

Academic Senate Minutes

November 30, 2006

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 10/26/06 approved. Computer Science Revision approved. Update on WASC. Statewide Senator report. Capping the Size of the Senate proposal failed. Sabbatical Policy revision first reading completed. Endorsement of Statewide Senate Resolution on Cornerstones first reading completed. Endorsement of Statewide Senate Resolution on ACR73 first reading completed. Cost Sharing policy referred back to FSAC with specific instructions.

Present: Elaine McDonald, Tim Wandling, Elizabeth Stanny, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Elizabeth Martinez, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Thaine Stearns, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Wanda Boda, Sandra Feldman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Scott Miller, Sandra Shand, Rachel Sagapolu, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Virginia Lea, Marguerite St. Germain, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jarrod Russell, Eric Halstrom, Mary Halavais

Proxies: Susan McKillop for Steve Orlick

Guests: Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Elaine Sundberg, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Joshua Schulz, Karina Nelson, Tony Apolloni

Chair Report – E. McDonald-Newman

E. McDonald-Newman reported on a couple of controversial items that happened in the previous two weeks. She had heard from many faculty about the change in transfer advising and clearly there had been no faculty consultation. She read from the consultation policy that was passed last year. “On all matters that have direct impact on areas where primary responsibility rests with the faculty, consultation will be a process that includes a review by appropriate committees with a formal recommendation and rationale submitted to the President.” To her knowledge, this process has not happened. She said she had a vague impression that the changes were forced upon the faculty by technology, but she didn’t have any more information. She did receive a call from Carol Blackshire-Belay who discussed with her at great length the steps she is taking with the CMS people to make sure these kinds of surprises don’t happen again. Sophie Summers from Enrollment Management will be contacting a few faculty members shortly about the degree audit report upgrade. C. Blackshire-Belay is working with the CMS team to create a CMS advisory committee that would include faculty. The Chair also reported that the CMS upgrade has been moved to January which means that faculty need to get

their grades entered in by December 31st. If that was not a workable deadline, she wanted to know. EPC is working on clarifying **the role of** Academic Affairs, in curriculum changes as facilitating changes and not **as** a separate level of review. She then talked about department admissions criteria being dropped from PeopleSoft without communication to departments. Our Statewide Senator has done some research on this. C. Nelson reported that departments are free to set prerequisite criteria for admissions to their departments, but they cannot set secondary criteria such as GPA or SAT scores without having received formal approval of impactation from the CSU. The Chair noted that while we may have been somewhat out of compliance, she hoped that on this campus some internal procedures would allow consultation with faculty before these kinds of decisions are made. She thought Enrollment Management's action violated the Consultation Policy. She read from the Policy: "Faculty have primary responsibility for the educational functions of the institution including admission and degree requirements, . . . On matters where the faculty has primary responsibility faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons." C. Nelson reported that an administrative workgroup (E. Leeder, J. Robinson, E. Sundberg, K. Pierce) has been created to put those kinds of consultation in place. It was asked if the faculty are able to set GPA standards for graduate programs. C. Nelson responded that to her knowledge they could. It was asked if there were plans to balance out demand for particular majors on campus without using secondary criteria. E. Sundberg responded that the issue was one identified by the working group and described their thinking to this point. **It was moved to add impactation and related issues as a discussion item to the agenda after the business. Second. No objection.**

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:42 PM
Deleted: role

Consent items:

Agenda – Approved as amended above.

Minutes of 10/26/06 – Approved. The Chair noted that written minutes will not be available for a while, but the digital minutes of subsequent meetings will be put on the SSU-5 server.

Computer Science Revision – Approved.

Update on WASC – E. Sundberg

E. Sundberg reported that the faculty associates continue with their work. They will be submitting a first draft of all the criteria for review and analysis and then they will begin developing reflective essays the first of May.

Statewide Senator Report – R. McNamara

R. McNamara reported that statewide the ratio between tenure-track faculty and adjunct faculty is not improving. This is having an impact on faculty workload. The lecturers do a good job, but are not expected to do committee work. Tenure track faculty are being loaded down with committee work. Increasingly they are also seeing RTP receiving more research emphasis and so newer faculty are not being rewarded for doing faculty governance. It's becoming a real problem.

Capping the Size of the Senate – Second Reading - T. Wandling

T. Wandling pointed out research done on the size of Senates in the CSU in the packet for the Senate's information. He opened the floor for discussion.

A Senator argued three objections. The language of the document is ambiguous in terms of the number of School Senators. Larger Schools should have larger representation. There doesn't really seem to be a problem with the size of the Senate, even as the campus grows.

It was asked if the proposal created an obstacle for student suffrage. T. Wandling said he did not see that it created any obstacle. He also gave some background on why Structure and Functions made this recommendation.

A Senator asked about how the new way of determining School Senators would be logistically handled. It was clarified that the appropriate number of Senators is calculated every Spring anyway, so the logistics would not change.

A Senator argued that the proposal reflected the discussions about release time. He also argued that managing discussions was the real issue.

A Senator argued that he didn't think that student enrollment would come as fast as it has been said. He noted the possible bad feelings Schools might have if their representation went down.

A Senator noted a concern that the more people on the body, the harder it is to have good, substantive discussions. One reason is that we only meet two hours every other week and if everyone now spoke to every issue, we would not get anything done. She thought it was appropriate to take quality into account.

A Senator argued that the body needs to police itself and valued the fact that people can vote in numbers either way and thus have some support. She also did not see a problem.

Vote on the proposal to Cap the Size of the Senate – Yes = 16, No = 17 – Failed.

Sabbatical Policy Revisions – First Reading – C. Ayala

C. Ayala noted that the copy passed out to the body with the track changes is more complete than the one in the packet. He then gave a history of the reason FSAC looked at the policy, the process they used to address the issues, and provided a legislative history. He noted the major changes.

Items from the first reading discussion:

Include the fact that the sabbatical application documents need to be notarized.

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:46 PM

Deleted: s

The weighting of the quality of the document in the sabbatical decisions in the policy was questioned.

A discussion was requested about who the audiences are for the sabbatical proposal documents.

Discussion extended 5 minutes.

It was asked how the departments should respond to the sabbatical proposals. It was clarified that departments and schools should not rank proposals.

There was a discussion about the role of scholarship in the evaluation of the sabbatical proposals.

It was clarified that the highest criteria for sabbatical was years since sabbatical and that the URTP committee asked for more flexibility.

First reading completed.

Endorsement of Statewide Senate Resolution on Cornerstones – First Reading – C. Nelson

C. Nelson introduced the resolution. She described the Statewide Resolution which asks the CSU Strategic Planning committee to pay attention to the three principals of the Cornerstones initiative that have, up to this point, not been addressed in any way. Her resolution requested that the body endorse the Statewide resolution. R. McNamara added that when the resolution came before the Statewide Senate there was considerable debate and he explained the debate, which centered on whether the principles the Chancellor's office had decided were the highest priority were the faculty's highest priority. A Senator who had been involved with the development of Cornerstones noted that Principle 10 had been very difficult to get and might also need to be included. The Chair explained her reasoning for asking for the resolution. **It was moved that the resolution be re-written for SSU's own needs. Second.** It was requested that all the Cornerstones principles be sent out on Senate-Talk. **The motion was withdrawn.**

First reading completed.

Endorsement of Statewide Senate Resolution on ACR73 – C. Nelson

C. Nelson introduced the Statewide resolution and read the SSU resolution to the body. She noted the rationale in the Statewide resolution for background information. R. McNamara noted that the Statewide resolution was written for the Board of Trustees and they have already met, so he thought it was moot. He also questioned whether the statement in the SSU resolution about the success of the administration was accurate as he had heard varying accounts. It was suggested that the proviso in ACR 73 that current lecturer faculty not be laid off to meet the requirements be included in the SSU resolution. A Senator noted that ACR 73 was

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:47 PM

Deleted: that

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:48 PM

Deleted: als

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:48 PM

Deleted: al

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:49 PM

Deleted: als

written for campuses where the ratio of tenure-track to lecturer faculty was very high. This was not the case at SSU and she cautioned that it may backfire on us.

First reading completed.

Cost Sharing Policy – Second Reading - C. Ayala

C. Ayala noted there was a motion to amend ~~that had been seconded~~ on the table from the last meeting.

III. D.

8. Uncompensated volunteer effort provided by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member as detailed in section IV. A. below.

Vote on the amendment. *Approved.*

C. Ayala introduced the guests – Joshua Schulz, Karina Nelson and Tony Apolloni

K. Nelson described the reason why she, as a faculty member, supported the Cost Sharing Policy as written, and her difficulties getting the grants she needed for her research without being able to use her time as cost share.

Concern was raised about the encouragement of volunteerism and that such faculty activity should be seen as work. If someone is doing research that is of value to the university and to the grantor, then it should be seen as work, and ~~the~~ faculty member should be released from other work.

K. Nelson responded that she appreciated that perspective, but found volunteering as cost share a pragmatic approach to being able to perform well.

It was asked if the previous policy forbade faculty from volunteering. J. Schulz said that it did forbid faculty work being used as cost share.

Discussion continued along these lines pro and con.

A motion was made to take language that forbids out, but not replace it with specific allowable language. Second.

Motion ruled out of order due to non-specificity of the language change.

It was argued that research time should be compensated time.

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:52 PM

Deleted: that had been seconded

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:52 PM

Deleted: ...

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:54 PM

Deleted: it should be

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:54 PM

Deleted: that

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:54 PM

Deleted: id

It was questioned whether taking the language out about volunteering would be enough. T. Apolloni responded that the policy does spell out how to document and track such time and did not think that would work.

It was asked how this was being done at other CSU's. J. Schulz said it is handled differently at different campuses. SSU's original policy was modeled after San Diego State's policy, which does not allow faculty time as cost share. K. Nelson said that at San Diego State part of the faculty workload is for research and she would prefer it that way.

C. Ayala suggested approving the policy as it is now and come up with a resolution that asks for increased focus on compensation for research activities from campus administration.

A Senator noted she had heard that the campus was now a comprehensive university and not a liberal arts and sciences university and that the Senate ought to think about what that might mean in this context.

A Senator argued that, since we are smart people, we need to find a way to have it both ways since the passion that drives the work is important and needs to be protected.

A Senator noted the Cornerstones principle that calls for more support for faculty development and scholarship.

C. Ayala argued that the policy offers opportunity and described the other benefits of grants beside faculty compensation.

Motion to refer back to FSAC. Second.

Amendment to add to the motion: to delete references to prohibiting volunteer work in the current policy and with no reference to encouraging volunteering. Second.

Motion to extend for 5 minutes. *Approved.*

Vote on amended language giving specific instructions to FSAC– *Approved.*

Vote to refer to FSAC – *Approved.*

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström

Edith Mendez 1/17/07 5:56 PM

Deleted: al