

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
March 6, 2009

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, March 6, 2009 at the Colleges 9 & 10 Multipurpose Room. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine and Secretary Judith Habicht-Mauche present, Chair Quentin Williams called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes (none)

2. Announcements

a. Chair Quentin Williams

Chair Williams announced that the Senate will have the opportunity to consider a proposal from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) for general education (GE) reform. Additional agenda items include a housing report from the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and a proposed amendment to the undergraduate academic assessment grievance procedure.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal began by stating three points about the current economic crisis:

1. We face big challenges, but history suggests that we will emerge from this current economic situation stronger, if we plan now and act strategically.
2. Despite the challenges, we will continue to be a place of teaching and research excellence.
3. We are investing in a strategic opportunity in Silicon Valley.

The chancellor said the campus has some tough choices ahead, but will continue to look ahead and plan for the future. In doing so, the campus has to be guided by its vision to be a leading institution for educating student as well as a top ranked university.

The chancellor then announced the following faculty honors:

- Professor Sandy Faber, Astronomy and Astrophysics, won the Bower Award and prize for achievement in science. The Bower Award is one the nation's richest sciences award, it includes a gold medal and \$250,000 prize.
- Professors Samit Dasgupta, Mathematics, and Mark Krumholz, Astronomy and Astrophysics, are both winners of Sloan Research Fellowships. There are now 25 Sloan winners teaching at UCSC.
- Professors Phillip Crew, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Darrel Long, Computer Sciences and Pradip Mascharak, Chemistry and Biochemistry have been elected as fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Professor Alexander Gamburd, Mathematics, won a Presidential Early Career Award for scientists and engineers, the highest honor that a beginning scientist or engineer can receive in the United States.

The chancellor commented that achievements like these elevate UCSC's national and international reputation, help attract other stellar faculty and students; and remind alumni, donors, and potential supporters why we are worthy of their support. Also, eight UCSC students won Fullbright Fellowships. That is a higher success rate than any other UC campus. The 8th Annual Campus Earth Summit held last week showed broad student participation. The summit is an example of the kind of energy and leadership students can exemplify regarding issues they care about, such as sustainability. The chancellor also announced the recent addition of the Golden Key Honor Society to the campus.

Finally, the chancellor informed the Senate that on March 13, 2009 the campus will formally announce and celebrate its landmark partnership with NASA Ames Research Center that will also include several other educational partners. The partnership is a strategic collaboration dedicated to teaching and research initiatives, focusing on innovation, entrepreneurship and sustainability. The chancellor believes UCSC is ideally positioned as the UC of Silicon Valley (SV). UCSC's existing research contract with NASA at \$330 million over ten years is the largest single competitive grant NASA has ever given to a university. The partnership also provides a deepened presence in SV which offers UCSC the untapped opportunity for students and faculty to become involved. In the case of the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC), the NASA grant's indirect costs actually support the main campus in a number of ways, unrelated to UARC. In a time of diminishing support from the state, the campus must invest in strategic ventures that expand our national reputation, create new opportunities for faculty to address global challenges, provide new educational opportunities to students and attract critical private support.

c. EVC Klinger

EVC Klinger began by announcing that the state adopted a budget that reduces UC funding by \$115 million. Based on that, and associated assumptions about the share of that cut that will likely come to the campus, the EVC projects that the campus will need to permanently reduce its budget by \$13 million in 2009-10. That estimate takes into account current information regarding expected increases in revenue due to expected approval of increases in systemwide fees. It also takes into account the estimated costs of other mandatory increase such as academic merits and utilities. The \$13 million will be captured by distributing the reductions over two broad categories: administrative divisions \$8.5 million and academic divisions \$4.5 million.

The EVC said the magnitude of the reductions the campus will face will require that the campus reduce funding across all functions of the institution, including our core academic areas, information technology (IT) and student life operations. The EVC has initiated consultation with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and provided for their consideration his preliminary assignments of targeted reductions across the academic and academic support divisions. The EVC has also informed principal officers of the preliminary reduction target for their unit, and asked that they proceed now to plan for implementation of the actions that will be necessary to absorb the budgetary reductions by July 1, 2009.

The EVC's approach in assigning the divisional targets is shaped by the fact that he believes the current situation is not one from which the campus will recover quickly. The EVC also believes it is imperative that the campus keep moving forward and retain the ability to invest in essential areas of opportunity and development. To do this the campus must plan to reduce divisional budgets differentially.

In January the EVC asked principal officers to provide him with a summary of how they might implement a 10 percent reduction to their operation budget. This was done to determine how best to preserve the essential functions needed to support instruction and research. The EVC believes it was important to do this, because the campus must acknowledge that essential functions extend far beyond the immediate classroom and/or laboratory and take place within every division on campus. The assignment of reduction to the academic support units is based on review of those summaries, the proposed actions and the resulting impacts. The target reductions by division range from 2.38 percent up to almost 10 percent. For the academic divisions a similar review was done, but the EVC applied three additional factors:

1. First, it is not the EVC's intention at this time to modify the academic plan. The current crisis will require adjustment to the pace and sequencing of FTE allocations, without modifying our long term goals.
2. Second, in considering the distribution across academic divisions, these factors were foremost in the EVC's thinking regarding short term actions:
 - Reductions will be responsive to expected enrollment trends to ensure timely progress to degree.
 - We will consider how we can best leverage the national investments expected in the areas of health and energy independence.
 - We will support areas or programs that have a strong potential to make significant impacts in their field, or have a strong potential to attract private funding.
3. Third, a reduction of 10 percent of state funded budgets would inevitably result in negative impacts to undergraduate and graduate instructional programs, a substantial decline in graduate student support, and a reduction of research support. Therefore the resulting reductions to academic divisions are substantially less than 10 percent. They range from 3.8 percent to 5.3 percent.

The EVC stated that the UC system has experienced dramatic reductions of state support over the past two decades. Since 1990, when the EVC was appointed dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci), there has been a succession of budget cuts. Permanent cuts were made at the system wide and campus level in 1990-91 and every year forward through 1994-95. That happened again at the beginning of the decade, with UCSC experiencing permanent budget reductions totaling over \$25 million between 2001-02 and 2005-06. The EVC then asked the Senate to consider the following:

- The interest in UCSC from prospective students has increased significantly during the past five years, making us increasingly selective within the UC system.
- 55 percent of UCSC undergraduates report assisting faculty with research or creative activity, underscoring our commitment to undergraduate education.

- Our six year graduation rates have been steadily improving with our most recent rate reaching a campus high and a rate comparable to AAU institutions.
- When normalized for size, UCSC is second only to Berkeley among UC campuses in the ratio of alumni earning doctorates to the total number of baccalaureates awarded. When engineering doctorates are excluded, UCSC is first among the UC's.
- UCSC's core value of service is reflected in the campus's ranking as second in the country among universities of its size for the number of alumni serving in Peace Corps.
- During the past fifteen years, the campus has more than doubled the number of PhD. Programs as well as doubled the number of doctoral degrees awarded.
- UCSC's overall citation impact was higher than all but three of all AAU institutions in the most recent five year period (2003-07), when analysis narrows its focus to public institutions; UCSC's research impact is the highest.
- Research awards to UCSC, reflecting the quality of our faculty and their work, increased 44 percent in the past five years.
- UCSC faculty rank 9th among AAU institutions without medical schools in terms of federal research dollars per faculty member.
- International economics, environmental science, literature, linguistics, history of consciousness and astronomy/astrophysics are consistently ranked among top ten programs nationally.

The EVC said this is impressive progress during a time when state support per student was reduced by almost 40 percent. UCSC truly is a distinguished research university committed to high quality undergraduate and graduate education. Now UCSC is faced with further permanent budget reductions of approximately \$18 million over a two year period, \$4.5 in reductions this fiscal year and the additional \$13 million anticipated next year. The EVC is confident the campus will continue to progress, but it will require even more creativity and flexibility.

The EVC concluded his remarks with a recent comment from one of the divisional deans: "Our challenge then, is to imagine and plan for a strong, stable institution with a smaller state budget, and then to make the decisions necessary to move us towards that goal. We must think hard about what aspects of our programs are truly distinctive and are critical for us to preserve, and what we are willing to give up in order to protect the things we value. We must always focus on achieving excellence in those things that we choose to do and we must be prepared to compete successfully for those non state resources we need to build and sustain this excellence."

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)

4. Special Order Annual Reports (none)

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Educational Policy and Academic Assessment Grievance Committee

i. Amendment to Appendix C: Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure (AS/SCP/1596)

Academic Assessment Grievance Committee (AAGC) Chair Campbell Leaper presented the proposed change. Currently, students have one year to file an academic grievance for a grade or a narrative evaluation and AAGC believes that is an unnecessarily long time period. If it is a class that is important for a student's major or graduation, it is in their best interest to resolve it sooner rather than later. Also, it is helpful for the faculty to not have to try and recall one year later what happened. AAGC proposes shortening the window to six months; nine months for a spring course to allow for summer session. AAGC believes that is enough time for students to go through the process, which includes approaching the faculty member, then the department chair or provost, and then filing a grievance with the committee. In addition, the committee always has the ability to extend the deadline if mitigating circumstances are present.

The proposed amendment to Appendix C; Undergraduate Academic Assessment Grievance Procedure (AS/SCP/1596) passed by voice vote.

Appendix C

I. Unchanged.

A. Unchanged.

B. Unchanged

II. Unchanged

III. Unchanged.

A. Unchanged.

B. Unchanged.

C. If the grievance is not resolved by steps A and B, the student may appeal to the Academic Assessment Grievance Committee. A formal appeal must be filed within six months for summer, fall, and winter quarter courses or nine months for spring quarter courses of the date on which the disputed grade or evaluation was made part of the student's permanent record by the Registrar.

D. Unchanged.

E. Unchanged.

b. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Amendment to Regulation 10.2 on Campus Breadth and General Education Requirements (AS/SCP/1597)

CEP Chair Jaye Padgett presented the amendment and the committee's justification. CEP's goals are:

- To provide students with a base of knowledge. The crucial part is providing students with something to build on.

- To expose students to a broad range of disciplines and methodologies in order to prepare them for a world with complex problems and where things change quickly.
- To help students approach problems in analytical ways and impart tools for thinking about problems.
- To prepare students to function as responsible participants in life considering the many pressing societal issues they will face, and be able to do that from a variety of perspectives.

CEP had a set of design principles that they tried to keep in mind as they developed the proposal and thinks it should be easy to understand because there is not a widespread sentiment among students that the current system is completely transparent, easy to explain, navigate or remember. CEP has also tried to make the proposed requirements less burdensome than the current requirements. CEP believes doing this gives students the freedom to do things that they want to do outside of general education. CEP wants the GE requirements to reflect campus principles and identity and has always considered it important that the GE reform reflects feedback from faculty, students and other campus constituencies.

CEP Chair Padgett then went over the proposed amended requirement in detail.

Following CEP Chair Padgett's presentation Chair Williams opened the floor to comments.

In favor of the resolution: Matthew Palm, SUA, Barbara Rogoff, John Tamkun, Jennifer De La Torres, Ravi Rajan

Question or points about the resolutions include:

- The resolution is endorsed by the SUA and nine out of ten college student senates.
- Is it the case that Disciplinary Communication could overlap with one of the other designations? Perhaps courses could have multiple designations, but the students could only choose one of them per course. It might help the students to have more choice if they could decide which one counts for what instead of having a single course have only one designation.
- Was it the intent of the committee to specifically include courses in the social sciences that also would cover observation, hypothesis, experimentation and measurement?

Professor John Tamkun proposed a friendly amendment to delete the word natural from section 10.2.3.1 of the proposed legislation.

The friendly amendment was accepted.

Following the friendly amendment discussion was continued.

In opposition of the resolution: Paul Koch, Barry Bowman, Carolyn Martin Shaw, Susan Gillman and Jim Gill

Points raised against the legislation include:

- The proposed legislation has only been in front of Senate members for two weeks and two days; there is concern about capacity and an environmental assessment of what this does. Do we have the capacity to offer the courses as CEP is proposing?
- Concerned that a group of academics will find multiple interpretations for any category, and as today’s discussion on race and ethnicity vs. diversity illustrates. One possibility for the next round is to ask divisions to supply a list of 20 courses that they think would fit a GE requirement. This would allow us to see whether faculty are interpreting these categories in similar ways. Going through this exercise would clarify what these categories are.
- CEP might want to assess student learning outcomes. Is a passing grade sufficient to show that they meet the GE requirement, or will students need to compile a portfolio on the GE component of the class, or will they be asked to demonstrate competency in some other way. To satisfy institutional needs for assessment data, some people will modify their courses and their teaching to accommodate assessment methods and techniques. When we slice and dice our courses in this way, we leave ourselves open to piecemeal interference and to accountability for parts of what should be an integrative experience.
- If we had a little more information we’d have fewer questions, and it might make the proposal better.
- The effort to coax out examples would do us all good in predicting what the outcome will be, absent which, this becomes a faith based proposal where we’re being asked to make an up and down decision without the kind of information that we normally have.

Professor Kevin Karplus, Biomolecular Engineering, stated that while he likes the proposal he does not like the description of scientific inquiry, but the basic notion of scientific inquiry as described currently in the legislation is fine. Professor Karplus also feels the race and ethnicity requirement is too narrow.

Professor Kevin Karplus then proposed an amendment to CEP’s proposed amendment changing words “ethnicity and race” to “diversity” to Section 10.2.3.1 D. The proposed amendment to the amendment was seconded.

Professor Richard Hughey, then proposed a friendly amendment to Professor Karplus’ amendment replacing the word “diversity” with “ethnicity, race and discrimination”. The proposed friendly amendment was accepted.

A number of faculty, administrators and students spoke out on Professor Karplus’ proposed amendment to the original amendment:

In Favor of	Opposed to	Commented on
Ethan Miller	Donald Potts	Loisa Nygaard

	Matthew Palms	Richard Hughey
	Jose Ruiz	Maureen Callanan
	Kalwis Lo	
	Victor Sanchez	

Points in favor include:

- Issues of gender, gender orientation, issues of relations are huge issues as well and to simply leave them out because they are not ethnicity and race is a big problem.
- You want to open diversity to a wider range of diversity, not just those areas.

Points opposed include:

- Oppose changing the term to “diversity” because it is meaningless and means so many things that we lose the distinction between the cross-cultural analysis and ethnicity and race.
- I am very disturbed to hear ethnicity and race reduced to discrimination, inequities and oppression. There is another side to ethnicity and race where the society is one of enrichment and opportunity.
- I’d be very concerned that a student would go through their entire UC education and not study race, and then go work and live in California, which is one of the most diverse states in the country.
- We don’t have diversity on our campus. We are not accepting of students of color; it stays the same every year. We should increase the number of student and faculty of color. If courses of race and ethnicity are requirements, we should have diverse professors who teach those courses. If someone is teaching about Mexican history but they haven’t lived it, it’s hard to learn from that professor who is just reading from a text.
- Changing the word “diversity” would completely change the “E” requirement. Since it’s an important issue, maybe CEP can look into it and create a diversity requirement in the future. We are endlessly reinscribing patterns of victimization and oppression, and we need to offer positive models.
- The term “diversity” has been really watered down from what its original meaning is and where it came from.

Professor Nygaard made a friendly amendment to Professor Karplus’ amendment changing the word “discrimination” to “diversity”.

The friendly amendment to Professor Karplus’ amendment passed by voice vote.

Senate Chair Williams then called to a vote Professor Karplus’ motion to add to Section D the words “or diversity” in the first lines and the words “and/or diversity” in the fourth line.

The motion failed by a show of hands.

The Senate then returned to discussion of the original motion.

VPDUE Ladusaw commented that the next step will be some process for CEP to go back into dialog with all the departments, look at the current courses and take those comments as a rubric to begin talking about how the existing curriculum maps into this new GE model. VPDUE Ladusaw has devoted some thought to that, and despite CEP Chair Padgett's comment that we all have to start at the beginning; there are some quick and clean ways of understanding how the categories do relate.

There are some categories that will require discussion. Currently, many of his colleagues desperately want an estimate of how many seats we need in GE, and it is a complicated task that would be much simplified by the kind of thing we are doing here. VPDUE Ladusaw does not feel there is any forced capacity shift until we start looking at the particular rubrics and classes. These are doable tasks and much more doable under the proposed system than the current system.

Professor Ravi Rajan, Environmental Studies and Provost of College Eight commented that there are two recurrent issues with the current system; one concerns the lack of clarity about what GE's are. They are seen as unclear, onerous, purposeless and problematic. Students have mentioned the need for courses like the ones CEP has proposed. The second issue cannot be addressed by a GE course; that is ethnicity and race. Most minority students don't feel supported on this campus, both in terms of courses available to them, but particularly because of lack of mentorship. GE reform does not address that concern of mentorship; it is something we need to take seriously at a later time.

Professor Rajan continued that while we do not have a quantitative account of how many types and how many courses will actually be offered, it is reasonable to expect that given the range of departments and disciplines that this won't be a big stretch. Although there is concern about providing statistical reasoning; other than that, these things can be put together.

The proposition that we consult with other departments will be resolved in two or three months; we have to look at and evaluate the proposal and look for synergies. A better method to normatively vote on the proposal and if there is a spectacular crisis, we can meet a Senate and push the dates back. It is important to our students and constituencies in terms of communication to make the clarity of vision apparent that we are embracing some of the more interesting trends in GE reform that many other intuitions have already embraced.

Professor David Draper, Applied Math and Statistics (AMS) made the following comments. I have no concerns whatsoever about capacity in Statistical Reasoning. In 2001 there was a comprehensive review of all the teaching of statistics campuswide as part of the curriculum process. The department has been completely up to date on where statistics is taught. In additions to AMS, Statistical Reasoning is taught in Mathematics, Psychology, Economics, Sociology, Electrical Engineering, and Biomolecular Engineering. We could start this requirement today. AMS will do its part to help, but we

will only be a small part of the overall effort to help the students be instructed in this area. I strongly support a positive vote for this motion today; this is the culmination of two years of thoughtful deliberation and we risk doing nothing in an effort to do this perfectly.

Professor Barbara Rogoff, Psychology, then called the question.

The proposed amendments to Santa Cruz Regulation 10.2 on General Education Requirements passed by voice vote.

10.2.2 General Education Requirements for Students Entering before Fall Quarter 2010.

10.2.2.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Science, or Music either: (1) between fall quarter 1986 and spring quarter 2010, or (2) between fall quarter 1984 and spring quarter 1986 with fewer than 45 quarter units of transfer credit, are required to fulfill the following campus general education requirements. The courses used to satisfy these requirements must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.2.6). Only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

a. – i. Unchanged.

10.2.2.2 Unchanged

10.2.2.3 Unchanged.

10.2.2.4 Unchanged.

10.2.2.5 Unchanged.

10.2.3 General Education Requirements for Students Entering Fall Quarter 2010 or Later.

10.2.3.1 Students who enter the University of California, Santa Cruz, in fall quarter 2010 or later, as candidates for a Bachelor's degree, are required to fulfill the campus general education requirements given below. Courses used to satisfy these requirements are subject to the following restrictions: i) they must be chosen from the lists of approved courses (SCR 10.2.3.4); ii) each course may apply toward only one of the requirements, unless a specific exception is granted by the Committee on Educational Policy; iii) only course work awarded the grade of P, C (2.0) or better may be used to satisfy these requirements.

a. Unchanged. [NOTE: 10.2.3.1a. Composition courses remains unchanged from 10.2.2.1.d.]

b. Unchanged. [NOTE: 10.2.3.1.b. Disciplinary communication remains unchanged from 10.2.2.1.f]

c. Cross-cultural analysis. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that emphasizes understanding of one or more cultures and societies outside the United States.

d. Ethnicity and race. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on issues of ethnicity and/or race.

e. Interpreting arts and media. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on the practice, analysis, interpretation, and/or history of one or more

artistic or mass media (media in which non-textual materials play primary roles).

f. Mathematical and formal reasoning. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that emphasizes university-level mathematics, computer programming, formal logic, or other material that stresses formal reasoning, formal model building, or application of formal systems.

g. Scientific inquiry. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on the essential roles of observation, hypothesis, experimentation and measurement in the sciences.

h. Statistical reasoning. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that focuses on developing skills in approaching quantitative data and statistical reasoning.

i. Textual analysis and interpretation. One five-credit course or equivalent is required that has as its primary methodology the interpretation or analysis of texts.

j. One additional five-credit course or equivalent is required in one of the following areas.

i) Environmental Awareness. Focuses on humankind's interactions with nature.

ii) Human behavior. Focuses on aspects of individual human behavior or the operation of human groups.

iii) Technology and society. Emphasizes issues raised by the prevalence of technology in society.

k. One additional course or equivalent, awarding a minimum of 2 credits, is required in one of the following areas.

i) Collaborative endeavor. Provides significant experience with collaboration on a project.

ii) Creative process. Teaches creative process and techniques in the arts (including creative writing), at an individual or a collaborative level.

iii) Service learning. Provides the opportunity for supervised campus or community service that contributes to a student's overall education.

10.2.3.2 Unchanged [NOTE: 10.2.3.2. on transfer credit remains unchanged from 10.2.2.2.]

10.2.3.3 Unchanged [NOTE: 10.2.3.3 on petitions for exceptions remains unchanged from 10.2.2.4 Composition]

10.2.3.4 Unchanged [NOTE: 10.2.3.4 on course approvals remains unchanged from 10.2.2.5]

Following the passage of CEP's amendment to the GE requirements, CEP Chair Padgett thanked the following:

- CEP members
 - Linda Burman-Hall
 - David Helbold
 - Loisa Nygaard
 - Donald Potts
 - Eileen Zurbriggen
 - Pam Hunt-Carter
 - Jon Ellis.
- Student reps

- Matt Palm
- Shawn Riley
- Ravi Rajan
- Elaine Kihara
- Holly Cordova
- Margie Claxton
- Michael McCawley
- Barbara Love
- VPDUE Bill Ladusaw
- Roxanne Monnet
- Former CEP members
 - Heather Bullock
 - Russ Flegal
 - Anatole Leikin
 - Kip Tellez
 - Jack Vevea
- Joel Ferguson
- Sarah-Hope Parmeter
- Stacey Sketo-Rosener
- Students
 - Larissa Adams
 - Jamal Atiba
 - Flori Lima
 - George Zhang
- Elizabeth Abrams
- Carol Freeman
- CPB and CPB Chair Gillman
- Members of SEC
- Senate Chair Quentin Williams
- Members of the Administration

c. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Report on Housing, March 2009 (AS/SCP/1598)

The Senate received the report without comment.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

SUA Commission of Academic Affairs (CAA) Matthew Palm provided the report. CAA Palm began with the College Affordability Act which is currently moving through the state assembly. UCSC is in a competition with other UC's to get the highest number of signatures on petitions in support of the College Affordability Act. UCSC is currently in first place. The College Affordability Act proposes freezing student fees for five years and after the fifth year only allows fees to rise with the consumer index. It would place a one percent tax on those making a taxable income of over one million dollars per year. About \$160 million will go to the UC system and 40 percent will go to K-14 education. The College Affordability Act will significantly increase accessibility and affordability to

the UC system. According to CAA Palm the master plan for higher education states that college tuition should be free, and it is not. CAA Palm compared the cost of other universities to UCSC and found all are more affordable than UCSC. CAA Palm explained that this is not because of tuition but because of room and board. Cost of living is a problem in Santa Cruz.

SUA is also interested in Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7 which would amend provisions of proposition 209 and allow higher education institutions to outreach to underrepresented groups. CAA Palm quoted the UC Undergraduate Work Team Study Group on University Diversity Report, “Schools with higher percentages of underrepresented students offer less access to approved coursework than schools with lower percentages of these students.” CAA Palm said in communities where there are larger numbers of underrepresented students, the kinds of courses needed to get to UC are not offered as much. The UC needs money and resources to specifically go into communities and help students get those courses so they can attend UCSC. A recent California Post Secondary Education Commission study showed significant progress in college eligibility for underrepresented students coming out of high school, but this progress was not reflected in the numbers of these groups being admitted to the UC system. Students in underrepresented communities are more and more making the grades and test scores necessary to get into UC, but still are not applying. He added that Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7 will not bring racial quotas to UC, but will allow resources to be spent to outreach to underrepresented communities. The SUA supports the amendment and hope Senate members contact State Assembly member Bill Monning and State Senate member Joe Simitian to encourage their support.

Next CAA Palm provided an update on Engaging Education (E2). E2 is a student initiated outreach and retention center at UCSC. Over 50 percent of the student who come up through E2’s programs end up attending UCSC. In addition, E2’s retention program is completely student led and student run, it is a leadership space where its goals and principles help to retain students and develop their skills and leadership abilities. CAA Palm stated that UCSC is below the UC average in retention, so losing E2 will only aggravate that disparity. There is concern about the future of E2 and its funding.

CAA Palm discussed the recent Earth Summit and the Committee on Sustainability and Stewardship efforts to create a sustainability curriculum working group. The working group would like to bring more sustainability focused courses to UCSC. An example is Electrical Engineering and its Sustainability Engineering and Practice. SUA would like to see more interdisciplinary sustainability courses.

SUA is gathering information from students on issues in the classroom environment. SUA has the support of the Student Regent and the Student Regent Designate. SUA is hoping to host a forum for graduate students to gather input on this issue from the graduate side. This will be on April 10, and SUA is asking students what they feel they need more training and support in, and how SUA can work together to address these issues. According to CAA Palm, if graduate students are overworked, under slept and not getting proper training it affects the quality of education for undergraduates.

Finally, CAA Palm said he has heard from some faculty members, staffers and a few student leaders that if things keep going as they are, a UC undergraduate education will not be worth the cost.

Professor Ethan Miller, Computer Science, commented that addressing the problem of cost by advocating for less money to go to the UC doesn't seem to help. At comparable institutions they have more money to do the job of teaching. Professor Miller encouraged people to think about that before signing SUA's petition.

Victor Sanchez, External Chair SUA, stated that although the mission is to teach, the number one mission is to provide the State of California and its residents with a quality education. In part, that is due to the accessibility problem. Student fees have risen over 100 percent since 2001 and many students are being pushed down. Rents are a big problem, but this is a state wide issue and SUA is trying to address the accessibility and affordability of UC schools. This legislation will not only benefit the UC, but the CSU and the California community colleges on top of K-12 education, receive revenues from this legislation.

CAA Palm added that one problem with fighting rent issues is during the summer the city council takes action on things like party ordinances. When students come back in the fall they find out what has been done, and spend the rest of the year organizing against it. The goal is to have the state pay for the university through taxing income above one million dollars by one percent. It is not that it will starve the UC, but SUA would like to shift who and how it is being paid for in a way that SUA finds to be more beneficial to society as a whole.

Robert Singleton, College Eight representative, commented that even though rents seem to be at the heart of the problem of accessibility, this does go in the right direction to make college more affordable. Mr. Singleton is currently a freshman and it costs him about \$25,000 to attend UCSC this year. He is dependent on a single parent who makes about \$60,000 a year. Mr. Singleton said this may not be a direct solution to the problem but it does help and does not cost the university. The money comes from taxation of the more affluent residents of California. Students and faculty alike are becoming increasingly aware that the cost of the UC may not be worth the education. Mr. Singleton lives next to Santa Rosa Junior College, but felt that a four year degree from UC is more valuable and a better experience as a whole to help him further develop the way he interacts with the world around him, not only academically but also socially.

Michelle Romero, College Ten representatives and student representative for the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, said the burden is on students in the form of increased student fees. Ms. Romero knows several students who are affected by this and are struggling. Middle income students are affected too. They don't receive financial aid and they depend solely on student loans. Ms. Romero asked if students can't get funding from the state, per the master plan, then how can students fulfill their commitment to be at UCSC four years and graduate.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Graduate Student Association (GSA) President Travis Orloff provided an update on recent GSA activities. The GSA is now up to 23 out of a potential 28 department representatives. The GSA has almost doubled its department representation this quarter. Their next focus is to maintain those representatives. The GSA would like to keep graduate students involved by giving them responsibilities.

The GSA is also focusing on getting graduate students involved when they first come to campus. They are looking at revamping and reorganizing how the GSA does their orientation. The GSA is working with the administration and Graduate Council to coordinate efforts.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:00 pm.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

May 12, 2009