

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division May 20, 2005

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 20, 2005 at the Colleges Nine & Ten Multipurpose Room at the University Center. With Secretary Loisa Nygaard 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 additional changes, other than those submitted in writing, to the minutes of February 16, 2005. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Galloway

The campus's investment in the Senate as an institution has increased over the past two years, both in the form of increased funding from the administration and increased time and effort on the part of the faculty who serve on Senate committees. So we could ask one very important question: Are we worth it? The short answer is yes. The Senate engaged in monumental efforts in the fall to deal with the draft Long Range Development Plan, the Environmental Impact Report, and the draft essays for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation process. The results have often been impressive. The report of the WASC visiting committee was almost glowing. To look at activities of just one Senate committee: the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid has worked with Student Affairs over the past few years to refocus the admissions package on the academic excellence of the campus. They have also established criteria for comprehensive review, explained changes in the SAT testing strategy, and are now taking on the very difficult question of National Merit scholarships. The Senate has also brought the campus financial benefits. Within days of the UCSC Senate passing a resolution on the library addressing the high subscription rates charged by Elsevier, the UC system successfully negotiated a new deal that saved the university millions. Many of our committees have or are planning to undertake studies and projects of the sort often delegated to consultants. Considering what we pay for consultants, the advice and experience offered by Senate faculty are a bargain. Chair Galloway thanked both the administration and her fellow senators for their investments during her term as the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Professor Sandra Faber introduced the following resolution which was approved by acclamation.

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate would like to express its deep gratitude to Professor Alison Galloway for outstanding leadership to the Division for the past two years. As Chair of the Division, she has shown intelligence and perseverance in her activities and significantly improved shared governance on this campus. She has

provided the campus with consistent leadership in an environment of rapidly changing administrations with stamina, wisdom and wit. For this service, the Senate thanks Professor Galloway.

b) Chancellor Denton

Chancellor Denton thanked Chair Galloway for all her great work and the leadership she has provided. The chancellor then gave a summary of her own recent activities, her impressions of the campus, and some of her emerging priorities. Since February, she has met with community leaders, news media, editorial boards, alumni and donors, K-12 and CSU representatives, elected officials, and corporate partners. She has also met with faculty, students, and several Senate committees. She is even more impressed than she was at her arrival with the quality of scholarship here, the outstanding teaching and research programs, the interdisciplinary efforts and successes, and the enthusiasm and commitment of students, staff and faculty. One priority that emerged from her meetings is enhancing academic excellence and diversity. Secondly, there is a need to analyze staff and faculty salary structures for equity and competitiveness with respect to the marketplace. Thirdly, we need to enhance the reputation of UCSC regionally, nationally, and internationally. A fourth set of priorities includes infrastructure and policy issues such as affordable housing, staff human resource infrastructure, and partner-hire issues.

These priorities lead to the following proposed actions. An initiative will be launched to review diversity on campus to get a baseline on where we are and what we need to do to enhance diversity. This effort will yield preliminary analysis in the fall and recommendations for action in 2005-06. With respect to academic excellence, she and CP/EVC Kliger support the process developed by the Senate to identify academic initiatives for new professional schools and programs that will build on existing strengths and reach across divisional lines. The request for proposals will be distributed shortly, with preliminary proposals due on October 1, 2005. In order to build our campus reputation, we will work to ensure that faculty are nominated for national and international recognition. We will continue to promote campus achievements through a variety of mechanisms, including working with national media outlets. We will also be improving our UCSC web presence, as this is an increasingly important communication vehicle.

The Chancellor has been consulting with the Senate leadership to develop plans for an ad hoc committee to develop a partner-hire policy. This committee would include Senate leaders, deans, and department chairs. The goal is to have a policy in place in time for 2005-06 recruitments. Affordable housing for faculty and staff is of critical importance for the future health of the campus. Chancellor Denton has asked staff to develop a set of recommendations regarding the strategic use of several programs, such as MOP loans, offered either by the campus or by the Office of the President. Further, a set of recommendations will be developed by October 1, 2005 on how the campus can proceed with future projects for building more housing for faculty and staff. These recommendations will include both on-campus and off-campus options. Another important challenge is how to provide sufficient child-care for students, staff and faculty on campus.

Finally, with respect to staff human resources, the Chancellor has heard that recruitment and reclassification processes can be painfully slow and can obstruct productivity. The business transformation process that is going forward will focus on recruitment management and will attempt to streamline recruitment and increase the diversity of the applicant pools. The Vice Chancellor is putting together a campus task group to look at classification and reclassification processes. The Chancellor hopes that changes in both these areas will improve the ability of staff to do their jobs.

In the ongoing campus academic planning process, it is time to move from the planning to the implementation stage. Interim CP/EVC Dave Kliger is working with the deans to develop a campus plan. In addition, the campus will be looking into private funding and philanthropy to meet the established goals and priorities. Chancellor Denton is pleased to report that the Cornerstone Campaign, which set an original goal of fifty million dollars, has raised sixty-five million, and she thanks the faculty, the deans, and the staff in University Relations who made this success possible.

For the first time in several years, we will not be subject to budget cuts from the state. Next year's budget should allow UCSC to fund increased faculty salaries by 3.28%. The Chancellor will advocate for even further funding to increase the competitiveness of campus salaries. The governor's revised budget did not restore funding for academic preparation programs, but UC is working with the legislature to restore that funding in the final budget.

The new budget will also accommodate an additional 250 to 300 new students on campus. For the second consecutive year, UCSC has been selective in admissions, turning away large numbers of UC-eligible students. Student quality and diversity both increased, with 44.4% of the incoming freshman class coming from underrepresented groups, including Asian American students. Specifically, there has been a 14.5% increase in Chicano students and a 23.1% increase in Latino students. Chancellor Denton thanked everyone, especially the Student Initiative Outreach Program participants, for their great work with respect to diversifying the campus.

Chancellor Denton stated that it will take time to address the important issues facing this campus and asked for everyone's patience. If students, staff, and faculty work together with the administration, this campus can move in a positive direction. Given the pressing priorities outlined above, Chancellor Denton announced she will forgo the traditional and costly formal inauguration process and will instead focus resources on scholarly symposia and fundraising for student scholarships and fellowships.

c) Interim Campus Provost/EVC Kliger

Since this is the first time that Interim CP/EVC Kliger has had the opportunity to address the Senate in his new capacity, he began by describing his approach to the job and what his focus will be in the near future.

The university is here to produce research, to create new knowledge, to deliver teaching, to disseminate knowledge, and to contribute service to society. The goal of the

administration and of the Academic Senate is to facilitate those functions. One of his priorities is to finish the business transformation processes so that he can concentrate on the academic mission of the campus. His desire is to direct as many resources as possible to fulfilling the academic mission. To be honest, he does not know yet how to accomplish this. Once he has a clearer understanding of the budget, he will have a better sense of how to move the campus ahead. It is obvious that there is a huge disparity between the needs and wants of all the different units on campus and the resources we have to fill them. CP/EVC Kliger wants to phase in the transformation in a way that will allow him to continue to fund the academic divisions on campus and to ease the stress that will result from change. The consolidations touch all of us, but affect most strongly departmental staff and service center staff. He would like to find a way to minimize the stress that has been placed on them.

The immediate question is resource allocation for next year. As a first step, we will look at the new resources that have come to campus in the past year and decide how to allocate them to the different divisions. However, there will not be nearly enough new resources to meet the needs of the campus. Phase two of the budget process will involve looking at the base budget and realigning it with campus priorities. This will be a challenging undertaking.

Interim CP/EVC Kliger will also be looking at the academic planning process. After engaging in four years of academic planning, each of the divisions now has an academic plan. Yet at this time we still have no overall campus academic plan. To produce one, we have to go through several steps. First, we must work to establish the appropriate size for each of the academic divisions as the campus grows to its full potential. Once these numbers have been established, we will know how to reconcile the divisional plans with the expected resources. The next step will be to look at the academic plans together and to integrate them to avoid duplication of effort. The goal will be to create programs within the divisions that are synergistic so that the overall campus plan is more than just a sum of its parts. He anticipates discussing a draft plan with the Senate in the fall quarter.

The staffing in the Chancellor's and EVC's office is being reviewed, as is the academic administrative structure. The aim is to align those resources so that the administration can provide the best support for the academic mission of the campus. The administration is also looking at the academic information system and the graduate admission system that faculty are probably all more familiar with than they want to be. The implementation of these systems has created some challenges and a lot of frustration. We are working to improve them so that as soon as possible the campus will get systems that meet its needs and actually represent an improvement over the old systems.

Over the last few years, there has been a lot of discussion and planning about programs in the Silicon Valley. VCR Miller established a university-affiliated research center that has been extremely successful at bringing new resources to the campus. UCSC is now investigating new opportunities for both research and academic programs in the Silicon Valley Center. The Academic Senate will be distributing a request for proposals for new

professional programs, and faculty are urged to think particularly about programs that might fit into the campus's activities in Silicon Valley.

Interim CP/EVC Kliger is optimistic that the administration and the Academic Senate will continue to collaborate effectively to enhance the academic excellence at UCSC, and he looks forward to working with faculty to accomplish campus goals.

Saurabh Mishra, student representative for Merrill College, asked if the Chancellor would match funds if the referendum on Measure 16 passes. Chancellor Denton stated she has been working with the Student Union Assembly (SUA) and the Graduate Student Association (GSA) since she arrived on campus. She is not in a position to negotiate matching funds at this time. She is willing to look at resource needs after the election is over.

Dan Healy, the undergraduate representative on the Committee on Academic Freedom, asked Chancellor Denton to address the issue of affordable housing for students. Chancellor Denton said she has been working with the GSA on graduate student housing issues and has also been working with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs about undergraduate housing. An analysis of the housing situation will be done this summer that will look at housing costs for students, staff and faculty.

Edris Rodriguez, student representative on the Committee on Education Abroad Program, asked the chancellor to comment on the many complaints that have arisen about the ongoing student elections. Chancellor Denton stated that after the election was over she would be happy to meet with officials from the SUA, GSA, and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to review the election process.

3. Reports of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1453)

The report was received without comment.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections 2003-04 (AS/SCP/1450)

In light of the fact that there is as yet no RJ&E report for 2004-05, Professor Joel Yellin asked for a verbal summary of what the committee has been working on this year. He asked particularly about the issue of counting abstentions in academic personnel actions, recording them in a personnel file, contrary to the normal rules, and then effectively penalizing the faculty member involved. He pointed out this issue has been raised before, but there has been no satisfactory response. The report was tabled because there was no representative from the Rules Committee present.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy

**a. Review of Quantitative General Education requirement-Interim Report
(AS/SCP/1457)**

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair Richard Hughey presented the report and stated that the committee has completed reviewing two-thirds of the Q courses and hopes to finish the remainder during fall quarter. Professor John Faulkner expressed the hope that CEP will be able to clear up inconsistencies among various campus formulations of the Q requirement. Professor Joel Yellin pointed out that much of the heat in the discussion of the Q requirement comes from the fact that many faculty members believe that enrollments in lower division courses influence the allocation of faculty FTE. Years ago, when he was Dean, EVC Kliger correctly pointed out that it is unwise to allocate 20 or 30-year resources on the basis of short-term enrollment trends. Professor Yellin suggested that now is the time for our new administration to publicly make clear that this is not our policy, and that FTE allocation will be made primarily on the basis of the intellectual quality of programs.

Professor Quentin Williams said there are issues that transcend in importance the Q requirement, such as UCSC having the second lowest six-year completion rate among undergraduates in the UC system. He expressed his concern that CEP is focusing on a micro-issue, a single requirement, at the expense of the macro issues that confront our undergraduate enterprise. Professor Quentin made a motion and, after friendly amendments were proposed and accepted, the motion read as follows:

The Academic Senate requests that the 2005-06 CEP, in consultation with CPB and CAFA, seek to determine (1) the principal causes that prevent students from completing their degrees at UCSC and (2) whether there are policy changes that could be instituted, without negatively impacting the quality of undergraduate education, which could increase the graduation rate at UCSC. CEP is requested to report on their results at the final meeting of the Academic Senate in the 2005-06 academic year.

In discussion of the motion, Professor Greta Gibson suggested that CEP study the data on non-completion to see if there are any patterns related to ethnicity, race, social class, or gender. COC Chair Carol Freeman stated that this is a huge issue that concerns the entire campus and should involve CAFA and CPB as well as CEP. She also noted that it is a specific part of the charge of CEP that it oversee campus general education requirements, such as the Q. Chair Hughey commented that CEP is already addressing certain aspects of campus graduation rates in collaboration with the Dean of Undergraduate Education and in particular has been working on new standards to monitor academic progress so that students can be advised early in the process before they become seventh- or eighth- or tenth-year students.

After discussion, the motion was passed by voice vote.

**b. Amendment to Appendix C, Undergraduate Student Grievance Procedure
(As/SCP/1456)**

CEP Chair Richard Hughey presented a revised amendment. After a friendly amendment was proposed and accepted, the resolution passed without opposition by voice vote. In its final form, it reads as follows:

Appendix C

Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure

I. A grievance may be filed if the student believes that the instructor has given a course grade or evaluation of the student's work by criteria that were not clearly and directly related to the student's performance in the course for which the grade or evaluation was assigned, as by the use of:

- A. Non-academic criteria such as ethnicity, political views, religion, age, sex, financial status or national origin;
- B. Capricious or arbitrary application of academic criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements.

II. A grievance must be initiated within the time limits specified in Part III of this Regulation.

III. Resolution of a grievance should follow these steps in this sequence:

A. A student who has a grievance concerning an evaluation or grade should first approach the instructor to see if the issue can be resolved. The initial contact must take place within one regular academic quarter from the issuance of the grade or evaluation.

B. If the matter is not resolved, the student should submit the grievance and documentation in writing to the executive officer of the academic sponsoring unit (department chair or college provost). The executive officer should attempt to facilitate a consensual resolution of the grievance between the student and the instructor.

C. If the grievance is not resolved by steps A and B, the student may appeal to the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee. A formal appeal must be filed within one calendar year of the date on which the disputed grade or evaluation was made part of the student's permanent record by the Registrar.

D. The Academic Assessment Grievance Committee will review the grievance and consult with the appropriate chair(s). If the Committee finds there is substantial evidence that the grievance has merit, it will hold a hearing at which the student and instructor can present evidence.

E. After the hearing, the Academic Assessment Committee shall attempt to facilitate a consensual resolution of the grievance with the student and the instructor. If no resolution is reached, the Committee will vote on a decision and report the matter to the Committee on Educational Policy for implementation.

The decision may include: 1) no change, 2) removal of course from transcript, 3) removal of evaluation from transcript, or 4) change of grade to Pass, No Pass, or Withdraw. In the case of option 4, if the course was originally taken for a letter grade, the change to a Pass will not affect the student's ability to graduate under letter grade requirements. The Committee's vote is final. A faculty member may request his or her name be removed from the course in the official transcript.

These procedures are designed solely to determine whether non-academic criteria or the capricious or arbitrary application of academic criteria have been used in assigning a grade, and if so to effect a change of that grade.

No punitive actions may be taken against the instructor on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of charges nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become a part of the personnel file of the instructor. The use of non-academic criteria in assigning a grade is a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Sanctions against an instructor for violation of the Faculty Code may be sought by filing a complaint in accordance with CAPP 002.015. A complaint may be filed by the student or by others.

No punitive actions may be taken against the complainant on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of charges nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become a part of the complainant's file. The instructor may, if he or she feels that his or her record has been impugned by false or unfounded charges, file charges against the complainant through the office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

b. Committee on Committees

a. Amendment to CEP Bylaw 13.17.8 (AS/SCP/1459)

Three friendly amendments were proposed from the floor, two of which were accepted and one rejected by COC Chair Carol Freeman. As there was no further discussion, the amendment was submitted to a voice vote and passed without opposition. The final amendment reads as follows:

13.17.8

The Committee oversees the grading and Narrative Evaluation System (NES) including all matters pertaining to the faculty's participation in the NES. The Committee periodically shall review the status of the NES and recommend appropriate changes to the Santa Cruz Division. The Committee shall explain and answer questions concerning grading and evaluations, and instruct the Registrar's Office about Committee interpretations of Academic Senate policies. The Committee on Committees, in accordance with Appendix C of these Bylaws and Regulations, and with the guidance of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), shall select an Academic Assessment Grievance Committee, comprised of three Senate members and one non-voting undergraduate student representative. CEP receives the reports of the Committee.

b. Nominations 2004-05 (AS/SCP/1458)

The nominations were approved without opposition by voice vote.

c. Committee on Education Abroad Program

a. Catalog Statement on International Education (AS/SCP/1454)

CEAP Chair Peter Young presented the mission statement for approval. If approved by the Senate, the statement will appear in the next issue of the UCSC catalog. The motivation for submitting this request is to recognize the value of learning about other countries and cultures, especially in the present rather tense world situation. Professor Mary-Kay Gamel proposed making explicit the desirability of studying a language other than English. This change was accepted as a friendly amendment, and the following mission statement approved by voice vote without opposition:

In our global age, understanding other countries and cultures is essential. The University of California Santa Cruz believes students should effectively prepare themselves for global citizenship through their on-campus coursework, through study of a second language, through interaction with foreign students, and through travel and study abroad. A course of study in a foreign country can also prepare students for a career which transcends national and cultural boundaries.

To encourage students to study abroad, the University of California Education Abroad Program provides a wide choice of programs in many countries. UC Santa Cruz also encourages students from other countries to enroll here through the Education Abroad Program and other international study options.

d. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (As/SCP/1452)

Chair Sandy Faber presented the report and the nomination of Professor Nathaniel Mackey of the Literature Department as the 2005-06 Faculty Research Lecturer, describing him as a creative writer and scholar of extraordinary breadth and distinction. His work has garnered numerous awards and honors, among them election in 2001 to the Board of Chancellors of the Academy of American Poets. Professor Mackey's nomination was approved by acclamation.

