

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
May 29, 2015

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, May 29, at the Stevenson Event Center. With Parliamentarian Don Potts present, Chair Don Brenneis called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

The meeting minutes of April 22, 2015 were approved as written by voice vote.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Brenneis

Chair Brenneis commented that the Special Committee on Development and Fundraising has been working toward the reinstatement of the Faculty Initiated Group Hires (FIGH's). The Committee would like to use these hires as fundraising tools to broaden the possibility for research and teaching beyond the usual resource application model. Of the four proposals forwarded by the Senate for further consideration, the committee focused on Natural Language Processing (NLP), and held an informal meeting with the faculty involved with this proposal and University Relations staff. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss how University Relations might identify fundraising possibilities for the NLP project, and to ensure follow-up on those ideas. The meeting was successful, and the Committee is now working to determine what the next steps will be for this project. NLP faculty will work with University Relations on presentations which will be tested at workshops with a selected audience of UCSC Foundation volunteers and Linguistics alums. University Relations will also develop a list of potential industry contacts for distinguished visiting faculty for an NLP program. The NLP faculty will first pursue a Designated Emphasis for this program. University Relations and NLP faculty together will identify target industry contacts, and pursue the possibility of bringing in distinguished adjunct faculty from outside the University. The Designated Emphasis for the NLP graduate program is now being examined by the Graduate Council, and there will be an update on this project in the fall.

The Joint Senate Administrative Task Force on Graduate Growth (TFGG) was charged on February 11, 2015 by EVC Galloway and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to assess campus efforts to achieve graduate student growth as part of the systemwide rebenching mandate, and to offer analysis and recommendations for strong, high-quality growth of graduate education and research at UCSC. TFGG membership included Senate faculty, Graduate Division representatives, campus administrative leadership, academic deans, and GSA representatives as well as staff support. The work focused on four major areas in order to leverage the full spectrum of graduate growth issues. The first area, capacity, focused on which programs, and under what conditions, could graduate programs potentially grow. The second area was allocations, which analyzed how campus funds are being used to encourage graduate growth and how UCSC's strategies differ from those of other UC campuses. The third area was incentives, which focused

on ways to encourage faculty to focus more on graduate education. The fourth area was professional development, which looked at how the campus could ensure that graduate growth would be accompanied by effective placement and increased opportunity for graduate students. The Task Force is currently working on a report that will summarize its findings, and offer recommendations for moving forward.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal noted some recent faculty achievements before discussing the recent campus budget agreement with the governor. The agreement gives a 4% increase in state support to UC each year for the next four years. \$438 million in one-time funding will be given to UC's pension system, and will be allocated over three years. In addition, approximately \$60 million in one-time funding will be allotted for maintenance and energy efficiency projects.

The budget agreement also mandates that there will be no California resident tuition increases for the next two years, after which increases will be commensurate with inflation. There will be an annual 5% increase in student services fees, much of which will be allocated toward mental health support. A tuition increase of up to 8% will be allowed for non-resident students. For Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST), increases will be based on current policy, with the exception of law schools in the UC system, for which no tuition increase is being allowed.

The agreement also stipulates development of uniform transfer pathways across the nine undergraduate campuses for the most popular majors. All major requirements will have to be reconsidered to ensure that they are appropriate and attainable for students. Each campus must now create a three year pathway through which a degree will be attainable for the top 50 majors. Some campuses, including UCSC, will now also be required to offer discounts for Summer Session courses.

Campuses must now comply with a two-to-one admissions ratios for incoming frosh to transfers- for every two frosh admitted, one transfer student must also be admitted. However, no campus will have to lower its academic standards in order to meet this requirement, and the Governor has also stated that he would not veto any enrollment agreement brought to the California legislature by UC.

The pension system will have a new third tier for all employees hired after June 30, 2016. Employees in this new tier will be offered two choices - a fully defined contribution (DC) plan, as most universities in the U.S. have now, and a new defined benefit (DB) plan up to the PEPR limit (currently \$117K) with some employees being offered a DC plan for income above that limit. This new plan is likely to break the principle of having just one pension system for all employees. Additionally, the risk of the DC plan falls entirely on the employee, even though DC plans on average have the same yield.

UCSC has now raised over \$200 million toward its fundraising campaign. Faculty and staff have generated 160 new gifts toward this campaign. Seven Presidential Chairs have been committed,

and another is currently in negotiation. Alumni have been working on the campaign, funding five of these new Chairs.

