

Tuesday, December 06, 2016, 3:00-5:00pm, Goodwin Forum (NHE 102)

Chair Julie Alderson called the meeting to order at 3:03pm on Tuesday, December 06, 2016 Goodwin Forum, Nelson Hall East, Room 102; a quorum was present.

Members Present

Abell, Alderson, Avitia, Camann, Creadon, Dunk, Enyedi, Eschker, Flynn, Frye, Guillen, Karadjova, Le, Lopes, Maguire, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Meyer, Oliver, O'Neill, Ortega, Pence, Rizzardi, Virnoche, Wilson, Wrenn

Members Absent

Blake, Platt, Rossbacher, Sadeghzadeh, Thobaben

Guests

Rock Braithwaite, Josh Callahan, Lisa Castellino, Nicholas Cutler, Mary Dingle, Ken Fulgham, Mary Glenn, Chris Harmon, Nikola Hobbel, Chris Hopper, Cindy Moyer, Jon Sapper, Suzanne Scott, Rick Zechman, Noah Zerbe, various students

Announcement of Proxies

K. Malloy for Platt, Avitia for Sadeghzadeh, Abell for Thobaben

Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S (Dunk/Abell) agenda item 5, *Reports, Announcements and Communications of the Chair*, and agenda item 6, *Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members*, to follow agenda item 17, *Resolution on Liberal Studies Elementary Education (LSEE) Program Changes*

Motion carried unanimously

Approval of Minutes from the November 15, 2016 Meeting

M/S (Avitia /Dunk) to approve the Minutes of the November 15, 2016 meeting with changes and additions to the approved minutes highlighted below in red.

Resolution to Amend Section 9.0 of the Constitution of the University Senate to Specify Time Limits for Electorates to Ratify Senate Constitution Amendments (05-16/17-CBC – November 15, 2016) Second Reading

Senate voted; Resolution to Amend Section 9.0 of the Constitution of the University Senate to Specify Time Limits for Electorates to Ratify Senate Constitution Amendments (05-16/17-CBC – November 15, 2016) **passed passed without dissent**

Ayes: Thobaben, Abell, Blake, Dunk, Lopes, Ortega, Platt, Meyer, Virnoche, Wrenn, Creadon, Wilson, Flynn, O'Neill, Maguire, Eschker, Oliver, Karadjova, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Frye

Abstentions: Enyedi, Le, Pence, Rizzardi, Sadeghzadeh

Vote not recorded: Avitia

Sense of the Senate Resolution on Confidential Student Evaluations (07-16/17-FAC – November 15, 2016)

Senate voted; Sense of the Senate Resolution on Confidential Student Evaluations (07-16/17-FAC – November 15, 2016) **passed passed without dissent**

Ayes: Thobaben, Abell, Blake, Dunk, Lopes, Ortega, Platt, Meyer, Pence, Virnoche, Wrenn, Creadon, Wilson, O’Neill, Maguire, Eschker, Oliver, Karadjova, Rizzardi, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Avitia, Frye, Sadeghzadeh

Abstentions: Enyedi, Le

Vote not recorded: Flynn

Motion carried unanimously

Faculty Senator Vote for ASCSU Temporary Representative

The officers of the General Faculty brought forward two candidates, Ben Marschke and Kerri Malloy, both of whom would be willing to fill HSU’s ASCSU temporary vacancy for the Spring 2017 semester.

Ken Fulgham was recognized by Chair Alderson and spoke in support of Ben Marschke to serve as the ASCSU temporary representative.

M/S (Virnoche/Meyer) to go to faculty session
Motion carried unanimously

AEC Chair, Jennifer Corgiat, oversaw the faculty vote. After results from a secret ballot were tallied, it was announced that Kerri Malloy had received the majority vote and would assume Erick Eschker’s Spring 2017 duties as one of the two HSU Faculty Representatives to the ASCSU.

Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC)

With item 15-370 pulled, a copy of the approved ICC Consent Calendar is attached.

TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM - Open Forum for the Campus Community

Emeritus Professor Ken Fulgham signed up to speak regarding the Spring 2017 ASCSU Temporary Representative; Professor Fulgham was recognized when that item was addressed.

TIME CERTAIN: 3:30-3:45 PM Discussion Item - GE All-University Requirement Resolution for Über Student Learning Outcome and GE All-University Requirement Proposal for Area Specific SLOs

Professor Chris Harmon, Chair of the GEAR Committee, provided a copy of two draft resolutions (attached) that the committee is in the process of vetting and preparing to be placed on a future Senate agenda. On behalf of the committee, Professor Harmon asked for feedback from Senate and the opportunity to address any questions and/or concerns about the drafts thus far.

Professor Harmon was able to answer some queries during the brief discussion that ensued; Senator Alderson asked that if Senators had any additional comments or questions to please direct them via email to Professor Harmon for the committee's consideration as they work to finalize the resolutions.

Resolution on Adopting a University Policy on Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines (06-16/17-UPC – December 6, 2016) Second Reading

UPC Chair, John Meyer, explained that the committee's goal in preparing documents for the second reading was to provide additional clarity and address the suggestions that had been provided after the first reading.

M/S (Abell/Avitia) to amend the Policy on Policies and its associated resolution with the following edits:

Edit second paragraph of Section II. *Proposing a new University Policy* with following underlined text:

"It is the responsibility of Senate to make policy recommendations to the President. The President has the sole authority to approve all new policies and refer them to the responsible office for implementation. The President's response to policy recommendations shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Senate within four weeks of the President's receipt of the policy recommendations. If the President does not approve a Senate-recommended policy or approves it in a modified form, the reason shall be communicated to the Senate."

