

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

University Senate Written Reports, March 28, 2017

Standing Committees, Statewide Senators and Ex-officio Members

Academic Policies Committee:

Submitted by Mary Virnoche, APC Chair

March 7, 2017 Meeting

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

Present: Joice Chang, Paul Cummings, Brandon Dolfi, Michael Goodman, Zach Kihm, Michael Le, Clint Rebik, Mary Virnoche (chair)

Absent: Mary Glenn, Heather Madar (schedule conflict)

Guests: Dominique Johnson, Acting Store Manager; Gael Duffy-Hill, Textbook Manager; Dave Nakamura, University Center; Mark Russell, Regional Manager, Follett Higher Education Group, Joyce Lopes VP Admin.; Cassandra Tex, SDRC; Steve Martin, Environmental Science; Josh Smith, Chemistry; and Joe Szewczak, Biology

Meeting Background

Faculty indicated problems with the documentation of orders (lost orders and errors in information about the orders) and errors in communication about orders (e.g. text not linked to class schedule, misinformation to faculty about the status of orders, faculty order questions unanswered, no faculty notice about problems with text orders). The bookstore staff remains concerned about the slow adoption rate of HSU faculty compared to other institutions. Timely adoption is also a concern for the SDRC that relies on book order information to prepare texts for universal access: [Section 133 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act. \(effective July 1, 2010\)](#).

Meeting Overview

The bookstore is in the process of hiring a new store manager. The new staff are still learning systems. The Follett Regional Manager and staff were committed to collaborating with the faculty to address concerns and develop practices that increase faculty adoption rates and an overall successful bookstore.

Action Plans Discussed at Meeting

1. Text and Materials Adoption Communication
 - a. Identify and develop key process milestones and related communications
 - b. Notices to faculty via Deans
 - c. Deadline: Week 10 (in time for processing before registration in week 12)
 - d. 1st Message 5 weeks into term; 2nd Message 7 weeks into term
 - e. Communicate “preferred” system of book ordering via Follett Portal to minimize errors.
 - f. Adoption report to Chairs via Deans Week 9 (Chairs work with their faculty to get orders in)

- g. Messaging: Law, Advantage to Students for Buyback -- Save Students Money; Incentives to Departments
 - h. Communicate with Chairs via Deans: Enter "no instructor assigned" for courses that will not have texts ordered due to staffing delays. This is a preferred practice rather than having a chair order the texts and the new instructor change them.
2. System Changes
- a. Confirm/Create "no text required"; "see instructor for readings"; "no instructor assigned" course tags are in the system
 - b. Maintain inventory of materials that are regularly sold each term (e.g. lab goggles) but communicate that orders should also be placed
 - c. Phone number provided for ordering will be staffed
 - d. Bookstore to share with the SDRC the data on "no instructor assigned" and "missing orders." This information will assist them in anticipating workload timing and perhaps mitigate some missing orders.
3. Text Availability Communication
- a. Regularly communicate directly with faculty members about (likely) problems with their orders.
 - b. At least 2 weeks before classes start notify faculty members directly of any book orders that have not yet arrived.
 - c. Communicate with faculty members about the # of copies of texts on the shelf and the numbers that the bookstore is expecting students to buy elsewhere. If there is a formula for ordering and stocking, share that with faculty in the request letter for text orders.
4. New faculty communication
- a. Introduce bookstore staff and processes to new faculty members perhaps at new faculty weekly lunches.

March 21, 2017 Meeting

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

Present: Joice Chang, Paul Cummings, Michael Goodman, Zach Kihm, Michael Le, Clint Rebik, Mary Virnoche (chair)

Absent: Brandon Dolfi, Heather Madar (schedule conflict)

Guests: Andrew Stubblefield, Chair, indirect committee, Kathy Thornhill, Director, ACAC

Academic Probation Data and Processes

Kathy Thornhill presented the APC with longitudinal data on HSU academic probation, as well as current advising practices for students who go on probation. About 10% of HSU students are on probation at any given time. About 25% or more of our first year students end up on probation. This has been the pattern for the last 25 years regardless of the changing student body. These are higher rates than most other CSUs. Kathy noted that addressing the probation problem needs to be

multifaceted approach that includes addressing issues that could prevent probation, as well as using best practices for success plans after the fact.

For those on probation all receive a probation hold. This hold goes into place after students are already registered for classes, but in order to add/drop classes, all students must complete an online tutorial and submit a learning plan. The hold is lifted outside of any evaluation of their learning plan.

After probation holds are lifted, there are two processes that students on probation may encounter. For students in majors participating in the professional advisor pilot, their professional advisors meet with them one or more times. The students complete best practice worksheets that the professional advisors use to facilitate conversations about how the students might be academically successful. For students with faculty advisors, the faculty member is notified that the student is on probation.

APC faculty members reported confusion about probation advising. Most of us were under the impression that these students developed learning plans that were reviewed and approved by staff at the learning center. Kathy reported that process had been discontinued some years ago because of the overwhelming workload on learning center staff.

APC will return to this issue in an upcoming meeting. In addition, Mary V. suggested that both Senate and Chairs need to hear presentations about probation research that is being conducted by Michael Le in institutional research. In addition, until we fully fund professional advising, we need a better plan for educating and supporting faculty on best practices for advising their students who are on probation.

U.direct Milestones

During the March 7, 2017 University Senate meeting the APC introduced for a first reading a U.direct Student Milestones Policy. At that meeting the APC was asked to consider existing policies that referenced academic milestones in amending and/or withdrawing the u.direct resolution introduced at that meeting. The APC considered two policies noted below, as well as additional feedback collected from the SenEx and CAHSS chairs. Given this information, the APC decided that no further policy was needed to require departments to create milestones; rather, the existing policy just needed to be implemented. The APC directed Mary Virnoche to initiate the implementation of existing policy through the Deans and Vice Provost. She sent an email to that effect on March 21, 2017.

39-11/12 APC *Academic Progress Rules for Undergraduate Programs*

<https://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/resolutions11-12>

18-15/16 APC *Resolution on University Degree Planning Software Policy*

<https://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/2015/2016%20Resolutions>

18 16/17 APC Resolution on uDirect Student Milestones: WITHDRAWN

Appointments and Elections Committee:

Submitted by Jen Corgiat, AEC Chair

Please see the current call for nominations as we still have a few committee positions to fill: [Call for Nominations to Fill Open Committee Vacancies](#). If these positions are not filled, AEC will continue to solicit for nominations for any unfilled positions.

Please let me know should you have any questions.

Constitutions and Bylaws Committee:

Submitted by Jeff Abell, CBC Chair

- I. This semester the CBC will be meeting every other Thursday from 3-4 pm in NHE 120. Our next meeting is Thursday April 6. Agenda for that meeting is in Item IV below.
- II. Report from Thursday February 23, 2017 Meeting
 - A. Meeting called to order at 16:00 in NHE 120 with Abell (Chair), Chang, Guzman, Shellhase and Watson. Quorum was met with 5 out of 5 members present including 3 faculty reps, 1 staff rep and 1 student rep.
 - B. Committee reviewed Resolution 15-16/17-CBC which alters Presidential notification requirements in Bylaws. No formal feedback was received from Senate members after first reading. A faculty member expressed concern that the Senate Office ASC may have to work overtime in order to send emergency items to the President the same day as the Senate meeting. To avoid logistical / overtime issues associated with that scenario, CBC agreed to alter second reading so that the deadline for Presidential notification of emergency items would be noon on the day following the Senate meeting.
 - C. Committee continued discussion of lecturer role in shared governance. In accordance with the Senate motion directing CBC and FAC to jointly gather info on this subject, the CBC added the following question to a lecturer survey being developed by FAC: "Do you know how your input is taken into account in departmental decision making? If so, briefly describe the process."
 - D. Committee continued discussion on agenda notification requirements for standing committees.
 1. The standing committee report is the primary means by which committee meeting times, locations, agenda items and deliberations are communicated to the campus community. This format is sufficient for communicating committee work to Senators, but does not likely reach to the broader campus community.
 2. Our Bylaws require open committee meetings but do not mandate a particular procedure for communicating location, time or agenda. CBC is discussing whether minimum notification requirements should be mandated in all Senate reports. Such requirements could include: next meeting date and time, location of next meeting, contact email for community members who might want to attend, list of agenda items, links to pertinent documents. CBC would like to discuss these ideas with the broader Senate before any formal

recommendations are made. CBC will ask SenEx to place this as a discussion item on our April 11 Senate agenda.

