

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division

November 5, 2010

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held on Friday, November 5, 2010 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian and Secretary Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Gillman asked for approval of the minutes from the May 21, 2010 Senate meeting. These minutes had been approved with one amendment at the October 20th Senate meeting, but following a request to reconsider on grounds that a second amendment had been proposed but was not considered, further consideration of the May 21, 2010 minutes had been tabled. After a call for a quorum established that a quorum was not present, Chair Gillman deferred consideration of the minutes until the next Senate meeting.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Susan Gillman

Chair Gillman introduced two new Academic Senate Analysts, Shari Skinner and Matthew Mednick. She also introduced Secretary and Parliamentarian Donald Potts.

Chair Gilman explained that the Senate is in the process of solving the Post Employment Benefits problem by organizing and communicating among the campuses. She stated that the principle of equity had been preserved and a two-tiered system prevented, and that President Yudof's draft recommendations were close to the Senate recommendations. His recommendations contained a skeleton finance plan to deal with the unfunded liability of the pension plan, with several suggestions involving debt restructuring, and borrowing from the short term investment pool (STIP). The Senate will continue to press for an improved finance plan, including rethinking capital investments across the campuses. Where this money will come from may shift due to the systemwide project of Rebenching (redistributing funding to campuses). The new methodology for returning educational fees to the campus that generated them is now in place. The next frontier is to readjust and equalize the per-student state funds that come to the campuses, and this should increase UCSC's per-student share of state general funds significantly.

On health care, Chair Gillman noted that UCSC had failed to get mitigations or offsets for those staying with the Palo Alto Medical Foundation who had Healthnet as the insurer, and that there was no movement on the request to return to a statewide averaging of employee fees. In concert with the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and UCSC's administration, the Senate will begin gathering data on who is switching from the Palo Alto Medical Foundation to the Physicians Medical Group, the choice of practices, whether they are open or closed to new patients, the time and distance required to get medical care, and the quality of services. A joint administrative/senate oversight committee will be created to ensure that the data are gathered and the results will be used to initiate conversations with Office of the President (OP). This is critical because negotiations for next year are starting immediately. UCSC will continue to coordinate with Berkeley and other affected campuses, and a UCSC member, Professor Barry Bowman, has been appointed to the

system-wide Health Care Task Force.

At UCSC, a joint Senate Executive Committee working group, consisting of representatives from CAP, CPB, and CFW, is being resurrected to work on increasing faculty salaries and to move UCSC salaries up to the system-wide median.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal agreed with Senate Chair Gillman about pension benefits, stated his appreciation for the efforts of the Senate which he felt have paid off, expressed the need to think forward to next year about health care, and welcomed the idea of a joint task force to collect data. He then described meeting two days prior with President Yudof, Vice President for Business Affairs Nathan Brostrom, and UC's Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and Services Jack Stobo to talk about developing new health care alternatives for UCSC faculty and staff, and he suggested that the Health Care Task Force should work with these key people.

The Chancellor did not have any major budget updates because of the recent election of a new governor, but he expressed concerns about the legislature re-convening in midyear and how that might affect the budget. He recommended that, at the Regents meeting in two weeks, we should ask for what we need, rather than what we're able to get. The Chancellor said he looked forward to continuing to work with the Senate on re-benching and expressed confidence in its success, with his only concern being about time.

Chancellor Blumenthal indicated there will be a request to the Regents in November to raise student fees for next year, probably in the 6-9% range. While there is a desire to increase faculty and staff salaries, he didn't know by how much, when, or if it will happen. That will depend on the state budget which should be decided over the next two months.

The Chancellor noted that Founder's Week went extremely well with lectures, forums and a reception at the Cocoanut Grove, and he thanked all of those involved. During the year, UCSC faculty raised \$148 million dollars in research awards, a record for the campus, and UCSC continues to outpace other universities in the growth of research awards. The Chancellor concluded by congratulating UCSC Faculty member Enrico Ramirez-Ruiz in Astronomy and Astrophysics on his election to the National Academy of Sciences of Mexico.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

EVC Alison Galloway began with the budget, commenting that the new governor has past experience of putting a budget together - but whether it will be good or bad for the University is unknown. She then expressed concerns about midyear cuts to state agencies, which would likely include UC. Because the 2010-11 budget is finalized, the campus is now planning for 2011-12. Priorities include limited but essential faculty hiring, part of which would be funded from the \$51.6 million given by the state to cover UC's unfunded enrollments and which will trickle down to the campuses. She also wants to give some funds to the divisions to allow for flexibility, and is

looking at restoring a few central funds. The Administration will start working with CPB on a broad scale, twenty year financial analysis looking at trends to determine strategic choices for increasing revenues to fund the core mission of the campus.

Commenting on health care, EVC Galloway noted that negotiations took place only between UCOP and Sutter Health, and not between individual campuses or the local PAMF.

Post Employment Benefits planning does not consider the unfunded liability, around \$12 billion, that will largely be funded out of employer contributions. Initial analysis suggested this would require a 20% increase over a relatively extended period from about 2017 – 2029, with high employer contributions. For UCSC the increased cost would be over \$26 million, and would affect such core functions and auxiliary units as Housing, Dining, the Bookstore, etc. UCOP is diligently trying to decrease this amount and has already reduced it to \$18.5 million. EVC Galloway added that she and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) chair have done a number of analyses regarding faculty salaries, and want to ensure checks and balances and maintain transparency.

Responding to a question about which universities UCSC outpaced in research funding, Chancellor Blumenthal replied that our percentage increase is one of the fastest growing in the country, and not only among other UC campuses.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- a. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1644)**
- b. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1647)**

Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Olof Einarsdóttir, expressed concern regarding the lack of an effective admissions policy for transfer students. Many arrive with few to no introductory science courses so they cannot complete a science degree in three years, making it extremely expensive for the campus and for students. This fall's influx of transfer students wishing to enter science programs pushed science departments to full capacity.

Professor Einarsdóttir continued with some examples to illustrate her point. All transfer students into physical and biological sciences majors are expected to have the minimum math calculus series completed when they come to the campus, but analyses showed that 65% had not taken a full year of calculus before transferring. In chemistry, transfer students are expected to have had a minimum of a general chemistry series, yet 35% did not, and 72% had not taken organic chemistry. In biological sciences, transfer students are expected to have completed the introductory biology series, yet roughly half had not done that. In physics, 44% of transfers had not taken the expected introductory physics series with laboratories. These statistics show that the system is broken, and new admissions criteria are needed, because the current situation is a recipe for failure for students. Many transfer students now take a very long time to finish, many drop out of sciences and go into

other divisions, and some are eligible for financial aid only for a limited time. Department chairs in physical and biological sciences share a sense of urgency about changing our admissions policy before the campus accepts the 2010-11 cohort of students, and they need to know where CAFA and the administration stand on this issue.

Responding to Professor Einarsdóttir, CEP chair John Tamkun commented that CEP has discussed this issue, not in terms of admissions, but for the impact on students. When CEP receives requests to limit transfer students' access to majors, they are treated as a separate entity from our "native" students. CEP feels strongly that any policy applied to transfer students should also be applied to "native" students. CEP wants to encourage departments to consider this issue when formulating transfer policies, and to develop policies that apply to all students and avoid stigmatizing transfer students as second class citizens. As an example, Chair Tamkun described a transfer student who arrived without introductory biology, yet is now completing his MD/Ph.D. at UCLA: blind application of admissions criteria would have prevented him from coming to UCSC.

Interim Dean of Humanities, Bill Ladusaw, speaking as a former Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) and long-time collaborator with CEP, suggested that CAFA will want to talk about criteria for admission to the campus, and possibly create criteria not used before, namely how admission to the campus is related to eligibility to enter a program. If programs define lower division qualifications that are required by both "native" and transfer students for admission to the major, that will provide the information needed to implement such a policy. It will also provide the basis for following the Senate's direction on resource-impacted programs where more qualified students seek admission than can be accommodated.

Professor Triloki Pandey, Anthropology, stated that his department became aware of this problem in the 1980s and developed two courses to prepare new students. He suggested thinking about investing in some similar system for the sciences.

Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) Steve Thorsett commented that the sciences want transfer students and also want them to be successful, but it is impossible for transfer students to do so if they come in without the necessary introductory courses. While the Admissions Office has only been advising students to take the introductory courses before coming to UCSC, some UC campuses require core classes before admission. Community college advisors currently inform students that UCSC is one campus that will take students without these requirements. Dean Thorsett suggested UCSC is differentially gaining unprepared students and he proposed working with community college advisors to change their advice. He concluded that these questions need to be addressed by the Senate as a whole, not just by CAFA, who's purview does not cover admissions to majors.

Chair Tamkun replied that CEP would be happy to consider any proposal that prevented students from declaring majors that they cannot possibly complete in a reasonable amount of time, but that this is a different question from admission to the campus.

School of Engineering Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs, Charlie McDowell, commented that the School of Engineering already screens transfer students, and only allows those with the preparatory classes into the program.

CAFA Chair Bruce Cooperstein stated that CAFA will take up the issue this year, that a representative from PBSci is being consulted, and that they hope to work with CEP to come up with a recommendation that meets the needs of the campus as a whole about admissions to the campus and to the majors, and which requires transfer students to arrive adequately prepared.

Chair Gillman closed the topic by noting there is a larger system-wide move to homogenize requirements for transfers and make the whole UC system better able to absorb the transfer population. This makes it an opportune time to deal with these issues locally, and she encouraged CEP and CAFA to present legislation to the Senate for consideration.

- c. **Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AS/SCP/1648)**
- d. **Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1649)**
- e. **Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1651)**
- f. **Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1652)**
- g. **Committee on International Education (AS/SCP/1653)**
- h. **Committee on Preparatory Education (AS/SCP/1654)**
- i. **Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1655)**
- j. **Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1656)**
- k. **Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (AS/SCP/1657)**
- l. **Committee on the Teaching (AS/SCP/1660)**
- m. **Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1658)**

After comments, items on the consent calendar were received.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

- a. Graduate Council
 - i. Amendment to Section IV Graduate Program Chapter 13 Grading and Transmission of Records (AS/SCP/1659)

Graduate Council Chair Sue Carter explained the proposed legislative changes in graduate grading policy which include five major changes. The first change adds the option of plus or minus in grades A through B and plus on grade C. The second provides an option for either letter grades or an S/U grade. The third enables official GPAs to be calculated for graduate courses. The fourth makes narrative evaluations optional. The fifth corrects problems of timeliness for grade changes in graduate courses. Reasons for proposing these changes include consistency of graduate and undergraduate grading policies, correcting unenforceable or inconsistent aspects of

current policies, and providing additional options for effectively evaluating performance in graduate courses.

Chair Carter then proposed an amendment to 13.2.1 to correct an error in the wording by adding “taking the course for credit” after “At the end of the term each instructor teaching a credit granting course shall have the option to prepare a written evaluation for any student.”

Dean Thorsett asked about the language concerning optional narrative evaluations which had not been considered in the PBSci Division during discussion of undergraduate optional narrative evaluations. Because one department is considering requiring faculty to provide narrative evaluations, he asked whether faculty could be required to do that by their own bylaw 55 unit, or did the proposed language exclude that?

Chair Carter replied this had not been discussed by GC and she does not know the answer.

Dean Ladusaw commented that when optional narratives were added to the undergraduate policy, conflict arose with the undergraduate regulation that no course can be used to satisfy a requirement unless it has been evaluated at the 2.0 level. Though a D grade is technically passing, for a course to qualify for a major or degree requirement it must be passed at the C level, which is why UCSC doesn't have a C minus. He asked whether there is an analogous issue for the graduate program, such as a 3.0?

Chair Carter replied that there is no GPA limit in the graduate policy, but only grades of A and B can be used to fulfill a requirement in a graduate course. Graduate students can pass with a C in a course that is not required.

After Dean Ladusaw asked if a B minus grade satisfies that requirement, since that would be a 2.7, not a 3.0. Chair Carter replied that a B minus is a B and is an acceptable grade.

Professor Einarisdóttir asked why we need minuses and pluses. Chair Carter replied that many faculty members feel strongly that, when evaluating graduate students, there is a considerable difference between, for instance, an A plus and an A minus, especially in classes where a significant fraction of the grades are A. There is nothing to stop faculty from ignoring the plus and minus designations if they wish.

Because of the lack of a quorum the Senate was unable to vote on the legislation, and consideration was deferred to the next Senate meeting.

- b.** Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (RJ&E)
 - i.** Amendment to Bylaw 8.4.1, 9.1, 13.28: Mail Ballots (AS/SCP/1637)

RJ&E chair, John Jordan outlined the proposed amendments to the manual. At the request of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), it is proposed to reduce the number of days for requesting a mail ballot from 21 to 14 days. This also changes the reference point of distribution of minutes, and ties it to the distribution of the Divisional Action Report. To correct inconsistencies in the manual about who runs elections, RJ&E is proposing that the Secretary should run mail ballots under the supervision of RJ&E, and that language should be consistent throughout the manual. RJ&E will continue to count the ballots.

Because of the lack of a quorum the Senate was unable to vote on the legislation, and consideration was deferred to the next Senate meeting.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Student Union Assembly Chair Tiffany Dena Loftin began with an announcement about Rainbow Theater, a multi-cultural production troupe performing on campus. She then noted that UCSC is the only UC campus without an Ethnic Studies program, and that students are thinking about ways to use interdisciplinary courses to create a minor in Ethnic Studies. She continued that the SUA is discussing and researching ways to gather information for a holistic review, and that she had concluded after talking to other campus's representatives that those campuses saw true differences in shades and backgrounds on campus.

Chair Loftin reported that the SUA will take a bus full of students to the Regents meeting at UCSF and hopes to give a public address showing opposition to any and all student fee increases. There may also be an action about this topic at UCSC. The SUA is looking forward to seeing which programs, courses and majors will be sustained for next year and how available they will be to students.

Chair Loftin described the success of the recent "Get Out the Vote" campaign in which 50 volunteers registered 2,600 students, doubling previous efforts. On November 19-21, the SUA will take 80 representatives to the Students of Color conference at UCSB where workshops, presentations and guest speakers will cover issues that students of color are facing in higher education. SUA reps and other students on campus are also working on a system-wide survey of students feelings about transfer students, accessibility to classes, and time to graduation. Chair Loftin concluded by saying she is looking forward to student government and the Academic Senate supporting each other.

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: 3:43 p.m.

ATTEST:

Donald Potts, Secretary

May 5, 2011