

Academic Senate Minutes

October 11, 2007

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Announcements from the Chair. Chair Report. Approval of Agenda. Minutes delayed. Recommendations from Structure and Functions for faculty on committees approved. **Special Report:** Sponsored Programs Subcommittee end of year recommendations to the CFO & Provost regarding minimum IDC, distribution of IDC & criteria for SSU approval of external grant proposals. Revision to Cheating and Plagiarism Policy approved. 30 minute conversations at the Senate referred to Executive Committee. Resolution: Reaffirmation of University Policy on Non-Discrimination - First Reading.

Present: Tim Wandling, Scott Miller, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Sam Brannen, Susan Moulton, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Ronald Lopez, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Terry Lease, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Rick Luttmann, Wanda Boda, William Poe, Margaret Purser, John Wingard, James Dean, Lillian Lee, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Eduardo Ochoa, Jonathan White, Art Warmoth, Thaine Stearns, Maria Hess, Karen Thompson

Absent: Elaine McDonald, Catherine Nelson, John Kunat, Janet Hess, Ada Jaarsma, Steve Cuellar, Charles Elster, John Kornfeld, John Kramer, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Whitney McClure, Adele Merritt, Lane Olson

Guests: Karina Nielsen, Joshua Schulz, Jan Beaulyn, Marisa Thigpen, David Abbott, Elaine Leeder, Rose Bruce, Carol Blackshire-Belay, William Babula, Katie Pierce, Elaine Sundberg, Steven Winter, Susan Kashack, Saeid Rahimi, TK Clarke

Announcements from the Chair

The Chair asked Senator Peterson to introduce the new Coordinator of International Programs, Marisa Thigpen, to the Senate. He noted that the Past Chair was ill and that Senator Poe, a former Faculty Chair, would be serving as parliamentarian. He noted there was still time to RSVP for the Emeritus Dinner next week.

Chair Report – T. Wandling

The Chair reported on his meeting the other CSU Senate Chairs last week. Some of the Chairs now are complaining about unfunded mandates. There was a mixed response among the campuses to local faculty governance. Some campuses loved their administration and thought consultation was working great. However, there are alarming trends in the CSU with the two recent votes of no confidence and two other campuses giving it serious consideration. He said there is a lot of faculty searching going on around the system. He noted that campus facilities such as payroll, parking and such, are good here, and maybe get too much attention. But on other campuses Chairs think facilities are not getting enough attention. Town/gown issues are cropping up everywhere. He gave an example about Chico and their need

Edith Mendez 12/5/07 5:22 PM

Deleted: that

Edith Mendez 12/5/07 5:22 PM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 12/5/07 5:23 PM

Deleted: they

to build new dorms. When the surrounding community opposed the building, the campus President said that even though he had the legal authority to do it, he wouldn't go forward with the project until he got buy-in from the community. The Chair suggested SSU could learn from that. Funding concerns are everywhere. There is concern about ATI.

Approval of Agenda – *Approved.*

Minutes delayed.

Consent items:

Recommendations from Structure and Functions for faculty on committees – *Approved.*

Special Report: Sponsored Programs Subcommittee end of year recommendations to the CFO & Provost regarding minimum IDC, distribution of IDC & criteria for SSU approval of external grant proposals – K. Nielsen & J. Schulz

K. Nielsen introduced herself as the current Chair of the Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs and thanked the Senate for the opportunity to give this report. She started by saying that last year the committee was charged with developing a rubric regarding low IDC grants. In the course of soliciting input into that process, they were meeting with the Provost and CFO and the CFO asked them to comment on other aspects of IDC. So, the report is in two parts. FSSP ultimately declined to develop a rubric for low IDC grants. The rubric was to determine if the faculty grant met the mission of the university, and FSSP could not imagine any grant from a faculty member that would not meet the mission of the university. They discovered in their discussions that the issue was more a financial one rather than about the mission. They did see instances where a grant could put an undue burden on the university finances, and there might be cases where we would want to support that and cases where we might not. FSSP thought that the Deans could review grants and she noted that FSSP created a list of potential questions a Dean might use to evaluate grants. They thought the list was a starting point, not an exhaustive list. The CFO then asked for their feedback on the distribution of IDC money for this year. That was the main subject of the rest of the report. The CFO suggested that the IDC of academic grants and contracts be separated from pre-college services and CIHS and asked the committee to consider that the administration of CMS be removed as a cost from IDC. FSSP expressed concerns about procedural hurdles in the grant process. The CFO's proposal also argued that 8% of IDC would be allocated to Administration and Finance for administration and an additional 4% would be allocated to Schools and Centers for their underwriting of grants and contracts. There was also a question about residual IDC and how that would be spent. It was proposed that some of the residual be given to the Schools and some be given to Administration and Finance to cover the cost of benefits. This was the proposal that FSSP was asked to comment on. FSSP questioned if 8% was a correct figure. There was no documentation of that amount, though it has been asked for. The idea that grants and contracts be run through a Foundation type situation was deemed too costly. FSSP recommended that the proposal was a reasonable interim

Edith Mendez 12/6/07 10:52 AM

Deleted: it

Edith Mendez 12/6/07 10:52 AM

Deleted: that

strategy. They welcomed being able to consult on IDC and that there could be additional discussion on how the 4% would be distributed and more discussion was needed about the residual IDC. They recommended that a Grants and Contracts Board be created to continue this conversation. She offered to take questions.

A Senator applauded the committee for their work and argued that it was very important to understand where the 8% and 4% were coming from. He thought with all the audits that are done, we should be able to know at the end of the year how much it costs to administer grants and contracts.

K. Nielson said that it was her understanding that the 8% was derived from historical averages, but she still did not know how the data was originally obtained.

A Senator asked if the Office of Sponsored Programs was paid out of the 4% IDC given to the Schools. J. Schulz said no, the two full time positions, etc. are paid out of the general fund. He said it was his understanding of the CFO's position that he was looking to the old Foundation information for the averages. The Provost said he thought that anything over the 8+4% would go to the Schools. That means they might get up to 4% more.

A Senator asked if the funding agencies for grants were aware that some of their money was not going to the grant. K. Nielsen said that many granting agencies negotiate IDC rates with universities for indirect costs. She and J. Schulz provided examples. J. Schulz noted that the 8% and 4% were understood to be aggregates of all grants and contracts activities.

A Senator recommended that as the conversation continues, she thought it would be good to examine how SSU stands systemwide in terms of a foundation that supports faculty seeking grants and the administration and finance part of the university. She noted that a few years ago, SSU moved all the foundation "stateside", ostensibly to save money, but that it has cost money and to date only San Francisco and our own campus do it this way.

K. Nielsen said she had done some research and found many models in the CSU. She said she and the committee would really like to have an on-going conversation with the administration about how these decisions are made. Other campuses are using recovered IDC as incentives for faculty to write grants and to help new faculty get started.

A Senator argued against using averages to create a normative model. He noted that the median might be more useful. K. Nielsen said she wasn't sure that was under the committee's charge and thought that perhaps the committee charge needed to be updated.

Another Senator echoed the request for an accounting of real costs. A Senator asked if a Dean signed off on a grant that requires space or equipment, etc., does the Dean have to provide it. J. Schulz said that previously that was the case, but now the CFO has mandated that any grant that requires space or equipment has to go through Capital Planning or the Space Committee and be signed off by C. Dinno.

Edith Mendez 12/6/07 10:54 AM

Deleted: ?

The Provost said he welcomed the recommendations of the committee. He did not agree that what drove the process was totally financial. He discussed the situation of grants that have low or no IDC, but are still very desirable by the university. He told the Senate that Chancellor's Office folks are going to come to campus to look at how we do grants and contracts.

The Chair thanked the guests.

Revision to Cheating and Plagiarism Policy – Second Reading – K. Thompson

K. Thompson reminded the body of the discussion at the first reading and what had been included from the first reading. There was some discussion.

Motion to refer to SAC to consider whether student records that leave the university can show charges of cheating and plagiarism. Second. No objection.

There was more discussion concerning what administrative sanctions are and the correct language for whether parties are in the same room if they make verbal presentations to the Fairness Board.

K. Thompson said that the following sentence needed to be struck from the policy as it was struck from the Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures. "The verbal presentations to the Fairness Board will be made without the opposing party being present."

Question called. Second. Approved.

Vote on Revision to Cheating and Plagiarism policy. Approved.

Motion for 30 minute conversations at the Senate – B. Moonwomon

B. Moonwomon noted that the motion was in the packet and moved that the Academic Senate devote thirty minutes of each session, when the demands of the agenda allow, to facilitated discussion of topics of pressing interest concerning the running, resources, and human face of our university. She envisioned the discussion in the middle of the Senate session facilitated by a knowledgeable person and discussion limited to three minutes per person. She provided the rationale for the motion that was based on the no confidence vote last spring. She saw the discussions leading to action. She outlined how she thought it might practically be accomplished.

There was discussion about the practical way to structure the discussions. There was discussion about the best way for the Senate to respond to the no confidence vote.

The motion brought by B. Moonwomon was seconded.

Time Certain reached. The Chair ruled that the body would return to the topic if time allowed.

Kinesiology Program revision – First Reading - T. Stearns

T. Stearns explained why the item was a business item instead of a consent item. Procedurally, the only issue was a letter of support from Biology that was missing at the time the item was at EPC. The letter was now attached to the proposal.

Motion to waive first reading. Second. *Approved.*

There was discussion.

Vote on Kinesiology Program revision – *Approved.*

Resolution: Reaffirmation of University Policy on Non-Discrimination - First Reading – R. McNamara & R. Luttmann

R. McNamara noted that included in the packet were the campus non-discrimination policy and a previous resolution passed by the Senate in 1998 regarding military recruiters on campus. He then turned the floor over to R. Luttmann. R. Luttmann said that the resolution was not about the military generally, etc, but rather about the issue that the U.S. Military is a discriminatory employer. He stated as far as he knew, the military is the only federal agency that does such discrimination. He recounted the previous history of not providing the military access to the campus and how that changed with the Solomon Act. He also said it is not about the Athletics program. He argued that, though we need money, we need to stand on our principles and not take money that violates our policies. He noted that 5-10% of all students, faculty and staff are gay and asked the body to think about what it would be like to go into the gym and see the Army banner and know that it means, because of who you are, you cannot serve your country. You are a second-class citizen, and he argued that the campus should not participate in that. He urged the body to pass the resolution.

A Senator argued that legal acts should be separated from people in the military and that this was a larger social/ cultural issue.

A Senator argued that the resolution make an independent statement of principle instead of asking the President to do something.

First reading completed.

Return to Motion for 30 minute Discussions at the Senate

A Senator argued that he thought the Senate already did these sorts of discussions. The Chair noted these would be more structured discussions led by knowledgeable persons.

A Senator argued for the proposal and noted that the Senate has yet to respond to the vote of no confidence.

A Senator suggested that the Chair of APC be charged with the task of bringing to the Senate reports on the suggested topics. Another Senator suggested giving any committee a specific time frame for action. The APC chair suggested that whoever decides on which topics to bring forward, they should have good contacts with faculty, the administration and students to provide the expertise needed for each topic. A Senator noted that the vote of no confidence was from the faculty, not the Senate. The Administration has told them that there isn't enough money. The CSU administration has said "so what?" The next body that the faculty needs to hear from is the Senate. She argued for focused discussions in the Senate that everyone could attend. Another Senator asked what the focus would be of the discussions since the topics provided were so broad. Support was voiced for the Executive Committee to put topics on the agenda and frame the discussions to be constructive. The Chair noted that there was general support for this idea, but the how was not clear.

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

Motion that the Executive Committee be directed to come back with concrete proposals around these ideas. Second.

Motion to amend that the Executive Committee report back at the next meeting and at every meeting until the issue is resolved. Second. *No objection.*

Vote on motion to refer issue to the Executive Committee. *Approved.*

The Chair invited B. Moonwomon to the Executive Committee as well as anyone else that would like to attend.

Good of the Order

S. Brannen noted to the body that the online survey of the Provost's Review was completely confidential and respondents would never be identified.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström

Edith Mendez 12/6/07 11:05 AM

Deleted: and