

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. on Tuesday, December 9, 2008, Nelson Hall East, Room 201, Goodwin Forum. A quorum was present.

Members Present: Arizzi, Bond, Cannon, Cheyne, Faulk, Flashman, Gleason, Goodman, Harrington, Howe, Knox, Kornreich, Larson, Lether, McElwain, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Pereira, Perryman, Powell, Reiss, Rizzardi, Shaeffer, Snyder, Virnoche, Weissbart, Yarnall, Zoellner.

Members Absent: Butler, Gunsalus, Nowak, Richmond, Schwetman.

Proxies: Virnoche for Bolick-Floss, Faulk for Haynes, Cheyne for Knox (after 5 pm)  
Zoellner for Marshall, Cheyne for Thobaben.

Guests: MacConnie, Ayoob, Burges, Kircher.

### **Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of November 18, 2008**

M/S (Zoellner/Weissbart) to approve the minutes from the meeting of November 18, 2008 as written. Motion **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

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

The President's Council met last Friday and heard a budget presentation. The web page link to the presentation has been sent to Academic Senate members.

Chair Mortazavi encouraged senators to volunteer and/or nominate colleagues for the Cabinet for Institutional Change. Names should be forwarded to the Provost.

The subcommittee that has been negotiating with the President on issues related to the Bill of Particulars has met four times with the President. A copy of the President's written response, to the subcommittee, on shared governance has been forwarded to the Senate. The President's response will be the first item on the Senate's January 27, 2009 meeting. At that time, the Senate will make a decision to accept or reject the President's response. If the decision is to reject, then the Senate will need to provide instruction on what to do next.

Senator Goodman invited any questions that senators might have about the meetings that took place between the subcommittee and the President.

- Does the subcommittee feel that the President's statement could be substantially improved by the Senate? Could a better statement of what shared governance includes be put together by this body? It was answered yes – if the Senate wants a model of shared governance. The President's statement is not a model of shared governance, it is a status quo document. It doesn't tell us how to proceed; it tells us what we are doing right now.

- If this body were to propose an alternative to what the President has written, is there room for further negotiation?

It was suggested that these questions be raised for the discussion in January.

Senator Powell stated that he will provide a draft of what could have and should have been said about shared governance at the January meeting, including categories on curriculum, personnel processes, sharing a vision of the university, budget, and program mix, including prioritization.

Proxies were announced.

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

Educational Policies Committee (Chair Moyer): The Committee is working with an Executive Order (EO) regarding new policies on withdrawals and repeating classes, etc. The HSU Catalog language needs to be revised to conform to the EO.

Senator Moyer distributed a handout from the task group working on re-designing how curriculum oversight is organized. The handout represents ideas still in development. The group is envisioning that there will no longer be college curriculum committees and that the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) will not exist in its present form. A centralized curriculum committee will oversee everything. The bulk of the work would occur in satellite committees; with different committees for academic policy, program review and assessment, academic master planning, and processing curriculum change forms. For example, if a new option were to be created, a pre-planning document would go to the academic master planning committee. It would be reviewed and if approved, would be forwarded to the centralized curriculum committee which would deal with the question of resources. After that, it would go back to the department for actual planning and implementation. The central committee's primary purpose is to ensure everything is coordinated and discussed among groups as well as to assign tasks to satellite committees. The chairs of the satellite committees would serve on the centralized committee to facilitate communication. The goal is to get the work done, in a timely manner, without having it re-done several times along the way.

Discussion:

- How does the Academic Senate fit into this plan? Anything policy-related would come to the Senate. There is an expectation that most curriculum changes of substance would come to the Senate in one form or another; in many cases as consent or information items.
- The handout indicates that committee members are appointed; will any members of the committees be elected by the faculty? The task group hasn't specifically discussed this yet. The appointments referred to on the handout are in reference to faculty who are already serving in various curriculum positions, and who will be asked to serve under the new structure. The long-term vision is that there will be elected faculty positions on the centralized curriculum committee.

- It was suggested the task group take some of the issues that have come through the college committees and the UCC on a regular basis during the past couple of years and do a dry run with them through this proposed process to see how they would work.

**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](http://www.humboldt.edu/~acadsen))**

There were no speakers.

### **Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio members cont.**

Cont. discussion of the handout on re-structuring curriculum oversight:

- Will there be student representation? Yes, on the satellite committees. There hasn't been specific discussion about membership of the central committee yet.
- The task group is working on the assumption that its work will be completed quickly; so there may be changes being made pretty quickly. As a result, there will not be a call for nominations for the UCC for the upcoming General Faculty election.

Further questions and/or comments should be forwarded to Senators Powell, Moyer, or Virnoche.

- What is the rationale for this re-design? It is a result of the WASC site visit team's report suggesting that curriculum oversight on campus is incomplete and fragmented.
- Are there any models being used for this re-design, i.e., from other CSU campuses or other universities? The group considered a number of models, many similar to what HSU currently has in place. Some of the models had fewer layers and repetition of tasks and the task group is more interested in adopting the latter type of model.
- What is the relationship between the process of re-structuring curriculum and the overall process of institutional change? Would it be better for this to be taken up with the overall process rather than being done piecemeal?
- The satellite committees will not be complete subsets of the central committee; but there will be some crossover. There may also be individuals who serve on more than one satellite committee.
- This would be a recommending body to the Provost. Shouldn't the chair be a faculty member rather than the Vice-Provost? This question has been raised in the subcommittee and is being discussed.
- In view of the WASC comments; there are two things missing – General Education and the graduate programs.

- It would help the discussion if there was a document that had descriptions of the committees, and a flow chart and/or description of the proposed organizational structure.

Senate Finance Officer (Senator Flashman): The University Budget Committee (UBC) is reviewing items to be posted on the UBC web site, including a university budget book (expenditures and resources) and quarterly reports which will be presented for various budget categories. This is an effort to continue to make budget matters more transparent.

University Curriculum Committee (UCC) (Chair Flashman): The UCC has completed a list of student learning outcomes for the areas of the curriculum that the UCC supervises. These will be posted on the UCC web page. Discussion of methods for the assessment of these areas has begun. A selective first run (ca. five courses in each area) will take place this spring, i.e., not every course will be assessed.

Statewide Senate (Senator Cheyne): The ASCSU will not have an interim meeting this month, due to the budget situation (an effort to save money). There will be a plenary meeting in January.

General Faculty President (Powell): A call for nominations for the spring General Faculty (GF) election in February will be issued shortly. GF President Powell encouraged senators to think about ways to develop leadership among other faculty to broaden the base for faculty service to the university.

California Faculty Association (CFA) (Shaeffer): The bargaining team has met a couple of times with the CSU bargaining team and it looks like an impasse may be called. If it goes to an impasse, a third-party arbiter will be brought in. The "Alliance to Save the CSU" will hold a rally on campus on February 13. More details will be provided later.

Associated Students (President Pereira): AS is hosting a study lounge during finals week with free food.

Staff Council (Arizzi): The Council held an open forum to discuss the Keeling Report and to discuss the Cabinet for Institutional Change. Several staff will be nominated for the Cabinet. The Provost indicated that he would be happy to answer questions from staff. Another open forum will be scheduled.

M/S (Yarnall/Kornreich) that the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts the final graduation list for Fall 2008 and recommends the graduation of all persons whose names are on that list, subject to the provision that any student whose name is on the list and who has not fulfilled the requirements for graduation will have her or his name removed from the list and that student shall not graduate. The motion **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

M/S/U (Yarnall/Zoellner) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

**1. Discussion Item: Draft CSU Responsible Use Policy (Anna Kircher, Chief Information Officer)**

Anna Kircher, Chief Information Officer, presented information about the draft systemwide policies currently under review. During the past couple of years, information security risks have increased and federal and state laws have been put in place demanding increasing responsibilities on the part of organizations. As a result, the Chancellor's Office (CO) decided that there should be a systemwide information security program. A draft policy and draft standards have been under development the past two years. An important part of the initiation of the program is the Responsible Use Policy. All three documents are out for review by faculty systemwide. Copies of both the policy and standards documents have been provided electronically. They are very technical documents and not everyone will want to read them all the way through. The Responsible Use Policy will be of more interest to faculty. Feedback is due to the CO in early March. In February, an electronic call will be issued to the entire campus for feedback on all three documents. The information will be released in blog format so that campus members can respond to sections of the documents and see what others are saying as well. Meetings will be held with the computing committees in each of the three colleges. Feedback from the IT Council has also been solicited.

Feedback on the document and suggestions for other ways of vetting the documents on campus is welcome from the Senate. The goal is to get the policies approved, finalized, and released an Executive Order by the end of the academic year.

Questions:

- Is there anything in this document that is unusual, compared to other similar types of documents? Existing responsible use documents from CSU campuses were used to help write the document, so there are no surprises.
- In Section 3, "General Principles" there is nothing in the language indicating that a person who allegedly violates the policy would be informed that an investigation is taking place.
- There is nothing in the language indicating who makes the decision to take punitive action outlined at the bottom of page 3. Elsewhere in the document it is stated that disciplinary procedures would go through existing institutional disciplinary procedures. It was suggested that the same language be referred to at the bottom of page 3.
- It would be helpful to have some kind of assurance about due process at the beginning of the document.
- Feedback is not due until March. The Senate could schedule a meeting to further discuss the document early next semester; or senators may want to send comments directly to Anna Kircher. Faculty will also have an opportunity to reply to the campus-wide electronic call for feedback.
- Under Section 6, "Policy Enforcement," it states that campuses must establish procedures.

Who and how will that happen at HSU? Procedures and policies are already established by campuses and bargaining units. It was noted that existing procedures would be used; and that the language may need to be clarified.

**2. Resolution to Replace the *HSU Procedures for Discontinuance of Academic Programs* (#12-08/09-EP)**

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

**Resolution to Replace the *HSU Procedures for Discontinuance of Academic Programs*  
#12-08/09-EP – December 9, 2008**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached procedure temporarily replace the current *HSU Procedures for Discontinuance of Academic Programs*; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached procedure be implemented at the beginning of the Spring 2009 term and remain in effect for a period of not longer than three years, ending Spring 2011; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University charges the Educational Policies (or other appropriate new curriculum management/policy) Committee to develop a policy for ongoing curriculum management, including all facets of curriculum change.

*RATIONALE: Because the Program Prioritization Process is a logical substitute for the beginning stages of the current discontinuation policy, this temporary procedure will provide for a more effective approach for any program discontinuations that result from Prioritization, while simultaneously planning for growth of top-ranked programs.*

The document has been presented to the Senate before for comment. A few changes have been made based on Senate feedback.

Discussion:

- In the last paragraph of p. 4 of the "Procedure for Post-Program Prioritization Process ..." it is stated: "In the case of the possible discontinuation of a degree program, where the Senate and Provost disagree on the appropriate action, a member of the APC will meet with the Provost and President to discuss their differing views." If the Senate and the Provost disagree, then a member of the Senate Executive Committee should be included in the discussions with the Provost, President, and member of the Academic Planning Committee (APC). It could be the Educational Policies Committee Chair or the Faculty Affairs Committee Chair. This was offered and accepted as a friendly amendment.

The statement now reads:

In the case of the possible discontinuation of a degree program, where the Senate and Provost disagree on the appropriate action, a member of the Senate Executive Committee and a member of the APC will meet with the Provost and President to discuss their differing views.

- The old procedure for discontinuance of academic programs specifies a role for the Provost's Council. This new document doesn't mention the Provost's Council; is this intentional or an accidental omission? It was stated that it was thought to be intentional.
- The APC is recommending action on discontinuing programs to the Senate. If the Senate and the Provost aren't in agreement on how to proceed, the APC shouldn't be involved at all. It is hard to get a clear idea of the process without a flow chart and without knowing who is in charge of curriculum overall on the part of the faculty. If the Senate is in charge, as opposed to the APC or other versions of this committee, then disagreements between the Senate and the Provost should be negotiated between the Senate and the Provost, not the APC. The Senate Chair could be charged with negotiating on behalf of the Senate. The Senate and/or Senate committees have the advantage of having more people in the room to talk things through. It was suggested that the Provost meet with the Senate Executive committee in order to have more people in the room for the discussion.
- Based on last year's experience with the German program, having the Senate Executive Committee meet with the President gives the faculty a variety of opportunities to provide feedback. There is an advantage of having more than one person in the room. On the other hand, it may also diffuse some of the focus that a one-on-one discussion could have. It is hard to know which is more effective.
- Using the word negotiation seems misleading. The Senate is recommending and the Provost makes a decision. There is a claim that the curriculum is up to the faculty, but when it comes to cutting a program or merging two programs, it does not seem to be up to the faculty. There is a limitation on the voice of the faculty.
- It was clarified that the term negotiation is not in the document and was used unintentionally in an earlier comment.

A friendly amendment was made to include the entire Senate Executive Committee:

In the case of the possible discontinuation of a degree program, where the Senate and Provost disagree on the appropriate action, the Senate Executive Committee and a member of the APC will meet with the Provost and President to discuss their differing views.

A friendly amendment was made to number 4 on page 2 of the "Procedure":

4. ~~In creating the list of programs, t~~The Provost will recommend a course of action for each of the programs selected. identifies potential solutions that are known and thought to be potentially useful.

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Under the heading of "Membership of the APC," there is an issue with the Provost making the appointments of faculty members in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. This works well with the current Provost, but could be a disaster with other provosts. It was recommended that a different process be used for determining membership of the APC. It was noted that the procedure is only temporary, and after the process is finished, there would be a return to the old discontinuance procedure.

Voting on the resolution and amended "Procedure" occurred and **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

M/S (Moyer/Harrington) to make it an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President. Voting occurred and the motion **PASSED** with 1 No vote and 4 Abstentions.

### **3. Resolution on Revised *Final Evaluation Week Policy* (#10-08/09-EP)**

M/S (Moyer/Larson) to place the resolution on the floor, with the correction of "Final's Week" to "Finals Week."

#### **Resolution on Revised *Final Evaluation Week Policy***

#10-08/09-EP – December 9, 2008

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached *Final Evaluation Week Policy* replace the current *Final Evaluation Week Policy* (2002). The new policy will take effect beginning in Spring Semester of 2009; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That Faculty should be widely informed of this policy through at least the following approaches:

1. The Policy shall be printed in the Schedule of Classes
2. The Policy shall be added to the *Faculty Handbook*, where it will replace the current statement on Courses with Final Examinations
3. The Office of Academic Affairs will be responsible for reminding faculty of the policy before every semester by encouraging Deans to offer oral reminders at College meetings, requesting Chairs to remind faculty, and through emails.

*Rationale: The existing Final Evaluation Week Policy was approved by the Senate in April of 2002. This revised version reflects several purposes:*

- 1) *The policy is updated to reflect the new syllabus policy*



- 2) *The location of final exams is specified so that students and faculty can be located if needed*
- 3) *Various logical inconsistencies in the old policy have been removed*
- 4) *More approaches to distributing the policy have been added to this resolution in the hope that all faculty will become aware of the policy.*

Senator Moyer outlined the changes made to the old policy and the rationale for the changes. The changes were initially cosmetic; intended to bring it in line with the new syllabus policy, as well as to provide a means of distributing the policy more broadly. The Senate Executive Committee raised several questions and pointed out various inconsistencies in the original policy. Since the changes became more extensive, a copy of the existing policy is included as an attachment.

Discussion:

- The rationale for the need of a policy was questioned. Does the State require a certain number of face to face hours? The intent of the original policy and the new policy is to prevent the reduction of instructional time in place of exams. Historically, the primary issue was raised by students who complained that final exams were being administered earlier than the fifteenth week. Out of sympathy for the students, a policy was written to prevent that from occurring and to acknowledge that finals week is a work week for faculty.
- Is there any enforcement mechanism in place? If a student feels the policy was not followed and that his/her grade was affected, a grievance could be filed under the current grievance procedures. It was noted that department chairs can also help to enforce the policy.
- The policy implies that you have to have “something” during finals week. Some classes may not require or lend themselves to holding final exams. It was noted that students could demand that their final projects be due at the designated time during finals week, rather than the week before.
- Number 3 refers to the designated time allotted during finals week for exams and includes oral examinations. It would be difficult to fit twenty oral examinations into one exam period.
- The policy works fine for traditional written exams, but there needs to be some flexibility for other types of evaluation. The main issue is that there needs to be an evaluative process during finals week.
- Item number 3 is permissive language, not mandatory, and does not prevent various ways used to assess students.

A friendly amendment was made to strike the word “such” from item number 3 in the policy, so it does not refer specifically to the antecedents in the previous sentence:

3. The designated hours allotted during the final evaluation week may be used for any number of summative or evaluative activities. They include, but are not limited to, traditional exams, presentations, portfolio sharing, performances, critiques, oral examinations, or, field trips. ~~Such-*i*~~n-class evaluation activities must occur during the final evaluation time designated for the course (not the week before).

The friendly amendment was accepted.

- Does this policy apply to graduate students, or is it only for undergraduates? It was assumed that it would apply to graduate students as well. Currently there is not a separate policy for graduate students.

A friendly amendment was made to further clarify item number 3 of the policy:

3. The designated hours allotted during the final evaluation week may be used for any number of summative or evaluative activities. They include, but are not limited to, traditional exams, presentations, portfolio sharing, performances, critiques, oral examinations, or, field trips. ~~Such-*i*~~n-class final evaluation activities must occur during the final evaluation time designated for the course (not the week before).

The amendment was accepted as friendly.

Voting on Resolution #10-08/09-EP, as amended, occurred and **PASSED** unanimously.

#### **4. Resolution on UFPC Composition (#09-08/09-FA)**

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

#### **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) Composition #09-08/09-FA – November 18, 2008**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that both currently used versions of Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2 (a) of the *HSU Faculty Handbook* be amended to read:

- (a) 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 professor, librarians or SSP-AR III. The term of office shall be for 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.

;and be it further

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

(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. The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.

;and be it further

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

(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

;and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that these proposed changes be put to a vote of the General Faculty in Spring 2009; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if approved by the General Faculty, these proposed changes become effective in the 2009/2010 academic year and will be initiated with an election rotation to be determined by the Academic Senate Executive Committee at that time.

*RATIONALE: There is currently no requirement for each college to have representation on the UFPC, and this year (AY 2008/2009) there is no representation from the College of Professional Studies. This amendment will ensure that there will be at least one faculty member from each college on the UFPC. Members of the UFPC will continue to be elected by the probationary and tenured members of the General Faculty.*

Current wording in Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2:

(a) The UFPC shall be composed of five members holding 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. 15.38

The Faculty Affairs Committee addressed issues raised at the Senate's first reading of the resolution. A resolved clause was added to ensure that individuals could not run for and/or be elected to more than one seat on the committee. Also, since changes to Appendix J cannot occur and be implemented in the same academic year, the statement regarding the rotation of seats for future elections was amended.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the language in Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2(b) be further revised to eliminate the wording "followed by an open meeting called by the General Faculty President to receive further nominations from the floor" – since this is a practice no longer being followed.
- In the past there have been open meetings, i.e., the General Faculty President has announced a time that he/she will be available and sits in a room waiting for people to show up.
- An open meeting of the General Faculty would require a quorum. There needs to be another mechanism in place to replace an open meeting of the faculty for this purpose.
- If the phrase is removed, then the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee is left with a lot of power and without any means of input from the General Faculty.
- If you are supposed to be following a practice that has not been followed for a number of years, it needs to be fixed, one way or another. If the current practice isn't working or being followed, it shouldn't be left the way it is. If the Nominating and Elections Committee is not charged with making a general call to the faculty for nominations to the UFPC, then the clause needs to be changed.
- It was stated that the Nominating and Elections Committee is required to nominate only two candidates, they might be eliminating others who were interested in running.
- The current process was explained. A repeated call goes out from the Senate Office to all faculty for nominations. The Nominating and Elections Committee helps to recruit candidates when there is a lack of nominations or self-nominations coming forward. No one who is eligible and wishes to run for election is turned down.
- It was suggested that section (b) read as follows: For each vacancy the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate two candidates followed by a notice from the General Faculty President of the nominees to the faculty and a request for further nominations. The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.
- Another suggestion for re-wording section (b) was made: Following a general call to the faculty for nominations for each vacancy, the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate two candidates. The Committee shall not nominate the same

candidate for more than one vacancy.

- It was suggested that it be stated that the Committee nominates a minimum of two candidates and any other names that come forward in response to the call.
- There is an advantage to providing a notice with the names of the nominees that have come forward, during the process of asking for nominees.

The following amendment was offered as friendly:

(b) For each vacancy the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate two candidates followed by a notice by the General Faculty President of nominees to the faculty and a request for further nominations. ~~an open meeting called by the General Faculty President to receive further nominations from the floor.~~ The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.

The amendment was accepted as friendly.

An additional friendly amendment was offered:

(b) For each vacancy the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates followed by a notice by the General Faculty President of nominees to the faculty and a request for further nominations. The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.

The amendment was accepted as friendly.

The statement now reads:

(b) For each vacancy the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates followed by a notice by the General Faculty President of nominees to the faculty and a request for further nominations. The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.

It was suggested that the statement be edited to be less-wordy. The following was offered:

(b) For each vacancy the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates. This will be followed by a notice by the General Faculty President to the faculty of these nominees ~~to the faculty~~ and a request for further nominations. The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.

The following wording was suggested for the second sentence: "The General Faculty President will notify the faculty of the nominees and ask for further nominations."

The following was read aloud and agreed to as a friendly amendment:

(b) The General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates for each vacancy. The General Faculty President will notify the faculty of the nominees and request further nominations. The Committee shall not nominate the same candidate for more than one vacancy.

A change was proposed to the last sentence: No candidate shall be nominated for more than one vacancy. This was accepted as friendly.

Voting on the amended section occurred and **PASSED** unanimously. The amended paragraph reads:

(b) The General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates for each vacancy. The General Faculty President will notify the faculty of the nominees and request further nominations. No candidate shall be nominated for more than one vacancy.

Voting on Resolution #09-08/09-FA, as amended, occurred and **PASSED** unanimously. The amended resolution reads:

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that both currently used versions of Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2 (a) of the *HSU Faculty Handbook* be amended to read:

(a) 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 professor, librarians or SSP-AR III. The term of office shall be for 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.

;and be it further

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

(b) The General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates for each vacancy. The General Faculty President will notify the faculty of the nominees and request further nominations. No candidate shall be nominated for more than one vacancy.

;and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that both currently used versions of Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2 (c) be amended to read:

(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

;and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that these proposed changes be put to a vote of the General Faculty in Spring 2009; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if approved by the General Faculty, these proposed changes become effective in the 2009/2010 academic year and will be initiated with an election rotation to be determined by the Academic Senate Executive Committee at that time.

*RATIONALE: There is currently no requirement for each college to have representation on the UFPC, and this year (AY 2008/2009) there is no representation from the College of Professional Studies. This amendment will ensure that there will be at least one faculty member from each college on the UFPC. Members of the UFPC will continue to be elected by the probationary and tenured members of the General Faculty.*

Current wording in Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2:

(a) The UFPC shall be composed of five members holding 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. 15.38

## **5. Resolution to Change the Meeting Schedule of the Academic Senate (#13-08/09-Zoellner)**

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

### **Resolution to Change the Meeting Schedule of the Academic Senate**

#13-08/09-Zoellner – December 9, 2008

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University will meet weekly every Tuesday from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm when classes are in session during the Spring 2009 semester rather than every other Tuesday as has been the schedule in the past; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That this change in meeting schedule for the Academic Senate shall remain in force throughout the Spring 2009 semester; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Chair of the Academic Senate, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, may, at its discretion, cancel an Academic Senate meeting should there be insufficient agenda items to warrant a meeting; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That this resolution shall, at the second to the last meeting of the Spring 2009 semester, be reconsidered for application during the Fall 2009 semester; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That if the weekly meeting schedule is also applied to the Fall 2009 semester, that the weekly meeting schedule be similarly reconsidered at the second to the last meeting of each semester in which it is in force for application in the following semester; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That if this resolution is not reapproved for a subsequent semester, the meeting times of the Academic Senate will automatically revert to the traditional “every-other-week” schedule on Tuesday from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm.

***Rationale:** Currently, Humboldt State University faces a number of challenges that require the consultation and advice of the Academic Senate, as well as the timely passage of appropriate resolutions. With the traditional “every-other-week” meeting schedule, the Academic Senate cannot respond rapidly enough to challenges to be an effective voice for the faculty, staff, and students of Humboldt State University. Therefore, because of the circumstances that currently exist, the Academic Senate must meet weekly to meet the demands and challenges that face Humboldt State University.*

*The resolution allows for the weekly meeting times to be extended by vote of the Academic Senate for additional semesters if the need remains to do so, but will cease to be in effect if the resolution is not reapproved for an additional, or subsequent, semesters.*

There is a perception that the Senate takes too long to do anything and that it rarely accomplishes anything. Considering the heavy agenda of tasks ahead, including program prioritization, budget problems, WASC, etc., it would be appropriate to meet to weekly. Tasks would be done in a more timely manner. Currently processes take too long to be feasible under somewhat emergency conditions.

Discussion:

- There are some occasions when meeting more often would be valuable. On the other hand, the two-week turnaround between meetings allows more time to think and consider ideas and for the production of the minutes and organization of a new agenda. There is no objection to having an agenda that serves over two meetings, but having a new agenda and minutes every week is more than would be useful.
- Doubt was expressed that more than a handful of senators spend time during the two weeks between meeting thinking about the past meeting or read meeting materials before the day of the current meeting. In these times the Senate really needs to meet and get things done in order to garner any respect from the faculty.
- Issues of workload for the Senate Office were raised. The weekly turnaround would provide a challenge for the office, in terms of producing minutes, especially at the current level of detail. It will also be challenging for the Senate Executive Committee, which is responsible for formulating the agendas.
- It is the nature of the Senate that it has difficulty getting things done quickly. It is necessary to allow everyone an opportunity to speak and discuss. There hasn't been a need to get things done that quickly during the past few semesters. If something came up that needed to be done urgently, why couldn't the Senate just schedule an emergency meeting, as opposed to scheduling meetings every single week. There are few items on the Senate agendas that are true emergencies. The resolution is not supported.



- The resolution wisely anticipates what might happen next semester, based on the state's budget crisis and other events. Is it possible to have a two-meeting agenda so only one agenda and set of minutes covers two meetings and redundancy in the meetings is reduced? Not having to go through the approval of minutes and reports at every meeting would make more efficient use of the meeting time. The Senate should anticipate that it will have some serious issues requiring in-depth and detailed discussion and we should institutionalize that time into senators' schedules.
- It was noted that the Senate chair has the ability to call special meetings and this has been done in the past.
- The Senate could manage its time better and get more done in two hours if discussions were more focused. If weekly meetings are desired in order to keep agenda items more current, then have a one-hour meeting every week.
- The Senate is a deliberative body and everyone has an opportunity to speak. The Senate has the ability to extend its meeting time and could run a three-hour meeting if needed. Having weekly meetings may present difficulties for standing committees to do their work.
- Mechanisms for addressing the need to meet more frequently, as needed, already exist. Calling for a weekly meeting, based upon a hypothetical need, is not necessary. Weekly meetings can be called at anytime; this is better than mandating them.
- The sense of a discussion may be lost with two weeks between meetings; weekly meetings would provide more continuity for discussions. Considering how long it took the Senate to respond to the Keeling Reports, something that needed to be responded to quickly, the Senate should consider weekly meetings. There would be fewer emergency items forwarded if the Senate met every week. The chair of the Senate may also cancel meetings if needed. With the exception of today, the Senate seems incapable of making decisions in a reasonable amount of time. Weekly meetings would also provide more time for people outside the Senate to respond and/or share comments.
- The Senate is designed to give everyone an opportunity to speak and for senators to do the best work they can. It may be frustrating at times, but there are already mechanisms in place, without this resolution, to move agenda items forward more quickly, if needed.
- We need weekly meetings; there are a lot of things happening statewide that will require the Senate to act. The fact that special meetings can be called doesn't mean that they will be called when necessary. Perhaps the meetings wouldn't need to be for two hours every week. Weekly meetings might not be possible for everyone, but the Senate should make the change to weekly meetings.
- Since the Senate has the ability to lengthen its meetings and/or call special meetings, a compromise was suggested. The Senate would vote whether or not it needs to meet the following week, depending upon the agenda and whether or not there are emergency items. It was also recommended that the Senate Executive Committee provide a heads-up

via email to senate members if it looks like a particular meeting might need to be extended and carried over to the following week.

- It is a good idea to schedule a meeting every week, but not to necessarily use that meeting time unless it is needed. There are ways the Senate could accomplish more and in a more timely manner. There are ways to limit the number of times an individual speaks on a topic and/or to encourage those who haven't spoken up yet. For example, the Chair could call for an opposing opinion or ask to hear from those who may not have had an opportunity to speak yet. It might speed things up to hear more opinions.

M/S (Virnoche/Rizzardi) to end debate and vote immediately. Voting occurred and the motion **FAILED** with 12 Yes votes, 10 no votes, and 2 Abstentions.

- It would be helpful to take a step back in the discussion and ask what it is that the Senate wants to accomplish with this resolution. If it is an issue of not being able to pass resolutions in a timely manner, then more meetings may not be needed. Not having enough time on each agenda to sufficiently discuss a matter is a different issue; sometimes the Senate is focused more on resolutions and actions rather than discussion of general matters. If the Senate needs to spend more time discussing general issues, i.e., the curriculum oversight process, then the argument is stronger for needing more regularly scheduled meetings.
- Today's meeting is an example of a productive meeting. It didn't just happen out of the blue, several of the resolutions had first readings, the feedback was used to revise the resolutions, and came back with successful resolutions. Even if the Senate meets every week, the standing committees will be operating under a different type of timeline and may not be able to accommodate such a quick turnaround for resolutions. There are places where more rapid and/or continuous discussion might be useful, but action items such as resolutions take more time than a weekly meeting allows.
- The Senate was reminded of some of the issues it will be facing soon: the prioritization ranking report, budget reductions, budget process reforms, WASC requirements for outcomes assessment results, curriculum supervision reform process, shared governance and the Senate's relationship with the President, the Keeling Report and Cabinet for Institutional Change, etc. This is a demanding array of difficult and complicated issues. The resolution to meet every week is supported.
- It is easier to take something off the calendar rather than to add it later; so it would be better to set the time aside now for weekly meetings. The Senate can rely upon the Senate Executive Committee to not call meetings unless there is good reason, i.e., substantive issues to discuss and/or act upon. It is not always possible to extend the meeting time past 6:00 p.m., due to classes that are scheduled.
- One of the reasons the Senate is sometimes slow to react is that it takes, under the best circumstances, two meetings to get an item to resolution; the first meeting to discuss and a second meeting to take action. If the Senate only meets every two weeks, it takes a month

to react. The Senate can't afford to react that slowly to many of the issues that will be coming up spring semester.

- It is a lot easier to take meetings off the calendar than to add them. It is also safe to assume that senators will have a larger workload for the next semester.
- It was noted that there has been a recurring agenda item under Old Business, "Continuing Discussion of Agenda Items from the UEC" that the Senate still hasn't finished discussing.

Voting on Resolution #13-08/09-Zoellner, as written, occurred and **PASSED** with 16 Yes votes, 7 No votes, and 3 Abstentions.

For Spring semester 2009, Senate meetings will be scheduled from 4:00-6:00 every Tuesday, and Senate Executive Committee meetings will be scheduled from 4:00-6:00 every Thursday.

The meeting ended at 6:00 p.m.