based on the responses of the deans to CPB's questions shows some unexpected results in patterns that might not have been anticipated. The results point to measures and pieces of

the budget and of budgetary impacts that should be monitored moving forward. Some are returning substantial numbers of open FTE to the center, with resulting cuts in the functions that were supported by those open FTE such as research, graduate support, and equipment. Another division is not returning any open FTE, but making deep curricular cuts that reflect their rethinking of how to sustain the undergraduate curriculum so that they can continue to develop their two newest graduate programs. The division eliminated minors, reduced the number of lecturers and increased course size, had ladder rank faculty take on a greater proportion of course instruction, and reduced TA support in the large courses.

CPB Chair Gillman stated that for the future, monitoring these divisional cuts and the resulting changes in the balance of three key elements; FTE (both filled and unfilled), TA support, and Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) monies, is extremely important must be done across the divisions as we move into planning for the next reductions.

- Planning needs to take into account the impacts from past reductions. If the campus does not keep this kind of budgetary accounting *specifically of the balance of those three elements*, it will not have any hope of assessing the impact overall on the divisions.
- The campus needs to track the anticipated and realized revenues that might be coming in to PBSci and BSOE from the Federal Stimulus Package and other external sources to ensure they meet the expectations on which the EVC has based these differentiated cuts. This is related to CPB's earlier discussion about basing cuts on future projections of revenue enhancing.
- Some people have assumed the following from the application of the differentiated cuts: that the campus will be investing most of the available marginal faculty lines in engineering, arts and the sciences and that there is visible in the percentage of the cuts, a campus preference for growing the arts, sciences and engineering and an emphasis on developing new professional programs that together will limit programmatic opportunities overall.

CPB Chair Gillman then closed with the following points:

- The Academic Senate never endorsed the divisional sizes that are in the academic plan. There was work done on CPB about comparable division sizes across the system, and that is still an open question.
- Since the Senate review of professional school options last year, CPB and the Senate have consistently registered detailed, principled doubts, questions, uncertainty, and stated opposition to a School of Management. The School of Management is not identical to, equivalent to, or reduceable to the Silicon Valley Initiative (SVI). CPB recommends working with the administration to ensure that the SVI is used to foster faculty initiatives already under way that need greater, more reliable institutional support through that mechanism.
- No budget crisis should be wasted. CPB calls on the administration to change the budgetary model of the campus, which has been long based on incremental growth.

- CPB and the EVC think the campus should embark on annual, comprehensive budget reviews for academic and support units. Annual budget reviewing is a way of ensuring that expenditures remain appropriate and necessary, that they do not continue because they are part of the historical patchwork that produced them, that functions are also aligned with expenses most efficiently, and that functions are achieved efficiently and effectively within and across units. That can only be achieved by having a full annual budget review process.
- A budget review process would be the place to focus on administrative positions and functions within and across divisions, conducting a review of all positions within specific classifications above a specified level to address the growth in administration relative to enrollment growth, growth in faculty and growth in staff. This is a task that is best suited to the administration.
- The call for the faculty is to make better use of the Senate to determine a process for some kind of systematic cross divisional thinking about structures of this campus. What impedes the kind of collaborative, intellectual work that is central to the instructional mission and how do we configure those structures instead of living with them and fighting against them?
- A second place that the campus should be looking at a cross divisional structure is rather than reacting passively and negatively to administrative proposals to realign departments, seize the Senate plenary authority over the curriculum and the Senate role in the establishment and disestablishment of programs as a chance to rethink and realign majors, undergraduate and graduate programs.
- The Senate should create a faculty review board that questions whether the current divisional and departmental configurations serve faculty and students as best as they should. The faculty need to lay down its historic oppositions, divisions and feuds.

Professor Phokion Kolaitis, Computer Science, said he appreciated the report and asked why events transpired the way that they did, with regards to consultation and participation in the budget process.

CPB Chair Gillman responded that is something that only the EVC can address. CPB and the EVC went through a budget planning process last year for a round of smaller cuts, which was a completely different process, and much more oriented towards the idea of differential cutting and protecting I & R. This year a different principle was given, and that was to make up for past cuts.

Professor Marcia Ochoa, Community Studies, asked to what extent the faculty have a responsibility to show some leadership? Do the faculty have the responsibility to make proposals? How are the UCSC faculty communicating with other faculty Senates across the UC system to coordinate something so that we can make the best of this moment and try to change the illusion that most of the state has about UC?

CPB Chair Gillman agreed that this is a moment where we hope there will be political change in the state, and a change in the relationship between the university and the state. Chair Gillman said there are system wide committees that regularly share information.

Currently system wide committees have rallied around in opposition of the proposed Presidential Emergency Powers Act.

Dean Steve Thorsett, PBCSci, stated this has been a difficult couple of years for all who are involved in budgeting on campus. The dean said throughout the last two years in particular, he wants to emphasize how wonderful CPB has been to work with. The two reports on the agenda today are examples of all of the work CPB has done. It is a committee with which the dean does not always agree, but it is a committee that Dean Thorsett respects greatly. CPB is always engaged, very well informed, and a committee that makes it a joy for the dean to come and talk with. Dean Thorsett acknowledged CPB Chair Gillman as the hardest working member of the hardest working committees in the UC system. The dean said CPB Chair Gillman has done a wonderful job and thanked her for her work.

