

Academic Senate Minutes

March 8, 2007

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 2/22/07 approved. President's Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Report on First Year Experience Pilot. Approval to run election granted. Discussion of Accreditation of the Business Department. Sabbatical Policy revision approved.

Present: Elaine McDonald, Tim Wandling, Elizabeth Stanny, Edith Mendez, Sam Brannen, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Thaine Stearns, Robert Train, Ada Jaarsma, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Virginia Lea, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Steve Orlick, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Scott Miller, Sandra Shand, Marguerite St. Germain, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jarrod Russell, Eric Halstrom, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Mary Halavais, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Michelle Moosebrugger, Eduardo Ochoa, Rachel Sagapolu

Proxy: Gerry Ann Olson proxy for Glenn Brassington

Guests: Ed Inch, Rose Bruce, Jim Robertson, Ian Hannah, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Susan Moulton, Katharyn Crabbe, T.K. Clarke and many faculty and students from the Business Department

Chair's Report – E. McDonald-Newman

E. McDonald-Newman said she had two items for her report – the funding of the Business School Accreditation and the second year of the FYE pilot. She noted that all the Schools have been assessed large amounts of money for the Business School Accreditation and so in the zero sum game, it shows that helping one department necessarily hurts another. What she wanted the body to focus on was meeting the educational needs of the Business Department to reduce their SFR. The body would be hearing a report about the Business Department about the rationale for the funding and she wanted to mention two facts that would be of interest to the body. The Business Department has been struggling, as have the rest of the Departments. Last Fall they had the highest upper, and second highest lower, division SFR on campus. She noted that one of the priorities of the Senate, as expressed last year, was to lower SFR. As much as it is important to the Business department, she wanted to criticize the decision making process. The first she heard of the transfer of permanent funds to the Business Department was last March at an AABAC (Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee) meeting. Her concern was, if we are going to make significant re-allocation of our budgets, we should use a rational process. We should consider division priorities and reallocate according to those

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:27 PM

Deleted: d

priorities. In her presence, there had never been a discussion of the rationale for the Business accreditation and up to that point of the meeting in March, it had not been discussed with Senate leadership. At that meeting they were given no rationale except that the Business Department was under-funded compared nationally. The Chair thought most of the campus programs are under-funded as well. It wasn't until last Fall that AABAC was told we were doing this because the Chancellor told us to. Indeed, 17 of the CSU Business Schools are accredited and the rest are undergoing accreditation by ACSB. So this has been a system priority. However, at the last meeting the President said there is no Executive Order making us do this, just a broad declaration that if accreditation is possible, the School or Department should seek accreditation. So the Business School does meet that criteria and it affects their students' ability to transfer to MBA programs. She thought many of our other programs also could be accredited and instead of going after the Business School, we ought to develop a rational process that will support all our academic programs.

The Chair then voiced her support for a second year of FYE. She noted the students in the program are reacting positively and the faculty are as well. She then spoke about what was discussed in AABAC regarding the comparison budgets for FYE and the GE courses FYE is replacing. She argued that the money used for FYE had been subsidizing other freshman courses and that perhaps that money could be used to subsidize other parts of the curriculum. She then noted that what else was making the program work was that faculty were over-worked in the program and not receiving the appropriate amount of WTUs. Despite these serious concerns she had over the program, she noted that today the Senate is not talking about the scale of the program, but just the second year of the pilot.

She noted that the EPC resolution on unclassified graduates admissions had been withdrawn. The Graduate Studies subcommittee was working directly with K. Crabbe on the issue.

Question for the Chair

A member asked about budget comparisons talked about in the report. The Chair-Elect responded with the specifics about how the comparison was made.

Approval of the Agenda – It was moved to postpone the Workload Resolution to the next meeting. Second. No objections. It was noted that the business item on the Accreditation of the Business School should be Business Department. Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 2/22/07 – Approved.

President's Report – R. Armiñana

The President introduced a guest to the Senate, Dr. Ed Inch, the Dean of Arts and Communication at Pacific Lutheran College in the state of Washington. He is an ACE fellow at Sacramento State for a year and he is visiting us today. He wanted to come here to see what the Senate does. The Chair welcomed Dr. Inch.

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:25 PM
Deleted: A

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:26 PM
Deleted:

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:26 PM
Deleted: '

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he did not have a report, but would answer questions.

A member asked about the shift in policy that faculty grants will now need to have at least 20% IDC. She wanted to know how that decision was made and wanted past figures on faculty research so they can see how this will change faculty research with the new policy.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that, as a point of reference, IDC rates, or grant administration costs, are calculated by the federal government to be 47%. So 20% implies a subsidy. He said this year the state is imposing pro-rata charges on grants and contracts programs, the most significant being post retirement health benefits. In order to just break even, we have figured we need at least 20%. That does not mean that a grant lower than that cannot go forward. If a grant comes in, that is closely tied in with faculty research or with students as appraised by the Provost, the difference between that and the 20% would have to be paid somewhere on the campus. The member said she had heard that faculty would provide that. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that is incorrect. The member then had questions about signatory authority. It was L. Furukawa-Schlereth's understanding, via current events, that the Provost wanted to take a personal interest in each grant.

The President said he thought they needed to separate grants and contracts. The current issue on campus has to do more with contracts where the university is doing work for state agencies and their IDC has been too low and the work was not related to the mission of the university. When it comes to research concerning our faculty and our students, there is a different perspective. We want to make sure our grants and contracts support the academic mission of the university. He said if a grant is worthy and does not have the 20% IDC, it will have to be subsidized. He said the actual reality of higher education budgets is cross subsidies.

A member asked about the dollar amount for new software for Development, and L. Furukawa-Schlereth clarified that it is an annual figure, largely staffing.

A member noted that making up the difference between worthy grants and this new policy was going to be difficult.

Report on First Year Experience Pilot – A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth made a few preliminary comments. He noted what is being discussed is the motion passed by the Senate last year regarding the second year of FYE. He described how APC was involved in the process since the resolution last year was directed at AABAC. He noted that AABAC and APC both endorsed the second year of FYE. He described APC's review process contained in their report. He noted the positive report from the Coordinator of FYE. He then reviewed the recommendations from APC.

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:31 PM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:32 PM

Deleted: z

A member argued that since the Schools have been assessed for the Business Department accreditation perhaps the money used for FYE could be used in another manner besides an experimental program. A. Warmoth responded that APC used SFR as the measure and did not find it significant to use the money for the other classes the freshmen would have been enrolled in to lower the SFR in those classes. They did not discuss moving the money somewhere completely different.

A member argued that the requirements of the Senate's resolution on FYE last year have not been met yet. Evidence that Academic Affairs can afford a second year and that Division priorities have been assessed to support a second year have not been presented. He urged the Senate not to approve a second year until such evidence was forthcoming.

The Chair noted that it was a struggle to get the issue on the AABAC agenda. She and the Provost agreed to send it to APC to look at the budget priorities, etc. and decide if we could afford it or not. She said the point was well taken.

There was discussion about whether the evidence had been presented through APC or not, as well as how and whether a discussion of allocating the resources elsewhere was appropriate. The APC chair reiterated APC's position of support of the second year of FYE and offered additional arguments.

Motion to thank the current FYE team for their good faith and fine work and for the Senate to endorse the second year of the pilot. Second.

A Senator asked why the Senate was not addressing the issue of a scale up of FYE today. The APC chair said they are very committed to looking at a scale up of FYE after they receive the assessments from the first year in the Fall. They are also eager to do a larger ranging analysis of the alignment of resources to mission.

Motion to amend: Add last resolved clause from APC's report to the main motion - "The Academic Senate directs the FYE program to return to APC in September 2007 with the results of the assessment of Year 1, in order to initiate discussion of the future of the FYE model and other planning implications of the results of the FYE experiment." Second.

Question called on motion to amend. *Approved.*

Vote on motion to amend. *Approved.*

Back to discussion of main motion

A faculty member of the FYE program said that they were not convinced of the scalability of the program either and they would not recommend it if they think it would be done on the backs of the faculty.

The EPC Chair said that C. Rhodes visited their committee today and they found out that the EMT program has been short of resources. The course used to be taught by a three-person team and that is now down to one person. In half of the cases, that

one person is someone with an MA who is not academic, but is a Student Services Professional. She argued that by approving the second year of FYE, the Senate was approving a profound inequity in the way freshman reading and writing was being taught to our students. The EOP students are part of that group. She said that there would be no EOP in FYE next year according to her understanding of the FYE coordinator's report to EPC.

The APC Chair said that was an interesting report on the funding and staffing of the Freshman Seminar program. The information they were given by Academic Affairs to compare was a projection of the SFR of 25:1 for Philosophy 101 and English 101 and that there would be additional money for Student Services Professionals and Peer Mentors for the EMT program. He thought this brought up issues about the comparison.

The EPC Chair asked if anyone from Academic Affairs was present to answer to this issue. No one was present that day. The Provost was at a WASC meeting and the Vice President for Academic Resources was ill.

The APC Chair said there were two issues. One was whether the Senate thought that the FYE pilot was worth doing a second year. The other was whether the Freshman Seminar Program was so under funded that it was no longer viable. He thought EPC was the appropriate place for discussion about the latter. He was not sure that if all the money from FYE were spread out over the Freshman Seminar that would solve the problem in Freshman Seminar.

Question called. Point of order noted that the motion required two readings. Chair ruled that the vote could go forward. There were objections. **Vote on overruling the Chair. No to overrule = 18; Yes to overrule = 16. Vote on calling the question. Failed.** The Chair asked to postpone the item to the next meeting and asked for the motion in writing. *No objection.*

Approval to run election – T. Wandling

T. Wandling asked the body to be able to hold elections without the requisite number of candidate for each position. He noted that two members of the Senate had stepped forward to run for Chair – Scott Miller and Robert Coleman-Senghor. He reviewed the roster of candidates. **Vote to run election. Approved.**

Discussion of Accreditation of the Business Department

The discussion began with a report from the Business Department. The Dean of the Business School introduced the report. He emphasized the tremendous work of the faculty and staff over the many years toward accreditation. He said the joint effort of the faculty in the Department was very gratifying. He then introduced T. K. Clarke, the Chair of the Business Department. The following remarks are summarized from his PowerPoint presentation. He began by stressing how having a quality program would impact the faculty, student, employers and the taxpayers. He reviewed how the department assessed the quality of their program. For a professional School, peer review is through accreditation. He reviewed how long the Department had been

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:39 PM

Deleted: d

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:39 PM

Deleted: e

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:39 PM

Deleted: d

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:40 PM

Deleted: the

working on accreditation and the issues that prevented them from gaining accreditation in the past. They spent five years in pre-candidacy. In June 2004, they presented their report to ACSB and were not visited. He presented the cost of FTE per student across the Schools to show the Business Department was the second lowest cost provider at SSU. He then reviewed SFR data that showed the Business Department at 29:1 when most of the campus was at 23:1. He said all the data showed that the Business Department was not in good shape. They submitted another report and were told they would not receive a visit, but demanded one anyway. The Accreditation agency did visit and wouldn't say yes or no and gave them things to fix. Their problem was not with the quality of faculty, but the quantity. ACSB thought they were still relying on too many lecturers to deliver their program. There were other issues too, and so the faculty of the Department responded by creating a few committees to work on the issues. One of these committees looked at what resources would be needed to deliver a quality program. One of the recommendations that the committee had was an Associate Dean, but the faculty said no, that is not the current culture of Sonoma State and that would not be the best use of limited resources in this program. That led to a budget being developed. After many meetings with the Provost and budget revisions, they got approval of a budget and were able to write the report to respond to ACSB. Their understanding was they would get a budget adjustment that would come in two parts. After the first adjustment, which is supposed to come this year, the Business Department will be average. After the last adjustment, assuming the same growth and distribution among the Schools, it does put them a little bit above average. This budget is based on a SFR of 27. They are not at an SFR of 27 yet. In the Department of Business, the SFR is for their majors. They have no GE courses. Then they looked at how much money, after the adjustment, they could spend per student. They went from \$1600 per student to \$1100 per student. He said they are going to deliver a quality program at an amazingly efficient price compared to the rest of the country. He then listed the benefits of a quality, accredited program for students. He offered to answer questions.

The Chair asked for discussion.

A member asked why the Business Department felt it deserved a quality program at the expense of other programs or more than other programs. T. K. Clarke said the first question was not in his purview. They had no say in where the money came from. Another member from the Business Department said they are just presenting their situation. She didn't think each program justifying its budget or why it wanted to be a quality program was appropriate for Senate discussion. The member said that in a collegial environment, he was surprised that the Business Department would find it acceptable to hurt other Schools for their own aspirations. The way budgeting is done at this campus, we have a fixed pie that shrinks every year because we have no mission-related priorities and we are not putting our resources into the instructional program. He thought the Business School was asking for more than their fair share in such an environment.

A member noted that it would be very nice if the Business Department could be accredited. The issue was how to do it on the painfully limited budgets that the Schools have. He said that this was not really the forum where this kind of

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:40 PM

Deleted: ed

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:43 PM

Deleted: -

presentation should be presented and he enumerated the other more appropriate budget committees. He thought this needed to be presented with information from all the other Schools where the needs of this School can be balanced against all the Schools. It needed a full spectrum discussion.

A member said he thought the proper question was the re-allocation of budgetary resources that have curricular consequences. As those decisions were not informed by the faculty per se, he thought the decisions and the process by which they are made needed to be assessed. He did not think the Business Department should have to justify the re-allocation. It did not seek to re-direct funds from other programs.

A member from the Business School said many of them did not realize where the money was coming from and many did not think it was fair. She said if the situation were switched, as it might be in years to come, the Business faculty would be happy to make some sacrifice to do that. She continued that she thought the budgetary decision making process needed to be discussed collaboratively.

A member noted that by making the lecturers permanent in the Business Department that might help solve their problem. T. K. Clark responded that he agreed that they were humanly equivalent, but argued that they did not always have the same intellectual capital. He said this only applied to the Business Department.

A member argued that it was good for the Senate to have this discussion. He said he was concerned about the rhetoric about a two-tiered faculty. He appreciated the hard work the Department put into it.

A student member asked what percentage of SSU students were declared as Business majors. T. K. Clark responded, approx 15%. He said they have around 1100 majors in the Department of Business.

A member asserted that lecturer faculty were not the intellectual inferior of tenured faculty here. It has to do with the marketplace and the nationwide movement to undercut the tenure system by using lecturers. She asked her colleagues to stop the disrespectful language toward lecturer faculty. Applause.

The President noted that the ACSB has a standard about faculty being academically qualified. It has nothing to do with being a lecturer or not. They want a terminal degree in the particular field and that the faculty member has active peer-reviewed scholarly activity that is quantified. So when the Business Department is talking about academically qualified, they are talking about these specific standards. He spoke about the history of the Business Department as being an off-shoot of the School of Social Science, so some of the faculty from that era do not meet the ACSB standard. The money given to the Business School is specifically to hire faculty. Also, the Business Department faculty currently have made a quantum leap in their own scholarship towards the ACSB standard. He emphasized that the university operates with cross subsidies and that this was the time to do this, given the history of the university.

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:46 PM

Deleted: how

Edith Mendez 3/25/07 1:47 PM

Deleted:

**Motion to postpone second reading of Sabbatical Policy. Second. Discussion.
*Failed.***

The Senate decided to consider this item further when the Provost could be present and the discussion would focus on the consultative process.

Sabbatical Policy revision – Second Reading – C. Ayala

C. Ayala spoke briefly about the changes to the Sabbatical Policy revision. It was clarified that the weighting was changed back to 40/30/30 and the language was re-inserted regarding what the President needs to do if he disagrees with the URTF ranking. He noted some other minor issues and the calendar were clarified. Also an explicit statement that ranking does not occur at the Department or School level was added.

A member, who is a department RTP chair, thanked the committee for making the policy clearer and **called the question. Second. *Approved.***

Vote on Sabbatical Policy revision – *Approved unanimously*

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström