

Senate Minutes
May 11, 2006
3:00 – 5:15 Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda Approve. Minutes of 4/27/06 approved. APC resolution on the Academic Affair Strategic Plan approved. Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making amended and approved. Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making postponed to May 25th meeting. Tenure Track Hiring Policy approved. First Year Experience Pilot approved. Special Report: Vice President Katharyn Crabbe on the Campus Life reorganization. Resolution regarding Gender and Cultures Center approved. S&F by-laws change: Duties of the Past Chair first reading. Good of the Order.

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Melanie Dreisbach, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Paul Draper, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Thaine Stearns, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Sunil Tiwari, Wanda Boda, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Marguerite St. Germain, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Greg Tichava, Art Warmoth, Perry Marker, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Michael Pinkston, Sandra Feldman, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Sara Statler

Proxies: Victor Garlin for Steve Cuellar, Jarrod Russell for Lindsey Simoncic and Rick Marks for John Kornfeld

Guests: Jim Robertson, David Abbott, Katie Pierce, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Rose Bruce, Bill Babula, Tim Wandling, Barbara Butler, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Sara Baker, Katharyn Crabbe, K. McNamera, Elaine Sundberg, Elaine Leeder, S. Cooper, Melinda Barnard, Sarah Baker, Tori Truss, Michael Ezra, Greta Vollmer, Anne Greenblatt, Marci Sanchez, Sascha Von Meier, Tom Shaw

Chair's Report – E. Stanny

E. Stanny reported that the New Student Convocation will be held on Monday, August 21st at 10:45.

Consent items:

Approval of Agenda – *Approved.*

Minutes of 4/27/06 – *Approved.*

APC resolution on the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan – *Approved.*

Resolved: The Academic Senate accepts the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan report and enters it into the record as an important contribution to the development of a culture of planning at Sonoma State University.

BUSINESS

Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making (Consultation Policies) – Second Reading – E. McDonald

E. McDonald introduced the items noting the changes to the Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making policies and giving the background to both the policies under consideration.

Motion to amend the Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making policy as presented, third paragraph with *Faculty have primary responsibility for the educational functions of the institution including admission and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities. On matters where the faculty has primary responsibility faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.* Second. *Approved.*

Motion to change “Consultation is a deliberative process by which faculty and administrators provide advice and information to each other and does not commit the President or designees to a specific action.” to “Consultation is a deliberative process by which faculty and administrators provide advice and information to each other.” Second.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on amendment above – *Approved.*

It was clarified that this policy would become “blue paper” policy.

It was clarified that the faculty’s responsibility for recruitment, tenure and promotion of academic faculty was intended to be included in the policy language of “on matters where the faculty has primary responsibility.”

Vote on Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making policy – *Approved.*

Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters – Second Reading – E. McDonald

R. Luttmann proposed several changes to the policy.

He moved to amend “The Chairs of Departments allocate fiscal resources within department programs” to “The Chairs of Departments coordinate faculty decisions on the allocation of fiscal resources within department programs.” Second.

There was discussion on the amendment centering around the flexibility for Department Chairs to be able to make budgetary decisions efficiently and the appropriate role for Department Chairs concerning the department budget.

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

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on amendment above – *Approved.*

Motion to accept policy as written with amendment just approved. Second.

Question called. Second. *Failed.*

Motion to postpone further consideration of policy until May 25th meeting. Second. *Approved.*

Faculty Recruitment Policy – Second Reading – C. Ayala

C. Ayala introduced changes to the policy due to feedback from Senators at the first reading and approved by FSAC.

Motion to accept the changes presented. Second. *Approved.*

Motion to amend “It is our intention to attract and retain diverse faculty members who are gifted and involved teachers, active scholars and enthusiastic participants in University and community service.” to “It is our intention to attract and retain diverse faculty members who are gifted and involved teachers. Tenure track faculty members are to be active scholars and enthusiastic participants in University and community service, and such contributions from contingent faculty are to be valued as well.” Second.

It was argued that a separate policy for lecturers was more appropriate as there were significant differences between the two processes.

Vote on amendment above – *Failed.*

It was clarified that the departments create the positions descriptions.

Motion to amend title to Tenure Track Hiring Policy instead of Tenure Track Recruitment Policy. Second.

Vote on amendment above – *Approved.*

Motion to add per the Board of Trustees’ Statement on Collegiality in second to last bullet item as “Per the Board of Trustees’ Statement on Collegiality, faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.” Second.

Vote on amendment above – *Approved.*

Motion to add “and ranking” to above statement after recommendations. **Second.**

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

Vote on “and rankings” amendment – *Approved.*

Question called on entire policy. **Second.** *Approved.*

Vote on Tenure Track Hiring Policy – *Approved.*

First Year Experience Pilot – Second Reading – P. Marker

P. Marker noted that EPC recommended the First Year Experience pilot with a vote of 7-1 and that it has the unanimous support of the GE subcommittee.

S. Von Meier introduced the members of the faculty FYE team: Melinda Barnard, Tim Wandling, Sarah Baker, Greta Vollmer, Mike Ezra, Tom Shaw, Anne Greenblatt, Marci Sanchez, Tori Truss and John Wingard. She spoke about how much the team learned about teaching during the process of working on the pilot. She talked about students and parents who have expressed excitement for the pilot. She talked about the assessment issues of the pilot. She offered other comments about what is possible to gain from the pilot.

A Senator from the School of Arts and Humanities reported on comments he received from faculty in his school. There were questions about whether the current GE program had been assessed, whether the pilot had a terminus, how it would affect resources in this school, how remediation would be handled, questions about the GE course credit for students and concern about the number of SSPs for the pilot.

E. Velasquez from the EMT Curriculum Committee brought concerns voiced by WASC about diversity. She suggested comparing the pilot to the EMT program which has been shown to be effective in terms of diversity. She argued for a cost/benefit analysis of the pilot on a large scale.

E. McDonald send around a proposed recommendation to replace EPC’s recommendation which stated: **“The Senate recommends implementation of the FYE Pilot for the 2006/2007 Academic Year, along with the amendment from the School of Science and Technology and attachments from the Departments of English and Philosophy and the GE Subcommittee.**

In addition the Senate recommends implementation of the FYE Pilot for the 2007/2008 academic year contingent upon a positive, written recommendation from the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee to the Senate (prior to the scheduling of the Fall 2007 semester) that: (1) the Academic Affairs Division can afford another year of FYE; and (2) that a full analysis of Division priorities supports a second year. This recommendation should be presented to the Senate with supporting evidence.” Second.

There was discussion about having a more specific deadline for the second year recommendation. Concern was voiced about whether the budget should drive the decision about continuing if the pilot proves to be sound, compelling and distinctive for the university. Support was voiced for the replacement amendment and the pilot. Dissent was expressed for the replacement amendment. It was argued that the Senate could choose to approve a two-year program right now. It was argued that the pilot would be detrimental to the Philosophy and English departments. Concern was expressed about the pedagogy of the FYE for freshmen and that perhaps it was better for sophomores. The President expressed concern about setting precedent with the proposed amendment for future curricular experiments.

Question called on replacement amendment. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on replacement amendment – Yes = 17; No = 13. *Approved.*

Motion to vote on recommendation as amended. Second.

Question called. Second. Yes = 21; No = 8. *Approved.*

Vote on the First Year Experience Pilot as recommended above – *Approved.*

Applause

Special Report: Vice President Katharyn Crabbe on the Campus Life reorganization

K. Crabbe said that the people who have reorganized Campus Life and developed the “Centers” concept are excited and proud. She reminded the body that the Student Services and Enrollment Management division was new. She read its mission statement and discussed its goals for student services. She noted this division was interested in services for traditionally underrepresented students. She gave statistics for graduation rates for non-white students at SSU. She listed the activities that they do for retaining students. Her remarks were primarily about effective student organizations work in the Student Union Corp, Associated Students Inc., and Campus Life. The division had asked these three units to come together to with their best understanding of current student development theory and best practices in this area and create a unified approach to increase efficiency, better deliver high quality programs and services, increase intentional collaboration between the units and decrease redundancy in the area of student life. The result was the “Centers” concept. Under this new design there will be six centers: the Center for Campus Activities and Programming; Center for Gender and Cultures; Center for Leadership and Service; Center for Recreation and Wellness; Center for Student Government and Representation, and Center for Student Life Operations. All of the centers are student-centered. They are committed to high quality training of students to design and deliver programs; to lead student organizations; to assess programs and services; and have an authentic role in helping give direction to the overall program. This will help students develop skills, habits and attitudes that they can then take with them when they leave the campus. The Centers’ charge is to focus on student activities and programs that lead to a satisfying experience with Student Life. The Centers are not intended to overlap with the Counseling Center, the Advising Center or the Health Center. All staff are prepared to be resource

persons for students. They are thinking about preparing for campus growth. They anticipate increase staff time for the Centers functioning. She stated that SAEM is strong and mature in its understanding of student development theory, minority identification theory and best practices. They are looking forward to continued collaboration within the division and with Academic Affairs.

Questions for VP Crabbe:

A Senator asked if an effort would be made to include non-resident students in the centers. VP Crabbe responded yes, the locus of all the Centers is in the Student Union, which is for all students. Representatives of the Gender and Cultures program and the Student Government will be present at Orientation. The Senator followed up on the attrition rate and how this would affect the Centers concept. VP Crabbe said that the literature told them that retention among traditionally unrepresented groups is improved by building relationships between students, by building relationships with faculty and promoting meaningful dialogue between peers. They think the Centers concept will support that.

The Chair asked about the current enrollment picture.

VP Crabbe described the enrollment figures to date and thought the campus would meet target.

A Senator discussed his thoughts on diversity and asked what's being done to make the campus look more like the state of California in terms of diversity. VP Crabbe responded that SAEM has made a three-year study about how to recruit in the communities where we've had trouble in the past. One example she noted was Chuck Rhodes work in Los Angeles, where he worked with churches and community groups. She said they have gone to the East Bay high schools with students from the East Bay who have been trained in helping students fill out application and financial aid forms and are seeing more applications and yield from those applications.

Resolution regarding Gender and Cultures Center – C. Nelson

C. Nelson thanked VP Crabbe for her comments and commended the staff of Student Life for their efforts to improve student retention and graduation. She said that we have similar goals, but very different ideas about how to do achieve them. She briefly gave an overview of the rationale for the resolution. She then reviewed the recommendations in the resolved clauses of the resolutions.

R. Luttmann, a co-sponsor of the resolution also spoke to the resolution. He stressed the different needs of the populations that would be served by the Gender and Culture Center. He noted the diversity statements in campus planning documents. He said the campus needs to walk its talk.

A guest noted that the CFA Executive Board voted to support the resolution. She also said that structures reflect climate and that our structure reflects our commitment to diversity.

Edith Mendez 5/24/06 4:36 PM

Deleted: and

Edith Mendez 5/24/06 4:36 PM

Deleted: r

B. Lesch-McCaffry, a co-sponsor of the resolution spoke about the lack of consultation on the reorganization with appropriate constituencies and her experience as former Affirmative Action officer with student run centers, and asked the Senate to support the resolution.

Edith Mendez 5/24/06 4:38 PM

Deleted: ,

Motion to waive first reading. Second.

A Senator noted the recruitment for the staff person for the Gender and Cultures Center was underway and thus the issue was timely.

Support was voiced for the resolution.

VP K. Crabbe said there were errors of fact in the resolution.

A Senator noted his concern about the lack of consultation.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on waiving the first reading. *Approved.*

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on Resolution regarding Gender and Culture – *Approved.*

Resolution Regarding New “Center for Gender and Cultures”

Resolved: That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate request senior campus administration to restore two full time positions of equal status devoted to Women’s Resources/Services and Multicultural Student Services, to be located within the new Center for Gender and Cultures.

Resolved: That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate request senior campus administration to identify funds to support a position for the provision of GLBTQ Programs/ Services equal in status to those of the supporting gender and multicultural programs/services.

Resolved: That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate request that senior administration ensure that separate physical spaces be provided for Multicultural Student Services, Women’s Resources/Services, and GLBTQ Programs/Services within the Center for Gender and Cultures.

Resolved: That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate request that senior administration ensure that services based upon gender are not fragmented across several employees and departments across campus.

Rationale

In the Fall of 2006, the Office of Campus Life, housed in the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment

Management, began implementation of a Campus Life Redesign Initiative, referred to as the “Centers Concept.” The purpose of the reorganization was “to increase efficiency, deliver high-quality programs and services, increase intentional collaborations and reduce redundancy within the division.” (Campus Life Redesign Initiative: The Centers Concept, handout 4/10/06). The Initiative reorganizes the Office of Campus Life into six Centers: the Center for Gender and Cultures, the Center for Leadership and Service, the Center for Recreation and Wellness, the Center for Campus Activities and Programming, the Center for Student Government and Representation, and the Center for Student Life Operations. The reorganization was conceived and designed by staff in the Office of Campus Life. Consultation involved the Associated Students, the Student Union Board and student staff in the Intercultural Center. Recruitment is currently under way for a single director of the Center for Gender and Cultures.

The primary concern reflected in this resolution is that the new Center for Gender and Cultures diminishes Sonoma State University’s commitment to diversity by amalgamating women’s, multicultural, and gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer (GLBTQ) programs and services into one office. Effective implementation of the Sonoma State University Diversity Mission Statement requires a separate and distinct commitment to each of these constituencies. Indeed, the seriousness of such a commitment is reflected not only in the University Diversity Mission Statement, but in the ranking of diversity as a campus-wide priority in the Core Academic Priorities document recently passed by the Academic Senate, the University Strategic Plan Macro Issues document, and the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan.

The Intercultural Center (ICC) and the Women’s Resource Center (WRC) have served a critical function in supporting a positive campus climate for students, and the directors of the centers have had several key functions: supporting programming much of which is co-curricular, leadership development, and support services. The directors and faculty worked collaboratively in support of the students and both prior directors were actively involved in departmental meetings to ensure support for both the academic programs and student programming.

The incumbents in these positions have also been instrumental to supporting students with significant personal challenges including potential complaints of discrimination and/or unequal treatment and referring them to key University personnel or community agencies that could assist in resolving these problems. The prior directors proposed that a third center be created to address the concerns of GLBTQ students, as campus climate surveys conducted over the past ten years have consistently shown concerns from these students in terms of their experience at SSU.

When the WRC was developed in its present format in 1987 by a working group of faculty, staff, student service professionals, administrators and students, half of the funding was provided by Academic Affairs and transferred into the Student Affairs budget. There were two full-time professional staff whose primary responsibilities were to serve multicultural students or to serve students dealing with a variety of gender based issues. The current plan is to have one full-time Director of the CGC in lieu of both a full-time ICC Director and a full-time WRC Director. The current model reduces the number of professional staff addressing these issues by 100% at a time when these services are critical, especially in light of the increase in the number of incoming freshman students.

There is also a serious concern about how issues related to gender will be addressed in this new configuration. The current position description for the Director for the CGC does not include the provision of any services for students based on gender nor does the job description require any

background or training in issues related to either gender or GLBTQ issues. In addition, as currently configured, there is no primary person on campus dealing with issues related to gender. The responsibility previously held by the Director of the WRC for sexual assault education support—including support for victims and alleged violators—is now being assumed by two Residential Life Advisors, student services professionals who are normally employed for not more than three years. These advisors are not easily accessible to non-residential students. The peer education program (SAFE) will be housed as a leadership program under the new Center for Leadership and Service (a program previously based in the Office of Campus Life as was the WRC), further fragmenting gender-based campus services. Based on prior experiences, when it is not clear to students who can help them in resolving a problem, they tend to seek external rather than internal resolutions.

Submitted for Consideration by Professor Myrna Goodman, Professor Rick Luttmann, Professor Barbara Lesch McCaffry, and Professor Catherine Nelson

S&F By-Laws proposal change: Duties of the Past Chair – E. McDonald

E. McDonald introduced a by-laws proposal from Structure and Functions to reduce the duties of the Past Chair as that position receives no release time and the duties have increased informally.

A Senator argued that the Senate should decide what the Past Chair should do and then decide about the number of units.

A Senator asked for more clarity about exactly what is being changed in the by-laws.

A Senator asked why the immediate Past Chair was taken off the PBAC instead of the Honorary Degree committee. The Chair responded that the budget committees are open committees and anyone can attend.

A Senator noted the experience and expertise of the Past Chair was valuable and argued against reducing the duties of the Past Chair.

The Chair-Elect responded that if senators wanted to add duties to the chairs, they could nominate themselves for the office.

A Senator asked for a review of how the duties had increased.

Good of the Order

EOP has its Awards Celebration Wednesday May 18th at 4:00 in the Commons. All are welcome.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström

