

MINUTES**Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
March 8, 2013****Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, March 8, 2013 at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Donald Potts present, Chair Joe Konopelski called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

The minutes of October 19, 2012 were approved as written.

2. Announcements**a. Chair Joe Konopelski**

Chair Konopelski recognized that the campus has experienced both triumphs and tragedies in recent weeks. Yesterday was the memorial for two fallen Santa Cruz police officers, and our thoughts are with their loved ones and comrades, including our own officers on campus. As for triumphs, Professor of Astronomy Sandra Faber has been awarded the National Medal of Science. Unfortunately she could not be present at this meeting as her duties as the interim Director of the UC Observatories have called her to Oakland. She is also the UCSC representative to the Academic Advisory Committee for the UC President search.

The passing of Proposition 30 has proven that California believes in education. The proposition will help stabilize UC finances. Nonetheless, there are cuts that need to be made to balance the UCSC budget; the passage of Prop 30 did not make up for the nearly \$1 billion in cuts the system has endured. UCSC is expecting full funding of Rebenching for the 2013-14 Budget. This money will be used for faculty hiring as retirements have stripped the campus's ability to fund new scholars. Future growth of the Senate is expected.

Rebenching will also provide funding for graduate student growth. We will hear from Graduate Council (GC) and the Dean of Graduate Studies for an update on what has been done to access a way forward. Increasing graduate students has been a long standing Senate desire.

Major changes were made regarding enrollment management during the 2007-08 academic year and now the systemwide enrollment plan is being updated again. UCOP has requested updated target enrollments from all campuses and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) will play a lead role in the process. UC is in a different place than it was in 2007-08. Nonresident enrollment was not an issue then, but it is now an issue on all nine campuses. The Committee on International Education (CIE) will provide the Senate with a report on non-resident enrollment.

Online education is on the mind of the Governor and UC students. The Committee on Teaching (COT) along with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) will hold a forum on April 26th

to discuss the challenges of online education. Questions regarding Coursera will also be considered. The campus' new contract with Coursera provides faculty with a new teaching platform.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal acknowledged the presence of the Leadership Academy who are attending in order to learn from the Senate meeting discussions.

The Chancellor began by acknowledging troubling times. Recently, a student was shot waiting for a bus; two police officers were killed, including Elizabeth Butler, a Community Studies Alumna, for whom the Chancellor attended services yesterday; there has been a recent suicide on campus; and an alleged rape on campus that turned out to be a false report. Chancellor Blumenthal thanked the Police Department for being on top of these issues. All of these recent events have taken a toll on the campus and the UCSC community. These are tragic events, and the campus needs to move on and be mutually supportive as a community.

As for the good news, Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway received the T. Dale Stewart Award - a forensic anthropology career achievement award. This is the highest honor offered by the Physical Anthropology Section of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. The Chancellor further acknowledged Sandra Faber for receiving the National Medal of Science. Chancellor Blumenthal accompanied Professor Faber to the White House to receive her award. These awards say something about the stature of UCSC faculty.

Charlie Conroy, Assistant Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, has been awarded a Sloan Research Fellowship. Alexander Sher, Assistant Professor of Physics, has received a \$2.5 million grant from the National Institute of Health (NIH) for research on retinal disease. In Humanities, Linguistics Professors Sandra Chung and Matthew Wagers have been awarded a \$300,000 grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF). This is good news that indicates activities and awards in research are continuing.

UCSC has recently received a \$5 million gift from Alec and Claudia Webster to refurbish the 19th century hay barn at base of campus. This will not only rejuvenate the base of campus but also provide programmatic space for students and faculty. This transformative gift is one of the most significant in recent years signaling a shift in the kind of fundraising the campus is doing. The Chancellor recently returned from his second trip to Washington, DC in a month, which included meeting with prospective donors. The meeting went very well and there appears to be a lot of interest. The Chancellor is optimistic that UCSC will continue to be more successful with its fundraising and campaigning.

The UCSC Foundation Board met recently and discussed providing faculty support and recruitment. The Foundation realizes that providing support for faculty to carry on teaching and research is crucial for recruiting new faculty to the campus.

UCSC had a successful scholarship dinner on campus that sold out in record time. Over the last 10 years UCSC has raised over \$23 million for scholarships and fellowships. This shows significant support for our students.

The Vice Chancellor for University Relations, Donna Murphy is planning to leave. This position has broad impact covering fundraising, faculty outreach, and as a community liaison. An open recruitment will be conducted to fill the position. The campus is also in process of conducting a search for the Vice Chancellor of Research. Jo Packham has been appointed as the new Assistant Vice Chancellor of Staff Human Resources. Lacey Raak has been appointed as UCSC's new Director of Sustainability.

There are also changes systemwide with the announced resignation of UC President Mark Yudof who will step down by September 1st. Our campus is represented on the faculty selection committee to screen candidates. The Chancellor is hopeful that the search will be successful and anticipates that a candidate will be selected by the summer.

UC Day is coming up for advocacy in Sacramento. A legislative forum was held on campus recently with local Assemblyman Mark Stone, local Senator Bill Monning, faculty, students, and community members. The discussion was positive.

Chancellor Blumenthal announced that UCSC has signed up with Coursera for online education. He hopes that the contract provides an opportunity for innovative ways to offer courses. It provides faculty with another tool to educate students and those contemplating coming to UC.

The Regents were scheduled to meet next week to discuss faculty workload. This meeting has been postponed, likely to occur May. This is an important discussion. The Chancellor doesn't think the Governor and Regents truly understand the level and magnitude of work already being done by faculty and hopes that this discussion can relay what faculty are already doing.

The campus has talked about graduate growth for a long time, both in Ph.D. and masters programs. The time to act is now and it has to be one of our top priorities. Graduate growth is aligned with the Silicon Valley Initiative, our research aspirations, and our reputational goals, American Association of Universities (AAU) membership, and with taking the maximum benefit from Rebenching. The Chancellor looks forward to working with the Senate leadership and faculty to move this forward and noted that it will take the UCSC campus to a new level of research and graduate achievement.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Alison Galloway acknowledged the recent tragic events on campus and emphasized the need to figure out how to address these types of issues in the future. We are working with our students to understand and address the culture that allows such incidents to take place.

Reporting on the budget EVC Galloway commented that since 2008 the campus has lost \$55 million in core funds. One time funds were used to cover the \$13 million shortfall for the 2013

fiscal year with an additional \$4 million coming from divisions, the remainder coming centrally. This coverage has helped but the loss of \$13 million still needs to be addressed on a permanent basis. The passing of Proposition 30 brought in no additional funding, but it did protect the University from \$125 million in additional cuts - our share of that would have been \$9 million. UC received about \$125 million to buyout the 2012-13 tuition increases, and the governor has proposed an additional \$125 million (a 5% augmentation) for the 2013-14 cost increases. Although there is an increase in core funds of about 1.6% - 2%, that does not increase the budget dramatically. UCSC should be getting \$15 million with additional augmentation, some coming from the buyout and some from other types of Rebenching money. This doesn't cover the mandatory cost increases from agreements with unions, benefits, retirement, teaching assistants, grad support, and the restoration of 20 faculty Full Time Equivalents (FTE) in the coming year. The Divisions are planning for reduction targets totaling \$7 million - the balance of the shortfall will be made up centrally. The submitted plans are currently being cross-read by principal officers and consultation with CPB. Decisions will likely be made in May.

Divisions have submitted faculty FTE requests for the 2013-14 academic year, and these plans will be reviewed by the Senate, not just CPB. Despite efforts to hire new faculty, projections through 2016-17 show that the campus will probably be unable to keep pace with separations of ladder rank faculty, largely due to retirements.

The 2013 indicators show improvements in undergraduate course offerings. The major mapping project has effectively increased the percentage of students able to take required classes with the addition of regular bridge-funding. EVC Galloway encourages all Departments to use the major mapping tool to assess curriculum from the student perspective.

The UC Rebenching program contains an aspirational graduate growth initiative. UCSC is projecting growth in graduate enrollments of 750-800 additional students over 2012-13 enrollments. This would bring us to a 12% ratio of doctoral to undergraduate enrollments. Resources are needed, as is a prioritization and commitment to the goal of getting the campus up to the 12% ratio. The primary focus for new money is to refund hollowed faculty positions. Increasing one time funds for faculty start-up needs, temporary staffing, and grad support all play a part. We must ensure that investments contribute to the general good of the campus as well as specific progress to graduate growth. Programs receiving these new resources will be held accountable for carrying through these aims while also sustaining the undergraduate curriculum. Rebenching resources are essential to realizing graduate growth goals, but new additional revenues are also needed. Academic and professional degree supplemental tuition charges could be one source of funding. The campus needs to launch new masters programs to attract full fee paying students. Consultations with Deans and Senate Committees have begun about how to implement new incentive programs for masters growth where programs would receive an increment of the net new tuition to augment doctoral support, hire temporary academic staff, additional teaching assistants or other resources to boost research and graduate growth. In areas where external research funds are available we need to hire strategically and with a clear view of growing the research funding. We must be consistent in our principles in applying investment of resources with transparency, strategic focus and accountability.

Learning outcomes is an effort to show students what skills they will have at graduation after completing their major and how the curriculum will deliver that. This understanding is important for those unfamiliar with university expectations, such as first generation students. Further, it provides information on how to improve our programs and will assist with the WASC accreditation process, which is on the horizon.

The strategic planning process is not a revision of the academic planning process from several years back. We will embark on a collaborative strategic planning process in the Fall bringing together perspectives of faculty, staff and students to create a comprehensive vision for the future. A preliminary group has already been meeting. Senate Chair Konopelski along with Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget Delaney are beginning to schedule meetings with divisional department chairs to begin the discussion. The Strategic Planning Team will be comprised of between 40 and 60 faculty, staff and students. The goal is not to create a lengthy document, but a short and clear description of where the campus is going and how we will get there.

In response to a question from the floor asking what the definition of shared governance is considering UCSC's signing a contract with Coursera having no consultation with faculty, EVC Galloway replied that the Coursera agreement required quick and discrete action and she simply had to make the decision. This opens the door for faculty to work with Coursera which would not have been possible without a university agreement. There are other Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) providers available for faculty to work with if they do not elect to use Coursera however some of them require a university contract. The decision was made primarily because there was no large initial investment of fees and it allows us to put a few classes up to highlight some of our strengths to the international population. Other MOOC providers require significant up-front investments from any participating university. Now we need to begin the consultation process on the course development agreements between individual faculty and Coursera. Some of the questions that need to be asked are: How are the courses selected internally to the campus; what kinds of support will the campus offer to faculty; and what are the expectations regarding compensation?

Another question from the floor asked EVC Galloway if she signed the Coursera contract in order to encourage faculty to work with Coursera and, if so, what that means. What incentives and encouragements will be made and when it will become a requirement? What specifically does "encouragement" mean in this case? An additional concern was expressed about the principle behind the "need for speed" in signing the Coursera contract which is suggestive of a market rationality trumping the valued rationality that not-for-profit organizations can take the time to consider and discuss together. EVC Galloway replied that the contract is simply opening the door as there are faculty who want to deliver Coursera classes and cannot do so without the signed agreement. We do not anticipate a requirement or expectation that faculty teach on Coursera. The Chancellor added that we are one of four UC campuses that have contracted with Coursera, the others being UCSF, UCI, and UCSD. Additionally UCB has joined with the edX MOOC provider. We are not considering any mandate that faculty use Coursera, it would be entirely voluntary.

A comment was made from the floor about the growth in graduate enrollment. It is inspiring that we are hoping to have 800 more graduate students. We used to ensure that new graduate

programs would get more than their share to help them get on their feet and it would be better to invest in areas where we excel instead of trying to satisfy every constituency on campus. EVC Galloway replied that with the Strategic Planning process we will be looking at how to set these priorities and how they will be considered when looking at the allocations of new resources this year.

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

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

a. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1721)

The report was received without discussion.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Graduate Council

i. Report on Aspirational Graduate Growth at UCSC (AS/SCP/1719)

Graduate Council Chair Bruce Schumm introduced the update on aspirational graduate growth as the beginning of what is hoped to be a substantive and open discussion about where graduate growth efforts will go. One resulting potential view may be that it is not a foregone conclusion that 12% is the goal we want to attain. In the discussion we will see the framing for what it might take to achieve the 12% goal.

Chair Schumm invited Tyrus Miller, Dean of Graduate Studies to deliver a presentation on graduate growth. Dean Miller discussed issues, process, and conclusions with scenarios, from consultations with Planning and Budget, Senate leadership, and deans that provide a snapshot of where we are and where broad faculty discussion and consultation are needed. The most important context for this presentation is twofold:

1. The goal to increase the graduate student ratio to 15% - a long standing goal of the Academic Senate.
2. Maximizing the benefits of Rebenching.

We currently receive a lower share of per student funding than the other campuses. Rebenching redresses this inequity of funding campuses at radically different levels and opens up the possibility to make significant progress on our un-resourced goals. Aspirational Graduate growth refers to the increase in funding which is tied to the goal of increasing the ratio of doctoral students to undergraduate students. Opportunities for increased funding put responsibilities on the campus for making progress toward this graduate growth goal. Rebenching will provide

resources to invest strategically in educating more Ph.D. students, increasing the quality of programs by recruiting the best students, diversify programs, enhance recruitment resources and increase course offerings.

We don't just want to be bigger, we want to be better and these two goals are linked strategically. There are many arguments for why bigger can be better. Additional graduate students can contribute to research and undergraduate education. Our ability to increase research funding and impact is enhanced by talented graduate students who also add to faculty productivity. We shape the profession when we train graduate students. Also, having more graduate students enhances the intellectual climate of the university adding to our reputation nationally and internationally. It increases the quality of undergraduate learning by providing instructional support to our undergraduate programs. Graduate students make a significant contribution to the work force in California, especially to high tech industries. The importance of graduate education has been confirmed and will play an increasing role as we move forward.

If we aim for a 12% doctoral ratio, that will translate to 15% overall for graduate students. The mandated target is 12% of Ph.D. to undergraduate students and masters students, excluding professional doctoral students, which doesn't apply on our campus. The message is not to ignore master students and put all resources into Ph.D. as it is really a more nuanced issue. Our current graduate student percentage is just over 7%. To achieve the 12% goal we will need 700-800 new enrollments. UCSC's Ph.D. enrollments are rising slightly, but we are still second to last compared to the other UC campuses.

As the Rebenching proposal was near final last May, we had our first discussions in the Graduate Division with Planning and Budget, Senate Leadership, and Graduate Council, discussing strategy, planning over the summer, looking at scenarios for 6 years and considering if it is even possible. We considered under what conditions this could be achievable. This is a year that we are already in Rebenching and we are going into the admission cycle with most of the graduate offers already sent. If we do not make progress this year we will be two years into the Rebenching process without having grown. On this basis, the Graduate Division requested one time funds to bring the numbers up for this year's round of admissions. Departments have extended more offers and we can anticipate higher numbers in masters and Ph.D.

On the basis of consultation with CPB, Senate Leadership and input from the deans we are currently in the process of moving from scenarios to an actual plan. The planning timetable is a two year operational plan with a rough sense of what the numbers will be further out. A draft of the development plan should be ready within the next six to eight weeks and allows us as a campus, with the faculty, Senate and administration to discuss and finalize this operational plan. Dean Miller will be in active communication with these groups over the next several weeks.

The next issue is where we will get funding to support this growth. Rebenching funds are a crucial part of this funding. There should be approximately \$23 million total from Rebenching money, with about \$7 million of that designated for aspirational graduate growth. Another key source is enrollment itself. There is a strong mandate for return to aid from graduate tuition. For all academic Masters and Ph.D., 50% of graduate tuition is return to aid. That is what generates the funds for TA remissions and what is allocated to the Graduate Division for fellowship

allocations. There is a mandatory growth in that pot of funds that is a return to aid and return for support to graduate students. In the case of professional programs with a supplementary tuition, that mandate of return to aid is about 1/3 of tuition – that is on top of a mandated return to aid from supplementary tuition that goes directly to the students of the program.

Increased extramural support, both fellowships coming to our students through their own applications and especially research support on faculty grants for new graduate students is a crucial element. As mentioned by the EVC there is the need to relate graduate growth to new FTE requests. Investing in new faculty that can help us build the research enterprise and support more graduate students is a crucial part of achieving this goal.

The need for new TA support which helps our undergraduate and graduate students, whether the restoration of TA cuts or the creation of new TA-ships, is a potential use of Rebenching funds. Nonresident tuition is a source of revenue and we can look to the example of other UC campuses using it to increase graduate support. We are in the midst of the Comprehensive Campaign, providing the opportunity to build endowments for grad students. All of the deans have specified as one of their goals to have endowed chairs used to support grad students. We have the fewest endowed chairs in the UC system and we can do better.

Chair Schumm continued that we have had a longstanding goal of increasing graduate enrollments and that this is an opportunity to reap the benefit of the Rebenching resources to actualize the goal. However the funds coming in from Rebenching may not be sufficient to fund such growth alone. It is yet unclear what the financial tradeoffs will be. We need to consider what principles should be used in implementing a concrete guide to graduate growth in terms of size and shape, dollars and cents, numbers of people, and what it will take to achieve this major shift. This may be an opportunity to reshape the institution overall with a new transformative enterprise as it parallels the larger discussion of strategic planning. We have seen examples of this with the development of the Baskin School of Engineering and this may be an opportunity to do something of that magnitude.

We should consider if we want to change the way we evaluate faculty files, the way we distribute research money, and the way we undertake our undergraduate instruction, in ways that would incentivize Ph.D. education. These should all be considered, as getting to 12% is not going to come easily.

A comment from the floor mentioned that five to seven years ago the 15% goal seemed ambitious. What has appeared to change is the landscape for higher education is the questioning of what Ph.D.s will be doing after obtaining their degree. The market has changed dramatically. How do goals from 5-7 years ago fit with current realities? We should have a shared vision of what we are sending our students off to do.

Dean Miller replied that this crucial question is the exact reasoning why he emphasized rationale before talking about numbers. It is important for faculty and students to engage in that conversation. There has been a dawning awareness that not all students in Ph.D. programs are destined for tenure track positions in research universities. Because of the depth of the economic crisis and changes in higher education there is a more forthright conversation about the

limitations in Ph.D. programs for equipping students for academic and non-academic professional employment. We are only beginning to create practical measures and programs for equipping students with transferrable skills, as well as the mentality and framework so their expertise can carry them through to careers. The expansion of scale and subsequent resources will allow us to do more of this. In the last two years the Graduate Division has instituted a leadership certificate workshop program. This has been an important pilot of the type of program we would like to do more of. We are also expanding the number of Graduate Student Researchers (GSR) that the Graduate Division is hiring or co-sponsoring with the Graduate Student Commons, to handle professional development and outreach. Various divisions are also taking up initiatives and Dean Miller encourages departments to talk more about that broader context of graduate expertise. We do want students to be as competitive as possible for academic jobs but do not assume that it is necessarily the aspiration or destination for all of them.

Chair Schumm added that when he was chairing the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) he worked with the UCOP staff to do a study of Ph.D. production of UC faculty. It was an academic faculty comparison, and UC faculty stood far above our public competitors for producing Ph.D. students per ladder rank faculty and was competitive with leading privates. UC produces 10% of the Ph.D.s in the country. It seems that this statistic was ignored when the Rebenching report gave the stipulation to strive to 12%. If we were asked how we wanted to Rebench ourselves we may not have said 12% of Ph.D. growth was our priority but that is what we have been told to think about. However, going through this exercise we may see is that there is a lot of opportunity for new programs that lead to a prosperous state of California and an educated population.

A question was put forth regarding the ramifications in the job market for Ph.Ds. Drawing on experience teaching in a law school it was stated that there has been a 45-46% decline of applicants to law schools in recent years in the United States. A lot of law faculty are rethinking what they thought was true in the past. Cuts that have affected National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) are likely to continue because the House has been reapportioned in a way that it is not likely to change until 2022. In terms of the numbers in this presentation you mention \$23 million with \$7 million of it mandated to grad growth but that it is not enough to cover costs, requiring the gap to be filled elsewhere. What is the gap in reaching this target and how will it be filled aside from the mentioned extramural funds and masters programs with supplemental tuition. Is there a sense of the total financial gap between the designated Rebenching funds and total costs to meet the target?

Dean Miller replied that he is not trying to be evasive in answering the question without providing a set of numbers. One part is a question of how we are thinking about using the Rebenching funds with the concept of the gap following from there. We have been talking about using the Rebenching funds largely to refill hollow faculty FTE lines which doesn't directly bring graduate students in or support them. Then we are looking into the direct graduate support needs to fill the gap. We do have to be aware of the federal sequester and its impacts but are unable to predict its actual effects or duration. To correct a misconception about masters growth, there is a budget model for self-supporting program off of the campus books, but for programs with supplementary tuition, the higher fees have to go to directly supporting the program. Dean Miller continued that he is presently unable to quote a number for the gap but that they were

looking at scenarios with sets of conditions that were a stretch but plausible. The conditions had to do with a growth in research dollars of 10% correlating with a growth of 200 additional masters enrollments. This would involve change, effort and upfront investment with projections that in five or six years would go from red to black, finally creating a sustainable graduate enterprise.

In response to a question of the money from Rebenching going away if we do not meet the target, Chair Konopelski replied that it could be interpreted that way but that there is a certain level of negotiation that needs to occur. In the first year of Rebenching we received only half; of \$4 million we got \$1.9 million. The plan indicates that we should be expecting not only the \$4 million but also the \$2 million that did not come last year in our budget for 2012-13. We are down to about 60% of our budgeted faculty from a high of about 70%. The 70% would put us in the middle compared to the other UC campuses. One goal that the Senate shares with the administration is to grow the number of faculty with what the EVC calls “full service faculty” that would fulfill both graduate growth and undergraduate responsibilities. Ten percent is a large number of faculty and across the system, faculty are eminently approaching retirement. This creates a significant challenge to hire enough faculty to get back into the 70% range.

It was asked how flexible the 12% or 15% is with regards to the Rebenching funds, if there will be negotiation or if it is a done deal. There should be Senate participation discussing whether this target should be a priority, especially if it is possible that it will not bring in the anticipated funding. There are ways that graduate growth could support and other ways that it could be in competition with undergraduate education. This should not be an afterthought but integral to the planning. Has the strategic development in graduate growth become a key criteria in hiring new faculty and what are the resulting implications? The full range of Senate input should be considered with these strategic development plans if we are potentially thinking of remaking the campus under the guise of graduate growth.

To these questions Chair Konopelski replied that we do indeed need to have these conversations. Currently these conversations are occurring in the Task Force on Academic Structures and the strategic planning group. The report will be submitted next quarter and is anticipated to be discussed at the next senate meeting. Both the administration and the Senate did not want to hold movement towards growth hostage to our campus-wide strategic planning exercise for next year. We felt it was reasonable to move forward this year and not be two years into a six year Rebenching program before addressing the issue. It is clear that as part of a broad discussion about strategic planning, this this needs to be considered. Chair Konopelski noted that he is part of the strategic planning group along with the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, and will be meeting with the leadership in all academic divisions between now and mid-April to begin the conversation.

Chair Schumm added that if at the end of this exercise we came out with something we could point to with a few glittering jewels brought forth in graduate education distinguishing us from other segments of California education, it would be seen as a benefit. It is a risk as well as a possibility to take this mandate and say that we have another path that we think is more beneficial which falls within the spirit if not the letter of the target.

Dean Miller concluded that he sees the 12% goal in addition to other benchmarks including the AAU accreditation, as means to an end to improve graduate programs, reputation, selective recruitment, and other non-controversial qualitative goals - all served by graduate growth. This benchmark is being used to catalyze the conversation about what specifically that means in different departments, programs and divisions - to see the ways in which we can help those programs meet those aspirations.

b. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Report: Update on Faculty Salaries (AS/SCP/1722)

CFW Chair Barry Bowman reported that over the last six years the Senate has been active in monitoring faculty salaries. We have a database of 5,000 university faculty salaries and have extracted all those on the regular salary scales. This does not include economics or engineering but compares historians and biologists at UCSC to historians and biologists at UCB, and so forth, apples to apples. Our salary depends on the rate of promotion and the real salary paid per rank and step.

Last year CFW focused on the rate of advancement vs. years since Ph.D. Generally Santa Cruz faculty get promoted at a similar rate as other campuses with a few anomalies at barrier steps. For example at associate professor I, it takes UC faculty 1.6 years longer to advance to this step. At professor II and III there is a large cohort of faculty who have served longer since Ph.D. to get to that rank and step with a similar situation at professor V and VI. Taking the average of all the numbers, the average UCSC faculty member is being advanced about 0.8 years slower than the average on all the other campuses. UCSC is advancing close to the average with anomalies at these barrier steps.

Concerning expectations in terms of the rate of advancement, most people advance at the regular rate until professor I and then tend to be accelerated. A professor that reaches step IX typically will have been accelerated two steps over their whole career. This should provide some sense of comparison for the faculty in your department with what is typical.

Over the years the Senate and the Academic Personnel Office (APO) have done analysis and have often differed whether UCSC faculty are getting salaries similar to those on other campuses or not. The key distinction has been if you are looking at median or average mean salary. Faculty salaries do not follow bell shaped curves and this real data illustrates that point. In a group of 40 step III professors at UCD and 30 step III professors at UCSC, the UCSC median was \$2,600 off-scale, with a median of \$1,200 at UCD. However when looking at the average you get very different numbers. Most of the variation is in the half of the distribution that is above the median. Off-scales at UCSC tend to be modest at \$3,000 – \$6,000 and even one with \$10,000. At UCD the off-scales range from \$1,000 – \$35,000 with a large group of people making more than the highest paid person at UCSC. For this reason we are using average salaries to make our comparison.

The chart, provided in the meeting agenda shows average salary for each rank and step comparing UCSC to seven other UC campuses. At assistant level III the average is about

\$70,000 at UCSC, which is similar to UCD and UCR, a bit lower than at UCSB and UCD, and a lot lower than UCB and UCLA. Overall, we can get a sense of how much money is put into salaries on our campus versus others by looking at the averages of salaries. There are three or four tiers of salaries at UC campuses. The average at UCSC is \$104,000. At the top is UCLA, an anomaly, making \$5,000 more than UCB - also on the top tier. The second tier is a cluster of UCSD, UCI, and UCSB, all within \$600 of each other. The bottom tier includes UCSC, UCR and UCD. The good news is that we used to be at the absolute bottom, and now we are grouped in the base cluster. It is important to note that the middle-tier campuses (UCI, UCSD, and UCSB) are all in coastal communities with high housing costs, comparable to UCSC, as compared with the central valley communities, such as Riverside and Davis, with their lower costs of living. It seems that we should be up in the middle tier considering cost of living.

Looking at the average off-scale salary per rank and step, at UCSC the assistant professor makes around \$7000 off-scale where the average at the other seven campuses make around \$14,000 off-scale. There are two main patterns coming out of this analysis. First is that the main difference in our salaries is that once you get to a certain rank and step you are in the off-scale salary. One effect of budget cuts is that campuses have gone on their own in setting salary scales and the official scale has become a sort of minimum wage. A standard scale is still good to have, but campuses have morphed into having their own effective salary scales. The second pattern is that the differences in salaries are independent of how senior you are. For example, overall salaries at UCSB are going to be about \$4,000 higher for assistant professors and \$4,000 - \$5,000 higher for full professors with a fixed increment going across the whole scale. At UCSC the more senior you become the greater the difference in off-scale when compared to other campuses.

In conclusion the good news is that the salary gap between UCSC and the other campuses has shrunk by \$2,000 - \$3,000 in the last five years. The salary boost program instituted by the EVC and CAP has had a positive effect in catching us up. The rate of advancement is a bit slower at UCSC, 0.8 years, or a salary difference of around \$1,500 - \$2,000 and occurs right after the barrier steps. There is a cohort of people at these steps (for example professor I and II) who have been there an unusually long time and this should be investigated by CAP. Because of these differences in off-scale salaries, UCSC is \$3,200 below UCSD, UCSB, UCI, and \$6,000 below the average of all 7 campuses considered here. Another difference at UCSC is that the off-scale limits have been religiously followed, where other campuses are more flexible. For example at professor step IX, there was not a single person above the off-scale limit, where at other campuses 25% of all step IX professors are above the limit. The CAP chair has informed CFW that the campus is becoming more flexible on this to maintain a competitive salary scale.

The differences are larger for UCSC at higher ranks and steps. Looking at how we pay our best above scale people it is almost the same for all campuses except for UCLA paying about \$10,000 more than anyone else, including UCB. Providing this information to faculty may help them to address inequities within the departments particularly when voting on personnel actions.

CFW makes the following recommendations;

1. The salary boost program is good, should be continued and should be applied to all ranks and steps.

2. UCSC should set the reasonable goal to be in the same salary range as UCSB, UCI, and UCSD - coastal communities with similar costs of living.
3. Off-scale salary limits are often exceeded at other campuses and UCSC may need to grant exceptions as well.
4. Department Chairs should make this data available to faculty as comparative data used in recommendations for merit increases.
5. CAP should consider looking at and addressing stalls in the rate of advancement near the barrier steps.

A clarification was requested about whether the stalls at barrier steps is the effect of deferral before going over the advancement step versus pausing after you have made it across. Chair Bowman replied it is not that people have a problem getting to full professor. Most people are advancing at an average rate but it is as though they make it to Professor, Step 1 and then stay there for a number of years. One speculation is that it may be related to departments that require publishing books to get to the next step. This is an area of active discussion for those departments. CAP could see what departments fall into this cohort.

c. Committee on International Education

i. The Parlous State of International Education at UCSC (AS/SCP/1720)

Rasmus Winther, member of CIE from the Philosophy Department, reported for CIE chair Ben Crow who was giving a talk at UCR. There is a crisis with regards to international enrollments at UCSC. There are opportunities that jibe well with the EVC's "5 for 2015" initiative, specifically financial stability and increasing nonresident student enrollments.

In 2007 campuses were allowed to retain revenue from nonresident tuition for international students. Enrollment graphs show relatively flat lines up until that point when it became incentivized, where the numbers skyrocket, especially at UCB and UCLA. Not only are we at the bottom but our numbers have decreased since 2007. This is a clear signal of a crisis of international enrollment. We have the second lowest number of applications and the lowest admission percentage.

There was a detailed report from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE), Richard Hughey, with recommendations; however CIE is worried about a misleading diagram showing the recruitment pipeline. It paints a rosier picture than what exists and CIE believes it is a reactive recruitment plan disguised as a proactive plan.

Analyzing the report we see that it shows international frosh applications are up 67% from 2,480 which is true but it still ranks as lowest in the UC system. Just because the numbers have increased they are not going up much relatively, especially when compared to other campuses. On page four of the CIE report we detail why application numbers are a poor measure of progress. There is a claim of a low admission rate solved by the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) approval of splitting the admission pool in to California students, nonresident domestic students and nonresident international students. CIE is concerned that CAFA has mandated the admission pool be split, but it was not implemented for this Fall. The

report states that yield has been low growing with active recruitment and CIE is concerned because there is no way to know at this point if the yield has grown this year since admission offers have not gone out yet. The report states a goal of 100 international students but CIE notes that this modest target is a mandate that we have yet to see accomplished, while the administration is aiming for 50.

One advantage of increasing international enrollment is the additional funds these students bring to the campus, currently \$22,878 each per year. The under-enrollment creates a monetary loss translating to a budget shortfall in the order of millions of dollars per year. There are set enrollment targets of 440 for undergraduate students and 255 for graduate students. We are in acceptable range at the graduate level but are not doing well at the undergraduate level, not only failing to meet the target but with consistently diminishing enrollments. CIE estimates that by investing \$500,000 in this effort we could recuperate \$3-4 million in a single year.

Increasing international enrollment could positively impact the diversity of student perspectives, secure more of a global presence, and nourish a number of positive feedback loops supporting finance and reputation. There are concrete solutions within our reach. We could re-examine international admissions procedures, enroll 100 new international frosh, and follow the recommendations in the International Recruitment and Graduation Team (IRGT) report. CIE sees the highest priorities as: re-engineering international architecture including hiring a high-level faculty director with autonomy; conducting stringent review of admissions procedures as soon as possible; restoring the International Education Office (IEO) staff; rebuilding faculty-led programs abroad and support for Education Abroad Program (EAP) students.

Humanities Dean Bill Ladusaw, former VPDUE, noted that the facts of the budgetary shortfalls have been clear since 2007 and broader attention is good. He encouraged the Senate to buy-in to the entrepreneurial and nimble activity required to succeed in this. One of the contributors to the current state is a long term culture of sensitivity to reputation and appearance in admissions processes and a reluctance to embrace the entrepreneurialism required to take action in this way.

Dean Ladusaw continued that in the period of 2005 – 2007 he was approached by a respectable community college in the Bay Area who had invested in very strong marketing ties for their programs in China and the Far East. UCSC was asked if we were interested in formulating an agreement to bring international students in for the first two years, if they could promise a gateway into UCSC. Initial discussions with the administration and the Senate were met with hesitation that we associate with anything that might bring “non-UC quality students” into our university. But what we were essentially saying to an institution that was ready to hand us 30-40 rising juniors paying international tuition was that we were not interested. Responding to this, and before staff reductions in IEO, we hired an entrepreneurial director with skillsets well beyond the necessities of creating study abroad programs, with connections on the recruitment side, and that director had a problematic reception from CIE at that time. Details can be found in meeting minutes. That director left to have a profitable career using his expertise in recruiting international students elsewhere. This current CIE report has the tone of this crisis as being a new discovery, however it has been known for a long time and when steps were attempted to solve the issue they have been met with reluctance. There is no such reluctance at UCI, and the VPDUE there makes four visits around the world to sell the UCI brand which is how their

numbers look good. If we are going to succeed like that it may take us out of our comfort zone in certain areas but that is where we have to go.

A former CIE member made a comment from the floor that they have watched the IEO get smaller and smaller and then smaller again while obligations increased. Also it was pointed out that bringing in international students at the graduate level is no cash cow as faculty often end up paying from their grants the out of state tuition which is not profitable.

A suggestion came from the floor of creating an incentive so that the funding from the additional tuition goes to the departments where those nonresident students are majoring. It would be great to see the faculty involved in recruiting, and providing an incentive may encourage such activity. To this, Professor Winther replied that CIE has discussed similar ideas such as setting up a database of faculty's international links and mobilizing these networks for recruiting. Winther noted that CIE is focused on undergraduate international enrollment, understanding that the situation is different for graduate enrollments.

VPDUE Hughey stated that he has been reflecting on the huge amount of engagement on this topic from CIE, CAFA, the office of admissions and IRGT. Tying into the discussions of strategic planning and graduate growth, funding models for graduate students being echoed for international students as we have for summer session; Hughey stated that he wants to make sure that this does not become just three or four senate committees and three or four offices on campus but that the globalization of our campus is about all the committees, units, and departments.

EVC Galloway commented that we have been trying to get this going for quite a while with some movement last year and that this is going to help to accelerate it. There was money set aside to augment the budgets for international recruitment for several years that were untapped. In regards to returning tuition money back to the departments, that would unfortunately negate the problem of bringing them in as we are trying to augment the general funds for the campus in order to support all of our programs. We are looking at a program incentive model that would bring some money back to the programs for some masters students.

7. Report of the Student Union Assembly

Student Union Assembly (SUA) Chair, Nwadiuto “DT” Amajoyi, noted the general student sentiment on campus right now is that it is a strange place to be with the recent incidents, problems with class availability, and the general campus climate. However this also presents opportunity as a time for change.

The student sentiment on online education is this is a move that was heavy-handedly placed on us by the Governor and if UCSC is going to be adopting it we ask that it be in a supplementary and complementary manner. It is of great concern that there was not faculty consultation prior to signing up with Coursera and moving forward we ask that there be greater consultation with faculty and students as well.

The UC Student Health Insurance Plan (UC SHIP) has a great amount of traction on campus, students are upset about it and don't understand how the \$57 million deficit happened. Students should not have to pay for this deficit and we hope that it is not the individual campuses that have to pay for it either. Negotiating what the benefits packages and premiums will look like, the students ask that there be no caps on lifetime benefits and that vision, dental and medical plans not be bundled since only 2% of students buy into vision care and only 3% into dental. If UC mandates the bundle it would mean \$500 - \$800 more that students would have to pay. We would also like to push for the standardization of rates across the UC system. UCSC currently pays one of the highest premiums.

The Library Referenda and Measure 42 may show up on the upcoming ballot in the spring. This would be a renewal of the library hours being extended to midnight, weekend hours and extended hours for finals week. Measure 42 was originally passed in 2010 as it was a huge issue that libraries were not open on the weekend and nights. When Chair Amajoyi was a freshman she was a tour guide and had to explain to parents that the library was not open on the weekends. With Measure 42 students agreed to tax themselves \$6.50 per quarter to keep the libraries open with the stipulation that it was merely a stop-gap to give the campus time to be figure out how to pay for it. Having libraries open is a fundamental, basic need for students at a university. It is not acceptable that this is not covered for us and that we have to pay extra for it. SUA has yet to come to a final vote on the issue but it has been one of the most contentious issues of the year.

Where are our priorities as a university? What are the ramifications of the decisions we make? What precedents are we setting? Students are frustrated but we want to be on the same page as the faculty and administration and all advocate for the same common causes together. Where do we fit in to the university of the future?

SUA continues to do advocacy on the statewide and national levels for many causes including Proposition 13 Reform, Prison Reform, Oil Severance Tax, and we continue to lobby in Sacramento and Washington, DC.

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

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare (none)

12. New Business (none)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11p.m.

ATTEST:

Judith Habicht-Mauche
Secretary

April 9, 2013