

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division February 10, 2010

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 10, 2010 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Michael Dine present, Chair Lori Kletzer called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Kletzer asked if there were any proposed change to the minutes of November 20, 2009. As there were none, the minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Lori Kletzer

Chair Kletzer introduced herself and welcomed attendees to the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda. Chair Kletzer stated that much of the Senate meeting environment is influenced by the state budget crisis, and the only constant is the uncertainty of the budget and lack of information. Chair Kletzer added that UC President Yudof has stated his commitment to ending the furlough program, but there is concern that ending the program will become another unfunded mandate. Chair Kletzer acknowledged CPEVC Dave Kliger, who is stepping down from his post on June 30, 2010. Chair Kletzer thanked CPEVC Kliger for his service to the campus.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

The chancellor began by thanking CPEVC Kliger for his five years as campus CPEVC and prior to that, his 15 years as dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci). The chancellor said CPEVC Kliger has given a lot of his life to campus, and replacing CPEVC Kliger will not be easy. Chancellor Blumenthal has initiated a search process which he hopes will be completed by June or soon after. The CPEVC search will be a UC wide search and is being chaired by Professor David Even Jones (Music). A formal announcement to campus, with more details, is forthcoming.

Chancellor Blumenthal said he believes the furlough program will end this summer, and hopes the end of the program does not pose too much of a budget issue. The chancellor is encouraged by the governor's January budget, which restores \$305 million to the University of California (UC). That money, along with the student fee increases will cover the end of the furlough program and restarting contributions to the retirement system. The chancellor added that the outlook is as good as UC could have hoped for, given the current budget environment. The chancellor said the campus budget reduction exercise is disheartening adding that there is potential for additional cuts, layoffs and challenges to providing educational opportunities for students.

Next the chancellor discussed advocacy. On January 22, UCSC held a forum for elected officials. The elected officials met with administrators, faculty, staff, students and community members. The chancellor thought it was extremely successful. On March 1, students led by the Student Union Assembly (SUA), will head to Sacramento for a day of action. In April an intersegmental day of action is planned in Sacramento. Chancellor Blumenthal mentioned the importance of all segments of higher education showing a united front and being mutually supportive.

The Gould Commission continues its work to think of new ways to meet the future needs of the state. Chancellor Blumenthal is the co-chair of the Size and Shape working group. All the Gould Commission working groups will present an interim set of recommendations to the commission in March, but work will not be completed until the end of the year. The working group's recommendations will be reviewed by the commission and then sent to campuses for review in fall 2010.

Chancellor Blumenthal provided an update on the Post Employment Benefits Task Force. The task force will be back to campus in early May for a forum, and the chancellor strongly encouraged faculty to attend.

Chancellor Blumenthal hosted UC Interim Provost and Executive Vice President Academic Affairs Larry Pitts to campus, and said the visit went well. Interim VP Pitts met with faculty, staff and students. The chancellor added that he hopes that some UCSC students apply for the student regent position.

The chancellor acknowledged recent faculty awards. The New American Association for the Advancement of Science Fellows honored Professor David Draper (Applied Math and Statistics), Professor Thorne Lay (Earth and Planetary Sciences), and Professor Glenn Millhauser (Chemistry/Biochemistry). Other faculty honors include two new members of the Institute of Electrical Engineers: Peyman Milanfar and John Vesecky, both professors of electrical engineering. Philosophy students are going to the National Ethics Bowl competition March 4 in Cincinnati. Students there analyze case studies of ethical dilemmas drawn from business, the environment, the biomedical field and personal ethics to then then build morally defensible solutions. Chancellor Blumenthal reported that the campus received nearly 35,000 frosh applications, adding that there was also a significant increase in the number of transfer student applications.

Finally the chancellor reported on the Annual Scholarship Benefit Dinner which was held at the San Jose Tech Museum. The event was extremely successful and raised money for student scholarships.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger

The CPEVC began by saying that he first arrived at UCSC in 1971, and has thus been a part of the campus community for 90 percent of the campus' life. The CPEVC acknowledged his leadership team, which he said is highly capable. He announced

that there were searches underway to add to the leadership team for a Vice Provost of Silicon Valley Initiatives, a Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget and a Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate Division.

The CPEVC is trying to plan for a campus budget in an environment of much ambiguity. The CPEVC does anticipate further budget cuts, but beyond that not much else is certain. The CPEVC reported on a recent campus budget retreat which was attended by Senate representatives, administrators, students and staff. The EVC has begun collecting information from all units on how they would take cuts ranging from 5.5 to 11 percent. The CPEVC has shared the information with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and teams of principal officers are also reviewing the information. CPEVC Klinger plans to have a budget proposal by mid April and encourages all faculty to become engaged and talk to their deans and CPB.

Following the CPEVC's comments Chair Kletzer opened the floor for questions and comments.

Professor Karen Bassi (Literature) asked the administration about plans for the March 4 day of action. How, she asked, is the campus planning for possible demonstrations, and is there a proactive approach? Professor Bassi said she was particularly concerned about students being punitively punished. The CPEVC responded that he is planning the same as he always plans for such events. He informed that the Demonstration Response Team and Demonstration Operations Team were meeting regularly. The CPEVC added that he could not say what the response would be unless he was told what the actions would be.

Professor Bassi asked how then can the campus engage in the issues and provide positive enforcement to students and faculty about what is supported. CPEVC Klinger said that the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs is suppose to be talking to faculty about what is likely to happen and how the administration should respond.

Tim Duane (Environmental Science) brought up the issue of decentralizing FTE's and how it can affect the campus. Professor Duane is quite alarmed about how divisions will feel the brunt of the cuts very differently. He asked the CPEVC if it is the administration's intention, at the end of the budget process, to have massively reallocated the faculty FTE. CPEVC Klinger said he would not respond to the question because Professor Duane is asking about an outcome of a process that has not yet been completed. The EVC is reviewing all submissions and trying to assess the impact of the cuts to the campus.

Professor Duane asked what the CPEVC desires at the end of the process. The CPEVC responded the least amount of damage. Professor Duane then said that process matters, and that it is really important to understand the kinds of criteria being considered. Professor Duane also wanted to know how the CPEVC was making decisions. The CPEVC said that last year the cuts were differential. A lot

people thought this was terrible, but the feedback the CPEVC received from CPB said the cuts were not differential enough. The CPEVC wants clear advice from CPB on how the cuts should be taken. He indicated that he would take CPB's advice into account when making his decisions.

Professor Joel Yellin (PBCSci) asked about the seemingly high risk/reward ratios over the last 20 years resulting from the UCRS investment policy and related matters. He wondered if expert advice from the statewide Senate has been forthcoming.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that Professor Yellin had made some good points. He pointed out that he is a member of the UCOP task force on retirement policy, though not of the subcommittee studying investment policy, and has heard similar remarks from others about the UCRS risk-reward ratio. He suggested that concerns about risk/reward ratios should be brought to the attention of the UC Treasurer. As to Senate expertise, the Chancellor pointed out that TFIR, a subcommittee of UCFW, considers UC finance and investment policies, has issued some excellent reports, and is available for giving advice.

Rebecca Cook (Academic Assessment and Grievance Committee [AAGC] student representative) asked what the criteria were for selecting a student representative to serve on the CPEVC search committee. The chancellor responded that the administration has asked for nominations from the SUA and the Graduate Student Association (GSA). They are looking for students who have been involved in campus issues and have shown a commitment to the campus.

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

i. Update Report on General Education

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair John Tamkun provided an update on general education (GE) reform efforts. CEP Chair Tamkun said the new requirements will go into effect in the fall, but there will be a transitional period at which time both systems will be in place. Currently the committee and departments are working towards implementing the requirements. CEP Chair Tamkun also provided an overview of course proposals submitted for approval, and concluded that there was reason to be optimistic.

b. Committee on International Education

i. Current Status Report on the Education Abroad Program (AS/SCP/1636)

Professor Tim Duane (Environmental Sciences) commended the committee for the report. He said there is a troubling trend involving the privatization of the overseas function. Professor Duane is concerned that overseas studies will be available only for the rich. Committee on International Education (CIE) Chair Debra Lewis said CIE just sent a survey to departments about the Education Abroad Program (EAP). EAP is going from \$18 million in general funds to \$1 million adding that cost cutting at the center should not become cost shifting to the campuses. CIE would like departments to think about how they interact with EAP. Chair Kletzer added that EAP needs to be an academic program and a top priority.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget

i. Report on 2010-11 Budget Process (AS/SCP/1632)

CPB Chair Brent Haddad said CPB would like to hear from faculty and students. The committee’s deadline to deliver advice is March 15.

Dean Steve Thorsett (PBSci) thanked CPB for the work the committee has done with the deans. The deans are looking for broad advice on their budget plans, and find CPB’s reports helpful.

d. Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections

i. Amendments to Bylaw 8.4.1 & 9.1 (AS/SCP/1634)

Following a lengthy discussion on the amendments Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (CRJ&E) that recommended that the Senate Secretary be designated to conduct all mail ballots with CRJE overseeing them, Chair John Jordan withdrew the motion.

Spoke in favor of the amendments	Spoke against the amendments	Comments about the amendments
John Jordan	Joel Yellin	Tim Duane
	Onuttom Narayan	Richard Hughey
	Judith Habicht-Mauche	Manfred Warmuth
		Mark Traugott
		Karen Bassi

Points made in favor of the amendments:

- CRJ&E is attempting to achieve consistency with respect to conducting mail ballots. Some language says the secretary counts the ballots and others say RJ&E counts the ballots. In fact, CRJ&E counts the ballots.

Points made against the amendments:

- There is something logically amiss. This amendment should be tabled until CRJ&E can work out the inconsistencies.
- CRJ&E already counts the ballots, the secretary never has.
- This is problematic because there is other language in the bylaw and now we have complicated the entire bylaw and need to fix it everywhere there is

similar language. The implication that CRJ&E supervises the election means CRJ&E has counted the ballots.

- The amendments need to indicate that the secretary conducting the referendum by mail ballot does not include counting which is what CRJ&E does already. Under the supervision means that CRJ&E ensures that elections are carried out properly.

Comments about the amendments:

- A sentence needs to be added stating that CRJ&E counts the ballots.

e. Senate Executive Committee

i. Amendment to Chapter 6.3 – Special Meetings (AS/SCP/1633)

Senate Executive Committee member Marc Mangel explained that the amendment changes the number of Senators needed to call for a special Senate meeting from 10 to 25. The current value of 10 is forty years old, and was established when the campus was much smaller and there were fewer Senators. The number 25 is half of a quorum for a Senate meeting, and the same number of Senators needed for a mail ballot.

Following a brief discussion the Senate voted on amendment 6.3.

The amendment passed by hand vote.

A Special Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division may be held on any day of instruction in the fall, winter, or spring quarter, and may be called by the President of the Academic Senate or the Chair of the Santa Cruz Division. Upon written request of twenty five voting members except as provided for in SB 75.B, a meeting shall be called within fourteen calendar days by the Chair of the Division. If a request is received within less than fourteen calendar days before the end of the quarter, the meeting will be called within the first seven calendar days of the next fall, winter, or spring quarter.

Spoke in favor of the amendments	Spoke against the amendments	Comments about the amendments
		Joel Yellin
		Tim Duane
		Onuttom Narayan

Comments about the amendments:

- What does SB 75.B refer to? SEC member Mangel explained SB 75.B is the way to appeal a decision by the assembly. SB 75.B. says ten is the required number.
- Is there a problem other than logistical inconsistency?
- Is there something to be solved?

ii. Framing a Senate Meeting Discussion of the Narrative Evaluation System (AS/SCP/1635)

Chair Kletzer reported that last fall the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) constituted a Narrative Evaluation System (NES) subcommittee. SEC felt there were a number of campus conversations about NES, and the SEC should take the lead on the issue. Chair Kletzer said consideration of the NES at this time is not entirely budget driven. The SEC is not advocating one way or another, but suggesting a set of options that might structure the conversation. This is the first step and Senate Chair Kletzer recognized that student and alumni opinions still needed to be heard. The SEC began alumni outreach last week, and students may be surveyed. There may be broader campus forums that allow people without privilege of the floor a place to speak.

Professor Joel Yellin (PBSci) moved that the Senate conduct an information discussion of the Narrative Evaluation system. Chair Kletzer acknowledged that there was not an actionable item on the floor and called for a vote.

The motion to move to a committee of the whole passed by voice vote.

The following individuals spoke on the issue of NES:

Barry Bowman, Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology

Daniel Press, Environmental Studies

Debra Lewis, Math

Gail Hershatter, History

Joel Yellin, PBSci

John Johnson, GSA President

Judith Habicht-Mauche, Anthropology

Karen Bassi, Literature

Marc Mangel, Applied Math and Statistics

Mark Traugott, History

Paul Koch, Earth and Planetary Sciences

Tim Duane, Environmental Sciences

Todd Lowe, Biomolecular Engineering

Rebecca Braslau, Chemistry/Biochemistry

Rebecca Cook, AAGC student representative

Mayanthi Fernando, Anthropology

Megan Moodie, Anthropolgy

Onuttom Narayan, Physics

Shigeko Okamoto, Language Program

Matthew Palm, CEP student representative

Triloki Pandey, Anthropology

Barbara Rogoff, Psychology

Deanna Shemek, Literature

Manfred Warmuth, Computer Science

Comments about the NES included:

