

Academic Senate Minutes

September 16, 2004

3:00-5:00 SSU Commons

Abstract

Chair's Report. Correspondence noted. Agenda approved. Minutes of 9/2/04 approved. Faculty Emeritus Policy moved to business and concluded first reading. Special Report from Christine Renaudin on International Programs. Misconduct in Research Policy– First Reading. First annual group photo. Revision of the Single Subject Waiver Program in English postponed to next meeting. Changes in the MBA approved. Changes in Global Studies referred back to EPC. President's Report. Provost's Report. Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document first reading concluded, second reading postponed for four weeks.

Present: Melanie Dreisbach, Elizabeth Stanny, Catherine Nelson, Jan Beauly, Robert McNamara, Susan McKillop, Robert Karlsrud, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwoman, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armíñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Jonathan Peacock, Greg Tichava, Robert Coleman-Senghor, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme

Absent: Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Wanda Boda, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Brad Mumaw, Caitlin Hicks, Elaine McDonald

Proxies: John Kunat for Tim Wandling

Guests: Carlos Niero, Katie Pierce, Elaine Sundberg, Rose Bruce, Judith Hunt, Bill Houghton, Tony White, Tony Apolloni, Cynthia Tasker

Chair's Report

The Chair handed out Faculty Advising Workshop flyers on the request of the Chair of SAC. She noted that a lot is being done this semester to improve the advising climate. The Emeritus Dinner planning is underway. The dinner will be held on Thursday, October 21st, in the Commons at 6:30. Invitations will be in campus mailboxes next week. The cost will be \$29. There is an excellent menu. She encouraged everyone to attend and noted that it was a good way to show the emeriti how much we value their contributions. The Chair stated she'd been thinking about spring convocation and how the attendance is down in the spring. This lead to the idea to collect some data from faculty, staff, administrators and students. This would be a quick survey put up on the web. She noted that the two remaining students have been appointed by the Associated Students to the Senate. They are Caitlin Hicks and Jonathan Peacock.

Correspondence

The Chair received more information regarding the Lower Division Transfer Pattern. The Chancellor's office is adding four more majors. SSU does not have these new majors. Also from International Programs a call for Resident Directors for the 2006-2007 year. They are particularly looking for Directors for China, France, Japan, Mexico or Spain. The Chair, having been a Resident Director in Mexico, highly recommended it.

Consent Items

Approval of Agenda – *Approved*

Approval of Minutes 9/2/04 – *Approved*

Faculty Emeritus Policy – moved to business, considered first reading

Special Report from Christine Renaudin on International Programs

C. Renaudin is the representative to the Academic Council on International Programs. She reported that Resident Directors are needed for China, France, Japan, Mexico and Spain. Another faculty program is the Wong Family Scholarship which provides up to \$10,000 for one month or one semester in China or Taiwan. If faculty are interested, they must be tenure-track or tenured to apply and must be proficient in the language. Faculty can email C. Renaudin. There is a third program designed for faculty – International Faculty Partnership Seminar. It was initiated in 2001. This year it is in Japan in a shortened version reflecting the budget cuts. It will not happen next year because of financial distress. It is not suspended forever. She told the body about the student participation in International Programs. CSU International Programs have been going on for 41 years and they have been growing steadily over the years. We send an average of 600 students a year. This year we had well over 900 applicants and sent away 698. Sonoma State is doing very well sending students to do part of their education abroad. For twelve years now our campus has been the biggest CSU sending campus per capita. We're good at globalizing our students and this is thanks to Jan Beaulyn's dedication in great part. This year at SSU we interviewed 92 students and sent 62. She gave the detail on how many went to each country in the CSU and how many from SSU. These figures reflect a general trend in the CSU for students choosing western European countries for their experience broad. 75% of CSU student choose western European countries. The ACIP has been trying to develop strategies to diversify the locations of the programs as well as the academic offerings that are provided. Leo Van Cleve who is the Director of International Programs has been visiting Africa and has identified successfully three sites in Africa where we are planning to open programs on an exchange basis as soon as Fall 2006. Some people have been interested that only 7% of international programs offered in the country were full year programs. For lots of reasons, one could understand why one semester programs might be appealing to students. So we are discussing the possibility of piloting some new one semester

programs along side the year long programs. Right now in the ACIP there is a feeling that we should keep what we have. (*she discussed how the ACIP has meet the budget cuts, but most of it was unintelligible on the tape*). ACIP is also involved in creating a more rigorous program review process. She invited questions.

A Senator argued for more resources to be put in this program. We need to think about the way our language programs are an integral part of our institutional public place and extending it outside of us. Due to reciprocity with international universities, we have an opportunity through our curriculum to build a stronger connection. Especially, in business, philosophy, religion, psychology, and pedagogy. He argued that is was important to look at our liberal arts identity as tied to our international identity as tied to our training students within language programs.

Business

Misconduct in Research Policy – J. Wingard – First Reading

J. Wingard introduced the item. It was written in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. FSAC was asked to review it. Tony Apolloni was invited to the Senate to speak to the item.

T. Apolloni stated that this policy is required by the National Science Foundation and the Public Health Service and required federal code. It covers misconduct in research activities and creative activity. Misconduct is broadly defined as plagiarism, falsification, fabrication and activity that is inconsistent with general standards for creative and scholarly activity. The policy has been in production for a year and a half. They worked with the Sponsored Programs subcommittee directly. It's gone through Administration and Finance, Academic Affairs and then FSAC brought it to the Executive Committee of the Senate. If the Senate approves it, it will go to the President for final approval. He offered to answer any questions about it. He introduced Cynthia Tasker from CIHS who has a background as an attorney and who helped put this together. It is modeled very closely after the federal code requirements and they looked at a quite a number of other campus policies to put this together.

The first reading was concluded.

The Senate then participated in the first annual group photo.



From EPC: Revision of the Single Subject Waiver Program in English – E. McDonald – Second Reading

E. McDonald was unavailable for this item. R. Coleman-Senghor introduced the item.

Typos and inconsistencies were noted by Senators.

C. Nelson moved to postpone the item to the next meeting at a time certain suggested by the Chair. Vote on postponing passed.

The floor was opened for any other issues on this item before it comes back. It was clarified that it was a departmental decision that no grade below a C would be accepted.

From EPC: Changes in the MBA – E. McDonald – Second Reading

R. Coleman-Senghor introduced the item.

E. Mendez moved to approve. Thatch second. Approved.

From EPC: Changes in Global Studies – E. McDonald – Second Reading

R. Coleman-Senghor introduced the item.

Various small changes were noted in course numbers and titles by Senators. A couple of typos were noted. A Senator asked why Germany was not a concentration. The answer was no money. A reconciliation issue was noted in the number of courses required in the concentration in Europe.

T. White joined the meeting. The question regarding reconciliation was addressed to him. He passed out a revision to the proposed changes.

C. Nelson moved to refer the changes handed out back to EPC, not for substantive reasons, but that the body is being asked to approved something that is different than what came from EPC. Peterson second.

The Provost asked that the body know what kinds of learning outcomes are expected for this program in case they are affected by the changes in curriculum proposed.

A Senator said she would send changes regarding Spanish courses to T. White.

A Senator noted that requiring learning outcomes for each program that comes before the Senate would be a new policy. If the Senate wants such a policy, it should be referred to EPC and not grandfathered in as requirement to this program. Support was voiced to refer the item back to EPC.

Vote on referring to EPC – Approved.

REPORTS

President's Report

R. Armiñana reported that yesterday the Board of Trustees accepted 150 acres of land which is an extension to the Fairfield Osborne Reserve. This was a donation of the Roth family. We had access to that land, but now it is part of the Reserve as well.

The body was reminded that the Reserve is open on Saturday mornings for hikes.

Provost's Report

E. Ochoa reported that he had two issues to discuss with body – Year Round Operations and WASC. He talked about what sets the stage for the choices we are faced with now. We have been running a summer session that has been a hybrid, self-support with buy down money which means that the Chancellor's office has mandated that summer courses be offered at the state fee whether or not they are self-support. So up until now we've run this hybrid model where courses are offered through continuing education on a self-support mode, but the Chancellor's office provided money to help subsidize those operations so we could charge the lower state fee to students. The other advantage of self-support was that it could take advantage of the lower pay scale of continuing education. As a result of an arbitrator's decision on a grievance, instructional pay for state support summer sessions was raised to the same rate as a normal teaching load. We didn't expect that to be applied to us, but the arbitrator decided to extend the decision to buy down campuses. So we do face a million dollar back pay bill. Even while that was unraveling, we received assurances that the special understanding arrived at by CFA and the CSU would allow the summer of 2004 to be conducted in the usual manner. Now it appears that there is the possibility that the understanding will be voided and we may face another bill of \$300,000 for the summer we just concluded. That's one problem. The other problem is where do we go from here. We cannot afford to do the hybrid model anymore because our costs have gone up because of

the arbitrator's decision and the revenues have gone down because there is no longer buy down money available.

Time certain reached.

Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document – C. Nelson – First Reading

C. Nelson refreshed the body's memory concerning this item. It had been held over from the last meeting of last year. Two things were talked about. The Executive Committee had discussed how best for the Senate to handle the Strategic Planning document and the Executive Committee recommended to the Senate that we hear from the chairs of the Standing committees about their reaction to the Strategic Plan. Then make whatever suggestions we think should be made, forward that on to the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee. Whatever came back to us from the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee, we would then say we accept or reject. The second thing that happened was that the Senate voted on a recommendation in the vision statement which is shown in the packet.

The Chair of SAC said they discussed the plan and were happy to see in the mission statement "encourages close mentoring relationships," but then advising is never addressed again in the document. They recommend that either the General Strategies or Strategic Initiatives include advising. They had a long discussion and decided not to suggest any specific language.

APC requested more time to review the document. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved to complete the first reading today and to postpone the second reading to 4 weeks from today to allow the Standing committees to respond in writing.**

There was discussion about whether the document should remain a business item or come as an information item. It was argued that it could be an information item since it was still in flux as a document. It was argued that the document is business item because it is a statement about what the academic division stands for and the Senate should have a say in that statement.

The Chair of APC argued that the Senate needs to consider whether the Strategic Plan before them is in alignment with the Long Range Plan that the Senate approved previously.

Vote on motion to complete the first reading today and to postpone the second reading to 4 weeks from today to allow the Standing committees to respond in writing – Approved.

Return to Provost's Report

The Provost noted that we are in somewhat of a bind for summer '05. The way we've been operating is no longer viable. The choice we face is to go to YRO state supported summer session immediately in '05 or to not have a summer session until '06 when we are mandated to make that transition. When we go YRO, we'll need a calendar and we've been working on what kind of calendar we would be able to

create. He has just been given information that it will not be possible for us to create a summer session that meets the definitions and minimum criteria for being considered a full fledged semester. It has to be fourteen weeks. If we have a fourteen week session it would squeeze out intersession and any break between semesters. The other model we have been looking at would allow the possibility of a second intersession between the spring and summer semester and would create a summer mini semester of six weeks and an intersession of three weeks. If we do that it means that staffing the summer term could not be done as a faculty members normal work load. Which means that probationary and tenured faculty would only be able to teach in the summer on an overload basis. Lecturers could teach as a special summer assignment. There's a possibility of developing a special agreement with CFA to allow summer units to be counted toward the academic year workload. That's very speculative. It is still a problematic situation. We expect to be constrained to 2% enrollment growth. The summer state supported session will not have additional resources or FTES for it, so it will have to come out of our annual target. Anything we do in the summer will have to be peeled off the rest of the year. It also means that if wanted to use some of our tenure or tenure-track faculty in the summer, it would be on an overload basis which means we would have to devote some of our part time instructional dollars to that end and would raise the cost of instruction, so the same FTES would become more expensive overall. This puts additional pressure on our budget and would displace some lecturers. There aren't many attractive options. The Chancellor's office needs to confirm that the intersession is technically not part of the summer. If that flies, we would have a reduced state supported summer at some level and have the option of a second intersession in order handle some of the excess demand we need to cater to in order to ensure timely graduation by students. That's where we are on YRO.

On WASC, he hopes by the end of the week to complete the master list of things to accomplish. Then we will be able to share and discuss it with faculty committees, and so forth. In terms of university planning, he is in conversation with the co-chair of the university planning effort, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth. What's coming clear is that the structure that will work is to have a large university planning council that will have several committees working on major areas and a steering committee or coordinating committee that will be small and coordinate the activities of the other committees. We're talking about what that membership will look like and will engage in appropriate consultation. He expects to finalize the membership of the steering committee and engage in some exercises that will identify what major areas we should use to carve up the overall challenge. The committees will do the main substantive work of planning. He hopes to identify the membership of all the committees by the end of the semester so that by the next semester we can begin work on the effort. On assessment, we should be getting a status report from all the departments in terms of their assessment plans that they identified in their interim program review processes. Once we know where we are we will know the magnitude of the challenge we face. The General Education subcommittee is making progress. Things are starting jell in terms of the freshman year experience. The Senate will probably see something about that before the end of the semester.

It was asked how it was decided to have the intersession three weeks and the state support summer session four weeks.

The Provost did not know the details on that. K. Crabbe is working with L. Adler on that. Looking at the logistics they felt that's what was viable, there needs to be a break at both end.

It was asked if the intersession could follow the state support session. The Provost said he would ask about that.

It was asked what the mechanism was for support for the summer session.

The Provost said the YRO initiative is all about expanding the capacity of our infrastructure. So there are no plans for additional support. Basically it means if you ask for a new building to expand the capacity of campus you're not going to get it unless you can show you have used your existing physical plant on an overload basis. It's a problematic proposition for semester based residential campuses.

One Senator noted that the campus is heavily utilized in the summer with orientation and outreach programs. What is going to happen to those with YRO?

The Provost responded that the summer session was never that big and it took place in tandem with those other activities. We are lobbying and advocating for adjusting the formula so we're not expected to generate 25% of our annual target in the summer. We want something smaller. The arguments are being heard, but no decision yet.

A Senator asked about programs that fall outside the summer session. Would they be affected?

The Provost said if they are a self-support special session then they should not be affected.

A Senator asked if the overload would be over the 30 units – isn't that not allowed in the CSU?

The Provost responded no. The President said up to 25% of faculty time. The Provost discussed how it works in a quarter system.

The Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs noted that the 25% over is only applicable in the Fall and Spring semesters. If we don't have a summer semester, faculty can't work overload then.

A Senator asked when the decision would be made about summer of '05. He also asked if counting FTES during summer session against the 2.5% growth mandate assumed to restrict access?

The Provost said they expected within the month the CSU will make a decision. He thought the second question was rhetorical and let it stand.

A Senator asked how many students we might expect the first summer we do this.

The Provost said the way to approach using the state supported summer session only to the extent that each School and department, on balance, finds the progress for graduation and service to students that a certain amount of FTEs would be better put to use in the summer. He thought it would be a significantly smaller number than current summer school.

Motion to extend meeting five minutes. Second. *Approved.*

A Senator argued that staff time over the summer cannot be expanded. She offered numerous examples of how current services have already been downsized and questioned how financial aid and admissions would function in the summer. She questioned whether this would really be advantageous to students.

The Provost said a task force was set up a number of years ago concerning YRO and quite a bit of work was done on many of these questions. That work remains available. We will go back to that.

A Senator asked if new tenure track hires are still being linked to assessment.

The Provost responded that this was one of several factors that one can consider when evaluating a request for a position. It is an important factor given the situation we are in right now.

Adjourned 5:05

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom