

Academic Senate Minutes

October 13, 2005

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Chair introduced Mayor MacKenzie. Agenda amended and approved. Special Guest Mayor Jake MacKenzie. Special Report: Faculty/Staff Housing. Motion to reconsider agenda approved. Resolution regarding Resources for Program Assessment approved.

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Melanie Dreisbach, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Elizabeth Martinez, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Tim Wandling, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Wanda Boda, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Marguerite St. Germain, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Lindsey Simoncic, Sara Statler, Carlos Ayala

Absent: Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Liz Thach, John Kornfeld, Theresa Alfaro-Velcamp

Guests: Bill Kortum, David Abbott, Ian Hannah, Rose Bruce, Dan Condron, Katie Pierce

Report of the Chair

E. Stanny introduced Jake MacKenzie, Mayor of Rohnert Park who was a special guest of the Senate for this meeting.

Approval of Agenda – motion to add resolution regarding resources for Program Assessment and place it before the Program Review item. Second. *Approved.*

Special Guest: Jake MacKenzie, Mayor of Rohnert Park

(Mayor MacKenzie's full report can be accessed via the digital minutes for this meeting.)

The Mayor discussed planning issues facing Rohnert Park currently and answered questions.

He reported that Rohnert Park has formed a Sonoma State University liaison committee and talked about how that committee interfaced with the university regarding the "party ordinance."

He talked about four planning issues facing Rohnert Park. The Faculty/Staff Housing project; the Casino project; the former Agilent property now purchased by Coddling Enterprises; and the University District.

A Senator asked about traffic concerns related to new developments in the City.

The Mayor responded that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority is the agency responsible for disbursing funds for transportation in this county and the council is represented there. Measure M which passed last year will help with money for widening 101 and the Railroad Ave interchange at 101. He said the council recognizes that the development will cause more traffic. He elaborated further on the Sonoma County general plan for traffic and the use of passenger rail.

A Senator asked about the housing development south of E. Cotati along Petaluma Hill road and whether the City would be providing sewer services to that development.

The Mayor addressed the issues of sewer, water and roads for this development.

A Senator noted that he was a resident of Rohnert Park and stated that when the city voters decided to extend the urban growth boundary to encompass the now University District what they had in mind was to mitigate some of the problems of the city, namely, the imbalance between the housing available and the people who want to live here and the failure of the city to integrate with the university. He thought the university district plan did not address those problems.

The Mayor said he recognized what the Senator said and stated he would work with the developers to help with those problems and commented on a number of points the Senator raised.

A Senator asked about bike paths and walk paths from the University District to the University.

The Mayor said that the cost of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge was something to be considered.

The Chair thanked the Mayor and presented him with two tickets to a performance at the Center for Performing Arts.

Special Report: Faculty/Staff Housing Report – S. Hayes

(The full report can be accessed via the digital minutes for this meeting)

Sue Hayes introduced herself as the co-chair of the Faculty/Staff housing committee.

She gave background information about how the housing problem grew starting in 1992. The Faculty /Staff Housing committee was formed in 1998. She described the current housing conditions in relationship to faculty salaries. She noted the number of faculty and staff that will be needed when the campus grows to 10,000 FTE.

She described the work of the committee and the results of its survey of faculty and staff. After the survey, they started to look for land. She described the vision of the kind of housing that would be built and the various attempts made by the committee to purchase land. Then she described the land that has been purchased and how it was funded.

A short movie was shown about the land and the vision that the committee has for its development.

She provided more detail about the different kinds of housing that would be in the development. She stressed that the images in the movie were not what the committee planned, but just a general idea. She gave the figures they were working with for the price of the housing.

It was noted that this housing project would be a land lease agreement and showed the numbers for using the studio unit as a rental unit as part of the house. There would be off street parking for the rental units, but not covered parking.

The committee has now four subcommittees that are working on the details. Best case scenario the houses would be built in 2008.

S. Hayes was asked what criteria were going to be used for eligibility for the housing. She said that they were still working on that, but initially were thinking it would be for people coming into the campus community.

It was clarified that on the second round of house buying, the houses would still be for university employees, not the general public.

A Senator asked what opportunity costs for Academic Affairs were lost by the purchase of this land out of the money used from parking and housing.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth answered that housing money can only be used for housing and parking money only for parking and roads. There was discussion about how some general fund money and some parking money is used to support the police services.

S. Hayes was asked if staff and faculty would get the same consideration.

She responded that she did not know at this time.

A guest, Bill Kortum, spoke to the body regarding a Rohnert Park citizens point of view about the Faculty/Staff Housing project. He noted that the citizens of Rohnert Park pioneered urban growth boundaries and thought these actions should be honored by the university. He said the university building outside of the urban growth boundaries was an insult to the people who developed those boundaries. He proposed that an existing site could be re-configured according to an environmentalist, Mr. Baker.

A Senator asked for Mayor MacKenzie's and perhaps L. Furukawa-Schlererth's responses to the guest's comments.

Mayor MacKenzie noted that Mr. Kortum was the first to bring the notion of urban growth boundaries to the Rohnert Park City Council. He gave a short history of how the boundaries came into being and noted he is a member of the Board of Directors for the Greenbelt Alliance. He was very touched by what the guest said.

Motion to extend by 5 minutes. *Approved.*

L. Furukawa-Schlererth responded that what is on his mind is to provide affordable housing for faculty, staff and students. He thought the Faculty/Staff Housing committee should look at all possibilities, which it has since 1998.

A Senator noted he was very supportive of the Faculty/Staff Housing initiative. But we have not been privy to the information of the bidding processes. How do we as a university argue for the larger social good, and when it comes to our need, we violate that larger social good, particularly at a time when we are building bridges to the community. He asked the administration to answer to this issue.

A Senator asked about the feasible alternative presented by the guest. Was the university contacted about this plan and if so, what was the outcome?

B. Kortum said all he knew was that the project was going to be offered to the university.

R. Armiñana said he had never received in writing or had a meeting with Mr. Baker on this issue. If someone else has, he didn't know. He stressed that the land price was key to faculty/staff housing. He stated that if Mr. Baker was willing to donate the land, the university would be more than willing to change our plans. The land has to be subsidized for the project to work.

Motion to extend for 10 more minutes. *Approved.*

S. Hayes apologized on behalf of the university for the body not knowing Bill Kortum, who was the first environmentalist county supervisor and described his works in the county. She was moved by what he said because of his credentials. However, she said Mr. Baker did not have credentials. She

described a presentation to the Business department from Mr. Baker. She said the committee did not choose this property to flout the will of the people, but because it was the only alternative that would be preferable to us. All the other places they tried were in the urban growth boundaries.

The Mayor made closing remarks. All were thanked for their participation in the discussion.

Motion to reconsider the agenda. Second. *Approved.*

Motion to move the resolution regarding resources for Program Assessment to #1. Second. *Approved.*

Resolution regarding Resources for Program Assessment – E. McDonald

E. McDonald gave the background on the resolution. Faculty representatives from various budget committees met with the Senate Budget committee and talked about various concerns. This resolution developed from the concern about the resource implications of the new Program Review Protocol. E. McDonald said she wrote the background herself, but that the resolution was supported by all faculty listed on the resolution. She described the rationale for the resolution and read the resolved clauses:

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University strongly encourages the Administration to plan for additional resources to allocate to faculty specifically for Program Review and Assessment beginning this academic year and for the future; and

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University will not approve a Program Review Policy that incorporates assessment as an institutional practice until a plan to support this work is implemented by appropriate administrative and faculty bodies.

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

Motion to amend a new whereas clause: “Whereas the administration bears the ultimate responsibility for ensuring adequate resources for program reviews” to be added before the first resolved. Second.

Discussion of amendment.

Vote on amendment – *Failed.*

Back to original document.

Discussion.

A Senator argued that the second resolved clause was not needed. He argued it was unacceptable for educators to say they would not do program review.

There were many statements in support of the second resolved clause.

The Provost stated that there is agreement that Program Review and Assessment are vital and that resources are needed for them. However, just identifying the need for resources does not manifest them. He said that WASC has said that lack of resources is no excuse for not doing program review. Whether we will have new resources or have to re-prioritize resources is an open question. He said that each department's tasks that need to be done and identifying the resources is an extremely complex process. The second resolve clause does not take that into account.

There was continued discussion about the meaning of the second resolved clause.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on Resolution – *Approved.*

Resolution regarding Resources for Program Assessment

Background and Rationale

The ideas in this resolution came about during a discussion in the first meeting on Tuesday, October 11, 2005, of what we call the "expanded" Senate Budget Committee. Andy Merrifield, chair, invited all faculty members of the PBAC, AABAC, and CRC to join the Senate Budget Committee for discussions about current fiscal threats to our ability to continue providing quality education to our students. The discussion covered wide ground including workload, climbing SFR, and average class size.

This resolution is in response to concerns about resource implications inherent in the proposed Policy on Program Review. The discussion participants were not objecting to the importance of doing assessment, but the workload increases on faculty without additional resources. The ultimate solution to the problem addressed here, and our ultimate goal, is for faculty to be able to play a larger role in setting budget priorities on this campus.

This resolution is sponsored by Lynn Cominsky, Bob Karlsrud, Rick Luttmann, Elaine McDonald, Andy Merrifield, Catherine Nelson, Steve Orlick, and Tim Wandling.

Whereas: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State agrees that WASC accreditation is critically important to quality education at Sonoma State; and

Whereas: WASC has stated that "the University will need to demonstrate how its systems of assessment and improvement are supported and sustained in order to demonstrate a commitment to institutional capacity and

educational effectiveness," and further, that the University will need to "be explicit about the resources and organizational structures that will enable self-review and evaluation of educational effectiveness." (WASC letter to President Armiñana, June 28, 2004); and

Whereas: The efficacy of assessment in a five-year review is directly tied to the ongoing effectiveness of reflective assessment procedure, which requires financial and academic resources; and

Whereas: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University believes that faculty cannot meet WASC requirements for quality assessment of educational effectiveness given the current allocation of resources,

Let it be

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University strongly encourages the Administration to plan for additional resources to allocate to faculty specifically for Program Review and Assessment beginning this academic year and for the future; and

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University will not approve a Program Review Policy that incorporates assessment as an institutional practice until a plan to support this work is implemented by appropriate administrative and faculty bodies.

Adjournment.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom