

## Academic Senate Minutes

September 2, 2004

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

### Abstract

Chair's Report. Correspondence. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 5/6 & 5/20 approved. Faculty eligible for Emeritus Status Fall 2004 approved. From EPC: Revision of Single Subject Waiver Program in English moved to business. Election of Senators to Executive Committee. Special Reports: WASC update and Green Music Center update. From EPC: Changes in the MBA – First Reading. From EPC: Changes in the Global Studies Program – First Reading. Good of the Order. Resolution in Support of Sonoma State University Associated Students, Inc. Voter Registration, Education and Mobilization Drive approved.

**Present:** Melanie Dreisbach, Elizabeth Stanny, Catherine Nelson, Jan Beaulyn, Robert McNamara, Susan McKillop, Robert Karlsrud, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Tim Wandling, 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, Glenn Brassington, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Brad Mumaw, Greg Tichava, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Elaine McDonald, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Ruben Armiñana

**Guests:** Floyd Ross, Rose Bruce, Katie Pierce, Elaine Sundberg, Judith Hunt, Bill Houghton, Jim Robertson, Jeff Langley, Tony White, Sam Seward

### Report of the Chair of the Senate - Melanie Dreisbach

The Chair welcomed the Senators to the 2004-2005 Academic year. She asked the Senators to note in the packet the Statewide Senate's resolution titled *Affirmation of Principles of Collegial Behavior* passed in May 2004. She wanted to share the document with the Senate to show that the Statewide Senators are also dealing with these issues and as a good way to start the academic year. She reminded the body of Robert's Rules concerning speaking only twice to an issue until everyone that wants to speak has spoken.

### Correspondences:

The Chair reported on a Memorandum from David Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor, concerning Systemwide Lower Division Transfer Patterns. This is an attempt by the Board of Trustees to modify Title V to get a sufficient pattern of classes for students who are in the community colleges, so if they take a designated pathway they would have priority admission transferring to a CSU campus. We need to establish across the CSU the lower division transfer patterns by major. Six units need to be identified within each major that would be accepted at all CSUs.

The Chair explained the process by which the transfer patterns would be decided and how people from our campus departments would be identified.

### **Continuation of Chair's Report**

At the last Executive Committee, representatives from the Associated Students asked for a representative from the Academic Senate to attend their Associated Students meetings. They meet every Monday from 12-2. The Chair called for volunteers to serve as a liaison for the Senate. The Chair offered to share the responsibility with another Senator. Senator Wilson volunteered. The Senate office received an announcement about a California Studies conference – it's the 16<sup>th</sup> annual Envisioning California Conference and it is specifically about Revisioning the Future of State Governance. She passed around brochures to the body. The Chair introduced the new student assistant to the Senate, Tia Starr. She reminded the Senators to speak up and alerted the meeting that L. Holmstrom was testing out digital recording software.

### **Consent Items:**

**Approval of the Agenda – C. Nelson submitted to the agenda a resolution supporting the SSU's Associated Students voter registration drive.** Copies of the resolution were passed out. *No objection to addition.*

**Approval of Minutes** - 5/6 & 5/20 emailed – *Approved.*

**Faculty eligible for Emeritus Status Fall 2004 – attachment – MSP.**

**From EPC: Revision of Single Subject Waiver Program in English** – attachment – E. McDonald introduced the item. It was noted that COMS 202 is not a GE course as listed in the documentation. **The item was moved to business.**

**Information Items:** End of Year reports from Senate, University Standards, Professional Development, Sponsored Programs, EPC, Academic Advising, SAC were noted.

### **BUSINESS**

#### **Election of Senators to Executive Committee**

E. Stanny noted that the by-laws require that the Senate elect two senators to serve on the Senate Executive Committee. The Executive Committee meets every other Thursday at the same time as the Senate. She called for nominations. Senator Wandling was nominated and accepted. Senator Brannen was nominated and accepted. No other nominations were heard. No election was required. The body approved the nominees to serve on the Executive Committee.

#### **Special Reports: WASC update**

E. Ochoa recapped some of his remarks about WASC from his convocation address. SSU had a visit from WASC half way through the ten year accreditation process

because of some issues that had been identified as requiring follow up on the part of SSU after the last full fledged accreditation visit in 1999. Those issues at the time were diversity, planning and assessment. We posted the team's report on the web in late spring and waited for the letter from the WASC commission that would be the official word on the visit. The letter came with a distinctly sterner tone than the team's report and was quite forceful about the commission's view that we had not made adequate progress in a number of areas and that we needed to step up the pace. They thought we had succeeded addressing the initial concerns regarding diversity. In the other two areas they thought we had not made progress relative to what they were hoping to see. They identified four areas that we really need to address in order to insure that we meet the standards at the time of the full review. The four areas are 1) alignment of institutional priorities with mission; 2) assessment of educational effectiveness; 3) general education and the uniqueness of the SSU student experience; and 4) institutional commitment to sustained follow up. The letter from the commission was followed up by a meeting with the WASC commission and members of the SSU community. A lot of us were a bit hurt by the letter and thought it did not recognize the accomplishments of the university. The commission has struggled to find the right elements in these letters and strike a balance between recognizing the accomplishments of a institution and also pointing out areas that they want us to aggressively address. The tone of the letter was meant to press upon us the urgency of the task that faces us. There are three major milestone dates that we need to focus our efforts around. One is the end of this academic year as in October we need to send to WASC a institutional proposal about how we propose to undertake our self study for accreditation review. When we submit the proposal, we also need to give them an update on progress we've made on the issues they identified. The other dates are December of '07 and December of '08 in preparation of visits in the spring of '08 and '09. The first visit is the preparatory review that looks at institutional capacity in terms of infrastructure and organization, etc. The final visit is the educational effectiveness review. So right now we are simply identifying tasks, deciding on deadlines and who will be the point person for each task. The Provost will run this by the Executive Committee and the Academic Council. Once the list of tasks are finalized, the work will start. We will be working on them through appropriate channels. Assessment will be worked on in the departments, for institutional wide planning we will need to set up a structure to do that, for general education we have a committee that is working on developing such a program. His office will keep track on what's happening, watch the schedules, do some prompting if necessary. We will all be involved in this in short order.

### **Questions/Comments:**

Currently, the assessment activities in the departments are going to be reviewed by the Deans and the Provost office. The Senator voiced a strong opinion that faculty should be heavily involved in the monitoring mechanism that she would be expected to answer to.

The Provost responded that faculty governance would be heavily involved in assessment. What his office will do is just see whether what's going on meets the standards of WASC.

The Senator asked who she would be sending her report on assessment to?

The Provost responded that the Deans would receive those reports.

A Senator noted that part of the assessment efforts should be an assessment of current assessments.

The Provost responded that was something that needed work right away - the feedback loop between assessment and the curriculum improvement process. We have to demonstrate to WASC that the assessments have had results.

A Senator asked for more specifics about what the WASC report means by a misalignment between priorities and mission.

The Provost said that WASC wanted to see some evidence that there was an explicit and purposeful alignment between priorities and mission. We have not been able to demonstrate that to an external agency. They are also calling for a process whereby that takes place which is participatory and inclusive and transparent to the whole community. They didn't say that our resources were misaligned, but that we hadn't shown evidence that they are in fact aligned.

A Senator asked how SSU rated in terms of diversity.

The Provost responded that WASC said we had met the concerns initially raised and that we had taken strong and decisive action in response to some of the concerns initially expressed which had to do with some episodes of intolerance on campus. They went on to make suggestions on future progress in this area. Right now we would not be deficient in terms of the standards for diversity. In terms of progress they particularly pointed out ways of insuring that diversity is incorporated into the curriculum and into the teaching and learning process.

A Senator noted he was skeptical of the culture of assessment and asked what can the Provost do to encourage more inclusiveness beyond committees for everyone to feel ownership of these issues.

The Provost responded that the WASC letter is a great opportunity to take stock and renew our commitment to our own mission and rethink about how we go about doing things. These accreditation visits and self-studies are very substantial efforts requiring significant amount of resources. WASC is sensitive to that. They have been trying to make the process as valuable to the institutions as possible. The idea is as much as possible to dovetail the efforts that have to go into accreditation and have it do double duty as part of our institutional self examination, focusing and planning that we do for our own purposes. What we need to do is constantly communicate. One way to engage everyone will be the institution wide planning effort. He will be working on ways to engage the entire community in issues that are raised by the institutional planning committee.

A Senator noted that the student/faculty ratio was an important issue to address in discussing the alignment of resources with mission and advocated bringing the student/faculty ratio down.

A Senator praised the Provost for bringing together funding and curricular matters as a unit. She noted he used the word curriculum five times in his report and that curriculum is primarily a faculty matter. Deans are not curriculum people. Administrators are facilitators.

A Senator noted that previously the Senate did not want a mandated top-down assessment process that was uniform for every the discipline. He noted that the WASC document used many verbs pertaining to disconnect. He argued for the faculty and the Senate to be clear on their prerogatives regarding assessment and carry through those responsibilities. He questioned whether we had the institutional support to carry out assessment and criticized past decision making processes. He urged the Senate to take the issue of assessment seriously.

A Senator asked what the consequences would be if SSU failed to be accredited by WASC and had that ever happened to a CSU campus.

The Provost responded that WASC has a number of sanctions before it removes accreditation. If an institution does lose it's accreditation, it means it doesn't qualify for federal money and the perception with the public would go way down. An institution would probably experience a dramatic drop in enrollment. If enrollment drops enough, we'd have to downsize or maybe even shut down.

The Chair stated that she was confident that our institution would not only meet the standards, but will exceed the standards. It is a great opportunity to be very clear on what our priorities are, aligning those priorities with resources and having sustainability.

### **Green Music Center update**

Vice President Furukawa-Schlereth stated that in his report he would be bringing the Senate up to date on the Green Music Center since April of last year, talking about the activities of the summer, updating the budget plan, and discussing next steps and time lines. Last year the bids for the GMC were \$9 million over budget. The increase was associated with the increased cost of lumber, copper and steel all over the world. The summer was spent trying to figure out how the project could go forward or how the \$9 million could be found. They used the classic strategy of reducing expenses and increasing revenue. First, they looked at simplifying the design of the building without affecting the acoustics in the concert hall itself. The on-staff architect was able to come up with a design that reduced the cost approximately \$1-2 million. Second, they asked the question what would happen if we could somehow combine the donor funded project with what we had been discussing as the state funded project. If they could be brought together into one project we concluded there would be savings of another \$2-3 million. However, the state funded portion of the project was not funded. We had to get approval to put the projects together from the Chancellor's office and then move the project up the list of projects for proposition money. We got approval from the Chancellor's office and as of yesterday our project stands at number 18 on the list. One final hurdle is the Board of Trustees meeting in two weeks. The third thing that happened was that by delaying the project one year, the cash on hand would earn interest. Then we

worked on bringing a revenue generating capacity to the GMC. Concert halls are not money makers. They are analyzing whether a restaurant and conference facility would be feasible and so far the answer is yes. Combining all those strategies, we believe we have closed the budget gap of the \$9 million. He passed out a revised budget and went over the figures which showed the project about \$1 million short. Private donors will be solicited for those funds. He described the staff for the project administration. He noted that the architect for the project has changed. They will use a construction project manager at risk instead of bidding for a general contractor. That way the budget costs are guaranteed. He detailed the timelines for the project.

Floyd Ross, Executive Director of the GMC, then spoke about the actual new design of the building and used a model to demonstrate to the Senate. The new building consists of the Concert hall, lobby, conference facility, restaurant, 17 faculty offices, 3 departmental suites, 2 classrooms for 60 students, 4 ensemble rooms, restrooms and a recital hall. It was noted that the lawn is not included in the budget and funding for that has not yet been obtained.

### **Questions/Comments:**

A Senator said that hearing that classrooms are going to be built for 60 students means to him that large classes are an institutional priority - where we are heading, our goal and plan. He objected and asked why these classrooms were being built so large. He asked if the faculty offices would have windows. He hoped that a one to one ration between women's and men's bathrooms was not be contemplated.

The Provost responded to the question about the classrooms. The design was based on feedback from the Schools and schedulers as to what sizes of classrooms were the most difficult to get a hold of now. This particular size is the one we have the least of. The reality is we have a somewhat spartan funding base. One strategy for maintaining small classes is to have some counter balance.

A Senator asked if the \$7 million dollars in project revenue from conferences, events and catering was a projection and whether that money would have to be borrowed.

VP Furukawa-Schlereth answered yes. He expected one of the key users would be the LifeLong Learning Program which is expected to grow.

The Senator continued and asked if the general contractor will be committed to paying union wages.

VP Furukawa-Schlereth answered that the state does not specify union labor, but does say we must pay prevailing wages.

The Senator continued and asked who would be on the GMC Advisory Board.

VP Furukawa-Schlereth answered it was still being discussed. It would include campus constituents, donors, representatives of all the people on and off campus who have an interest in the hall.

A Senator asked if there would be use fees for faculty to use the facility for instruction or other fees for other events, such as an alumni event.

VP Furukawa-Schlereth answered it depends. The Concert hall will be free to faculty. The academic space will be free. The revenue spaces will probably have a charge associated with them. That applies to students as well.

The Chair noted that five people were still on the speakers list, but the body would move on to other business and return as time permitted.

#### **From EPC: Changes in the MBA – First Reading – E. McDonald – attachment**

E. McDonald introduced the item. She also introduced Sam Seward from the Business department who was present to answer any questions. Sam Seward gave background on the changes which stemmed from an accreditation process with AACSB. He also described the changes in specific. E. McDonald noted that the item passed through EPC unanimously.

Questions were raised concerning the department's decision to make Organizational Behavior and Theory and the Leadership class electives instead of required courses. S. Seward responded that the department has a small number of electives, so the courses will come up frequently. A Senator asked whether there was an ethics in business course. S. Seward responded that all the courses have an ethics component.

*First reading completed.*

#### **From EPC: Changes in the Global Studies Program – First Reading – E. McDonald – attachment**

E. McDonald introduced the item. She noted the Global Studies Steering committee revised the Central European concentration and developed a new concentration in Environmental Global Policy. The item passed through EPC unanimously. It was placed as a business item as some members of the Executive Committee were concerned that participating departments in this interdisciplinary program had not necessarily made a commitment to courses that were part of these concentrations. She introduced Tony White who was available to answer question and put the body at ease about the issue.

T. White gave background on the development of concentrations in general and how the new concentrations developed. He stated that all the concentrations were developed in consultation with faculty in all the departments represented by the courses. He noted that there are many choices under the concentrations for students to choose from and he could not remember an issue coming up that didn't allow a student to complete a concentration.

A Senator argued that commitments from the departments need to be in writing to show faculty and institutional support for the vitality of interdisciplinary programs.

A Senator asked whether there was a language requirement in the major. T. White responded that in the core requirements there are various levels of competence required for language depending on the concentrations and international study.

*First reading completed.*

Speakers remained for questions for the GMC report. They were asked to email their questions to VP Furukawa-Schlereth who would report back at the next Senate.

New Senators to the Senate this year introduced themselves.

### **Good of the Order**

A Senator recommended to the Senate to look at the September 3, 2004 Chronicle of Higher Education. In particular he recommended the articles "How Can Colleges Prove They Measure Up" and "Lost in the Life of the Mind."

**Motion to extend time five minutes to consider Resolution in Support of Sonoma State University Associated Students, Inc. Voter Registration, Education and Mobilization Drive. Second. *Passed.***

**Resolution in Support of Sonoma State University Associated Students, Inc. Voter Registration, Education and Mobilization Drive**

C. Nelson introduced the item. **She moved to waive the first reading. Second. No objection.**

A Senator was uncomfortable with the language allowing voter registration of students in their classrooms. A second Senator voiced similar concern and **moved to strike out "by allowing non-partisan voter registration of students in their classrooms." Second.**

The amendment to strike was discussed. Pro and con positions were voiced regarding using class time to hand out voter registration cards.

**The question was called. Second. *Passed.***

**Vote on striking "by allowing non-partisan voter registration of students in their classrooms" - Yes = 7 No = 18; *Failed.***

**The question was called on the resolution. Second. *Passed.***

**Vote on Resolution in Support of Sonoma State University Associated Students, Inc. Voter Registration, Education and Mobilization Drive – *Passed.***

**Resolution in Support of Sonoma State University Associated Students, Inc. Voter Registration, Education and Mobilization Drive**

Whereas Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) is the official recognized voice of students at Sonoma State University; and



Whereas ASI is committed to the institutionalization of voter registration within the university community, educating student voters in a non-partisan manner and turning out the student vote; and

Whereas the 1998 Higher Education Act requires that higher education institutions "make a good faith effort to distribute a mail voter registration form, requested, and received from the State, to each student enrolled in a degree or certificate program and physically in attendance at the institution, and to make such forms widely available to students at the institution;" and

Whereas the mission of the California State University is "To prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California's schools, economy, culture, and future; To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society; and  
To provide public services that enrich the university and its communities;" and

Whereas the Sonoma State University Academic Affairs Mission "inspires ethical exploration, civic engagement, social responsibility and global awareness," which begins with exercising one's right to vote; and

Whereas less than half of eligible citizens between the ages of 18-24 voted in the 2000 presidential election, compared with 70% of older citizens; and

Whereas an engaged citizenry is essential to the success of the democratic process in the city of Rohnert Park, the County of Sonoma, the State of California, and the United States of America; and

Whereas collaboration between Students, Administration, and Faculty is necessary for a significant voter registration drive and to encourage participation of students at Sonoma State University in the electoral process;

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University in conjunction with ASI encourage all faculty to promote civic engagement by allowing non-partisan voter registration of students in their classrooms, encouraging and promoting attendance at voter awareness events and make a good faith attempt to spend a few moments of class time to relate the importance of voting to the subject matter in each class.

Meeting adjourned 5:05

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*