Academic Senate Minutes
April 27, 2006
3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Approval of Minutes of 3/23 & 4/6. Agenda amended and approved. Changing Schools to Colleges – First Reading. Faculty Recruitment Policy first reading. Resolution from Art History Faculty Concerning Faculty Workload approved. First Year Experience Pilot first reading. Consultation Policies second reading postponed to next meeting. Core Academic Priorities Resolution approved.

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Melanie Dreisbach, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Paul Draper, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Martínez, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Thaine Stearns, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Sunil Tiwari, Wanda Boda, Sandra Feldman, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Bruce Peterson, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Lindsey Simoncic, Sara Statler, Greg Tichava, Art Warmoth, Perry Marker, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Kristen Daley, John Kornfeld

Proxy: Jan Beaulyn for Marguerite St. Germain

Guests: Carol Blackshire-Belay, Barbara Butler, Elaine Sundberg, Rose Bruce, Jarrod Russell, William Babula, Ian Hannah, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Melinda Barnard, Les Adler, David Abbott, Saeid Rahimi, Sascha Von Meier, Sharon Cabaniss, Susan Moulton, Susan McKillop

Approval of Minutes of 3/23 & 4/6 - *Approved*.

Approval of Agenda – Motion of 3:20-3:35 time certain for item #2. Second. No objections.

Changing Schools to Colleges – First Reading - A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth reported that APC brings this issue to the Senate. APC determined that basically it was a question of aesthetics and whether we believe there are resource allocation implications. APC gathered information and feedback. The main argument is that this is a trend in higher education. It would solve the problem of having the Hutchins School within the School of Arts and Humanities and provide the mechanism for different clusters to come together as Schools within Colleges. APC felt this discussion was more pertinent in the Senate and brought the Senate no recommendation.

It was clarified that the proposal to change Schools to Colleges originated with the Provost.

It was suggested that if approved, the Senate state that we are not approving any additional administrative costs or administrative restructuring.

A Senator asked how this would make our university better.

The Provost responded that the proposal has some benefit at no cost. A benefit is perception. It is a trend in higher education. The Hutchins School is the School of Arts & Humanities which is confusing, so using Colleges would help clarify our current structure. It would also provide for other units that are something between a department and a School. The only group currently interested in this is are the departments of the performing arts. It carries more cachet now and may be helpful in fundraising.

It was argued that administrative positions would increase under this type of organization.

The Provost responded that other universities that have made this type of change have not increased their administrative structures and Deans remain the heads of Colleges. He stated any administrative restructuring would have to have merit no matter what the unit was called.

It was asked if the creation of another School within a College, would require Senate action. The Provost responded that the Senate would be consulted.

A Senator reminded the body of the history of the Cluster Schools on campus of which Hutchins is the only remainder. He suggested that instead of changing Schools to Colleges an option would be to find another name for the Hutchins School.

A Senator asked if the Provost would compare his proposal to the structure at UC Santa Cruz. The Provost said he thought UC Santa Cruz was more following the British model and they used different names for similar jobs we have in the CSU. The Provost said there would be no change in how curriculum would be delivered or administrated.

Next time certain reached.

Faculty Recruitment Policy – First Reading – C. Ayala

The Chair noted that a revised version of the policy had been passed out prior to the meeting.

C. Ayala introduced the item stating that one of the most important things faculty do is hire new faculty. FSAC was asked to generate a Faculty Recruitment Policy. He said that these are not procedures, but the main important ideas about recruiting faculty.

It was asked if it was required to send more than one candidate forward or not.

C. Ayala responded that the policies provided for both scenarios.

It was suggested that timeliness be included in the document concerning the administration taking action on faculty recommendations for hires.

It was pointed out that the document only addresses the hiring of tenure track faculty and not lecturers.

It was asked if the committee discussed ranking of candidates.

C. Ayala said the committee did discussed ranking and found that this varies widely by School. They wanted to leave the policy as open as possible.

A Senator said he would like to see a strategy about how we would go about recruiting a diverse faculty. C. Ayala said that was an excellent idea and that would be part of the procedures.

First reading completed.

Resolution from Art History Faculty Concerning Faculty Workload – R. Coleman-Senghor

R. Coleman-Senghor turned the floor over to S. Moulton.

S. Moulton argued for what the resolution asks for in terms of collecting information and the work of the task force. S. Moulton praised the faculty for their commitment and contribution to the mission of the university.

A Senator asked if the Chairs of the committees would comment on their proposed role in the task force.

It was argued that the Senate would put together the task force itself and not the committees.

The Provost offered a suggestion for an alternative approach. He argued that APC could look at the information Art History has presented, boil down the research questions and then ask his office to provide whatever information they have to respond to those questions and decide if there was enough information and if a task force was required.

S. Moulton responded that APC has discussed this over two years and they determined that a more comprehensive effort was needed. She said we know what our information is in our departments. She argued that the Provost's suggestion would take more time and the need is urgent. She wanted to proceed towards a solution in a logical and rational manner.

The Provost argued that information gathered at the department level is not necessarily going to be consistent or of a higher quality than what his office gathers. There is a lot of inconsistency within the CSU itself in coding faculty time. He described the uncertainty.

S. Moulton countered that faculty know what they are doing in terms of workload.

Motion to accept resolution. Second. Approved.

Resolution from Art History Faculty Concerning Faculty Workload

Rationale: Inasmuch as SSU gained 1393 full time equivalent students (FTES) between Fall 1995 and Fall 2004, and lost 54.6 FTEF (full time equivalent faculty) between Fall 2000 and Fall 2004 alone, it has seen an increase in its student faculty ratio (SFR = FTES/FTEF) from Fall 1995 to Fall 2004 of 21.2 to 24.6. Between 1995 to 2004 the CSU increased its SFR from 20.4 to 21.9. Within the same period the Chancellor requested the campuses to incorporate capstone projects in the majors. As a result of these changes, SSU-approved curricula have increasingly required that faculty either (1) work beyond standards in Weighted Teaching Units (WTU) and/or carry excessive SFR, or (2) that it encourage matriculated students to go outside SSU to fulfill major requirements. The Art History Program offers a case in point.

Whereas: Art History's growth in the five years between Fall 1998 and Fall 2004 (extracted from the official CSU Academic Planning Data Base--APDB) was 157.8% at the lower division level, 194.5% at the upper division level and 157.8% at the undergraduate level, yielding an actual overall growth of 11.7 SFR, (from 20.26 to 31.97 SFR); and

Whereas: Art History achieved this undergraduate growth despite a reduction of FTEF; and

Whereas: Art History experienced a significant increase in General Education responsibilities during this period--in Fall 2004 its lower division student faculty ratio (almost all of it GE) was 50.4 SFR; and

Whereas: Art History's majors doubled in number (from 25 in 2000 to 53.5 in the Spring of 2006) with associated needs to supervise additional capstone senior theses; and

Whereas: Art History, given these circumstances, has found it difficult (1) to provide necessary breadth in the major, (2) to meet the extensive enrollment targets assigned by the Dean to meet his School's own enrollment target, and (3) at the same time maintain the highest standards for the major unless its faculty either exceed Contract benchmarks for WTU and SFR, or ask its students to achieve timely graduation by taking courses in other institutions or venues such as Extended Education; and,

Whereas: the Senate Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee (FSAC) has forwarded a resolution to bring workload into alignment with benchmark standards agreed to by the CSU in the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and with standards promised to the public through the university's Mission Statement;

Resolved: that the Senate establish and charge a task force chosen from its Faculty Affairs, Educational Policy, Academic Planning and Senate Budget Committees and from members of the Senate body itself (1) to undertake a survey of WTU and SFR practices throughout the University in order to define the extent of the problem that Art History has identified, and (2) to offer the Senate a resolution requesting that the administration ensure that the university-wide workload and funding of classes are adequate to meet in quality the approved curricula of majors and programs.

Resolved: that the task force publicize the results of said survey throughout the university community: to participants in faculty governance, to appropriate Senate and administrative committees, to University, School, department and program administrators and to individual faculty members;

Resolved: that the task force recommend to its constituent committees and the Senate as a whole, immediate relief to problem areas of whatever WTU and/or excessive SFR overload it may discern, and in cooperation with Senate governance, develop long range strategies to preserve the academic quality of the majors and ensure on-going compliance with the CSU approved benchmark workload practices.

Resolved: that Senate governance also consider the merits of incorporating and regularizing appropriate WTU and SFR standards into academic program review and university-wide planning processes.

First Year Experience Pilot – First Reading – P. Marker

P. Marker noted that the recommendation passed out was what the body should be reading instead of what was in the packet. He read the resolution that EPC passed last year regarding the FYE Pilot. He noted a lot of work has been done with curriculum, assessment and budget. EPC brings their recommendation to the Senate in favor of the FYE Pilot 7 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions. EPC held two, two hour meetings on this issue to air all perspectives. He noted the attachments for the Senate's information that EPC wanted to go forward with their recommendation and stated that in no way do the attachments lessen the support of EPC for the pilot. He stated that all the representatives on EPC connected with the departments that brought the attachments forward voted in favor of the pilot. He noted a chronology put together by Paul Draper.

A Senator asked if the Science and Technology rep who put in an attachment to the pilot had voted in favor of it. He was under the impression that she abstained.

It was clarified that the S&T rep to EPC had abstained from the vote.

A Senator noted that the document from S&T was an amendment to the pilot and not just an attachment. P. Marker agreed.

It was clarified that comments about the syllabus could be directed to the Coordinator of the FYE Pilot, Sascha Von Meier and cc'd to P. Marker. It was suggested that they also be posted on Senate-Talk.

A Senator asked what discussions EPC had around budget issues with FYE. P. Marker said the Provost visited EPC many times. Many questions about the budget were asked and answered. EPC's recommendation includes vetting of the budget.

A Senator noted that it is an expensive program and only serves 150 people. The UC has raised their enrollment. We are expecting to grow, but not getting more faculty. She asked to hear from the English and Philosophy department chairs as they had valuable comments.

A guest brought up legislative activity that is in the works that asks for a common GE curriculum between the CCC's, the CSU and the UC's. She thought the administration should look at what the legislation is doing before the pilot comes back to the Senate.

The Provost reminded the body about the Lower Division Transfer project going on now in the CSU.

A Senator asked for more information about the assessment strategy and the use of a comparison group.

S. Von Meier provided an overview of how they went about creating the assessment. First, they want to know if the FYE itself provides the outcomes it sets out. She described the outcomes desired. She thought retention over time would be very important. R. Bruce described the assessment instruments that will be used.

A guest that was a member of EPC spoke about her concerns about the finances for the project. She felt the financial projections seemed optimistic and wondered what would happen if after one year, we couldn't afford it. She recommended the body review EPC minutes.

A guest noted that we have never assessed our current GE curriculum.

A Senator voiced her praise for the FYE curriculum committee's work. She thought the Senate should consider priorities and agreed with the suggestion that it be re-looked at after the first year.

P. Draper, the Chair of the GE subcommittee explained the reasoning behind the two year program. He stressed it is a pilot and thought it was important that we give it try. He noted that there were many concerns brought to the committee that helped shape it into what it is now. He described specific examples.

First reading concluded.

Consultation Policies – Second Reading – E. McDonald

E. McDonald introduced the item and noted that N. Byrne's substitute motion was pending before the body.

N. Byrne discussed his substitute motion.

E. McDonald noted the importance of having a consultation policy. She stressed that the original policy was worked on in cooperation with the President and Provost to create a cooperative, consultative policy we could all agree on. She did not think that the term joint decision-making in the substitute motion would be agreed to by the President. She described the different area of primary responsibility for the faculty as stated in the CSU Collegiality Statement.

N. Byrne stated that the Senate could say what it wanted, even if the administration disagrees.

A Senator argued that the substitute motion takes the policy in a different direction.

N. Byrne noted the source of the language of the substitute motion as footnoted in the document. He said he discerned what the language was in higher education today. He did not author it himself.

The Chair noted that the documents cited were not CSU documents and that the other documents were derived from other contexts. They used the Collegiality Statement as it was specific to the CSU.

Question called. Second. Approved.

Vote on substitute amendment. Yes = 10; No = 21. Failed

Motion to add language about faculty primary responsibilities from the Collegiality Statement to the consultation policy. Second.

Motion to postpone to next meeting. Second. Approved.

Core Academic Priorities Resolution and APC's report on the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan – Second Reading – A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth gave background on the item. He noted that the Senate had referred the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan to APC for comment and during their deliberations, the Core Academic Priorities report and resolution came before APC. They decided that the Core Academic Priorities report was a stronger, more developed and articulated document about what the faculty's priorities really are in regard to academic planning.

First, he moved for the Senate to adopt the resolution on Core Academic Priorities.

Second he said APC's recommendation on the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan is that it be entered into the record as a planning document.

E. McDonald introduced a revised version of the Core Academic Priorities report based on the feedback from the first reading. She noted the changes were in *italics*.

There was a second to the motion to adopt the resolution.

Motion to strike in report 3.2 phrase "prior to any further faculty governance activity in the area of GE reform." E. McDonald did not object.

E. McDonald then went through all the changes to the resolution and report.

Motion to amend language in introductory paragraph of resolution: *To promote academic quality, to improve faculty work environment, to promote an effective GE program, to support a diverse University culture, and to facilitate planning on campus* ~~Amid the deterioration of academic quality and faculty work environment, and inspired by the new culture of planning on campus.~~ **And to add** *Appendix A, and to make a report to the Senate by the end of March each year* **at the end of the fourth resolved clause. Second.**

Vote on motion to amend. *Approved.*

It was argued that the Core Academic Priorities report is a living document and was hoped to guide the APC and the University Strategic Planning.

Motion to amend in report: Replace Initiative 4.1. Develop a student, faculty, and staff recruitment program aimed at achieving a diversity profile at Sonoma State comparable to the demographics of the North Bay Region *with* **Initiative 4.1 Faculty, administration, and student groups need to work together to clarify what SSUs optimal diversity profile should be, and whether we should reach for representation comparable to our service area, the North Bay region, or the state. Second.**

Amendment to amendment: Initiative 4.1 Faculty, administration, and student groups need to work together to clarify what SSUs optimal diversity profile should be, and whether we should reach for representation comparable to our service area, the North Bay region, or the state. Achieving representative diversity will require investment in both recruitment and student support. Existing groups representing diversity students, such as MEChA and the Black Student Union, should be consulted and utilized as planning resources. Second.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on amendment to amendment above – *Failed.*

Question called on original amendment discussion. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on original amendment above – *Approved.*

Question called on resolution. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on resolution – *Approved.*

<div align="center">

Academic Senate of Sonoma State University
Resolution Endorsing Core Academic Priorities

</div>

To promote academic quality, to improve faculty work environment, to promote an effective GE program, to support a diverse University culture, and to facilitate planning on campus, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Art Warmoth, and Melanie Dreisbach drafted the below-referenced *Core Academic Priorities Require University-wide Solutions* with the attached template metric progress report. We respectfully submit this resolution asking for Senate endorsement of the priorities and recommendations to the University administration.

At the time of its approval by the Senate, this resolution had been endorsed by the Academic Planning Committee, Senate Budget Committee, Structure and Functions Subcommittee, School of Science and Technology CDC and the Economics Department.

<div align="center">

Resolution

</div>

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University endorses the four core academic priorities and related initiatives outlined in *Core Academic Priorities Require University-wide Solutions*; and

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University requests that the administration work with faculty to establish reasonable goals regarding the initiatives and a reasonable time-frame to achieve those goals; and

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University requests that the administration estimate costs to achieve these goals, and to identify resources to fund those costs; and

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Sonoma State University directs the Academic Planning Committee to track the progress towards achieving those goals using metrics such as those suggested in Appendix A, and to make a report to the Senate by the end of March each year.

Adjournment.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström