

MINUTES
A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
October 16, 2002 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, October 16, 2002 in the UCSC Recital Hall. With Secretary David Belanger and Parliamentarian Wally Goldfrank present, Chair George Blumenthal called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Blumenthal called for changes to the minutes of May 17, 2002. A minor correction was made on the third page, to correct the spelling of Laureate. Professor Yellin also submitted a change by e-mail, to change language attributed to him on page 5 to: "Professor 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."

A motion to approve the minutes, with these changes, was made and seconded. The minutes were thus accepted by a voice vote.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Blumenthal

Chair Blumenthal welcomed everyone to the meeting and read the names of new faculty joining the university this year. The Academic Senate will face a number of interesting and exciting issues over the course of this year. One issue the Senate will be focusing on is increasing graduate enrollments. Last year, the Senate passed a resolution agreeing to grow our enrollment of graduate students to 15%. An important goal for this year will be to institute a graduate college at UCSC. Another major goal, which is fundamentally a system-wide issue, is the question of admissions testing for UC admissions. For a student to be eligible for admission to UC, he or she must be within the top 12.5% of the high school students within California. UC defines the top 12.5% in a variety of ways, the most important of which is based upon both high school grade point average and admissions testing to the university. Last year, it was agreed by the Academic Senate and the Academic Assembly that the SAT I exam should be replaced by an updated exam which is a better measure of intelligence rather than reasoning. There will be considerable discussions about what other exams we will require in addition to the new SAT I exam.

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) will be coming up with a set of criteria for a comprehensive review. Enrollments on this campus have been growing to the point where we will actually be turning away UC-eligible students. In order to do that, it will be necessary for us to have a plan in place to decide which students to accept. CAFA will have an open forum on Friday, November 15, to discuss their plans for comprehensive review.

Our campus will also be looking at general education this year. The Committee on Educational Policy will be reviewing our general education requirements. We will also continue revising Senate bylaws to eliminate inconsistencies and to improve the efficiency of Senate operations.

Senate Committees have also been asked to think about the way they operate and to consider whether the committee structure we currently use is the optimal structure or whether it can be improved.

Our campus has recently completed a two-year academic planning process that produced an academic document leading toward the year 2010. As we contemplate building the physical plan, we need to know the long-term goal of the campus. The decisions that we make now will affect the physical plan of this campus for decades to come. The Chancellor and Chair Blumenthal will co-chair a campus-wide task force that will focus on how big UCSC should be. The goal of the task force is to come up with some answers and some consensus within the campus on this matter.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood expressed her gratitude to everyone who participated in the ongoing planning process. There is anticipation of a mid-year budget cut. Proposition 47 would provide UC with about \$408 million and, for Santa Cruz, it will impact Engineering, Humanities, Social Sciences, the campus Emergency Response Center, and the McHenry Library project.

The university has been subjected to a substantial increase in health care costs. Most of the bids that came in to UC for health care plans were 30 to 50% above what was anticipated. For the first time in many years, UC is not offering a fully employer-paid California HMO, although there is a very low-cost option available. On October 24, there will be a safety and wellness day with classes and workshops and booths to try to improve our physical fitness and health awareness on this campus.

One outcome of the State audit will be a system-wide analysis of faculty workloads. UCSC has maintained the lowest average class size for lower division courses compared to any other UC campus. We also offer more small discussion sessions. Our freshman one-year retention rate increased and we have increased the number of community college transfer students by 15%. We have also increased the diversity in our faculty hires. There is a continuing issue at the UC level about participation of women in a number of fields and there is at present some gender inequity. A small group of senior women faculty will be meeting with the President to talk about issues related to improving this situation.

Important issues for this year are to define the graduate college concept and to increase our graduate enrollments. Also, we have made progress on the habitat conservation plan and hope to move forward with the Inclusion Area D project this year.

Professor Joe Bunnett asked whether Chancellor Greenwood's comments regarding participation of women in academic affairs indicated that it was too little or too much. He noted that women chair many of the Academic Senate Committees. Chancellor Greenwood stated she doesn't believe one can ever have an overparticipation of women in the university. The largest growing pool of domestic academics in this country is female. The only other growing pool is international students. If we expect to populate our university with the same quality of faculty drawn in the past decades, we must look at these new pools and find a way to make our institution an attractive environment for them to succeed in.

c) Campus Provost/EVC Simpson

The budget and audit issues come at a time when there is significant and substantial growth in student population at the UC. This growth is a political reality even in the face of the current budgetary exigencies. CPEVC Simpson encouraged all to look at the planning documents from the Academic and Academic Support Divisions, as well as the overall Academic Campus Plan.

There was, by many, a general expectation with the planning process that it would be very much like a grant competition; certain programs would be approved for funding, others would be disapproved, and then over the next ten years those that were approved would be built. But this planning process has had a very different outcome that is much more appropriate for a university in transition. The plans that exist, the divisional plans or the campus-wide plans, are a picture at a moment in time. They were produced some months ago and are a vision of what the future would look like over the next ten years. One thing these plans must incorporate is a degree of flexibility, a degree of plasticity, and they must evolve as situations change in the academic enterprise, as situations change in the internal world of UCSC and as the world outside of the university changes. They are not final, but rather works in progress. CPEVC Simpson will use some of the principles, aims and aspirations expressed in the divisional plans as well as in the overall campus plan, as a framework for guiding how we will grow in the future. He acknowledged the hard work that the deans and vice chancellors put into leading the planning efforts of their divisions. He also thanked the Academic Senate, in particular the Committee on Planning and Budget, for their thoughtful, careful and thorough consideration and advice on these plans as the whole process came forward.

CPEVC Simpson described four principle over-arching issues that concern the future of this campus:

- Graduate Education
- Undergraduate Education
- Research
- Campus Infrastructure

Commensurate with the changes that have been proposed by the campus plans, there must be new ways to consider how we allocate our budget. Some considerations include: we must review what we have in our present and ongoing base budget and develop new means of revenue from sources beyond the State of California; allocation and budgetary support cannot be based solely on proposals and good ideas, but rather in significant measure on achievements, outcomes and accomplishments; and budget cuts cannot be unidimensional, such as being based primarily on workload, but rather include consideration of budgetary allocations, accomplishment, quality of proposal, and issues such as student enrollment pressure.

As we move forward, diversity must be maintained as a core campus value. It is absolutely critical to our responsibility as a public research university. We must also have broad faculty

leadership if we are to succeed. It is the academic enterprise that defines the character, the notoriety, and the significance of UC Santa Cruz and it is faculty leadership that drives and defines the academic enterprise.

The campus must prepare for budget cuts. The planning process we have just completed has put in place principles and processes that will be very helpful in dealing with budget cuts in the same way they would be helpful for dealing with budgetary expansion.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1364)

The report was received without comment.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1350)

The report was received without comment.

b. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1351)

Professor Joe Bunnett pointed out a minor grammatical error. A mathematical error was also pointed out regarding the number of cases. Chair Blumenthal noted that CAP Chair Miller will receive these comments.

c. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1352)

The report was received without comment.

d. Committee on Affirmative Action (AS/SCP/1353)

The report was received without comment.

e. Committee on Committees (AS/SCP/1365)

The report was received without comment.

f. Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1354)

The report was received without comment.

g. Committee on the Education Abroad Program (AS/SCP/1359)

The report was received without comment.

h. Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1357)

Professor Joe Bunnett noted that CEP commented that external reviews ignore undergraduate education and that the Graduate Council expressed dissatisfaction with the external review process because there are very few comments on graduate programs. Professor Bunnett rose to question what external reviews are paying attention to. Professor Joe Konopelski asked whether the Senate will be addressing the concerns about the external review process. VPAA George Brown responded that the Senate Committees are currently reviewing a proposal for revision of the External Review Process. One major change is to involve the CEP as a reviewer of the undergraduate curriculum and the Graduate Council as reviewer of graduate issues.

i. Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1355)

The report was received without comment.

j. Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1356)

The report was received without comment.

k. Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1360)

The report was received without comment.

l. Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1363)

Professor Onuttom Narayan asked for clarification on page 68 of the call regarding the Academic Information System where it says, "We are concerned that a final disposition has been made over

the Summer without allowing CPB to comment on the proposed cost and method of financing.” CPEVC Simpson responded that he was responsible for making that decision. He felt there was significant consultation previously and he was satisfied with the very important feedback he received from CPB.

CPEVC Simpson commented on the statement on page 67, “a budgetary plan that would reverse the relative decline since the early 1990s of per-student expenditures on Instruction and Research in comparison to administration, student services, and other items.” In order to correct a misconception given by that data, CPEVC Simpson stated that if the expenditures on Instruction and Research (I&R) are compared to the expenditures on institutional support, as totals, one comes up with the conclusion made in the report. If one makes the appropriate comparison and factors out the cost of base expenditures for institutional support (expenditures made for specific programs which are mandated by the State), then one ends up with the following data: the increase in institutional support dropped from 9.4% in 1990-1991 to 8.9% of general fund expenditures in 2000-2001 accompanied by a change in the student/faculty ratio from 19.99 in 1997-98 to 19.5 in 2000-01. This is another indicator that this campus has selectively funded Instruction and Research.

CPB Chair Bob Meister responded by stating that in order to reach our goal of increasing graduate enrollments to 15%, the real per-student expenditure on Instruction and Research coming from state funds needs to increase. Does this require a budgetary allocation, and applications of funds from one part of the base to another? Chair Meister stated that he believes the answer to this question is yes. The next questions are whether historically the proportion has decreased, when has it decreased, and why has it decreased. At two particular points in the history of our campus, those proportions on an index per student basis were different. Is our campus worse than others? System-wide, UCPB concluded that over a ten-year period, Instruction and Research, using only State funds as a basis of comparison, had dropped system-wide from 57 to 46%. The University experienced a substantial cost reduction in the area of Instruction and Research that has not been reversed. One reason may be that we have experienced a decline system-wide of the proportion of graduates to undergraduates. If we are going to have a larger proportion of graduate students, they will require a larger per-student expenditure on Instruction and Research than we now make. In addition to extramural support, one source of funding is the base budget, particularly the areas in the base budget that have benefited from the declines of recent years.

Professor Helene Moglen asked for comment from CPB on the Silicon Valley Center and Freshman Seminars. CPB Chair Meister stated that CPB has not yet addressed the budgetary implications regarding Freshman Seminars. There are serious resource implications that could be large if there is a high demand for these programs. The request for proposals is out and the Senate is now beginning the process of consultation that will determine how many of these proposals should be funded and what the future funding will involve. Regarding Silicon Valley, there has never been any question about the importance and value of the Silicon Valley site for research partnerships and the consequent value they might have for graduate education. The concerns raised by Senate Committees have focused entirely on the undergraduate component. The plan submitted last year was based on the idea that only those programs that would not be developed on this campus would be considered as programs upon which new departments might

be developed at SVC. CPB has been informed that all plans for an undergraduate program at Silicon Valley are presently in abeyance and that the supervision of that project has now been turned over to the Vice Chancellor of Research.

m. Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1362)

The report was received without comment.

n. Committee on Teaching (AS/SCP/1358)

The report was received without comment.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees: Nominations 2002-03 (AS/SCP/1366)

COC Chair Sandy Faber submitted nominations for 2002-03, which were approved by voice vote. Answering an inquiry on whether Career Advising is a new committee, COC Chair Sandy Faber stated it is not a new committee. COC will be reconsidering its role and will be asking the Senate for their viewpoint.

b. Committee on Faculty Welfare: Oral Report

CFW member Roger Anderson presented the report because CFW Chair Faye Crosby was at the first UC Faculty Welfare meeting. He raised the issue of faculty housing: the supply; the phasing of faculty housing; and the unmet demand for faculty housing. We are likely to increase our faculty by about 50 per year over the next ten years. It is assumed that two-thirds of those people are going to need campus for-sale housing. The new faculty number includes both replacements for retiring faculty as well as new people to accommodate the increased enrollment. The increase in the demand for housing will be enlarged by the fact that many of the retiring faculty are not going to leave their homes. To accommodate this demand, the campus has commenced the acquiring of additional housing. They are converting Hager Court Apartments into condominiums. Of these 50 units, 25 will be available next year and another 25 the year after that. There are 64 units at Laureate Court, which is an apartment unit at the bottom of the campus. In order to satisfy city ordinances, 13 of those are going to be converted into for-sale housing. That housing will become available in 2004. We expect Inclusion Area D, which will provide another 65 units, to be available in 2005. In 2005, we expect that faculty demand will be satisfied by the housing that we will have available. However, as time goes by our faculty will continue to grow and, unless we build the north campus by 2009, we are going to be in trouble. There are now discussions in the Campus Welfare Committee about the priorities for the allocation of housing and it is clear that it is intended that some of the housing is going to go to staff as well as faculty. That will mean that the unmet demand will actually be larger for faculty. There will be a public forum to discuss primary housing allocation on October 17, 2002 at 12:00 in the Stevenson College dining hall.

There will be an increase of the monthly premiums for health care this year. Points noted include: some programs have been dropped; there is now a two-tier premium; people making less than \$40,000 per year will have a lower cost for their health insurance; and there is little or no increase in the co-payments. The university has established a new option in terms of family situation, which is for a single employee plus children. During Open Enrollment, one should consider what the changes mean and whether one wants to continue a plan or switch to

something else. There is also going to be a new health care plan reimbursement for those who have various co-pays. One can put aside ahead of time what one expects to pay over the coming year and in this way pay with pre-tax dollars.

Professor Karen Bassi asked if loans that are available to faculty are still going to be available and at what levels those funds are going to be available from the Office of the President, down to the campuses and through the Deans. CFW member Roger Anderson stated that the MAP loans are absolutely crucial to help satisfy the faculty housing demand. The University has made some changes to the MAP Loan Program. One can now get a 40-year loan and borrow up to 90% of the purchase price. The Regents have recently authorized the step interest in these loans. That is a substantial increase over what it was before. There is only one MAP loan allowable per person. There needs to be a proactive effort in order to increase the allocation that comes to this campus from the Office of the President.

Professor Stanley Flatte asked about the section of the report entitled "Phased Retirement." CFW member Roger Anderson reported that he had no further information at this time. As soon as information becomes available, the Committee on Faculty Welfare will report on it.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Matt Jones, Chair of the Student Union Assembly, reported that SUA has been focusing on the issue of voting and educating students on Propositions 47 and 542. The USSA Higher Educational Act was discussed at a meeting in Washington, D.C., which led to a further discussion on the value of grants versus loans. Six major issues being discussed by the USSA are: 24-hour parking; campus diversity; labor solidarity; student appointments; establishing a faculty advisor; and a major campaign to get students registered to vote.

COT Chair Judith Habicht-Mauche inquired as to when the appointments of students to Senate committees would be made. The committees are getting on with their work and need the input of the students. SUA President Matt Jones replied that he is serving as the interim Chair of SCOC and they hope to have elections and decisions within the next couple of weeks.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Lee Ritscher, President of the Graduate Student Association, reported that the GSA is experiencing a period of increased participation and increased departmental representation. Several members have been voted in from departments which have not had representation during her tenure as president. The GSA has focused on summer funding for graduate students. GSA is putting together an informative and mutually beneficial town hall meeting on student funding. They are currently assembling participation from each of the divisional deans to attend the meeting. They are also working with the Graduate Council and the Graduate Dean on this issue.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business

a. Submitted 5/17/02 (AS/SCP/1361)

At the May 17, 2002 meeting of the Senate, legislation was introduced to change the way the Committee on Committees is chosen. The legislation was introduced and seconded before this

body and is now open for discussion. Professor Michael Cowan asked what happens if no candidate is nominated within the specified two-week period following an original two week nomination period wherein no candidate is nominated under the provisions of the proposed legislation. Furthermore, this is a substantial change, not merely a procedural one. If the goal is to ensure that the representatives on the committee have good knowledge of the faculty, the question is whether five members is sufficient. COC Chair Sandy Faber stated that since this proposed legislation affects the working of the Committee on Committees, the current COC polled a number of people on campus who had opinions about how all this legislation would work. COC Chair Faber read the document that summarized the various questions about the legislation and questions on some of the implications raised. Points raised in the document include:

- The proposed bylaw changes would require the Secretary to extend the election process by two weeks if fewer than two candidate nominations are submitted for a particular position. It is not clear whether this extension is to be a one-time event for each election or would be repeated indefinitely.
- The proposal does not say how the changes would be phased in.
- The proposed bylaw requires the secretary to know the voting privilege of each senator but does not specify how this information is to be obtained.
- Further thought must be given to ex-officio members of the Academic Senate as well as Senators with voting rights in more than one Division or School, and how their divisional affiliations for the purposes of voting will be determined.
- The election to replace a vacancy, which often occurs in Fall, would typically take place in Winter quarter, possibly leaving COC without representation for nearly half a year.
- It is not workable that the proposed changes take effect in January 2003 since many outstanding issues must be addressed.
- Although the idea of divisional elections sounds simple, there are many complications along with increases in various workloads that will occur.

Speaking against the motion:

Steve Thorsett
Donald Potts
Joe Bunnett
Donna Hunter

Karen McNally
Steven Miller

Points made against the motion:

The legislation is inconsistent with both the letter and spirit of divisional and system-wide bylaws. On the question of voting rights, it is clearly stated in the system-wide bylaws who has voting rights here on campus. The 14-day delay in the election if there are not sufficient nominations is in specific disagreement with the system-wide bylaw 340. Specifically, it requires

30-days notice of all elections and that all nominating positions be filed within ten days of the mailing of that notice. The current membership has advantages over going to a system where each member of COC is charged with representing a particular faculty on the campus. The legislation's proposed procedure and its practice would be unworkable. It is not clear what problem this legislation would solve. Until the problem is defined, an evaluation of whether this would be an improvement cannot be made. We should be voting for people who will accept the responsibility to consult widely. The issues need to be considered more carefully. Some of the problems would be solved if more Senators stood for nomination and election.

The motion failed to pass by voice vote.

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business

Professor Joe Bunnnett proposed a motion to establish a committee to examine the situation of lecturers in our institution.

“I move that Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate establish an ad hoc committee to study the situation of UCSC members with the title lecturer. The committee should be comprised of seven members of the division, three members respectively of the Committees on Academic Personnel, Educational Policy, and Privilege and Tenure. The committee should consider lecturer contributions to education at UCSC and should inquire whether current rules and practices are optimum for high-quality instruction and for recognition and reward of lecturers’ contributions. The committee should report to the Division at its first regular meeting in the fall of 2003.”

Chair Blumenthal asked if “ad hoc” means special committee of the Senate. Professor Bunnnett confirmed that he did indeed mean special and stated that in intellectual circles and internationally, the work “ad hoc” is often used for these situations. Chair Blumenthal asked if there was any objection to changing the wording of the resolution. A motion was made and seconded to create a special committee of the Academic Senate. Professor Helene Moglen was in favor of the motion and stated there is no way for faculty and lecturers to communicate formally with one another. Professor Steven Thorsett proposed an amendment to the motion to replace the work “lecturer” with the phrase “non-Senate teaching faculty.” This amendment was adopted as a friendly amendment to the legislation. Professor Donald Potts asked whether this procedure is an appropriate one for establishing a special committee. Chair Blumenthal responded that in order for a resolution to be considered at a meeting in which it does not appear in the call requires a three-quarters vote to pass. Also, a special committee requires an ending date, which is normally at the end of the academic year. Professor Bunnnett stated he would like the end date for this special committee to be the end of fall quarter of 2003. COC Chair Sandy Faber asked for an explanation of the role of Privilege and Tenure on this special committee. Professor Bunnnett responded that a person from Privilege and Tenure might be useful with respect to considering the aspects of the appointment rules and practices.

Speaking in favor of the motion
Carol Freeman Bob Meister
Carolyn Martin-Shaw Don Potts

Helene Moglen Steve Thorsett

Points made for the motion

There need to be some changes for the better for lecturers on campus. Lecturers are currently the only university employees who can be fired because of seniority with no other factors taken into consideration. The rules of the Academic Senate permit the Academic Senate to take cognizance of the criteria used in the appointment and termination of all academic faculty, whether Senate or non-Senate faculty. Lecturers should be allowed to sit with Senate committees and advise committees that are appropriate to the academic issues to which lecturers are now key participants. SOE Lecturer Liz Abrams asked whether it is possible for lecturers to sit on a special committee. Chair Blumenthal responded that they may sit but cannot be voting members of the special committee.

The final resolution was:

I move that the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate establish a special committee to study the situation at UCSC of faculty members with the title non-senate teaching faculty members. The committee should be comprised of seven members of the Division, three members respectively of the Committees on Academic Personnel, Educational Policy, and Privilege and Tenure. The committee should consider non-senate teaching faculty contributions to education at UCSC and should inquire whether current rules and practices are optimum for high-quality instruction and for recognition and reward of non-senate teaching faculty contributions. The committee should report to the Division at its first regular meeting in the fall of 2003. Established until 12/31/03.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

Chair Blumenthal adjourned the meeting at 5:04pm.

ATTEST:
Dave Belanger
Secretary
December 26, 2002