

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division
February 12, 2016

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Friday, February 12, at the Stevenson Event Center. Chair Don Brenneis called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

The meeting minutes of November 13, 2015 were approved as written by voice vote.

2. Announcements

a. Chair Brenneis

Chair Brenneis noted that the meeting agenda was full and reminded everyone to be mindful of discussion time limits before giving the floor to Chancellor Blumenthal.

b. Chancellor Blumenthal

Chancellor Blumenthal remarked that he had been meeting with faculty in each division to discuss the status of their departments, and to address any questions or concerns that faculty may have for the coming year.

Enrollments continue to be a concern for the campus, with President Napolitano's agreement with the state for UC to take an additional 5,000 students this fall. UC will also enroll an additional 5,000 California undergraduates over the course of the following two years. For the students coming this fall, the California legislature has allocated approximately half of the standard funding required to support each of these students. As a result, President Napolitano has agreed to make up this difference and fully fund the new students coming to the campuses. This money will come from changes to non-resident financial aid.

What this means for UCSC is that, using the enrollment numbers from fall 2014 as a base, the campus will take on approximately 300 additional undergraduate students. The campus will need to ensure that these students have classes and housing. The campus will also have to be very precise with enrollment projections, which will be challenging. UCSC will be using waitlists, and the Office of the President (UCOP) will be providing real-time admissions data from the other UC campuses over the course of admissions season.

The UC Regents will be meeting in March to discuss the new pension tier.

As a member of the system-wide Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Prevention, Chancellor Blumenthal reported that the committee has met three times, and a draft report has been written and will be distributed soon.

The UC budget for the year looks to be in alignment with the June 2015 agreement with the California state legislature. UC is also making efforts to find additional funding, one of which

has been applying for funds to use toward innovation and entrepreneurship. If successful, each campus will receive an additional \$2 million to further these goals.

Regarding upcoming Administrative staffing changes, a search committee for the next EVC has been appointed and is being chaired by Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences Paul Koch. This committee has faculty representation from each academic division. Alex Wolf has also been appointed as the new Dean of Engineering, and will take this position beginning July, 2016. The campus is currently beginning a search for the new Dean of Arts.

UCSC's fundraising campaign has raised \$223 million toward the \$300 million goal, and is currently on schedule to reach this goal. Part of this progress stems from the eight Presidential Chairs that the campus has endowed during this campaign. The Office of the President assigned eight \$500k matches in funding to each campus for Presidential Chairs. UCSC was able to raise the funds for each of these chairs last year. Each academic division now has at least one of these Presidential Chairs. President Napolitano is now allocating two more Chairs to each campus, one of which must fall under a specific set of guidelines, and another with no restrictions. The campus will be working to raise the funds for these Chairs. President Napolitano has also assigned ten additional Chair matches that will be competitive across all UC campuses.

Thirty-five new hires are expected this fall. However, there are concerns that the pension tier changes may affect UCSC's ability to continually hire and retain new faculty in the future.

The Chancellor then congratulated several faculty on their recent achievements before giving the floor to CP/EVC Galloway.

c. Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway

CP/EVC Galloway remarked that the campus is anticipating a \$2.5 million shortfall this year. This is due to mandatory cost increases, which are approximately 2% higher than our increases in revenue. These cuts have been allocated to the academic divisions per their ability to make up the difference with summer enrollments. The divisions have also gotten a larger disbursement of summer enrollment revenue with the hopes that the number of enrollments during summer session will increase to make up the difference. Non-academic units have been assigned budget cuts of approximately 1-2%. These cuts come with a lowered ability to support the campus, so these units have also been asked where they would need either one-time or permanent funds in order to help adjust to the changing campus climate.

UCSC has been informed by UCOP that we will need to accommodate 200 new frosh and 100 new transfer students over the 2014-15 enrollment numbers. Since levels were down last year, the campus will need to work hard to ensure that it can meet this goal. While difficult, this task is in alignment with UCSC's commitment to serve its students and promote social mobility.

In total, UCSC will need to enroll approximately 600 new frosh and 60 transfer students this year. The impact of these additional students will be most severe in the fall. In an effort to mitigate this impact, UCSC's undergraduate over-enrollment supplemental funding of approximately \$2.2 million will be used to fund approximately 275-290 courses. This represents an increase of approximately 75-80 additional courses when compared to 2015-16, or

approximately 10% of undergraduate courses. In addition, there will be an increase in teaching assistant funding of approximately \$1 million. This amounts to approximately 14.4 FTE and should produce about 86 additional TA-ships, which will be allocated based on this year's and next year's enrollments. Approximately \$1.3 million will be allocated into new faculty positions. This amounts to about 18 new FTE – possibly more – which will be intended for new faculty hires. These funds will be available for the coming year, and may be used for temporary instruction during that time. This would produce around 160 additional courses. Money has also been allocated toward instructional equipment replacement, Campus Curriculum and Leave Planning (CCLP), funding for classroom improvements and upgrades, and \$300k over three years in funding for the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL). Graduate support is also getting additional funding, and the campus is looking to increase doctoral enrollments from 235 to 300 in 2016-17. This growth requires substantial campus funding as well as increasing extramural support, and the Administration is currently working to find ways to accommodate the needs for such this initiative.

With the increased number of enrollments, the campus housing issue is now critical. The Administration is looking at short-term housing options, as well as medium-term options that would increase housing at affordable rates. The Office of the President is also assisting with campus efforts to plan for longer-term housing options.

Other considerations toward the increased enrollments will include changes to classroom usage and class times, and finding additional instructors.

UCSC's Division III Athletics program attracts academically strong students, and has excellent retention rates. Under the current Athletics Director, the campus has seen an increase in the professionalism in the programs. UCSC's athletes are held to standards of behavior in alignment with the campus and NCAA expectations, with strictly enforced consequences for unacceptable behavior. However, this program is expensive. Coaching, equipment, and a safe environment must be provided, and the sustainability of the program has been in question for the last five years. OPERS contributes approximately \$800k in permanent funding, the campus provides over \$1 million annually, and the program still runs a deficit annually. Two years ago it was determined that the program needed more funding from student fees. The current rate for these fees at UCSC is \$15 per student per year. Other campuses are closer to \$150 per student per year. The program was given two opportunities to secure these fees through ballot measure. Both measures were voted down, with the most current fee proposal of \$110 per quarter receiving 60% of votes against the measure. This year, a more refined poll will out to gauge student support for this program. A three-year tiered fee has been proposed that would add extra support, and would run from \$70-\$90 per quarter. If student support for this measure is not strong, the campus is likely to consider closing the program. Athletics is also considering a move to Division II. There are more California teams in Division II, which would decrease the travel costs for away games. However, this move would also require more scholarship funding and improved facilities for the program to continue.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)**3. Special Orders: Annual Reports****CONSENT CALENDAR:****a. Committee on Academic Personnel (AS/SCP/1818)**

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

4. Reports of Special Committees (none)**5. Reports of Standing Committees****a. Committee on Educational Policy****i. Amendment to Bylaw 13.17(AS/SCP/1819)**

Chair Tamkun explained that the amendment would restructure the responsibility of the Committee on Educational Policy by allowing for the establishment of a Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI). This would reduce the workload of CEP by shifting the task of reviewing proposals for new courses, and revisions for existing courses, to the new committee. This would allow CEP to focus primarily on policy issues, and would bring UCSC into alignment with committee structures on most other UC campuses.

Adding CCI would also benefit faculty, as the committee would be able to spend more time reviewing course proposals and revisions, which would be able to give faculty more detailed and timely feedback.

Most of the changes to the bylaw include updating and removing obsolete language, and clarification of CEP's responsibilities with the addition of CCI.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

ii. Establishment of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (AS/SCP/1820)

Chair Tamkun explained that the Committee on Courses of Instruction would have six Senate members, with at least one member from each division, one undergraduate student representative, and the Associate Registrar sitting ex-officio.

CCI would handle all matters related to courses of instruction. They would also approve GE designations for courses, and would approve graduate student instructors and undergraduate teaching assistants using criteria already established by CEP. CCI would review student petitions for exceptions to the regulations for the Santa Cruz division. CCI would also consider grade appeals as allowable under Appendix C of the Senate manual.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

The legislation passed by voice vote.

iii. Oral Report – CEP Update on UCSC General Education Requirements in Writing

Chair Tamkun reported that the most recent review of UCSC's Writing Program raised some significant concerns relating to the general education requirements in writing.

Currently, campus writing requirements include the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), Core, Composition 1 and Composition 2 (C1 and C2), and the Disciplinary Communication (DC) requirement.

ELWR can be satisfied prior to entry by scoring high enough on the UC Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE), or by scoring high enough on standardized tests such as the SAT, IB, or AP. This requirement can also be satisfied after entering UCSC by passing a portfolio review. Either way, ELWR must be satisfied by the end of a student's fourth quarter on campus.

C1 and C2 were integrated with required college core courses in 2005. C1 can be satisfied prior to entry by scoring high enough on AWPE or standardized tests. Most students satisfy C1 by taking either the College 80A or 80C/D Core courses. C2 can be satisfied by taking either the Writing 2 or College 80B Core course. C1 and C2 must be satisfied prior to the seventh quarter of enrollment at UCSC.

The DC requirement provides instruction in writing and in other forms of disciplinary communication. This requirement can be satisfied by taking one to three upper-division major requirements, for a minimum of five credits. C1 and C2 are pre-requisites for all of UCSC's DC courses.

If a student has not satisfied the ELWR prior to entry, UCSC requires taking two to seven related courses, equivalent to earning 10 to 32 credits, to satisfy the lower-division writing requirements.

Students who have satisfied ELWR and C1 prior to entry may take Core 80B to satisfy C2 before continuing on to a DC course. Students who have satisfied ELWR but not C1 must take Core 80A to satisfy C1, followed by Writing 2 to satisfy C2, before moving on to a DC course. When ELWR is not satisfied prior to entry, the pathways to meeting this requirement vary depending on college affiliation. Students are allowed to attempt and pass their C1 course before satisfying ELWR, which is a concern for the campus. CEP is currently working to address this issue through future regulation changes.

There is a new multilingual curriculum for ELWR-unsatisfied international students and F1 visa holders. Within the curriculum, there is a sequence of four writing courses: Writing 24-27. Once a student earns a passing score in WRIT 27, the ELWR requirement is satisfied. Placement within these courses is based on AWPE scores with the lowest-scoring students starting in Writing 24, and the highest-scoring students starting in Writing 27. Writing 27 satisfies ELWR. There are approximately

five different pathways, which vary by college, toward satisfying the Core and C1 requirements.

When a freshman enters UCSC, their academic plans are based on their college selection, incoming writing proficiency, incoming math proficiency, and proposed majors, leaving them with thousands of possible academic plans. It can take up to a year for students to satisfy their college core, writing, and preparatory math requirements, which is a concern with regard to advising and student success, as many departments are not aware of this.

CEP recommends that the campus continuously recognize and adapt to the changing needs of students, and for UCSC to make ELWR a formal prerequisite for all C1 courses.

The floor was opened for questions.

June Gordon of Education asked what percentage of non-international students do not satisfy ELWR upon entry to UCSC.

Chair Tamkun responded that the numbers in the report are for the 2014-15 academic year, but that the numbers for this year were likely around 40%.

Barry Bowman of Biology remarked that there are many students who do not pass ELWR but pass C1, and remarked that in principle this should not be possible.

Chair Tamkun responded that the Core courses, in general, have many purposes other than C1. They are also only offered once a year. The consequences of not passing a student in a first-quarter Core course, and having them come back the following year, are major. This is one reason why CEP are emphasizing the importance of not allowing these courses to be taken until ELWR is satisfied.

b. Committee on Faculty Welfare

i. Report on Child Care and Faculty Spousal/Partner Hire Resources (AS/SCP/1821)

Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) member Shelly Grabe reported that in 2001 funds were made available to all UC campuses to address child care facilities or lack thereof. UCSC is currently the only UC campus that does not have a child care center. In both 2004 and 2009, UCSC's Academic Senate passed resolutions to provide more child care, and in 2011 the campus Child Care Task Force issued a report with recommendations for moving forward with this initiative. In 2012-13 the University conducted informal discussions with an off-site child care facility downtown, but the arrangements for this facility were deemed unsatisfactory. In 2014, the Granary on campus was considered as a possible child care center, but this idea was ultimately rejected due to projected costs. In 2015, the Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Team, appointed by CP/EVC Galloway and led by VCBAS Sarah Latham, was charged with providing a technical analysis of two models for providing

employee child care – a reimbursement model, and building a child care facility either on or off campus. CFW noted a preference for a child care center on campus, as it would provide long-term cost savings for the campus (though not necessarily for the parents as they would still have to pay for some of the costs of having such a facility available).

CFW recommend that faculty be included in future analysis teams, as this analysis team did not have any faculty representation. The campus was also recently informed that a matching UCOP Grant for child care facilities is still available, and CFW has recommended that the CP/EVC set aside \$250k per year to take advantage of these funds to help move the campus forward toward securing employee child care. This issue is particularly important now, as 30% faculty turnover is expected in the next 7-10 years with more junior faculty with children expected to join the campus. Child care facilities would help UCSC to recruit and retain these new faculty.

CFW member Ted Holman reported that given the high cost of living in Santa Cruz and its effect on recruitment and retention, CFW has identified assistance with partner employment as one of the biggest ways to help increase employee household incomes. The goal in any initiative related to this issue would be to provide resources for spousal/partner employment, to increase the confidence of prospective faculty in relocating to Santa Cruz, and to encourage faculty retention. On February 2, 2015, CFW sent a proposal to CP/EVC Galloway asking for assistance in expanding and updating the Academic Personnel Office (APO) website on dual employment, and with securing infrastructure for a voluntary Faculty Spousal/Partner Hire Contact List that would be maintained by APO. This list could also include local alumni who would volunteer to help assist faculty partners and spouses who are trying to find work in the area. This would be a relatively low cost way of helping to ameliorate the high costs of living in the area.

The floor was opened for questions.

Juan Poblete of Literature asked if the committee had received a response from the CP/EVC yet.

CP/EVC Galloway responded that the Administration has sent the list from the assessment group to CFW. The issue is that building a child care facility would be extremely expensive, and at the moment the University does not have funds available for such an initiative. A full response to the report has not yet been issued to CFW.

Maureen Callanan of Psychology remarked that child care does not seem to be a priority for the campus, and encouraged Senate leadership to work with faculty to see if child care is a priority for them, and if so, figure out how to work with the Administration to make it a campus priority as well.

ii. Faculty Salary Analysis, January 2016 (AS/SCP/1822)

CFW Chair Jim Zachos reported that since the institution of the merit boost program, UCSC's salaries have moved closer to the median among the UC campuses. The main differences between the campuses is the usage of off-scale salaries. UCSC's off-scales tend to be uniform through each rank and step, while other campuses have higher variability.

The floor was opened for questions.

Barry Bowman of Biology commented that the data as presented is somewhat difficult to understand, and asked for some clarification to be included in future reports. He also remarked that using the UC median could give statistically inaccurate data, as opposed to using the means across the UC campuses. This may be a better way to analyze the data as it would enable us to see how much each campus spends on off-scale salaries.

Chair Zachos responded that CFW is still in the process of getting the data finalized, and a table of mean salaries would likely be added once this process is finished.

iii. Report on the New Third Retirement Tier (AS/SCP/1823)

Chair Zachos reported that the new tier is a result of the June 2015 budget agreement with the state legislature, which includes \$436 million in Proposition 2 debt repayment funds, a lower cap on University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) eligible pay, and a Public Employees Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) cap for Defined Benefit (DB) plans (which is currently at \$117,020 and increases annually). This meant a substantial reduction in retirement income for faculty, which resulted in the creation of the Retirement Options Task Force. The Task Force designed two new retirement options: a DB plan supplemented with a Defined Contribution (DC) plan to offset the retirement income reduction, as well as a full DC plan. In creating these options, the Task Force had to take three limitations into account – an 8-10% employer contribution, a 4-6% employer-paid unfunded liability surcharge, and a 7% employee-paid contribution. These new plans will only affect those hired in 2016 or thereafter. Current employee plans will not change.

The two 2016 plans have differing employee and employer contributions. For the DB/DC plan, there is a 7% employee contribution, a 14% employer contribution to the Covered Compensation Limit (CCL) – including a 6% unfunded liability surcharge – on both the DB and DC plans, and a 10% minimum contribution toward the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) limit.

Under the full DC plan, employee contribution would be 7%, with a 10% employer contribution toward the IRC limit. It was also recommended to add a 4% unfunded liability surcharge so that the total employer contribution would remain at 14%.

Current projections indicate that at retirement age, employees under the 2013 tier plan will have the highest retirement income, followed by the 2016 DB/DC plan which

will have a lower income replacement rate, and the DC plan which will have the lowest rate of return.

The current (2013) plan encourages mid-career faculty to stay at UCSC, and encourages a higher rate of turnover for faculty at or nearing retirement age. The new plans with the lower rates of return do not encourage this retention or turnover as faculty would have to work longer in order to achieve higher retirement income.

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) sent a recommendation to Academic Council to discourage enacting these new retirement plans before more research is conducted as to how this new tier will fully affect the University in both academic excellence and in financial terms. The UC Academic Assembly has also put forth a resolution rejecting the imposition of the PEPRA cap on UC, and discouraging the discontinuation of the current plan in the absence of any program that would provide compensating increases in total remuneration.

Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Chair Abel Rodriguez remarked that the pension is not capped directly for the PEPRA cap. The salaries used to compute the pension are capped. Most employees would be highly unlikely to reach this cap by retirement age.

Not shown in the report is the 1976 tier, which differs greatly from the 2013 tier and has a lower rate of return. The goal of the 2013 tier was to encourage retention. The newly proposed 2016 plan contradicts this goal and does not encourage retention.

The floor was opened for questions.

Loisa Nygaard of Literature commented that while hiring new faculty is very important, it is also very costly for the University. New faculty also often take a couple of years to settle in to their positions. She asked if these factors are being considered by those who are in charge of constructing these new plans or by President Napolitano.

Chair Zachos responded that these factors are articulated in the Senate's recommendations being submitted to UCOP.

Chris Connery of Literature commented that if these new plans are implemented, it would force UC employees into two very different tiers of retirement income. This would not only affect the University in the ways stated in the report, but would also affect the way the campuses are governed and how employees interact with one another. He then encouraged the Senate to try and block the initiative.

Barry Bowman of Biology commented that these new tiers would apply not only to faculty, but also to staff. This is a concern as employees with lower income will be affected more by the new tiers. The plan also puts all of the financial risk onto the employees.

CPB Chair Rodriguez responded that the DC plan is only one of the options being considered. If the DB plan is maintained with the PEPRA cap, there is no consequence for being under this cap. For lower paid employees, the institution of the PEPRA cap would have no effect on retirement compensation. The option that seems to have the strongest support is to give employees the choice between the DC or the DB plan when they come to the University, and to allow for a second choice five to seven years later.

6. Report of the Student Union Assembly Chair

Student Union Association (SUA) President Julie Foster remarked that overcrowding is a big issue for students at UCSC. This can be seen in transportation and parking, where parking is always very limited, and buses are often full or overcrowded making it difficult for students to get to class.

Housing is also an issue, as Santa Cruz has a very high cost of living, and many students are unable to afford living off campus. On-campus housing is also a problem, with dormitories being crowded with more students than they were meant to accommodate, and spaces initially intended as student lounge areas being converted into dorms. The cost of living on campus is also unaffordable for many students.

Library space has also been problematic. With student lounge spaces no longer available as study spaces, the libraries have become overcrowded. At peak times, such as during finals week, some students have been forced to sit on the floor because there are no desk spaces available. This has also been an issue in classrooms, where there are more students than desks available. Classroom quality is also very poor due to this overcrowding, with chairs and other equipment falling apart or breaking from extended use.

Enrolling extra students in the coming years will be detrimental to student education as well. In an effort to preserve the quality of education at UCSC, the SUA passed a resolution calling for Chancellor Blumenthal, CP/EVC Galloway, and the Administration to reject the enrollment plan mandated by President Napolitano. The resolution calls for Chancellor Blumenthal's immediate resignation if he does not reject this plan. It also states that should the Administration continue to comply with the enrollment mandate, the SUA will work with students to protest and disrupt daily operations on campus.

The floor was opened for questions. There were none.

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. Resolution to Create a Special Committee on Athletics (AS/SCP/1824)

Professor Dan Wirls of Politics introduced the resolution, stating that the new committee's task would be to inform the Senate of the priorities, policies, and strategies related to athletics on campus.

The committee would also provide the Academic Senate with a report on the values and impacts of having – or not having – an athletics program at the NCAA level. The committee would also provide the Senate with recommendations regarding the future of the program.

In its recommendations, the committee would consider multiple aspects including faculty welfare, ability to attract and retain high-performing students, UCSC's standing as a top-tier university, the quality of recreational facilities, and campus life in general.

The floor was opened for questions.

Charlie McDowell of Computer Science asked how the composition of the committee would be determined.

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Patty Gallagher responded that when staffing this committee, COC would use the same criteria as it does when staffing other committees, prioritizing divisional representation.

Jim Whitehead of Computational Media asked for how long this committee is intended to be formed. He also asked for clarification as to why the report from this committee is necessary.

Professor Wirls commented that the committee would disband at the end of the academic year. He then stated that with the current uncertainty regarding the state of the Athletics program, it is important for the Senate to have a sense of whether or not athletics is important to UCSC faculty. If it is found that the program is important to faculty, it will then be important for the Senate to find ways to engage faculty to support the program. No Senate committees are currently assigned to this task.

CP/EVC Galloway commented that during the coming year, the Administration will delay making a decision about the Athletics program while the student fee options are researched. During this time, the Athletics program will continue to receive funding. However, it would be helpful for the faculty to have a clearer understanding about the implications of either maintaining or defunding of this program.

The resolution passed by a voice vote.

b. Standard Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals (AS/SCP/1825)

VPDUE Richard Hughey reported that with increasing enrollments, the University will need to find ways to increase classroom capacity. To do this, UCSC will be changing its classroom schedule.

Currently, approximately one third of classroom seats are in just six classrooms. These six rooms are the most impacted on campus. Last fall, these classrooms were at 140% capacity for over 35% of the week. There is less impactation in the smaller rooms, but these are also still always very full. Changing course time slots and class length could help to ease this impactation. Additional early and late class times are being considered. Also being considered is a decrease in class times from 42 minutes to 37.5 minutes, which would be more in line with UC wide practices.

Some issues with changing course times include inadequate transportation to and from campus for early and late classes making arrival and departure times more difficult for students, lack of child care during extended classroom hours, and general safety concerns with courses ending later at night. Additionally, reduction in contact minutes may affect educational quality, reduction in passing time may increase the portion of students arriving late or leaving early, and lack of capacity may increase time to major declaration and degree completion.

Presently, there are four options for class schedules. For Option One, which is what UCSC uses currently, all classes start at 8:00am and end at 8:45pm on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and end at 9:45pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Option Two would change end times to either 10:25pm or 10:35pm Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays and would shorten class times on these days by five minutes. Classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays would be shortened by ten minutes and end at 10:15pm. For Option Three, courses on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays would begin at 7:45am and end at 9:45pm. Classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays would begin at 7:20am and end at 9:45pm. For Option Four, classes on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays would begin at 7:45am and end at 9:45pm, and classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays would begin at 8:00am and end at 10:25pm.

For final exams, the current model only has exams scheduled four days during final exam week. This means that 25% of exams currently end at 10:35pm. As the course time slots increase, the final exam time slots will need to increase as well. Final exams may also be shortened to two hours instead of four. Disability accommodations will also need to be considered for these exams. Senate input on this issue is requested through March 1, 2016.

The floor was opened for questions.

Charlie McDowell of Computer Science commented that 37.5 minutes does not seem to be the UC wide standard for class duration, and noted concerns over diminished contact time with students.

VPDUE Hughey responded that 37.5 is the number of minutes that each UC course uses on average, once semester-to-quarter conversions have been calculated.

Abel Rodriguez of Applied Math and Statistics asked if it would be possible to break down some of the larger classes into smaller classes that would fit in the smaller rooms.

VPDUE Hughey responded that this is being considered as an option in addition to the rescheduling.

SUA Vice President of Academic Affairs Seamus Howard commented that rescheduling class times would have many impacts on all forms of student life on campus. Student life revolves around the schedule of classes, so shifting these times would be a very stressful and complicated process for students. Student workers in dining would have to begin their shifts earlier in the day. Additionally, students with late night and early morning classes would have their sleep schedules impacted, which would likely cause an increase in students using Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), which is already very overcrowded. He then urged the Senate to give specific feedback on how this schedule change would affect students.

Chair of Computer Science Manfred Warmuth commented that changing the class schedule would not fix the issue of impaction, as the number of students at UCSC would continue to rapidly grow.

Jim Whitehead of Computational Media asked about utilizing spaces on campus that are not currently being used as classrooms, and also asked about the possibility of using temporary classrooms.

VPDUE Hughey responded that these options are being looked into.

University Registrar Tchad Sanger responded that the administration is working with departments to see if there are spaces that would be viable options that the campus could use as temporary classroom spaces.

SUA President Julie Foster stated that the University could refuse to take additional students. She also noted that UCSC is the only UC that has five-unit classes, and asked if the University could explore the possibility of decreasing the number of units per class to free up classroom space.

Loisa Nygaard of Literature commented that the next building priority on campus needs to be classroom space. She also stated that while going to five days during final exam week would be helpful, shortening all exams to two hours would not be. Some exams involve heavy reading and writing, and two hours would not be sufficient time for students to complete these types of exams. Other types of exams should have the option to be shortened to two hours, but it should not be mandatory for all examinations to be this short. She then noted that currently, the 8:00-9:45pm class

time slots are underutilized, and the campus should consider fully utilizing these slots before changing the schedule.

The Meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

ATTEST:

Heather Shearer

Secretary

April 14, 2016