

Academic Senate Minutes

February 10, 2005
3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Chair's report. Agenda approved. Minutes of 12/16/04 approved. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status approved. Report from E. McDonald on WASC workshop. Provost report. Chair-Elect report. Statewide Senator report. APC, EPC, FSAC and SAC reports. Course Outline Policy amended and tabled until next meeting.

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Catherine Nelson, Jan Beaulyn, Robert McNamara, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martínez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Tim Wandling, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Dan Karner, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Wanda Boda, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Ruben Arminañá, Eduardo Ochoa, Caitlin Hicks, Greg Tichava, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Elaine McDonald, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme

Absent: Melanie Dreisbach, Robert Train, Steve Cuellar, Marguerite St. Germain, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Brad Mumaw, Jonathan Peacock

Guests: Rose Bruce, Linda Lipps, Bill Houghton

Elizabeth Stanny chaired the meeting. Chair Dreisbach was in Long Beach. E. Stanny recognized Dan Karner as Edith Mendez' replacement for the Spring semester, welcomed newly elected SSP Marguerite St. Germain and welcomed back Rick Luttmann from sabbatical.

Chair's Report

Chair Elect Stanny gave Chair Dreisbach's report. On March 24, David McNeil, Chair of the Statewide Senate and Board of Trustee member Roberta Achtenberg will visit the Senate. Chair Dreisbach and other faculty members went to a WASC workshop on "Ensuring Student Success" last weekend. Senator McDonald will report on that. The GE Fair is Feb. 15, 16, and 17th and there is going to be a WASC panel on Feb. 16th which Chair Dreisbach will chair.

Approval of Agenda – Time certain added. Order of business items reversed.
Approved.

Minutes of 12/16/04 – *Approved.*

BUSINESS

Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – attachment – First Reading

Motion to waive first reading. Second. *Approved.*

Motion to approve list of faculty eligible for emeritus status: Francisco Gaona, Modern Languages & Donna Yonash, English. Second. *Approved.*

Report from E. McDonald on WASC workshop

E. McDonald reported that a team of eight faculty and administrators went to the joint workshop given by WASC and AAHE (American Association for Higher Education). The workshop was titled “Assuring Improvement in Student Learning.” It was a two-part workshop. Part of the time the school teams discussed a project with a mentor. The other part of the time they attended workshops presented by people with a great deal of experience with assessment issues. It was very impressive. We were instructed prior to the workshop to create a project we would be interested in. They had a very good experience with the mentor, Amy Driscoll, and would like to work with her again. The project we used to focus our experience at the conference was what the process of creating a Sonoma State signature statement might be? She thought that the WASC review process is meant to create an institution-wide learning community. So instead of being individual departments assessing and determining student learning outcomes, could we as a total institution develop a signature statement about an SSU graduate. She found this question interesting as she attended the workshops. She said she would defer to the Provost for what’s next with WASC.

President Report

The President passed.

A Senator asked the President if he could give a report on our institutional response to the WASC concern about aligning resources with mission.

The President said that would be part of the strategic planning process. The Senate asked him to be more specific now or come back later and give a more specific response.

The President agreed.

Provost Report

The Provost reported that the workshop followed on the heels of an earlier workshop from WASC itself in January. That one was focused on institutions seeking re-accreditation or initial accreditation. It went into great detail about the new standards, how to address them, nature of the evidence and the core commitments those standards imply. People returning from that meeting

recommended that the campus create a group to insure that the process proceeded in a timely manner separate from the Strategic Planning Steering committee. He accepted that recommendation. They are planning now to create an Accreditation Review Steering Committee that would have membership from key internal constituencies of the university, no more than 12 in number. Its responsibilities would be to select a format for our proposal out of four possible – strategic planning, theme-based, comprehensive, and audit or quality management approach-format. Next, we need to write an institutional proposal by October 15 laying out what we plan to do between now and the second visit. To put the committee together they will create a sort of job description of the qualities they are looking for. Structure and Functions will recommend to the Provost from the responses. How they will do this for the other constituencies has not been determined. The Strategic Planning process will continue as it is. The President had asked the Provost for a update on assessment. The Provost has submitted a report. A set of rubrics has been developed to categorize the stages that assessment is at for educational effectiveness in various departments.

Questions for the Provost

A Senator asked if continuing ed dollars and IDC will be going back to departments.

The Provost responded with some background and reported that IDC distribution for '03 – '04 that has been held back will be released. The IDC earned by the end of this year will be released as well. It appears that the situation in Extended Education regarding the arbitrator's decision is resolving itself with help from the Chancellor's office, so Extended Education will be able to send the continuing education dollars back to departments.

The Senator followed up asking if there were any plans to replace the OE dollars lost in a previous difficult budget period and OE dollars lost by Extended Education not sending dollars back to the departments.

The Provost responded that there were a variety of ways that could work out. We will still have an intercession, stand along degree programs, certificate programs and short courses.

A Senator asked about a recent email regarding students submitting repeat course forms by February 11th. He thought that was the purview of the Senate.

The Provost responded that he did not know the intent of the email. He deferred the question to a later time when K. Crabbe might be in attendance at the Senate.

An SSP Senator responded that in their consultation with K. Crabbe the deadline was there so that grades could be immediately re-calculated at the end of the semester.

The Chair of EPC requested that the emails regarding these sorts of changes be more specific in meaning.