**f. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections**

**i. Amendment to Bylaw 11: Elections (AS/SCP/1606)**

The Senate voted on the Amendment to Bylaw 11.

**11.1 All balloting in the Santa Cruz Division is either by mail or, if arising from a motion in a meeting of the Divisional Senate, conducted in the meeting.**

**11.2 All elections in the Santa Cruz Division are by mail and are conducted by the Secretary under the direction of the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections in accordance with SB 340A-B.**

**11.3 Unchanged.**

**11.4 Nominating petitions shall be filed with the Secretary by the deadline specified in the Notice of Election, which will be no less than fourteen and no more than twenty eight calendar days following the mailing or electronic distribution of the Notice. Each nominating petition for an office must be signed by five voting members and must contain certification of acceptance by the nominee or nominees. Each nominating petition may include as many nominees as there are places to be filled.**

**If the number of nominees is equal to the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected. If the number of nominees is less than the number of places to be filled, all the nominees will be declared elected and the remaining vacancies remaining will be treated as mid-year vacancies to be filled in accordance with SCB 13.14.2.**

**11.5 Unchanged.**

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

**g. Senate Executive Committee**

**i. Recommendation on Faculty Salaries (AS/SCP/1607)**

The Senate received the report without comment.

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

Student Union Assembly (SUA) Commissioner on Academic Affairs (CAA) Matthew Palm provided the report. He began by announcing that proceeds from a pizza fundraiser and bake sale will benefit the Community Studies Department. CAA Palm then discussed SUA accomplishments. The SUA founded a Slug Day, which is a celebration in the quarry for sports teams and successful programs. The SUA registered over 4,000 voters in the presidential election; the campus SUA was seventh in the nation among four year universities that registered voters. They were fourth in the nation with regards to the percentage of the campus that they registered to vote. The SUA sponsored multiple budget forums, which enabled Student Affairs to hear students' most critical needs during difficult budget times. The SUA also informed students about the proposed changes to GE reform. CAA Palm recognized Jamal Atiba for his work on the GE reform efforts. SUA is very proud of the campus for taking a lead on what students believe are innovative educational policies like the new GE requirements. CAA Palm thanked CEP and its chair, Jaye Padgett, for their hard work.

CCA Palm then informed the Senate about SUA's efforts to obtain comprehensive training for TA's on issues of diversity in the classroom. The SUA has been working with the Committee on Teaching (COT) and the Office of Institutional Research. SUA has postponed gathering research so that they can work with COT to ensure that faculty and students are addressing the issue collectively.

Next CAA Palm addressed the recent budget cuts. He stated that student organizations that represent under represented communities on campus have shifted their collective priorities away from developing proposals for new programs and towards defending basic student needs during these budgetary times. CAA Palm read from a series of requests and demands from a body of students who feel the budget cuts are disproportionately impacting students from under represented communities. According to CAA Palm these issues have served as a catalyst for the formation of a new coalition on campus, which is called the Student of Color Collective.

- UCSC needs to hire a full time director for both the American Indian Resource Center and the Women's Center with student voices being included in the hiring process.
- We ask the administration to continue Chancellor Denton's legacy and provide matching funding for Engaging Education, which is our incredibly successful and very inspiring student led outreach and retention center.
- We advocate for institutionalized scholarships and other resources for AB540 students.
- The campus needs to provide permanent funding for ethnic year end ceremonies. These are ceremonies for students from under represented communities who are graduating to recognize their success and their contributions to this campus and to their communities. Recently funding for these ceremonies had been jeopardized and

this is a problem. A lot of these issues tie into issues of retention, which are a big problem for this campus because we have the second lowest retention rate in the UC system, although we are working on that and we see the administration working on that, and we appreciate the progress. These changes can also help in the retention of students on this campus.

- Several college Senates have begun advocating having the library open 24 hours during the week of finals and during the week before finals.

CAA Palm understands that these requests and demands may be unrealistic given the budget circumstances, but these demands reflect the level of very serious concern and frustration students are facing regarding the budget cuts.

SUA is also concerned about the cuts to the Community Studies Program. CAA Palm stated that no cuts should be finalized to the campus until the Academic Senate's proper committees have officially declared that the administration of those cuts is in line with shared governance. CAA Palm has become impressed with students' commitment to the Community Studies. The Community Studies Program was a pioneer in the field of community based experiential learning. The program sends over 100 students per year to perform more than 90,000 hours of community service with community organizations and social justice movements. CAA Palm continued by saying local, regional and national organizations depend on students in these programs as a vital source of labor and ideas for these projects, strategic planning and service delivery. There is a perception among students that the major is being cut, and SUA has done its best to inform students that is not what is happening.

CAA Palm closed by saying that it has been an exciting year, and he has learned a lot.

### **8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)**

### **9. Petitions of Students (none)**

### **10. Unfinished Business (none)**

### **11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)**

### **12. New Business (none)**

Adjournment: 5:00 pm.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche  
Secretary  
July 21, 2009