



## [Skip navigation](#)

- [Home](#)
- [About the Senate](#)
- [Agendas & Minutes](#)
- [Resolutions](#)
- [Reports & Documents](#)
- [Election Information](#)
- [Faculty Awards](#)
- [University Committees](#)

## Related Organizations & Associations:

- [General Faculty](#)
- [University Faculty Personnel Committee](#)
- [HSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association](#)
- [Academic Senate CSU](#)

 

Department Name

# Agendas & Minutes

## HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY Academic Senate Minutes 11/09/04

Vice-Chair Bernadette Cheyne called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. on Tuesday, November 9, 2004, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum).

Members Present: Borgeld, Butler, Bruce, Cheyne, Dunk, Eichstedt, Farley, Green, Knox, Kornreich, Meiggs, Moyer, Mullery, O'Rourke-Andrews, Paynton, Richmond, Roberts, Sanford, Schwab, Schwetman, Shellhase, Varkey, Vrem, Wieand, Yarnall, Zeck.

Members Absent: Coffey, Fonseca, Fulgham, Platin, Vellanoweth.

Proxies: Burroughs for Dixon, Meiggs for MacConnie, Mullery for Mortazavi, Martin for Thobaben.

Guests: Nicole Alvarado, John Powell, Linda Phillips, Burt Nordstrom, Joseph Freeman, Steve Carlson, Val Phillips.

### 1. Adoption of the Agenda

Prior to adoption of the agenda, Vice-Chair Cheyne shared the discussion from the Senate Executive Committee meeting concerning the vote at the end of the 10-26-04 Senate meeting on the Resolution on UCC Recommendation to Double Count Institutions. Concern was expressed after the Senate meeting that not all voices had been heard during the voting process. A transcription of the tape of that portion of the meeting was made, and it was clear from the tape that the resolution passed. The Senate Executive Committee discussed various options. It is not an option to re-do the vote since the make-up of the Senate would not be identical. The only way to vote again on the resolution is to have a motion to rescind the decision. If a motion to rescind is passed, the resolution would be re-opened for debate, and then voted upon again.

The resolutions on the 10-26-04 agenda that were not discussed have been postponed to 11-30-04.

The agenda was adopted.

## **2. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of October 26, 2004**

M/S/P (Meiggs/Paynton) to approve as written, with 2 Abstentions.

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

Chair Fulgham is out of town, so Vice-Chair Cheyne is chairing the meeting.

Proxies were announced.

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

Educational Policies Committee (Chair Kornreich): The Committee has reviewed the Strategic Plan and prepared a response. The Resolution on Parameters for Time to Completion of Basic Subjects is waiting review by the Senate, and the Resolution on Program Review Policy will be returned to the Senate at the next meeting.

Student Affairs Committee (Chair Knox): The Committee has reviewed the Strategic Plan and prepared a response. A subcommittee has been formed to look at the issue of course evaluations. Information on course evaluations and evaluation processes is being collected in order to develop a standardized university-wide process. Online course evaluations will be looked at as a second step.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Chair Cheyne): The Committee's comments on the Strategic Plan were distributed via email. The Committee is always reviewing and developing a "best practices" in mentoring document. A draft will be disseminated for review and input from various sources, before coming to the Senate for review. The next item on the Committee's agenda is a review of Appendix J as it refers to descriptions of academic ranks as well as the "compensatory in nature" language.

California Faculty Association (CFA Chapter President Meiggs): The holiday social will be December 6 at the Plaza Grill. All are invited. The social is jointly presented by CFA and the General Faculty Association.

University Curriculum Committee (Chair Eichstedt): UCC will also be reviewing the Strategic Plan. The Committee continues to look at GE reform.

Associated Students (Representative Zeck): The A.S. approved a resolution in reference to the Strategic Plan. A resolution asking for continuous funding for an Alcohol and Other Drug Education Program Coordinator was also approved.

Without objection, the floor was yielded to Nicole Alvarado, Student Affairs Vice President. It was reported that the centerpiece event of the annual Dialogue on Race last week, which was designed for 120-140 attendees, had an extremely low turnout (ca. 40 people). The majority of the attendees were students of color, with only one administrator, and two staff members attending. It was noted that the low turn out, and especially the lack of attendance by faculty was disheartening to the students, as well as frustrating. The Associated Students will be drafting a letter to the Senate Executive Committee, asking for a call to action from the faculty on campus. They would like to see more faculty attendance at such future events.

Academic Affairs (Provost Vrem): The next University Budget Committee meeting will be Friday, November 1. The FY05-06 budget will be the topic of discussion. There are tentative plans for a campus town hall meeting on the topic of academic quality, on the first Friday of spring semester, from 2-4 in Goodwin Forum.

Student Affairs (Vice President Butler): There was a good turn out for the activities organized by the students to increase voter turn out. Student voter turnout at the polls was good. It was announced that Tim Wise will be speaking on white privilege at one of the last major activities of the Dialogue on Race. All were reminded that this is a high student stress time during second mid-terms.

President's Office (President Richmond): The President announced that the Redwood Coast Rural Action (College of the Redwoods, Humboldt Area Foundation, Institute of the North Coast, Prosperity Network, and Humboldt State University), applied for a grant to the California Endowment, to create a rural health policy center that would assemble data on the rural counties of Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte, and Trinity. The grant would provide ca. \$600,000 over a three year period to HSU to create the center. The center would provide opportunities for faculty, students, and staff to be involved in generating and analyzing data on health issues in the area. There has been a site visit and the response has been positive. The funds have not yet been approved by the board. The Redwood Coast Rural Action also applied to the Kellogg Foundation for a grant to help encourage entrepreneurialism in our region. Out of 180 grant applications, twelve finalists were selected, and the Redwood Coast Rural Action was a finalist. Four grants will be given. The site visit has occurred and results are expected to be reported by Christmas time. If the grant is received, it will be ca. \$2 million.

## **5. Nomination for Outstanding Professor of the Year Award**

The Senate moved to executive session.

Charlie Biles, Chair of the Faculty Award Committee, read the Committee's letter of nomination. The Senate returned to formal session.

M/S/P (Yarnall/Moyer) to approve the nomination submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

M/S/P (Yarnall/Meiggs) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

## **6. Discussion of HSU Strategic Plan**

Handouts with comments from the Senate's Educational Policies Committee and Student Affairs Committee were distributed.

Senator Kornreich summarized the comments from the Educational Policies Committee. It was noted that the Committee is speaking with a single voice in the document. The Committee feels that the Strategic Plan appears to stress the importance of research over the importance of undergraduate studies. The following serious concerns are presented to the Senate for discussion before any ratification of the document occurs:

- The first strategy of AE Goal 1 is to revise Appendix J to reflect a much greater importance for research in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process. Appendix III, which is included in the main document by reference, re-defines scholarship in such a way that only peer review publications or review by respected critics is acceptable as evidence of scholarly activity.
- Appendix III (of the Strategic Plan) proposes to change Appendix J (Faculty Handbook) to remove the language "equal in weight and compensatory in combination".
- The Strategic Plan proposes to make promotion explicitly contingent on consistently peer reviewed publishable creative and scholarly activities without regard to service components.
- The goals and strategies for Academic Excellence include a goal for encouraging growth and diversity in graduate programs but don't include any similar goals for undergraduate programs.
- Overall, the sense from reading the Academic Excellence section of the Plan is that research is to be stressed over undergraduate education. The primary focus of undergraduate education seems to be missing from primary parts of the document overall. AE Goals 3-6 mention improvements in undergraduate curriculum, but there is very little or no mention of improving teaching effectiveness or faculty teaching development. The document clarifies the expectations and rewards for scholarly activity, but it does not provide incentives for excellent teaching or for the hiring of excellent instructors.

Points the Committee agreed with included:

- The all university curriculum needs to be reviewed and overhauled to reflect a signature program in General Education (AE Goal 5)
- Oral and written communications need to be incorporated into undergraduate degree majors (AE Goal 6), and should also include quantitative reasoning and logic.

Other minor points include:

- The Vision Statement of the Plan seems to contain mostly jargon, and doesn't have much to say about teaching excellence. Interdisciplinary education should be stressed more than it is in the Plan.

A request was made to have comments from the Senate standing committees sent out electronically so that senators could share with colleagues.

Senator Knox summarized the comments from the Student Affairs Committee. The Committee looked at the Plan from the point of view of student support services, co-curricular learning experiences, and other areas directly impacting student experience. Three broad concerns were identified:

- The document that lays out the goals did not reflect the efforts of some of the focus groups. The organization of the document was confusing, in terms of clarifying the intent of the material. For example, it was difficult to locate the material on student support services. It was necessary to dig around in different sections to find the information.
- The Plan does not specifically mention the concept of "student-centered campus". This phrase has been important in past and recent discussions.
- The Plan does not reflect the unique residential and teaching oriented character of the University. There were brief references, but it does not come through specifically.

More specific concerns within each section include:

- The majority of the content in the Academic Excellence section is focused on faculty and research and graduate programs. The relative proportion of attention to undergraduate programs and teaching is too low.
- With the emphasis on assessment of faculty, there needs to be clarification of the idea of learning outcomes and broadening of the idea of assessment beyond people evaluating faculty as a way of assessing the quality of teaching.
- The Committee felt there were a number of well-written sections in the focus groups reports that were not included in the Plan, and might be worth re-considering.
- Intellectual Underpinnings was an interesting section, and includes material on financial aid support and on coordination of student services and advising.
- Because the Diversity Plan is much more explicit and provides specific ideas for ways for students to be involved, the Diversity Plan should specifically be referred to in the section that discusses cultural issues.
- Overall, the Committee has grave concerns about the Strategic Plan as it is currently organized and cannot support its adoption in its current form.

Senator Cheyne provided brief comments from the review of the Strategic Plan by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Committee had no overarching concerns, similar to the previous two committees. Concerns on a smaller scale included:

- Health and safety issues and the need for education and improvement were not emphasized to the degree felt needed.
- There was a focus on student wellness that the Committee felt needed to be expanded to include faculty and staff wellness.
- Concern was expressed regarding the clarity of terms under information technology and the placement of certain issues within the document, which would be "easy fixes".

- Hazardous materials were not discussed in either the physical campus and/or health and safety areas, and should be addressed in the Plan.
- Under Intellectual Underpinnings, the area of human resources was reviewed. There was concern that the term “family friendly” was not universal enough and requires clarification. More specific language was suggested in terms of increasing the percentage of probationary and temporary faculty.

#### General Discussion:

Background was provided on the last attempt to alter Appendix J unilaterally by the administration, which was not successful. The current language in Appendix J has worked well and allows for faculty members to emphasize their strengths. It was urged that no serious attempt be made to alter the language in Appendix J without it coming from the faculty.

Disappointment in the comments and recommendations from the standing committees was expressed. While faculty members should be able to act as individuals, and with the understanding that they will have strengths in various areas, there is evidence that strength in scholarship is directly related to excellence in teaching. The language “equal in weight and compensatory in combination” has been used in the past to protect individuals who were inadequate scholars. It is a disservice to our students and to each other to have tenured faculty who are not adequate scholars.

The concerns expressed from the Student Affairs Committee stem primarily from the fact that the Plan does not give enough attention to undergraduate education. Research informs teaching and there are a variety of levels of research opportunities available to individuals. There is a perception of a shifting of resources away from opportunities to improve undergraduate education and a need to recognize that undergraduate education has traditionally been the mission of the University.

The responses seem to be setting up a dichotomy. On one hand, the implication seems to be that we are moving the University to a Research I institution. On the opposite extreme is that we have no expectations at all. What is actually being discussed is the expectation that every faculty member will have some balance to their activities, including excellence in teaching, some level of scholarly and creative activity, and some level of service. To be an effective teacher it is important to be active in one's field.

It was noted that Lecturers (47% of total faculty) are not mentioned on page 12. The definition of scholarship in the appendix is more inclusive than what has been portrayed by previous comments. There is a danger of research taking too much precedence over teaching and a middle ground that maintains competency and currency, and the ability to share with the students and make the subject accessible needs to be found.

The document appears to be changing the definition of scholar. While agreeing with the idea that one cannot be a good teacher without being a good scholar, there is a concern that students do not want professors who only do research. Emphasis on research as a priority will not benefit the University.

At a departmental level there was concern expressed about changing Appendix J and not having it come from the faculty. There was less concern about doing research; many are already doing it. But there was a concern about the lack of asserting undergraduate excellence. If it is still the most important focus of the campus, then it needs to be re-iterated throughout the document. A change in the ordering of the goals, to include undergraduate education first, would be helpful. Even though they were not intended to be in a priority order, they will be read that way. Concerns should not be taken as anti-intellectual criticism, but more the lack of focus on undergraduate education, which is why many faculty are here.

The Diversity Action Plan should be part of the Strategic Plan, under the area of cultural issues.

Most agree that we want to be an excellent undergraduate educational institution, and that good teachers are excellent scholars. If we do want to be an excellent undergraduate educational institution, it should be explicitly stated in the Strategic Plan.

Regarding the proposed changes to Appendix J, it might be helpful to change the language in the document from “revise Appendix J as discussed in appendix III ...” to something less restrictive, such as “examine Appendix J for possible changes to help encourage faculty to be better scholars”.

Everything depends on how we define scholarship. Broad definitions have been passed by HSU and CSU senates. In some disciplines, scholars (i.e., highly published researchers) are not necessarily good teachers, so scholarship is not necessarily an indication of good teaching.

One of the main functions of the CSU has been preparing the teachers of California; this should be emphasized very strongly as part of our mission statement in the Strategic Plan. It is one of our primary missions, and should be more prominent in the Plan.

The focus groups were made up of over 200 faculty, staff, students, and administrators. What is reflected in the plan came from those focus groups and there was no attempt to re-write it. The recommendations for changes to Appendix J originally came from faculty, and will not be implemented carte blanche without going through proper procedures. The plan reflects what members of the campus discussed.

Focus groups were primarily concerned about what needed changing, and did not necessarily discuss what is going right; many of the things that are “good” about the University are missing.

The recent recommendation for the Outstanding Professor Award is an example of the importance and benefit of scholarship to teaching. The University needs to strengthen many areas that have not been focused on while undergraduate education has received much attention already.

Some are reading the Plan to suggest that the faculty needs to “shape up”. At any university there will always be a variety of faculty talents. This university has an exceptional faculty and we’re not hearing about that. The Strategic Plan does not change Appendix J; the faculty does.

The Strategic Plan does not need to mention Appendix J at all, since it is a faculty document. Recommendations for improving the quality of teaching are appropriate, but not specific changes to Appendix J.

The relationship between research and publication quality and teaching quality is complex; it is not simple. The claim that you cannot be a good teacher without being an active and engaged scholar is false, as exemplified by our lecturer faculty.

The minutes of this meeting and the documents from the Senate standing committees will be forwarded to the Strategic Plan Steering Committee.

## **7. Update on Capital Outlay Program and Master Plan (Bob Schulz)**

Bob Schulz reported on the Capital Outlay Program that will begin the process of building out the campus over the next thirty years to the Master Plan. He showed an abbreviated PowerPoint presentation that had been made a month earlier to representatives from the Governor’s Department of Finance and the chair of the legislative budget committee.

The campus is 144 acres (i.e., not a very big campus) with 93 buildings. This is a high number of buildings for a university of our size. About half of our facilities are the size of a house or smaller. About 40% are over a half century old and the rest are a minimum of 30 years old. Classrooms and labs are in poor condition, some pretty shocking. This has happened over time. HSU has a tremendous amount of deferred maintenance, a number of temporary buildings which are very expensive to maintain, and a lot of space. We have very expensive and inefficient space, but are still funded at the level of campuses built more appropriately.

According to the CSU process of tracking what it costs to stay even on a physical campus, based on current campus infrastructure we need to be spending \$4 million dollars a year to keep the campus in shape.

In order to get money to implement the Master Plan a five year capital outlay program has been put together. The 05-06 request includes construction funding for the renovation of the Forbes Complex, and acquisition of the Mai Kai apartments. The 06-07 projects will be replacing decrepit old space, not building new space.

As indicated on the handout on the State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2005/06 Priority List, HSU received more capital allocation than any other campus except one, in the entire system.

The handout on State Owned Facilities by College year Head Count & FTES shows that HSU has more space than all other CSU campuses except the Maritime Academy. We average 100 square foot versus 75 square foot per FTE.

We can't talk about needing new space, but we can talk about renovating old space. The CSU will not renovate buildings unless they serve a capacity need, so HSU is at a disadvantage. 129% represents our capacity versus enrollment needs after we complete the Behavioral and Social Sciences Building. A process is underway to correct the current course reporting activities, so that number will probably drop by 3%. But it will not have an impact for about three years.

For the long term, our solution to justifying academic space needs will be doing our course reporting better, cleaning up the space data, and enrollment growth. This will happen 3-5 years down the line.

The approach of this capital outlay program is to try and replace some of the non-capacity space on campus, and so focus is on an educational services building. Since there are no classrooms or labs in the building, we are sidestepping the issues of enrollment and capacity.

In response to a question about the refurbishing of the Student Services Building, it was explained that if the bond issue passes, this building will come online in 2011. By that time, two generations of students will have been better served by the project to renovate the Student Services Building, which represented about .07% of our operating budget that year. It was a reasonable investment.

We can show that the new building will eliminate about \$10 million dollars of deferred maintenance, which is something the Trustees are concerned about at the state level.

Locally, it will provide a savings in operating costs of \$133,000 a year or more, roughly the cost of renovating a single classroom. A feasibility study is currently being conducted, and the cost of the new building is estimated at about \$50 million dollars.

Work is also being done with the non-state program to help build out the campus Master Plan, that will include projects like the western parking structure behind the library, the pedestrian free campus core, and the clean-up of the Harpst street entry which will become staging for buses at a transfer point, providing direct public transit route point.

Priorities for the next five (to ten) years are:

- Educational Services Building (Siemens Hall will go away)
- Theatre Arts replacement building
- Replacement/renovation of Fine Arts and Industrial Tech building
- Non-state money will be used to build out the lower quad on campus.

There is a new color of capital money called capital renewal for this coming year (05-06) which is part of the Trustees effort to solve the \$6 billion deferred maintenance problem. HSU has requested \$1.5 million dollars for the Science B building. The cap renewal program becomes an annual allocation, which would make it possible to do major classroom improvements over time.

M/S/P (Zeck/Knox) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

[Get Adobe Reader](#)

[Get Word Viewer](#)

[Academic Senate](#) • Gist Hall 101 • 1 Harpst St., Arcata, CA 95521  
Phone 707.826.3657 • Fax 707.826.3651 • [Contact Us](#).