

Chair Zerbe called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm on Tuesday, October 29, 2013, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, Blake, Braithwaite, Bruce, Creadon, Dye, Fulgham, Geck, Gold, Grabinski, Karl, Lopes, Meyer, Mola, Moyer, Pierce, Richmond, Shellhase, Snyder, Stubblefield, Thobaben, Tillinghast, Virnoche, Wrenn, Zerbe.

Members absent: Bloom, Shaeffer.

Guests: Cheyne, S. Smith, Burges, Dunk, Steinberg, Bolick-Floss, Mullery, Ayoob, Martin, Lee.

### **1. Announcement of Proxies**

Gold for Ortega and Creadon for Eschker.

### **2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda**

M/S/P (Fulgham/Pierce) to approve and adopt the agenda.

### **3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of October 29, 2013**

M/S/P (Bruce/Pierce) to approve the minutes from the meeting of October 29, 2013 as written.

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

Chair Zerbe provided a written report. In addition, he announced that Greg Young has resigned from the Senate, leaving vacant a lecturer faculty position as well as the position of Senate Parliamentarian. The Lecturer Faculty position will be filled in the Spring General Faculty election. Anyone interested in serving as the Senate Parliamentarian for the remainder of the academic year was invited to send their name to the Senate Office by Monday, 5:00 pm.

The sign-up for the Open Forum is now available online.

There was an excellent turnout for the campus forum and open meeting with the Advisory Committee to the Trustee's Committee for the Selection of the President. The Advisory Committee will have a website to facilitate communication with the campus and provide opportunity for feedback from the campus. The campus' Advisory Committee will be working more closely with the Board of Trustee's committee than initially expected.

### **5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (Written reports included in packet)**

Academic Policies Committee (Gold): The Committee is planning to ask for faculty feedback on the PREP process.

Appointments and Elections Committee (Alderson): The Committee is working on some appointment issues.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (Bruce): The deadline for comments on the proposed revision of the Senate Constitution has passed. Feedback that was received will be reviewed by the Committee tomorrow and the document will be forwarded to the Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) (Virnoche): Brandon Schwab (CNRS) has replaced Gregg Gold on the ad hoc committee that is reviewing and evaluating the current standardized core student evaluation form. Other members are Jayne McGuire (CPS) and Marisol Cortes-Rincon (CAHSS). Nancy Dye is the FAC liaison to the group.

The FAC asks that Senators be mindful and considerate of others when addressing remarks to the Senate. Discussions may become passionate but remarks need to remain respectful and thoughtful.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC met today as subcommittees and continues to work on curriculum proposals.

General Faculty Representatives to the ASCSU (Creadon): A new Faculty Trustee has been appointed to the CSU Board of Trustees (BoT) – Steven Stepanek, CSU Northridge. Bernadette Cheyne, former Faculty Trustee, was honored and congratulated for the work she has done.

Professor Cheyne spoke to the Senate, noting that her tenure and association with the HSU and CSU academic senates began in the early 1990's. This twenty-plus year association is effectively ending now and she thanked everyone she has served with over the years for a wonderful and rewarding experience.

On behalf of the Senate, Chair Zerbe thanked Professor Cheyne for her work, both locally and statewide, and on the Board of Trustees. She received a round of enthusiastic applause.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): The OAA Working Group is in the early stages of prioritizing budget and space requests.

Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (Blake): The new AVP for Enrollment Management, Vikash Lakhani, will begin on Monday. The search for a Registrar is ongoing; telephone interviews will be conducted next week.

The STARS Scholarship System, implemented this past year, has not worked as well as expected. In response to feedback from faculty, staff researched other software products. It is hoped that a different scholarship system called Academicworks will be rolled out in January.

President's Office (Richmond): In October, the Chancellor met with the leadership team (President's Council) in San Jose at the headquarters of Cisco. They were introduced to a new technology call Telepresence. This technology could be effectively used by the CSU to provide classes as well as for meetings and presentations. President Richmond invited a Cisco representative to visit Humboldt County and present the technology to a group of representatives from HSU, CR, and the K-12 system. If anyone is interested in learning more, they should contact the President.

The President attended a meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and reported on several interesting initiatives at different campuses, including creation of interdisciplinary departments, competency-based education program, and a new technology from Virginia Tech, focusing on freshmen and students needing remediation.

The President recently visited Zane Middle School in Eureka. Zane is in the process of becoming a STEAM school (STEM disciplines plus the Arts) and they are interested in collaborating with HSU faculty. Ideas are welcome for future collaborations with Zane.

#### **6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – October 29, 2013**

Item "13-293: DANC 488: Dance Performance Ensemble" was pulled from the Consent Calendar and placed at the end of the business agenda.

The following items were approved without objection:

- 13-271: ES 308: Multicultural Perspectives in American Society
- 13-265: ART 321: Intermediate Drawing
- 13-273: Critical Race, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
- 13-275: WS 430: "Queer" Across Cultures
- 13-278: PSCI 343: International Organization
- 13-280: PSCI 373: Politics of a Sustainable Society
- 13-281: PSCI 482: Internship
- 13-282: PSCI 484: Seminar in Political Science
- 13-302: FILM 315: Filmmaking I
- 13-311: PSYC 690: Thesis
- 13-312: PSYC 695: Research Practicum
- 13-327: 13-327: ENVS 370: Energy, Technology, and Society
- 13-329: FOR 471: Forest Administration
- 13-330: FILM 362: Social Change Digital Production
- 13-331: Film 455S: Grant Writing
- 13-334: NAS 306: Native Peoples of North America
- 13-335: ENGL 481: Internship in Teaching Writing and Literature
- 13-336: ENGL 690; Master's Project
- 13-337: ENGL 435: Issues in English as a Second/Foreign Language
- 13-338: ENGL 635: Issues in English as a Second/Foreign Language
- 13-339: English Writing Practices Major pathway
- 13-137: Course Change, PHYX 462 Senior Lab

- 13-138: Course Change, PHYX 485 Physics Seminar
- 11-334: Program Change Liberal Studies Recreation Administration
- 12-314: SPAN 310
- 12-229: KINS 482: Internship in Kinesiology
- 13-055: Native American Studies Program Change (in the Major):
- 13-156: Native American Studies Minor Program Change:
- 13-113: MATH 113 College Algebra New Course Proposal
- 13-114: MATH 114 Trigonometry
- 13-154: PE 263: Intermediate Yoga
- 13-109: French and Francophone Studies Major Change
- 13-246: FREN 310: Nouvelles en francais

**7. Consent Calendar from the Senate Executive Committee (One Item):**  
Revision of Senate Standing Rule on Readings of Resolutions (CBC)

Approved without objection.

**8. TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM – Open Forum for the Campus Community**

Professor Sabra Steinberg, a Lecturer in the Environmental Science & Management Department, shared concerns with the Senate regarding protection of the anonymity of students who use the student evaluation process for hate speech or other forms of harassment against faculty.

Professor Steinberg shared her personal experience from the previous semester of receiving a particularly vicious and hateful message from a student via an online evaluation. She brought it to the attention of administrators and felt betrayed when no action was taken. As a result, she has filed a grievance.

In her opinion, a student should forfeit the privilege of anonymity when violating conduct codes. In this particular case, it was determined that what the student wrote was a violation of student conduct, but was not harassment (it was not repeated) and was not hate speech (face to face).

Professor Steinberg urged the Senate to consider exploring policy options for dealing with instances of abuse such as this. It is important to protect faculty and the issue needs to be addressed if the campus is going to continue to diversify. Harassment of any kind should not be tolerated.

**9. Resolution on New Faculty Award: “Excellence in Service Learning” (#09-13/14-FAC) –  
Second Reading**

Senators were reminded that the resolution is a second reading and three arguments “in favor” and three arguments “against” would be heard.

The fact that the Service Learning method is used across disciplines on campus distinguishes it and lifts it to the level of a Senate award.

Service Learning is one of many, innovative pedagogies available. Rather than see the process of faculty awards snowball, the Senate should continue with the current five awards until a more comprehensive overview is undertaken.

It is necessary to convey the importance of students engaging in community service. It enriches students' educational experience. The award offers an opportunity to reward the service learning that is done and it also promotes that kind of learning on campus. It would be valuable to the campus to make the award available.

There are about fifteen service learning courses being taught on campus. That is too small of a pool of faculty.

The floor was given to Annie Bolick-Floss: Service Learning has an advisory committee comprised of administrators, students, faculty, and community partners. The award is one of the few ways to recognize faculty engagement. It extends beyond pedagogy – it is also about working hand in hand with community partners. Offering the award is not intended to discredit or ignore other teaching strategies.

The pool of faculty is too small for a university-wide award. The Service Learning Committee should not let the Senate's lack of support preclude offering the award in another way, such as being sponsored by the Service Learning office.

It was clarified that even though there are only fifteen courses being taught, some are taught by more than one faculty. There is a sizable number of faculty involved.

Voting on Resolution #09-13/14-FAC occurred and FAILED with 8 Yes votes, 12 No votes, and 3 Abstentions.

#### **10. Resolution on Online Administration of Teaching Evaluations (#13-13/14-FAC) – First Reading**

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

##### **Resolution on Online Administration of Teaching Evaluations #13-13/14-FAC - October 29, 2013 – First Reading**

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (Senate) has received the report on the Spring 2013 pilot of online administration of teaching evaluations from the "Implementation Task Force" as outlined in Resolution #27-12/13-FAC; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Senate approves the permanent online administration of teaching evaluations; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the oversight for teaching evaluation policy and processes is the responsibility of the University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the administration of the online teaching evaluations is the responsibility of the Dean of each college and should be coordinated so that processes align across the colleges.

**Rationale:**

We moved to piloting and now permanent use of online administration of teaching evaluations when the CSU required that all courses (with some exceptions) be evaluated every term. This policy mandate more than tripled the number of courses to be evaluated each term with serious fiscal and human resource implications.

The report on the pilot administration of online teaching evaluations noted that mean scores on the online teaching evaluation pilot were only .1 points lower than average scores from paper administration done in earlier years. Response rates for online evaluations were slightly lower than paper evaluations with the average response rate dropping by six points.

The drop in both teaching scores and response rates was expected. The Senate discussed that with less diligent reminders response rates will likely fall. The sentiment of the Senate was that in future administration the colleges should try to balance the concern about annoying students and faculty with many emails against the need to maintain reasonable response rates.

**Humboldt State University  
University Senate  
Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Recommendations to College Deans  
Online Administration of Teaching Evaluations**

October 29, 2013

- The administration of online teaching evaluations should begin no sooner than the first day of week 14: research suggests that exam week solicitation of evaluations contributes to lower scores.
- Students may be sent up to three requests to complete teaching evaluations. The subject line should be specific to the course: BIO 104 Teaching Evaluation.
- Once students complete a teaching evaluation for a course, they should not receive further notices.
- Midway through the evaluation process, faculty members should receive an email indicating their response rate in each course.
- The Deans should explore linking teaching evaluation status (complete/pending) to the student portals.

Senator Virnoche noted that based on earlier feedback, this resolution was separated from the one that follows on the agenda, with the hope that this resolution would be non-controversial.

M/S/P (Bruce/Moyer) to waive the second reading.

Discussion of the resolution as a second reading with three speakers in favor and three speakers against:

Q: Will there be a way to determine if a student has stopped attending the class? Information needs to be available as to how often the student actually attended the class and interacted with the instructor. A: The Faculty Affairs Committee will be addressing this concern.

Q: What happens if the resolution doesn't pass? A: The colleges will default to paper evaluations.

If this passes it will become permanent. There isn't anything in the resolution about continuing to evaluate the process. There needs to be ongoing evaluation of the process.

The Faculty Affairs Committee will continue to work on the form, determine other data that may need to be collected, etc.

Support was expressed for the resolution and establishing a permanent process for online evaluations.

Q: How do the recommendations to the college deans fit with the resolutions? A: They are recommendations for implementation, not part of the policy.

M/S/P (Gold/Bruce) to end debate and vote immediately.

Voting on Resolution #13-13/14-FAC (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading Waived) occurred and PASSED.

M/S/P (Bruce/Virnoche) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

### **11. Resolution on Institutional Reporting and Safety Linked to Online Teaching Evaluations (#14-13/14-FAC) – First Reading**

M/S (Virnoche/Gold) to place the resolution on the floor.

#### Resolution on Institutional Reporting and Safety Linked to Online Teaching Evaluations #14-13/14-FAC - October 29, 2013 – First Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (Senate) recommends to the Provost that the compilation and summary reporting of online teaching evaluations is the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP). Each term IRP will submit to the University Senate through the Faculty Affairs Committee a report providing institution-level data on the previous term's teaching evaluations. IRP reports should include data on mean response rates and mean and median scores across all classes; as well as reports that compare measures by course category such as lab, large lecture, small lecture and graduate seminar. These reports will be made available to faculty members to use in interpreting their own evaluation scores; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Senate requests that the Senior Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs-Human Resources and the HSU CFA President or designee explore the policy options for allowing identification of student respondents in cases where a narrative reveals a threat of serious harm to any party.

**Rationale:** The University Senate in resolution #13-13/14-FAC approved the permanent online administration of teaching evaluations. The first resolve addresses concerns for ongoing monitoring of institutional outcomes on response rates and faculty scores to provide a context for interpreting individual faculty scores. Note: In the pilot year, one college office provided the data analysis and reporting of this type of institutional data. It is more appropriate to locate an all-institution reporting process in the IRP office so that analysis and reporting is consistent across colleges. Faculty Affairs worked with IRP and college offices to develop the first resolve. The second resolve addresses concerns raised by the CFA and individual faculty members regarding communication norms in online forums and our ability to responsibly respond when serious safety concerns are raised by student comments.

Discussion:

It was noted that the second resolved clause speaks to concerns raised regarding student comments and provides direction to explore policy options.

It was suggested that additional language from the Student Code of Conduct be included, as well as language providing for cases where student comments may suggest inappropriate behavior on the part of an instructor.

It was recommended that the final sentence of the first resolved clause state that the reports will be available to faculty members and for the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process.

Allowing for identification of student respondents is one approach to the problem. Another step that needs to be taken is to provide education for students on boundaries and acceptable ways of communicating, for example, through the instructions with the evaluation form.

Concern was expressed that having language on the student evaluations outlining everything that might jeopardize a student's anonymity might prohibit good comments as well.

The second resolved clause should include something about this being reported back to the Senate and/or that the Senate Chair or Chair of Faculty Affairs is involved.

It was noted that the Student Code of Conduct does not specify hate speech, so earlier suggested language additions need to be modified.

There is a difference between anonymous student evaluations and confidential student evaluations. The latter would allow some capacity to trace students, therefore would no longer be anonymous.

The resolution is supported as written. It is important for a group to get together and carefully consider all defined categories – student conduct, harassment, faculty conduct.

Q: At what point will language be created that says what actions will be taken to address problems? A: The group that is charged with developing a policy will identify what actions would be taken.



Resolution #13-13/14-FAC (above) gives the Faculty Affairs Committee oversight of the process. This resolution is just requesting that options be presented to the Committee.

Q: Should there be provision for removing an evaluation from a faculty member's personnel file? A: Faculty personnel policies already contain this provision.

**12. Action Item: Revision of Senate Standing Rule on Process for Approving ICC Consent Calendar Items (CBC)**

M/S/U (Fulgham/Abell) to approve the changes to the Senate standing rule on approving ICC Consent Calendar items. There was no discussion. Voting occurred and the motion PASSED unanimously.

**13. Resolution on Administrative-Academic Probation Policy (#12-13/14-APC) – First Reading**  
Attachment: Proposed Policy  
Attachment: EO 1038

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

Resolution on Special Cases of Administrative-Academic Probation and Disqualification  
#12-13/14-APC – October 15, 2013 – First Reading

**Resolved:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached document regarding Administrative-Academic Probation and Disqualification be approved by the Senate for inclusion in the 2014-2015 HSU catalog.

**Rationale:** On September 15, 2008 CSU Chancellor Charles Reed issued, "Executive Order No. 1038 relating to minimum requirements for probation and disqualification" (see attached). As noted in the document, "In accordance with policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders..." In accordance with the order, the APC has incorporated the language of EO 1038 into the proposed catalog language regarding administrative-academic probation and disqualification. Since policies in the HSU catalog already exist for academic probation and disqualification, these sections in EO 1038 are not addressed. Please note that in the proposed policy document, language adding additional student safeguards has been added. This language requires that decisions regarding administrative-academic probation and disqualification must be made in consultation with other relevant parties. Also, as directed by EO 1038, appeal processes for any student subject to this policy have been developed.

Executive Order (EO) 1038 was issued by the Chancellor's Office a few years ago. It contains language regarding special cases of administrative-academic disqualification which applies to rare situation when a student demonstrates "behavior so contrary to the standards of the profession for which the student is preparing as to render the student unfit for the profession." It is expected that this would be used infrequently.

Discussion:

Q: Is the language of the attached document from the Chancellor's Office: A: No. Q: Can the policy be amended? A: Yes.

The policy contains no examples of administrative probation. It would be helpful to have clarification on what that would be so a department has the ability to make a recommendation. Vice Provost Burges noted that an example would be a student not making progress toward a degree. Situations are diverse across campus.

The floor was yielded to Randi Darnall Burke, Dean of Students. She is consulting with the campus' legal counsel, Stephen Silver, regarding the language being proposed. For students failing to make academic progress, the language is fine. The language regarding professional standards is questionable; especially if there are state licensing standards (nursing, teaching, etc.) involved. Silver's first read is that this cannot apply to undergraduates, but he is checking on this with the head of curriculum at the Chancellor's Office.

Q: Who assesses whether or not a student has violated a professional standard? A: It could be a professor, a department chair, a program director; this is not specifically addressed in the document. In Social Work or teacher credential programs it is the department that determines professional standards and continuation. An appeal process (a committee) must be in place.

The EO from the Chancellor specifically states that an administrator may disqualify a student immediately. If the EO is in conflict with legal counsel, then caution needs to be exercised.

It was clarified that undergraduates in Social Work or teaching in the schools can be removed from a program if they don't demonstrate behavior in keeping with standards of the profession because there are national and state standards established by licensing boards.

It was suggested that the language under Graduate Administrative-Academic Probation (p.2, 1.) state that the impetus for probation come from the program, e.g. "by recommendation of the program" rather than "following consultation with the program."

The policy is more useful for encouraging students to make adequate progress, especially at the graduate level. Currently, there is no way to deal with students who do not progress. The appeals process is a safeguard to overzealousness. No one is looking for reasons to toss students out. This is about looking after the best interests of students.

Is it important to break out graduate from undergraduate? The first part of the document also applies to graduate students.

#### **14. Resolution on Revision of the ICC Constitution (#08-13/14-ICC) – First Reading**

Attachment: Proposed Revision

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

Resolution on Revision of the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) Constitution  
#08-13/14-ICC – October 15, 2013 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the attached revised version of the Integrated Curriculum Committee Constitution be approved, and be it further

RESOLVED: That use of the revised Constitution shall begin in Spring 2014.

*RATIONALE: The only change in this revision is to make the faculty who represent specific colleges appointed or elected by the specific college rather than elected by the faculty at large. This change allows for more rapid replacements should a college representative need to be replaced for any reason.*

*The faculty on the ICC include three faculty who represent the three colleges and three faculty who are elected at large by the HSU faculty. The three at-large ICC faculty will continue to be elected by the full HSU faculty.*

Discussion:

At beginning of the year the ICC had a vacancy for a college position and the question of requiring an election was raised. The Senate Executive Committee recommended that college faculty be elected/appointed by the college. This is the only substantive change; the remaining changes are editorial.

The original reason for having the General Faculty elect the faculty representatives from the colleges was to reinforce the view that they are not serving on the ICC to represent their colleges, but to provide perspective across the disciplines and consider what is best for the campus and for the faculty as a whole. An important factor to the ICC working effectively is not having partisanship.

All of the colleges need to hold elections for these positions, they should not be appointed. The exception shouldn't become the rule. If an election is not successful, then an appointment may be made. It would be helpful to have the colleges' policies and procedures attached.

Concerns about faculty representing a university-wide perspective are addressed at the beginning of the ICC Constitution.

**15. Discussion Item: Revision to the "Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU" (from ICC)**

The revision is being presented as a discussion item because it raised some larger questions about faculty oversight of the curriculum that need to be discussed. It is postponed to the next Senate meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 pm.