

Academic Senate Minutes
October 27, 2011
3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda approved. Minutes of 9/29 approved. New Major in Early Childhood Studies and Revision to Bi-Disciplinary concentration in Mathematics & Statistics approved by consent. Academic Advising Subcommittee Report. Provost Report. Chair-Elect Report. Questions for Vice President of Administration and Finance. Vice President of SAEM Report. Associated Students Report. From SDS: Regarding the Subsidization of the new CAPS Student Fee for Pell Grant Students -Second Reading – referred back to committee. Revision to the Grade Appeal, Student Grievance and Cheating and Plagiarism policies – Second Reading – Approved. Statewide Senator Report. Question for P. Ramey. APC Report. EPC Report. FSAC Report. SAC report. Staff Representative Report. Question about how other campuses address campus fees. Question for the President.

Present: Ben Ford, Margaret Purser, John Wingard, Terry Lease, Catherine Nelson, Brian Wilson, Rick Luttmann, Sam Brannen, Deborah Roberts, Steve Wilson, Helmut Wautischer, Marco Calavita, Parissa Tadrissi, Janet Hess, Ed Beebout, John Urbanski, Florence Bouvet, Tom Buckley, Jean Chan, Sharon Cabaniss, Matty Mookerjee, Michael Cohen, Noel Byrne, Laura Watt, Don Romesburg, Phil Brownell, Sandra Shand, Edie Brown, Ruben Armiñana, Andrew Rogerson, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Matthew Lopez-Phillips Paul Ramey, Emily Hurd, Amanda Burke, Dolores Bainter, Armand Gilinsky, Richard Senghas, Jennifer Mahdavi

Absent: Chip McAuley, Mutombo M'Panya, Karen Brodsky, Andy Merrifield, Kelly Estrada

Proxies: Donna Garbesi for Marisa Thigpen

Guests: Johanna Filp-Hanke, Chiara Bacigalupa, Barbara Lesch McCaffry, Anthony Gallino

Chair Report – B. Ford

B. Ford reported on the progress of the “academic story” conversation and announced the upcoming breakfast the following Friday to continue the conversation.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 9/29/11 – Approved.

Consent Items:

New Major in Early Childhood Studies
Revision to Bi-Disciplinary concentration in Mathematics & Statistics

Approved.

Academic Advising Subcommittee Report – E. Brown for J. Lillig

E. Brown said she would give the report as J. Lillig was unexpectedly unable to be present. She noted that AAS was a subcommittee of SAC. She thought AAS wanted to talk to the Senate today as they had heard of some discussion about advising on campus and of possibly creating other committees and they wanted folks to know they exist and work on advising issues for the whole campus. She reported on activities of the subcommittee in the past few years. They were most proud of the university Advising policy -

<http://www.sonoma.edu/UAffairs/policies/advisingpolicy.htm> and they wished it was more utilized. She said it was hard to change the culture of students. She noted they had created advising months – April for Fall advising and November for Spring which they promote heavily. There were now advising alerts on PeopleSoft and they had reports from departments represented on their committee that foot traffic of students increased after the alerts. They were currently working with the ASI for a joint resolution on advising. E. Brown thought it was very exciting to see a combination of efforts on advising. She noted they had done a survey in 2005 and were now creating a different type of survey to find out what departments's needs were. They hoped to have the results by the first of December and then would try to provide what was needed. A member asked the subcommittee to find out what average advising load was and what would be appropriate. A member asked what kind of mentoring faculty were receiving on advising. A member asked for what each department's advising plan was and how they implemented it. E. Brown responded that the committee was interested in what advising plans departments had, what was working, if mentoring was needed and how that was accomplished. She said faculty could call the Advising Office for general questions and the committee wanted to pull that sort of information together in one place.

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson commented that the recruitment publication called Viewbook included information about academics and appreciated Student Affairs for including that kind of information and hoped there would be more in future.

