

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm on Tuesday, March 8, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: August, Berman, Blake, Cheyne, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Kelly, Knox, Madar, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Reiss, Richmond, Rizzardi, Rodriguez, Snyder, Thobaben, Tripp, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Wilyer, Yarnall, Yzaguirre.

Members Absent: Altschul, Crowder-Fiore, Shaeffer, Whitlatch.

Proxies: Reiss for Craig, Heise for Goodman, Mola for Powell, Knox for Van Duzer (2nd half).

Guests: Ayoob, S. Smith, Varkey, Oliver, Martin.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 22, 2011

M/S/P (Mola/Cheyne) to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 22, 2011 as written. Motion PASSED with 3 Abstentions.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Chair VerLinden's report and announcements were sent via email to the Senate prior to the meeting.

Proxies were announced.

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

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): A written report is included in the packet.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Knox): Continuing discussion of draft documents is on the agenda.

General Faculty Representatives to the Statewide Senate (Thobaben): A plenary meeting is scheduled next week; a report will be forthcoming after that.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (Moyer): The Committee has several items on the agenda.

Associated Students (Rodriguez): Election packets are available in the AS Office. Students attended the recent California Higher Education Student Summit in Sacramento.

Senate Finance Officer (Mortazavi): The University Budget Committee (UBC) reviewed and responded to the 2011/2012 budget proposal from the President. The UBC's written response to the President is available on the UBC web site (<http://www.humboldt.edu/budget/committee.html>).

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): No report.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): Written report included in packet.

Student Affairs (Blake): Vice President Blake reported that the average FTES for this year is 7,009. The target was 7,010.

President's Office (Richmond): The President noted that at the UBC's request, the committee will be reconvened if the budget situation further deteriorates. The President apologized for his absences at Senate meetings this year; he has been travelling and busy due to the budget situation and also due to his involvement with the California Institute of Science and Technology. The President reported that he has reappointed Burt Nordstrom as the Vice President for Administrative Affairs. VP Nordstrom has done an excellent job in serving the university as the interim VP.

4. Consent Calendar

Senator Flashman requested that Curriculum Item 10-311 be pulled from the Consent Calendar and moved to bottom of agenda.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Cheyne) to change the rules [Senate bylaws] for Consent Calendar so that a question may be asked and resolved before an consent calendar item from the ICC is pulled off. Voting would occur immediately on whether or not to approve the item.

Voting on the motion occurred and passed with 1 No vote.

The new procedure will not apply until the next meeting.

The following Senate Consent Calendar items from the ICC were approved without objection:

- 09-410 ANTH 113 Anthropology Skills Development (Revised 12/14/10)**
- 10-074 ANTH 310 History of Anthropology (Revised 12/14/10)**
- 10-299: EDUC 698: Educational Research**
- 10-301: EDUC 660: Assessment**
- 10-302: EDUC 650: Educational Psychology**
- 10-303: EDUC 634: Academic Writing in Education**
- 10-304: EDUC 633: Pedagogy: Practice and Research**
- 10-305: EDUC 604: Education in Society**
- 10-312: ENGR 331: Thermodynamics & Energy Systems I**
- 10-194 BA 417: Small Business Consulting**

5. Nominations from Faculty Awards Committee [closed session – Senate members only]

M/S/P (Yarnall/Cheyne) that the Senate move to executive session open only to members of the senate.

M/S/P (Yarnall/Van Duzer) to end the executive session.

Chair VerLinden reminded senators that the previous discussion is confidential.

M/S/U (Thobaben/Yarnall) to accept the nominations of the Faculty Awards Committee and forward them immediately to the President as an Emergency Item.

OLD BUSINESS:

6. Resolution on *Curricular Guidelines for Minors at HSU (#04-10/11-ICC(Revised))* – Second Reading

Resolution on *Curricular Guidelines for Minors at HSU*
#04-10/11-ICC – March 8, 2010 (Second Reading)

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that the attached *Curricular Guidelines for Minors at HSU (2/22/11)*, developed by the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC), be adopted for use by the ICC.

RATIONALE: *The initial charge to the ICC included developing clear criteria for making curricular decisions. The Curricular Guidelines for Minors is the first of several such documents that the ICC is creating. Having clear guidelines should clarify expectations for everyone on campus, making evaluating proposals a more straightforward process.*

Discussion:

Q: Section IV. Viability – There are standards that can be used to review existing minors. What kind of evidence is needed for new minors or for revisions to minors? A: The criteria for viability are listed.

Q: Will there be a separate set of learning outcomes for minors? A: Yes – learning outcomes should be specific to the minor.

It was noted that the footnote on page 2 should be corrected to read “six [not eight] unique minor units” to match the first paragraph on p. 2. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

III.2. (p. 4) – This is intended for a minor that has courses that don’t belong to any major. It was suggested that the wording be changed to: Minors that require courses that are not included in any ~~another~~ major will need to provide This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Concern was expressed about the sentence “In addition, a minimum of six units of the minor must be applied exclusively to the student’s minor requirements ...” at the top of page 2. It was suggested that the wording be changed to “... a minimum of six units of the minor must be delivered or offered by a program other than the minor program... .”

If there are courses required for the minor that are not required for any other major, the department must show a robust demand for the minor. Why require this? When this cycles

back to existing minors already in the catalog, do departments need to be concerned about defending minors if they are low enrolled? A: Yes – it is a sign of either lack of student interest or need for curricular review and revision.

It was noted that the paragraph under discussion is just a program definition, not a set of regulations.

HSU students graduate with a lot of units; double majors, minors, etc. add to those units. HSU needs to think carefully about why programs are offered to students. The number of students who declare majors and don't complete them is quite high. This adds to the overall costs of education.

ICC Chair Moyer reported that Academic Policies Committee has been assigned to create a policy addressing which minors can be combined with which majors.

It was suggested that setting a GPA requirement as a pre-requisite for entering into a minor program might help improve retention rates.

Voting on the resolution occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

NEW BUSINESS:

7. Resolution on Program Review, Evaluation and Planning (PREP) (#20-10/11-ICC) – First Reading

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

Resolution on Program Review, Evaluation and Planning (PREP)
#20-10/11-ICC – March 8, 2011 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the processes described in the attached *Program Review, Evaluation and Planning* (PREP) document (March 2011) be implemented beginning in Fall 2012; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Senate expresses its gratitude to all people who worked on developing this new process, especially the PREP Task Force.

RATIONALE: *This new process supersedes the "Policy and Procedures for Department Self-Study and Resource Review" (Senate Resolution #03-04/05-EP). It is designed to change Program Review from a huge 'do-it-and-forget-it' document into a series of smaller reports that help a program continuously track changes and plan for the future.*

Senator Moyer explained the changes made to the document since the Senate last reviewed it:

- The term “mandatory” was removed from the first paragraph of page 5.
- A ‘bragging’ section was added; documents will be posted on the web.
- The document still does not include general education.
- Concerns were expressed previously about increased faculty workload with the new process. However, the ICC felt that the process does not increase faculty workload. Documentation will be posted on the web and available for all, so there should be fewer interruptions and requests for information. The intention is that it will be less work in the past.
- Programs with special accreditation needs can have a customized process.
- The language on external reviews was removed to address the concern that departments would be required in the future to pay for external reviews.
- The word “assessment” has been replaced with the word “evaluation” in the second paragraph on page 1.

Discussion:

It was noted that the implementation date in the first resolved clause should be 2011 rather than 2012.

Q: How would customization for programs with special accreditation needs occur? A: It would be negotiated between the college dean and the department.

Q: To what extent have departments and department chairs been involved in vetting this document? A: It went to every council of chairs for discussion.

M/S/P (Moyer/Thobaben) to waive the first [sic] reading.

There was no further discussion.

Voting on Resolution #20-10/11-ICC occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

M/S/P (Heise/Thobaben) to make it an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

M/S (Thobaben/Moyer) to move to agenda item number ten immediately. There were no objections.

8. Resolution on New Environmental Policy and Ecological Restoration Minors (#25-10/11-ICC) (formerly #10 on the agenda)

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

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that *Curriculum Proposal 09-085: New Minor in Environmental Policy (ENVS Program), and *Curriculum Proposal 09-086: New Minor in Ecological Restoration (ENVS Program) be approved.

RATIONALE: The Academic Master Planning Subcommittee and the full ICC have carefully examined these minors. We find the proposed curriculum to be coherent and focused. Because of substantial overlap in requirements, students in majors that are most likely to complete these minors will easily be able to complete the minor requirements, but even students with highly-unrelated majors will be able to complete the minors (including pre-requisite courses) in under 30 units. All courses included in the minor are already offered frequently enough to permit students to easily complete the minor, and there is enough space left in those courses to add minors. In addition, these minors seem very likely to meet the proposed standard of at least 2 graduates per year. (Comparable minors on other campuses have enrollment much higher than our standard, non-major enrollment in the entry-level courses for the minor is presently high, and the department reports frequent inquiries from students about minors.)

Discussion:

Q: Who are the students outside of the major that would be taking these minors? A: Pathways for students from other majors were developed; several were noted.

Voting on Resolution #25-10/11-ICC occurred and PASSED Unanimously.

9. Resolution on Modifying the Enforcement Mechanism for the Timely Completion of a Major Contract (#23-10/11-APC) – First Reading

10. Resolution on Prerequisite Grade List (#24-10/11-APC) – First Reading

11. Resolution on Establishing Program Currency Requirements Policy (#26-10/11-APC) – First Reading

12. TIME CERTAIN: 5:00 pm – Continuing discussion of Draft Bylaws for Proposed University

Draft of Proposed University Senate Constitution

Draft of Proposed University Senate Bylaws

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) made changes to the University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) on p. 7 of the Bylaws and tried to clarify that the committee is not intended to micromanage division level budget work but instead will provide a forum for conversations about university vision and budget priorities. The URPC is only a recommending committee; it will not make decisions. The FAC received feedback expressing a variety of concerns. Additional feedback from the senate was welcomed.

Discussion – Bylaws Section 2.4 University Resources and Planning Committee:

It was noted that one of the co-chairs should be non-voting, otherwise there is an even number of voting members, and no one to break a tie.

Q: Under 2.439, what does “non-traditional funding” mean? A: The language comes from another source. The university is looking to find new ways to fund things, i.e., other sources of revenue.

Q: How does this fit with the University Center Board if they have a charge to provide new sources of income? A: If the campus were to pursue this, the URPC would have a broad conversation about it.

The language in 2.439 is not clear – it states that the committee “shall serve” (i.e., mandatory) as consultant and then states the committee “shall assist” in development

It is not clear how the committee would function in terms of self-support operations like Extended Education, the Marine Facilities, etc. How much work does the committee want to do in these areas?

Under 2.437 it states that when budget reductions are made the committee will review division plans – this sounds like micromanagement and seems to conflict with the general principle of how the committee operates.

Given that so much of funding is tied up in personnel and collective bargaining agreements do not allow for public discussion, this will not apply for the most part.

There are two different types of discussions: the practical implications of cutting services versus cutting personnel.

Discussion – Bylaws Section 2.6334

Q: Why can't faculty serve on more than one committee? A: An attempt is being made to spread the work around and not have the same people serving on committees all of the time.

Suggestion – add the disclaimer “when possible.”

A large number of members of the senate are chairs of departments and their schedules may be more accommodating to committee meetings/work, etc.

This raises issues for lecturers. To be required to serve on a committee (in addition to the senate) could be an enormous burden. Lecturers do not get assigned time, and do not get any credit or compensation for committee service. Will it be possible to get three lecturers who have the time and commitment?

It was noted that the same concern has also been raised in terms of staff members of the Senate.

Should 2.6334 be removed? Senators need to be fully involved in committee work; but the language is disproportionately difficult for lecturers and staff. Could a provision be made that lecturers and staff are exempt?

The idea that senators are engaged in the business of the senate at the committee levels is central to the idea of the Cabinet for Institution Change recommendations.

Making the workload sound onerous may also discourage junior faculty from getting involved.

How does giving lecturers release time violate entitlement? The question needs to be referred to Colleen Mullery, AVP for Faculty Personnel Services. There may be other ways than assigned time to help lecturers.

It is important to have lecturers participate but there is an issue of fairness that is difficult to address.

The issue may not be able to be adequately addressed before these documents move forward, but will need to be resolved over time. It was suggested that the senate move ahead with the understanding that there will be an investigation of a way to address the situation in the near future. AVP Mullery will be asked to investigate the possibilities, so that when a vote is taken on the proposed university senate there is some kind of understanding of how the issue will be dealt with if the documents are approved.

Currently Appendix J does not adequately recognize service on the senate; this should be re-visited.

Several suggestions for changes in language were made. It was noted that there is a distinction between lecturers and staff and that there are differences in staff; some staff are exempt and some are not. Some of the same concerns apply to students as well.

Senator Knox outlined the next steps: the documents will be posted on the web site for the entire campus community. The senate needs to discuss a couple of issues before forwarding them to the general faculty for a vote.

M/S/P (Thobaben/Cheyne) that the next senate meeting will be the last discussion of these two documents.

There were no objections to posting the documents on the web site.

As a final agenda item, the senate addressed Curriculum Item ICC 10-311 from the consent calendar:

10-311: ENGR 333: Fluid Mechanics - Pre-requisite changes: old pre-reqs: ENGR 325 and 331. New pre-reqs: ENGR 211 and 325. The engineering department has concluded that the revised pre-requisites will adequately prepare students for ENGR 333.

The objection to approving 10-311 via the consent calendar was that the courses being removed had a pre-requisite of third semester Calculus and the new pre-requisites do not have the same requirement of third semester Calculus. Will students be prepared for ENGR 333 without third semester Calculus? It would help to hear from the Engineering program about this change since the backgrounds of the people sending this forward are not known.

The question could not be specifically addressed, but the ICC trusted that the engineering program knew what would be appropriate.

Voting occurred and curriculum item 10-311 PASSED with 13 Yes votes, 3 No votes, and 5 Abstentions.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 pm.