

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division May 30, 2007

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 30, 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 March 9, 2007. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Faye Crosby

Chair Crosby began by providing an update on a number of system-wide issues. At the system-wide level there may be a desire to reform the way admissions are conducted at UC. UCSC's Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) is monitoring this closely. There is a reorganization of the Office of the President taking place and the hope is there may be some financial savings. Should this happen the money will be used towards faculty salaries and graduate education. The final system-wide issue is the Los Alamos National Laboratory contract that UC entered into with Bechtel and other corporations. Recently it was discovered by a faculty representative that the terms of the actual contract are different than what had been represented to the faculty. The faculty understood the contract to be for seven years. However, each year UC performs well another year is added to the back of the contract. In the end the contract is for 20 years.

Local issues include the Chancellor search. The advisory committee is proceeding as expected. Everything is on schedule. In late summer there will be a presentation to the Regents with recommendations.

The campus may have an extra 300-400 frosh next year. This may be the start of the campus being highly selective. The Senate and administration are working together to ensure that resources are going where they needed.

Finally six faculty members have been awarded the Excellence in Teaching Awards: George Brown from Physics, David Draper from Applied Math and Statistics, Bruce Lyon from Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Mara Mather from Psychology, Brad Olsen from Education, Adrianna Steineker from Astronomy and Astrophysics and Andrew Szasz from Sociology. In addition Gary Griggs has been nominated for a national award of teacher of the year. Professor Griggs won the Alumni Award of Teaching Excellence this year.

At the conclusion of Chair Crosby's remarks Senate member Ted Holman, Chemistry, made a motion to move the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate would like to express its deep gratitude to Faye Crosby for your leadership of the Division during the past uniquely challenging two years. As the Chair of the Division, you have worked tirelessly on all aspects of our mission to improve our campus, and prepare us for the future. For this invaluable service, we thank you.

The resolution passed by acclamation.

b. Acting Chancellor George Blumenthal

Acting Chancellor Blumenthal began with an update on the state budget. The Governor released his revised budget, which is almost identical to the January budget; notable was the absence of academic preparation money, but both houses of the Legislature have now added \$19 million in academic preparation money to the budget. However, neither house included money that would go to this campus for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. There is hope that this will be settled in subsequent negotiations with the Governor, who is a strong advocate for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. Two of the four California institutes have branches on the Santa Cruz campus.

Capital projects have been approved by the Legislature. The Legislature has also approved language which suggests that contributions to the UC retirement system will begin again next year, likely in July of 2008. This year the pension system did well in terms of making money.

Next, Acting Chancellor Blumenthal provided an update on faculty salaries. Two years ago, the Regents announced a ten-year plan to bring salaries up to market. Two years have passed; salaries have gone up about one half of a percent, relative to our comparison institutions. UC will announce a plan starting in July to increase faculty salaries by 26 percent over the next four years. This will provide a significant catch-up to our comparison institutions. The CSU system also reached a collective bargaining agreement of 26 percent salary increases over the next four years. Wages have also been increased here at UCSC for the lowest wage workers, which has been a concern on our campus.

Acting Chancellor Blumenthal also said childcare continues to be a priority for the campus. There is a plan to reconfigure childcare space so that in the short-run the campus can create additional spaces. By next fall the campus will be able to create about a dozen new spaces with our existing facilities. The campus really needs a permanent facility though. There have been cost analyses and every year the cost goes up.

The campus will conduct a sustainability assessment; both to benchmark what we are currently doing in terms of sustainability, and to acknowledge what the campus does well. In addition, it gives the campus an opportunity measure progress and to identify areas where we could do better.

Acting Chancellor Blumenthal acknowledged a number of faculty who won significant awards this year: Bob Edgar, retired professor of Biology, for being elected to the National Academy of Sciences; Gail Hershatter, History and Jim Clifford, History of Consciousness, won Guggenheim Awards; Emeritus Professor Bill Domhoff for winning UC's Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeriti Award; Abraham Stone of Philosophy won the UC President's Research Fellowship; Harry Noller, the Sinsheimer Professor of Molecular Biology won the Darmstaedter Prize; Terrie Williams won one of the 2007 Women of Discovery Award; Nate Mackey, who had earlier won the National Book Award in November, was recently awarded a Northern California Book Award as well as a Foundation for Contemporary Arts Poetry Grant; and Geoff Pullum, last year's Faculty Research Lecturer.

Next the acting chancellor provided an update on negotiations with the city. The lawsuits from the city and county with regards to the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) will soon come to a hearing. UCSC has made settlement proposals to the city and county, and actively awaits a response, and possibly a counterproposal. Those negotiations are ongoing. Single-occupancy vehicle trips to the campus are down by ten percent this year. UCSC is finding areas to work carefully and actively with city leaders. Last month, UCSC hosted a Climate Leadership Summit to discuss the issue of greenhouse gas emissions in Santa Cruz.

Fundraising is up 15 percent this year. The final results will be available after June 30. UCSC has raised four new endowed chairs: one in Engineering, one in Physical and Biological Sciences, and two in the Humanities. That brings the total number of endowed chairs on this campus to 23.

Lastly, Acting Chancellor Blumenthal thanked Senate Chair Crosby for her years of Senate service.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger

CPEVC Kliger began by saying that when he first stepped into his position, one of his highest priorities was to help the Chancellor to build a strong leadership team for the campus. The CPEVC believes they have accomplished that and now have a great group of vice-chancellors, vice-provosts and deans.

In the area of faculty salaries, the CPEVC reported that UC will soon make an announcement on this issue. CPEVC Kliger will learn more when he attends the Council of Vice-Chancellors meeting. Earlier this year the CPEVC convened a campus task force to review faculty salary issues from a campus perspective. At the moment, that task force has been put on hold pending the UC-wide proposal, and there is hope that the proposal will solve those issues. If they don't, then the CPEVC will reconvene the task force.

With regard to housing, the campus has broken ground on Ranch View Terrace (RVT), and established a new supplemental home loan program. The Employee Housing Assistance Plan was submitted to the Senate for review in the fall, and the administration is now actively working on implementing some of the major recommendations.

Next, CPEVC Kliger reported on academic planning. Earlier this year, a revised academic plan was forwarded to the Senate; the latest draft is posted on the academic web site. The administration is approaching the academic plan in two phases. First, is what is on the web site – a vision plan that defines the academic directions for the campus in the near future. Vice-Provost Academic Affairs (VPAA) Galloway is working on the second phase of an implementation plan that would define the conditions that are needed to implement the vision plan.

In addition to the campus plan, the Office of the President is currently working on a system-wide academic plan. Throughout this year, there have been discussions between campus chancellors and the EVC's and Provost's Office about the process to create academic plans, and the results that each campus has so far.

Another area the administration has concentrated on is budget planning. This year the CPEVC convened a budget advisory group to evaluate how to move from a budget process that the campus has historically used, which allocates financial resources incrementally as a result of student growth, to one that focuses on using all the available resources on campus in a way that supports all priorities. The campus needs to do this because: first, we know our needs will exceed the new revenues that will be coming to the campus, and second, our past budget processes have resulted in most of the funds decentralized out to divisions with very little flexibility at the center to fund new initiatives. The CPEVC's budget advisory group has evaluated budgetary options for providing flexibility at the center in order to better align the budget with our academic priorities. This is a necessary step if the campus is going to implement its academic plans.

As the CPEVC previously mentioned, work began on the implementation component of the academic plan, which the administration expects to present to the Senate in the fall of 2007. VPAA Galloway will convene a group to advise her on the components of this plan and to produce a first draft in order to initiate discussions with the Senate early next fall that will focus on the entire academic plan.

More broadly, as the campus begins to address the implementation issues next year, there needs to be a more integrated planning process. A major focus of work next year will be to integrate planning efforts for capital, academic support and budget planning to develop a comprehensive, multi-year financial plan for the campus.

CPEVC Kliger closed by thanking Acting Chancellor Blumenthal, Senate Chair Crosby and Senate Vice Chair Williams for all their support and good work this year.

Following the Senate Chair, Acting Chancellor and Vice Chancellor remarks Chair Crosby asked if there were any comments or questions.

Former Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) member Onuttom Narayan, Physics, asked for an estimate of the amount of money that will be lost by University Extension (UNEX) this year, and if the administration is planning to implement the

recommendations that CPB made in 2005-06 about UNEX, which involve major restructuring while retaining those units that have academic function, or which are financially viable.

CPEVC Klinger responded by saying that Carl Walsh, who has been acting Vice Provost Silicon Valley Initiatives (VPSVI), will be presenting a report at the end of the month, providing financial information and suggestions for the structure of UNEX that will make the most sense. As to the financial loss, it is three to four million this year. The CPEVC is not planning to implement the suggested changes that the Senate made last year in restructuring UNEX. The CPEVC is talking to other UNEX deans about what structures makes sense, and VPSVI Walsh will talk to CPB about the UNEX situation, but from all the information the CPEVC has gathered, the recommendations of the Senate are not likely to get the campus out of the UNEX financial problems.

Professor Narayan reminded the Senate of the 2003-04 CPB report on UNEX. The report states that over the last three to four years, UNEX had lost \$15 million. CPB said there was a high likelihood that this gap will continue to grow since the current business plan of UNEX does not provide a viable means to increase enrollment and decrease costs so that annual revenues exceed expenses. In 2005-06, CPB recommended a major restructuring of UNEX; this was reported briefly in the CPB annual report. Then, in 2006-07 CPB reiterated its previous recommendations to downsize and restructure UNEX.

Professor Narayan then made the following motion which was seconded.

THEREFOR BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate calls on the central administration to provide a report about UCSC Extension (UNEX) to the Senate two weeks before the first Senate meeting in the fall quarter 2007. The report should include the following information:

- i. Annual UNEX deficits for every year from 2001-02 to 2006-07, the cumulative UNEX debt at the end of 2006-07, the amount we will pay in interest on this debt in 2006-07 and the source(s) of funds used to pay this interest.**
- ii. Whether the central administration is willing to implement the recommendations of the 2005-06 Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) for restructuring UNEX (summarized in the CPB 05-06 Annual Report and endorsed by CPB in 2006-07). If not, the report should define:
 - a) How the administration plans to return UNEX to solvency;**
 - b) The maximum losses and other trip points that will signal the failure of the administrative plan and the need to implement the recommendations made by CPB (or make a commensurate change in direction with regard to UNEX operation).****

Carl Walsh, VPSVI, commented that one of the problems he faced in assessing the direction of recommendations was the CPB report contained no analysis. There were suggestions but no analysis of the financial implications of implementation. He expressed concern over a call for implementation without analysis.

Paul Koch, former chair of CPB, added that in addition to what is stated in the resolution the Senate would like to have explained at the next Senate meeting how the UNEX will obtain solvency and what the maximum losses will be before we go to this plan for solvency.

Current CPB Chair Susan Gillman addressed VPSVI Walsh's comments by saying that at the beginning of the year, there was an effort by then UNEX Dean Sandeen to present two scenarios that did follow through on CPB's suggestions; that is to keep pieces of UNEX that were profitable, and see what happened if you eliminated the largest causes of major debt. Chair Gillman does believe there is some financial analysis of some of those pieces; what the resolution is asking for is to make sure it continues now. The Senate believed it would receive analysis and movement by the end of the year, the resolution expresses the Senate's frustration.

Andy Fisher, Earth and Planetary Sciences, said that the resolution is not a referendum on UNEX, but an important request for information; Senate members need this information to fulfill their obligations, participate in shared governance and evaluate the distribution and use of scarce campus resources in this time of academic planning. UCSC appears to have incurred considerable debt over the last seven years while operating UNEX, debt that appears to grow at an alarming rate despite cuts in operation. Because of a dearth of information regarding UNEX funding, it is not clear to the Senate how the UNEX deficit is being financed, the extent to which the financing has a negative impact on the goals of this campus, or what those future impacts might be. He is concerned about the negative impact that the ongoing and growing UNEX deficit could have on UCSC's research mission. This information is important to CPB, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Committee on Research (COR) and the Graduate Council (GC), but it should concern all Senators who care about UCSC's future.

Roger Anderson, Chemistry, expressed his support for the resolution and said that any time the campus runs a continuing deficit is a cause for concern.

The resolution passed by voice vote.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (AS/SCP/1536)

The report was received with one change- correcting the title Vice Chair of Committee on Committees.

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL)

Leta Miller, Chair of the Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture (CFRL) acknowledged her colleagues on the committee: Jonathan Beecher, Catherine Cooper, Donna Haraway and Bakthan Singaram. CFRL nominated Stan Woosley, Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, to deliver the 2007-08 Faculty Research Lecture. Professor Woosley is one of the world's leading astronomers, known for his pioneering work with understanding the end-stage evolution of massive stars. He has been at UCSC since 1975; in 2001 he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 2006 to the National Academy of Sciences. Recent awards cite his fundamental contributions to stellar evolution theory, particularly noting his work in the mathematical mechanisms involved in stellar death.

Woosley's most recent bio lists 358 published articles with 11 more under review; citations of his work exceed 16,000; his most influential paper having been cited nearly 1,200 times.

CFRL's nomination was accepted by acclamation.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Academic Personnel

ii. Amendment to Bylaw 13 (AS/SCP/1534)

Barry Bowman, Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) provided background on the Amendment to Bylaw 13. The amendment is procedural and does not affect any policy. Currently, when a vote on a personnel action is reported, Bylaw 55 states that the number in favor/opposed/abstained/recused/waived/absent/not voting is recorded. It is not clear what happens if a person goes on leave, and would normally waive their right to vote but in fact wants to vote on a case. The recommendation is a member cannot waive their right to vote; they have to waive for a period of time. If one wants to be gone but wishes to vote on a particular case, they may vote on it, and those who do not vote should be recorded as absent/not voting. The proposed Bylaw does nothing more than state that. There was some confusion between absent/not voting which means a member just didn't vote, versus abstained, which means they cast a vote that said abstain, meaning the vote supports neither a positive or negative recommendation.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Bylaw 13.4.

13.4.5 Waiver of vote: Members of the Division may give up their right to vote on all actions for a specified period of time. If a member goes on leave, but chooses to participate in some personnel actions, that member cannot waive her/his right to vote; the actions not voted on will be recorded as “absent, not voting”, just as for a member not on leave. If a member has a conflict of interest for any given action, not voting on that action constitutes a “recusal” (as in SCB 13.4.3) not a waiver of voting rights.

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

b. Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

i. Report on the Executive Summary of the 2005-06 Diversity Climate Study (AS/SCP/1525)

Pedro Castillo, Chair of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) presented the summary. He announced that a draft of the 2005-06 Diversity Climate Study will be finished this summer and presented to the Academic Senate in the fall for deliberations over implementation of the study.

The Executive Summary was accepted without comment.

c. Committee on Committees

i. Committee Nominations for 2007-08 (AS/SCP/1537)

Carol Freeman, Chair of the Committee on Committees (COC) presented additional 2006-07 nominations. These included: Lori Kletzer for Vice Chair, Bruce Cooperstein for Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, Olof Einarsdottir and Gabriel Elkaim for Committee on Career Advising, Andrew Moore for Committee on Computing and Telecommunications, Jorge Hankamer, Chair and Kenneth Bruland for Committee on Research, and Alex Pang for Committee on International Education. In addition, Ken Kletzer will not be the chair for the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. All the nominations were approved by acclamation.

Chair Freeman announced that the 2007-08 Senate Service Scholar is Assistant Professor Lora Bartlett, Education.

iii. Amendment to Bylaw 3.4 Non-Senate Members Privilege of the Floor at Meetings of the Santa Cruz Division (AS/SCp/1527)

COC Chair Freeman provided background on the amendment to Bylaw 3.4. COC proposed that the non-Senate faculty members who serve on standing Senate Committees be offered privilege of the floor. In 2004, as a result of recommendations of the special Committee on Non-Senate Teaching Faculty, the Academic Senate changed the Bylaws of six committees to have non-Senate faculty representatives recognizing that a large proportion of instruction is provided by non-Senate faculty, and they have important perspectives that would be helpful to Senate committees. Following the Special Committee’s advice that the Senate do what it can to enhance the ability of non-Senate faculty to fulfill their vital role in UCSC’s educational and service missions; COC now proposes that those non-Senate faculty who serve on committees be allowed to speak at

Senate meetings. This does not include voting, moving or seconding motions; just entering the debate.

Responding to an inquiry from the floor, questioning if it isn't already the right of the Senate Chair to recognize anybody on the floor to speak on an issue, Chair Crosby responded that this is not the case. Students have privilege of the floor as prescribed by our Bylaws and their names have to be submitted in advance of the meeting.

The Senate then voted on Amendment to Bylaw 3.4:

3.4.1 The following students of the Santa Cruz campus may attend meetings of the Santa Cruz Division and shall have the privilege of the floor, but may not make or second motions, and may not vote: the Chair of the Student Union Assembly; the President of the Graduate Student Association; the student campus representative; one student delegate from each college (the method of selection of the delegate from a college to be determined by the students of that college); and up to four students per committee from those students who are appointed to sit regularly with Divisional committees appointed by the Committee on Committees.

3.4.2 Non-senate faculty members of the Santa Cruz campus who are appointed as representatives to Divisional committees appointed by the Committee on Committees may attend meetings of the Santa Cruz Division and shall have the privilege of the floor, but may not make or second motions, and may not vote.

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

d. Committee on Computing and Telecommunications

i. 2006-07 CCT Report (AS/SCP/1535)

Luca de Alfaro, Chair of the Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (CCT) presented the 2006-07 report. He began with the issue of dark fiber connectivity to campus. Currently UCSC has a slow, unreliable internet connection and has only one leased 1GB connection to the rest of the internet. There is no true redundancy, limited bandwidth and no ability to manage the connection. UCOP has committed to help with the cost of the connection, which other campuses already have. This will happen in the next two to three years. This means the campus will have the ability to cooperate across campuses and the U.S. for data centers, fast access to resources and data sharing.

Chair de Alfaro reported that we are running out of space in data centers, both for administration and for research computing. A top-notch data center in the Delaware Street building would cost approximately \$12 million. CCT believes data center capability will be of strategic importance. CCT encourages Information and Technology Services (ITS) to consider alternative and cheaper solutions, such as: co-location with industrial partners, creating a data center suitable for research, and one for administrative computing.

CCT Chair de Alfaro addressed the question of whether UCSC should make laptops a requirement for undergraduates. He explained this is not a way of encouraging students and instructors to bring laptops to class. The use of laptops in instruction is at the complete discretion of the instructor. This is a way to: raise financial help for students, help bridge the digital divide between the wealthy and poor and make laptop ownership easier. Currently students can buy laptops at a discount and 80 percent of current students own a laptop. If it is made a requirement the campus can reach agreements with multiple vendors so that ten percent of what the students pay at the discounted price will be returned to UCSC. This ten percent can be used for two things: providing a laptop help desk or distribution to the office of financial aid to help provide laptops for low-income students.

CCT Chair de Alfaro then addressed Cruz Mail. The problems with Cruz Mail include failures in third-party hardware components and misconfigurations. CCT has the following recommendations to improve Cruz Mail.

- Technical
 - Rearchitect the storage system
 - Explore more distributed server configurations
 - Copy well-tried solutions in other institutions
- Management: Somebody should “own Cruz Mail”; create the figure of a technical project manager
 - Person with clear technical expertise and vision
 - Has decision-making authority, including policy
 - Is responsible for pushing issues through committees
 - Has vision for campus-wide implications of service

Finally, CCT Chair de Alfaro discussed Google Apps. Google Apps features include: Email (gmail style), calendar, shared documents and spreadsheets, new applications, offered for students at no cost. Google Apps is being discussed across the UC system. CCT Chair de Alfaro presented aspects of using Google Apps.

- Positive
 - It gives the campus a recovery plan
 - Many students like the interface
 - Good collaboration tools
 - Facilitates providing email to students, alumni
 - Faculty could use it on a trial basis
- Negatives
 - Not currently suited to staff/administration
 - Legal agreement still in process
 - Lock-in: what if conditions change?

Responding to an inquiry about the cost savings of outsourcing student email and confidentiality issues, CCT Chair de Alfaro confirmed that if the staff is not committed to Google there is not a cost savings. Also, there are issues for faculty related to subpoenas; if Google receives a subpoena for UCSC information, UCSC cannot take over the process

of fighting the subpoena. Responding to an inquiry that no one has any accountability for Cruz Mail, Senate Chair Crosby responded that Vice Provost of Information Technology (VPIT) has authority over Cruz Mail, but the meaning is there are people in the lower level of the organization who have technical ability to do the changes, but the changes have to be approved by committee, and there is not a single person who has the ability to command these changes except for VPIT Larry Merkley. UCSC needs one person with authority to accept and move forward with committee recommendations.

It was noted that recapturing the money for laptops requires that students buy their computers on campus. At this point how many students buy their computer at UCSC? Chair de Alfaro did not have an exact number but did say that the money the campus would be capturing is more than a half million per year.

e. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.17.6 (AS/SCP/1529)

Jaye Padgett, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) presented the change to Bylaw 13.17.6. The change is to clarify what CEP's responsibilities are with respect to UNEX. CEP Chair Padgett understands that the original language was grafted into CEP Bylaws some years ago from a Senate committee that had the purview of oversight of UNEX and was then abolished.

The current language is problematic in that it attributes to CEP oversight of the UNEX budget which is CPB's purview. In addition, the language is so overly specific that it might be taken to imply inappropriate limitations on CEP's purview. The new language states CEP does the same thing for UNEX that it does for the regular campus.

Responding to an inquiry, Chair Padgett confirmed that CEP currently approves programs at UNEX.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Bylaw 13.17.6:

13.17.6 The powers and responsibilities stated in SCB 13.17 extend to University Extension under the auspices of the Santa Cruz campus. In addition CEP coordinates, in such respects as it deems advisable, the relations of University Extension with the Division.

The Amendment passed by voice vote.

ii. Report on Change in Student Health Center Policies (AS/SCP/1526)

The report was received without comment.

iii. Progress Report on the W Requirement (AS/SCP/1538)

CEP Chair Padgett reported that CEP is beginning to get involved with individual departments to try to solve the Writing Intensive Requirement (W) issue. CEP has proposed to work with CPB next fall on the issue and there will be legislation.

The report was received without comment.

f. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Oral Report on Quality of Life

Paul Ortiz, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), provided an update on childcare. CFW had a productive meeting with Acting Chancellor Blumenthal who made a strong statement favoring childcare and agreed to assign a representative from his office to attend subsequent Childcare Advisory Committee meetings. He also agreed to work with the development office to make fundraising for childcare a priority. Chair Ortiz said that as the campus grows it needs to factor in childcare facilities. The campus has not done this in the past and now is paying the price. Childcare needs to be an integral part of any future discussion regarding growth.

Faculty workload is a key problem that CFW identified in the fall when reviewing the draft academic plan. CFW feels the administration needs to factor in workload more seriously to the current and subsequent academic plans.

Currently the campus does not have the resources to improve faculty's quality of life. CFW has consistently made the argument that salaries, housing and childcare are bundled issues that should not be pitted against each other. UCSC has proven that we can find resources for projects when it has been necessary. When it comes to quality of life for faculty and staff, we need to commit to finding resources for that.

CFW Chair Ortiz then introduced CFW members Ted Holman and Karen Bassi who discussed CFW's ideas of reindexing the pricing of existing housing stock. Professor Holman reported that the administration is developing a master housing plan. UCSC has outside consultants working toward this plan. The key will be building future houses at good price points; Ranch View Terrace's price point is too high.

Within the concept of a global master housing plan, one issue is the reindexing/repricing of existing housing. The Senate committees weighed in on this in the fall, and there were some responses to the CPEVC; and now CFW is weighing in on them.

CFW would like the repricing to be equitable and flexible so the neediest people will benefit. The price will be set for livability, not affordability, and CFW hasn't come up with a good idea as to where these prices should be. CFW agrees they should be lower than RVT.

One concept is all the profits will go towards a fund that will be used to lower the cost for the faculty members who need it the most. For example, if you buy a house that is at a current price point, and you are double income, two full professors, you don't need to have a low-price on this unit. You'll pay "full freight," but the next person could be an assistant professor, and UCSC will provide a low-interest loan to take that price point down so they can afford it.

CFW is trying to make this a resource to help those who need it. All the profits will be deposited into a stand alone account so CFW knows where the money is going, and can keep track of it so that it doesn't get touched by other programs. UCSC will buy the homes directly which makes it easier for people to vacate the homes.

Professor Holman addressed how the low-interest loan might be implemented. Currently it is a ten year low interest loan, and if it is going to be beneficial to those who need it, it has to lower their monthly mortgage; not necessarily make it cheap for them over the long-term, but each month allow them to pay their bills.

Professor Bassi added that reindexing is a euphemism that hides the fact that the proposal is to increase the price of existing on-campus for-sale housing. When CFW started discussing this with the administration, the term "affordability" was used, and people were talking about monthly payments that were measured against the market value of houses, or RVT. That is not appropriate. The people CFW wants to serve the most are incoming assistant professors; the main point is the ability to recruit and retain the best faculty. CFW does not want 40 to 50 percent of someone's income to go toward their mortgage. CFW wants people to have a good quality of life.

Following the CFW presentation there were a number of questions and comments from the floor. Dean Mathiowetz, Politics, inquired as to how raising the price on a property in order to lend him more money will lower his monthly payments.

Professor Holman responded of the 60 faculty on that list, there is no ranking in terms of need. CFW wants to put a curve on the grading. That way when the homes are repriced they are still affordable. By raising all the prices, they can target the people who need it. Helping a full professor buy a cheap house on campus isn't what this resource should be used for. This plan is more socialist.

Professor Bassi added that the loans are extremely low-interest, at three percent. CFW wants to make it possible that the home that comes up is the home you want, can afford and that your monthly payment will be such that you can live a good life.

Suresh Lodha, Computer Engineering, asked if the money for housing comes from the same pot as the money for salaries. If the answer is yes he said, one can wonder if UCSC is more efficient than the average American in building houses and whether we should just give people the cash instead of worrying about building. Also, because cash can be split in smaller amounts people can decide where to live.

Professor Holman answered by saying that campus housing has to pay for itself. There are infusions of cash; the CPEVC allotted a million dollars for the low interest loan program, but the cost of RVT has been recouped from the purchasers. That is the concept. We either pay for ourselves it or go to the administration and ask for more money to help us get into homes. The low interest program is working very well. There are start-up packages that include part of a down payment towards a home. The problem with selling the homes at the market prices is with taxes. If the prices were raised and the

profits went to current owners when they leave, everyone in the community would have to pay higher taxes, whether they sell or not.

Professor Lodha asked if UCSC can add additional floors and livings spaces to these units, or it is just internal remodeling. Professor Holman responded that if UCSC can make some internal upgrades the buyer doesn't have to spend as much out-of-pocket money. Lodha added that he does not support external changes or additions to existing homes.

Professor Shelly Errington, Anthropology, commented that this is an urgent matter. Professor Bassi said that one of the major differences is that CFW is proposing that 100 percent of profits go into the loan program. None of those profits will be used for anything else but facilitating home ownership at a livable price, particularly for new professors for whom housing is an issue. None of the money will go towards administration or future projects, but there will be oversight by the Senate. Senate Chair Crosby reminded the Senate that MOP loans are for faculty only.

g. Committee on Planning and Budget

i. Report on Conditions and Strategies for Growth (AS/SCP/1531)

Susan Gillman, Chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget, stated that CPB's intent on writing the report is both retrospective and prospective. CPB wanted to insure that the Senate is informed of various recommendations that faculty made as a group over the past five years of intensive growth.

The report shows that the campus experienced a series of anomalies. First, there were two central recommendations in a resolution passed in 2002: that the campus should meet 80 percent of the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) space requirement, and that UCSC should strive for a goal of a 15 percent graduate ratio. No target date was put on either. The anomalies are that UCSC is about to meet the CPEC standard for space; in fall, 2007 the campus will have 82.9 percent of the space standards. This does not mean they have been met across campus. There are differential space requirements. There is a space crisis on campus among some disciplines, primarily those with labs. In Social Sciences, Physical and Biological Sciences and Engineering, there are also cost overruns for new construction. Those cost overruns which every campus is facing, present another issue in relation to the projected estimated space going up in the next few years.

The second anomaly is the graduate ratio: UCSC did not meet the 15 percent, but slipped below our graduate ratio from last year, as the campus has in the past few years. The campus increased the number of new graduate programs coming online, as well as the absolute number of graduate courses. However, the campus received an unanticipated 12 percent increase in freshman for fall, 2007. Without a commensurate decrease in undergrad enrollment contemplated, as was part of the original resolution, the 15 percent has not been met. Taken together, all this produced a disproportionate increase in graduate courses relative to graduate enrollments, and a corresponding decrease in

undergraduate offerings. Meeting that 15 percent goal has engaged the campus in a series of anomalies, some of which could have been predicted, but which are disturbing.

The third anomaly is professional schools, which have been a corollary of that 15 percent goal. Discussion of professional schools has been in resolutions and CPB reports since 2002. The campus still lacks the necessary follow through that was envisioned for professional schools in regards to the precise mix of students that would produce the kind of graduate growth that UCSC wanted. UCSC has not considered the relationship of these professional programs to undergraduate instruction and research that is the interdependencies between undergraduate and graduate growth.

The last anomaly is that the best developed professional school that initially surfaced, the School of Management, has raised concerns about the intellectual fit of the planned school with our campus and its financial sustainability.

The campus needs immediate measures like increasing TA allocations and changing the method of those allocations. CPEVC Kliger has taken an important mitigation step in that the 2007-08 proposed budget includes a one-time increase for improvements to undergraduate education. This type of immediate response is essential.

CPB Chair Gillman reported the following developments in relationship to other professional schools and programs. Interest is emerging in three programs: Education, Environmental Science and Policy, and Public Health. The Graduate Division (GD) is funding one summer GSR-ship for a student under the Environmental Studies chair to do research to help frame this school, and there should be a similar request from the School of Education, the GD will fund that too. The Division of Social Sciences is funding a one-month summer salary to the chair of both Environmental Studies and Education to work with a small committee, from both inside and outside the respective departments, which are drafting a pre-proposal for professional schools in their areas. Despite the fact that there was not a professional school forum in the spring, it will happen in the fall, and there will be a better set of options for us to discuss.

The final two recommendations: CPB believes it is important to establish some kind of enrollment targets by program with commensurate resources to follow; targets without resources are useless. Resources may be allocated differentially by graduate programs, based on the mix of grants, fellowships and TA-ships that are available in different disciplines. CPB thinks that those targets are important to consider and establish in view of possible negative and unintended consequences, such as ones that occurred in the past, as an almost exclusive way to allocate resources. CPB considers this a more nuanced notion of what a target would be; who counts within it. CPB then reviews those targets during annual FTE requests, allowing two to three years for the programs to make progress, and to have the option to reevaluate the FTE allocation based on the progress.

Finally, enrollment manipulation, not management, will be the key.

Paul Koch, Earth and Planetary Sciences, commented that there is a third part of the anomaly which is making it seem like there is a disproportionate amount of resources going to graduate classes. There is a disproportionate amount of the ladder-ranked faculty resources going there. One would hope that as we fill in those faculty positions that were left open, there will be fill-in for the undergraduates as well.

Barry Bowman, Biology, expressed concern that there are a certain number of FTE that are being set aside for professional schools. The effect being that if your group isn't designing some type of professional school, you are going to be excluded. He questioned if plans are coming because people feel a need for those schools or if it is simply scrambling for academic resources.

CPB Chair Gillman responded that there are central FTE reserves that are held for various kinds of initiatives, including professional schools. There are none that have been dedicated exclusively to professional schools.

John Tamkun, Biology, said that the plan is that at an enrollment of 17,000, we would have 60 FTE held aside for professional schools or new programs, and at an enrollment of 19,500, the number would be increased to 100. Those are reserved for faculty in professional schools in part, but are also held for start-up packages and research support.

Bob Meister, Politics, stated that in 2002 the Senate passed a resolution making future campus growth at the undergraduate level conditional on not moving downward for two consecutive years in our graduate/undergraduate ratio. He surmises that the campus has moved downward, and asked if the Senate waived the condition or whether the administration ignored it. CPB Chair Gillman responded that the Senate did not waive the condition.

Senate Chair Crosby added that it is an inexact science as to how many students are going to come, and the number of students that were admitted as undergraduates was exactly the same as before; we didn't increase the number of admits, but we had a much higher take rate, many more students who signaled their intention to register. Also, she said, the campus did make an effort to have more graduate students, and unfortunately, in part because of our graduate support packages, we are slightly down, so that it is not as if we tried to ignore what was happening. The timing caught us by surprise.

CPB Chair Gillman said it is not easy to reach 15 percent. The methods by which we do it, such as developing professional schools, are not something we all agree on, have not been studied extensively, and need to be discussed comprehensively.

Professor Tamkun commented that he hopes that before the discussion of professional programs goes much further that the campus will create a concrete plan for addressing the problems facing undergraduate education. There are many over-subscribed courses, a declining quality of undergraduate education, increased reliance on inexperienced lecturers in introductory courses, the lack of advising support, financial aid, and many other problems.

CPB Chair Gillman responded that the report focused on undergraduate education. CPB did devote a lot of attention since the resolution in 2002, to graduate education, and followed the intent of the original resolution to always think of it in concert with undergraduate education. CPB took that measure as a single goal and that is the point of the report.

There were two final comments from the floor. Roger Anderson, Chemistry, suggested CPB should include student credit hours in each of these categories: graduate, upper division, lower division, permanent faculty. The number of courses at the lower division level is constant, although faculty has increased. Professor Anderson suspects that means that the size of the courses has increased substantially. Margo Hendricks, Literature, requested that CPB reconsider the holding of resources for future possibilities and look at mitigating the current problems, we face with respect to the quality of life, including the retention and hiring of excellent faculty.

ii. Oral Report on Research Funding

CPB member Quentin William provided a brief interim report on research funding. He said this report is a precursor to a longer and more involved report incorporating other committee's opinions. The report contains a comparison of UCSC state support and another university that has seen a similar decline in state support. CPB questions, as state support continues to decline, what will take up the slack? CPB looked at the research/extramural portions, and tried to evaluate what current expenses and income are associated with it. Of that 23 percent of the budget that comes from external grants, there is a formulation for how a particular portion of the indirect cost, is routed around the campus.

CPB is working to provide a basis for further analysis for campus growth plans. An interim report will be coming soon to the CPB web site and there will be a more thorough look at this next year.

Andy Fisher, Chair of the Committee on Research (COR), commented that COR has been looking at questions of indirect cost recovery (ICR) tracking on COR and UCORP. For the vast majority of the research, which is secured at the federal rate of 50 percent, it is cost reimbursement. The University works hard to justify those indirect cost rates, and they are real rates. As those funds get shifted around, we consume ourselves. We use up resources and infrastructure that is not replaced. The University has no legal obligation to spend indirect costs on what they are secured for. This is risky, and indirect costs are particularly vulnerable during periods of economic crisis due to that flexibility. The campus ought to be very cautious in looking at them as a source of revenue. They are reimbursement.

Professor Williams added that how the federal indirect costs are generated is dictated carefully by the Office of Management and Budget.

VPSVI Walsh remarked that the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC), unlike the approximate 50 percent indirect cost receipt rate mentioned for on campus activities, is only 17.8 percent, because this is a contract. The campus is supposedly reimbursed for costs, so it only gets an indirect rate that reflects the costs associated with operating the contract. It is reduced because the costs did not justify the standard off-campus rate of 28 percent. There are other benefits we see from research activities. For example, by managing the UARC, the campus receives an award fee, and the million dollars that the campus provost provided for faculty housing support was made possible by that award fee. There are other sources of revenue that can be obtained by these research tasks that are more discretionary; they are returns to the campus for doing a good job, and not returns for costs, and that gives us flexibility in some of our research activities to use those funds for other things.

Professor Williams closed by saying that indirect cost rates are negotiated, so an equipment grant has a 0 percent overhead rate, UARC has 17 percent, and the standard rate on campus is 51 percent. The other point is there are ancillary benefits of research that are clearly not taken into account here. The campus brings in a lot of graduate student researchers (GSRs) and maintains state of the art research facilities. Each of those is pivotal to our mission.

h. Committee on Preparatory Education

i. Oral and Written Report on Enforcement of Senate Regulation 10.5.2 (AS/SCP/1539)

Judith Habicht-Mauche, Chair of the Committee on Preparatory Education, provided background on the report. Last year, CPE reported its concern with the rising number of students entering UCSC without having satisfied the entry level writing requirement (ELWR), combined with a significant decrease on the “pass” rate of the November writing exam, and the increasing number of students reaching the fourth quarter of enrollment without having passed the ELWR.

According to CPE Chair Habicht-Mauche there are some data to suggest that the problem may be due to a number of students who are English as second language students (ELS), but who can not be the entire cause for the level of changes.

Increasing numbers of students do not meet UCSC’s expectations for university-level writing, and they were taking longer to achieve that level of competency. To mitigate this trend, CPE decided to enforce regulation 10.5.2, which is a Senate regulation controlling the ELWR regulations, and states in part that students who have not fulfilled the ELWR before coming to campus need to enroll in an appropriate writing course to help them meet the requirement, and remain enrolled until they do. CPE collaborated successfully with a number of units on campus to see it enforced this year; they worked with the Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Registrar’s office, the Writing Program, and the Humanities Division and college advisors to make sure the students were properly enrolled.

CPE also enforced the rule for the spring quarter. There are seven sections of Writing 21 currently, and some of the curricular changes that the Writing Program put in place for those fourth quarter students which seem to be successful. Enforcement of regulation 10.5.2 may be helping. Students are completing the requirement earlier in the four-quarter sequence. This trend needs to be followed for a few years to validate it. By enforcing this rule, the campus will get students through faster. CPE is concerned that there is no support for these troubled writers after they complete the ELWR and their second composition requirement, so they take one more course after these ELWR courses, and then they enter the general population. There is no way to assess the writing of transfer students, and there is no support for them. They come in having fulfilled the ELWR, Comp 1 and Comp 2 requirements almost universally.

Tutoring support on this campus has been reduced; there is no writing support for people not in education opportunity programs (EOP). Faculty can not send students to get tutoring, and there are no courses in the Writing Program applicable to these students. CPE considers this a problem. CPE recommends that UCSC provide support to this growing segment of the UC-eligible student body. This will be a bigger part of campus admissions, even as we become more selective. Dealing with these curricular and resource impacts of these trends in writing prep needs to be a more centralized part of any academic plan adopted by UCSC.

i. Committee on Privilege and Tenure

i. Proposed Revision to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.26.3 (AS/SCP/1530)

Ken Kletzer, Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), explained that the existing divisional Bylaw is inconsistent with the system-wide one. P&T proposes striking that inconsistent language. This amendment clarifies that this grievance panel is not available to advise faculty on discipline. Instead P&T advises faculty to seek appropriate legal counsel since the University is represented by legal counsel. P&T does not want faculty to be potentially deceived that there are resources on campus to advise them on disciplinary matters.

The grievance panel advises faculty file a grievance stating that their rights and privileges have been violated.

The Senate then voted on the Amendment to Bylaw 10.5.2.

13.26.3 The Committee on Committees shall appoint a panel of up to six members to serve as grievance advisors, in accordance with SB 335B(1). Panel members should be experienced in privilege and tenure processes, and preferably be former members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Appointments are for three years and are renewable. Panel members shall advise members of the faculty with respect to their rights or privileges and grievance procedures. Panel members may not serve on investigative or hearing panels or as representative of any of the parties of such procedures.

The motion passed by voice vote.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Kresge College representative Ariel Hamburger introduced the new Commissioner of Academic Affairs, Jamal Atiba.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Berra Yazar, the President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), announced that the GSA recently elected a new president, Chelsea Juarez.

The GSA still believes that abolishing the non-resident graduate student tuition is instrumental in approaching the 15 percent enrollment goals which currently seem to be financially unfeasible. GSA President Yazar reported that the Regents agree in principle with the GSA's position, however they need a push from the faculty. The GSA feels that national legislation is not helping their cause, because the new immigration laws and statistics show that almost half of all graduate students stay in California and contribute to the economy. With the new immigration laws, graduate students are less likely to stay in the states because their families can not accompany them. In the interest of controlling certain populations, the immigration laws are hurting graduate students. For next year, non-resident tuition will be a priority at the UC-wide Student Association. The Association recently changed some Bylaws and now have a dedicated action agenda item specific to graduate student issues. Current plans are to push the legislature to allow tuition waivers for resident international students as they have done for AB540 students.

The GSA has formally responded to the Demonstration Response Team (DRT) report with the following comments:

1. There were no students on the DRT. Their input was sought after the process was completed.
2. The GSA feels that classification of demonstrations on a numerical basis does not serve the intended purpose. If a protest has more than 50 students, the police are fully authorized to engage. According to the police chief, they determine their own laws and can do whatever they feel like. The GSA feels it is the responsibility of the administration to make every attempt to keep things from getting to that level by removing the numerical classification.
3. The GSA feels it is important to improve accountability on campus. They feel that the Campus Safety Committee that had student members should be revived. This will allow a constant student voice about campus safety issues, and will hopefully validate points of view and prevent demonstrations from getting out of hand.

President Yazar also reported that graduate student health insurance has been fully funded. There are no benefit cuts to the graduate student health plan this year, despite a 14 percent cost increase. Graduate Dean Lisa Sloan is working to establish system-wide health insurance through the Graduate Dean's Council and the GSA will also continue to push this at the UC-wide Student Association.

Following President Yazar's presentation Karen Bassi, Literature, asked how the Senate and administration are responding to the non-resident tuition recommendation, and to the numerical demonstration item.

Senate Chair Crosby responded that the system-wide Senate has been vociferous, and has cast a vote in favor of having no non-resident tuition. President Yazar added that the state legislature has to be informed of this issue, because it is becoming clouded by surrounding issues such as AB540. She recommended getting in touch with the faculty Regent representative.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Prior to adjourning the meeting, Senate Chair Crosby acknowledged that the Senate has worked extremely well together, and acknowledged the Academic Senate staff for their help.

Adjournment: 5:18 pm.

ATTEST:

Deborah K. Letourneau
Secretary