

## Academic Senate Minutes

5/20/04

Commons 3:00-5:00

### Abstract

Chair's report. Agenda approved. Minutes of 4/22/04 approved. Interim Withdrawal policy approved. Candidates for Graduation approved. Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document – suggestion for change approved. Item moved to business for next fall. APC Statement regarding "A New Path for General Education at Sonoma State" including charge to EPC and GE subcommittee with developing a GE reform proposal to bring back to the Senate approved. Report on the Budget – President, Provost, Vice President of Administration & Finance. Dean Saeid Rahimi – B.S. in Engineering Science report. Statement from Campus Climate Committee on same-sex marriage endorsed. Installation of New Officers.

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwoman, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Sandra Shand, Scott Miller, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Ephriam Freed, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Cuellar, Derek Girman, Robert McNamara, Jason Spencer

**Proxies:** Laurie Ogg for Jan Beaulyn

**Guests:** Katie Pierce, Rose Bruce, Paul Draper, Judith Hunt, William Poe, Saeid Rahimi, Jagan Agrawal, Richard Rodriguez, Sue Hayes, Carolyn Epple.

### Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

The Chair reminded the body that the New Student Convocation will be on Tuesday, August 24<sup>th</sup> from 11-1pm. Faculty are encouraged to wear regalia. Lunch will be provided. Meet at Stevenson loading dock at 10:50am. Elaine Leeder, Dean of the School of Social Sciences sent her thanks. The Chair noted there were extra copies of the Candidates for Graduation available at the meeting. She asked all Senators to speak up as some Senators have complained that they cannot hear everyone.

**Correspondences:** None

### Consent Items:

**Approval of the Agenda – Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes – 4/22/04 emailed – *Approved*.**

**Interim Withdrawal policy – attachment**

E. McDonald noted that EPC had been looking at the withdrawal policy as there had been a change due to PeopleSoft where students did not need to get permission from their instructor to withdrawal. In that process, it was discovered that our current withdrawal policy was completely out of line with Executive Order 792 in the length of time we allowed students to withdraw. We could withdraw for any reason up to the eighth week of classes and we are only allowed to let them withdraw for any reason up to the fourth week of classes through the census. We just found this out a week ago. EPC has approved an interim policy for the Fall semester that allows students to withdraw for any reason up through the census date. And then withdraw for serious and compelling reasons as defined by the CSU up through the eighth week. A subcommittee of EPC will be looking at the policy in the Fall semester to develop a permanent policy. **Moved to Business items.**

**Candidates for Graduation – (handed out on 5/6)**

It was suggested that in future years the list be emailed to the Senators. It was also requested that the list be given to the Senate before it goes to be printed.

*Approved.*

**Return to Interim Withdrawal Policy**

E. McDonald said we have to have a policy in place for the Fall semester and this is the most liberal one we can do according to the state guidelines. Further, what it does is take us back to policies that we have had in the past with the petition process. The only change is the deadline of the fourth week, which we may or may not like, but is mandated by Executive Order 792.

A Senator questioned the need to have the instructor and the student's advisor sign off on the petition. He did not note this requirement in the Executive Order.

E. McDonald said they did not discuss that particular issue in EPC and she assumed they would be using the same form from past years.

A Senator advocated for advisor input on withdrawal.

E. McDonald said all these things will need to be discussed next year to create a permanent policy.

A Senator suggested for the future policy that students would need to go to someone for the form for withdrawal and not have them just available. This would cut down the workload.

E. McDonald said they were concerned on EPC about the workload for University Standards subcommittee down the road looking at these petitions. Part of the problem is that it is still unclear how excess units will be defined and whether classes students withdraw from don't count as excess units, but if they fail the class it will count. One of our worries is that will have the unintended consequence of many, many more students wanting to withdraw from courses because they are failing.

**Interim Withdrawal policy approved.**

## **BUSINESS**

### **Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document – attachment – C. Nelson –Second Reading**

C. Nelson reviewed the nature of the process regarding this document as discussed in the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee suggests to the Senate that this document be handled in the following matter. First the Senate take all the comments of the standing committees into account and individual members of the Senate when deciding what to do with the draft Strategic Plan. Secondly, that the Senate take action in two possible ways. One would be to send those recommendations for changes to the Strategic Planning committee and ask that the committee take the recommendations into consideration. Then take the opportunity to review whatever final document the Planning committee comes up with next year for a second time. So the Senate could see if its suggested changes had been taken into consideration and at that time take a position of support or lack of support. The other option discussed, which is not mutually exclusive of any others, would be to vote to support it or not support it. If voting to support it, and send the recommendations for changes with the vote of support.

A Senator supported the first option and argued that the Senate be the final decision maker on the document and that the Senate reserves the right to approve or disapprove. With that in mind, he **moved a change in the vision statement – “a catalyst for social justice and the cultural transformation.”** Social justice means moral, ethical fairness. **Second.**

It was argued against the motion that adding social justice makes the vision statement more specific rather than broad and more partisan. The Senator argued for the vision statement to be broad and open.

It was argued in favor of the motion that as the statement currently reads the “a catalyst for the social and cultural transformation of the region” could be negative, so that adding social justice makes it positive.

Another Senator concurred that social justice makes the statement positive.

The Chair of EPC asked if the Senate would like to hear responses to the document from the Standing committees before proceeding with a vote on the motion. There

were objections. **The Chair asked if there was any objection to continuing with the discussion of the motion. There was an objection.**

**The question was called. Second. Vote on calling the question – Yes = 21, No = 6. Approved.**

**Vote on sense of the Senate to the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee to change the wording in the draft of the Vision statement of the Strategic Plan from “a catalyst for the social and cultural transformation” to “a catalyst for social justice, and the cultural transformation.” Approved. Senator Coleman-Senghor abstained.**

**APC Statement regarding “A New Path for General Education at Sonoma State” – attachment – R. Coleman-Senghor –Second Reading**

**R. Coleman-Senghor said that APC revisited its statement and modified the statement for greater clarity.**

Revised concluding paragraph of APC Statement on G.E. Pathway proposal (May 14, 2004)

Therefore, finding the six principles of “A New Path for General Education at Sonoma State” proposal to be in alignment ~~with the vision and mission statements as well as the~~ the guiding assumptions embodied in Sonoma State University’s Long Range Plan, APC supports the G.E. Pathway process and calls on the Academic Senate to charge EPC and its G.E. Sub-committee with developing a General Education Program proposal guided by pathway tenets.

\* Please note that this revision represents APC’s effort to respond to faculty concerns and to further clarify its position on the G.E. reform process by focusing the Senate’s attention on its unanimous support of six principles stated in bold font in the “A New Path for General Education at Sonoma State” document.

It reflects APC unanimous support for the six principles in the pathway for General Education. There is a discussion of each one of these principles. APC does not necessarily adhere to each discussion, but we do adhere to and support the principles that are involved. He asked the body not to get locked in to the articulation of the six principles. He overviewed the changes. **The amendment was seconded. No objection.**

R. Coleman-Senghor said he looked at the catalogs back to 1962 and noted that change has been going on with respect to GE since the founding of the institution. There has been both formal change within and from without the institution. He gave examples. The problem with these changes is that it has lead to a great deal of incoherence programmatically. The question we are now looking at is how to bring about coherence. This question came up dramatically in the mid 1990’s and a lot of work has been done at all levels, but nothing substantial has happened because this body has not taken a formal stance with respect to an overall review and assessment of general education. There have been issues of preparation, coherence

and quality of education. Numerous surveys have been done on student perception and it does not bode well for us. Students are unhappy and dissociated from general education. The document before you addresses whether the effort to reform GE aligns itself with the Long Range Plan. It is asking you to formalize and bring about coherence in the process by which we are going to have either reform or assessment. In either case we will need assessment. By formalizing this and collectively saying yea or nay to what they want to have in terms of general education on this campus is a very positive move. We made a commitment as a body to a mission statement for general education. APC supports us moving forward in this way. He noted the recent WASC report with supports the need for GE reform on this campus. It's not that WASC can tell us what to do, but we need to find out what we are doing. There's not consensus among the faculty as whole about what we're doing, so there is no coherence and no real unifying commitment to general education.

The Chair passed the gavel to the Chair-Elect. She voiced some concerns about general education in general and the six principles in particular. There are three areas of concerns – academic freedom, impact upon the discipline's majors and resource allocation. It seems to her that the way the changes play out, a lot of our courses than are sent to the GE subcommittee now might be subject to review by the GE subcommittee and in some cases it seems the expertise of the faculty in their departments in terms of content and appropriateness of assignments should be enough to justify the class fitting into GE. She acknowledged there is not a lot of agreement on that. But it seems that the GE subcommittee becomes the overarching approval body with regard to a lot more courses than we have now. Regarding the impact on the disciplines and majors, primarily with regard to the nature of the GE program itself, the numbers of courses students will be provided to take and when the recommendation for taking those course has been made and how that might infringe upon the students ability to take courses in the major and departments offering major courses rather than GE courses. The majors are under an incredible amount of pressure right now to meet both GE and major targets at the same time. This might make that more difficult. Regarding resource allocation she noted that the Provost has been talking about how we should be doing this – looking at what the nature of a first class GE program should be, figuring out what that is and then talk about the resources to do it. She thinks we do not have that luxury. Every step along the way we need to talk about resources because this pathway document asks for a fairly substantial commitment of resources in terms of mentoring, in terms of class size with regards to freshman writing classes and the capstone experience. In the majors we are all struggling with keeping our major classes small enough to give our students an effective major experience. So she thought we were being asked to potentially shift resources in a substantial way. She thought that if the Senate approves the document that they should see the six principles as flexible rather than fixed. She thought it should be provisional endorsement of the principles and a provisional endorsement of the direction reform has taken thus far. This conversation is very important and the changes are too substantive to consider any other possibility at this stage. This is the first time the Senate has been asked to charge EPC and the GE task force with GE reform.

The Chair of EPC reinforced that what the GE subcommittee is doing today through EPC and APC with this document is a check in to the Senate saying this is what we've done so far, this is where we'd like to head, it's still in the very initial stages of planning. If this isn't going to happen, then we'll stop it right here. What she could assure the body is that the GE subcommittee has been doing extensive collaboration and consultation with the various Schools. EPC has been assured that this is a very flexible process. EPC and the GE subcommittee would like to hear the feedback of all parties concern and will very seriously take those into effect. EPC has endorsed the statement, particularly the comprehensive consultative process that has gone on thus far. EPC is asking the Senate to charge it and the GE subcommittee to develop a GE program proposal that would be flexible and meet the needs of all the parties involved.

The Chair of the GE subcommittee spoke to the item. He recounted a story about hearing a student commencement speaker say the great thing about Sonoma State is that you can graduate from here without learning how to write. He would like see Sonoma State graduate people who say I learned how to write here, I learned how to think here, I learned how to collaborate here, I learned how to imagine here, I learned how to think across disciplines and I learned to deal with social justice issues, learned to go out into the world strong and proud and capable. The ability to do that comes from a strong academic foundation which is what general education should do and will bring students strong and capable into our majors. It will strengthen our majors. This process which began four years ago will continue to be consultative, open and seeking all stakeholders opinions and try to form a cohesive whole that works for this university, not for one person, not for one committee, for this university. What we are asking for is the endorsement of Senate to strengthen general education and do it in a way to strengthen the majors and says to the faculty, we collectively take responsibility for the education of all our students. No one is asking the Senate to endorse a particular path at this moment. We're asking for the Senate to endorse going forward and explore and come back to the Senate at appropriate stages for ratification of certain elements as it goes. He emphasized the consultative nature of the process.

A Senator commented on his experience with the writing of students and did not think that changing the GE program would make him a better teacher. What would matter would be smaller classes, a lot more resources in place and possibly for some of the new faculty coming in some skill development.

It was pointed out that the university has an assessment of whether students can write and that is the WEPT. The Senator asked S. Miller if he had any estimate of the percentage students that pass the WEPT on the first try. He estimated that it was between 80% and 90%. She argued that saying students can graduate from Sonoma State and not be able to write is not based on figures, but perhaps perception.

The Chair-Elect noted that GE reform goes beyond writing across the curriculum. She wholeheartedly supported the work of the GE subcommittee and P. Draper's leadership. She argued this is an opportunity for us to come together as a community to improve the educational experience of our undergraduate students. She has heard many complaints from freshman about the GE program. We should

listen to our students and each other about this. What is a university experience all about, but an opportunity for transformation as an individual and a learner. A solid GE program that excites the learner, that opens up new vistas, that challenges the individual, that encourages them to look at different way is a transformational type of experience. She encourage the body to work together to share in this challenge of developing GE reform.

The Chair of EPC agreed with the Chair-Elect. To have a GE program that everyone can get excited about would be really be a beautiful thing. She argued for the Senate to endorse the process.

A student Senator affirmed that the thing that will help students most is to have direct instruction from professors. He noted that he knew a student who is paying other students to write papers for him/her. Completely re-changing the GE structure could miss the very necessary requirement that instruction be improved in its quality perhaps the way it is structured right now.

The importance of research skills was emphasized by a Senator in concurring with the Chair-Elect.

The notion that increased coherence overall in the curriculum is a good idea was questioned. A university is a place of different disciplines that are not all on the same page. The Senator thought there should be more dialogue about that particular aspect of the statement.

R. Coleman-Senghor ended the discussion by noting that the Senate is being asked that these issues be formally vetted and a specific recommendation comes back to the Senate. The Senate has never reviewed itself with respect to general education in any assessment process. This proposal will allow us to look at all the issues, many of them raised here. The fact that there is this much difference means that we should look at the matter deeply and in a concerted and focused way.

**Vote to charge EPC and the GE subcommittee with developing a GE reform proposal to bring back to the Senate – Approved, R. Karlsrud abstention.**

#### **Report on the Budget – President, Provost, Vice President of Administration & Finance**

R. Armiñana began by saying there is hope that the budget will be approved by the Legislature and the Governor by June 30<sup>th</sup>. In the last 29 years there has only been four times that constitutional deadline has been met. The May revise from Governor Schwarzenegger does not change the recommendations from the January budget except it takes out specific issues. In terms of money it does not change. It does take out language for specific reductions such as EOP, changes in the SFR, etc. It leaves it as unallocated reductions. It does mean in the CSU there will be a reduction from last year plus unrecognized mandatory costs amounting to about \$240 million with a decrease in enrollment of 5%. The other action taken has been an agreement between the Governor and the two institutions of higher education in California about a compact which begins formally in '05 and goes on through '11. The compact

is a specific agreement of what the Governor will include in his budget proposals to the Legislature. This is not ratified by the Legislature. It is a compact done through the budget process. He passed around a handout. He explained the specifics of the compact. What it gives the CSU is a high level of stability and predictability in times when the CSU is in the 12% of the undesignated part of the budget. The compact serves as a floor, not a ceiling. Yesterday the Board of Trustees approved a fee increase for undergraduates of 14% and for graduates 25% and for teaching certificates 20%. The vote was all but one. The Student Trustee voted against it. One Trustee boycotted the meeting because of the fee increase and lack of support.

E. Ochoa commented on what the impact of the \$1.2 million that is being directed to support instruction for next year. We've done some preliminary calculations and estimate approximately 70 sections would be opened up that wouldn't have otherwise been in existence. In addition we will be able to use funds out of the Solidarity Fund to open three additional sections.

A Senator expressed his concern that the financial aid portion of the budget was going from 1/3 to 1/5. As the cost of going to the CSU increases, we are going to need more, not less financial aid. He asked if the President was able to share the thinking of the Trustees on this decision.

The President said it is balanced out by the availability of the state financial aid. Between the state financial aid and the fact that it has become more of an entitlement. The 20% is basically enough to cover all of the students under that program.

A Senator asked if the 2% enrollment increase means it will take us two years to get back to the enrollment we had last year. The President answered yes. The Senator continued asking about the 3% increase in the base, is that this year's base or ? The President answered it was for from next year's base. The Senator asked if it has been calculated how long it will take to get us with this 3% to get where we were last year. The President answered yes, about two years.

One Senator noted that the CSU experienced a 22% decrease in its base budget over the last three years. We are not going to get back to where we were in terms of the base budget in two years even presuming this compact is approved by the Legislature. We'd get back the students, but not the budget.

The President answered that yes it does, as you have to add in the increased amount of tuition. The Legislature does not have the ability to approve the compact. The Legislature has the ability to allocate budget. The compact just says the numbers are included in the budget.

The Senator asked what the campus goal is for Student/Faculty Ratios in the foreseeable future.

The Provost said he didn't think the campus had zeroed in on a particular numerical goal.

The President said Academic Affairs will be funded at the 21:1 SFR which is in the budget.

The Vice President of Administration and Finance said that growth money will come from the State at 21:1, so growth will be funded at 21:1. He didn't know the SFR now. We will have to see what it is as it gets calculated for the current year.

### **Dean Saeid Rahimi – B.S. in Engineering Science**

The Chair introduced Dean Rahimi and asked the Senate to congratulate him on the acceptance of the B.S. in Engineering Science by the Board of Trustees. (applause)

S. Rahimi reported to the Senate that the Board of Trustees did approve the B.S. in Engineering Science which this body approved almost a year ago. This was not done easily, there were many questions and we had to go back and forth, rewrite the proposal, but eventually we got it right. He wanted to thank the Chair of the Senate and the Executive Committee of the Senate for allowing him to speak for a few minutes. He reported to the body that there are now 55 students in the M.S. in Engineering Science and on Saturday we will be graduating 15 students. By all standards that is a significant number. The B.S. program is trying to establish links between the M.S. program and other departments within the School of Science and Technology and also with other Schools. Currently, the Engineering Science program has funded 3 WTU's of assigned time for the School of Arts and Humanities to develop a course in ethics in science and technology by Professor John Sullins. They are studying links between the School of Science and Technology and the School of Business and Economics. We are starting to look at links between the Engineering Science program and the Arts program as there is a lot in common between engineering and art. We hope soon we will bring to you concrete proposals. The Engineering Program has been successful in bringing funds to us and continues to bring funds. We have helped the university with a \$250,000 donation that came to us and we contributed it to the budget situation at the university level. We just have received word that two companies are giving us about \$300,000 of equipment. Some have volunteered to teach for us in the Engineering Science program, so the success is continuing. We are now in the process of developing a department of Engineering Science so that the graduate program and the undergraduate program will be combined into one. This recommendation has gone to the Provost and will need the approval of the Provost and President. If this is approved, we will hire a maximum of two faculty members for the program. He thanked the body.

### **Return to Academic Affairs Strategic Plan**

The Chair suggested that the body endorse the process recommendation of the Executive committee and move substantive discussion including the motion on the floor to next Fall. **The recommendation is that the Senate will forward to the Strategic Planning committee any changes it wants made in the Strategic Planning document. The Planning committee will deal with the changes. Once the Planning comes up with a final document, the Senate will take that up for deliberation and**

**review. There was no objection to the process or to moving the discussion and motion over to the first meeting of the Fall.**

**Statement from Campus Climate Committee – attachment – E. Ochoa - First reading**

E. Ochoa introduced the item. He said the Campus Climate committee had passed this statement regarding civil rights and same-sex marriages and it is being forwarded to the Senate to consider endorsing a similar statement.

**Motion to waive the first reading. Second. No objection.**

The Co-Chair of the Campus Climate committee noted to the body that the committee felt very strongly about this issue. They did discuss whether the university could take such a position and clarified that they are standing on the civil rights part of it and not encouraging anyone to break the law.

R. Rodriguez, member of the Campus Climate committee said that he thought the statement was an excellent example of a collaboration of various communities. It came out of a discussion within the Campus Climate committee and is not just about issues of race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, social class. This is about issues of social justice. He thought it was appropriate for the university to take a stand on this in a pro-active manner rather of a reactive manner. He hoped the Senate would support it.

A Senator commented that he thought some members of the body might be thinking that this matter doesn't have anything to do with the academic mission of the university and therefore shouldn't be dealt with by the Senate. He pointed out that the final clause of our charter does give us very broad authority to deal with issues of public concern and there is a great deal of precedent for this body to take a stand on public issues. He would be proud to be part of an institution whose Senate stood up for these rights.

**Motion that the Senate endorse the statement: Consistent with Sonoma State University's Diversity Statement, the Academic Senate at Sonoma State University supports civil rights, privileges, and responsibilities in all areas of civil life for its students, staff, faculty, and administration, including the right of marriage between same-sex couples. Second.**

A Senator noted that he supported the statement, but suggested that currently same sex couples do not have the right to marry and perhaps the language needed to be changed.

A Senator stated that he supported the statement in terms of civil rights in all areas of civil life, but wondered why one civil right was being pointed out in particular. Was this civil right more important than other civil rights we should support?

E. Ochoa responded that the reason we are singling this out is that this civil right is not available by law to this group. Just as in the past people supported civil rights for African Americans specifically, and there is a national debate on this issue, we

take this position in support of a right that is currently not available.

A guest noted that the statement does not single out one civil right. The fact that we can talk about, in Anthropology, that there are same sex marriages throughout the world, by introducing students to those sorts concepts and then by us an academic body also saying the very definition of marriage is one that is based on relationship, that is based on love, it creates a whole academic environment that helps our students have more open minds. It challenges them to address to their own biases. It challenges them to examine how does our society creates a category of an "other."

One Senator questioned the statement. One group is being denied full access to civil right and the rights of human beings to make choices without regard to whether those choices are going to be selected out for same-sex marriage. It's the statement itself, the way it is written that the Senator opposed.

R. Rodriguez said that as one who does a lot of diversity training, when you don't name a particular group then that group does not feel like they are included in the word "all." It is very important to actually state a particular grouping. This is also in line with recommendations from WASC regarding diversity issues on this campus.

**A motion was made to amend the statement read: Consistent with Sonoma State University's Diversity Statement, the Academic Senate of Sonoma State university supports the right of marriage between same-sex couples. Second.**

It was noted that in freshman seminar student evidence the strongest prejudice against gay/lesbian/transgender folk and thus to help them understand why we would make such a statement, the Senator liked the preamble and didn't think it hurt anything to have it there and it would perhaps make it clear to members of the community. It only strengthens it.

Two more Senators expressed their opposition to the motion and voiced similar arguments.

A student Senator suggested putting the context after the statement supporting same-sex marriage.

Another Senator voice support to keep the statement the way it is and noted that often the issue gets confused with religion. But what gay and lesbian people want are the civil rights.

R. Bruce noted her office assesses the campus climate with respect to diversity and for the past nine years we have used the same instrument and homophobia has shown to be one of the major problems on our campus and if anything it is getting worse, not better. WASC is definitely recommending that we take on the issue of diversity as a campus, not in little pockets. She hoped the Senate would adopt the statement as it is.

**The question was called. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on motion to amend the statement read: Consistent with Sonoma State University's Diversity Statement, the Academic Senate of Sonoma State university supports the right of marriage between same-sex couples – Failed.**

**The question was called on the main motion. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on motion to endorse statement: Consistent with Sonoma State University's Diversity Statement, the Academic Senate at Sonoma State University supports civil rights, privileges, and responsibilities in all areas of civil life for its students, staff, faculty, and administration, including the right of marriage between same-sex couples – Approved.**

### **Installation of New Officers**

Laurel Holmstrom's contribution to the Senate was acknowledged by the Chair. (applause)

The Chair noted the Senator's leaving the Senate – Phil McGough, Statewide Senator; Victor Garlin, Senator-At-Large (12 years continuous service on the Academic Senate); Derek Girman and Steve Winter from Science and Technology; Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Lecturer Senator. The Chair thanked them for their service. (applause)

Senator McKillop read a commendation from the Statewide Academic Senate for Phil McGough. (applause)

The Chair presented the Past Chair with the traditional chair as a symbol of the dedication it takes to be Chair of the Senate for three years. She thanked the Past Chair for his service. (applause)

The Chair noted that Dr. Rodriguez was leaving the campus for the University of Colorado, Boulder. She thanked him for his service to the campus. (applause)

The Chair turned over the gavel to the Chair-Elect. The Chair-Elect offered a resolution for the Chair, Catherine Nelson. She read the following resolution.

RESOLUTION  
Honoring

Catherine Nelson  
Chair of the Faculty  
2003-2004

WHEREAS Catherine Nelson, with her signature charm and fine-tuned intellect, helped bridge the divide that has separated administration and faculty and fostered a climate of respect in the proceedings of the Academic Senate and Strategic Planning Committee; and

WHEREAS Petite, but mighty, she powerfully fought for faculty rights and shared governance during her ongoing repartee with Provost Ochoa; and

WHEREAS She leaves her *stomp* on the floors of academe with the passion of a fiery Flamenco feminist, fortified by a seemingly endless flow of red-waxed Baby Bels; and

WHEREAS Her wit and wisdom are cherished by members of the Academic Senate, whom she impressed immeasurably with her command of Robert's Rules of Order; therefore, be it

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate and the faculty of Sonoma State University express their utmost appreciation for her sterling leadership in unsettling budgetary times and for her unwavering ideals that mark her tenure as Chair of the Faculty of Sonoma State University.

(applause)

The Chair-Elect presented the Chair with a gift in appreciation for the mentoring and friendship she received from the Chair.

The Chair expressed her appreciation to those who helped keep her sanity this year. She said she was very grateful to serve in this capacity. With pleasure and confidence she looks forward to next year with M. Dreisbach as Chair. (applause)

M. Dreisbach noted that she will work as team with C. Nelson and incoming Chair-Elect E. Stanny and plans to meet monthly with the President, Provost and CFO. She asked for constant faculty input so they could be faithful liaisons to the administration. (applause)

M. Dreisbach announced the incoming members of the Senate. Chair-elect, Elizabeth Stanny; Secretary, Jan Beauly; New Statewide Senator, Robert McNamara; At-Large Senator, Noel Byrne. New Senators from Science and Technology, Tia Watts and Wanda Boda; Lecturer Senator, Michael Pinkston; from Social Sciences, Glenn Brassington; from Arts and Humanities, Tim Wandling.

Adjourned.

Reception followed the meeting. At the reception Susan McKillop was honored for receiving the Wang Award this year.

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*

