

Executive Committee
November 4, 2004
3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Melanie Dreisbach, Jan Beaulyn, Sam Brannen, Elaine McDonald, Brigitte Lahme, Eduardo Ochoa, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Bran Mumaw, Elizabeth Stanny, John Wingard, Tim Wandling, Catherine Nelson, Susan McKillop

Guests: Kris Montgomery, Santos Torres

The President introduced Dr. Santos Torres from Sacramento State. He was visiting the campus and the President invited him to join the meeting.

Approval of Agenda – added - Review of Procedures for selecting members of the Academic Freedom subcommittee – *Approved*.

Minutes of 10/21/04 – Approved.

Correspondence: The Chair noted receipt of a resolution from San Marcos supporting the re-nomination of Kathleen Kaiser for Faculty Trustee. They are asking other campuses to consider this re-nomination. The Chair stated that we do have our call out for people interested in being nominated for Faculty Trustee and with the body's approval we will hold off on this and bring a resolution to the Senate closer our deadline.

Chair's Report

The Chair reported that there is a team going down to the WASC workshop on January 4 and 5th at Samuel Merritt College. She reported the make up of the team - Katharyn Crabbe, Carlos Benito, Rose Bruce, herself, Jim Robertson and Elaine Sundberg. They will be getting the inside scope to help us go forward with the re-accreditation process. The convocation survey is out there on the web. Please complete it yourselves. It only takes a few minutes. Encourage everyone else to take it. We've had 89 responses and want to hear from all the community. She reported that the Senate has started a library. From time to time the Provost passes along books. We have the gold standard of Robert's Rules. And the latest book we have received is the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports. She said there is a lot of meaty stuff to help us in our work in this book. We will have one that stays in the library and one that circulates. She asked all the Committee Chairs to advise their committees if any of their members want an updated handbook they need to come to the Senate office. They can also use it online.

Cheating and Plagiarism policy – B. Lahme – attachment

B. Lahme introduced the item. She said the policy was brought to SAC by Kris Montgomery, Interim Student Discipline Coordinator. B. Lahme turned the item over to K. Montgomery. The policy revision was unanimously approved in SAC.

K. Montgomery stated that the Student Affairs office recently went through an audit by the Chancellor's office. One of the findings was that we did not have a centralized way to track cheating and plagiarism violations that happened in more than one department. The changes proposed in the policy revision address that issue. She noted that the amount and sophistication of cheating and plagiarism has changed. A recent study by the Center for Academic Integrity found that 75% of college students said they have cheated on tests. In the new policy, the informal forms between faculty and students would now go to a central place. They would sit in a file until another charge came in and then we would check to see if the student was already on file. If there were two violations, we would probably take action. The faculty member could still request immediate Administrative Sanction in their informal resolution.

A Senator wondered how informal the informal resolution would be if we start keeping a record.

K. Montgomery responded that the file would only come into play if there were multiple violations. The philosophy of student discipline is really student development and about teaching students what behavior works. One of the sanctions she has given is for the student to write a paper on what plagiarism is so the student does understand what it is. It is a permanent, but confidential record.

The Chair of SAC said it does not really go on a student's permanent academic record. It goes into a file and if they never ever have a case again, it will not show up anywhere. If they have another infraction, the Student Discipline officer calls them in and then maybe there are sanctions. But after five years the files will be trashed. Nothing will appear on the student's record.

It was suggested that the appendices be attached to the document that comes to the Senate.

Grammatical changes were noted on page 2 of the policy.

It was suggested to have "business days" changed to "academic days."

Motion to move policy forward to the Senate – *Approved*.

Spring Faculty Retreat – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach introduced the item. She brought forward three suggestions for topics of the retreat. She presented them to the body and asked for feedback.

1. GE Initiative suggested by Paul Draper
2. Academic Freedom suggested by Elaine McDonald
3. Individual definition of work and the alignment of that with institutional mission statements and planning suggested by Tim Wandling

The following were suggestions for the retreat:

In terms of Academic Freedom, who will be making decisions about curriculum when new programs are created.

How do we negotiate the tension between an individual's work teaching and changes in mission.

The role of faculty scholarship for the university, its definition and its relationship to the RTP process was discussed. The tension between a 12 unit teaching load and pressure to publish was noted among newer faculty.

If workload and RTP was part of the retreat, it was suggested that the union have a formal invitation to participate.

How the faculty "fit" in the university, what are career expectations for faculty at SSU.

The historical tension between GE and the major was described and seen as a fundamental question at our university. What would the compromise between GE and the disciplines look like.

The Chair thanked everyone for the discussion and will bring it back at another meeting.

Review of Procedures for selecting members of the Academic Freedom subcommittee – J. Wingard

J. Wingard introduced the item. A handout was passed out with the new proposal for membership in the Academic Freedom subcommittee.

It was determined that the proposal only need be discussed between FSAC and Structure and Functions.

Reports

President Report

The President reported that the Board of Trustees approved a budget that follows the compact – 3% general increase, 2.5% enrollment, 8% fee increase for undergraduates and 10% for graduates. It passed 13 to 3. It now goes to the Governor and he will build his budget on that.

A Senator asked if there was a Chancellor's committee or task force would report that Cornerstones is being carried out.

The President responded that it is not a committee, but it is part of the Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence's job to report yearly on some of the accountability

measures, etc. The Chancellor refers often to that and he feels that is his charge from the Trustees.

Provost Report

The Provost reported that they have developed a proposal for FIPSE for the freshman year experience. If we get it, it would give us about \$450,000 over two years to fund the start up phase of the program. He had just met with FSAC about the referral from his office of the RTP policy. He outlined to FSAC a number of areas where we think it could be improved. He hopes to meet with the other committees as well. One area of concern – there are no criteria called for in the policy, he is recommending that departments develop RTP criteria documents and review them in a set period of time.

He asked the committee to consider developing a tiered approach to the criteria documents, so that baseline standards could be identified. If we go with that approach, he suggested a standard format for the documents. That could simplify generating the RTP documents. He also asked them to consider adding the Provost to the review cycle consistent with the practice of every other campus in the CSU. If the committee felt it was a worthwhile direction, he suggested that the development of university wide standards would have to be a more drawn out process with much more extensive consultation and deliberation by faculty. So this could be done by first developing all the procedural part and indicating that such standards will be established at a later date and that can become an appendix or have a place holder in the text. Another point he made to FSAC was that when structuring expectations that consideration be given to broadening category scheme we use for defining faculty roles to consider such notions as expanded notion of scholarship à la Boyer and how that might be able to better capture the richness of what faculty do.

A Senator asked how the Provost envisioned his role in the RTP process. Some untenured faculty may not want to serve on the Senate if the Provost was involved in RTP.

The Provost said that that fear is endemic in the process and not just toward administrators, but colleagues in your departments. In reality we have a multi-layered process, with multiple levels of review that is thoroughly regulated and vetted. He said that systematically discourages capricious and arbitrary abuses. And if everything else fails, there's a grievance process. There are a lot of checks and balances in the system. The way Provost review levels have worked is when there are mixed reviews and there's a problem that has to be sorted out in some fashion.

A Senator offered suggestions for the process of looking at the RTP policy. It should be open and solicitous, with open meetings and forums, a website for feedback, etc. They should look at the repetition issue in the first years. We should also think about the faculty role in general, not just RTP. RTP is seven years. We are talking about what faculty should do for their careers.

The President commented on the role of the Provost in the RTP process. He noted that presently there is no official role for the Provost. In practice, the Provost plays a

role because he is an advisor/consult to the President on every issue. It would put in policy what has been practice for the last twelve years.

A Senator asked if adding in the Provost was another layer of review or taking the place of the Deans.

The Provost responded that he thought the Deans needed to have a role. He felt as chief Academic Officer he had to have that level of review.

The chair of FSAC noted that the Provost's visit to their committee was very helpful in providing context and the urged the other committees to have him at their committees as well. He wants to keep it as open as possible and move it forward, though the thought it will be a long process.

A Senator suggested that the committee look at whether the levels of review are going to give us what we want in terms of evaluation of the academic performance of faculty. Also there are other models of review that do not include the Provost at all. He noted that some departments have created criteria for evaluation, but not all and many have not shared those documents with new faculty. What the departments expect and what the President expects needs to be teased out. Also, will the RTP document be tied to the mission of the university.

A Senator asked if the RTP policy was broken.

The Provost responded that in reading the policy he saw a lot of time bombs that could lead to problems. There's tremendous opportunity for grievances, lawsuits, etc by faculty not having a very clear, explicit articulation of performance expectations. Aligning RTP with mission as per WASC is also very important.

The Chair noted the heavy workload for departments writing the RTP documents, particularly in department with few tenured faculty.

A Senator asked how different the Provost envisioned the university wide standards being from the current RTP policy.

The Provost responded that he saw a typology of types of activity, but no real sense of what level of activity or performance would be expected. It would not get too specific at the university level, but there are ways of developing narrative rubrics that give a sense, for example, of when someone is maintaining currency in their field and that becomes more specific in the departments.

A Senator suggested with all the changes happening with strategic planning, the GE initiative and now RTP, is there a hidden agenda?

The Provost responded that he thought it was just the opposite of a hidden agenda. The approach to planning and the RTP changes he is suggesting is trying to articulate and make explicit expectations, to get everyone with a common understanding of what's expected and to have the discussion of whether or not our expectations are in sync or appropriate upfront. It was clarified that it starts with the

faculty and the administration could bring up concerns in the approval process and it would be discussed until everyone is on the same page.

Vice President of Administration and Finance report

L. Furukawa-Schlereth alerted the body that next week he would like to do a report at the Senate on faculty / staff housing.

APC report

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC has developed a position on assessment and its tie to academic planning and will be bringing that forward. We will also bring a discussion to this body on the status of the Long Range Plan. They are looking at residential housing and fiscal alignment to curriculum. They will have guidelines for academic planning. The committee asked him to remind the Executive Committee that we do in fact have a Long Range Academic Plan and planning should refer to this document until the Senate has another document.

EPC report

E. McDonald reported they are hard at work on the Course Outline Policy that was referred. They are making serious changes. They will have the RPT document on the December agenda and will be looking at policies that EPC had anything to do with over time. They have a task force that is working on a program review protocol. She hopes it will get to the Senate by the end of the year, at least for a first reading.

FSAC report

J. Wingard reported that in addition to RTP, FSAC did a first reading on developing a faculty recruitment policy.

SAC report

B. Lahme reported they are currently looking at the Grade Appeal policy. The Honors Graduation Policy was brought to us by a student. It is harder for transfer students to graduate with honors. They are having another advising workshop on November 12th. If faculty want to learn hands-on advising with PeopleSoft, that's in the morning. The second workshop is for beginning advisors.

A Senator asked when the advising survey would be discussed.

B. Lahme responded that they just got feedback from the Academic Advising subcommittee and it will be ready to go out soon.

The Chair reminded the body about the party on Saturday.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Melanie Dreisbach

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes - 10/28/04 emailed

Special Report: GE Initiative update – P. Draper – T.C. 3:15

http://www.sonoma.edu/ge_initiative/

BUSINESS

1. Endowed Chairs Policy – J. Wingard – Second Reading – attachment – T.C. 4:00
2. Withdrawal Policy – E. McDonald – Second Reading – attachment – T.C. 4:15
3. Cheating and Plagiarism policy revision – B. Lahme – First Reading – attachment – T. C. 4:30

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom