

Academic Senate Minutes

October 28, 2010

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 9/30/10 approved. Revision to the Financial Management concentration – Approved. Revision to the Finance concentration – Approved. Resolution on the Early Start Program approved. Provost Report. Chair-Elect Report. Associated Students Report. JCAP Report and Discussion. Early Start Program Report. Report from the Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence. Revision to the Learning Objectives A & C approved. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Good of the Order.

Present: John Wingard, Ben Ford, Susan Moulton, Maria Hess, Catherine Nelson, Michaela Grobbel, Sam Brannan, Edith Mendez, Steve Wilson, Helmut Wautischer, Sarah Baker, John Sullins, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Ed Beebout, Chip McAuley, Mutombo M’Panya, Terry Lease, Florence Bouvet, Rick Robison, Tom Buckley, Nick Geist, Sharon Cabaniss, Matty Mookerjee, Michael Cohen, Karin Jaffe, Noel Byrne, Laura Watt, Don Romesburg, Margaret Purser, Sandra Shand, Marisa Thigpen, Ruben Armiñana, Saeid Rahimi, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Alex Boyar, Nicolas Carjuzaa, Paul Ramey, Dolores Bainter, Art Warmoth, Elaine Newman, Richard Senghas, Jennifer Mahdavi

Absent: Brian Wilson, Kathy Morris, Edie Brown, Andy Merrifield

Guests: Thaine Stearns, Jason Wenrick, Elaine Leeder, Barbara Butler

Chair Report – J. Wingard

J. Wingard said that he had been attending the Statewide Chairs meeting last week and heard that Chair-Elect Ford had done a great job of keeping the Senate in order and thanked him for that. He noted the major topics of discussion at the Chair’s meeting were similar to ones being discussed at SSU – the Graduation Initiative, Early Start, program restructuring, SB 1440. Different matrices were sent to the Chairs showing how the other campuses were dealing with the same issues. He noted the matrices were posted on the Senate website.

(<http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/Currentinfo.html>) He reported on the recent Executive Committee where it had been decided to collapse Spring Convocation and the Faculty Retreat into one day, January 27th, and have something similar to the retreat, but broader in focus. He noted that a number of possible topics had been discussed and was still open to ideas.

Agenda – the Mayor of Rohnert Park could not attend and that report was removed from the agenda; item added: Resolution on Early Start Program – Approved.

Minutes of 9/30/10 – Approved.

Consent Items:

Revision to the Financial Management concentration – Approved.

Revision to the Finance concentration – Approved.

Resolution on the Early Start Program – First Reading – S. Cabaniss

S. Cabaniss offered the floor to T. Stearns to introduce the resolution. He said the resolution was initiated by the Math and English departments, endorsed without objection by the Math department and unanimously endorsed by the English department and approved by EPC unanimously. He noted the resolution was part of his report coming up about Early Start and he was fine with presenting the resolution first.

Motion to waive the first reading. Second. Approved.

Vote on Resolution on the Early Start Program – Approved.

Resolution on Mandatory Early Start Programs

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University (ASSSU) endorses and supports the commitments articulated in the resolutions regarding Early Start Programs passed by the Academic Senate of the CSU (cf. AS-2895-09/APEP/AA: "Opposition to Impending Implementation Mandatory Early Start Programs" and AS-2926-09/AA/APEP "Recommendations Regarding the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs"); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASSSU endorses the resolutions passed both by CSU Los Angeles (2 March 2010) and by Cal Poly SLO (4 May 2010); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASSSU supports the efforts of its Math and English faculty to plan an intentional and pedagogically sound program that meets the Chancellor's mandate and that is reconciled with the aforementioned Resolutions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASSSU opposes any judgment by any non-faculty implementation board as to the sufficiency of the SSU plan relative to other Early Start models; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASSSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees; the Office of the Chancellor; the Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU; campus Presidents, Provosts, and Senate Chairs; the Chair of the English Council of the CSU; and the Chair of the Mathematics Council of the CSU.

Provost Report – S. Rahimi

S. Rahimi reported that after receiving news about the new targets systemwide, SSU was revising the campus enrollment target to 7420. He described how the targets had changed in such a short period of time. He noted that the Chancellor's office thought SSU's target could increase to 7474. They will send a report to the Chancellor asking for a target of 7420 and if approved, would release growth money

to the campus. The Provost noted that the campus strategy to increase the target for the Spring was by admitting more transfer students and increasing the average student load. He said that increasing the average student load would help students get the classes they need and thought it was good news. There was a question about admitting more students. The Provost noted the variability of admitting new students and that increasing the student unit load gave the campus a chance to move up and down in relation to the target. He noted a number of programs were still open and if by some chance the campus goes over 7420, there would not be a penalty from the Chancellor's office. A member suggested that the unit cap at first registration not be increased to allow students a broad range of choices on the first go round. The Provost said they had heard a lot of opinions about that idea and would be discussing a strategy the next week. A member asked how exactly the campus would increase the average student load. The Provost said they would do that by offering more sections in areas where they have observed bottlenecks.

Chair-Elect Report – B. Ford

B. Ford reported that the Sustainability Workgroup hosted a Sustainability Day in the MultiPurpose room the past week that was attended by about 200 people. He offered that members could be involved in the workgroup and to email him for information.

Associated Students Report – A. Boyar

A. Boyar reported on the ASI's new first year council program, which was set up to bring freshmen into leadership positions. He also reported that Sonoma finished in the top 5 for registering student voters among all the CSUs. He reported that a recent ASP event was sold out three weeks in advance. A member asked about the legacy costs for the new Student Center. A. Boyar said they were in discussion about it. They had a resolution from the ASI from three years ago stating that they were partners in the building and fully supported it.

JCAP Report and Discussion – S. Rahimi and A. Warmoth

The Chair noted that he had mentioned at the beginning of the year that items might appear on the agenda that are reports/discussions to give a more complete airing of the issues involved. A. Warmoth discussed the item in the packet that was a consulting framework that came out of the last JCAP meeting. He noted the action areas in the consulting framework that derived from the University Strategic Plan. Some of the areas had been identified by the Provost, and some by APC. He described the current functioning of JCAP as a horizontal communication structure between faculty and administrators. It was not a policy making body. When policy issues arose in their discussions, then they would direct them to the appropriate channel for policy changes, creation or implementation. He said the consulting framework was not a formal structure, but a kind of map of relationships that were evolving for more effective consultation over various issues for the upcoming year. The people involved in the different areas would be reporting back to JCAP what they hoped to accomplish this year. He said basically the structure was meant to improve the communication between administrators on Academic Affairs and

Faculty Governance. The Provost explained the process of consultation as he envisioned it. A member voiced her confusion as Chair of the Graduate Studies subcommittee as she had heard four versions of the consultation idea. The Provost noted there were two tracks going on, one for administrators and the other for faculty. They were supposed to invite each other's ideas. He attributed the handout to A. Warmoth. The Chair voiced the need for a strong faculty voice in the process and that faculty should be proactive about it rather than reactive. A. Warmoth noted that the next JCAP meeting was November 18th and all Committee Chairs could come and voice any concerns.

Time certain reached.

Early Start Program Report – T. Stearns

T. Stearns noted that the document in the packet was a draft of the Early Start proposal and that it included the membership of the committee working on the proposal. He said that B. Ford was on the committee and might help with the Math portion of the proposal. He said the reason this draft was coming to the Senate was a time consideration. The proposal was due to the Chancellor's office on November 19th. When they discussed it at EPC, the Chair argued that the Early Start program was a piece of curriculum and therefore was under the purview of the faculty and should have two readings at EPC and the Senate. He thought the Early Start mandate required careful thinking by the university in terms of meeting the Chancellor's mandate and still be palatable by our university. He said negotiating that line has been challenging and would continue to be challenging. It was noted that for Math, no new curriculum was being proposed. A member asked if the proposal's intent was to make up for the lack of knowledge on part of students attending SSU. T. Stearns responded that it was difficult to know the intention of the mandate and that what the member had said might be one of the intentions. Other speculative intentions were to make money for the universities, or actually increase access. He noted there was a lack of clear guidance. It was noted that the Trustee who began this initiative had access in mind when he started it, but ironically the main criticism of the proposal was that it would decrease access. There was a question about additional costs that might be imposed on students. T. Stearns responded that yes, there would be additional costs to students. A member argued that the cost of education and the kind of students that came to the university were correlated and thought the Senate should take a position on that and use the implications of costs to students in reviewing the Early Start program. A member asked of the English 99 course intended to be the beginning of remediation. T. Stearns responded that English 99 was the English departments attempt to respond to the mandate of the Chancellor's office. A member asked about how other CSUs were responding to the Early Start initiative and how they would articulate between CSUs. A member asked who the students were that needed remediation. T. Stearns noted that the students were determined by their scores on standardized tests. The Provost pointed out that the Math portion of the remediation could be done online for less cost. He also noted that the retention task force found out that students who had difficulty graduating within 6 years were the ones with remedial needs, so the issue needed to be addressed. There was further discussion about the increased costs implied by the Early Start Program. A request was made for statistics to be shown

that prove a correlation between low-income students and remediation. It was noted that the Math portion of the program did not significantly increase costs. The President said that student financial aid would not cover the summer remediation course nor would the summer course work against the receiving of financial aid. A member asked if the plan included a clause about being able to amend the plan. T. Stearns asked that the document come before the Senate for a second reading and asked for comments and suggestions to be sent to him or E. Sundberg. A few other suggestions were made for the document.

Report from the Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence – E. Velasquez

E. Velasquez began her report by noting that she had been in the position for nine weeks. She said she reviewed the Diversity Vision statement and concluded that campus climate was a key component of the vision statement and a good campus climate would allow all students to reach their highest human potential without discrimination. This was very important to her. She then discussed how to achieve a better campus climate. She discussed her view of the Diversity portion of the University Strategic plan. She discussed her position as Director of Diversity as it related to the structure of the University. She noted that the campus had been very good at collecting data and suggestions about diversity, creating committees and reports. She noted the challenge was to translate all that data into action. She reported on the recent Diversity Summit, where all groups working on diversity met and looked at the PDC's diversity plan to see where they might fit, where there might be overlap or where there might be areas that were missed. She said she thought she was a connector and was helping things happen in a more coordinated way. She discussed the Faculty Learning Community created to help faculty infuse more diversity into their curriculum. She announced the first multicultural competence training for staff. She noted the Richard A. Rodriguez foundation which funds student projects that focus on diversity. Last year the foundation funded a student project on reviving the Safe Zone program, this year they were funding Campus Allies for Social Responsibility and a face-to-face interaction between the student clubs. She thought everyone had a common goal about diversity even though there were differences of opinion about exactly what to do. She planned to set up regular meeting times next semester for campus members to talk to her. She noted that the stories she was hearing were unacceptable and that improving the campus climate was the easiest thing to do, since everyone is involved in that. A member asked how the campus climate would be assessed. E. Velasquez said she was not sure what was available. A member asked how CFA was related to diversity. E. Velasquez said CFA had an affirmative action committee with various caucuses. A member asked about the recommendation in the Mapping Project presentation for a Rapid Response Team. Dean Leeder noted that SAEM already had a critical response team and said she was in conversation with San Francisco State about how they do it. It was noted that the new Diversity website would link to all the diversity efforts on campus and would be up soon.

Revision to the Learning Objectives A & C – Second Reading – E. Newman

E. Newman moved to suspend the rules allowing for amendment of the learning objectives. Second. E. Newman noted that the motion still allowed for an up or

down vote by the Senate. Her intent with the motion was to protect the integrity of the faculty working groups that created the learning objectives and noted the inclusiveness of the process so far. She noted that the language proposed by the Philosophy department was considered in the faculty working groups and not included. She respected the proposed changes by the Philosophy department, but thought the timing was off.

Vote on suspending the rules allowing for amendment to the item – Approved.

The floor was open for discussion. The Senator proposing the Philosophy department language spoke to their issues with the Learning Objectives. A member expressed interest in getting the GE reform “right.” A member objected to Area A1 being blank. The EPC Chair noted that the Senate approved the areas A&C reform last semester which left area A1 blank, so the learning objectives were following what was previously approved. A member brought up articulation issues. The EPC Chair noted that articulation issues were not germane to the Learning Objectives. A member challenged the Senate to speak to him about what they didn’t understand about the document. A member argued for the passage of the learning objectives. A member argued that the learning objectives were mapping on to a foundational document that had already passed. A member argued further to send the document back to address the concerns of the Philosophy department. A member hoped the joy of the new curriculum would out weigh the articulation issues and that it might become a mark of distinction for SSU. There was a suggestion to have the GE subcommittee come to address the Senate about questions concerning the A&H GE reform.

Vote on the Revision to the Learning Objectives for Areas A and C – Hand count called, majority approved.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – L. Furukawa-Schlereth

L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted the handout passed around that was presented to the PBAC that morning concerning the Updated Budget Plan for 2010 -2011. He discussed various aspects of the budget assumptions and budget reductions as presented in the handout. It was clarified that the stimulus money was put in to the base budget as a CSU strategy.

Motion to extend by 5 minutes. Second. Approved.

The AS rep asked about the reduction to the Student Affairs division. There was a question about how money was allocated to the divisions.

Good of the Order

Go Giants!

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström Vega