

## Academic Senate Minutes

December 2, 2004  
3:00 – 5:00, Commons

### Abstract

Chair's Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 11/11/04 approved. Copeland Creed Advisory Committee recommendations approved. Endowed Chairs Policy approved. Withdrawal Policy approved. Cheating and Plagiarism Policy revision first reading. Resolution in Support of Boycotting Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe / McGraw-Hill Publishers first reading. Motion: That administration carry out existing course repeat policy, i.e. the policy adopted by the Academic Senate. Most recent grade and no deadline - Approved. Motion to refer to Executive Committee the issue of changing Senate approved policy without going through appropriate procedures – Approved. Associated Students report. Statewide Senator report. APC report

**Present:** Elizabeth Stanny, Catherine Nelson, Jan Beaulyn, Robert McNamara, Susan McKillop, Deborah Kindy, Robert Karlsrud, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwoman, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Eric McGuckin, Robert Train, Tim Wandling, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Wanda Boda, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armiñana, Caitlin Hicks, Jonathan Peacock, Greg Tichava, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Elaine McDonald, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Melanie Dreisbach, Elizabeth Martinez, Heidi LaMoreaux, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Brad Mumaw

**Guests:** Bill Houghton, Rose Bruce, Sara Wade, Carolyn Epple

The Chair-Elect, Elizabeth Stanny, chaired the meeting as the Chair was out of town.

### Chair's report

E. Stanny reported that the results of the Convocation Survey came back and were very interesting, especially the qualitative responses. Some of the reasons why people don't come to convocation include other work commitments as well as the format of convocation. Some suggestions for changing the Spring convocation in particular included making convocation more interactive, possibly having a keynote speaker, etc. She said M. Dreisbach will be presenting a one page summary of the findings. The latest Statewide Senate newsletter is available online.

**Approval of Agenda – Motion to add to agenda Course Repeat Policy. Second.**  
*Approved.* It was noted that the Copeland Creek Committee attachment was not in the packet.

The Chair-Elect described what should have been in the packet. The missing text is appended here:

**Copeland Creek Advisory Committee (CCAC).** The charge of this committee is to provide advice to the President on strategies to: a) maintain and enhance native biodiversity; b) protect plant and animal species of concern; c) and restore native plant communities. The Advisory Committee will also assist in the development of a program for the President's consideration that will: a) monitor and study the quality of Copeland Creek over time; b) monitor habitat and physical parameters to provide information on the effects of development and restoration opportunities.

To date there has not been a term length for faculty members serving on the CCAC. The Chair of S&F suggested to Bruce Walker, chair of the CCAC, the possibility of implementing term lengths to allow for a greater number of faculty members to serve. Bruce supported 3-year staggered terms. The committee recommended that **David Stokes** (ENSP) and **Tom Jacobson** (ENSP) continue serving on the committee. To begin the staggering of the terms S&F recommended that David receive the **2**-year term and **Tom** receive the **1**- year term. The committee unanimously recommended that **Heidi LaMoreaux** (Hutchins) be appointed to the committee for a 3 year term based on her statement of interest in serving. Three faculty members expressed interest in serving.

**Agenda approved as amended.**

**Minutes of 11/11/04 – Approved.**

**Copeland Creek Committee recommendations – Approved.**

**Endowed Chairs Policy – J. Wingard – Second Reading**

J. Wingard noted the amendment to the policy approved at the last Senate meeting now appears in the policy.

**Motion to add a five year review of the policy to see that statements reflected in the policy have been realized to the benefit of the university rather than to its detriment. This would be item six. Second.**

It was noted that there was no enforcement mechanism for reviewing policies.

It was argued that even though there is no enforcement mechanism, reviewing the policy should still be noted in the policy. If the five year deadline passed, then the review could be conducted right away once discovered.

**It was suggested to charge a specific committee with the review. FASC was suggested. The maker of the motion accepted the suggestion as a friendly amendment. No objections.**

**The question was called. Approved.**

**Vote on amendment to review every 5 years. *Approved.***

A Senator expressed his concern that the subtext of the policy was that what faculty are actually doing is not worth fundraising. He did not support the policy.

**Motion to amend: First page, Section A add sentence to end of paragraph: It should include a participation that enriches broadly the life of the university community. Second.**

It was asked of the Chair of FSAC if there was other language in the policy that addressed the intention of this amendment. J. Wingard thought not.

**Vote on amendment: First page, Section A add sentence to end of paragraph: It should include a participation that enriches broadly the life of the university community. *Approved.***

Discussion of item extended 5 minutes

A Senator noted that he didn't think a company would support an endowed chair for excellence in teaching. It would be up to the university to do that. He reminded the body that we will probably not be overrun with endowed chairs. **He moved to strike from Item II. F. "an average of." Second.**

**Question called. Second. *Approved.***

**Vote on amendment to strike "an average of." – *Approved.***

**Question called on Endowed Chair's Policy. Second. *Approved.***

**Vote on Endowed Chair's Policy as amended. Yes = 17; No = 9; abstentions = 3? *Approved.***

### **Withdrawal Policy – E. McDonald – Second Reading**

E. McDonald introduced M. Jolly who is Chair of the University Standards subcommittee. EPC asked University Standards to review this policy. They created the current draft. She is available to answer questions.

M. Jolly noted that one change the Senate had made at the first reading was now included. The first section now shows that students can drop classes from the beginning of registration to the drop deadline. They had considerable discussion regarding whether an advisor could sign a withdrawal request. She noted that the Executive Order to which this relates stipulates that the signatures must be the instructor and Department Chair or Dean. One of those cannot be replaced with an advisor. The committee was also very opposed to adding a third signature. University Standards is deeply committed to doing some training or orientation when this policy goes into effect. The list of what is considered serious and compelling reasons and what are not will be listed on the back of the new form. University Standards will work with Department Chairs on the "gray areas" that

come up but are not listed.

A Senator asked if this policy was correlated with the incomplete policy.

M. Jolly responded no. The list of do's and don'ts came from two places – what other campuses do and University Standards experiences.

A Senator asked if PeopleSoft has the capability of sending an email to a faculty member when a student withdrawal from a class.

M. Jolly responded that it is being worked on to have the list of students updated in real time on PeopleSoft and did not think PeopleSoft had email capability.

A Senator described the distinction between an incomplete and a withdrawal.

**It was noted that percentage of instruction and percentage of semester were both being used in the policy. M. Jolly checked with the Executive Order and said that is should be percentage of instruction. There were no objections to this change.**

It was suggested that the last 20% of instruction be noted on the academic calendar.

It was noted that the last day to withdrawal is already on the calendar.

A Senator brought up substantive issues concerning not having an advisor sign on the form as some student may not want to talk with their instructor about their reasons for withdrawing. She hoped that trainings or orientations will include confidentiality. She was concerned about the decentralization of the process. If it is easier to withdrawal from one department to another, the word will get around.

M. Jolly noted that the University Standards has only done this for retroactive withdrawal. The Executive Order tells us where this has to be managed and we have to wrestle with the issues of confidentiality and different departments working different ways, etc. through experience and discussion.

**Question called. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on Withdrawal Policy – Approved.**

### **Cheating and Plagiarism Policy revision – B. Lahme – First Reading**

B. Lahme introduced Kris Montgomery who is the coordinator of University Student Discipline. She brought this policy to the Student Affairs committee and will be introducing the revisions.

K. Montgomery reported that the Student Discipline component of Student Affairs had an audit finding. In our Cheating and Plagiarism procedures there is no provision for tracking repeat offenders. Cheating and plagiarism is becoming more prevalent. She did some research and found that the Center for Academic Integrity talked to many students on many campuses and reported that over 75% of students

admitted to some kind of cheating. SAC unanimously approved the revisions.

B. Lahme noted that most of the changes are grammatical with the only substantive change being procedures for tracking repeat offenders.

It was noted that on the informal resolution form it does not state that the student could be subject to administrative sanctions if they are a repeat offender. Nor does it require the student to read the policy.

A Senator suggested adding false representation of attendance to the list of cheating offences.

A Senator remarked that the informal process was no longer such since the forms have to be turned in.

A Senator noted that in recent New York Times article it was reported that in the U. S. Patriot Act, power was given to the government to dip into students files. She wondered how confidential this cheating and plagiarism file to track repeat offenders would be.

K. Montgomery responded that the records would be kept in a locked cabinet. No one would have access to it except the Judicial Affairs officer and the confidential staff of the office. She would do some research on the Patriot Act to see how it applies in this case.

A Senator argued that the policy protects cheaters. He argued for repeated cheating charges to show up in the student's transcript. He said he often supported student's rights, but thought the full weight of the university should come down on cheaters.

A Senator thought that perhaps "permanent" and "temporary" could be used instead of "informal" and "formal." He thought that even though borderline cheating and plagiarism can be dealt with as learning moments, repeated offences need to be dealt with.

A Senator noted that for foreign students often their definition of plagiarism is different. She said that if their English is not good, they may plagiarize multiple times before they get it.

First reading concluded.

#### **Resolution in Support of Boycotting Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers – M. Goodman - First Reading**

M. Goodman introduced the item. She was asked to bring the resolution to the Senate and supports it. It has come to our attention that the Texas Board of Education has approved a new series of health texts after pressure was put on the publishers of the texts to change the wording of the texts to depict marriage strictly as between a man and a woman. They changed this wording from married partners to husband and wife. It is an example of Texas' influence on the high and middle

school market. What goes on in Texas spreads all across the country. Based on that influence we would like to have it resolved that the Academic Senate is disturbed by the ideological pressure put on publisher's by the Texas Board of Education, to have it resolved that the Academic Senate calls on the Sonoma State faculty and bookstore boycott Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe / McGraw-Hill Publishers and that the Senate send this resolution to those publishers, the CSU Senates and the Statewide Academic Senate.

A Senator asked if the textbooks were only changed for Texas.

M. Goodman responded that what's done in Texas is almost exclusively offered to the rest of the country.

The President did not think it was appropriate to include the bookstore in the resolution. He thought it was only appropriate for faculty to decided what to order.

A Senator suggested replace "calls for faculty to boycott" with "recommend the faculty to boycott" as he didn't think the Senate had the authority to "call" and it sounded like we were ordering the faculty to do so. He also noted that not choosing those publishers could hurt the authors of the textbooks.

A Senator argued that it is not the Senate's duty to talk about politics on large matters and respected people's reasons for wanting to do so on this particular matter. He also thought the resolution was too narrowly focused. There are many instances where politics is being used to drive publishers and academics. A more general resolution should be introduced where we as academics are opposed to political pressure being applied to change curriculum.

A guest spoke to the resolution and pointed out that same sex marriage occurs around the world and occurred in North America before the Europeans arrived. In terms of economic impact, she had contacted the American Anthropological Association about the resolution. They are waiting to see what SSU faculty do and there are those who are willing to take it before the Anthropological Association. This is one area where we can have an impact. She argued that everything is political. She noted the implications on youth. Youth perceived as homosexual are at higher risk for suicide and harassment. Taking out the words such as married partners removes a source for these student who are in desperate need of locating some source of positive affirmation of their identity at a time when identity formation is at its most crucial juncture.

A Senator asked if the publishers published under other names.

M. Goodman responded that she did not have that information, but noted that in an article in Edutopia ([http://www.glef.org/magazine/ed1article.php?id=art\\_1195&issue=nov\\_04](http://www.glef.org/magazine/ed1article.php?id=art_1195&issue=nov_04)) said we have gotten to the point where there are five or six major development houses down from 22.

A Senator agreed with the President's remark on removing the SSU bookstore from the resolution. He reminded the body of the boycott against apartheid by the UC. When something is written as scholarly activity it should remain as it is and not be changed for a particular market.

A Senator suggested a reference to academic freedom be included in the resolution. He said that the Statewide Senate is working on a resolution reaffirming academic freedom and may consider this particular issue in their reaffirmation of academic freedom. He also noted that in the Handbook on Election Issue authored by the CSU General Counsel it states "There is a rich tradition in academia that certain bodies within the university may express their common views on matters of public importance. The Academic Senate, for example, frequently "takes positions" on various matters in furtherance of its function within the institution. . . There is no reason why such bodies cannot continue to express their viewpoints, even on matters which go before the electorate. . . Thus, a deliberative body may take a position on an issue of importance to society. . ."

A Senator suggested that the resolution offer the faculty choice.

A Senator argued that the issue was immoral and it was right for the Senate to take a position.

A Senator noted that with the wording as it is now, the resolution would be difficult for librarian faculty.

*(Unfortunately, the tape of the meeting was damaged here)*

From notes taken at meeting:

First reading concluded

### **Course Repeat Policy**

**Motion:** There be no change to deadline in course repeat policy until proper procedures have been followed and that the Executive Committee of the Senate take up seriously policies being changed without faculty being notified. Second.

**Call for division of the question. Second. Approved.**

**Motion divided.**

**Motion:** That administration carry out existing course repeat policy, i.e. the policy adopted by the Academic Senate. Most recent grade and no deadline.

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

**Question called. Second. Approved.**

**Motion:** That administration carry out existing policy, i.e. the policy adopted by the Academic Senate. Most recent grade and no deadline – *Approved*.

**Motion to refer to Executive Committee the issue of changing Senate approved policy without going through appropriate procedures.**

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

**Motion to refer to Executive Committee the issue of changing Senate approved policy without going through appropriate procedures – *Approved*.**

**Associated Students report**

**Statewide Senator report**

**APC report**

**Adjournment**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*