

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division May 16, 2003

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 16, 2003 at the University Center. With Secretary David Belanger present, Chair George Blumenthal called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Blumenthal asked if there were any changes to the minutes of February 19, 2003, other than the one spelling change that was submitted in writing. As there was no objection to this change, the minutes were adopted.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Blumenthal

Chair Blumenthal announced that four Academic Senate staff positions, including that of the Senate Director, have been reclassified to levels that are comparable to positions of other UC Senate offices. These reclassifications are well deserved and now more accurately reflect the actual role of these positions in our Senate office.

Chair Blumenthal recognized the 2002-03 Excellence in Teaching Awardees: Margaret Brose (Literature), Ann Caudle (Science Communication), Nancy Chen (Anthropology), Sandy Chung (Linguistics), Melanie Dupuis (Sociology), Lori Kletzer (Economics), Marc Mangel (Applied Math & Statistics), Wendy Martyna (Sociology), Bruce Schumm (Physics), and Gene Switkes (Chemistry).

Several issues will occupy much of the Senate's attention next year. The first is the budget process. The Senate will consult with the administration on budgetary decisions and will be primarily responsible for curricular issues. The Senate and Administration must work together to minimize the budgetary consequences for UCSC's teaching and research mission. The Senate will also play a key role in the decision to move forward on the merger with the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Faculty involvement will be crucial in determining how we deal with personnel, curricular and programmatic issues. Our campus is also crossing the threshold into selectivity for UC eligible freshmen applicants. Next year we will have to test and refine our approach to comprehensive review. The final issue concerns the expiration of our 15-year-old Long-Range Development Plan. A group is planning how we might prepare a new LRDP and how it would interface with the City of Santa Cruz's own planning efforts. It is essential that the Senate stay involved in this planning effort throughout the year.

Chair Blumenthal called attention to four action items which will be on the agenda at the next Academic Assembly meeting: several changes to the system-wide bylaws; a revision of the faculty code of conduct to preclude faculty members from having romantic or sexual liaisons with students over whom they have an evaluative or supervisory role;

adoption of a new policy on academic freedom; and officially revising required tests for UC admission to include the new core exam, with writing and algebra included, as well as two achievement exams.

Chair Blumenthal noted that this is the last regularly scheduled UCSC division meeting that he would be chairing and said that it has been an interesting, challenging and rewarding experience. As his two-year term comes to an end, there are a number of people to thank. He benefited greatly from the knowledge, experience and professionalism of the Senate staff, especially Mary-Beth Harhen. He also thanked Chancellor Greenwood and Provost Simpson for helping to develop a spirit of cooperation between the administration and the Senate as we share responsibility for the governance of this campus. Senate committees have accomplished most of the Senate's hard work and real progress, and he thanked the committee chairs and Senate officers, especially Secretary Dave Belanger and Vice Chair Alison Galloway. Finally, he thanked the Santa Cruz Division for allowing him the opportunity to serve the Senate and the campus. Participating in shared governance has been a great experience.

Rising on a question of privilege, Professor Bill Ladusaw proposed the following motion to the floor which was passed by acclamation.

That the Santa Cruz division of the Academic Senate would like to express its deep gratitude to George Blumenthal for your outstanding leadership of the Division during the past two years. As chair of the division, you have shown intelligence and wisdom in your activities, and improved the involvement for shared governance on this campus. You have been both courageous and patient and also strategic, as you have led the Senate through a time of complex planning and decision-making, which will profoundly affect the future of this campus. And we thank you.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood stated that no one has worked harder in this university in the last two years than George Blumenthal. He has been dedicated to representing the university's faculty, not only with the administration here on the campus, but also with the system-wide administration and in other venues. He has been thoughtful, insightful, intelligent and extremely patient. Chancellor Greenwood said how much she enjoyed working with Vice-Chair Alison Galloway and she looks forward to working with her next year. She thanked retiring university librarian Lan Dyson, who has served this campus for nearly three decades, working very closely with the faculty to enhance the quality of our library's collection and service. He is a tireless advocate for the library and, thanks to his persistence and hard work, we have a plan that is going to serve the campus well. His contributions will be remembered now and in the future.

The Governor's revised budget makes it clear that education is a high priority. UCSC has taken a number of essential cuts to programs, and our position is that we cannot absorb more cuts without serious harm to our future. We hope to sustain the governor's budget and that we are not asked to take an additional \$80 million cut. One of the big arguments

is that community colleges are not being treated as fairly as the University of California. An analysis in the governor's budget shows that the funding per student over a ten-year period has been roughly equivalent for all three segments.

Although college graduation rates in the State of California are among the top quartile nationally, rates of granting B.A. degrees are much lower. One of the issues is that many students are going to college in California but are not completing four-year degrees. Our graduation rates are substantially better than CSU as are our transfer rates from the community colleges. We still have among the highest rates in the nation for public research universities. Applications were up both at the graduate and undergraduate level and there has been a strong growth in graduate and undergraduate enrollments.

UCSC needs to work hard on revenue generation. Chancellor Greenwood congratulated the faculty, who have worked to move our federal funding up to almost \$74 million this year. This is an eight percent increase over last year, and a 45 percent increase from our base five years ago. The current total for University Development is \$20.3 million, which is nearly double where we were last year at this point. We are trying to involve faculty in direct contact with donors and with alumni. This is the way to build continuing support for our campus.

Construction projects underway include Engineering II and the Humanities and Social Sciences facility. The McHenry project will add 120,000 square feet to the existing building and includes a lot of renovations and Americans with Disabilities Act improvements. It will need the November 2004 education bond to pass. If so, construction will start in the fall of 2005. The planning for the Arts Complex and the Emergency Response Center is also underway.

There is tremendous pressure for providing housing for our students, faculty and staff. Although the process has been slow, housing units are coming online.

The current Long Range Development Plan will have served its useful lifetime by 2005. We are working very hard to align our LRDP with the City's general plan. We are currently defining the process that we will enter into in the fall. We are defining the framework in which the LRDP will be considered, assessing the critical components of the LRDP, and mapping out the consultation and communication strategy that will lead to adoption of a plan by the campus, local community, and the Regents.

The Monterey Institute for International Studies is an interesting and spectacular opportunity which we need to explore with an open mind. A campus team will be developed to review the issues involved with this process.

For the dedication of colleges Nine and Ten there will be a Clark Kerr symposium on the issues facing the research university of the 21st century, with an emphasis on undergraduate education. Dick Atkinson will be the keynote speaker. Chancellor Greenwood urged faculty to mark their calendars for both the symposium and the student scholarships benefit dinner.

c) Campus Provost/EVC Simpson

CPEVC John Simpson thanked outgoing Chair George Blumenthal for his leadership of the Academic Senate. He expressed his excitement and anticipation of successful working relationships with the incoming Senate leadership, Professor Alison Galloway and Professor Peggy Delaney. He thanked the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Committee on Planning and Budget for a very productive year. He also thanked and congratulated librarian Lan Dyson for his many years of productive, dedicated and valuable service to UCSC, as well as to the issue of libraries throughout the University of California system.

The Governor's proposed budget recommends a cut of \$340 million UC. This means an anticipated minimum cut of \$15 million to UCSC. There are significant pressures on future budgets and the governor's proposal for next year shows a deficit of \$7.9 billion for the 2004-05 budget. This campus, along with other research universities, is facing additional and significant pressures on activities, including increased competition for private support, increasing costs for faculty startup and recruitment, increasing needs to fund IT costs, escalating energy costs, inflation and increased costs for planning, housing, and the LRDP, all of which are occurring in the context of increasing undergraduate and graduate enrollments. The cuts will come in three forms: targeted cuts of approximately \$9 million; undesignated cuts in the vicinity of \$5 to \$6 million; and de facto cuts, which are cuts due to the cost of doing business that goes up, not down. These cuts are coming on top of a \$2.5 million one time cut this year and over \$5 million in cuts to UCSC during the previous year.

With its high dependency on state funds, reduced budgets in public higher education are universal. UCSC, while having an overall operating budget of \$368 million, has state funds of \$170 million. These state funds are crucial because they pay salaries and support the basic instruction and research mission of the university. State governments everywhere are wreaking havoc with public higher education to balance state budgets. Most universities are dealing with this in traditional ways by not addressing their underlying structure, function and operations. Our approach at UCSC is to look at the ways in which we do everything and think of ways of improving that, in a strategic and planful way, mindful of our overall mission of the creation, dissemination and the use and application of knowledge and information. We will do this by improving the efficiency of our operations, consolidating and sharing functions where possible, leveraging our purchasing power, placing more emphasis on the use of technology to do our academic and academic support business, and reducing or eliminating redundancies in infrastructure. We are also looking at redesigning major administrative organizational structures and functions to best deliver support for academic instruction and research. The campus has the opportunity to address and change in fundamental ways our ways of doing business. There will be significant changes to services. The campus will also end up having fewer employees and there will be less funding for nonessential activities. We must continue diversifying our support base, especially seeking nontraditional or private support as an increasing part of our funding base.

The Executive Budget Committee process has produced a number of recommendations that will be discussed at the divisional meetings. The recommendations are grouped into four principal areas: business transformation; IT transformation; changes in academic support; and revenue generation. The project teams and steering committees will present their findings to the EBC at the end of May, and those that are judged worthy of pursuit will go forward for further analysis, consultation and consideration for implementation. Decisions about how to proceed with IT, business and financial transformation will be made in the next few weeks. Appropriate deliberation and consultation with the Senate regarding academic areas will continue into the fall. This will occur in at least two substantive ways: first, formal consultation with the Senate over specific proposals and recommendations and, second, involvement of specific Senate committees in formulating solutions where appropriate and, if possible, to specific issues raised by the ongoing analysis.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1387)

The report was received without comment.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1378)

Professor Amelie Hastie reported on the nomination of Professor Barbara Rogoff of the Department of Psychology as the Faculty Research Lecturer for 2003-2004. The report was accepted by acclamation.

5. Reports of Special Committees

a. Special Advisory Committee on Affordable Housing (AS/SCP/1377)

The report was received without comment.

b. Special Committee on the Colleges: Report (AS/SCP/1388)

Graduate Council Chair Quentin Williams congratulated the committee on the interim report and urged that they consult the previous task force report, the Graduate Division, and the Graduate Council about the development of a prospective graduate college at UCSC. The college may or may not have a substantive academic role. Chair Williams commented that the graduate college is a blank slate and he asked that we not typecast early on without a lot of due discussion. In response to a question, Special Committee member Jodi Greene stated that another report is expected before the end of the year. Crown College student representative Daniel Barnett noted the importance of the core course, especially for writing experience. He also stated that students would like to see more involvement with the faculty at the colleges level so that students can interact with faculty one-on-one. Stevenson College student representative Benjamin Eichert agreed with the finding that the core course represents a community building experience. A strong sense of community adds greatly to students' academic success and retention. The colleges provide the opportunity for creating a manageable and intimate community within the campus-wide system that can be daunting and unmanageable.

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees: Nominations 2003-04 (AS/SCP/1385)

COC member John Isbister presented the nominations. He asked the Senate to confirm the nominations for Committee membership as printed, with the following additions and corrections: Committee on Academic Personnel, Joyce Brodsky will be the fall and winter university-wide representative; Committee on Career Advising, June Gordon as Chair and Phokion Kolaitis as member; Committee on Computing and Telecommunications, add Warren Sack; Committee on Education Abroad, add Peter Young as Chair and representative to the UCEAP; Committee on Emeriti Relations, add Stanley Williamson as Chair; and the Committee on Planning and Budget, add Doris Ash for fall quarter. The nominations with the additions and corrections announced were approved by a voice vote.

Professor Faye Crosby asked why the Land and Building Committee is unfilled. COC member John Isbister replied that next year a subcommittee of the Committee on Planning and Budget will be established to consider the issues of land and building development. If the subcommittee is successful, COC will return to the division and ask that the Land and Building Committee be disestablished.

Professor Roger Anderson asked why there is only one member of the physical sciences, instead of two, on the Committee on Planning and Budget. COC member John Isbister replied that it was due to the limited number of spots on CPB and that not every division can have two representatives every year.

Proposed Change to Bylaw 13.21, Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1379)

Without discussion, the motion was passed by voice vote.

Proposed Change to Bylaw 13.12, Committee on Affirmative Action (AS/SCP/1386)

Without discussion, the motion was passed by voice vote.

Proposed Replacement of Senate Advisory Committee with the Executive Committee (AS/SCP/1380)

SAC was established in order to advise the chair of the Senate, but it now has a number of additional responsibilities. The proposed duties of the Executive Committee include: coordinating activities of the Senate committees on matters pertaining to divisional and system-wide issues; serving as a liaison to the administration for consultation and advise when it is not possible to convene the Senate; proposing legislation; considering effects of significant policy changes; seeking meetings with the chancellor and executive vice chancellor, at least quarterly, and consulting with other members of administration as necessary; and reporting to the Senate annually.

Two friendly amendments from the floor were accepted, to add “and diversity” to 14.1, and to add “or designee”. Responding to Professor Karen McNally’s question about the role of system-wide representatives, Chair Blumenthal stated there is an assumption that the system-wide committee representatives are in touch with the local committees.

Chapter 14. Executive Committee

14.1 The Executive Committee shall be composed of the Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary of the Division, the Representative(s) to the Assembly and the Chairs or designees of the Graduate Council, and of the Committees on Academic Personnel, Admissions and Financial Aid, Affirmative Action and Diversity, Committees, Educational Policy, Faculty Welfare, Planning and Budget, Privilege and Tenure, and Research.

14.3 The duties of the Committee include the following:

To coordinate activities of Senate Committees on matters pertaining to Divisional and Systemwide issues.

To advise the Division and its officers on matters of policy, and to serve as a liaison to the Administration for consultation and advice when it is not possible to convene the Senate as a whole and/or specific Senate committees. The Committee may act upon reports or legislation under the conditions set forth in SCB8.5.

To propose legislation.

To consider effects of significant policy changes.

To seek to meet with the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor at least quarterly and consult with other members of the Administration as necessary.

6) To report to the Senate annually.

14.4 (DELETE)

The motion was passed by voice vote.

Proposed Changes to Bylaw 13.14, Committee on Committees (AS/SCP/1381)

The Committee on Committees takes a proactive responsibility for reviewing how all the various committees are working.

Professor Karen McNally stated that it used to be the responsibility of the divisional chair to oversee the functioning of the committees. Chair Blumenthal stated this is still the case and this legislation would not change this. But the legislation would give the Committee on Committees the responsibility to look at the structure and charges of the committees, which is not normally the responsibility of the divisional chair.

Professor Shelly Errington stated the proposed motion increases the importance and responsibility of the Committee on Committees.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

b. Committee on Educational Policy: Amendments to Regulations on Double Majors and Minors (AS/SCP/1382)

Introducing the amendment, CEP Chair Carol Freeman stated this will reflect current policy which does not permit routine double-counting of courses for double majors. CEP considered various options, but in the end decided to maintain the policy that we have had in the past in order to continue and affirm the principle that a double major or a major

and a minor does in fact reflect a significant extra commitment to a concentrated and coherent body of work. CEP also wanted to allow for reasonable flexibility for exceptions, especially because the designation of what is an upper division and a lower division course does not always make programmatic sense. They also wanted to encourage the development of combined majors rather than a proliferation of double counting in double majors.

Stevenson College representative Benjamin Eichert stated the act of majoring seems more about the acquisition and development of knowledge than simply the accumulation of units. He encouraged the Academic Senate to ensure that students are aware of their ability to petition CEP for exceptions. CEP Chair Carol Freeman clarified that the exception referred to in the regulation is actually an exception for units of study to request formal exceptions for programs, not for individual students to bring forth exceptions in individual cases. Students may not double-count courses across two or more minors.

CAFA Member Karen McNally said she is concerned that because we have a five-unit system for courses that students will either stay longer or we will be decreasing the opportunities for double majors. CEP Chair Freeman responded that the regulations for getting permission to extend one's enrollment are quite complex. The possibility of double majors, when proposing them would increase time to degree, is very carefully regulated.

Professor Joe Bunnett noted that the policy disadvantages students wanting to double major in closely related majors, such as Chemistry and Physics where requirements may overlap. CEP Chair Freeman responded that CEP did consider this, but wanted to keep double majoring as something exceptional that represented a commitment to a particular body of work, rather than something that could be easily achieved by adding a few courses.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Rising to a point of privilege, Professor John Isbister moved a vote of thanks to Chair Carol Freeman, whose term on CEP is ending this year, for her extraordinary service. The motion passed by acclamation.

c. Committee on Faculty Welfare: Resolution on Parking (AS/SCP/1384)

CFW Chair Faye Crosby explained that currently she and CFW member Onottum Narayan sit on the Transportation Advisory Committee and the Transportation Oversight Committee. These two committees deal with implementation of transportation policies. While it is important for faculty to be represented in implementation design, it is also important for faculty to be involved during policy formulation. This resolution states that the Senate wants to consult with the administration during the formulation of transportation and parking policies.

UCSC is comparable to other UC campuses in the following ways: parking spaces per population; parking spaces per permits sold; and parking fees. UCSC is different in the proportion of spaces that are in parking lots (with construction costs of \$8,000 per space) to parking structures (construction cost of \$24,000), the latter representing only 9%. Other campuses are as high as 60% in structures. We might anticipate that we will go in the direction of other campuses and that the cost for building parking spaces will significantly increase in the future.

CFW member Onottum Narayan reported that, as of May 1st, the "A" permit for parking will cost faculty \$684 per year and, subject to labor negotiations, it will rise to \$756. Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) projects rate increases of 5% per year for the next several years. TAPS also projects that expenses will be greater than revenue. More parking spaces are slated to be lost to construction of the new humanities building. So, the situation is bad and will get worse.

According to the Master Plan for Higher Education, student parking is required to be self-supporting, but it is anticipated that faculty would be subsidized. This has not been the practice here or on other UC campuses. The goal today in presenting this resolution is not to change that practice, but to request that fees paid by parking users should only pay for parking related activities.

About one third of next year's parking revenues will be spent on expenses of replacing parking spaces that have been lost to construction of new buildings. Thus, about 20 percent of the parking budget can be viewed as hidden subsidies from a subset of employees, those who park on campus, to fund the construction of buildings. There are other items that are incorrectly included or excluded from the parking budget, but the financing of replacement parking is the single largest disputed item in the parking budget. Decisions about inclusions in the TAPS budget are policy decisions made at the EVC/Chancellor level, so it is appropriate that the Senate consult at this level.

Professor Shelly Errington gave background on parking issues in relation to the Santa Cruz Faculty Association (SCFA). It is the position of SCFA that parking fees should be user fees and should not be used to subsidize things which are not related to parking. As it stands now, nothing legally prevents those funds from use for non-parking related activities. SCFA has exhausted its legal procedures for keeping fees down. Hence the fees will increase for faculty. It is important that the administration work with the Senate faculty to develop policies that are equitable and rational.

Professor John Isbister inquired about policy decisions regarding development of alternate transportation, close-in parking, preservation of the land, sensitivity to environmental issues, and issues of the surrounding community. CFW Chair Crosby responded that the faculty representatives on TAC/TOC have been impressed that TAPS is doing everything it can to not only manage costs but also develop good solutions to bring people to campus. There are large policy issues that need to be addressed such as whether to discontinue close-in parking and rely on shuttle service. These are the types of issues for which the resolution requests faculty involvement.

Professor Lynda Goff expressed concern that faculty will negotiate for their own needs when staff should also be considered. CFW Chair Crosby explained that systemwide the Senate passed a set of parking principles which articulate that for any class of permit, everyone (whether staff or faculty) should pay the same price.

CFW member Narayan clarified that the resolution does not champion parking on campus in favor of alternate transportation. Also, all the calculations of fees done by CFW have been with the assumption that all users will pay the same rates.

The resolution passed without opposition by voice vote.

d.Committee on Planning and Budget: Oral Report

CPB Chair Bob Meister reported on the campus budget cutting process. In a previous report CPB demonstrated that over successive ten-year periods the campus has spent declining proportions of its discretionary state funds on instruction and research and growing proportions on administration and services. Last year, CPB was pleased to report that this trend has begun to reverse under the present administration. CPEVC Simpson is committed to increasing, rather than decreasing, our number and proportion of ladder faculty. He has brought in a management consultant team, AVCOR, to address the reasons why in the past campus costs have escalated in the areas that lie outside of our core academic mission and to consider ways in which such costs might be brought under better control. CPB has been included in this process. The recommendations of AVCOR will be presented to the administration in mid June. In addition to the process for identifying long-term opportunities for budget savings, there is a parallel process going on in which the deans and other unit heads have been asked to identify one time budget cuts. CPB has had preliminary conversations with the deans, but we do not know whether the one-time cuts that are now being planned will be reversible, and we don't know to what extent they might negatively affect the core academic mission of the campus.

AVCOR has identified extensive opportunities for savings in campus business practices. The magnitude of the savings that can be achieved through reorganizing business functions is very large. Many of the potential savings identified in the AVCOR/EBC process can be realized in the near term without compromising our core academic mission. Restructuring the business and academic administration on this campus also offers significant savings. CPB feels that the campus lacks adequate financial and performance data to evaluate the cost and benefits of various possible administrative reorganizations that are under consideration. The present approach to campus financial reporting focuses on source of funds rather than on the discretionary uses of funds that are made by campus managers. Funds that come to the campus through the agreed upon student-faculty ratio are denominated throughout the budget process as FTE. To develop discretionary funds, managers delay hiring, or do not hire. The result is an economy of carry-forwards. If a manager can successfully spend less than his or her annual budget and still get an annual increase, then we have a system that does not reward transparent reporting. Instead, we should consider financial reporting that allows the total non-academic costs on the campus to be better managed and thereby maximizes the state

funds available for instruction and research. AVCOR has started by taking some ordinary business functions outside of their budgetary silos, but the campus still needs to perform a budgetary analysis of these silos. In the opinion of CPB, this analysis should answer the following questions:

- What is the value added of the academic divisions? Assuming first that business functions are centralized, that divisions can no longer accumulate carry-forwards from unfilled staff FTE, and that faculty leave savings are transparent to both the central administration and departments, that is, assuming that the sources of decanal budgetary discretion became visible, the campus needs to ask whether the division is the right level for academic planning to occur.
- What is the function and value of the vice provost positions? This should be asked in light of the current divisional structure and if the campus moved to a different model, with fewer divisions.
- What are the sources of budgetary discretion in Student Affairs that might be used to advance the academic mission in a time of financial distress? Are there functions that either duplicate or substitute for functions that might best be performed on the academic side of campus?

Greater financial transparency is necessary in order to evaluate the various possible realizations that have emerged in the AVCOR/EBC budget process.

Last May, CPB criticized the divisional 10-year academic plans because they were largely written to compete for resources at the margin and failed to demonstrate how divisions planned to use resources in their base budget, as they were charged by the CP/EVC to do. At that time CPB could neither recommend in favor nor against most of the plans based on the financial information provided. We expected to see more comprehensive financial reporting at the time we reviewed each division's annual resource request. It became apparent to CPB this year that few of the divisions nor the central administration have financial reporting systems that are necessary to do this type of analysis. CPB believes that this budget cutting process may lead to desirable reforms on the campus. We hope it will also lead to more transparent measures of financial reporting which will assist Senate committees and the administration in decision making and planning.

e. Committee on the Library: Special Report on the University Librarian (AS/SCP/1383)

Committee on Library Chair Ben Crow reported on the retirement of Librarian Allan Dyson. Lan has made many contributions during his 24 years of service at UCSC, including an award-winning, world-class science and engineering library. He also fought hard for the proposed \$74 million proposed McHenry Library addition, which is due to start at the beginning of July. To Lans' credit, we have a library that is the smallest in the UC system, but it is arguably the most effective one. The Library has a great staff that is focused on services. The university faces the challenge of hiring a new librarian who will meet the challenges of dealing with a financial crisis, a new addition, and the opportunities of new technology. The report was accepted by acclamation.

Librarian Lan Dyson said the following quote from Mark Twain guided his membership in the Academic Senate. "It is by the goodness of God that in our country we have those three unspeakably precious things, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and the prudence never to practice either of them." Lan went on to say he was touched and flattered by the wonderful write up by his colleagues on the Committee on the Library.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair (none)

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

GSA President Emily Robinson reported on the rate increase to \$920 a month for graduate student housing. GSA sees this as a further erosion of benefits and services to graduate students. Another unfortunate development is that out of the 82 spaces provided for graduate housing, almost 10% are now being allocated to undergraduates.

Graduate students are concerned about the research implications and academic freedom issues resulting from the Patriot Act. They are also concerned about the welfare of grads, especially the vulnerability of international graduate students. GSA would like to see an official UCSC stance about the concerns regarding individuals impacted by the Patriot Act, both in academic and personal ways.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Chair Blumenthal adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.

ATTEST:

Dave Belanger
Secretary
August 15, 2003