

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting of the Senate to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, February 23, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Berman, Bolick-Floss, Cannon, Chapin, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Haynes, Margell, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Olson, Powell, Reiss, Rodriguez, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Thobaben, Tripp, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Yarnall.

Members Absent: Altschul, Butler, Gunsalus, Richmond, Rizzardi.

Proxies: VerLinden for Paynton.

Guests: Darnall Burke, Rouse, Ayoob, Dashiell, Fernandez, and other guests.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 9, 2010

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Heise) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 9, 2010, with 1 Abstention.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Program rankings have been sent to members of the Senate and to department chairs. The college deans are working on calculating cost savings for each program. By March 9, the list will come to the Senate for consideration. Programs being considered for possible elimination will be asked to attend the meeting and submit a two-page report to the Senate.

Senators have been provided this information in advance in case they would like to discuss among themselves and/or strategize prior to the Senate meetings at which program elimination will be discussed.

Questions:

How will it be determined which programs will be costed out? Cost calculations will begin at the bottom of the list and work upwards to 200% of the cost savings needed.

Are we looking at savings to be gained within two years or five years? The cost calculator looks at lecturer rate alone; once the program has been phased out, permanent faculty will back into these temporary positions. It is pretty straightforward. The cost savings will occur after the program is phased out.

The cost calculator will be forwarded to members of the Senate.

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

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee is working on a recommendation on the GWPE. It has begun looking at the recommendations in the retention report.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Goodman): The Committee has determined a meeting time and will meet as needed. The Committee has not been assigned any work by the Senate Executive Committee yet.

Statewide Senate (ASCSU) (Thobaben): The Executive Vice Chancellor has submitted her resignation as of June 30. This will mean changes for the system, Academic Affairs in the Chancellor's Office (CO), and for the Senate.

General Faculty (Powell): A call for nominations for the spring general faculty election has gone out. Senators were asked to help with soliciting nominations. Name of potential candidates may be forwarded to Senator Powell.

Senator Powell is soliciting advice regarding criteria to use in program elimination because it is becoming clear that the criteria and process the Senate approved is only to be used for deciding which names come forward. Criteria is not in place for deciding which programs should be eliminated. Comments may be forwarded to Senator Powell.

Senator Powell also asked for advice on the Cabinet for Institutional Change's (CIC) recommendations on changes to governance structure, specifically to eliminate the general faculty officer positions.

Senator Powell was asked if he is taking on the position of an independent recommending entity, as was suggested in the CIC's report? Typically the General Faculty President has not made independent recommendations to the Provost or President regarding items before the Senate.

Senator Powell indicated that he is gathering information and arguments for the faculty about what the faculty think regarding these issues. He will share this information with other faculty.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) is working on an initiative to transform seven existing courses into online or hybrid (half online/half traditional) courses. The campus has a Distance Education Policy which states that any course that becomes an online course has to go through special curricular review. After discussing it, the ICC has decided to give approval for a pilot project, rather than evaluating and approving each course. Courses will be given 2-3 times and then a curricular review will be done. The decision was made for two reasons: 1) the campus needs to begin doing more online courses in order to gain experience and this project will enable that beginning, and 2) the Distance Education Policy is supposed to be reviewed and revised this year and it is unlikely that the ICC will have time to review it this year.

Senator Van Duzer noted that it is the purview of the Academic Policies Committee to review the Distance Education Policy and that the committee hasn't decided whether it will do so this year or not.

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

Senator Flashman continued his previous discussion on what he feels are flaws in the measurements being used to assess the costs of programs. The measurements are flawed by conflating the programs with other things they do such as General Education and service courses, and basically assigning the costs to the department.

He distributed a handout on a way to assign costs to programs and stated that he hoped the method will be further investigated. The measurement is based on enrollments and courses taught in the upper division. Most programs have requirements or electives that are mainly upper division courses. They are usually in one department.

The methodology involves using enrollment figures and units to get an average enrollment per unit which gives the cost basis for the program. If the number is high, it indicates that the many students are being served by one unit, a low number indicates that few students are served by one unit.

Departments are not being assessed correctly in terms of costs and enrollment figures. He used the Mathematics Department as an example. It falls high on the list that has been prepared for the current elimination process, but using this methodology it is does not fare as well.

This data should be gathered over 3-4 years and used for programs being considered for elimination. This is a meaningful cost basis which should be used in conjunction with other measures.

Comments:

The cost calculator is eliminating general education which is similar to what this is doing.

The program elimination task force discussed this type of methodology and it became very complicated for certain majors. There was not a number that could be produced accurately for every major.

The numbers in the existing rankings are not accurate; but we have used those rough numbers to come up with a list to have the next step of the conversation.

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

Associated Students (AS) (Chapin): AS unanimously passed a resolution in support of the CIC Report and Recommendations and urged the other three campus governance bodies to approve it as well. Scholarship applications are due on Friday. AS elections are coming up

soon. Packets will be available on March 8. Brochures were distributed for senators to pass out to students. AS would like to have at least two nominees for each council position this year. AS would like to make presentations in large classes regarding the election and faculty will be contacted. If faculty with smaller classes would like an AS representative to make a presentation for a class, contact Brandon.

California Faculty Association (CFA) (Haynes): The CFA chapter is co-sponsoring a rally on March 4, 4-6 pm, at the Humboldt County courthouse in Eureka. It is a rally to save education and education funding in the State of California. The Eureka school system will be involved – it is not just a CSU event. McKinleyville is having a separate event in the morning; contact Haynes for details.

Staff Council (Ryerson-Replogle): Staff Council had a special meeting to discuss the CIC report and recommendations. Not everyone has responded yet, but it looks like Staff Council will also be supporting the CIC recommendations.

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): Vice President Nordstrom thanked the Associated Students and President Chapin for hosting the lunchtime forum with the vice presidents and students. Students had an opportunity to ask a lot of questions and it was a good event.

5. Consent Calendar

Discontinuation of the MA in Art: Approved without objection.

6. Resolution on Special Topics Course Numbering Policy (#18-09/10-AP)

M/S (Van Duzer/Goodman) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Special Topics (ST) Course Numbering Policy #18-09/10-AP – February 23, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *Special Topics (ST) Course Numbering Policy*, which expands the current ST designation for 480/580/680 courses to include 180, 280, and 380 courses so that all courses numbered *80 (e.g., 180) will be Special Topics courses, be adopted immediately; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that courses which are currently in the catalog that do not conform to the ST standards as stated in the attached policy submit a curriculum change form to revise the course number prior to March 2010 in order to offer the course in 2010/2011 and/or beyond; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Office of Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies will administer the policy and evaluate the effectiveness of the policy as it is implemented.

RATIONALE: According to current course numbering policy, 480/580/680 courses are reserved for baccalaureate/master's special (selected) topics courses. There is considerable inconsistency in the type of courses offered as 180, 280, and 380, with some special topics and

others standard c-class courses offered on an ongoing basis. Standardizing the ST numbering to include 180, 280, and 380 courses will improve consistency in interpretation, communication and application and will also allow for a variety of automated curricular processes using the CMS system.

This policy clarifies the unique nature of Special Topics courses and provides a mechanism to identify ongoing courses that should undergo appropriate curricular review and approval processes.

Each Special Topics course will be titled in a way that reflects the specific content. To provide time to transition from current practices and implement this policy, current courses that need to undergo curricular review either for a number change or for review as a new course must have completed the process by fall 2011. It is recommended that the curriculum change forms be submitted no later than April 30 2010 to ensure that the process is completed in time for fall 2011.

Discussion:

Senator Van Duzer introduced the resolution which extends the 480/480/680 course designation to 180, 280, and 380, to develop consistency and ensure that special topics are represented anytime there is an '80' at the end of the number. The policy distinguishes between ongoing courses, such as senior seminars, and courses that are taught only once, for example, by a visiting professor. The number of times a special topics course can be offered is limited to four times. This allows for the course to be offered twice and then get into the line for the curriculum review process to make it permanent.

Discussion:

- Are curriculum change forms to be submitted to the ICC? Yes. It was suggested that "to the ICC" be inserted in the second resolved clause. It was accepted by the body as a friendly amendment.
- It was suggested that the date in the second resolved clause be changed to April 19, which is the due date for curriculum change forms. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
- It was suggested that the date in the Rationale be also changed to April 19. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
- Should selected topics courses for credential programs be numbered 780 and if a program does not have one, should it be added? HSU can add a 780 course number, but 780's don't exist in the system and it is unclear where the authority is to designate a course as a 780 if it is not one of the available course numbers.
- It was accepted as a friendly amendment to add '780' to the list of designations in the first resolved clause.
- Who is responsible for changing these numbers? Curriculum change forms will be submitted by the department to the ICC.

Does every department that does not have a 180 course have to submit a curriculum proposal for it, or can there just be a blanket university policy about the '80 courses? Departments may enter a 180 course as long as there isn't a conflicting number, without going through the curriculum review process.

Voting on Resolution #18-09/10-AP, as amended, occurred and **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

The resolution reads:

Resolution on Special Topics (ST) Course Numbering Policy
#18-09/10-AP – February 23, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *Special Topics (ST) Course Numbering Policy*, which expands the current ST designation for 480/580/680/780 courses to include 180, 280, and 380 courses so that all courses numbered *80 (e.g., 180) will be Special Topics courses, be adopted immediately; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that courses which are currently in the catalog that do not conform to the ST standards as stated in the attached policy submit a curriculum change form to the ICC to revise the course number prior to April 19 2010 in order to offer the course in 2010/2011 and/or beyond; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Office of Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies will administer the policy and evaluate the effectiveness of the policy as it is implemented.

RATIONALE: According to current course numbering policy, 480/580/680 courses are reserved for baccalaureate/master's special (selected) topics courses. There is considerable inconsistency in the type of courses offered as 180, 280, and 380, with some special topics and others standard c-class courses offered on an ongoing basis. Standardizing the ST numbering to include 180, 280, and 380 courses will improve consistency in interpretation, communication and application and will also allow for a variety of automated curricular processes using the CMS system.

This policy clarifies the unique nature of Special Topics courses and provides a mechanism to identify ongoing courses that should undergo appropriate curricular review and approval processes.

Each Special Topics course will be titled in a way that reflects the specific content. To provide time to transition from current practices and implement this policy, current courses that need to undergo curricular review either for a number change or for review as a new course must have completed the process by fall 2011. It is recommended that the curriculum change forms be submitted no later than April 19 2010 to ensure that the process is completed in time for fall 2011.

7. Resolution on Independent Academic Work Courses Numbering and Naming Policy (#19-09/10-AP)

M/S (Van Duzer/Powell) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Independent Academic Work (IAW) Courses Numbering and Naming Policy
#19-09/10-AP – February 23, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *Independent Academic Work (IAW) Courses Numbering and Naming 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.

***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.

Senator Van Duzer introduced the resolution. The Committee tried to define independent and directed study more clearly and a list of examples has been provided. There may be instances that require curriculum change forms to bring course numbers in line with the policy. The policy requires an agreement between the student and faculty member and a form has been attached to provide a written record of the agreement. The form is designed to be used over a period of one or more semesters. The option to use a unique course title for an independent study has been eliminated in order to bring HSU in line with the rest of the CSU and to increase workload in the Registrar's Office. In the case of an accreditation requirement or other specific need, the course would be titled 'Independent Study: [unique title]'. The policy also includes a guideline on appropriate use. For example, it is not appropriate to take a low-enrolled class that has been cancelled and turn it into a 499.

Discussion:

The resolution is not supported because of this last issue. Just because a course is cancelled, students shouldn't be prevented from learning the course content through other means, such as a 499.

The course may be important, but that decision needs to be made 'above the table' through the college dean. Turning it into a 499 is just hiding the course; it is still costing the university.

A lot of 499's are taught as overloads and they don't cost the university. There are too many constraints; faculty members need the flexibility to teach an overload to accommodate students.

In regard to the policy, it shouldn't matter what other CSU campuses do. Independent study classes are very important to many students. Students have fewer opportunities to learn in small groups, and 449/499/699 courses offer this. The classes should be named because it is important to have on transcripts, especially for students submitting transcripts to graduate

schools. How much of a workload is this for the Registrar's Office? The policy should be altered to allow for the naming of these courses.

The Registrar provided a response. The way HSU transcripts are run and have been run in the past, no one outside of the university knows that these are independent studies. It is a nationwide convention to label independent studies as "Independent Study." HSU is actually doing students a disservice by not recognizing these as independent studies. Typically, when graduate schools see an independent study on a transcript, they ask the prospective student about it as part of the admission process. The workload entails un-enrolling the student, creating a new section, providing a title for that one student, and then re-registering the student the section. This would create a large number of sections in the catalog. The Registrar's Office would like to follow what is a generally accepted practice among Registrar's Offices across the nation.

The second to the last paragraph of the policy refers to small groups. The use of the term is ambiguous. It would be helpful if a number was named here.

Attachment #2, the IAW course form, includes blanks for a succession of CRN numbers. It was suggested that either all but one of the lines be removed or that an asterisk with a parenthetical remark that says "To be filled out in successive semesters/years as needed" be inserted.

Attachment #2, the IAW course form, includes the statement "HSU expects students to invest a minimum of 3 hours per week for each unit of credit." Is this a university policy that has been passed and does everyone have this expectation? If so, where is the policy?

The intention is to communicate to the student what the faculty member's expectations are.

Historically, the C-classification lays out the expectation of number of contact hours and non-contact hours for units. The formula of three hours per week for each unit of credit is standard across c-classification courses.

Following up on the concern expressed last fall about not having unique titles on transcripts for independent studies, other CSU campuses were polled to see if they had experienced any problems by not using unique titles, i.e., if it was causing problems for students. Other campuses have not experienced this as a problem for students. Since this doesn't cause a problem for students and the Registrar's Office has other priorities in terms of workload, it seems that this could be given up.

Do any of the courses listed as examples equate to experiential learning? [The answer was not heard.]

It was suggested that number 6 include a slash between activities and research.

The following changes to the resolution have been proposed:

Policy: number 6, page 1 – add a slash between activities and Research
Policy: Question about size of small groups has not been discussed
Course Form: add an asterisk at end of paragraph beginning “Any IAW course that involves students leaving the United States ...” saying “The CRN information should be updated each semester.”

In a previous discussion the Senate discussed having footnotes on the transcript to indicate what the course was. What happened to this idea?

The Registrar responded that the footnotes don't work the way expected and would require more work than is feasible. A text box can be included at the bottom of the transcript, but it is not connected to the course. It requires modification and is not straightforward. The Registrar's Office has tried it out and it does not work as expected and would not address the concern.

Should number four on page 2 of the IAW course form be regulatory or advisory? It was suggested that the following be used: (Normally a student would invest a minimum of 3 hours...) rather than “HSU expects.”

It is not clear that the sentence means that HSU expects students in every course to meet this minimum requirement; the form is about independent study. Why can't we expect this for independent study?

It was not the intention of the committee to constrain the faculty; it was intended to let students know what expectations are in terms of earning units.

There is a statement in the HSU Catalog about this which included in syllabi. It seems the same language could be adopted here.

Using the number of hours per week is somewhat confusing. Independent studies may set the number of hours to earn a credit; it might be 20 hours in one weekend. It's an independent contract with a student and should reflect the number of hours per credit, not per week.

A blank is provided for the faculty member to stipulate the number of hours per unit of credit that is expected.

We should find a way to put titles of courses on independent academic work. It seems like this would be simple for the people working on PeopleSoft to automate.

Even with designating the statement in number four as advisory, there is a potential problem with students misinterpreting this.

The statement from the HSU Catalog was read: "In general, it is expected that the successful student will spend two hours of preparation per week for each unit earned." This language could be adopted if everyone agrees.

If this is a general policy/expectation of the university, does the parenthetical remark even need to be included on this form?

The Committee felt it would be helpful to have a guideline, which is what this is intended to be. A faculty member on the committee had observed tremendous variation in the amount of work required for the same number of units. Another faculty member felt that including the guideline would be helpful to faculty as well, in order to know what was appropriate to require. It is intended to improve consistency and to provide support for faculty as they negotiate these agreements with students.

It was suggested that the statement from the HSU Catalog be modified and used as follows: "In general, it is expected that the successful student will spend a minimum of two hours of preparation per week for each unit earned."

It was asked if this was a friendly amendment.

It was noted that the policy says two hours outside of class for one hour of class, so that is three hours. It should be modified to state three hours, not two.

The statement was read aloud: "In general, it is expected that the successful student will spend a minimum of three hours of preparation per week for each unit earned."

It was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The form doesn't need number four at all. The contract already addresses the specifics. It was suggested that the statement just agreed upon be moved to number one as a parenthetical remark. The word "average" is better than "minimum."

M/S/F (Thobaben/Yarnall) to move to postpone temporarily the item on the table and proceed to agenda item number 8, and return to it after discussing agenda items 8 and 9. Voting occurred and the motion **FAILED** with 5 Yes votes, 9 No votes, and 8 Abstentions.

It was noted that the form does not have a place to include the number of the units the student is enrolling in and this should be added. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Moyer) to end debate. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 1 No vote and 1 Abstention.

Voting on Resolution #19-09/10-AP as amended occurred and **PASSED** with 21 Yes votes and 2 No votes.

The Academic Policies Committee was asked to find a new way for students who have classes cancelled, to have the opportunity to learn the subject matter.

It was noted that there is nothing preventing faculty from teaching overloads.

8. Resolution on the Report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change (#20-09/10-EX)

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

**Resolution on the Report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change
#20-09/10-EX – February 23, 2010**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses the document *Building the Capacity for Change: Improving the Structure and Culture of Decision-Making at HSU* / a report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change (February 2, 2010).

Senator Thobaben moved that the resolved clause be amended to state: that the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses the general recommendations of the document , with the exception of campus governance which has a separate resolution #21-09/10-EX.

There was no second.

The document is not laid out with general recommendations and/or specific recommendations. Another way to make the statement is to say “accepts and endorses in principle ...”. This will allow for arguing about the details.

It was asked if this was friendly to the body. There was no response.

It should still include the statement about the exception to the governance recommendations since those are addressed in a separate resolution.

The qualifier is not needed if it says accepts and endorses “in principle”.

The document does have separate recommendations. It is convoluted to adopt everything and then go back and address specific recommendations. Use the separate recommendations to outline the discussion.

It is unclear on what the process is for moving forward if the Senate accepts the general recommendations. Where will the details be hashed out and will it come back to the Senate?

The table in the report and recommendations indicates who is responsible for hashing out the details and to which groups it would come back to.

It also depends on the recommendations. Those that are purely administrative would not come back to the Senate. Recommendations on policy issues, for example restructuring general education to address the theme of sustainability and social responsibility, would have to come back to the Senate.

The letter from President Richmond, included in the packet, indicates that there will be a steering committee formed to manage the implementation of the recommendations. One of the specific recommendations is that the meetings of the reconstituted university senate be extended until the agenda is completed. If we agree “in principle” where does this type of recommendation get worked out?

The details will be argued about where it is appropriate. It seems like this is a detail that would have to be worked out with the Senate.

It was stated that the addition of “in principle” has been accepted as a friendly amendment.

It was disagreed and stated that it should be “in general” rather than “in principle.”

M/S/P (Goodman/Fulgham) that the clause be modified to include “in principle”. It now reads:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses, in principle, the document *Building the Capacity for Change: Improving the Structure and Culture of Decision-Making at HSU* / a report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change (February 2, 2010).

It was pointed out that one function of passing the resolution is to make a statement to the rest of the faculty. The faculty will take the Senate seriously and it will be more likely that the faculty will pass the recommendations of the CIC.

M/S (Flashman/Thobaben) to amend the clause by adding “with the exception of the recommendations on campus governance.”

Discussion on the amendment:

It is better to be clear about what we want to highlight for further discussion.

The CIC has presented a document with recommendations that we should try out. This motion is not compatible with the next resolution.

The Senate Executive Committee thought that the recommendations on governance would be the most controversial and so they were pulled out for a separate resolution.

Specific exclusions should be included in terms of what is not being endorsed in principle. This indicates what we endorse and what we want to discuss further.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 23 Yes votes and 1 No vote.

Voting on Resolution #20-09/10-EX occurred and **PASSED** Unanimously. The amended resolution reads:

Resolution on the Report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change
#20-09/10-EX – February 23, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses, in principle, the document *Building the Capacity for Change: Improving the Structure and Culture of Decision-Making at HSU* / a report and Recommendations of the Cabinet for Institutional Change (February 2, 2010), with the exception of the recommendations on campus governance.

9. Resolution on the Recommendations Regarding Campus Governance from the Cabinet for Institutional Change (#21-09/10-EX)

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

Discussion:

The Provost asked to speak before he had to leave the meeting early. He expressed his feeling that it is critical to get rid of the general faculty association, primarily due to the lack of accountability. As an example, in the newspaper article on the CIC, the Senate chair states that he must go back to the Senate and does not state whether he is for or against the CIC recommendations. The Senate Chair is accountable to the Senate and speaks for the Senate. The General Faculty President is in a position to choose to speak for the entire faculty, but there is no accountability mechanism. There is no mechanism for the General Faculty President to speak to the faculty. For the most part, the GF President speaks for herself/himself. The Academic Prioritization process is an example of policy setting where the Senate as a whole did not make a statement disagreeing with or not supporting the prioritization process. However, there have been a number of instances when the GF President has spoken against the prioritization process. There have been a number of instances when the GF President and the Senate have been at odds and this makes it difficult for people to understand what is going on with the faculty. If faculty are worried about a university senate not having a faculty voice, San Diego has a model where the faculty can caucus without the other constituencies. This could be built in. If there is concern about representing particular constituencies, then these representatives could be elected university-wide. There are various ways to address these concerns. It is not a good idea to have a single individual who speaks for the faculty but is not accountable to a body like the Senate.

M/S/P (Powell/Craig) to postpone the discussion and vote on the resolution until the Provost can be present. Voting occurred and motion **PASSED** with 16 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 1 Abstention. The resolution will be taken up in two weeks.

The President has requested a response by March 9 – so there is still time to discuss at the next Senate meeting and respond.

Is it possible to schedule a special meeting of the Senate to have a focused discussion on only this resolution and to not interfere with upcoming program elimination discussions?

M/S/P (Margell/Van Duzer) that the Senate hold an emergency meeting on March 2 to address the Resolution #21-09/10-EX.

It was noted that confirmation is needed that the Provost will be able to attend. It was noted that this will be the sole agenda item for the meeting.

M/S (Van Duzer/Fulgham) to move Rangeland Resources and Wildland Soils, which has gone through this body already, to the category which is inclusive of those that are too new to be evaluated. This group was given a specific mandate to change their curriculum and at this point there is no way to evaluate what the changed curriculum is going to do.

Discussion:

This seems to be a “sticking point” with the Provost; he should be in the room to respond before the Senate discusses and makes a decision. This was discussed at the last Senate Executive Committee meeting.

It was stated that the Provost has held the line and said that any changes in curriculum will not be considered because doing so will mean that all programs with changes will have to be re-visited.

The Provost had strong arguments for not doing this; he should be present for the discussion. The Senate should not be discussing it behind his back.

The Senate Executive Committee heard enough of what he had to say that it could be discussed now. It was noted that the Senate Executive Committee itself was divided on the issue.

It was suggested that the discussion be postponed to next week.

M/S/P (Fulgham/Goodman) to postpone the discussion of the motion to the emergency meeting on March 2 and place it on the agenda as a second item. Motion **PASSED** with 1 No vote and 1 Abstention.

M/S (Flashman/Cheyne) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:47 pm.