

Tuesday, November 27, 2001, 4:00pm, Goodwin Forum (NHE 102)

Chair Bicknell called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. on Tuesday, November 27, 2001, in Goodwin Forum (NHE 102); a quorum was present

### **Members Present**

Adams, Bicknell, Bockover, Braggs, Burroughs, Fulgham, Goodman, Jenkins, Kenyon, Klein, Little, MacConnie, Martin, Mayer, McFarland, Meiggs, Mortazavi, Novotney, Oliver, Paselk, Paynton, Sheppard, Thobaben, Thompson, Travis, Wang

### **Members Absent**

Christensen, McCrone, Sanford, Siering for Varkey, F. Wilson, M. Wilson, Yarnall

### **Guests**

Steve Butler, Student Affairs; Randi Darnall Burke, Student Affairs; Carolyn Mueller, President's Office; Donna Schafer, Research & Graduate Studies Office

### **Announcement of Proxies**

Wang for Smith, Fritzsche for Stokes

### **Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of November 6, 2001**

M/S (Goodman/Fulgham) to approve the minutes from the Meeting of November 6, 2001

Motion passed

### **Reports, Announcement, and Communications of the Chair**

Chair Bicknell announced:

- The vacancy announcement for the President of Humboldt State University is available on the web at [www.calstate.edu/execsearch/HSU\\_Pres.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/execsearch/HSU_Pres.shtml). Please direct any potential candidates appropriately.
- In today's Senate packet is a letter from Chancellor Reed requesting that the campuses identify 1 percent of their budget to return to the state. On November 19, 2001, Chancellor Reed again wrote to the campuses informing them that the Department of Finance had asked him for an additional \$10 million. To this letter is attached a table identifying Humboldt's total "de-allocation" of \$952,620. The original 1 percent had been identified from campus reserves; there are no reserves to cover the additional \$280,000.
- Senator Little stated that Chancellor Reed discusses in his memo that this will not be happening until January. Also, it is understood that the Chancellor's Office has given the campus presidents complete discretion on how to accomplish this budget decrease. Chancellor Reed is declaring a freeze on all hiring positions except for tenure track searches currently under way. It is not known what affect this will have on other searches nor is it known when this will be clarified. Departments and units may get

permission for searches that have a direct educational benefit.

- President McCrone has responded to several of the resolutions passed recently by the Academic Senate:
- President McCrone's response to the Humboldt State University Senate's resolutions on athletics and all of its supporting documentation is on reserve at the Library under ACADEMIC SENATE. This includes materials in addition to the ones in today's packet.
- President McCrone has approved the Resolution Regarding CR/NC Grading for Undergraduate Courses for Level 5 Students (#09-01/02-SA).
- President McCrone has approved the Resolution on Elections of Representatives and Officers of the General Faculty (#10-01/02-EX).
- President McCrone did not entirely approve the Resolution Regarding Ombudspersons at Humboldt State University insofar as the current arrangement of one Ombudsperson at 3 WTUs will continue for the remainder of AY 2001-2002. He has appointed Lynda Moore, Ron Fritzsche and Randi Darnall-Burke to convene a representative study group, including staff and faculty, to make recommendations regarding informal dispute resolution generally, and specifically the Ombudsperson(s), which is generally consistent with the final three resolved clauses of the Senate's resolution.
- A copy of a letter from Chancellor Reed to Dr. Richard C. Atkinson, President of the University of California, has been received. This letter documents the agreement to seek to establish "an expedited joint Ed.D. program between the University of California and the California State University, and that . . . the California State University will join with UC in supporting legislative action on behalf of this new joint effort and, as a consequence, will withdraw its support for the legislative proposal to secure independent authority to grant the Ed.D. degree." The System is no longer seeking an independent Ed.D. Questions may be directed to Senator Snyder.
- Included in today's packet is a letter from Chair Bicknell to President McCrone documenting their conversations regarding the draft Intellectual Property Policy. Chair Bicknell has had two subsequent conversations with President McCrone, one with Vice President Stokes, and one with Dean Schafer regarding perceived problems with the policy, and she also participated in a meeting of a committee of the Foundation Board of Directors regarding the draft policy. It is unclear what the next step will be in addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the draft policy.

### **Committee and State Senate Reports**

**Student Affairs:** The Committee continues to review the noise policy on campus and will bring to the senate a resolution based on investigations and tests. Complaints regarding the volume initiated investigation into this issue.

**Senate Finance:** There is a resolution on today's agenda. Regarding the budget situation, the trustees did recommend partnership funding for next year's budget knowing that the situation will change and the 2002/2003 budget will not be known until January when the Governor's

budget is revealed. Both the OAA Joint Committee and the Budget Committee are meeting tomorrow. There has been a call for URPBC to meet and probably that meeting will focus on the budget.

**Faculty Affairs:** The Committee will meet Friday and continue its discussions on assigned time of faculty governance positions and the reporting line for the faculty development coordinator.

**OAA:** Dr. Fritzsche announced that there are two searches underway in Academic Affairs, the Director of Diversity & Compliance Programs and the Director for Budget and Institutional Data.

**Educational Policies:** The Committee is continuing its discussion on high school students taking courses for Humboldt State University credit and is looking for input on this issue. The Committee is struggling over whether to continue or to expand the program. A document will be brought to the Senate for discussion. The Committee also is working on the revised document for the program review and the comments received from department chairs will be made available for senate discussion. The Joint UCC/Senate subcommittee finished the draft for the policy on suspending academic programs and this will be brought to the senate soon.

**General Faculty:** The academic year calendar committee has finalized two survey instruments, one for students and one for faculty, and these will be distributed during spring term; the committee also is beginning its work on the reconstruction of the perpetual calendar.

**Additional Announcements:** Senators were alerted to the fact that the printed copy of the spring schedule does not indicate the Chavez holiday; the holiday is shown on the website. Senators may wish to inform their colleagues of this.

**UCC:** The subcommittees are continuing their work; some significant action items will be presented at the next few meetings.

**TIME CERTAIN: 4:15 PM: Discussion Item: President McCrone's Response to Athletics Resolutions**

Chair Bicknell stated that reactions and comments from the senators regarding the President's response to the resolutions would be helpful, and she would like the senators to advise the Senate Executive Committee on whether any further action on the issue addressed in the resolutions is needed.

Discussion included the following comments:

Questions were raised regarding the gender equity report that was attached to President McCrone's letter; what is the status of this report in terms of its importance for policy and for job description, etc.? [This is a consultant's report that was prepared for the campus; the campus's response to the consultant's findings follow the report.]

Severe disappointment with the President's response was expressed. The Senate became involved with this issue when the President informed Chair Bicknell during the summer that he was considering transferring Athletics to Student Affairs. After reviewing the President's decision, it appears as though he looked at the Title 9 consultant's report and consulted with the Executive Committee, and he completely ignored the report by the Athletics Review Committee and the senate's work. Since many of the senate's resolutions were passed unanimously, some attempt at honest dialogue and an explanation for any response was expected. The letter is seen as a deliberate attempt to mislead and it is most disturbing. There appears to be no interest in joint governance or consultation. This appears to be the most superficial solution that could be suggested; simply transferring Athletics to Student Affairs probably will not solve any problems. The looming budget cuts need to be considered. One example of disappointment in the President's memo is his response to the Resolution on the Mission and Role of Intercollegiate Athletics at Humboldt State University where he states that safety and gender equity in an environment in which learning is the highest priority are "important factors." The senate's resolution mentioned sports equity, which is not included in the President's memo, and the Senate's resolution did not state "important factors" but rather stated that they were the "most important factors." The President's statement in this context purposely misinterprets the senate's intent while at the same time, it appears as if there is agreement with the Senate's intent. There is no attempt at genuine communication.

Questions and concerns were raised regarding the gender equity report: what kind of authority should the coordinator have over all departments; the language is vague in terms of gender equity; some of the language is troubling and some of it, such as the language regarding grievance, is very good; is the report from Athletic Director Swan also the university's response to the report; what is the status of the report; who approved it? More information is needed on this report. [The report was attached to the packet of materials received from the President.]

Concern was expressed regarding the type of budget review for Athletics that will be completed in order to compare the advantages of having Athletics be part of Student Affairs rather than Academic Affairs. The Senate should review this issue in one year.

How will this move affect other academic programs and colleges? If there is a plan in place to move departments to a different college, this is a process in which the Senate normally is involved, and it should be discussed before the Senate body.

Another disturbing aspect of this response is that no mention is made of the senate's stance regarding the status of coaches as faculty and that coaches should be running the program review and making decisions on their own behalf, including budget decisions.

Given the amount of work and time that the senate put into the crafting of the resolutions,

the President's report is insulting as well as disturbing to the senate members.

The President's memo to the general campus refers to the Athletic Review Committee's report and to the senate resolutions in the same context as his decision to move Athletics to Student Affairs. This is a misleading statement. The Athletic Review Committee's report recommended reporting to a vice president and to engage in more evaluation if the move to Student Affairs was to be considered; the senate resolutions recommended no move at this time given the current changes on campus. Thus, referencing these two documents in the memo misrepresented the actual contents of the documents.

While not all details regarding such an organizational change can be considered, at the least there needs to be a vision or concept that precipitates such a change. There are many questions regarding staffing, graduate student assistants, etc., that have no answers and such questions should have been answered before such a move is made.

The Senate needs to focus on gender equity and safety issues, not the change in reporting lines.

A straw vote was taken and 17 agreed that a strongly worded resolution to the president is needed; 1 did not agree, and 2 were undecided. Chair Bicknell requested that senators send any commentary on this issue before next Tuesday so that the Senate Executive Committee can review all comments.

**TIME CERTAIN: 4:30 PM: Discussion Item: Outcomes and Assessment [Ann Burroughs, Chair, UCC]**

Ann Burroughs, Chair of the UCC, reported that the Committee is working on identifying learning outcomes and assessment techniques for general education. Material she presented included these observations: Assessment may be defined as a cycle wherein student mastery of learning objectives is assessed, then the program is modified as needed, then reassessed, then modified again so that a feedback loop is developed. Faculty routinely conduct course-level assessment on many different levels. But when assessment is programmatic in scope, formalization is now required for the definition of learning outcomes and specification of the assessment techniques. Because a program includes many individual courses, programmatic assessment is more complex.

There are two pressures behind assessment. One is the CSU System. The accountability documents contained in the agenda packet for the November 6, 2001, meeting imply the requirement that Humboldt State University engage in programmatic assessment of its degree programs and its general education programs. The other pressure is from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Also in the November 6, 2001, packet is a copy of Standard 2 from WASC. Distributed at today's meeting was a copy of a communication from

WASC to Dean Richard Vrem that discusses four issues of accreditation-related concern and contains the following language about assessment:

The University has demonstrated a commitment to "making assessment central to the academic culture" in the approval by the academic senate and the administration of a resolution on assessment. The resolution established an Assessment Committee, and mandated that a comprehensive assessment plan be developed. . . . the University is encouraged to consider how the institution intends to integrate what it is learning from the assessment activities into its analysis of educational effectiveness.

The UCC is engaged in the design of assessment practices for general education.

According to the accountability requirements, the campus has three years in which to design its approach to assessment and this applies to major program assessment as well as general education assessment. By the end of AY 2001-2002, the campus needs to have something in place that will be implemented in the beginning of AY 2003.

Regarding general education, following is a brief synopsis for the different areas:

Area A - This area is somewhat difficult because it is in three different categories: critical thinking, written communication and oral communication. Closure on the written and oral communication areas appears to be imminent. The critical thinking area is more difficult because of the large number of departments that are responsible. A document constructed in Summer 1999 was circulated and feedback was requested. To date, there has been no response indicating any problem so the conclusion is that this area also is reaching closure.