A Senator asked for the SFR figures for Fall 2004.

The Provost said the data for Fall '04 was available, but he didn't have it with him.

A Senator suggested that the Senate have a say in the format of the WASC proposal.

The Provost responded that the Steering Committee's charge states that they need to develop a process to get feedback from the entire campus community including the Senate.

The Senator followed up asking when the Provost would be bringing reports on the other issues brought about by WASC's report.

The Provost responded that after meeting with WASC and from the teams going to workshops, he understood it was one thing to address the specific issues from WASC, but another to meet the standards for accreditation.

The Senator continued by arguing that the issue of aligning resources with academic programs was primary and that other issues could not be dealt with well until that was dealt with. How will we go about assessing aligning resources with mission? Are we going to use the Long Range Academic Plan to help us deal with the specific issues WASC has raised?

The Provost responded that the Long Range Academic Plan is very comprehensive. In substance the outlines of that plan will come up. Aligning resources and mission will be dealt with in the Strategic Planning process.

A Senator asked when the Provost will be getting back to the Senate on it's recommendations regarding the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan.

The Provost responded as soon as possible and elaborated how he would facilitate the process.

Chair- Elect Report

E. Stanny reported on the state of the nominations for the Spring 2005 Senate elections. She reported on progress for faculty to serve on the search committee for the Director of Admissions. Additionally, she reported on the Senate's self-study.

A Senator noted that here is a problem with faculty governance if we only have one person running for Chair-Elect and he encouraged the Senate and all faculty to have a serious discussion about this situation.

Statewide Senator

S. McKillop noted that the Statewide Senate now has a very good newsletter and recommended everyone read it. She reminded the body of Trustee policy titled Cornerstones about changing and reshaping the university. She reviewed the highlights of Cornerstones she created and had passed out to the body.

APC report

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC is working on bringing out a report and recommendations concerning whether SSU's SFR is aligned to our mission. They will also be presenting a report on Residential Life and diversity and a statement on the GE First Year Experience.

EPC report

E. McDonald reported that EPC has two main issues consuming the committee so far. They are developing a Program Review protocol and the GE reform. They are working hard in fulfilling their charge to assess the resource implications of curricular changes for both these issues.

FASC report

J. Wingard reported that FSAC is considering revisions to the RTP policy and developing a faculty recruitment policy.

SAC report

B. Lahme reported that SAC is working on the second revision of the Cheating and Plagiarism policy. In March they expect to bring the Grade Appeal policy to the Senate. They are moving forward with the Advising survey.

Course Outline Policy – E. McDonald – attachment

E. McDonald agreed to accept a suggestion as a friendly amendment made at the first reading. ***“Course outline should be provided to students in writing or electronic format within the first week of classes, but no later than the end of the drop period, and must include the following items.”*** Second.

Discussion

It was argued that there was no reason not to have course outlines given out on the first day.

It was noted that sometimes course assignments are given out at the last minute and people need some leeway.

It was argued that “must” in the sentence has been replaced by “should” and thus the amendment was unnecessary.

More support was voiced for giving out the syllabus on the first day of class.

Question called. Second. Vote = Yes = 18, No = 6

Vote on amendment - Course outline should be provided to students in writing or electronic format within the first week of classes, *but no later than the end of the drop period*, and must include the following items. Failed.

It was argued that the policy should outline normative behavior. The word should takes care of any exceptions. The course outline should be given out at the first class.

It was asked if this policy was going to replace the current listing in the catalog under other policies and procedures about course outlines.

E. McDonald answered that the status of the catalog copy was in dispute and FSAC was asked to create this policy to clear up any ambiguity.

It was argued that the catalog copy was under a section called policies and thus was a policy.

A Senator answered that the catalog copy was a statement in the catalog, not policy as the President had never signed off on such a policy.

The Provost noted that university wide policies are signed off by the President, but policies pertaining only to a department or division would fall under that governance structure.

An amendment was offered “the Course Outlines should be provided to students in writing or electronic format *at the first class meeting*.” Second.

An amendment to the amendment was offered “ Course Outlines *will* be provided to students in writing or electronic format *at the first class meeting*.” Second.

Question called. Second. Vote – *Approved*.

Vote on amendment to the amendment - “Course Outlines will be provided to students in writing or electronic format *at the first class meeting*.” Failed.

Return to original amendment.

Question called. Second. *Approved*.

Vote on amendment the Course Outlines should be provided to students in writing or electronic format *at the first class meeting. Approved.*

Return to entire policy

E. McDonald asked to refocus the discussion on two issues – 1) that the course goals and objectives were under strongly encouraged and not under must have and 2) the single URL for important policies.

It was argued that the list of policies that the single URL would contain should be listed on the syllabus. He moved to put that language back into the policy under number 3.

As a reminder to the students, ~~language such as the following is strongly recommended:~~ “There are important University policies that you should be aware of, including but not limited to:

- a. Add/Drop/Withdrawal deadlines**
- b. Campus diversity statement**
- c. Grade appeals procedures**
- d. Cheating and plagiarism policy; and**
- e. Statement on accommodation for students with disabilities.**

Go to this URL to find them.” (list a single URL).

Second.

Discussion

Support was voiced for the amendment as students wanted as much information as possible.

Question called. Second. Vote - Yes = 15, No = 5. *Approved.*

Vote on amendment as above – *Approved.*

Motion to table to next meeting. Second. *Approved.*

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom