

Academic Senate Minutes

April 16, 2015

3:00 – 5:00, Ballroom A

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 4/2/15 – Approved. Questions for the President. CANDEL Discontinuance - First Reading. Provost Report. CFA Report. Statewide Senators Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Associated Students Report. Special Guests: Steven Filling, Chair of the Statewide Senate and Stephen Stepanek, Faculty Trustee. Classroom Upgrades Report. EPC Report. FSAC Report. SAC Report. Good of the Order.

Present: Richard J. Senghas, Margaret Purser, Kirsten Ely, Tom Targett, Catherine Nelson, Deborah Roberts, Michaela Grobbel, Sam Brannen, Matthew James, Birch Moonwomon, Judith Friscia, Jess Hazelwood, Joshua Glasgow, John Palmer, Ed Beebout, Jennifer Roberson, Karen Thompson, Florence Bouvet, Jennifer Mahdavi, Laura Krier, Sunil Tiwari, Mary Ellen Wilkosz, Lauren Morimoto, Suzanne Rivoire, Michelle Goman, Melissa Garvin, Michael Pinkston, Donna Garbesi, Marisa Thigpen, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Elaine Newman, Cynthia Figueroa, Brandon Mercer, Katie Musick, Richard Whitkus, Julie Shulman

Absent: Laura Watt, Rheyna Laney, Edie Brown, Matthew Lopez-Phillips

Proxies: Armand Gilinsky for Melinda Milligan, Adam Rosencranz for Christian George, John Kunat for Parissa Tadrissi, Tia Watts for Matty Mookerjee, Melinda Barnard for Andrew Rogerson

Guests: Carlos Ayala, Scott Horstein, Steven Filling, Steven Stepanek, Geoff Cirullo, Carol Ingerman

The Vice Chair began the meeting.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 4/2/15 – Approved.

Questions for the President

The CFA President asked the President to make a statement to the Senate about whether he would consider a second phase of the campus equity program to include more faculty and lecturers. The President said not this year. When asked to elaborate, he said until he knew the budget for next year, the campus could not consider expanding the equity program. The CFA President asked if it was probable that there would be a second phase. The President said he could not give a probability. A member asked if the President's Award for Scholarship was replacing the Goldstein Award. The President said yes. A member asked for an update on the number of new hires for faculty for next year. The President said he received a

recommendation for six new hires and had asked that the number be increased to 10. A member said she thought that previously the Senate had heard that there would be 15 hires a year for the next 3 years. Her School had made some decisions based on that expectation. She said that it was not only disappointing to hear about the number of hires for next year, but that the information eroded trust. She asked that the campus work toward 15 hires. The President said that the university was able to hire 19 this year and next year he wanted to hire 11 to make the 30 for two years. He quoted a Yiddish proverb – “Humans plan and God laughs.” When they proposed the hires over three years, the idea was based on some assumptions given to the campus about money available from the State including the 3% commitment for salaries which was reduced to 2%. At that time, there was not an understanding that the campuses would have to commit a significant amount of money toward compensation. Additionally, the campus had to cover release time for 26 newer faculty. He didn't think this was a matter of trust, but a matter of reality.

CANDEL Discontinuance - First Reading – A. Gilinsky, C. Ayala

A. Gilinsky said this discontinuance had been approved at all levels so far, if somewhat after the fact. The joint program MOU between SSU and UC Davis expires in May, and the decision to discontinue the program preceded review in faculty governance. He noted that in the Discontinuance policy there were six criteria to consider with reference to discontinuing a program. Regarding the overall quality of the program, EPC determined the CANDEL program was high quality. EPC was not provided with a program review. EPC found evidence at SSU for the capacity and ability of faculty to deliver current curriculum in sound pedagogical ways and this was unknown at UC Davis. The adequacy of resources available to deliver the program was a primary reason for the discontinuance. Resources had been dwindling over the years and reduced by more than half by UC Davis. He noted that both SSU faculty involved in the CANDEL program could not agree on discontinuance. EPC held a public meeting for this item and did not receive any public comment in favor of discontinuance. EPC voted 5 to 2 in favor of discontinuance, with one abstention.

