

# Minutes of the Executive Meeting of the Academic Senate

## November 20, 2003

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Penny Washbourn at 3:00 p.m. November 20, 2003. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Penny Washbourn, Vice-Chair Jim Sauerberg, Past-Chair Charles Hamaker, Theo Carlile, Richard Courtney, Wayne Harter, Rye Huber, Sam Lind, Patrizia Longo, Claude Rheal-Malary, Susan Marston, Keith Ogawa, James Temple, Mindy Thomas, and Parliamentarian Michael Barram. Absent were Robert Gorsch, James Hawley, and Yung Jae Lee. Also present was Frank Murray.
2. Minutes of the November 6, 2003 General Meeting were approved as amended with one abstention.

### REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Washbourn attended the monthly meeting with the President. He will attend a shared governance study circle. The Faculty Handbook Committee will meet in mid December to consider Senate Actions approved in the fall as well as any items carried over from last year. She has invited Pete Michell to report on the budget process at the December meeting. Ed Biglin will report on technology at the January meeting. Provost/AVP Stampf will report on the WASC visit and the appointment of deans. At the Provost/deans meeting there was discussion about the role of the deans. It was the consensus of the group that a mix of internal and external deans was preferred. There is ongoing discussion about the role of the vice provost. Provost/AVP Stampf announced the hiring of a consultant to work with the deans and directors in the graduate and adult education areas to help with synergies between the different grad programs. Chair Washbourn asked the Senators to consider agenda items that would be of concern to the faculty at-large for the spring.

Senator Carlile questioned the need for any Senate action based on the report of the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) at the last general meeting. Chair Washbourn responded that the FWC needs to have more explicit direction to take responsibility in the spring, when the Academe report is published, to do the analysis which will indicate where SMC stands in relation to the PAC IIA schools' salary scales, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The strategy is to make sure the budget projections reflect the commitment made by the Trustees. The FWC will bring Faculty Handbook language forward to the Senate for consideration.

4. Senate Self-Assessment subcommittee - Senator Ogawa reported that the categories and questions were finalized and a meeting is being formalized with the consultant. The plan is to complete one focus group by the last week of instruction in December.

5. Senate Governance subcommittee - Past-Chair Hamaker reported that the subcommittee has not met since its last report.

6. Senate Rank and Tenure subcommittee - Senator Carlile reported that the subcommittee has not met since its last report. However, they will convene around the issue of the grievance procedures as they impinge upon rank and tenure. Chair Washbourn commented that the subcommittee may soon be considering the role of the Vice Provost in the rank and tenure process.

7. Committee on Committees (CoC) - Vice-Chair Sauerberg reported that it has been discovered that the Equal Employment Opportunity Compliance (EEOC) committee has not met in five or six years. Therefore, the CoC decided that if a candidate opts for the EEOC as a preference on the Candidate Information Survey, the candidate must choose four preferences rather than three.

8. Vice Provost Job Description - Vice-Chair Sauerberg reported that he and Senators Temple and Hawley met with Provost/AVP Stamp and Vice Provost/Dean Sweeney to discuss the responsibilities of the vice provost. There is a need for an interim vice provost of academics, which is Frances Sweeney. She will serve as vice provost through January 2005. The candidate will be chosen through a search. The interim job duties are not clear at this point, but the finalization for the job description for the search is due January 2005. The final duties of the position need to be sorted out over the next year.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

9. Data related to the Senate action for a reserved sabbatical fund - Chair Washbourn reported that she has conducted an initial analysis on the data for sabbatical eligibility. There are 190 tenure track faculty, 53 are untenured. For 2003-2004, 20 faculty were eligible. 15 applications were received, 14 were recommended, and two were carried over from last year, bringing the total number of sabbaticals for 2003/04 to 16. For 2004/05, 20 faculty are eligible to apply. Due to hiring over the last several years, 22 faculty will be eligible to apply in 2005/06, 24 faculty will be eligible in 2007/08, and 26 faculty will be eligible in 2008/09. The budget assumptions currently include an increase in the number of sabbaticals for the next two years, which will bring the number of funded sabbaticals to 17 in the year 2005/06. The Budget Committee needs to be aware that it is likely that the 17 sabbaticals per year will not be adequate for the future.

10. Provost Job Description - Vice-Chair Sauerberg revised the job description based on Senate feedback. Following are some of the discussion items:

- The description does not refer to the relationship with the Academic Senate.
- Remove "...student, affairs and enrollment services." from the end of bullet #3.
- The Provost should keep in touch with the classroom - teach every five years perhaps?

- Amend bullet #2: "As the College's chief academic officer, **is accessible to the faculty** and coordinates all activities relating to the academic mission of the institution and **collaborates with faculty regarding that mission.**"
- Under Qualifications: under bullet #2 add "and budgetary experience."
- The second sentence in the Job Summary is too long.

Vice-Chair Sauerberg will amend the document and forward it to the President and Provost/AVP Stampf for review.

11. Definition of a Major Field of Study - Ken Brown explained that the Educational Policies Board (EPB) approved this as part of a four part action last year. The Academic Senate returned this portion to the EPB centered around the question of why the EPB dropped the word "ordinarily" from the description. The Senate also questioned the strict minimums for the number of courses for a major.

The EPB reconsidered the item. The EPB wants to maintain departmental autonomy to decide what they feel should constitute a major in their particular discipline, but at the same time it needs to have a guideline to serve in its program review operation and in consideration of new proposals for programs. Typical ranges for upper and lower division courses were added. Also, the idea of an area of concentration was also added.

At the November 17, 2003 meeting of the Educational Policies Board, the following proposed change in policy was approved by a vote of 15-0-0:

The current description of a major field of study, found on page 34 in the 2003-2004 College catalog, should be changed as shown below (changes & additions shown with italics; deletions shown with strikethrough). Existing departments and programs should consider this description of a major in their regular self-evaluations and the Program Review Committee should consider it as a guideline in reviewing departments and programs. This description should also be used to guide proposals for new majors and should be considered by the Undergraduate Policies Committee in its evaluation of such proposals.

### **A Major Field of Study**

Defined as a group of coordinated courses ordinarily including **at least two to four** preparatory courses at the lower division level and **at least eight to ten** courses at the upper division level. Certain majors may require additional background course work in related fields. **Within certain majors, students may choose to focus their study by selecting an area of concentration.** The regular major groups available to students in the various curricula of the College are listed elsewhere in this Catalog. **The specific requirements for each major are fully described in the catalog section of the corresponding department or program.** A student may declare or change majors on the appropriate petition form available in the Registrar's Office. A student being graduated with a double major will receive only one degree even if the majors are in two different schools. Students choose a major field of study, an in-depth concentration in a specific academic area, and elective courses according to their interests. (Those who have not

determined a program or major filed of study at entry are encouraged to take introductory courses in various fields and to settle on a major field of study only as their interests develop a sharper focus. Ordinarily, students are expected to have determined their major field of study before commencing their junior year.)

key: removed/struck text, replaced/added text

The proposal was approved on the consent agenda.

12. Satisfactory/Pass/Fail Grading Option - Ken Brown explained that this item was initially approved by the EPB in February, 2003. The Senate had many concerns and returned it to the EPB in May 2003. The policy attempted to raise the minimum grade required for a "P" to the current D- to a C- level. The Senate's primary difficulty with the proposed policy was that two students doing equivalent work would be graded differently: the student taking the course on a pass/fail basis and does D level work gets a fail, whereby for the student taking it on a graded basis that receives a D it is a passing grade which counts towards graduation. The EPB, however, feels that a D- grade is too low to award a passing grade. After reconsideration, the EPB proposes the following new policy:

The current Pass/Fail grading option should be changed to a S/D/F grading option, where S means satisfactory and is earned with the equivalent of C- work or better. In implementing this change, the catalog section entitled "Pass/Fail Grading" should be changed as follows (changes & additions shown with italics; deletions shown with strikethrough).

### **Satisfactory/Pass/Fail Grading**

*Satisfactory/pass/fail (S/D/F)* grading is offered as an option to the undergraduate student for certain elective courses. Courses required for a student's major, minor, and courses taken to satisfy the general education requirements (see Program of Study, pp 34) may not be taken on a S/D/F basis. In courses taken on this basis, the *satisfactory* grade (the equivalent of C- or higher on the regular grading scale) will not affect the student's grade point average. *The D and F grades will affect the GPA in the usual manner.* A student may not take more than three courses during his/her four years on the *pass/fail S/D/F* basis; in any one term he/she may not take more than one such course. *Pass/fail* Petitions for S/D/F grading, which require the instructor's permission, are available from the Registrar's Office and must be filed *in the Registrar's Office* by the end of the tenth week of instruction.

key: removed/struck text, replaced/added text

Frank Murray said that the EPB considered whether grades should reflect the historical achievement of the student or allow students to perform poorly in areas where it doesn't matter to their major or graduation requirements. The EPB agreed that historical accuracy of achievement was more important values than allowing a greater range of passing

effort. This proposal allows that students that take a courses pass/fail and do poorly will have that D recorded in their transcript and included in their GPA. Currently, the students do not have the option of taking a class pass/fail if it is a required course.

The proposal was approved on the consent agenda.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

13. Revision of due date regarding promotion decisions - Chair Washbourn introduced the proposal from the President to change the date in the Faculty Handbook from May 31st to June 30th for receipt of letters of promotion. His rationale is that it is not reasonable to respond by May 31st due to graduation, Board of Trustees meetings, and end of year activities. He doesn't want the faculty to become anxious if they don't receive the letter by May 31st. The Rank and Tenure Committee has considered this proposed change and they support it.

Past-Chair Hamaker said that contracts are due by July 1st, how will the June 30th date work? Senator Longo suggested a compromise to June 15th.

It was **MOVED** by Senator Temple and **SECONDED** by Senator Thomas to place the item on the agenda for the General Meeting. The motion passed.

14. Guidelines of Termination of a Department or Program - Frank Murray explained that the EPB has considered this document for several years, going through many versions. In light of the issues surrounding the School of Extended Education recently, a new section was added regarding the suspension of a program. The Psychology Department successfully terminated the masters program following a prototype of these guidelines because it was consensual. The guidelines also provide for a situation where it is not clear that termination is the appropriate choice. There is a presumption that an administrator will act in good faith. The Senate agreed to amend item 5, line 1 to read, "The Dean of a School, after consultation with the appropriate senior ranked faculty in the affected program or department..."

Chair Washbourn suggested that the proper placement of the guidelines in the Faculty Handbook must be identified, it may require a new section. The item was approved on the consent agenda.

14. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Cathe Michalosky  
Academic Senate Secretary