Academic Senate Minutes
December 1, 2005
3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Chair-Elect McDonald chaired meeting in absence of Chair Stanny. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 11/10/05 approved. Nursing Department changes approved. Update on WASC. Course Repeat Policy First Reading. Course Add Policy First Reading. Resolution Endorsing The Spring Semester 2005 Advising Survey Summary of Results and Supporting Promulgation of Those Results Campus Wide approved. Special Report: G. Flores and K. Crabbe on admission and Enrollment Management Council. Provost's report including funding plan for Program Review. Referral of the question of whether the Senate is ready to re-consider the Program Review Protocol to the Executive Committee approved.

Present: Elaine McDonald, Melanie Dreisbach, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Tim Wandling, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Wanda Boda, Sandra Feldman, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Marguerite St. Germain, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Lindsey Simoncic, Sara Statler, Greg Tichava, Art Warmoth, Perry Marker, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan, Tia Watts

Absent: Elizabeth Stanny, Elizabeth Martinez, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth,

Proxies: Sue Hayes for Steve Cuellar

Guests: Ian Hannah, Rose Bruce, Barbara Butler, Saeid Rahimi, Elaine Sundberg, Elaine Leeder, Les Adler, Katharyn Crabbe, Gustavo Flores, Susan Kashack, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Michelle Jolly

Report of Chair

Chair-Elect McDonald announced that Chair Stanny was at a Statewide Chairs meeting today.

Approval of Agenda – time certain given to Provost report; Resolution on Workload withdrawn; Standing Rule on Senate-Talk added. No objections. *Approved.*

Approval of Minutes of 11/10/05 – *Approved.*

Nursing Department Change – P. Marker – *Approved.*

Update on WASC – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa reported that yesterday there was a phone conference with the WASC team. The phone conference was to give us feedback on our institutional proposal. The one significant issue was that we are being too ambitious with our proposal.

They suggested we pare it down. They stressed that learning outcomes and educational effectiveness were the main points of this exercise. The President made the formal request of WASC to re-submit our proposal with a sharpened and reduced scope. The WASC Steering Committee will re-draft the proposal along the lines of recognizing the importance of assessment and related activities plus identifying activities that we have already made progress on that we can complete during the accreditation period. The other items will be put "on the back burner, " but will not "fall off the stove."

Questions for the Provost postponed as time certain reached.

Course Repeat Policy – First Reading – P. Marker

P. Marker introduced the item. He noted that the policy received unanimous approval from EPC. He introduced Michelle Jolly, Chair of the University Standards subcommittee that drafted the policy.

M. Jolly noted why the policy was looked at in the first place. Our current policy was not in line with the rest of the CSU. There is a cap now on the number of courses (24) that can be repeated and other rules concerning under what conditions a course can be repeated and how grades would be reflected in a transcript.

Questions:

The nature of this policy was very complicated and the questions became involved and technical. They included why a C- was the cut off point, if students could still say they were repeating after a class had started, whether the policy limited the amount of work students could do, questions about whether the cap at 24 would really facilitate graduation of individual students; and support was voiced for departments to approve repeats so advisors could query students about their reasons and preparedness.

The next time certain was reached and the Chair asked Senators to email their questions to M. Jolly for the second reading.

Course Add Policy –First Reading - P. Marker

P. Marker introduced the item and noted that EPC passed it unanimously. He turned it over to M. Jolly.

M. Jolly gave the reasons why the serious and compelling reasons used in the withdrawal policy didn't work for the add policy. She gave an overview of the policy, noting that students can add/drop during the add/drop period and faculty can add students after that date per their discretion.

It was clarified that this policy does not affect how certain departments control enrollment in specific classes.

Motion to waive first reading. Second.

There was discussion of the motion to waive.

Question called. Second. Yes = 25; No = 10 *Approved.*

Vote on waiving first reading - *Failed*

First reading completed.

Resolution endorsing SAC's Advising Survey – Second Reading - D. Jordan

D. Jordan reminded the body of the history and results of the survey.

There was discussion about the inference in the survey summary report that students who visit their advisor are more satisfied with their advising. Alternate explanations were offered. The methodology of the survey was discussed. A list of the classes that were used in the survey was requested. There was concern that people who had never been advised had assessed advising. D. Jordan responded that 16% said they had not received advising and needed help. He said there were many cross tabulations that would further answer the question. D. Jordan emphasized that their recommendations were not casual explanations, but inferences from the data. Several Senators expressed discomfort with the methodology of the survey, but not with the substance of the resolution.

Question called. Second. Yes= 20; No=10. *Approved.*

Vote on Resolution – *Approved.*

RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE SPRING SEMESTER 2005 ADVISING SURVEY SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND SUPPORTING PROMULGATION OF THOSE RESULTS CAMPUS WIDE.

Whereas, in the Fall of 2002 the Associated Students of Sonoma State University passed resolution BOD # 162.02-03 requesting the office of Academic Affairs inform the ASI of the status of the implementation of the current advising policy on a school to school basis; and,

Whereas, on February 2, 2004 the Associated Students passed resolution ASI-R 195.03-04 which requested a commitment from the Provost and the Deans of each School to ensure that all levels of the advising policy are being adhered to; and,

Whereas, in response to the two above mentioned Associated Student Resolutions, the Student Affairs Committee of Sonoma State University conducted a survey of approximately 1100 students concerning advising on campus during the Spring semester 2005; and,

Whereas, the Student Affairs Committee has written a summary of the advising survey results entitled, Spring Semester 2005 Advising Survey Summary of Results;

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University endorses the Spring Semester 2005 Advising Survey Summary of Results and supports the

promulgation of those results to all parties interested in the status of advising on SSU campus including but not limited to Associated Students, Deans of all Schools, the faculty, and the student body as a whole.

Special Report: Gustavo Flores and Katharyn Crabbe report on admissions and the Enrollment Management Council

(*the full report is available on the digital minutes on the SSU-5 server*)

K. Crabbe thought that the Senate would want to know three things. What is our current situation and what went into it, how do things look for the coming year and what changes are we making in process and circumstances in preparation for the coming year. Included in this would be comments about the Enrollment Management Council.

Highlights of the report:

The freshman class is smaller than anticipated. There was a healthy amount of applicants though, so there is interest in SSU. In Fall 2005, the University of California offered admission to all eligible students and many who had already chosen SSU changed their minds. The composition of the Enrollment Management Council was described and the activity of the council was explained as working towards an understanding of strategic enrollment management. She described three factors in determining enrollment – how many continuing students, how many students do you need and what is the average unit load.

G. Flores spoke to the coming year. He passed out a handout with data about students that have applied currently. He emphasized that SSU is a popular campus. He described the extensive recruiting efforts they have undertaken this year. He explained and interpreted the data. He stated that the recruiting efforts will be more aggressive in the coming year. He noted the competition for students from the UC system and within the CSU. He described the recruiting activities for the coming year. He noted the number of online admissions applications that indicated they were interested in EOP.

Questions for the speakers:

It was asked how many EOP students can we support and what can the Senate do to help get them here. K. Crabbe replied that the EOP program can support 120 first time freshman. She did not know what the Senate could do. She noted there is a $3000 gap between the best financial aid packet for EOP students and the cost of coming to SSU. She said once EOP students come here, one on one mentoring would be helpful.

A question was raised about how valid the assertion was that our admission fell because of UC recruitment. K. Crabbe said we admit based on an eligibility index. Last year the applicant pool was so large that we made our first cut at a 3600 index. The CSU minimum is 2900. The yield on applicants at 3600 is about 16%, from 3200 to 3600, we get 33%.

It was suggested to move some of the recruiting activities to before UC acceptance letters start arriving at student's homes.

It was asked if other CSUs were affected by the UC System and if there was a contingency plan for admissions. K. Crabbe answered that she did not know for sure, but many CSU campuses were down in enrollment this year. A contingency plan was used. They increased the number of transfer students, and attempted to re-recruit ones that had been turned away. In retrospect, it would have been better to hold the applications and not send denial letters.

It was asked what other CSUs use for their eligibility index. K. Crabbe responded that if a campus is popular enough, in November they can raise the eligibility index to control enrollment.

Questions were asked about the data presented. It was asked how many transfer students we will have in the Spring. K. Crabbe said we have about 1850 applicants for the Spring and they hope to get 1200 - 1300 out of that. That goal should "keep us out of trouble."

The President gave an overview of the CSU system in terms of enrollment. He noted that if not for Fullerton's over-enrollment, the entire system would have been significantly under-enrolled. He did not think the UC was the whole answer about why enrollment is down systemwide. He noted that in terms of the EOP question, some students in that population come from families who do not believe in taking on debt to make up the gap. The CSU is trying to do some level of education in particular groups that this is not a bad debt, but cultural change takes time.

Motion to extend 10 minutes. Second. Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on extension. *Failed.*

Guest will be invited back to the Senate.

Provost's Report

E. Ochoa reported on the plan for supporting program review in the Academic Affairs division. It has three parts. 1) Honorariums for external reviewers will be funded centrally from the Provost's office. 2) Conversations have been going on at the School level and departments. This has two parts. a) Programs that have been receiving support for regional accreditation do not need more support as their accreditation process can stand in for program review; b) There are about 12 other departments that do not fit the first category. How these would be funded varied by School. 3) Academic Affairs will provide the funds to the Schools. He argued that Program Review was a high institutional priority. He stated that his office will identify funds that can be shifted over for this purpose.

Questions:

It was requested to have the plan in writing. E. Ochoa responded that was up to the Senate.

It was asked if the funds would be taken from the instructional budget or in addition. E. Ochoa responded in addition.

It was asked when the regional accreditation process began again for departments in the future, would that money come from the same pot. E. Ochoa responded that in future years he thought this would become part of the process in discussing broader issues of supporting funding needed by Academic Affairs. Appreciation was expressed to the administration for recognizing that the Program Review function needed separate funding from instruction.

It was asked if the plan were to be implemented, would it increase student/faculty ratios. E. Ochoa responded no.

It was suggested that the Executive Committee work out whether the Program Review policy was ready to come back to the Senate. It was asked how the on-going work of assessment would be supported as well.

It was asked what would be reduced in Academic Affairs to provide this money. E. Ochoa responded that two possible sources were lottery funds and the IDC that comes to the division. It was asked what uses those funds were used for previously. E. Ochoa said he is still working that out. He noted that IDC is growing.

It was suggested that the Provost bring something in writing that included criteria.

E. Ochoa thought that the previous suggestion might move the Senate into budget areas that are not its purview.

Appreciation was voiced for the administration working toward finding specific funds for the important function of program review.

Motion to refer the question of whether the Senate is ready to re-consider the Program Review Protocol to the Executive Committee. Second.

Concern was voiced regarding money being used for Program Review that could be used for a faculty workstation refresh program.

E. Ochoa responded that the cost of the Program Review was only a fraction of what it would take to refresh faculty workstations. He did state that faculty workstations were critically important and hoped to be able to fund it next year.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on referral of the question of whether the Senate is ready to re-consider the Program Review Protocol to the Executive Committee. *Approved.*

Adjourned.

respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom