

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division

March 7, 2008

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, March 7, 2008 at the Colleges Nine & Ten Multipurpose Room. Prior to the meeting Senate Vice Chair Lori Kletzer was appointed to serve as secretary *pro tem* for this meeting. With Parliamentarian Bruce Bridgeman present, Chair Quentin Williams called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Williams asked if there were any additional changes, other than those submitted in writing, to the minutes of November 9, 2007. Professor Onuttom Narayan asked that the reference to “the chancellor” on page five of the minutes be changed to read “the provost.” Chair Williams accepted the change and the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Quentin Williams

Chair Williams provided an update on issues occurring at the system-wide level. The presidential search is ongoing and President Dynes is slated to step down in June. There is a high degree of uncertainty surrounding the 2008-09 budget. It appears the Regents will not formally decide on the level of 2008-09 student fees before May and how the legislature may revise the governor’s proposed budget is of great concern.

Chair Williams also provided an update on system-wide Senate business. The Board on Admissions and Relations to Schools (BOARS) has generated a revised proposal to notably change UC’s freshman eligibility policies. Divisional Senate committees will review and assess the revised proposal during the spring quarter.

Chair Williams reported that the Senate is continuing to monitor faculty salaries. Last fall the UC system initiated a four year plan to bring UC faculty compensation in line with that of its comparison institutions and then the state budget crisis hit. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has been working on a review of UCSC salaries relative to the other campuses, along with proposals for further addressing the salary situation. This will be an ongoing issue of attention for the next several months.

Chair Williams informed the Senate that Chancellor Blumenthal will be invested on June 6 and expressed pleasure that a UCSC faculty member is occupying the highest office of the campus. Chair Williams concluded his comments by saying that over the last few weeks truly reprehensible actions have taken place including the targeting of faculty and other colleagues via assaults at their homes. While the campus can civilly argue over campus protests, such actions strike not only long standing and cherished values of academic freedom, but at the basic underpinnings of civilized society, and are, in Chair Williams’ view, completely contemptible and unacceptable.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal joined Chair Williams in condemning the attempted invasion of a faculty member's home. He called it an insidious act and the most serious attack on academic freedom in the 42 year history of the campus. The attack is unacceptable and should not be tolerated. The campus is offering support in a variety of ways to those faculty members whose security is threatened at their homes. He believes it is important to have civil and rational dialogues on this campus. While this recent act was an illegal protest it should not color the campus reaction to legal and civil protests. For such protests the campus should be tolerant and accepting that students do have a right to protest.

Chancellor Blumenthal provided an update on the state budget noting that the Governor's proposed budget for UC was 417 million dollars less than the request from the Regents. There will be budget cuts to the university. The university has already made the decision to admit all UC eligible students this year, even though UC may not be fully funded for them. However, the university feels and has stated no obligation to continue that next year should the budget situation continue to worsen.

Chancellor Blumenthal said one of the most important issues from a statewide viewpoint is faculty salaries. The chancellor is not sure how the budget cuts will affect the four year plan but believes that faculty salaries are the highest or one of the highest priorities. Chancellor Blumenthal added the budget situation is sufficiently serious that he thinks the campus has to be supportive of UC's efforts in Sacramento. Tuesday, March 4 was UC Day at the state capital. Alumni from all UC campuses descended upon Sacramento to meet with legislators. Chancellor Blumenthal was present and pleased to note the enthusiasm that alumni have shown toward the university, the university experience and the need to continue to provide accessible and affordable education to the students of California. While at the capital Chancellor Blumenthal presented an award to John Laird as the Outstanding Legislator.

The chancellor also reported that UC students were in Sacramento lobbying legislators this past week and Chancellor Blumenthal met with five Bay area legislators. Chancellor Blumenthal briefly mentioned the presidential search. The recent letter that was sent to the university by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) may impact the search. WASC conducted an assessment of UCOP operations, motivated originally by the controversy surrounding compensation issues, and in the course of their examination they discovered there are governance issues, particularly with regard to the relationship between the president and the Regents. WASC has now issued a letter to the university calling into question some practices at the highest level of the university, and have announced their intention to revisit the issue in one year.

Next the chancellor provided an update on campus issues. This year there are a record number of new student applications to UCSC. There are 28,000 frosh applications; that is an increase of about 14 percent from last year, and it's much higher than the UC average increase which was about nine percent. More and more students are finding

UCSC as a place they want attend and the same is true of transfer applications. There are 5,200 transfer applications, up 12 percent which is significantly higher than UC average. The applicant pool is the most diverse ever.

Regarding the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), the chancellor reported that since December the university, city, county and a coalition called CLUE have been in ongoing mediation and discussion aimed at reaching a settlement of all outstanding litigation. Chancellor Blumenthal has a certain degree of optimism but cannot guarantee a satisfactory resolution.

Finally, the chancellor provided an update on the comprehensive capital campaign. Chancellor Blumenthal said that with state funding so uncertain it is more important than ever that we concentrate on raising private funds to support the many functions of the university. One of the first steps of the capital campaign is setting priorities and the administration is trying to consult broadly across the campus in establishing those priorities. The process has been from the bottom up thus far and ideas have been solicited from departments and from every division on campus including the Senate. The chancellor added that priorities for fundraising need to align with the academic plan and vision for the campus. Significant fundraising is necessary for need- and merit-based financial aid as well as graduate fellowships because graduate education is such a priority for the campus. There is also the research mission, which will include raising money for endowed chairs and research facilities. During the spring and fall quarters the campus will conduct a feasibility study for the capital campaign which should help refine the goals. The campus continues to invest in staffing for University Relations (UR). UCSC has the potential to raise significantly more money than it has in the past which will require participation and leadership from the faculty. Chancellor Blumenthal is counting on the faculty to be active participants in the campaign and sees the faculty as a key part of the campus fundraising efforts.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Klinger

EVC Klinger provided updates on the state budget, enrollment targets for 2008-09, University Extension (UNEX), Ranchview Terrace and the employee master housing plan.

The outlook for the 2008-09 budget is very serious with respect to the potential impact on the university. The state is facing a deficit that continues to rise; the governor's proposed budget for UC is 417 million dollars below the 2008-09 request from the Regents. The amount of budget reduction to the campus is very uncertain. The magnitude will depend on budget resolutions reached between the governor and the legislature; and how the Office of the President (OP) decides to allocate reductions to campuses. Also Regental decisions could result in unfunded mandates to the campuses. EVC Klinger said this level of uncertainty makes planning very difficult. He provided planning targets to each division; however, these targets are not intended to communicate decisions. Targets were simply provided with the intent of initiating discussion. The level of planning targets is the middle of the estimates of what the EVC anticipates as a best-case and worst-case scenario for the campus. The EVC is currently working with deans, vice provosts, vice

chancellors and the Senate leadership to understand the impact of differential cuts and to identify areas that should either be protected from or slated for reduction.

Next, the EVC discussed enrollments. OP has taken the position that with student demand up sharply, the university will continue to offer admission in fall of 2008 to all undergraduate applicants who meet the university eligibility requirements, despite the prospects of reduced state support. However, university officials warned that UC cannot commit to expand its enrollments any further for the 2009-10 year unless the state is able to provide funding at that time for the additional students enrolled in 2008-09. After consulting with the Senate the EVC has proposed a local enrollment strategy for 2008-09 that will strive to keep the enrollments in the first year class the same as this year. The campus will focus on meeting its budgeted enrollment target by increasing the number of graduate and transfer students. This strategy is in alignment with the enrollment decisions made by OP and at the same time it is responsive to growing concerns about curricular capacity and impact at the lower division levels. As stated by OP, “In order to continue to provide student access, the university will need to look even more intensively at budget reduction in other areas as well as student fee levels. In addition, while the university will offer a place in the UC system to all eligible applicants, the application increase and the budget constraints mean that it is possible that fewer students will be admitted to their first choice campus this year relative to prior years.”

EVC Kliger provided a brief update on UNEX. At the last Senate meeting it was stated that UNEX would decrease its annual deficit this year by one million dollars and would increase enrollments in remaining programs by ten percent. Since this summer many significant changes have been made to the UNEX operation in marketing strategies, course approval procedures, integration into campus information technology (IT) and expansion of online offerings as well as changes within the academic programs. Many of these changes did not begin to have an impact on performance until winter quarter due to the catalog production cycle. However, January and February have seen a ten to eleven percent increase in revenues overall. In specific programs the results are even more promising, with business and management showing a 13 percent enrollment increase; engineering and technology experienced an 18 percent enrollment increase and a 39 percent income growth. EVC Kliger cautioned this does not mean that there aren't still significant difficulties facing UNEX and he will continue his assessment as spring quarter enrollments are monitored.

Ranchview Terrace Phase I construction is underway. Sales contracting is scheduled for April with actual move in to begin in August or September. A recent letter from potential buyers raised a number of concerns about the project. EVC Kliger feels the underlying dissatisfaction originates from the view that there is a need for greater transparency about the project including origination, budget and cost escalation. EVC Kliger has asked Jean Marie Scott and Steve Houser to brief the Senate representatives, including Chair Williams, Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Chair Susan Gillman and Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) Chair Ted Holman on the issues.

The employee master housing plan is currently in development. The schedule has been delayed due to an ongoing lawsuit and the mediation process for the LRDP. Some aspects of the master plan may be influenced by the outcome of the ongoing lawsuit and LRDP mediation process; the campus can not proceed with the plan until there is a resolution to the LRDP lawsuit. The EVC hopes to complete the master housing plan within eight weeks of knowing the final outcome of the lawsuit and/or mediation.

Finally, the EVC discussed broader issues of activism and demonstrations on campus. One of the hallmarks of our academic institution and a point of pride for many who live and work in this community has been the long standing commitment to diversity. The student experience at UCSC is enriched through the diversity that exists within its communities, including the diversity of thoughts and beliefs. It is the nature of such diversity to pose the challenge of addressing conflicts that may arise when good, reasonable people hold very strong, passionate and opposing opinions on issues of societal importance. A genuine commitment to diversity must include the will to find resolution to the inevitable conflict. Over the past few years campus protests have ended in confrontations between students, non-affiliates and campus personnel. The EVC continued to say some people choose to blame the confrontation on administrators and police; others place the blame on students and non-affiliates. It is time to move beyond blame. The EVC, along with his administrative colleagues, particularly the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and the Vice Chancellor of Business Administrative Services, struggle everyday with balancing their obligations to uphold academic freedom of the faculty, to protect the rights of all campus community members, and to ensure a safe environment for all who live and work on campus. The EVC referred to the recent attack at a faculty member's home and said that was not an exercise of free speech and said he believes all agree that such actions cannot be tolerated, and that the campus must take all necessary steps within the law to prevent such assaults on personal and academic freedom, provide for the safety of faculty, their families and all other members of the campus community.

The EVC also believes that when people choose to demonstrate their beliefs through actions that harass, intimidate, vandalize or otherwise break the laws of the social contracts that govern our community they should expect to be held accountable for their actions. As educators faculty have an obligation to teach and a collective responsibility to come together around difficult issues and [see information] something is wrong with this phrase, meaning unclear, wrong verb??—go back to transcript and try to fix] that can further inform thinking and actions.

With the support of Chancellor Blumenthal, EVC Kliger has committed to support two initiatives that will help forward the campus's ability to more effectively resolve conflict without violence. EVC Kliger has invited two experienced mediators to come to campus. The mediators will engage individuals and small groups in a series of conversations about issues that have divided the campus. The purpose of the conversations is to provide an opportunity for people to express their views around these issues and to provide an opportunity for people to be heard. EVC Kliger is hopeful that this process will result in recommendations about how the campus can further engage individuals and groups in

continuing dialog that increases understanding, acknowledges differences, allows the vigorous pursuit of discourse and debate, and strives to resolve differences through actions characterized by tolerance, civility and respect.

The second initiative is to establish a mediation program on campus. In 2003, a working group of faculty including Professors Carolyn Martin-Shaw, John Isbister and Bill Ladusaw as well as staff convened at the request of Assistant Chancellor Leslie Sunell. The group was advised by then Senate Chair George Blumenthal. At the end of the study, the group proposed that UCSC expand access to professional mediation for faculty, staff and students, citing that such a program would be a sound investment. Most UC campuses have implemented mediation services to expand the conflict resolution alternatives available to their communities. The goal of the UCSC program is to model pro-active conflict resolution, strategies and expand alternative dispute resolution options of the UCSC community, administrators, faculty, staff and students.

Following the EVC and Chancellor's comments, Chair Williams opened the floor to questions.

Professor Onuttom Narayan, Physics, asked about funding for a feasibility study on housing in the north campus. He noted that the EVC had previously announced that increases in the prices of existing employee housing would be plowed back into the housing program for future projects. After careful study, CPB's report of 2005 calculates that 90% of academic building growth could be achieved in the core campus. Assuming that the build up of North Campus would occur only after the core was developed CPB noted that there was very little possibility of any academic buildings in North Campus. Building housing there without an academic core would be unattractive for various reasons but most importantly, it would be financially impossible. CPB made a strong recommendation that planning for employee housing should be focused on south campus. Professor Narayan queried if the feasibility study found that the cost of housing on the north campus would be exorbitant, i.e., substantially above Ranchview Terrace, will the campus refund the cost of the study to the housing program since this sound CPB recommendation was ignored? The EVC asked AVC Campus and University Housing Services Jean Marie Scott to respond.

By unanimous consent the Senate extended privilege of the floor to AVC Jean Marie Scott.

AVC Scott stated that the study, which includes north campus and off campus analysis, will not be complete until about eight weeks after the LRDP lawsuit is settled. AVC Scott will not comment on the results until the report is complete. EVC Klinger, in responding to a question about the cost of the report, stated that regardless of the results the study was valuable. Since it is a housing issue, the housing fees should pay for the study and the EVC will not reimburse housing for the study.

Grant Hartwell, student from College Ten, commented that he is excited to hear about the mediation program, but disheartened by the injunction against the tree sitters. He asked

the EVC if the administration is planning on using the mediation program to resolve the tree sitter situation. The EVC responded that the lack of communication between the administration and tree sitters is an issue and the whole idea of mediation is to foster communication. To that extent, the EVC hopes mediation will solve the issue. The EVC stated that the administration believes the tree sitting activity is illegal and therefore asked for the injunction. Others feel differently, so the administration asked the court to decide. The court has tentatively decided that it is illegal, and will give a final resolution next week.

Grant Hartwell expressed discontent with the charges against two freshmen students from College Nine involved in the tree sit. Mr. Hartwell understands that the students are charged because they identified the tree sitters as their guests. Mr. Hartwell finds it hard to believe that two freshmen from College Nine are really so immersed in the community to know what is going on. He asked EVC Kliger to comment.

EVC Kliger stated the court has ruled not only is tree sitting an illegal activity, but feeding and supplying resources to the tree sitters is an illegal activity. The court made the decision on that for all of the people involved, including the two students.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly

The Senate accepted the report without comment.

4. Annual Reports

None

5. Reports of Special Committees

None

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy

Oral Report on General Education

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair Jaye Padgett reported the committee is working to reassess and reform General Education (GE) at UCSC. Next quarter, CEP plans to present two proposals, the first being a joint proposal with CPB. This proposal calls for a fundamental change in our approach to the upper division writing requirement (W). The proposal addresses the capacity issue which has plagued the W and is designed to improve the educational effectiveness of the requirement. The proposal asks all departments to take more responsibility for defining and overseeing their own educational objectives for the forms of disciplinary communication they deem relevant for their own majors, and for seeing that these educational objectives are met. The document for next quarter is likely to include proposals for a seriously reinvigorated peer tutoring program and for the dedication for some or all of an FTE in the writing program to assist departments that wish to consult to develop or improve their approach to disciplinary communication in the major. Also, where appropriate, the targeting of funds toward places in the curriculum where capacity issues make meeting educational objectives in disciplinary communication a challenge.

The second proposal is for a reformed system of GE at UCSC. This quarter a CEP representative visited every department on campus in order to give a presentation of the committee's ideas. During the spring quarter CEP plans to synthesize the department information. The Senate will first review the proposals at its spring meeting and CEP will bring it for a vote during the fall Senate meeting. CEP plans to present the proposals to department chairs and undergrad directors at Council of Chairs' meetings and looks forward to faculty feedback.

Margaret Fitzsimmons, Environmental Studies, commented on the wide ranging discussion between her department and the CEP representative. Her department is looking forward to reading the proposals and is pleased to hear CEP is working jointly with CPB. From the perspective of a classroom with 70 students where the fire marshal wants only 50, it seems a careful investigation of resource implications is necessary. As the discussion proceeds, the Senate needs some sense from the administration of the degree to which they can help and the degree to which this falls to the faculty in the current resource situation.

b. Committee on Planning and Budget:

Report on Professional Schools (AS/SCP/1561)

CPB Chair Susan Gillman informed the Senate that the Academic Senate website has a very good section on professional schools including the process that CPB designed to vet these pre-proposals, the pre-proposals themselves and comparative data on professional schools in the UC system.

Professional schools have always been a corollary of the campus discussions and CPB's work on enrollment growth, which has been going on for about eight years. CPB initially thought about enrollment in terms of conditions for growth. CPB's questions were: 1) what is the right mix for graduate/undergraduate enrollments? 2) What is the right mix of academic/professional programs that would achieve the desired graduate growth? In tandem with that, CPB reported in May 2007 that it had begun to work on enrollment management by monitoring the effects of growth on undergraduate education, attempting to develop a set of metrics meant to assess overall the educational effectiveness and instructional capacity. CPB sees the professional school discussion in the context of overall campus planning and enrollment management and manipulation in terms of the work it is doing right now on GE reform and the W.

CPB Chair Gillman called on CPB member Professor Herbie Lee, Applied Math and Statistics, to provide an update on the committee's work on enrollment management metrics. Professor Lee began by saying that a CPB subcommittee is working with the administration and staff in Planning and Budget to find out more about what information is available about enrollment, and it turns out there is quite a lot of information out there. Professor Lee provided samples of two sets of reports: one is a retrospective look in terms of students who have graduated with a certain degree and the second view is a prospective one. The prospective view looks at students coming to UCSC, what they plan to major in, and what happens to them. The view is a six year time span and CPB would like to make this available to all the departments. The information is useful at a

low level to determine who the students are and what is happening with them. It is useful for advising, planning, and enrollment management and retention issues. Professor Lee illustrated his point by providing information on the economics major. There were 46 people in this cohort that graduated with a degree in economics. Of them, 16 came undeclared; the other 30 came declared with some major. Of those, there is one that was proposed economics. Professor Lee believes this is not atypical of other majors. There were some that proposed related majors such as global or business management economics, but there was a wide variety of other majors such as literature and computer science. There is a lot of migration between programs.

Professor Lee's next slide showed the students that initially came in proposed to be economics majors and how they migrated out of an economics major over the year.

Professor Richard Hughey, Computer and Biomolecular Engineering, commented that data and departmental access to data is great. He asked how the data can be effectively used. In the case of economics if one were to do some early checks to see if any of these pre-majors have taken pre-calculus, calculus or economics in the first quarter of first year, then we know they are progressing that way. For those that are not, they should be pulled into their college office for advising. We need to be using our information systems to advise our students rather than just look at and juggle resources.

Professor Daniel Press, Environmental Studies, commented that it would be wonderful to look at what courses students take in different cohorts so that you can see what effect your lower division courses are having on retention and recruitment into the major. If that data is available we could calibrate the effect of our lower division instruction.

Professor Lee agreed the data would be valuable but said that information is stored in different databases which are not fully compatible, so tracking individual students is difficult.

Professor Press asked CPB Chair Gillman about CPB's current view of professional school planning given budget realities. CPB Chair Gillman responded that there is a very long timeline in terms of developing structures of academic and administration that would lead to a school. While it does feel incompatible to be thinking about something as expensive as professional education at a time of budget cuts, the nature of the proposals that came forward does indicate faculty interest in a variety of areas that we can work on short of full on proposals for professional schools. CPB is looking for ways to encourage the programs that look like they have the most potential, will not take a lot of money to begin with, and will not be a waste of faculty time.

Professor Press stated that environmental science and policy on this campus is not in a vestigial condition, and therefore he knows that there is some interest in doing things short of new school. He reported the sentiment that marginal, incremental program development, like new masters programs that don't occur in the context of capacity building and fundraising for a school, expect the departments to do things on the cheap so there is not much support. Professor Press said he would place an early opinion that we

are concerned that in a budget crunch, looking for things to do early that are incremental would not be so great.

CPB Chair Gillman responded CPB did discuss the notion of different kinds of timelines for different programs before the budget cuts came in. This was a way CPB thought of developing interest in professional programs that would not force us to pick one over another, but that would see them in tandem.

c. Committee on Preparatory Education

Amendment to Bylaw 13.25 (CPE Charge)

Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) Chair Elizabeth Abrams provided information on CPE's proposed bylaw change. CPB would like the Coordinator of Entry-Level Writing (ELW) at UCSC as a participant at its regular meetings. CPE recommends this because entry level writing is often an agenda topic and it is written into the committee's charge. A number of CPE's or CPE-equivalents at other campuses already include their ELW Coordinator on their committees. The ELW Coordinator is not just an expert on entry level writing, but also because of the population that s/he deals with, very familiar with students who are members of other groups whose profiles makes them of particular interest to CPE. This includes EOP and ELS students, students from high schools with low API's, students under prepared for university level math, etc. Often times the entry level writers fall into those other categories, the ELW Coordinator has pretty close contact with them and is familiar with the constellation of issues that they face.

CPE Chair Abrams added that it is important to note CPE is asking that the Senate approve a bylaw change that would allow the ELW Coordinator to "sit with" CPE. The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E) took a look at the phrase "sits with," because it is used in a number of committee charges and needed some clarification. RJ&E determined "sits with" means a person who has a permanent invitation to attend committee meetings but can be uninvited for specific meetings.

Professor Richard Hughey proposed a friendly amendment to strike the phrase "at UCSC" and change it to read "the campus coordinator" to match other styles. CPE Chair Abrams accepted the friendly amendment and Chair Williams asked for a voice vote on the amendment.

The amendment passed by acclamation.

The Senate then voted on the CPE proposed committee charge:

13.25.1 There are three Santa Cruz Division members. The Coordinator of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) is invited to sit with the Committee. In addition, there is one non-senate teaching faculty representative.

The legislation passed by a voice vote.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Jamal Atiba, Commissioner of Academic Affairs (CAA) for the Student Union Assembly (SUA) provided an update on current SUA activities, beginning with SUA's voter registration campaign. The SUA external vice chair was engaged in an extensive voter registration campaign in an attempt to increase the number of registered voters on campus before the California primary elections occurred in February. These efforts culminated in dorm visits and phone calls the week before and a day before the primary elections and were successful as evidenced by an award UCSC and the SUA's external vice chair won from the system-wide student government, the UC Student Association. Since then, the external vice chair has been preparing the SUA Lobby Corps Committee to lobby on behalf of students at the state and national level. A formal lobby event took place last weekend and was especially important given the state budget deficit and the estimated \$330 million budget cut to the UC system. At this event, students across the UC lobbied state legislators to make any and all possible attempts to negate potential tuition increases. Mr. Atiba urges the Senate to join with students and others in lobbying the legislature and Regents for the needs of the UC community.

Another area where the SUA and other students have been involved is the 2007-08 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) contract negotiations. AFSCME represents over 2000 service and patient care workers across the UC system. AFSCME is asking for increased wages to be on par with the market rate, and an automatic step system in which employees would receive yearly wage increase. A strike by AFSCME is possible. The organizing director of the SUA has been organizing campaigns on this issue throughout the year which have included students, faculty and staff in protests and other demonstrations. While the SUA has not yet taken a formal stance on this issue, SUA has a history of supporting on campus workers, and students have expressed concern and support for AFSCME. Mr. Atiba strongly suggests that faculty and administrators inform themselves of the issues and its possible effect on the members of the UCSC community.

Mr. Atiba then explained that it is his job as CAA to periodically survey the undergrad community on the state of UCSC academics. Some concerns previously raised include: the problem of class availability and class size for students; the want of many students to see journalism brought back and ethnic studies developed on campus, and the political, racial and other biases that can often make classroom environments uncomfortable for students. These concerns have begun to be addressed. The Vice-Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) has informed Mr. Atiba that the VPDUE has been developing a faculty guidance committee to explore journalism on campus. The Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs (VPAA), and a group of faculty and students, met to discuss the possibility of ethnic studies on campus. The very fact that all three parties involved, students, faculty and administration, discussed the issue in a productive way demonstrates a willingness to work on issues of concern.

Mr. Atiba suggested others follow the VPDUE and VPAA's lead and reach out to students to inform them of how concerns are being addressed. This will allow greater communication and respect between all parties.

As for new student concerns, the biggest is the budget situation with tuition increases and resource constraints. According to Mr. Atiba, some students have said that a relatively small increase in tuition may force them to withdraw from UCSC. The added reduction of resources means that coming years will be difficult ones for students. As to class size, most students can barely afford to attend UCSC for four years, much less five, in order to get the necessary classes. The budget affects everyone, and Mr. Atiba urges the Senate to address the issue.

Mr. Atiba closed by thanking CEP for its efforts to involve the whole UCSC community in GE reform. UCSC has had many challenges and will certainly have more. It is unclear how we will fare with the coming budget cuts, but we do know success or failure will depend on our ability to work together and communicate effectively.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Chelsea Juarez, Graduate Student Association (GSA) president, provided an update on recent GSA activities. She recognized the SUA for receiving the award for their voter registration efforts. Next President Juarez discussed the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) town hall meeting with Student Affairs Vice Chancellor Felicia McGinty and Alma Sifuentes and a few administrators from Science Hill, which was sponsored by the GSA. Their appearance was a direct response to the GSA president's call for communication. This has opened the door of communication between all student groups and the administration.

The GSA sent four students to the lobbying conference. There were about 50 professional and graduate students and several hundred undergraduates in attendance. The group discussed and lobbied for a fee freeze. They also discussed academic preparation, restoring the competitive Cal Grants and AB540. One of the concerns in terms of academic preparation is that it is not a permanent line item in the budget and is a bargaining chip each year. Graduate students in the stem field have the ability to become involved with program like the Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professorate (AGEP), which allows some academic prep. However, if you are not in the STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) fields, the availability of academic preparation is varied by department. The GSA calls on the faculty to work with the GSA and the grad division to ensure that even if academic prep is cut, professional development is implemented in a systematic way.

The GSA held some diversity events in conjunction with the administration. There was a successful diversity dinner which included a round table discussion with the chancellor and a host of administrators. President Juarez said that graduate students are aware of recruitment budget cuts and they are willing to help recruit both graduate and undergraduate students while at professional conferences.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

a. Resolution on Conflict Management and Demonstration Response

Chair Williams called on Professor Carolyn Martin Shaw, Anthropology, who proposed the resolution. Professor Martin Shaw began by saying that we all have an idea of the importance of demonstrations. What we are currently facing is more about the disruption caused by demonstrations; what it is like to have people interfering with our ability to do our work. How should the university respond when people are being uncivil or when they don't go along with the ideas put forward? Can we come up with a procedure that would keep us from calling in the police at the onset of a demonstration? Do we have such procedures already, and are they being followed?

Professor Martin Shaw expressed gratitude toward the Senate and a commitment to the community. She has previously served on campus task forces that dealt with conflict resolution and mediation. Professor Martin Shaw worked on the task force that brought labor relations, the ombudsperson and a host of people to talk about how the campus could establish a Conflict Resolution Center. Professor Martin Shaw also worked on the Senate's Tent University Task Force.

Professor Martin Shaw urged the Senate to be proactive in considering how to adjust to new forms of activist organizing whether by students or others who organize on campus. The campus needs to understand what performative violence is; how it is sometimes used by demonstrators to provoke a violent response and how we can resist giving into that.

Professor Martin Shaw said she is bringing this up now because of the criminal acts perpetrated against members of our faculty and their families, which we all find reprehensible.

There are some good things happening. After the initial show of police force, Professor Martin Shaw believes that UCSC has shown some restraint in dealing with the tree-sit. There have been a number of other campus activities, including with the ombudsperson; having some observers at some of the World Café's demonstrations and successful forums such as one by Provost Helen Shapiro at Colleges Nine and Ten.

Professor Martin Shaw stressed this resolution is not about the LRDP, the tree-sit demonstration or declaring what is valuable/allowable research on campus. This is not about the biomedical center or our colleagues in biology and researchers being able to continue their research according to university and government guidelines. It is not about supporting criminal acts on or off campus. The intent is for Senate members to talk about whether or not they approve or disapprove of the strong initial police action in response to demonstrations on campus. Professor Martin Shaw believes the Senate should disapprove of strong initial police action and that the Senate should call on the administration to adopt procedures that mitigate the use of police force and arrest. Also,

the Senate should say yes to work on demonstration teams or to go out to a demonstration or sit in a meeting to talk about what policies should be established.

The resolution was seconded. Chair Williams asked the assembly for general consent to conduct the vote via secret ballot. He informed the Senate that within Sturgis there is a particular description of a call for a secret ballot which can be initiated by the Chair. Chair Williams then asked for objection to unanimous consent on conducting a secret ballot on the vote for Professor Martin Shaw's resolution.

A motion to conduct a secret ballot was made and seconded.
After an inconclusive voice vote, the motion passed by a show of hands 30-24.

Following the vote, Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion.

| In Favor of the Amendment | Opposed to the Amendment |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Paul Ortiz | Martin Chemers |
| Chris Connery | Steve Thorsett |
| Don Rothman | Ethan Miller |
| Dana Frank | Olof Einarsdottir |
| Kathy Foley | Doug Kellogg |
| Shelly Errington | |

Points raised in favor of the amendment:

Last week at a demonstration on this campus about 300 students, workers and staff participated in support of the AFSCME demands. It was a spirited and positive protest and there were no police even though it was an act of civil disobedience. Unfortunately there was only one ladder faculty member at the demonstration. This resolution supports the philosophical principles of nonviolence.

This resolution is about adding more intelligence and deliberation to demonstration response. This is not about excusing crime or excusing excess; this is about intelligent responses that will not exacerbate existing difficulties.

It is essential to reject violence and to speak out against it. We are good at analyzing issues; trying to illuminate complex issues; we are people who depend upon conflict in order to create knowledge. The resolution encourages us as faculty to go out of our way to make our work more transparent so that the students can learn something that will be enormously valuable in dealing with conflict and figuring out ways that are non violent to sustain the conversation amongst each other.

If we can involve everyone within the conversation we will have greater solidarity amongst ourselves on the campus, and not be feeding into divisive dialogs that may cross disciplines or the people who are near to the nexus of the action and the people who have to endure its results.

We should be talking more on campus, especially with students, and I call on the administration to develop different kinds of scenarios in response to violence which are happening elsewhere and can also happen here.

The level of police response to student activism has dramatically escalated in the last five years. We have had no discussion about what the police have actually done in any of these events. There should be a process after one of these incidents in which we have discussion and multi-sided testimony about what were the best practices, and how we can improve them.

Few oppose police investigation of outright unlawful activities. We are talking about demonstrations here, and a tradition of non-violent direct action that campus supports with the Martin Luther King Jr. convocation every year. There must be some consistency between that tradition and rights to activism that need protections, as well as an open dialogue about the role of police as we are entering a period where police response is at a much higher level. There are some threats that need to be taken seriously and may warrant other actions.

We do not have an effective way to bring together our campus to deal with either violent or non-violent demonstrations. We need that.

Points raises against the amendment:

Faculty are very concerned about the level of violence that has surrounded the campus. Faculty have been targeted, and their names, addresses and phone numbers have been published. There are new kinds of demonstrations, we should not be imagining these to be just innocent college students trying to have a say. Chancellor Blumenthal and EVC Klinger have been on campus many years. They are fair, intelligent, honorable men and we ought to let them decide. If we don't know what is going on and we don't understand the nature of these demonstrations and the kinds of intelligence that they have before the act it behooves us to cut them a little slack.

The resolution is structurally flawed. The resolution is the clauses that come after the, "Be it resolved," lines and if the point of the resolution is to address police response, then we ought to be having a resolution about that, not a resolution that is directed at the assumption that in some way, the EVC, VC BAS, and the VC Student Affairs have failed in their jobs, or that the Academic Senate has not participated effectively in demonstration response. Those who read the Demonstration Planning Team Report will see something different, in particular, it says that early intervention by administration and law enforcement to curtail potentially violent protest situations is often called for and that more, rather than fewer, officers at a protest is a sound practice. I believe this community has lost track of the important lines between free speech and academic freedom on the one side; civil disobedience in the middle, and illegal and violent intimidation of members of our community.

Demonstrators should be aware that when you violate laws you get thrown in jail. They should be prepared to accept the consequences of their actions; one of them is jail time.

The fact is we need to respond to illegal acts by putting the perpetrators someplace where they can't threaten faculty and other students.

The demonstrators have affected the lives of the researchers on Science Hill. Students and researchers in chemistry, biochemistry and environmental toxicology have been under lockdown for four months. We have security guards in our halls and entrances. The demonstrators entered the building and pulled the fire alarms twice. This was done with the intention of bringing us out of the building which is extremely hazardous in a building where chemical reactions are constantly being run and monitored. If a student or faculty member inadvertently left a certain reaction in response to the fire alarm, there is a chance of a fire or explosion.

Professor Allen Van Gelder, Computer Science, made a motion to refer this resolution to the Committee on Faculty Welfare. The motion was seconded.

Seeing no discussion, the Chair proceeded to a vote. After an inconclusive voice vote the motion was passed by a show of hands vote of 31 to 19.

Professor Joel Yellin, Division of Physical and Biological Sciences, moved the following resolution from the floor:

Resolved:

The faculty commends the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor for their efforts to guarantee the safety of faculty members, research staff, and students and uphold the academic freedom of faculty to carry out their research and teaching.

(signed)

Dmitris Achlioptis
Manny Ares
Ilan Benjamin
Giacomo Bernardi
Barry Bowman
Ken Bruland
Scott Brandt
Bruce Cooperstein
Luca de Alfaro
Peggy Delaney
David Draper
Gabriel Elkaim
Andrew Fisher
J.J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves
James Gill
Gary Glatzmaier
Gary Griggs

Matthew Guthaus
David Haussler
Ted Holman
Garth Illingworth
Michael Isaacson
Kevin Karplus
Doug Kellogg
Paul Koch
Phokion Kolaitis
Joe Konopelski
Thorne Lay
Darrell Long
Todd Lowe
Bob Ludwig
Bruce Lyon
Roberto Manduchi
Patrick Mantey

Michael Mateas
Charles McDowell
Peyman Milanfar
Ethan Miller
Glenn Millhauser
Harry Noller
Ingrid Parker
Ken Pedrotti
Nader Pourmand
Pete Raimondi
Bill Saxton
Hamid Sadjadpour

Bruno Sanso
William Scott
Lisa Sloan
Susan Strome
William Sullivan
Lincoln Taiz
Anthony Tromba
Allen Van Gelder
Joel Yellin
James Zachos
Alan Zahler
Martha Zuniga

After the motion was seconded, Professor Yellin then put forward a unanimous consent request to add the names of three faculty members to the resolution: David Cope, Dan Costa and Mary Silver.

Seeing no objections, the three names were added to the resolution.

Senate Chair Williams asked Professor Yellin to explain, for the record, the relation of his resolution to the resolution presented by Professor Martin Shaw. Professor Yellin responded that his resolution was a response to Professor Martin Shaw's proposal.

Explaining his motion, Professor Yellin said that as a result of recent events, many faculty members believe they face risks that are oppressive and unprecedented. Everyone is aware that there has been violence and harassment directed against faculty and graduate students; a breakdown of our peaceful campus environment; a continuation of the sporadic violence that has plagued us for the last few years; and an effort, principally directed by outsiders, to halt the construction of a biomedical sciences building and thereby stop campus growth.

Professor Yellin said conditions here are not unique in the UC system. There have been other similar incidents at UCLA, Santa Barbara, Berkeley and UCSF, some very damaging to faculty members. The problem is growing.

If all our difficulties were due to outside forces, the solutions would be purely administrative, difficult as they still might be to realize. The reality is that pressures from the outside have merged with conflicting long term internal developments so we have a much more delicate situation to deal with.

The recent developments raise a crucial question: Do we as faculty share any common values? Those of us who present this resolution believe that the highest priority must be given to securing our safety and protecting the core of what we do: research and teaching. In doing so, we uphold the traditional principles of academic freedom. Judging from their actions, others believe that what they see as the core values inherent in political activism deserve at least as high priority: the freedom of outsiders and members of our

community to demonstrate by physically interfering with campus plans and activities and confronting individual faculty.

This fundamental disagreement has existed in latent form for a long time. It will not be settled by a vote, whatever the outcome. But a reasonable first step is to express support for the two long term faculty members who now have administrative responsibility for our campus. Their responsibility in turn is to open themselves to discussion with all the faculty and keep us well informed.

A second helpful step is to organize some private discussions among faculty with different views; it would clear the air to clarify what those support political activism hope to achieve. Professor Yellin clings to the hope, as he believes do others, that the present circumstances cannot be as bleak as they now appear. The authority for a third step lies with the system wide Senate. Ironically, the Senate reforms of the past few years, as well as bizarre events unexpected by anyone, have made the administrative task more difficult. The Senate can ameliorate some of this by re-implementing basic academic freedom principles that once served the University well.

Professor Van Gelder made a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Faculty Welfare. The motion was seconded.

Seeing no discussion, the Chair proceeded to a vote. After an inconclusive voice vote the motion was failed by a show of hands vote of 16 to 23.

The Senate then voted on the resolution which passed by voice vote.

EVC Kliger then expressed his appreciation for the support, but added that this should not just be an expression of support for the EVC and chancellor but for the entire administrative team.

Adjournment: 5:30 p.m.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

And
Lori Kletzer
Secretary *pro tem*