

**Executive Committee**  
September 23, 2004  
3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

**Present:** Melanie Dreisbach, Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Sam Brannen, Brigitte Lahme, John Wingard, Brad Mumaw, Susan McKillop, Catherine Nelson, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Eduardo Ochoa, Ruben Armiñana, Tim Wandling

**Absent:** Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

The Chair noted that the Senate will be setting up a small lending library with the books that come to the Chairs.

**Approval of Agenda** – items requested to be added to agenda: Policy on Periodic Review of University Administrators; Nominations for Search committees; Faculty Voter Registration Days; Request to Call a Senate Committee & Subcommittee Chairs meeting – *Approved as amended*.

**Minutes of 9/9/04 – Approved**

**Correspondence:** The Chair reported that she received a letter regarding nominees for faculty trustee. She said it was up to the Senate to develop procedures for nominees. At least one option is nomination by petition with the signed concurrence of at least 10% of the full time teaching faculty or 50 faculty whichever is less. She said she added it to the Senate agenda. Nominations are due Friday December 10<sup>th</sup>. The term is for two years. The Statewide Senator said she thought Faculty Trustees had full release time.

**Business**

**Course Outline Policy – J. Wingard**

J. Wingard introduced the item. The course outline policy has had a torturous time getting here. It has been reviewed by SAC and the GE subcommittee. Our guiding idea writing this was to address everyone's needs, but keep it short as possible. That is reflected in the decision to include URLs for policies. This would be what faculty would be required to give to students for each class. The policy was unanimously approved by FSAC.

It was suggested that a history / rationale of the document be included with it when it goes to the Senate.

**Motion to move the document forward to the Senate with the suggested history/rationale. Second. Vote – Approved.**

**University Convocation Survey – M. Dreisbach**

M. Dreisbach introduced the item. She described the data the survey would try to capture. She passed around a sample survey. She asked the body to take the survey and make changes on it that they deem appropriate. Return it to the Senate office.

It was suggested that people sign in at convocation since it is a work day and that it be required. The opposite view was also expressed. There was general discussion about attendance at convocation and the survey.

“Should university convocation have mandatory attendance” was suggested as an additional question.

The Chair suggested to pilot the survey for more feedback on the questions with an office of staff and with the Senate.

### **Resolution from the Writing Coordinators – E. McDonald**

E. McDonald introduced the item. The resolution was generated by the Writing Coordinator’s Ad Hoc committee, which is a body chaired by the SSU Writing Center Director including faculty and administrators with special interest and expertise in the teaching of writing. The committee wanted to raise awareness about the class size situation in writing classes and that we are out of compliance with national organization professional standards. They argue that current writing class sizes are educationally unsound. E. McDonald thought they were referring primarily to English 101 courses. The resolution was passed unanimously in the English department and not unanimously in EPC. The dissenter’s concern was that this was a department matter and did not need to be brought to the university.

A question was raised how the class sizes held at 21 would be paid. It was argued that it should be university-wide paid, and not just by the School of Arts and Humanities. It was suggested that this be added to the resolution.

A cover sheet was requested showing the composition of the Writing Coordinator’s Ad Hoc Committee. It was requested that the term “developmental courses be defined” and that the cover sheet include a legislative history of the document.

It was suggested that the cover sheet include the number of students in each class at SSU with comparison to other classes in the CSU.

The Provost noted that his office is gathering information in a systematic way about class sizes and benchmarking it against CSU averages.

**It was moved to refer the resolution back to the makers due to confusion about who is the audience for the resolution. No second.**

**Motion to send resolution forward to the Senate with accompanying cover sheet with which courses are being talked about, clarifying the average numbers in these courses at the moment and CSU numbers, a description page of FAQ’s, membership list and intro paragraph and legislative history. Second.**

**Vote on motion – Failed. The resolution was sent back through EPC to the Writing Coordinators Ad Hoc Committee.** It was suggested that the resolution go through the Philosophy department and the Council of Department Chairs in Arts & Humanities.

## **New Concentration in Nursing MS – E. McDonald**

E. McDonald introduced the item. The Nursing department is proposing a new concentration in one of their tracks. The track is the Leadership and Management track and the new concentration is Clinical Nurse Leader. This is an adaptation of the current curriculum to address the nursing shortage in northern and central California. It is supported by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing to address contemporary issues in nursing practice. Sonoma State was one of three California schools chosen out of 94 nationwide direct entry Master of Science in Nursing programs to participate in developing, implementing and evaluating this Clinical Nurse Leader role. This is for a person with a baccalaureate degree in some other field than nursing. The Nursing department has partnered with local health care institutions. Clinical work will be done one-on-one with SSU faculty mentors and nurses in the institutions. The program is budgeted as self-support with revenue from students and hospital partners. It will not increase the workload of current faculty. EPC passed it unanimously.

**Motion for the item to go forward to the Senate as a consent item. Second. Vote – Approved.**

## **Discussion item – Do we need to archive sound?**

L. Holmstrom asked two questions of the body. In exploring digital recording, she questioned the need to archive the sound recordings of the minutes at all. She also asked what people use the current minutes for.

There was a general consensus that archiving sound was a good idea. It was suggested that time stamps be added to the transcribed minutes. It was suggested that speakers request if they want something in the transcribed minutes. Many people in the meeting said that if the sound was accessible on the web, they would use it. There were different opinions on what kind of transcribed minutes would still be needed if the Senate went to digital recording that was readily available online.

## **Periodic Review of University Administrators policy**

S. Brannen introduced the item. He was approached in his official capacity as Senate representative to the School of Science and Technology by a faculty member who was concerned that the Executive Committee had not been implementing the Periodic Review of University Administrators policy. He was hoping to see if this was true and if we could get in compliance with the policy. He outlined aspects of the policy that were of concern. An informal survey of Deans revealed that the review described in the policy for Deans has not been occurring. He asked the President and Provost if these reviews were being done.

The President said all the administrators were done with the exception of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director of Athletics. The President said that he would look into it as they are probably approaching the six year mark.

It was determined that some of the Deans had been reviewed under this policy, but not all. A distinction was made between the annual reviews for MPPs and the

Periodic Review of University Administrators. The Provost said he would also look into it. The issue was raised of when the time for review begins and if interim administrators are reviewed.

It was pointed out that no report comes back to the Executive Committee according to the policy.

The Provost noted that the Executive Committee, in the policy, is being consulted with for assistance in forming the review committee. The committee is to advise the administrator to whom the person reports. It's a less frequent review with broader consultation, but it is still done by the administrator.

It was noted that the policy was due for review by the Executive Committee in 2001.

It was noted that there is a larger issue with the campus culture in terms of responsibility for implementing policies and the suggestion was made to consider when the Senate passes a policy, how do we make sure it actually happens.

The Provost noted that in the policy it says that these kinds of reviews typically include anonymous response survey of faculty and those have been ruled out of bounds by CSU and HR legal counsel recently and so campuses have to stop doing that.

**Motion to refer the policy to Structure and Functions. Second. Vote – *Approved*.**

It was noted that faculty have anonymous response student evaluations. What is the distinction?

The Provost was not sure.

### **Nominations for Committees – E. Stanny**

E. Stanny reported that Structure and Functions recommended faculty for three administrative search committees. For the Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance, Sue Hayes and Doug Jordan are recommended. Senior Director of Entrepreneurial Activities, Ali Kooshesh and Carlos Benito, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bill Poe and Mike Ezra.

A member of the body stated that he thought new faculty needed to be brought into these kinds of positions.

E. Stanny said we asked all faculty members to serve on these committees. She disagreed with the previous point.

**Motion to recommend Structure and Functions' choices for the search committees named. Second. Vote – *Approved*. One vote against.**

## **Faculty Voter Registration Days – B. Mumaw**

B. Mumaw introduced the item. After the resolution the Senate passed supporting the Associated Students voter registration drive, the AS would love the faculty to participate in two days in October when the faculty would spend a few minutes to register students in their classes.

There was discussion regarding this recommendation from the AS. Some members were opposed to registering students in class and taking away from the curriculum. Some were not opposed to registration, but wanted students in the class to do it. The recommendations seemed proscriptive to many members of the body.

**Motion to bring the item to the Senate with the additional suggestion that if faculty do not want to do it themselves, they could ask a student to do it. Second. Second withdrawn.**

It was decided that the Associated Students would provide this information in their report.

## **Senate Agenda**

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Melanie Dreisbach

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes - 9/16/04 emailed

Changes to Nursing MS

## **BUSINESS**

1. From EPC: Revision of Single Subject Waiver Program in English – Second Reading – attachment
2. Misconduct in Research Policy – J. Wingard – Second Reading – attachment
3. Faculty Emeritus Policy – J. Wingard – Second Reading - attachment
4. Course Outline Policy – J. Wingard – First Reading - attachment
5. Procedures for Selecting Faculty Trustee Nomination – M. Dreisbach

## **Request to Call a Senate Committee & Subcommittee Chairs meeting – R. Coleman-Senghor**

R. Coleman-Senghor passed out a handout. He voiced concern about the way in which we are proceeding with several areas. As the Chair of APC, he wanted to have a clear sense from the Senate as a whole and its Standing Committees about exactly the direction we are going as body. We are promised an internal audit of our activities and he thought we needed to be positioned for that discussion. He recommended calling meetings of the Standing committees such as the administration does to discuss matters openly and frankly. He wanted a clear sense

of the body's priorities as a governance body and its future direction, what is guiding us.

The Chair-Elect said that is a discussion occurring in Structure and Functions. They will be having all the chairs of standing committees come to Structure and Functions to talk about what they are doing and how they fit in with the university. They will also be inviting members of other Senates to visit to find out what they do. Structure and Functions wants a global perspective and is not working in isolation from the standing committees.

Further discussion ensued. It was noted that the review process of the Senate was not an audit nor would any report from the process be submitted to the Provost. Recommendations from Structure and Functions would come to the Executive Committee. There was support for the standing committee chairs to meet on a regular basis. It was clarified that the term "administrative audit" meant any self study of an organization, not an audit conducted by the administration.

It was suggested to take up this item at the next meeting.

**Motion to extend meeting two minutes for committee reports. Second. *Approved.***

#### **EPC report**

E. McDonald reported that the General Education subcommittee will be holding a GE Fair on Dec. 6-10 in Schulz 3001. It will be a series of different events. They are working on a proposal for the freshman year experience.

#### **SAC report**

B. Lahme reported that the Advising Workshop went very well. They had five sessions that were fully attended. It was a great experience and they will follow up on topics that were most interesting to people. Their next project is a quantitative study on student views about advising to get some meaningful data.

#### **APC report**

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC has task groups formed for Strategic Plan, Residential Life, Alignment and Assessment.

#### **FSAC report**

J. Wingard reported that FSAC has drafted an endowed chair policy which they will send out to appropriate people for comments.

Meeting adjourned.

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*