

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.