

MINUTES
A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
November 9, 2000

Meeting

A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Thursday, November 9, 2000 at Kresge Town Hall. With Parliamentarian Allen Van Gelder and Secretary David Koo present, Chair Roger Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:10pm.

Chair Anderson asked for and received approval, without objection, to re-order the agenda as follows.

- 5b. Special Senate Committee on the University Center Report was deferred to the Winter quarter meeting.
- 4d. Committee on Affirmative Action Report moved after 4m.
- 6f. Graduate Council proposed change to Bylaw 13.21 moved before 6a.

1. Approval of Minutes**a. Minutes of December 3, 1999 (AS/SCM/258)**

Professor Joel Yellin moved to accept corrections #1-3 that were published in the CALL to the minutes of December 3, 1999 and substitute the following paragraph for the last paragraph.

After a motion to stop the debate was approved, the motion to refer the matter to CEP and the Graduate Council was then subjected to a counted rising vote. Those rising in favor were counted first and then those against. The Chair announced that there was a tie at 79 to 79 without any vote from the officers. Professor William Sullivan rose to state he had mistakenly risen for the motion and requested to change his vote to against the motion. A point of order was raised concerning whether a senator can change his vote. No ruling was announced, but the Chair proposed that the vote be conducted again. An objection was raised on the grounds that some Senators had left the hall. The Chair then suggested that both of the officers should vote at this time. A point of order was raised on the grounds that since the officers did not vote when the count was taken, they had ipso facto abstained from voting. The Chair did not explicitly rule on this but announced that the count was tied at 79/79. He then announced that he would cast his own vote in favor of the motion to commit. A Senator asked the Chair what the ruling had been on the question of the change of vote, and the Parliamentarian stated "It was cancelled." Another point of order was made that a tie means the motion was not passed, but was ruled to be dependent on the vote of the Chair. Chair Anderson, exercising the right to break a tie, voted for the motion so that the motion passed 80 to 79.

A motion to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting on December 3, 1999 with these corrections was seconded and passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Minutes of February 23, 2000 (AS/SCM/259)

The minutes of February 23, 2000 meeting were then considered. Professor George Brown moved to modify the minutes to reflect the exact wording by Professor Kevin Karplus of his amendment at the February 23 meeting. Professor Joel Yellin then made two points for the record. First, the Chair should not admit a motion that the Secretary would have to paraphrase for the record. Second, the wording in the minutes should be the same as was stated by the Chair. Professor Yellin then proposed an amendment to include the Chair's restatement of the motion by Professor Karplus. After the accuracy of this restatement was questioned, a motion was made, seconded, and passed by voice vote to postpone the February 23, 2000 minutes until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

c. Minutes of June 1, 2000 (AS/SCM/260)

A motion to approve the minutes of June 1, 2000 as written was seconded and passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Announcements**a. Chair Anderson**

Chair Anderson started with a reiteration of three points carried from last year. The first was that the campus and Systemwide administration will respect Senate advice on issues. This characterized much of the Senate/Administrative interactions last year. With the new administrative committee structure and new budgetary process at UCSC this year, however, both the Senate and the Administration need to continue to ensure that adequate consultation occurs. The second point was that the Senate has put forward imaginative, constructive and thoughtful analysis of campus problems. The Chair believes the Senate did this last year and will continue to do so this year. The third point was that the Senate

will reach reasonable consensus on reaffirmation and reinvention of our campus values, traditions, and image. The ongoing and constructive discussions of narrative evaluations and grading policy are examples of these efforts.

Chair Anderson announced the call for a Special Meeting of the Academic Senate on November 27th to consider the general issue of retention or elimination of narrative evaluations. The current discussion of narrative evaluations has been conducted for the past year and it is now time for the Senate to settle the issue with a vote. Chair Anderson has asked three faculty groups, students and alumni to write summary arguments on the issue. These will be circulated by the November 27th meeting.

The Department of Energy is renegotiating the UC management contract for the DOE Laboratories: Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore, and the Lawrence Berkeley National Labs. The negotiation for a new contract is coming up for renewal two years earlier than normal and is on a fast track. To provide informed Senate discussion on the national lab contract, there will be a forum on November 29th, with participation from the Office of the President. The Chair invited the Senate to join him in supporting Professor Peter Young in his role as Chair of the UC Systemwide Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), which is dealing with the renegotiations.

The general issue of growth will be very important to the campus this year. Graduate education was the topic of the Chancellor's retreat this fall. There are tremendous constraints facing UCSC's ability to increase graduate enrollments, such as cost of housing and making competitive stipend offers. It will be important to look at the possibility of new graduate programs and professional schools. The Silicon Valley Center, year-round operations, and changes to admissions policies must be considered as part of this growth. Other problems resulting from growth, such as childcare and housing, are also in need of rapid resolution.

Chair Anderson proceeded to the annual new faculty introductions. Professor Joel Yellin rose to a point of order that the introduction of new faculty is not in the order of business and is more appropriate for the social occasion after the Senate meeting. The Chair ruled that faculty introductions are a tradition for the fall meeting and were announced in his cover letter to the call. The Chair said that Professor Yellin's point will be considered for future fall meetings.

Humanities: Dean Wlad Godzich introduced Assistant Professors Alexandra Stern (History), Anjali Arondekar (Women's Studies), Radhika Mongia (Women's Studies), and Lecturers with Security of Employment Roz Spafford (Writing Program) and Liz Abrams (Writing Program).

Social Sciences: Dean Martin Chemers introduced Assistant Professors Pamela Perry (Community Studies), Judy Scott (Education), Judy Mascovich (Education), Doris Ash (Education), Marc Howard (Politics), Mara Mather (Psychology), Eileen Zurbruggen (Psychology), Associate Professor Kip Tellez (Education), and Professor Gordon Wells (Education).

Engineering: Dean Pat Mantey introduced Assistant Professors Ethan Miller and James Whitehead from the Department of Computer Engineering.

Natural Sciences: Dean David Kliger introduced Assistant Professors Erik Asphaug (Earth Sciences), Don Croll (Biology), Margaret Deksheniaks (Ocean Sciences), Slawek Tulaczyk (Earth Sciences), and Professors Piero Madau (Astronomy) and John Thompson (Biology).

Arts: Dean Ed Houghton introduced Assistant Professor Karlton Hester (Music).

b. Chancellor M.R.C. Greenwood

The Budget: The Regents budget will be presented this week before going to the Governor. The basic partnership with the state should ensure approximately 300 million new dollars or a 7.7 percent increase coming to the University in the next fiscal year. Much of this represents expenditures for fixed costs. There will also be additional funds for initiatives such as increased graduate student support, student outreach and retention, support for the California digital library project, and increases in staff salaries. The University is in the process of final contract negotiations with CUE employees. There has been a tentative agreement that will result in between 13% -22% salary increase which the union is in the process of ratifying. Many of the University's other union contracts have recently been settled. The unions assisted the University this summer to get funds included in the budget for additional support for staff. UCSC faculty sent a petition to Chancellor Greenwood to increase staff salaries that will be presented to a systemwide work group dealing with staff compensation issues.

Enrollments: Total enrollment at UCSC is 12,125 students. GPA's were up at 3.53 and average SAT scores were 1145. UCSC had 44 new Regent's Scholars with GPA's of 4.2 and SAT scores over 1400. There was a 10% increase in the number of transfers to 888. Engineering has seen a 21% increase in enrollments. There has been an increase in underrepresented students in all categories. Additional details can be found on the web.

Fund Raising: Last year, the campus received \$24.3 million in private gift support. There has been a continual rise from a base of \$8-9 million three to four years ago. This is the fourth record breaking year in a row, with a target in three to five years of \$50 million. The Division of Social Sciences received three large grants to support the New Teacher Center. The Division of Arts received a new gift to create the Kamil and Talat Hasan Endowed Chair in Classical Indian Music. Endowed Chairs are increasing at a regular rate. There are currently 11 active fund raising campaigns across the divisions that will require raising over \$50 million over the next several years.

University Center: It is very important that the University Center open by fall 2002 with the completion of Colleges 9 and 10. Included in fund raising campaigns this year is one to raise the remaining \$400,000 to complete the Center. Progress toward achieving this goal is halfway. The UCSC Foundation raised a \$50,000 gift from a trustee, \$25,000 gift from the Sentinel, \$15,000 from another trustee, and several \$5,000 gifts for lifetime membership. \$50,000 is pledged from alumni and \$50,000 from academic administrators. Chancellor Greenwood proposed that faculty close the remaining \$100,000 gap by each contributing \$1,000 over three years at \$33 per month. If 100 faculty rise to this challenge, targeted fund raising will be complete and there will be no need to assign University Relations staff to this campaign.

c. Campus Provost and EVC John Simpson

Campus Provost Simpson announced changes in the senior administrative leadership: Wlad Godzich replaces Jorge Hankamer as Humanities Dean; Steve Kang replaces Pat Mantey as Dean of Engineering; Cathy Sandeen is Dean of University Extension replacing Interim Dean Marcie Dekking; and Frank Talamantes is Dean of Graduate Studies replacing Interim Dean Bud Bridges. Professor Jim Gill was acknowledged for his service as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research. The search for a new VC Research is continuing.

Campus Provost Simpson highlighted some results from growth: the Center for Justice and Tolerance; the Institute for Geophysics and Planetary Physics; the Institute for Humanities Research; the Campus Curriculum Initiative to hire new faculty specifically in disciplines that diversify the curriculum; and \$850,000 in new funds to support graduate fellowships. Growth funds have produced over 70 new faculty positions, 164 new staff positions, and 25 new teaching assistants.

The Compact (UC – State Partnership Agreement) with the state will provide UC with greater budgetary predictability. He read from the Compact: "The University will receive a 4 percent increase to the state general funds base, plus funding for enrollment growth consistent with access under the massive plan at the agreed upon marginal rate adjusted annually." In 2000-2001 this rate is \$8,139. As we increase in size, we can expect funding to accompany the growth. These funds come with increased enrollment, accepting increasing numbers of students from K12 or the community colleges. The Compact with the state will bring substantial changes to all campuses, but at UCSC it will be particularly important to consider a new planning and budgeting process in support of this growth. Since resources are expected to be predictable, CP Simpson will be asking units to plan in terms of where they will be at campus build out (2010). These plans should be clearly derived from current six-year plans. Plans should integrate staff support, I&R support, graduate support, workload support, including dealing with increased enrollments. Enrollment growth can be accommodated not only on campus but also through Summer Session, the Silicon Valley Center, Education Abroad Program, and UCDC. Plans will include accountability measures in order to monitor success.

CP Simpson announced a new administrative committee structure to support this long term planning process. Five committees have been formed: the Academic Planning Committee; Academic Support Planning Committee; Information Technology Committee; Advisory Committee on Facilities; and the Campus Welfare Committee. These committees will consist of members of the administration, the Senate, appropriate staff and student representation. They are charged with advising CP Simpson about issues that confront the campus as it grows. Over these five committees is a sixth, the Provost's Advisory Council (PAC), consisting of administrative and Senate representatives, and Vice Chancellors. PAC's minutes and agendas will be made public in order to facilitate greater understanding of the planning process.

Chair Anderson then recognized Professor Manfred Warmuth who rose to recognize the service of Pat Mantey as Dean of Engineering. The intention to establish an engineering school was part of UCSC's 1961 academic plan. In 1964 Chancellor McHenry hired Professor Clauser to spearhead the effort of beginning the new school. In the fall of 1967, the school was launched with graduate classes. However, two years later it was deferred due to budgetary reasons. There were various other attempts to start the school over the years. In the fall of 1984, Dr. Pat Mantey from IBM was hired as the first faculty member and Chair of Computer Engineering. Pat had bigger plans than developing a single department, and never lost sight of that vision. Pat hired 11 new faculty members, including five Presidential Young Investigators. The School of Engineering was officially launched in June, 1997, with Pat Mantey as Dean. He immediately started another department in Electrical Engineering, which now has 10 faculty. He started the Information Systems Management Program. He hired the founding Chair and faculty for the Applied Math and Statistics Program. Dean Mantey brought in large research grants, such as the REINAS Project. He solicited a \$5 million endowment from Jack Baskin, the largest private donation in the history of UCSC. He secured an endowed Chair in Electronics. He facilitated growth in Biomolecular Engineering, culminating in the Howard Hughes Award for David Haussler. The School of Engineering now has 42 faculty and 1,100 students. These enrollments exceed projections by 15 percent. These are just some of Dean Mantey's achievements.

3. Report of Representatives to the Assembly

Shelly Errington reported on the Academic Assembly meeting of May 2000 by referring to the letter sent to all faculty from Academic Council Chair Larry Coleman. (This letter is available from the Senate Office upon request)

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1283)

Former CAF Chair Jerome Neu presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

b. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1284)

Former CAP Chair Sandy Chung presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

c. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1274)

Former CAFA Chair John Wilkes presented the annual report. There was discussion of the dual admissions program proposal from UC President Atkinson and its effect on local admissions policies. UCSC currently has its own dual admissions policy for transfers from community colleges. This year CAFA will be examining the effects of the Atkinson proposal on local policies.

d. Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1285)

CCT Chair Charlie McDowell presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

e. Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1279)

Former CEP Chair George Brown presented the annual report. There was discussion about the future of comprehensive exam exit requirements. Exit exam requirements are not affected by the new legislation on grading. This graduation requirement is part of the Senate Regulations and is not at the discretion of the department.

f. Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1267)

Former CER Chair Joe Bunnett presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

g. Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1287)

CFW Chair Mark Traugott presented the annual report. There was discussion about the Administration's new policy that short term interest (STIP) from parking revenues will return to TAPS rather than the Chancellor's discretionary fund. Yet the Administration has been reluctant to include this in a Memorandum of Understanding with the Santa Cruz Faculty Association. The Memorandum of Understanding with the Faculty Association is independent of the Senate Legislation. In developing the policy on STIP, the Administration was responding to a Senate Committee.

Faculty housing was also discussed, especially for new faculty. CFW identifies faculty housing as of high priority this year and is meeting with campus administrators to discuss Inclusion Area D, long-term leases, and off campus housing. CFW and the Administration are jointly conducting a survey on faculty housing issues. A database of hiring over the last three years is being developed to determine, among other things, the degree to which housing played into faculty decisions in recruitments.

h. Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1277)

GC Chair Phokion Kolaitis presented the annual report. A question was raised about grade appeals mentioned in the report. This year's Graduate Council has not yet addressed the issue.

i. Committee on the Library (AS/SCP/1280)

COL Chair Armin Mester presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

j. Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1295)

CPB Chair John Hay presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

k. Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1276)

P&T Chair George Blumenthal presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

i. Committee on Teaching (AS/SCP/1281)

COT Chair Jaye Padgett presented the annual report, which was received without comment.

m. Committee on Affirmative Action (AS/SCP/1282)

CAA Chair Judy Yung and CAA member Bettina Aptheker presented the annual report with a note that a resolution for a Senate vote follows. Although UCSC, compared to other campuses, has the most diverse faculty, progress in recruitment of women and minorities has been slow in the past ten years. In 1990, 110 women made up 26.5 percent of the faculty. Ten years later there are 152 women for 33.3 percent, which means that 66 percent of the faculty are men. During the same period, percentages of non-white faculty has grown from 73 to 105 for a change from 17.4 to 22.9 percent, African Americans from 11 to 17 for an increase from 2.6 to 3.7 percent, Chicanos and Latinos from 24 to 29, or 5.7 to 6.3 percent, and Native Americans from 3 to 4 which is 0.7 to 0.9 percent. Based on federal affirmative action regulations that require us to compare the percentage of women and minorities in departments to the percentage available in the respective fields, every division falls short in some areas. This percentage is expected to grow. Also, the faculty does not reflect the diversity of the population served. In the state of California, there are currently 50.2 percent non-whites. This fraction is expected to grow to 60 percent by 2020. At UCSC, as a result of projected enrollment growth and separations, 600 new faculty will be hired in the next 10 years. This growth provides an opportunity to increase faculty diversity and to raise standards of excellence.

CAA Chair Yung moved the following resolution:

Resolution:

Whereas progress has been slow in the recruitment of underrepresented groups of faculty over the past ten years;

Whereas the campus has arrived at an opportune moment for faculty diversity in that over 600 new faculty will be hired in the next ten years as a result of projected enrollment increases and faculty retirements; and

Whereas the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and service at a public land grant university depends on the commitment and achievements of a diverse community of faculty;

It is Resolved:

That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate affirms its commitment to excellence through affirmative action and strongly urges Chancellor Greenwood and Executive Vice Chancellor Simpson to join efforts with the Academic Senate in advancing faculty diversity and excellence on this campus;

That departments and programs be rewarded for both their past and present efforts in hiring and retaining diverse faculty;

That deans, departments, and programs should be held accountable for promoting diversity and equal opportunity; and

That the Committee on Affirmative Action work with appropriate Senate committees and the administration to develop the format for implementing the items above.

The motion was seconded and followed by discussion with the following points made. In response, Senators noted that as a Federal contractor, the University is required to meet minimum standards so that the percentage of underrepresented groups reflects the available pool of people with Ph.D.'s in that field. To meet a standard of matching faculty diversity to state demographics is beyond this minimum requirement of representation in proportion to availability. According to Faye Crosby, these two standards are not contradictory. As the number of available minority Ph.D.s in some fields are so low, and indeed already met in departments, UCSC can attempt to reach the larger goal of matching state demographics. Targeted minority groups include women and, on the color dimension, African Americans, Asian Americans, Latino and Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans. The only group that is not identified as a target group is white males.

Senators expressed concerns that matching California's mix may violate Federal law and is inconsistent with the notion we are a world not a regional university; that the statistics for all faculty do not accurately reflect the mix of just the most recent hires; that the basis for the claim that guidelines have been violated is unclear; that in one case the requirement seems to be an unreasonable one that there should be 100% female membership of a department; that achieving a proportional mix is difficult with small numbers within a department; that the available pool of candidates may be very scarce or non-existent; that there is no authority for any Senate unit other than the Privilege and Tenure Committee to investigate violations of rules by faculty; and that the meaning of accountability for refusing to follow the behavior favored by the proponents of the resolution was not clear.

Accountability measures are not specifically described in the resolution because that will be the work of Senate committees. The report does contain lists of strategies and best practices, which have been successfully implemented in some UCSC departments. In Attachment C of the report (page 35), "X" is meant to show under representation in relation to the available pool of Ph.D.s in that discipline.

The question was called to limit debate on the resolution. It was seconded and carried by voice vote. Professor Joel Yellin then rose and made a motion to table the resolution pending an explanation of terminology in the report and to answer questions raised in the discussion. The motion to table was seconded but did not carry by a show of hands.

The question having been called, the resolution was then voted on. By a show of hands, those in favor exceeded those opposed, so the resolution was adopted.

The resolution was adopted

5. Reports of Special Committees

a. Special Senate Committee on Merit Equity Review (AS/SCP/1265)

CMER Chair Mary Silver presented the report and made a number of comments, some of which follow. In 1997 the Special Committee on Merit Equity was established and charged with examining whether there was evidence that inequities exist in rank and step for faculty with comparable length of service and time since degree, and if such evidence were found, to recommend procedures to be used to identify cases of possible inequity. In February of 1999, the committee presented a statistical report to the Senate. Questions raised on the floor at that time, and new findings since then, led to this re-analysis.

The results of the study show the same patterns of salary differences found in analysis by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). However, this report addresses issues of salary difference not only between women and men but also between minorities and non-minorities. Differences in salary based on merit or excellence cannot be addressed in statistical analysis, so proxies or measures of experience that are correlated with excellence or merit are substituted. The controls that were used are those usually considered legitimate reasons that contribute to salary differences, such as controls for the discipline because certain fields get higher or greater remuneration than others.

One difference in the current analysis is that the controls for rank and step have been dropped because they produce a bias of moving more slowly through the system. The results show that there is clear evidence that the null hypothesis: namely, that there is no difference in salary between women, minorities, and non-minority males, can be rejected. Chair Mary Silver then moved the resolution as it appeared in the call (AS/SCP/1265). After a minor amendment from the floor, the resolution read:

Resolution:

Whereas the analyses presented by the Committee on Merit Equity Review in its two statistical reports, February 1999 and May 2000, indicate some significant salary differences between women and men faculty and between minority and non-minority faculty;

Whereas these data cannot rule out the possibility of discrimination;

Whereas the results indicate a need for the investigation of individual cases, if the Senate and administration are to ensure that discrimination is not a possible outcome of the personnel review process;

It is Resolved:

(1) *That* a "Merit Equity Review Process," which is a full-career review, be available to any individual faculty member who perceives her/his salary **or whose salary is perceived** to be lower than appropriate for a scholar of her/his merit, based on parity at UCSC;

and

(2) *That* the Special Committee on Merit Equity Review work with appropriate Senate committees and the administration to develop the format of the Merit Equity Review Process.

Points made by various Senators during discussion follow. The resolution is written in such a way that does not advantage any particular group. It is based on whether persons perceive themselves or someone else to perceive them as having been treated unfairly. Is it possible to do this now, so that the resolution is unnecessary.

The current practice of the Committee on Academic Personnel is to consider the recommendations of any authority or committee that comments on the file, but only for the period under review. What a merit equity process would allow CAP to do, that it cannot do now, is a full career review. If there were inequities in the past outside of the current review period, the merit equity review process would provide a method to rectify them. A merit review process would be set up after broad consultation. Details, such as how many times a review could be requested or whether requests would go through a screening committee, will be addressed later if the Senate decides to pass the resolution.

The question was called, seconded, and passed without objection. The vote to adopt the resolution was unanimous by a show of hands.

6 Reports of Standing Committees

a. Graduate Council: Proposed Change to Santa Cruz Division Bylaw 13.21 (AS/SCP/1289)

GC Chair Phokion Kolaitis presented legislation to change Bylaw 13.21 so that membership of the Graduate Council would be increased from 6 to 10. In the coming years, GC will be faced with significant challenges associated with the growth of graduate education on the campus. Other UC campuses have 8 to 20 members. Professor Joel Yellin moved approval of the change. The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Committee on Committees: Proposal for a New Standing Committee: Committee on Land and Building Development (AS/SCP/1263)

COC Chair Shelly Errington moved approval of a proposal for a new standing committee on Land and Building Development. The committee is being established to enhance faculty input into building designs

Several faculty made the following points during the discussion. Duplication of efforts by review committees could cause delays and increase costs in the construction/design process. The committee must be integrated into the new administrative committee structure proposed by the EVC, which includes an analogous administrative committee. Arrangements should be made so that the two committees work simultaneously to review projects. There is currently very little faculty input and no formal Senate involvement in the siting and design of buildings.

The question was called and seconded. After an inconclusive voice vote, the motion passed 45 to 19 by a show of hands.

c. Committee on Committee: Nominations (AS/SCP/1297)

Chair Errington then moved approval of nominations proposed in the call with the addition of the following: Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid: the BOARS representative will be Zack Schlesinger; Committee on Affirmative Action: Avril Thorne; Computing and Telecommunications: Lisa Sloan; Graduate Council: Martine Schlag, Olof Einsdottir, and Paul Nauert; Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections: Chair Ron Grieson has resigned and Stanley Williamson will replace him as Chair; Privilege and Tenure: advisors Angela Davis, Phil Crews, and David Brundage.

During the discussion, one Senator made the suggestion that all the names of P&T advisors should be published in every call along with the phone numbers and departments of committee members.

The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Errington also reported that Chancellor Greenwood's five year review will be conducted and coordinated by the Academic Council this year. Letters soliciting comments for the review will be sent to all faculty soon.

COC has also been working with EVC Simpson, the Senate Advisory Committee, and Senate committee Chairs to provide input to the EVC regarding the new administrative committee structure. The new structure will include not only the formal process of consultation as established in the Regents' Standing Orders, but also informal consultation and review at earlier stages in the process.

d. Committee on Committees: Proposed Change to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.23: Increase in Membership to Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1296)

Chair Errington moved approval of legislation to include the Senate Vice Chair *ex officio* in the membership of the Committee on Planning and Budget. Professor Joel Yellin moved to pass the legislation by unanimous consent. It passed by unanimous consent.

Professor Joel Yellin then moved to adjourn. The motion was not seconded. Chair Anderson called for a count to determine if there was a quorum. The count determined that a quorum was present.

e. Committee on Educational Policy: Amendments to Perfect the New Regulations on Grading (AS/SCP/1275)

Chair Carol Freeman presented legislation to eliminate the grade C minus. This will resolve significant problems and discrepancies in the current regulations on grading. According to Systemwide regulations about grade points, the grade of C gets 2.0 grade points. A grade of C minus gets a grade point of 1.7. To graduate from the University of California, one has to have an average grade point of 2.0. Eliminating C minus preserves the definition of the pass grade as signified in work of C or better. It prevents any erosion of the perception of the quality of the pass or "P" work. It moves the level of passing work to C or 2.0 grade points. Eliminating the grade C minus removes inconsistencies which would permit two students doing identical work in a class to have different outcomes in terms of grading and allows clear demarcation between satisfactory and unsatisfactory work. Chair Freeman then moved to adopt the changes to Senate regulations on grading. The motion was seconded.

Several Senators participated in the discussion that followed and made the following questions, replies, and points: If C minus is eliminated, where is the appropriate place to put students with that grade? Faculty must make the decision on what constitutes satisfactory work, that is, work at the level worthy of graduation from UC and usable to satisfy as a major requirement and put them at a passing grade. No other UC campuses have eliminated the grade C minus and UCSC's grading should have a grading system as close to other UC's as possible. All the campuses have had to introduce legislation to fix the problems caused by the grade C minus. UCSC has, overall, a different approach to grading and so may not benefit from duplicating the grading systems of the other campuses. The variance that UCSC got originally was a passing grade that was for clearly passing work, not for a grade point. If the C minus grade is not being viewed as clearly passing work, then it cannot be equated to "P".

Professor Joel Yellin moved an amendment to the motion so that all parts of the CEP proposal be struck except for the changes in SR9.2.1. The CEP proposal takes away departmental control in determining minimum qualification requirements for major programs. The motion was seconded.

A point of inquiry was raised regarding what motions are appropriate to raise within one year of a mail ballot. Chair Anderson clarified that what was voted on in the recent mail ballot was the establishment of mandatory grades. Whether those grades are modified with pluses and minuses does not address that fundamental question and so is inconsequential enough to discuss without waiting one year after a mail ballot.

Throughout the discussion there were several calls to count quorum, which is currently 62, but each time, quorum was confirmed.

The question was called on the motion to amend, and seconded. The motion to amend was defeated by 51 to 16 in a counted show of hands.

The question was called on the main motion and seconded. The main motion passed by a show of hands.

Chair Anderson adjourned the meeting at 6:20pm.

ATTEST:
David Koo
Secretary
February 5, 2001

Recording Secretary: Mary-Beth Harhen