This year there was a 12% increase in frosh applications for resident, non-resident, and international students. The campus goal is to have approximately 3,500 incoming frosh. The campus yield is higher than projected for resident students, especially those in higher GPA bands. Both the GPA's and SAT scores are up for all incoming students. There was a decrease in underrepresented student applicants, which needs to be looked into and addressed further. The deadline for transfer students is June 1, and UCSC is currently on track to enroll 1,200 new transfers, up by approximately 100 from last year. Campus selectivity is increasing, which should assist in ensuring that transfer students are better prepared to succeed and graduate in two years. So far, there have been 568 total acceptances for graduate students. This number is not quite final and may change. Among these graduate acceptances, 221 are resident students, and 347 are non-resident students. Doctoral student numbers have stayed mostly flat, with the majority of graduate student growth coming from Masters students.

Multiple 50th Anniversary events have been happening on campus, such as Alumni Weekend, which drew approximately 2,500 alumni visitors to the campus. There is also an upcoming Founders Celebration featuring Alice Waters.

There have been some challenges this year, such as the Office of Civil Rights investigation and the Kresge assault, but the campus is working to prevent these kinds of issues from occurring again. Notably, the Black Experience Team (BET) and various faculty, administrators, students, and staff have been working to address the problem and find suitable solutions for the campus.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

CPEVC Galloway commented on faculty allocations, noting that the FTE allocation for 2015-16 will be out shortly. There will likely be a \$3-\$4 million budget shortfall for the coming year. This will be covered by one-time funds. There will need to be a consultation process for these budget reductions for the following year in order to balance the need for faculty lines with the need for staff support for these faculty. A holistic process will be developed to help ensure that the effects of these budget cuts stays minimal.

For the Silicon Valley project, UCSC is currently looking to relocate the employees located at 2505 Augustine, which is in the middle of a construction zone. The campus is also looking to have maintenance and programmatic functions handled centrally at the new location once it is found. Pre-proposals for master's programs for the Silicon Valley initiative have been received and are currently being evaluated by the Senate and administration. In looking at these pre-proposals, a business plan and a baseline of student and faculty services needed for these projects will be developed.

There are two new positions being proposed as additions to the current Vice Provost structure at UCSC. The first is the Vice Provost of Internationalization. This position will look at the pipelines for both undergraduate and graduate students, and look at MOU's with international institutions. This position would also look at the research affiliations for faculty, and at international educational opportunities, such as EAP and international classes. The second

position is the Vice Provost of Student Success, which will look at retention services, including LSS and EOP. This position was created in response to pressure to improve graduation rates and retention by both the state of California and WASC. The administration is also currently looking at proposals for a Center for Advancement of Teaching, as good teaching and student success go hand in hand.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Barry Bowman asked if faculty opposition to the new retirement agreement could affect the decision to enact of this plan.

Chancellor Blumenthal responded that this decision will be made by the Regents Office, and if the faculty or the Senate wish to oppose it, they would need to do so there. If this happened, it is likely that the University would not receive the one-time funds noted in the budget agreement. There will be a task force created this fall to research and discuss this topic, which will likely include some form of Senate representation. It is unlikely that faculty would be able to stop this decision, but it is not impossible.

President of the Emeriti Association Michael Nauenberg asked if it would be possible that the annual Dickson Award winners be announced at future Senate meetings.

The Chancellor affirmed that this would be fine.

Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)

3. Special Orders: Annual Reports

CONSENT CALENDAR:

a. Committee on Faculty Research Lecture (AS/SCP/1796)

The nomination of Professor Susan Strome as the 2015-16 Faculty Research Lecturer was approved by acclamation.

4. Reports of Special Committees (none)

5. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees

i. Committee Nominations for 2015-16 (AS/SCP/1787)

With the addition of the following, the nominations were approved by acclamation.

Admissions and Financial Aid

Charlie McDowell

Computer Science

Computing and Telecommunications

Add: Margaret Wilson

Psychology

Faculty Welfare

Add: Andrew Mathews Anthropology
 Remove Duplicate: Shelly Grabe Anthropology (typo)

Preparatory Education

Add: Gabriela Arredondo Latin American & Latino Studies

Privilege and Tenure

Add: Carl Walsh Economics

Senate Executive Committee

Add: Yat Li (CIE) Chemistry & Biochemistry
 Add: Judith Scott (COT) Education

b. Committee on Computing and Telecommunications**i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.15 (AS/SCP/1788)**

CCT Chair Debra Lewis explained that the amendment would update the Committee charge to bring it into alignment with current technological practices, and would allow the committee to look more closely at ways to potentially support faculty and students in areas where technology is involved. The amendment would also change the committee's name to the Committee on Information Technology.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Onuttom Narayan asked why the section of the charge that dictates that the Committee send a representative to the systemwide meetings was deleted.

Chair Lewis responded that this was changed to bring the Committee charge into better alignment with the Committee charges of the other UC campuses. RJ&E Chair Nancy Chen also commented that a new paragraph detailing the Committee's systemwide participation would likely be written in the near future. She stated that this portion was deleted because it would add unnecessary work for the Committee to find a substitute whenever the Committee Chair was unable to attend the systemwide meeting.

The amendment was passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Faculty Welfare**i. Report on Faculty Housing and the Campus Resale Pricing Program (AS/SCP/1789)****ii. Updates on Child Care, Faculty Salaries, Healthcare, and Retirement (AS/SCP/1790)**

Committee Chair Jim Zachos gave remarks on both reports, beginning with faculty salaries and remuneration. In its 2013 study, CFW found that UCSC's median salaries had improved somewhat, bringing UCSC's salaries closer to those of UC Davis and UC Santa Barbara. However, there are continuing concerns about salary compression due to the use of off-scales for faculty salaries on campus, which are almost evenly distributed across all ranks and steps. This is due to UCSC's hiring process. Since the campus has to offer market salaries to incoming faculty, the off-scales, which are used to compensate for lower salaries, are higher. This is starting to create salary compressions and inversions. At many other UC campuses, the off-scales are proportional to rank, with the higher ranks receiving higher off-scales.

Faculty remuneration for UC systemwide has dropped approximately 10% since 2009. This can be attributed to a decline in the value of UC retirement benefits. UCSC's remuneration fell by approximately 20% overall, with the highest ranks having the lowest remuneration.

The Committee recommends that the Merit Boost Plan continue through 2016-17. The plan should maintain its speed of acceleration and advancement, and should further boost the amount of off-scales. Stronger measures should also be considered at the higher ranks to close the gaps with other coastal campuses.

For health care, no major changes are planned for UCSC's offerings for 2015-16, and premiums for existing plans are expected to rise by no more than 5%. There are plans to implement changes to UC Care beyond 2016, with the possible introduction of an HMO plan, and/or UC medical centers. More information about these changes should be available in the coming year.

UCRP, with a 17% return, was just under 80% funded in July 2014. \$700 million was borrowed from STIP to reduce the unfunded liability. With current contributions of 14% from UC and 8% from individuals, UCRP is on track to return to 100% funding by 2035, assuming a 7.5% rate of return. The recent proposal by the state to reduce unfunded liability by \$40 million would accelerate the return to 100% funding, assuming there was no reduction in our annual contributions.

For child care, EVC Galloway was consulted and has asked Business Administration (BAS) to look into possibly finding an off-campus facility, a reimbursement program, or other possible options. The Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) will also be reconstituted, with meetings beginning in the fall. Their first task will be looking into employee child care. CCAC will be working closely with BAS to encourage all stakeholders to get involved in this process.

CFW is concerned that, given market pressure, housing will become a major issue again. On-campus housing is shrinking to the point where UCSC may not be able

to accommodate new hires and junior faculty. In this regard, the possibility of housing allowance increases, or expanded campus inventory should be considered.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Barry Bowman asked if across-the-board salary increases for the coming year were likely. He also asked what was being heard at the system-wide level about the status of UC Care.

On salary increases, EVC Galloway responded that UCSC has gotten instructions from UCOP in this regard, but nothing has been finalized yet.

On UC Care, Chair Zachos responded that in order for UC Care to stop operating at a financial deficit, an HMO option is necessary to reduce the risk profile.

Professor Onuttom Narayan asked about the employee housing resale program. He asked if the program still applies to houses that have already gone through the program once, and if not, what the reason would be for putting a house through the program a second time. He also asked if the waiting lists are still so short that sometimes faculty members need the University to step in and buy the house.

Ted Holman, the head of CFW's Subcommittee on Housing, responded that the point of the resale program is to maintain the quality of the houses. If a home has already gone through the program, it is likely that it has recently been renovated. The resale program adds a lot of value, with half the housing costs covered by the program and minor repairs taken care of. The program is used by UCSC to get the houses ready for new faculty. If a faculty member wants to sell their house, UCSC buys it from them immediately. However, for homes where the waiting lists are longer, it isn't necessarily needed for the University to immediately step in to purchase the house.

d. Committee on International Education

i. Making International Collaboration Agreements Swift, Flexible and Open (AS/SCP/1791)

ii. Principles, Processes, and Questions For Global Engagement: Lessons from CIE's 2013-14 Faculty Survey and Department Visits (AS/SCP/1792)

These reports were received without comment.

e. Committee on Teaching

i. Report on the Center for Advancement of Teaching (AS/SCP/1793)

Committee Chair Judy Scott commented that after submitting their previous report on reinvestment in teaching at UCSC, COT was asked by the EVC to

submit a proposal for a new center for teaching on campus. The Committee has also been working on a website with teaching resources available for instructors to use as needed. The new website includes posted interviews with eight recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Awards, along with their teaching statements and copies of their syllabi. The Committee has also met with various campus units, including the Writing Program, which offered to share their resources for the site as well. Faculty are encouraged to view these materials and use these resources to help advance their teaching skills.