- People are using budgetary considerations as a motive to get rid of the NES. People will use the opportunity of a budget crisis to do something they have wanted to do for a long time.
- The SEC report says the NES cost \$50k annually, but that is just central staff, AIS and IT related costs. There is also faculty and department manager time. All those costs are distributed across the campus and it is very difficult to estimate.
- When I first arrived faculty members were supposed to have only 6 to 8 advisees for which to write evaluations. What made the campus special is disappearing. If we make it optional no one will do it. We need to think who will benefit.
- I came here because I believed in the narrative system, but from my arrival in 1996 and beyond the NES has been a joke.
- I was opposed to letter grades last time we had this discussion, then students were begging us to save narratives. Now if I felt the students valued the labor effort I would be up here arguing in favor, but a lot of students do not even know there are narratives.
- As a student I value them. There is a lot of important feedback that sets a context to a letter grade. When it comes to big classes it challenges the professor and students to develop some sort of communication and relationship.
- A lot of students do not know these options are being considered.
- At every point until now I have supported the NES, but I do not think it is working anymore. Classes are bigger and we do not have the same contact with students, it is just not feasible.
- There should be a hybrid. Math tests intimidate people and evaluations allow me to indicate how a student does on the homework. NES encourages people to persist.
- The NES should be kept in some form. For some people it is a very valuable pedagogical tool. In an optional system, faculty concerned with workload can do the minimal and tardiness issue will go away.
- The core reason for eliminating the NES is that support among the faculty is very shallow. Compliance on timeliness has always been issue. Department managers have had to be the police in the system. Staff has been reduced to the point that they cannot do what they need to. A number of department managers have said it would be a big help if the NES would go away.
- I used to believe in the NES, but I do not anymore. TA's have been only mentioned once and non ladder rank faculty not all. Any further discussion needs to include the GSA and non ladder rank faculty.

- I was in disbelief when I found out I had to do evaluations, then I was told that one line was required, and I knew the system was gutted. New faculty see the point of this tradition less and less. The purpose has come and gone, we should remove it before it becomes a complete joke.
- I took it very seriously until I found out my colleagues used excel spreadsheets. I am in favor of a hybrid.
- When I review graduate school applications, I look at grades and letters of recommendations. The NES is a data dump.
- Graduate students want to receive evaluations, but we do not want to write them.
- We need to ensure evaluations have meaningful content. Preserving relics from the past is not meaningful. The NES should be optional. If there is suitable software that allows input of other scores, it might be motivating.
- I have been teaching here since '74 and would count myself as a supporter in concept, but not of what the NES has become. Procedurally, I would like to urge SEC to carefully frame whatever discussion takes place.
- Evaluations can be valuable if they are done well. What I have heard today is good evaluations are good and bad evaluations are bad.
- I love them until I have to write them. I came here because of the dedication to undergraduate and graduate students, research and teaching. I see it eroding and we need to decide what we are going to be in the future.
- We need to think about our audience and our goals. Students get input from me every day, not just the end of the quarter.
- It is important to add contextualization to grades. I want to add information about what the class was, in addition to how the student performed.
- The accountability measures that have been added to the NES have given faculty so much trouble; they should have never been included. Once we went to mandatory grades the only accountability measures that should have been included were whether faculty turned in grades are not.
- The NES is used punitively. We should be evaluating students throughout the quarter on the work they are turning in.
- Class sizes are increasing and lecturers teach many courses with no TAs, and they are penalized on timeliness and even content of narrative evaluations much more severely than ladder rank faculty.

Following the comments, Chair Kletzer said the SEC will take all comments very seriously and think about a revised set of options that bring some coherence to the situation.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Matt Palm (SUA Commissioner of Academic Affairs [CAA]) reported on recent SUA activities. The SUA bused students to the recent Regents meeting, conducted a

survey on library hours, worked with the Center for Teaching and Learning to publicize awards, and organized forums for students about the budget. The SUA is willing to run a survey on the NES.

CAA Palm also said students are fiercely opposed to the elimination of language programs, are concerned about cuts to students with disabilities, and course capacities. Frustrations include not getting into needed courses and cuts to diversity related courses.

CAA Palm closed by saying that UC is accountable to students who are paying for their education.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

John Johnson, President of the GSA, reported that the system-wide GSA submitted a resolution to the Regents regarding a fee increase, and turned in recommendations to the Gould Commission. The campus GSA, he reported, has expressed interest in being part of the EVC search. GSA President Johnson then applauded the Senate on its work on the budget and childcare issues. GSA's main concern, he expressed, is the budget, and graduate students would like more communication and transparency about how departments plan to implement the cuts.

GSA President Johnson closed by acknowledging the recent deaths of UCSC students.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. New Business (none)

Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

Norma Klahn
Secretary