

Vice Chair Knox called the meeting to order at 4:05 on Tuesday, February 22, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, August, Berman, Blake, Cheyne, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Powell, Reiss, Rodriguez, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, Yarnall, Yzaguirre.

Members Absent: Crowder-Fiore, Madar, Richmond, Rizzardi, Tripp, VerLinden, Whitlatch.

Proxies: Yarnall for Craig, Rodriguez for Wilyer, Yzaguirre for Kelly.

Guests: Burges, Ayoob, Lee.

### **1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 8, 2011**

M/S/U (Mortazavi/Goodman) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 8, 2011 as written.

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

Proxies were announced.

Vice Chair Knox reminded everyone about the workshop on shared governance on February 23, 5-7 pm, in the University Banquet Room.

### **3. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members**

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee will have three new policies to present as First Readings at the next Senate meeting.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Knox): The revised Bylaws for the proposed University Senate will be discussed later in the meeting.

General Faculty Representatives to the Statewide Senate: No report.

General Faculty (Powell): A General Faculty Election is currently underway. General Faculty President Powell asked senators to provide him with direction on how to put together an agenda for a general faculty meeting regarding the proposed university senate.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The full ICC met today and dealt with numerous curriculum matters, finished the guidelines on minors, and spent time discussing how to deal with assessment of general education. The ICC is also working on improving communication with departments regarding their curriculum proposals.

Associated Students (Rodriguez): AS is working on filling elections positions and senators were asked to encourage students to apply.

Senate Finance Officer (Mortazavi): The University Budget Committee will meet on Friday.

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): The College Creek Market Place is now open and about 70% complete. The fresh food cooking area is being developed.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): A budget proposal for next year has been developed and will be presented to the University Budget Committee on Friday. The UBC will be asked to respond with its recommendation by March 11. The enrollment target for next year is 7,000. HSU is pretty close to its FTES target this year. The budget being developed assumes that the tax extensions will pass; no contingency budget has been developed yet. Senators were encouraged to attend the campus presentations of the CAHSS Dean candidates.

Student Affairs (Blake): No report.

#### 4. Consent Calendar

The following consent calendar items were approved without objection:

**09-006: INTL 280: New Course: Topics in Int'l Studies** International Studies presently doesn't have special topics courses. This new course now gives them the flexibility of offering special topics courses at the lower division level.

**09-007: INTL 480: New Course: Topics in Int'l Studies** International Studies presently doesn't have special topics courses. This new course now gives them the flexibility of offering special topics courses at the upper division level.

**10-196: BA 252: Management and Accounting** - C-class change from 3 units of C-4 and 1 unit of C-13 (lab) to 4 units of C-4 to reflect the fact that the class is currently being taught without a lab component. The change reduces the WTUs from 4.3 to 4.0.

**10-197: BA 496: Strategic Management** - C-class change from 3 units of C-4 and 1 unit of C-13 (lab) to 4 units of C-4 to reflect the fact that the class is currently being taught without a lab component. The change reduces the WTUs from 4.3 to 4.0.

**10-254: Business Education Option** - suspend the program. No students are currently enrolled in the program, and the program no longer meets accreditation standards.

**10-273: PHYX 450: Quantum Physics I** - remove PHYX 340: Symbolic Computation in the Sciences from the list of Pre-requisites because 340 has been suspended

**10-283: MUS 338: Vocal and Instrumental Scoring** change pre-req. from MUS 315: Theory IV to MUS 314: Theory III to accommodate changes in course scheduling. Faculty agree that students will be adequately prepared for the course with 314 as the pre-req.

**10-284: MUS 394: Fundamentals of Conducting** - change pre-req. from MUS 315: Theory IV

to MUS 314: Theory III to accommodate changes in course scheduling. Faculty agree that students will be adequately prepared for the course with 314 as the pre-req.

**10-285: MUS 348: Music History: Antiquity to 1750** - change pre-reqs to permit MUS 314: Theory III to be taken as a co-requisite. The relevant material in 314 is covered before students encounter the same material in Music History, so these courses make acceptable co-requisites.

**10-286: MUS 349: Music History: 1750 to Present** - change pre-reqs to permit MUS 315: Theory IV to be taken as a co-requisite. The relevant material in 315 is covered before students encounter the same material in Music History, so these courses make acceptable co-requisites.

**10-294: MUS 216: Ear Training I** - add MUS 110: Music Fundamentals or I.A. as pre-requisite. Students need the information from 110 to succeed in 216.

**10-296: SOC 690: Master's Degree Thesis** - change units from 1-3 to 1-5 so that students can take 5 units during the semester they write their thesis.

**10-297: SOC 692: Master's Degree Project** - change units from 1-3 to 1-5 so that students can take 5 units during the semester they write their project document.

**10-287: VPA 110A: Summer Arts Lab - Music** - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**10-288: VPA 110B: Summer Arts Lab - Film and Video** - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**10-289: VPA 110C: Summer Arts Lab - Theater** - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**10-290: VPA 110D: Summer Arts Lab - Dance** - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**10-291: VPA 110E: Summer Arts Lab - Dramatic Writing** - - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**10-292: VPA 110F: Summer Arts Lab - Visual Arts and Crafts** - - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**10-293: VPA 110G: Summer Arts Lab - Animation** - - suspend course. VPA courses were used for students enrolled in Summer Arts Courses. Although Summer Arts has not been held on the HSU campus for over 15 years, the courses are being suspended, not eliminated in hopes that Summer Arts might someday return to HSU.

**5. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 – Open forum for the campus community**

Senator Van Duzer shared his concerns about the rate at which HSU is losing faculty. He has tried unsuccessfully to get data on faculty who voluntarily resign in an effort to determine how competitive HSU is. There will be many retirements in the next few years; HSU is losing talent at the top and at the same time having a hard time retaining junior faculty. The Senate should not be adding to the workload of the faculty. The campus cannot keep asking for more and more from the faculty without taking some things off the table. No one is willing to sacrifice anything. Everyone needs to realize that establishing task forces, etc. is just adding to the workload which leads to losing focus the students. The consequence is a producing a worse product.

**6. Resolution to Extend the Term of the Current General Faculty President (#21-10/11-EX) – First Reading**

Resolution to Extend the Term of the Current General Faculty President  
#21-10/11-EX – February 22, 2011  
First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the Spring 2011 election for a General Faculty President be postponed and that the current General Faculty President's term (ending Spring 2011), be extended through Fall 2011; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that this proposed temporary change be put to a vote of the General Faculty in the next Spring 2011 General Faculty election.

RATIONALE: If the upcoming General Faculty referendum approves the proposed University Senate Constitution and Bylaws and the revised General Faculty Constitution, an election will be held in Fall 2011 for new officers and senators. If the referendum is not passed, a General Faculty election will be held to fill the position, beginning in Spring 2012.

M/S (Thobaben/Van Duzer) to place the resolution on the floor.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Mortazavi) to waive the second reading. Motion PASSED with 1 No vote.

There was no discussion. Voting on the resolution occurred and it PASSED Unanimously.

**7. Resolution to Extend the Terms of the Current Academic Senate Officers (#22-10/11-EX) – First Reading**

Resolution to Extend the Terms of the Current Academic Senate Officers  
#22-10/11-EX – February 22, 2011  
First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt University resolves that the current Senate Officers' terms, ending Spring 2011, be extended through Fall 2011; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University resolves that if the proposed new governance structures are approved by the HSU General Faculty in Spring 2011, Elections for University Senate Officers will occur in the Fall, prior to the establishment of Spring 2012 schedules, and that the new University Senate will be constituted at the beginning of Spring 2012; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Humboldt State University Academic Senate resolves that if the proposed new governance structures are not approved by the HSU General Faculty in Spring 2011, that elections for Senate officers will be held at the last Senate meeting of 2011.

RATIONALE: Resolution #20-10/11-EX approved an extension of the timeline for deliberating on the new faculty governance structures as well as an extension of the terms of currently serving senators. Since the new governance structures (if approved) will not be implemented until Spring 2012, the terms for senate officers need to be extended as well.

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

Discussion:

The second resolved clause is problematic; it should say university senate president (only), since other senate officers would be elected by the senate after it is constituted in the spring.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Thobaben) to waive the second reading. Motion PASSED with 3 No votes.

M/S/P (Cheyne/Thobaben) to amend the second resolved clause as follows:

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University resolves that if the proposed new governance structures are approved by the HSU General Faculty in Spring 2011, [election of the individual who will preside over the Senate Elections for University Senate Officers](#) will occur in the Fall, prior to the establishment of Spring 2012 schedules, and that the new University Senate will be constituted at the beginning of Spring 2012; and be it further

Discussion:

- It was noted that the person who is the senate chair is also the general faculty president.

Voting on the amendment occurred and it PASSED with 1 No vote.

Discussion of the resolution as amended:

- The third resolved clause is problematic – the current senate members cannot elect new senate officers. New senators are supposed to be seated before officers are elected.

M/S/F (Flashman/Goodman) to postpone temporarily. Voting occurred and motion FAILED with 1 Abstention.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Goodman) to eliminate the second and third resolved clauses.

Discussion:

- Will there be ambiguity about the issues addressed in these clauses if they are removed?
- It was noted that the senate could re-visit these issues after the referendum on the proposed university senate.

Voting on amendment occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

There was no further discussion on the resolution as amended. Voting occurred and Resolution #22, as amended, PASSED unanimously.

The approved resolution reads:

Resolution to Extend the Terms of the Current Academic Senate Officers  
#22-10/11-EX – February 22, 2011

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt University resolves that the current Senate Officers' terms, ending Spring 2011, be extended through Fall 2011.

**RATIONALE:** Resolution #20-10/11-EX approved an extension of the timeline for deliberating on the new faculty governance structures as well as an extension of the terms of currently serving senators. Since the new governance structures (if approved) will not be implemented until Spring 2012, the terms for senate officers need to be extended as well.

Discussion Items:

## **8. Draft Bylaws for Proposed University Senate – Section on Elections (Knox)**

Senator Knox requested that senators discuss Section 3.0 (Elections) *of the Draft Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate of HSU (2/22/11 draft)*. The language in this section is new and has not been discussed yet. Portions that are highlighted are areas where the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) thought there might be concerns or where the Committee made substantial changes to existing language.

Discussion:

Section 3.12: What does "posted" mean?

Section 3.13: Eight days is too long of a period for an election, especially if there is a provision for proxy voting.

There is too much information and detail that does not need to be included in the bylaws.

Section 3.43: The language refers to a section of the Constitution [of the University Senate]. The eligibility requirements should be included here instead of referring to another document.

Senator Knox welcomed additional feedback from senators during the week, as people have time to become more familiar with the document.

Section 3.233: Concerns were expressed about the requirement of at least two nominations for each vacancy. Increasing workload will make it more and more difficult to staff the senate. This provision should be removed, unless there is a compelling argument for leaving it in.

While it has become more difficult to find enough nominees for many vacancies, there has also been a history of faculty members announcing they will run so that no one else will run. It is good to have diversity on the senate.

It was suggested that language be kept, but an escape clause added. Or it could state that a reasonable attempt will be made to secure at least two nominations. Another suggestion was to add "If possible", at least two nominations shall be made for each vacancy.

It would be reasonable to fill a position temporarily until two nominees can be found to run for election. Having only one candidate promotes the 'old boy/old girl network' and is not healthy, especially for younger faculty. Requiring opposition can be beneficial. It is going to be harder to recruit people without giving full credit for university senate service.

Q: What happened with term limits? A: They have stayed in for senators and senate officers.

The Faculty Affairs Committee will work on drafting new language for this section.

Section 3.212: The grammar needs to be corrected.

Discussion on other sections of the draft Bylaws:

Section 4.0 Proxies: Include either 4.1 or 4.2, but not both.

Section 3.5 Nomination of Faculty Trustee: This is the same language as the statewide senate, which could change, so it should not be included here.

It was noted that the statewide senate procedure says that each campus shall have a policy. A campus policy is needed, but it doesn't need to be in the bylaws.

Section 4.3: Q: What is the benefit of not allowing a senator to proxy for more than one person? A: It keeps as many people around the table as possible, and allows for more diversity. The discussion and changes made during a meeting can change people's opinions; a proxy cannot know if the person he/she is voting for would still cast the same vote.

Section 2.4 University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC): Concern was expressed about the workload of this committee. And it is not clear at what level the URPC will be

operating. It appears as if it will be taking over some of the functions (processes and procedures) that are already set up and working well in divisions. If the committee is going to do all of these things, it will be meeting weekly for hours.

For example, in Section 4.33 – does this mean the committee will make decision on all unallocated funds (which can happen very often)? There are already groups at the division level that make recommendations on unallocated funds – and they are closer to the decision making process than a university committee would be. Concern was expressed that the URPC would not be able to act in a timely manner.

Section 2.434 states the committee will review quarterly budget reports. These reports are huge and it takes hours to learn and to review them. At what level will the committee review them?

Section 2.433: If the URPC is going to make budget recommendations to units, it is untenable. Is the assumption that all of this is at the university level, in terms of the budget allocation process?

The intent is that it reviews and recommends allocations to divisions.

The URPC is similar to a committee that existed years ago – in one year it met 75 times for 2 hours at a time, plus two weekend retreats. This whole section needs to be re-written to ensure that the workload is not excessive. If this is an advisory and recommending committee, there needs to be some assurance that the workload and the homework will be kept within reason.

Senator Knox invited more feedback and encouraged senators to use the Senate listserv. FAC hopes to get the last edits done in the next couple of weeks.

## **9. Discussion of the revised document: Program Review, Evaluation and Planning (February 2011 revision) (Cheyne)**

Senator Cheyne introduced the document. It is a revision of the document that was discussed at a Senate meeting last Fall. Since that time, changes have been made to the document. There is some disagreement about the extent of the changes that have been made. The Senate Executive Committee expressed concern about sections where the language is ambiguous, so the document is being brought back to the Senate for more input. Senate feedback will go back to the committee that is working on it.

Discussion:

Q: What is the Senate doing with this, and where does it go from here? A: The document was written by a steering committee. It came through the Senate for review last Fall and has since been routed to other groups. Changes have been made based on feedback received. Additional Senate feedback will be forwarded to Dale Oliver, chair of the steering committee.



Page 5 – Requiring “mandatory” participation for faculty is probably a violation of academic freedom at the very least and this language should be re-thought.

Q: Where is program review currently – is it in a state of limbo? A: After prioritization, a 2-year interim program review process began. This is the second year of the process. Elements of the interim process are included in this new process, including the department MOUs. Experience with the interim process has informed this new process.

The ICC worked on the PREP document; it gave it to a task force to complete. The document has gone through the Provost’s Council and the Senate. The ICC doesn’t want it back.

Some group needs to bring a resolution to the Senate. It was recommended that the document be brought back in two weeks as a first reading and that Dale Oliver be invited. Concern was expressed about who will make changes to the document; it is not a Senate document.

The language “mandatory” is a concern – it is more a collective bargaining issue than an issue of academic freedom. A compromise needs to be reached as to what is needed by administration and what is needed by departments. Both share a common purpose.

How does the workload get distributed for this process in departments with a majority of lecturers?

The process looks fairly burdensome for the Chair of the department. There is a certain ‘coldness’ and ‘detached’ feeling to the document – it does not talk about what the teachers are like, etc. There doesn’t seem to be any explicit assessment of teaching in the department.

Use of the word “mandatory” on page 5 suggests that the periodic review process is more serious.

M/S (Cheyne/Powell) to forward the document to the Academic Policies Committee to review and revise, and bring back to the Senate with a resolution.

Discussion:

The document should go back to the task force that wrote it. A friendly amendment was made and accepted that the document be returned to the ICC, which created the task force.

M/S (Flashman/Goodman) to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 5:53 pm.