

Academic Senate Minutes

April 5, 2007

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair report. Approval of minutes of 3/8/07. Engineering curriculum revision – Approved. President report. Workload Resolution approved. Cost Sharing Policy revision approved. Advising Policy revision – First Reading. Substitute Resolution for San Bernardino's on Access to Excellence approved.

Present: Elaine McDonald-Newman, Tim Wandling Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Elizabeth Martinez, Thaine Stearns, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Virginia Lea, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Michelle Moosebrugger, Steve Orlick, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Scott Miller, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Mary Halavais, Carol Ayala,

Absent: Elizabeth Stanny, Ada Jaarsma, Steve Cuellar, Marguerite St. Germain, Jarrod Russell, Eric Halstrom, Rachel Sagapolu, Doug Jordan

Proxies: Victor Garlin for Steve Cuellar, Mark Fermanich for Doug Jordan

Guests: Elaine Sundberg, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Katharyn Crabbe, Elaine Leeder

Chair's Report – E. McDonald-Newman

The Chair said she did not have an oral report today and directed the Senator's attention to a handout about the current situation regarding IDC rates for grants. She noted that the 20% IDC rate was not accurate which was good news, but she still had concerns about how the costs will be paid. She asked the Senators to read her report at a later time. She had an announcement from the Associated Students that they have gotten Eric Schlosser, the author of *Fast Food Nation* to be the Commencement speaker this year. It is their gift to the graduating class.

Approval of Minutes of 3/8/07 – *Approved.*

Approval of Agenda – It was moved to postpone the Workload Resolution until the ad hoc committee apparently appointed at the last Senate meeting could reach consensus. Second. Discussion. *Failed.* It was moved to add a resolution to item 3 with a time certain. Second. *Approved. Agenda approved as amended.*

Consent item: Engineering curriculum revision – *Approved.*

Reports

President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana passed out a handout showing how much SSU has been under funded in the past 5 years in real dollars. He noted this happened in the Davis administration and the Schwarzenegger administration. He said SSU has lost around \$13 million. He gave figures that explained the net reduction that included student fees, but assumed that the costs had not changed. This gave SSU a 7% reduction. He said, however, that costs have not been static, but have gone up. The second page of the handout showed how the CSU has done in terms of state funding from last year to this year and compared to other parts of the State budget.

Workload Resolution – T. Wandling

T. Wandling introduced the resolution and emphasized that the resolution was focused on faculty. He explained each of the resolved clauses. **He asked that the version of the resolution he passed around be accepted as a substitute resolution. Second. *Approved.*** He also passed around a potential motion to delete the second resolved clause. He said he did not support it, but provided it in case someone else wants to do this.

T. Wandling noted the changes in the new version of the resolution.

Summary of Discussion

Concern was expressed about creating a formula to see overwork due to the variety in types of classes and pedagogies. It was clarified that CFA had been consulted prior to the making of the resolution.

Motion to amend: add “to” to the very last sentence and remove “considered” from the second paragraph – “and to respond to the concerns expressed herein.” “Instances where instructors are assigned student enrollment in excess of this figure should be ~~considered~~ rare,” Second. Vote on motion to amend – *Approved.*

It was argued that the resolved clause referring to the MOU section 20.3 was inaccurate. T. Wandling said 20.3 is not specific and this resolution is attempting to set a guideline for our intellectual community about what is too much work. It was argued that the limit might become a target and that all classes would be at least 30. T. Wandling said that was not his intent. He thought people needed to be aware of their rights.

Motion to amend: insert GE between average and class in second paragraph. “(that is, an average GE class size of 30)” Second. Discussion. Vote on motion to amend. *Failed.*

Motion to remove second paragraph and send the issue to FSAC. Second. Some discussion. Vote on motion – Yes =12, No = 15 – *Failed.*

Motion to amend: on fifth line after WTUs. *The university should strive to maintain an overall SFR of at most 20:1.* Second. T. Wandling asked the Provost how he would interpret their resolution if it passed. The Provost said faculty have a lot of discretion about their workload. T. Wandling asked if the Provost would see 120 students as an outer limit of workload. The Provost said he would support smaller classes as resources allowed. There was support voiced for the resolution as it stands. **Question called. Second. Approved. Vote on motion to amend. Failed.**

There was a question about what review means for Standing Committees. T. Wandling said he just wanted the committees to consult appropriate documents to understand what workload the policies are creating. Support was voiced for specificity in the document. **Question called. Second. Approved.**

Vote on Workload Resolution – Approved.

Resolution on Faculty Workload

Resolved:

The Academic Senate charges its standing committees and their sub-committees to review policies relevant to faculty workload to ensure that they are in keeping with the guidelines and the spirit of the current CSU/CFA MOU. Policies which shall be reviewed for this purpose include: RTP, Advising, Program Review, Assessment and any other policies that committees consider to be institutionalizing faculty volunteerism.

Academic departments and programs should avoid scheduling classes for any full-time instructor in such a way that his or her total enrollment exceeds an average of 24 FTES per 12 WTUs by more than 10% in a given semester (that is, an average class size of 30) for a full-time instructor. Proportional adjustments should be made for instructors teaching fewer or more WTUs. While the Senate recognizes that this is a broad statement of acceptable limits and does not address the unique work situations of many faculty members, it nonetheless expresses its sense of what defines an “overload” for instructors teaching typical 12-unit teaching loads. Instances where instructors are assigned student enrollment in excess of this figure should be rare, and should be matched with assignments in subsequent semesters with proportionally lower enrollments. Individuals assigned to teaching workloads in excess of these guidelines shall be experiencing excessive workload as defined by article 20.3.c in the current MOU between the CSU and CFA. Departments not adhering to article 20 in their scheduling practices shall be in violation of the spirit of this resolution.

Individual faculty members are encouraged to “work to contract.” A teacher/scholar’s workload calls for a minimum of two hours of time outside the classroom for each hour spent in it, in order to ensure quality educational experiences for students. Such activities include but are not limited to: scholarly preparation for classes, evaluation and response to student work, record keeping and data input, and development of course materials. At a proportional rate, three units indirect teaching time allows nine additional work hours for faculty to support the university mission, including such tasks as governance, advising students on

requirements, and mentoring students in discipline-based learning and career development.

The Academic Senate urges the Sonoma State Administration to endorse this resolution and to respond to the concerns expressed herein.

Motion from the floor – that the Senate appoint a subcommittee to study best practices for the implementation of the Workload Resolution with a report back to the Senate in the Fall in consultation with Faculty Affairs with regards to target. Second. Motion to postpone to next meeting in written form. Second. *Approved.*

Agenda amended for time certain – *No objection.*

Cost Sharing Policy revision – First Reading - C. Ayala and J. Schulz

C. Ayala provided a history of the policy. It had previously come before the Senate, but many concerns were raised about “volunteer time” being used as cost share. J. Schulz went back to the original policy and worked on that to bring back to the Senate today. J. Schulz offered to review the changes. Changes were made such that faculty volunteer time was allowed as cost share, but was not explicitly encouraged or stated. A Senator asked how many faculty were doing volunteer time now and how many might do it in the future. J. Schulz said the three faculty are doing volunteer time. Most of them ~~had~~ grants requiring such cost share. He thought faculty volunteer time as cost share would be rare.

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

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on Cost Sharing Policy revision – *Approved.*

Resolution regarding Reallocation of Academic Affairs funds to Advance Accreditation of Business Program, without Proper Faculty Consultation – First Reading – R. Luttmann

R. Luttmann said the resolution does not take a position on whether the accreditation of the Business Department is a good thing or whether or not the funding should go forward eventually. It just says that in this zero sum game we need to consider the effect the funding of the accreditation of the Business Department is having on other programs. He also considered this matter an abridgement of the policy on Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters.

There was discussion. It was suggested that the “appropriate bodies” be defined in the resolution. The Provost said the issue was discussed a couple of times in the AABAC. The Chair responded that she agreed that the issue was on the budget sheet in AABAC, but ~~the issue of how it would be paid for~~ was never discussed. She also noted that the item brought up in the first resolved clause about consultation about the “negative effects on programs that will be taxed to achieve such a reallocation” was not discussed in the AABAC.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:25 AM

Deleted: those

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:25 AM

Deleted: ed

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:26 AM

Deleted: a

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:30 AM

Deleted: it

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:29 AM

Deleted: how it would be paid for

First reading completed.

Advising Policy revision – First Reading – M. Fermanich

M. Fermanich gave a history of the revision of the policy. He described the largest changes in the policy. Students are now required to be assigned an advisor, undeclared students need to be advised at 30 units instead of 65 units, it encourages students to declare a major by 60 units and meet with their advisor to develop an individualized academic plan. It requires both Schools and the University to provide information to students about their responsibilities on contact with the University. It requires Departments to provide a template for individualized academic plans. It requires the university to make adequate resources available for advising.

It was clarified that there was no enforcement for this policy. It was asked if the committee talked about how advising records were produced and who would provide them. M. Fermanich said no, the committee did not discuss that. The Chair asked if the committee knew what resources were necessary for adequate advising. *M. Fermanich's response unintelligible.* The Chair asked if the Provost's office would look at the resources needed for adequate advising. The Provost responded yes. The Senator who sits on the student Senate remarked that this was a huge deal for the students. They are working on a resolution about advising and are wondering how this policy will change their experience. It was noted that there were not enough faculty to do what the policy describes. The Staff representative remarked she had developed advising at Dominican College that trained faculty and advised students. She talked about a national organization that has it all laid out nicely and **this** would be a good resource for the Provost's office. The Provost noted that many of the SSP's in ACE were members of this national organization and had attended their workshops. It was asked what is an "identified" student in A. 3b. M. Fermanich did not know and the Chair asked for clarification when the policy returns.

First reading completed.

Substitute Resolution for San Bernardino's on Access to Excellence – Second Reading – E. McDonald-Newman

E. McDonald-Newman said she originally received the resolution from San Bernardino about the Access to Excellence initiative that said they saw minimal value in the process. The Senate requested that another resolution be created in a similar vein more specific to SSU. She passed the gavel to the Chair-Elect as she was bringing this resolution to the Senate. **She moved that the Senate accept the resolution in the packet as a substitute. Second. Approved.**

E. McDonald-Newman explained how she changed the resolution to be specific to SSU.

The Provost provided background on the Access to Excellence initiative as it is now for the body to be able to evaluate the resolution appropriately. He noted that the faculty are playing an important role in the process and will continue to do so. He urged the Senators to be inside the process, not outside. The Chair said that if the Statewide Senators provide evidence of faculty involvement, she would withdraw

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:30 AM

Deleted: the

the resolution. One of the Statewide Senators, C. Nelson, said that she looked at the 46 Steering Committee members for Access to Excellence and reported to the Senate that there are 8 faculty, 10 presidents, 2 provosts, 5 system wide administrators, 12 trustees, and 7 community members. The campus conversations were open to all members of the campus communities and what they are hearing back is that faculty did turn out in large numbers and criticized the document, much as we had done here. She said both Statewide Senators would be attending the conference on this and she would make the same arguments there. The other Statewide Senator, R. McNamara, did not report much confidence in the upcoming conference. C. Nelson also said the new tentative agreement of CFA includes language to support ACR 78, the hiring of tenure track faculty, but not at the expense of lecturer faculty. There were further arguments for and against the resolution. The Provost provided more information about the activities of the Steering Committee and argued that the document would eventually become a political document to be used to get more resources. **Motion to postpone resolution until after conference. Second. Discussion. Question called. Second. Approved. Vote on motion to postpone. Failed. Question called. Second. Failed.**

Motion to amend: second resolved clause. ."hiring of more tenure-track faculty and to increase the diversity of faculty as to better fulfill. . ." Second. Approved.

Vote on amended resolution – Approved unanimously.

Calling for the Preeminent Role and Support of Academics and Faculty in the New CSU Strategic Plan

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate sees minimal value in the CSU Access to Excellence process until academic programs receive an appropriately significant emphasis and until faculty system-wide receive an appropriately central role in this long term strategic planning; and

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate exhorts the CSU Board of Trustees and the Chancellor to take immediate steps to substantially increase and/or appropriately re-direct budget allocations for the support of high-quality academic programs and for the accelerated hiring of more tenure-track faculty and to increase the diversity of faculty, so as to better fulfill key priorities of the Cornerstones plan and greatly enhance the realistic success potential for the Access to Excellence plan; and

RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate forward copies of this resolution to our faculty, the SSU Provost and President, all CSU Academic Senates, the CSU Chancellor, the CSU Executive Vice Chancellors, and the CSU Board of Trustees.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström