

Chair Mortazavi called the emergency meeting of the Senate to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, March 2, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Berman, Bolick-Floss, Cannon, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Margell, Meiggs, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Olson, Paynton, Powell, Reiss, Rodriguez, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Thobaben, VerLinden.

Members Absent: Altschul, Butler, Chapin, Gunsalus, Nordstrom, Richmond, Rizzardi, Tripp, Van Duzer.

Proxies: Thobaben for Cheyne, Craig for Yarnall.

Guests: Fernandez, Marshall, Burges, MacConnie, Hurlbut, S. Smith, Mann, Ayoob, Tam, and others.

## **1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 23, 2010**

M/S/P (Rodriguez/VerLinden) to approve the minutes as written, with 1 Abstention.

Chair Mortazavi announced the proxies.

Chair Mortazavi acknowledged that colleagues had received lay-off notices on Monday, affecting a significant number of people. He called it a Black Monday for the university.

## **2. Resolution on the Recommendations Regarding Campus Governance from the Cabinet for Institutional Change (#21-09/10-EX) – Postponed from February 26, 2010**

The resolution was introduced at the last meeting and the discussion was postponed:

### **Resolution on the Recommendations Regarding Campus Governance from the Cabinet for Institutional Change**

#21-09/10-EX – February 23, 2010

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses the following recommendations on Campus Governance in 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):

- 2.1 Restructure the existing Academic Senate into a University-wide Senate
- 2.2 Restructure the university committee system
- 2.3 Eliminate the General Faculty Association.

Discussion:

Several observations were made about the Cabinet for Institutional Change (CIC) recommendations on governance. Recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 are reasonable. Recommendation 2.3 is “incongruous, unreasoned, and unhelpful.” The recommendation basically “destroys” the faculty as a separate organization. The CIC recommendations don’t abolish student or staff governance, just faculty governance. Just because there is dissatisfaction with the faculty, doesn’t mean it should be abolished. It is analogous to chopping off your head when you have a headache.

An assumption is being made that faculty, students, and staff are equal in power on campus; this is not true. The obvious power differentials on campus cannot be ignored. The idea that the CIC’s recommendations somehow reflect administration’s annoyance with faculty vote of no confidence has come up more than once now. For everyone’s benefit, the list of names of CIC members was read along with their positions on campus. Of the thirteen member cabinet, 5 members are faculty, 2 are students, 3 are staff/MPPs, 2 are upper level administrators, and one is a community member and alumnus. The members of the Senate were encouraged not attack or try to discredit the intentions of the group in order to reject the recommendations.

It was asked if there was a way to re-word the resolution to make it more acceptable.

Will the vote of the proposed university senate be binding, since it will have voting administrators on it, or will it still be a recommendation to the Provost or President and will they have the right to reject it? If the outcome of the voting process does not change, it is not worth changing the structure.

The faculty should be advised to re-structure its organization rather than eliminate it. The CIC has gone beyond what is appropriate in terms of making a recommendation. They have missed the point about re-structuring. Everyone else gets to re-structure, but the faculty is just eliminated.

Is there an alternate process that the Senate would view as acceptable in terms of providing the general faculty president and general faculty association with defined responsibilities and a structure that provides for the accountability that is needed according to the CIC?

The general faculty (gf) president is elected by a vote of the general faculty. How can any other body on campus get rid of the general faculty president? The major argument against having a gf president is one of accountability. The gf president is as accountable to the faculty as the senate chair is to the senate. The argument that there are confusing lines of recommendation is bothersome. The senate is the primary policy recommending body to the President, but anyone can recommend policy to the president.

These recommendations are the culmination of a year’s worth of work trying to figure out a way to re-structure the university to meet WASC’s recommendations and remain accredited. At what point is the Senate going to move on and discuss the specific recommendations and provide feedback and/or change them?

Focusing on the recommendation to eliminate the general faculty association is putting the cart before the horse. Page 24 of the report lists actions to occur, including having the senate

participate in the re-writing of a constitution and bylaws, etc. Those responsible for this task include the senate chair, general faculty president, and others. The revision would go to the faculty for a vote. The Senate was encouraged to endorse the CIC recommendations and let the working groups and faculty representatives begin the process. A vote to accept this is not a vote to eliminate the general faculty association.

The issue for the Senate to consider is the extent to which it appears to be endorsing the abolishing of the general faculty. The report can be sent to the campus for discussion, without the senate taking a stand on it. It was noted that the issue of eliminating the general faculty officer positions has been raised in the past by members of the faculty. It was pointed out the CIC did not contact the current officers of the general faculty and don't seem to be aware of the functions and work of the general faculty. Section 2.3 from the CIC report was read. It would be appropriate for the Senate to send the CIC recommendations to the faculty and ask departments to discuss and provide guidance on how a new constitution should be put together. Feedback from past general faculty presidents has varied. One felt it was just fine to 'get rid of the general faculty.' Five out of six were opposed. The opinion was expressed that a result of accepting the CIC recommendation will be to reduce the strength of the faculty voice on campus. It is the faculty who should and will decide this. It is okay for the Senate to carefully say that it is in favor of having the faculty discuss and prepare drafts of a new constitution and put it to a vote of the faculty. It was stated that this likely will be a wasted effort as there is a strong contingent among the faculty who will vote against 'doing away with the general faculty.' It was suggested that someone make an amendment that clarifies that the Senate is forwarding this for discussion by the general faculty.

An objection was raised to "endorsing and supporting" the recommendations – this gives the impression that the Senate is saying "do everything that is in the report." It was suggested that changes in the wording be made to clarify what "endorse and supports" means to the Senate. It is up to the faculty association to decide to disband; it is not the business of the Senate to make that decision for the faculty. The repercussions from doing so would be worse than anything seen so far. No complaints have been heard about the general faculty president until recently; it sounds like this is an attempt to eliminate a temporary problem.

There is something being left out of the conversation. Within all governance groups on campus (general faculty, associated students, senate) there is a fundamental belief in the value of democracy. A diversity of views on every subject is embraced and recognized. Leaders of these organizations are accountable through election processes. The administration perspective is not democratic. Administrators are appointed by a board that is not elected. This is an authoritarian model that believes in one voice and does not like diversity of opinion. A university in California has two primary functions: to prepare the workforce for the economy that exists and to create a civically engaged citizenry. Faculty are responsible for preparing students for democracy. HSU represents a multiplicity of perspectives and its diversity is a good thing. If the CIC recommendations propose to eliminate this diversity of perspective, the Senate should be hesitant to endorse the document.

The question is who speaks for the faculty. The Academic Senate speaks for the faculty; and the faculty expects the administration to pay attention to it. Individual senators do not speak

for the faculty; they speak for themselves and/or their college constituencies. The general faculty president has a position that speaks for the faculty as a whole. How is the administration supposed to interpret the faculty point of view when the general faculty president says one thing and the senate says another and time after time they disagree? This is confusing for the administration and is difficult from a governance standpoint.

The President is asking the Senate if it endorses the three principle recommendations on governance as a framework to move forward. He is not asking the Senate to endorse every last detail; the details still need to be worked out.

Universities are hierarchical organizations. Administrators are responsible for making decisions. Administration has used the idea that faculty have more power than students and staff on campus very effectively. Power differential is an inherent part of the university organization. Faculty should have more power, in terms of decision-making, as opposed to students and staff. Faculty and students are the academy. Faculty must have more power in shared governance than staff or students; that is a fact of life. To ignore this is to not be sincere. Students have significantly more voice on the HSU Senate as opposed to the university wide senate at San Diego State. The problematic issue is including administrators as voting members of the senate. Every day there are reminders about who is making the decisions on campus (not the faculty). The idea that there should be no power differential on campus is not a sincere idea. The faculty must have a clear voice on this campus and it should not be reduced.

The real issue is what the voice of the faculty will be in the new structure. It was disappointing that there weren't more models presented in the recommendations, with pros and cons for each. It would be preferable to have an all faculty senate (no administrators, no students) in order to have a clear faculty voice. Administrators, students, staff, and faculty have different roles in the university and varying degrees of access to information. Due to the lack of information, faculty are operating at a disadvantage and don't have the same ability to affect decisions being made. Differences between faculty and administrators in terms of viewpoint are notable, for example, decisions made by the ICC are often colored by budget information, which "muddies the water." It would be nice to have separate faculty discussions. The Senate as it has existed has had a lot of problems; it does not have a good reputation at HSU. There is a huge amount of dissatisfaction that the Senate does not speak out more. It was the general faculty that brought forth the no confidence vote. Term limits should be instituted. The Senate has taken on a life of its own.

The duties of the general faculty president and senate chair were shared. "The General Faculty President shall (1) preside over all meetings of the General Faculty; (2) carry out the directions of the General Faculty; (3) represent the General Faculty at formal functions of the University or appoint someone to serve in his or her stead; and (4) perform the duties customarily performed by presiding officers, including making all arrangements for meetings of the General Faculty." This seems harmless; it is more like a presidential member-at-large on the senate – one last check and balance. The Senate chair duties are: "The Chair shall preside at meetings of the Academic Senate; make appointments to committees of the Academic Senate, except as provided in the bylaws or by action of the Academic Senate; and carry out such directions as

are given by the General Faculty or by the Academic Senate." The position of general faculty chair doesn't seem altogether malignant. There are a lot of good reforms in the CIC recommendations in regard to changes to the senate, but perhaps they could be done to this body or to a faculty senate. On a faculty senate, you have a clearer understanding of what the faculty thinks.

It was suggested that another resolved clause be added to the resolution, thanking for the CIC for its hard work. The Senate needs to say that publicly. The CIC report seems to recognize the need to increase civility between individuals on the senate and around campus. They think a university-wide senate and a different kind of committee structure would help this effort. The issue of the general faculty and the general faculty president doesn't have any impact on this. The concept of "speaks for" and the concept of "represents" are ambiguous. Anyone who has been elected has encountered the difficulty of knowing how to vote or act. "Speaks for" is not the right phrase here; the general faculty president is a representative.

Term limits on the Senate are not new and should either be brought back to the table and/or enforced. The Senate has a long history of doing the same thing over and over. For example, years ago it discussed doing away with the general faculty association and general faculty president. This is already a university senate by representation. What happens to a university senate recommendation? What difference does it make if the Provost and President can still reject a resolution? It was suggested that each of the CIC recommendations (2.1, 2.2, 2.3) in the resolution be considered *ad seriatim* so that some can be dispensed with.

A university wide senate, as recommended by the CIC, gives the senate more power. It is giving votes to those already represented on the senate. Could the administration give the faculty that power to begin with? It seems like senate recommendations are approved when they are convenient and when they are not convenient they are overruled, for example, the recommendation on the German program. Institutional change should come from the administration side, rather than the faculty giving up some of their power on the senate.

M/S/F (Olson/Rodriguez) to end debate. Voting occurred and motion **FAILED** with 3 Yes votes, 18 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

The Senate speaks through resolutions passed by the majority of the Senate. The Senate did not speak to the German program; that was an example of a failure of the senate to speak. The faculty only speaks through its resolutions. The only resolution voted on by the faculty was the vote of no confidence taken last spring. The faculty has voted on items brought to it by the senate, but rarely on anything taken up by the faculty as a whole. The faculty needs to be re-structured as well as the senate. There is really not much difference in the outcome of the proposed new senate structure and what the current senate does. There are no recommendations on re-structuring administration or the colleges – it is all focused on the senate. The recommendation to re-structure senate debate to make it more deliberative is a negative statement; how do you deliberate without debate? The debate could be re-structured so action items have limited time debates and are more efficiently dealt with. Once a semester, this body (the academic senate) makes a recommendation to the president to give to degrees

to people on a list. This is a role and position given to the faculty that is not replaceable. It will need to be dealt with when the details are worked out.

Concern was expressed that everyone needs to be clear about what is being voted on. The reason for calling for the senate to be more action oriented is understandable. But it can become more efficient and action oriented without taking away the deliberative process. There is confusion about the distinctions between the general faculty president and the senate chair. Included under the senate chair duties is: “and carry out such directions as are given by the General Faculty or by the Academic Senate.” There may be some ambiguity that needs to be clarified; it doesn’t mean we need to get rid of the general faculty president. Is there a way to give everyone what they want? Does changing the voting structure on the senate make the senate stronger? Changing the committee structure would definitely make the senate stronger. The recommendation regarding councils and their connection with the senate is a good one.

Chair Mortazavi announced that he was suspending the rule that no new agenda items are introduced after 5:29 pm. If the current discussion concludes in time, the senate will consider the next item on the agenda.

This is discouraging. How many Senate resolutions has the administration rejected in the recent past? It has been very few. According to the Keeling Report, HSU has a “distrustful bitterly divided partisan campus that dwells on constituencies rather issues.” The San Diego model brings all of the key players to the table and they work on issues together; it does not work in partisan groups. When a recommendation is made to the president, the senate has every reason to believe the president will accept it. The CIC is trying to work to create a more non-partisan structure on campus. It is offering a way to move forward out of the malaise the campus is in. If the position of the Senate is to go back to the drawing board, then it is doubtful that much is going to change on this campus.

M/S/F (VerLinden/Flashman) to amend the resolution as follows:

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University ~~accepts and~~ endorses considering the following recommendations on Campus Governance in 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)

Discussion of the amendment:

Does the motion including sending this to the general faculty? No – that can be done with a separate amendment.

The word “endorse” should not be included – the Senate should stay neutral and send this to the President to send to the general faculty for a vote. The recommendation to eliminate the general faculty association is not supported.

A group of people with a spirit of working together created this document and the Senate should at least “endorse considering” it. What is going to be difficult is the upcoming program

elimination process and we need to come up with a voice of the senate. Let's move forward and show some respect and appreciation for all of the time and work that has gone into this document.

The amendment is not supported. The word "accepts" should be included. And it needs to be made *ad seriatim*.

The resolution should be rejected. The CIC did not fulfill its role. It did not deal with changing the institution; it simply focused on changing the senate. It's creating an illusion of change; it is not real. It should be rejected out of hand.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **FAILED** with 9 Yes votes, 14 No votes

M/S/F (Goodman/Cannon) to amend the resolution as follows:

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to President Richmond that he send accepts and endorses the following recommendations on Campus Governance in 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) to the general faculty for a vote:

Discussion of the amendment:

It was clarified this means sending recommendations 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 to the faculty for a vote.

How can this be forwarded for a vote when no details have been worked out? It could go to a committee to work out the details and then be forwarded to the faculty for a vote – which is what the document has already suggested.

The reputation of the Senate is that it talks and weasels but never actually makes a decision and takes a stance. The Senate should either say "yes – this is a good direction to move in" or "no – this is not a good direction to move in." Just tossing it out to the faculty affirms the Senate's reputation.

We're chasing our tails. The Senate needs to decide to accept this or not and move on.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **FAILED**.

How can the Senate vote *ad seriatim* on this? Someone needs to make a motion.

M/S/P (Thobaben/Fulgham) to amend the resolution as follows:

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses, in principle, the following recommendations on Campus Governance in 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):

- 2.1 Restructure the existing Academic Senate into a University-wide Senate
- 2.2 Restructure the university committee system,
- ~~2.3 Eliminate the General Faculty Association.~~

And be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the CIC recommendation 2.3 *Elimination the General Faculty Association* be forwarded to the General Faculty for vote, listing the pros and cons of eliminating the General Faculty Association.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** with 18 Yes votes, 1 No vote, and 4 Abstentions.

When does this go to the general faculty for a vote? It was answered as soon as possible.

Discussion the resolution as amended:

It was stated that under the San Diego model, the administration brings all key players together to work out issues and then they bring it to the senate. What is missing in these governance recommendations is any recognition of fault on the part of the administration in their sharing of consultation with affected players before decisions come done. No amount of re-structuring is going to change this.

If the problem is partisanship, why is the CIC focusing only on changes that have to do with the faculty? The recommendations have no integrity because they do not deal with all involved. Having administrators who threaten bodies like the senate is partisan and destructive. These recommendations do not address that problem.

M/S/F (Powell/Craig) to amend the resolution by striking all reference to 2.3. as follows:

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses, in principle, the following recommendations on Campus Governance in 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):

- 2.1 Restructure the existing Academic Senate into a University-wide Senate
- 2.2 Restructure the university committee system,

And be it further

~~RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the CIC recommendation 2.3 *Elimination the General Faculty Association* be forwarded to the General Faculty for vote, listing the pros and cons of eliminating the General Faculty Association.~~

Discussion of the amendment:

This amendment is proposed based on recommendations received from general faculty members at large.

The general faculty needs to have a say about this, so the amendment is not supported.

Clarification was requested – what is being sent to the faculty for a vote? There were several varying responses.

The Senate needs to make a statement one way or another. Striking the 2.3 recommendation leaves the Senate without any opinion on the matter.

The general faculty has a constitution, but the senate does not, it has bylaws. The President asked each governing body to pass judgment on the CIC recommendations. The resolution is in its present form because the Senate Executive Committee decided to hand it forward. There has been a full discussion at this meeting. If the senate decides that they do not wish to forward, or endorse, or accept 2.3, then that is a pretty strong message.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **FAILED** with 6 Yes votes, 14 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

M/S/P (Rodriquez/Olson) to end debate. Voting occurred and motion **PASSED**.

Voting on the resolution as amended occurred and **PASSED** with 17 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

The approved resolution reads:

**Resolution on the Recommendations Regarding Campus Governance from the Cabinet for Institutional Change**  
#21-09/10-EX – February 23, 2010

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accepts and endorses, in principle, the following recommendations on Campus Governance in 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):

- 2.1 Restructure the existing Academic Senate into a University-wide Senate
- 2.2 Restructure the university committee system

And be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the CIC recommendation, 2.3 *Eliminate the General Faculty Association*, be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote, listing the pros and cons of eliminating the General Faculty Association.

Clarification was asked as to when this goes to the faculty for a vote. It was suggested that the Senate Executive Committee decide.

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

**3. 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 – Postponed from February 26, 2010.**

Not discussed.

**4. Discussion of Program Elimination Process – Strategy and Timeline**

Not discussed.

M/S/P (Goodman/Fulgham) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:55 pm.