

MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division November 9, 2011

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, November 9, 2011 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Susan Gillman called the meeting to order at 2:43 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Gillman asked if there are any corrections to the draft minutes of May 27, 2011. The minutes of May 27, 2011 were approved with no discussion.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Susan Gillman

Chair Gillman welcomed the Senate members to the first Senate meeting of the year and introduced the new Senate Analysts; Kim Smith and Michael Tassio.

Last year the Senate initiated a proposal on which the administration acted this summer - the realignment of academic support functions under the oversight and accountability of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The outcome of this realignment is still in progress though overall this has been a successful restructuring. The colleges, departments and divisions all intersect as an advising trio under the VPDUE and there are many opportunities for greater coordination there.

Not intended as a money-saver the net-revenue-neutral proposal eliminated the Student Affairs division to better serve our students and ensure educational excellence and administrative accountability in many of the formally grey-zones of academic support functions.

We will continue to monitor the implementation, mindful of any unanticipated outcomes and gaps; ensure integration of academic functions, curriculum, advising and retention, that they all work smoothly from both faculty and student perspectives. Now that Admissions and the Office of the Registrar have started the year under the office of the VPDUE we should monitor what we are doing to increase our non-resident enrollment. Additionally we should monitor the college co-curricular programs which moved along with housing to the Business and Administrative Services Division (BAS) are faring under that new leadership.

This year there is a broad effort to focus on student retention and graduation rates including the Executive Vice Chancellor's (EVC) measures looking for an annual two percent increase in retention rates. The Senate advocates a comprehensive overview of all undergraduate functions for which the Senate has plenary authority ranging from admissions, assessment and grades, advising, and major and graduation requirements.

Curricular Review

The Senate is encouraging departments to implement full curricular review of their majors and minors. At last fall's Senate meeting the PBSci department chairs pointed out that UCSC is an outlier lacking in transfer requirements that exist at other campuses, allowing transfer students to enter UCSC who are not prepared to finish their major of choice in the time allotted. Also, UCSC is out of compliance with systemwide regulations in regards to our major disqualification policies.

The goal of this curricular review is to create a balance in our profile of campus majors such that requirements would range from 50 to 150, not a target number of units like UCLA's "Challenge 45". We are looking for better overall sequencing and rationality within individual majors. The tools that will help to accomplish this goal are the major mapping project and departmental review of major disqualification policies.

The major mapping project is still not ready. Initiated by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) in 2010-11 and handed over to the office of the VPDUE, the major mapping project creates a visual display for each of our majors showing pre-requisites, course dependencies, and sequencing for all requirements and electives. These maps are intended as a tool for faculty in helping departments enhance coherence and relevance of the curriculum, eliminate redundancy and orphaned pre-requisites, identify bottlenecks, and assure that course sequencing enables students to graduate in four years or less. Once the maps are available in a useable format, faculty will be able to monitor the curriculum over time, maintaining its coherency and consistency. A secondary longer-term goal is to provide students with independent access to that information as a preparation for and supplement to consultation with advisors.

The second tool is more labor intensive. CEP has initiated departmental review of major disqualification policies (DQs) in order to bring them into compliance with our systemwide regulations. A more comprehensive issue arising from the timing of this is that the campus relies on major disqualification generally too late in the student's progress though the major to allow them to find another degree program and graduate. Major maps reveal that students can take prerequisite courses as late as their last quarter, fail to pass and then be unable to graduate. To rectify this problem with obvious implications for both retention and graduation rates, CEP will emphasize gateways or qualification policies at the beginning of the major process rather than the end.

The Senate is aware that comprehensive review of the curriculum for the majors of this kind is a significant undertaking that will take departments substantial time to identify roadblocks and create realistic major requirements and sequencing. CEP is asking departments to remove those disqualification policies that are most problematic, particularly courses that are out of sequence, and if we get this done by the time of new catalog copy, the greatest part of the effort will have been done. Once these most egregious DQs have been removed then departments can use the major maps to restructure their programs as needed including new qualification policies.

The primary goal of this effort is not to cut costs, rather to challenge the assumption that quantity equals quality in major requirements and secondarily to update the curriculum more globally as a campus. This differs from and offers greater benefits than periodic curricular re-evaluation that most departments do individually in isolation.

The broader questions in this curricular review are:

- How effectively are our development, planning and implementation of the curriculum, both undergraduate and graduate, being served by campus practices, policies, and structures?
- How effective is our current campus organization at the delivery of our curriculum?
- How are research and curricular needs aligned and served by those structures?

Course Time Slots

Last year an administrative proposal to reduce class times from 210 minutes per week to 180 was informally presented and consulted on with Senate committees. It was formally transmitted at the end of the spring quarter. That proposal has now been reviewed by all relevant Senate committees who have collectively requested more information before making a recommendation to the administration. This issue raises the question of when and how to consult with departments as Senate committees. Most faculty learn of issues through departmental meetings yet this issue has not gone out to departments. Some of the collective questions that came from the committees reviews are:

- 1) The nominal reason for this proposal is the need for more large-lecture rooms. The Senate requested data about that need ranging from the use of large classrooms over the course of a day, divisional and departmental differences in that usage, and faculty presence. This is a request for more data on the nature of the problem.
- 2) If the problem is large-lecture space, then the solution seems disproportionate to the problem.
- 3) What are other options? Some suggestions have been made including reducing passing time, and other efforts to increase capacity.

Faculty Salaries

Over the past four years campus efforts have been trained on raising our UCSC faculty salaries relative to those across the UC system. There was a joint Senate/Administrative work group led by (then) vice-chair Lori Kletzer, resulting in a set of recommendations that were implemented by the EVC as a greater-than-normal salary plan for a three-year period, which just concluded at the end of last year. The data have been collected and the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) will report on what they are doing to analyze the data and present recommendations for possible next-steps.

This year the Senate would like to supplement this comparative study with an internal look at faculty advancement, with salaries as a subset, and might re-look at advancement to Step VI, which had been the focus of earlier interest. Earlier studies had shown that smaller percentages of UCSC faculty put themselves forward for Step VI than the system norm but with an equivalent rate of success in the cases that are put forward.

Departmental cultures vary in terms of advancement. Where do we shoot ourselves in the foot? How will we fix it? How will those local fixes fit with systemwide efforts at faculty salary strengthening? There also is a Faculty Salary Task Force, which will report at a systemwide

level, that is looking at off-scale salaries and how to use them to increase salaries at individual campuses.

Health Care

This summer a message went out from the Office of the President to the EVC explaining that rate increases for Health Net (full-network) are “moderate” this year. Ten percent with a pay band of single-coverage going up less than \$5, and for a family less than \$18. The message went on to say that though we did see concessions from Sutter this year in relation to Health Net’s Blue & Gold, and will be able to add more of their groups to our network, Santa Cruz Palo Alto Medical Foundation was not one that they were able to cap contracted rates sufficiently to make the financial thresholds so that it could be within the Blue & Gold network. Health Net concluded negotiations with Sutter on any further network changes already for 2012 with no good news. The campus view is that we are going to launch a new effort joining forces with the systemwide Health Care Task Force Chair to join Blue & Gold in 2013.

Rebenching

You’ll hear next from Chancellor Blumenthal, channeling the EVC (who has wisely chosen to miss the Senate meeting so that she could be physically present at today’s campus rally at the Quarry in support of the statewide Day of Action) on our local multi-year approach to coping with the cuts. He will also comment on the parallel track at Office of the President (OP), where there is an effort at systemic reform of the UC budget, in the form of what are known as Funding Streams and Rebenching. These are both inelegant terms for major systemwide reform of the budget, both accounting and allocation.

Funding streams refers to creating greater transparency for non-state funds that are generated by each campus. Rebenching refers to allocations of all of the remainder that are the state funds.

This is intended to address the problem that UCOP uses an incremental budget process to determine the annual budget for each campus. This process consists of a permanent base amount, which varies by campus, and incremental adjustments made annually to that base amount. The budget process results in varying amounts per student distributed among campuses—for fiscal year 2009-10, for example, the State Auditor Report issued in July 2011 shows a range of per student allocation of \$12,309 (at UCSB) to \$55,186 (at UCSF). In that fiscal year UCSC was second from the bottom at \$12,846.

UCOP couldn’t identify the reasons for the differences or quantify them, (as indicated in the Auditors report) other than to cite the cumulative outcome of a long history of incentives and disincentives, marginal increments and decrements, with the base permanent and all changes occurring only on the margins. Cross-subsidies between and among the campuses thus reflect historic reasons and rationales that may have changed considerably. There was weighting of graduate students by 1.5 FTE that began in the 1980s and ended in 1990s - but those subsidies themselves were built into the base budgets of each campus and have therefore become permanent.

The solution is a two-part approach. Budget reform was launched, with the first phase, Funding Streams: it makes more transparent various revenue sources in the non-state portions of the

budget, allocating them on the basic principle that revenues generated by a campus, whether in the form of student tuition, including non-resident-tuition, contracts and grants, or other fundraising, should be returned to the campus that generated them.

In July 2011 the State Auditor Report came out, *in medias res*, when phase one, Funding Streams, had been completed and phase two, Rebenching, was launched- but very shakily. The President's administrative Budget Rebenching Task Force was initiated at the end of last year. The membership includes five Chancellors, one EVC, Vice Chancellors of Planning and Budget, UCOP budget managers and five Senate representatives. UCSC Chancellor George Blumenthal and Senate Chair Susan Gillman are on it.

The second solution in phase two is Rebenching but it is not ready yet. We are now operating under a partially-completed budget reform, having implemented phase one, Funding Streams, which depends for its intended outcomes on phase two, Rebenching, the second phase of UC's own internal budgetary reform—the allocation of state funding to the campuses in a more fair and transparent way. This is a situation that, in many respects, promotes the status quo, which President Yudof has publicly recognized as the leaderless outcome of a long history of ad hoc budgetary decisions. By permitting campuses to retain all the revenues they generate, "funding streams", without reallocating state funds, locks in the competitive advantage of those who were historically advantaged by differential funding; by not moving to "rebenching," we also lock in that competitive advantage.

The momentum in Rebenching is in the direction of a formula linking systemwide allocation of core funds to current student numbers - with funding tiers for different classifications of students. Closing the per-student funding differential, which is essentially what the State Auditor's Report verified and revealed, will bring the UC budgetary model in line with the long held value, reaffirmed in multiple times and venues by the Senate but that is now in jeopardy, of a single public university with ten distinctive locations across California.

The Senate response to this is to advocate the principle of equal per-student-allocation by type of student across campuses with the reasoning that the cost of a UC education is the same at each campus.

The principle has been nominally accepted in the rebenching discussions but it is not clear how, when or even whether it will be implemented. Some of the questions that have been raised include the following.

- Should rebenching apply to new state funds only, or be implemented over a very long period of transition?
- How would funding for Health Sciences and other systemwide priorities be treated?

Now is the time to proceed deliberately with budget reform. The Senate and the Administration endorse the value of UC as one university, and if we mean that we are one university, we need to stand by that value in defining principles for budgeting.

The whole Rebenching effort could be viewed as a systemwide version of "let no budget crisis go to waste." How that experiment will end, with greater transparency and equity in budgetary

allocations across the system--whether any principled basis at all will emerge--is still an open question.

b. Chancellor George Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal thanked Chair Gillman for her very clear exposition on Rebenching stating that he would come back to it but that he has little to add to what she already said. He apologized that EVC Alison Galloway is not present today as she is “occupying Santa Cruz” and that he will do his best to fill in for her.

The Chancellor admitted that he would like to begin by bragging a little bit. A couple of months ago Britain’s Times Higher Education Magazine conducted a ranking of all Universities in the world on the issue of research impact and UCSC came out third in the world behind only Princeton and MIT. This was measured by the number of citations, by paper, averaged over all the scholarly publications of all the universities. This is very impressive and something we can be proud of as a campus. Our scholarly communications are being cited more frequently than almost any other in the world. The Chancellor congratulated the faculty for this result.

The student centered focus in curricular issues is driven in part by the budget and we have to recognize that we are in the worst economy in the United States since the Great Depression. Tuition is going up and becoming increasingly expensive particularly for middle class families. This is an issue of legislative responsibility and a failure to recognize that higher education is not just a private good but a public good as well. This year especially it is very important to make sure our voices are heard in Sacramento whether it be through days of action, lobbying, or legislative forums.

We have to do everything we can to ensure that students are getting their money’s worth when they pay increasingly more out of pocket for their education. That is the origin of some of these student centered initiatives; re-examining our majors, making sure our curriculum planning is such that students can get the courses they need to graduate on time – in four years or less.

Another issue is student retention. We need to coordinate our retention activities; one of our focuses for this year that will help us in many ways is to be able to achieve our status as a Hispanic Serving Institution. We are very close to qualifying, with dramatic increase of Hispanic students over the last few years. Focusing on retention will help us get over that threshold. Currently only two UC campuses are designated as Hispanic Serving Institutions; Riverside and Merced. UCSC has a good shot of becoming the third within the next year or so.

We have reorganized Student Services and Student Affairs as well as coordinating other activities on campus and it is working well so far. There have also been a number of new hires within the administration. We have a new Dean of Humanities, Bill Ladusaw; Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Richard Hughey; Acting Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, Christina Valentino; Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Herbie Lee; Acting Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences, Paul Koch; and Police Chief, Nader Oweis. However, in the past year we have significantly downsized the number of people serving in senior administrative positions as one of our budget cutting mechanisms.

Budget

At the Regents meeting next week there will be an expenditure plan presented calling for an increase in the UC budget in the order of \$400 million. It has been a long time since we received our request budget from the state, but it is important that we are asking for more money as we genuinely need it.

One of the highest priorities for additional funding for the university has to be funding the pension system. Since we restarted contributions to the pension system a couple of years ago contributions have all come out of operating expenses due to lack of state funding. The fact that we did not make contributions for 20 years before that had to do with the responsible investing strategies of the Regents – because at that time the pension system was so over-funded. It seems unfair that the University of California is being punished for showing fiduciary responsibility in early years. Restarting state funding of the pension system is probably going to be the highest priority of the university in terms of new money going into the system. This would ease the financial burden of the University at this time.

Another upcoming issue is the “100 million dollar trigger” – When the state passed the budget last year they imposed a \$650 million cut on the University of California with a similar cut to the CSU system. Revenues had appeared to be going up when the budget was passed so they agreed to not make the cuts more than \$650 million but if the revenues did not continue to be above the original projections then there would be an automatic \$100 million cut to UC and CSU sometime in December. Many people have asked me what is going to happen with regards to the \$100 million and at this point we don't know. However the cut is likely to occur. This year the cut would not cause a major tuition increase or additional budget cuts to the campus. UCOP has agreed to use central funds to cover the remainder of the cut on a one-time basis for this year. This will prevent a devastating immediate impact of an extra cut. The Chancellor stated that he hopes that this extra \$100 million cut will not be part of the permanent budget.

Rebenching

It is going to be difficult to reach a consensus among the Rebenching Task Force. The Systemwide Academic Senate has taken some clear positions on Rebenching issues with which the Chancellor is aligned and he is pleased with their commitment and effort on this issue in bringing forth responsible solutions.

A key issue of contention is whether Rebenching applies to our existing budget or if it should apply only to budgets going forward. The Chancellor feels that it must rebase old budgets. We cannot go forward with a budget where a major piece is so unknown in terms of the driving allocation principles that we embed it into history forever. That simply makes no sense. An analogy on this campus might be for me to say that the budget of this unit over here can never be questioned because they have always had that budget and all we are going to do is add ten percent or drop five percent off that budget but never agree to reexamine the underlying purposes of that budget and principles by which it was set. At a time of budget cuts or increases we have to reexamine our units' budgets – and if that is what a campus should be doing then that is what the UC system should be doing. We need to be principled in our budgetary decisions.

The Chancellor stated that he agrees with everything that Chair Gillman said on Rebenching. Originally we were hoping to have this phase complete by December but now a much more realistic time scale given the amount of work still to be done, is the end of the academic year. Senate Chair Gillman and Chancellor Blumenthal are also members of two of the subgroups of the Rebenching Task Force. Chancellor Blumenthal is on the Health Sciences subgroup and Chair Gillman is on the Agriculture subgroup.

Pension System

The Regents have already approved an increase in employee contributions to our pension system from our current amount of 3.5% to 5% in July 2012. There will be a proposal on next week's Regents meeting that in July 2013 employee contributions go up to 6.5% and employer to 12% with a total funding of 18.5%. The good news is that it is not planned to go any higher from there as this amount will fully fund the ongoing cost of the current pension system and pay off some of the already unfunded liabilities. That amount is slated to continue for some years, maybe ten years, but eventually the contributions would go down again to just fund the ongoing costs. The Systemwide Senate has strongly endorsed this increase in pension contributions and has long endorsed the restart of contributions.

Health Care

We at UCSC have worked very hard on getting PAMF included in the University's Blue and Gold plan over the past year and the Chancellor is disappointed that we don't have more to show for it. He has attended board meetings of Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) and has invited the systemwide Vice President of Health Affairs to talk in Santa Cruz. We have all put forth a lot of effort to get this resolved and it has not gotten done. This probably has more to do with the insurance industry and the middle people involved. The Chancellor expressed particular disappointment since a year ago other campuses were facing similar issues to UCSC but theirs have all been resolved. The Chancellor harbors hope that he will have better news to share at the same time next year especially because the contracts will be up for renewal or re-competing next year. The good news is that the rates have not changed much during the year.

Congratulations

The Chancellor congratulated Professor David Haussler for winning Oxford's Weldon Memorial Prize. He congratulated Professor Harry Noller who was awarded the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences Gregori Aminoff Prize in Crystallography. He also congratulated UCSC's students with the most diverse entering freshmen class in our history with 34% coming from underrepresented minorities. 45% of our students, when they graduate will be the first in their families to graduate from a four year institution. Last year five of our students won Fulbright awards – two in Environmental Studies, one in History, one in Literature and one in Biology.

Chancellor Blumenthal noted that we are making progress in many ways. In the past month he has been out with 1000 donors or potential donors with fund raising opportunities increasing dramatically. Visiting New York last week the Chancellor found that there are several Banana Slugs that are occupying Wall Street "for real", by working in firms. Last year fundraising was up ten percent just counting cash contributions despite the terrible economy and if you include future contribution pledges then the number is actually much higher.

The university will soon have a proposal from a group of faculty for a new program in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies. The Chancellor and EVC strongly support this and it is likely to foster further support.

The university is beginning to plan for its 50th anniversary and as planning moves forward the Senate will be involved. This can be a source of pride for the campus.

The Chancellor responded to a question asking if PAMF is calling a two to three percent proposed rate reduction “considerable” or if their proposed considerable rate reduction had been eaten up by an even more considerable increase in Health Net’s overhead - and if that is the case, was the university willing to say so publically - and what are they planning to do about it? The Chancellor replied that he does not know the specific amount of rate reduction that was offered. UCOP negotiates with Health Net and Sutter negotiates with Health Net, yet the Chancellor was able to get a conversation started between PAMF and UCOP. The Chancellor continued that the university covers about 90% of the cost of health care for employees depending on which plan one is in.

The Chancellor was asked if there were going to be any checks and balances or reasoning put forth to explain the UCOP assessment placed on revenue sources by the campus and UCOP with regards to the Funding Streams Proposal. The Chancellor replied that the Systemwide EVCs are very exercised over this issue asking the same question. One question is what is paid for out of that tax. An upcoming retreat of Chancellors will also be discussing this issue and since the Regents now approve the Office of the President’s budget this has now become fair game for public discussion. If the answer is that the tax is too high then we should find a way to eliminate those things and lower the tax. If everything that is being paid for by this tax deserves it, then it should be demonstrated in a transparent way.

A question was asked about where the Chancellor’s source was for stating that 6.5% is maximum employee contribution to UCRP when as recent as a week ago the Regents were considering a proposal to increase the contribution to as much as 8% starting 2014. There is a statement from the systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) that the Regents should know that we are strongly opposed to increasing our contributions beyond 7%. The Chancellor’s reply is that the 6.5% is not carved into stone but there is a new pension system going into effect soon for new employees and this reference is to the old system for current employees and looking at future funding for UCRP and making the assumption that the average return on investments of UCRP are in the 7.5% range. Then the plan of having 6.5% employee contribution and 12% from the University puts us on a trajectory to not only pay our ongoing costs (something around 16%) but also to pay off the current debt incurred due to the decline in the markets and our delay in restarting contributions.

Another comment was made regarding the \$400 million request before the Regents and that much of this was to deal with the UCRP, with the 12% figure assumed coming from the Legislature rather than out of operating funds. The governor recently laid out a proposal for public pension reform calling for a number of components that are already in the UC system such as a three year average paying compensation with a key factor of employees and employers

paying an equal amount, which would take us to 8% out of the 16%. The question was then asked what the Regents' backup plan is if the legislature adopts a broad set of pension reforms that do call for equal contributions as well as the state not taking any fiscal responsibility for contributions. The Chancellor replied the Regents have "constitutional autonomy" protecting them from being forced into adopting the legislative pension reform if it did go into effect. It is difficult to predict what the Regents would do in such a case.

A comment was made that AB130 and AB131 have recently been passed constituting the California Dream Act going into effect starting January 2012 allowing undocumented students to receive financial aid for higher education. The Chancellor was asked what efforts he has been involved in to find funding for these students, and when we might have a scholarship for our students. The Chancellor said that he has met with potential donors for raising money for scholarships for AB540 students, that there is a willingness to contribute, that we will get money into scholarships but he is not exactly sure when.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

Not present due to attending the Occupy Santa Cruz demonstration.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- a. **Committee on Academic Freedom (AS/SCP/1676)**
- b. **Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1678)**
- c. **Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (AS/SCP/1677)**
- d. **Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AS/SCP/1675)**
- e. **Committee on Computing and Telecommunications (AS/SCP/1679)**
- f. **Committee on Educational Policy (AS/SCP/1680)**
- g. **Committee on Emeriti Relations (AS/SCP/1681)**
- h. **Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1682)**
- i. **Committee on International Education (AS/SCP/1683)**
- j. **Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communications (AS/SCP/1684)**
- k. **Committee on Planning and Budget – 2009-10 (AS/SCP/1685)**
- l. **Committee on Planning and Budget (AS/SCP/1686)**
- m. **Committee on Preparatory Education (AS/SCP/1687)**
- n. **Committee on Privilege and Tenure (AS/SCP/1688)**
- o. **Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1689)**
- p. **Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (AS/SCP/1690)**
- q. **Graduate Council (AS/SCP/1691)**

Chair Gillman asked if there was anyone who would like any of the reports to be removed from the consent calendar for discussion. Hearing no requests the consent calendar was adopted by voice vote.

5. Report of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees:

a. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Oral Report: Faculty Salaries

Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) Chair, Suresh Lodha, wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate some major shifts on the whole approach to faculty salaries that are taking place at the systemwide level. One of the consequences is that people believe that off-scale salary, used as a metric for comparison between different campuses, is going to be increasingly inadequate and misleading in comparing campuses' faculty salaries. This conversation is going on at the systemwide level.

There is the central core value that UC is a single university with the same level of excellence in all ten campuses. This core value has been and continues to be tested in various arenas; retirement, student fees, and faculty salaries. We are beginning to see faculty salary decisions being delegated more to local campuses. Implementation of the recent 3% merit based increase was left at the campus level. At the systemwide level the individual campuses are being given more and more autonomy leading to more fragmentation for the systemwide salary scales.

Concurrent with that there has been no cost of living increase, nor a dialog going in that direction, with a fundamental shift in the approach to faculty salaries. The implication in comparing salaries across campuses using the metric of off-scale salaries is that it is an increasingly inadequate metric to compare. Take for example, two individuals with similar performance, one may get a step acceleration of 2.0, and the other not get a two step increase but \$100 less than a step increase. When these two are compared, one is being compared at a different step and rank than the other. Campuses are implementing different policies with some combination of step and rank adjustments along with off-scale adjustments.

CFW's approach to this complex issue is threefold. First the committee has introduced two new metrics, one related to salary growth and the other to promotion growth. These metrics together over an individual's career provide a much better basis of comparison irrespective of diverse personnel practices followed at various campuses.

Last year in preparation for the 3% merit increase CFW had requested salary data from the Academic Personnel Office. After analyzing the data we have come to some new conclusions with preliminary observations that we hope will lead to better policy practices in regard to salaries. One observation endorsed by both the previous CFW and the current CFW is that there is a large percentage of faculty who find that their merit based salary growth has been eroded. This group of faculty includes various categories of people including long-term meritorious faculty, some that have received the three-year-merit boost but feel that it is not sufficient, and some faculty who have not been able to leverage the three-year-merit boost plan. CFW endorses the need for augmentation of the three-year-merit boost plan.

The approach that CFW is taking is to use these preliminary observations and insights to engage with various units including SEC, CPB, CAP, with the EVC, and VPAA. CFW generally endorses data driven advocacy of faculty salary policy and transparency.

CFW has become more deeply sensitive that UCSC's comparative status is not the result of one particular action but rather a complex series of units' participation. There are various steps and stakeholders involved, each working in its best capacity to make a positive change yet it is analogous to a large piece of software that is "patchy". CFW believes that there is a better, more effective way to understand the faculty salary situation through this new lens of salary growth and promotion growth.

In summary, the objective is to provide a good foundation for comparing faculty salary irrespective of various and diverse personal practices followed at the individual campuses - and that can then lead to well informed policy decisions and recommendations on faculty salary.

When asked if UCSC's salaries are still the bottom campus Chair Lodha replied that CFW is currently vetting this with SEC and hopes to report with data in the Winter.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

Student Union Assembly (SUA) Chair, Amanda Buchanan, began by taking a moment to reflect on the importance of the day as it was a "day of action" for activists across California, to draw attention to the Refund California Campaign, amidst the national "Occupy" movement with many of the students, faculty, union members, activists and even the EVC joining in a rally at the quarry with a march down to the Occupy Santa Cruz site at the courthouse downtown. These actions are the first in a series of actions to refund public education in California. The second action will take place on November 16th. There will be a protest at the Regents meeting in San Francisco with the unions funding seven busses to transport students--actions including marching through the financial district and meeting up with Occupy San Francisco. The busses are free and SUA encourages everyone to participate. Students' sights are focused on a larger picture today and we encourage you to stand in solidarity with us—as we are sure most of you already do.

The SUA is broken up into six offices headed by one officer each. We thought it would be useful to describe what each of the officers are doing this quarter. The SUA Chair is Amanda Buchanan, a graduating 4th year from Oakes College double majoring in Politics and Sociology who has been working hard to change-up the structure of SUA in a few different ways. She has also done rounds to college student governments and within our campus administration as well. The Chair has taken several trips to UCOP meeting with President Yudof on behalf of our UC Presidents Council, which is made up of each UC student body president/chair. She also sits on the UC Planning and Budget committee. The UCSC SUA office is working with the campus sustainability office to strengthen collaborative efforts. Her biggest project has been getting the SUA back on track with finances and creating a model that promotes financial sustainability as SUA uses up the remainder of their carry forward this year and looks into doing some fundraising.

The SUA Internal Vice Chair, Victor Velasco, is a 2nd year from Kresge College, Literature and Politics double major. Victor has been working with the Student Committee on Committees to implement a new appointment process for the big 10 committees—which include Academic Senate committees. Now, in order to sit on these committees, the top applicants go through an

interview process, which allows SCOC to ensure that the absolute most qualified students are the representative voice for students on those committees.

The SUA External Vice Chair, Nelson Cortez, is a graduating 4th year from Merrill College, Latin American Latino Studies major with an Education minor. Nelson also sits on CAFA. He is SUA's representative to all external branches including local, state, Regental, and nation affairs. As such he sits on the UC Student Association as the Santa Cruz representative and is also the Chair of the University Affairs committee, which deals directly with UCOP, the Academic Senate, and the Regents.

Some of the undergraduate campaigns that UCSA has taken on this year are the Voter Registration Reform and Holistic Opportunity Providing Equality (H.O.P.E.), including Comprehensive Financial Aid Reform. The Voter Registration Reform includes Same Day Voter Registration and Online Voter Registration. These will greatly increase student participation and access in the voting process. UCSA is supporting legislation to have both of these reforms implemented in time for the 2012 elections. Unfortunately Same Day Voter Registration died in committee but Online Voter Registration was signed. The second part of that reform is to create a Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) to Institutionalize Voter Registration Access on Campus with access to dorms and other institutional support on a yearly basis. The EVC and Chancellor have so far been very supportive.

On the H.O.P.E., UCSA was in support of SB 1985, which unfortunately died. However UCSA will work throughout the year to create a fair and more holistic process to increase diversity in our admissions for underrepresented groups.

With the Comprehensive Financial Aid Reform UCSA is working to ensure that the financial aid appeals process, which allows students to provide and explain critical factors such as family expenses, is accessible, streamlined, and standardized. UCSA is calling on Governor Brown to include progressive taxes in his 2012 budget.

SUA would also like to celebrate the passing of the California DREAM Act.

The SUA Commissioner of Diversity, DT Amajoyi, is a 3rd year from College 9, double major in Literature and Psychology. DT is also the Chair of the United States Students' (USSA) National People of Color Student Coalition. With her spot on USSA Board of Directors, she is spearheading their postcard campaign aimed at the federal budget. Specifically, the Super Committee is proposing a \$1.5 trillion cut to programs like TRIO, Pell grants and work study. DT is also the delegation leader for the Student of Color Conference happening this weekend at UC Davis. SUA is taking 80 students to the conference.

The SUA Organizing Director, Sindy Ramirez, is a 2nd year from Oakes College, a Human Biology major. She has been working hard to host a Grassroots Organizing Weekend training at the end of November. This training is put on by the USSA.

The SUA Commissioner of Academic Affairs, Jessica Greenstreet, is a 3rd year from Stevenson College, Politics and Theater Arts double major. She has been around for 3 years now. Jessica

has spent time reinstating the Student Academic Senate which has been a sleeping committee under SUA for several years now. Jessica realized the importance of promoting a regular meeting time for students who sit on Academic Senate committees both at UCSC and systemwide levels to collaborate and take stances on important issues for students. Jessica has also been working on the Class and Availability Survey.

The SUA wants to acknowledge CEP's leadership in urging the campus into compliance with systemwide regulations concerning major disqualification policies.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

The GSA President Erik Green is a second year doctoral student in the Education Department. He introduced the Internal Vice President Alice Ye and stated that he will not disclose who all the other GSA officers are as he has been told that some advisors discourage graduate students from getting involved in student government with one person already dropping out because of that. He asks the Senate to please support the graduate students that want to get involved outside of their research and teaching. Also he thanked Chair Gillman for her creative way of having faculty be involved in the "day of action" reminding the audience that "together we are the 99%".

The actions today are part of the Refund California Coalition which was in a large part started by the Teaching Assistants Union, the UAW and was moved forward by graduate students at UCSC. He gave special thanks to Mary Virginia Watson, Sarah Smith, and Joshua Brahenski who were instrumental in getting these actions going and drawing many people in to the fight for higher education. There is a website to visit called www.refundcalifornia.com with a pledge that educational leaders can sign and he asked that Senate and campus leaders to please visit and sign the pledge. Also there has been a call for a general strike across the state of California.

Additionally there is www.teachthebudget.com designed by Santa Cruz graduate students. He asked faculty to "teach the budget" in their classes with a 15 minute presentation or to have someone come as a guest speaker in sections and classes. He also offered to do it himself. There is a wealth of information to make available and it is all available on the website. He asked for outreach on this to get involved and organize.

The graduate students are also involved with the UCSA's budget campaign including the Progressive Income Tax and reforming Proposition 13. As this moves forward there will need to be coalitions that include the faculty and staff. The Refund California Campaign is pushing to have a Progressive Income Tax measure on the ballot in 2012 and to have a measure in 2014 to close the corporate loophole of Proposition 13 where corporations are being treated as families and individuals on their property taxes. Another eventual goal is to get rid of the 2/3 vote required for increasing taxes and for budget reform in this state which has absolutely crippled our economy.

For the graduate students there are some specific campaigns as well, including the Graduate Students' Bill of Rights with plans to get it approved by the Regents and applied systemwide.

This year's campaign is to add two more student Regents to the Board of Regents. Currently there is only one student Regent and we would like to propose that there be three; one undergraduate, one graduate professional; and one graduate academic. This would benefit the board in the long run by bringing a variety of voices to the table and allow the student regents to focus on what they are good at as well as being the voice of their community without being expected to speak for all of the students at UC. Currently there is only one student Regent who is supposed to speak for all the UC students, who currently are paying for more of the cost of their education than what the state contributes. In the future we may be looking towards a Regential Reform Campaign including constitutional amendments and removing some of the Governor appointed Regents.

GSA believes that UCOP should not be taxing funds from student referendum. GSA believes that it should not be allowed. Referendum are a tax that students are willing to put on themselves not one that they are willing to send up to UCOP.

Funding continues to be a priority for graduate students. There has been a request to have multi-year packages that for the most part do not exist at UCSC. There is also a request to stop cutting TAs. When cuts come down to the campus it is often TAs that are the first to go. President Yudof has said that if there is a mid-year cut there will not be a tuition increase but we hope that it does not equate to losing more TAs. Chair Green asked the deans to look at alternative ways to manage the budget cuts without having to compromise the funding needed to support TAs.

In the realm of research, faculty work with students in creating grants and GSA asks faculty to consider students when completing their applications. There is a concern that it is almost becoming cheaper to have a post doctorate researcher than to have two GSRs; because of the way the tuition increases have occurred he asks faculty not to think about the problem that way – funding graduate students puts money back into the campuses – as opposed to a post doctorate where all that funding immediately leaves the campus. There has also been a wish that faculty apply for grants that benefit their students but which may not benefit the professor directly.

In addition, creating graduate assistant positions that provide opportunities for graduate students to work in professional development capacities outside of research and teaching would acknowledge the reality that not everyone who is a graduate student is going to become a faculty member. It is equally important for those people to have professional development opportunities and be able to work in places like the registrar and student affairs. Also it has become important for graduate students to have a consistent and reliable source of funding.

The final campaign with GSA is in regard to students with families; looking at daycare, affordable food options, and a focus on affordable housing with the potential of creating a graduate student housing co-op to take over student family housing.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

11. New Business (none)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35p.m.

ATTEST:
Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

February 3, 2012