

Academic Senate Minutes

May 7, 2009

3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda approved. Minutes of 4/2/09 approved. GE Program Review Progress Report. Request for endorsement of recommendations for the Center for Culture, Gender and Sexuality from the Senate's Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee approved. New Executive MBA approved. Revision of three Academic Policies: Course Repeat, Withdrawal and Academic Probation, Disqualification and Progress - First Reading. University Strategic Plan – First Reading. Brannen Motion re: amending Robert's Rules Calling for Orders of the Day postponed indefinitely. Good of the Order.

Present: Scott Miller, Susan Moulton, Tim Wandling, Deb Kindy, Sam Brannen, Edith Mendez, Noel Byrne, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, John Sullins, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Brian Wilson, Terry Lease, Kathy Morris, John Kornfeld, Rick Robison, Tia Watts, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Wanda Boda, Maria Hess, John Wingard, James Dean, Lillian Lee, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Andy Merrifield, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Thaine Stearns, Sunil Tiwari, Karen Thompson

Absent: Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Birch Moonwomon, Steve Cuellar, Nick Geist, Margie Purser, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Derek Pierre, Casey Jones, Whitney McClure

Proxies: Barbara Lesch-McCaffry for Steve Orlick, Bruce Berkowitz for Jacqueline Holley, Margaret Anderson for Ronald Lopez

Guests: Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Nathan Rank, Barbara Butler, Elaine Sundberg, Rose Bruce, Saeid Rahimi, Michelle Jolly

Approval of Agenda – *Approved.*

Chair Report – S. Miller

S. Miller thanked the body for an extraordinary year as Chair of the Faculty. He said there was a draft of the Educational Effectiveness Review for WASC in progress and within a week it would be posted on the SSU Portfolio site (<http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/portfolio/>). There would be an opportunity for feedback on the Review. The Chair then gave a brief report on the outcomes of the President's Diversity Council this year and noted a handout that was passed out. He said two calls will go out to faculty, one offering release time for facilitating multi-cultural competence workshops and one for an inclusive excellence coordinator. A member asked for the notes from the Town Halls and Retreats on Diversity. The Chair said the information from the Open Forums would be presented when the Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee presents its report. The material from the Retreat was fed back to the PDC subcommittees to inform their work on the Diversity Plan. It was

noted that the Town Hall on Diversity was on available on YouTube:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y1xYH2xKC58>.

Approval of Minutes of 4/2/09 – amended and *approved*.

GE Program Review Progress Report – N. Rank

N. Rank reported the accomplishments of the GE Program Review and provided a summary handout. He noted that GE Program Review was one of the charges of the GE subcommittee and the six program review steps followed by the committee:

- Develop GE learning objectives with faculty teaching in GE (S08, F08).
- Collect and analyze enrollment and assessment data (S09)
- Write self study document (S 09).
- Gather input from students (S 09).
- External review visit (S 09)
- Complete program review write-up (Sum 09)

He provided an outline of the written program review:

Administration- program structure, course formats, advising, oversight, history of change, articulations and petitions, minor changes, new courses.

Analysis of curriculum- distribution of FTE, overlap of GE and majors courses, instruction in GE vs. majors, role of lecturers, units typically taken in GE before graduation.

Analysis of curriculum- distribution of FTE, overlap of GE and majors courses, instruction in GE vs. majors, role of lecturers, units typically taken in GE before graduation.

Alignment of learning objectives- local vs. CSU wide vs. national.

Assessment- department program review, standardized assessment, current embedded assessment in courses.

Action plan.

He then discussed the visit by the External Reviewer, Dr. Sally Murphy Director of the General Education Program, Chair of GE Subcommittee CSU East Bay. They will incorporate her report in their final report.

He offered a few “tidbits” from the self-study document. The review of what GE syllabi actually say was illuminating and he discussed their analysis methods. They also looked at the scheduling of GE courses as students had complained that there were time conflicts for enrolling in GE courses. They found that indeed more GE courses are scheduled on MW from 10-12 and TTH 1-3. The external reviewer noted that the decentralized scheduling of GE courses has contributed to this conflict. The external reviewer was most helpful. N. Rank noted that many people worked very hard to do the work of the Program Review. The Provost praised the

subcommittee's work and said it set a new benchmark for program review. The Chair of EPC asked if any action items could be discussed. N. Rank said the committee has come to understand an overview of the whole curriculum, and proposals that integrate as well as address the specific learning objectives would be encouraged. There was wide recognition that the decentralization was not helpful, but questions about how some centralizing of the GE curriculum would come about. He was reluctant to offer any more items as the committee had not discussed those in detail yet. There was more discussion.

The Chair thanked N. Rank. Applause.

Request for endorsement of recommendations for the Center for Culture, Gender and Sexuality from the Senate's Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee – Second Reading – B. Lesch-McCaffry

B. Lesch-McCaffry noted some very minor changes in the document based on the first reading. She passed out a new version of the document. She also wished to include the Senate's resolution on the CCGS (<http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/Resolutions/ResGenderCulture.html>) because it provided more rationale. There was no objection to replacing the original item with the new one. The Chair of SAC noted that SAC endorsed and approved the recommendations. The Provost noted that approximately \$50,000 was being budgeted for the Center. There was further discussion regarding funding, personnel for the Center and clarification of specific language used in the recommendations.
Motion to endorse. Second. Vote – *Approved unanimously.*

New Executive MBA - Second Reading – T. Stearns and T. Lease

T. Lease introduced the second reading of this curriculum item. There was discussion concerning business ethics in the program. The Chair of EPC defended the department's right to choose their own theoretical perspective. It was suggested that co-curricular offerings be highlighted. T. Lease described how such offerings might be offered in the program, even though a professional audience is targeted. The CFA President discussed issues surrounding Executive Order 802 that related to the proposed program and pay issues of concern to CFA. T. Lease responded to CFA's concerns. Concerns were raised about programs coming forward as self-support and then requiring state money. T. Lease said if the program does not make money, they would not keep it going. There was more discussion.

Question called. Second. *No objection.*

Vote on New Executive MBA program – *Approved.*

Revision of three Academic Policies: Course Repeat, Withdrawal and Academic Probation, Disqualification and Progress - First Reading – T. Stearns and M. Jolly

T. Stearns introduced the items and commended their precision and coherence with the Executive Orders. M. Jolly described the two Executive Orders, 1037 and 1038 that require changes to campus policies. She had brought all the policies together

because the University Standards subcommittee sees them working together even though they are three separate issues. She noted that the policy changes were coming late in the semester due to the need for clarifications on EO 1037 from the Chancellor's Office. She noted they all needed to go into affect by Fall 2009. She described implementation of the policies if they pass, such as form revisions, notice to students and discussions with departments. She began with the Course Repeat policy and discussed the major changes, namely that the policy will apply to Graduate Students as well, and the grade needed to repeat course was now C- or below. She moved on to the Withdrawal policy and said the biggest change was that the EO order puts a lifetime limit on the number of units student may withdraw from, except for "serious and compelling reasons." The revised policy articulates how this would play out at SSU. She then discussed the Academic Probation, Disqualification and Progress. She noted that second BA students need to maintain a 2.0 average instead of a 3.0 average, a definition of disqualification was included, and other clarifications were added. There were many questions and discussion. The Chair asked M. Jolly to write out answers to the questions and send them to Senate-Talk. First reading completed.

University Strategic Plan – First Reading – E. Ochoa

The Chair noted that the University Strategic Plan was now coming before the Senate for endorsement. E. Ochoa provided background on the process of creating the plan. He noted there were contextual documents included in the packet. He described appendices included on the website: <http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/strategicplan/>. He said the budget priorities document had been approved by the PBAC and CRC and showed how the plan was influencing budget decisions already, and stressed that the budget document was not part of the plan the Senate was being asked to endorse. There were questions and discussion.

S. Brannen Called for Orders of the Day

Brannen Motion re: amending Robert's Rules Calling for Orders of the Day

S. Brannen moved to postpone his motion indefinitely as he was satisfied by the Senate Analyst's interpretation and clarification of Calling for Orders of the Day.
Second. No objection.

Motion to return to the University Strategic Plan. Second. No objection.

Return to University Strategic Plan discussion

Discussion continued with specific remarks about the plan, particularly about prioritizing the strategic plan. There were also concerns expressed about the budget priorities document.

First reading completed.

Good of the Order

J. Wingard announced that an undergraduate student paper forum was taking place in the MPR starting at 5:00 and he urged Senators to attend and give their support. S. Miller asked the Senate to publicly thank J. Wingard for his future service as Chair-Elect. Applause.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström Vega