

Tuesday, March 29, 2016, 3:00-5:00pm, Goodwin Forum (NHE 102)

Chair Julie Alderson called the meeting to order at 3:03pm on Tuesday, March 29, 2016 Goodwin Forum, Nelson Hall East, Room 102; a quorum was present.

### **Members Present**

Abel, Alderson, Blake, Burkhalter, Chipres, Creadon, Dunk, Enyedi, Eschker, Flynn, Frye, Gold, Guzman, Karadjova, Karl, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, McGuire, Moyer, Ortega, Roszbacher, Stubblefield, Wilson

### **Members Absent**

Camann, Cervantes, Lopes, Meyer, Pence, Thobaben, Tillinghast, Wrenn

### **Guests**

Ken Ayoob, Jená Burges, Lisa Castellino, Alex Hwu, Clint Rebik, Rhea Williamson, Craig Wruck, Rick Zechman

### **Seating of Newly Elected Senator**

Newly elected Tenure-line Instructional Faculty member, Professor Joshua Frye, from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, was formally seated. Senator Frye will fill a recently vacated Senate seat with his term ending in 2018.

### **Announcement of Proxies**

Guzman for Cervantes, Ortega for Meyer, Flynn for Pence, Abell for Thobaben, Karadjova for Wrenn

### **Approval of and Adoption of Agenda**

M/S (Ortega/Stubblefield) to approve and adopt the agenda  
Motion carried unanimously

### **Approval of Minutes from the March 8, 2016 Meeting**

M/S (Dunk/Guzman) to approve the Minutes of the March 8, 2016 meeting  
Motion carried unanimously

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

- Written report attached

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

**Appointments and Elections Committee:**

- Written report attached

**Academic Policies Committee:**

APC continues their work on revisions to the Academic Honesty Policy and the Faculty Initiated Drop Policy.

**California Faculty Association:**

The public blackout period for the neutral Fact Finder's report has ended and the report has been made public. It completely vindicates CFA's position on salary in the second year of our current contract, recommending a 5% GSI and a 2.65% SSI. The Chancellor's office is so far refusing to budge from its original offer of a 2% GSI and no SSI.

**Constitutions and Bylaws Committee:**

- Written report attached

**Faculty Affairs Committee:**

The Intellectual Property Policy draft is currently being vetted and will be coming to Senate soon for a First Reading. Committee Chair Burkhalter will provide an early copy to Senators upon request.

**Integrated Curriculum Committee:**

- Written report attached

In addition to providing a written report, ICC Chair Moyer requested feedback from Senators about a proposal to Senate to fast-track certain curriculum proposals. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the option of fast-tracking specified curriculum proposals would not be implemented and there would be no change to the current process for approval.

**University Resources and Planning Committee:**

The URPC meeting on 3/25 was devoted mainly to discussion about the Reserve Policy. Budget numbers will be provided at the URPC meeting on 4/8.

**Student Affairs Report:**

Vice President Blake reported on the successful Spring Preview which took place on March 25<sup>th</sup>, with a reminder that on Friday, April 1<sup>st</sup>, HOP will welcome hundreds more (600+ with the

number continuing to grow) admitted freshman, transfer students and their families for another Preview where they will have the opportunity to learn more about academic and campus life at HSU.

The 9<sup>th</sup> Annual California Big Time and Social Gathering will take place on Saturday, April 1<sup>st</sup>. Vice President Blake shared information about the wonderful program and the importance of the event as it strengthens the indigenous tribal identity among our students and the community.

### **University Advancement:**

A survey was deployed to discover the participation of HSU faculty and staff in community outreach activities. The information gathered will be helpful as it relates to our Strategic Plan. Vice President Wruck encouraged participation noting that the survey only takes about three minutes to complete.

### **Provost's Report:**

Among other discussions, the high priority to increase faculty diversity via comprehensive recruitment was discussed at the Academic Council meeting of the CSU.

The AASCU *Re-Imagining the First Year (RFY)* project "Super-team" met on March 29<sup>th</sup> and will meet again to participate in a webinar with other campuses. A webpage devoted to the RFY program is being developed to increase communication.

The Provost asks to please give feedback if you take advantage of one of the ongoing evaluation opportunities to interact with the Canvas Learning Management System.

The search for a new Dean for CNRS is ongoing. The committee hopes to have finalists on campus by the end of April or early May.

With very significant transitions currently taking place in the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, the Provost is actively seeking feedback from members of the campus community about their views on what the strategic direction of ODI and a new director should be.

### **President's Report:**

President Rossbacher was delighted to report some exciting news and upcoming events:

- Three of HSU's women's sports (Softball, Crew and Track and Field) have all been Nationally ranked
- The California Big Time and Social Gathering will be taking place on Saturday, April 1<sup>st</sup>
- On Wednesday, March 30<sup>th</sup> the Centers for Academic Excellence will be hosting the

### Cesar Chavez Film Festival

The President shared her concerns regarding the budget and matters of funding. She also spoke about her concerns regarding a faculty strike and her heartfelt hopes for a positive outcome.

### **Approval of the 2016/17 Senate Meeting Calendar**

The 2016/17 Senate Meeting Calendar was approved. A copy of the calendar is attached.

### **Resolution on University Degree Planning Policy (18-15/16-APC – March 29, 2016)**

Second Reading

Some of the revisions that were made since the first reading include changes to the title of the Resolution, the process for Senate/Provost approval and that the consequences will be decided before the milestones are determined. After a little conversation, Senate voted; the Resolution on a University Degree Planning Policy **passed without dissent**.

Ayes: Thobaben, Abell, Blake, Dunk, Enyedi, Karl, Ortega, Cervantes, Meyer, Pence, Burkhalter, Wrenn, Creadon, Wilson, Flynn, Gold, Stubblefield, Eschker, Moyer, Karadjova, McGuire, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Guzman, Chipres

Abstentions: Frye

### **Resolution on Course Evaluations by Students (CEbS) Evaluation Period (22-15/16-FAC – March 29, 2016)**

First Reading

M/S (Burkhalter/Eschker) to move the resolution

College staff responsible for administering CEbS asked FAC for leadership to standardize evaluation open/close dates.

Concern if opened too early: students will not be able to evaluate the structure, materials and pedagogy of a semester-long course.

Concern if not open long enough: The last two weeks of instruction are typically very busy for students; students are not always able to complete evaluations or forget to fill out evaluations before the last day of classes.

FAC is recommending the evaluation period to be the last two weeks of instruction plus the weekend following. Evaluations would close at 11:59pm on the Sunday before the Monday of exam week.

Resolution will return for a second reading.

**Resolution on Protocol for Conducting In-class Electronic Course Evaluations (23-15/16-FAC – March 29, 2016)**

First Reading

M/S (Burkhalter/Abell) to move the resolution

Faculty have expressed concern that the response rates on their course evaluations have dropped since the switch to on-line evaluations. To increase their course evaluation response rates, some faculty designate class time for students to complete their evaluations. FAC is recommending protocol for administering in-class evaluations.

Concern was expressed regarding the use of support staff for proctoring evaluations. Comments conveyed on behalf of Senator Tillinghast, Labor Council representative, are attached. Discussion regarding the use of support staff for proctoring evaluations ensued.

Resolution will return for a second reading.

---

**Meeting adjourned at 4:39pm**

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Senate Chair's Report**  
**Senate Meeting, March 29, 2016**

---

Dean Oberlander and I hosted a series of three World Café events (3/7, 3/8 and 3/11) to discuss the establishment of a Faculty Development Center on campus. We gathered much helpful feedback on our professional development needs. We will be posting a website shortly to present this information and to solicit input from an even broader audience across campus.

My next CSU Senate Chairs meeting will happen April 7th at San Francisco State. On the agenda are Executive Order 1064 (September 9, 2011, re: student internships), structural deficits and budgeting issues, Senate Chair membership on CSU Presidents' Cabinets, and "student demand for mini syllabi."

### **Appointments and Elections Committee:**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 previous 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?

Humboldt State University  
University Senate  
Meeting Calendar for AY 2016/2017

**2016 Fall Semester**

<b>Executive Committee (3-5 pm, NHE 106)</b>	<b>University Senate (3-5pm, NHE 102)</b>
August 30, 2016	September 6, 2016
September 13, 2016	September 20, 2016
September 27, 2016	October 4, 2016
October 11, 2016	October 18, 2016
October 25, 2016	November 1, 2016
November 8, 2016	November 15, 2016
<i>Fall Break, November 21-25</i>	
November 29, 2016	December 6, 2016
December 13, 2016 <i>(if needed)</i>	
<i>Finals, December 12-16</i>	

**2017 Spring Semester**

<b>Executive Committee (3-5 pm, NHE 106)</b>	<b>University Senate (3-5pm, NHE 102)</b>
January 17, 2017	January 24, 2017
January 31, 2017	February 7, 2017
February 14, 2017	February 21, 2017
February 28, 2017	March 7, 2017
<i>Spring Break, March 13-17</i>	
March 21, 2017	March 28, 2017
April 4, 2017	April 11, 2017
April 18, 2017	April 25, 2017
May 2, 2017 <i>(if needed)</i>	May 9, 2017 <i>(if needed)</i>
<i>Finals, May 8-12</i>	

Conveyed on behalf of Stephen Tillinghast, Staff Senator:

I am concerned about the language in the second sentence of line 3 in resolution 23-15/16, Protocol for Conducting In-class Electronic Course Evaluations:

3. In accordance with Appendix J, section VII.A.2.a (1), instructors must leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted. Instructors may enlist a proctor (departmental staff, if available, or designated student) to potentially improve participation and quality of responses.

I would like to see the mention of staff involvement removed from this resolution.

Dept. ASC's already have significant workloads and asking them to take 15 or 20 minutes out of their day, probably multiple times, depending on the number of proctoring requests, is just another burden on them. One of the reasons for the change to the electronic evaluation was to remove the administering of the evaluations from Department ASC's in the first place.

Also, while the language tries to be fair to department staff by adding, "If available..." I am concerned that some faculty will **expect** the ASC to do this. We *have* made progress on this campus in making it clear that faculty are not the supervisors, or superiors, of staff; We are all co-workers.

Unfortunately, there are still some faculty who believe that they can order staff to do work. As such, there are still some Department offices where the ASC might not feel comfortable saying "no" to faculty and I am afraid they will not feel empowered to do so, if they don't have the time to proctor evaluations.

Changing the language by removing the mention of staff will not preclude them from being able to, but it should not be spelled out explicitly.

I would like to see the language changed to say:

3. in accordance with Appendix J, section VII.A.2.a (1), instructors must leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted. Instructors may enlist a proctor (fellow faculty, if available, or designated student) to potentially improve participation and quality of responses.

Or;

3. in accordance with Appendix J, section VII.A.2.a (1), instructors must leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted. Instructors may enlist a student proctor to potentially improve participation and quality of responses.