Standing Committees, Statewide Senators and Ex-officio Members
Humboldt State University
University Senate Written Reports – March 29, 2016

Appointments and Elections Committee:

The 2nd spring call to faculty, seeking nominations for unfilled appointed/elected committee positions, has now closed. Elections took place from Monday 3/21 and closed Friday 3/25. Nominees will be notified the following week with results available online shortly after.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee:

I.   Report from Fri Mar 11, 2016 – No meeting was called to order

II. Report from Fri Mar 25, 2016
   A. Meeting called to order at 9:00 in NHE 116 with Abell (Chair), Kyte, Locher and Shellhase.   Abell served as proxy for Guzman.
   B. CBC was asked by SenEx to consider a proposed modification to Appendix J Article VII.B.4.b. The article states: "These materials shall be retained by the IUPC and not forwarded to higher committees or administrators unless specifically requested. "
      1. "Materials" refers to supporting documents which are provided by the candidate for their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). SenEx asked if this article could be deleted entirely since the WPAF is now kept online and thus there are no longer any hardcopy documents that the Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) can "retain" after their initial review of the file.
      2. With the current procedure for handling WPAFs in Moodle, once the IUPC has completed its review, the Supporting Materials section is "hidden" so that higher committees and administrators can't view them without a specific request for access. The CBC agreed unanimously that the current system under Moodle is consistent with the spirit of Article VII.B.4.b. There would be no need to delete this article simply because we are now using an online system.
      3. In Fall 2016, campus will migrate to Interfolio to manage WPAFs online. Interfolio will not have the capability of hiding specific sections of the WPAF. So supporting materials will be viewable by anyone who has access to the file. This system would seem to be inconsistent with article VII.B.4.b. However, higher committees and administrators never needed "permission" to view the supporting materials in the first place. The need for a "specific request" is a holdover from hardcopy WPAF days, when it was desirable to minimize the transfer of a large supplemental

binder which could contain a very large volume of supporting documents. In light of this, the CBC agreed unanimously that Article VII.B.4.b is not necessary in a system where WPAFs are managed online.

4. As such, CBC will draft an amendment to App J which deletes Article VII.B.4.b. This will be brought to Senate for consideration at its Apr 12 meeting. CBC notes, in accordance with Appendix J Article IX: Amendments, that the General Faculty must be notified of a proposed amendment to App J at least seven days prior to its discussion. Therefore, CBC plans to complete a draft by Fri Apr 1 in time for distribution via email to general faculty no later than Tues Apr 5.

C. In our review of Appendix J Article IX: Amendments, the CBC noted that voting on any amendment to App J is currently restricted to General Faculty "in residence" (excluding non-tenure track faculty). Based on the revised definition of voting membership which passed the GF this semester, we want to delete the "in residence" clause from any subsection of Article IX. We'd like to incorporate those changes into the same resolution as item B. above. An issue this brings up is whether FERP faculty or administrators with retreat rights should be able to vote on App J changes. Input from Senate is welcome on this issue.

D. CBC discussed language to amend Senate Constitution and Bylaws re: changing notification of Senate agenda from two days to three days. We will forward first reading resolutions for Senate consideration at the Apr 12 meeting. Resolutions will address:

1. Senate Constitution amendment which will modify Section 6.11 to change notification of agenda to three days, move the three day deadline for materials notification from the Bylaws into the Constitution, and move section 2.91 from the Bylaws into the Constitution. We felt it was prudent to move items related to notification out of the Bylaws and into Constitution so that the various Senate electorates have some input on notification deadlines.

2. Senate Bylaws amendment which will delete Sections 2.8 and 2.91. These sections are no longer necessary as they will be re-located into the Constitution.

E. Meeting adjourned at 9:45.

III. Fri Apr 1, 2016 – Agenda Items
   A. Draft first reading resolution re: App J changes referenced above
   B. Draft first reading resolution re: Senate Constitution changes referenced above
   C. Draft first reading resolution re: Senate Bylaws changes referenced above.

Integrated Curriculum Committee:

The ICC continues working on:

- Curriculum Proposals

- Revisions to the PREP process and WASC Core Competency Assessment.

Lisa Castelino and the Academic Master Planning Subcommittee of the ICC have collaborated to revise the PREP annual Diversity/Enrollment/Student Success Questions and Process. The revised questions (and the preamble to the questions) are provided below. Note that:

1) We have committed to using these questions for at least three years so trends can be usefully tracked – and so programs will know what to expect from the PREP process.

2) Each question will have an accompanying Dashboard – a collection of charts and graphs showing the data to be discussed.

3) One of the goals is to develop a departmental process that will encourage all faculty to consider, discuss, analyze, and act on the data. Thus the questions are somewhat open-ended and will partially serve as documentation of the faculty discussion and any resulting action plans.

Annual PREP Diversity/Enrollment/Student Success Questions

Preamble:

Version A: One guiding principle for Program Review is that it should not focus on completing a report to satisfy a campus obligation; rather, it should be part of ongoing program faculty discussion about fostering student success. PREP reports done in isolation by a busy chair or by a small subgroup of faculty can feel pointless. More importantly, they fail to capture the insights and discussions that occur during the entire academic year, whenever program faculty gather.

This template represents a different approach – one that captures those insights and discussions, making the process meaningful enough that we can commit to following it for the next four years.

Faculty talk frequently about how their students are doing, often informally or as sidebar conversations in meetings focused on other topics. These sessions can be very valuable, but they can also be difficult to translate into reflective review or plans for the future. Instead, consider convening your colleagues in a series of single-topic departmental meetings, or perhaps a retreat, for extended conversations about both the encouraging and the disappointing trends in student performance, and for exploration of promising solutions. To inform this activity, data will be easy to access via the Tableau dashboards that were introduced in Fall 2015. You can, of course, also consider additional kinds of data for your program. The open-ended questions we have provided below are intended to structure the programmatic conversations, but they are not meant to be their culmination.

The new process won't end with your submission of a report to the PREP website, although that part remains necessary as it contributes to the self-study report for periodic program review

and serves as a record of ongoing reflection. Instead, these focused Department level conversations that take place in September and October will lead to robust college-wide and ultimately campus-wide discussions among faculty, chairs, deans, provost and other stakeholders to describe and share what was learned.

Questions: (Each Question will be linked to specific data.)

1. Describe enrollment trends in your program, major(s), FTES, and retention/graduation rates. Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.

2. Describe trends in the composition of your majors (such as diversity, level of college preparedness, time to degree etc.). Please highlight any significant findings or unique outliers. Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.

3. Describe trends in overall course success rates for service courses as well as major courses. Please highlight any notable findings or opportunities for improvement you see in the coming year. If trends have been stable over time, to what do you attribute that stability? Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.

4. Describe how your program has influenced student success rates. What efforts have you made to improve or what opportunities are available to improve it? If trends have been stable over time, to what do you attribute that stability? Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.

5. Describe trends in inclusive student success for your program. What efforts have you made to improve or what opportunities are available to improve it? If trends have been stable over time, to what do you attribute that stability? Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.

6. Summarize the actions that your program has taken in the past three to five years in response to Enrollment/Diversity/Student Success data. Based on the data, evaluate whether the changes have been effective.

For the 5-year program Review: What were your enrollment/diversity/student success goals from your pervious Program Review MOU? Provide an update on those goals. Are they still

relevant? If so, what have you done? What progress has been made? What will the program continue to do? If the goals are no longer relevant, why has the situation changed? What would be appropriate alternative goals?