A member said he thought that the reasons for discontinuance were not that substantial and wondered if something was missing. The Chair noted that the comments were in the packet sent out to the Senators via email. It was cost prohibitive to print it for the Senators. A member argued that the previous remarks were a clarifying question and she wanted to hear the answer. C. Ayala provided background on the creation of CANDEL and the changes that had occurred over the years. In 2008 and 2009, the budget for this program was cut in half. The School of Education had been trying to be on equal par with UC Davis, but there were lots of indicators that this was not happening. Many unilateral decisions were being made by UC Davis about the budget for the program and how it should be run.

Motion to extend for 10 minutes. Second. There was discussion. **Vote – Approved.**

C. Ayala said that the two faculty involved in the CANDEL program could not reach an agreement, so he was faced with this difficult decision. He had to think hard about the students and faculty in the School of Education. He noted the levels

of review the proposal had gone through. He provided the main reasons for the discontinuance: the grant money they received was not enough and not under their control; UC Davis makes unilateral decisions, it is not a true partnership. He wanted the discontinuance, so he could support the Educational Leadership department and the students at SSU. The Chair asked that the Senators review the large number of documents before the second reading, so that the deliberations could be careful and serious.

The President provided more context for the discontinuance. He said that all of the joint doctorate programs between the CSU and the UC had folded, except San Diego State and UC San Diego. What was happening with the CANDEL program had been repeated all over the state.

Provost Report – M. Barnard for A. Rogerson

M. Barnard presented an overview of the SSU equity program for faculty. She said they had completed the four phases of the salary portion of the collective bargaining agreement. In December, she, the Provost and the President met with CFA and at that time, they estimated that the program would cost between \$160,000 – \$180,000, plus benefits. They had spent \$227,000 on the program. The program combines two different pieces. For inversion issues, they went School by School to make sure that Full Professors were paid more than Associates and Associates were paid more than Assistants. They did look separately at Business, Computer Science, Engineering and Nursing to make sure within those departments there was no inversion, but did not compare them to other departments. For compression, they focused on the lower portion of the percentile range that was impacted and too low. She noted the example she had provided in her handout for a specific department to show how the approach to compression worked. She said emails had gone out to the faculty who were affected by the programs. A member asked if everyone was supposed to be at the 10% percentile in their discipline. M. Barnard said yes. A member asked if this was a one time salary correction. M. Barnard said that all the campuses were doing this a little differently. The money from the Chancellor's office did not cover the full amount for smaller campuses and provided a surplus for larger campuses. This was frustrating and continued inequities across the CSU. She was trying to correct what she saw at SSU, but thought in the fall, it would still show that faculty at SSU were paid less. She thought there would be more pressure to correct this, but she didn't know if the resources would come from the system or be campus based. She thought the campus based solutions perpetuated the inequities. A member thanked M. Barnard for all her work and asked if faculty could email her directly with questions. M. Barnard said yes, she was already getting emails and was happy to talk to faculty. A member noted that in the example, it looked as though when faculty moved up for promotion, they would no longer be in the 10th percentile. She wondered if this was sustainable for future faculty. M. Barnard said she did an analysis for those up for promotion in the next two years, using the bargained 2%, and saw that they moved up very nicely.

CFA Report – E. Newman

E. Newman congratulated those faculty who received raises from bargained equity program and said CFA thought they deserved more. Those who received large raises did so due to being underpaid for many years. Many more faculty deserved pay raises as well through the equity program. She would continue the pressure on the administration. She appreciated what the campus had done, but thought money should be given to hard working faculty. CFA had some concerns about the equity program. They were concerned about how the percentiles had been computed. The plan looked very different from the plan proposed in December and CFA had yet to receive information about why it was scaled back. She thought that compression issues would remain on campus and noted that SSU faculty were among the lowest paid in the CSU. Many faculty were below the SSI max. The campus was losing accomplished faculty to industry and other CSUs. Not many faculty were being hired. She said they would need to fight for more than 2% in the next years. They needed higher SSIs, large GSIs and help for faculty who were not helped under this program. CFA will reopen on salary on May 1th and had retained the right to collective action including strike. She said she and other CFA activists would stand up and fight and needed faculty to stand up with them. While the raises were appreciated, more needed to be done. A member asked how the December plan was different. E. Newman said at the December meeting, the plan was to have two phases of the equity program over the next 6 months, and each phase would have used \$160,000 - \$200,000 for the program. M. Barnard said that they had proposed \$200,000 over two years and the President had asked for it to be used in one year. This was an improvement on the original December plan. The CFA President disagreed and said her notes showed that \$200,000 was supposed to be used in each phase.

Statewide Senators Report – D. Roberts, C. Nelson

D. Roberts introduced the Chair of the Statewide Senate, Steven Filling. She reported on Statewide Senators visiting legislators offices to lobby for more money for the CSU. They talked to 23 legislators and staff. She noted that the huge roadblock was the Governor.

Vice Chair Report – K. Ely

K. Ely noted that the run off election for Lecturer Senator was in process and encouraged everyone to vote.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said his written report was in the Senate packet. The Chair noted that in the report it showed where some of the resources were coming from to cover the salary adjustments in the CBA.

Associated Students Report – B. Mercer for C. Christian

B. Mercer reported that the Associated Students were in the process of approving their budget for AY 15 -16. A draft resolution was coming before their Senate asking for a change in the title of the policy “Faculty Representation on Administrative Appointment Committees.” The Chair clarified that the policy included more than faculty and the proposal was to change the title to just “Representation on Administrative Appointment Committees.”

Special Guests: Steven Filling, Chair of the Statewide Senate and Stephen Stepanek, the Faculty Trustee

S. Filling said he was somewhat intimidated being at the SSU Senate, having been mentored by A. Merrifield and E. Newman and Statewide Senators C. Nelson and D. Roberts who provided him a treasure trove of well-reasoned and thoughtful advice. He thought SSU was truly lucky to have such faculty. One of his goals this year had been to improve communication between the Statewide Senate and the campuses. They had tried to make the newsletter more readable and give the Statewide Senators information to take back to their campuses. They had also tried very hard to be in close communication with campus Senate Chairs to strengthen the sharing of information. He noted that the Statewide Senate dealt with system issues and stayed out of the business of local Senates, but wanted to share information. He noted that at the system level there was a task force working towards a sustainable financial model. They were rethinking how the CSU allocates assets to campuses. They would be providing a preliminary report to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees in the next month. He encouraged the Senators to pay attention to that and provide their considered feedback. Some of the things the report suggests were: to change how the CSU allocates university grants to students; make significant changes in Title V and Executive Orders that govern how the university spends money from different funds; and explore how the CSU generates revenue such as out-of-state tuition. These ideas would have significant impact on how the CSU does business and would affect every campus. He said he would really appreciate the Senators reviewing the report carefully and getting feedback to them, either through the Statewide Senators or the Chair of the Faculty. He noted that the Intersegmental Group of Academic Senates (University of California Senate, Community Colleges Senate and the CSU Senate) also went to the Capitol and heard a lot about the budget. Unfortunately, it was not that good. There was reference to the surplus of the revenues this year, but most of that would go to Prop. 98 entities and not the CSU. They heard the suggestion repeatedly to not give up and to visit legislators more often. He urged all the faculty to make a presence for higher education among the legislators so they could get the money needed to accomplish the CSU mission. At the Board of Trustee meeting CFO Relyea did a presentation about all the millions of dollars the CSU had saved from efficiencies, such as combining payroll systems and parking violation systems. He thought the Chancellor had “one of those light bulb moments”. The Chancellor told them the CSU could not efficiency themselves out of a billion dollar budget cut. He made some off the cuff comments that highlighted the needs the CSU has and S. Filling recommended his remarks to the Senators: <https://youtu.be/qnxc51XbROA>. S. Filling spoke about the

Community College bachelor's degrees. The feedback from the campuses reported that 13 of the 15 degrees were clearly seen as duplication of content and two were not. The Chancellor reported to the Community Colleges that "9 of the programs we had no problem with, 4 we wanted to talk about and 2 were seen as a problem". He thought the Chancellor probably had reasons for his report that were different than the faculty. The Community Colleges sent 14 forward for approval. S. Filling asked the faculty to consider issues that were sure to come up. The UC's had said that they would not consider the CC BA's as sufficient for students to apply to their graduate programs. He suggested the CSU might consider doing the same. Do those BA degrees provide sufficient training for CSU graduate programs? Another issue would be that a student could spend two years in a CC BA program and then decide to come to the CSU for their degree and want credit for all that course work. How would that be dealt with? It had to be dealt with at the campus level. He said he used a "bill tracker app" that followed any mention of the word California State University. The app was currently tracking 275 pieces of legislation. He gave examples of the bills being tracked. He asked the members to be suitably mindful of the need to talk to Legislators and to neighbors about the CSU's need for money to meet the mission.

Faculty Trustee Steven Stepanek

S. Stepanek said he had timed his visit to attend the Statewide Academic Senate Chairs Council and do a trustee visit to the campus. He invited Senators to talk to him about the credible things they had done and the problems/issues they were facing. He noted that the Board of Trustee largely deals with issues of a system wide nature and not the campus level. He understood that SSU needed more FTE and more resources and he would bring that back, but those topics were generally not addressed by the Board. They looked at the budget coming in for the whole CSU and their main battle was with the Legislators and the Governor. There were many reasons the state needed to provide more money to the CSU. He was frustrated to hear that campuses could handle more students, but the resources were just not there. He said the Legislators and Governor need to hear that message. He thought the task force for a sustainable financial model was very exciting. One of the things on the table for that task force was - what is the mechanism by which the Chancellor's office allocates FTES to campuses. They are proposing that there needs to be a second level of work groups or task forces that would follow on from the first one. Next year he hoped some very concrete proposals would come forward.

A member asked S. Filling about the bill he was tracking that had to do with different kinds of donations available to the GMC and who introduced the bill. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that the bill was introduced by Representative Wolk and would allow the GMC to accept donations from a wine, beer, or spirits company, so that on the same night they sponsored, the GMC could sell their product. This was not currently allowed under state law unless there was a special exemption from the State Board of Alcohol and Drugs. The bill had left committee without any votes and would move on to Appropriations next and then the Assembly. A member asked if this bill would apply to just the GMC or to the whole campus. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it would only apply to the GMC grounds, but a campus entity could do a event in the GMC sponsored by, say Lagunitas, and then serve

their beer. A member asked Trustee Stepanek what it meant to be a state funded institution, does the CSU care whether it is a state funded institution anymore, and is the CSU really state subsidized? S. Stepanek said he was not speaking as Board member to answer this question and noted he had been associated with the CSU for over 40 years. He could remember when in 1960's, the fee for students was \$65 per semester and there was no tuition. At that point, the CSU was completely funded by the State. There was no significant fundraising. During the economic downturn in 2006 – 2008, the State let the CSU know that the “luxury days” were over. The State would provide a certain level of support, but the CSU was told to provide the rest. The CSU finds those resources in increased tuition and development activities. He noted that the system as a whole was now receiving more than 50% support from the State. All these sources of revenue were still not sufficient to provide the educational experience the CSU needs to provide. One thing that faculty might notice is that the campus infrastructure needs repair and laboratories do not have the most up to date equipment. To provide the greatest access to students, the CSU had cut other corners and this was now reaching a breaking point. The infrastructure had to be fixed. He also recommended the Chancellor's remarks (via the link on the previous page). In effect, the CSU was in a different model. He said the CSU was better than some other systems in other states. He believed that the state did need to invest more in the CSU. The Chair thanked both S. Filling and S. Stepanek for their visit. Applause.

Classroom Upgrades Report – S. Horstein

S. Horstein introduced other committee members to the classroom upgrade workgroup – Carol Ingerman and Geoff Cirullo. He said the classroom upgrade workgroup was functioning as an ad hoc group of the Executive Committee. He provided a written report. He noted this group was a remnant of APC, which was on hiatus currently. G. Cirullo came to APC and said he had a budget for classrooms upgrades and wanted faculty input. That triggered a year of conversation and former members of APC felt it was important to continue that conversation. They were trying to prioritize upgrades based on their own understandings and a survey that went out in fall. Additionally, they were talking about improving communication between IT, facilities and the faculty in terms of needs, faculty hearing what's happening, not hearing after the fact and that faculty needs are being solicited when there are upgrades. They assessed the functionality of general use classroom for the technology in the actual space, such as was the projector in front of the white board, were there enough white boards, was the room cleaned, was there furniture that didn't belong, etc. They also wanted to enable different faculty needs for technology. He said general use classrooms that had no technology were becoming laptop enabled and those that do have technology were being upgraded. If money is left over, they might try to obtain more modern classroom furniture for a few classrooms. In terms of upgrades, they were getting all the general use classrooms to the point of being able to support some level of technology and they were trying to put together an on-going refresh program for classrooms. He noted the report showed their progress so far and the projected timeline. He said they thought it was good to have a faculty / staff group working on this together. A member asked if computers with region-free DVD drives could be put in certain classrooms that would allow faculty to play DVDs produced in different parts of the

world through the computer. G. Cirullo said they did not have the capability at this time, but would work toward that functionality. A member thanked the workgroup for their efforts. She asked about the laptop enabled classrooms and asked if faculty could borrow laptops or could departments received funding to purchase a set for faculty to use? S. Horstein said that the University Scheduler was also on their group, so they might change the technology designation for classrooms and faculty could request what they needed. In the fall, 15 laptops would be available for check out in the Faculty Center to faculty who were assigned to a laptop enabled classroom, but did not have one. The IT cart system would remain as a backup. A member asked if the classrooms would allow use of the computer projector and a white board at the same time. S. Horstein said that was one of their guiding principles. A member said that asbestos was in Stevenson around her office area, and had been previously sealed. A small area around their chairs was recently re-sealed, but not the whole area. She wondered if that could be done. C. Ingerman wanted to know what room she was referring to and asked the member to email her about it. A member asked if athletics classrooms were being considered in this process. G. Cirullo said the scope of the project was just for general use classrooms and he said he could partner with any department to help find solutions. A member was concerned with the internet connections in the classrooms. She said the wireless connection was unreliable. She asked if all ports could be active in the classrooms. G. Cirullo said every room they were upgrading would have an active port for the instructor and they were doubling the wireless capability. A member voiced concern about classrooms not being cleaned. C. Ingerman said she wanted to know of particular classrooms that were of concern: carol.ingerman@sonoma.edu. A member thought that classroom furniture should be on wheels and be able to be moved around and hoped they would bring the classroom furniture into the 21st century. A member asked if there was a regular calendar for cleaning the classrooms. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that the custodians were asked to do a surface cleaning most nights and he reminded the Senate that the number of custodians had been cut significantly due to budget cuts, and at the same time, the campus had grown. The Chair noted that the use of projectors requiring wireless connectivity did not allow another wireless connections in the room and he hope they would work on that issue.

EPC Report – A. Gilinsky for M. Milligan

A. Gilinsky report that EPC approved the Early Childhood Education certificate and the revision to the Human Development program. EPC vote against the discontinuation of the Direct Entry Master's in Nursing. A proposal was floated to rename EPC to the Extinguished Programs Committee. A member asked if EPC would be reviewing the Discontinuance policy. A. Gilinsky said that was not on their docket now, but probably would be in the fall.

FSAC Report – R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus reported that FSAC reviewed the end of year report for the Professional Development subcommittee and that would be coming forward to the Senate. They started a number of discussion items regarding the RTP policy revision. One idea they were discussion was taking a multi-level approach to assessing teaching

effectiveness. They also discussed campus policies about professional responsibilities and how those would inform the RTP process.

SAC Report – J. Shulman

J. Shulman reported that a couple of members of Structure and Functions visited SAC to discuss the lack of a Chair for next year. They considered a tag-team approach, one person would chair in the fall and one in the spring. They discussed electing at-large members for Schools seats that were vacant. They discussed reaching out to FYE and SYE faculty to serve on SAC. There was brief mention in their meeting of a student store front opening at the Student Center in the fall that would give students experience in business. The Career Center held a mock interview workshop and were currently reviewing applications for a new one year grant funded position in Career Services. They heard about the registration tool for open registration that students could use. They would put in the parameters needed and the tool would show them options. They also heard about “Course Planner” which would allow a department to see ahead of time how many students were in need of specific classes. The Fee Advisory Committee had heard their last presenter. The Scholarship subcommittee received 610 applications this year.

Good of the Order

A member noted that Senator Suzanne Rivoire had received the President’s Scholarship Award this year. Applause. The Chair thanked everyone that helped make the recent research symposium a great success. He reminded the Senator to closely review the CANDEL documents before the next meeting:
<http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/committees/discontinuance.html>.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes