

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
November 17, 2006

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, November 17, 2006 at the Colleges Nine & Ten Multipurpose Room at the University Center. With Parliamentarian Bruce Bridgeman present, Chair Faye Crosby called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Crosby asked if there were any changes to the minutes of April 26, 2006 and May 19, 2006 other than those submitted in writing. No further changes were requested; the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Crosby

The Senate conducted a short moment of silence in memory of late Chancellor Denice Denton. Senate Chair Faye Crosby spoke of the late Chancellor's dedication to diversity and freedom of speech in the context of encouraging positive student activism at UCSC. Chair Crosby, who sits on the Demonstration Response Team, invited faculty members with interest or expertise in non-violent activism to contact her. Chair Crosby introduced our new Acting Chancellor George Blumenthal.

Campus Provost / Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger introduced new administrators: Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Alison Galloway, Vice Chancellor for Research Bruce Margon, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Resources Pamela Peterson, Acting Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jean Marie Scott and Deans Sheldon Kamieniecki (Social Sciences Division) and Georges Van Den Abbeele (Humanities). The academic deans or department chairs introduced over 30 new faculty members.

Professor Barry Bowman made the following motion:

That UCSC grant privilege of the floor to UCSC Foundation Chair Anu Lather and UCSC Foundation Vice Chair Gordon Ringold at either a winter or spring Senate meeting in 2007.

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

b. Acting Chancellor Blumenthal

Acting Chancellor Blumenthal made a statement about the strength of shared governance at UCSC. His discussion focused on three areas: priorities for the campus, the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and budgetary and systemwide issues. UCSC has experienced a decade-long upward trajectory. To continue with this upward trajectory, he listed seven critical areas for the campus.

1. Recruiting and retaining the outstanding faculty, staff, and students that characterize our campus.
2. Building on our academic strengths as we refine and implement our academic plan.
3. Expanding graduate programs and enrollments, and considering the creation of additional professional schools.
4. Building upon our distinction and achievements as an outstanding undergraduate institution.
5. Ensuring diversity among all segments of the university.
6. Building positive relationships with the local community and community leaders.
7. Spreading the word about our campus's distinctions as we prepare for a new comprehensive campaign.

The biggest local issue concerns the LRDP. The Regents approved UCSC's plan, presented in September 2006 with added information requested by the Senate Executive Committee and a reduced enrollment envelope of 19,500 students. The lower envelope reflects efforts to provide access to UC for all qualified students in California while minimizing negative impacts on our environment and our community. The possibility of growth is an essential part of providing access to the growing numbers of an increasingly diverse population of young people of California. We now face litigation over the plan and over Measures I & J. Acting Chancellor Blumenthal will continue negotiations with the City of Santa Cruz, with the goal of finding mutually beneficial solutions.

Acting Chancellor Blumenthal touched on several systemwide issues, including the Long Range Guidance Team's report to be submitted to the Regents in January, resumption of UC retirement contributions, and next year's proposed budget for UC. Due to the passage of Proposition 1D, UCSC will be able to complete the McHenry Library renovation project and move forward with the planning for digital media, biomedical sciences, and various other infrastructure projects.

In closing, Acting Chancellor Blumenthal thanked the faculty for their welcome and support, and he is looking forward to working together with the Academic Senate.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Klinger

CPEVC Klinger stressed the importance of academic planning. He stated that the divisional plans have not yet been incorporated into a campus plan, which is fundamentally needed to grow the campus in a strategic way and make optimal use of limited resources. An integrated campus plan is still in draft form, and there has been broad discussion and significant consultation with Senate committees, particularly the Committee on Planning and Budget. He expects further consultation with the Senate and the Deans to refine the draft. CPEVC Klinger noted that academic planning must emerge from the faculty, not the administration. The campus plan should be a flexible framework for future decision making. It should allow us to revisit the strengths and priorities on campus as new ideas, issues and opportunities emerge over time.

The campus budget cycle includes both financial planning and budgetary practices. We must be strategic with our resources and fund higher priorities instead of just spreading resources evenly across campus. CPEVC Klinger noted that 95% of the total budget is allocated out to the divisions, and 5% is held centrally. When the budget was decentralized, no clear accountability for resource management was put in place. We need to establish clear priorities, develop a budget strategy that considers all campus resources, and examine and make adjustments to the current budget practices.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1516)

The report was received without comment.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

Chair Crosby introduced the consent calendar, explaining that anyone wishing to pull a report from the consent calendar for discussion might do so. The reports of the Committee on Academic Personnel, Committee on Career Advising, Committee on Faculty Welfare, Committee on Planning and Budget and the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid were pulled.

Items that remained on the consent calendar and were received without comment were the reports of: the Committee on Academic Freedom, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, the Committee on Computers and Telecommunications, the Committee on the Education Abroad Program, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Emeriti Relations, the Graduate Council, the Committee on the Library, the Committee on Preparatory Education, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Committee on Research, the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections and the Committee on Teaching.

b. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1518)

CAP member Susan Gillman referred the Senate to the most important part of the report (pp 7-9) which calls for a joint task force consisting of members of CPB, CAP, and relevant administrators in order to develop strategies for addressing low faculty salaries in a systematic way. There is already a systemwide effort to address faculty salary and advancement issues. UCAP has been addressing the issue; their report dated June 12, 2006 outlines the principles of faculty compensation. Professor Gillman also referred to the UCLA faculty newsletter from Winter, 2005 which discusses two experiments to consistently address faculty salaries internally.

c. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1514)

Former CAFA Chair Robert Coe stressed the importance of faculty involvement in student recruitment, especially when students near their point of decision. Responding to a question from the floor, Professor Coe reported that the request to discontinue use of the word "freshman" for use of "frosh" is now before the administration's Strategic Communications Committee.

e. Committee on Career Advising (AS/SCP/1512)

Current CCA Chair Geoff Pullum noted the results of the CCA survey which indicates contrary perceptions of mentoring in departments. For example, all departments said they mentor junior faculty on teaching, but 2/3 of those junior faculty responding indicated that this did not happen. All departments said they mentored on expectations for tenure; however 2/3 of junior faculty respondents said they were not mentored.

j. Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1517)

CFW member Ted Holman reported that CFW consulted with the administration over the summer about how to create a master plan for housing. This year's challenge is to begin to devise a master plan so that the university will have affordable housing for future faculty. After being granted privilege of the floor by voice vote, Acting VC Student Affairs Jean Marie Scott reported on the progress of the Ranch View Terrace project. The final license agreement, which is an agreement between UC and the project developer, is being packaged today and given to the Office of the President on Monday. She added that, assuming the document is signed on Monday, the bank will fund the loan and by the end of November, the loan for the project will be funded and will allow the developer to break ground on December 1.

Responding to a question from the floor, Professor Holman concurred that the timing for the reinstatement of faculty contributions to their retirement funds is unfortunate. It comes at a time when faculty salaries lag significantly behind our comparison eight institutions. Resuming contributions only serves to further erode faculty salaries.

m. Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1513)

Former CPB Chair Paul Koch reported on several aspects of the committee's work. For the past five years, CPB has been concerned about the rising deficits in University Extension (UNEX). CPB met regularly with UNEX Dean Cathy Sandeen who reported cutting the UNEX budget aggressively. CPB noted that as she cut the expenses, the revenues dropped proportionately and the deficit continued to rise. Last spring after a target CPB created was not met, the committee concluded that if UNEX continues to operate as it does, the deficit would continue to grow. CPB recommended to CPEVC Klinger that he immediately consider downsizing and restructuring UNEX to keep the core parts but minimize the accruing debts. In response to this recommendation, the CPEVC instead formed a group to examine the budget and consider how losses can be minimized. Though last year's CPB recommendation for immediate action was not followed by the CPEVC, this group's analysis should be available for discussion by this year's committee.

CPB worked on LRDP/EIR issues, and was involved through the summer on negotiations on whether or not the campus should submit the plans for Regent approval. CPB has never viewed the LRDP/EIR as a commitment to growth but as a framework for potential growth. CPB conducted an analysis using data supplied by the campus Institutional Research, of the sizes of the divisions that were being proposed by the EVC, and recommended slightly different sizes. Since the final assembled academic plans have not been produced, former CPB Chair Koch recommends that the current committee review

last year's committee recommendations; if the plan doesn't follow those, request supporting data and a justification why the alternate plan being suggested is better.

CPB also did an analysis of faculty salaries using data gathered by the office of Academic Human Resources. As a system, UC lags our comparison institutions by 10-15%. CPB tried to understand where UCSC stood relative to the rest of the UC system. The report's table 3 shows that UCSC salaries are comparable to UC Riverside, but on other campuses we are 5- 30% lower, depending on rank. The report does not consider Engineering salaries, which are on a separate scale; nor did it pull out Economics salaries. The report represents normal salaries for non-engineers, non-business school, and non-professional schools – just Arts and Sciences faculty. This comparison is salaries only and does not take into account cost of living, etc.

Finally, Professor Koch reported that partly in response to the compensation scandals at UCOP last year, a step system has been put in place for administrators. That step system sets administrative salaries based on criteria like the size and complexity as well as the stature of the campus. As a consequence, the Regents have formalized a salary scale that pays our UCSC administrators less than other campuses. There is concern that as the Regents and UCOP review faculty salaries, they may consider the same method and formalize the second-class salary status of smaller campuses and Davis.

Comments from the floor included: One way to fix the salary problem is to institute additions to the faculty scale like other UC campuses have done. It is also important to look at the rate at which faculty are moving through step and rank because there is variation among the campuses. We end up with the same scale and paid different rates for different years of service. If augmentations are established, they should first be applied to new faculty.

Responding to a question about inaccuracies in the report regarding the program in Technology and Information Management (TIM), Professor Koch made the following comments. First, CPB's recommendations dealt with two issues, one budgetary, the other related to the launch of the program. CPB's comments on the program were sent on May 2, 2006 and we had contact with Dean Michael Isaacson in late June. Those conversations focused more on the issues of the launch of TIM, not on budgetary issues. CPB made several recommendations to the EVC about deliverables that we expected to see from the TIM program. By the end of the summer, when this annual report was finalized, CPB had received neither written challenges nor documentation from the School of Engineering citing problems with the data or analysis.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees: Additional Nominations 2006-07 (AS/SCP/1519)

The additional nominations were accepted without comment.

b. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.3 on Transfer Credit (AS/SCP/1515)

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett provided background for the Amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.3 on Transfer Credit. The Committee on Educational Policy proposed amendment to Regulation 10.2.2.3 on Transfer Credit passed by a show of hands.

10.2.2.3 Transfer or advanced standing credit may apply toward all of the requirements in SCR 10.2.2.1 except the Writing-intensive courses. Writing-intensive courses must be taken at UCSC. An eligible transferred course with a minimum of 4.0 quarter units or 3.0 semester units may be considered one course with respect to campus general education requirements.

Responsibility for assessment of work completed at other campuses of the University of California or at other institutions is delegated to the Director of Admissions. In making such assessments, the Director consults with the faculty when appropriate.

ii. Oral Report on General Education Reform

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett reviewed the current General Education (GE) requirements. Aside from external calls from Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to review our GE requirements, the Senate has its own internal reasons for thinking about the GE requirements. It is worthwhile to note that depending on how many courses overlap with their majors, the amount of time a student takes fulfilling GE requirements on the way to a degree is substantial. It might be up to a year. While the requirements for a major are regularly reviewed by their departments, the GE requirements are owned by all of us. The last major overhaul of the GE requirements was in 1984. There was an unsuccessful attempt at comprehensive changes in 1999. There have been incremental changes in the meantime, but no holistic overview to the system has been done in twenty years.

CEP believes that it is now time to clarify the objectives of GE requirements and the criteria by which courses are evaluated to determine the designation of a GE. It is now time to think about: (1) the subject areas that the GE requirements are trying to define, (2) what UCSC graduates out to know, and (3) how these objectives are to be implemented. Current thinking in General Education puts emphasis on teaching “modes of inquiry” such as critical thinking, writing, speaking, quantitative formal reasoning, research experience, ethical exploration and cultural understanding rather than simply imparting knowledge of subject matter or topics.

Chair Padgett explained that universities nation-wide are reviewing and revising their GE requirements. He cited an example of a recently revised GE curriculum from Duke University, being very clear that this is just an example, and that CEP is not proposing the Duke model as something UCSC should do.

The subject areas roughly correspond to our subject areas but the requirements are fulfilled through the categories along the top. What makes this system different than

UCSC's is that it aggressively tries to make things cross-classify. They want to accomplish goals in both dimensions.

	MODES OF INQUIRY					
Areas of Knowledge	Cross Cultural Inquiry	Science, Technology, & Society	Ethical Inquiry	Foreign Language	Writing	Research
Arts, Literatures, & Performance (2)						
Civilizations (2)						
Social Sciences (2)						
Natural Sciences (2)						
Quantitative Studies (2)						
TOTAL Minimum Exposures	2	2	2	1-3	3	2

This example moves away from the idea that fulfilling GE requirements is something that happens apart from the major and only in the lower division curriculum. If the goals of GE are to teach writing and reasoning well, it is senseless to decouple those goals from those of the majors. A separate but related issue is that under the current system, the GE keeps students from engaging in their major earlier because they feel they have to get GE requirements done first. This has a negative impact on our retention rates.

Our current system has also created problems of capacity to fulfill the requirements. Chair Padgett cited the particular problem of lack of capacity to fulfill the W at this time and similar potential problems for the Q.

It is important to consider the effect of our GE system on retention and recruitment. Last year's study showed that retention rates for the top tier of students is poor. We need to question whether increasing the rigor and timeliness of the completing GE requirements and getting students into majors sooner will aid in retaining these students.

In sum, CEP recommends re-considering the GE system to create more coherence, more rigor, clarify educational objectives, help admissions and retention, and strengthen UCSC's public profile and sense of identity.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair (none)

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Berra Yazar, the President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) addressed a strategy for improving recruitment of graduate students. She suggested that student representatives be included in their departmental meetings. These students would be able to generate department-specific ways for attracting new students and increasing graduate enrollments. The departments that already include graduate students in their departmental meetings have experienced a more cohesive population of graduate students and it has improved the outcome of External Reviews, success in national rankings, as well as graduate student recruitments.

The Draft Campus Strategic Academic Plan proposes graduate groups and interdisciplinary work to attract graduate students. The GSA supports this and thinks it will attract more external funding to support Graduate Student Researchers. It will be crucial to maintain breadth in areas of research for maximal graduate student recruitment while seeing interdisciplinarity as a vehicle for new ideas.

The increase of Nonresident Tuition (NRT) has significantly impacted graduate enrollment. Aside from the obvious detrimental effect on international student recruitment, the NRT limits departments in their ability to recruit domestic students. The value of a Ph.D. from UCSC decreases if we cannot compete globally. The GSA gratefully acknowledges the support of the Alumni Association and the Academic Senate of this issue on the systemwide level. Thanks to that support, President Dynes has addressed graduate education needs in the upcoming budget. The GSA feels that now is the time to push the Regents to abolish the NRT so we can afford to hire more international and domestic graduate students. This will enable us to increase enrollment and maintain quality of our graduate programs.

This week the Regents decided to take control of the UC Budget by voting to review and approve the budget in detail each year, apart from the annual approval of UC's overall spending plan. According to a non-partisan budget advisor to the governor, there may be \$300 million for discretionary education funding for the coming year. Now is the time to work together, students, faculty and alumni, to educate the state legislature about the importance of graduate education for quality of education of the UC system.

The GSA has worked constantly to improve student rights and quality of life, mainly with the Graduate Council and the Graduate Division. She encouraged faculty to review the set of Mentoring Guidelines available on the Graduate Division web site, and to enter into a dialogue with the GSA to discuss productive ways to foster mentoring activities.

The GSA is cooperating with the Engineering Graduate Student Association and Women in Engineering to organize a major event at UCSC on January 19, 2007. Jorge Cham, the author of the very popular comic strip "Piled High and Deeper" will be coming to campus. The comic strip focuses on the familiar idiosyncrasies of graduate school, centered on interpersonal relationships, research and teaching. Faculty members are encouraged to attend the event; details can be located on the GSA website.

The GSA, the Division of Graduate Studies, and the Alumni Association have re-established the Grad Fund, an alumni donation fund that will specifically be used to support graduate student activities.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:15 pm.

ATTEST:

Deborah K. Letourneau
Secretary
February 12, 2007