

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, November 2, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was not present.

Members present: Berman, Crowder-Fiore, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Heise, Kelly, Knox, Madar, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Reiss, Richmond, Rizzardi, Rodriguez, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, VerLinden, Webb, Yzaguirre.

Members absent: Altschul, Tripp, Van Duzer, Whitlatch, Harper-McPike.

Proxies: Crowder-Fiore for Cheyne, Reiss for Craig, Shaeffer for Goodman, Mola for Powell, Thobaben for Yarnall.

Guests: Rawal, Creadon, Burges, Ayoob, Smith, Lee.

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

A memorial service for Professor George Estrada will be held on Saturday, November 6, 10:30 am at Sacred Heart Church in Eureka. There will be a gathering at noon, at St. Bernard's Parish Hall, Eureka.

The meeting agenda was reviewed and explained.

## **2. TIME CERTAIN: 4:05-4:20 pm – Presentation on the Graduation Rate Improvement Program (Jyoti Rawal, Associate Dean, Academic Programs/UGS/GS)**

Chair VerLinden invited Jyoti Rawal to give the Senate a report on campus efforts towards improving graduation rates, as well as to provide ongoing updates in the future. The Graduation Rate Improvement Initiative from the Chancellor's Office (CO) is supported by the Provost and the President, and faculty need to be aware of what is happening locally.

Jyoti Rawal presented information on the work of the Graduation Rate Improvement Work Group at HSU. In 2009 a group was convened to look at graduation rates and develop a plan for increasing them, as part of a system-wide effort. Each CSU campus has developed its own plan.

Currently, the HSU Plan is looking at three main issues:

- 1) Early Alert System: Many CSU campuses are using this already, both as a technological tool and as a process tool. The system alerts students, faculty, and advisers as to how students are doing early in the semester so that any needed intervention can occur in a timely manner.

- 2) First-year experience: HSU has used FIGS (freshman interest groups) in the past to provide a first-year experience for students. However, the FIGS only dealt with a small number of students. The group would like to see it expanded and used for a larger freshmen group.
- 3) Advising: Advising is being reviewed at both the faculty and staff level, and the group will be forwarding recommendations soon.

The Work Group is also looking at student learning outcomes in terms of work done in service centers (Multicultural Center, Clubs & Activities Office, etc.)

Discussion:

Q: What is the timeline? A: Different projects have different timelines. The timelines are included in the HSU Graduation Rate Improvement Plan.

Q: Is there a deadline from the Chancellor's Office (CO)? A: No. The Plan has been submitted and will be updated as it is implemented.

Q: Are there student learning outcomes for clubs? A: The work group is thinking about how to come up with learning outcomes for student services areas, such as the Clubs & Activities Office, the Multicultural Center, etc. Research indicates that there are a number of ways to engage students, some with higher impact than others. This is what learning outcomes would try to measure.

It was noted that part of the HSU Plan includes reducing the achievement gap for underrepresented minority students.

### **3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of October 26, 2010**

A quorum was present.

M/S/U (Thobaben/Mortazavi) approve the minutes from the meeting of October 26, 2010 as written.

### **4. Resolution on Mandatory Early Start Programs (#10-10/11-English Department)**

M/S (Shaeffer/Mortazavi) to place the resolution on the floor.

#### **RESOLUTION ON MANDATORY EARLY START PROGRAMS**

#10-10/11-English Department – November 2, 2010

Background:

The CSU Board of Trustees has proposed mandatory Early Start Programs beginning in the summer of 2012. Eventually all incoming students deficient in English and/or Mathematics as measured by the EPT and ELM will be required to begin making up those deficiencies before matriculation.

Funding for these summer remediation courses is unclear. The Board of Trustees has indicated that there will be no additional funding provided for this instruction.

The Academic Senate of the CSU and the English Council of the CSU have opposed implementation of the mandatory Early Start Programs.

**WHEREAS** The CSU Board of Trustees has proposed mandatory Early Start programs beginning in the summer of 2012; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of the CSU has identified the following concerns regarding the mandatory Early Start Programs that have been proposed by the CSU Board of Trustees (AS-2895-09/APEP/AA):

- The legality of denying admission to fully qualified first-time freshmen (FTF);
- The limitation of access for economically disadvantaged students;
- The financial aid implications for students;
- The potential hardship for out-of-area students;
- The shift of mandatory instruction to a non-traditional instructional session;
- The presumed desirability of identifying reciprocal “early start” programs for the CSU system;
- The paucity of evidence-based, longitudinal data on the effectiveness and social impact of “early start” programs; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University supports the commitments expressed by the Academic Senate of the California State University in AS-2895-09/APEPAA (“Opposition to Impending Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs”) and in AS-2926-09/AA/APEP (“Recommendations Regarding the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs”) and the “CSU English Council Position Statement: Mandatory Early Start” (April 2010); and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University values the regional character of individual campuses and the diversity of their student populations, and affirms the necessity of diverse campus approaches to ensure that students who fully meet entrance requirements for first-time freshmen, but who require additional skill acquisition (remediation) in English, achieve proficiency during their first year of enrollment; be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University opposes the use of tests such as the EPT (English Placement Test), which were originally designed as placement instruments, to either grant or deny otherwise qualified first-time freshmen admission to HSU; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University urges that, prior to implementation of any “early start” programs in English, the CSU ensure that serious attention be paid to the financial consequences—both to campuses and to individual students—resulting from the various “early start” approaches; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University opposes the implementation of “early start” programs in English as a pre-condition for enrollment at the HSU campus; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU, campus Presidents, Provosts and Senate Chairs, the Chair of the English Council of the CSU, and the Chair of the Mathematics Council of the CSU.

Professor Mary Ann Creadon (English Department) gave a brief introduction to the resolution and provided a handout detailing the English Department's rationale for opposing the Early Start program. The program is an unfunded mandate from the CO. The campus will have to fund the program and the cost will be passed along to the students. Students will admitted, and if told they need to complete the Early Start Program, will not be allowed to enroll until they have completed it. Campuses are to submit plans to the CO, and if the CO doesn't like the campus plans, it may impose a standardized plan. The autonomy of the faculty and the campus is at stake. The program should be opposed for ethical and pedagogical reasons. The HSU administration is coming up with a plan that it will submit by Nov. 19. It is important for the faculty at HSU to express its opposition.

#### Discussion:

- Q: Is the opposition to having any kind of Early Start Program, or is it to the fact that it is mandatory? A: There is no opposition to a voluntary program. Summer Bridge programs and others that have been offered have been good. It is a problem though, to admit students, and then tell them that they cannot enroll in classes.
- Q: If this is an unfunded mandate, will money being taken out of remediation and put into Early Start? Is this a labor question and is the union involved? A: These are questions that the English Council has asked. The product and the delivery of the product did not necessarily have to happen.
- The person leading this program at the CO is Trustee Herb Carter. He is concerned about the preparation of underrepresented students entering the CSU system. Arguments about the morality or immorality of it should not be used. The program will probably be paid for on the self-support side (i.e., Extended Education). The logistics are overwhelming and it is difficult to envision how it will get done. Full remediation is not being required. Mathematics has come up with a plan that is fairly straightforward and can be implemented. The CO is waiting to see what the plans from the campuses look like. It is not developing a plan.
- A lot of questions have been raised by academic affairs administrators in the CSU. There is hope that the plans that are being submitted will reflect the complexity of the situation and that the CO will realize what it is taking on. Some campuses have found very creative ways to implement Early Start. For example, Long Beach is encouraging high school students to take a preventative approach to avoid the need for remediation. Solutions don't have to involve HSU personnel. HSU can partner with AP programs, etc. There are opportunities that would not require extensive resources, but would enable students to be better prepared.
- Q: What about the current services being offered and how would the HSU plan collaborate with the Learning Center? A: 80% of HSU students come from out of the area, so the Summer Bridge program would not work for them. Involving the Learning Center is unknown.

- HSU already admits students provisionally. However, HSU is not in the same position as other CSU campuses; it will have to rely heavily on other campuses to provide Early Start programs for its out of the area students. Once students are admitted, financial aid will have to be provided. There are a lot of unanswered questions about the program.
- The California Faculty Association is concerned primarily about the fact that Early Start will place an undue burden on students who cannot afford it and that many of the students affected by the policy are from underrepresented populations.
- It was noted that there is a waiver for students who cannot afford to take Early Start.
- The plan is discriminatory in its effect, even though that was not the original intention.
- Once upon a time, it was felt that remediation was not appropriate, and that students should not be admitted to HSU or the CSU unless they were qualified and prepared for college-level work. The Early Start Program sounds good at a basic level. The problem is that there is no money to support it. The HSU Mathematics Department met with the College Dean to discuss it. The faculty has not been engaged any further in the process of developing a plan.

M/S/F (Moyer/Rizzardi) to end debate and vote immediately. Voting occurred and the motion **FAILED** with only 4 Yes votes.

Chair VerLinden announced that further discussion of the resolution will occur, if needed, following the remaining agenda items. If the Senate wishes to propose any re-wording of the resolution, Senator Shaeffer will notify the English Department. It is hoped that the resolution will be passed before the November 19<sup>th</sup> deadline for campus plans to be submitted.

#### **5. TIME CERTAIN: 4:40 pm – Discussion of Draft university senate constitution and bylaws**

Little input was received during the last Senate meeting on the proposed University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC). However, input was received after the meeting, and based on that, the Faculty Affairs Committee has re-written the charge to the committee. Copies of the new draft were distributed and Senator Knox led the discussion and invited feedback from members of the senate.

Senator Knox gave an overview of the remaining process. The committee will work on getting constitutional language to the Senate, incorporating all of the feedback received so far. A web site will be set up with the draft documents posted for review by the campus community. Two town hall forums will be held the week before Thanksgiving Break for public comment. Feedback from those meetings will be incorporated and brought back to the Senate, in the form of a proposed model and replacement for the general faculty constitution. The Senate will review the document and develop a resolution for forwarding it to the general faculty for a vote. There will be another set of town hall meetings scheduled to provide information on the new constitution before the general faculty vote.

Q: Does the process include having a faculty-only group discuss the nature of the faculty constitution? A: No.

Q: What is the Maddox report? A: It is a report from a consultant who visited the campus two years ago and provided a report with a number of recommendations on budget processes for HSU.

Discussion of the University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC):

The document says that this committee will be a subcommittee of the University Senate and will report to the University Senate and the Senate makes recommendations to the President. Does this eliminate the University Budget Committee? The Long Beach model, which this is based on, has a university budget committee that makes recommendations and also has a senate subcommittee that looks at a range of issues. The Long Beach senate's subcommittee does not formulate the university's budget.

Response: Long Beach has a resource planning task force that is involved with the planning of the university's budget. The task force is responsible to the university senate, but the senate gives the task force the authority to act, without coming to the senate. The constitutions from both Long Beach and San Diego have language that gives authority to act to various subcommittees and task forces.

The annual budget process at Long Beach does not go through the senate. This proposed model indicates that the annual university budget would go through the senate. How is it possible to implement that? The current charge is not clear as to who is responsible for what level of decision-making. For example, who determines the allocation of faculty positions?

Response: The intent is that this group (URPC) will have a broad charge, part of which will be the annual budget process. The URPC may assign that process to a subcommittee. Budget presentations would be made to the subcommittee, not to the senate. This is a broad committee that has jurisdiction over the budget, which might have a number of subcommittees under it. Language regarding the committee not being involved in budget decisions at the level of the colleges has been considered.

Chair VerLinden suggested that individuals with lists of specific concerns forward them to the Faculty Affairs Committee to be addressed.

Q: Is this committee supposed to replace the University Budget Committee? A: That is the idea.

Q: Why does a whole new committee need to be created to do this? A: So that the Senate can take some of the conversations that have been occurring on the floor of the senate and have them dealt with by a committee and brought to the senate. Currently, the senate does not have a mechanism for this.

Based on past experience with the University Budget Committee, the efficacy of this scheme is questionable. How can this replace the current process, without also changing the structure of the University Executive Committee and integrating it into this process? Will the vice presidents still be constructing their own budgets and presenting them to this proposed committee? It is not clear as to who is constructing the budget and how the budget will be constructed.

Q: Will this committee replace the University Budget committee? A: Yes.

It was noted that the Senate passed a resolution disagreeing with the composition of the current University Budget Committee.

Concerns have been expressed about micromanagement of the budget. They should be addressed in the proposal. A clear delegation of authority is needed to avoid problems. It should be clear and well-articulated as to where shared governance is occurring and where authority is being delegated.

Both Long Beach and San Diego have groups with clear processes and procedures for developing annual budgets. Could this proposed group be charged with developing that type of process?

The scope of the proposed committee's decision-making needs to be well-defined. For example, the first bullet under "the Committee shall" includes "one-time funds." Are these one-time funds at the division level, or at the university level?

It is important to define the scope of the committee's work. If it is too broad, it will be difficult to find individuals to have the time to serve, without the allocation of release time, etc.

There needs to be something in place that helps the entire faculty feel that everyone is being treated fairly. In the past there have been administrators who have exhibited less benevolence than others.

Senator Knox welcomed feedback and input and suggestions for possible wording. One of the challenges of drafting constitutional language and proposing new committees is that it is difficult to get everything right from the start. As new committees begin their work, they will need to work some of the details out. The Senate needs to strike a balance between getting started with a new model and spending excessive time on finer details which can be worked out later.

Q: Why can't the San Diego model just be adapted for local use, rather than trying to reinvent it? A: The Faculty Affairs Committee started to do that. It is now making changes based on what the Committee has discussed and what people have brought to the Committee. Part of the problem is that San Diego is much bigger in scale. The Committee decided to use the Long Beach model for the budget process, since that is what HSU's current budget process was modeled on.

The idea of having the senate chair elected by the general faculty has gotten support. Senator Knox asked how senators felt about having the senate chair serve for more than one year.

Discussion:

An alternative was suggested: the senate would have a chair-elect who serves one year before becoming the senate chair. This also would provide an additional faculty on the University Executive Committee.

It was noted that a two-year term cause senators serving the last year of their term to be ineligible, unless there is a proviso that if elected, their term would be extended for one year. Otherwise, the pool of candidates will be limited.

The Chair-Elect could automatically become a chair of one of the standing committees.

A Chair-elect position would create same problem as a two-year term for senators in the last year of their term.

Q: Would nominations for the senate chair be open to the general faculty? A: The committee discussed this and feels that it should be someone with senate experience, or someone currently serving on the senate.

It was recommended that it be someone currently serving on the senate. Someone with experience may have served in the past, and would not be up on the current issues before the senate.

Nominations would need to come from the senate; members of the general faculty would not know the senators well enough.

Comments made so far point to a need to elect individuals to the senate who have potential for leadership roles.

Discussion returned to agenda item #4: Resolution on Mandatory Early Start Programs (#10-10/11-English Department):

- The reason why the ASCSU and other local senates feel the Early Start Program is problematic is that it did not go through the statewide senate. The Board of Trustees (BOT) bypassed the ASCSU on several issues last year. The HSU Senate should support this resolution which is a statement of principle. It is important for the Senate to go on record stating the concerns that have been raised.
- It was clarified, if the resolution passed, it will not be forwarded to the President for approval. It will be forwarded as an information item and will be distributed as indicated in the last resolved clause.



- It doesn't seem like this would be very effective in terms of preparing students. There are other affordable opportunities for students, for example, community colleges, that offer good programs and are effective in preparing students.

Chair VerLinden asked if there were speakers against the resolution, since the majority who have spoken already have been in favor of the resolution.

- It is not possible to remediate students in six weeks, but the Early Start Program will at least get them started. The details of the Early Start Program as presented are not supported. However, the purpose of the resolution before the senate is unclear. This is not worthy of putting up a fight against at this point. The resolution doesn't accomplish anything. The general concept of Early Start can be supported. The details as presented are objectionable, but the CSU just needs to give it a try.
- It is not clear what the consequences of 'not' trying to help students early on would be. One of the problems in higher education is that we don't often experiment and try new things. This should at least be given a try.
- The Senate has repeatedly passed symbolic resolutions in support of important principals. It is important for the Senate to take sides with colleagues in the English Department and pass the resolution and forward it throughout the campus system.
- This is a curricular matter and the faculty should have a voice in it, and not just go quietly into the night. Both of the ASCSU resolutions affirm the program, but not the implementation. That is what this resolution does. Faculty need to speak up. Mathematics should be added to the resolution.
- It was noted that administrators at HSU have tried to consult with departments on the curriculum, but if departments choose not to participate in the process, then it is left for administrators to do it themselves.
- Q: What percentage of HSU students does this apply to? A: About half of students entering HSU.
- It was suggested that a better distribution of student fees might be toward supporting this initiative, rather than going to athletics (only 5% of HSU students).

M/S (Flashman/Kelly) to amend the resolution by adding "Mathematics" to places in the resolution where "English" is mentioned.

Discussion of the amendment:

- The amendment was strongly opposed. The Math Department voted against this; it is not fair to include Mathematics.

- It was noted that the Math Department vote was not an overwhelming majority and that Math remediation affects many departments across campus.
- The Math Council, at the system level, is working on implementing Early Start; it has not opposed it like the English Council has. The Math Council is working towards a flexible and reasonable solution.
- What will campuses do with students who fail after going through Early Start? The tests that are being offered are not qualified as admission tests. There is no longitudinal data that indicates that this will be successful or not.
- It doesn't make sense to throw a program at students that will not work.
- If Math wants to bring a similar resolution, they can. This amendment should be voted down.
- Pre-testing and post-testing provides empirical evidence. And there is nothing that states that if students fail Early Start, they will not be admitted. It is not a pass or fail program.

M/S/P (Mola/Faulk) to end debate and vote immediately. Voting occurred and motion **PASSED** with 19 Yes votes and 1 No vote.

Voting on the amendment occurred and motion **FAILED**, with 1 Yes vote, and 1 Abstention.

M/S/P (Mortazavi/Thobaben) to end debate on the main resolution and vote immediately. Voting occurred and motion **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

Voting on Resolution #10-10/11-English Dept. occurred and the resolution **PASSED**.

#### **6. TIME CERTAIN: 5:40 pm – Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-Officio Members**

President Richmond reported on resolutions coming to the Board of Trustees next week. The BOT is proposing a two-step process for increasing tuition: 5% for next semester and 10% for 2011/2012. The legislature will be asked to pay the tuition increase for 2011/2011.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.