Area B - A proposal from the College of Natural Resources and Sciences that was approved by the UCC is now with the Joint Senate/UCC/Associated Student subcommittee.

Areas C and D - The College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences is developing a proposal for learning outcomes and assessment techniques and has promised this proposal to the UCC by December 31, 2001.

Area E - The problem with this area is that there are thirteen departments considering Area E courses. A proposal was developed, responses were generated, the UCC merged the original document with the responses received and distributed the revised document to the Area E departments with a request for response to the UCC by November 30, 2001.

Eventually all of these documents will be brought to the senate for its deliberation and approval. The UCC hopes to be done with its part of this process by the end of this calendar year.

UCC Chair Burroughs stated that her intent in talking with the senate body is to alert the senators to where the campus is in regard to this process. Much work already has been invested in this process and much work still needs to be done. Senators were reminded that this is a work in progress and changes will need to be made as the campus goes through the process.

Discussion included:

How qualitative of a structure needs to be developed? Perhaps a minimalist approach would work. [This would be a decision of the colleges--except for Areas A and E, which are under the direct control of the UCC.]

It may be that there is a better way to accomplish this task; there may be several attempts before a solid policy is developed, but a first step needs to be taken. [Some of the other campuses in the CSU system have established assessment offices and have charged specific individuals with this responsibility. Part of the lack of popularity of this topic is that faculty view it as another obligation to be accomplished.]

Apparently someone is receiving assigned time in the College of Natural Resources and Sciences to implement that College's plan and a question was raised regarding this apparent implementation of a process that requires eventual senate approval. [In CNRS, Area B is undergoing program review so there is development of a program review instrument for Area B independent of assessment. The cyclic program review for Area B is underway and Chair Burroughs believes that some of the assigned time was for this purpose, but does not know for sure.] [The process, according to a senate resolution, is that with respect to general education, the UCC would work with various departments and colleges and bring a proposal to the senate via the joint UCC/Senate/Associated Student subcommittee. The subcommittee will review the documents and eventually such documents will come to the senate although the exact process is not known.]

Additional comments may be forwarded to UCC Chair Burroughs.

**TIME CERTAIN: 5:00 PM: Discussion Item: Procedure for Review of Existing Graduate Programs**

Senator MacConnie provided background on the document. A draft of a procedure for graduate programs was included in the October 09, 2001, agenda packet. This document was part of the packet of materials that needed to be reviewed at the beginning of the 1999-2000 academic year. When the current Educational Policies Committee received this document and began its review, it became apparent that this is a separate document from the typical program review document; however, it is an addendum in the sense that it is a request for additional information that is asked for in the regular program review. One question that was

raised is why the need for additional information and a separate track with slightly different reporting channels and a slightly different time line. Part of the reasoning for the separateness of it is that the additional information had to do with one of the recommendations from one of the WASC reports from the mid-1990's. The document was reviewed by all of the college curriculum committees before it reached the senate. Part of the reason for bringing it to the senate body is to learn if there is anything else that might need to be considered in view of the time frame. There were some concerns as to should this be included in the general program review document as a separate program review document so that the same time frame and same reporting lines are used as opposed to separate reporting lines. Also there was some concern regarding the additional information requested in the graduate program review as opposed to the general program review, in part because there is not separate budget funding for graduate programs. There are some graduate programs that are not housed within any one particular department and so it provided them an avenue to follow if they are not conducting a regular program review.

Discussion included the following:

Background was provided by Dr. Fritzsche who stated that the process for developing this document began with Linda Parker, then Dean for Research and Graduate Studies. A draft was developed and approved by the Graduate Council and then was sent to the UCC. Many of the time lines were modified by the UCC and then approved and forwarded to the Joint Council. After approval by the Joint Council, it was forwarded to the academic senate. There have been successful trial runs using this process by the M.A. program in Social Sciences and by the Sociology Department.

One concern expressed by an outside reviewer has to do with the identification of how many students go on for a Ph.D. as a measure of success. Such a measure is not reflective for all areas.

Concern was expressed that this procedure for graduate program review is serious in the context of underfunded graduate programs and in the context of faculty predominately carrying graduate programs as overloads.

Concern was expressed that an elite graduate teaching faculty core will be created, and that the smaller graduate programs which draw upon a lot of external resources in terms of curriculum may not be deemed worthy. Yet many of the students who graduate have gone on for Ph.D.s in academic institutions so there is a qualitative assessment that needs to be considered.

The approach at Humboldt State University is that we don't differentiate between the resource implication of undergraduate and graduate instruction. Faculty teach across the graduate and undergraduate boundaries. The problem is that we don't treat those resources

differently.

Data gathered will be compared to what standards?

The document is dated April 21, 1999, so it is in effect.

According to Dean Schafer, it is important that a document be in place that deals with academic program review at the graduate level. The policy needs to be moved forward to give some direction to departments. The program review policies currently under discussion have been developed on a parallel track and there may be some revision needed regarding the time lines, for example, but it is best to move forward. The Graduate Council discussed this draft fairly recently and continues to endorse it.

Chair Bicknell stated that in the near future, the senate will be reviewing this document, or one similar to it, with a resolution, and asked for input on how senators feel about this approach to program review for graduate programs. There was general agreement that the Senate take up its next time certain item and then return to a discussion of this item.

**TIME CERTAIN: 5:20 PM: Resolution on Appendix W of the Faculty Handbook - Travel Policy for Academic Personnel (#12-01/02-SF)**

M/S (Little Mortazavi) to move the Resolution

Motion passed

Senator Little provided background on the resolution stating that each college and the Library have violated Appendix W in some way so the Senate Finance Committee decided to recommend revising Appendix W so that decisions regarding travel compensation are made by each college or the Library.

M/S (Fulgham/Snyder) to amend Appendix W by striking the third and fourth sentences contained in the first paragraph of the section titled Coverage of Classes During Absence of Faculty Members.

Voting occurred and MOTION PASSED WITH 13 YES VOTES AND 4 NO VOTES.

Concern was expressed that the text appears to be incomplete and it was suggested that some of the state and system regulations referred to in the first paragraph of the section titled Authorization to Travel be identified, such as international travel, release forms, etc. It was agreed that Dr. Fritzsche will provide a list of such regulations to be added to Appendix W before it goes to the general faculty for a vote.

Voting occurred and MOTION PASSED WITH AMENDMENT TO THE ATTACHMENT.

**TIME CERTAIN: 5:00 PM: Discussion Item: Procedure for Review of Existing Graduate Programs (Continuation)**

Comments included:

If a review is needed, perhaps those teaching in the graduate program could provide a curriculum vita.

Perhaps the expanded definition of scholarship should be added.

If reference to funding is included, then the undergraduate funding should be separated from graduate funding, or this part should be deleted.

Language in number 3 of the section titled GRADUATE STUDENTS should be modified.

An explanation as to why the proposed consultants should not be contacted is needed. [Perhaps the list of proposed consultants should be annotated.]

The Educational Policies Committee should bring a resolution to the senate with any revisions to the document.

This document has been before the Graduate Council and through each of the college curriculum committees so therefore it appears as though sufficient faculty review has occurred and it may not be necessary to reject the previous work of others by making major revisions.

Senators must remember that this could be considered a working document; it is the first time for using this policy and probably changes will need to be made.

The Senate members seem to be favorably disposed towards this draft; there is some concern regarding identifying an elite graduate faculty and some clarification is needed (such as number 3 of the section titled GRADUATE STUDENTS).

Editorial suggestions or other comments should be forwarded to Senator MacConnie. There was general agreement that this will not be a problematical adoption; most senators are in favor of this policy.

---

M/S (Goodman/Fulgham) motion to adjourn

**Meeting adjourned at 5:45pm**