

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division March 9, 2007

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, March 9, 2007 at the Colleges Nine & Ten Multipurpose Room. With Parliamentarian Bruce Bridgeman and Secretary Deborah Letourneau present, Chair Faye Crosby called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Crosby asked if there were any additional changes, other than those submitted in writing, to the minutes of November 17, 2006. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Crosby

Chair Crosby provided an update on the Chancellor Search. On March 2, the campus submitted a letter to President Dynes giving names of faculty members, both on and off campus, to be considered for the President's Advisory Committee on the Chancellor Search. The Graduate Student Association, Student Union Association, Alumni Association and the Foundation have all submitted their representatives' names. Regents, chosen by President Dynes, will also be on the committee. On April 9, the Advisory Committee will be on campus to hold meetings with various campus constituents. In their advisement to President Dynes, the Senate will share its hopes and aspirations for the campus, as well as the qualities that we think are important in a new Chancellor. All involved would like the process to be as transparent as possible. Transparency of the process is not to be confused with knowing the identity of the individual candidates. The Senate is communicating with the "Coalition of Faculty" about the issue of transparency and qualities we think are important in the search for the new Chancellor.

b. Acting Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal began by announcing several notable recent events, including the UCSC endowment fund passing \$100 million, the Ranch View Terrace ground breaking and the BioInfoNano Bin-Rid Initiative partnership with Hewlett Packard. Chancellor Blumenthal recognized two Foundation members who have donated time and funds to the University, Ann Levin and Julie Packard. These members were honored recently at the annual Scholarship Benefit Dinner, which raised a considerable amount of money for scholarships. Similarly an Alumni Awards luncheon was held on campus, and three people were honored; the Outstanding Teaching award went to Gary Griggs; the Outstanding Staff Award went to Lynn Wolcott; and the Outstanding Alumnus Award went to Joe DeRisi.

Next Chancellor Blumenthal discussed campus issues. UCSC is in the final stages of trying to find a site for where a new childcare center will go, and what it will look like. He gave an update on the state budget and UC retirement system. The budget, which was proposed by the Governor in January was, with a couple of exceptions, equivalent to the

compact that's been in place for several years. The exceptions include some negatives; namely, that the Governor eliminated \$19 million previously designated for academic preparation, and eliminated all funding for labor institutes.

The Governor added research money to support a building in Berkeley for the British Petroleum effort. He also added money for UC to compete at the National Science Foundation for the Petascale Computing Project (a UC project, led by UCSD and Livermore), and included money for the four California Institutes for Science and Innovation. UCSC has pieces of two of those Institutes on this campus, and will benefit if the budget passes.

The budget that the Governor submitted included no money for the University's contribution to the UC retirement system. Chancellor Blumenthal expects that there will not be a resumption of contributions to the retirement system this year. However, the retirement system has been doing extremely well this year, and its funded status has not degraded.

Chancellor Blumenthal then gave an update on salaries. The Regents stated two years ago that they intended to bring faculty salaries up to market value over a ten-year period. Market value is defined as a comparison rate of UC's sister institutions. He said this is extremely difficult to do under the current compact with the Governor. A system-wide task force has been created and led by Rory Hume, the Provost of the University, to look at faculty salaries and the allocation of funds.

Chancellor Blumenthal closed his remarks by mentioning a number of faculty and department honors.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Klinger

CP/EVC Klinger discussed three topics: faculty salaries, housing and the academic planning process. Competitive salaries are crucial to UCSC in order to hire and retain the best faculty. In November 2006 CP/EVC Klinger convened a task force to examine UCSC's competitive position regarding faculty salaries and consider strategies UCSC might employ to improve its position. Currently, the task force is examining other campus models including those at Berkeley, Davis, Irvine and Riverside to evaluate how aspects of their compensation models can translate to UCSC. The task force will also consider the increasing number of off-scale salary offers that UCSC needs to make to new faculty in order to be successful in its recruitments, but which also result in salary compression issues for existing faculty. If a system-wide solution is not found, the problem will be dealt with locally.

CP/EVC Klinger reported that last spring UCSC engaged a consulting firm to review its current housing program and produce an Employee Housing Administrative Plan (EHAP). The Senate spent the fall quarter reviewing EHAP and its recommendations, and provided CP/EVC Klinger with feedback in December. He has taken into consideration the EHAP recommendations and the Senate's comments and come up with

several courses of action he believes UCSC needs to pursue. CP/EVC Kliger has asked Acting Vice Chancellor Jean Marie Scott to act in the following ways.

1. One of the recommendations of the report was to modify the employee housing administrative structure UCSC uses by establishing a 501(c)3. Acting Vice Chancellor Scott has been asked to deliver a comprehensive analysis of this recommendation including political, legal and financial considerations to be completed by June 1, 2007.
2. Another recommendation of the report is to modify the pricing for UCSC's "For Sale" inventory. The employee housing program should purchase any unit that's offered for resale, make necessary renovations, bring the unit up to program standards, and then re-index the value to approximately 60 percent of market rates. 40 percent of the profits gained from re-indexing will be applied to the Supplemental Home Loan Program, and 60 percent will be reinvested for master planning and new project development. In addition, CP/EVC Kliger has directed that the Supplemental Home Loan Program be modified so that UCSC can increase the maximum loan limit for eligible current homeowners from \$50k to \$75k.
3. The completion of the LRDP and the EHAP allows UCSC to complete the development of a Master Housing Plan. Components of this plan include a physical plan, site identification, feasibility studies and the timing of bringing units to the market. This should be completed by December 15, 2008. CP/EVC Kliger has also asked the Employee Housing Program to bring forward one additional on-campus construction opportunity that includes complete site analysis on financial feasibility by March 2008.

Finally, CP/EVC Kliger reviewed academic planning. The last draft of the Strategic Academic Plan was released for review in October 2006. Subsequent conversations with the Senate, department chairs and Deans resulted in comments that have been used to reorganize and rewrite the draft of the plan. A revised plan was released March 8. This new draft plan encompasses the vision portion of the plan, including synopses of divisional plans and the organization of those plans into campus strengths and direction. Strategies will focus on developing UCSC's research, scholarly and creative activities; expanding research infrastructure; expanding University development efforts; increasing our efforts in graduate education; and maintaining the quality of undergraduate education. The interdisciplinary themes that were in the draft Plan continue as a way to envision the strengths of existing programs and planned expansions. Similar to the previous draft, this plan will be further revised in consultation with the Senate and campus community. At the same time, the campus must turn its attention to the much more difficult task of developing an implementation plan. This must take into account broad campus needs including: GE requirements, academic support for under-prepared students, hiring practices to include joint and cluster hires and many other issues. CP/EVC Kliger has charged a task force consisting of administrators and Senate members to work collaboratively to define these issues and create a format within which to address them.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1523)

The report was received without comment.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.17.1 Regulation Student Representatives (AS/SCP/1522)

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett provided background on the Amendment to Regulation 13.17.1 Student Representatives. According to the bylaw, there can be up to two student representatives on the Committee. CEP recently learned that there is no distinction between graduate or undergraduate students. CEP was approached by the Graduate Student Association (GSA) asking who could be sent as a representative to CEP, and at the time the committee responded that the representatives are undergrads. CEP has since learned that while the representatives to CEP have always been undergrads there is no basis for this. CEP thinks the bylaws should be explicit about the status of the students so that the relevant student organizations know what they're entitled to. CEP believes the bylaws should state that the student representatives should be two undergraduate students. The Committee on Committees has come to the same conclusion. The reason for this is that the majority of CEP policy discussions affect only undergraduate students and the point of having student representatives on CEP is to give voice to an entire body of people whose lives are affected by the decisions CEP makes.

Senate Vice Chair Quentin Williams commented that at a future date CEP might determine that the role of graduate students in undergraduate education would be a principle agenda item for the year. In that instance, a graduate student representative on CEP would not only be appropriate, but desired, and the proposed change seems to shut off that possibility. In the last quarter century, we have had one graduate student serve on CEP. Since CEP does have purview over some aspects of the graduate students' interaction with the undergraduate instructional mission, shutting the door on graduate student representation may not be wise. CEP Chair Padgett responded that CEP always has the ability to invite visitors to the meeting.

GSA President Berra Yazar stated that she contests the proposed change because at least 40 percent of the graduate student population works as Teaching Assistants (TA's), and are heavily involved in the quality of undergraduate education. GSA would value the opportunity to have a graduate representative.

CEP member Loisa Nygaard noted that CEP's perception is that graduate students have more opportunities than undergraduates to express their views about education. As TA's they meet regularly with faculty. Because undergraduates have fewer opportunities to have a say in their education, CEP felt they should stipulate that the two student representatives be undergraduates.

After several amendments to the motion failed, the original CEP proposed Amendment to Regulation 13.17.1 failed by a show of hands.

13.17.1 There are six Santa Cruz Division members plus the Registrar serving *ex officio*. In addition, there are one non-senate teaching faculty representative, one non-voting provosts' representative selected by the Council of Provosts, and no more than two undergraduate student representatives.

ii. Oral Report on Writing Intensive Requirement

Slides to accompany this presentation are available at: <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/>

CEP Chair Padgett provided background on the Writing Intensive Requirement (W). CEP has embarked on a reexamination of the general education program. The W is in a crisis due to a shortfall of capacity. This is one example of a larger problem, the campus's increasing difficulties in supplying undergraduate students the courses it requires and experiences it promises. We need a W, but our W is not what it should be namely, a guarantee that students will learn to write according to the conventions of their chosen field. CEP has the following recommendations concerning the W: (1) Reformulate W as a requirement that students learn to write according to the conventions of their own academic field; (2) Broaden W to a "Disciplinary Communications" requirement encompassing not only writing but other forms of communication; (3) Restore the Peer Writing Assistant Program; (4) Provide FTE for professional writing instructors to support writing in the disciplines; (5) Provide Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds to targeted departments or divisions where the need for W support is greatest.

CEP recognizes that the question of who should offer W courses has sometimes caused controversy on campus. Current regulation allows the W to be satisfied within a student's major or outside of it. CEP is not revisiting the regulation today. They would like to separate the question of who teaches W from whether W should exist and be funded. But CEP would like all departments to consider providing writing for their own majors. Every discipline has its own conventions for communicating, and departments should have considerable leeway to decide what a W-like requirement ought to mean. This should entail flexibility on CEP's part in determining W policy. Going further; scholarly communications occurs in important forms other than writing. Though writing must be a component of a requirement on scholarly communications, it need not be the only one.

CEP's goals are to recast the W as a more broadly conceived requirement in disciplinary communications, to encourage departments to develop their own educational objectives for communication within the disciplines and to take responsibility for assuring they are met. CEP Chair Padgett recognized that there are a number of objections to the W and there is a capacity problem. As an under funded requirement, W is becoming an unacceptable burden to students, advisors, and faculty. CEP feels we must increase funding for it or consider abolishing the W.

iii. Resolution on Writing Intensive Requirement (AS/SCP/1521)

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

In Favor of the Resolution	Opposed to the Resolution	Commented on
Gordon Wells	Ronnie Lipschutz	Susan Gillman
Jim Gill	Rebecca Braslau	Carol Freeman
Jaye Padgett	Grant Hartzog	Paul Koch
David Helmbold		Helen Shapiro
Loisa Nygaard		
Elizabeth Abrams		
Pamela Perry		
Don Rothman		
Forrest Robinson		

Points raised in favor of the resolution:

The suggestion that TA's should do a lot of the work in writing is a sound one, but it can't be supposed that all those graduate students who are looking for TAship positions are necessarily well-equipped to provide writing support. There should be a faculty member who is committed to the improvement of writing in the disciplines of the department or division, and that they have some responsibility for advising and supervising the TA's who adopt this role.

The resolution is in the spirit of which the W was created. Namely, CEP thought it was creating a dynamic by which there would be interaction between departments and administration to provide resources to do what is set as a matter of policy. The will of the Senate to continue the process is captured by the resolution, and the mechanism of implementation can be done in a variety of ways, including the annual budget negotiations.

CEP has thought hard about whether this is a binary choice and what that means. Notice that CEP is not asking the faculty to make a binary choice today. CEP has expressed the opinion that UCSC will have to eventually consider eliminating the requirement if the W is not supported better. CEP is inviting the Senate to express an opinion about whether a detailed proposal is worth their time. It is going to take a lot of time to create a solution. If the Senate would like the committee to spend more time working on this problem, CEP would like to know if it will result in an outcome that's worth having.

This vote is not on the funding outline that CEP prepared. It is on the idea that W is a high priority and deserves some resources.

The problem cannot be solved without additional resources. There is an idea of what a basic solution would cost, which wouldn't give an ideal system, but would represent a dramatic improvement on the current untenable situation.

Revisiting the W is the first stage of re-imagining the GE requirements. This requirement needs to be considered in terms of a student's entire education. The faculty needs this resource. Over the years there has been an increase in students who can't write sentences, and they are not transfer students.

The quality of the dialogue of writing is what's at stake, and it may not cost a lot of money to make some significant improvements if the faculty who are interested in improving the dialogue amongst students and themselves could have some models in introducing conversations about writing in their class. Faculty who know how to teach about writing can share that knowledge with faculty who want to do it, but don't know how.

The crisis in the W program and in writing in undergraduate education reflects the fact that students coming to the University are less prepared than they used to be. UCSC has lost its reputation for excellence in undergraduate education; that means the campus attracts fewer well-qualified students, and there is a greater demand for this kind of instruction in undergraduate programs. This is a broad problem that requires more money, and as UCSC begins to succeed, it will attract better students and the problem will begin to alleviate.

Points raised against the resolution:

The resolution is providing a binary choice that is inaccurate. By wording the resolution in this particular way the Senate has the choice of approving this with a recommendation of \$50k/year or abolishing the requirement. The issue is not to abolish it, but rather what must we do to improve writing.

To try and teach a student how to do a citation and the type of working used in that major when they can't write a sentence is not what the W was intended for; that's supposed to be at the core course. There are a lot of transfer students and others who complete the core courses and don't learn those fundamental skills. That needs to be addressed before we talk about disciplinary style.

It is not clear that spending money at the end of the students' careers on their writing is the best time to do it. The solution may be to spend more money earlier rather than on the W. If we can do that and improve the writing of the students when they enter the junior and senior level, faculty would be more willing to be involved.

Comments on the resolution:

This resolution and excellent report was the product of several consultations with CPB. CEP is not asking for a change in the W yet. They want our support for the work. Once they do that, they will forward that request to CPB.

Students cannot pass Writing II if they can't write a sentence. If there are classes where 50 percent of the students are not writing in sentences, their papers should be returned to them. The writing program would be interested in having lists of those students because they would like to figure out how that came to be.

The general report on the state of writing is a good one, and the recommendations make some sense. The problem is that the resolution has nothing to do with the report. The resolution is calling on the Senate to authorize CEP to fund writing in the disciplines, and it's demanding that the central administration supply the resources for whatever plan the CEP devises. Given that the last time CEP tried this, it was voted down by the Senate, we should see the actual plan. We will need to vote on a new W, so we can also look at the financials associated with it, and how responsibility is assigned to the departments.

By voting yes here, I don't want to say that we approve CEP's final statement on this. This body needs to see what CEP ends up producing, and this body needs to vote on it after CPB analyzes it. You have made a good start here on the solution, but we have to vote on what you finally do produce, because we might say no at that point.

The W requirement should be viewed within the larger context of writing resources on campus. There are a lot of complementarities; it's not just at the W level. At the core levels, the faculty is struggling to find anyone who can teach these courses, so I encourage you to look at this within the larger context of resources that Writing Program needs.

The Senate then voted on the CEP proposed resolution:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate calls on the Central and Divisional administration to work with departments and with Senate committees to find a solution to the W crisis and to allocate the resources needed for it.

The resolution passed by a voice vote.

iv. Report on Senate Resolution on Graduation Rates (AS/SCP/1520)

The report was received without comment.

b. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Oral Report on Quality of Life

CFW Chair Paul Ortiz began with an update on childcare, stating that there is no issue more important to the quality of life for faculty than access to affordable childcare. The campus needs an expanded childcare facility. Many other UC campuses are moving in this direction; UCSC has a significant amount of funds to do this but more are still needed. He thanked the campus Childcare Advisory Committee for the work they've done to keep childcare at the forefront of campus concerns. In terms of the existing childcare program, faculty/staff slots have increased this year, whereby faculty/staff slots are nearing parity with student slots. The Childcare Advisory Committee and Faculty Welfare are also working with childcare services to develop an emergency or drop-in plan for school-age rooms.

Chair Ortiz gave brief updates on CruzMail and salaries/benefits issues. CFW has been working with the Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (CCT) to address a number of CruzMail issues. CCT has been analyzing Cruz Mail problems and working with ITS to avoid future outages. Regarding resumption of contributions to UCRS, system-wide Faculty Welfare has taken the position that the benefit changes should be neutral as far as total remuneration is concerned, and that resumption of contributions to UCRS should begin only if UC also begins contributions.

Finally, Chair Ortiz provided a housing update. CFW believes the emphasis on future housing developments needs to be centered on affordability. Chair Ortiz then said he would like Steve Houser from the Faculty Staff Housing Program to provide more information.

Professor Quentin Williams made the following motion.

That UCSC grant privilege of the floor to UCSC Assistant Director, Faculty and Staff Housing, Steve Houser.

The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Assistant Director Houser reported that there are 100 members of the Academic Senate currently on the Ranch View Terrace waiting list. There is now a process guide on the housing web site that identifies the next steps for selecting and buying homes at Ranch View Terrace. There is also information on obtaining financing and the low interest option and supplemental loan program. The Faculty and Staff housing office is offering briefings to roll out the process guide the week of April 9. Specific questions might be best addressed at those briefings.

Assistant Director Houser also addressed the issues that have added to the increase in the home cost for Ranch View Terrace from \$300,000 to 400,000 in 2002 to \$480,000 to \$650,000 in 2007. The two major reasons are the increases in the cost of building materials and the cost to put the infrastructure in place. The construction market has appreciated significantly since Ranch View Terrace was first proposed, and the development is about ¼ to ½ mile away from a city street.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget

CPB Chair Susan Gillman reported that CPB has been working on issues of planning, conditions for growth, and related sub-issues. Before beginning the professional schools report CPB Chair Gillman provided an update on academic planning and enrollment growth, which relate to professional school initiatives.

Responding to the recent period of rapid growth that the campus has sustained over the past five to seven years, the campus has two conditions of growth in place: one is to increase the percentage of graduate enrollments from our current 8.7 percent to 15 percent, which is more in line with the UC average, and to increase our capacity of Instruction and Research (I&R) space to bring UCSC more in line with UCOP's overall

goal of meeting at least 80 percent of the guidelines that are set by the California Post-Secondary Education Commission. These two conditions of growth are already in place. Now, with so-called Tidal Wave II of student demographics nearing its end, we're facing different consequences of growth the swelling and flattening of undergraduate enrollments. This is going to be intensified by looming efforts to reform UC eligibility requirements, removing SAT requirements, etc, that will have unpredictable consequences for UCSC's own applicant pool and enrollment process.

Given this shift in the situation involving growth, we need to supplement these current conditions of growth with new principles of growth in order to meet these new needs. Based on CPB's discussion, UCSC needs to think about two things. First, rather than focus on raw numbers, we need to think about enrollment management all the way through the educational life cycle of the student: from the composition of the freshman class, to the distribution of students in divisions and department, to time to degree and graduation rates. UCSC also needs to monitor capacity issues. How effectively are we delivering our programs, from GE to exit seminars, for all majors? Given that these are the two areas that CPB thinks UCSC needs to focus on, CPB is developing key measures to assess the quality of undergraduate education. CPB already has measures of growth that involve graduate ratio but needs something to address undergraduate education. CPB will be looking for two more key measures that assess whether, and to what extent, educational quality is being maintained and improved. CPB is also working possibly on some sort of measures to assess and track research dollars and performance benchmarks for fundraising. CPB will report on this at the spring Senate meeting.

i. Oral Report on Professional Schools Outline (AS/SCP/1524)

CPB Chair Gillman provided background and a status update on professional schools. Professional schools promise to be a means of increasing graduate growth that is outside of traditional M.A. and Ph.D programs, which add students relatively slowly. They also promise a means of enhancing current campus strengths, rather than embarking on new ideas. Also, professional schools promise to be a means of developing community ties around the region, including Monterey Bay area institutions and the Silicon Valley.

Last year there was a call by the Academic Senate for proposals for professional schools. Seed money to further develop proposals was provided by the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs. Money available from the Office of the President for developing the UCSC-Silicon Valley connection can be used for professional school proposals. The money available for Silicon Valley initiatives is \$1.1 million. UCSC has received these funds annually for the past 5-6 years.

There are a number of options that have emerged. The most developed include the following schools: architecture and design, education, environmental science and policy, library and information technology, nursing and public health. There is a pre-professional school program that's been suggested by a small group of faculty in climate change, and among the pre-proposals from last year, coastal and marine policy was deemed to be a program, not a school, and was returned to PBSci. Two other proposals,

public media and public policy, were funded for further development in that process last year. CPB has yet to hear the outcome of any of these pre-proposals.

The most fully developed professional school proposal is for the School of Management (SOM). Two years ago, then Acting Chancellor Chemers commissioned two faculty to do a report on the feasibility of the SOM, and provided funds from the Silicon Valley initiative, which are available to anyone interested in developing a professional school that would have a component in the Silicon Valley. Since that time, CP/EVC Kliger appointed a Steering Committee that is under the leadership of Vice Provost for Silicon Valley Initiatives Carl Walsh, which produced a preliminary report in June 2006 on the feasibility of the SOM. This report was based in part on the June 2006 report of a consultant group called "Collaborative Economics." UCSC has now started to take the next step; a resource plan has been produced showing financial options for the SOM and suggesting the level of resources needed. CPB has been asked to advise on the information that the Senate might need to give this group the confidence to move to the next phase which would be to undertake the formal proposal development and approval process.

There were a number of questions and comments from the floor primarily about the SOM. Professor Dana Frank expressed concern about the SOM going against the grain of many of the values, commitments and perspectives of the UCSC faculty and students. She is concerned that this is a particular intervention on the side of a particular approach and a particular definition of the Silicon Valley, which has a very vibrant labor movement that has been trying to represent the interests of people that clean houses, clean Silicon Valley buildings and work in production. She is concerned about this as a step toward a particular definition of what UCSC is and how it is going to balance between protecting our perspective on labor management issues and the UC. If we go forward with it, what steps would be taken for matching funds for labor studies programs that represent a labor perspective and workers' perspective?

Professor Roger Anderson asked if there is a published document which outlines the criteria the campus will use in deciding whether or not to pursue a professional school. Professor Barry Bowman stated concern about starting another new program. He feels the campus has a long history of starting new programs and not finishing them. CPB Chair Gillman responded to the comments by saying that CPB has asked as part of the review of the pre-proposal of the SOM to see a set of guidelines for how the campus evaluates these proposals. Professor Shelly Errington expressed her concern, based on the recent Senate forum, that professional schools don't make sense, either as way to increase graduate student enrollment or income.

VPSVI Carl Walsh added that the budget that he oversees is given to us from the Office of the President to promote educational and research activities in Silicon Valley. He welcomes anyone who is interested in developing programs that focus on labor issues in Silicon Valley to come see him. We need to ensure that the SOM generates the resources necessary to make it a world-class institution, and that it's not subsidized by taking from on-campus programs. One of the issues is to identify the resources needed to make this

into the type of SOM, with the research strengths and connections to the faculty and programs already on campus that will bring great benefit to UCSC.

CPB Chair Gilman closed her presentation by saying that not many faculty are aware of the Silicon Valley money, and inviting Senate faculty to request a forum on professional schools.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Flori Lima, Commissioner of Academic Affairs for SUA, addressed the Senate. She began with an update on SUA activities surrounding the proposed seven percent fee increase. Over the past two weeks SUA has taken students to Sacramento and Washington DC to talk to legislators or their staff about fees and other educational issues. The seven percent fee increase will be a burden on students, particularly because CalGrant B funds have not been increased in 20 years and students are being forced to take out more in student loans.

SUA is concerned about wage parity at UCSC and support of workers. She cited examples of gaps in wages and mistreatment of workers at UCSC. According to Commissioner Lima there is \$8.5 million earmarked in the UC budget to help close the wage gap but President Dynes is proposing workers put more money in their monthly pension plans. If workers are getting more money monthly but have to give it back to the institution in their pension plans, there is no real increase in wages. Another way to support workers is to see them for their humanity. The mistreatment of workers on this campus should not be ignored.

Finally Commissioner Lima reported on two issues discussed at the recent Student Town Hall Meeting. The first issue is ethnic studies. The SUA suggested that an ethnic studies department or space is needed on campus. Their concern is that nowhere is ethnicity and race the framework used to look at issues. Rather, it has become an issue to be looked at under other frameworks. The second issue is the Alette Kendrick case, a student arrested at the Regents' campus visit protest. The SUA is concerned that her arrest was a racially motivated targeting of a student activism which they assert should not and cannot be condoned by silence or passivity. The SUA urges the Senate to write a letter to Acting Chancellor Blumenthal urging him to urge the D.A. to drop the charges.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Berra Yazar, the President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), discussed graduate student fees and student unrest on campus. GSA Representative Yazar said UCSC has the most expensive health insurance and transportation system across all the UC's, and next week the Regents will vote to increase student fees by seven percent. The GSA would like the non-resident tuition decreased. For every international graduate student, UCSC could fund approximately two grad students if there were no non-resident tuition, allowing for equal access for international and domestics. Recently, the GSA external Vice-President went to Sacramento to speak to the Committee on Higher Education about this issue. GSA President Yazar expressed concern that graduate student fees and non-resident tuition must be reduced or else UCSC will be unable to

fulfill the Academic Senate goals of increasing graduate student enrollment to 15 percent while maintaining its graduate programs' competitiveness. To help accomplish this, the GSA would like to invite some faculty to inform the Committee on Higher Education about graduate education issues.

President Yazar gave an update on student unrest on campus. Among the major concerns raised at the Student Town Hall Meeting, sponsored by the SUA, were a confusion about what is required for campus security and questions about the accountability of UC police. The GSA would like to encourage students to serve on the committee that oversees the UC police. Currently students need the support of their faculty in mentoring and understanding the need for a student voice on campus. The GSA would like the Senate to look critically at the data supplied by the UC police, and to work with students to develop more effective modes of communication.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:20 pm.

ATTEST:

Deborah K. Letourneau
Secretary

5/11/07