

Chair Mortazavi called the special meeting of the Senate to order at 4:03 pm on Tuesday, February 2, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, Berman, Cannon, Chapin, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Meiggs, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Olson, Paynton, Powell, Reiss, Rodriguez, Snyder, Thobaben, Tripp, Van Duzer.

Members Absent: Butler, Gunsalus, Nordstrom, Richmond, Ryerson-Replogle.

Proxies: Knox for Bolick-Floss, Moyer for Rizzardi, Paynton for VerLinden, Craig for Yarnall.

Guests: There were ca. 25 guests.

M/S/P (Thobaben/Van Duzer) to add the election of a Senate Vice-Chair to the agenda as item number two. Motion **PASSED** with 2 Abstentions.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of January 26, 2010

M/S/P (Thobaben/Van Duzer) to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 26, 2010. A correction was noted on page 12. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 2 Abstentions.

Clarification was requested on what the standard is for removing items from the consent calendar. It is inefficient to have questions stop the process by moving an item off the consent calendar. It would be helpful to understand the rules of order and ascertain whether or not there could be some flexibility so that a few questions could be answered.

Any senator may request to have an item removed from the consent calendar. At the previous meeting a question was raised about an item but it was not a request to remove it. However, no one was available to answer the question.

At the last meeting the assumption was made that because a question was asked about an item, it automatically came off the consent calendar. Is this a correct assumption?

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Senator Mortazavi announced the proxies for the meeting.

Senator Mortazavi announced that a Senator is needed to serve on the Academic Policies Committee.

Election of Senate Vice-Chair

M/S/U (Thobaben/Cheyne) that Michael Goodman be elected as Vice-Chair of the Senate and

Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Chair Mortazavi asked for other nominations. There were no further nominations.

Senator Goodman was congratulated on his election to serve as Vice-Chair of the Senate and Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Chair Mortazavi welcomed Monty Mola (Physics) to the Senate as the new representative from CNRS.

Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio members

Faculty Affairs Committee (Goodman): The Committee will be re-convened and pick up where it left off as soon as possible.

Statewide Senate (Thobaben): The faculty trustee still has not been selected by the Governor; it has been quite controversial. The two candidates forwarded by the ASCSU were not acceptable to the Governor and the ASCSU has not wanted to deviate from the established process and submit additional names. There is a stalemate. Unfortunately, without two faculty trustees in place, it has meant that since July there has been no representation by a faculty trustee on the Board of Trustees.

(Cheyne) – A number of resolutions were passed at the recent plenary session. A summary of the resolutions will be forwarded to members of the Senate in the near future.

General Faculty (Powell): Two members of the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) had to take unexpected leaves this semester. Nominations to fill the 1-semester vacancies were solicited and only one name was forwarded. An appointment was made to fill one of the vacancies. The other vacancy will remain unfilled.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): ICC will be forwarding recommendations to the Senate on two more post-prioritization items next week. A letter from the ICC will be sent to all faculty reminding them of the deadline for submitting the next round of curriculum proposals.

Associated Students (Chapin): Two “Meet the Decision-Makers” events are coming up. Next week there will be an event with the President of the California State Student Association (CSSA) and the Executive Director of CSSA. The following week on February 15, there will be a pizza with the President event. Provost Snyder and Vice President Butler will be there also. Next month, a meet the decisions-makers event will be set up with members of the Senate Executive Committee, including Chair Mortazavi and General Faculty President Powell. Applications for the AS Annual Campus Community Scholarships (\$1,000 scholarships for 30 students) are being solicited. A link to the information will be sent to all senators to help encourage students to apply. CSSA is looking for a student trustee and applications will be accepted until April.

California Faculty Association (CFA) (Meiggs): Bargaining reopeners will occur in June. A member survey is coming out the end of this month.

Senate Finance (Paynton): Senator Paynton will be attending four WASC meetings this week, dealing with shared governance, budget, and finance issues. Provost's Council is meeting with the candidates for Dean of the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. The University Budget Committee (UBC) met on Friday and will meet again a week from Friday with the vice presidents to receive their budget proposals for AY 2010/2011.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): The report and recommendations from the Cabinet for Institutional Change (CIC) came out this afternoon. Senators were encouraged to look at the document and the Academic Senate was encouraged to review the governance recommendations in the near future. Chair Mortazavi noted that this is on the agenda for next week's Senate meeting.

The WASC review team is on campus for the Educational Effectiveness Review. Everyone was encouraged to participate in the open forums and/or other relevant meetings and to read the documents ahead of time. The times and locations for the open forums are on the WASC web site. Vice Provost Burges reminded everyone that there is a confidential email account set up which will only be accessible to the visiting WASC team members. If individuals do not want to share their comments publicly, they can use this email account. It will be deactivated at the end of the visit. Unless designated as an open forum, WASC meetings are by invitation only.

The Provost was asked if he had a plan for replacing the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Provost reported on the process that is currently underway. The President's Office is doing a review of the position; interviewing people both inside and outside of Student Affairs and a recommendation will be forthcoming.

Will it be an interim position? The Provost responded that a review of the position is being done. Once the review is concluded (it is not known how long the review will take) decisions will be made on how to proceed.

The Provost was asked if he knew whether or not the review would include where the office fits in the organization chart and whether there should be any rearrangement of what falls under the Student Affairs vice president. The Provost responded that when a review of a position is done, it is looked at both organizationally and structurally – everything is under review. He reiterated that the President's Office is conducting the review.

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

No speakers signed up for the open forum. Chair Mortazavi asked if anyone in the audience would like to address the Senate.

While the prioritization process was a failed process in many ways, it was far more deliberative than the process currently being created. The remaining criteria are only financially based and that is extremely dangerous. Campus vision was an important part of the prioritization process but it has not been part of this conversation. The Senate should consider the campus vision as

a piece of the process. Don't throw away a year's worth of hard work on the part of many people for something that is rushed into and will provide less satisfactory results.

The Senate was asked to take into account the significant revisions that have been undertaken by some programs as an outcome of the prioritization process. Using financial data from the past four years as an average will not reflect the recent changes and improvements that have been made.

4. Continued discussion the "Proposed Program Elimination Criteria and Procedure" from the Program Elimination Task Force

Discussion continued on the motion from the previous meeting: M/S (Thobaben/Fulgham) that the Senate accepts the *Proposed Program Elimination Criteria and Procedure* from the Program Elimination Task Force.

The Provost explained how he sees himself and the process fitting into the current discussion. The Senate and the Provost agreed that a group would be formed to develop an expedited program elimination process. The proposal developed by the group needs to be agreeable to both the Provost and the Senate. If it is not agreeable to either party, then the Provost will have to take other measures for budget reductions. The Program Elimination Task Force had four senators on it. They spent fourteen hours of meeting time developing this proposal. In 'Senate years' this is three and a half months. When it was brought to the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost said he was willing to live with it and was willing to accept it, even though it wasn't exactly what he had in mind. Clearly, the Senate is not taking this path; it wants to substantially revise the document.

The Provost indicated that he is struggling with the removal of the graduate criteria "Average Number of Units at Completion." Efficiency and cost have to be two of the major factors in looking at program elimination. The Task Force explained to the Senate that it is very difficult to get accurate cost data for graduate programs and it is necessary to employ some type of proxy. The criterion "Average Number of Units at Completion" was a pretty good proxy for cost.

The Provost warned that if the proposal is modified too much, he may not accept it. That may or may not be what the Senate wants.

It would be helpful to know what the Provost's plan is if this proposal does not pass. The Provost outlined the options he presented in December, which include cancelling all faculty searches, cancelling every under-enrolled class without exception, etc. There is a range of much broader measures that will fall more indiscriminately on programs. These are administrative prerogatives that the Provost can exercise without involving the governance structure.

The Senate had good conversations last week and the group worked expeditiously. If there was adequate time and resources for getting good data, there might be a reason for keeping the criterion "Average number of units at completion" for graduate programs. The Senate has not expressed any desire to stop the process or make it less meaningful. It is important not to

make this adversarial.

The options stated by the Provost seem more *pro rata* than targeted, which is something the Provost has argued against. Are these the only options possible? The Provost stated that the options are broader, but they are not necessarily *pro rata*. He will look at how students are affected the least, time to graduation, etc.

If the Senate does not get to a vote today or chooses to vote no on the proposal, it cannot be turn around and say that administrators were not receptive to shared governance. Many of the discussions the Senate is having were already thoroughly discussed by the Task Force. It is a bitter pill to swallow, any way you look at it. The criteria were picked based on the best data that was accessible and available. The Senate needs to move from this conversation with the Provost to discussing the document.

Several areas of the proposal can use some tweaking; it is not a perfect document. The Senate has an obligation to do the best job possible. This process is a way to assemble a list of programs that will come before the Senate for review and elimination. The list will have more than enough programs on it to satisfy the needs of the Provost. Placement of programs on the list is important. The creation of the list and who creates it is important. The current process is unclear. The use of the term "rank" is unclear. A ranking is not an evaluation. Averaging ranking is not the same thing as averaging various criteria – we're talking about mixing up the data.

The role of the Task Force is not clear. Task Force members were selected to develop criteria and a process. They now seem to be playing a role in the evaluation – they were not selected for that purpose. It was suggested that the prioritization committee be resurrected to serve as the evaluating group – they have experience with all of the programs and would be much better prepared to do the evaluation.

M/S (Thobaben/Powell) that the Criteria for Undergraduate Programs be weighted according to the following percentages: Prioritization Ranking = 20%, Number of Degrees Awarded Annually – 30%, Subject Area SFR = 25% and Department Cost per FTES = 25% and that the three Criteria for Graduate and Credential Programs be weighted equally.

Discussion:

- The reason for not giving the undergraduate criteria equal weighting is the concern that was expressed last week about the prioritization ranking being more subjective than the others.
- For the purpose of setting the record straight, a statement was made about the prioritization process. Remarks that have been made repeatedly which are in error and need to be corrected. An assumption has been made that because the prioritization task force did not respond specifically to every program's report, it did not pay any attention at all to the reports. In fact, the task force did pay attention to all of the responses it received. The responses were read carefully and considered, however in some cases the task force did not find arguments convincing enough to alter its original recommendation.

- Opinions on the weighting of the criterion “prioritization ranking” were shared, ranging from it should be the only criterion used to it should not be used at all.
- It doesn’t matter; the compiled data will be available to members of the senate. Individuals voting in the Senate can provide their own weighting to the criteria.
- The “prioritization ranking” should be ranked higher than lower; it reduces the conflation of the data used in the prior prioritization ranking.
- The prioritization ranking included five separate criteria. It should be weighted at least 50% and the other three criteria weighted equally.
- The prioritization task force may have done its job, but it did not do a good job. The arguments presented by departments were convincing.
- The Program Elimination Task Force played with the data and numbers, trying different approaches to factoring the multiple categories. It did not make considerable difference when certain numbers were doubled, etc. How much time needs to be spent on this when in reality it may only make a difference to one or two departments and affect the ranking only by one or two places?
- The overwhelming factor will be the vote that the Senate will take as it goes through the list.
- If a higher weight is given to the prioritization ranking it will put quality programs that are costly programs out of consideration for elimination. The impact on the campus will be less if costly programs with minimal impact are eliminated versus cutting a large number of low cost programs. Higher weighting should be given to the cost.
- The floor was yielded. Weighting the number of graduates higher than SFR could also keep the more costly programs in.
- Concern was expressed as to how the numbers would be interpreted and weighted to come up with the final ranking.
- In 1990, criteria were chosen based on importance. Each of the criteria generated a different list. Rather than prioritization, a “centrality” measure was used to address mission, vision, etc. That is what this proposal is doing. Each list gives a rank order which will be added up across categories. It is pretty straightforward. The Senate is making this much too complicated.

M/S/F (Moyer/Knox) to end debate. Voting occurred and motion **FAILED** with 15 Yes votes, 9 No votes, 1 Abstention.

Discussion continued:

- Just add the ranking for each column. It is not clear why weighting is being discussed.
- The percentages that have been suggested will not make any difference in the total ranking. The low score from all areas will be the one most protected from elimination and the highest score will be the least protected from elimination. The Senate needs to ensure that the list that comes forward is not a windfall from having something counted more than once. The current proposal will not make any difference.
- The floor was yielded. The creation of the list just gives the Senate a basis to begin its deliberation and strategy. The Senate could strategize and skip all programs at the bottom of the list. This is just a list of cost figures. Tinkering with it is beside the point. The Senate needs to know the rankings and decide on a strategy for approaching the rankings and using them in the elimination process.
- If weighted averages are used, then rankings will not work. This process is not suitable for weighting.
- It was suggested that each of the categories be weighted equally (25% each).

M/S/P (Cheyne/Powell) to amend the motion by making each of the categories for undergraduate programs weighted equally (25%).

Discussion of the amendment:

- If they are being weighted equally, why does a percentage need to be assigned?

M/S/P (Paynton/Fulgham) to end debate on the amendment. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 21 Yes votes, 3 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

Voting on the amendment to give the four criteria for undergraduate programs equal weighting (25% each) occurred and **PASSED** with 14 Yes votes, 7 No votes, and 4 Abstentions.

Discussion returned to the original motion which has been amended to read: that the Criteria for Undergraduate Programs are weighted according to the following percentages:

Prioritization Ranking = 25%, Number of Degrees Awarded Annually =25%, Subject Area SFR = 25% and Department Cost per FTES = 25% and that the three Criteria for Graduate and Credential Programs be weighted equally.

- At the last meeting there were several suggestions about how these lists might be changed. Is everyone satisfied with these criteria as the final criteria?

Voting on the amended motion occurred and **PASSED** with 15 Yes votes, 6 No votes and 4 Abstentions.

The floor was yielded. The question of why the SFR would be ranked within the institution rather than having the SFR ranked to SFR averages throughout the system was asked. It was responded that in the context of needing to maintain FTES various reasons for eliminating programs need to be considered. Either programs that are undersubscribed are going to be eliminated or expensive programs will be eliminated. It doesn't matter how you compare your data to other institutions.

What happens if two programs are ranked the same? If this occurs, they both should get the lower ranking rather than the higher ranking.

Discussion of process:

- It was suggested that all of the dates be moved back one week. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
- It was suggested that the percentage of programs identified for needed savings be increased from 150% to 200% to provide more flexibility. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
- It was suggested that the final date, April 13 also be moved up a week. This was accepted as friendly. The Provost also agreed.
- Colleagues have expressed concern that departments won't have enough time to do fact-checking and clarify that the data are correct. Where in the timeline is this included and how much time do departments have?
- Departments will have one week to look at their data. It was noted that this is not included in the timeline. It is listed under methodology but not in the timeline. The Senate needs to decide where it goes. It needs to occur before the rankings.
- Several people requested that it be put explicitly in the timeline.
- Where does the data originate? John Filce will generate the data for the task force. The Task Force gives the department the data and the department has an opportunity to review. Where does the department go to check its data – analytical studies office? Isn't this somewhat circular?
- Departments may have access to data that has not been reported to IR which can help to verify or correct the data that was received. For example, double-majors don't always show up on reports; departments can correct this kind of information.
- It was asked if the Senate Executive Committee has discretion to choose to not put programs on the list, or does it take the list it receives from the Provost and certify it is okay? It was clarified that the Senate Executive Committee is a pass through at this point in the procedure.

- By what date will departments receive their data and by what dates does it need to be forwarded to the Task Force?
- It appears that all of this has to occur between now and February 11. Departments need a minimum of a few days to review and check the data. What is a reasonable timeframe?
- The data is mostly compiled; it is being reviewed internally and double-checked. It should be ready to cut loose next Monday or Tuesday.
- The Provost was asked how he sees this playing out, i.e. will he strictly follow the recommendations from the Academic Senate or will he make his own judgments as necessary? The Provost responded that it will probably be the latter, though he would prefer to follow the Senate's recommendation. It really depends on how it sorts out.
- The Program Elimination Task Force discussed the possibility that some departments may offer correction to data without substantial evidence to support the changes they are making. It is possible that the Task Force may need to meet one more time to determine whether the revised data is what should be used.
- It sounds like February 9 is the earliest date feasible to get the data to the departments. Previous discussions provided departments one week to review data. It was suggested that departments return their data by February 15 and then the task force has four days until February 19 to get the data to the Provost. How long will it take the Provost to identify the amount of cost savings for each program?

M/S/U (Cheyne/Faulk) to amend the procedure and timeline as follows:

Add – Tuesday, February 9 – as the date that the data goes to the Provost [department].

Add – Monday, February 15 – as the date that programs have to deliver their corrected data back to the task force

Change February 11 (originally Feb. 4) to Friday, February 19

Change February 19 (originally Feb. 12) to Friday, February 26.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** unanimously.

Discussion continued:

- Does the Senate feel that ten minutes will be long enough to have questions answered sufficiently in order to make a decision on whether or not a program should be eliminated?
- The Task Force took into consideration the number of times the Senate is scheduled to meet. If the ten-minute time is extended, there will not be sufficient meeting time and the Senate will need to schedule emergency meetings.

- It was stated that someone could dominate the question period and take up the entire ten minutes. It is not a fair way to proceed.
- Questions could be forwarded to the program prior to the meeting and the program could provide a written response to questions. Any ambiguity could be addressed at the panel.

M/S (Knox/Van Duzer) that senators forward their questions to individual programs and that those programs respond to questions in writing prior to the panel at the Senate meeting.

Discussion:

- It will be important for senators to ask questions and make decisions about one program relative to another. Programs need time to respond, but the Senate still needs to have some on the spot time for discussion.
- The Provost needs a commitment from the Senate that it will have a recommendation by the agreed upon date. The timeline for reaching its recommendation will depend on the number of programs that will need to be considered. The Senate needs to keep to a timeline but it may also need some flexibility rather than this kind of micromanaging of the timeline.
- Is this process of program elimination intended to come up with the entire \$1.2 million dollars? This could mean eliminating of 14-18 small programs to reach that amount. Can HSU remain a comprehensive university with the elimination of this many programs?

M/S/P (Paynton/Moyer) to amend the motion on the floor to add a line after the third bullet stating "Senators are encouraged to email questions regarding the rebuttal of particular programs previous to the oral presentation/question & answer and those programs are asked to submit their responses to those questions in writing."

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 23 Yes votes, 2 No votes.

Discussion continued on the motion on the floor:

- This is too much micromanagement and is not helpful. The number of programs on the list has just been increased from 150% to 200%. There are now more programs to look at and the Senate needs to acknowledge that it will have to meet more often than every other week.

Voting on the re-stated motion that senators forward their questions to individual programs and that those programs respond to questions in writing prior to the panel at the Senate meeting occurred and **PASSED** with 25 Yes votes, 1 No vote.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Knox) to amend the proposal by eliminating the fourth and fifth bullets, allowing the Senate to define its own process. The Senate then could decide how often it needs to meet and when.

- It was suggested that the process of voting on programs one at a time be kept in the fifth bullet. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Voting on the motion as amended occurred and **PASSED** with 16 Yes votes, 6 No votes and 3 Abstentions.

Chair Mortazavi asked if the Senate is ready to vote on the whole document as amended.

- Should the last bullet be eliminated? Yes - this was accepted as friendly.

The amendments to the proposal were reviewed.

Voting on the *Proposed Program Elimination Criteria and Procedure* as amended occurred and **PASSED** with 24 Yes votes and 2 Abstentions.

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

- It was asked if it was necessary to forward the document to the President for approval. It will add at least a week to the timeline. It was answered yes – the Senate recommends to the President.

Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 1 no vote.

M/S (Fulgham/Cheyne) to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.