

Academic Senate Minutes

February 22, 2007

3:30 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 2/8/07 approved. Special Session on Access to Excellence including resolution from San Bernardino, Senate Task Force Workload Study group report and Workload Resolution.

Present: Elaine McDonald, Tim Wandling, Elizabeth Stanny, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwoman, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Elizabeth Martínez, Thaine Stearns, Robert Train, Ada Jaarsma, Steve Cuellar, Virginia Lea, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Steve Orlick, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Michelle Moosebrugger, Scott Miller, Marguerite St. Germain, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Rachel Sagapolu, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Mary Halavais, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jarrod Russell, Eric Halstrom

Proxies: Terry Lease for Liz Thach, Jan Beauly for Sandra Shand

Guests: Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Rose Bruce, David Abbott, Susan Moulton, Susan McKillop, William Babula, Barbara Butler, Elaine Sundberg, Katharyn Crabbe, Whitney Diver

Chair Report – E. McDonald-Newman

The Chair started by saying that the Senate meeting today was an extension of the campus conversation on Access to Excellence. She said the Executive Committee decided to structure the session as follows: reports from Standing Committees, how the Access to Excellence draft relates to faculty workload and to consider a resolution from San Bernardino on the Access to Excellence project. She also reported some good news from the PBAC (President's Budget Advisory Committee). The President has chosen to select some of the priorities that the Senate had proposed. \$200,000 of the growth money has been earmarked for faculty development. Currently, it is for faculty travel, but that will be discussed further in AABAC (Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee). And \$200,000 will go to instructional technology. Details need to be worked out. She thanked the President for listening to the faculty.

Approval of Agenda – Motion to move *Endorse San Bernardino resolution* to the special session. No objection. Motion to move *Resolution on Tenure-Track Faculty Workload* to special session. No objection. *Approved.*

Approval of Minutes of 2/8/07 – Approved.

Access to Excellence Special Session

The Chair asked the students to report first. The student representative noted the questions they came up with regarding the draft. The questions were included in the Senate packet. W. Diver reported that they did not have the time they would have wanted to devote to it.

It was noted APC's report was in the packet.

The Chair of FSAC discussed the draft. They had questions about the purpose of the CSU and its relationship to the community colleges and the UC system. They came to a philosophical agreement that the CSU is having an identity crisis. They are trying to do community college things and UC things. They thought a preamble addressing this issue would be good to add to the document. They could not find a mission statement for the CSU. Many people on FSAC felt the draft did not fit them well. They thought the ordering of the domains did not reflect the priorities of the group. They understood it was a university wide thing and so maybe the ordering didn't matter. FSAC also noted that in Domain 5 there was no mention of administration. They thought a domain was needed about funding. They thought that how the issue of the value of faculty and staff were presented was problematic and could use more clarification. Another domain they thought was missing was about campus climate.

The Chair of SAC noted SAC's report in the packet and said that they concurred with the statements on advising and recommended the reinstitution of a Director of Academic Advising who is a faculty member, and a university wide advising center.

The Chair of EPC said they also spent time discussing the need for advising. They commended the use of the word rigorous as an adjective for learning. They supported item number 10 in domain 4: "Preparing students with a global perspective, language abilities, cross-cultural competencies, and technological capabilities that will lead to successful lives and lifelong learning skills" as this reaffirms the need for a traditional liberal arts and sciences education. They wondered by domain 4 was not domain 1. She argued that without our students, there is no university.

The Chair thanked the committees for their reports and for the faculty who attended the conversation during the day. She then asked the body to turn to the resolution from San Bernardino. It was suggested that the Senate endorse this resolution by replacing the words 'San Bernardino' with 'Sonoma State'. A Senator asked what the evidence was for the statements made in the "Whereas" clauses. There was discussion on this point as well as clarification that the Access to Excellence document was not a strategic plan. It was just a starting point for conversations. It was argued that the resolution was input into the process. It was suggested that the resolution be re-written and formatted with resolved clauses and a rationale. The Provost suggested that APC might formulate, in a systemic way, a resolution about how the CSU planning process connects with SSU's planning process.

First reading completed.

A Senator asked about the language in the domains about supporting under-enrolled campuses and if this represented a change in the Board of Trustee policy that moves resources from under-enrolled campuses to other campuses. The President responded that there was no change in policy that he was aware of.

A Senator asked how the ordering of the domains was decided. The Provost said that the order was not important and did not imply any priorities. He reiterated that the document was just to start conversations.

A Senator asked what the next step in the process was. The Provost said the comments would be transcribed and then grouped thematically in a report. This report would go on our campus website and to the Chancellor's office. There is a large conference at the end of April where all the campuses will send 14 representatives. The list of representative is pretty specific. The Provost said that a lot of work will need to be done with all the input before the end of April and that the Steering committee is too large to do such work. He said that he is suggesting that they set up smaller working groups to do more intensive work. Otherwise it will be a Chancellor's staff generated document.

A Senator suggested building in a cost/benefit analysis in the assessment of the process.

Report from Academic Senate Workload Committee - B. Moonwoman

Included here is the Executive Summary of the Report that was presented to the body by B. Moonwoman, with additional comments.

The Faculty Workload Committee, reporting to APC and chaired by Susan Moulton designed and distributed to faculty, by email and hard copy, a one-page survey in November, 2006. The questionnaire asked how many hours faculty members spent each week on various tasks and inquired in other ways about a sense of the job and about health in relation to working conditions.

The Results include both qualitative and quantitative data. The results could be compared to the administration survey on faculty satisfaction administered last Fall, the case study Sick and Tired (Birch Moonwoman) and results from a survey of student access to classes last spring as well as health issues as known to our union and how the administration is handling it. She also thought T. Wandling's resolution on Workload was relevant.

Sixty-four faculty members returned the survey form (63 instructional faculty, 1 coach)—@12% of faculty—from across the schools and faculty ranks, ranging from 1 to 37 years of service.

Findings: Every three FTEF produce the work of four FTEF. Faculty workload averages 139% of full (compensated) time. The great majority (92%) of faculty

Edith Mendez 3/6/07 4:09 PM

Deleted:

Edith Mendez 3/6/07 4:09 PM

Deleted:

responding are performing uncompensated labor and more than two-thirds of the respondents report working more than full-time each week (45 hours) whether or not they are employed for full-time work. Percent of compensated labor varies more for lecturers than for other ranks.

Faculty report classroom instruction as the most visible job activity. Tasks associated with classroom instruction such as preparation and advising, are named as least visible job aspects, along with research and committee work. Respondents comment that they are assessed by the administration as lazy; that the increase in work that comes from teaching large classes is not acknowledged; and that the time, effort, and product of creative teaching, administrative work, and research are not appreciated. A realistic job description would mention low pay, fragmentation of work, and the burden of administrative tasks.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents say their health has deteriorated since becoming employed at SSU. Many faculty members believe their working conditions contribute to loss of good health. Respondents comment that they have no time for exercise and other aspects of self-care. They specify health problems such as migraines, joint problems, insomnia, and pneumonia. One who had a heart attack at 37 blames the pressure to fund raise for his program. More comments refer to the effects of stress than to any other issue. Lack of janitorial services and other environmental concerns are also mentioned.

As "other comments" (question 7) survey respondents mention pay as "the worst part of job," workload as "an equity issue that must be dealt with," and note that "the faculty gets little respect and seems to be held in contempt by some sectors of the administration."

A casual comparison of survey comments with remarks from interviewees in Sick and Tired shows striking similarities for almost every category of comment.

She asked what is to be done.

A Senator argued that the survey was not random, but self-selected and thus he could only know with certainty that 12% of the faculty were overworked. He thought the number could be higher, but this was all the survey told him.

A Senator asked about the "clumpiness" of work and how that was accounted for in the survey.

B. Moonwoman said the survey did not account for the "clumpiness" of work. She also addressed the previous Senator's comments about methodology. She noted that in the Social Sciences there is always this problem. To get people to talk to you, they have to want to talk to you. This does not say anything about the psychological state of any respondent. She agreed it is not random and that out of the number of people who would answer, some did. She did not know how many would answer.

R. Bruce said that Institutional Research did do a survey on faculty and had a good response with lots of satisfaction and happiness reported.

The Chair thanked the Task Force for their work.

Resolution on Tenure-Track Faculty Workload – First Reading - T. Wandling

T. Wandling said that perhaps the resolution would be a response to the report just heard. He and E. McDonald-Newman had met with lots of committee representatives to get a handle on the workload issue. Their main concern was the quality of the student educational experience. He validated the other issues as well, but said his issue was not that faculty are working 60 hours a week, but that 60 hours a week is not enough time to get the job done. He discussed the resolution on workload that FSAC brought previously and its relationship to the current resolution. He said in this resolution they wanted to give pro-active advice to the Standing Committees, individual faculty and Departments/Programs. The guidance provided derives from the faculty union contract. The resolution puts an upper limit on class sizes. They wanted to build in flexibility so that if a faculty member did teach the upper limit one semester, the next they wouldn't and someone else would, so that the load would be shifted around. This is also getting at the number of students faculty actually see, besides hours worked. He encouraged everyone to have a lot of conversation about this and would oppose a waiver of a first reading. He wanted the resolution to have unity behind it.

A Senator voiced support for the resolution. Another argued that this may be also looked at in terms of aligning resources to mission. How the money that comes to campus goes out to the departments is another issue to consider. T. Wandling said that this resolution's audience is the faculty and he hopes it will be supported by the administration. If faculty say they can't do something, perhaps then the resources needed for that activity will flow to it.

A Senator asked why adjunct faculty were not included in the resolution. T. Wandling said he supported another resolution for lecturers specifically, as their situation was different.

A Senator asked if the faculty have any input on how the WTU calculations are made on specific kinds of classes and teaching, such as independent study or labs. The President of the local chapter of CFA responded that workload is contract issue. Workload is one of the issues in the current contractual situation that has gone to fact-finding and they have a gag order. A Senator noted that new faculty hires depend on SFR and that the resolution could complicate this. T. Wandling said that the resolution is attempting to stop competition on that level between departments. The Provost offered the historical background for assignment of WTUs. He also argued that the MOU provided guidelines and not specifics about workload. He agreed there is a workload issue. He said that originally the CSU baseline was 12 WTUs of teaching, but there has been a drift toward expecting more scholarship from faculty and that is the big elephant in the room. To change the whole system to 9 units of teaching would be a huge task. He also said that the SFR proposed by the resolution could be done with existing resources.

The APC Chair remarked that he thought the resolution was a good start for a longer conversation. He thought an interesting question was whether the data showed something typical and/or something critical. He said APC would be looking at the methodology issues and long range planning issues ~~that~~ the Workload Report raises. He also argued that a political discussion was appropriate and that the Senate was the appropriate information-gathering body. He thought the information gathered might be more impressionistic, but if the feelings on the campus are as critical as he and others are hearing, then it is a political issue and as political representatives, the Senator~~s~~ need to take this back to their constituencies for discussion and bring back substantive information for debate in the Senate.

Edith Mendez 3/6/07 5:40 PM

Deleted:

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström