

Academic Senate Minutes

April 26, 2007

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Moment of silence for Virginia Tech. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 3/22 and 4/5 – Approved. Communications Department change from 3 to 4 units – Approved. Revision to Wine Business concentration in the MBA – Approved. Update on WASC. Resolution on Virginia Tech tragedy approved. Provost Report. Motion on Referendum for vote of no confidence First Reading. Advising Policy revision referred back to SAC. Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures First Reading. By-Laws Revision: Standing Committees and Liaisons First Reading. APC resolution on Changing Schools to Colleges First Reading. Question for the Chair-Elect. Statewide Senators report. Resolution Regarding Reallocation of Academic Affairs Funds to Advance Accreditation of Business Program without Proper Faculty Consultation postponed to next meeting.

Present: Tim Wandling, Elizabeth Stanny, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Elizabeth Martinez, Thaine Stearns, Robert Train, Ada Jaarsma, Steve Cuellar, Virginia Lea, John Kornfeld, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Michelle Moosebrugger, Steve Orlick, Melinda Milligan, Scott Miller, Sandra Shand, Marguerite St. Germain, Eduardo Ochoa, Rachel Sagapolu, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Mary Halavais, Doug Jordan

Absent: Elaine McDonald-Newman, Glenn Brassington, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Eric Halstrom, Carlos Ayala

Proxies: Terry Lease for Liz Thach, Whitney McClure for Jarrod Russell, David McCuan for John Wingard and Erin Bower for Raye Lynn Thomas

Guests: Jim Robertson, Rose Bruce, Katharyn Crabbe, William Babula, Saeid Rahimi, Barbara Butler, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Elaine Sundberg, TK Clarke

The meeting began with a moment of silence for the victims of the tragedy at Virginia Tech.

Approval of Agenda – Motion to add the following motion to agenda: that the Academic Senate manage and endorse a campus wide referendum on the following resolution: We, the faculty of Sonoma State University, express no confidence in Ruben Armiñana’s ability to continue as president to serve our students, faculty and staff and to uphold our University’s academic mission of teaching and learning. Second. No objection.

Approval of Minutes of 3/22 and 4/5 – Approved.

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:22 PM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:22 PM

Deleted:

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:23 PM

Deleted:

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:23 PM

Deleted:

Consent items:

Communications Department change from 3 to 4 units – *Approved.*
Revision to Wine Business concentration in the MBA – *Approved.*

Update on WASC – E. Sundberg

E. Sundberg reported that the WASC Accreditation Review Steering Committee is currently going through every standard and criteria for review to see if the evidence gathered supports our compliance. They will be holding another special meeting of the committee May 21st to plan next year's agenda and prepare to send out information to the campus community for input. The report to WASC is due in December.

Resolution on Virginia Tech tragedy – C. Nelson

C. Nelson introduced the item. She noted that the Associated Students have also passed a similar resolution and **asked for a waiver of a first reading** so that both resolutions and the remembrances being gathered in the meditation garden could all be sent to Virginia Tech together. **Second. *No objection.*** A member spoke against the resolution concerning the passivity of it. He argued that there is a major problem going on in the country about guns. He has been shocked that there hasn't been more discourse in the academy. **Question called. Second. *No objection.* Vote on Resolution – *Approved.***

Resolution on Virginia Tech Tragedy

Resolved: the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University is shocked and profoundly saddened by the recent events at Virginia Tech University. The Senate extends its support and deepest sympathy to the University community and to the family and friends of the deceased and wounded.

Rationale

On the morning of April 16, 2007, more than 30 people, including both students and faculty, were killed by a gunman in Norris Hall, the Engineering Building, and in the West Ambler Johnston Residence Hall of Virginia Tech University.

Provost Report – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa reported that he attended the annual WASC conference where they heard concerns about the direction the U. S. Department of Education is going under Secretary Spellings and **DOE's** attempts to use the accreditation agencies of the DOE to mandate certain kinds of outcomes and assessments on higher education. He then reported on the CSU Access to Excellence summit meeting. He noted it was a rich conversation **with** a very large representation of faculty. He said that SSU has joined 16 other CSU campuses to have an ACSB Accredited Business Program. He congratulated the faculty, staff and administrators of the School of Business.

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:25 PM

Deleted: their

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:26 PM

Deleted: and

Motion on Referendum for vote of no confidence – N. Byrne

N. Byrne moved that the Academic Senate manage and endorse a campus wide referendum on the following resolution: We, the faculty of Sonoma State University, express no confidence in Ruben Armiñana's ability to continue as president to serve our students, faculty and staff and to uphold our University's academic mission of teaching and learning. Additionally, the full motion included holding the referendum from May 11th until 4:30pm May 18th. Eligible voters would be all faculty eligible to vote for Chair-Elect. He noted that the signatories to the resolution were not a complete list. This listing was limited to full professors as others expressed fears. Even some full professors expressed support for the motion, but were afraid to sign on to it. He said he knew of Senators present who were being pressured by their Dean to vote against the motion. He said the motion has nothing to do with the California Faculty Association. Members of the body were interested in what the consequences would be if the referendum **were** approved. N. Byrne said there was interest in perhaps an investigation from the Chancellor's office or the removal of the President. A member noted that from a historical perspective, in European universities, a vote of no confidence results **in** a resignation. A member asked what the makers of the resolution were hoping to achieve. N. Byrne said a number of people behind the resolution wanted the removal of the President. A member said this is obviously a very painful matter for the campus and he hoped everyone could approach it with compassion and in a way that would foster learning for everyone. He suggested a conversation on Senate-Talk or another more anonymous way to share positions and information to get questions answered. N. Byrne said a campus wide meeting of faculty might be useful prior to the second reading. A member clarified that the motion was asking for the Senate to vote on the process of a referendum, not no confidence in the President. She also asked for clarification that the referendum was asking faculty to vote on no confidence in the President on the measures in the resolution and that the results of the referendum may be used to request an investigation on the financial status of the university by the Chancellor's office. N. Byrne said he was only citing examples such as an investigation or resignation and was not stating what the results of the referendum might lead to. The member asked that the makers be crystal clear if the vote is going to be used for some specific purpose. She also asked for evidence for some of the assertions in rationale of the resolution. It was clarified again that the Senate was only being asked to vote on whether to hold the referendum. A member asked if the Senate did not approve the voting on a referendum, would the referendum go ahead anyway. N. Byrne said the matter was now before the Senate and he did not want to speculate on what the Senate would do. Dean Robertson asked if he was one of the Deans mentioned as pressuring faculty to vote a certain way. N. Byrne said, no, his name had not been mentioned. A member suggested that the makers of the motion include possible consequences of a no confidence vote in the motion. A member asked if the Senate owned the content of the resolution. Another member responded that the Senate was only being asked to endorse the process of a referendum and not the content of the resolution. The Chair-Elect suggested that the makers of the motion specify the audience for the resolution. He also suggested that the Senate itself may or may not want to vote to endorse the resolution as well. It was clarified that if the Senate does not vote for the referendum, it can be appealed by a petition of 10% of the faculty. A meeting would have to be called of all faculty and if a

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:27 PM

Deleted: was

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:29 PM

Deleted: d

quorum was reached, then the vote could be taken to overturn the decision of the Senate. First reading completed.

Advising Policy revision – D. Jordan

D. Jordan introduced the item. He noted that there were issues brought forward from the 22 Points for Facilitating Graduation and SAC revised the policy along those lines. There was discussion on the following points: a formal mechanism for faculty to receive advising training, implementation of the policy, procedures to be included in the policy, who the agent was to assess advising, that the policy appeared to predate the administrative reorganization of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and whether a faculty coordinator was being recommended. D. Jordan noted that this was a revision of an existing policy. It was argued that the Senate should not pass policies for which resources do not exist. **Motion to refer back to SAC to address concerns raised by the Senate by the next meeting. Second. Discussion. Question called. Second. Approved. Vote on motion to refer – Yes = 18, No = 14. Approved.**

Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures – D. Jordan

D. Jordan introduced the item. He highlighted the reasons the jury system for Grade Appeals, Student Grievances and Cheating and Plagiarism was being changed to a Fairness Board. It was clarified that informal procedures were now being given more emphasis. Concerns about “due process” were raised. The difference between juries and the Fairness Board were clarified. It was asked how a person could provide a verbal rebuttal, if they had not heard the other party’s verbal presentation. It was noted that the language in D.1.c was not in an appropriate form. There was a question about why administrators were proposed to be on the Fairness Board. It was asked who was part of Student Counseling as named in the Fairness Board Charge. First Reading completed.

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:31 PM

Deleted: h

Edith Mendez 5/2/07 6:32 PM

Deleted: ies

By-Laws Revision: Standing Committees and Liaisons – T. Wandling

T. Wandling introduced the item. He noted this proposed change to the by-laws was passed by Structure and Functions last year and derived from the Senate Self Study in '05-'06. It cleans up the look of the section on the membership of the Standing Committees, recommends that all members of committee be elected and clarifies the voting status of liaisons. The Chair of APC noted at the second reading they will propose a change to the language about their committee. A member noted that when the Senate originally created liaisons in the early 1990's, they were thought to be fully functioning members of the committees. The issue of student suffrage was brought up. The reasons behind recommending that liaisons not vote were discussed. First Reading completed.

APC resolution on Changing Schools to Colleges – A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth introduced the item by saying that all the Schools have gone through a consultative process about whether they want to change from Schools to Colleges. He then summarized the resolved clauses. Concern was raised about whether having both Schools and Colleges would be confusing. APC thought it was only the

Professional Schools that wished to retain “School” and the other schools wanted to change to Colleges. They thought that would be consistent. A member asked for data on the voting in the Schools regarding the percentage of voting of faculty and staff. Concern was raised about administrative changes based on the name change. The definition of “School” and “College” was offered. The Provost noted that any administrative changes would only be made if the need was there and the resources were present, whether the name change occurred or not. First Reading completed.

Question for the Chair-Elect

A member asked who was appointed to the Dean of Extended Ed search. The Chair of Structure and Functions said he thought they were Maria Hess and Brian Wilson.

Statewide Senators report – C. Nelson and R. McNamara

C. Nelson reported on the activities of the Statewide General Education Advisory committee. They are considering changes to EO order 595, which gives broad outlines for general education in the CSU. She is taking those suggested changes to the GE committee for input. The Fiscal and Governmental Affairs committee had legislative day on April 11th in Sacramento. Concerns they heard about from legislators were cost of textbooks and career/technical education. Both she and R. McNamara attended the Access to Excellence summit. She noted the major concerns coming out at that summit. R. McNamara reported that in the Faculty Affairs committee they are working on putting together a faculty satisfaction survey to be administered after the contract issues are past. The campuses are sending data to the Chancellor’s office showing who is staying and who is leaving and the numbers are bad. They are not doing good faculty exit surveys.

Resolution Regarding Reallocation of Academic Affairs Funds to Advance Accreditation of Business Program, without Proper Faculty Consultation – Second Reading - R. Luttmann

R. Luttmann noted that he had provided a list of appropriate bodies in the resolution as requested in the first reading - (e.g., AABAC, AA Council, SBC, APC, the Senate, School CDC’s). **He formally moved to add the list to the resolution after “appropriate bodies” in the first resolved clause. Second. Discussion. Question called. Second. Approved. Vote on adding list of appropriate bodies to the resolution. Approved.**

R. Luttmann said that the resolution does not oppose the accreditation of the Business Program or the transfer of funds. The concern is that we have a proposal with extremely negative affects on other Schools and the balance of the negative affects on the other Schools and the positive affect on the Business School has not be vetted. He also reported a development since the last Senate meeting, which is that the ACSB has unconditionally accredited the Business School. He did not think that it altered the resolution.

Highlight of discussion

It was argued that the resolution was setting a precedent that is not actionable.

The Provost noted that 17 Business Schools in the CSU are ACSB accredited. To not be accredited at SSU would have put them at the bottom. It was noted that the accreditation had been in process for twelve years and has had appropriate consultation.

Motion to extend meeting for 5 minutes. Second. *Approved.*

The Provost also clarified that unconditional accreditation means that there will be no follow up for five years.

It was noted that the Darwin assessment affected everyone equally, but that the assessment for the Business School was permanent and one School does not suffer. It was also noted that department Foundation accounts have been cut in half. It was argued that the University should have found the money elsewhere, not in the Schools.

It was argued that the Business School was under funded to begin with and that might mean the some other School is over funded.

Motion to postpone to next Senate meeting. Second. *No objection.*

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström