

## Academic Senate Minutes

March 6, 2008

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

### Abstract

Chair Report. Chair-Elect announcement of Spring election results. Approval of Agenda. Minutes delayed. Revision to Economics and Music approved. Information Item: FAQ's about the Senate Agenda. Update on WASC. Associate Student Report. University 150 postponed to next meeting. New member of Ad-Hoc committee approved: Birch Moonwomon. RTP Policy revision postponed to next meeting. TESL Program Discontinuance approved. Resolution regarding Independent Audit approved. Remedies Recommendations in Response to the Spring 2007 No Confidence Vote from Ad-Hoc Committee approved.

**Present:** Tim Wandling, Scott Miller, Edith Mendez, Sam Brannen, Susan Moulton, Noel Byrne, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Ronald Lopez, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Janet Hess, Ada Jaarsma, Terry Lease, Robert Eyler, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Rick Luttmann, Wanda Boda, Steve Orlick, William Poe, Margaret Purser, John Wingard, James Dean, Lillian Lee, Sandra Shand, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Whitney McClure, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Thaine Stearns, Maria Hess, Karen Thompson

**Absent:** Elaine Newman, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Birch Moonwomon, Charles Elster, Jonathan White, Adele Merritt, Ruben Armiñana

**Guests:** Rose Bruce, William Babula, Barbara Butler, Nathan Rank, Bob Karlsrud, Elaine Sundberg, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Philip Beard, Richard Senghas

**Proxies:** Rick Robison for Raye Lynn Thomas; Janet Swing for Bruce Peterson

### Report of the Chair – T. Wandling

The Chair asked the body to speak up and asked the members to be on time. He then asked the Chair-Elect to announce the results of the election.

### Chair –Elect Report – S. Miller

S. Miller announced the winners of the Spring 2008 election: Chair-Elect: Susan Moulton; Secretary – Deb Kindy; At-Large Senator: Edie Mendez, Lecturer Senator: Birch Moonwomon; At-Large Member of the Senate Budget Committee: Tim Wandling; At-Large Member of APC: Kelly Estrada. He noted with some chagrin that the turnout was 34%.

## **Report of the Chair continued – T. Wandling**

The Chair congratulated all the winners and all who ran in the election. He described the bounded time certain on the items and recommended to the body to make motions on many of the items to get the business moving along. He said he would hold to two minutes for each speaker. He spoke about the CIHS resolution and asked the body to vote on it today. He spoke about sending a letter to the Chair of the Board of Trustees lamenting the lack of response to the no confidence vote. He noted the much higher turnout for the no confidence vote than the current election. He would appreciate being able to make reference to Senate action in his letter, if possible. He also asked that, if there are handouts, to let him know and explain what they are.

## **Approval of Agenda – No objections.**

Minutes delayed.

## **Consent items:**

**Revision to Economics – *Approved***

**Revision to Music – *Approved*.**

**Information Item:** FAQ's about the Senate Agenda. The Chair noted the document in the packet provided by the Senate Analyst about how the agenda is created.

## **Update on WASC – E. Sundberg**

E. Sundberg reported that the WASC team visit was the following week. She passed out the itinerary, which she said was the most recent version and also that it is posted on the SSU portfolio (<http://www.sonomae.edu/aa/portfolio/>). She thanked all the departments that have provided information to her that the WASC team has asked for, and was appreciative of the hard work. She said it was also typical for the team to ask for more during the visit. She said she was looking forward to the team visit as it was really a time to get feedback on moving forward on the educational effectiveness review. She described all public meetings that have been set. The Chair urged the body to show up to as many meetings as possible.

## **Associated Students Report – W. McClure**

W. McClure passed out the FYE resolution the AS passed supporting the continuance of University 150. They passed a resolution about student fees. They went over their legislative action report and talked about working with the student trustee to help with the Business M.A. fee increase. On their agenda, they still have a resolution on advising and the blood bank resolution.

## **University 150 (FYE) – Second Reading - T. Stearns**

T. Stearns noted that EPC is asking the Senate to approve the course in conformance with the 1985 Curriculum Guide, which states that experimental courses can be taught for two years and then must go through faculty governance for permanent status. He noted three elements that are converging on FYE. One is creative work of faculty in developing curriculum and a demonstration of how assessment can be used to improve curriculum. Secondly, this process is an example of the diligent oversight through the sanctioned venues of faculty governance committees to help faculty achieve important curricular results. Thirdly, he said it was a good example of how this kind of curricular development can positively affect students and how students can respond to faculty leadership on curricular issues. He noted the AS resolution supporting FYE and also the students who had come to the meeting on their own to support this kind of curricular development by faculty. He noted who was present to answer questions on various topics. He then turned the floor over to the Chair of APC. The APC Chair reported that APC approved University 150 at the present scale contingent on the understanding that any "ramp up" of the course would come through normal faculty governance committees. T. Stearns also noted that in the packet were written responses from the first reading. J. Kornfeld described how the students came to be at the Senate. There were questions about how the course would be designated in the GE scheme. A member congratulated the faculty for creating a fine course and expressed concern about the course being "ramped up" to fit in the Green Music Center and lecturers losing their jobs. It was suggested that the member only consider the proposal before the body and that he could make a motion to bring APC's resolution into play. A member noted funding and structural concerns. It was noted that the notion of permanency comes from the Curriculum Guide and that there is also a procedure for discontinuance of programs and courses in that Guide as well. The Chair advocated for the support of the course. Another member brought up funding issues and offered a specific example of another GE course that is not funded appropriately. The EPC chair noted that FYE was also competing for funding and that it had not changed the SFR in the English 101 courses while it was being taught. He urged programs to advocate for funding, if that is what they need. A member asked questions about assessment of FYE students in their sophomore year and how students get accepted to the course. T. Shaw said that they would be looking at that kind of assessment data at the end of the semester. J. Kornfeld said that students self-select for the course. It is first come, first served.

**Motion to postpone to next meeting. Second. Approved.**

## **Vote for New Member of Ad-Hoc Committee – T. Wandling**

Birch Moonwoman was approved to be the third member of the Ad-Hoc committee.

## **RTP Policy Revision – Second Reading – M. Hess**

M. Hess noted that C. Ayala was available for the discussion. She thanked the Provost and various Senate members for their generous feedback on the document. **She moved that the Senate become a Committee of the Whole to have a final**

**opportunity to discuss the RTP revisions. Second.** It was clarified that a Committee of the Whole functions as a committee except that if a vote is called, it is a recommendation to the Senate and would need to be voted on again once out of the Committee of Whole.

**Vote on motion to move to a Committee of the Whole approved.**

M. Hess asked for any new information from members. A member suggested that the document be referred back to FSAC to describe the process better. **Motion for M. Hess to run the meeting as a Committee of the Whole. Second. Approved.** A member asked for more specifics in the document about what could be included in the RTP document. C. Ayala noted that department criteria have been added to the document to create those specifics. The department criteria would go to FSAC to review for alignment with the policy and with the university mission. A member asked if departments are supposed to come up with standards that explicate the criteria and how FSAC would do their work. M. Hess said that the department criteria and standards would be negotiated in relation to a particular candidate's plan. The policy was specifically left open to allow professional creativity. FSAC will have to look at what each department's criteria are, in terms of what the department standards are. The Chair of SAC asked if advising concerns could be added to the document in 2 d. 1. d. M. Hess spoke about FSAC's discussion on this issue and thought that this was more about the mentorship relationship between faculty and students, which FSAC is still discussing. A member argued that the document does not show departments how to align their criteria with their standards and argued that URTP has made decisions about what those standards should be and questioned whether that was appropriate. He also noted that departments cannot move candidates forward without criteria. A former Chair of URTP said the document does not require departments to create criteria other than the university criteria. The document allows departments to create such criteria and to notify URTP, but there is no approval process. **Time was ended and the committee of the whole was dissolved with no resolution. Motion to postpone to next meeting. Second. Approved.**

**TESL Program Discontinuance – Second Reading – T. Stearns**

T. Stearns turned the floor over to Professor Richard Senghas to answer questions. Professor Senghas noted that he has started meeting with faculty to begin a Master's program in TESL on campus. **Motion to approve discontinuance of TESL Program in Linguistics and Anthropology. Second. Approved. One abstention.**

**Provost Report – E. Ochoa**

No report. A member asked about a rumor circulating about some kind of simulation on the campus. The Provost deferred to the Vice President of Administration and Finance. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that a memo had come from the Chancellor's office for each campus to come up with a shooter simulation within the next six months. He said the Police Department was working on that and everyone will be informed. It seemed a good idea to test our processes and procedures. There was discussion about whether the faculty would have input on

the simulation and suggestions were made. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he would talk to the Police Chief about how to incorporate more input. The Chair asked the Provost if he would be asking the Senate for endorsement of the University Strategic Plan. The Provost said that if the plan was brought before the Senate during the public comment period, then the Senate could make a statement. Or perhaps the final version would be more appropriate to bring before the Senate.

**Ad-Hoc Committee Business:**

**Resolution regarding Independent Audit – First Reading - N. Byrne**

**N. Byrne asked for a waiver of the first reading. Second. Approved.**

**N. Byrne moved the following amendment for the first Resolved clause (shown in italics):**

That the Sonoma State University (SSU) Academic Senate calls for a comprehensive financial and management audit of the University, *as well as Grants and Contract Administration and CIHS*, by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee or some other institution acceptable to the Senate; and be it further. . .

There was discussion about the amendment.

**It was moved to amend the amendment by replacing *as well as* with *including*. Second.**

There was discussion. **Vote on amendment to the amendment. Approved.**

**Vote on previous amendment. Approved.**

There was continued discussion about the resolution itself.

**N. Byrne moved to call the question. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on resolution. Approved.**

**Resolution Regarding Independent Audit of Sonoma State University**

Resolved: That the Sonoma State University (SSU) Academic Senate calls for a comprehensive financial and management audit of the University, including Grants and Contract Administration and CIHS, by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee or some other institution acceptable to the Senate; and be it further

Resolved: That an SSU Academic Senate subcommittee or the Senate Executive Committee approve the auditing firm or entity, the audit proposal, and the audit contract, meet with the auditors for an exit interview and receive an original copy of the final audit report.

Resolved: That the SSU Academic Senate calls for this audit to include university

internal controls, documented financial roles and responsibilities, compliance with system and campus policies, accounting for staff paid from outside sources, flow of funds between university entities and accuracy of financial reporting provided to the campus community for fiscal years 2004-2005, 2005-06 and 2006-07.

The audit should specifically address some or all of the following questions as determined in consultation with Senate subcommittee or Executive Committee and based on on-going results.

- Did University administrative policies and procedures provide strong controls to ensure financial accuracy and integrity?
- Does the University administrative process for developing and monitoring budgets for all funds comply with CSU and campus policies and with sound fiscal management?
- Did Administration and Finance provide adequate training to A&F staff and all other involved university staff to ensure competent administration and oversight of donor funds and grants?
- What specific expenditures were made with University FTES growth funds?
- Were Academic Foundation funds spent according to donor agreements, including funds for the Green Center?
- Were Academic Foundation investment practices consistent with policy and sound fiscal management?
- Was delegated authority for grants and contracts documented and practiced according to CSU and campus policy? Who had delegated authority?
- What specific expenditures were made with grants and contracts Indirect Cost funds? Did these funds supplant General Fund supported positions and operating expenditures? How were the supplanted General Funds then used?
- Are the labor cost analyses used to allocate A&F positions to grants and contracts accurate and documented?
- Specifically in regard to CIHS: Was the financial condition accurately reported by A&F; were expenditures denied by funding agencies; were Principal Investigators consulted prior to determining expenditure denials to ensure that they were disallowable; were financial transactions processed timely by A&F; were strong internal controls in place; and, were IDC sharing agreements complied with by A&F?
- To what extent have General Fund monies, including supplanted expenditures, been used to finance the development of the Green Center?
- Are the revenue and expenditure projections for the operation, capital outlay and debt repayment obligations of the Green Center based on sound financial assumptions?

Resolved: That the SSU Academic Senate calls upon President Armiñana to continue to disclose all financial audits and reports as they become available.

## **RATIONALE**

All of the following argue strongly for the independent audit described above:

- A special trustee audit of the Sonoma State University Academic Foundation conducted in late 2006 revealed numerous problems with the business practices being followed by A&F. See:  
[http://www.calstate.edu/audit/Audit\\_Reports/auxorg/2006/0652AUXSonomia.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/audit/Audit_Reports/auxorg/2006/0652AUXSonomia.pdf)
- A Special Audit Investigation of the California Institute on Human Services revealed numerous problems with business practices in relationship to this center.
- The Green Music Center is a project being developed on the campus of SSU as a public private partnership. The Academic Senate has gone on record stating that it does not approve supporting the GMC with General Funds. There are widespread allegations that General Funds and funds from many sources across the campus are being diverted away from the university's academic mission to support the GMC and that some of these funds may not be being transferred or spent in keeping with CSU policies.
- SSU has borrowed heavily to support development of GMC and other controversial projects such as the purchase of land in Rohnert Park for faculty/staff housing that is not appropriately zoned for this purpose.
- In 2004, WASC issued an accreditation report indicating that there was poor alignment between SSU institutional priorities and mission. In many respects, it would appear that this criticism is even more valid today than when first issued.
- It is alleged that SSU used the over 10 million dollars that it received for general administrative expenditures from grants and contracts across the past five years to free general funds and other fund accounts, with the freed up funds used to pursue other, non academically-related priorities.

**Remedies Recommendations in Response to the Spring 2007 No Confidence Vote from Ad-Hoc Committee – Second Reading – N. Byrne**

N. Byrne introduced the item and passed out a clarified version to the body. **N. Byrne moved the version passed out as a substitute motion. Second. Approved.**

There was discussion about the document.

**The following amendment was moved shown in italics:** All new campus construction projects, *except the University Center*, will be deferred until GMC fiscal policies and funding strategies are resolved. Second.

There was a short discussion on this amendment.

A Senator brought a point of information and asked the status of the University Center. The Chair answered the point.

**Vote on amendment. Approved.**

**Question called on entire document. Second. Approved.**

**Vote on Remedies Recommendations – Approved.**

**Adjourned.**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström*