

## Academic Senate Minutes

December 16, 2003

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

### Abstract

Chair's Report. Special Report: GE Initiative Q & A. Resolution in Support of Boycotting Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe / McGraw-Hill Publishers approved. Course Outline Policy First Reading. Posthumous Certificate of Recognition for Jessica Liparini approved. Resolution re-nominating Kathy Kaiser for Faculty Trustee approved. President report. Provost report.

**Present:** Melanie Dreisbach, Elizabeth Stanny, Catherine Nelson, Jan Beaulyn, Robert McNamara, Noel Byrne, Sam Brannen, Robert Karlsrud, Eric McGuckin, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Heidi LaMoreaux, Tim Wandling, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Edith Mendez, Tia Watts, Wanda Boda, Melinda Mulligan, Charlene Tung, Glenn Brassington, John Kornfeld, Bob Vieth, Raye Lynn Thomas, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Michael Pinkston, Birch Moonwoman, Steve Wilson, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme, Robert Coleman-Senghor

**Absent:** Susan McKillop, Steve Cuellar, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Brad Mumaw, Caitlin Hicks, Jonathan Peacock

**Guests:** Dr. Santos Tomas, Paul Draper, Scott Miller

**Proxies:** Rick Luttmann for Sam Brannen until S. Brannen arrived at which time R. Luttmann became proxy for T. Wandling who had to leave early, Mark Kearley for Richard Whitkus, Peter Phillips for Myrna Goodman

R. Armiñana introduced Dr. Santos Tomas visiting from Sacramento State.

### Chair's Report

M. Dreisbach announced the Faculty Retreat on January 26, 2005 from 8:30 – 2:30 in the Commons. RSVPs for lunch should be sent to L. Holmstrom in the Senate office. The title of the retreat is *The Role of the Faculty in the University Mission, or The Three-Legged Stool of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service: Balanced or Lopsided?* There will be a panel in the morning with participants from each School and the Provost talking about their personal experiences being faculty on this campus. They are Lynn Cominsky, Tim Wandling, Mary Dingle, Robert Eyler, David McCuan, and Paula Hammett. Readings pertinent to the Retreat are available on the Senate website: <http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/retreatread04.html>. We are using Boyer as a model for our discussion. After the panel there will be small group discussions. She asked the Senators to email their colleagues about the retreat. The Spring Convocation will take place on January 27<sup>th</sup>. After feedback from our survey, the Spring Convocation will have updates from the usual speakers and we will then have a discussion about we want to do as a community when we come together in

the spring. We will have visitors to the Senate this spring. The Mayor of Rohnert Park will join us. David McNeil, Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate with Trustee Roberta Achtenberg will also be visiting.

### **Special Report: GE Initiative Q & A – Paul Draper and Scott Miller**

P. Draper offered a couple of updates. Last week the GE Taskforce put out a document written by S. Toczyski called the “University as Whole: Supporting the Whole Student.” There is a PowerPoint presentation that is a distillation of that document primarily centering on the First Year Experience proposal. Both are available on the GE website: [http://www.sonoma.edu/ge\\_initiative/](http://www.sonoma.edu/ge_initiative/) under What’s New. There is the PowerPoint presentation and the 35 page document. These have the same information, but in different formats. We made two PowerPoint presentations. One to the GE Initiative Task Force and one to the GE subcommittee as a first reading for the purpose of looking at the first year experience portion of any GE reform.

A Senator asked what is the status of the pilot project.

P. Draper responded that it is advanced in design. They are starting to apply resource issues to it. The plan is to pilot 150 students, 10 sections with 15 students in each section for Fall 2005 in hopes that the Senate will approve it in time to implement. Two funding potentials are on the table - 1) Students earn 9 units, faculty get 6 units; 2) Arts and Humanities proposed 10 units for students and 8 for faculty.

A Senator asked if there was a beginning to the curriculum, such as course objectives and sample syllabi. How will students enroll in the sections? This did not work well for EMT. Will there be a Director of the GE program?

P. Draper responded that faculty and SSPs identified for the pilot will develop the syllabi, along with the theme and course objectives for the pilot. Issues that have come up: How much of it is common content? How much is provided by individual faculty in their own sections? How to work out collaborative means to develop the lecture series and who should speak in the series. The War & Peace Lecture series model was noted as favorable. He asked S. Miller to talk about standards for the course.

S. Miller said he has written a document in the voice of a teacher talking to students. It is on the GE website and outlines the writing assignments and some of the expectations. It contains a number of different genres. It outlines in some detail how the genres would work and has learning outcomes. He has discussed the proposed Freshman Year Course in the Ad Hoc Writing Coordinators committee and we provided to P. Draper and the Task Force a long list of recommendations regarding quantity and quality of writing students would be engaged in. And a long list of recommendations for training of faculty members for professional development. There is a strong argument from writing professionals on campus that we have the word quantity, that all faculty will be expected to enforce. And a strong recommendation that there be a variety of genres that students will be writing in the class.

P. Draper said one of the things he is most excited about concerning standards in the course is the notion that students should be exposed to a lot of different writing styles. At the end of the year of the Freshman Year Experience, students should be able to pick up any syllabus and understand the writing requirements. S. Miller has pointed that over two semesters writing skills can really be developed. Writing takes time to develop. The first semester could be research and developing an outline, second semester could be on writing. As we look at writing across the curriculum, the path is envisioned where students would have writing intensive courses over their four year period and this would be their first.

Enrollment will be developed as we build the pilot. Preliminary discussions are underway. There should be a cross-section of students in the pilot. As far as a director, it is envisioned that we won't need one for the pilot because it is so small. Continuity is needed and a director position should be looked at to see what is needed to make it go.

A Senator noted that the War and Peace lecture series work fell to two faculty and requires a great deal of effort to put together every year. If the students get 9 units and the faculty get 6 units, where are the other 3 units going? Total FTES left over would be 256. Where does that go?

P. Draper responded that it is a complicated formula and that the PowerPoint presentation explains a lot about it. There is a spreadsheet in Appendix C of the paper online. It shows specific distribution of hours for faculty and SSPs, peers and students. Students earn 3 units in EMT right now. It is assumed that that funding will be included because we are rolling in EMT in to the GE reform. EMT students don't get any GE credit. We need to have a way to put that material into the GE program.

The Senator said don't EMT faculty get units too?

P. Draper referred the question to the Provost.

A Senator said that there would be fewer sections.

The Provost responded that the 3 units represent activities the students would be engaged in for academic credit. Some of it is support by faculty time, some by SSP time. Some of those activities happen in the larger sections, the lecture.

P. Draper said it is envisioned that in the one hour lecture a week, faculty are not deliverers. That is supported by three other hours in the seminar. He referred the body again to the Appendix of the document online.

A Senator asked about the SSP portion of the formula. How would it logically work? When EMT started we had 600 freshman in sections of 25-30 and had enough SSP staff. How will 1200 students fit with same amount of SSPs? Will the interdisciplinary nature over the two semesters be similar to the Hutchins model? And what happens if a student transfers before the two semesters? Have they earned any credit?

P. Draper responded that they will credit students when they have completed the whole semester. We might need to articulate with other CSU campuses if they drop mid-term.

A Senator thought that the answers to previous questions from the Senate would be posted on Senate-Talk.

P. Draper said they are in the paper published on the website. They will post an FAQ on the website.

A Senator asked about support for remedial students.

P. Draper said specific sections in the program would be paired. Regardless of your skill level coming in students shouldn't be denied the same Freshman Year Experience of other freshman. There will be several sections, 1 paired with EOP, 1 paired with Eng 99 and some with FIG.

The Senator asked if they would have the same objectives or more remedial work? Would they get the same credit?

S. Miller said yes they will be doing the same work for the credit. The Ad Hoc Writing committee is excited about looking at remedial courses and enhancing them. We're not going to replace the content of courses, but change the framework to make students more excited.