e. Committee on Faculty Welfare

a. Oral Report on Housing

CFW Chair Paul Ortiz invited committee member Ted Holman to join him on the podium, since he has been doing extensive work on the issues of housing and salaries. Chair Ortiz also thanked Senate Chair Galloway and previous Senate Chair George Blumenthal for their support and guidance. In email correspondence, Chair Ortiz notified Chancellor Denton of the Ranch View Terrace housing crisis precipitated by the fact that the proposed pricing scale is out of the reach of most faculty. Chancellor Denton immediately responded and has facilitated meetings with various administrators to

address the issue. CFW supports the Senate Executive Committee's housing resolution which is to be presented today. He encouraged faculty to read the April 23, 2003 UCSC Special Advisory Committee Report as it contains several good ideas that are worth revisiting. One of the solutions proposed in the earlier report is to increase UCSC salaries to be competitive across UC campuses in relation to housing costs. He cited a statistic from the latest issue of the American Association of University Professors newsletter that nationwide, there has been an average real increase in faculty wages of 4.5%. We have certainly seen nothing like this in the UC system, where salaries have remained stagnant. Another recommendation in the 2003 report is that the campus needs to provide competitive, not merely adequate, housing for faculty. Long-term faculty recruitment and retention requires that we offer faculty a quality of life equivalent to that available to them in other areas in the country. If we don't deal with the salary issue, the housing issue becomes more acute. Solutions also need to be found to the problem of affordable child-care if we are to improve faculty morale, retention and recruitment. CFW has noted the positive change in administrative attitudes about housing. We need start to "Thinking at the Edge" not only in our research, but also in our attempts to resolve faculty welfare issues.

f. Senate Executive Committee

a. Resolution on Faculty Housing and Campus Growth (AS/SCP/1462)

Speaking on the resolution:

Bill Friedland	Diana Gifford-Gonzalez
Charles Hedrick	Ted Holman
Faye Crosby	

The administration has primary control over the material resources of the university, and housing needs have been put aside by this campus for the past twenty years. A particular problem is that we are pursuing a new Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) when a number of the issues raised in the 1988 LRDP have not yet been resolved. One result is that people in the community are organizing to challenge the new LRDP's projected growth target of 21,000 students.

Proposals were made from the floor that the resolution be amended to include both staff and students as well as faculty. It was also suggested that the resolution should require that the housing be both sufficient and affordable and that at least 50% of it be geared to the salaries of assistant professors. The suggestion was made that the LRDP process be stopped until the mitigations that were put forward in the 1988 LRDP are accomplished. Chair Galloway accepted as a friendly amendment the proposal to include students and staff in the resolution. Professor Emeritus Bill Friedland made a two-part motion to amend the original motion, the first part requiring that at least 50% of new housing be priced to suit the salaries of assistant professors (later specified at the Assistant Professor II level), and the second part that the new LRDP plan be stopped until the 1988 LRDP mitigation is resolved. The Senate proceeded to discussion of these amendments.

The University of California is facing a crisis of profound proportions, and the university administration needs to meet with and communicate the seriousness of the situation to state representatives. We are becoming some sort of horrible permutation of an Ivy League school, where assistant professors come for four or five years and then leave in state of economic despair. We will not be able to maintain the quality of education that students and families expect if this crisis isn't resolved. When the baby-boom generation starts retiring, which will happen shortly, it will be difficult to recruit highly qualified young faculty to take their place.

The university needs to have more realistic notion of what people can and will pay for housing. We do not have the endowments to build 2,000-square-foot homes at an affordable price for faculty, and maybe it is time to start considering apartment models instead of single-family homes. Putting up \$500,000 homes does not help the people that we actually have here, junior faculty and staff. The Rancho Vista project could become a debacle, especially if interest rates go up.

The recommendation that 50% of new housing be scaled to the salary of an assistant professor is problematic, the reason being that when the university offered small but affordable housing in Hagar Court, a significant number of faculty on the waiting list turned down the option of buying there. Secondly, this is a grave crisis, and a resolution that is overly specific and sets too many conditions could impede our successfully resolving it.

Coupling the housing crisis with the LRDP is unwise. Many senators are probably unaware of what exactly the unresolved mitigations from the 1988 LRDP entail and would be voting in ignorance.

The proposed amendment to the original motion to include the requirement that a minimum of 50% of new housing units be priced for the salary status of an Assistant Professor, Step 2 failed by a show of hands. The second proposed change, recommending that the LRDP be stopped until 1988 LRDP mitigations have been resolved, was voted down by voice vote.

The Senate then returned to the original motion, which passed by voice vote without opposition.

Resolution on Faculty Housing and Campus Growth (AS/SCP/1462)

WHEREAS our ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty and staff depends, in part, on their ability to obtain adequate and affordable housing, and

WHEREAS the cost of housing in the Santa Cruz area has risen dramatically over the last decade, and

WHEREAS the campus cannot support an increase in the student population without a corresponding increase in the number of faculty,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, if UCSC plans to grow beyond 15,000 students, then it must offer plans for sufficient and affordable faculty, student and staff housing. The Senate calls on the administration to provide plans by October 1, 2005.

b. Report on Senate Tent University and Restructuring Emergency Response Procedures (AS/SCP/1461)

For this motion, Senate Chair Allison Galloway turned the podium over to Vice Chair Faye Crosby so that she herself could report on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee.

A task force will be established with the charge to understand the events that took place around Tent University and to make recommendations about changes in emergency response procedures for the future. The task force will include three senate faculty members, one non-senate teaching faculty, one administrator, two undergraduate students, one graduate student, and one staff member. There will also be an advisor who is the ombudsman for the university and a staff person. In order to be as impartial and neutral as possible, the task force will be made up of people who had nothing to do with the events of Tent University.

SEC Chair Alison Galloway clarified that this was merely a report and did not require Senate action. Senator Shelley Errington then asked what exactly the word “impartial” meant in the resolution, and what it meant that those involved with the events surrounding Tent University would be excluded. Would that mean that the large number of faculty who had signed a petition about Tent University would be considered ineligible for serving on the task force? Chair Galloway said that, rumors to the contrary, such faculty would not be excluded from consideration for membership.

g. Committee on Library

a. Resolution on Scholarly Publishing (AS/SCP/1460)

COL Chair Ben Crow stated that the resolution focuses on two important areas. Scholarly Publishing is going through enormous changes that in the long term could benefit research, teaching and connections to the community. In the short term, however, we are facing a crisis in scholarly publishing. Library budgets have been under great pressure for several years due to the pricing policies of commercial journal publishers. Universities are paying more for a declining portion of scholarly knowledge. Many UC campuses and other universities are discussing this issue and many have passed resolutions. UCSC can be at the leading edge of higher education across the world, and these four resolutions are an attempt to push forward the general principles and to establish directions for change.

Some minor changes were proposed from the floor and accepted as friendly amendments. The final resolution reads as follows:

We resolve the following:

1. Prices for online access to journals. The UCSC Senate proposes the following principle be conveyed to UC negotiators to use in their negotiations with journal publishers. Where publishers submit systemwide contracts for access to online content with prices which exceed the consumer price index by more than 1.5% in any one year averaged over five years, then that contract should be referred to the Committee on the Library of the UC Academic Senate (UCOL) for comment.

2. Academic promotion and the evaluation of scholarly work. We propose that the UCSC Senate establish a task force including former chairs of CAP to explore ways to meet the challenge of academic evaluation in an era when publication and performance possibilities are changing.

3. We assert a collective right to make our work widely available. We propose that the UCSC Academic Senate, in collaboration with the UC Academic Senate and the UC Administration, take urgent steps to explore the restructuring of the University's copyright policy to assert a collective right, under the direction of individual faculty, to distribute faculty work for research and teaching.

4. University stewardship of all forms of publishing. We propose the UCSC administration explore the establishment of an Office of Scholarly Communication or similar administrative unit to take responsibility for the persistent stewardship of all forms of scholarly communication.

Items #1, #2, and #3 passed by voice vote, and Item #4 passed by a show of hands.

h. Committee on Planning and Budget

a. Report on the Long Range Development Plan (AS/SCP/1451)

The report was received without comment.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Reuben Barnes-Levering, Chair of the Student Union Assembly (SUA), addressed the Senate and submitted to the Secretary the full text of his speech, which follows.

So, once again, I'm not going to come in here and pretend like everything is all good with this university because it's not.

There are serious issues that are compounding by the day. I'm going to mention some surface problems and some deep-rooted issues which I, and other students and faculty that I have spoken with, believe to be at the core of these problems.

Housing costs remain a huge issue for students, workers and faculty, especially non-tenured faculty and lecturers. I know that we continue to build on-campus housing and faculty housing, but the costs of living in these developments make them almost a moot

point for a majority of potential residents. While sitting on the panel in the town hall meeting between the city council and our administration I posed the question, 'do you have any long-term strategies for affordable housing growth?' No one from either the University or the city was able to answer me. This is a huge problem.

There continue to be issues with a lack of student input into the LRDP plan. I would like to single out Matt Waxman as being wonderfully committed to doing his best to see this process through. It's not my intention to demand a process that is 100% transparent or democratic. We have obviously moved beyond that possibility. However, I would like to say that the level of student input currently incorporated is not sufficient, and that is reflected in the mediocre-at-best reception of the plan by the campus community and the overall Santa Cruz community.

Diversity. This term is thrown around like candy. When I look around this room I do not see diversity at level equivalent or comparable to that of our student population. When I look at the statistics of our student population I do not see diversity on a level comparable to that of my age statistic in the State of California. The gender and ethnicity inequalities continued to be a huge problem in every population except our low-income workers, and that is not just. When, in my faculty meetings, I can glance around the room and see not one person with a darker shade of skin than my own it hurts deeply. I do not want to be another white male adding to the inequity, but I cannot control who I am, just as you all are not responsible for who you are. However, on a larger level, this University *is* responsible for the lower rate at which women faculty are promoted. We are responsible for the fact that we are the *richest* and *whitest* UC in the system – and please believe that class has just as much, if not more, to do with the diversity issues at this school than does race. This institution *is* responsible for the fact that a significant majority of it's high-level administrators are white. And this statewide system is responsible to step up to the plate to ensure that our K-12 systems are preparing low-income students and students of color to enter our Universities.

When I glance around our school's programs to see what efforts are being made to address these inequalities, I see students at the forefront. The E2 outreach and retention center, along with other activists and organizers statewide have been on the front lines of the battle to save our funding for outreach to K-12 schools with underrepresented student populations. Without this pressure we would no longer have a budget to do this work today. We need to recognize this and congratulate them (and all of the others who do hard work within the admissions office, for it is not only students), but as an institution we are failing.

There are two concrete things that I, as a student representing other students, need to see happen. Number one is a working definition of diversity, what it means in terms of race, class, gender, geographic location, and other variables. – Does diversity mean a University population representative of that of our State? Does it mean minimum percentages? What does Diversity really mean?

Two, we need to set goals for ourselves to which the student body and others can hold the administration and Regents accountable. I personally would call for a ban on the word diversity as a principle until it has been *proven* through concrete actions that we actually have a commitment to it. The word is used so much without substance that it has lost its meaning. I am definitely not the only one who feels this way, but unfortunately I am one of the only people given the forum to express this.

Ok, Academic Programs... I would really like to lower the intensity of this speech at this time, but I'm afraid I can't. There are so few forums in which students can represent their frustrations, that I have to try to relate these perspectives as well as possible. We, as students, have not seen any concrete steps taken to ensure that we retain our language programs. I don't know how much more we can do to show that there *is* a demand and support for these programs to continue to exist. I would like to think that our administration takes notice when hundreds of students come out on their free time to support a program, and thousands more express their support (side note: I personally have not met one student who is not in support of these programs), but it just doesn't appear that way from our school's actions. There are still students upset over the elimination of the Journalism department, as witnessed by the fact that the issue continues to be brought up on various student demand lists such as the one created by Tent U. As well, we need to ensure that we hire a tenured Asian-American Studies professor, and address other student issues in expanding and solidifying the American Studies department.

The fact that this department houses the specific study of almost every other ethnicity besides Latinos (which has its own department) only reinforces the fact that nearly every other department in this University is, by default, a 'white studies department', meaning that it represents the world from a distinctly western, European, and colonial perspective. This comment is only directed to open eyes as to what our students understand. We recognize that this is inherent not only in this University, but in almost every other University across the western world (and many in the non-western world as well). However, we cannot begin to tackle these problems unless we recognize them.

For example, I am in a Contemporary Sociological Theory class this quarter. It does not seem very contemporary *or* sociological to study *all-white* authors, with very few feminist perspectives, with the most contemporary reading to this point being from the 1940s. The course's readings entirely build off of 'classic sociology,' which originates in Europe, ignoring the fact that much of contemporary sociology works to deconstruct these mono-cultural and mono-contextual views of the world and society. The world in which I live is very multicultural, although our nation's institutions, this University included, continue to be dominated by a western, white, male-oriented perspective – a.k.a. the perspective that needs no clarification in its title, such as the words feminist, or ethnic. I'm not saying that we can change the world's institutions, but if we really are an institution dedicated to 'Thinking at the Edge', and re-envisioning society through thought and research, we need to examine the fundamental context in which all of this thinking and research operates.

Nearly every one of our departments needs more TA resources. This is no secret. We need to work on this. Students need more one-on-one support, and online tutorials just do not cut it.

Stop raising student fees. There is a reason why our retention rates of low-income students and students of color (who have a higher chance of being low-income, as well as alienated by the school's lack of diversity) are so low compared to upper middle class and white or Asian-American students. Financial aid is being decreased by the year, loan rates are increasing, students are forced into a lifetime of debt which most people in this room probably know nothing about. Imagine graduating college and already having a debt equivalent to mortgage on a small home – but having no home to show for it.

The financial situation facing our students today, point blank, is nothing like the financial situation facing anyone in this room when they graduated college. It is nothing like the financial situation facing students who graduated 6, 5, or even 2 years ago. If you are not actively working to change or speak out against this situation, you silently comply. And yes, I am calling out every individual in this room. Take a stand for your students and yourselves. I would like to imagine that you all care that the student population you are responsible for educating is not solely comprised of upper middle or upper class, light-skinned students. That when you assign a large amount of homework your students can complete it without endangering their part-time or full-time job, or not sleeping. That your students can get out of college with some choice over their future and career, and not one determined by a College Loan Advisory Board. Step up to the plate. Talk with your students, talk to me, talk to other student activists, because we need you as allies in this struggle.

At this point I would like to begin to examine some of the larger, core issues behind these last points. The Regents of the University of California – is everyone ready? I'm going to say something very dangerous but something that I hope everyone already knows – sit on a fund of roughly \$5.2 billion in reserve money. Reserved for what? No one that I have asked has been able to answer that question for me -- or been able to answer why our student fees were raised by even one percent last year, or why our financial aid was decreased, or why there was even a question of granting a new contract to our workers or lecturers when the UC Regents recorded a *net income* of \$786 million dollars last year alone. Please, if anyone can answer this question for me, please approach me afterwards, because I am on the verge of launching a massive information campaign to students regarding these core issues, and I want to make sure that we are not missing something. Do we have secret plans to build the next Dodger Stadium, or to end hunger in this community? Why does this money exist, and why do we keep crying 'budget crisis' when we have it?

The nuclear contract – everyone has their own opinion, including students (a majority of those with whom I have spoken are against it). Keep the contract vs. privatization... a much more complicated and larger issue, as are most significant problems we face. However, the main difference between this issue and the others that I am mentioning is that this one has to do with national policy and priorities. A majority of these other issues

could be addressed, if not solved, on a state-wide level with enough political pressure from *us*.

Parking and transportation continue to be issues, which everyone already knows. If there has been significant progress on this issue that actually makes environmental, fiscal, and social sense please let me know, because I have not seen it.

On a lighter note, congratulations on the sustainability efforts that have been initiated by this University (including the Chancellor's committee and the upcoming conference...). However, as with outreach and retention, this initiative has been initiated and sustained by students, working with a vision for change. I cannot completely congratulate our administration for complying with brilliant proposals put together by groups of insistent and committed student groups, although I commend your compliance and help in furthering this politically appealing cause.

Which brings me to my last point for this speech, though not a final point in any means. Hopefully, it can be more of a jumping off point than anything else. The reason for the intensity, frustration, and anger in many of the words in this speech is not arbitrary. As I said earlier, this is one of the only forums allotted for our views to be heard in a non-contextual manner. This means, where we can give input that has not been specifically requested, or has already had parameters set for it. I thank the administrators and the Chancellor who met with myself and other members of the SUA and GSA a few weeks ago in order to hear our perspectives. However, it is not coincidental to me that our general input and insights were not requested until student activism hit levels that seriously affected the PR image of this University.

When students, faculty, staff, and administrative input are all substantively included in decisions, the decisions which are made are much more creative, constructive, and feasible as solutions. Nearly all of the bright spots which I could find in this University right now are either student-motivated, or have significant collaboration between administration and faculty.

We have been working to form an inter-organizational coalition among students on this campus, so that we may have the forum to really figure out how we feel as students about specific issues, and to form goals and demands for our administration. Once we get ourselves together, although I can't speak for the entire group, I would say that we are more than willing to work with faculty and administration on our goals and issues, and support those of the administration and faculty as well. Our intention as students is not to be in opposition, but we are forced into these oppositional roles by the fact that our voices are not heard or included in substantive ways until we make a lot of noise. As witnessed by some of the actions that have taken place this year and in past years, this cannot be guaranteed to always have the most productive or collaborative result as it could have if our input was granted from the start.

All of that having been said, I respect many of you in this room on many different levels. I support you all in struggles, and I ask that you go out of your way to figure out how to support us in ours.

Thank you.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

The current external vice chair and incoming President for the Graduate Student Association (GSA), Ian Dobbs-Dixon, addressed the Senate. The GSA has recently submitted a document to the Graduate Council pertaining to the ethical treatment of graduate students and the options available to those who feel mistreated. The GSA was shocked at the number of students who felt abuse of graduate students was a serious problem at UCSC. Abuses included, but were not limited to: poor advising, lack of guidelines for resolving disputes, racial discrimination, faculty with unchecked powers, faculty abusing students emotionally, and unequal treatment of women in the sciences. Graduate students reported that there are no avenues for redress should abuses occur. The GSA formed a subcommittee that looked into formal avenues for redress of abused graduate students. They concluded that the appeals process for graduate students needs to be rewritten as the current process is extremely limited. The GSA has submitted a revised series of comprehensive guidelines to the Graduate Council for the redress process.

Many students have approached the GSA about the increasing number of undergraduates assigned to TAs. This is worrisome because the quality of education decreases drastically when you increase the number of students in the classroom. Increasing TA workloads also reduces the amount of time graduate students spend on their own research. In order for the university to expand the scope and prestige of its graduate program, the faculty and the administration need to become stronger advocates for increasing TA funding.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:35 pm.

ATTEST:

Loisa Nygaard
Secretary
June 17, 2005