3. In connection with the above discussion, the CBC is also considering other options for advertising the time, location and meeting agenda for standing committees. Some ideas include posting in a publicly available calendar; inclusion in the 25live comprehensive schedule; posting on the portal as an event. CBC would like to discuss this with the broader Senate and will ask SenEx to place this as a discussion item on our April 11 Senate agenda.

E. Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

III. Report from Thursday March 23, 2017 Meeting

- A. Meeting called to order at 16:00 in NHE 120 with Abell (Chair), Chang, Guzman, and Watson. Shellhase was absent. Quorum was met with 4 out of 5 members present including 2 faculty reps, 1 staff rep and 1 student rep.
- B. Committee continued discussion on lecturer role in shared governance. The lecturer survey drafted by FAC is under revision as per SenEx recommendation. CBC will ask FAC to add the following questions related to governance.
 1. Are you interested in participating in shared governance processes? If so, in what way?
 2. Have you reviewed any documents which outline your rights in shared governance at the University, college and department level. If so, which documents have you reviewed?
- C. Committee discussed amendments to Bylaws section 12.61 as it relates to who is eligible to vote for Senate officers.
 1. As it is currently written, 12.61 allows continuing Senators and incoming Senators to vote for next year's Senate officers.
 2. Because the election for next year's officers occurs in the prior Spring semester, there are circumstances where an electorate group will be left without a Senator to give them voice in the selection of Senate officers. Some examples:
 - a. Student Senators are appointed at the start of the academic year, well after the Senate officer election. The currently seated students do not qualify as continuing Senators and would thus be denied a vote.
 - b. An elected Senate seat may not fill with the election or may have no nominees to begin with, thus rendering the seat vacant for the following year. The outgoing Senator occupying that seat does not qualify as a continuing member and would not be allowed to vote even though a temporary appointment for the vacancy may eventually be made.
 - c. An incoming Senator may not be able to make the meeting where Senate officers are elected or they may not be aware that they can provide a proxy to a seated Senator during that meeting. As with the above case, the outgoing Senator occupying that seat would not be able to vote and the electorate group denied a voice in selecting officers.
 3. CBC unanimously agreed that preserving the voice of each electorate group in the selection of Senator Officers is more important than ensuring that

continuing or incoming members are the only ones who vote. As such, CBC agreed to draft a Bylaws amendment that will allow all sitting Senators to vote for Senate officers unless newly elected Senators wish to attend the meeting or give their proxy. Language will be drafted and presented to SenEx with a request to include as a first reading on the Senate's Apr 11 agenda.

4. In the context of this discussion, the committee also broached the idea of a "Chair-elect", who would be selected a year in advance (Fall term?) and serve the following academic year. This could help alleviate some of the voting and scheduling issues that arise with the current procedure for selecting Senate officers. Its advantages include: plenty of lead time for departments to plan workload for the Chair-elect; a substantial period of time for the Chair-elect to familiarize themselves with the position; sitting Senators can choose a Chair-elect without regard for whether the Senator will be vacating the position in the year in which the Chair-elect will serve. CBC recommends looking into this option in the future, but will wait further word from SenEx on how to formally proceed.

- D. Committee discussed the issue of open committee meetings. This topic came up in the context of URPC meetings where sensitive budgeting and financial information was to be discussed. CBC looked at this from the governing docs perspective and provides the following perspective. Note these are informational items for the moment, but the CBC is prepared to draft formal interpretations if requested.

1. Bylaws 10.75 states that all standing committee meetings are open to "members of the University community". Current administrators, staff, faculty and students clearly fall under the definition of "University community" member. Such individuals have the right to access information regarding the location, time and agenda of committee meetings and to attend committee meetings if they so desire.
2. Bylaws 10.75 also gives the committee Chair plenty of power to control committee meetings so that they function efficiently. Chairs may call meetings into executive session without objection or with majority approval of the committee if there is an objection. This is the primary tool by which sensitive subjects can be handled. CBC notes that there are procedural rules when calling a meeting into executive session. These are the same rules that apply to executive session for the broader Senate. These rules include: the meeting must first convene in the open and then move into Executive session; no minutes, no votes and no formal decisions can be taken in executive session (this restriction includes decisions that are made "tacitly" or with general consent); decisions must be made at the conclusion of the executive session in the open meeting.
3. CBC also discussed what constitutes a "member of the University community" beyond the individuals mentioned in item 1 above. There was no clear consensus on this during discussion. Does it include all Emeritus faculty? all alumni? donors? local folks that collaborate with faculty/student clubs/etc? residents of the neighborhoods surrounding campus. CBC plans to continue this discussion at our next meeting and would like approval from Senate or SenEx to draft a formal interpretation on what constitutes a member of the "University community"?

- E. Meeting Adjourned at 4:05 pm.
- IV. Agenda for next meeting on Thursday April 6, 2017 from 3-4 pm in NHE 120
- A. Draft amendments to Bylaws 12.61 which will allow outgoing Senators to vote for future Senate officers if the replacement for the following year is not present in person or by proxy.
 - B. Refine ideas for improved communication of committee meeting times and agenda items. Present ideas as discussion item at future Senate meeting.
 - C. Develop interpretation of “member of the University community” as it relates to Bylaws 10.75 (pending Senate or SenEx approval to proceed.)
-

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Submitted by George Wrenn, FAC Chair

The Committee met on March 22, 2017. The next meetings will occur on March 29, April 12 and April 26. 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>.

March 22 Meeting Notes:

Agenda:

1. Update on SenEx discussion of shared governance (voting rights for CFA Chapter President)
 2. Update on SenEx discussion of Faculty Lecturer survey
 3. RTP Standards and Criteria (with guests Claire Know and Yvonne Everett)
 4. Review draft of Lab Evaluation Instrument
 5. Review summary of assigned time data
 6. Additional item: Boosting Teaching Evaluation response rates
-

1. Update on SenEx discussion of shared governance (voting rights for CFA Chapter President)

Senate will discuss voting rights at March 28 meeting. FAC will put forward Resolution following that discussion.

2. Update on SenEx discussion of Faculty Lecturer survey

Faculty Affairs is developing a survey to learn how lecturers engage in service. SenEx reviewed the draft on March 21 and provided comments: obtain a one-year snapshot of service (not three); make clear distinctions between voluntary and compensated service; reconsider how to

specify time commitment; send survey directly to lecturers from faculty president, not through department chairs; make use of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to design the survey.

ACTION: The Chair will be in touch with OIE regarding survey design and administration.

3. RTP Standards and Criteria (with guests Claire Knox and Yvonne Everett)

Claire Knox and Yvonne Everett shared their rationale for making RTP Standards and Criteria (which sunsets this academic year) a standing committee. The Committee believes there is work to accomplish in several key areas: 14 departmental standards still require approval (nine of which will remain to be addressed in after this academic year, and the next cycle of five-year reviews begins again in fall 2019); comparative analysis of standards is underway and has revealed the need to promote effective models and provide templates to departments in preparation for the next round of review; work with IUPCs is needed to ensure that standards are applied effectively in evaluation. Overall, the current process is working well and the next cycle will benefit from the continuity and institutional memory provided by a standing committee.

ACTION: The Faculty Affairs committee agreed to facilitate this change, which will require a vote of the general faculty.

4. Review draft of Lab Evaluation Instrument

The Committee reviewed the draft provided by Mark Wilson and suggested changes.

ACTION: FAC will develop a Resolution on the instrument and bring to Senate in April.

5. Review summary of Assigned Time data

This item was postponed to March 29.

6. Additional item: Boosting Teaching Evaluation response rates

Colleen Mullery asked the Committee to revisit the issue of teaching evaluation response rates and incentivizing responses through early release of grades, which has been effective at San Diego State. The Chair indicated a willingness to include this in the Committee's work at year's end.

Administrative Affairs:

Submitted by Joyce Lopes, Vice President, Administration and Finance

The Office of Sustainability has created a webpage focused on HSU's Climate Action Plan. The webpage is accessible via the following link:

<http://www2.humboldt.edu/sustainability/node/192>

Additionally, a pdf version of the finalized Climate Action Plan is available via the link below.
<http://www2.humboldt.edu/sustainability/sites/default/files/climateActionPlan.pdf>