

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division

May 27, 2011

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, May 27, 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 was any discussion or amendments to the draft minutes of November 5, 2010 and to the draft minutes of March 9, 2011. The minutes of November 5, 2010 and March 9, 2011 were approved with no discussion.

2. Announcements**a. Chair Susan Gillman**

Chair Gillman welcomed the Senate members to the final Senate meeting of the year. She noted that we started the year working on Post-Employment Benefits and are ending the year working on the UC Online Education Project.

The approval of the online education pilot project put forth by the Office of the President (OP) had been contingent upon OP garnering extramural funding which did not materialize. OP went forward by taking out an internal UC loan to finance the \$7 million pilot project. Concerns were raised across the campuses regarding the changing nature of the pilot itself, from a UC student audience to a focus on non-UC students whose course fees would be critical to the payback of the internal loan. Other concerns included the cross campus processes of course approval, resource and workload implications, and evaluation of the program. The divisional senate chairs communicated these concerns to the Academic Council which wrote a letter of quiet protest and requested senate consultation producing a series of resolutions that were passed by a vote of 16 to 1.

The UCSC Health Care Task force sent a letter to OP in March requesting data. One of the results of that letter is that OP has put forth a formal request to Healthnet to follow up on the new lower rates that were announced by the Palo Alto Medical Foundation and find out if Sutter and Palo Alto Medical Foundation have decided to be reconsidered for membership in the less expensive UC Blue and Gold Health Plan for next year. The issue is whether Sutter will request membership from OP based on these new rates. We will keep you posted on the results.

There has been a joint effort by the faculty and the administration to create a comprehensive student retention plan for our campus. We have struggled with retention rates lower than the UC average for both low and high achievers who are lost at different stages of the educational process. This was announced as a Senate priority in the winter. The goal was to bring together under the oversight and accountability of an academic administrator, all of the undergraduate

functions over which the Senate has plenary authority. These include admissions, retention, advising, major and graduation requirements, assessments and grading. Their functions are currently located in a variety of offices and units across campus. The Senate produced a proposal co-authored by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), to realign academic functions under the office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The proposal recommends improvement in the following areas;

- Nonresident student admissions
- Access to courses
- Time to degree
- Graduation rates
- Retention of both high and low performing students
- An Academic Information System (AIS) that is more student/user friendly
- Work to bring down total cost of education to our students

The original implementation date of July 1, 2011 will not be met, but we are continuing forward with consultations to implement these changes as soon as possible next year.

We are moving forward on several retention issues, including reviewing major requirements, moving from quantified admissions review to holistic review, a pilot honors program that will be test-driven at Cowell next year, and a proposal to change class times. We hope that this marks the start of a UCSC internal reorganization. It is important to consider whether our current structures will continue to be effective given the budget crisis. We hope to launch a “UCSC 50” similar to the “UCLA 45” so our students can make it through to graduation with greater ease.

The Chancellor will talk about the systemwide reform of budget. The initial phase was to identify UC’s funding streams, then consider the return of non-state revenue to the campus which generates it. The next step in this reform is rebenching which concerns state funding, based on the principal that UC is one university with one standard of excellence across ten campuses - so the funding should be the same on every campus. Rebenching would redistribute state funds to allow the same quality of education across campuses at the same cost with the same resources. Students may be defined by category such as undergraduate, graduate, MA, PhD, and professional, but students within any given category should receive the same state subsidy regardless of campus. The pitfall will be that of campus self-interest driving the process. There are implications of new relations emerging among the campuses and from campus to center. These can be seen in library planning, online education and rebenching and the Senate is the sole remaining centripetal force so we need to keep it powerful and strong.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal stated that it has been an interesting and challenging year. It has left faculty questioning what the future will hold. There are fears that the budget cuts may compromise our campus, students may not graduate on time, and that the university is becoming so expensive that it is losing its value as a public research university. He remains optimistic despite these challenges.

The Chancellor announced that The Vice Chancellor of Business Administration Services (VCBAS), Tom Vani, is retiring after many years at UCSC. Additionally the Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci), Stephen Thorsett, is moving on to become the president of Willamette University. He thanked and congratulated them both. Christina Valentino has been appointed as acting VCBAS, and Paul Koch will be the acting PBSci Dean.

We have spent much of this year discussing the \$31 million budget cut. There is not yet a state budget agreement and we face the potential danger of an additional \$500 million cut systemwide if there's no tax extension. The legislature is obliged to achieve a budget by June. If we do have another all-cuts-budget we will have to make it up with an increase of student fees which would be an enormous burden on our students.

The Chancellor was in Sacramento for several meetings and was impressed by the number of UCSC alumni that are in positions of influence in Sacramento. He expressed a sense of optimism that there will be a budget by June 15 that won't involve greater cuts. He lobbied for the Coastal Biology building, which is not yet in the state budget, and will require a legislature that will actively lobby for it. He also lobbied for an agreement that the state has an obligation to contribute to the state pension systems. They should contribute to UC retirement system just as they contribute to CSU and community college state retirement systems. The university and certain state sectors have reached an agreement on SB 8, which would have subjected our foundations to the public records acts requirements. There was a compromise reached to protect the identities of donors. Gary Novak, president of UCSC foundation, discussed this in Sacramento and was key to helping this legislation move through. Beginning in July 2012, UCSC will again have an alumnus on the board of regents.

As UCSC's 50th birthday approaches, it is important that we lay a path for ourselves and understand our own distinctiveness as a campus. We provide the best research opportunities for undergraduates, we provide an environment that fosters multi-disciplinary partnerships, we balance access opportunity and educational rigor, and we are concerned about sustainability and social justice. These things make UCSC unique.

In this budget environment we are going to have to answer some difficult questions going forward. Should we be growing or shrinking? What should be the balance of students and faculty be across the divisions? What should be the balance of graduate students to undergrads, upper division students to lower division students, non-California-residents to Californians, masters versus PhD students? Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Allison Galloway and the Chancellor have begun a task force to address these questions.

The Chancellor stated his focus is to do everything possible to get adequate campus funding. He stressed the need to continue to invest in research while seeking additional financial support and setting aside stimulus funding. Our federal fundraising in the first ten months of this year is up \$4 million dollars compared to last year and this reflects the quality of faculty work. We need to continue with our fundraising campaign. We are seeing an increase in donations to the campus and we need to continue. It is our first fundraising campaign and we are aiming for a public rollout of the campaign in the fall of 2015. Also we need to increase our numbers of non-resident students as we are currently at only three to four percent and if we can, that it will bring

us positive financial benefits. We need to assure that we get a fair slice of the UC pie through funding streams and rebenching. The Academic Senate is in alignment on how this should proceed. We all need to work together to support public higher education.

It is the best of times and the worst of times. We are challenged by the budget but the success of our students and faculty is striking. This spring three of our faculty members were elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; Tom Banks in Physics, James Zachos in Earth and Planetary Sciences, and Jim Clifford in History of Consciousness. No other UC campus had more than three elected. Rene Tajima-Pena won a Guggenheim. Richard Edward Green in Biomolecular Engineering became a Searle Scholar and a Sloan Fellow. We also received funding from the Hellman foundation to provide research support for assistant professors. Karen Yamashita won the California Book Award. We should not lose sight of the distinctiveness and qualities of UCSC.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway.

EVC Galloway thanked the Senate for their work this year. She agrees with the Chancellor that we want to focus on our future. Each department is still putting forward ideas for the future even under the stress of the budget cuts. We have had a number of competing offers this year but have been successful in retaining most of the faculty. There have been two major shifts in leadership and we have a succession plan.

We have a campus that has not given up on itself and has protected the academic mission. We released new faculty lines, initiated instructional equipment replacement funds, initiated non-resident outreach, expanded summer session, added liaison officers for the Office of Sponsored Projects and the Office of Management of Intellectual Property. We have changed the Off-the-Top-Funding methodology to return more monies to the academic divisions, are working on the continuation of the UARC contract, and building out some of the research facilities for Silicon Valley.

We are on the third year of an enhanced plan regarding faculty salaries. The GTN (Greater Than Normal) program is being extended another three years to help keep pace with increases in salaries at other campuses. We are looking at ways to streamline the recruitment and review process. UC Irvine and UC San Diego have put together an online recruitment package computer program called RECRUIT and we hope to be on that program as soon as possible. UC Irvine estimates that they saved three million dollars in time using this system. We are hopeful that a similar system will be created and adopted to streamline the review process at UCSC.

The Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE), Mark Cioc, has put forward for full review changing class time from 70 minute time slots to 60 minute time slots. This is not to increase faculty workload but to increase the number of time slots available for large classes. Three slots would be freed up for large lecture halls so that we can provide more of the larger classes.

This year was dominated by budget reductions and we jumped on it right away, so we can see a path to get out. Other campuses are just coming to grips with the size of cuts. The principles are

to preserve instructional and research missions, to generate revenue when we can, and to take cuts on a permanent basis. We have focused on maintaining the instructional capacity with the use of some glide-path money, on preserving the research environment by maintaining staffing in the Office of Sponsored Projects, and returning some research safety support positions which if eliminated would have downloaded work to the faculty. We also addressed some public safety issues that required mitigation.

Despite all of this there will be layoffs. People are losing their jobs and it is very painful for everyone. The remaining staff members are trying to figure out how to handle the increased workloads and determine what simply won't be done anymore. We are asking staff members to report on the practical results of these layoffs to help us understand the impacts.

Because of the budget cuts and increased fees we need tactics to better serve our students. We have compiled five goals that we hope to reach by 2015. One name for this is "5 for 50" – reaching these five goals by our 50th anniversary. These are big tasks that will require work across all the divisions, academic support and institutional support.

1. We need to be in a position of financial stability, to at least plan out a three year budget. We will need to address some pervasive issues such as our tolerance to risk aversion.
2. We need to increase our retention rates to at least the UC average. 70% of students graduate on a six year basis. We would like to bring our first year retention rates to the UC average of 92%, and to decrease attrition from second to sixth years to 10% or less. We need to challenge high achievers with an honors program and encourage low achievers to succeed. We need to promote a sense of community for all of our students. As our data shows one of our most critical issues is transitioning students into majors.
3. We are close to achieving Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status, which would mean 25% of our students are listed as Hispanic. We should be seen as a primary place for Hispanic students to move through to higher degrees. Incidentally there may be additional funding support if we achieve HSI status, but this is not the primary reason for seeking such status.
4. We need to increase the number of undergraduate non-resident students to five percent of the total undergraduate student population. This will not only help to alleviate some of the financial strains to our campus but also add diversity, especially if we can attract international students.
5. We need to collaborate with the Senate to provide a pathway through majors for students to graduate in 4 years or less. We would like to see a streamlining of the majors as proposed by the Senate, help students find the majors they want, make better use of summer session, and find challenging uses of online learning. By the end of their sophomore year students should be poised to be successful in the major that they have chosen.

The areas of research and program development lie with the faculty. We are excited about what is coming forward from the faculty and we certainly don't wish to push them in ways they don't want to go.

When asked how UCSC would handle the funding stream proposal to tax student assessed fees, the EVC replied that anything spent on campus is the basis for the assessment. It has been decided that next year the tax will not be imposed on the fees self-assessed by UCSC students and we will begin discussions with SFAC in the fall about the future.

Replying to a question about what steps have been taken for student's ability to get classes to graduate, the EVC stated that the Senate has started a major mapping project that has been taken up by the VPDUE in conjunction with the Office Planning and Budget to assess these issues, determine where potential twists are, putting together a universal disqualification policy, and analyzing where costs of education are in all areas. The mapping is just within our campus for now, but we may share with other campuses. The Chancellor added that the Systemwide Academic Senate is working together to develop common undergraduate requirements in some departments.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1669)

FRL Chair Barbara Rogoff from Psychology announced the Faculty Research Lecture's (FRL) Nomination of Professor Stephen Vogt of Astronomy and Astrophysics to deliver the 2011-2012 FRL lecture. Professor Vogt's background and accomplishments were highlighted including his joining the LICK Observatory in 1978, his record discovery of extra solar planets, and the building of revolutionary astronomical equipment.

The nomination was approved by acclamation.

5. Report of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees:

a. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid

i. Policy for Frosh Admission – Holistic Review (AS/SCP/1674)

CAFA Chair Bruce Cooperstein reported on freshman admissions. The committee has engaged in a process this year to re-do how we select freshmen applicants. We select between 63% and 65% currently, a marked improvement from five years ago that has since shown annual improvements. The driver of the process is the policy developed by BOARS, the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools, a systemwide committee that makes admissions policies. BOARS decided that all campuses should use "holistic review," which ranks each

student by a single number, not involving fixed weights for each criterion used. UCOP has also pushed for this.

Students will be ranked from one to five with one being the best and five being the poorest, according to assessments by trained readers in the likelihood of applicants' potential success at our University. There are cost savings involved in that approximately 60% of our applicants also apply to UCLA and UCB and since they use a similar system we'll use their rankings to save time. There is potential to improve the process. SR1 removed affirmative action criteria from admissions. There are 14 criteria for assessing applicants; we continue with those 14 but they're grouped differently.

Curricular achievement of students will consist of one half of the rating - performance in the A-G courses as indicated by their GPA. The other 50% is everything else – initiative, leadership capacity, motivation, effort, etc.

Chair Cooperstein believes that we can do slightly better than we do now in terms of admission with this holistic review process. Currently two GPAs of 3.5 are treated exactly the same. If a student gets a 4.0 in sophomore year and 3.0 in junior year, and another does the opposite, we can give extra credit for the second student who is showing improvement over time, but holistic review allows for that. It also takes away the appearance of precision in the current process. Due to the current calculations, students who are just below the cutoff for admission are not admitted, including non-resident students. We may now be able to admit more non-resident students.

We will be able to assess each student in terms of their full opportunities. We have new read sheets that will be more detailed, and we will be able to see how students compare to each other in a less mechanistic way. Now we can consider factors for same-GPA applicants such as their taking of honors classes.

CAFA views this as something of an experiment with hopes that it will be successful, but will review and change the policy based on any problems. We expect to have a diverse group of students prepared to attend UCSC.

Professor Onuttom Narayan, physics, commented that a substantial part of the rationale behind the new policy is the intrinsic over-precision of the present scale. He asked if it would make sense to go with the present scale and then when you have applicants that are well above or below the cutoff you impose, you make a decision based on the scale, and then the borderline applicants be looked at more closely - similar to the way we do grading. When you said that we could not admit non-resident applicants because they were lower on the scale, how much lower were they? What are the predictive powers of success from the holistic review as it has been used at UCLA and Berkeley?

Chair Cooperstein replied that the whole non-resident cohort would have been captured by about 200 points. As for the predictive powers, that cannot really be answered. However UCSC will be an interesting experiment. UCLA has 14,000 applicants with a 4.0 or better GPA. As we don't have the same brand it requires more care. We won't make decisions on the basis of the old

system but the technology for using the old system will still be in place next year and consequently we will run that on the cohort to see in which ways it differs.

Roger Anderson, Chemistry, asked how many hours it will take to specially train readers for this new holistic review. Additionally he asked what the “not app” category in the CAFA report was as the table was confusing. He also asked what our take rate was for the different groups.

Chair Cooperstein replied that on the readers question he will defer to the admissions office to answer, but that there is currently an extensive training and then a “norming” process. The “not app” category means that they applied to one campus but not the other. Although he did not have the data with him he explained that the lower the score, the lower the take rate is.

Michelle Whittingham, Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management and Director of Admissions, clarified that the “not app” means unique to Santa Cruz, so beyond that were cross-applicants to the other two institutions. About 93% of the students who applied at either UCLA or UC Berkeley were offered admission to UCSC. In regards to the training, it is a three to four day intensive training and there are hopes to cross-train with UCB, and we hope to do norming throughout the cycle.

Regina Langhout, Psychology, asked if we anticipate our numbers to be unique to UCSC, or align with UCLA or UCB. There doesn't seem to be much alignment with the other campuses - one giving a 3 and the other a 4; which would we align with and why?

Chair Cooperstein replied that when there is a difference between the campuses ratings we will take the average of the two, so that our process is not going to be identical. There is also discussion that since UCLA and UCB read 80% of applicants for the UC system, that maybe we should give them more resources and have them do all the reads.

b. Committee on Committees

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.17.1 – Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1667)

COC Chair, Loisa Nygaard presented the amendment to bylaw 13.17.1 stating that according to academic senate bylaws COC nominates chairs and members as well as overseeing the functions for all the senate committees and periodically assesses effectiveness. In recent years, the workload of CEP has increased drastically, notably the change in the campus' general education requirements and implementation of the new general education requirement structure. COC has been waiting for CEP's workload to normalize however it has become clear that this will not happen with challenges on the horizon including budget cuts prompting department disestablishments and improving the campus retention rates. Because of this COC is proposing to increase the committee by one to three members. CEP is unusually small for a major Senate committee, a total of six members; only five members and one chair. CPB, CAP, and COR have nine members each, CAFA has seven to nine, and GC has ten.

CEP is one of only three senate committees that have plenary authority, not only serving the administration at an advisory capacity – the others being CAFA and GC. One of the immediate triggers for this legislative amendment is our concern regarding how difficult it can be to find a

chair for this committee. We've had a series of outstanding chairs, but that can run out. We always draw from membership of the committee for the chair position, and members learn quickly how much work it is. The VPDUE did agree to take over some of CEP's data collection upon the Senate's request.

A partial list of what the committee does is; it reads and reviews every course proposal, every course revision, every course suspension or reactivation, every catalog statement with significant changes, every proposal for an independent major, it has to approve all changes to major and minor requirements, weighs in on external reviews and faculty transfers between departments, and more - just as routine business. Expanding the committee will allow the chair to delegate tasks more frequently, and it will give COC a larger pool from which to select chairs.

Chair Nygaard relayed some of the main concerns that had been voiced to her regarding this change. One concern was that adding new members could lead to an imbalance in the committee's membership with a chair and five members, those five each representing one of the five divisions. In response to that concern she explained that although COC does attempt to have this even representation of divisions it cannot guarantee such a balance in any given year as sometimes it simply does not happen. The only senate committee mandated to have member from each division is CAF. COC additionally aims for other kinds of variety in membership such as generations of faculty and members from small and large departments. Another concern was that although it is a small committee in membership, it is a large committee when you add in all the guests. In response to that she replied that this is a senate committee and the senate should not get squeezed out. COC does not recommend this expansion lightly as it means more work for COC.

Professor Bill Ladusaw, Linguistics, commented that though he does understand the complexity and workload of CEP he is skeptical that merely increasing the number of members will address the problems. He recommends following the undergraduate council models at UCLA, UCSB, and UCD where the work of CEP, CPE and CAFA are more integrated.

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

ii. 2011-12 Nominations (AS/SCP/1670)

Chair Gillman noted that COC has provided a slate of nominations for the 2011-12 senate service. Chair Nygaard noted that there is one addition to the list in the call; Eve Zyzik, serving on CPE.

The slate was accepted by acclamation.

c. Committee on Educational Policy

i. Report on Major Admissions and Disqualifications Policies (AS/SCP/1671)

Chair Tamkun reported that CEP has spent a lot of time over the last two years discussing the admissions and disqualification policies with an emphasis on the potential impact on retention and graduation rates. Currently a student needs to complete all their general education

requirements, major requirements, a minimum grade point average of 2.0, and complete a minimum of 180 total credits. The minimum major requirements are at least 45 total credits – the equivalent of about nine courses – 40 of which must be earned at the upper-division level. There's a tremendous degree of variation among divisions for what's really needed for graduation. Approximate total number of credits required for graduation in different divisions ranges from about 65 – 70 in the Humanities and Arts to over 180 in the School of Engineering. There is some consistency for upper division course work at 50-60 credits in all divisions excluding the School of Engineering, which is slightly higher. There is tremendous variability for lower-division requirements with some majors that require over 100 credits of lower division course work and only 40 of upper division. Most of the differences are in lower division courses typically taken in the first or second year, during the first 90 credits of coursework.

Students must declare their major by the spring quarter of their sophomore year so they can enroll for classes in junior year. Basically they have to declare within five quarters, which is about 75 credits of coursework. Junior transfers get until their second quarter of residency to declare.

A major admissions policy articulates the conditions students must meet to declare a major. A major disqualification policy articulates the conditions a student must meet to remain in a major once they have declared it. All of these policies are developed by departments and vary by discipline. Proposed policies must be approved by CEP. Initially things seemed to go well but eventually we became aware of many problems such as students getting disqualified in their senior year and students unable to get into any majors. It was our intent for disqualifications to occur earlier to avoid these problems. One issue is that the number and complexity of majors has skyrocketed over the last decade with a skyrocketing in disqualification policies as well. On some campuses disqualification policies are rare or non-existent while they have become strikingly common at UCSC with at least two divisions where every major in that division has a disqualification policy.

These policies are also becoming increasingly difficult to understand or evaluate. We adopted a project that presents major requirements in a graphical form in which pre-requisites are represented by arrows so that we can look at how all the course requirements are interrelated, look at dependency relationships and get a better idea of how the curriculum is structured in a comprehensive way. This is the mapping project.

Some of the problems with disqualification policies became apparent when we started this mapping for majors. For example, looking at a Chemistry Bachelor of Science, there is a minefield of courses that have a disqualification policy that we at CEP call a "cradle to grave" scenario, which unfortunately is a norm on our campus. There are some interesting regulations on the books, one of which is that after a student has achieved 90 credits no department is required to accept them into the major. The staggering implication is that if a student is disqualified once they reach their junior year, no one needs to take them, which is effectively dismissal from the university. However most departments won't let this happen and they utilize an appeal policy where some faculty or staff must review and grant the appeal or the student will not be able to graduate.

Looking at an admissions policy map, Physics as an example is the only department in Physical and Biological Sciences that has an admissions policy, and there are foundational admissions gate courses, maintaining a GPA of 2.7; but once they are in the major they will not be disqualified. Selective admission to campus and major is the norm at other universities. Somehow our campus has focused on disqualification instead of qualification/admissions.

CEP recommends that the campus should align with the UC norm transitioning from major disqualification policies to major admissions policies as soon as possible. This will be a big transition for some departments so we ask them to look at their policies now to plan how to transition as quickly as possible for inclusion in the program statements for next year. Typical students should be able to satisfy admissions requirements before the end of their sophomore year, which is the norm on other UC campuses. These discipline specific admissions policies have to come from departments and CEP will be happy to assist in any way possible. The committee will also post updated guidelines to CEP's page later this year.

Brent Haddad, Environmental Studies, asked if this is a recommendation that we should transition or that we will transition.

Chair Tamkun replied that our current model is not in compliance with the systemwide regulations and suspects that we will be required to make the changes.

Justin Reardon, student representative on CEP, asked what the current enforcement for the disqualification policies were and how this will affect students caught in the middle.

Chair Tamkun replied that we need to come up with something that supports the policies and protects the students but it will not happen immediately.

Jaye Padgett, Linguistics, expressed his support, and asked if the substantive idea is that by the end of the sophomore year, students are in majors where they know they are going to be okay.

Chair Tamkun replied in the positive and continued that with more difficult majors we could provide options like a BA instead of BS or a switch to a major that still fulfills their interest that they are more likely to complete.

Professor Bill Ladusaw, Linguistics, commented that he fully supports this effort. He pointed out that we are exceptional within the system by having disqualification policies that kick in after the third year and are also exceptional within the system in losing 10% of our students after the third year, and suggested a correlation. Hopefully this will positively impact retention.

Jessica Greenstreet, Student Representative for CPB and CAFA, asked how this change would be different for transfer students versus native students.

Chair Tamkun replied that when we adopt the 90 credit viewpoint we are telling students what they have to do by the end of their sophomore year and also telling the transfer students what they need to have as well - they just get an extra quarter to do it. Any department that puts in the effort to do this will have defined their junior transfer admissions requirements. Our campus

does not have good criteria for determining impact on a major, so this should help with that too.

ii. Amendment to Regulation 9.1 – One year limit of grade change exceptions (AS/SCP/1668)

Chair Tamkun explained that there is currently a one year limit on grade changes, but there are special circumstances in which more time is needed, such as when a professor dies. This amendment allows the committee to approve late requests when it is warranted.

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

d. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Oral Report on Child Care, Health Care, Housing, and Faculty Salaries

Suresh Lodha, CFW Chair, facilitated oral reports by members of the committee of highlights to ongoing topics that the committee is working on; the Metro Bus Update, Housing, Healthcare, Childcare, Retirement, and Faculty Salaries.

CFW member Gina Langhout made a presentation on the METRO update and stated that she is a representative on the Transportation Advisory Committee. Due to the economy Santa Cruz Metro will be cutting their services by twelve percent leaving 28 routes that will be considered for elimination, reduction, or revision - five of which directly affect service to UCSC. During the school year route 10 would run once per hour instead of twice, and route 19 would run twice an hour instead of once an hour. The nightowl services to the campus, 16N and 19N, currently running seven days per week from midnight to 2:30am are up for being cut. The Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) is considering picking up the night service for Friday and Saturday nights only, which would require a student or staff ID to ride, but they would have to eliminate the day CORE shuttle route to accommodate this change. Anyone needing to get on or off campus Sunday through Thursday after midnight won't be able to use public transportation to do so. The METRO decision will be made around June 24th.

CFW member Hirotaka Tamanoi, presented an update of the re-pricing housing program. The program began in 2007 with 132 units currently in the program, with 49 houses purchased by the campus within the last several years, 38 of them have been resold to faculty and staff leaving 11 houses remaining to be resold. Housing prices have been changing year by year determined by price per square foot, based on three factors; 1) the average salary of incoming assistant professors, 2) interest rate of mortgage origination program, currently three percent, an historic lowest rate, 3) a cap of 60% of off campus housing market. CFW is recommending no increase to the housing price for the next year because salaries have been stagnant since 2007, there has been an increase in the health insurance premiums and increased retirement contributions. Additionally there are concerns about the housing cost rate methodology with an uncertain interest rate, and the stagnation of the off campus housing market. The housing rate has already increased housing prices by about 15% since 2007, so we don't see a need to increase for next year.

Onuttom Narayan, physics, stated that one of main motivations for the re-pricing program was that it would generate profits that could be used for loans and for new housing projects. He then asked how much money has been generated by that.

In response Professor Tamanoi responded that the program is currently \$2 million dollars in the red but after the 11 remaining houses are sold there should be a \$1 million dollar profit.

Professor Narayan expressed his astonishment that a project in which the houses practically doubled in price, with renovations carried out that could have been made by the prospective buyers at a much lower price showing a substantial profit being made in the renovations - if all this effort has brought only one million dollars profit then was it worth it? With faculty and staff paying substantially higher prices for these houses, the employees of the housing program have been turned into unwilling super-general contractors having to deal with general contractors who are constantly trying to extract as much money as possible from the university, and at the end of the day the amount of money the university will make is fairly small for a project of this scale. Professor Narayan asked if there is any way that the university can exit gracefully from this program and return to the old system where the university acted as a third party that brought buyers and sellers together.

Professor Tamanoi replied that the program is meant to benefit incoming assistant professors and although the margin of profit is relatively small, it will generate some money that can be used for faculty to purchase off campus and Ranch View Terrace houses.

Professor Narayan clarified that it is not a particularly compelling argument that in exchange for nearly doubling the price of houses we will get projected \$1 million dollars of which some fraction will be returned to the faculty and staff as low interest loans.

Professor Faye Crosby, Psychology, asked if another motivation for the re-pricing program was to try to equalize the per square foot cost. Chair Lodha replied that indeed this was one of the reasons why the project was taken up.

Chair Lodha reported briefly on the Health Care Task Force (HCTF) noting that CFW had advocated for and succeeded in having a UCSC representative on the systemwide HCTF, Barry Bowman. We also have created a local HCTF with Allison Galloway and Susan Gillman as the joint co-chairs, and they are working with PAMF and other organizations to reduce premiums. We won't know until late summer if this is translated into the reduced health care costs.

Laurel Fox, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, made a presentation on the Child Care Task Force pointing out that child care is provided for faculty and employees on all other nine campuses, Santa Cruz being the only campus that does not have any with UC Davis having four child care facilities. The task force recommends three financially viable options. 1) To buy and remodel a place off campus. 2) To lease and remodel a space off campus. 3) To build on campus near the base of the campus. They examined remodeling existing buildings on campus but found that it would not be financially viable. They recommended using a third party vendor to maintain the child care facility and to keep employee and student child care centers separate. CFW has requested additional information for evaluating their estimates of costs and to further document

what their lines of reasoning are. Child care has been a big issue on campus for over 30 years and still remains to be satisfactorily resolved. The task force report was excellent but it left out some of the documentation to support their reasoning. We do support moving ahead with long term planning for affordable child care for our employees and advocate for immediate short-term solutions starting this fall.

Chair Lodha reported that there has been no movement since the fall on retirement contributions with a reminder that contributions to the University of California Retirement Program (UCRP) will be going up from 2% to 3.5% starting in July. Next year the contribution will go up to 5% and although the Regents have not voted yet the contributions are expected to go up to 7% or 8% in 2013.

Reporting on the faculty salary policies Chair Lodha reported that the VPAA has provided data for faculty salary only recently and that CFW is engaged in assessing the impact of the three year merit boost plan. After July additional data may allow CFW to recommend augmentations or modifications after analysis. There have been some concerns that the implications of this plan have not been widely understood with possible salary compression, if faculty of excellence will benefit, or if this plan may increase inequality within faculty salaries. CFW is looking into these questions and implications.

e. Committee on Planning and Budget

i. Report on 2011-12 Budget and Budget Process (AS/SCP/1673)

ii. Report on Impacts of the Unfunded Liability in the UC Retirement Plan on UCSC Budget (AS/SCP/1672)

Due to time constraints Chair Haddad did not make an oral report for the two CPB reports in the meeting agenda but offered to answer question of which there were none.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

Alma De Castro, Commissioner for Academic Affairs, stood in for the SUA chair, Tiffany Dena Loftin. SUA thanked the Senate for their continued support and advocacy for student welfare. SUA took delegations to University of California Student Union Association (UCSUA) student lobby conference in Sacramento and to the United States Legislative Conference in Washington DC. Delegations met with elected representatives about support of higher education, PELL grants and the Dream Act. SUA will continue to work with systemwide counterparts to relay the importance of universal access to higher education.

One SUA focus for the year was ethnic studies and SUA thanks the administration and faculty for the push for an ethnic studies curriculum. SUA would like to see a proposal on the senate floor in the near future for an ethnic studies curriculum that will accurately address the cultural tensions and misunderstandings on our campus. Given the increase in ethnic and racial graffiti plaguing the campus this year, SUA looks to the administration for greater response and punishment for the perpetrators. This is an important issue that needs to be addressed because it furthers tensions among the student body fostering a hostile environment detrimental to physical and mental health and educational abilities.

SUA representatives were able to take the class availability student survey systemwide with UCSC as the flagship campus coming in with the highest student response percentage among the UC campuses. SUA will be hosting a grassroots organizing weekend beginning today to better educate students for advocacy methods for all their campaigns.

Next year's SUA leaders and officers resulting from SUA elections are as follows:

Amanda Buchanan, SUA Chair
Victor Velasco, Internal Vice Chair
Nelson Cortez, External Vice Chair
Nwadiuto (DT) Amajoyi, Commissioner of Diversity
Sindy Ramirez, Organizing Director
Jessica Greenstreet, Commissioner of Academic Affairs

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

11. New Business (none)

Steve Thorsett, Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences, rising on a point of personal privilege thanked everyone as this was to be his last Senate meeting at UCSC. He offered a brief recap of his history in the UCSC Senate which began 12 years prior. He offered special thanks to CPB and CAP for working so hard and being a model of shared governance. He closed offering a special gift by moving to adjourn this meeting. (Applause)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15p.m.

ATTEST:
Judith Habicht Mauche
Secretary

August 25, 2011