In preparing the proposal for the teaching center, COT consulted with multiple campus groups to understand the resources already in place that UCSC could potentially build on, how the Committee could work with these groups in the future, and how their work could be facilitated by the proposed center. The resulting proposal has a three-year development plan, with a fully funded and operational center available by 2018. The proposed name is the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT).

In the spring, COT surveyed all department and program chairs asking for their input regarding a teaching center. 79% of the respondents indicated that re-establishing a center for teaching on campus was either “important” or “very important.” The other top priority was providing pedagogical support to faculty members who request help, or are referred by their chairs or deans for help. Other high priorities include mentoring activities, and pedagogical support for TA’s, GSI’s, and new faculty. Lower priorities included innovation grants, events, issues of accessibility, new technology integration, and issues of classroom climate.

In the proposal, COT emphasized the human element of mentoring support and networking. Some of the areas included were providing support and resources for developing or restructuring courses and syllabi; providing resources, networking opportunities, mentoring, general teaching assistance and consultation, creating opportunities to develop communities of practice that are dedicated to excellence in teaching through peer-to-peer interaction, organizing workshops and other events, facilitating inquiry into teaching excellence, and developing and maintaining readily available resources dedicated to best practices and excellence in teaching. The Committee plans to survey the faculty widely in the coming year, and use that feedback to determine the direction that the CAT will take.

Central to the proposal is an autonomous member of the Academic Senate who will serve as a Faculty Director. This position will serve as a principal investigator who will facilitate the overall vision of the center, work with budgets, serve as a liaison, and spearhead developmental efforts. Also proposed is a full-time Professional Development Coordinator who will create a safe environment for focusing on teaching improvement. Doctoral students will also be invited to participate at the center as mentors and researchers, and undergraduates will be

invited as interns. The CAT would be a faculty-centered and administered structure.

VPAA Herbie Lee was consulted and asked by the EVC to propose a potential administrative structure for the CAT. In his model, CAT staff would report to the VPAA, who would report to the Chancellor and EVC. COT is concerned that faculty may be more hesitant to access services for teaching under these more traditional reporting lines. The Committee is currently negotiating how the CAT would be structured, and will be meeting with the VPAA to discuss the matter.

The funding for the CAT would have to compete with already scarce campus resources. However, COT does recommend funding the CAT, as teaching support should be a high campus priority. There is already a new CUIP intern charged with completing the website, COT is planning several teaching events, and the Academic Senate is planning to fund the faculty director for one year.

The floor was opened for questions.

Michael Nauenberg asked how much funding would be required for the CAT.

Chair Scott responded that the proposed cost is approximately \$300,000 per year. The Committee is hoping to raise some of this money through external fundraising and development funds. The budget has not been finished yet, and may be closer to \$400 thousand per year once finalized.

f. Graduate Council

i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.21 (AS/SCP/1794)

Chair Ken Kletzer reported that the amendment would not change what the Graduate Council does. The changes would update and remove obsolete language, clarify the Council's plenary and advisory authority, clarify the activities and actions that the Council regularly undertakes, and clarify areas where the Council works with or delegates to the Graduate Division.

The amendment was passed by voice vote.

6. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

SUA Commissioner of Academic Affairs Max Hufft reported that this year the SUA took on campaigns and events such as sexual assault awareness, the Holy Festival and Edge of Eden Music Festival, Campus Cleanup Day, and the class availability student survey.

Approximately 10% of undergraduate students responded to the class lecture availability student survey. 85% of these respondents entered UCSC as frosh, and 15% entered as transfer students. Most of the respondents stated that they had experienced overcrowding in classes, and that this had diminished their classroom experience. Additionally, most

respondents indicated that the current waitlist option was helpful when enrolling in classes, However most of these students also did not believe the current waitlist system to be fair. To this end, the SUA is working on restructuring the waitlist option for next year. Students were asked if they felt they were on track to graduate, and 64% responded “no,” with most respondents indicating that this was because they were unable to register for the classes they needed in order to graduate. The students were also asked about summer session, with the majority of respondents stating that they had no intention of ever taking summer session courses. The SUA will be working to see how this can be improved. The full report of survey results can be viewed on the SUA’s website.

The SUA also prepared a statement on UC’s possible divestment from fossil fuels, stating that with the widely realized hazards presented with climate change, UC should be helping to ensure the safety of our planet for future generations. UC needs to make this a priority when making decisions, including campus investments. Undergraduate governments across UC agree that it is wrong to cause severe damage to the planet and profit from such activities, and the SUA encourage all faculty to support the resolution to divest from fossil fuels.

7. **Report of the Graduate Student Association President (none)**

8. **Petitions of Students (none)**

9. **Unfinished Business (none)**

10. **University and Faculty Welfare**

11. **New Business**

a. **A Resolution Calling on the UC Academic Council to Request that all Divisional Senates (a) Discuss and (b) Vote to Support a Memorial to the Regents to Divest the UC’s General Endowment Pool of Fossil Fuel Holdings (AS/SCP/1795)**

Professor Andrew Szasz introduced a resolution:

Whereas the threat posed by climate change is perhaps the biggest challenge facing humanity in the course of the 21st century, and the international community has consistently held that a total rise of less than 2 degrees Celsius is the maximum permissible warming of the planet, beyond which the risk of uncontrollable and devastating climate change increases unacceptably, and

Whereas the remaining atmospheric space for additional greenhouse gas emissions is estimated at approximately 1000 gigatons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) or its equivalent in other greenhouse gases to give a 66 percent chance of staying below 2°C in this century, and

Whereas the proven world fossil fuel reserves (natural gas, oil, and coal) are currently estimated at about 3,000 gigatons of CO₂, three times the additional

greenhouse gas emissions “budget” that, if burned, yields only a 2/3rds chance of staying below 2°C, and

Whereas the University of California, and UC Santa Cruz in particular, should be at the forefront of building a sustainable future, and in a great many ways, already are making critical contributions in research, teaching, and community service that address the threat of climate change, and finally,

Whereas, the UCSC Student Union Assembly, the Associated Students of UC Santa Barbara, and the student associations of five other UC campuses have called upon the Regents of the University of California to divest the UC’s General Endowment Pool from its holdings in the fossil fuel industry,

Therefore be it resolved that, we, the Faculty Senate of UC Santa Cruz, call upon Academic Council of the University of California to request that each UC campus’s Divisional Senate (a) discuss divestment and (b) endorse a Memorial to the Regents to divest the UC General Endowment Pool from direct ownership of fossil fuel public equities and corporate bonds, and of any commingled funds that include such equities and bonds.

The motion was seconded and the floor opened for debate.

Speaking for the motion:
Andrew Szasz
Kevin Bell

Speaking Against the motion:
Barry Bowman
Onottum Narayan

Points for the motion:

The move to divest is becoming an international movement. It is primarily political instead of economic. The dangers of climate change to the planet are well known, and political resistance increases these dangers. The most obvious solution is to divest from fossil fuel holdings.

Divestment would put UC on track with a growing movement, with 31 colleges and universities across the country already either divesting or committing to divest from fossil fuels. A growing number of cities across the U.S., and foundations and religious groups across the world have also made commitments to divest. And banking companies such as HSBC have reported that fossil fuels may soon become economically non-viable, so divestment makes sense financially.

UC is already committed to helping stop climate change, with investments in renewable energy, and this divestment would be a natural next step. It is illogical for a University to be committed to sustainability and also investing in unsustainable energy sources such as fossil fuels.

It is immoral to continue to invest in an energy source that causes harm to the planet and its inhabitants. The resolution calls on faculty to take a decisive stance on the issue and make it a priority.

Points against the motion:

There is a lot of potential for hypocrisy. As a campus, we use large amounts of fossil fuels in our daily operations. Some campuses, such as UC Berkeley, also use money from fossil fuel companies to help fund investments toward alternative fuel sources.

Implementation of this divestment would be difficult from an accounting standpoint.

It is unclear how much of an impact this divestment would actually make on this issue.

The resolution may not be in line with current procedures. The Regents have stipulated that the Academic Senate may address them on any issue, but only through the President. They also stipulate that when a message is sent through to the Regents, it must be in the form of a memorial. There are very specific procedures on how a memorial should be generated. In this resolution, it is unclear who would create the memorial or how it would be written. It ignores the current procedures that are in place, which could potentially weaken the impact on any future issues that the Academic Senate might bring to the Regents.

After a vote by show of hands was taken there was a call for quorum.

Quorum was not established.

The resolution did not pass due to lack of quorum.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

Junko Ito
Secretary

October 1, 2015