

Academic Senate Minutes
May 19, 2011
3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Agenda approved. Minutes of 5/5/11 approved. Question from Senate Analyst. Consent items: CCJS revisions, Psychology MA revisions, Counseling MA revisions, Candidates for Graduation all approved. Deborah Roberts elected to the Executive Committee for Fall 2011. Discontinuance Policy in the Curriculum Guide approved. Policy on Representation on Administrative Appointment Committees approved. President Report. Provost Report. Resolution requesting letter sent to CSU Office of the University Auditor or Other Impartial Third Party regarding allegations of violations of CSU election guidelines in recent student referendum amended and approved. FSAC Report. EPC Report. Changing of the Guard.

Present: John Wingard, Ben Ford, Susan Moulton, Maria Hess, Catherine Nelson, Brian Wilson, Sam Brannen, Deborah Roberts, Steve Wilson, Helmut Wautischer, Sarah Baker, John Sullins, Barbara Lesch McCaffry, Ed Beebout, Chip McAuley, Mutombo M'Panya, Terry Lease, Florence Bouvet, Kathy Morris, Karen Brodsky, Tom Buckley, Nick Geist, Sharon Cabaniss, Matty Mookerjee, Michael Cohen, Karin Jaffe, Noel Byrne, Laura Watt, Margaret Purser, Phil Brownell, Marisa Thigpen, Ruben Armiñana, Saeid Rahimi, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Alex Boyar, Collin Yballa, Nicolas Carjuzaa, Dolores Bainter, Elaine Newman, Richard Senghas, Jennifer Mahdavi

Proxies: Jeffery Reeder for Michaela Grobbel; Donna Garbesi for Sandra Shand

Absent: Don Romesburg, Kelly Estrada

Guests: Robert Plantz, Elaine Sundberg, students who did not sign in

Approval of Agenda – candidates for graduation added to consent calendar. **Approved.**

Minutes of 5/5/11 – Request for a clarification and **approved**.

Question from Senate Analyst

The Senate Analyst requested feedback on the new set up of the Senate during the past year. There was general feedback that the new set up was good and there was a request for the Senate to be miked.

Consent Items:

CCJS revisions; Psychology MA revisions; Counseling MA revisions
Candidates for Graduation

All approved.

Elect Ex Com member for F' 11 – B. Ford

B. Ford explained that because T. Lease had been elected to the Executive Committee at the last meeting and would also be the replacement for the Secretary in the Fall, the Senate needed to elect a replacement for T. Lease for the Fall as he could not hold two positions at the same time. The two nominees were Steve Wilson and Deborah Roberts. Ballots were passed out.

Discontinuance Policy in the Curriculum Guide – Second Reading – E. Newman

E. Newman reviewed the reasons for the revision. A member asked about the reasons for expanding who could bring a discontinuance. E. Newman said that the original policy did not specify who could bring a discontinuance, so language was added for clarity. **Vote on Discontinuance Policy in Curriculum Guide - Approved.**

Policy on Representation on Administrative Appointment Committees – Second Reading – B. Ford

B. Ford reviewed the item. He noted that two positions were removed from the negative list – Administrative Manager for the Northwest Information Center and the Director of Operations and Business for Extended Education. A member asked what would happen if a title on the negative list changed. B. Ford said that now by default all positions would require faculty until S&F amended the negative list. The immediate Past Chair asked that S&F take up the issue of interim appointments in the next academic year. The Chair of FSAC noted the same concern from FSAC. **Vote on Policy on Representation on Administrative Appointment Committees – Approved.**

Election Results

Deborah Roberts was elected to serve on the Executive Committee for Fall 2011.

President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana reported that the May revise of the budget was out and did not help the CSU or the UC. None of the extra revenues received by the State went to higher education. The May revise stated that if the state went into "an all cuts budget," then the CSU would be cut another \$500,000. One of the strategies to meet some of a further reduction would be to raise student tuition up to 32%. He said the 32% was on an annualized basis, so if it was instituted in the Spring, it would be a 64% increase in order to annualize it. He thought that such an increase would do significant damage to about 40% of the students. The UC had taken the exact same position. The President noted that in the May revise, under technical adjustments, the Department of Finance was claiming there should have been an adjustment to PERS of \$69 million. He noted that the way the furloughs were presented, it was said it would not affect PERS. He thought what that showed was a significant level of this Governor's administration not being helpful to higher education. He discussed the state of the tax extensions and said he was not optimistic about that proposal. He said he hoped the weather for Commencement would be as nice as the

day was that day. A member asked how much the proposed 32% tuition increase would offset the “all cuts budget” and the President responded \$100 million. The member asked how the rest would be dealt with. The President responded that there was no specific way being discussed. He noted that most of the budget was in personnel and with the \$500 million cut already in the CSU, there will be little else to cut. He said SSU had a \$9 million dollar cut, of which \$7 million had been identified and there was still \$2 million to go. If more cuts came, it would definitely affect people. A student rep asked if the legislature would protect higher education. The President said in his experience, the Governor’s budget was usually what the budget became 99% of the time. He didn’t think the Legislature would be able to change it much and if they did, it might be worse for higher education. The student rep argued that all governance structures on campus should focus on changing this fundamental attack on higher education. A member asked if the Chancellor’s office was looking at what point the fee increase would have zero help because there would not be students to pay it. The President said there was not enough historical data to model that and discussed the various limits to alternatives to the CSU for students. A member asked about a rumor she had heard about a sexual assault ad hoc committee being formed. M. Lopez-Phillips noted that national standards about sexual assault on campuses had been received and SSU would be reviewing their policies for compliance. He did not know if the group doing that work was calling themselves that particular name. A member asked whether it had been discussed that more students could graduate in the Fall by offering more classes, anticipating that student would not be able to return in the Spring and whether there was a freeze on positions on campus. The President responded that there was a freeze on positions on campus, with exceptions being made for specific needs, such as the 14 new faculty hires. He said he did not know how more courses could be offered in the Fall because there was no funding. A member asked if some of the strategies for the \$7 million cuts could be identified and wondered why students would transfer to SSU when there was a 64% fee increase and why wouldn’t student leave in droves to not pay that 64% increase. The President responded that it might not be possible for students to transfer in the Spring. He also thought time would factor into student’s decisions.

Provost Report – S. Rahimi

S. Rahimi reported that the AVP for Faculty Affairs search was reaching its conclusion. He thanked the search committee and said a decision would be made next week. He discussed the concept of a new faculty center in the Library that would be for faculty development. The instructional designer would be housed there as well as the faculty writing program. He thanked J. Wenrick and Dean Butler for working on this together. He talked about laboratory operations recommended by the ACT and how they were being implemented. He reported on the IDC formula that had been developed and would be implemented in July with IDC funds being distributed to the Schools that generated the grants. He thanked L. Furukawa-Schlereth for coming up with the \$106, 000 for that purpose. He hoped faculty would continue to apply for grants and contracts. He noted a \$7 million donation to the Galbreath Preserve to improve the habitat and it would be used to improve the roads. The Chair of EPC asked the Provost about the job description change for the Director of Undergraduate Programs and other changes to such jobs

on campus. The Provost responded that the Director of Undergraduate Programs had been changed to a full time positions due to the workload. Other changes were made elsewhere to make this possible due to the budget situation. The position in the Center for Teaching and Professional Development was moved to the Chancellor's office in the Center for Distributed Learning and the ITDS program was moved under the Director for Undergraduate Programs. He noted that some year round department chairs would be renewed to be academic year chairs. There was an update on the faculty refresh programs in terms of lecturers and FERPs. There was some clarification about the faculty writing program. The Immediate Past Chair appreciated the Provost for his hard work on behalf of the faculty during the year as this was his last Senate meeting. Applause. Provost Rahimi said he looked forward to continuing his service to the university as a faculty member and especially for students.

Resolution requesting letter sent to CSU Office of the University Auditor or Other Impartial Third Party regarding allegations of violations of CSU election guidelines in recent student referendum – Second Reading – S. Cabaniss

S. Cabaniss noted that a revision to the resolution was passed out showing the suggestions made by the Senate at the first reading. She described the changes. She emphasized that the resolution did not take sides on the referendum, but was calling for an evaluation of what actually happened so that might inform policy changes. The Chair noted that he had received a number of requests for the final vote on this item to be held by paper ballot and ruled that in order.

Motion to substitute for the resolution - “that the Academic Senate direct the Student Affairs Committee to collaborate with the Associated Students in Fall 2011 to draft a policy on “Advocacy Activities in Campus Referenda Campaigns.” The mover argued that this substitute moved the issue forward and if the policy changes did not help, then the fall back would be to have an impartial party evaluate the process. Second.

The Chair explained the motion to substitute.

There was discussion about the original resolution. A member questioned what improper governmental activities meant. S. Cabaniss responded that she used language from the CSU Auditor's office. The member asked for examples of improper governmental activities. A student guest argued that there had been five student referenda over the past 10 years and there was still no policy governing such referenda that would address the concerns about the recent Student Center referendum. The Student Rep suggested that whatever group got together to write the letter proposed should have an expert on Free Speech issues available. There was support voiced for the substitution. A student guest argued that the negative perception created by the Student Center referendum issues needed to be addressed as well as policy issues. Support was voiced for the resolution as it stood calling for an impartial third party evaluation. Another student guest from the Campus Allies for Racial Responsibility organization spoke about why there should be an evaluation and argued that the AS should not be involved in writing policy since

they were part of the problem. Concerned was voiced about corporate privilege as it pertained to SSU.

Motion to amend by incorporating the language of the substitution as the fourth resolved clause in the original resolution. Second. There was discussion about which was the appropriate body for SAC to work with on policy issues.

Motion to amend amendment: replace “the Associated Students” with “appropriate student governance and administrative bodies . . .” Second. The mover of the substitution voiced his support for the amendment.

Question called. Second. Approved. Debate closed.

Vote on amendment to amendment above – approved.

Discussion continued on the motion for a new 4th resolved clause.

Motion to amend “draft a policy on Advocacy Activities in Campus Referenda Campaigns” to “revise elections code.” Second. There was discussion.

Request to withdraw amendment above. There was no objection.

Motion to amend “draft a policy on Advocacy Activities in Campus Referenda Campaigns” to “revise campus polices on student referendum.” Second.

Question called. Second. Approved. Debate closed.

Vote on amendment above – Approved.

Return to discussion on motion for new 4th resolved clause. Discussion continued.

Question called. Second. Approved. Debate closed.

Vote on including the new 4th resolved clause as amended: that the Academic Senate direct the Student Affairs Committee to collaborate with appropriate Student governance and administrative bodies in Fall 2011 to revise campus policies on student referenda. Approved.

Return to discussion of entire resolution. S. Cabaniss spoke to a possible organization that might be an appropriate impartial third party, but did not know the cost. She stressed that an impartial evaluation would help with the transparency of referendum processes. The Vice President of Administration and Finance brought up issues about that process and how an impartial evaluator would have to be hired or put out for bid. S. Cabaniss thought the letter writers would make that determination. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that a bid process would have to be followed to hire such a person.

Question called. Second. Approved. Debate closed.

Vote on whether to substitute – Failed.

Vote on resolution as amended. A paper ballot was passed out.

FSAC Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that the Director of Sponsored Programs had resigned and FSAC was sending a letter to the Administration to fill that position with an interim person as soon as possible.

EPC Report – E. Newman

E. Newman passed out a letter EPC received from the Graduate Studies Subcommittee regarding the future of administrative leadership for graduate programs at SSU. She noted that most CSU's had an administrator with Graduate Studies in their title, but SSU did not. She thanked E. Sundberg for filling that role and to GSS for writing the letter. She also reported that EPC had started to meet with the President's Diversity Council to work on diversity in the curriculum.

Changing of the Guard

The Chair thanked the Immediate Past Chair, Susan Moulton, for her three years of outstanding service.

The results of the vote on the resolution were presented: Yes = 19; No = 13. The resolution passed.

Resolution requesting letter sent to an impartial third party requesting an evaluation of the recent student referendum

Resolved: that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University draft a letter to an impartial third party requesting an evaluation of the recent student referendum on increasing student fees to fund a new Student Center and;

Resolved: that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University requests specifically that the evaluation should look into allegations of improprieties involving use of resources and business activities of auxiliary organizations as well as improper governmental activities regarding violations of the spirit of the CSU Student Fee Policy and Executive Order 1054 and;

Resolved: that a work group consisting of members of the Senate and in consultation with Structure and Functions should be established to draft this letter;

Resolved: that the Academic Senate direct the Student Affairs Committee to collaborate with appropriate Student governance and administrative bodies in Fall 2011 to revise campus policies on student referenda.

The Changing of the Guard continued.

The Past Chair was presented with “the Chair” and she said it would feel strange not to be on the Senate after many years of service and thanked everyone for being “comrades in arms.” Applause

The Chair offered some comments before handing over the Chair position to the Chair-Elect. He said it had been a privilege to serve the Senate and his appreciation had grown over the year for the work of faculty governance. He noted that the Chair role was just the “tip of the iceberg” of the work that goes on in countless committee meetings and he recognized the Chairs of the all the faculty governance committees and their members, appreciating them for their hard work. He appreciated working with the administration, particularly the interim Provost and the Vice President for SAEM. He hoped with the new Provost would continue to build on the efforts of this year. He noted that his Chairship was a team effort and appreciated the support of many faculty members, a few of which he noted personally. He acknowledged the “three people” surrounding him at the Senate: L. Holmstrom, the Senate Analyst; S. Moulton, the immediate Past Chair and B. Ford the incoming Chair for their generous help this year. He then turned the gavel over, with great confidence to Ben Ford.

B. Ford began by recognizing C. Nelson who read a statement from CFA honoring John Wingard.

“Colleagues:

Sonoma State University has been fortunate over the last several years because of the leaders they have selected to oversee the critically important role of faculty senate chair. Our leadership has been unfailingly forthright in standing up for the principles of shared governance and academic freedom in a time of economic downturn and systematic defunding of public higher education, that has led to a “shock doctrine” mentality at the national, state, system and campus level.

Politicians from the White House on down have blamed faculty and staff for their own short sightedness and their pandering or tolerating the corrupt for profit model, that continue to invade our university. The chancellor’s office has stated over and over again, “don’t blame us, blame the legislature...” and “if the faculty would just each teach one more section, it would be so much more efficient.” Some campus managers have suggested that quality education is a casualty of the “new budgetary realities,” while others suggest that the fight to keep quality education suggests believing in myth.

Despite this atmosphere, Chair Wingard has stood up for us and never moved from his belief that quality education for our students is not lost and the way that is done is through dedication to protecting the mission and those who must design quality education, the faculty and the staff that are instrumental in delivering the quality education.

Simultaneously, he understands and realizes that shared governance and adherence to the contract between the faculty and the CSU managers, as negotiated and enforced by the California Faculty Association, are fundamentally interconnected in protecting our rights and our working conditions. He does not accept the false

notion that concern for quality education on behalf of CFA somehow interferes with the role of the senate, but rather supports it.

Last year the Sonoma Chapter President of CFA stated that the then outgoing chair of the Senate, Susan Moulton, was as good as any chair and better than most. John Wingard is certainly in the same category. Like Susan, John always demonstrated the professionalism and the courage that makes for a great chair.

The Sonoma Chapter of CFA wants to take this opportunity to join in with all of the others who have warm and fully deserved accolades for John.

Cheers and Solidarity
Andy Merrifield"

B. Ford then offered a resolution for the new Past Chair:

Resolution Honoring Professor John Wingard for his Service as Chair of the Faculty, Sonoma State University, 2010-2011

Whereas, Professor of Anthropology John D. Wingard stepped forward to lead the Sonoma State University faculty during a tumultuous year of declining state support, national political assaults on public employees, and a largely interim Sonoma State University administration; and

Whereas, he guided the Academic Senate through difficult decisions with good humor, commitment to the airing of all points of view, and a firm command of Sonoma State's particular brand of Robert's Rules of Order; and

Whereas, despite a history of acrimonious faculty-administration relationships, he worked tirelessly to build and maintain excellent working relationships with all campus constituencies, thereby building a significant foundation for future progress; and

Whereas, he has successfully worked for the establishment of the Academic Coordinating Team to institutionalize improved faculty-administration consultation within Academic Affairs; and

Whereas, the benefits of childhood experiences on a dairy farm in Pennsylvania were evident in his expert milking of resources, shepherding of proposals, and mucking of metaphorical manure; and

Whereas, his experience in the bureaucracy of the U.S. Government—analyzing the sociocultural effects of fisheries regulation—proved invaluable in navigating the byzantine intricacies of the California State University administration; and

Whereas, an understanding of the complex culture that comprises the University community was informed by his anthropological (if not archaeological) expertise, perhaps including his scholarly work on community struggle against corporate power; and

Whereas, beginning with his address at University Convocation in August 2010, he has highlighted the forces at work in opposition to public higher education in this country, and spoken eloquently of the powerful mission which we serve and which we must re-energize if a vision of a vibrant, equitable, democratic society is to advance;

Therefore be it

Resolved: that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University offers hearty appreciation to John Wingard for his outstanding service as Faculty Chair for 2010-2011; and be it further

Resolved: that the members of the Academic Senate wish for him a most relaxing summer and an energizing chance to once again think about teaching and scholarly pursuits, and look forward to his continuing engagement in the important issues of the day.

Applause and **approved by acclamation**.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström