

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2008, Nelson Hall East. Room 102, Goodwin Forum. A quorum was present.

Members Present: Arizzi, Bolick-Floss, Bond, Butler, Cheyne, Faulk, Flashman, Gleason, Goodman, Gunsalus, Harrington, Howe, Knox, Kornreich, Larson, Lether, Marshall, McElwain, Mortazavi, Moyer, Perryman, Powell, Reiss, Rizzardi, Schwetman, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, Virnoche, Weissbart, Zoellner.

Members Absent: Coffey, Haynes, Nowak, Pereira, Richmond.

Proxies: Goodman for Cannon, Reiss for Yarnall.

Guests: Ayoob, MacConnie, Mullery, Burges.

Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of November 4, 2008

M/S (Schwetman/Zoellner) to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 4, 2008. It was requested that the report on the subcommittee's meeting with President Richmond be amended for clarification. Voting occurred and the amended minutes were APPROVED unanimously.

Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

The Senate subcommittee (Mortazavi, Moyer, Goodman) met with the Provost and the President and discussed various documents on shared governance. The President was asked to provide, in writing, his definition of shared governance. The group will meet again in early December.

Proxies were announced.

The newly appointed student representative from Associated Students, Dominic Lether, was asked to introduce himself and was welcomed to the Senate.

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

Faculty Affairs Committee (Chair Kornreich): The Committee has received input on possible updates to Appendix K. Currently, the Committee feels that Appendix K is fine as it stands, and will not be proposing any amendments to it at this time.

Educational Policies Committee (Chair Moyer): The Committee is working on revising and updating the Final Exam Policy and creating a procedures for distribution of the policy. It will begin working on the definition of "serious and compelling" next.

Student Affairs Committee (Chair Schwetman): The Committee will bring documents to the next Senate meeting regarding its two ongoing projects.

Senate Finance Officer (Flashman): The University Budget Committee (UBC) met last week and reviewed several items regarding the budget process, as well as the President's recommendations on how to handle upcoming budget reductions. The consensus of the UBC was to approve the use of HSU's centrally held one-time funds to cover the HSU part of the upcoming CSU cuts.

University Curriculum Committee (UCC) (Chair Flashman): The UCC continues to discuss learning outcomes for various university-wide requirements. A list has been compiled of new or revised student learning outcomes for almost all of the requirements. The Committee is still working on Diversity and Common Grounds and hopes to have something by December to discuss with instructors teaching those courses. Senators were asked to alert their colleagues in those areas.

Statewide Senate: Senator Cheyne will forward a report on the recent plenary.

Academic Affairs (Interim Provost Snyder): The Provost distributed a budget document to department chairs, the Provost's Council and the Senate Executive Committee containing ideas on how to reduce the Academic Affairs budget by \$1.5 million. This is the beginning of a discussion on what may need to be done for next year. The Provost's Council will be discussing two new positions in Academic Affairs: an Assessment Coordinator and a Director for International Programs.

There were questions and discussion regarding possible additional reductions, based on what is happening at the State level. The question for HSU as this unfolds is what sort of contingency planning do we want to do to plan for next year? The State is facing serious financial difficulties and the campus needs to take this seriously.

TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 – Open forum for the campus community (see Procedures for HSU Academic Senate Open Forum at www.humboldt.edu/~acadsen)

There were no speakers for the forum.

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

Student Affairs (Vice President Butler): The search committee for the Associate Vice President for the Office of Enrollment Management will have two finalists on campus during the first week in December. An electronic notice will be sent out to all faculty and staff. Interviews will include open sessions with each candidate.

Associated Students (Weissbart): AS appointed a new student representative to the Senate. The CSSA representative attended the recent Board of Trustees' (BOT) meeting in Long Beach and reported that the CSU will be limiting enrollment next year.

1. Resolution on Response to the October 7 & 14, 2008 Keeling Associates Reports (#07-08/09-Virnoche) – postponed from November 4, 2008, meeting, with an amendment on the floor

**Resolution on Response to the October 7 & 14, 2008 Keeling Associates Reports
#07-08/09-Virnoche – November 4, 2008**

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University affirms and commends the faculty, staff and administration for their work, cooperation and progress made in planning and implementing strategies to meet the accreditation requirements of the Western Association of Schools and College (WASC); and be it further

Resolved: The Senate rejects the “institutional urgency” and panic that the Keeling Associates reports incite to the extent that such characterizations may compromise the thoughtful planning processes already underway to address WASC requirements; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate affirms its confidence and trust in Interim Provost Robert Snyder; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate supports the Keeling recommendation that (Interim) Provost Snyder be designated the Chief Operating Officer for Humboldt State University ; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate supports a 2-3-year appointment of Robert Snyder to Provost and Chief Operating Officer; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate rejects the immediate “permanent” appointment of Robert Snyder to Provost and Chief Operating Officer based upon the Senate’s commitment to shared processes for selecting long-term leadership and diversity considerations in those processes; and be it further

Resolved: If the Provost finds helpful in meeting WASC deliverables a structure such as a “Cabinet for Institutional Change” recommended in the Keeling Reports, the Senate supports its creation if it draws on qualified campus leadership, particularly in the area of diversity and change; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate requests a memo from the Provost to the university and the community documenting each WASC deliverable and the current structures and processes that are already in motion to meet each one; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate requests that President Richmond ask Keeling Associates to provide specific models (structures and processes) that would be appropriate for the HSU campus in addressing unmet WASC deliverables; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate affirms the Keeling finding of faculty “fatigue” in the wake of the long-term budget crisis, workload issues associated with institutional change and ineffective administrative leadership; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate remains hopeful that new structures, processes and leadership will restore unity, trust and energy, as long as shared governance and communication principles guide decisions.

Rationale: The Keeling Associates consulting group was contracted to assist the university in meeting WASC requirements. The President has requested faculty response on the reports Keeling Associates prepared after their campus visit. The reports identify central organizational, cultural and leadership issues on the HSU campus. The documents were less successful in clearly matching WASC deliverables to changes in process. While the WASC requirements are serious business, the subtext of the narrative suggests that HSU has not yet taken seriously the requirements and backstages the work in process. Further, it calls for a dangerous state of emergency that is exasperating to faculty who have been working diligently on changes. In its call for the immediate unilateral appointment of

the Provost, it gives credibility to personnel decisions that do not honor shared decision making and diversity goals imbedded in personnel processes and linked to WASC deliverables. Further, the document fell short of offering specific suggestions for structures and processes still needed to address unmet WASC deliverables. Instead, the report suggests we create a "Cabinet for Institutional Change" and develop those changes ourselves. Keeling Associates as a consulting group is well versed in education organization structures and should be able to provide more direction in helping us identify existing models that would match our institutional needs.

Chair Mortazavi read the amendment which was on the floor at the close of the prior meeting:

Resolved: The Senate rejects the ~~"institutional urgency" and~~ panic that the Keeling Associates reports incite ~~because to the extent that~~ such a characterizations ~~may~~ compromise the thoughtful planning processes already underway to address campus issues ~~WASC requirements~~; and be it further

Discussion of the amendment:

- It is unclear what "such a characterization" is referring to. "Institutional urgency" is a characterization; "panic" is not. The sentence doesn't make sense.
- The discussion that informed this resolved clause was one in which Keeling suggested suspending existing hiring practices and making appointments without due process, creating a sense of panic. That initial reading of the report informed this particular resolved clause. We've moved beyond that now; it may no longer necessary to include this resolved clause.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 10 Yes votes, 6 No votes, and 5 Abstentions.

Discussion on resolution, as amended, continued:

- It is important for a resolution of this nature to recognize that there is some institutional urgency. The report is accurate in recognizing the state of the university requires more than casual attention. As a group, the Senate should acknowledge that this is an urgent situation.
- The general consensus of colleagues who read the first draft of the resolution was that that this document is a waste of the Senate's time. A document like this is not needed. Many of the resolves are premature, for example, for the Senate to make a public statement that it has the utmost confidence and trust in the Provost, without taking the time to establish that relationship, is premature. Colleagues felt that there are far more important things for the Senate to address than arguing over an unnecessary document. There are already wheels in motion to respond to both of the reports and the Senate should be focusing on the reports during its meetings and trying to move something forward.
- The resolution contains too many conflicting ideas; some resolves are supported and some are not. It is not concrete enough to vote on.

- The resolution should be supported. It is important for the Senate to speak to the issues that confront the university. This is an attempt to get something done. For example, the fourth resolved clause stating that the Senate supports the recommendation that the Provost be appointed HSU's Chief Operating Officer is one that is important for the Senate to speak out on.
- The Senate is often perceived by the faculty at large to be a group that talks for a long time and does absolutely nothing. There are many choices in the resolution that are for the good of the university and during these times the Senate needs to either support those making decisions and/or provide its best advice to those decision-makers. The resolution accomplishes both.

M/S (Knox/Flashman) to amend the resolution by adding a new resolved clause, following the clause that was just amended: "Resolved, That the Senate affirms that urgent work needs to be done in addressing systemic issues identified in both the WASC and Keeling reports."

Discussion of the amendment:

- While we may not need to panic because work is already being done on the WASC requirements, the Senate needs to recognize the urgency of addressing systemic issues identified by the Keeling report in regard to governance, decision-making, and other broad issues . Faculty colleagues are very concerned about these issues.
- Senator Virnoche offered a friendly amendment to insert the word "continues" into the new resolved clause. It was not accepted as a friendly amendment.

M/S (Virnoche/Cheyne) to amend the clause to read: "That the Senate affirms that urgent work needs to continue to be done in addressing systemic issues identified in both the WASC and Keeling reports."

Discussion of the amendment to the amendment:

- Most of this discussion has centered on the issue of how much we respect the work being done by committees and governance structures on campus versus setting those aside and doing things differently. The amendment walks a fine line in respect to both of these.
- We don't have, as an institution and community, a continuing sense of urgency. There is an urgency that may not have been recognized by people in the past; but which needs to be recognized now.

M/S (Weissbart/Marshall) to end debate. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 2 No votes and 1 Abstention.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 13 Yes votes, 7 No votes, and 3 Abstentions.

The amendment now reads:

That the Senate affirms that urgent work needs to continue to be done in addressing systemic issues identified in both the WASC and Keeling reports.”

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 22 Yes votes, 1 No vote, and 2 Abstentions.

It was moved (Flashman) to strike the ninth resolved clause which states “The Senate requests that President Richmond ask Keeling Associates to provide specific models ...” The motion died for lack of a second.

M/S (Virnoche/Kornreich) to strike the second to the last resolved clause which states: “The Senate affirms the Keeling finding of faculty “fatigue” in the wake of long-term budget crisis, workload issues associated with institutional change and ineffective administrative leadership.”

An objection was raised to continuing discussion on the resolution, which has too many points of disagreement in it.

Discussion of the amendment:

- The resolved clause is basically finger-pointing; if we are going to move ahead, we need to do so together. It is not appropriate to include in a resolution of this type.
- Constantly debating amendments is an indication that the resolution needs to be improved. It needs to be tabled and brought back.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 14 Yes votes, 5 No votes, and 5 Abstentions.

Discussion of the resolution:

- There is a lack of constructive information in the Keeling report. It is appropriate to ask them to do a little more, i.e., what they were paid to do, and offer some solutions and specific models. The Senate should move quickly on this resolution and move on to other agenda items.

M/S/P (Kornreich/Cheyne) to end debate.

Voting on the amended resolution occurred and **PASSED** with 18 Yes votes, 3 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

The approved resolution reads:

**Resolution on Response to the October 7 & 14, 2008 Keeling Associates Reports
#07-08/09-Virnoche – November 4, 2008**

Resolved: The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University affirms and commends the faculty, staff and administration for their work, cooperation and progress made in planning and implementing strategies to meet the accreditation requirements of the Western Association of Schools and College (WASC); and be it further

Resolved: The Senate rejects the panic that the Keeling Associates reports incite because such characterization compromises the thoughtful planning processes already underway to address campus issues; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate affirms that urgent work needs to continue to be done in addressing systemic issues identified in both the WASC and Keeling reports

Resolved: The Senate affirms its confidence and trust in Interim Provost Robert Snyder; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate supports the Keeling recommendation that (Interim) Provost Snyder be designated the Chief Operating Officer for Humboldt State University ; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate supports a 2-3-year appointment of Robert Snyder to Provost and Chief Operating Officer; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate rejects the immediate “permanent” appointment of Robert Snyder to Provost and Chief Operating Officer based upon the Senate’s commitment to shared processes for selecting long-term leadership and diversity considerations in those processes; and be it further

Resolved: If the Provost finds helpful in meeting WASC deliverables a structure such as a “Cabinet for Institutional Change” recommended in the Keeling Reports, the Senate supports its creation if it draws on qualified campus leadership, particularly in the area of diversity and change; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate requests a memo from the Provost to the university and the community documenting each WASC deliverable and the current structures and processes that are already in motion to meet each one; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate requests that President Richmond ask Keeling Associates to provide specific models (structures and processes) that would be appropriate for the HSU campus in addressing unmet WASC deliverables; and be it further

Resolved: The Senate remains hopeful that new structures, processes and leadership will restore unity, trust and energy, as long as shared governance and communication principles guide decisions.

Rationale: The Keeling Associates consulting group was contracted to assist the university in meeting WASC requirements. The President has requested faculty response on the reports Keeling Associates prepared after their campus visit. The reports identify central organizational, cultural and leadership issues on the HSU campus. The documents were less successful in clearly matching WASC deliverables to changes in process. While the WASC requirements are serious business, the subtext of the narrative suggests that HSU has not yet taken seriously the requirements and backstages the work in process. Further, it calls for a dangerous state of emergency that is exasperating to faculty who have been working diligently on changes. In its call for the immediate unilateral appointment of the Provost, it gives credibility to personnel decisions that do not honor shared decision making and diversity goals imbedded in personnel processes and linked to WASC deliverables. Further, the document fell short of offering specific suggestions for structures and processes still needed to address unmet WASC

deliverables. Instead, the report suggests we create a “Cabinet for Institutional Change” and develop those changes ourselves. Keeling Associates as a consulting group is well versed in education organization structures and should be able to provide more direction in helping us identify existing models that would match our institutional needs.

M/S (Cheyne/Virnoche) to make the resolution an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 5 Abstentions.

2. Resolution on UFPC Composition (#09-08/09-FA) – First Reading

Resolution on UFPC Composition

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook, Section VIII.D.2(a) be amended to read:

The UFPC shall be composed of five seats: One seat shall be held by a faculty member of the College of Natural Resources and Sciences, one by a faculty member of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, one by a faculty member of the College of Professional Studies, and two by faculty members from the general faculty at-large. Members of the UFPC must be tenured and hold the rank of full professor, librarian or SSP-AR III. The term of office shall be two years. The amount of assigned time will be determined annually through the faculty governance recommending process of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook, Section VIII.D.2(c) be amended to read:

The General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall hold elections in the spring before teaching schedules for the following fall term are determined. Electors may vote for one candidate for each vacancy. All electors may vote for any vacancy.15.38

RESOLVED: The above committee configuration will be initiated with the following election rotation:

- Elected spring 2009 for service AY 2009-2011 – CPS Seat and at-large seat 1
- Elected spring 2010 for service AY 2010-2012 – CNRS Seat, CAHSS Seat, and at-large seat 2

RESOLVED: These amendments shall be submitted to a February 2009 vote of the General Faculty.

RATIONALE: *There is currently no requirement for each college to have representation on UFPC, and this year there is no representation from COPS. This amendment will ensure that at least one representative from each college sits on UFPC. Under this structure, the entire campus votes for each member, even though some members represent specific colleges. This scheme is in alignment with the current elections process, for instance, for UCC. This change also ensures that tenure is a requirement for service on the UFPC.*

Track of the changes:

2. Organization

a) The UFPC shall be composed of five seats: One seat shall be held by faculty of the College of Natural Resources and Sciences, one by faculty of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, one by faculty of the College of Professional Studies, and two shall be held at-large. Members of the UFPC must be tenured and hold the rank of full professor, librarian or SSP-AR III. The term of office shall be two years. The amount of assigned time will be determined annually through the faculty governance recommending process of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

b) For each vacancy the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate two candidates followed by an open meeting called by the General Faculty President to receive

further nominations from the floor.

c) The General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall hold elections in the spring before teaching schedules for the following fall term are determined. Electors may vote for one candidate for each vacancy. All electors may vote for any vacancy. 15.38

d) Any vacancies which occur during the academic year shall be immediately filled for the remainder of the academic year by a special election called by the General Faculty President.

Copies of the resolution were handed out. Senator Kornreich provided background information on the resolution. The Senate was asked to discuss this issue by the President. Currently, there is no representation on the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) from the College of Professional Studies. The Faculty Affairs Committee considered both sides of the issue and decided to bring it to the Senate for discussion. The resolution does not change the number of members of the UFPC, but it assigns one seat to each academic college and allows two seats to be elected at large. Elections will continue to be conducted in the same manner, and all members of the faculty will vote for each seat. A structure is provided to transition to the new election configuration. The resolution also closes a small loophole in Appendix J, which would have allowed non-tenured, full professors to serve on the UFPC. The benefit of the resolution is that each college would be guaranteed representation on the UFPC. However, it is already difficult to find candidates for the UFPC and this would restrict the number of people who could run for a particular seat. The current chair of the UFPC expressed concern about limiting the number of candidates and how the election process would be changed.

Discussion:

- The idea of having members on the UFPC from each college is good. The resolution needs to be more carefully worded in terms of how the elections will be run and how the choices will be made. It needs to be more clearly delineated. A primary concern is the statement about assigned time. What if the assigned time changes during a faculty member's tenure on the UFPC? There should be something more explicit about the assigned time for this committee. It should not be left to the whim of the Senate Executive Committee each year. It was noted that the wording on assigned time is the current wording in Appendix J and has not been changed.
- How would the at-large positions be elected at the same time as the college positions? There would be separate races/elections for each seat.
- Have there been problems because there haven't been faculty from each college on the UFPC? No specific situations or problems were known. It was stated that it reduces the legitimacy of the UFPC to not have that representation.
- It was noted that both Appendix J and the CBA state that only tenured professors may serve on the UFPC.
- Could a faculty member run for both a college position and an at large seat at the same time? This needs to be spelled out.
- Did the committee consider representation of faculty that are not within one of the three

colleges, such as librarians and counselors? The committee did consider this and that is why there are two at large seats. It wasn't feasible to have one seat just for librarians or counselors, since there are so few who would be eligible and it would entail having them serve more often.

- The spirit of the resolution is supported; representation from each area is a good idea. But we have been hard-pressed to fill vacancies as it is. Can there be some kind of fall-back position, i.e., that we try our best to get a representative from each college, but if this is not successful, the seat reverts to another at-large seat. We need to ensure that UFPC vacancies are filled.
- The intention is good. On the other hand, initiating unit and college personnel committees are supposed to write recommendations that any reasonable person should be able to understand. This creates another silo. The assigned time is still a recommending process. Given the time it takes to serve on the UFPC, it would be pretty foolish to take away the assigned time and the administration would have to deal with the consequences of not having people willing to serve without assigned time.
- Can the UFPC do its work with less than a full membership? It was answered yes.
- The election process is spelled out in the General Faculty Constitution. There are two different processes: 1) for one position to fill and 2) for multiple positions to fill. UFPC falls under the second scheme. Will this change it to the first scheme? We need to be aware of the voting procedures. This may require more balloting of elections.
- The silo metaphor doesn't work here; this is a centralized forum intended to capitalize on shared decision-making from all colleges. It has more to do with the expertise and disciplinary orientation. Should we be making policy based on the reality we live in; or if this is the ideal, should it become the policy?
- This is well-intentioned, but if the President was to hear this debate, he might say it should be left as it is. It's a good idea, but when you think about the details, it's not worth it.
- The goal of the UFPC is to have a university-wide perspective, using the university-wide Appendix J standards. Evaluation should have already been done by the candidate's peers. Historically there have been several members from the same college on the UFPC. We still need to think about the university-wide perspective.
- If people in any given college want to be represented, they need to get people to run. The change is not supported.
- It's true that people often have to be coerced into running for the UFPC. Having a person from each college on the UFPC is good because of the need for a university-wide perspective. Someone from inside the college may have knowledge that lends a better university-wide perspective. It would be good to force the colleges to make their full professors take part in something this important. It was stated that in the past the UFPC

has been forced to correct serious errors before it made its final decision. Those errors might be minimized if there was representation from every college. If a college is small, with fewer electors, it may never succeed in getting a person from the college elected to the committee. The proposal is supported.

- Part of the issue has been the College of Professional Studies because there are a fewer number of full professors qualified for the committee. It makes sense to aim for the ideal and work in that direction. The ideal is to use whatever opportunities we have to bring people together from across the colleges. It enriches our understanding of one another and creates a broader base of experience which better informs decision-making.

A straw poll was taken to see if the Faculty Affairs Committee should continue to work on the resolution. A vote was taken to see who supported the resolution. There were ca. 18 Yes votes, and ca. 3 No votes.

3. Resolution on Accepting a Course of Study as Fulfilling Area E and/or Upper Division GE (#08-08/09-EP) – Revised resolution distributed via email

M/S (Moyer/Cheyne) to place the resolution on the floor.

The resolution comes from a discussion that began last Spring at Provost's Council about the idea of allowing some GE to double-count. The idea was forwarded to the UCC. After considerable discussion, the UCC thought was a good idea for Area E and for upper division areas. It was forwarded to the Educational Policies Committee to draft a policy. The proposed policy reduces the number of courses a student has to take and also saves students from repeating material they have already learned.

Resolution on Accepting a Course of Study as Fulfilling Area E and/or Upper Division GE #08-08/09-EP (Revised) – November 18, 2008

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that completion of a program of study in a major may fulfill the requirements for Area E General Education (GE) and/or one (and only one) of the Upper Division GE Areas (B, C, or D). If a program wishes to provide students in its major with this opportunity, the program must demonstrate that the Student Learning Outcomes for the GE area(s) to be replaced are met by the required coursework in every Option/Pathway/Concentration/Emphasis, etc. of the major; and be it further

RESOLVED: That students with double (multiple) majors may exercise this substitution in each major if available; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the process for gaining approval for a program of study replacing an Upper Division GE course will be as follows:

- 1)The department prepares a proposal (using the attached guidelines) showing which Upper Divisions courses(s) in the major meet which GE Student Learning Outcomes, how those learning outcomes will be communicated to students, and how the department will ensure that those learning outcomes will continue to be met in future years.

2)The proposal will be reviewed and approved by the same process used to evaluate new GE courses.

3)The approved list of courses that will be used to satisfy the GE requirement will be forwarded to the Registrar's Office to ensure that the information is entered into the University Catalog and DARS; and be it further

RESOLVED: That oversight and assessment of GE Student Learning Outcomes will occur on an ongoing basis, by the same process, and on the same schedule as traditional GE courses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That when accepting transfer credit and/or student petitions for substitution of a major course, issues of GE requirements must also be considered. If a course is accepted in place of an HSU major course but does not fulfill needed GE requirements, then that student will need to fulfill the GE requirement by taking a traditional GE course.

Rationale: Permitting a major's course of study to fulfill Upper Division GE and/or Area E requirements has several benefits:

1)It reduces the number of units that students are required to take, because taking a separate GE course is no longer required. This reduction in required units may enable students to graduate earlier and the University to save money by offering fewer classes.

2)It reduces unnecessary redundancy in the student's education.

One suggested approach to assessment of GE Learning Outcomes that are covered in a variety of different courses might be to do the assessment in a required capstone course.

Discussion:

- Does the policy allow a department in Area D to propose a class that would fulfill an upper division GE Area C? There isn't anything in the policy that would prevent that and it seems like it would be reasonable to do.
- The policy is aimed at programs of study, not at specific courses. The previous question would not apply to this policy.
- Does this affect most majors? The exact numbers were not know, but there are fewer than 50% of majors that have upper division GE courses that count towards the major. They are largely arts, humanities, and social sciences majors.
- How do we save money by getting students graduated sooner? If we wanted to save money, it seems like we would require students to stay another year.
- If the business of the university is simply to generate FTES, then we don't want to reduce the number of courses. But that is not our primary purpose. In the larger interests of the State, in order to produce enough baccalaureates to keep even with the number of retirees, we will have to increase baccalaureate production by about 50%. One way to do that would be to build another thirteen campuses. Another way is to look seriously at bringing down

the average number of units required. It may not be ideal from an educational standpoint, but we are being funded by the State to prepare a future workforce. FTES production, however, is not our primary goal.

- There is an approval mechanism in place for individual courses, but a benefit of this resolution is that it provides a way to approve a list of a combination of courses.
- It was reiterated that the resolution has nothing to do with individual courses; it is only about programs of study.
- Students should be encouraged to take classes across the campus; not just satisfy all their requirements in one department. The fifth resolved clause is something that is really needed on this campus, regardless of whether or not the rest of the resolution passes. It is very important to know whether or not transfer classes will fulfill GE requirements.
- In the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, students who want to get GE credit for a class taken at another institution must provide a syllabus and write an essay that explains how the class specifically meets the requirement.
- Should Area E be included in this? There are other possibilities for Area E that might be better to do elsewhere; it might be best not to include it here.
- The resolution does not prevent students from getting outside of the department; if you have a minor in another program area, you are exempt from the upper division area that is covered by the minor. This allows for the possibility for students to take more upper division courses that are germane to their major.

M/S (Moyer/Powell) to add as a second resolved clause the following:

A major may not exercise this substitution if it already includes an upper division GE course as a degree requirement.

Discussion:

- This amendment is logically redundant. If you require an upper division Area B in an Area B major, a student must take it because it is required for the major. By taking the course, the student has fulfilled upper division Area B.
- The amendment addresses a concern raised earlier.
- Since students change majors fairly often, in order to fulfill this requirement there would have to be a published list of courses, to answer petitions that come through the college offices.

M/S (Knox/Zoellner) to refer the resolution back to the committee for revisions.

Discussion:

- A lot of “what-ifs” are being raised and sending it back to the committee won’t stop people from coming up with “what-ifs.” The resolution, with the proposed amendment, should be approved.
- It was noted that if the resolution is approved, the Provost’s office will work with faculty on the implementation and work out the details.

Voting on referring the resolution back to the Educational Policies Committee occurred and **FAILED** with 1 Yes vote, 22 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

Discussion returned to the resolution:

- There are advantages and disadvantages to students taking upper division courses in another discipline. Something to consider is that this resolution may change the make-up of courses in certain areas and will change the interaction of students in those courses.

Senator Larson made the following friendly amendment to the third resolved clause, which was accepted:

3) The approved list of majors and their courses that will be used to satisfy the GE requirement will be forwarded to the Registrar’s Office to ensure that the information is entered into the University Catalog and DARS;

- Enrollments in upper division GE courses may be affected by this resolution. Courses that were marginal may now fall below a level the Dean will want to support. This will mean consolidation and less diversity in offerings. It’s a marginal change, and would probably not be substantial.
- Currently all GE areas are managed by the number of seats needed. Minimum enrollments don’t matter; courses are by and large full. The number of seats needed once this resolution is passed will be calculated, and it could mean that fewer courses will be offered in some areas. This will affect those areas that currently don’t have GE courses in their major disproportionately to those programs that have GE courses in their majors. If we were over our FTES target, this would save money, since fewer classes could be offered. That is not the case, so money savings is not a big issue. Time to degree is being saved.
- What is unknown is how many majors will participate. It should reduce enrollments in upper division GE courses. We have too many GE course requirements, and hypothetically this might drop that number, which is progress.

Voting on the resolution occurred and **PASSED** with 19 Yes votes, 2 No votes, and 3 Abstentions.

The amended resolution now reads:

#08-08/09-EP (Revised) – November 18, 2008

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that completion of a program of study in a major may fulfill the requirements for Area E General Education (GE) and/or one (and only one) of the Upper Division GE Areas (B, C, or D). If a program wishes to provide students in its major with this opportunity, the program must demonstrate that the Student Learning Outcomes for the GE area(s) to be replaced are met by the required coursework in every Option/Pathway/Concentration/Emphasis, etc. of the major; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a major may not exercise this substitution if it already includes an upper division GE course as a degree requirement; and be it further

RESOLVED: That students with double (multiple) majors may exercise this substitution in each major if available; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the process for gaining approval for a program of study replacing an Upper Division GE course will be as follows:

- 1) The department prepares a proposal (using the attached guidelines) showing which Upper Division course(s) in the major meet(s) which GE Student Learning Outcomes, how those learning outcomes will be communicated to students, and how the department will ensure that those learning outcomes will continue to be met in future years.
- 2) The proposal will be reviewed and approved by the same process used to evaluate new GE courses.
- 3) The approved list of majors and their courses that will be used to satisfy the GE requirements will be forwarded to the Registrar's Office to ensure that the information is entered into the University Catalog and DARS; and be it further

RESOLVED: That oversight and assessment of GE Student Learning Outcomes will occur on an ongoing basis, by the same process, and on the same schedule as traditional GE courses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That when accepting transfer credit and/or student petitions for substitution of a major course, issues of GE requirements must also be considered. If a course is accepted in place of an HSU major course but does not fulfill needed GE requirements, then that student will need to fulfill the GE requirement by taking a traditional GE course.

Rationale: Permitting a major's course of study to fulfill Upper Division GE and/or Area E requirements has several benefits:

1. *It reduces the number of units that students are required to take, because taking a separate GE course is no longer required. This reduction in required units may enable students to graduate earlier and the University to save money by offering fewer classes.*
2. *It reduces unnecessary redundancy in the student's education.*

One suggested approach to assessment of GE Learning Outcomes that are covered in a variety of different courses might be to do the assessment in a required capstone course.

OLD BUSINESS

4. Discussion of draft proposal for Post-Prioritization process (Moyer) – Senate feedback and comment is needed so a final document can be approved this semester. [bring your packet from 11/04/08]

Senator Moyer introduced the proposal to create an Academic Planning Committee which would deal with the results of Prioritization. Last Spring, it became clear that the current discontinuation process was flawed. A joint UCC/Educational Policies ad hoc committee began working on revising the discontinuation policy last semester and decided that a policy to handle the end of the prioritization process was needed first. This policy will be temporary and is designed to work with the programs that are targeted for augmentation as well as the programs that are targeted to be reconfigured. It is a draft, presented for comments and feedback from the Senate. The UCC will be reviewing it as well.

Discussion:

The Senate will need to approve this document and it needs to be in place by mid-February. The Senate was encouraged to read it carefully and provide comments soon.

This is one approach to what happens after the prioritization approach. Another approach is to have the report forwarded to the Provost, who would write a set of recommendations, which would be forwarded to the Senate. There are several options for handling the post-prioritization process. The Provost would like to arrive at an agreement on how it will be done.

It is anticipated that the final report will be submitted sometime in February. A more detailed timeline was not available.

It was recommended that a cycle of review be established, so everyone knows what the workload looks like. It would be desirable for departments to have some input on who the faculty representative will be on the program committee as well as input on any external members of the program committee.

The procedure seems to invent complexity and doesn't mention the role and function of the Provost's Council. How does it fit with this structure?

This recommendation, in the context of restructuring curriculum oversight, is putting an academic planning committee in place – both for creating new programs, and for modifying or discontinuing programs. This committee should be primarily faculty. Provost's Council has a majority of administrators on it, so it would not be appropriate to have it serve in this type of committee structure. It seems reasonable that recommendations made to the Provost by the academic planning committee might be taken to Provost's Council.

The current discontinuation policy allows for a schedule of response and due process on the part of interested parties. What is the difference between this policy and the existing discontinuation policy?

The current policy takes a much longer time. The prioritization process substitutes for some of that process. The current discontinuation process only applies to degree programs and majors. The main outcome of the prioritization process will not be to eliminate degree programs. This process allows for the faculty to weigh-in on programs, and not just degrees. This gives faculty more input into the overall discontinuation process than the old policy does.

Would the Educational Policies Committee consider bringing several options for consideration to the Senate? Another option would be to have recommendations from the Provost come to the Senate. This would give the Senate two options to consider.

It would be helpful if the group proposing this would provide a comparison of the two processes, this new one and the old discontinuation process, in terms of timeline, numbers of steps, and the opportunities for input. It would help to recognize what is present and what might be missing .

A copy of the current discontinuation policy will be sent to the Senate. The proposal will be brought back to the Senate for a vote.

It was noted that a process of designing a new curriculum management process and structure is underway. The proposed academic planning committee will be a short-lived body.

M/S (Cheyne/Kornreich) to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.