

Draft Background and Summary of Proposal Associated with Proposed University Senate - February 1, 2011

In their February 2, 2010 report, *Building the Capacity for Change: Improving the structure and culture of Decision making at HSU*, the Cabinet for Institutional Change made specific recommendations with regard to campus governance at HSU (Section 2 of the Focus Areas). In the background discussion the Cabinet provided, they noted that "...all constituencies should be directly involved in developing policy that reflects shared goals, and that policy proposals should be fully developed by the time they reach the full Senate for review and recommendation to the President. The Administration should approve and implement policy, and while the Senate can take up any matter it chooses, it should not become entangled with implementation" (p.9). The three primary proposals discussed in the document are:

1. Restructure the existing Academic Senate into a University-wide Senate
 - a. Faculty should be majority but all four constituencies should have voting representation
 - b. Senate should be action oriented rather than primarily a debating body; policy details should be hammered out at the Council level
2. Restructure the university committee system
 - a. Create a coordinated system at the same time that the Senate is restructured and new bylaws are written
3. Eliminate the General Faculty Association and incorporation of certain social activities into a university-wide group.

On February 23, 2010 the Academic Senate discussed the recommendations of the Cabinet and passed two resolutions in response to the recommendations:

Resolution 20 – 09/10 EX endorsing in principle the recommendations of the CIC as presented in the February 2nd report, "...with the exception of the recommendations on campus governance."

Resolution 21 – 09/10 EX endorsing in principle the restructuring of the Academic Senate and the restructuring of committee structures, and recommending that the CIC proposal for elimination of the General Faculty Association be "...forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote, listing the pros and cons of eliminating the General Faculty Association.

The governance issues were referred by the Senate to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Based on a report from that committee, the Senate charged the committee to "begin articulating, in written form and to the wider HSU community, a new Senate structure for HSU, a *University Senate* built on the model of the Senate at SDSU..." (April 2, 2010). The Faculty Affairs committee was expanded for this purpose by the Senate to include a staff representative, the President of the Associated Students and the CFA Chapter President. The committee began work on this assignment late last spring and has continued its work through the fall, bringing components of the project to the Academic Senate for input as work has progressed. Documents used as resources in this work include, the General Faculty Association

Constitution, which also creates the Academic Senate and provides its constitutional structure (Appendix E), the Bylaws of the Academic Senate (Appendix F), the Faculty Handbook which describes committees and committee structures, The CIC report, the Maddox Report, the WASC report, the San Diego State University Senate constitution and website, the Long Beach State website, the Senate Recommendations on the University Budget committee. As we have examined and requested input on components of the work, documents have been posted on the Academic Senate website and the CIC website. Two townhalls were held during the fall semester to further solicit input.

Academic Senate

It is important to understand that in agreeing to give up the Academic Senate and support the creation of a University Senate, the faculty would be choosing, in the interests of sharing governance and building community, to change an institution which has been traditionally been the voice of the faculty into an institution which would be a voice for the community. As the constitution of the Statewide Academic Senate states, “ As the official voice of the faculty in matters of systemwide concern, the Academic Senate of the California State University provides the means for the faculty to participate in the collegial form of governance which is based on historic academic traditions as recognized by California law.” Retrieved from <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/> January 20, 2011. Academic Senates, at HSU and across the nation, have been the official voice of faculty for many years. California state law, as embodied in HEERA, recognizes the role and responsibilities of the academic senate and recognizes that there are issues directly connected to the circumstances of faculty work that are not part of the “scope of representation” by the collective bargaining unit. These include:

3562 (r)(3) Admission requirements for students, conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students, and the content and conduct of courses, curricula, and research programs.

(4) Criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees, which shall be the joint responsibility of the academic senate and the trustees.

Retrieved from <http://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.asp#ST3562> January 20, 2011.

It is in these areas, and in areas such as budget which directly affect the faculty’s ability to conduct its responsibility for courses, curricula, research and evaluation, that the heart of shared governance lies. The faculty union does not and cannot speak on these issues directly. Yet the faculty has a recognized responsibility, as well as critical expertise and experience, with regard to decision making in these areas. This role is embodied at the system wide level in the State Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University was created by the Constitution of the General Faculty. It serves as the primary voice of the faculty and is given its powers by the General Faculty Constitution. It is not a body of the University; it is a body of the General Faculty. Over the years at HSU our Academic Senate has gradually become a somewhat more inclusive body; administrators, staff and students have been added to the faculty membership, though in small numbers and with limited voting privileges. As a faculty delegate body, the Academic Senate was designed to be a representative body and membership was apportioned based on size of constituent academic units.

What has been suggested, based on the recommendation of the CIC and the suggestion that we use SDSU as a model, is a University Senate which is a deliberative body (not representative) that includes delegates (not proportional representatives) from the broad constituencies of the University – faculty, staff, administrators and students (not academic units). Such a body, while still having a majority of faculty, would no longer be an Academic Senate and would not have the express responsibility of representing the voice of the faculty. Creating a University Senate in which the faculty members are a majority simply recognizes the primary responsibility of faculty for leadership in shared governance in the areas identified above: the entry into, conduct and content of courses, curricula and research programs, and the criteria and standards for faculty evaluation. The inclusion of staff, administrators and students in a University Senate recognizes that faculty members do not engage in these activities in a vacuum, that the life of the community is highly interdependent and that there are many different kinds of expertise and perspectives that we need to capitalize on as a community as we make decisions. The work of the University is also complex and involves some elements which go beyond these areas and yet require community discussion and benefit from community involvement in governing. A University Senate provides a venue that recognizes this complexity.

If the General Faculty of HSU decide to give up the Academic Senate and support the creation of a University Senate that is independent of the General Faculty Constitution, thereby entrusting that independent deliberative body to take on a portion of the responsibilities of the faculty, then there still needs to be a means for the faculty to make decisions with regard to the discharge or delegation of its responsibilities. This balance is accomplished in different universities that have a university senate in different ways. In the SDSU model, it is accomplished through two mechanisms: one is the provision for a “faculty session” of the University Senate which structurally supports discussion/action on content that is specific to the responsibilities of the faculty; the other is the provision for the calling of a special meeting of the general faculty for the purpose of discussion/action of such content which might lead to a recommendation from the general faculty to the University Senate or to a direct action by the faculty independent of the University Senate. Both of these provisions appear in the proposed University Senate Constitution and in the proposed revisions to the General Faculty Constitution. A faculty session of the University Senate might be called for purposes of discussion and voting on content specific to faculty; for example the graduation list or recommendations with regard to standards in Appendix J. The results of such a session would be reported to the University Senate where further discussion/action might occur. In supporting the creation of the University Senate and delegating much of its shared governance responsibility to that body, it would be the intention and expectation of the faculty that the calling of a special General Faculty meeting would be an unusual event.

These are the sources, principles and discussions that have provided background to the proposals before you. In summary, these proposals include:

1. Putting to a vote of the Faculty (because only the General Faculty can change the General Faculty Constitution), a proposal for a University Senate independent of the General Faculty Associate, composed of a majority of faculty but including as voting members delegates of the administration, staff and students and maintaining a revised committee structure designed to

facilitate communication, deliberation and flexibility in engaging the community in governance discussions and recommendations.

2. Putting to a vote of the General Faculty a proposal for a major revision of the General Faculty Constitution which would remove all officers of the general faculty except the President (who would also be Chair of the University Senate), delegate the majority of shared governance responsibilities to the University Senate, and delete some of the current responsibilities of the General Faculty Association.

Summary of Proposals

The following summary is intended to highlight components of the actual documents. *It is not a replacement for the actual documents which propose amendments to the General Faculty Constitution, and provide for the proposed University Senate Bylaws and the Proposed University Senate Constitution.*

Proposed Constitution of the University Senate

Composition of the University Senate

All members would be voting members except the University President.

1. The Chair of the University Senate would be elected by the General Faculty and serve as General Faculty President
2. The positions of Vice Chair and Secretary of the Senate would remain as they currently are. These would be faculty positions, elected by Senate, serving as Chairs of the Faculty Affairs and Academic Policies Committees respectively and counted in the fourteen full time and lecturer faculty listed below.
3. The membership of the University Senate shall include:
 - a. Administrators: University President (non-voting), Provost or designee, one Academic Dean, one MPP appointed by the President
 - b. Staff: three non-Management Personnel Plan (MPP) staff senators elected from permanent non-MPP staff.
 - c. Students: President of the Associated Students, chosen according to the Bylaws of Associated Students and two students, chosen by Associated Students, according to the Bylaws of Associated Students.
 - d. Faculty:
 - i. Eleven full time faculty: two from each college, two from other major academic units (as defined in sec. 4.33 of the Preamble), and three elected at-large
 - ii. Three Lecturers; The electorate shall be all Lecturers holding a .4 or greater appointment.
 - iii. The two Statewide Academic Senate representatives

- iv. Chair of the Integrated Curriculum committee
 - v. Past Chair of the Senate
 - vi. A professor emeritus chosen by procedures specified in the Bylaws of the Humboldt State University Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association
 - vii. President of the faculty collective bargaining unit
- e. The Parliamentarian, who need not be an elected member of the Senate but shall be a member of the Constitution and By Laws Committee. The Parliamentarian shall be appointed annually by the Senate Executive Committee and shall advise the presiding officer on parliamentary issues.

Committees of the University Senate

The proposed Constitution deletes the Student Affairs Committee (which is currently suspended; much of the work it has done in the past could be the responsibility of the Campus Climate Committee)

The proposal adds:

1. the Constitutions and Bylaws Committee which will be particularly important in implementing and monitoring the transition;
2. the Campus Climate Committee which will address some of the recommendations of the CIC, take on some of the responsibilities previously covered by the General Faculty Association and the Student Affairs committee, and assist in addressing policy related to campus life including social events and diversity issues ;
3. the University Resources and Planning Committee which is conceptualized as replacing the University Budget Committee

Other committees of the Senate remain as currently constituted.

Actual language:

Committees of the Senate shall include the Executive Committee, the Academic Policy Committee, the Appointments and Elections Committee, the Constitution and Bylaws committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Integrated Curriculum Committee, the University Budget Committee, the Campus Climate Committee and other ad hoc or pro tempore committees as specified in the Bylaws.

Other committees and councils that report to or through the Senate shall be designated Senate-appointed university committees.

Proposed Changes to the General Faculty Constitution

Continuing components of the General Faculty Constitution:

1. Statement on shared governance
2. Definition of the members of the General Faculty

3. Provision for the election of a General Faculty President who is the University Senate Chair
4. Provision for the election of representatives of the General Faculty on boards or other bodies as may be required to support the work of the University
5. Provisions for the General Faculty to meet
6. Provisions for the General Faculty to raise funds
7. Provisions for the General Faculty to amend the constitution and bylaws of the General Faculty

Changes to the General Faculty Constitution

1. Removes all of Article VI “The Academic Senate” thereby removing the constitution of the Academic Senate from the General Faculty Constitution
2. Replaces the current language in Article VI with the following: *The General Faculty exercises its responsibilities to formulate, review, and recommend academic policies for the university to the President and other appropriate agents through its elected delegates in the University Senate.*
3. Deletes the officers of the General Faculty other than the president and revises the duties of the President.

Proposed Changes to the Senate Bylaws

Since these changes are still under review, the draft of this summary is awaiting completion