

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
March 9, 2011

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Gillman asked if there were any proposed substantive changes to the minutes of May 21, 2010 and October 20, 2010 commenting that typos in the October minutes have been identified and will be fixed. The May 21, 2010 minutes had been amended and approved at the October 20, 2010 meeting, were accepted then tabled. The minutes of May 21 and October 21, 2010 were approved.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Susan Gillman

Chair Gillman welcomed the Senate members and explained that the budget is a pressing matter for the Senate. She acknowledged the recent layoff of AVC Public Affairs and Communications Barry Shiller.

At the winter quarter budget forum for faculty there was a question about the mechanics of fee increases and how they affect this year's cuts. Where we used to get \$0.67 on the dollar we will now be getting 100%. At that forum it was explained that thanks to some new revenues, including these fees, as well as administrative foresight in not allocating some resources, the cut that will be allocated out to units is approximately \$18.7 million rather than the full \$30.9 million UCSC cut. Faculty also expressed concern about possible dis-proportionality in the allocation of the cuts between divisions over the last three years and EVC Galloway will speak to this issue as well as this distribution of cuts this year; 6% cuts to Academic Divisions and 16% cuts to Academic Support.

The UC Funding Streams Proposal is meant to provide transparency in budgeting and could potentially keep education fees on campus. All campus responses to the Funding Streams Proposal are on the Senate website. The second part of this project is "rebenching". Rebenching is intended to provide a rational allocation system for state funds and will offset historical inequities, ensuring that all UC campuses receive adequate state funding. Chair Gillman and Chancellor Blumenthal will serve on a systemwide task force for Rebenching.

The Committee on Research (COR) FRG/SRG applications have gone out and the deadline is April 1st. Applicants can contact Senate Committee Analyst Liana Thompson directly with questions. She introduced Liana as the new Senate analyst and also Jason Greenberg, Assistant to the Senate Director.

On March 2 there was a student event on behalf of student participation in more transparent budgetary process, expansion of Ethnic Resource Centers, and creation of an Ethnic Studies major. There was no fallout although there was occupation of a facility overnight, with a quick cleanup.

A faculty letter requesting that firearms not be used in the context of campus policing of demonstrations was initiated by a Faculty Group on Campus (FOG) and signed by over 105 faculty from across campus. Gillman noted that the EVC had already ended regular photo surveillance of demonstrations.

With regard to Silicon Valley, the proposed School of Management has been removed from 5-year list. Educational activities in Silicon Valley have been consolidated in the UNEX building for lease relief. The Graduate Council and COR are working with Silicon Valley Initiatives Director, Gordon Ringold on the academic plan. The Office of the President (UCOP) did give the campus \$1.5M in permanent funding for development and research in Silicon Valley.

The Senate Executive Committee met with the Executive Committee of the Alumni Council, which is energizing the alumni for fund-raising and mobilizing as political advocates to support public education and the UC as well as recruiting of non-resident students. There is need for better, more systematic use of alumni in the admissions process, especially using the regional organizations. This year there is an effort to end the campus penalty of approximately \$1.7M from UCOP for not meeting our modest non-resident target.

An internal rebenching/reform to be initiated by the Senate includes a proposal to bring together undergraduate functions over which the Senate has plenary authority and that run the gamut of the student educational experience/life-cycle such as admissions, major and graduation requirements, assessment and grades. SEC will propose coordination of certain educational functions in a single office, under the direction and oversight of academic administrator. Advantages to this restructuring will include accountability to the Senate by an officer directly charged with academic authority; coordination of departments and Senate committees that rely on the administration for implementation. Also it will provide structural symmetry of undergraduate organization with the way that graduate and research are structured on campus. The Senate Executive Committee will be submitting a proposal to the Administration.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

The Chancellor noted that many students and faculty have attracted national attention and won an array of awards. Further, donors continue to support our educational mission such as the million dollar donation from the Baskins. We have much to preserve here and to make even better.

There were two budget forums last week on campus. The Governor's budget has assigned a \$500 million cut to the UC system. This is part of a \$1.4 billion cut to education and there is almost no likelihood that this figure will decrease. The danger is that the cuts could double if there is no June ballot measure or if there is one that does not pass.

UCSC has received a roughly \$31 million cut. The good news is that with additional income from the 8% increase of student fees and permanent budget cuts made last year, we are actually facing an approximate \$19 million dollar cut. If the tax measure doesn't pass, this figure could more than double - \$19 million plus another \$31 million making a \$50 million cut. It is important that we reach out to our elected representatives, particularly Sam Blakesly. Tom Barryhill, Bill Emerson, Tom Harman and Anthony Canella are also key Senators to contact.

The Chancellor met with UC President Mark Yudof along with Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway and Vice Chancellor Planning and Budget (VCPB) Peggy Delaney to discuss the impact of cuts on our campus. Additionally UC Day in Sacramento had UC Alumni and faculty representatives, such as Joe Konopelski, lobbying on the issue of the ballot measure.

Next week, Chancellor Blumenthal will be one of the 3 chancellors making a presentation to the Regents about the impact of the cuts. Blumenthal commented that UCSC is a very administratively lean campus.

There will be a fee increase this fall. Traditionally, this campus has been allocated fee money based on the percentage we are assigned from UCOP (roughly 6% of systemwide). The fee money was allocated out based on the budget - we were only getting 67 cents back on every dollar students were paying in fees. Beginning next year, we will be getting back 100% of our fees. But this doesn't mean that the fee increases from the past three years will be recovered—they are now part of the permanent budget—this is why there is a necessity for rebenching.

Chancellor Blumenthal acknowledged the Senate as an ally in getting Rebenching started. The job will take some time to complete - it took 2 years for the Funding Streams Proposal, which was too long. UCSC should move forward on rebenching as quickly as possible. It will not have an effect next year, but the “mindless budgeting” that has taken place at UC in the past must stop.

There is a need to increase the number of non-resident students. It is important for cultural diversity as well as for budgetary reasons.

The campus may be facing a budget situation that is the “new normal”. Governor Brown's proposal is a balanced budget. We cannot expect more next year, but we can hope that there will not be more cuts, as the situation normalizes. We need to think about what things are worth preserving on campus and crucial to the identity of UCSC.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway.

EVC Galloway made a presentation about assumptions that are being made regarding the budget cuts. The presentation also outlined new resources for revenues and showed that campuses will be paying an assessment to support UCOP as part of the Funding Streams Proposal.

She explained the university's obligations and cuts. The overall cut will be approximately \$39.7 million. Roughly \$20 million was not allocated out from last year and will be applied to our campus cut so the campus shortfall is \$18.7 million. If the tax extension is not passed, then the shortfall could be just under \$50 million.

EVC Galloway explained that funds which campuses manage do not only include educational fees but also a number of other fees such as non-resident tuition, overhead on contracts and grants, patent income, interest on campus funds, gifts and endowments, auxiliary sales, and research. One thing that is taken out is undergraduate financial aid. There are some campuses that have large amounts of students who need financial aid and others with less. Simply returning financial aid proportionally to each campus enrollments would mean some campuses would be giving out extremely rich financial aid packages while others would be giving out a pittance. So these funds are redistributed based upon the needs of the students on the different campuses.

The remaining funds are primarily from student fees, from state funding, and other UC sources, including payouts on endowments. The important thing is how the state fees are allocated out to the campuses and this is the Rebenching issue. Currently those distributions are uneven and UCSC is at a disadvantage. Rebenching would give UCSC a more equitable compensation from state budget and from the fees.

EVC Galloway then outlined how UCSC is going to distribute the cuts that came to our campus. Initial targets for units composed of institutional support and academic support was 15.5% of their total budgets. For the academic divisions this kind of cut could not be made because the core purpose of the university is the academic mission and because we have tenured faculty who cannot be released. So 15.5% cuts were to come out of remaining budgets of academic divisions, which is the equivalent of a 5.9% cut to the divisions. Unfortunately this means that lay-offs are inevitable, and their impacts will be significant. The administration is looking at ways to increase revenue – including non-resident enrollments and summer session income.

The Demonstration Advisory Group which represents the campus community, not a group of administrators, has had its first meeting and is looking at policies governing protest management, surveillance, and judicial affairs.

The Child Care Task Force is underway as is the Health Care Task Force which has transmitted a letter to Office of the President regarding health care options at UCSC.

Some administrative recruitments have started including the VPDUE, Dean of Humanities, VPAA, and the Dean of Extension.

Responding to a question about how the UCOP tax will be calculated, EVC Galloway stated that we have not gotten that far yet but that initial estimates are based on all expenditures on the campus.

Asked if Assembly member Fong's 2302 bill for streamlined transfers from community colleges to UC would help our funding, Chancellor Blumenthal replied that streamlined transfer is very important, the ASSIST program needs to be updated, and that there is a need for more uniformity

in undergraduate requirements throughout the system. From a state perspective it is a good thing but from a university point of view the extent that we educate more upper division students, it may be more expensive for us and would need more funding. From a university financial perspective it is less clear cut.

When told that many students are completely unaware of the summer ballot tax extensions a request was made that the Chancellor send a message to every UCSC alumni, student, faculty and staff member about the issue and how they can contact the legislature. Chancellor Blumenthal agreed that it was a good suggestion.

Asked how they plan on protecting non-revenue generating majors, such as the Social Sciences, EVC Galloway replied that cuts are allocated evenly across campus, so revenue streams have not been considered. Most departments are in the same boat and unfortunately we cannot completely protect every part of the educational mission.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- a. Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1664)**
- b. Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1666)**

Professor Margret Fitzsimmons from Environmental Studies requested that the annual report be removed from the consent calendar. She agrees with the analysis and conclusions, but was concerned about losing some of the most unique and remarkable things that have been accomplished at UCSC. The Environmental Studies Department works to build inter-divisional contact. We need to consider the impact of budget cuts to enterprises that do not reside in a single division. One example of a well established and internationally known program that may be in jeopardy is the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems because it lies within four or five divisions.

5. Report of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees:

a. Graduate Council (GC)

- i. Amendment to Section IV Graduate Program Chapter 13 Grading and Transmission of Records (AS/SCP/1659):**

Chair of Graduate Council (GC) Sue Carter, presented the five legislative changes based on letter grades on graduate courses, optional evaluations, and grading change limit, which brings these regulations in line with the undergraduate policies on grading students. Senate Chair Gillman established that there was quorum.

Spoke in favor of the amendments	Spoke against the amendments	Comments about the amendments
	Jeff Sanceri, GSA President	Justin Reardon, SUA(CEP):
	Erik Green, GSA (CPB)	
	Onuttom Narayan, Physics	
	Carla Freccero, Literature	

Points Made against the amendments

- Graduate Students feel that narrative evaluations are very important for their coursework and for employment opportunities.
- Departments are allowed to require certain courses for grades.
- The choice is up to the instructor and the department cannot decide to override an individual instructor's preference.
- Distinguishing between a B- and a B in a class with only 10 students is wishful thinking.
- It is inappropriate given the scope of graduate education which should be research.

Comments about the Amendments

- There was a request that the Senate require instructors to put in the course syllabi that students have an option of narrative evaluations, providing a deadline for the request to be submitted.

Responding to comments from the floor GC Chair Carter replied that it is the instructors' option to offer grades or narrative evaluations but it is hoped that if a student requests a narrative evaluation that the instructor would comply. The current norm is to not assign grades, however the department can require letter grades for any course. It is fine to have a course that is only graded as A, B, C, etc. if the instructor wishes to not use the + and – designations. The goal of the proposed legislation is to provide faculty with the flexibility to employ the best methods for evaluating graduate students, rather than mandating any one practice over another.

The motion to amend the legislation was passed by voice vote.

b. Committee on Committees

i. Amendment to Bylaw 4.1 Senate Chair (AS/SCP/1662)

Committee on Committee (COC) Chair Loisa Nygaard announced that COC had two amendments that attempt to problem solve and improve the functioning of the Senate. The amendment to 4.1 would allow the term of a current chair to be extended by a year. The previous Senate Chair resigned her position in June 2010 when the current chair stepped in for a one year term following regulations. Based on current regulations COC is faced with two alternatives for the coming year. One is to reappoint the current chair for a full two year term which is problematic because it is a lot to ask of one person. The other is to appoint a new chair but that is problematic because it would mean three years in a row with a first year chair which is not an attractive option. The change in legislation would allow COC, in these situations, to extend the term of the current chair by one additional year. At this point Senate Chair Gillman recused herself from conducting the meeting and Senate Vice Chair Joe Konopelski took the podium.

Commenting on the amendment Richard Hughey, Biomolecular Engineering, offered the following alternate wording; “in cases where the interim Chair serves for one year or less (Comma) the committee may extend the term for an additional year”.

COC Chair Nygaard replied to the comment that COC considered the alternate phrasing but found that it could pose significant technical difficulties.

The motion to amend the legislation was passed by voice vote.

ii. Amendment to Chapter 11 Elections (AS/SCP/1665)

With Chair Gillman presiding, COC Chair Nygaard presented a long-term ongoing problem with the senate bylaws. In the absence of nominations for the Committee on Committees coming from the faculty at large, the COC must act very quickly to get nominees. When a COC member does not fulfill their two year term, the replacement one year term can be very problematic and can produce a COC that consists entirely of new members. If this proposed change passes, then any nominees necessary to fill out COC will be selected thoughtfully by the entire COC rather than allocated at the last moment. The senate will have the opportunity to review, and approve or not-approve the nominees that the COC generates. The practices used to re-staff COC will be open and transparent.

Professor Carl Walsh, Economics, inquired about the lack of faculty willingness to be nominated. COC Chair Nygaard replied that there is no firm answer but that this has been a longstanding problem.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)

i. Oral report on transition to new General Education and curricular planning.

CEP Chair John Tamkun presented a mapping tool to display course requirements for majors. This analysis can be used to look at one’s own curriculum, compare across departments for interdisciplinary issues, to look at impaction, department sizes, course flows, and reasons for program suspension/disestablishment. The curriculum mapping tool can also be used to analyze many aspects of curricular planning including General Education Requirements (GE), course capacity, course and major prerequisites, effects of the curriculum on retention, cross-departmental impacts, admissions, and disqualifications policies. CEP is working on revising major admissions and disqualification policies to improve the student experience and retention. This mapping tool has proven to be an extremely useful guide to visually clarify many complex factors. A graphical representation of each major can be easily generated, clearly showing what classes can be taken with regards to prerequisites, and reveals complex relationships between departments, divisions and majors. This tool will facilitate planning and promote efficiency.

Looking at the results of these charts made it evident that we need to implement early admissions policies and focus advising in the gateways to help with student success. Goals include

graphically displaying data on maps (such as enrollments, pass rates, offerings per year), develop fully automated methods for generating and updating maps, generating full divisional and campus maps, current and revised maps can be analyzed for proposed changes to majors, and these maps can also become available to students.

Professor Shelly Errington, Anthropology, suggested mapping units and entities that serve our students which are an intrinsic part of research - such as the Agroecology program and the Social Sciences Media Lab - to help us decide when cuts need to be made and what the academic costs are of those cuts.

d. Committee on the Library

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.23 (AS/SCP/1661)

Robert Manduchi, Chair of COL, announced the bylaw changes to the name and charge of the Committee on the Library. Bylaw 13.23 would enable greater involvement of COL in advising on budget. The Library does not have a protected budget. In the budget crisis it is important that that changes to the Library budget are carefully considered. Chair Manduchi invited Librarian Ginny Steel to address the issues.

Librarian Steel supports and welcomes the proposed changes to the bylaws. The current budget crisis is forcing the Library to cut even more of its subscriptions and functions on top of the effects of previous years' budget cuts. After the sunset of the student-initiated fee to extend library hours, the library is going to face significant problems with keeping the library open.

Chair Manduchi presented the second portion of the legislation which proposes to change the name of the Committee on the Library to the Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication reflecting the Library's modernization with regards to publishing research and supporting teaching.

Spoke in favor of the amendments	Spoke against the amendments	Comments about the amendments
Brent Haddad, CPB Chair		John Jordan, RJ&E Chair
Michael Laird, SUA (COL)		
Jessica Greenstreet, SUA (CAFA)		

Points made in favor of the amendments

- Budget issues facing the library are very important right now and it is good that this is explicit in the charge.
- The importance of keeping the library open for study space was stressed.

Comments about the amendments

- Friendly amendments were offered and accepted to change "Assists" to "Advises" and to add "The Committee"
- This will go into effect April 1st instead of September.

An incidental motion that if this legislation passes it would go into effect on April 1st, was passed by voice vote.

The legislation passed by voice vote.

e. Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB)
i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.24 (AS/SCP/1663)

Brent Haddad, Chair of CPB presented an efficiency measure to go into effect on April 1st inviting the Academic Senate Director to sit on CPB in order to take advantage of the broad array of information that the Senate Director can provide to the committee.

Spoke in favor of the amendments	Spoke against the amendments	Comments about the amendments
Quentin Williams, COR Chair		
		Richard Hughey, Biomolecular Engineering

Points made in favor of the amendments

- This places the Senate Director in a position to support one of the most crucial committees of the Senate.

Comments about the amendments

- The Senate office has already figured out which staff members sit with the committees.

Chair Haddad responded that the Director does assign support staff for each committee, but because the Director has so much information from both systemwide senate and from UCSC staff, it is particularly valuable to have the Director sit with CPB.

An incidental motion that if this legislation passes it would go into effect on April 1st, was passed by voice vote.

The legislation passed by voice vote.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

Tiffany Dena Loftin, the Student Union Assembly (SUA) Chair, reported on the following points:

- SUA has conducted outreach asking students to attend Senate meetings for informational purposes.
- A few weeks ago they brought 40 students to Sacramento for a lobbying field trip garnering support for the Dream Act, CA student Aid, and Cal Grants. Over 400 students from all UC campuses were there.
- Asked that curricular maps be integrated into the course catalog.
- SUA succeeded in getting 2% tax removed from student referendums.

- Students are experiencing issues with course availability, diversity, campus climate, and priority enrollment criteria.
- Students are still advocating for an Ethnic Studies Program.
- SUA is organizing students to vote and lobby for tax extensions on the June ballot.
- May 13-15 is annual Women of Color Conference.
- SUA is working on bringing Cornell West here on May 6th.
- SUA is planning an event in Sacramento on April 14th.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Jeff Sanceri, the Graduate Student Association (GSA) Chair, reported on the following points:

- GSA is very concerned about the proposed cuts to the Library and doesn't understand why it is getting categorized as a non-academic entity when it is so essential to graduate research.
- Regarding narrative evaluations many graduate students are in favor of it as long as they live up to their potential. If the system is broken we should fix it instead of eliminating it.
- GSA voted unanimously to co-sign the letter prohibiting the use of weapons in dealing with student activism.
- GSA is concerned about the improvement of living conditions in Family Student Housing and affordable rent rates for on campus housing.
- GSA is concerned about child care.
- GSA is looking for faculty support in challenging the "18-quarter rule"
- GSA is sending a group of graduate students to an Ethnic Studies conference at UC Riverside. The hope is that the ambassadors to this conference will be able to come back to UCSC armed with strategies to launch the Ethnic Studies movement here on campus.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

11. New Business (none)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20p.m.

ATTEST:
Judith Habicht Mauche
Secretary

May 9, 2011