

Academic Senate Minutes

April 2, 2009

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda approved. Minutes delayed. Philosophy curriculum changes approved. Philosophy pre-law concentration moved to business and postponed to next meeting. Special Report: Our EOP Academy – B. Peterson. New Concentration in ENSP approved. Revision to the Faculty Representation on Administrative Search Committees amended and approved. President's Report. Revision to the RTP policy approved. Vice President of SAEM Report. Statewide Senators Report. FSAC Report. Academic Affairs Strategic Plan - First Reading

Present: Scott Miller, Susan Moulton, Tim Wandling, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Edith Mendez, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Ronald Lopez, John Sullins, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Terry Lease, Kathy Morris, John Kornfeld, Rick Robison, Tia Watts, Wanda Boda, Maria Hess, Margaret Purser, John Wingard, James Dean, Lillian Lee, Sandra Shand, Jacqueline Holley, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Andy Merrifield, Casey Jones, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Thaine Stearns, Sunil Tiwari, Karen Thompson

Absent: Noel Byrne, Brian Wilson, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Steve Orlick, Eduardo Ochoa, Derek Pierre, Whitney McClure

Proxies: Jim Christmann for Nick Geist

Guests: Bruce Peterson, Rose Bruce, Eric Williams, Elaine Sundberg, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Elaine Leeder, Paula Hammett, Andy Wallace, Steven Norwick, Elizabeth Hoffman

(There was a technical problem with the recording for this meeting and thus the minutes are greatly abbreviated.)

The Chair asked A. Merrifield to introduce a distinguished guest to the Senate. A. Merrifield introduced Elizabeth Hoffman, from the English Department at Long Beach State as the Associate Vice President for Lecturers in CFA. All faculty were invited to a reception immediately following the Senate meeting to meet Ms. Hoffman, etc.

Chair Report – S. Miller

S. Miller reminded the body that the meeting needed to end on time today as a courtesy for the next event. He also reminded the members that the Diversity Retreat was the next day and encouraged everyone to attend. He

also thanked the Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee for the fabulous job they did on the Open Forums last week.

Approval of the Agenda – *Approved.*

Minutes delayed.

Consent items:

Revision to the Philosophy curriculum and new concentration in Pre-Law – **Motion to move the concentration to business. Revision to the Philosophy curriculum *approved.***

Motion to postpone pre-law concentration to the next meeting. Second. *No objection.*

Update on WASC – E. Sundberg described the Steering Committee process at this point.

Special Report: Our EOP Academy – B. Peterson

B. Peterson began his report by noting that next Wednesday marked the 40th anniversary of EOP (Educational Opportunity Program). Within the last 40 years, 300,000 students have graduated through EOP. (*Many thanks to B. Peterson for sharing his PowerPoint slides for the minutes*)

THE E.O.P. ACADEMY

Increasing retention for low-income, first generation students

Our EOP Students

- Are historically low income and the first in their family to go to a four-year university
- **Represent the entire state of CA**
Class of 2008 :
 - 29% from Sonoma County,
 - 25% from Northern CA,
 - 18% from Southern CA
 - 17% from the S.F. Bay area, and
 - 15% from Sacramento and the Inland Valley
- **Come from a wide range of ethnicities**
 - 51% Mexican-American
 - 21% Caucasian
 - 12.5% Other Latino
 - 7.5% African American

5.5% Asian and Pacific Islander
2.5% Native American

- **Have a mean high school G.P.A. of 3.08**

He described what “historically low income” referred to and noted these students are survivors. They tend to be more focused and are more clear why they are here. He noted EOP is not an affirmative action program and it is not an academically deficient program. They are working with low income students who are the first in the their family to go to a four year college. EOP students are Presidential scholars, and do go on to get advanced degrees.

History of Summer Bridge at SSU

- **Summer Bridge was an academic readiness program, developing remedial skills in math and English.**
- **EOP Students placed in remedial classes were the only ones to attend (approximately 65% of our Freshmen).**
- **Academic skills improved, but students had no contact with one-third of our EOP Freshman class.**
- **Budget cuts and rising costs reduced Summer Bridge from 8 weeks to 6 weeks to 3 weeks.**
- **We could no longer run a viable academic skills development program**
- **Too little time was spent on issues effecting social transition to college.**
- **Summer Bridge was changed, and the EOP Academy was introduced in 2001.**

B. Peterson gave a history of the Summer Bridge program. It has changed from an academic support program to a social transition program.

Objectives of Summer Bridge

- **Form a sense of community between Summer Bridge students, Peer Leaders, and Staff**
- **Gain a realistic understanding of the university culture and environment**
- **Develop a relationship with an EOP Advisor**
- **Academic advising and class selection**

- Take care of any financial aid or housing problems
- Experience a week of living on campus

He noted that a third of EOP students live off campus, so staying on campus for a week gives them a unique experience. This week of summer bridge is now required for all EOP students.

Current Program

- Summer Bridge was changed from an academic support program to a social transition program.
- It now lasts one week, and is required of all incoming EOP FTF.
- Purpose is to help smooth the transition from high school to college, and begin developing a learning community among our students.
- They attend Summer Bridge for one week, and then become part of the EOP Academy in the Fall.

Objectives of the EOP Academy

- *Increase* academic success of EOP FTF
- *Increase* both 1 year and 2 year EOP retention rates
- *Increase* overall EOP Freshman retention rate to be comparable to that of all SSU FTF

He said that by retaining EOP students, they have a greater chance of graduating.

EOP Academy Model

- During Summer Bridge, 15-20 EOP FTF live together with two student Peer Mentors.
- They receive advising from their EOP Advisor, who becomes a mentor for them

throughout their career at SSU.

- They attend a series of workshops dealing with subjects such as financial aid, academic expectations, finding a job, and balancing school with home.
- Each group forms a cohort that will take classes together in the Fall.

Fall Semester

- Student cohorts take English, Freshman Seminar, and a G.E. class, or English support courses, together
- Cohorts are developed based on English placement scores
- They work with a faculty instructor in Freshman Seminar and with their EOP Advisor
- Their Peer Mentor at Summer Bridge continues that relationship in Freshman Seminar
- Students take nine units in EOP Academy classes and six units or more in other university classes

Spring Semester

- Students move out of their cohorts and take nine units of classes with other EOP FTF.
- These include their next level English class, G.E. courses, and electives.
- They take nine units in EOP Academy classes; six or more units in other university classes.
- They maintain their advising relationship with their EOP Advisor throughout the time they are at SSU.

Academic Department Involvement

The EOP Academy offers courses from:

- *American Multicultural Studies*
- *English*
- *Education*
- *Learning Skills Services*
- *Mathematics*
- *Philosophy*
- *Sociology*
- *University Studies*

How Are We Doing? Changes in EOP Retention

- 1991-2000 1 year rate = 74.45%
- 1991-2000 2 year rate = 57.44%
- 2001-2004 1 year rate = 83.50%
- 2001-2004 2 year rate = 63.70%
- 2005-2006 1 year rate = 75.30%
- 2005-2006 2 year rate = 67.90%
- 2007 1 year rate = 73.30%

1 Year Retention: *EOP vs. all SSU FTF*

- 1991-2000 EOP = 74.45%
- 1991-2000 SSU FTF = 81.50%
- 2001-2004 EOP = 83.50%
- 2001-2004 SSU FTF = 81.50%
- 2005-2005 EOP = 75.30%
- 2005-2006 SSU FTF = 75.80%
- 2007 EOP = 73.30%
- 2007 SSU FTF = 74.00%
- 2008 (Fall) EOP = 92.70%
- 2008 (Fall) SSU FTF = 92.60%

2 Year Retention: *EOP vs. all SSU FTF*

- 1991-2000 EOP = 57.44%
- 1991-2000 SSU = 67.50%

- 2001-2004 EOP = 67.50%
- 2001-2004 SSU = 67.50%

- 2005-2006 EOP = 67.90%
- 2005-2006 SSU = 53.70%

Conclusions

- 1 year and 2 year retention rates of EOP FTF have increased since introduction of EOP Academy.
- 1 year and 2 year retention rates of EOP FTF are comparable to the rates of all SSU FTF since introduction of EOP Academy.

B. Peterson said they have great hopes that these increased retention rates will lead to increased graduation rates for our EOP students.

Questions Raised

- Why the drop off in retention the past few years?
 - *Economic realities for a residential campus*
 - *Increased numbers and decreased support*

Changes and Challenges

CHANGES:

- Development of “student to student” courses
- Stronger emphasis on 2nd Year and transfer students

CHALLENGES:

- Maintaining retention in difficult economic times
- Overcoming challenges of Unit 3/4 agreement
- Potential reduction in support monies

For more information on the EOP Academy, please contact:

Bruce Peterson
Associate Director of EOP
Advising, Career and EOP Services
Sonoma State University
(707) 664-3077
peterson@sonoma.edu
www.sonoma.edu/sas/eop

A member asked for the gender breakdown of EOP students. B. Peterson said it's almost 80% female and noted some reasons for this. A member asked how many of the EOP students were regular and special admits. B. Peterson said close to 90% of EOP students are now regular admits. A member asked about the change in racial demographics. B. Peterson said there has been a change as the demographics of California have changed.

New Concentration in ENSP – T. Stearns

T. Stearns noted that S. Norwick was present to answer questions from the first reading. He also noted letters from other departments as requested at the first reading. There was some discussion. *Approved.*

Revision to the Faculty Representation on Administrative Search Committees Policy – S. Miller

S. Miller responded to questions raised in the first reading. He passed the gavel to the Chair Elect. He noted that staff were never included in the policy to begin with. He noted that the appendix was not meant to be exhaustive of all the administrative titles, but he had done his due diligence and reminded the body that the policy would be reviewed each year. There was discussion.

Motion to amend: in Section 3A. 2 – change title of Vice President of Student Affairs to Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management as well as in the appendix; also in 3C 3 - (under provisions noted below in IV. A) to remove A as there is only a section A in IV; in 4A. Student membership *of* search committees – should be Student membership *on* search committees. **Second.** The Chair-elect stated the vote would be on the entire motion. *Approved.*

There was more discussion.

Motion to change in the appendix – The Director of Housing to the Directory of Residential Life. Second. *No objection.*

Vote on amended revision to the Representation on Administrative Search Committees policy – *Approved.*

President's Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana reported that the Department of Finance has determined that California will only receive \$8 billion in stimulus money, triggering a budget reduction to the CSU and the UC of \$50 million each. He then discussed the May 19th proposition election. If they do not pass, \$6 billion dollars in additional deficits in the '09 year will be added. This basically throws out the 18-month budget. There is going to be a June revise instead of a May revise due to the propositions. He noted the difference in the State's schedule and the campus schedule and said that individual campuses will not be able to contend with these issues alone, but will need help from the system. He reported that at the Board of the Trustees meeting last week, Trustee Herb Carter said he will be presenting a resolution/policy to the Board that will eliminate campus remediation programs. Students would be admitted conditionally until they come up to the ELM/EPT standards on their own. This has strong implications about how remediation is managed and funded. He discussed the current remediation efforts.

Revision to the RTP policy - Second Reading– S. Tiwari and P. Hammett

S. Tiwari described the documents in the previous packet. He asked if anyone found anything else to be revised to let him know and he will bring it to FSAC for the next round of clean ups. The Chair noted that the first things to consider were the recommended changes from FSAC about issues noted in the RTP policy. **Motion to approve recommended changes. Second.** There was discussion.

Motion to amend C.3bii: change “ordinarily” to “typically” in the sentence: self-assessment of teaching and professional activity (~~ordinarily~~ typically no more than 5 pages or 2500 words). Second. *No objection.*

Vote on FSAC recommendations to clean up RTP policy. Approved.

There was continued discussion.

Vote on revision of the RTP policy. Approved.

Vice President of SAEM Report – M. Lopez-Phillips

M. Lopez-Phillips noted that the coming weekend was Latino/a Family Day. The President and Provost would be attending. The afternoon session for families will be in Spanish only. He also noted that the Greek organizations would be coming together to talk about alcohol awareness on campus, leadership and hazing, etc.

Statewide Senators Report – R. McNamara and C. Nelson

R. McNamara noted he had sent out a link to resolutions before the Statewide Senate and encouraged the Senators to give them feedback on resolutions up for first readings. He discussed current resolutions before the Senate. C. Nelson reported that the Statewide Senate had forwarded two names to the Governor for the position of Faculty Trustee. She discussed legislative bills the committee on Fiscal and Governmental Affairs were watching. There were some questions and discussion.

FSAC Report – S. Tiwari

S. Tiwari reported that in addition to the RTP policy just approved, they have reviewed department RTP criteria and sent letters to all departments. They are working on a textbook adoption policy in light of ATI. They continue to work on the Excellence in Teaching Award policy. FSAC is also working on a list of priorities for faculty development monies. The Chair of EPC commended FSAC for their excellent work this year.

Academic Affairs Strategic Plan - First Reading – A. Warmoth

The Chair noted that the Executive Committee thought that this discussion could end the meeting early or morph into a broader discussion of planning regarding WASC issues. A. Warmoth noted that there was also a framing statement included, meant to help guide the discussion of the plan. He noted that the plan was developed by JCAP and incorporates the Long Range Academic Plan and the Core Academic Priorities Report. He noted the document was a milestone on a journey and not a completed process. It will be reviewed annually. He said JCAP would meet next week and take into account any and all recommendations.

Another member of APC read a note from the Provost about the status of the document at the Senate, namely that amendments from the Senate had the status of recommendations to JCAP and that JCAP, being a joint administrative committee would have the final say. The member pointed out that this was in direct violation of what faculty understood at the JCAP

meeting. A. Warmoth agreed and recommended that a conversation was needed with the Provost. He saw JCAP as an experiment in shared governance and hoped that a document could emerge from JCAP that both the faculty and the administration could agree on. He asked for support from the Senate for this position. He articulated two possible outcomes for the process of approving the document.

A member articulated a number of issues she wanted to see in the plan language about quality academic advising. She talked about what the term “quality students” means – she thought “attract students with high academic potential” was clearer. She thought there was a meta-message embodied in 3.15 and 3.2 – that shows we are actually worried about low-income students pulling us down academically.

Motion to extend discussion. Second. *No objection.*

A member reported that staff wanted clarification if “staff” in the document were teaching staff or all staff. A member had a concern about the lack of language about preparing students for jobs. A member suggested that retired and active military duty personnel be included in the plan as many students have either boyfriends, girlfriends, or family in the military as well as having been in the military themselves. A member suggested stronger language about graduate programs. The Chair of EPC noted that GE’s self study includes a section tying together GE and advising. The Chair-Elect suggested that there be implementation strategy benchmarks.

A. Warmoth addressed some of the comments and asked that any more specific comments be sent to him. He also offered to have people come to address JCAP. Another APC member noted that this plan would represent a faculty collective voice that could be compared to the University Strategic Plan.

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström Vega