Chair-Elect Report – M. Purser

M. Purser said S&F recommended Suzanne Riviore for the Graduation Initiative group. **No objection.** They moved forward five faculty names to participate in the Engaged Learning Conference. They put forward J. Hess for the MCC Director Search Committee. She asked that any departments that had an interest in that search to see J. Hess as their representative on that search committee. She also encouraged everyone to vote in the current election.

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

A member asked about the qualifications of N. Markley to supervise Residential Life and Student Leadership. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it was not appropriate to discuss human resource matters in the Senate but noted that N. Markley has retained his position and has not been given a new or different title. The member asked how he would address the short staffing in the accounts payable department. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he was not aware of any such issues. The member noted that administrative coordinators now had to wait 30 days to get a check where before it had been two weeks and when questioned, accounts payable said they were short staffed. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the campus was regularly reducing the number of staff employees and managers in response to the budget reductions and it should not be surprising that there would be delays in processing.

Vice President of SAEM Report – M. Lopez-Phillips

M. Lopez-Phillips thanked the faculty for their time on the MCC Director Search Committee. He described the student application numbers so far this year – 4326. This was up by 96 from last year and it was too early to tell how it would change. The transfer applications numbers were up to 150. He talked about the Career Counselor search process. A member asked if there were targets for the Fall. M. Lopez-Phillips said they were still talking in generalities and thought it would be similar to last year. He noted all the campuses had rich populations of students. A member described a possible sexual assault on campus and how faculty had dealt with it. M. Lopez-Phillips said he hoped the student was reaching out for support and getting appropriate information as he had not heard about it.

Associated Students Report – P. Ramey

P. Ramey noted that it was Homecoming Week for the students. He described the activities and noted it was good week to build spirit for the School. He said the additional consultation process would be coming to the ASI for an official position on last year's student fee referendum next week. A member asked what would be presented to the ASI on the fee referendum. P. Ramey said the Fee Advisory Committee was holding focus groups and open forums, and one of their charges was to consult the ASI. The Faculty Chair described the Fee Advisory Committee's process for alternative consultation. He said there were no presentations at the focus groups or open forums or meetings with official bodies, just a packet of information given to help with the dialogues. A member asked how the smoking policy recommendation was coming along. P. Ramey said the ASI had completed their recommendations and submitted them to the President. A member asked about the intended outcome of the alternative consultation process. P. Ramey said his understanding was that there was a dispute over the "fairness" of the vote on the student fee referendum last spring and the President had asked the campus to go through the alternative consultation process for more feedback about student opinions about the fee and whether the building should be built. A member asked why the Student Union Board would be consulted in the process since they were a partner in the new Student Center and why the faculty were not consulted in the

process. P. Ramey said the alternative consultation process was not an Associated Students process. It was at the request of the President. They had no say in who was consulted in the process.

From SDS: Regarding the Subsidization of the new CAPS Student Fee for Pell Grant Students -Second Reading – S. Cabaniss

S. Cabaniss noted she had revised the resolution to align the figures more due to differences in reporting for Pell Grants. She reviewed the rationale and talked about the fee increases for SSU students. She talked about why just the CAPS fee and said SDS wanted to start with something reasonable. She said subsidizing all of the fees was not workable at this time, but thought that a fee waiver could be discussed in the future. She discussed income based scholarships, restoring some of the general fund monies to CAPS, and discretionary fee waivers. A member asked about the Dream Act and whether those students would be eligible. He argued against the resolution as it started something that needed to be fixed later. A member argued against the resolution saying it was a zero sum game and thought the money would have to come from somewhere else on campus. The Chair of SAC said they had discussed the resolution and put forward a statement: "SAC believes the scope of this resolution is too limited and recommends that it be reconsidered for a more comprehensive view on student fees." A member argued that helping low income students was very fundamental and thought the resources were a matter of priority. A member argued for the resolution because it did set an intention and put potential money behind faculty ideas to support underprivileged students. A member questioned if there was data about whether the increase in fees actually decreased diversity on campus. A member said he would have liked to have seen more vision in the resolution. A member argued that the resolution should call for all campus fees to be augmented by a certain amount and money could be set aside for this as it is for other things. **Motion to vote by paper ballot. Second. No objection.** A guest argued that the resolution was a recommendation to the President and that he could be more expansive with it and the Senate Diversity Subcommittee could also bring forward more. **Motion to refer the resolution back to SDS taking into consideration the issues about scope brought up at the Senate. Second.** There was substantial discussion about referring the resolution back to committee. **Question called. Second. Vote – Approved. Vote on motion to refer – Approved. (17-14).** S. Cabaniss asked for members to send their ideas to the Senate Diversity Subcommittee.

Revision to the Grade Appeal, Student Grievance and Cheating and Plagiarism policies – Second Reading – J. Mahdavi

J. Mahdavi reminded the body that the change was to move the procedures from the policies to the Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures. **Vote on these policy revisions – Approved.**

Statewide Senator Report – B. Wilson & C. Nelson

B. Wilson said they were meeting the next week. C. Nelson noted that the CSU Online initiative was creating a governance structure and they were seeking faculty for the Board of Directors. They wanted faculty with experience in online teaching preferably and the deadline for nomination was the next day. She had sent the call out on Senate-Talk previously. The Chair said it would be good for SSU to have someone in those discussions.

Question for P. Ramey

A guest asked if ASI provided feedback to M. Lopez-Phillips about the alternative consultation process. P. Ramey said yes, they had provided feedback about the composition of the focus groups.

APC Report – D. Roberts

D. Roberts reported that APC was working on a set of academic priorities from three views – staff, faculty and students. They would start the report with what they think the campus was doing well and what the challenges were currently.

EPC Report – A. Gilinsky

A. Gilinsky was pleased to report that, after a ritual hazing at the Executive Committee, EPC had brought two items to the consent calendar. He reported on the EPC meeting that day with Dean of Extended Education to discuss writing a new MOU between Extended Ed and EPC. He said EPC requested that the item be put on the Executive Committee agenda to decide who would write the new MOU in collaboration with many others.

FSAC Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported on FSAC's work on the revision of the SETE's and they wanted to reach out to all the Schools with three questions: faculty general thoughts on the SETEs, how the SETE's were being used, and if there were suggestions for changes. Once they get that information, they would strategize about how to move forward. They were also working on revising the Sabbatical Policy and were starting that from scratch. They worked with the SAC committee on giving faculty feedback for the Disruptive Student Behavior policy. He said they would be talking at their next meeting about issues brought up by the ATI committee about textbook ordering and instructional materials. They want to discuss how the institution can get things together so that students get their books on time to be made accessible. There were some questions about the SETE request.

SAC Report – J. Mahdavi

J. Mahdavi reported that SAC was looking at the student election code in light of the controversy last spring. They had looked at 15 or 16 student election codes, none of which talked about referendum. They would continue to work on it.

Staff Representative Report – D. Bainter

D. Bainter reported that the next staff development workshop was in the process of being organized. She put in a plug for the music department and encouraged people to come and hear the great music they put on. A member asked about the Disability and Diversity workshop. It was noted that many staff turned out for that workshop.

Question about how other campuses address campus fees

President Armíñana said that in the CSU no one waives campus fees. He noted that local fees are part of the calculation of the cost of education. He said each School was asked to submit to the Department of Education the cost of education for that year, which would include any new fees. In terms of Pell Grants, he said, it depended on how much of the Pell Grant was being used. If students were at the top of the Pell Grant, then they might not have financial aid for local fees.

Question for the President

A member asked if the alternative consultation process addressed the second resolved clause in the Senate resolution (<http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/resolutions/studenterendum.html>) that asks that improprieties in the student referendum vote be looked at. The President said the process was not to determine what the referendum results were and how that happened. The alternative consultation was an additional measure to inform him about support for the project at the cost of the fee. He said once the process was over, he would take into consideration both the vote and the outcome of the alternative consultation process and either go ahead with the project or cancel it.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström