

MINUTES

A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
February 21, 2001 with continuation on March 8, 2001

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 21, 2001 in Classroom Unit II. With Parliamentarian Allen Van Gelder and Secretary David Koo present, Chair Roger Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:39p.m. Professor Karen McNally asked for and received, without objection, approval to re-order the agenda as follows: Item 5a. Report on the University Center was deferred to the to the Spring Quarter meeting. Item 6a. Committee on Committees: Proposed change in the Santa Cruz Bylaw 4.2 was moved after 6c.

1. Approval of Minutes

Professor George Brown moved to postpone the approval of the minutes of February 23, 2000, November 9, 2000, and November 27, 2000, until the next meeting of the Senate. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous voice vote.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Anderson

The Campus Administrative Planning Committees are attempting to plan for reaching the Long-Range Development Plan target of 15,000 students. At the present rate of growth, this target will be reached by the year 2005. UCSC cannot develop buildings, faculty and student housing, graduate programs and professional schools as quickly as our undergraduate enrollments increase. In an effort to help provide space for campus growth, many construction projects are underway, such as the bookstore, the Graduate Commons, and the Science Hill parking structure. The entire University of California is facing space constraints, but UCSC presently has the smallest amount of instruction and research space for the size and nature of its student body; hence, our needs for space are relatively greater.

The California energy problem is affecting the campuses both directly and indirectly. The direct consequence is increased costs for utility power. On this campus, we are presently without a co-generation capacity due to this energy crisis and the cost of natural gas. An indirect effect is the major cost increase for the state government to fund this buyout of power. Consequently, money to fund some UC initiatives may not be available.

State-supported summer session will start on three campuses in the year 2001. These campuses are Berkeley, UCLA, and UCSB. Santa Cruz is likely to join this program in the year 2002, and at the latest, in the year 2003.

Many UC campuses are currently proposing professional schools. Professional schools increase graduate enrollments as well as provide additional intellectual diversity to the campus. UCSC may also want to consider development of a professional school.

Planning for UC Merced continues but environmental concerns are likely to move the site.

The contract to extend UC management of two national laboratories, Los Alamos and Livermore was signed. The new contract contains modifications, which will hopefully avoid any security problems, delays, and cost overruns on major projects. Two last-minute modifications are very troubling. The first is that the Department of Energy may now fire any employee at the labs, including the laboratory director who is appointed by the University of California. The second change is that it is now easier for DOE to reduce the UC management fee if the DOE is dissatisfied with our management performance. The management fee is presently about \$15 million a year and a large majority goes back to the laboratories to fund various forms of collaborative research.

b. Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood's comments were directed to the issues of growth and development of UCSC raised by the CPB report and to disputing any claims that no planning had occurred, no capital projects are in process or being

planned, or stopping our progress is a good idea. She pledged, for the record, better communication and a broader faculty dialog on these issues. Essential ingredients for institutional growth seem to the Chancellor to be trust, confidence, integrity, and optimism. The Millenium Report stated this sense of optimism along with six goals. All remain important in the planning process. Chancellor Greenwood expressed confidence in the team of Administrators currently leading UCSC and respect for the faculty.

Although UCSC may not expect to topple Berkeley for the top-ranking UC campus in the near future, UCSC is steadily improving its national reputation. UCSC might expect a steady increase in the student body on the average of 3.5% to 4% annual increases over the next ten years. This provides opportunity to move UCSC to a new level of accomplishment similar to the kinds of leaps that some of the sister UC campuses made in the past.

At a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science attended by Chancellor Greenwood, UCSC received high visibility regarding both the Human Genome Project and the astronomy and astrophysics department. UCSC's research awards are up almost 20% over last year, bringing the total between \$53 and \$60 million. Fund raising is up and reached almost \$24 million last year, an amount well above the \$8 million or \$9 million raised in the past. Faculty awards are also increasing.

CPEC is the California Post-secondary Education Commission, an advisory group to the legislature with no statutory authority. Among many issues, CPEC advises on space and capital outlays. CPEC has established a set of guidelines about quantity and type of space needed by public institutions for state supported instruction and research. These guidelines were changed about eight years ago to include space for postdocs, researchers, and graduate students and are often used by the University Office of the President as a basis to justify what UC is entitled to under the Master Plan for Education with the State. CPEC guidelines only measure certain types of space and currently count only about 22% of the total available space at UCSC. An example of non-CPEC space would be a new library, which is a very high priority for the campus. Yet if resources were acquired to allocate \$50 million to this project, with a resultant gain of more than 80,000 square feet of library space, the library would not be counted in the totals calculated within the CPEC guidelines. For the 22% of the total space that CPEC actually measures, UCSC currently hovers around 80% of the CPEC guidelines. Although current trends show this fraction declining in the future, the Office of the President has assured the Chancellor that the University's plan and commitment is to work with every campus to ensure that they achieve at least 80% of CPEC guidelines. So far, although the State does not provide enough total funds, UCSC has competed well for the funds that have been available. Some non-CPEC space also includes Instruction and Research space, such as computer labs, ORU's, and MRU's. As we press the limits on State-funded space, UCSC is trying to secure other funding for space and to maximize the flexibility in the usage of that space. The Chancellor provided examples of such strategies via the Seymour Marine Discovery Center, the Ocean Health Facility, the NSF Center for Adaptive Optics, the University Town Center, and the Holiday Inn. The potential usage of the new space range from meeting rooms, research labs, to traditional classrooms. Faculty office space is being increased with the Physical Sciences Building and the Engineering Building, while academic space has been increased by moving some administrative offices off campus.

UCSC was also successful in playing a partnership role with two of the Governor's Institutes --- QB3, which is funded, and CITRIS which is highly likely to be funded. These initiatives have added over 30,000 square feet of space and raised nearly \$25 million in non-state capital dollars. Utilization of existing teaching and research space is currently at 77% and plans are underway to maximize this further. These efforts represent a coordinated campus strategy to acquire space, to maximize flexibility, and to help us through this period while our planning process is going on. The Chancellor anticipates that this strategy, along with the ongoing capital planning and process developed in consultation with the Senate, will meet most of our critical needs for the next five years and positions UCSC for the future and for the acquisition of the resources that we really need.

Moving to a new topic regarding students, the Chancellor said that the quality indicators for students are increasing slowly and steadily. Special action admissions are down, retention is moving up, and applications are increasing. Much of the credit for these accomplishments goes to Student Affairs. Their five-year strategic plan has been very effective in improving UCSC admissions. UCSC is among the best in the UC system regarding housing. Through careful planning and creativity, the need for new bed space has kept pace with demand. To help accommodate the

housing demand, the UCOP is providing special funding for planning the development of the north campus.

To counter claims that little academic planning has been underway, the Chancellor highlighted the Engineering School as an example of a really major academic initiative executed in the past five years. As a result of continued planning for years, UCOP forward-funded the faculty FTE based on projected enrollments and provided special funding for student growth and faculty start-up. Student growth has doubled and faculty growth will double as well. Moreover, the Engineering School plans continue with participation in the Governor's institutes (QB3 and CITRIS), with plans to add space to the Engineering Building with private dollars, and with developing synergies with other academic divisions, including IGPP in the Natural Sciences and with the Arts. Academic planning has also occurred in the form of the California Curriculum Initiative that has already resulted in 8 FTE to develop new areas of scholarship that involve the Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences.

Another area of academic initiatives has been in the area of education. The governor makes educational policy for the State by working through the budget process. Last year the governor requested that UC campuses increase its production of new teachers from 4% to 10% annually. All of the resources required for this expansion have been forward-funded by UCOP, and we are well on our way. Our colleagues in Education started year-round operations last year. They planned and instituted a five-quarter Masters credential program that admitted 92 students, and their faculty are already teaching three out of four quarters on a rotational basis in order to meet the increased demand. With UCSC close to 12,000 students now, with Dean Talamantes working with the Graduate Council to increase the graduate enrollment by another 1000 over the next 10 years, and with potential growth in programs already underway such as in Engineering and new programs forthcoming from other divisions, the Chancellor thinks that UCSC has a very good probability of increasing enrollment to 15,000 with the planning process already in place. As recognized by CPB, the issues are what combination of State-supported summer session, off-campus field work, internships, UCDC, EAP, regional center enrollments, etc. can we plan for accommodating an additional 1,900 students by 2010? The Chancellor hopes the answers will be the result of the next several months of planning effort with the Divisions and the Senate. The Chancellor commented on one of these new components, summer session. For participation in State-supported summer session, Berkeley, UCLA, and UCSB have received a total of \$31 million. If UCSC had participated at our current summer session enrollment of 350 FTE, we would have added \$3.2 million to the campus budget. The Chancellor believes that UCSC should try to be one of the three campuses to implement State-supported summer session in 2002. UCSC would be asked to increase summer enrollment by 20% and involve more ladder rank faculty. If UCSC moves to a fourth quarter, then questions about faculty incentives and facilities to accommodate faculty remain to be addressed.

The other component addressed by the Chancellor was the Silicon Valley Center. The opportunity to develop a regional center in Silicon Valley is important to the future of UCSC. The value and impact of enhanced presence, research opportunities, and partnerships with the community colleges and San Jose State University should not be underestimated. The Silicon Valley Center Task Force Report identified a number of possibilities and initial enrollment at a modest level. The Office of the President has agreed to hold an additional \$20 million in reserve for this project until UCSC is ready to move forward. Environmental work needs to be done by NASA so that the Regents can accept the land on behalf of the University. This process will take another eight or nine months, so this will put the physical planning process and academic planning process in much better synchronization. Though much planning remains, the academic component is not the only one within SVC, and the other components may progress at different speeds. In particular, the Chancellor said the suggestion to stop the SVC initiative at this stage is unrealistic given that two very important and growing programs, Network Engineering and Education, were developed through the recognized purview of existing academic departments.

The Chancellor concluded by appealing to the faculty to give the planning process a chance to work, to recognize that flexibility has been built into existing plans, to strive with optimism and confidence, to inspire the Office of the President to invest in us, to renew our common commitment to this institution, to ask hard questions, but to be ready to create novel solutions.

c. Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Simpson

The California Higher Education Master Plan requires the UC system to offer admissions to the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates each year. All UC campuses are currently expanding to accommodate this population and a graph shown by the EVC suggested an improved ratio of student to faculty during this growth. Thus the predictable funding from projected growth will allow UCSC to grow, to expand, to invent, to enrich, and to diversify programs. Faculty concerns regarding planning fall into four principal areas: space and facilities; housing for faculty, staff, and students; development of State-supported summer session and establishment of Silicon Valley Center; and academic planning for expansion including faculty recruitment. New plan-driven academic enterprises that have emerged from recent planning processes include the School of Engineering; the IGPP; Biomolecular Science and Engineering; the Humanities Research Institute; the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community; the Center for International Economics; as well as the Campus Curriculum Initiative and campus workstation replacement program.

UCSC now has a campus-wide strategic planning process, which includes undergraduate and graduate programs, research support, staff and instructional support, staffing, and information technology. Non-traditional forms of instruction must be considered, such as summer session and off-campus locations like the Silicon Valley Center, the EAP Program, and UCDC. It is the non-traditional forms of instruction that will likely accommodate up to 1,900 students beyond our LRDP on-campus cap of 15,000. The SVC is a remarkable opportunity for UCSC to increase its visibility, prestige, and research presence in the region, as well as accommodating additional student enrollments. With careful planning and consideration, summer session could also provide a new means of flexibility in our instructional programs and in the apportionment of faculty time and commitment. Resource stakes are high for the divisions and departments that participate in SVC and summer session.

The Council of Vice Chancellors has identified space as the single largest obstacle to UC's ability to accommodate the growth in student population and is working with the Office of the President to identify various means, state-funded as well as non-state funded, to provide space. A thorough campus space survey will be completed this year in order to understand present space utilization. UCSC will receive \$1 million from UCOP for childcare facilities to be leveraged against our own private and campus resources. UCSC was the only campus immediately eligible for these funds, because of prior planning and fundraising. UCSC must find ways to increase our housing stock for faculty and staff. The likely location for new housing will be the Inclusion Area D, at the base of the campus and/or in the north campus up Empire Grade. Both are likely to face significant financial and political challenges. UCSC is ready to lease local apartments to provide faculty with interim housing until on-campus options become available. The Council of Vice Chancellors is working with UCOP in an effort to find solutions that go beyond the popular MOP loan program in order to find new and creative ways to finance housing for faculty. Faculty have the opportunity to participate in planning the academic programs that will define the campus. EVC Simpson proposed that the Administration and the Senate conduct joint topical forums over the next year and a half on issues of planning and campus growth. Plans will be made with the Senate Advisory Committee and staff support was pledged by the EVC for this proposal. He also suggested that the Senate evaluate its structure and bylaws to ensure that it has in place the framework and processes that ensure the full involvement of the faculty in the planning and development of the campus.

3. Report of Representatives to the Assembly (none)

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1298)

Former Graduate Council Chair Peter Young presented the 1999-00 annual report, which was received without comment.

5. Reports of Special Committees

a. University Center (AS/SCP/1300)

This item was postponed until the regular Senate meeting in the spring.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

b. Committee on Committees: Committee Nominations (AS/SCP/1304)

COC Chair Shelly Errington moved approval of the following nominations:

- Admissions and Financial Aid: Hongyun Wong and John Wilkes
- Committee on Career Advising: John Isbister as Chair, Jean Langenheim, and Mel Wong
- Committee on Educational Policy: Richard Hughey
- Committee on Faculty Welfare: Maureen Callanan
- Graduate Council: Mike Dooley
- Land and Building Development: Dave Dorfan as Chair, Karen Holl, Virginia Jansen, Pat Mantey, and John Lynch
- RJ&E: K.C. Fung

The nominations were approved by unanimous voice vote.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget: Report #4 on the Silicon Valley Center (AS/SCP/1302)

Professor Karen McNally moved to postpone discussion of the CPB report to a special meeting at a later date. In a brief discussion of the motion, speakers pointed out that many senators had come to the meeting for the purpose of discussing the report, and that hearing CPB's presentations would allow meaningful dialog (on the issue of Silicon Valley) to begin in the departments. After an inconclusive voice vote, the motion to postpone the discussion was defeated 50 to 40 by a show of hands.

The following points were included in the presentations of CPB Chair John Hay and Members Bob Meister, Barry Bowman, and Susan Gillman. An academic plan for both the Silicon Valley Center and year-round operations will enable the Administration, with the Senate's support, to develop strategies that will optimize the campus' quality while undergoing growth and to present a unified front at UCOP. After 20 months of study and consultation, this is CPB's fourth report on the Silicon Valley Center. Neither a moratorium on growth nor an expression of no confidence in the administration has been the intention or part of the deliberations of CPB. The academic planning process proposed by the SVC Task Force was endorsed by both the Administration and CPB, but has yet to be followed. It is now time for the campus to decide what kinds of academic programs should be offered. The existence of an overall planning framework would enable departments to make proposals for SVC and summer courses in a coherent, curricular context. UCSC will need such a plan to ensure that the benefits outweigh the costs, and to clarify the extent to which year-round operations would alleviate the rapidly increasing problem of enrollment. CPB believes that the genuinely exciting potential for research and other enterprises of the NASA Ames site is obscured by the continual deferral to the notion that SVC would serve the bulge. Equally, UCSC's planning for the bulge is disadvantaged by an expectation that it serve 2,000 students by 2010. It is quite possible that SVC could properly mount modest enrollments in its first years of operations, but it would take planning and a realistic look at what numbers are appropriate.

The two CPB resolutions included in the report ask that the Senate have an opportunity to deliberate and to vote on the major growth-related issues facing UCSC. CPB calls for the initiation of a principled dialog about growth between the Senate and the Administration. Capital funding at UC is essentially on a five-year pipeline. Nothing comes out that was not put in five years earlier. The current resource problem reflects the fact that UCSC has been asked to take the growth that was originally projected in our 1989 20-year plan in a six-year period between 2000 and 2006. The fact that UCSC neither expected nor planned for such accelerated growth in the five-years previous to this means that the gap in resources will grow deeper by the year 2006. It must be acknowledged that this gap will increase if we accept projected enrollments over the next five years with the capital projects that are currently projected to accommodate them. UCSC's starting point in accommodating the bulge (or Tidal Wave II) was not neutral with respect to other UC campuses. UCSC entered into Tidal Wave II with capital resources of approximately 80.8% of the minimal allowable CPEC standard, the lowest in the UC system. Riverside, the second to lowest is at 86.8%. Further, at the end of the next five-year growth period, UCSC will have fallen even further below the CPEC standard. In order to minimize the gap, CPB would like to change the discourse of long and mid-range planning between the Administration and the Senate to develop a more principled basis that can be shared

with other campuses and that can be put forward to UCOP as a basis for allocating resources for enrollment growth. The Silicon Valley Center offers significant and unparalleled opportunities for research among various campus constituencies. To ensure successful planning for the Silicon Valley Center as a cluster of research and partnership enterprises, UCSC should disconnect the Center from the larger context of planning for enrollment growth. Research and partnership opportunities can be pursued independent of accommodating student growth. At this time, it is proposed that 2,000 student FTE are enrolled at SVC, starting in the next few years and reaching the target by 2010. One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) is a student who takes nine courses a year; therefore, we need 18,000 enrollments there. Mounting enrollments at this level will require approximately 100 faculty, and 200-600 staff. Additionally, this will require space, depending on how imaginatively we use it, equal to something like 15% of what we have now on this campus. Planning for SVC should address the following questions. Is mounting this academic effort feasible? What is the appropriate mix of upper, lower division and graduate students? Can SVC support itself from enrollment income or will it have to be subsidized? Subsidy may be okay if there is good return. Will the academic programs benefit us, or are we essentially being asked to start a separate campus, which might be good for the state, but not related much to UCSC.

Professor Gillman asked for unanimous consent to substitute the following language for Resolution Number 1 in the CPB report.

Resolution Number 1:

Whereas, it is the sense of the Academic Senate and under the present circumstances of rapid enrollment growth, the proposals for a Silicon Valley Center be regarded as new academic programs requiring Senate approval in their entirety before courses and curriculum are offered;

And whereas, the Senate wishes its committees to consider the Silicon Valley Center in the context of an integrated plan for accommodating the rapid enrollment growth that is expected on this campus;

It is resolved

That no new curriculum be offered under this proposal until the process of approval is completed in the form of a vote of the Senate as a whole in a manner to be determined by consultation among the appropriate standing committee.

Nothing in this resolution is intended to affect the bylaw authority of CEP and the Graduate Council to deal with proposals for new academic programs.

After the initial presentations, the floor was opened for discussion.

Speaking for the Resolution

Bill Ladusaw

Carol Freeman

Mathew Becker (student representative)

Speaking Against the Resolution

John Isbister

Points made for the Resolution:

The CPB resolution is an encouragement to proceed with concrete steps towards further planning of the SVC. The CPB resolution does not usurp the authority of CEP and the GC and instead addresses curriculum or the overall academic planning, rather than approval of specific programs or courses. Students support planned growth that maintains the services and educational quality at its current level.

Points made against the Resolution:

The resolution appears to change the procedures or process by which academic programs are approved, from approval by CEP and the Graduate Council to one in which the Senate as a whole is in charge.

Professor Karen McNally moved to continue this meeting within the next 10 days. This motion was approved unanimously by voice.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

**A Continuation of the Regular February 21, 2001 Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
March 8, 2001**

A continuation of the February 21, 2001 Regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Thursday, March 8, 2001 in Theatre Arts, with Parliamentarian Allen Van Gelder and Secretary David Koo present. Chair Roger Anderson called the continued meeting to order at 3:00pm.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Anderson moved to dispense with the minutes from the February 21, 2001 meeting minutes as they had yet to be completed.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget: Report #4 on the Silicon Valley Center (AS/SCP/1302)

Professor Susan Gillman made a motion to withdraw the original resolution that was introduced at the Senate meeting of February 21, 2001, and presented a modified resolution. The motion to withdraw passed without objection and the modified resolution read as follows:

Resolution:

Modified 3/8/01

Whereas the Graduate Council approves specific graduate programs and courses in the context of academic plans, reporting to the University-wide Senate *and*

Whereas the Committee on Educational Policy approves specific undergraduate courses and programs in the context of academic plans, reporting to the Divisional Senate *and*

Whereas the Committee on Planning and Budget advises the Divisional Senate and the Chancellor on the resource implications of all proposals with academic content *and*

Whereas the Committee on Planning and Budget considers the sustainability of the curricular component of the Silicon Valley Center and its impact on resources available at the UCSC campus, and is committed to working jointly with the administration to develop the significant opportunities in Silicon Valley,

It is resolved that the Academic Senate

- (a) requests the Graduate Council and CEP to consider the overall feasibility and quality of the curriculum to be offered at the Silicon Valley Center when approving individual programs and courses to be offered there;*
- (b) requests the Chancellor and the EVC with the Graduate Council, CEP, and CPB reach mutual agreement about the timeline for producing and implementing a phased, comprehensive academic plan for the SVC, and to include in this agreement an opportunity for the Senate as a whole to express its support for that plan before it is implemented;
- (c) requests the Graduate Council, CEP, and CPB to report at the next regular meeting of the Senate on the progress of their discussions with the Chancellor and the EVC in the context of overall planning for growth.

*Nothing in (a) is intended to preclude continuance of any programs or curricula currently offered at the SVC

After the presentation of the modified resolution, the floor was opened for discussion.

Speaking for the motion:

Matt Becker- (Student Representative)
Joseph Bunnett
Sandra Faber
Katy Flint- (GSA Representative)

John Isbister
Karen McNally
Michael Tanner
Joel Yellin

Speaking against the motion:

Catherine Cooper

Points made for the resolution:

The resolution simply reinforces the jurisdiction of Senate Committees over courses, curricula, and degree requirements.

At the Student Union Assembly, a resolution was adopted that is similar to CPB's: It reads: "Whereas, there is concern that the Silicon Valley Regional Center might use faculty and graduate student resources that could cease to be available at the UCSC main campus; And whereas, student services, such as housing and transportation, will need to be provided to the students at both campuses; And whereas, U.C. quality must be maintained at the main campus as well as be provided for any extension program; Therefore, be it resolved that the SUA requests a campus-wide discussion involving these and other issues surrounding the Silicon Valley Regional Center, and that this discussion shall include the administration, the Academic Senate, and the students."

We are on an upswing, both intellectually and from the point of view of public reputation. The publication, in the New York Times and elsewhere, of stories about faculty participation in the Human Genome Project have given us what arguably is the best publicity this campus has ever received. Judging from what I have heard from colleagues, teachers in the local high schools, and others, there has been a synergy between this research news and the news about the changeover to conventional grading. This synergy is very likely to improve our admissions, particularly in attracting more students interested in science and engineering.

At the same time, as we all know, there is pressure from the President's Office and the Legislature to admit more students. This in turn is a response to what is seen as simple demography. Under the circumstances, one would naturally expect that the LRDP would be reopened, and that planning would begin for further major growth. The phasing would work out well, because it will surely take some time to reopen LRDP, and that delay will give us an opportunity to shift into a different curricular gear, with selective admissions for the first time in many years, and higher academic standards. For those like myself who have consistently favored major growth, all this seems very good.

But evidently other plans are afoot. We have somehow become embroiled in new curricular and related projects, in Silicon Valley, said by some to involve thousands of students. The research side of this new activity appears to be very good, at least topic wise, so that is not an issue. But the curricular side of the Valley project seems odd, and certainly a distraction from the main projects before us of growing our programs here and raising standards. And Senate involvement in the consideration, let alone approval, of these projects, appears to have been minimal at best.

Problems of shared governance aside, as an agnostic on the Silicon Valley Center I have a simple request. I would like to know from the Chancellor, from CPB, and from our Admissions Committee, what we know and what we expect with regard to the influence of the SVC on the quality of admissions. I would also like to know, having noticed the footnote in the newest version of the CPB document, whether CEP and the Graduate Council have in fact already approved courses and academic programs in the Valley. It seems to me that as matters now stand the effects on quality of admissions and standards ought to be our major concerns with respect to this discussion.

SVC raises issues for students such as transportation, housing, and student services at an off-campus site that must be planned with the Administration. A considered planning process will allow us to look at larger issues. This resolution represents an opportunity for a joint approach to planning. Planning for SVC is a very large endeavor that

faculty will not be able to do alone. The resolution states an intent to work with the Administration and that will accelerate the planning process. The timeline for SVC has been pushed back so there is now adequate time for considered planning.

Points made against the resolution:

The resolution creates an additional structure and labor that is costly in time and money and would thus create a drag on the planning process. It sends a message of distrust not only to the Administration, but also to the faculty and the existing Administrative committee structure.

During the discussion Professor Joel Yellin raised a point of information regarding the footnote on the resolution. Chair John Hay rose to explain that the resolution was not intended to interfere with any ongoing programs in Silicon Valley. Graduate Council Belanger rose to clarify that GC has not approved anything specifically for the Center. Committee on Educational Policy Chair Carol Freeman then rose to clarify that CEP has not approved anything specifically for the Center.

The question on the main motion was called and the resolution was passed by voice vote.

a. Committee on Committees: Proposed Change to Santa Cruz Bylaw 4.2 (AS/SCP/1301)

Committee on Committees Chair Shelly Errington moved a change to Bylaw 4.2 changing the term of office for Senate Vice Chair from two years to one year. Under the current system of two year appointments and assuming that the Vice Chair will assume the Chair, it becomes a four year commitment which has been difficulty for faculty to make. The one year appointment is renewable. The Vice Chair was recently added to Committee on Planning and Budget as an *ex-officio* member. The motion was seconded. Responding to an inquiry from the floor regarding the Chair becoming ill, COC Chair Errington explained that should a Senate Chair become sick, the Vice Chair would take over. It is the hope of COC that having Vice Chairs serve only one year will create, over several years, a qualified pool of people who could assume the Chair. Responding to an inquiry whether this change was intended to address problems with Senate leadership, Chair Errington responded that it was not. There was one brief comment from the floor that the Vice Chair serves as representative to the University-wide Academic Assembly. The shorter term will provide less continuity and therefore less experience at the Assembly. It is very important for each campus to be strongly represented at the Assembly, perhaps more so for the smaller campuses.

The question was called, but before the vote was completed, there was call for a quorum count. It was established that quorum was not present. After a ten minute break, quorum was still not present. The point was made that many faculty teach a Tuesday/Thursday schedule and therefore could not attend. A unanimous voice vote was taken by those present that Senate meetings should be arranged for Wednesdays.

Chair Anderson entertained a motion for adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:15 p.m.

ATTEST:
David Koo
Secretary
May 9, 2001

Recording Secretary: Mary-Beth Harhen