

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, September 22, 2009, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Ahmed, Altschul, Berman, Cannon, Chapin, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Heise, Knox, Larson, Mortazavi, Moyer, Powell, Reiss, Rodriguez, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Van Duzer, Verlinden, Yarnall, Zoellner.

Members Absent: Butler, Cheyne, Gleason, Gunsalus, Meiggs/Haynes, Nordstrom, Richmond.

Proxies: Knox for Bolick-Floss, Mortazavi for Thobaben, Powell for Goodman, Powell for Paynton, Reiss for Rizzardi.

Guests: Webley, MacConnie, Burges, Ayoob.

### **Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of September 8, 2009**

M/S/U (Zoellner/Knox) to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 8, 2009, with corrections.

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

Proxies were announced.

Senator Mortazavi introduced two new student senators: Iban Rodriguez and Nida Ahmed. He also introduced Eliot Altschul, the new Counselor representative.

President Richmond is in Long Beach attending a Board of Trustees meeting.

### **Reports of Standing Committee, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio members**

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The committee's next item to address is selected topics and then it will go back to service learning and the disqualification policy.

General Faculty (Powell): There are still faculty vacancies on committees; if interested, contact the Senate Office. General Faculty President Powell is considering holding a general faculty meeting to follow-up and to assess progress toward achieving confidence in the university president. He has received feedback requesting further discussion before such a meeting is scheduled.

Chair Mortazavi noted that the Senate Appointments Committee will be meeting following the Senate meeting to discuss faculty appointments to committees.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC met last week and discussed the process and criteria for dealing with the post-prioritization reports from the Category 4 programs. It concluded that the four most important criteria are: 1) how essential and directly related the program is to the University's vision and mission, 2) evidence of the quality of the program, 3) how efficient or cost-

effective or how expensive the program is, and 4) internal and external demands for the program. A basic assumption will be made that the assigned prioritization categories are appropriate. If a decision is made not to eliminate or suspend a program that was recommended for suspension or elimination, the program will need to demonstrate “phenomenal” change in the way it has satisfied the four criteria.

ICC subcommittees met this week. The Academic Master Planning subcommittee has begun work on the post-prioritization reports. The reports will gradually move out of the subcommittee. No decisions have been made yet.

- Senator Moyer was asked to define “phenomenal” change. It wasn’t defined by the committee. It was noted that it is difficult to meet a standard that is not articulated.
- What is the role of the criteria and how will they be used? The ICC is using the criteria to determine its recommendations for the programs in Category 4 of the prioritization process. Recommendations for suspension or elimination will come to the Senate as an action item. Other recommendations, depending on the nature of the recommendation, may appear on the Consent Calendar. Most cases will likely appear as action items on the Senate agenda.
- Will the ICC use the criteria that were just articulated to review recommendations from the committees working on individual programs? When the ICC forwards its recommendation to the Senate, will the criteria and how they were met or not met be included? Will the Senate establish its own standards or does it have to use the ICC’s standards? The plan is that as recommendations are forwarded, they will be accompanied by documentation providing a rationale for the decision.
- In the agreement worked out last year, recommendations concerning degree programs were to come to the Senate with a timeline for discussion and recommendation. Non-degree programs were to go directly to the Provost, bypassing the Senate. Now that the UCC has been re-configured into the ICC and all curricular recommendations go through the Senate, all recommendations regarding prioritization will come through the Senate. There is no structured process and timeline for recommendations regarding non-degree programs.
- How do the four criteria established by the ICC relate to the criteria used by the Prioritization Task Force to put programs into Category 4? It sounds like a different set of criteria. It was responded that these are essentially four of the original five or six – it is not a substantial change.

Associated Students (AS) (Chapin): AS held a retreat two weekends ago. AS’s vision for the year is to create and foster more awareness and participation by students on campus. Three goals towards achieving the vision were established: 1) provide regular tabling on the quad by AS council members, 2) ask decision-making bodies and representatives on campus to speak to students more, and 3) fill committee positions as quickly as possible. AS passed a resolution in support of supplying flu vaccination to students who cannot afford to pay for it. Senators were asked to encourage students to apply for committee vacancies and openings on the AS Council.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): The Provost has been sharing information and asking for feedback on the creation of an Enrollment Management Task Force and an ITS Task Force. Data on CSU comparisons

(HSU compared to CSU averages) was sent to the Provost's Council and to department chairs. The Provost asked that the information be forwarded to the members of the Senate as well. The data looks at numbers of unique courses, programs and majors, small sections, average class size, and overall c-sections offered by the campus. The standardized data indicates that HSU is either number one or number two in every category. This is an indication that HSU is trying to do too many things with too few resources. None of them are bad – there are just too many and the campus cannot afford them all. Budget reduction strategies will need to include consideration of ways to reduce the base budget and do fewer things.

- How was the data standardized for the size of the campus? How do c-class and class size differ in calculations?

The spreadsheet shows raw numbers in the top graph. The calculations are standardized by campus size in the middle graph. The bottom graph is the important one. It shows HSU compared to a CSU average. For example, HSU is 140% over the CSU average for small sections and 90% over the CSU average for numbers of degrees and options.

- The Provost was asked if he could provide the following information: a comparison of the number of hours faculty spend teaching over the past three years, including Fall 2009. The loss in faculty hours is not seen by just looking at FTEF. Assigned time needs to be separated as well.

Analytic Studies provides student/faculty ratio data which is a good indicator of the number faculty in teaching positions. Faculty assigned time, sabbaticals, leaves, etc. is pulled out of these numbers. The FTEF can be calculated using the SFR data and FTES data.

### **Consent Calendar (see page 2 of the Agenda for list of Consent Calendar items)**

The Consent Calendar was approved without objection.

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

Professor Greg Crawford provided a brief update on the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Report. Four draft chapters will be posted soon at [www.humboldt.edu/~wasc](http://www.humboldt.edu/~wasc). The committee would like feedback from the Senate and the campus. The report is broken up into four to make it easier to read and comment on: 1) understanding the student learning we produce, 2) making excellence inclusive, 3) realigning resources with institutional structures, and 4) engaging in organizational learning and improvement.

This report differs from the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, which defined who we are and created a roadmap for the process. The report outlines the progress that has been made in the important areas that WASC pointed out as needing particular attention. WASC will be looking for adequate progress and more importantly, sustainability. Professor Crawford stated that he would be surprised if WASC waited ten years to come and visit HSU again.

The report covers assessments of general education, outcomes, programs and writing and includes the diversity report and the metrics that have been established. The academic prioritization process and

similar efforts in Administrative Affairs and Students Affairs are mentioned. The development and implementation of the ICC, and responses to consultants' reports (Keeling, Maddox) are outlined.

The steering committee is working on the introduction and conclusion to the report while getting feedback on the chapters. The report is due in early November and the WASC site team will be visiting HSU in early February. The report is honest and does not try to sweep anything under the carpet. Senators may forward comments and feedback to Professor Crawford or respond on the WASC web site.

Professor Martin Flashman addressed the Senate as a member of the faculty. The issue of confidence has not just been with the President; it is a general matter of morale. Viewed in the perspective of the past three years and the actions or inactions by the Senate, those that are expressing confidence include: 1) the general faculty expressed no confidence in the President at its meeting last May, 2) the Senate has both discussed and avoided discussions and has not been clear on its view of confidence, 3) the President has expressed his lack of confidence in the Senate and other faculty bodies, and as a result, is encouraging discussions of changing the organization of governance structures.

What is the Senate doing? The Senate is responding to the President's response to the faculty's statement of no confidence. The Senate has a responsibility to both the faculty and the administration in terms of being the voice of the faculty on certain policy matters. At the last Senate meeting, the Senate ignored the vote at the general faculty meeting last spring and went back to saying "let's talk about change." The President has not changed his views of shared governance. The Senate is now in a place where it does not have the confidence of the faculty. Senators are not meeting with their college constituencies. It does not appear that Senators are listening to the faculty.

Professor Flashman read the following text:

Diamonds and Rust (Words and Music by Joan Baez)

*I'll be damned  
Here comes your ghost again  
But that's not unusual  
It's just that the moon is full  
And you happened to call  
And here I sit  
Hand on the telephone  
Hearing a voice I'd known  
A couple of light years ago  
Heading straight for a fall*

*As I remember your eyes  
Were bluer than robin's eggs  
My poetry was lousy you said  
Where are you calling from?  
A booth in the midwest  
Ten years ago  
I bought you some cufflinks*

*You brought me something  
We both know what memories can bring  
They bring diamonds and rust*

*Well you burst on the scene  
Already a legend  
The unwashed phenomenon  
The original vagabond  
You strayed into my arms  
And there you stayed  
Temporarily lost at sea  
The Madonna was yours for free  
Yes the girl on the half-shell  
Would keep you unharmed  
Now I see you standing  
With brown leaves falling around  
And snow in your hair  
Now you're smiling out the window*

*Of that crummy hotel  
Over Washington Square  
Our breath comes out white clouds  
Mingles and hangs in the air  
Speaking strictly for me  
We both could have died then and there  
Now you're telling me  
You're not nostalgic*

*Then give me another word for it  
You who are so good with words  
And at keeping things vague  
Because I need some of that vagueness now It's  
all come back too clearly Yes I loved you dearly  
And if you're offering me diamonds and rust I've  
already paid*

© 1975 Chandos Music (ASCAP)

**1. *Dissecting Diversity at HSU* (August 2009) – Radha Webley, Associate Director, Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Bob Snyder, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs**

Provost Snyder described the genesis of the development of the diversity metrics and the report. Last year, Dr. Daryl G. Smith, Professor of Education and Psychology at Claremont Graduate University, was on campus for the Professional Development Day on Diversity. She is a long-time expert in diversity issues and has created a program for helping campuses diversify. The program involves developing a set of metrics to measure progress on diversity issues. The measures are put in place and used consistently over time to show where progress is being made. If the desired progress is not being made in a particular area, then programs to help further progress in the area are devised and implemented and measured again.

HSU has taken the first step by developing a set of diversity metrics. Radha Webley and Patty Yancey worked closely with Institutional Research (IR), Academic Personnel Resources, and Human Resources to develop the report *Dissecting Diversity at HSU*. The next step is to identify the areas of concern and determine what to do about them. The Comprehensive Enrollment Management Task Force that is being formed will have a retention working group that will address these areas.

Radha Webley gave a brief overview of the 90 page report. The document includes an executive summary. She highlighted the following four main points in the report:

- 1) Relative to student enrollment, HSU is significantly less diverse than expected, given the geographic origin of students, etc.
- 2) HSU student retention and graduation rates are markedly disproportionate across ethnic groups
- 3) HSU needs to diversify faculty and staff populations, not just because of the low numbers, but because in focus groups, students repeatedly stated that is the one of the most important things the university could do
- 4) Various issues concerning campus climate and inclusion on campus exist – there are a number of students, particularly students of color or students with disabilities, who feel isolated on campus, experience stereotyping, and note that there is a lack of diversity across the curriculum.

Chapter three – the most important part of the report – highlights students' voices. Information was gathered through focus groups and surveys. There is a section on gateway courses and their role. A preliminary one-year analysis shows that these courses disproportionately weed out certain groups of

students, i.e., there are much higher fail rates for students of color. The report contains a number of comparisons, including cross-department comparisons, of retention, graduation, drop-out rates, and successes in different areas.

Questions and comments were welcomed and may be forwarded to Radha Webley at [rw76@humboldt.edu](mailto:rw76@humboldt.edu).

Questions:

- Does the report consider data on programs that have provided supplemental or special courses for students having difficulty in gateway courses? No – it was not included because of time and space issues. It will depend upon time and resources whether or not this will be done in the future.
- The *Chronicle of Higher Education* recently published an article that provides data at the national level that helps to set all of this in a broader context. Senator Larson will forward the article.
- HSU's overall retention rates are low and decreasing. A plan that concentrates on diversity should not ignore that. The national literature on what works in retention has been "settled" for the past thirty years. HSU could take any of several well-established measures from this literature to reach out and support students. HSU needs to carefully re-examine cuts to programs which support students. Comments were made on the graph on p. 30, noting the steady decline in graduation rates for Native American students. It was postulated that the decline is a direct result of the cuts made to support programs for Native American students at HSU. The table on page 44 that shows which departments lose disproportionately greater or fewer numbers of students (by ethnic group) indicates that Native American students are less likely to drop out of Education. It was postulated that this is because of the existence of the Indian Teacher & Educational Personnel Program (ITEPP) which has been decimated in the past few years.

HSU is low across the board in retention rates, especially for second and third year students, and all groups need to be considered in that context. The retention working group of the Enrollment Management Task Force will be talking about implementing ideas that have been shown to work. The report intentionally does not hypothesize as to cause and effect, because of the difficulty in proving such hypotheses. There are definite areas of concern, as has been pointed out, but it is harder to say specifically what explains the numbers without more investigation.

- It was noted that there is a grave problem with the sample size, especially with Native American students.

In general, retention measures that are adopted should help both diverse and non-diverse students. HSU needs to identify what the most serious problems are and adopt strategies to deal with those critical areas. Not every problem can be addressed and HSU needs to respond as an institution and work in a coordinated effort across campus to address the identified problems.

- It was noted that retention and graduation rates of Native American students were phenomenal compared to nationwide rates until around 2002. Programs supporting Native American students such as ITEPP and INTERCEPT contributed to that.

- It was noted that research contradicts the earlier statement that effective retention strategies apply to all students.
- People come here as people. In looking at the issue of what supports people in getting to graduation, it is important to think about the ability of individuals to find community, to feel safe, and to find connections at HSU. We need to look at students' as people, not just as students trying to get grades in classes.
- What is the timeline for the Task Force? The Provost hopes to receive some recommendations before the end of the semester which can be implemented by Fall 2010.
- How does this fit into priorities for the budget? The Provost will ask the Task Force to make budget recommendations. The resources will have to come from somewhere on the academic side of the campus; it has to be something we can afford.

Questions for the Provost on the CSU comparative data continued:

- It wasn't clear in the explanations accompanying the data what "unique course section" means. The Provost will find out and provide further explanation.
- If HSU stands out in terms of unique course sections, why is that inherently bad? It was responded that it is not bad. The data is not intended to show what is "bad." It was reasoned that there may be a correlation between unique courses, small courses, and more courses overall, and the cost for a full time equivalent student. It is not clear why HSU is the fourth best-funded campus in the system per student, yet has no money. The data are being used to help correlate costs and find answers to campus budget questions.
- It was clarified that the cost per FTES includes the overhead for the campus, not just the cost of instruction. The opinion was expressed that having a significant amount of administrators on this campus, with only 7,000 students, would make the fixed cost per student significantly higher at HSU than at other larger CSU campuses. Is it possible to figure out what is the nature of the higher cost per FTES at HSU? Could it be that faculty and departments are inefficient or are there too many administrators on this campus?
- There could be a variety of reasons, including too many staff and high-cost programs. The campus needs to look at this together. It was suggested that senators look at the most recent IPEDS data. In comparison to other universities, the cost for administrators was the only category that was below average. That might suggest that HSU is not over-administered. However, everyone needs to look at the data and the cost comparisons.
- The standard deviation of the average is not included in the CSU comparison data. Comparisons to the average are difficult to interpret without knowing the standard deviation.
- The Provost will ask for that information and forward it. He was noted that the data can be considered many different ways and discouraged too much argument with the data. At this point, in most cases HSU is so far over the average that even with arguments against the data, there is still a lot to explain.

- It was pointed out that the Vice President for Academic Affairs is in charge of Academic Affairs, but he is also the Provost, who is in charge of the whole university, next to the President.
- One reason for HSU being the fourth highest funded campus in the system is that it was grandfathered in when it split off from the orange book. How does this figure in with the last round of budget reductions? The Provost provided his take on it: HSU is still at about the same FTES level as it was with the orange book. After the orange book, the funding formula changed and campuses began receiving funding based on enrollment growth, average cost of instruction, and the campus' old budget plus growth or cuts. Extra money was given for growth, and cuts were made pro rata across the system, based on campus size. Other CSU campuses realized they could do well on funding from the system plus the state university grant money, if they managed their programs well. Campuses that grew have less money per FTES, but they have more money and more flexibility. HSU has not changed much since it was on the old orange book funding formula and is trying to do too many things. There are campuses in the CSU that are doing well and some that are not doing well – and it is all a function of enrollment growth. HSU is paying the price for not growing its enrollment.

## **2. Resolution on New Independent Academic Work (IAW) Course Policy (#01-09/10-AP)**

Senator Van Duzer withdrew the resolution that was distributed in the packet.

M/S (Van Duzer/Larson) to place a substitute (amended) resolution on the floor. The only difference in the resolution, which was handed out, is the addition of a second resolved clause indicating who will be responsible for managing the policy.

### **Resolution on New Independent Academic Work Course Policy**

#01-09/10-AP – September 22, 2009

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached “Independent Academic Work (IAW) Course Policy” be adopted, with implementation of the IAW forms to be effective Spring 2010, and course renumbering/renaming to be implemented in time for inclusion in the 2011-2012 catalog; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the Office of Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies administers the policy.

***RATIONALE:** There is a need to develop consistent practices in the calculation of course units, and course expectations for Independent Academic Work (IAW) in independent/directed study courses and to ensure that the use of the related course numbering is appropriate for the type of course offered.*

*There is also a need to have a written record of the agreement between a faculty member and student regarding the terms under which the student will earn credit for IAW and to ensure compliance with HSU policy requiring that all off-campus academic work for these courses be covered by a standard CSU waiver signed by the student before the work commences and, for students under the age of 18, an additional signature by a parent or legal guardian.*



Discussion:

- It was asked if this was a first reading of the resolution, as it has not been seen before.
- It was explained that resolutions are given first readings when they are complicated and difficult. Most of the time resolutions will be action items the first time around.
- A senator raised objection to having the Senate act on the resolution, because there had not been time to share the document at the department level and the resolution will have severe impacts on the department. The department has ca. sixty graduate students enrolled who are required to take two units of 699 every semester. So every semester the department will get 60 forms in addition to other IAW students. It doesn't seem like it will be a helpful addition to the way the office is run.
- It was explained that the waiver is a CSU requirement. Under a new Executive Order, each campus is to determine its own risk management process. This particular form came from the CSU lawyers.
- Could students entering graduate programs just sign the waiver for the time period they will be here? There needs to be discussion about this.

Chair Mortazavi suggested that if others agree that they do not want to vote on the resolution today, then someone should make a motion to postpone the resolution to the next meeting.

- It was not clear if a current policy exists. The reason for the development of this policy is that there has been a proliferation of courses using these numbers (which are designated for independent/directed study for master's and senior theses) in ways that were not originally intended. The intent is to clarify when the course numbers are appropriate and when they are not. The form is new. The rationale behind having a form and having it kept in the department is to have some kind of institutional record of what students/faculty agreed to.
- There is no indication in the resolution of where the forms are to reside and what should be done with them. There is no indication in the resolution of what the Office of Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies is going to do to administer the policy. Will they review the forms and tell faculty if they are not approved?
- The policy states that the forms go to the department office. The policy is attached to the resolution. This allows individual departments to determine how they want to manage it. The second resolved clause was added to clarify who will review the policy in the future, as needed, and provide oversight. It is not intended that Academic Programs will have anything to do with the forms submitted to departments.
- How is this supposed to work in light of the 10% reduction in workload, if both the department chair and the department ASC have to administer this? If it is just kept in the department office and filed, and not looked at again, why do we need to do this paperwork? What have the problems been require this new paperwork? Have there been disputes over grades for 499 courses for undergraduates?

- There have been incidences that brought attention to this. If one looks at the HSU Catalog, it is clear there are 399 and 499 courses that do not fit with the definition. There has been an instance of a transfer student getting credit for the same independent study both at HSU and another campus. Faculty complete this process with students for 499 courses already, it is just not written down. The question of whether or not it is worth taking the extra step to have a record needs to be decided. The committee tried hard not to make it an onerous process or to have it reduce faculty flexibility or discretion.
- Having an appropriate descriptive course title, rather than a generic title, saves effort for the student having to explain what the course was, when they apply for graduate programs. Concern was expressed that this would not be permitted anymore.
- A counter argument could be made that the majority of classes in the current schedule are just directed study or independent study – unique titles are not that prevalent. It is more difficult for the Registrar's Office to have so many different courses, not just in terms of the time to put them in the system, but also in terms of the ability to analyze information using CMS.
- The issue was pronounced in the transition from Banner to PeopleSoft when thousands of these individually named courses had to be rolled over. Entering each course individually is not only a workload issue, it also became a space issue on a student's transcript. For Master's theses, the title of the thesis is not included; it puts the onus on the student to describe what the course was, which is not inappropriate.
- Could there be an increased effort to change the coding in CMS so it can be patched and made easier to do? There are times when it is helpful to have the name of the subject matter in the course title for students getting into graduate school.
- When a unique title is used, it does not show as an independent study on the transcript. A possible compromise would be to use the generic title followed by a colon and the unique title. A reading of the transcript would be more accurate.
- A plea was made that whoever puts the form out – don't make it an Adobe file format that cannot be saved.
- It has been the practice for years that a student who was doing an independent study could go to the Registrar's Office and provide a name for that independent study. Will they no longer be allowed to do this? That is correct.
- Why is there nothing on the form addressing internship experiences or other types of field experience?
- They are not included because they have a different legal orientation. Internships have to be negotiated with the University because they include liability, etc.
- HSU has all sorts of policies for classes, but independent studies are pretty much unregulated. Most departments do not regulate independent studies and faculty do what they want. If

independent study is an important part of a student's education, then it should be subjected to some degree of oversight. This is a pretty moderate policy and modest step in that direction. A lot of independent studies are not on the workload radar and faculty are doing them as overload. For workload consideration, there should be some paper trail to account for what students and faculty are doing. There are not that many people that take advantage of the title for the course. It is important to distinguish an independent study from a regular course – they are treated very differently on this campus.

Chair Mortazavi reminded everyone that there is a class in Goodwin Forum that begins at 6 pm and they will need to re-arrange the room before the class begins.

- It is surprising to hear that other departments are not already doing this. It is a useful way to track students, in case a student begins in a semester and is not able to finish, or a faculty member needs to be replaced, etc. Students know exactly what they are expected to do and how they will be assessed. Copies go to the student, faculty member, and the department office. It is useful and it doesn't increase workload. This process is not onerous. It is helpful, however, for students applying to graduate school to have unique titles for independent study showing what the course was.
- If there are people abusing the privilege, then those abuses should be addressed. Abuses by a few should not be a reason for having a new policy that potentially places large burdens on those who have not done this before. Little reason is seen for asking faculty to fill out another form and in general, this seems unnecessary.
- It was clarified that the primary argument made earlier for implementing this policy was that independent studies play a significant role in students' education at HSU and they are largely undocumented in any way. There is no tracking of what is being done or how it is being assessed. That is the primary problem, not the fact that there are few abuses of the system.

Senator Mortazavi announced that the resolution will be postponed to the next meeting.

Senator Van Duzer asked senators to forward any additional comments they have to him via email.

M/S (Reiss/Flashman) to adjourn the meeting.

It was stated that the committee may revise the resolution before the next Senate meeting. It was clarified that no motion was made to refer the resolution back to the committee. It was asked if a motion could be made to refer the resolution back to the committee.

Point of order – there is a motion to adjourn on the floor. Chair Mortazavi stated that the resolution will be postponed to the next meeting of the Senate. The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.