

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm on Tuesday, January 26, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, Berman, Cannon, Craig, Chapin, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Meiggs, Mortazavi, Nordstrom, Olson, Paynton, Powell, Reiss, Rizzardi, Rodriguez, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Thobaben, Tripp, Van Duzer, Verlinden.

Members Absent: Ahmed, Bolick-Floss, Butler, Gunsalus, Richmond.

Proxies: Thobaben for Cheyne, Reiss for Moyer, Craig for Yarnall.

Guests: There were about two dozen guests.

### **1. Approval of Minutes from the Meetings of December 8 & 9, 2009**

M/S/P (Cannon/Paynton) to approve the minutes from the meetings of December 8 and 9, 2009 as presented.

A request was made to change the first sentence on page 6 of the December 8.

[The following change was made to the first sentence on page 6 of the 12/8/09 minutes:  
| It was asked if this was a friendly amendment. ~~Is this a friendly?~~]

Minutes were **APPROVED** with 1 Abstention.

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

Chair Mortazavi announced proxies for the meeting.

Senator Fulgham announced that he is back on the Senate as the most immediate past Senate Chair, replacing Senator Larson who is on FERP for the spring term.

It was asked if the Senate just approved both sets of minutes. It was answered yes.

It was asked how the action that was taken on the Consent Calendar “during the interim” fits into the minutes. It was requested that it be recorded appropriately as an email vote in the minutes, because it is an unfortunate precedent and should be noted.

[The following change was made on p. 17 of the Dec. 8 minutes: “Consent Calendar  
| (distributed electronically 12/10/11 for email vote) – Approved without objection.”]

Chair Mortazavi announced that there will be an election for Senate Vice-Chair later in the meeting. This is an opportunity for those who have been critical of the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee to join the group and help provide direction.

M/S/P (Heise/Goodman) to table agenda items #4 and #5 until the next Senate meeting in order to have more time to deal with the issue of program elimination.

Discussion:

- The Senate is without an officer and a standing committee chair.
- It is better to remove them from the agenda rather than table them.

Voting occurred and motion **PASSED**.

It was noted that the Consent Calendar items (curriculum items) are important to get into the Catalog.

Chair Mortazavi suggested that the Senate deal with the Consent Calendar after the vote at 5:45 pm if there is no objection.

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

No reports.

### **4. Consent Calendar**

Postponed until after the vote at 5:45 pm.

### **5. Election to fill vacancy for Senate Vice-Chair**

Tabled.

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

Professor Christian Itin, Social Work suggested that the criterion for graduate programs, "Average Number of Units at Completion," does not take into account that graduate programs have varying requirements for number of units. Required units may vary between 30 up to 60. He suggested that a ratio between the average number of units and the number of units required in a degree program be used – if the true purpose is to capture the 'excess' cost.

Professor Kathy Munoz, Kinesiology and Recreation Administration raised questions about how the data will be gathered. For example, will an option that has been recently eliminated be counted in data gathered for the criterion "Subject Area SFR (3-yr average)" or will programs that have been eliminated not be counted? How will the criterion "Department Cost per FTES (4-yr average)" be counted? Within a department there may be a wide range of costs – will these be lumped together?

John Filce, Institutional Research (IR), provided answers. In terms of SFRs by option, the standard data available is by the course subject area. Unless a process is undertaken to define which courses belong to which options, etc., that level of detail is not available. At this point, data that is available and that has been calculated in a standard and meaningful way is being recommended for use. Due to core accounting practices of the university, only costs at the department level are available. There are no indicators that allow for breaking out and assigning costs at the program level – it would have to be done manually. Some departments may have that data. However, IR does not have the tools to do this consistently across all departments at this point.

Additional questions/comments from guests and senators:

Will calculation of costs include non-major units in department costs? If they aren't teased out, may departments rebut the data and provide their own data?

Senator Mortazavi responded that there will be a period of time for departments to receive, review and correct their data.

"Point of Information" – Senator Fulgham stated that the document as written states that any program that is in the tier to be eliminated will have will have 2 pages and 10 minutes.

The process does not involve automatically eliminating any program based only on the data. If so, there would be greater concern that the data be precise. However, the process will involve discussion and judgment and there is room to sort out the data questions as part of the process.

There may be a secondary opportunity to respond; however, once a program has been ranked the ranking will carry a tremendous amount of weight in the discussion.

It was clarified: there are two opportunities to check the data in the process. In the initial process, departments will check their own data for errors and make corrections, before the departments are put in list order. After the list is created, programs may respond with a two-page document.

Chair Mortazavi introduced the members of the Program Elimination Task Force: Saeed Mortazavi, Brandon Chapin, Richard Bruce, Steve Smith, Cindy Moyer, Brent Duncan, Mark Rizzardi, John Filce, Scott Paynton, and Jená Burges.

There is nothing in the criteria that accounts for added revenue that may offset some of the other criteria – there should be something that accounts for revenue that is brought in. The Task Force considered this and felt that this was an item a department could include in its two-page response. In response, it was noted that this should be considered before a department gets ranked.

Concern was expressed that the ranking of cost per FTES will be more expensive for small departments which have more senior faculty and will emphasize the hiring of more part-time faculty and having less senior faculty.

How is the criterion “Uniqueness in the CSU” being defined? A program could be unique for many reasons – is there some value attached to uniqueness? The Task Force considered uniqueness in terms of HSU being the only campus offering a program within the CSU.

Is there some other judgment that goes along with this? If every other campus has gotten rid of the program because it is antiquated and HSU still has it, it is not necessarily a good thing. How will this be dealt with?

Chair Mortazavi stated that after discussion, the Senate may choose to approve the proposal, modify and approve the approval, or reject the proposal.

It was suggested a straw poll be taken on each criteria to see whether or not the Senate wants to keep it.

A number of arguments have been conveyed by various means to individuals and which need to be conveyed to the entire Senate before voting on which criteria should be kept or eliminated. A straw vote shouldn't be taken too early.

#### **7. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:45 PM – Discussion of “Proposed Program Elimination Criteria and Procedure” from the Program Elimination Task Force**

Senators shared feedback from colleagues in their departments and colleges, as well as their own opinions. The following is a list of discussion points and comments:

##### General:

- Pursue program elimination, but with revised parameters (criteria)
- Be extremely careful that data is both accurate and reflective of factors that may be unique to certain programs prior to programs being ranked
- This proposal turns its back on discussions of strategic concerns or considering what HSU should keep, i.e., what mix of faculty, programs, appropriate SFR in disciplinary areas, balance between GE and majors, etc.
- If the proposal is not passed in its current form or an amended form, decisions will be taken from the faculty's hands and the Provost will take other measures that are in his purview
- Without a plan and process to make base budget cuts, there won't be an argument for bridge funding to take the cuts over a period of time rather than all at once
- Strong support for targeted cuts has been voiced; the University Budget Committee (UBC) has not debated this and it has not been debated elsewhere; the issue is unresolved
- Suggested alternative: look at largest majors (especially the most expensive ones) and reduce them by one third; the programs would remain viable and comparatively large, though would have to be declared impacted; we would get our money and still have our university

- The established prioritization process should serve to complete this process; this second round of ranking is unnecessary and redundant; prior review involved significant faculty review; the administration should make cuts based on the work that has been done and not put the faculty in an adversarial position against one another
- The Senate needs to resolve the issue of whether the criteria will be weighted equally or not
- In terms of targeted cuts – there are programs that if cut would not be viable in terms of accreditation or professional standards ; need to judge program as a whole, not eliminate programs by allowing program to “bleed out”

Possible additional criteria:

- If department or program is important in meeting WASC goals, it should have a “safety box”
- Outside funding received by programs

Undergraduate/Graduate – “Prioritization Ranking”:

- Use of prioritization ranking as criterion is problematic
- Prioritization work governed by a different set of circumstances and was not intended for this purpose
- Quality measures of programs are inadequate
- Many department responses were not taken into account and rankings were not changed
- Only use prioritization ranking – do not use anything else
- Use prioritization ranking and heavily weight it
- Eliminate prioritization ranking
- Prioritization rankings very flawed for some departments; remove as a criterion or weight very low

Undergraduate – “Uniqueness in the CSU”:

- Eliminate
- Problematic - it can lead to the inflation in the standing of programs which are not “good” programs but are unique
- Excellent programs with parallels on every campus will find themselves penalized because they are not unique

Undergraduate – “Department Cost per FTES (4-year average)”:

- Unclear on how this will be neutralized by standardizing the costs; as it stands (un-standardized) it is driven by proportion of tenure-track to lecturer faculty
- Contributes to the tendency for HSU to become a university of part-time faculty and erodes capacity to perform the collateral duties which accompany tenure-track positions, including governance
- Concern expressed about not being able to look at program costs and only looking at department costs

Undergraduate – “Number of Non-resident Students (4-year average)”:

- Eliminate
- Needs to be a proportion rather than a raw number; if it is valuable to have non-resident students, then smaller programs are at a disadvantage if only the raw number is counted
- This is the CSU and the priority is to serve California students; criterion should be eliminated

Graduate – “Average Number of Units at Completion”:

- Take into consideration different kinds of graduate programs (i.e. MA versus terminal MFA programs)

Proposed Procedure and Timeline:

- Concerns expressed about the giving departments long enough to complete a fact-check on their data before the ranking
- Is the proposed role of the Program Elimination Task Force to ‘tally’ or to ‘evaluate’? Concern was expressed about the Task Force undertaking an evaluative role, since it was appointed to develop a procedure, and the choice of people on the task force reflected this. This needs to be clarified.

Chair Mortazavi reminded Senators that at the December 9 meeting it was agreed to move quickly on this. The Task Force is aware that the data are not absolutely perfect. But there is not enough time to generate the kinds of data that people are proposing; it is necessary to use what is available. This proposal uses data that is easily available with an awareness of its shortcomings.

It was noted that the ‘ranking’ or ordering of the programs only provides the sequence for which programs will be voted on; regardless of any ‘tweaking’ that is done to the criteria. Ultimately, it comes down to how Senators vote when presented with the programs. Endlessly discussing the criteria is a waste of time.

Chair Mortazavi suggested the Senate take straw polls on each criterion to determine which ones need to be discussed further.

Straw poll results:

Undergraduate Programs – “in favor of keeping”

- Prioritization: 15 Yes, 6 No, 2 Abstentions
- Uniqueness in the CSU: 7 Yes, 13 No, 1 Abstention
- Number of Degrees ...: 16 Yes, 2 No, 4 Abstentions
- Subject Area SFR: 14 Yes, 1 No, 4 Abstentions
- Department Cost per FTES: 15 Yes, 4 No, 3 Abstentions
- Number of Non-resident Students: 3 Yes, 13 No, 8 Abstentions

M/S/W (Van Duzer/Powell) to add average student course ratings as a measure of teaching quality at a university that is a teaching school.

- Does this mean student evaluations? Yes.
- Is this an average of all categories or just 'overall teaching effectiveness'? It was clarified it is the average student evaluation ratings (items 12 & 13) for a program over four years.

There was discussion on how to proceed with the discussion and voting.

Senator Van Duzer withdrew his motion.

M/S (Thobaben/Fulgham) that the Senate accept the "Proposed Program Elimination Criteria and Procedure" from the Program Elimination Task Force.

M/S/P (Powell/Van Duzer) to amend the proposal by eliminating the Undergraduate Programs criterion "Uniqueness in the CSU."

Discussion of the amendment:

- The Senate spent a considerable amount of time hearing about 'unique' programs last semester. There are clearly some programs that are small, valuable, and the only one of its kind in the State of California, so it seems to be an important criterion.
- Those things that are unique, exceptional and well-done make HSU a more attractive place to come. We need to at least think about uniqueness.
- Uniqueness in the CSU has a weighting factor. There are many unique components and programs that bring students to HSU. Some type of evaluation of uniqueness is needed. It was suggested that it be less quantitative and more qualitative. It should not be categorically eliminated without further defining how to describe uniqueness.
- Prioritization already counted uniqueness; this is double-counting.
- Ultimately, it is not going to affect the ordering of the programs that much. Departments will have an opportunity to make their case and rebut the data.

Voting on the Amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 14 Yes votes, 9 No votes, and 1 Abstention. The criterion of "Uniqueness in the CSU" under Undergraduate Programs was eliminated.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Altschul) to amend the proposal by eliminating the Undergraduate Programs criterion "Number of Non-resident Students."

Discussion on the amendment:

- There needs to be some sense of income related to program costs and non-resident students bring income to the University. If the State of California isn't going to provide money for more California students then we need to find other means of income.

“Point of Information” – Senator Fulgham stated that ‘non-resident’ is Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE), out-of-state, and international students.

- Does this criterion count WUE students? Yes.
- Does the number of non-resident students increase the rating of the program? Yes.
- This is another measure of a program's productivity in terms of evaluating costs of FTES. It shows what programs bring in extra revenue. We have not done any evaluation of the weighting of the criterion. Changing the weighting is an alternative to getting rid of a criterion.
- Departments will be unfairly penalized if this criterion is used. It changes the standards of evaluation without telling departments ahead of time. Some departments could have been recruiting non-resident students, but they weren't told that it was a good idea to do so, so have not done it.
- Vote against the criterion as stated, and then reinstate it on the basis of percentage, so that smaller departments are not at a disadvantage.
- Is there a reason why this one category of income generation the ‘privileged’ one? The Task Force considered other types of revenue, but this one was the cleanest in terms of gathering data on the revenue. Grants and contracts are murky; even though money is coming in, it is not always a positive flow. Other entrepreneurial activities were not discussed.
- This could be considered under department costs per FTES.

Voting on the Amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 16 Yes votes, 6 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

M/S/F (Heise/Cannon) to amend the Undergraduate Programs criterion “Number of Degrees Awarded Annually (4-year average) to reflect a ratio of degrees to faculty.

- Based on raw numbers, departments with more faculty will look like they are doing a better job.



- Departments with a large GE service component will have a large faculty but not many graduates and will have an unfair advantage. This was intended to show how many students will be impacted if the program is removed. It shows a raw count of how many students will be taken away from the University if the program is eliminated.
- The amendment doesn't specify whether it is a headcount of faculty or of FTEF. It was clarified that it should be FTEF in the department.

Voting on the Amendment occurred and **FAILED** with 3 Yes votes, 17 No votes, and 4 Abstentions.

M/S/F (Van Duzer/Powell) to amend the proposal by adding a criterion to include the average course evaluation ratings on the basis of the "Overall Teaching Effectiveness" in order to demonstrate a commitment to being a teaching institution.

- Does this include all faculty headcount in a program, in a department, on a FTEF basis in a program, on a FTEF basis in a department? It would include all of the courses offered for a particular major or program and those would be summed across all faculty teaching in that program.
- The Task Force discussed this and dropped it. Not all faculty are required to have every course evaluated. This would skew the results. If this route is chosen, there will be issues of counting graduate student instructors, weighting according to the number of students in a course, etc. It would require a lot of fine-tuning if this metric is used.
- How readily available is this data and who will collect it and format it for departments to use?
- While the concerns about the complexity of the data and the short timeline carry some weight, this is a university and we have lost sight of our purpose if "teaching effectiveness" is not a component of the criteria being used to evaluate programs.
- We want to preserve the programs that students get the best education from and part of that is related to quality of teaching.
- According to staff from Information Technology Services, it would be challenging but it would be possible to do without involving many personnel. It would be able to be done in a way that could place departments in groups and ensure the anonymity of individual faculty members.
- The Senate resolution on the current standardized evaluation states that the data can only be used for the retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) process. According to RTP, the primary evaluation for teaching effectiveness is collegial letters, not student evaluations. Jumping to secondary level data is problematic. The evaluations are useful; however, if faculty are honest about it, much of the data reflects how well students liked the course and the ease of the course rather than teaching effectiveness and how much a student

learns. It is problematic in this sense.

- The assessment process has already denied that student evaluations are a measure of teaching effectiveness. Everyone has had to go through several layers of evaluation of teaching effectiveness throughout the RTP process; ostensibly we've already established that departments have good teachers.
- This is personnel action information and CFA needs to address the question of whether or not it is appropriate for the University to be extracting personnel data and putting it in the public domain for use in making decisions.
- Assurances received from ITS about providing anonymity should address these concerns. The Senate should amend what it did before. In the process of eliminating programs they are owed a clear statement of how well they have been doing as teaching.
- It is essential for an institution that has articulated its commitment to teaching to find some way to value teaching and find some kind of measure of teaching.

M/S/P (Rizzardi/Paynton) to end debate. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 18 Yes votes, 5 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

Voting on the motion occurred and **FAILED** with 6 Yes votes, 14 No votes, and 3 Abstentions.

Discussion of the Criteria for Graduate and Credential Programs:

An explanation of the criterion "Average Number of Units at Completion" was requested. It was explained that it reflects the cost to the university to graduate a student through the program. In some programs students may complete 90-100 units; other programs have a set sequence of classes and require fewer units. It is a measure of effectiveness and a proxy for cost.

How are the units counted? This counts the number of units a student takes at a post-baccalaureate level, whether here or elsewhere.

We need to also think about the quality of the product – where do students end up?

Why is the set of criteria for graduate and credential programs significantly different from the criteria for undergraduate programs?

The Task Force looked at what kinds of data were available for each category. It was argued that average number of units at completion was not a good measure of cost; the number of WTUs would be a better measure, but this was data that could not be generated.

It was more difficult to find a clean set of criteria for the graduate programs.

The calculation of post-baccalaureate units confounds many things and would not be an accurate reflection of a program. It makes sense to count the number of units from the time the student is accepted into the program to the time the student leaves the university.

M/S/P (Fulgham/Powell) to amend the proposal by eliminating the criterion “Average Number of Units at Completion” under criteria for Graduate and Credential Programs.

- This is a miscalculation of units and disproportionate evaluation because it does not address what a student needs to complete a program. It should be removed.
- It is a good measure of productivity and efficiency, but programs should be given a year’s lead time before using this criterion.
- There is a real cost associated with S-factor courses which gets captured here. This is measure of cost of offering the graduate program. Having students sign up repeatedly for thesis units accumulates in terms of faculty workload and this is a cost.
- If there is a criterion reflecting costs, then there should be a criterion for reflecting revenue.
- Graduate programs have a different profile than undergraduate programs; graduate students come for specific programs and so there is not the same measure of demand as with undergraduate programs. Due to the number of cross-disciplinary programs at the graduate level without measurable department costs per FTES, programs cannot be measured like undergraduate programs.

Voting on the Amendment occurred and PASSED with 14 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 6 Abstentions.

The amended program elimination criteria now include four criteria for Undergraduate programs and three criteria for Graduate and Credential Programs.

M/S/W (Goodman/Powell) that the criterion “Prioritization Ranking” under the criteria for Undergraduate programs receive no more than 5% weight in the consideration by the program elimination task force.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the Senate meet next week to take the time needed to complete the discussion.
- Chair Mortazavi asked the Provost to respond. The Provost stated the Senate could take a week or two, but it still needs to come up with a process that can be completed by the end of the semester.
- Chair Mortazavi stated that the Senate can meet next Tuesday if it would like to do so.

- The motion on the floor deals only with the weighting of one criterion. The Senate should discuss a comprehensive weighting process.
- It was asked if the Task Force could spend the next week discussing this and come back with their thoughts (not decisions and not a new template) about where we're going with this – so the Senate has this as additional input to its deliberations next week.
- The Senate should take the vote it was scheduled to take at 5:45 pm with the idea that it will come back for an hour next week and deal with the weighting of the criteria.

Senator Goodman withdrew his motion.

It was noted that the Senate needs to discuss both weighting of criteria and the process next week.

It was noted that the methodology also needs discussion. An hour will not be adequate.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Cannon) that the Senate will meet next Tuesday and come to a final decision by the end of the meeting.

#### **8. TIME CERTAIN: 4:45 PM – Senate vote on the “Proposed Program Elimination Criteria and Procedure”**

No vote was taken.

#### **Consent Calendar (agenda item #4)**

There was a question about the implications of item 09-278: ‘Politics and Sustainable Society’ – the answer couldn’t be found on the SharePoint site.

“Point of Order” – Senator Flashman advised that a question on a Consent Calendar item takes it off the Consent Calendar.

Item #09-278 was removed from the Consent Calendar and will be placed on the business agenda for the Senate meeting on February 9, 2010.

The following Consent Calendar items were approved without objection:

**09-264: ENGR 518: Applied Hydraulics** – Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-265: ENGR 548: River Hydraulics** – Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-266: ENGR 551: Water & Wastewater Treatment Engineering** - Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-267: ENGR 571: Advanced Thermodynamics & Energy Systems** - Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-268: ENGR 573: Building Energy Analysis** - Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-269: ENGR 575: Renewable Energy Power Systems** - Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-270: ENGR 577: Solar Thermal Engineering** - Change grade mode from letter to option of letter, CR/NC, or Audit

**09-274: WS 436: Psychology of Women** – Change C-class from C-2 to C-3. This course is cross-listed with the Psych department, and the Psych class is C-3.

**09-282: Spanish 108: Level III for Spanish Speakers** title change to “Level III for Heritage Speakers”

**09-283: Spanish 208: Level IV for Spanish Speakers** title change to “Level IV for Heritage Speakers”

#### **Election to fill vacancy for Senate Vice-Chair (agenda item #5)**

Senator Mortazavi called for nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Senate. There were no nominations.

The meeting ended at 5:52 pm.