

MINUTES
A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
May 17, 2002

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 17, 2002 in EMS B206. With Secretary David Belanger and Parliamentarian Allen Van Gelder present, Chair George Blumenthal called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Chair Blumenthal requested to move item 7, the Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair, after item 2. Professor Yellin requested that the item be moved under "Petitions of Students" because he believes agenda items 7 and 8 violate the statewide bylaws. Chair Blumenthal noted the objection and stated that it is consistent with the ruling of the Rules Committee to have a report of the Student Union Assembly Chair on the agenda. The motion to move agenda item 7 was made by Professor Mary Silver, seconded and adopted by voice vote.

1. Approval of Minutes

Chair Blumenthal called for changes to the minutes of March 6, 2002. The following changed wording was proposed by Professor Joel Yellin:

Professor Joel Yellin proposed a change on page 7, to give an accurate account for the record of the Chair's response to a point of order adding the sentence: "The Senate has no power to change the words of a committee report."

A motion to accept the minutes, with this change, was made and seconded. The minutes were thus accepted by a voice vote.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Blumenthal

Chair Blumenthal recognized the 2001-02 Excellence in Teaching Awardees: Kathy Anderson (Education), Robert Boltje (Mathematics), John Lynch (Literature), James McCloskey (Linguistics), Glenn Millhauser (Chemistry), Ingrid Parker (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology), Donald Rothman (Writing Program), Wendy Rothwell (Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology), Paul Skenazy (Literature), Bruce Thompson (History), Anthony Tromba (Mathematics), Brent Wexler (Languages), and Adrienne Zihlman (Anthropology).

There is a proposal from the Office of the President to establish freshman seminars, a set of one or two unit courses allowing ladder-rank faculty to interact with freshmen on research topics. Freshman seminars are currently offered at a number of UC campuses and have been highly successful. They are now being proposed system-wide. CEP has endorsed a preliminary proposal but has concerns about the financial implications.

Regarding the SAT issue, the College Board at a recent Regent's meeting announced that they are going to develop a new national test. The College Board and the ACT are

working with BOARS, the system-wide Senate Committee on Admissions and Relations with Schools, to develop a new test that will meet UC standards. The College Board is also modifying the existing SAT I exam. There will be two resolutions on the agenda of the Academic Assembly regarding the status of the SAT proposals. One is that BOARS continue to work with the testing agencies to develop improved admissions tests. The second is that BOARS bring its recommendations for improved admissions tests to the divisions, the Academic Council, and the Assembly for review and approval.

There were a number of problems with the Academic/Administrative calendar this year. It will not be possible to modify the calendar for next year, although next year's calendar isn't as problematic. CEP is actively doing modeling with the view of changing the way we do calendaring and will propose changes to the calendars of subsequent years.

Two long-term members of the campus, Michael and Eileen Tanner, are departing from UCSC. Michael Tanner is currently the Acting Director of the Silicon Valley Center and was the longest serving Executive Vice Chancellor on this campus. He has been a dean and served for a number of years in a variety of Senate posts, including chair of CEP. Special thanks are due to Eileen Tanner for her successful stewardship of the Center for Teaching Excellence. The Center will miss her activity, enthusiasm, and leadership.

The Regents considered domestic partner benefits and the retirement system recently. They approved domestic partner benefits for both same gender and opposite gender.

Chair Blumenthal thanked all the members of Senate committees for the excellent work they have done, including the staff to those committees.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood congratulated the Teaching Award honorees and was looking forward to seeing them at the reception in their honor. She also congratulated the Faculty Research Lecturer chosen for next year. She thanked the faculty, all the Senate committees, and a variety of other ad hoc committees on the difficult and important collegial work completed this year. In the post 9/11/02 era, she acknowledged the faculty's willingness to step up to the issues, deal with the public on important issues, and assist the freshman class transition into the university during a very traumatic time. All who helped in the Sinsheimer fire and recovery process, including EH&S staff, Fire, Risk Management, the deans, and faculty were thanked for their remarkable recovery effort. She thanked all who have been involved in the campus planning process. Special thanks went to Chair George Blumenthal and Vice Chair Alison Galloway for the work they have done this year.

The State is in a major fiscal crisis, and UCSC, being part of the State's budget, is in a fiscal crisis along with the State. The enrollment growth money for our campus has been funded. Modest merit increases for faculty and staff were preserved in the May revise budget. There have been very serious cuts proposed for our outreach budgets, the subject matter projects, some State-funded research, information technology, library materials, and some aspects of instruction. We are in the process of finding ways to mitigate the

impact of the cuts to outreach programs on our campus. We will be asking some of the business partners in these programs to help us get through this period of downturn in the State's economy. The University of California's major issues continue to be access, equity and excellence. The budget protects the excellence aspects, but does not protect the access in a way we would like to see. The engineering building was included in the Governor's Economic Stimulus Package and is fully funded and construction will begin in June. It looks likely that the public will vote for the GAO bond. If the bond passes, we will have a Social Science and Humanities facility and we will be moving along on the McHenry Library expansion.

Housing projects are coming along with College 9 and 10 near completion. The in-fill housing is out for bid again. Everything is being done to move ahead as fast as possible on the new faculty housing. The University acquired Laureate Court and is moving on a project to convert the Hagar Court apartments into for-sale housing.

It is important that the campus hold together during economic downturns. So far, we have not sustained anything at the level of cuts we received in the early 90's. We currently have new buildings, new programs, and new students. We have in place a planning process and will be poised to move ahead with plans on the table when the financial picture improves.

The Chancellor noted the strong Senate support regarding enrollment management and increasing graduate enrollments to 15%. She also supports this growth and identified two issues: how we accomplish these goals and at what price. UCSC is headed for an increasing level of selectivity in undergraduate admissions.

As UCSC alumni are coming of age, they are also developing a philanthropic bent. One such alumnus, Gordon Ringhold and his wife, Tanya Suruki, have made the single largest alumni gift of \$500,000. The goal for the University Center of \$400,000 has been surpassed. Chancellor Greenwood will send to faculty information about how to become founding members of the University Center. The student callers raised over a million dollars for our annual fund and deserve our thanks. The Center for Adaptive Optics will be dedicated on June 20th and 21st. Rita Colwell, the Director of the National Science Foundation, will be here for the dedication and will give a public talk. This will be an opportunity for faculty, student and staff to interact with Rita and further their understanding of national funding priorities.

c) Campus Provost/EVC Simpson

Among other activities this year, EVC Simpson has been primarily involved with the campus planning process. The budget climate has changed since we began the planning process nearly two years ago. UCSC cannot abandon the need to position ourselves for the future. The Deans and Vice Chancellors took the planning task seriously and produced excellent plans. These plans emphasize the quality of instruction, service and outreach, innovative scholarship, and new programmatic directions. They provide a blueprint for expansion in interesting and timely ways, while at the same time preserving what is unique, interesting, and valuable from UCSC's rich history. The Senate was also

critically involved in thinking carefully about our future. EVC Simpson gave particular thanks to the Committee on Planning and Budget who invested considerable time in the process and provided the EVC and the campus with valuable insights and creative thoughts on the plans and policies that we will use to ensure success.

The funding for enrollment expansion remains intact in the Governor's revised budget. It is this fund source that was the basis for the source projections assumed at the beginning of the planning process. While we do not know the outcome of the budget process, it is imperative that we not stall planning.

There are already a number of interesting changes that have occurred in the campus culture as a result of the planning process. First, there has been an evolution of seeing plans not as an annual budget process, but as longer range, comprehensive strategies to achieve campus, unit, and professional goals. The budget process becomes a tool rather than an end in itself. Second, there is an implementation of a framework that provides transparent administrative, budgetary and planning processes. Further, a campus commitment was endorsed by the Senate to significantly increase graduate enrollments. The important roles of the Vice Provost and Deans for Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, Academic Affairs, and the Vice Chancellor for Research arose in campus planning, curriculum, program development, and scholarship in complementing the roles of deans, department chairs, and the faculty. There is increasing awareness of the value of considering all funds while budgeting, that is, present as well as new resources and revenues derived from a multiplicity of resources in addition to vital State support. Enrollment management is critical to the future wellbeing of UCSC, a focus on measures of accomplishment as measures of success rather than a primary focus on input metrics such as the budget. Perhaps most important, the process pointed to the value of collegial integrative planning involving all organizational units on campus, including the Senate as well as departmental and divisional units. We are well positioned to deal with the challenges ahead, whether growth of the student body or the State's budget. EVC Simpson encouraged faculty to become involved in the ongoing planning process by contacting their department chair or divisional dean, or via the campus website. It is the academic enterprise that sets the direction, tone, and success of the campus, and for this, collective faculty involvement is absolutely critical.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

LaTrice Jones, President of the Student Union Assembly, commented that this has been a very challenging and rewarding year for the undergraduate student government. One of the problems this year has been the relationship between the Student Affairs and the undergraduate student government. Students have come to the SUA office expressing concerns but feel they are being left out of decision making processes on crucial campus issues. For example, there have been a lot of miscommunication and financial and structural problems associated with the move of the Student Union. Also, students have not been consulted on the proposal to restructure how students receive their advising. The students are asking that Student Affairs hold the reorganization off until Fall quarter so they can get more information and include more students in the process. The SUA hopes to continue to build relationships and open communication between all parties. The

events of 9/11, combined with the restructuring, have created a stressful environment for students. SUA Chair Jones is open to any ideas, suggestions, and constructive criticism and can be contacted at SUACHAIR@CATS.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1347)

Professor Adrienne Zihlman reported the nomination of Professor Jonathan Beecher of the Department of History as the Faculty Research Lecturer for 2002-2003. Professor Beecher's career has successfully combined and integrated his roles at teacher, scholar, and campus citizen. He came to UCSC in 1970 and taught courses in French history and European and Russian intellectual history. His careful, detailed, and insightful research and literary skill represent the highest standards of scholarship. We honor our colleague, Professor Jonathan Beecher, for his accomplishments and as exemplar of UCSC faculty excellence.

5. Reports of Special Committees

a. Special Committee n Merit Equity Review: Report on Merit Equity Procedure (AS/SCP/1346)

The report was received without comment.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Rules, Jurisdiction, & Election

Finding on Appendix C (AS/SCP/1339)

Professor Joel Yellin called attention to page 13, 1b of the report, which states a grievance may be filed if a student is persuaded that the instructor has acted with a capricious or arbitrary application of appropriate criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements. The normal situation across the university is if a grade is given not based on student performance, there is a basis for a grievance. If a faculty member does give a grade that is not based on student performance, it is a violation of the Code of Conduct, which are supposed to be decided by the Privilege and Tenure Committee. At UCSC, a subcommittee of CEP decides the undergraduate cases. In the case of a graduate grade, there is a sequence of levels of appeal that are not defined in the rules in such a way that one would know at what level the ultimate decision is made. An appeal regarding these issues will go to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.

Report on COC Election Spring 2002 (AS/SCP/1343)

Professor Stanley Williamson called attention to Item 4 where the word "consuming" had been left out of the report. Professor Joel Yellin expressed concern over the lack of any COC election.. He does not believe that RJ&E has the power to revise the bylaws, particularly in ways that damage the Senate's democratic process. He is concerned that as a non-elected body COC's nomination will be seen as illegitimate.

b. Senate Advisory Committee: Proposed Changes to Santa Cruz Divisional Bylaws (AS/SCP/1340)

Professor Alison Galloway stated that in an effort to clarify the bylaws of the Academic Senate, SAC has proposed seven changes to the bylaws.

Bylaw 6.2 Quorum

Professor Galloway moved to change Bylaw 6.2, which specifies the size of quorum. The current requirement for quorum at UCSC is 62 members (10% of voting members). Using a chart, she showed that the requirement for every other campus is much lower, including those that have an open assembly. If we cannot make quorum, the Senate business is either frozen for the next meeting or decided upon by the Senate Advisory Committee. A smaller quorum will not hand over control to a small body since for controversial items the meetings are packed. Lowering the quorum will also not negate the controls over changing the structure of the Senate. A two-thirds vote will still be required and any changes proposed would be subjected to a mail ballot by the non-attending faculty.

Responding to an inquiry why the number fifty was chosen instead of something more commensurate with the size of the campus, Professor Alison Galloway replied that a five percent commitment was considered but it was felt that number was too small.

Speaking against the motion:

Joel Yellin

Speaking for the motion:

Joe Bunnett

Points made against the motion:

A small number of people could pass motions. It would be better to have a sliding scale rather than a fixed number. Problems of attaining quorum are due to irregular and unfair procedures at Senate meetings, announcements taking up an unjustifiable amount of the meeting time, administrative committees that take over the area of responsibility of Senate committees, providing little incentive for faculty to participate in Senate activities and some members have not been appointed to Senate committees. Perhaps quorum could be calculated to make the base against which the quorum is computed equal to the number of active members, or the number of members corrected for the problem that people are on sabbatical. The measure should be considered further.

Points made for the motion:

The proposed number of 50 is reasonable for the Senate to conduct its business. Rising to a point of order, Professor Joel Yellin questioned the legitimacy of the same person (referring to the Senate Chair) proposing a motion and conducting the Senate meeting. Chair Blumenthal ruled against the point stating that the Senate Chair has always served as a member of CPB, for example. So any CPB motion before the Senate automatically has the Senate Chair serving on the committee making the proposal. Furthermore, the obligation of the Chair is to conduct the meeting fairly, allowing everyone the right to speak and vote. Conducting a fair meeting is not necessarily the same thing as not having an opinion on an issue.

The motion was then passed by voice vote.

Bylaw 6.6 Minutes

Professor Galloway explained that currently our bylaws refer only to “the minutes” without distinguishing whether they are draft or approved minutes. In reality, the minutes are drafted and do not become an official document until they are approved. The proposed bylaw changes will clarify which minutes (approved or draft) and the time frame for distribution.

Professor Ethan Miller proposed an amendment, that Senate members receive notification either electronic or otherwise when the approved minutes are posted on the web. The amendment was seconded and the question was called. A vote to end debate passed by voice vote. Professor Joel Yellin inquired whether this bylaw change will imply distribution of the draft minutes outside the membership. Professor Alison Galloway clarified that the draft minutes will continue to be distributed only to Senate members and the approved minutes will be available on the web page. Chris Amico, the CEP student representative, asked that the student and college representatives be included in the notification of the minutes. Chair Blumenthal agreed, and suggested that an office procedure be adopted to handle this request. The amendment was adopted by a voice vote.

Responding to an inquiry, Professor Galloway explained that the draft minutes will be distributed to members but not posted on the web. The approved minutes will, however, be posted on the web. CEP student representative requested that all student representatives are included in the notification that minutes are available.

6.6 Minutes

The draft minutes of every meeting of the Santa Cruz Division are to be sent by the Secretary to every member of the Santa Cruz Division within 45 instructional days of the meeting described by the minutes. The approved minutes shall be sent by the Secretary within 30 days of approval to every member of the Santa Cruz Division, the executive offices of the other Divisions, the President and the Secretary of the Academic Senate, and each member of the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. The Secretary is authorized to post the approved minutes on the Senate's web page in lieu of sending the approved minutes to every member of the Division. Members will be notified electronically that approved minutes are posted.

The main motion as amended was passed by voice vote.

Bylaw 7.1 Rules of Order

Without debate, the proposed changes for Bylaw 7.1 were approved by a voice vote.

Bylaw 7.2 Rules of Order

Without debate, the proposed changes for Bylaw 7.2 were approved by a voice vote.

Bylaw 7.3 Rules of Order

Professor Galloway presented the bylaw change which introduces a consent calendar for annual reports. Professor Joel Yellin proposed a friendly amendment to remove the words “with a single unanimous vote”. Professor Galloway accepted the friendly amendment. The following motion was approved by a voice vote.

7.3 Discussions of *Annual Reports* of Standing Committees constitute special orders for the first regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division in the fall term. In the meeting Call, at the discretion of the Division Chair, any or all special orders may be placed on a Consent Calendar under Special Orders. During consideration of Special Orders, at the request of any Senate member, any such Consent Calendar item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately by the Division. All remaining special orders on the Consent Calendar may be received by the Division.

Bylaw 6.7.1 Written Divisional Actions and 6.7.2 Notice of Divisional Actions

Professor Galloway presented the new legislation. Any legislation or resolution to be considered at a divisional meeting will be required to be presented in written form. Bylaw 6.7.1 clarifies that written motions projected onto a screen will be deemed to have met this requirement. Bylaw 6.7.2 requires that after the divisional meeting, notice of all the divisional actions will be sent to all members within two weeks. Responding to an inquiry Professor Galloway clarified that only divisional actions on legislation or resolutions will be included, no other material. Student representative Chris Amico requested that students be included in the notification. Chair Blumenthal noted the request. The bylaw change was approved by a voice vote.

Bylaw 8.4.1 Referendum

Professor Galloway presented the bylaw change which proposes to link the deadline for the mail ballots to the Notice of Divisional Action approved earlier in the meeting (Bylaw 6.7.2). Petition deadlines would be set at 21 calendar days after the distribution of such notice. Professor Joel Yellin stated that 21 calendar days shortens the time, which he thought RJ&E had interpreted as 21 business days, and asked for clarification of the words “has been circulated through the Division”. Professor Galloway stated the date of record is the date the Notification of Divisional Actions is mailed. Professor Mark Traugott asked why the words “unless authorized to do so” were left in the report. Professor Galloway responded that there was a lengthy discussion about this but SAC could not come up with a better substitute.

Professor Bob Meister moved to table the motion until the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded. The motion to table was passed by a voice vote.

c. Committee on Committees

Nominations 2002-2003 (AS/SCP/1342)

COC Chair Shelly Errington asked the Senate to confirm the nominations for Committee membership as printed, with the following additions and corrections: RJ&E, Donald Wittman; Committee on Teaching, replace Margaret Morse with David Swanger; Committee on the Colleges, add Ted Holman and Carolyn Dean. Responding to an inquiry, Professor Shelly Errington stated that the Senate is not being asked to confirm

the membership of COC, but that the list is provided for informational purposes only. Professor John Faulkner inquired about the member on CAP who is being asked to serve a fourth or fifth consecutive year. Professor Errington responded that although the policy is to move members off committees at more frequent intervals, in this particular instance, an appropriate replacement could not be found.

Professor Joel Yellin asked whether COC checked to be sure the appointments do not create violation of the conflict-of-interest bylaw, or a similar rule. Professor Errington stated they will check to make sure that those appointed are not precluded by our conflict-of-interest bylaw.

The nominations with the additions and corrections announced were approved by a voice vote.

COC Chair Errington announced that COC is instituting a new practice of writing an annual report. It will detail some of the agreements with the administration and list activities from the year. COC has become the committee that not only puts people on committees, but also thinks about organizational structures and deficiencies and how the administration and the Senate can interact productively. Professor Errington thanked both EVC Simpson and Chancellor Greenwood for their confidence in COC. She also thanked the faculty members who have served on committees in the last two years, as well as those that will serve in the future. The standardized meeting times for committees were announced. Professor Errington stated she will step down from COC on June 15, and that it has been a pleasure serving the faculty.

Dean McHenry Award (AS/SCP/1341)

Professor Shelly Errington announced that Professor Emeritus Bill Domhoff is the recipient of the Dean McHenry Award for Senate Service and yielded the floor to COC member John Isbister to announce the award.

For the last six years, the University of California Academic Senate has asked each campus for a nominee for the Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Service in the Academic Senate. Whether or not our nominee wins the U.C.-wide award, the nominee will receive the Dean McHenry Award for distinguished service to the UCSC Academic Senate. The two previous winners are Michael Cowan and Joe Bunnett. The winner of the award this year is Professor Bill Domhoff. He has made a remarkable contribution to the success of the Academic Senate as a founder, inspirer, mentor, teacher, and scholar. The full award announcement is the meeting CALL.

d. Committee on Planning and Budget

Enrollment Management at U.C. Santa Cruz: Planning and Information Needs (AS/SCP/1348)

CPB Chair Bob Meister presented the Committee on Planning and Budget's report. In its March 6, 2002 resolution, the Senate set a goal of graduate enrollments at 15% of the student body. At that time, CPB committed to present a plan that would articulate the relationship between this goal and our undergraduate enrollment projections as well as

the resource and cost constraints that would affect achieving this goal. The first part of the document concerns enrollment planning and the need to look at our plans for freshman admission in order to produce both the revenues necessary to reach 15% graduate enrollments and have adequate space for the graduate students.

CPB member Professor Brent Haddad explained Figure A.1 of the report titled "Campus Planning Model Output: Three Scenarios" (page 44). CPB has developed scenarios that use actual data up to the present time and projects out using such input elements as retention rates of undergraduate and graduates, number of entering fresh persons, transfer entry rate, graduate student entry rate as well as assumptions about years to graduation. The Programmatic Model numbers are taken from our ten-year plans.

In the UCOP Model, 1,900 graduate students is about 11%, which is less than the 15% minimum that we resolved as our goal at UCSC. All three models show that the number of freshman admittees has reached a peak at 2003-03 and has flattened out. This has an implication for when we would start invoking different forms of selectivity in our freshman admissions. It is hoped that the recommendations noted in the report will be used by the Provost Advisory Committee and the Academic Planning Committee, in order to guide the many different decisions that will be made to reach our 15% goal.

The second appendix of the report lists four measures of accountability towards reaching these goals. They are: enrollment management; monitoring the development of the graduate programs that will be phased in to meet the overall enrollment goals of 15% graduate students; including the Development Office in our long-range academic and financial planning; and the need to reallocate intramural funds over time to the core mission of the campus, which is instruction and research. Part of our academic planning will be concerned with maintaining and improving our budgetary component of our uncommon commitment to the educational and research enterprise. These measures of accountability will enable us to move toward our goal in the longer term and will allow us to take account of any short-term setbacks that may be necessary for immediate needs so that they do not result in permanent cutbacks to our budgetary commitment to our core educational mission.

John Buzan, the Stevenson College representative, commented they would like to see student involvement on these committees. Professor Joseph Bunnett noted an oversight of the report, which is that it does not address the need to demonstrate the function an expanded or new graduate program would serve. Chair Meister noted the need for a justification for each and every graduate program created, as well as support for those that already exist. Professor Joel Yellin pointed out that Figure A.1 does not take into account retention or transfers. CPB member Brent Haddad responded that the spreadsheet for the model accounts for the transfers, but the lines were left off the page. Retention was also built into the report, but is not explicitly shown in the materials in the Call. Professor Gail Hershatter noted it is hard to track development costs because they are listed under both Institutional Support and Academic Administration. Professor Bob Meister replied that they should only be under Academic Administration. EVC John Simpson commented that with respect to the graduate planning, one might have the

impression that graduate growth is dependent entirely on State funding. However, other means of support include federal grants and contracts, developments, etc., for floating new graduate programs, and for the potential for self-sustaining programs. With respect to Table 1.B of accountability, EVC Simpson noted there is complete complicity between the Provost and the Senate. He felt it would be instructive for all of us to have a sense of similar measures at other U.C. or other university campuses. Professor Meister stated that UCPB is currently considering the adoption of this methodology system-wide. The normalization of the methodology will allow cross-campus comparisons. It is important to continue to remember the achievements of our faculty, and for the faculty to be able to assess the budgetary performance of the administration in delivering funds to the core mission of the university. Professor James Gill pointed out that even the least aggressive graduate growth, the UCOP model, involves more graduate students growing each year than the campus has grown almost any year in the past. He also noted the need for housing a significant number of graduate students off campus and noted that we are only two years away from reaching the maximum number of undergraduates. Professor Gill asked what the graduate enrollment is likely to be next year. Graduate Council Chair Quentin Williams stated we are going to be very close to the target outlined in the plan.

Interim Report: Divisional 10-Year Planning (AS/SCP/1349)

Presenting the report, Chair Meister noted several major changes resulting from the current planning process. For example, ten-year plans that have been submitted cannot be considered to be “approved”. The review of a proposal for a new program (that may have been mentioned in a 10-year plan) by the administration and the Senate will include explicit discussion of its priority in relation to existing budgetary commitments. In the future, proposals include explicit discussion of the conditions under which it will be funded and describe the extent of administrative support. It will include specific discussion of the steps and timeline that the administration is going to take to advance it. One of the best results of this planning process will be a convergence between the way we set planning priorities and the way we analyze current commitments.

CPB member Professor Susan Gillman pointed out that the idea of plans being approved should never be understood as truncating the normal processes of Senate and Administrative approval. Those processes have always been critical to guaranteeing our overall campus responsiveness to up-to-the minute changes and opportunities. One fundamental change that became apparent during this planning process is a reaffirmation of the Senate role in consultation that will now extend beyond the level of the central administration into the divisional arena of the deans. The Committee on Planning and Budget is looking forward to a continuation of a cordial and effective partnership with the deans and EVC Simpson.

e. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid: Report on Comprehensive Review (AS/SCP/1345)

CAFA Chair John Tamkun noted that the report provides a summary of the committee’s progress towards formulating a comprehensive admissions review plan along with a set of recommendations. Professor Joel Yellin asked if the committee will accept or even formalize with a bylaw the Regent’s delegation of power to the faculty over enrollment.

He also asked for clarification regarding the review plan to the selection of students without consideration of the area of interest stated on their application. Chair Tamkun stated there has been a lot of discussion about whether a comprehensive review could be used as a mechanism for controlling the distribution of students among different majors or divisions. CAFA felt strongly that CEP might want to look at other mechanisms for restricting the flow of students into specific majors. With 40% of the applicants not stating a major preference, CAFA did not feel it would be appropriate to determine whether or not a student was accepted or rejected from UCSC based on their area of interest. CAFA feels there is no problem with the current charge or title of the committee with respect to the Regent's delegation of power over enrollment.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Lee Ritscher, President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), reported that the idea of a graduate college has received positive endorsement and there is movement towards realizing this goal. There has been formation of graduate groups, support groups, and increased awareness of graduate students needs at the Health Center. Graduate students still need a career counselor in the Career Center and a counselor dedicated to graduate students needs at the Counseling Center at the Health Center. There is a critical need for a browsable collection at the library in the Humanities and Social Sciences. There is also a need for summer support for graduate students. If UCSC plans to increase graduate student enrollment and improve retention, the financial support offered will need to improve. Currently, most graduate students who serve as teaching assistants are paid \$15,000 to \$16,000 a year. During the summer, graduate students are often expected to make progress on their research and writing, while receiving no paycheck. A fellowship program, which focuses on supporting graduate students through the summer, would work towards achieving the goals of UCSC by making our university more competitive for new graduate students and in helping retain current graduate students. Chancellor Greenwood has recommended that deans and faculty help obtain more grants, private donors, and other means of support for graduate students.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business

Professor Joel Yellin proposed a motion to amend Senate Bylaws 13.14.1, 13.14.2, and 13.14.5, to provide for a direct election by each major campus component of members of the Committee on Committees. The motion was moved and seconded. Professor Shelly Errington inquired as to what would be done if a division did not put forward a candidate. Professor Yellin responded that the amended bylaw should state that if two or more candidates are not nominated for a vacant seat, the nomination period would be extended for two weeks. Professor Errington proposed that the entire faculty vote on the five members from the different divisions. Professor Yellin proposed to table this motion to

the next Senate meeting in the fall. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

RESOLVED: Senate Bylaws 13.14.1, 13.14.2 and 13.14.5 are amended to read as follows:

13.14 Committee on Committees

13.14.1 The Committee shall have five members. Each member must be a voting member of the Santa Cruz Division. The Divisions of the Arts, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Humanities, and the School of Engineering, shall each have one representative. Each member of the Committee shall be elected by a mail ballot of the Senate members of his or her Division or School. Elections shall be held in the winter quarter in accordance with Chapter 11 of these Bylaws. Senators with voting privileges in multiple Divisions or in the School of Engineering and other Division(s) may cast only one vote, and must notify the Secretary of the Senate of the Division or School in which they choose to vote. This choice may be changed by timely notice to the Secretary. In each election, the candidate with the second highest vote total shall be named alternate member. If two or more candidates are not nominated for a vacant seat on the Committee, the Secretary of the Senate shall announce that fact, and the nomination period shall be extended for two weeks.

13.14.2 Members shall be elected to two-year terms which run from September first following election. If a member fails to serve, or resigns from office, the alternate for that member shall take office immediately. If an alternate member is not available, a special election shall be held in the next quarter to fill the vacancy. In such a case, the Senator elected shall serve until the next election or for the remainder of the term associated with the vacated seat, whichever is longer.

13.14.5 The Committee **shall** reports to the Santa Cruz division at its next regular meeting for confirmation of all replacements of Divisional officers, ~~of its own membership~~, and of the membership of other committees. Replacements of officers and replacements in committees ~~other than the Committee on Committees~~ shall serve with authority from the time they are named by the Committee on Committees. ~~Replacement of members of the Committee on Committees may not serve until after their appointment has been confirmed by the Santa Cruz Division.~~

FURTHER RESOLVED:

This resolution shall take effect beginning Winter Quarter AY 2002-03.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:42p.m.

ATTEST:

Dave Belanger
Secretary
August 2, 2002

