

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division February 16, 2005

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 16, 2005 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Secretary Loisa Nygaard and Parliamentarian Steve Thorsett present, Chair Alison Galloway called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Galloway asked if there were any changes to the minutes of November 19, 2004. As there were no requests for changes, the minutes were accepted as written.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Galloway

The campus has survived a series of major transitions, and we are all looking forward to a period of stability. The Senate has been working very hard on the following issues: the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation process; the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); the UCSC campus climate; and several system-wide issues, notable among them proposed restrictions on funding sources for faculty research. The WASC visiting committee was impressed by the level of Senate involvement in the accreditation process and said that the campus's contribution to the second part of the process was exemplary.

Chair Galloway announced a reception taking place after the meeting to welcome Chancellor Denise Denton. She also announced the upcoming Faculty Research Lecture by Professor Mary Silver. In closing, Chair Galloway welcomed Professor Martin Chemers back to the faculty from his administrative duties as Dean and Acting Chancellor.

b) Chancellor Denton

Chancellor Denton stated how delighted she is to be UCSC's ninth chancellor. UCSC is a wonderful place, and she feels privileged and honored to join the campus. Originally from Texas, she received her undergraduate and graduate degrees from the Massachusetts Institution of Technology. She was a faculty member in electrical engineering and chemistry at the University of Wisconsin and became the director of a National Science Foundation (NSF) Center. She then moved on to the University of Washington as the Dean of Engineering. She was the director of NSF Advance Award, a relatively new program that focuses on advancing a diverse range of women faculty in science, math and engineering.

Chancellor Denton has met with Senate leadership, faculty, students, staff, donors, and alumni, and has learned a great deal about the campus. She pointed out four existing strengths of UCSC on which she hopes to help the campus build:

- An abiding commitment to diversity and excellence
- Evolving graduate programs
- The use of graduate growth to further enhance undergraduate education
- A propensity for inter-disciplinary work

UCSC is a younger campus than its peers. This is often seen as a disadvantage, but also brings huge advantages with it, such as greater nimbleness and adaptability as well as freedom from the ossification that can afflict older institutions. The Silicon Valley Center, for example, offers us seemingly limitless opportunities to take advantage of our flexibility.

Campus priorities that Chancellor Denton has identified from her various meetings on campus are:

- Expanding graduate education
- Continuing to provide leadership in bridging the gulf between the humanities, arts, and social sciences on the one hand and the physical sciences, life sciences and engineering on the other
- Building on our progressive traditions to expand educational opportunities for all

After conversations with various constituencies, the Chancellor has also identified several practical challenges confronting the campus, including:

- Providing affordable faculty housing
- Expanding the availability of childcare and developing more family-friendly work policies
- Collaborating effectively with local communities to ameliorate the impact of campus growth
- Keeping the door of opportunity open, especially for first-generation college students

The positive culture of the campus and the exceptional achievements of the faculty convinced Chancellor Denton to accept this position, and she is enthusiastic and eager to tackle the work ahead.

c) Interim Campus Provost/EVC Delaney

The campus has faced and accomplished a lot in the past 12 months, including: the Long Range Development Plan; budget reductions amounting to some \$25 million in permanent cuts; WASC accreditation; and changes in state and campus leadership. At the WASC exit meeting, Chair Duderstadt stressed the importance of UCSC as a pioneer institution and noted the challenges it faces in sustaining its uniqueness as it moves to increase graduate and research programs.

The draft Environmental Impact Report and draft LRDP are to be released for public and campus review in the fall of 2005. The goal is to have the LRDP and EIR ready for the Chancellor to take to the Regents in July 2006. The business and information technology transformation projects continue and should help position the campus for the future. The

campus is now focused on the next stage of academic planning and will need to develop an implementation plan that is aligned with available resources. Effective academic planning is an ongoing process that needs to occur at multiple levels within the institution. VPAA George Brown is coordinating this phase of the planning process and creating a timeline for an academic implementation plan that will establish the framework for resource distribution to the academic divisions through 2010.

Liam Welcher, student representative to the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), observed that despite growing enrollments, the Language Program is slated to be cut severely. He asked if the campus intends to make the Language Program a funding priority and if it is considering centralizing the funding for Languages. Interim CPEVC Delaney said that there has been no final decision about Language funding for next year. The Dean of Humanities, the Council of Deans, and the Committee on Planning and Budget are discussing how to address this issue and how to balance Language needs with other, competing campus priorities.

Mr. Welcher also asked about the status of University Extension (UNEX) and about Information Technology (IT) budget issues. CPEVC Delaney responded that UNEX has cut programs that were not financially sustainable and that a task force has been set up to plan for its future. On the question of IT, the Senate has been engaged in discussions with Vice Provost Larry Merkley about how the campus's needs can most efficiently be addressed.

Professor Ronnie Gruhn stated that faculty, retirees, and students all have a common interest in Chancellor Denton succeeding at UCSC. She remarked that there appears to be an increasing disconnect between the campus and the Office of the President (UCOP). UCOP management has become more like the management of corporations. They live in a different universe, with different salaries and perks and a different quality of life. They have lost touch with the reality of daily life on campus. Whereas in the mid-1980s a Chancellor would be paid roughly double the salary of a beginning full professor, Chancellors are now paid three to five times that salary. Staff cannot obtain housing in this community, where the median home price is \$750,000. They must commute long hours, pay seven to eight hundred dollars a year for a parking permit, and often do the job duties of two workers because of staffing cuts. Departments find it difficult to hire faculty because UCSC salaries are not competitive. UCOP's lives, incomes, and perceptions diverge from what occurs on an actual campus. Professor Gruhn encouraged Chancellor Denton to exercise her leverage at UCOP to bring a fuller awareness of the real working conditions of staff and faculty.

Chancellor Denton responded by stating that the question of the redistribution of wealth is part of a conversation that must continue and that UCSC is positioned to provide leadership in this arena. She directed any questions regarding her salary to the Office of the President. She also encouraged UCSC to use the term "partner hire" rather than spousal hire because it is more inclusive.

Professor Tyrus Miller mentioned the obstacles to graduate recruitment posed by the UC graduate fee structure and asked Chancellor Denton what measures she would pursue to help the campus recruit from a larger pool of national and international students. Because Chancellor Denton has only been on campus for three days, Interim CPEVC Delaney responded to this question. She stated that the most unacceptable part of the Governor's January budget was the large increase in graduate student fees. UC was successful in moderating that increase. President Dynes and Vice President Greenwood have also addressed this issue with the Regents. UCSC will never be able to fully fund graduate education with state monies and will need to look for other, external sources of funding. Chair Galloway added that the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly are bringing a resolution to the Legislature to support graduate education.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Galloway pulled the CPB report (AS/SCP/1450) from the consent calendar

b. Committee on Research 2003-04 (AS/SCP/1448)

The report was received without comment.

a. Committee on Planning and Budget 2003-04 (AS/SCP/1450)

The full text of Professor Meister's speech is attached as an appendix to these minutes. Professor Bob Meister, former Chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), explained that CPB's annual report takes the form of a unanimously approved document, plus additional comments by the Chair. He stated that under the Regent's Standing Orders, shared governance does not require that the administration act as the Senate recommends. Shared governance does, however, require that the administration consult with the Senate on all matters of planning and budget before it acts. CPB has a duty to regularly report to the Senate whether the administration has acted without consultation, or before consultation has been completed.

This report highlights two areas of concern: University Extension's cumulative debt, and the campus budget reduction strategies. University Extension is running a deficit of \$15 million, which undermines the campus's ability to take on additional debt to support its core missions. The discernable savings from the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) process are minimal, and the campus may never fully know the amount of savings because no accountability measures have been put in place. There was agreement between the Senate and the administration that the protection of teaching and research, the core missions of the campus, was vital and that more efficiencies in the delivery of IT and business services were necessary. But rather than being subject to greater management accountability, these services, according to Professor Meister, have in effect been largely sequestered from recent budget cuts.

The CPB report clearly states that no comprehensive academic plan was produced by the ten-year academic planning process. The lack of a plan did not deter the administration from going forward with a revised enrollment cap in the new LRDP based on academic

reasons. The CPB report calls for a different kind of planning that would link enrollments to budgetary conditions and to successful implementation of curricular conditions.

Professor Jerry Neu agreed that there is no academic plan and no measure of accountability for campus management, and he asked how the chancellor should proceed with the planning process. Professor Meister urged Chancellor Denton to read the CPB report and said the campus needs to look into redefining its planning and budgetary processes.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Faculty Welfare: Oral Report on Housing

CFW Chair Paul Ortiz and CFW member Ted Holman presented the report. CFW is working on the following issues: child care; housing; faculty salaries; and transportation.

Chair Ortiz thanked VC Jean Marie Scott and Housing Manager Steve Houser for meeting with CFW several times to discuss the Ranch View Terrace housing project.

There was a presentation by Professor Holman on Ranch View Terrace and faculty housing in which he asked the faculty to consider the following questions:

- How will faculty be able to afford these houses?
- Where will faculty who live both on and off campus find affordable child care that allows them to be productive faculty members?
- How can we work together to make Ranch View Terrace and subsequent housing policy and development on campus positive contributors to faculty recruitment, retention, and morale and, as Chancellor Denton so aptly puts it, to diversity, excellence, and vitality?

The two main issues in recruiting and retaining top quality faculty are the connected issues of salaries and housing. According to recent reports, UCSC faculty are clearly paid less than faculty at all other UC campuses. Further, we live in one of the most expensive areas in California.

There will be 78 units available to faculty at Ranch View Terrace. The estimated cost per square foot is \$225. The houses are approximately 1,780 square feet and will cost around \$400,000. The primary goal of faculty housing should be to recruit and retain high-quality faculty. The faculty and administration need to work together creatively to develop solutions to faculty housing problems. Some ideas include: encouraging all those eligible to apply for MOP loans; possibly instituting a campus-wide housing allotment program; possibly devising a sliding scale for Ranch View Terrace; possibly arranging for co-purchases of houses; and developing an incentive program to have faculty move out of cheaper campus units into the more expensive Ranch View Terrace.

Professor Brent Haddad brought up the question of the lag between UCSC faculty salaries and those at other UC campuses. He asked that the faculty consider where we put the stops on our own salaries. Are we too conservative in recommending merits and

accelerations? The Deans and the Committee on Academic Personnel also need to rethink their roles.

Professor Pamela Roby raised the question of the Governor's proposed changes to state employee retirement benefits. Committee representatives responded that the system-wide Faculty Welfare Committee is working with OP to do all it can to face up to this coming storm. This problem concerns staff as well as faculty.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Reuben Barnes-Levering, the Commissioner of Academic Affairs for the Student Union Assembly (SUA), addressed the Senate. He observed that the state is providing less and less funding per student per year. Our facilities are in ever greater demand. Each successive graduating high school class is larger than the last. In these times when we should be expanding our system's capabilities and gearing up for the future, our politicians are stuck in the present, treading water on social issues which urgently need to be addressed. Judging from the state's budget priorities, we'd rather our children go to jail than to school, and we'd rather have them go to war than to a university.

Mr. Barnes-Levering also spoke from personal experience about the difficulties caused by the underfunding of the Language Program. He has tried unsuccessfully to enroll in a Spanish language course in 6 out of the 8 quarters he has been at UCSC. This, he remarked, is a scandalous state of affairs in an era of globalization.

Other issues concerning UCSC undergraduates include: the lack of a tenured Asian American or Pacific Islander professor in the American Studies Department; the lack of student, faculty, and administrative diversity; the lack of an overall sense of community on campus; the need to preserve the campus environment; and fees, which have gone up 63% in the past 3 years. He also observed that the LRDP has many students upset because they feel that their input has been stifled. Other student concerns include: support for students with disabilities; UC corporate and nuclear connections; access to reproductive rights, including emergency contraception; the worsening Teaching Assistant to student ratio; lack of facilities; accountability for administrative decisions; the lack of student voice in administrative planning and decisions; declining money for student-initiated outreach; labor issues; worker and faculty pay; the declining funding of non-science fields; parking; housing; the need for better orientation of frosh and incoming transfer students; and the need for a more inter-disciplinary model for education. The majority of these issues cannot be solved at the UCSC level. Reuben urged the Senate to formulate a resolution against the budget cuts and against the systematic destruction of public education. He also urged the faculty to listen to the students and to build true dialogue around these issues.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

On behalf of UCSC graduate students, Kai Pommerenke welcomed Chancellor Denton to the campus and thanked Marty Chemers for his service as Acting Chancellor. Housing and health care costs continue to be the top two concerns for graduate students. The Graduate Student Association (GSA) conducted a survey of graduate student opinion

about a graduate college and services for graduate students. Affordable housing was the main issue, with students living off campus paying an average of 50% of their monthly income on housing and those students living on campus paying even more. The on-campus rents are well above market price, and graduate students currently occupy only 56 out of the 82 available units. Health insurance benefits have declined over the past two years, and the deductible has doubled. The GSA is asking faculty to support maintaining the level of benefits in order to guarantee an adequate level of health care and insurance coverage for graduate students.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare

Chancellor Denton stated that this meeting has been enlightening, educational, and enjoyable. She proceeded to speak several foreign languages, emphasizing the importance of bi- and multi-lingualism in the current world.

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:00 pm.

ATTEST:

Loisa Nygaard
Secretary
March 14, 2005

Appendix to Minutes of 2/16/05
CPB Annual Report – full text of Professor Meister’s speech
Wednesday, February 16, 2005

CPB's Annual Report takes the unusual form of a unanimous document plus an additional comment by me, as Chair.

The decision to label that comment as a "Minority View" was made by the Senate Leadership after the final version of the Report was submitted on behalf of the committee. Despite this label, I want to stress that I am proud of this committee and its work; that I fully concur with the report as submitted; and that my additional comments are probably not the views of a minority and are certainly shared by several other committee members, perhaps a substantial majority. Nevertheless, I chose to express them in my own voice for reasons that I will be happy to explain in response to questions if they are not clear from the Report itself.

Taken as a whole, this Annual Report is an exercise of shared governance in more than the usual way. Under the Regents' Standing Orders, shared governance does not require that the administration act as the Senate recommends. It does require, however, that the administration consult with the Senate on **all** matters of Planning and Budget before it acts.

This places a large responsibility on a Committee on Planning and Budget if shared governance is to be meaningful. In all matters of planning and budget, CPB has a duty to regularly report to the Senate:

- Whether the administration has acted without consulting, or before consultation was complete
- What advice CPB gave to the administration
- Whether the administration followed CPB's advice
- And, if not, what reason the administration gave CPB for declining to do so.

The unanimous report of last year's CPB is a brave effort to discharge this responsibility. The Committee reports, in sum, that in many (all-important) areas of academic planning, financial management, and long range planning—areas where we had previously given assurances that shared governance was working—the administration acted without CPB's advice and/or against CPB's advice, and in either case contrary to assurances about the outcome that CPB (as your representatives) had given you in our previous reports.

We report that, as a result of these administrative decisions, there will be little accountability for the effective management of millions of dollars that might otherwise be available annually to support the educational and research mission of the campus, including the expansion of graduate programs. This is a disturbing conclusion, and the Committee tried to report it with circumspection—partly, I believe, because of differences in the degree to which its individual members were in the confidence of the administration when decisions were made to avoid public accountability for campus management. Nevertheless, the CPB Annual Report is now out and available for you to read.

Before taking questions, let me highlight key areas of CPB's concern:

University Extension: In the past four years UNEX has amassed a cumulative deficit of \$15M by running job training programs in Silicon Valley that were never designed to make money, and that lost a lot after the bubble burst. Although UNEX's "negative carry-forward" is not charged against the reserves of any other unit, it limits the ability of the campus to run annual deficits in other areas that are more central to the core mission of Instruction and Research. CPB reports that this occurred without Senate consultation. My supplementary comment points out that the UNEX deficit is a continuing cost of the aborted Silicon Valley initiative, and that as of September 1, CPB had received no information that this problem was being addressed

Budget Reduction Strategies: CPB's recommendation last February regarding campus implementation of the state-wide budget cuts marked what we thought would be a major advance in shared governance. We there linked (for the first time) the protection of the teaching and research mission of the campus to administrative accountability for becoming more efficient in business areas where universities ought to be as well-run as other large organizations. And for the first time, we recommended considering these questions on an all-funds basis, including the use of carry-forwards for which there had been too-little previous accountability. The administration agreed in principle with our recommendation, and cut a lower percentage from academics than it did elsewhere. My comment adds the observation that the administration did not follow through in requiring accountability measures for campus management. Instead, areas where management inefficiencies had been identified were sequestered from cuts while they were under study, and were, then, not cut at all. The result of this sequestration for the campus academic mission was probably worse than if uniform across-the-board cuts had been imposed on all campus units, including those that were being reorganized under the EBC Process.

This brings us to the **EBC Process** itself. CPB reports that, after all the time, and effort that went into the EBC process, the known savings are minimal, and that, if any further savings occur, we will never know because no accountability measures are in place. The Report also makes clear that, after having been extensively consulted on all previous stages of the EBC process, CPB was not properly consulted on the administration's decision to let benchmarks of cost-efficiency drop out as a "driver" in campus reorganization (and to redefine as "efficient-for-the-campus" whatever the reorganization produced). The Committee concludes that we will never know whether the EBC process was worth what it cost in time and money. My comment both adds a narrative analysis of how this happened and speculates on what it means for campus management in the future. I will be happy to elaborate if you have questions, but I will confine myself here to the committee's stated conclusions, which effectively close the book on CPB's earlier assurances to the Senate that the EBC Process was real.

Finally, I come to the subject of **campus planning**. CPB's Report makes clear that there was no academic plan produced by our last 10-year planning process, but that this did not deter the administration from going forward with a proposal for growth based on ostensible academic reasons. It goes on to suggest that the real academic reason for a reflexive commitment to growth is that, unlike mature institutions, we have never learned how to recycle and redeploy existing resources to become better—we, thus, believe that all improvement depends on new enrollments and that no improvement is possible at steady-state. To repeat, however, *there is no academic plan* in the relevant sense of stating the conditions under which new enrollments *will* make the campus better. Such a plan would prioritize our programmatic goals, and set the *conditions* linking plans to budgets. Without it, higher enrollments make us *prima facie* poorer on a per student basis, and hence defer, rather than advance, the achievement of our goals. My additional comment, underscores the need for this *different kind* of planning before further growth occurs.

It also reveals that the present urgency in moving forward with a new LRDP is to accommodate the 2500 undergraduate students that we once expected to put in the Silicon Valley Center by about now. UC Office of the President was assured five years ago that the SVC could accommodate UCSC enrollments up to 17,500 without a new LRDP, and this assurance was not withdrawn when the undergraduate component of the SVC was effectively dropped in Spring 2001. It is only in the last few months, however, that we have begun academic planning to accommodate the extra 2500 students *here*. Even though the campus administration no longer claims that the necessary academic planning has occurred, it is still rushing through an increase in our present enrollment cap rather than acknowledging the consequences of what happened—and didn't happen—in Silicon Valley.

I will be happy to take your questions.