Motion to amend carried unanimously

Delete the following underlined sentence from paragraph two of Section II. *Proposing a new University Policy*:

"The Senate committee solicits and/or reviews feedback from stakeholder groups as appropriate to the subject matter and makes a recommendation to the University Senate. If the committee does not recommend Senate action, the reason will be

communicated to the University Senate. In some cases, SenEx may deem it appropriate to utilize a different committee review process, and may also deem it appropriate to pass along certain policies directly to the Senate as an informational item or on a consent calendar."

Motion to amend carried unanimously

Add the following resolved clauses to the resolution:

RESOLVED: That the University Policies Committee report to the University Senate on the efficacy of this policy at least once a semester for the first three semesters of its implementation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy undergo mandatory review and revision as necessary by the University Senate in Spring 2018 to improve its efficacy and implementation."

Motion to amend carried unanimously

Senate voted; Resolution on Adopting a University Policy on Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines (06-16/17-UPC – December 6, 2016) **passed without dissent**

Ayes: Abell, Avitia, Creadon, Dunk, Enyedi, Eschker, Flynn, Frye, Karadjova, Le, Lopes, Maguire, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Meyer, Oliver, O'Neill, Ortega, Platt, Rizzardi, Sadeghzadeh, Thobaben, Virnoche, Wilson, Wrenn

Abstentions: Pence

Resolution on Adopting a University Policy on eLearning (09-16/17-APC – December 6, 2016)
First Reading

M/S (Virnoche/Avitia) to move the resolution

APC Chair, Mary Virnoche, introduced the policy giving examples of portions of the document that have been changed and the vetting that has taken place since the committee began examining the original draft of the policy that had been previously presented to Senate.

Senators provided feedback for the committee to consider as they prepare the policy for its second reading.

TIME CERTAIN: 4:30 PM – Resolution on Liberal Studies Elementary Education (LSEE) Program Changes (11-16/17-ICC - December 6, 2016)

M/S (Oliver/Ortega) to move the resolution

ICC Chair, Dale Oliver, introduced the resolution. Professor Oliver also introduced and recognized the following guests who each spoke in favor of the proposed LSEE Program

changes.

Mary Dingle – Chair, School of Education

Professor Dingle spoke to the design of the program which infuses clinical practice into each year of study, blending the undergrad and credential programs, so that prospective elementary teachers can earn their BA and credential by the end of their senior year. She stated that the academic program is a plan supported statewide, nationally, and by the CSU.

Chris Hopper – Interim Dean, College of Professional Studies

Dean Hopper noted that this proposal has been five years in the planning due to the increasing recognition over the past ten years that there is a need to improve upon the current program, which lacks in preparing first and second year teachers who find that they are not as prepared as they could be.

Jon Sapper, Deputy Superintendent, Humboldt County Office of Education

On behalf of the Humboldt County Office of Education, Dr. Sapper gave his assurance that the HCOE and K-12 schools throughout Humboldt County are willing and eager to participate in the new model as they recognize the great value in creating an early relationship between the schools and incoming teachers and the significance that such a relationship will have on the education of future teachers and Humboldt County students.

Several guests who spoke against the resolution were recognized.

Nicholas Cutler – Current LSEE Undergraduate Student

Nicholas read a letter that he and a current EED Multiple Subject Credential Student, Jennifer Griffin, wrote on behalf of concerned students. Their letter is an accumulated response to the LSEE program's structural changes that are being proposed. A copy of the letter along with over forty signatures in support of the letter is attached.

Nikola Hobbel – Professor, Department of English

Professor Hobbel provided a handout to Senators which outlines and explains the major concerns that have been voiced by LSEE faculty over the past several years in regard to the proposed LSEE program changes. A copy of Professor Hobbel's handout is attached.

Suzanne Scott – Professor, Department of English

Professor Scott addressed Senate stating that although she is not against field work, she is not in support of adding additional field work in lieu of cutting course work. A copy of Professor Scott's full statement is attached.

M/S (Meyer/Wilson) to postpone further discussion of the resolution until the first Senate meeting in January

Motion carried without dissent; one abstention

Senator Abell motioned to extend the meeting by ten minutes

Motion carried

M/S (Malloy/Creadon) to skip to agenda item 13, *Sense of the Senate Resolution on Opposing a Tuition Increase*

Motion carried

Sense of the Senate Resolution on Opposing a Tuition Increase (10-15/16-EX - December 6, 2017)

M/S (Malloy/Creadon) to move the resolution

Senator Creadon explained that the CSU has proposed the possibility of a tuition increase for the next academic year despite the already dramatic rise that has occurred in past years. Senator Creadon asks that HSU show their support by joining the California State Student Association in opposing the proposed tuition increase.

Senate voted; Sense of the Senate Resolution on Opposing a Tuition Increase (10-15/16-EX - December 6, 2017) **passed**

Ayes: Abell, Avitia, Creadon, Dunk, Flynn, Frye, Karadjova, Le, Maguire, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Meyer, Oliver, O'Neill, Ortega, Pence, Platt, Rizzardi, Sadeghzadeh, Virnoche, Wrenn

Nays: Eschker

Abstentions: Enyedi, Lopes, Thobaben

Vote not recorded: Wilson

Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members

The following written reports were provided prior to the meeting and are attached:

- Academic Policies Committee Report
- Faculty Affairs Committee Report
- Constitutions and Bylaws Report

Meeting adjourned at 5:13pm

ICC Consent Calendar for 12/6/16 Senate

15-225

ESM 301: Biodiversity on Earth NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

New Area B UD GE Course covering origins of biodiversity, advantages of biodiversity for humans, and contemporary challenges to biodiversity. The proposal includes a GE SLO matrix that demonstrates the course will meet

16-068

GERM 107 German Level III COURSE CHANGE FORM

This course change seeks to add non-domestic DCG status to the existing course. Similar courses in Chinese, French & Spanish are currently certified as DCG and the World Languages & Cultures Department wants to elevate GERM 107 to the same status. The course title will be updated to "German Language & Culture III" to reflect the DCG content. The course description is updated to reflect the DCG content.

16-080

SPAN 105L Spanish Laboratory Level I COURSE CHANGE FORM

Reactivate Spanish Laboratory Level I as a stand-alone laboratory experience (not a co-requisite of SPAN 105).

16-081

GERM 207 German Level IV COURSE CHANGE FORM

This course change seeks to add non-domestic DCG status to the existing course. Similar courses in Chinese, French & Spanish are currently certified as DCG and the World Languages & Cultures Department wants to elevate GERM 207 to the same status. The course title will be updated to "German Language & Culture IV" to reflect the DCG content. The course description is updated to reflect the DCG content.

GEAR Discussion Items
Two Draft Resolutions
University Senate Meeting, 12/6/16

**Resolution on
General Education All-University Requirement Resolution
for Über Student Learning Outcome**

AY-16/17-Chris Harmon, Chair, General Education All-University Requirement

WHEREAS: General Education All-University Requirement outcomes are too numerous (currently 39 in total) to allow for meaningful ongoing assessment.

WHEREAS: The General and All-University Requirements (GEAR) committee was formed in order to provide a forum in which General Education (GE) assessment, planning, and general oversight could be discussed and managed in a consistent manner. The primary task of the committee included the clarification and revision of the HSU's GE student learning outcomes (SLO) and the assessment of student learning.

WHEREAS: Committee members strived to streamline the SLOs so faculty and students could universally apply them to a broad array of discipline specific content.^{1,2} The committee also sought to identify a central component of student learning that all GE courses could support and enhance.

WHEREAS: A companion proposal outlines area-specific SLOs that simultaneously satisfy Executive Orders (EO) 1061 & 1100.

RESOLVED: Approval of an overarching GE Program "Über" SLO, as presented below and applied to the GE program in satisfaction of EO 1061 & 1100 in addition to the unique Diversity and Common Ground (DCG) requirements at HSU.

¹EO 1061: Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals

²EO 1100: General Education Breadth Requirements

Proposed GE Program Über SLO

The General Education Program at Humboldt State University is designed, in concert with the major, to ensure that all graduates have attained the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives necessary to achieve the HSU Baccalaureate Student Outcomes.

Upon completion of the General Education Program students will be able to:

- Communicate effectively through oral, written, and quantitative methods.
- Demonstrate the ability to locate, assess, and employ information relevant to the discipline, approach, or method.
- Demonstrate depth of knowledge of United States history and politics.

They will apply these skills to:

- Critically evaluate information through methods of thoughtful inquiry.

GEAR Discussion Items

Two Draft Resolutions

University Senate Meeting, 12/6/16

- Analyze and consider diverse, multicultural, and interdisciplinary perspectives.
- Apply knowledge to principled action and professionalism across disciplines.

The diversity of thought fostered by the GE Program enhances the knowledge and abilities developed within the major program to assure graduates have made noteworthy progress towards becoming truly educated persons.

RESOLVED: A charge be given to the GEAR committee regarding the development of detailed assessment plans, crafted in collaboration with key GE faculty and members of ICC.

RESOLVED: This GE reform and adoption of an overarching GE SLO would transpire without forcing current GE courses to go through a re-certification process through the ICC, which is in accordance with the Strategic Plan on better coordination and integration of academics.

RATIONALE: The purpose of the proposed GE Program Über SLO is to facilitate assessment of GE as a program at the university level. The content of the area-specific SLO would not be assessed at the university level as the GEAR committee recommends assessment of this content at the department level or instructor level. The GE Program Über SLO can be broken into three main components where assessment is concerned. The first component essentially comprises the core competencies, which have not been numbered to avoid prioritization. These can easily be assessed using the American Association of Colleges and Universities Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (AACU VALUE) rubrics or some variant form thereof. The second component is related to the American Institutions requirements, which is not as easily assessed by the AACU VALUE rubrics. Last, the third component is the applications of skill within GE, which are not as easily assessed by the AACU VALUE rubrics and will require customized HSU rubrics to fully encapsulate the HSU experience, including the DCG requirement. Each of these components will be addressed in detail upon approval of this resolution in full collaboration with the ICC and invested faculty members.

**Resolution on General Education All-University Requirement Proposal
for Area Specific SLOs'**

AY-16/17-Chris Harmon, Chair, General Education All-University Requirement

WHEREAS: A companion proposal outlines an overarching GE Program “Über” SLO that simultaneously satisfies Executive Orders (EO) 1061¹ & 1100² in addition to the unique Diversity and Common Ground (DCG) requirements at HSU.

RESOLVED: In addition to the overarching GE SLO and its accompanying assessment plan, area-specific SLOs are proposed as described by EO 1061 & 1100, where language for development of Freshman Year Experiences (FYE) in Area E is included.

¹EO 1061: Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals

²EO 1100: General Education Breadth Requirements

Proposed Area Specific SLO

The following area specific SLOs are taken from EO 1061 & 1100, where descriptions developed from the EO are included to define each GE area.

Area A-English Language Communication and Critical Thinking

Minimum 9 semester units (one course in each subarea)

A1: Oral Communication (3 semester units)

A2: Written Communication (3 semester units)

A3: Critical Thinking (3 semester units)

Students taking courses in fulfillment of sub-areas A1 and A2 will be able to:

- Develop knowledge and understanding of the form, content, context, and effectiveness of communication.
- Develop proficiency in oral and written communication in English, examining communication from rhetorical perspectives, and practicing reasoning and advocacy, organization, and accuracy.
- Practice the discovery, critical evaluation, and reporting of information, as well as reading, writing, and listening effectively.
- Actively participate and practice both written communication and oral communication in English.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of subarea A3 will be able to:

- Understand logic and its relation to language; elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal

fallacies of language and thought; and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgment or opinion.

- Develop the ability to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas; to reason inductively and deductively; and to reach well-supported factual or judgmental conclusions.

Area B-Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning

Minimum of 12 semester units (3 must be at the upper division level*)

One course each in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses.

B1: Physical Science (3 semester units)

B2: Life Science (3 semester units)

B3: Laboratory Activity (associated with a course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2)

B4: Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (3 semester units)

Students taking courses in fulfillment of subarea B1-B3 will be able to:

- Develop knowledge of scientific theories, concepts, and data about both living and non-living systems.
- Apply and evaluate scientific principles and the scientific method.
- Apply and evaluate the potential limits of scientific endeavors and the value and ethics associated with the human conditions and the natural world.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of subarea B4 will be able to:

- Explain and apply basic mathematical concepts and solve problems through quantitative reasoning.
- Develop skills and understanding beyond the level of intermediate algebra.

* The following majors have Upper Division Area B requirements incorporated into the major requirements: Biochemistry and Chemistry, Fisheries Biology, Kinesiology, Oceanography, Physics and Physics Astronomy (BS options only)

Area C-Arts and Humanities

Minimum of 12 semester units (3 must be at the upper division level)

At least one course completed in each of these two subareas:

C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater

C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English

Coursework that exclusively emphasize skills development are excluded from Area C; however, activities may include participation in individual aesthetic and creative experiences.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of Area C will be able to:

- Cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility, and sensitivity.
- Respond subjectively as well as objectively to aesthetic experiences.
- Develop an understanding of the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses.
- Cultivate and refine their affective, cognitive, and physical faculties through studying great works of the human imagination.
- Develop a better understanding of the interrelationship between the self and the creative arts and of the humanities in a variety of cultures.

Area D-Social Sciences

Minimum of 12 semester units (3 must be a the upper division level)

Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D. Coursework taken in fulfillment of this requirement must be taught from more than one disciplinary perspective dealing with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background. Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of Area D will be able to:

- Analyze social phenomena from multiple disciplinary perspectives.
- Analyze social phenomena considering contemporary, historical and cultural contexts.
- Apply the principles, methodologies, and ethics employed in social scientific and historical inquiry.

Area E Lifelong Learning and Self-Development

Minimum 3 semester units

Courses in Area E may follow a Freshman Year Experience (FYE) design to equip learners for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social, and psychological beings.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of Area E will:

- Explain and demonstrate an understanding of the nature of being human as an integration of physiological, psychological, and sociocultural influences.
- Demonstrate a preparation for the lifelong and complex process of self-understanding, self-analysis, and self-development as an individual among others.

American Institutions

Minimum of 6 semester units

At least one course completed in each of these two subareas:

United States History

U.S. & California Government

Students taking courses in fulfillment of U.S. History will be able to:

- Explain significant events covering a time span of at least 100 years of U.S. history, including the relationships of U.S. regions and relationships with foreign nations.
- Analyze the role of major ethnic and social groups in the significant events above, and the contexts in which those events have occurred.
- Explain how these events illustrate both the continuity of “the American experience” and its derivation from other cultures by considering at least three of the following: politics, economics, social movements, and geography.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of U.S. & California Government will be able to:

- Distinguish the key philosophies of the framers of the U.S. Constitution.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the nature and operation of major U.S. political institutions and processes.
- Identify the liberties, rights, and responsibilities of citizens under the political system established by the US Constitution.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the California Constitution and state and local government within the framework of evolving federal-state relations.

Diversity & Common Ground (DCG)

Minimum of 6 semester units

At least one course must be designated domestic DCG.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of DCG will be able to:

- Analyze the complexity of diversity through the perspective of differential power and privilege, identity politics, and/or multicultural studies.

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate

Resolution on Adopting a University Policy on Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines

06-16/17-UPC – December 6, 2016 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate recommend to the University President that the attached University Policy on Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Policies Committee report to the University Senate on the efficacy of this policy at least once a semester for the first three semesters of its implementation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy undergo mandatory review and revision as necessary by the University Senate in Spring 2018 to improve its efficacy and implementation.

RATIONALE: *Since transitioning from an Academic Senate to a University Senate, this body has ostensibly expanded its charge to considering all policy at the university, yet there has been no widely shared understanding of the process for review and recommendation of such policies. Moreover, the University has no shared definition of the distinctions between policy, procedures, and guidelines. Finally, the University has no up-to-date and consistent system by which policies are assigned to a responsible office, maintained, evaluated for currency, and readily accessible to the entire University community. This proposed University Policy aims to address these issues. The Senate anticipates that this University Policy will require it to develop new procedures and guidelines for managing the workflow generated by adoption of this proposed policy.*

To Whom it May Concern,

This letter has been written in regards to the future structural changes of Humboldt State University's Liberal Studies in Elementary Education (LSEE) program. As written by both a current LSEE undergraduate and current EED Credential candidate, the concerns brought forth in this letter have been accumulated amongst the students of these programs. This is a response to the resolution proposed to change the LSEE program in regards to financial concerns, academic concerns, and a concern for a lack of preparedness for future elementary school teachers.

Upon review of the proposal put forward by this senate, a variety of potential financial complications became very apparent. A financial burden may be found in transportation to and from fieldwork, which many LSEE students already have problems and concerns with, this concern does not even factor in the logistical nightmare that fieldwork can be. Even with the prospect of fuel costs being covered by the school, one must already own a vehicle to take full advantage of that resource. While a shortened LSEE program may reduce long term costs on LSEE students, it does not help if they must find more money in the short term, especially if there are cuts to student financial aid under the upcoming political administration. Another example is the CSET, which is an exam that all future teachers must pass to become credentialed teachers in California and requires them to have a strong understanding of the content on that exam. If HSU LSEE students are not prepared for the CSET, then they will be less likely to pass and will need to take it again, which places a financial burden on the already financially strained students. Discussed above are a few examples of possible increased financial burden on LSEE students from this proposal. With a further review of this proposal from a wider selection of the LSEE student body, many more financial issues may be discovered.

Looking in on the changes planned to be made to the LSEE program, it's easy to see the future academic complications to be projected. In the current set-up of the LSEE program, students are being taught the basic academic content that they will be required to teach within the elementary schools. Upon entrance into the EED credential programs, the concepts being taught switch from learning the content to learning how to teach the content. If students do not have a strong background of the academic content, it will be immensely harder for them to learn how to teach it. The fear of most all


credential candidates is that they do not know enough of the content to be able to effectively teach the standards to the students. Yes, a set of standard-related curricula is given to all teachers, but if the teacher is unknowledgeable about what the academic content is, they are setting their students up for failure. The whole goal of being a teacher is to give students as many opportunities as possible to learn the content, and if LSEE students are not being given the chance to learn the content, then HSU will be responsible for putting hundreds of unprepared people into a field where preparation is key.

The current LSEE program prepares future educators for a career in the elementary schools through a variety of courses that utilize both lecture and fieldwork. For example, courses such as Engl 326, Engl 323, Engl 424, Geog 470, Kins 475, Math 308b, Math 308c, Econ 322, and Hist 311 are extremely important for LSEE students to obtain a full grasp on the content that teachers will be required to teach to students in an elementary school setting. Without these courses LSEE students would be entering elementary schools without the necessary content background to effectively teach their pupils. Under the resolution being proposed, the content based courses within the LSEE program will transform into LSEE courses with a fieldwork-basis. It is understandable to make the assumption that more fieldwork can only reward the LSEE students of HSU, but that is not necessarily true. The fieldwork is an invaluable resource to the students in LSEE program but is not what it could be. The chance for LSEE students to learn from a teacher who has extensive elementary education experience is vital but their experience does not directly translate to mastery of the content that LSEE students must learn to be able to teach in a TK-8 setting. With the current LSEE program at HSU, the professors that teach the core academic content are experts in their fields and are more qualified to teach LSEE students the academic content than LSEE professors alone. Through a review of the proposal, it can be argued that a change to HSU's LSEE program will foster an environment of underpreparedness for LSEE students.

Throughout this letter, issues of financial concerns, academic concerns, and a concern for a lack of preparedness have been brought forth. The lack of transparency as well as the lack of opportunity for student input does not bode well for the future of the LSEE program. Additionally, the formation of this letter, created by students whom this proposal will not affect, shows the gravity of the situation at hand. Rather than a

complete conversion of the content courses to fieldwork courses, accommodations should be made to the current program for an inclusion of both fieldwork and academic content courses.

Thank you for your time,





Jennifer Griffin
(Current EED Multiple Subject Credential Student)





Nicholas Cutler
(Current LSEE undergraduate)

Other Signers and Supporters to this letter:

Name	Current Academic Standing	Signature
Gabriel Ayivo	Senior LSEE	
Joanna Campos-Inostros	Senior LSEE	
Benjamin Tarango	Super Senior LSEE	
Erin Anderson	Senior LSEE	
Olivia Bernstein	Senior LSEE	
Ann Spaulding	Junior LSEE	
Sarah Kivela	Senior LSEE <small>sarah Kivela</small>	
Daisy Ronquillo	Junior LSEE	
Kristin Butler	Junior LSEE	
Marla Calleja	Junior LSEE	
April Utile	Junior LSEE	
Amber Lemmer	Senior LSEE	
Casey Brown	Junior LSEE	
Vanessa Mored	Junior LSEE	
Berthita Jasmin Villegas	Senior LSEE	
Kalyn Rutland	Senior LSEE	

Other Signers and Supporters to this letter:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Current Academic Standing</u>	<u>Signature</u>
Octavio X Perez Robles SACTA VP	Senior	
Giovanni Partida-Morales	Junior	
Kimberly Gutierrez	Junior	
Bekka Forkner	Junior	
Angela Vasquez	senior	
Miranda Sears	Senior	
Dina Llopis	Senior	
James Dickey	Junior	
Tito CABADING	Senior	
Bryan Estro	Senior	
Tyler Goldsmith	Junior	
Michelle Crocker	Senior	
Sara Chase	Junior	
Jazmin Sawyer	Senior	
Daniel J. Eserrada	Junior	
SARA Cotter	Junior	
Remil Asuncion	senior	
ELIANNA CAMPOS	Senior	

Juliana Diaz

Junior

Nicole Mullen

Senior

Alex Espinoza

JUNIOR

Emmett McCoy

Junior

Andrea Warren

JUNIOR

Rosa Hernandez

Senior

Marissa McCay

Senior

Jacqueline Equihua-Rall

Junior

Juliana C Diaz

Nicole Mullen

Alex Espinoza

Emmett McCoy

Andrea Warren

Rosa Hernandez

Marissa McCay

Jacqueline Equihua-Rall

Highlighted Concerns of LSEE Faculty in regard to Proposed LSEE Program Change

This bulleted list outlines the major concerns raised over the past three years by LSEE faculty in the following content areas: Mathematics, Art, Theater/Film/Dance, English, History, Geography, and Economics. These concerns have been raised by LSEE Faculty consistently over the past five years--by group email, formal letters to the School of Education Chair, and the ICC.

Curricular Concerns

- Preservice teachers must have, first and foremost, content knowledge before they can develop pedagogical knowledge
- The clinical hours proposed diminish content hours severely
- LSEE students must take the Multiple Subjects CSET test in order to qualify for entrance to a credential program; the proposed program does not offer a robust preparation for this test, jeopardizing the success of our students
- Clinical/Fieldwork placements are at specific grade levels (Kindergarten-1st grade, for example) for the entire semester. HSU Content courses address the entire developmental range (Kindergarten-8th grade) for prospective elementary school teachers
- Mentor teachers in the field may or may not have adequate or current content knowledge in linguistics, literacy development, history, economics, math, etc.

Sustainability & Infrastructure

- An average of 130 LSEE students would be placed in clinical fieldwork in local schools
- Rural Humboldt County cannot offer enough high-quality placements for our enrolled students
- Clinical experiences are typically assigned to schoolteachers as extra work. This is not a sustainable model, as working teachers are likely to transition in and out of program participation over time.
- The proposed program does not account for much-needed training and support for inservice educators in order to deliver high quality outcomes for students

Data/Evidence for Proposed Changes

- No systematic evaluation of pilot courses for new program has taken place
- Anecdotal evidence includes HSU students being asked to “tutor” the “difficult” students outside the mentor teachers’ classrooms, as well as bigoted curriculum
- What systems have been put in place to evaluate the proposed program? NCATE accreditation principles do not support this program design

Procedural Concerns

- Consultation meetings have been minimal over the past three years
- Pilot program not announced to LSEE/All-University Faculty
- Concerns about curriculum content, program evaluation, loss of service courses, benefit to LSEE students, and sustainability have been ignored

Suzanne Scott
Statement to Senate re: LSEE Program Changes
12/06/2016

1) This LSEE proposal affects not only the School of Education, but multiple departments. These departments have voiced **many** concerns over the last several years (e.g., six different departments co-authored a letter to the School of Education sent on March 17, 2014). We have typically received NO response from the School of Education to any of our questions or concerns. For example, we have never seen revised syllabi which clearly and distinctly show how XYZ content from Dept. ABC's course will move into newly proposed LSEE courses--or if it will. Another example of the lack of communication and consultation comes from this last Senate meeting (December 6, 2016), in which Senator John Meyer explicitly stated that the School of Education needed to have "meaningful discussions" with affected departments prior to the Senate discussing the LSEE proposal again on January 24th. Yet no such communication has occurred, nor been scheduled by the School of Education.

2) Many courses in other majors are challenging for LSEE students. ENGL 326, Language Studies for Teachers, is one example. This is a 4-unit course, and *many* students struggle to learn the content in the time given. Yet the proposals from LSEE have been for 2+1 or 3+1 unit models, with the "+1" component being fieldwork. Any way that is looked at, it is a loss of time to teach content.

3) This proposal appears to be being raced through, without adequate consultation with affected departments *or* with LSEE students. What is needed is greater transparency and clarity; clear, two-way communication; and a long-term focus on students (HSU students as well as their future students) and faculty, at HSU and in community schools who might host fieldwork.

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate

Sense of the Senate Resolution on Opposing a Tuition Increase

10-15/16-EX - December 6, 2017

RESOLVED: That the University Senate oppose the possible proposed tuition increase by California State University of up to \$270 per resident undergraduate student annually, with similar increases for non-resident, graduate, doctoral, and credential students, to take effect in 2017-18, and be it further

RESOLVED: That this Resolution be forwarded to CSU Chancellor Timothy White, CSU Campus Senate Chairs, CSSA President David Lopez, ASCSU Chair Christine Miller, CSU-CFA President Jennifer Eagan, and CSU ERFA President William Blischke.

RATIONALE: The California State University has proposed a possible tuition increase for the academic year 2017-18 (see <https://www2.calstate.edu/Documents/Possible-17-18-Tuition-Proposal.pdf>). However, CSU tuition fees have risen dramatically in recent years and decades, having more than doubled in the last decade, and tripled in the last fifteen years. Moreover, many CSU students are financially disadvantaged and cannot afford an increase in tuition. While financial aid may help to mitigate some of the effects of a tuition increase, students who receive financial aid in the form of loans will only incur more debt as a result of a tuition increase. The HSU University Senate concurs with the California State Student Association (CSSA), which has expressed opposition to the proposed tuition increase (see <http://tuition.calstatestudents.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Letter-Regarding-CSU-Tuition-Proposal-CSSA-President-David-Lopez.pdf>). Rather than accept this undue burden on students, the University Senate recommends 1) that the state recognize higher education as a public good, and 2) that the ASCSU, the CSU Chancellor's Office, and the CSU Board of Trustees strongly advocate to secure adequate state funding for the CSU, in order to repair the disinvestment in our system by the state over the past decades.

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

University Senate Written Reports, December 6, 2016

Standing Committees, Statewide Senators and Ex-officio Members

Academic Policies Committee:

Submitted by Mary Virnoche, APC Chair

Meetings and Work - November 1 - 14, 2016

Members:

<http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/academic-policies-committee>

November 1, 2016:

Present -, Paul Cummings, Brandon Dolfi, Mary Glenn, Michael Goodman, Zach Kihm, Michael Le, Heather Madar, Clint Rebik, Mary Virnoche (chair);

Absent - Joice Chang

Golden 4 gateway hard requirement for transfer admission, but soft requirement for continuing students moving into junior and senior year.

- Oral Communication (A1)
- Written Communication (A2)
- Critical Thinking (A3)
- Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (B4)

Issue: The CSU has a policy that requires “golden four” completion before transfer admission. There is also a policy for continuing students (who started with us) to complete the golden four before earning more than 60 units. Clint Rebik reported 400-500 juniors or seniors in each of the two last years had not completed one or more of their golden four. The areas most likely to be left uncompleted were math and critical thinking. We have no current mechanism to force them to comply with the “4 by 60” requirement.

Discussion: The committee identified several concerns with the current 4 by 60 situation. First, we discussed the potential link between foundation GE and success and graduation rates. In addition, we discussed the problems with enrolling junior and senior level students in 100 level courses in which they are likely bored, as reported by a student committee member who had that experience. While Clint reported there is no problem with seat availability, we learned from a student committee members that science labs make scheduling in general very difficult: there is just not room in the day to get in the other courses. While U-Direct will highlight the problem, it will not provide technological fix. The committee discussed a “golden four hold” and decided that such a mechanism would have to be lifted by an advisor and replicate the advising hold. The committee did think that many advisers in general do not know about the 4 by 60 policy and that we need better messaging to students and advisers. The committee seemed in agreement that any changes we make need to grandfather in (ignore) current

juniors and seniors who have not met the 4 by 60 policy. Brandon, who is a HOP student leader, suggested existing structures in that program that could support at least first semester enrollment. Mary Glenn reported that SLO controls this requirement by putting golden four prereqs on their upper division courses. She also reported that other campuses have created first year programs that integrate the golden four and work around block scheduling. Mary Glenn said that San Francisco State has a “meta major” program that we should look at.

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/Meet-the-Meta-Major.aspx>

We also discussed disenrolling students who had not met the 4 by 60 requirement and decided that would create more problems and have a negative impact on our graduation goals. Similarly, blocking student capacity to drop courses was problematic.

Action Items (in the order of ease of action)

1. Target Current Sophomores: Email the current sophomores that have 45-60 units without golden 4 completion -- with the message: HSU requires all students to complete the golden four before their junior year. Please check your DARS and enroll for Spring 2017 in your missing course(s). (Clint will take this to his team).
2. Stronger Messaging: Via U-Direct and other mechanisms: “Golden 4 by 60” (possible marketing image and campaign) (Mary Glenn?)
3. HOP: Moodle Tutorial Information and Mechanisms for Enrollment in June (Steve Ladwig contact). RAMP and Professional Advising practice review for 2nd - 4th semester enrollment (Tracy Smith and Kathy Thornhill contacts)l. (Mary Virnoche).
4. Faculty Development: As we bring in new faculty members, train them on comprehensive advising. Contact Sarah Fay Phillips, current faculty development coordinator. Remind all chairs to block off training time for new faculty cohort as they schedule in January/February for Fall 2017. Work with anticipated new hire who will coordinate CELT or some iteration of that office. (Mary Virnoche)
5. Block Enrolling First Year Students. See current work around Global Humboldt. (Mary Virnoche and Mary Glenn to explore further).

Written Report to Committee: Resolution from Earlier Meetings

Classroom ADA furniture and Facilities Management (FM) contact: FM will tag the ADA desks and chairs over the Winter break and post classroom signage that illustrates all classroom furniture placement. We asked also for the posting of general instructions (contract #) for FM in each classroom, just as there is a number for technology support.

Thesis Embargo: The graduate council adjusted the forms and instructions for graduate thesis submission to allow graduate students to elect to embargo their thesis for x given period.

Bookstore Management Problems: The bookstore has made some personnel changes and believes the new management will address concerns expressed by faculty and discussed by APC earlier in the year. See:

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Submitted by George Wrenn, FAC Chair

The Committee held its ninth meeting of 2016-17 on Wednesday, November 30.

The last meeting of the semester is scheduled for December 14. Meetings are open to the campus community. The Committee currently meets in Library 118 at 8 a.m.

The Faculty Affairs Committee addresses matters involving the individual or collective relationship of faculty to the University. The Committee can be reached through the Senate's Faculty Affairs web page: <https://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/faculty-affairs-committee>.

Unless otherwise noted, all members were present.

Absent: Colleen Mullery, Marissa O'Neill

Agenda for November 30:

- 1) Resolution on Guidelines for Extraordinary University Support (final draft review)
- 2) Priorities for Spring Semester
- 3) Update on Lab Evaluation Instrument

-
- 1) Resolution on Guidelines for Extraordinary Support (final draft review)

The Committee reviewed and approved a Resolution to accompany the draft Guidelines on Extraordinary Support. This has been sent to Senate for a first reading.

- 2) Priorities for Spring Semester

The Committee reviewed priorities for the Spring Semester. These include:

- Lecturer assigned time and participation in shared governance;
- Assigned time for department chairs;
- Resolution to make CFA President a voting member of Senate;
- Classroom assignment and class scheduling – transparency and fairness of process;
- Departmental variation in evaluation of advisors;
- Faculty Handbook clean up – removing non-existent positions;
- Faculty Presence resolution;

- 3) A draft Lab Evaluation instrument is being shared with colleagues in CNRS for feedback. It will be finalized in the Spring Semester.

Constitutions and Bylaws Committee:

Submitted by Jeff Abell, CBC Chair

I. Report from Mon Nov 14, 2016 Meeting

- A. Meeting called to order at 16:10 in NHE 116 with Abell (Chair), Chang, Guzman, Shellhase and Watson.
- B. CBC reviewed the first reading of the Policy on Policies developed by the University Policy Committee (UPC) and discussed at the Senate meeting on November 1, 2016. CBC developed recommendations for edits and forwarded these to the Chair of the UPC. Substantive recommendations included:
 1. Remove the criteria for what constitutes policy listed in **Policy Details Section I**. Any restrictions on what constitutes a policy and any proscriptions about length, applicability, etc. should not be in a policy on policy itself. That should be determined by deliberation and debate among involved parties. At the very least the term “criteria” should be changed to “goals”.
 2. Interim policy development should follow same shared governance process as any other policy. First-reading specified effectively no shared governance process for interim policy but only “consultation” with SenEx. Well-vetted and planned policy with broad input and recommendation from the Senate should always be sought no matter how long a policy will be in effect. The committee liked the imposition of standard timelines for interim policy but would prefer six months in lieu of 18 months.
 3. Mandating responsible office with review and revision of policy is not consistent with Senate governing docs. Our constitution vests Senate with power to review and revise policies particularly as they relate to faculty responsibilities. Our bylaws vest Senate committees with specific power to review and revise certain policy. From a technical standpoint, charging another office to do that requires bylaws or constitutional review (even if it is clear from the Policy on Policy that at some point during revision Senate must be involved.) From a practical standpoint the mandate to review would likely distract the office from some of its substantial day to day duties. Do they really want that responsibility? CBC recommends that responsible offices be given the option to review and revise rather than the charge to review and revise. This address the constitutional technicality and allows a responsible office to commit resources to review and revision if it so desires.
- C. Meeting adjourned at 16:45.

II. Report from Mon Nov 28, 2016 Meeting

- A. Meeting called to order at 16:05 in NHE 116 with Abell (Chair), Chang, Guzman, and Watson. Shellhase was absent.

- B. Committee drafted language for Constitutional Amendment allowing CBC to interpret Senate actions and Senate recommended policies. We seek input from Senators on this language and associated changes to the bylaws. First-readings will likely come to Senate in our first meeting next Spring.

1. Add section **10.0 Interpretation** to Senate Constitution with following sub-headings:

10.1 Requests for interpretation of any Senate action or Senate-approved document shall be forwarded to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC).

10.2 The CBC shall formulate a written interpretation if at least two members of the committee wish to consider the request.

10.3 The written interpretation shall be forwarded to the Senate and placed as an action item on the Senate agenda as soon as possible. The interpretation shall be considered binding unless rejected by a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

2. Delete Section **14.0** from the Senate Bylaws. With the addition of similar language to Constitution as noted above, there is no need for an interpretation clause in the Bylaws.

14.0 Interpretation of Senate Actions

Requests for interpretations of Senate actions or Senate-approved documents shall be forwarded to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The Committee's rulings shall be reported in writing to the Senate and shall be considered binding unless rejected by a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

3. Edit **11.64.ii** in the Senate Bylaws describing the interpretation duty of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

Replace: "Questions concerning interpretations of the text of a Senate-approved document shall be referred to the Committee. Interpretations by the Committee shall be reported in writing to the Senate and shall be considered binding unless reversed or altered by action of the Senate."

with...

"The committee shall consider requests for interpretations of Senate actions and Senate-approved documents and formulate written interpretations for consideration by the Senate."

- C. Committee discussed a recommendation to include a timeline for Presidential reaction to Senate recommended policies into the currently proposed Policy on Policies.

1. Currently section **9.1** of our bylaws stipulates a timeline for the President to respond to Senate recommended policies that require Presidential approval.

Inclusion of this stipulation in our bylaws is problematic. The President has no vote in our bylaws or constitution; and the bylaws cannot obligate the President to perform any action outside of those involving participation during Senate or Senate committee meetings.

2. CBC unanimously agreed that language specifying a timeline for the President's response would be more appropriate in the proposed Policy on Policies. Since the President would need to approve this policy, their consent to a timeline would be implied. The following excerpt from Bylaws 9.1 seems most appropriate to include in the Policy on Policies: "Reactions of the University President to the policy recommendations adopted by the University Senate shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Senate within two weeks of the President's receipt of the recommendation. A Senate action approved by the President shall become official university policy at the time the President approves the action and shall be implemented as soon as is practical, which may precede its appearance in the university policy file."

D. Meeting adjourned at 17:00.

III. Agenda for next meeting on Monday Dec 12, 2016 in NHE 116

- A. Edit Constitutional Amendment allowing CBC to interpret Senate action and Senate recommended policies.
- B. Continue discussion of whether committees should have agenda notification and document posting deadlines. Propose bylaws amendments if necessary.
- C. Initiate discussion on whether posting of vote tallies with election results is mandated by our governing docs. Recommend appropriate practice to AEC or Senate Office or propose bylaws amendments if necessary.