

## Academic Senate Minutes

October 28, 2004

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

### Abstract

Chair's report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 10/14/04 approved. Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document second reading. Procedures for Faculty Trustee Nominations – motion to amend something previously adopted approved. Endowed Chairs Policy first reading. Withdrawal Policy first reading. Provost report including annual report of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

**Present:** Melanie Dreisbach, Elizabeth Stanny, Catherine Nelson, Jan Beaulyn, Robert McNamara, Susan McKillop, Deborah Kindy, Robert Karlsrud, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Wanda Boda, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, E. Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Brad Mumaw, Greg Tichava, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Elaine McDonald, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Tim Wandling, Ruben Armiñana, Caitlin Hicks, Jonathan Peacock

**Proxies:** Art Warmoth for Glenn Brassington

**Guests:** Katie Pierce, Rose Bruce, Elaine Sundberg, Bill Houghton

The Chair appreciated Senator's effort to arrive at the meeting on time.

### Chair's Report

The Chair reported on the Faculty Emeritus Dinner which was very successful. She thanked the Senate Analyst for her work. She stated it was a lively evening. The President provided a wonderful recognition and celebration of all the faculty. The Provost played a very interactive role and gave equal time to emeritus attending to share about themselves. Based upon that instead of having a speaker next time we might have the Emeriti share words of wisdom, what they had wished they had known while they were here with those of us who are here. She reported that she and the Chair-Elect had lunch with Paul Draper about the GE program and some of the intended proposed revisions. We encouraged him to come spend some time with the Senate ahead of bringing a formal proposal. It looks like he will be able to be with us on November 11<sup>th</sup>. We've been working on a survey about convocation to solicit feedback. It will go up on the web next week. She also asked the body to speak up for her benefit and the recording quality.

**Approval of Agenda – motion to change status of Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document from a special report to a business item.** By doing so the item would be able to be acted upon by the Senate. **Second.** There was discussion. **Vote on motion – Approved.**

## **Minutes of 10/14/04 – *Approved***

### **Business**

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

C. Nelson thanked all the Standing Committees for their recommendations. She recommended to the Senate that when the time comes that the Senate approve forwarding these recommendations to the Strategic Planning committee.

A Senator offered comments on the vision statement. He noted the vision statement says “academic affairs will achieve national distinction for its excellence in public liberal arts and sciences education. . .” His concern was that achieving national distinction is not the same as excellence. He argued that this promotes a marketing formulation and that this vision will guide reward structures. These rewards structures will influence Deans and Chairs. Deans and Chairs will then seek a highly regarded reputation for a program. When marketing becomes the primary thrust of the reward structure, dysfunctional consequences follow. Therefore, he wished that the vision statement not place emphasis on national distinction for its excellence. To achieve excellence is a vision he would fully support.

A Senator supported the previous comments and argued that achieving excellence was more important than gaining national distinction.

The Provost argued that it makes it harder to achieve excellence if we are the best kept secret in the nation because it requires additional resources. Additional resources flow from our university being perceived as being high quality. Some level of marketing allows us to do things with the recognition and support we would get.

The Senator reiterated his concern of the consequences for reward structures in organizations that certain kind of statements encourage. He believed that the vision statement will have its most direct impact on reward structures.

A Senator commented on the general strategies – 1. Identify, maintain and enhance excellent and distinctive academic programs responsive to changing student populations. She argued that this means that some programs will be dropped and other added. If it is made totally student focused, where is education going? Many students don’t know about certain fields when they come directly from high school, etc. She urged the Senate to look carefully at how many programs are potentially going to go out the door to follow this particular statement.

The Chair hoped that the graphic could be more dynamic. The current graphic does not represent us well.

A Senator commented that he would prefer to have education in the mission statement rather than the vision statement. He argued that marketing is necessary and that it should be use to support education and not the other way around.

A Senator asked what the Strategic Plan means now in light of the WASC report.

The Provost responded that because of short run considerations it became more convenient to get the ball rolling for strategic planning (unintelligible). The work that has been done will stand us in good stead as we move forward with university wide planning. This is a fairly well articulated expression of our broad priorities in the academic core of the institution so it will inform and provide a context for the university wide plan.

A Senator who is a member of APC responded to the question as well. APC did review the Strategic Plan with the Long Range Academic Plan and the WASC report. The consensus was that the three documents are in general alignment. **He moved that the Senate accept the specific amendments to the Strategic Plan that APC recommends and forward them to the Strategic Planning committee.** He reviewed the recommendations from APC. **Second.**

The VP of Administrative and Finance asked since the Department of Finance under our current Governor has ruled that the student/faculty ratio be budgeted at 21 to 1, did APC have any idea how to obtain 18 to 1 when the budgeting formulas are now 21 to 1?

The Senator responded that given our liberal arts and sciences mission our student/faculty ratio should be lower than the system wide average. How we get there is another question. The goal of getting there seemed clear with our mission to have a small liberal arts and sciences university. Small in higher education now more refers to the student/faculty ratio than the absolute size of the enrollment of the university.

The VP of Administrative and Finance asked if APC considered that the state does not recognize us as a liberal arts university.

The Senator responded they were operating mainly from the statements in the WASC report.

The Provost responded he appreciated that APC recognized that to truly become an institution that has the character of a liberal arts and science institution, the seminar experience for students has to be a key element. The committee will have to consider whether the student/faculty ratio is the most effective way to get at that issue given some of the external/environmental constraints that we face in terms of funding or is it possible to address it by articulating the need to have that as component of the overall educational experience, maybe not necessarily every single class.

The Senate responded that is was not about every single class, but the resources needed per student in order to achieve the goal of being a small, high quality, public liberal arts university. If there is a target for everyone to see, then the strategy of how we get to that target becomes a fruitful debate.

A Senator argued that she agreed with the previous Senator and thought that the mission and vision statement should state what we want to become. She argued that many of the terms in the document need to be defined. She made the case that the

seminar experience should be a broad range of a student's experience. She encouraged the Strategic Planning committee to hash out what it means to be small.

The Chair-Elect noted that in striving to achieve national distinction she did not see a problem having the student/faculty ratio at 18 to 1. If we get the money, then maybe this something we should do with it.

A Senator asked if COPLAC has a recommended SFR.

The Chair noted the previous motion and asked the body to consider the other responses from the Standing committees in the motion.

The Chair of FSAC read their response as it was not provided in the packet.

"FSAC appreciates the effort that went into the development of the strategic plan. Discussions in FSAC raised two primary areas of concern: minimal attention to faculty development and only vague measures for implementation.

While teaching and learning are placed at the center of the diagram, only strategic initiative 4 explicitly addresses ways to enhance teaching and learning, and there the focus is on information technology.

FSAC would like to see greater attention given to increased support for faculty development which is a key component of achieving the other strategic initiatives.

Finally, discussion of actions for and measures of successful implementation of the strategic plan are overly vague."

**Motion to amend the motion to include other Standing committee recommendations as well as APC, plus comments made today by members of the Academic Senate. Second.**

**Question called on amendment. Second. Vote = *Approved*.**

**Vote on motion to amend = *Approved*.**

Vote on original motion as amended: Moved that the Senate accept the specific amendments to the Strategic Planning document that all Standing Committees of the Senate recommend, plus comments by members of the body today, and forward them to the Strategic Planning committee = *Approved*.

### **Procedures for Faculty Trustee Nominations – motion to amend something previously adopted – attachment**

E. Stanny introduced the item. She noted that at the last Senate meeting a motion was passed to remove "full time" from the criteria for faculty signatures on petitions for nomination for Faculty Trustee. The statewide criteria includes "full time" and it has to be put back. We are trying to conform to the statewide criteria.

**The motion received a second.**

It was suggested that we could also have a procedure that didn't require full time faculty signatures.

The Chair-Elect responded that we could create any procedures, but depending on what we did it might weaken our case.

A Statewide Senator noted that all issues of definitions and eligibility would be decided by the CSU Academic Senate and that they have made their intentions clear.

**Vote on motion to amend Procedures for Faculty Trustee Nominations by re-inserting "full time" in the criteria for faculty signature on petitions for nomination for Faculty Trustee = *Approved*.**

### **Endowed Chairs Policy – J. Wingard – First Reading – attachment**

J. Wingard introduced the item. He noted that the issue was referred to FSAC by the Executive Committee. The purpose of the policy is to facilitate and provide guidelines for the establishment and administration of endowed chairs. An endowed chair is a faculty position, with or without perquisites and staff or administrative assistance, supported by income from an endowed fund established by a gift or gifts from private sources. The policy was developed in collaboration with Academic Affairs and the Development Office. He listed the issues that had come up in FSAC: Relationship between definition of endowed chairs and the roles of the endowed faculty vis à vis the curriculum and mission of the university; the role of faculty in choosing individuals to fill endowed chairs; the obligation of departments, schools and the university to provide support of endowed chairs once appointed; the relationship between endowment support and the duration of the endowment appointment; evaluation procedures for endowed appointment; flexibility on the part of the university in securing sufficient funding for an endowment and procedures for disestablishing an endowed chair. FSAC reviewed other CSU policies. This policy draws heavily on the CSU Fresno policy which addressed most of our concerns, but we drew on CSU Long Beach as well. We used UC policy for the disestablishment of endowed chairs. This version was passed unanimously by FSAC.

A Senator asked who would make up the consultative body if the endowed chair is not linked to a department. He also asked what happens if the endowment is not sufficient after the beginning of an appointment.

J. Wingard said FSAC could work on the language for the first point. He pointed out that the policy does say that we will not fill an endowed chair until there are sufficient funds.

A Senator asked if the policy would cover endowed chairs in Student Services. J. Wingard responded it was only for faculty.

A Senator asked about "a reasonable charge will be set to manage each endowment." Who will manage? Academic Affairs?

The Provost said it would be whatever overhead costs were identified.

A Senator asked if an endowed chair has tenure and the funding falls below what's needed, what happens then? That individual would have retreat rights to a department. What will they come with?

The Provost responded that we have differentiated between the endowed chair appointment and the tenure appointment. The idea is that the endowment is going to support the chair appointment. We as a university would be considering whether or not an endowed chair would be granted tenure. We would go through the full vetting process.

A Senator asked about an endowed chair teaching at least 3 WTU's per semester.

J. Wingard responded that we wouldn't bring in an endowed chair with no teaching load whatsoever. So they put in a minimum teaching load. Before we actually brought in an endowed chair there would be an endowed chair agreement, so a lot of these things would be covered in the agreement itself. They did not want to lock in certain limitations in the policy that they would regret later. The policy provides guidelines and retains a level of flexibility.

### **Withdrawal Policy – E. McDonald – First Reading**

E. McDonald provided a history of the document. Our withdrawal policy of letting students withdraw for any reason up to the eighth week of class was found to be out of compliance with state law Executive Order 792. The Senate passed an interim policy last year. EPC asked the University Standards subcommittee to draft a permanent policy. This was passed unanimously by University Standards and EPC. She outlined what in the policy was already existing and what had changed and offered explanations for the changes.

The Provost asked if a student was distraught couldn't we ask that they visit the Counseling Center or Health Center and get certification that they are too upset to continue with classes? If it has an impact on the student, there's probably a way to have it verified by a professional.

A Senator noted she, as an instructor, would be uncomfortable making a decision for serious and compelling reasons to withdraw and would want the assistance of Counseling or the Health Center.

E. McDonald noted that EPC had similar concerns that faculty would have to make that determination, but the law is very clear that students can only withdraw for serious and compelling reasons and someone has to determine that.

A Senator noted students can withdraw from classes before classes begin too. He noted that the student's advisor has been left out of the policy. He argued that the advisor might be in a better position than the instructor of a class to offer helpful comments regarding serious and compelling reasons. He questioned whether petitions need to go to both the Registrar and the University Standards committee.

E. McDonald stated that the Chair of University Standards has said that the Registrar would make decisions on petitions that were cut and dried.

A Senator suggested that there might be some lag between the drop date and the add date.

A Senator said she would like to see how the drop date is determined in the withdrawal policy.

E. McDonald stated that the policy is meant to deal with withdrawal and drop, not setting those dates. There is a new committee on Enrollment Management. She wanted to see those two issues separated and perhaps that new committee could deal with the deadlines.

A Senator who is a member of University Standards responded to why the advisor was left out of the policy. They felt it was too much for the student to have to go to the instructor, advisor and chair for signatures. They wanted to get it out of the hands of Deans. They felt it was critical that the instructor be involved so that they would know who is withdrawing from their class. He liked that the policy included the University Standards committee. The Registrar approves cut and dried petitions. Petitions that have questions or no documentation come to the committee.

**The Chair asked the body if they were in favor of extending the discussion past it's first reading time. *Approved. 15-12 vote.***

**Time extended 5 minutes.**

A Senator asked what "errors made by SSU" means in the policy. She suggested some examples would be useful.

The University Standards member responded that they are advising errors and PeopleSoft errors.

A Senator suggested that the petitions be signed by the instructor and Counseling only.

A Senator noted that having the advisor was a good idea since sometimes the instructor is part of the serious and compelling reasons for withdrawal. She also advocated for loosening up on the documentation requirements.

The University Standards member responded that they put in the Chair's signature for situations where the instructor is part of the problem.

## **Reports**

### **Provost Report**

The Provost yielded his time to Tony Apolloni for a report on the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

T. Apolloni offered the annual report for the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. He passed out a written report. He reported that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is very large with an overall budget of external grants and contracts is equal to that of the rest of the university. There was 30% growth this past year in the number of proposals produced on campus. The expenditures this past year were \$32 million in the area of grants and contracts. We are by numbers the top campus in the CSU per faculty and per student basis providing grants and contract expenditures. The report includes several pages of each of the awards. He noted the work on policies this year and thanked FSAC for their help getting the policies in place. He thanked the faculty and staff for all their hard work putting these proposals together and Provost Ochoa for his support and the Deans and particularly thanked the small staff in his office for the volume of work they do. We're the clearing house for all proposals on campus too. He offered time for questions.

A Senator asked where we could find the cost of administering the grants.

T. Apolloni gave a quick overview of indirect costs. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is a self-support function. Last year we had an average indirect of 11.6%. That's about average for the CSU overall. There are fixed costs mandated by Executive Order for administration of grants and contracts. There are formulas for that. We have two large Centers that are funded by formula. The reminder has gone to Academic Affairs. In '02-'03 it was about \$4 million.

A Senator asked how SSU ranked giving indirect costs back to departments or Schools.

T. Apolloni said that was a very hard question to answer. First because other campuses don't want to tell you. He thought SSU was in the zone of average, but didn't have hard data on that. He said that the Schools get indirect based on how much they generated. Even if they don't generate any indirect, they still get some.

The Chair-Elect asked if it would be possible to have a breakdown of what part of indirect goes to different divisions in the university.

The Vice President for Administration and Finance responded that the indirect is shown in the Campus Expenditure Plan.

The Provost said that he was motivated to bring this to the Senate so that the body would be aware of the extent of scholarship and research that is taking place among our faculty. He hoped Senators would peruse the grants.

**The Chair asked the body if they wanted to move to reports – Failed.**

### **Questions for the Provost**

The Past Chair said she was approached by a constituent with two questions. When does the search committee for Vice President of Academic Affairs start meeting and will that search committee be involved in developing the job description?



The Provost responded said he will be putting out the call to the committee very shortly, within two weeks. We will take a past job description, make some changes that we know need to be made to update it, and we'll submit this to the committee as a first draft for them to work off of.

The Past Chair repeated her question about the search committee being involved in developing the job description.

The Provost responded that the search committee will reflect on the first draft and be able to modify it.

A Senator asked about her School's financial contribution to the associated costs of the Darwin remodeling. The figure was high enough to cover several classes in her School. She said her department has been seriously impacted by the budget problems. Is there some other way to cover these associated costs?

The Provost responded that this is the trough of the downturn in the budget that we are experiencing right now. We over achieved our target in the fall so in the spring we are having to ratchet back. The trough we're experiencing is the result of two years of cuts to the base, as well as a reduction in enrollment of 3%. This year we are in much better shape than we would have been if it were not for the \$1.2 million that were permanently added to our base, redistributed from other units. We're being shielded from the full impact of those cuts. The CSU as a matter of policy does not provide funding for transition costs when you have remodeling. It's an outrage. So the campus has had to absorb the cost. On this campus there is no significant amount of money held centrally. It is out in the divisions. In our division, the money is in the Schools. So the it's a sort of a tax. Cuts can only be made in the Schools in temporary faculty. It's unfortunate, but you can see why it's happening.

A Senator inquired about the Enrollment Management Council. She noted that there is no SSP slated for membership on the Council. She wanted to know who to appeal to to have an SSP on the body.

The Provost responded that the Vice Provost would be the one to talk to.

## **Adjournment**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*