

## MINUTES

### Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division February 29, 2012

#### **Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 29, 2012 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:41 p.m.

#### **1. Approval of Draft Minutes**

The minutes of November 9 2011 were approved as written.

#### **2. Announcements**

##### **a. Chair Susan Gillman**

Chair Gillman welcomed the Leadership Academy and the new Senate Committee Analyst, Jaden Silva-Espinoza. Chair Gillman noted that we are not lurching from crisis to crisis as much as in the past, providing time and imperative to get things done for the future.

##### **Curricular Review**

Last year the Senate began curricular review, a reform movement to undertake major mapping, which is a means to visualize major pathways and requirements to majors, noting how they do or don't work within the major, and how they articulate with allied disciplines.

We are working on replacing disqualification policies with adequate acceptance policies including clear prerequisites and predictive gateway courses. We are working on getting our disqualification policies into compliance with the system-wide disqualification policy. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) is also introducing a new transfer policy to help improve retention and graduation rates.

UCSC is undergoing a Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) review to reaffirm accreditation. We are encouraging departments to use their own boiler-plates for the WASC review to help streamline majors.

The goal of the curricular review is to use the curriculum as proxy to review how campus is structured. We are asking a broader question; "How effectively are our development, planning and implementation of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum being served by our campus's practices, policies and structures?"

##### **Online Education**

Currently the UC On-line Education Project is moving slowly with only one on-line course presently offered. However it is moving at a breakneck pace in the size and scope of the program, led by Vice Provost Dan Greenstein and Provost Larry Pitts, leaving behind the senate's recommendation that a pilot project should be launched that could be evaluated before any further steps are taken. Many budgetary questions remain unanswered. Which campus gets the dollars from the students enrolled in courses on other campuses? How would faculty

workload be calculated, as overload or as regular teaching duties? There are also substantive curricular issues. Who is the intended audience, UCSC students or non-UC-students? If non-UC students, how much should they pay and what kind of course credit should they receive? There appears to be a lot of faculty interested in large online introductory courses and specialized small graduate courses, the latter of which might have possible cross enrollment with other campuses. These ideas are not currently being addressed by the larger discussion.

### **Rebenching**

The view of the systemwide UC Senate Chair regarding rebenching is optimistic. However, Senate Chair Gillman, EVC Galloway, and Chancellor Blumenthal think that there is potential that it won't happen. Pressure needs to be put on President Yudof to ensure that the process comes to a meaningful completion. It is not clear that a consensus is being reached.

### **Memorial to the Regents**

There is a need to increase state revenues for higher education. As such, the UC systemwide Senate passed the proposal to initiate producing a "memorial to the regents." This memorial calls on the Regents to exercise their power to authorize faculty and all UC community members to advocate publically on specific measures that will increase state revenues for public education. The memorial will come to each campus for a faculty vote. The memorial is calling on the UC Regents to take a public stand on the upcoming tax initiatives. We will leave the voting open as long as possible in order to get as high a proportion of votes as possible.

### **March 1 Day of Action**

A message went out yesterday regarding faculty participation in tomorrow's day of action for education. A group of faculty will be at the base of campus at noon and it may be helpful to have a large faculty presence. Chair Gillman stated that on this day, the administration are partners, not adversaries with those participating in the day of action. There have been a lot of emails to police and the administration from students and parents who are angry that the campus might be closed. Chair Gillman worries that frustrations on both sides might spark and turn the action into a flash point, drawing attention away from the true cause of the day. We don't want the ends, budget politics, to be lost in the debate about the means.

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

Chancellor Blumenthal was not present as he was required to attend a Chancellors' retreat.

### **c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway**

#### **Budget**

An all campus informational budget forum was held on Monday, February 27th. There are bound to be mandatory cost increases, mandatory contributions to the pension, and possible tuition increases. We are looking at a potential \$4M to \$18M budget cut on our campus. The \$18M cut will triggered if the tax initiatives do not pass. Then we are looking at a \$200M cut to the UC budget of which our share is approximately \$13M – in addition to the other costs.

The EVC is requesting that Divisions provide a draft plan for a staggered \$8M cut and plans for what would be done if there are greater long-term cuts. Because the actual cut is unpredictable,

all these variables are up in the air. We are trying to plan but realize that we may need to use reserves. Due to the magnitude of the cuts we've already taken, the next cuts will be difficult to face.

There are hidden costs to the curriculum. Amidst difficult economic times, the campus has maintained the majority of its course offerings, aside from an 8% loss. However, class size is increasing. An optimal student to faculty ratio is 18.7 to 1, but the number of students has been increasing. This year's ratio is not expected to be pleasant. The EVC thanked faculty for "hanging in there."

### **Faculty Salaries**

The UC Senate/Administration Task Force Report on Faculty Salaries has been released and proposes changes to salaries to get UC back up to the comparison group. Merit and CAP reviews are important and should continue. Also there should be a task force on professional schools. There was disagreement about the ways that salaries should be adjusted. The UCSC Merit Boost Plan will be continued for another 3 years. The cost of the program is \$2.5M which comes out of the campus operating budget. A 3% salary increase across the campus would widen the gap of UCSC salary in comparison to other campuses.

### **Childcare**

It was hoped that a viable option would be found for childcare for faculty and staff. However, there were financial and curricular problems with the specific option explored. In lieu of going ahead with that option, \$150k per year will be reserved for at least five years, depending on the budget, retroactive to the 2010-2011 academic year. If a solution to childcare is found in the future, the reserves will be there to support it.

### **Comprehensive Campaign**

UCSC is embarking on its first-ever comprehensive fundraising campaign. The Framework for the campaign has been developed. The campaign brings out what is distinctive of our campus; the extraordinary student experience, high impact research, social responsibility and environmental stewardship. The "transformative student experience" is the campaign's primary focus. What are those things that allow our students to find their passion, voice, and confidence to make a mark on the world as they go forward? What do they take from the classroom and make something that they can put on a resume as an accomplishment? This can be brought forward from the colleges, divisions, and departments particularly through internships, field study programs, laboratory research, and extra-curricular/intra-mural activities. We need college case studies in order to have a content rich campaign. What we need to know is; what kinds of things can we do, how much would it cost, and what would the impact be? This will be one of our primary goals for the next six to eight weeks.

Signature initiatives of the campaign are customized health, Silicon Valley campus, a University Museum of Arts and Sciences (actual name forthcoming) and coastal sustainability. This framework has been presented to the Foundation and the Alumni Council as well as student groups and Senate Leadership. The discussion has been positive. Currently the goals are to raise money for endowed chairs, sponsorship for programs, student scholarships/fellowships, and buildings.

### **Learning Objectives**

EVC Galloway noted that the WASC review may be used to our benefit. While looking at major mapping we will want to know what skills we expect students to graduate with and what they themselves are expecting to learn? We need to be able to tell students early on in their academic careers, what the likelihood is of succeeding in their major. CPB, the VPDUE and the VPAA are collaborating on this.

### **Demonstration Advisory Group**

The Demonstration Advisory Group has met for 18 months. There are now a set of principles in draft form, about how we manage the protests – from both the side of the protestors and the administration. They are now looking at the judicial system and how it applies. The group hopes to have these principles vetted and ready for consultation with the Academic Senate and other groups in the spring.

### **March 1 Day of Action**

We understand the sentiment behind the student protests. Tuition is causing a burden on students. We also appreciate that the protest tomorrow is a comment on the national statement of support for higher education. EVC Galloway will not say whether or not faculty should or should not hold classes. We will provide notice to community as to whether access is impeded. The campus has tried to prepare in many ways. For instance, paper paychecks were to go out on 2/29. EVC Galloway noted that the administration wants to ensure that emergency vehicles have access to the campus and that public safety is a priority. She encouraged students, faculty, and staff not to ignore their own safety.

In response to a statement about the lack of quality of education for UCSC students - limited access to faculty, under qualified TAs, and an education system that needs to be re-planned on a fundamental level - EVC Galloway agreed with the general sentiment and points to the budget cuts as a major contributor. She also acknowledged the importance of re-thinking education and that discussions on this front have been initiated.

Chair Gillman added that this is the very occasion for doing the curricular review so that all departments simultaneously re-think their operations and the interdisciplinary factors involved. Our structures keep us very isolated and there should be some venue for cross-campus curricular planning - looking at the practices that break down departmental lines in some of the divisions and think about using those elsewhere on campus. For instance, Engineering is an extremely interdisciplinary area with a lot of centralized thinking about graduate and undergraduate curriculum. This is the real goal of the curricular review – to bring departments into greater conversations with each other in the planning, bringing them out of isolation and talk about divisional structures.

Further comments were made from faculty endorsing a re-thinking of education. Different areas will require different solutions, acknowledging the fact that a large proportion of students are in a small number of programs. Three departments out of forty five, Biology, Psychology and Economics, are producing about a third of all the degrees. Last year's Biology-required Genetics course had an enrollment of 1,000 students, a scenario which does not allow for student/faculty

interaction. The solution cannot be exclusively curriculum based as some situations require resource based solutions.

The higher education system that we are pigeonholed into was created in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The way we think about, approach and deliver education could use a 21<sup>st</sup> century update. UCSC was founded with this kind of forward-thinking but it is not being done. We have a lot of talent at this university and hopefully the Senate and the EVC can make some initiatives to bring this change.

To these additional comments EVC Galloway replied that she and the Senate are happy to collaborate on this re-thinking. There are many treasures at UCSC including the Colleges, which have been largely underutilized as a format for interdisciplinary exchange. We have great building blocks so we should not make just another box. We can make something very different and we have the faculty to do it.

Chair Gillman expressed that she is encouraged we are talking about this at all. This is why we shouldn't cancel Senate meetings when there is nothing actionable on the agenda as it is a time that faculty can discuss these important issues. She agreed that one solution cannot fit all. The large programs are one problem while another is the small units that are in danger of failing.

Colleges' core courses and co-curricular activities have not been introduced into the central conversation at all. The Senate does not have a history of reaching out to the colleges but we are meeting with the Council of Provosts (COP) to think about how to incorporate colleges into the delivery of curriculum - possibly to align interdisciplinary programs into the colleges that are not surviving as departments. We need to think about all of the issues comprehensively without getting stuck on any one part of them.

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

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

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

#### **a. Committee on Faculty Welfare**

#### **i. Update on Health Care, Child Care, Housing, and Salary (AS/SCP/1692)**

Suresh Lodha, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare, delivered an update on welfare issues.

#### **Child Care**

There is some good news that UCSC has committed to allocating \$150K per year for child care reserves for a minimum five years. This will be retroactive, starting from last year. It is up to us to find the childcare facility and make it affordable to the faculty.

Last year the Child Care Task Force (CCTF) finalized a report that was reviewed by CFW. The dialog has moved forward resolving issues that had continually been revisited. Out of three options, the most promising is to buy a child care facility off campus as opposed to leasing one off campus or building one on campus. Also there was a consensus to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendor

management, which is common to the child care facilities at the other UC campuses. We are still the only UC campus with no child care facility but we are making a huge step forward by allocating these funds.

### **Employee Housing**

Around this time every year the EVC decides how homes should be priced using the re-pricing index with the goal that housing should be affordable for faculty and staff. It is worrisome that the housing program has been constantly in a budget deficit. When the program was launched five years ago the two main goals were to make housing affordable to faculty at junior level and that there should be enough money to fund low interest loans (LIO-SHLP) to the faculty. Unfortunately these goals are not being met. There is a third goal that the Housing Office is serving; that of acting as an intermediary between buyer and seller. CFW is hoping to engage with the EVC and the Housing Office to find a solution hopefully by the end of this year.

### **UC Health Care**

A systemwide health care benefits working group has been formed to re-think health care options. CFW is concerned about how changes will impact employees. The conversations have been mostly budget driven. It is unclear how this is going to impact recruitment and retention. UCSC should engage in this process without delay to make a difference before something is formulated and we should promote healthcare advocacy as a priority. CFW plays only a minor role as the Health Care Task Force (HCTF) does most of the deliberations. We now have a representative on that task force, Barry Bowman.

EVC Galloway replied to a question expressing concern about the 4%-6% of our paychecks that go to health care premiums and if these are expected to increase. The EVC commented that the specifics are still a heated discussion. There was a task to ensure a 0% increase in costs but this could have serious consequences by changing benefits or offloading costs on to others. Proposals with specific numbers attached are just coming in.

Asked what “alert and proactive actions and advocacy” he recommends, Chair Lodha replied that CFW had recommended creating a local HCTF group with local representation as well as engagement with UCOP. Some engagement did take place but the dialog is fragmented with different information coming from UCFW, HCTF and the EVC. There is no common consensus on how to approach the problem. We need to get our house in order before we can do the advocacy.

Responding to a comment that UC is a big employer and should be able to do more bargaining with the insurance companies, Chair Lodha replied that this is the kind of dialog we can have. There are fragmented ideas so having a group that could brainstorm and come to a consensus then we could move forward with useful advocacy speaking for the campus.

### **ii. Analysis of the UCSC Faculty Salary Merit Boost Plan (AS/SCP/1693)**

CFW member Abel Rodriguez made a presentation on the UCSC Faculty Salary Merit Boost Plan. The Merit Boost Plan is a set of guidelines issued originally by former EVC Klinger and continued by EVC Galloway. It is useful to compare the guidelines for the merit review process

before the Merit Boost Plan, pre 2008 and after 2008. In the merit review process there are three categories for the reviews. Regular increases are salary increases that do not modify the step or the rank of the individual. Then there are regular merits that do move the rank and step but do not award any off-scale increment. There are two augmented outcomes for the reviews. One only awards off-scale salary. The other awards an additional step to what would be a standard award. Before 2008 there were four possible outcomes:

1. <1
2. 1
3. 1.5
4. 2

With the modifications introduced by the Merit Boost Plan new categories were created. The guidelines for regular merit increases did not change. The new categories, depending on how much additional merit you are awarded, increase salary by 1.5 or 1.9 steps (two steps minus \$100). Another new category is the 2.5 increase. The four outcomes of this are:

1. There was an increase in the number of “boosted” merit increases, but decreases in the number of accelerations.
2. Accelerations are more common than boosted accelerations.
3. The annual cost of the program is relatively modest at roughly \$250K per year.
4. There is higher inter-departmental variability.

In response to a question about the a decline in the occurrence of 2.0 steps, Professor Rodriguez replied that the largest difference was in assistant professors and that there is a tendency with them not to accelerate but rather increase salaries. This is open to interpretation though.

Replying to the question of where we stand in comparison to other campuses, Chair Lodha replied that currently we do not know and are awaiting receipt of requested data. To this EVC Galloway added that there is a problem with staffing due to budget cuts in APO which has held up the report.

Professor Rodriguez continued that there is evidence that practices have changed over time and that we need to start looking at how we are promoting people and granting accelerations.

Chair Lodha concluded that one of the insights gained is that off-scale salary provides an inadequate picture of how the faculty are advancing and that we need to look at two independent but related measures; first, how faculty advance through rank and step irrespective of the salaries associated with them; and second how the salaries are growing. We have come up with metrics for promotion growth and salary growth and then studied the relationships between them. That is why we call them faculty advancement metrics. We will be holding two faculty forums on March 15 and 16 on faculty salaries and encourage attendance.

## **b. Senate Executive Committee**

### **i. Senate Executive Committee on the UC Budget and Student Protest. (AS/SCP/1694)**

Chair Gillman explained that the main goal for this agenda item is to look at the table we are using in our report, show the table from the State Auditor’s report that it was derived from, and get feedback on how to improve the presentation of the data. The table in SEC’s report was

collapsed from three within the State Auditor's Report. The tuition and enrollment budget are by individual campuses, but the numbers for under-represented race or ethnic group or difference from average budget are rolled up averages of lower and highest campuses.

SEC member Lynn Walker explained that SEC was trying to come up with one concise table that communicated the correlations between variables found within the many tables in the Auditor's report.

Chair Gillman explained that the text leading up to the table has been changed and asked if the table itself should be changed. Professor Walker interjected that we are unable to get the exact numbers for some of the variables.

EVC Galloway noted that our calculation includes non-resident tuition. Some campuses get more while some get less. The difference between UCSC and the UC average is around \$1,500 per student. You can see the gap between state funding and what we have.

Chair Gillman continued asking what the best way to present the data is and how SEC should use the report. The Alumni Association has offered to initiate a letter writing campaign to UCOP to support rebenching so it is imperative that this report and the table be clear. We need to be clear what we want to happen with rebenching.

It was pointed out that there is a lot of information missing in the SEC report and the Auditor's report. What are the numbers for each of the campuses, of in state and out of state undergraduate and graduate students? CPB Chair Westerkamp replied that step one was funding streams where the money that the campus brings in be kept by the campus, but the distribution of state funds needs to be addressed. Professor Walker added that currently state funds are being used to finance out of state students.

Another comment was that the table is not self-explanatory, and two self-explanatory tables would be better. It was suggested that non-resident information be removed and to see state funds per campus per student. It was then asked what the main political obstacles to real rebenching are. Chair Gillman speculated that the main obstacles are from the backroom dealings of the campuses that stand to lose from this.

EVC Galloway pointed out that the table's funds and tuition dollars numbers were calculated prior to funding streams and needs to be updated. We have to be careful about how we back rebenching - as even with rebenching enacted, the distribution of funds could potentially not be changed at all by creating a model for the weighting of students, allocations for the basic operation of a campus, and how earmarks are treated, which could potentially replicate the current distribution of money.

A comment was made that if this document will have publicity beyond our confines, it should be understandable by members of the general public who may want to know how many students are at each campus. Are the numbers of students on financial aid evenly distributed? What are the dollars allocated from general funds per student and per California student? The more complete the info, the more helpful it will be.

Chair Gillman concluded that SEC will make two new tables with revised text and send them out for feedback.

#### **4. Report of the Student Union Assembly (SUA)**

SUA Chair Amanda Buchannan was unable to attend and SUA member Jessica Greenstreet spoke on her behalf.

SUA has been working on changing its constitution. An SUA constitutional amendment should go up for the Spring to solve some internal issues. They have spoken with Chair Gillman in trying to improve the relationship between the Academic Senate and the SUA. The Course and Lecture Availability Student Survey is currently going on for the third year. Showing a good relationship between students and the administration, it is trying to figure out what to ask students so that policies can be made that make sense to everyone. Greenstreet asked that faculty encourage their undergraduate students to take it. The survey is at [www.uc-class.org](http://www.uc-class.org). The focus of the survey this year is on class availability, advising, summer session, and why students might want to leave the university.

Nationwide there are two campaigns to hold Sallie Mae accountable for student loan debt. SUA Commissioner of Diversity DT Amajoyi, who is also Chair of the National Students of Color Caucus for the United States Student Association, is working on federal funding for the Pell Grant. This weekend 40 students are going to the student lobby conference to lobby on behalf of the UC system.

SUA is informing students about rebenching. It is a complicated issue and we want to work with the Academic Senate to get information out to the students.

UCSC has a goal of small and supportive student experience. This is seen by looking at the fight on admission policies and disqualification policies. We thank the Academic Senate for the hard work on these fronts.

We are excited to see the conversations on the total cost of education becoming a holistic discussion and not just looking at tuition but also on the cost of books, living expenses and so forth. CPB is looking at this and it brings up many issues that need to be addressed.

Students are concerned that the smallest departments might be sacrificed with budget cuts, but our uniqueness is something that sets us apart. We need to develop a plan to keep educational diversity and realize the part that we play for the entire system.

Finally we are all a valuable part of UCSC in a symbiotic relationship. Students, faculty and staff are all fighting for the same goals. We are allies in this and I hope that we can all realize our similar goals.

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

The GSA President Erik Green is a second year doctoral student in the Education Department. The graduate students are in support of rebenching. There will be a presentation that OP has been invited to in April for the UCSA to educate student leaders and want to see it benefit those that are currently being hurt.

Regarding UC Online Education, UCSA recently had a resolution that Office of the President hasn't done enough research nor responded to senate or campus concerns. Their focus is not on UC students and it has now become a program for non-UC students.

We support the administration and faculty advocating in November and we are trying to get students be allowed to do campaigning. UCSA has endorsed the millionaires' tax and remain neutral on Governor Brown's Tax.

GSA is strongly against the changes to the student health centers. There was a March report and Santa Cruz got feedback on what could be improved. But Regent De La Pena acted on that report without consultation and moved to relocate the reporting lines of the student health centers as well as asking for a change in the health center mission where it will now be fee-for-service. We are extremely upset about this and sent a letter in strong opposition with concerns both procedural, explicitly about the change in the mission and what it will mean for medical care on campus. We are advocating for student referendum fees not to be included in the base for the OP assessment.

This Spring the GSA will be running a ballot measure to increase the tax for our Graduate Student Association because of how it is related to faculty and travel grants. This year we have increased the allocation GSA gives to travel grants since they have been cut out of the budget of almost every department on campus. GSA offered to provide for that vacuum understanding that faculty's research grants are becoming unable to fund their graduate students to do the necessary presentations and conferences needed for their academic success. Normally GSA along with the Graduate Student Commons each gives about \$18,000 per year. This year the GSA bumped it up to \$24,000, which will run through the reserves. This was meant to be temporary but we realize it will need to be ongoing. We want to make it permanent and request you talk to graduate students encouraging them to vote in the Spring. If they vote we are confident it will pass.

We are also fighting for affordable family student housing. From the budget numbers that we have been able to analyze it seems that it costs us about \$2M for expenses but the revenue from rent from students is \$3M. That is a \$1M surplus. They subsidize other buildings on campus with the idea that family student housing will be rebuilt next. But we do not want that since rent will go up due to a new building. SUA has proposed a co-op model where \$2M revenue will be matched with \$2M expenses. Our inability to access current budget data is a problem, and we appreciate support from faculty, looking to moving forward with a proposal.

Tomorrow, there is a day of action for education and everyone should go to [www.march1strikeucsc.org](http://www.march1strikeucsc.org). If you are able, you can have your class at the base of campus in "Tent University" and offer extra credit to students who go and attend a workshop. We are confident in the well thought out decisions about tomorrow's day of action. The reason for the

strike is that the University has become a business and in order to break that, you need to stop “business as usual” to force people to have space to look at this and move forward.

On March 5th there will be a day of action in Sacramento with allies such as Occupy Education who will be converging to have days of action, lobbying, radical tactics and planned occupation of the capital. We are asking for flexibility on behalf of faculty for students to attend.

The final point is to remind you about Teach the Budget – [teachthebudget.com/org](http://teachthebudget.com/org). There are new resources and curriculum with an updated presentation. There is a seven minute video there as well that would be great to show to your students in class. We also provide live in class presentations.

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

**10. Unfinished Business (none)**

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

**11. New Business (none)**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49p.m.

ATTEST:  
Judith Habicht-Mauche  
Secretary

April 3, 2012