A Senator noted that is it hard to make change, but he glad to see that is would create a writing program sequence. He also thought that providing student with how different disciplines frame ideas is an exciting component of what is being discussed in GE reform.

The Chair asked when the Senate might see the proposal.

P. Draper said it is getting it's first reading by the GE subcommittee soon. Then it goes to EPC.

**A Senator moved to extend the time as this is an important change to our institution. Second. Motion withdrawn.**

Senate decided to ask guests back for another session at the beginning of the Spring semester. P. Draper invited all interested faculty to their GE subcommittee meetings.

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

**P. Phillips acting as proxy for M. Goodman moved to substitute prior resolution with re-formulated one in packet. Second. No objection.**

P. Phillips briefly summarized the resolution.

A Senator argued for the resolution noting that economic pressure is vital. She also noted that California is the second largest textbook buyer and thus if we do not speak up, who will?

A Senator said that the changed language was helpful to her in making her decision how to respond to the resolution. While she could not boycott, she could use her relationship with the publisher and editor of the McGraw Hill book she uses for influence.

A Senator spoke in favor of the resolution and argued that he was not sure it would hurt the author. **He move to change wording in second Whereas to "succumbed to pressure."** Second. **He also moved to delete the third Whereas, as we are targeting the publishers, not Texas.** Second.

**Amendment to change wording in second Whereas to "succumbed to pressure."**  
*Approved.*

Discussion ensued concerning deleting the third Whereas.

**Motion to delete third Whereas. Vote - Yes = 20, No = 12, Approved.**

It was requested to have a complete list of imprints for the publishers.

**Question called. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on Resolution in Support of Boycotting Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers – Approved unanimously.**

#### **Resolution in Support of Boycotting Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers**

**Whereas**, the Texas Board of Education approved new health textbooks for the state's high schools and middle schools on November 5, 2004 after the publishers agreed to change wordings in the texts to depict marriage strictly as the union of a man and a woman;

**Whereas**, the publishers Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill succumbed to pressure from the members of the Texas Board of Education to change language in their health books texts from "married partners" to "husband and wife," etc;

**Whereas**, the decision could affect hundreds of thousands of books in Texas alone and possibly other states;

**Whereas**, the definition of marriage as between a man and a woman is ethnocentric and thus is counter to the academic endeavor of critical inquiry;

**Whereas**, the SSU Academic Senate endorsed the Campus Climate Committee's statement on same-sex marriage on May 20, 2004;

**Therefore be it**

**Resolved** that the SSU Academic Senate is disturbed by ideological pressuring of publishers by Education Boards in any state and its implications to academic freedom;

**Resolved** that the SSU Academic Senate calls for faculty to boycott Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers when ordering textbooks or if they must use textbooks from these publishers to do so under protest and;

**Resolved** that this resolution does not include SSU Library purchasing and;

**Resolved** that the SSU Academic Senate encourages the California State Board of Education to counter the Texas State Board of Education by only approving textbooks that reflect inclusiveness in human sexuality and marriage and;

**Resolved** that the SSU Academic Senate send this resolution to Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers, all SSU faculty, the California State Board of Education, sister CSU Senates and the Statewide Academic Senate of the CSU.

#### **Course Outline Policy – E. McDonald – First Reading – attachment**

E. McDonald introduced the item. She noted that EPC made major changes to the policy. Of the original seven items from FSAC, EPC split them into Required and Strongly Recommended. She also summarized other changes. This version passed unanimously in EPC.

A Senator asked for a definition of outline.

A Senator asked who will manage the single URL pointing to policies for students? Who will make sure it gets done and when will it get done?

It was suggested that Sandra Bannister be contacted for updating the university webpage.

A Senator asked if this passes would the single URL be available for spring?

The Provost said his office is working on a single web page, but there is no promise for spring.

It was suggested that a course outline be provided no later than the drop deadline.

It was suggested that the title of the policy be change to course syllabus, not outline.

It was suggested that the single URL be listed on the home page as well as faculty putting it in their syllabi.

First reading completed.

### **Posthumous Certificate of Recognition for Jessica Liparini – attachment**

E. McGuckin introduced the item. He noted Jessica Liparini was a Hutchins major killed in a traffic accident on Labor Day. She had completed 89 units. Hutchins did not feel they could argue for a Posthumous Degree, but a Certificate of Recognition would be nice and mean a lot to the family.

It was noted that certificates of recognition have been given out twice before.

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

**Question called. Second. No objections. *Approved unanimously.***

### **Resolution re-nominating Kathy Kaiser for Faculty Trustee – First Reading – attachment**

M. Dreisbach introduced the item. She noted we developed procedures for nominating a faculty trustee, but no one came forward. We would be joining Chico and San Marcos in the resolution of re-nominating Kathy Kaiser for a second term.

**First reading waived.**

**Motion to approve resolution. Second.**

A Senator said we really don't have a say. Is this how this is normally done? How many people know of her work? How did this come to us?

M. Dreisbach responded that it was shared among campus chairs and there was discussion about having the faculty trustee bring a sustained effort. Support was voiced at the campus chairs meeting. Two other campuses have passed this resolution.

A Senator noted that since the resolution was written by another campus, we are a bit in the dark. She did come to the Senate last year and said she thought the President and Chancellor weren't paid enough.

Support was voiced for the resolution.

A Senator noted that she voted for the fee increase and asked the Statewide Senator if he had any information that would help him.

The Statewide Senator said there was some concern among some faculty about her vote on the fee increase. He asked her about it directly. Her position was that the uneven increases were not viable in the long term.

**Question called. No objection.**

**Vote on Resolution re-nominating Kathy Kaiser for Faculty Trustee – Approved unanimously.**

**RESOLUTION RENOMINATING PROFESSOR KATHLEEN E. KAISER AS FACULTY TRUSTEE**

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kathleen E. Kaiser has been an honored faculty colleague for the last 32 years at California State University, Chico and has been recognized for her outstanding teaching and advising, successful grant writing and scholarly activities, and her remarkable record of service to students and faculty; and.

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kaiser has long been dedicated to the principles of shared governance and academic excellence as reflected in her fifteen years of service to the CSU, Chico Academic Senate and her twelve years of service on the Academic Senate, CSU, and

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kaiser has served in significant Systemwide leadership positions and developed a broad knowledge of California's system of higher education through her participation on the Executive Committee of the ASCSU, the GE Breadth Committee, on which she served as chair, the Academic Affairs Committee, on which she served as vice chair, and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates where she worked with colleagues from the University of California and the California Community Colleges in developing intersegmental transfer and articulation programs in the state, and

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kaiser has been a leader in the state and a champion for course articulation and transfer between the CSU and all other segments of higher education in California so that the principle of seamless transfer, as envisioned by the Master Plan for Higher Education, can be brought to fruition; and,

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kaiser has had an extended commitment to service learning and distance education not only as reflected by her participation on statewide and international programs, the Technology Task Force, and the Information Competency Task Force, but also as the director of hundreds of internships at CSU, Chico that place students at sites located throughout California and the United States as well as a writer, leader and evaluator of many community-based grants and outreach activities; and,

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kaiser has demonstrated time and again that she is a dedicated and trustworthy colleague who has the ability to articulate and represent the faculty's perspective in shared governance but recognizes, understands and values the necessity to work collegially and constructively with other bodies who have also been entrusted to carry out the Master Plan for Higher Education; and

**WHEREAS**, Professor Kaiser in her first year of service as Faculty Trustee visited 14 campuses, attended 9 graduations, was the first trustee to accompany the CSU Maritime Academy's T.S. Golden Bear on cruise, including presiding at the 'at-sea' graduation, serves on four BOT committees and as a CPEC alternate, and was recognized by CSSA as the Outstanding Trustee of the Year in 2004; and,

**WHEREAS**, Faculty Trustee Kaiser has been an effective voice for students, faculty and staff on the Board of Trustees and has become a respected force on the board that should be continued for another term, therefore be it

**RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University supports the re-nomination of Professor Kathleen E. Kaiser for the position of California State University Faculty Trustee.

## Reports

### President Report

R. Armíñana reported on enrollment system wide and it's relationship to the budget. When the legislature added \$47 million to our budget, it reduced the enrollment growth to 3% as opposed to the 5% the Governor proposed. That \$47 million roughly will cover about 1000 FTES across the system. It is estimated by the system that by the end of the academic year we will fall short of that. Simply, it came too late for the large campuses and some small campuses and they cannot recover that. In the act of the legislature, it was stated that any difference from the new target would be taken away in the '05-'06 budget. We do face, as a system, about 1000 FTE less than target. He is concerned about it and had conversations with the Chancellor. It is going to be hard to argue with the Governor to give us 2.5% above the last target, if we haven't been able to make the last target. He has also requested, not optimistically, that this campus could absorb another 100 FTES, if the money would come to support it. The Chancellor expressed gratitude for the offer, but to be honest it is difficult to take money from one campus to another at this point. It would have to happen by the first week of January to add courses. Some campuses can add courses, but adding bodies is not possible. In the area of access, the system is looking at enrollment planning over a long period of time. They are beginning to look at a plan that would spread 2.5% enrollment growth differentially instead of across the board taking into consideration historical patterns, enrollment strategies and demand for the campus, etc. This is based on a couple of assumptions. One is demographic growth in the population of the state in the next decade, about 60,000 more students to the CSU. The second assumption is no new campuses and the third is that the delivery mode really is not going to significantly change that would impact enrollment, i.e. distance learning is not going to be a way to enroll. It's a zero sum game. We are scheduled across the board for about 5%. As we move into the odd years we cannot do that without additional academic buildings. Buildings come through bond issues. There are real doubts that a bond issue would come next year. This also takes into consideration the need to absorb the summer sessions under YRO.

### Provost Report

E. Ochoa passed out a handout. The handout was in response to the Senate Budget committee request for how the \$1.2 million that came to the division was being used to support instruction. He reviewed where the \$1.2 million came from and discussed a handout that showed where the funds went to Schools and departments. He noted that the part time budgets of the schools exceeded the \$1.2 million. Clearly, the budgets were not fully restored. He clarified that the 100 FTES that the President

offered to absorb from the systemwide deficit was generated by how the Deans responded to the question of how much more they could absorb in their School.

A Senator noted that the issue of military recruiters has returned. Since the military is a discriminating employer we had previously refused recruiters on campus. Since the Solomon Amendment, we were blackmailed into giving them access to our students or losing all our federal aid. This body in 1998 took a very strong stand against the Solomon amendment. Recently, a U. S. Court of Appeals in Philadelphia ruled that the Solomon amendment was unconstitutional. He expected the administration to reinstate the ban on military recruiters.

The President said they had received a letter from the General Counsel of the CSU asking us not to change the present policy on military recruiters at this time. What has happened is that a panel of the Third Court of Appeals in Philadelphia did conclude on a 2-1 vote that the sanctions of the Solomon Amendment were not enforceable. That decision only applies to the states governed by the Third Circuit – Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Delaware, three or four more. It only binds on those states. There is an indication that the Department of Justice will ask for a full panel to review the decision. If that is unattainable due to conflict of interest, then it will go directly to the Supreme Court. If it is approved there, then it would apply to the whole country. We have been advised not to take any actions on the Solomon Amendment at this point and we will comply.

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

A Senator said he did not understand why we were moving to 5% enrollment growth.

The President said because of our demand, that we are an impacted campus, we do not accept students from the forbidden four, and we will still be under our Master Plan number.

The Senator asked if the increase will come with dollars.

The President said each student will come with at least the marginal cost funding.

A Senator thanked the President on his update about military recruiters. He noted that the CSU is the largest college system in the country and is not challenging this discriminatory policy. Given that Stanford University is one of the litigants in this case, if they stand forward, so should we. We should not allow further discrimination on this campus or any campus in the CSU by the US military.

**Adjourned**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom who is very grateful for the assistance of Katie Pierce, Sue Hardisty and Tia Starr.*