

Academic Senate Minutes

December 15, 2005

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Chair's Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 12/1/05 approved. CCJ Electives and Sociology Curriculum changes approved. Course Repeat Policy approved. Course Add Policy approved. Update on WASC. Special Report – Update on First Year Experience – S. Von Meier. Discussion of Funding Plan for Program Review. Motion that plan in packet regarding Program Review satisfies previous Senate resolution – approved. Provost report. Vice President of Administration and Finance report. Good of the Order.

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Melanie Dreisbach, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Elizabeth Martínez, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Tim Wandling, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Wanda Boda, Myrna Goodman, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Greg Tichava, Perry Marker, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Steve Cuellar, Marguerite St. Germain, Lindsey Simoncic, Sara Statler

Proxies: Meri Storino for Sandra Feldman, Michael Ezra for Art Warmoth

Guests: David Abbott, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Jennifer Evich, Rose Bruce, Elaine Sundberg, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Pat Jackson, Elaine Leeder, Barbara Butler, William Babula, Ian Hannah, Paul Draper

Report of the Chair – E. Stanny

The Chair reported that there was a retirement party for Linda Lipps the same day in the University Club from 4-6. She attended a statewide Chair's meeting and they discussed budgetary practices at other campuses. It was very informative. The Convocation is January 25. It is in a different format this year based on survey feedback and will focus on the distinctiveness of an SSU educational experience. She described the format for the convocation. The Faculty Retreat will be on Shared Governance. Bernie Goldstein will give opening remarks and an excellent panel has been set up. She reported to the body that the Green Music Center report has been delayed, and gave out information that she knew at this point in time. She passed out a handout about the academic support needed for the GMC and explained the document. She noted that Academic Affairs would have a \$900,000 shortfall every year.

The Provost responded to the Chair's report and noted that the figures were preliminary. He said that he thought the marginal cost formula would grow in the

coming years. He thought that using real time dollars for this calculation was not appropriate for an on-going project. Money would be matched flow to flow.

The Chair responded by saying that even if the marginal cost formula went up, other costs would go up too and that would be a wash. She appreciated hearing that the figure for Academic Affairs expenses for the GMC were preliminary and would probably go down.

A Senator asked for information about how growth money would flow to academic support in upcoming reports.

A Senator noted that this body did not ask for a Green Music Center, the GMC does not set forward the educational mission of the institution and we are already very short of money. He urged the body to ask the administration to come up with a plan where zero dollars of the operating deficit of the GMC would be borne by the instructional budget.

Consent Items:

Approval of Agenda – added CCJ electives and Sociology curriculum changes to consent calendar; **Discussion of plan for program review to be put before Program Review Policy, Second. *Approved.***

Minutes of 12/1/05 – *Approved.*

CCJ Electives and Sociology Curriculum Course changes – *Approved.*

Course Repeat Policy – Second Reading – P. Marker

P. Marker gave the floor to M. Jolly, Chair of University Standards. She noted a modification to the policy since its first reading regarding the deadline to file a course repeat form. She noted the Registrar's perspective on the deadline.

There was a question regarding the number of times a student can withdraw from class.

M. Jolly said the recent revision to the withdrawal policy should see the number of withdrawals go down. Students now need serious and compelling reasons to withdraw.

There was a question regarding why a student cannot repeat a course if they receive a C.

M. Jolly said the University Standards did go over this issue and thought the C- had to stand.

It was suggested that the repeat course form have a statement that students do not have priority registration for a class just because they completed the form.

M. Jolly said the committee will be looking at the form and noted the suggestion.

A Senator argued against the policy, offering perspectives on how it was restricting access.

A Senator discussed the learning curve of freshman and her concerns about the policy in this regard.

M. Jolly said that was why they have a 24 unit limit on repeating courses, whereas some campuses have extreme limits on repeating.

It was suggested that the language on filing the repeat be clearer - that if one does not meet the deadline it could reflect on their records, but they could still file later than the deadline.

Motion to remove the word “originally” and “for purposes of improving GPA” in first paragraph. Second.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on amendment – *Approved.*

It was clarified that repeated units are not counted towards graduation.

Question called by chair. *Approved.*

Vote on Course Repeat Policy – *Approved.*

Course Add Policy – Second Reading – P. Marker

P. Marker turned the floor over to M. Jolly.

It was suggested that two forms should exist for the two processes of adding. M. Jolly said the committee will do that.

Question called by Chair. *Approved.*

Vote on Course Add Policy – *Approved.*

P. Marker thanked the University Standards Chair for the committee’s hard work.

Update on WASC

E. Ochoa reported that WASC accepted our request to revise our institutional proposal by focusing it on achievable objectives in the time frame available and gave strong hints to focus on the first two themes of developing the signature of an SSU graduate, which we are now calling the distinguishing characteristics of an SSU graduate, and the nature of the baccalaureate and learning outcomes. These two themes have sub-themes which may be pruned somewhat. A re-drafting of the

proposal will be available to the campus community before we sent it back to WASC on February 1st. WASC generally praised our institutional proposal for its thoroughness and comprehensiveness.

A Senator asked about the issue of aligning resources to the institutional mission.

E. Ochoa said that WASC remarked about our general planning processes, praising them and in our institutional proposal we were asked to discuss the previous items WASC identified. WASC does not appear to have lingering concern about those issues. He said they will attempt to get explicit confirmation that we have addressed the previous areas of concern from WASC.

Special Report – Update on First Year Experience – S. Von Meier

(The complete report can be heard on the SSU-5 server. The Senate Analyst recommends the digital recording as this summary does not express the full flavor of the report on this topic. S. Von Meier was thanked twice for her excellent presentation.)

Summary of report

S. Von Meier introduced herself as the Coordinator of the First Year Experience pilot. A team of twelve faculty are working on a syllabus for this experimental course. She briefed the body on the progress of the group and the issues they are working with. She said that the syllabus follows the basic design of a weekly plenary lecture with breakout sections. They are working on translating the theoretical to the concrete. They have delved deeply into learning outcomes and the issues that arise when outcomes are combined. They have created a matrix of learning outcomes. The theme they have chosen is human identity and she discussed what perspectives might be used. They are struggling with how standardized to make the sections. They have now broken into smaller groups such as technology, faculty training, final presentations, and assessment. She discussed assessment as it differs from program review. She discussed two caveats about assessment. One is the timeline. Data about this experimental course will not be available in time for scheduling for the next year. The second is that the assessment of this experimental course will not answer the question whether GE reform is a good idea. It will hopefully tell us whether this type of course is viable for this campus, faculty and students. It also cannot answer whether multi-disciplinary or disciplinary education is better. She spoke about her personal ideas about being able to work with faculty colleagues in the educational process and the role of educators in the current society.

A Senator asked if the First Year pilot team would be talking with the EMT curriculum committee. S. Von Meier responded that they have not, but would like to in the future.

A Senator asked if the theme would remain the same or change over the years. S. Von Meier said that in her vision of the second year, some faculty would stay and some would go, others would join and so the theme could change.

A Senator asked about the issue of Area E. S. Von Meier said the team did not have a strong compelling sense that this experimental course would overlap with upper division Area E courses.

A Senator asked about where modern languages fit in with the theme of identity and globalization.

It was noted that several people on the team were interested in how language shapes identity and S. Von Meier asked for input on how to incorporate modern languages into the pilot.

A Senator asked if the pilot would overlap with lower division Area E. S. Von Meier responded that the syllabus team will not recommend any overlap in that area to the GE subcommittee for this year.

A Senator asked if the pilot will trump any existing courses and asked where that discussion will take place. S. Von Meier said her team would not decide for individual students which GE courses this experimental course might be a substitute for. That is up to the GE subcommittee. She said that the experimental course does not fit into the current GE categories and any substitution would be by necessity and approximation. The Senator followed up by suggesting using the learning outcomes as the measurement and encouraged discussion with current faculty teaching in Area A.

A Senator remarked that if the FYE is going to teach writing, reading and critical thinking she was concerned about who was going to teach it. She argued that there is a tendency to think that everyone can teach writing. She asked the team to take seriously the need for students to have people who have expertise teach them these skills. S. Von Meier said that was one of the most difficult issues of the team. The question of how much do we have to be expert to attain the learning outcomes is causing a lot of soul searching. We really don't know until we try it.

A Senator asked about the plans for the future, when the syllabus will be ready, when the assessment will be ready, and how much it will cost. S. Von Meier said she could not answer the last question. The syllabus and assessment dates she thought would be early to mid spring semester. She would have liked to have had a syllabus by now.

A Senator remarked that she hoped the resources would be commensurate with the vision.

A Senator suggested some of the FYE be team-taught, which could address some of the expertise issues. S. Von Meier said her concern was to see more numbers in the pilot regarding budget and thought the point was well taken.

Discussion of Plan for Program Review – E. McDonald

E. McDonald recommended that the body discuss the plan for Program Review before taking up the Program Review Policy to separate out the issues.

There was considerable discussion offered for and against the notion that the plan in the packet met the Senate's resolution request for a plan for funding from the administration before approving the new Program Review policy.

Motion to vote on whether the resolution has been satisfied by the plan in the packet. Second.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on motion – Yes = 15, No =15. Chair voted yes. *Approved.*

President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana passed in the interest of time.

Provost Report – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa spoke about why the Green Music Center report was deferred. He said that they are still working on the report regarding Academic Affairs support and it will be presented in February. He also reported that the FYE project received a small grant from the Ford Foundation.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported that the reason construction has not begun on the Green Music Center is that construction costs have risen significantly. The current budget is now about 2.5 to 3 million dollars off. He is working to resolve that issue.

Good of the Order

A Senator thanked Administration and Finance for the excellent food provided at the Senate meetings.

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom