

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting of the Senate to order at 4:04 pm on Tuesday, February 9, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, Berman, Cannon, Chapin, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Goodman, Gunsalus, Heise, Knox, Margell, Meiggs, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Paynton, Powell, Reiss, Rizzardi, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, Yarnall.

Members Absent: Butler, Richmond, Tripp.

Proxies: Knox for Bolick-Floss, Thobaben for Fulgham, Paynton for VerLinden.

Guests: MacConnie, Ayoob, Burges, Hendrickson, Smith, Martin, Darnall Burke, Colegrove-Raymond, Meyer, Rouse, Ortega, Kornreich, Hurlbut.

During the first half hour of the meeting about half a dozen people stood in the back of the room in silence with signs protesting program elimination.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 2, 2010

M/S/U (Paynton/Cannon) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 2, 2010 as written.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Chair Mortazavi announced the proxies for the meeting.

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

Faculty Affairs Committee (Goodman): Committee members have been contacted for their schedules in order to set up a meeting time.

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee will have two policies to forward to the Senate soon. The Committee has completed its editing of the dishonesty policy that is published in the HSU Catalog. The primary purpose was to clarify the language in the policy. It will be shared with the Senate as an information item. The Committee is beginning a discussion of the GWPE.

Statewide Senate (Thobaben): The two nominees (from the ASCSU) for Faculty Trustee are being interviewed by the Governor's office this week.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The Academic Master Planning subcommittee has begun looking at programs placed in category 1 as a result of prioritization. The discussion is beginning on a broad level, looking at the university's vision and how to make decisions about new programs and/or enhancing existing programs.

Associated Students (Chapin): Another “Meet the Decision-Makers” event will be held next week. President Richmond, Provost Snyder, and Vice President Butler have been invited and pizza will be provided for students. A.S. has a call out for applications for campus community service scholarships. Faculty were asked to encourage students to apply.

California Faculty Association (CFA) (Meiggs): An email was forwarded last week to senators regarding the remaining stimulus money to be released to CSU campuses. Humboldt’s share is ca. \$1.4 million dollars. The money is to be used to add needed classes for Fall 2010 and it can also be used for new CSU mandates on improving graduation rates.

Flyers were distributed about a statewide event being held on March 4. It is an effort on the part of K-12, community colleges, UC and CSU is to try and increase funding for education. There will be a special Humboldt event on March 4, 3:30-5:00 pm, at the courthouse. Efforts are being made to get a large number of people to participate and increase the media exposure.

Senate Finance Officer (Paynton): Senator Paynton met with several WASC committees last week; two meetings were primarily on budget. Overall, the WASC team seemed pleased with the progress HSU has made on budget transparency and process issues. The University Budget Committee (UBC) meets this Friday to receive the vice presidents’ budget reports in order to make recommendations for next year.

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): Phase I of the College Creek Housing Project is still on schedule. The Schatz Energy Lab construction is continuing. VP Nordstrom publicly thanked everyone who helped after the earthquake last month. Many helped survey the campus and make sure there were no safety issues resulting from the quake. There was no structural damage on campus from the quake; there are only minor fixes. It was a wake-up call and emphasized the importance of earthquake preparedness. An extensive review of the Library building was done and HSU’s highest priority in the system budget right now is for seismic work on the south end of the Library.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): The WASC review last week was good. The team was pleased with the progress HSU is making on capacity issues. They expressed concern about whether the progress will continue.

The money from the Chancellor’s Office (CO) (HSU’s share of stimulus money - \$1.4 million) will be allocated to Academic Affairs for next year. The \$750,000 received last semester has been allocated and used to put on needed classes this year. The \$1.4 million is for next year (2010/2011). If budget planning proceeds as hoped, Academic Affairs will have a \$3 million dollar deficit next year. The Provost is happy to have any additional money to help put on classes for next year. The Provost is planning on 1100 freshmen students and remains concerned that the yield may be greater than anticipated. If that occurs, additional classes will need to be put on.

The \$305 million included in the Governor’s budget is confusing. It is labeled as returning one-time money that was taken away this year. One-time money doesn’t go back into the base budget, so it is not clear how this will work. There is discussion at the CO that the money may be used to enable the system to not decrease the number of students as planned. It is all preliminary right now; no one is planning on receiving it at this point. It remains to be seen how the budget will play out.

It was asked of the \$1.4 million dollars can be used to cover the current deficit and postpone program elimination. The answer is no, because it is one-time funding.

University Advancement (Gunsalus): The new general manager of KHSU, Ed Subkis, began last week; he brings considerable experience as a general manager to HSU. Patrick Cleary was acknowledged and thanked for his service as the Interim General Manager for the past year and a half.

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

Jean Doran, a student in the over-60 program addressed the Senate. She has been reading about the history of the problems at HSU. HSU should be a place for students, faculty, staff, and the president to exchange ideas and work together. Rather than everyone working together, it has become as divisive as national politics. She expressed her hope that everyone will work together to bring back the strong institution that HSU was a number of years ago.

Professor Martin Flashman spoke on managing the budget. In Mathematics there is a theory called “category theory.” If you work in the wrong category, your results will be nonsense. There is a problem in the way the budget is made up and the categories that are being considered for reducing the budget. Budgets in Academic Affairs are generally done by departments. Data is provided about departments, but the discussions have been about programs. In the process of evaluating programs, the evaluation has been done on departments. The cost and budget figures that have been provided are not about programs, they are about departments. This is confusing. Some departments work only with their own programs/majors. Other departments work in “service” areas – they service the general education program or other major programs in the university. Cost figures and allocation of resources will vary between different types of departments. The data being used for program elimination is not accurate for program costs. The Senate needs to discuss other parts of academic programs where costs can be cut or tightened up and to think about planning for the general education program next year and consider not offering courses with a history of just barely making their numbers. There needs to be better coordination with College of the Redwoods on remediation parts of our programs.

Brandon Chapin, Associated Students President, introduced a new student representative on the Senate, Steven Margell.

5. Item removed from January 26, 2010 Consent Calendar

09-278: PSCI 373: Politics of Sustainable Society – Change C-class from C-15 to C-2 as “housekeeping change to correct improper C-Classification.”

There were no questions. The item was approved without objection.

6. Resolution on Elimination of the Wastewater Utilization MS Option in Natural Resources (#16-09/10-EX)

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

Resolution on Elimination of the Wastewater Utilization MS Option in Natural Resources
#16-09/10-EX – February 9, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the elimination of the Wastewater Utilization MS Option in Natural Resources.

RATIONALE: The HSU Academic Senate makes this recommendation based on the attached Memo, dated December 1, 2009, from the Integrated Curriculum Committee.

The department is in agreement that the program should be eliminated. There are very few students in the program.

- The floor was yielded. Professor Gary Hendrickson stated that the fact the department is not opposing the recommendation is no reflection on the quality of the program. The department felt it had made its case in the prioritization documents and that the Senate decision should be made based on the facts presented.
- What is the estimate of savings to be had by eliminating the programs? The floor was yielded. Professor Hendrickson stated there is little savings to be made, if any, and there is a possibility of a net loss.
- If there is no net savings, is this potentially a shortsighted decision? Is wastewater management a possible growth area?
- The graduate program in Natural Resources is an “umbrella” title for a number of graduate programs. Almost all of the options under Natural Resources are, for the most part, individually designed for each student. There is no list of courses that students in a particular option take. Some have a few required courses and some are almost entirely designed between student and advisor. It is difficult to know what the cost savings are by eliminating an option, because students are taking courses across campus. Even if the Wastewater Utilization option is eliminated, a student who is interested in the topic could do a master’s program in Fisheries and select relevant courses. As long as the courses can be offered, the opportunities for students are not being reduced.
- It was suggested that the Senate discuss to what extent programs are being eliminated in order to achieve budgetary savings, and request and review the numbers. The prioritization process did not do a good job of defining what a “program” is and this will come back to plague us in the next program elimination process.
- The academic prioritization process was not essentially about saving money. The expedited program elimination process is primarily about saving money. The Senate needs to keep the two separate. This option is an interdisciplinary program which at one time had strong advocates in the department and had a partnership with the City of Arcata. The program is not well-subscribed and does not have the strong support it used to have. It is a marginal program and that is why it is being looked at. This is not about saving money.

- The floor was yielded. It has been a small program from the onset with no more than three students at any one time with between one and two graduates per year; there is not a critical mass. It is questionable whether HSU is doing a service to those students bringing them through with so few at a time.

Voting occurred by written ballot and the *Resolution on Elimination of the Wastewater Utilization MS Option in Natural Resources (#16-09/10-EX)* and **PASSED** with 17 yes votes, 4 no votes, 2 Abstentions, and 1 recused.

7. Resolution on Suspension of GIS Option in NRPI Major and Creation of a Geospatial Technologies Task Force (#17-09/10-EX)

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

Resolution on Suspension of GIS Option in NRPI Major and Creation of a Geospatial Technologies Task Force
#17-09/10-EX – February 9, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the suspension of the GIS Option in NRPI; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the creation of an *ad hoc* Geospatial Technologies Task Force to address the most efficient and effective ways to teach Geospatial Technology at HSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University endorses the Integrated Curriculum Committee's recommendation that membership of the *ad hoc* Geospatial Technologies Task Force include one faculty member from each department currently teaching GIS courses (Forestry, Geography, Geology, NRPI, Sociology), one faculty member (to be identified based on interest) from the College of Professional Studies, one ITS representative, the Vice Provost, and the Associate Dean from each college.

RATIONALE: The HSU Academic Senate makes this recommendation based on the attached Memo, dated February 2, 2010, from the Integrated Curriculum Committee.

Senator Moyer introduced the resolution. The suspension of the GIS option is part of the clean-up from program changes that were made at the end of fall term. In order to consider how GIS is offered across the university, a task force has been suggested.

Discussion:

- It was noted that a specific charge for the task force and a timeline for the task force to respond is not included. In response, it was stated that the ICC intentionally did not include a charge. The Committee felt that it would be easier and more appropriate for members of the task force to draft the charge, since they would be more knowledgeable about the field.

- It seems reasonable to have a charge and timeline. The Provost said he would with the AVP Burges to help define the parameters for a charge.
- Would it be beneficial to have a student on the task force?
- Is it realistic to have the task force complete its work by the end of the semester?

M/S (Flashman/Cannon) to amend the resolution by removing the second and third resolved clauses about the task force.

Senator Flashman spoke to the motion. It is a good idea to have a task force but without have a clear charge and a timeline, the Senate should not move forward to create a task force. The workload needs to be considered as well. The ICC could set up a task force on its own; this is something they should do rather than have it come from the Senate.

Discussion:

- The Senate could endorse having a task force and leave the details to be worked out. If the Senate doesn't want to have a say on whether or not there is a task force, then the resolved clauses should be removed.
- Could these concerns be addressed by asking the Vice Provost to work with the ICC to draft the charge and timeline?
- The floor was yielded. Professor Martin noted that the current terminology is "Geospatial Analysis." It might be easier to find a graduate student to serve on the committee than an undergraduate student and he/she might be in a better position to serve in terms of appropriate background knowledge. Professor Martin stated that he would like to serve on the task force if possible.
- Does the Senate really want to spend its time having individuals develop a charge and come back and consider the timeline?
- It doesn't need to come to the Senate at all. The ICC has the authority to set up its own ad hoc committees to deal with curriculum issues. Recommendations can be brought to the Senate.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 13 yes votes, 7 no votes, and 3 Abstentions.

Voting occurred by secret ballot on the amended *Resolution on Suspension of GIS Option in NRPI Major and Creation of a Geospatial Technologies Task Force (#17-09/10-EX)* and **PASSED** with 21 yes votes, 1 no vote, 1 Abstention, and 1 recused.

8. Discussion of *Draft Proposal for HSU Graduation Rate Improvement and Draft Retention Work Group Recommendations*

[The two documents were distributed via email (2/4/10) and made available online with other Senate packet materials. A revised version of the *Draft Retention Work Group Recommendations* was distributed at the meeting]

The Provost established an Enrollment Management Task Force and two working groups. In addition, there has been a mandated systemwide initiative to improve the graduation rate. HSU will develop a plan for increasing graduation rates and monitor it on a monthly basis. This proposal was developed very quickly. It has been sent out to the campus for feedback.

Much of the graduation rate improvement plan is centered on retention. The Task Force has disseminated the proposal and is consulting broadly, but on a short timeline.

Discussion:

- What is the process? Will some form of the proposal come back to the Senate so the Senate can make a recommendation to the Provost?
- The Provost asked the Senate to focus on the issues that are policy oriented and that require the Senate to work to put them in place. Comments on administrative issues are welcomed, but the Senate needs to focus on the policies that need to be put in place. Policy issues will come to the Senate from the task force and go through the appropriate Senate standing committee as needed. For example, some have been identified as going to the Academic Policies Committee.
- Will the early warning system software [from Retention Working Group Recommendations] be a universal system? Yes – it will include certain indicators. This is something many faculty already do on an *ad hoc* basis. This will be a way to do it in an institutionalized way.
- Interactions that happen with early warning systems typically involve the course instructor, the faculty advisor and the student. Is this intended to engage faculty more in advising? Will student continue to work with the AIR center?
- The intention is to use the advising center as front line reference. If a course instructor indicates that a student needs some intervention, the advising center will decide where the information needs to be forwarded, i.e., to the residence hall or the faculty advisor, etc.

Discussion of Retention Working Group recommendations:

- If resources are shifted to retaining sophomores (strategy #4), what cost will there be to freshmen retention? What is being proposed are additional measures focused on retaining sophomores and juniors; it is not a matter of allocating fewer resources for freshmen in order to pay for it.
- In terms of costs, what should not be done in order to pay for this? There has been a significant increase in the number of staff on campus over the last 4-5 years. The \$85,000 needed for these strategies is the equivalent of one small graduate program. Is this money going to be allocated to

OAA or is it going to come out of the OAA budget? Concern was expressed about approving this without having ongoing money to fund it.

- The Provost responded that because these are all pilot projects, they will be funded on a one-time basis and the money will come out of University reserves. Once the pilot is assessed, a decision will be made whether or not to give it base budget funding.
- Was a distinction made between different categories of students when the retention data was considered? No – not in terms of the strategies that were developed.
- Enforcement of mandatory advising is dependent upon the faculty advisor and the student. The new software system no longer has the registration codes that forced students to go to an advisor. What mechanism will be used to enforce mandatory advising? PeopleSoft will allow a hold to be put on any student's record that must be individually lifted. It will be a matter of deciding who does that. It will most likely be the advisor and the department chair.
- Concern was expressed about enforcing mandatory advising. The AIR center is heavily involved in advising students; perhaps they could help. It was noted that the advising workload is not distributed equally across the faculty.
- The enforcement of mandatory advising will fall on advisors, both faculty and in the advising center. The number of early warning at risk students in the freshmen and sophomore classes is small and the advising center will oversee this. There is not going to be a large increase in workload across campus.
- There will also be an effort to overhaul advising in general and provide more support in terms of 'best practices,' a web site, etc.
- A question was asked about item 5.a. under the proposal for improving graduate rates: "Eliminate excessive numbers of units in majors, lack of clarity in major requirements or set course rotations schedules to assist students in navigating major pathways." Who will be making these determinations and/or clarifying requirements? In the past, this has originated with the faculty and gone through the curricular process. Is the intention to have the ICC review all majors?
- A lot of this has been done already. The Provost has asked the deans some time ago to look at and compare majors to see if the number of units required at HSU were out of line. Initiating curricular change is a faculty-driven process, but others may look at it as well. It is not intended that the ICC is going to be doing this.
- Currently, the way majors are laid out in the catalog is arcane – it is difficult for students to read and understand. This will be addressed and improved.
- Where is all of this being housed? It will be in different areas across campus and will require coordination.

- Chair Mortazavi reminded members of the Senate that deadlines for comments are February 15 for the Draft Proposal for Graduation Rate Improvement and February 22 for the recommendations from the Retention Work Group. Comments should be sent to Ken Ayoob.
 - It was suggested that the new housing becoming available may also provide opportunity to increase the socialization and integration of students on campus and might open up other housing for more freshmen.
 - Will the proposed early warning system take care of all at risk students or will there still be multiple forms to fill out for students affiliated with different groups, for example student athletes? This could be a major workload issue. This is an operational detail that will need to be worked out. NCAA guidelines may require certain forms.
 - Will there be an early reporting system in every class? It is a web-based program so faculty members can log on and get the same information and see where a student is in terms of any interventions in process.
 - It was noted that the implementation process will be mindful of workload.
 - What is the role of lecturers who teach large introductory classes and may not be trained advisors, but who have contact with and informally advise many freshmen students? It's not clear if tracking a quantitative matrix is as valuable as having one-on-one informal conversations with students. The document does not deal with the reality of the situation.
 - What are the metrics to be used for measuring success? Over the long term it will be the increase in graduation rate. Over the short term, the list of actions proposed in the plan will be measured in terms of completion, etc.
 - Students who come to HSU have different backgrounds and some may not be a good fit. Are we developing a profile of what types of students will succeed at HSU? The current profile may not be a good match – leading to our low retention rate.
 - The campus recruiting staff have been doing a good job and HSU is in demand; the campus will probably be impacted in 2011/12, either at the system or campus level. This will allow us to take a look what kind of students HSU wants to recruit.
 - It was noted that there are equity and social justice issues involved as well and HSU has an obligation to the State of California to admit the top third of all high school students graduating in California and do everything possible to ensure the success of these students.
9. Discussion of the *Report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change*
[The report is available at: <http://change.humboldt.edu/>]

Chair Mortazavi announced that the University Executive Committee, the Cabinet for Institutional Change (CIC), and the Senate Executive Committee will meet next week to discuss the CIC's report and

recommendations. He asked the Provost what the role of the Senate is and if this should it be on the Senate's agenda in two weeks.

The Provost stated he would like a decision from the Senate in two weeks on whether or not it is going to buy into the recommendations on governance structure.

It was suggested that the Senate Executive Committee look at the report on Tuesday and come up with a series of recommendations.

- The CIC was thanked for putting together a thoughtful document. A good job was done of identifying some of the challenges and offering creative ideas for addressing existing problems.
- It is important to think about approaching the document as a working framework and to have more discussion of some of the details.
- In regard to the recommendation to establish a university senate – what is the point of administrators essentially having two votes, i.e., a vote and a veto. The president should not have a veto over a governance body that includes participation by administrators. If the university senate is a governing institution that makes decisions, then the faculty needs to have a place where it can have a conversation and discussion before sending representatives to the senate. If the general faculty association is eliminated where will this deliberative process among the faculty, as an interest group, occur?
- The main question is whether or not the Senate can endorse the CIC's framework and it seems like it is possible to do so. Whether or not the Senate recommends to the President, if the President is a voting member of the Senate is an issue. Another issue is whether or not there should remain an individual, elected by the faculty, to represent the faculty.
- The floor was yielded. The reason for having all constituencies represented on the Senate and with a vote is to increase the Senate's legitimacy across campus. In return, the Senate is given the authority to be the only recommending body to the President on campus. The re-constituted Senate as proposed by the CIC is still a super majority of faculty. The CIC discussed the issue of a faculty interest group and different ideas were presented.
- The Senate should support this and try it out. There are some details that need to be discussed and changed, but it should be given a try. Monitor it and see what happens over a two year period.
- The floor was yielded. In terms of the governance recommendations, there are other more powerful and significant issues to consider, beyond changing the voting structure of the Senate. The role of senators in the committee structure is an example. All senators will serve on a committee and when issues come to the Senate, having been thoroughly vetted through the committee process, senators can bring the issues to the floor and inform the discussion.
- Will the proposal to create councils mean that they are independent bodies of the Senate or will they be subcommittees? Councils would be part of the Senate and senators would serve on the Councils. The details of the councils, such as membership, have yet to be worked out. It will be

dependent upon what kinds of councils are chosen. Ideally each will be an appropriate mix of different campus constituencies.

- Simply restructuring the Senate isn't going to solve one of the major problems of the current Senate – the endless debate that occurs. The process and the mentality of members of the Senate has to change. There needs to be trust among Senate colleagues; that the work that has been done is well-thought out and a university-wide perspective has been taken. The process of starting from scratch every time a document is presented to the Senate needs to cease.
- The floor was yielded. Committees need to know why they are meeting and to whom recommendations are reported and who should be held accountable. Currently, many committee chairs aren't clear on this. It is hoped that creating a more streamline process will reduce the amount of ongoing committee work that has become a frustration for many people.
- Chair Mortazavi asked who is going to be responsible for developing the details. The implementation plan begins on page 23 and identifies the individuals who will be held accountable for getting the work done. Working groups will need to be created to develop the details.
- Ideally the constitution and bylaws would be re-written and voted on by the end of this academic year and elections for new senators would be held in fall 2010 for terms beginning spring 2011. A transition group will need to carry things through the fall semester.
- The floor was yielded. Members of the CIC talked to many people on campus who feel like they are not being heard. The proposed committee structure is important for inclusion and involvement of campus members. It also needs to tap into the knowledge resources of people on campus that are currently being wasted in the current committee structure.

It was recommended that the Senate Executive Committee bring a recommendation back to the Senate at the next meeting. Senators were invited to send comments to members of the Senate Executive committee regarding issues they would like discussed.

Meeting concluded at 5:55 pm.