

Senate Minutes
April 26, 2001
Harvest Room

Abstract

Agenda and Minutes Approved with small changes. Report on Admissions from Katharyn Crabbe. First Reading on R. Luttmann's resolution on target admissions. First Reading on revised Student Grievance Procedures. Posthumous B.S. degree for Justin Pienta approved. Reports from the Chair, Vice President of the Associated Students, APC, EPC, FASC and Chair-Elect of the Faculty. Announcement of winners of Excellence in Teaching awards. Remarks for the Good of the Order.

Present: P. McGough, R. Luttmann, A. Merrifield, L. Brooks, W. Poe, W. Boda, D. Hammond, T. Wandling, V. Garlin, S. Tiwari, D. Trowbridge, T. Nolan, H. Smith, C. Nelson, R. L. Thomas, S. Miller, L. Furukawa-Schlereth, S. Pridmore, J. Filp, S. Heft, M. Dreisbach, S. Moulton

Absent: P. Phillips, S. McKillop, G. Parker, E. Martinez, H. LaMoreaux, D. Dove, R. McNamara, P. Marker, R. Armiñana, B. Goldstein, M. Rattigan, R. Deorse, E. Mendez.

Guests: Katharyn Crabbe, Judith Hunt, Dennis Harris.

Proxies: Susan Gutierrez for Renee Deorse, Steve Wilson for Edith Mendez

Meeting began at 3:12

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Phil McGough

P. McGough – This past week I was at the Chairs of the Senates meeting. This group is becoming more of voice. The main concern last week was the rumor that the Chancellor's Office would force schools on the quarter system to semesters. The big issues surrounding this were the lack of consultation with faculty, and directives from above that transform individual campuses. The memo we saw said to consult with faculty and ask them why they shouldn't move to the semester system. If they still choose to stay on the quarter system they need to justify it. I asked the Vice Chancellor if he could think of anything that would justify it. He couldn't. I wonder if people would really do this if both the Chancellor and Board of Trustees were against it and these campus presidents work for them.

Correspondences: None

Consent Items: None

Approval of the Agenda- One change – to give a time certain of 4:30pm for Justin Pienta's posthumous degree. **MS Approved**

Approval of Minutes – Minor changes noted by S. Heft and V. Garlin. **MS Approved**

BUSINESS

Admissions Report – Katharyn Crabbe

K. Crabbe – What I have is an interim Admissions report. I brought some numbers that I think you will find interesting (she passed out a handout). I'd like to share the numbers for our pool, update you on where we are in accepting applications for admissions and to tell you of a change in practice around enrollment confirmation deposits. I'll start with the numbers. It is always of interest to faculty to see how we are doing with the pool in terms of diversity and local students. Looking at the far right on chart as of 4/26 we've received 8233 applications and made 5391 offers of admissions. We do not have the total number of applications received yet as some are not all complete, so for some we have not responded with an offer of admissions yet to people who may still be eligible. We've broken out applications by ethnicity. We are now closed for first time freshman and have been since December. We're interested in keeping the lower division population small. We're open until the end of this month for lower division student's applications. For upper division students we are still open. We're looking for another 150 UD students. We're also looking for another couple of hundred graduate students. We have 250 people more than we had at the end of last year. At the end of the process we should have 600 more. That means that our recruiters and outreach staff did a bang up job in generating the numbers. Some people in this room helped out and I thank you for that. I asked for a report on diversity in total pool because we've been asked by the Chancellor's Office to go to a one month application period. If this has an adverse effect on diversity we would be reluctant to do so. In the percentages "other than white" we have 36% - last year's pool was 35%. So we didn't lose ground. We have requested to continue with a 2 month period for next year to improve diversity.

Regarding residents. What is interesting is that first time freshman applications from our region are at 16%, 16% transfer, 27% are sophomores, 49% are juniors, 64% are seniors, 72% are graduate students. From the admit rate we can see the effect of our pledge that we would offer admission to all CSU qualified residents. 86% of local applications we've granted admission to. These numbers represent our numbers on the 26th of April.

L. Brooks - Do you do any data collection on socio-economic status?

K. Crabbe – We don't have that kind of data in retrieval form on the pool. Once we get a class we can get that information.

L. Brooks - Do we have that for last few years and are we doing better?

K. Crabbe - We had made a promise to local students and a promise to lower income students. We have admitted CSU qualified students that were also EOP qualified.

It would be good thing if I gave yield numbers. Our deadline is not here yet. We have in the past used enrollment confirmation deposits to tell how we are coming along. This semester we've had a change in procedure, so that makes it difficult to compare. We may need to undo it. We had a practice to send in deposit and if you changed your mind you can get it back. We encouraged students to send it in as soon as they got their admit letter. What we saw happen was that deposits came in and went out and came in and went out. We then thought we would see if we could encourage students to hold the money until they've made their mind up. Here's our refund policy now, if you change your mind within ten days you can have your deposit back. We turned it into taxes and encourage people to wait until the last minute to send them in. That has resulted in people waiting till the last minute to send them in. Our goal for our freshman class is 1200, but I don't have 1200 deposits today. I have about 900. There is no deadline but I asked people to respond by May 1. We're actually more worried about getting a big bonus of deposits on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week and will have to sort out who really got here first for the Residential Halls. That's what you've been hearing about.

R. Luttmann – Kathryn, you mentioned our recruiters doing a great job and we have lots of applicants. It's nice to be loved, but what are we doing to make sure we don't get more students here next year than we can afford to teach?

K. Crabbe - We've stopped offering admission to first time freshman until May 1 deadline. We need to see what we have. If we have what we need at that point then we will be able to write to students who have not yet completed their applications and say thank you, it's over. You can see what our worry is. If you reply to us by May 1 you may come. If they don't reply then we can say we have our class and we are no longer accepting enrollment deposits.

J. Filp - The people who were rejected - on the basis of not meeting criteria?

K. Crabbe - Either they didn't complete all application materials or they did not meet the qualifications. If they were low income or local the minimum quals were CSU's minimums. If they were other, we were looking for an admission index of 3220. The first cut we are looking for 2.9 min GPA in high school, 900 combined SAT with PART scores at 450. Second cut we looked for 3220 with no part scores below 400.

J. Filp - Since we are looking for diversity, I'm concerned that we rejected so many Hispanics and African Americans.

D. Trowbridge – I'm concerned about the gender diversity. Each year we are getting more and more unbalanced.

K. Crabbe - I didn't think to ask that question. No reason to be any different than last year. Yes, the gender difference is a trend in liberal arts colleges.

V. Garlin – I'm prepared to accept your data but not your interpretation. Each and every person that is unknown added into people of color does not give an accurate view of diversity on this campus. Anyone can see this by the empirical evidence. How do we know that people who tick the box unknown are people of color and which are not? It seems to me unreasonable and unsupportable that everyone one is a person of color. That 1/3 of campus are people of color is counter intuitive. How does WASC approach the measurement of diversity? Is this acceptable to them?

K. Crabbe – I do know of studies . . . actually I don't but I know where to look. I draw on scholars such as Carlos Cortez in discussing this issue. I know that on our campus we did a survey out of Institutional Research and we have some numbers which I don't have here. I can ask Rose Bruce about that.

V. Garlin - You and everyone else at the university puts those people in with people of color and I'm mystified by what the foundation is for that.

K. Crabbe -We are actually trying to be careful. We use "other than white" because they didn't indicate themselves as white. When I go to conferences on these issues and listen to scholars who are studying diversity in education talk about the changing nature of diversity – they are talking about young people of mixed race who choose not to choose. Regarding WASC - I think that it is true that WASC's position on diversity is that diversity is a broad concept and their concern about diversity is not limited to racial and ethnic diversity and will not be. The reason I believe this to be true is that when WASC developed its statement on diversity there was all this brouhaha because their concept of diversity was so broad that they wanted St. Thomas Aquinas College to teach other religions. So I think that WASC is expecting us to make progress on diversity in ways that are not only reflected in numbers.

A. Merrifield - What are we doing to avoid SSU exploitation of faculty? Do we want quality education or do we say, so we go over our goals, who gives a damn if classes are too big? Are we going to try to avoid that - is what we did this year new?

K. Crabbe – This is not first year we've done that. We have no policy to be wildly over enrolled and exploit the faculty. This year we're 87 FTES long. We're budgeted at 6145 and are something on order of 1 1/2 % over goal.

A. Merrifield - That's several hundred thousand dollars from another perspective. I asked have we done anything to avoid that and you're saying we're doing the same as last year.

K. Crabbe – It would be good if you had a certain number of tickets to sell. But we have to use our historic information. We tend to get about a 1/3 of the people who we offer admission. Now first time freshman count almost one for one for FTES.

A. Merrifield - So we're not doing anything new. And you're saying our traditional yield is a 1/3?

K. Crabbe – We offer to about 80%.

L. Brooks - I appreciate this as a complex problem. My question is part of my confusion about how can you identify yourself as unknown.

W. Boda – At least one student on the campus climate survey declared mixed race when asked.

L. Brooks - So unknown is a category? They did pretty well. Statistically they did about the same as white.

K. Crabbe - I was pretty happy when I looked at the residency numbers at that 86% admit rate from Solano County for first time freshman. I know that when you are teaching students it must be impossible to not feel put upon by over enrollment. Let me clarify one more thing. In the good old days there was the 2% rule, if you are under enrollment target by 2% you did not lose any money and if over 2% don't get any extra money. When the orange book went away we all starting shooting to be just a hair under. The Chancellor changed that. If you are under at all, the Chancellor's Office wants our money back. And if you are over, thank you very much and money will come next year. So it is not acceptable to be under at all. The political ramifications are unacceptable. It is always the case now to be a little over because the risk of being under are so bad.

A. Merrifield - That just absolutely verified everything I said - that we've been exploiting the faculty. We'd be giving back money for work we didn't do. It seems to me that it makes more sense from a PR point of view. I understand what you just said, but it doesn't change the exploitation of faculty.

J. Filp – I feel very uncomfortable with the exchange with Katharyn. I heard the same thing you heard and see that it is a complex problem. It is difficult to come to agreement civilly.

A. Merrifield - Katharyn wasn't attacked.

L. Brooks - I don't view it as an attack either. Any time there is confrontation it is appropriate to make points. That is an important part of our democratic process. If we are only going to be nice to everyone that comes to the Senate then they shouldn't come.

P. McGough - Rick has a resolution on the senate agenda today that we try to admit below our targets. Thank you, Katharyn, for coming and giving an update on admissions.

FIRST READING: Resolution on Target Admissions - attachment – R. Luttmann

P. McGough – Historically we have tried to get larger than target enrollments but we don't get marginal costs for students over target. We get money they pay in fees, which is considerably lower. The difference is between getting \$6500 per student

rather than \$1300 per student. If we are under the money must be returned. Arguably, there are non-financial reasons to meet our target.

R. Luttmann - The University has to come up with targets. We've heard how difficult it is to come to that. The question is what do we do - try to hit to higher or lower. If we come over we don't get extra money, if we are under we have to give money back, but we at least get paid for everyone we teach. We get exactly as much money as students. It seems to me from a budget point of view that it looks better to be under targets. To argue to be over targets, seems concerned with image and when it comes to a trade off with image on one hand and the serious budget consideration we have on the other, I come down to budget.

D. Trowbridge – I'd like a little more information before I'm ready to vote. Except for one, I think every year we end up with a budgetary problem. Would this end up with layoffs? If we had less money, how would we deal with that?

V. Garlin - Layoffs would constitute a change in the fundamental parameters since the current President came here. It would open whole can of worms. I wouldn't worry about that. We might end up with fewer sections staffed by lecturers, but no formal layoffs.

T Wandling - Can we waive first reading? I move to waive first reading.

P. McGough – The problem about waving the first readings is that we don't have the President and Provost here to present arguments.

S. Moulton - How is it 1.5 over? Aren't we really growing by 5.5% per year?

L. Schlereth – It's not 4 or 5%, not every year. All we know is 355 FTE next year, not 5.5.

J. Filp - I think it is a good idea. Don't we get additional money the next year?

L. Schlereth - Not necessarily. There is a one year lag. If we choose to grow for enrollment for the next year.

W. Poe - When university growth money gets allocated it is supposed to come to Student Affairs and Instruction. On this campus when campus-wide needs come off the top that means that Instruction pulls more than Student Affairs. We continue to grow this way.

S. Wilson - One point about growth. Getting more students is bad if we are not able to support these students. If we have money it should go for students to get the classes they need.

D. Hammond - Does the same thing happen on other campuses? What is the possibility of getting the State to kick in extra money?

P. McGough – The answer to your second question is zero. The first is you really need to define that some came in lower but didn't mean to.

D. Hammond - If some come in under why can't that money be used to fund who came in over?

L. Schlereth - That has happened. In this current year I don't see it happening. Not certain if that has happened under Chancellor Reed.

L. Brooks – The reason that we're so sensitive about this is because of a budget crisis year after year. We have a constant budget crisis, what varies is the reason.

S. Heft – We're moving into advocacy. A first reading is just to be about information.

D. Harris - Given the conditions that have existed in the past when we have been in 'Payback': 1. Since part of the money received for growth would already have been spent by the point after Census Date when we find out we are in Payback, what would be the impact on that portion of the budget not already spent or legally contracted? 2. Since about 80% of the campus budget is Salaries and Wages, what would be the impact of Payback on both permanent and temporary employees? 3. Since Academic Affairs represents about 78% of the budget, and Instruction is a substantial portion of that, what would be the impact of Payback on Academic Affairs as a whole and on Instruction in particular? 4. Since part-time and temporary Faculty are not protected by the provisions of Layoff, what would be the impact of Payback on part-time and temporary Faculty?"

D. Trowbridge - I'm upset that system-wide average SFRS are 17 to one. The campus seems to be going up and up.

P. McGough – System-wide is just under 20 to 1, our campus is 20 to 1.

T. Wandling – Is it feasible to create shadow sections without going into deficit?

R. Luttmann - I didn't have a plan in mind. I'm aware that paying back money is not desirable. That's why I aim to target over.

S. Wilson - Would this bring in more money than we would have to payback? If we target above and get more money and we don't make target we wouldn't have to pay it all back, would we?

R. Luttmann - We only give back the short fall.

A. Merrifield - Senate resolutions don't need implementation language.

FIRST READING: Student Grievance Procedures – attachment - M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach - The Senate a year ago passed interim Student Grievance Procedures. At that time the Senate asked SAC to continue to look at procedures. Two specific issues were the department where the Student Grievance reporting would take place and secondly the restriction that no one on the Student Grievance committee could practice law. We took a very close look to see if there are any other things that needed changing. We worked on bringing the procedures into alignment with the Cheating & Plagiarism and Grade Appeal policies. With these policies there is a grade appeal panel formed by Structures & Functions and that panel exists for one year. Instead of having bunch of different panels we use the same pool of people. We worked closely with Joaquin Sanchez. In the past year we've had one formal grievance. The emphasis has been on trying to resolve things informally. It is not a policy that is used a lot on a formal basis. The major revisions were to change the contact office from HR to Student Affairs and we removed the restriction regarding practicing law. That doesn't appear in the Cheating & Plagiarism and Grade Appeal policies. Other changes - we continued to bring it into alignment with the other policies or cleaned up sloppy language in the interim policy. We tighten the timelines and gave more time. Laurel did a great job re-doing the flow chart in appendix A. The committee as whole looked at it again on Wednesday and we do have a few more suggestions which will appear for the second reading. One substantive change we did not catch was that people serve on the Grievance panel for two years, so we brought that in line with the other policies – they will serve for one year. I think we've greatly improved the policy.

P. McGough – A clarification. My understanding is that a student grievance was filed last year. It was a student that lost a grade appeal. In last 8 years not one student grievance? Would a charge of sexual harassment go through this? It is in fact a policy we may never use.

W. Poe – It may need to be more explicit that, first one would file a grade appeal and then a grievance.

S. Pridmore - How many people actually know they can do this? My friends don't know that it exists. I don't know whose job it is to publicize this.

M. Dreisbach - It is in the schedule of classes and on the web.

P. McGough – It only comes into affect when an issue has not been resolved through informal channels.

J. Hunt - We have a discrimination and complaint procedure. There is an investigation. It is possible that if the claimant does not get satisfaction, I think, the student could grieve, but generally it would go to the EEOC or OCR.

P. McGough – There is a distinction. With a student grievance, if we didn't comply with our policy, we would lose the grievance. This grievance procedure could not deal with whether a student had been discriminated against only whether we followed policy.

V. Garlin - Does our policy on discrimination complaints say that all go to the same office? It would be contrary to the policy if a whole class of complaints are funneled to the manager of employee relations than Student Affairs. I would like to know why that class has been reserved to HR.

L. Schlereth – It was a condition of the consent decree of the Office of Civil Rights that there would be a single office that complaints would go to.

T. Wandling – Why did you change the time of filing a grievance from one year to one semester?

M. Dreisbach – That came from our input from Joaquin Sanchez. We looked at that thinking that it was one semester longer than necessary and left open too long a window of time after the original action.

L. Brooks – Congratulations to you and your committee. You did a very thorough job. The flow chart here is really outstanding if you look at previous one. Is the same kind also available for Cheating & Plagiarism and Grade Appeal?

W. Poe – I also think you did a good job. I hope it will not be used, but if it is used it will be very serious. I have two questions. It can not be intended to initiate disciplinary action? And on page 9 top, people who have access to material. It needs to be precise. Either we think the finding of the panel can be used by a Chair or we prohibit it. It is arguable either way.

V. Garlin - Sometimes confidentiality clauses really prejudice the person bringing the grievance to not be able to discuss their complaint. The person bringing the grievance is free to talk to anyone they want to. People who hear grievances have different level of confidentiality. It is helpful to put in words that the confidentiality is not binding on the grievant or upon whom the grievance is brought, but on the people hearing the grievance.

J. Hunt – A Chair can't bring disciplinary action against a faculty member. That comes from the President's office.

P. McGough – This will comeback for a second reading. Susan and Raye Lynn have announcements.

S. Moulton – I'd like to announce that the recipients of the Excellence in Teaching award are Marilyn Cannon in Biology and Kim Hester-Williams in English.

R. L. Thomas - The library will be having an open house where you can talk to the selectors for your discipline and see new library resources. A flyer is going out, but I wanted to give you advance notice. It will be held on May 15 from 4-5:30 and May 16 from noon to one.

P. McGough – I urge you to sign up for the senate talk listserv. **It was agreed that everyone on the Senate be subscribed to the list.**

Nomination of Justin Pienta for Posthumous Degree – attachment (w/ 1999 Senate guidelines)

P. McGough – We have a letter from Tom Ormond of the Kinesiology Department nominating a posthumous degree for Justin Pienta who had that awful accident. Representing the department today is Wanda Boda. It is my understanding that Justin more than meets the requirements.

W. Boda – The letter Tom wrote states the requirements Justin completed.

S. Heft – I move to waive the first reading.

Seconded. Approved.

S. Pridmore – I am troubled thinking about a friend of mine, Francis Conneley who died a week before Justin did. Justin was a very popular person and Francis wasn't. Has this body done anything for Francis? She was a Biology major.

W. Boda - Biology chair needs to bring forward a nomination for Francis.

A. Merrifield - I am in full agreement with Sean. We've been insensitive. I personally apologize.

P. McGough – The reason I asked for silence for Justin was because he died on campus. I'm grateful you've brought this up.

W. Boda – Justin has met all the requirements. I want to say that I hope you'll support this nomination. He was a really big part of our department. I move to vote on a posthumous degree for Justin Pienta.

Seconded. Approved. Unanimous

REPORTS

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

No report

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)

No report

Vice President/Admin. and Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

No report

President of the Associated Students - (E. Carlson)

S. Pridmore - Tuesday night I went before the city council. My resolution to accept a co-signer for rentals was pretty well received. The City Attorney is reviewing it. If it is oked it will go ahead on May 8th. Also the Star came out with a disturbing article about limiting skateboards on campus. My skateboard is my means of transportation and of not driving my car to campus. I believe if we go forward with this we will tamper with the university's commitment to alternative transportation. We shouldn't just ban skateboards, we should ban everyone thing else too. I'm very sad to see this happen.

J. Filp - I agree. Could the AS produce some kind of rule, safe for both for students and people who walk? If something came out of AS that would be good.

S. Moulton – The Residential Hall policy says skateboards are only for transportation. I love that policy.

V. Garlin - Is the appropriate place to ride skateboards on the sidewalk?

S. Pridmore – No, I prefer to ride where bikes lanes are.

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (R. Luttmann)

The Senate budget committee is in place. The winners of the election are Andy Merrifield, Catherine Nelson, and Steve Orlick. Structures & Functions is reviewing our Constitution and By-Laws to see if there are any other changes we need to make. If you have any concerns let me know. We meet again Tuesday next week.

Statewide Senators - (S. McKillop, P. Phillips)

No Report.

Chairs, Standing Committee - (Moulton, Filp, Heft, Dreisbach)

APC

S. Moulton - We are drafting our final report and fine tuning some of the Planning procedures we developed.

EPC

J. Filp - Linda Nowack will represent EPC at the Senate Budget Committee.

FSAC

S. Heft – We are looking at revisions to the University wide RTP policy. Schools should be holding elections now.

SAC

M. Dreisbach – Pass.

Items from the Floor - none

Good of the Order

P. McGough – Dennis Harris and his wife, Bonnie Leigh have donated an electronic carillon bell system for the bell tower that arrived today.

S. Miller –I'd like to comment on the language used here today that Johanna commented on. My perspective as senator is that in order to make decisions on votes what I need is the most information from the most perspectives I can get. When we have inflammatory rhetoric or an emotional charge or speech that feels like grandstanding or raises broader political positions that don't narrowly apply in the case at hand, I often feel that discussion is halted or people invited to speak get silenced and I can't hear what I need to hear. For example, Rick's resolution. I would have to abstain from voting, as I didn't get all the information I needed. For the Good of the Order civil discourse is very important.

C. Nelson - I appreciate and agree with things you are saying, but it strikes a cord for me regarding what the university stands for - freedom - freedom for exploring all viewpoints. If someone feels passionate about a belief do not ask to ask them to tie up their passion. That feels so contrary to what we are supposed to be about. Perhaps we can come together on middle ground to be able to express passion and be civil. My passion is not a personal attack on someone.

R. Luttmann – The Ad Hoc Student Housing Committee has done a report that went to SAC on Wednesday and should be available at our final Senate meeting.

Adjournment 5:08

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom