

**MINUTES**  
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division  
April 26, 2006

**Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, April 26, 2006 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Secretary Deborah Letourneau and Parliamentarian John Isbister present, Chair Faye Crosby called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

**1. Approval of Draft Minutes (none)**

**2. Announcements**

**a) Chair Crosby**

Academic Senate Chair Faye Crosby announced that the final Senate meeting for 2006-07 will be held on May 19, 2006, followed by a reception honoring non-emeriti pioneer faculty. In November 2005, an administrative report on housing was issued; this housing report is now available on the web. The Senate has been working closely with the administration on housing issues. CPEVC Klinger has responded to the Senate by sending a series of documents, which included questions for the Senate. The Senate Executive Committee has empowered the Committee on Faculty Welfare to come up with preliminary answers to those questions; these preliminary responses on housing will be presented today for open discussion. At the March 8, 2006 Senate meeting, CPEVC Klinger announced that the administration has made available a one-time million dollar fund for recruitment and retention. The senate and administration will be working on establishing principles for spending the \$1M. Chair Crosby stated that this money should be used for building and growing our community. She also said it is likely that the Senate will advocate that the money be devoted to resolving issues of housing. The main idea is to make the resources recyclable so the effects of this fund will be felt by many. Equity between divisions will also be considered when making funding decisions.

There are a number of ongoing UC system-wide audits. The system-wide leadership has sought many exceptions to rules on compensation, sometimes without informing the Regents. There is a call for increased transparency and accountability, which President Dynes seems committed to establish.

Three UCSC faculty members, Harold Widom, Harry Berger and David Haussler, were recently welcomed as new members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The National Academy of Sciences also welcomed as new members two of our faculty, Stan Woolsey and David Haussler.

**b) Chancellor Denton**

Chancellor Denice Denton congratulated the new members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences. Her remarks summarizing the

administration's progress on priority areas presented at the investiture are included in the meeting notice; she will entertain any questions. "The War on Terror: A Credible Threat", the daylong teach-in that took place on Monday, April 24, at the Quarry Amphitheater was very successful. The next Research Symposium, which showcases graduate student research will be held on May 5, 2006. In response to a question about the progress on salary support for staff, Chancellor Denton stated that non-represented staff who made less than \$45,000 received letters a month ago regarding their salary increase. Chancellor Denton also made a statement about the Resolution to be presented today by the Committee on Planning and Budget on the 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and its Environmental Impact Report (EIR). She believes we have reached a reasonable balance between the need and desire to serve the future generations of the young people of California and the desire to minimize the impact on the environment. She stated her support of the LRDP plan moving forward. She reminded faculty that the LRDP is a land use plan, and that when this legal process is completed we can focus on the academic aspirations of the campus. Decisions about program expansion and enrollment increases will be made on an annual basis in light of academic planning, budget realities and other factors. She stated that if the LRDP process is delayed it could affect the admissions process, loss of enrollment revenue and loss of opportunities for the campus. Delay in the process also complicates the planning process due to uncertainties about future resources.

**c) Campus Provost/EVC Kliger**

CPEVC Dave Kliger announced that the senior management searches are going well. Name of candidates for two divisional Dean posts have been forwarded to the Regents, and a third name will be forwarded soon. No announcements will be made until there has been formal approval by the Regents.

**3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1485)**

The report was received without comment.

**4. Reports of Special Committees (none)**

**5. Reports of Standing Committees**

**a. Committee on Committees**

**i. Proposed Change to Bylaw 13.28 (AS/SCP/1487)**

The Committee on Committees Proposed Change to Bylaw 13.28 to increase membership of Rules, Jurisdiction & Elections from four to five members. The motion passed by a show of hands.

**13.28.1 There are five Santa Cruz Division members.**

**ii. Proposed Elimination of Bylaw 13.22 (AS/SCP/1486)**

The Committee on Committees proposed elimination of Bylaw 13.22 – Committee on Land Use and Building Development. The motion passed by a show of hands.

**b. Senate Executive Committee**

**Update on Senate Resolution on Faculty Housing and Campus Growth (AS/SCP/1489)**

Quentin Williams, Vice Chair of the Senate, stated that the Senate resolution of May, 2005 requested an administrative housing plan by October 1, 2005. The Senate Executive Committee followed up with the Administration in February, 2006 and the document in this meeting's agenda is the initial report produced by the administration. It describes a process and its associated costs for developing an employee housing administrative plan. The document includes some very important queries for the Senate and commits to producing a plan by October, 2006.

Vice Chair Williams yielded the floor to Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair Paul Ortiz and CFW member Ted Holman who presented the following specifics on the housing crisis. We have lost outstanding faculty because of the lack of affordable housing and we will lose more if we don't pick up the pace on planning. UCSC is approximately ten years behind in producing a housing plan. There are concerns about the level of commitment across campus to address the issue of housing. CFW Chair Ortiz announced that the new deadline for the administration to produce a housing plan is Fall 2006. Although convinced that the administration is concerned about housing, CFW considers the October 1, 2006 the "drop dead" deadline for administration. CFW member Ted Holman stated a dialogue must occur with the administration before May 1 in order for them to clarify their housing questions. We must come up with options and then make an informed decision on which option is best for the future of our campus. We must determine the target audience, how big the houses will be, how many houses we build, and make them affordable.

Responding from the floor, Professor Roger Anderson estimated that we will need housing for roughly 50% of all new faculty hires and cannot expect someone to pay 50% of their income for housing. He is concerned that if we wait for a master plan, as indicated in the "plan to plan" submitted by the administration for this meeting, we will not be able to address the building of housing for new faculty in a timely manner. He also stated that he does not view the use of a consultant, as described in the document, as a very productive way of proceeding with the housing plan.

Professor Daniel Press stated that the priority ranking system that assigns lower priority to people who already have faculty housing is counterproductive. These faculty members won't have the opportunity to get into Ranch View Terrace because they are low priority on the list. Professor Anderson responded to this and said that CFW has proposed to EVC Klinger for one-time funds to help transition faculty out of existing faculty housing. CFW member Ted Holman stated that it is likely that everyone on the list will be offered Ranch View Terrace home.

Professor Ethan Miller noted how slowly the university moves in regards to the housing planning process. He proposed going through a commercial building process instead of the university process. CFW member Ted Holman said because we are a state institution we are unable to do this. Senate Chair Crosby commented that there may be innovative ways to network among families who could find property together off-campus or with emeriti faculty interested in an equity-sharing scheme. Professor Miller pointed out that

the university is allowed to buy down the interest rate on a MOP loan, and that more information can be found on the UC Office of the President's web page.

Professor Bill Friedland noted that the campus' administration and the Academic Senate record with respect to housing is disgraceful. UCSC is two decades late with respect to housing. He proposed that the Senate stop the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) until principles are established. He also said that any campus housing should be geared at providing 70% housing for students and 70% of the faculty housing be geared at assistant professors.

Professor Andy Fisher noted that the duties described for the proposed consultant are what many people on campus are already being paid to do. The planning process as currently proposed by the administration will cause delays and incur extra costs for work that staff are already being paid to do.

Professor Michael Hutchison remarked on the progress that the campus has made over the last two decades. Hager Meadows was established, we purchased Laureate Court, and Hagar Court condominiums were converted into regular faculty housing. Professor Onuttom Narayan asked for clarification about the boundary between the housing administrative plan and the housing master plan. CFW member Ted Holman said the administrative plan is the framework and the master plan works out the details.

Due to the absence of Vice Chancellor Student Affairs Francisco Hernandez, a motion by EVC Kliger was seconded and passed by voice vote to allow Associate Vice Chancellor Jean Marie Scott to have privilege of the floor. She addressed two issues: Ranch View Terrace and the development of an employee housing master plan. She stated that the university prevailed in the lawsuit on Ranch View Terrace (RVT) and a June groundbreaking is anticipated. Housing staff and Physical Planning and Construction (PPC) are currently putting a lot of energy into delivering the RVT project including the assignment process, housing access policy, finance incentives. They are still focused on moving individuals out of Hagar Court and Meadows into RVT and allow vacancies affordable to new faculty.

Moving forward and developing an administrative plan for employee housing will take place this summer. The cost of developing the plan is necessary because the Housing Office does not have the expertise on all things related to environmental issues, land use issues, and intersections with the EIR and the LRDP and they must contract with the campus PPC to help with those aspects of planning. She also stated that the costs associated with hiring an outside consultant are necessary to help facilitate meetings and help focus the campus' attention this summer. We are not looking for an outside consultant to answer all the questions, but to have someone assist the campus in the facilitation of the meetings that must occur, and the development of all the questions that need to be answered. She encouraged more dialogue and discussion regarding the use of a consultant if there are deep concerns among Senators. Several meetings with CFW and other Senate constituencies will be held to discuss the many issues that go into the consensus building process.

Responding to a question from the floor, AVC Scott stated that there are no further plans for building housing in the north campus and that the next housing project, after RVT will be the redevelopment for family and student housing. This will take that complex from a 200-unit capacity to a 400-unit capacity. It will also include a child care component. Housing cannot move forward until we have an approved LRDP.

Professor Bill Friedland asked about the possibility that the administration's financial model and the interests of the faculty are in conflict. For example, could the administration, thinking of housing as an investment, see the loss of a few mid-career or early career faculty as a short term financial gain while the faculty consider the loss of members of our community as abstract costs? CPEVC Klinger responded that he does not believe the administration has different priorities than faculty. His priority is to have successful faculty on this campus, not a business plan to save money by losing faculty. He also stated that it is better to have a plan that works than to have the perfect plan. Professor Margo Hendricks noted that the issue of housing affordability and the compressed faculty salaries are connected.

### **c. Committee on Planning and Budget**

#### **Resolution on the 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and its Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (AS/SCP/1488)**

CPB member Onuttom Narayan presented the report and resolution. He stated clearly that the resolution is not anti-growth. CPB believes that growth has a potential to generate substantial academic benefits for the campus, but only if it is planned properly. If growth takes place without proper planning, it is a squandered opportunity. We will never be able to return to 15,000 and grow again to 21,000. Adequate planning is essential so that the opportunities can be fully realized

For this reason, the resolution asks the administration to correct errors and omission in the LRDP/EIR or to show how CPB is wrong, provide financial estimates, and submit this to the Senate for review two months before submission of the LRDP to the Regents. . CPB believes that the traffic delays and congestion reported in the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be much worse than projected. Also, the need for housing is underestimated, many more employees and students than the EIR projects will be unable to find housing in the county than projected in the LRDP.

CPB proposes that now is the time for the Senate to weigh in on the accuracy of the EIR. CPB comments on the EIR were treated by the administration as those of any member of the general public. Administrative response to CPB questions will be made only to the extent that they are legally required to provide a response. The CEQA process (California Environmental Quality Act) that guides development of an EIR is not very demanding as far as the actual content analysis. If the role the Senate can expect to play within shared governance is greater than the role that individual members of the public can legally demand, then this is the occasion for the Senate to speak.

CPB has made their concerns about the LRDP process known repeatedly. The committee commented on the first draft of the LRDP in Fall, 2004, a report to the Senate in Spring 2005 and also in comments on the draft EIR in December 2005. CPB recognizes that the LRDP, which is frequently asserted to be just a land use document, may not be required to contain all the information that we have requested, especially regarding financial analyses. However, the campus must know the answers to these questions; they should form part of the planning process, and must be understood before any plan for growth can make sense. It is also asserted that the enrollment target of 21,000 is just an outer envelope and does not necessitate growth to that limit. But, once the outer envelope is in place, ultimately, the Office of the President can determine enrollment targets.

CPB also considered the scenario of the LRDP not being approved by the Regents this year. Enrollments for the purposes of an LRDP/EIR are calculated on on-campus fall, winter, spring averages. Total enrollment, relevant for resource calculations also includes off-campus and summer students. We are currently slightly under-enrolled, but even if this were not the case, our target for on-campus fall, winter, and spring average enrollment would not breach the current 15,000 limit of the 1988 LRDP until 2008 or 2009.

Professor Bruce Schumm offered the following friendly amendment at the end of the second “be it resolved”, that reads: “unless an earlier submission has been endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee.” As there were no objections, the friendly amendment was accepted.

Faculty and/or administrators who were in favor or opposed to the resolution voiced the following discussion points:

<b>In Favor of the Resolution</b>	<b>Opposed to the Resolution</b>
Roger Anderson	Dave Kliger
Bob Meister	Steven Thorsett
Jim Gill	Bill Ladusaw
David Evan Jones	Tom Vani
George Blumenthal	

Points raised in favor of the resolution:

Many of those speaking in favor of the resolution clarified that they were not anti-growth, but advocated careful planning for growth.

Housing and traffic are important issues that have an impact on our future employees. There are no numbers in the LRDP document for employee housing, as these estimates were taken out between the October draft and the January draft.

UCSC does not provide salaries comparable with the local market. Given the declining resources from the state, which would be necessary for the mitigations in the EIR, this LRDP may not be implementable. Under accurate, plausible, realistic assumptions, the

physical plan for campus is not realistic. There is no campus academic plan in place that guides enrollment growth. The moment has come for faculty to insist on a kind of planning that makes growth conditional on the uses to which new resources are put. Passing the resolution will not have any resource impacts on the campus for 2006-07.

It would not take another four million dollars or take another two years to do the kind of revision that the Senate is requesting. UCSC has a history of taking enrollments and not enacting the mitigations in the 1988 LRDP implementation plan. There is a need for a feasible implementation plan to guide the campus growth. We are growing without an academic or physical campus plan.

The resolution is asking for a proper analysis to determine the impact of the LRDP. The EIR is the faculty's first chance to see what the growth consequences are for our campus. The information upon which this resolution is based is contained in reports from CPB issued last spring and then again in the fall. CPB designed a resolution that would allow the administration to respond with analysis to compelling points that CPB has made. If there is a delay, it means that there are substantive issues that need to be addressed. If this is the first opportunity for the Senate to comment on this EIR, then how is it that we are responsible for the delay produced? CPB has repeatedly made its criticisms of the EIR available to the administration and attempted to engage them in dialog on these issues. There was unwillingness on the part of the administration to recognize the Senate in a manner different from the general public and that is why this resolution is before us. Likewise, the administration's lack of consultation on the addition of four rental apartments to the RVT project, at the expense of the home buyers resulted in delay and expense.

Points raised against the resolution:

There is concern that if the LRDP is delayed that resources will be withheld. If the resolution passes there might be a delay in those resources. We have to be much more careful about handing out resources because of the need to set aside money for an additional EIR analysis. If the resolution passes there will be a substantial delay for the EIR to be submitted to the Regents. Redoing the analysis of the EIR could cost anywhere from nothing to another 4.6 million dollars. These resources will come from supporting the academic mission. Passage of the resolution might help those who will file a lawsuit against the university regarding growth and the LRDP. It will also make planning for enrollments in 2007 more difficult because we will have to be careful about not exceeding the current 15,000-student limit.

Delaying submission to November is inadvisable because the Regents already have the UC Irvine LRDP on their agenda and they won't address the UCSC LRDP at that meeting and possibly not until next spring. The November Regent's meeting is in Los Angeles. There may be an outcry from the local community that we intentionally moved to a location that was inconvenient for people to go and comment. Our ability to plan for housing will be delayed. There are other planning decisions that will be delayed.

RVT was delayed because a number of faculty were concerned about the four rental apartments that were included in the project. Even though there were financial arrangements to cover their costs the apartments would have cost each of the 84 home owners approximately \$3,000. When we removed the four apartments from the plan, the EIR, which had already gone through the 30-day period with no lawsuit, had to be re-circulated. The CLUE lawsuit, which caused considerable expense and delay was the result of the re-circulation of that EIR.

A delay will force the divisions who are running permanent deficits to figure out how to take permanent cuts. If the resolution passes and if the Regents do not accept this LRDP, we risk the ability to move ahead with our plans. According to state demographics, college age population will peak in 2010; if we don't take these students in the next few years, UCOP will place them on another campus. By the time UCSC is ready, there won't be enrollments to take. There are many losers if we do not grow: the faculty, future students and the City of Santa Cruz.

***Resolution:***

***Whereas a careful physical development and land use plan is essential for UCSC to realize the academic benefits of growth,***

***Whereas the Academic Senate's Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has found the analysis in the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of the impact of the draft 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) on traffic and housing may be flawed,***

***Whereas the CPB has found that the impact of growth under the LRDP on vehicular traffic delays may be significantly more severe than estimated in the draft EIR,***

***Whereas the administration has not analyzed the costs to be borne by student, staff, and faculty users of the parking facilities proposed in the draft EIR,***

***Whereas the CPB finds no analysis in the draft EIR to counter CPB's estimate that the land set aside for employee housing under the LRDP may be inadequate for the number of units needed,***

***Whereas the administration has not analyzed the factors affecting the affordability of proposed on-campus housing,***

**THEREFORE BE IT**

***resolved that the Academic Senate calls upon the UCSC administration to refrain from transmitting the LRDP/EIR to the University of California Regents for approval until the apparent errors and omissions cited in this resolution have been addressed;***

***resolved that the Academic Senate calls upon the UCSC administration to transmit the LRDP/EIR to the Regents no earlier than the November 2006 Regents meeting unless an earlier submission is endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee;***

***resolved that the Academic Senate calls upon the UCSC administration to provide to the Senate Executive Committee, at least two months in advance of the transmittal of the LRDP/EIR to the University of California Regents, a public written response to the apparent errors and omissions cited in this resolution;***

***resolved that the Academic Senate requests the Senate Executive Committee to determine, if possible, within two months after receiving such a response, whether the errors and omissions cited have been addressed satisfactorily and to make public its views in that regard.***

The Committee on Planning and Budget Resolution on the 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and its Environmental Impact Report (EIR) passed by secret ballot. Chair Crosby announced the vote as 69 in favor, 26 opposed.

**6. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair**

Floyd Amuchie spoke on behalf of the Student Union Assembly (SUA). Six issues have been identified as student priorities:

- Lack of Asian-American professors
- Sustainable fair labor practices
- Additional recycling locations and increased awareness
- A more centralized space in the quarry to support student emotional and physical growth.
- Creation of a diversity task force on campus to support historically marginalized populations
- Financial support for the Rainbow Theater

**7. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)**

**8. Petitions of Students (none)**

**9. Unfinished Business (none)**

**10. University and Faculty Welfare (none)**

**11. New Business (none)**

Adjournment: 4:51 pm.

ATTEST:

Deborah K. Letourneau  
Secretary  
May 5, 2006