

Chair Zerbe called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm on Tuesday, February 25, 2014, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Braithwaite, Bruce, Cervantes, Creadon, Dye, Ercole, Eschker, Fulgham, Geck, Gold, Karl, Lopes, Meyer, Mola, Moyer, Ortega, Pierce, Shaeffer, Shellhase, Snyder, Stubblefield, Thobaben, Virnoche, Wrenn, Zerbe.

Members absent: Richmond, Tillinghast.

Guests: Burges, Lee, Glenn.

1. Announcement of Proxies

Moyer for Alderson, Fulgham for Abell.

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S/U (Ortega/Bruce) to approve and adopt the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of [February 11, 2014](#)

M/S/P (Dye/Braithwaite) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 11, 2014 as written. There were two Abstentions.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Chair Zerbe attended the CSU senate chairs meeting last week. Meeting topics included a progress report on Course Match and a discussion of student success fees and how they are used differently across CSU campuses.

HSU has the fourth highest fees in the system. It was noted that HSU is unique in that all athletics are funded through student fees. There are system-wide, ongoing discussions about how the fees can and cannot be used. Senate Eschker forwarded a chart comparing student fees across campuses to all senators via email.

Justus Ortega will chair the Appointments and Elections Committee for Spring 2014. The Committee selects its own chair.

Jeffry Borgeld (Oceanography) has been reappointed to the position of Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) for a three-year term.

Merry Phillips, Senate Office ASC will be retiring April 1.

5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members ([Written reports](#))

Appointments and Elections Committee (AEC) (Ortega): The results of the recent General Faculty election and runoff have been distributed. The election for vacant positions on the UFPC will be held soon. The Committee is drafting a resolution to amend Appendix J to make it possible to have only one candidate for a vacant UFPC position on the General Faculty election ballot.

Chair Zerbe announced that newly-elected senators will be invited to a University Senate meeting in April to participate in the election of Senate officers for 2014/15.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) (Virnoche): The Committee continues to make progress on its agenda and is close to reaching a decision on the electronic WPAF system. A draft of the revised teaching evaluation instrument will be reviewed at the Committee's next meeting.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC approved another revision of the Certificate Guidelines and provided the Academic Policies Committee Chair with feedback and ideas for a policy on co-scheduled dual courses.

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) (Eschker): The Committee met on Friday and heard the remaining augmented budget requests. Members are ranking requests and will meet on Friday to discuss the rankings as a committee.

Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) (Eschker): A legislative day will be held on April 22 in Sacramento. Senate Eschker will be attending and asked people to let him know if they have concerns they would like him to relay to legislators and legislative staff.

Associated Students (AS) (Ercole): AS will host a budget hearing on Saturday to review proposed budgets from AS programs. AS was successful in getting the Library to extend its hours on Fridays and Saturdays and will be encouraging students to take advantage of the extended hours. Tabling for the upcoming AS election will begin on Friday. Senators were asked to encourage students they know to participate in student governance.

California Faculty Association (CFA)-HSU Chapter (Shaeffer): CFA Chapter President Shaeffer met with Colleen Mullery, Senior AVP for Faculty Affairs-Human Resources, to discuss policy implications for identification of student respondents to online teaching evaluations [per Senate Resolution #14-13/14-FAC]. The Contract states that student evaluations must be "anonymous." It may be possible to make the HSU evaluations "confidential" rather than anonymous. However, since the original issue is now a Level II grievance, they feel it would be best to wait and see what the outcome of the grievance is before proceeding. The same issues and concerns expressed at last Fall's Senate meeting regarding anonymous student evaluations are being discussed at the statewide level with people from the Chancellor's Office.

Q: What is the timeline in terms of waiting? Could the campus go ahead and act now, for example, draft an MOU? A: It's not clear what the process for changing it for this campus would be since it is part of the CBA; for example, would it require the faculty to vote on it?

Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (VP Blake): Friday is John Capaccio's last day after thirty years at HSU. There will be a party for him in the Great Hall. Peggy Metzger has been appointed as the Director of Financial Aid.

A question was raised about the written report for the Academic Policies Committee (APC): "... regarding the details about the Presidential Service-Learning Leader Designation for transcripts." Chair Mola explained that a faculty member approached the APC about having a designation on the student transcript, like the presidential scholar designation, recognizing leadership in service learning. There are other meetings and discussions happening on campus, and the President has invited people to a meeting in mid-March. It is very early in the process and while the APC has concerns, it is a long way from being ready to bring to the Senate.

6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – [February 25, 2014](#)

The following items were approved without objection:

13-398 – 13-402: HSU Program Change for Biology, Botany, and Zoology

13-407: Forestry - Fire Ecology Minor program change

13-408: Forestry Minor - Program change

13-416: ENGR 331: Thermodynamics & Energy Systems I.

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

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

8. Resolution on Special Cases of Administrative-Academic Probation and Disqualification (#12-13/14-APC) – Second Reading

Resolution on Special Cases of Administrative-Academic Probation and Disqualification

12-13/14-APC – February 25, 2014 – Second 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 read 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 language of EO 1038 has been incorporated 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, has also been developed.

Second Reading of the Resolution: The delay in bringing the resolution back to the Senate involved getting a legal opinion from the Chancellor's Office. Changes have been made to the policy to reflect who it would apply to. It was an intentional decision not to include a specific list of programs that the policy would apply to, so as to not have to change the policy every time a program changes. Instead, clarifying notes will be provided.

Discussion:

Q: Why is the section on notification under Administrative-Academic Probation deleted? A: It was not known why it was deleted; possible because it was duplicated elsewhere in the policy.

It was suggested that since the deletion has created some confusion, the language be reinstated. It will need to go back to the Committee to amend the policy.

Additionally, it was recommended that parallel language for the appeals process be added.

M/S/U (Fulgham/Meyer) to send the resolution and policy back to the Academic Policies Committee to add the recommended language to the policy and make other recommended editorial changes to the resolution.

9. Resolution on Course Substitutions to Create Articulation Agreements (#32-13/14-APC) – First Reading

M/S (Mola/Ortega) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Course Substitutions to Initiate Articulation Agreements #32-13/14-APC – February 25, 2014 – First Reading

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (the Senate) recommends to the President that our current process, known as the *Petition to Substitute*, be modified such that when agreed upon by the student's advisor, the chair of the department whose course is the subject of the substitution and the Dean or designee in the appropriate college, the approved petition *by default* gives the HSU Registrar's office the authority to initiate an articulation agreement between HSU and the other institution ; and be it further

Resolved: That there also be a mechanism on the petition such that the department whose course is the subject of the substitution may make an exception to the above default, thereby allowing only for the one-time substitution for a particular student.

Rationale: Our students arrive on the HSU campus from a myriad of locations and prior institutions. Many of them have completed coursework that should articulate with our courses but we may not yet have an articulation agreement with their prior institution. The Petition to Substitute allows for such students to substitute a course from another institution to be used as a degree requirement in place of an HSU course, upon approval by the student's advisor, the chair of the department whose course is the subject of the substitution and the Dean or designee in the appropriate college. This resolution would allow the registrar's office to automatically initiate articulation agreements with the students prior intuitions based on the curricular review required for the agreed upon substitution(s), requiring signatures from the appropriate parties. In cases where the substitution is approved by the appropriate

stakeholders but an articulation agreement should not be made, there will be an exception to allow the substitution to count only for that individual student rather than initiate the articulation agreement process.

Senator Mola introduced the resolution. Its purpose is to allow the Registrar's Office, by default, to initiate the articulation process. The current process requires students to gather several signatures from different office locations. This will decrease the time students will have to spend on the process. In addition, the resolution provides an exception to the default process for a one-time only substitution for a particular student, on a case by case basis.

Discussion:

An exception for one-time only substitution might be made in the case where a student needs a particular course to graduate – the substitution may not be ideal but the department may be willing to make an exception. Another example given was that a transfer student might be allowed to substitute a STAT 108 course for a STAT 109 course under a particular circumstance.

Articulation is an agreement from course to course; it doesn't take into account context, so the provision for exceptions is needed.

Q: Is there a sense of how this might affect workloads? A: Currently department chairs do the articulation agreements and substitutions. This should create less work in the long run.

10. Resolution on Counting More Than One CWT Course Toward Upper Division GE Requirements (#33-13/14-APC) – First Reading

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

Resolution on Counting More than One CWT Course Toward Upper Division GE Requirements #33-13/14-APC – February 25, 2014 – First Reading

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that the current policy of allowing only one Communication and Ways of Thinking (CWT) course to count toward a student's upper division General Education requirements be amended to allow as many as three CWT courses to count.

Rationale: Currently the HSU Catalog states: "Communication and Ways of Thinking (CWT) courses can address outcomes in multiple GE areas. Students are limited to one CWT course within the upper division component." This limitation of allowing just one CWT course comes from a bygone era and adds to the confusion surrounding our current GE curriculum. Students who may not have known that they have taken multiple CWT courses must petition to have them all count and many students are not even aware that they can petition. Thus, even though a student may have taken a course that satisfies the GE area requirements, they cannot count it towards their degree. Recent students who have petitioned the Vice Provost of Academic Programs to count multiple CWT courses toward their upper division GE requirements have been consistently approved. Finally, if a course has shown that it satisfies the student learning outcomes in multiple areas of upper division GE, the course should be allowed to count towards a student's degree requirements regardless of whether they have taken a previous CWT course or not.

This policy would *not* allow a student to count *a single course* toward two or more upper division GE requirements.

Senator Mola introduced the resolution. There is one sentence in the HSU Catalog that defines CWT (Communication and Ways of Thinking) courses which were created a few decades ago to satisfy multiple areas of GE at the same time. There are only about fifteen courses left and many of them satisfy only one area of GE. But the Catalog states that students can only use one of these courses to satisfy upper-division area requirements. The last sentence of the resolved clause ensures that a single course cannot satisfy more than one requirement.

Discussion:

Q: How (or will) this change the current CWT courses listed in the Catalog and what was the original intent behind them? A: The resolution doesn't intend to change anything about what current courses are doing; it just allows students to count courses that satisfy learning outcomes in upper-division areas.

Q: Is there a slightly different way to approach the question, for example, eliminate the CWT course designation in its entirety? A: The Committee would be in favor of that, but for now, decided to wait and see what happens with GE reform before taking that step.

It was suggested that the courses be dual listed and the CWT designation eliminated.

There is a document on the ICC website from May 1997 that established CWT courses, which were states the original goal. It was an attempt to create interdisciplinary courses.

The change will eliminate the need for students to file petitions.

It was proposed that the course designation "CWT" be eliminated at the same time. A straw poll was taken and was unanimously in favor of eliminating the course designation.

M/S (Meyer/Cervantes) to waive the second reading of the resolution. Voting occurred and PASSED with one No vote.

Second Reading Discussion:

M/S (Karl/Fulgham) to revise the resolved clause as follows:

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that the current policy of allowing only one Communication and Ways of Thinking (CWT) course to count toward a student's upper division General Education requirements be amended to allow as many as three distinct CWT courses to count in three distinct upper-division GE areas.

Voting on the amendment occurred and PASSED with one Abstention.

M/S (Bruce/Fulgham) to add a second resolved clause as follows: That the Office of the Registrar grandfather this policy for students currently enrolled in Fall 2014.

Discussion of the amendment:

Students must choose a Catalog version; they can't be grandfathered in.

The Advising Center could be asked to advise students about this change; but current students shouldn't be grandfathered in.

Voting occurred and the amendment Failed.

Voting on the amended resolution occurred and PASSED with 1 No vote and 1 Abstention.

The approved resolution reads as follows:

Resolution on Counting More than One CWT Course Toward Upper Division GE Requirements
#33-13/14-APC – February 25, 2014 – Second Reading Waived

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that the current policy of allowing only one Communication and Ways of Thinking (CWT) course to count toward a student's upper division General Education requirements be amended to allow as many as three distinct CWT courses to count in three distinct upper-division GE areas.

Rationale: Currently the HSU Catalog states: "Communication and Ways of Thinking (CWT) courses can address outcomes in multiple GE areas. Students are limited to one CWT course within the upper division component." This limitation of allowing just one CWT course comes from a bygone era and adds to the confusion surrounding our current GE curriculum. Students who may not have known that they have taken multiple CWT courses must petition to have them all count and many students are not even aware that they can petition. Thus, even though a student may have taken a course that satisfies the GE area requirements, they cannot count it towards their degree. Recent students who have petitioned the Vice Provost of Academic Programs to count multiple CWT courses toward their upper division GE requirements have been consistently approved. Finally, if a course has shown that it satisfies the student learning outcomes in multiple areas of upper division GE, the course should be allowed to count towards a student's degree requirements regardless of whether they have taken a previous CWT course or not. This policy would *not* allow a student to count *a single course* toward two or more upper division GE requirements.

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

The Academic Policies Committee will take into consideration the straw poll in favor of eliminating the CWT course designation.

11. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30 PM – Information Item: Restructuring the University's Foundations and Auxiliary Organizations

Vice President Wruck and Vice President Lopes provided background information and an update on a proposal to reorganize the University's foundations and auxiliary organizations. Last year, President Richmond convened a task force to look at the current structure of the University's foundation and auxiliary organizations and find out if there were ways to make them more efficient and to improve the ways in which they serve the university. The large task force met

over the summer and into the Fall and made a recommendation to the President (included in the Senate packet). It was recommended that the Associated Students remain somewhat independent and that the other three organizations could be reorganized together. President Richmond was supportive of the recommendation and appointed two technical working groups to work out the details.

Vice President Lopes is leading the working group on administrative matters (business practices, human resources, etc.) and the group is charged with determining whether or not the proposed reorganization would result in economic savings. Vice President Wruck will lead the group focusing on governance issues. They are learning a lot about the legal matters that govern these entities in addition to all of the CSU policies and procedures.

The groups are supposed to report back to the President by the end of March and they have informed the President that they will not be able to meet that timeline.

Discussion:

Concerns were expressed about the Foundation Task Force “Executive Summary” – it is not clear what is being proposed. Additionally, it would be helpful to know who the task force members were. The memo presents the Associated Students as just another auxiliary, but it is unique and should not be lumped in with the rest. In less than a decade, the campus will have turned one foundation into two and now seems to be returning to one. It would help to explain the reasons why this is being proposed.

Vice President Wruck responded that the initial expectation was that it would be a simple matter to merge the four entities into one in order to create efficiencies. However, early on it was recognized that the Associated Students was unique and independent. Not having been on campus ten years ago with the foundations were separated, he did not know all of the reasons behind that decision. The idea behind this proposal is to have governing boards that would create policy while the day to day work would be managed in separate operational units.

Concern was expressed about the separation of responsibilities and why these major changes are taking place at the end of President Richmond’s tenure rather than waiting for the new President.

The President appointed the task force before he announced his retirement. Exploring these possibilities is important work that needs to be done. It will be handed off to the new President to continue.

It was clarified that the University Center is a Student Union – it is run by students and was paid for by a student bond. The proposed change could have huge financial consequences for Associated Students.

The effort underway is exploratory; there is no reason it should not proceed. The business process issues and the governance issues need to be sorted out along with the pros and cons of other aspects like combining funds to increase cash flow for allocating money to PI’s and

departments. After being appointed, the new president will be involved in the learning and decision-making process. This will not be decided without the new president.

In the spirit of shared governance, it would be good to ensure that the people who will be affected by the decisions are informed and included in the exploratory process.

Q: Half of the entities involved are student-run. Are the members of task forces proportionally based? A: Student members for the task forces would be welcome.

Q: Are the working groups aware of how this has affected other schools? A: The working group on administrative matters has visited the East Bay campus and plans to get more information from other campuses.

It was clarified that the "Task Force Recommendation" is a recommendation to pursue the possibility of reorganization; it is not recommending this structure and there is not pre-determined outcome.

Concern was expressed that the "Task Force Recommendation" makes it appear as if "the train has left the station."

The president's email and charge the working groups makes it clearer that this is an exploratory process.

Q: What does the Student Union represent? A: As they look at the University Center, the working groups are trying to better understand which pieces need to be part of the Student Union and which may be better as part of a business enterprise entity.

Students are concerned about losing the business enterprise and the financial cost it would have to Associated Students programs.

It was recommended that periodic reports from the working groups be scheduled.

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 pm.