

Vice Chair Goodman called the meeting of the Senate to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, March 9, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, Berman, Cannon, Chapin, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman (after 5 pm), Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Knox, Margell, Mola, Mortazavi (after 5 pm), Moyer, Nordstrom, Paynton, Powell, Reiss, Richmond, Rizzardi (after 5 pm), Rodriguez, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, VerLinden.

Members Absent: Butler, Gunsalus, Tripp.

Proxies: Knox for Bolick-Floss, Goodman for Heise, Knox for Meiggs, Moyer for Rizzardi (before 5 pm), Craig for Yarnall, Chapin for Olson.

Guests: Scott, Eichstedt, Ayoob, MacConnie, Marshall, Oliver, Hankin, Borgeld, Eschenbach, Rice, and others.

### **1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 2 , 2010**

Minutes were not available; approval of the minutes from March 2 was postponed to March 23.

Proxies were announced.

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

No report.

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

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee discussed a resolution passed by the Senate in 2005/2006 for implementation in 2006/2007, requiring students to declare a major by 60 units. There was no enforcement mechanism for this until recently. Beginning next year, for Spring 2011, the Registrar's Office will place a block on a student's record until she/he has turned in a contract for declaring a major. For transfer students, the deadline will be the beginning of the second semester that they are here.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Goodman): The Committee has no assigned work yet.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC reviewed the report and recommendations from the Educational Effectiveness Review regarding HSU's university-wide student learning outcomes. A task force will be created to work on recommendations that were made.

Associated Students (A.S.) (Chapin): Packets are available for students who would like to run for Associated Students' officer position. A.S. will sponsor a bus from Sacramento to Arcata on

the Monday after Spring Break for students who participate in the March on the Capitol, sponsored by the California State Student Association and need a ride back. It is one-way only.

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): HSU will have a Financial Aid audit, beginning April 5, as part of the regular audit cycle. There will compliance audits of the campus auxiliaries beginning sometime in November. These are done on a 3-year cycle.

President's Office (Richmond): President Richmond thanked the Senate for working expeditiously on its many agenda items and for helping move forward the recommendations from the Cabinet for Institutional Change.

#### **4. Consent Calendar (see page 2 of the Agenda for list of Consent Calendar items)**

The following item was approved without objection:

##### **09-285 Social Work General Education Upper Division E Course of Study Proposal**

Propose to use two courses in the Social Work BA program (SW350: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I: Individuals, Families, Small Groups (4 units) and SW 351: Human Behavior and the Social Environment II: Large Groups, Communities and Organizations (4 units)) to meet upper division Area E requirements. Proposal addresses all requirements outlined in Senate Resolution #08-08/09 (Revised). Learning Outcomes for the courses meet SLOs for Area E.

#### **5. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 – Presentation by Gerry Hanley, Senior Director, CSU Academic Technology Services**

Dr. Hanley gave a brief presentation on *Affordable Learning Solutions (ALS)*, a campaign launched by the CSU to reduce the cost of learning resources for students and offer greater access to free or low-cost academic content for faculty.

#### **6. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30 – Faculty Awards Committee presentation of nominations for 2009/2010 Faculty Awards**

M/S/U (Cheyne/Powell) that the Academic Senate go into closed session. Those who were not members of the Senate were asked to step outside of the room.

The Senate returned to open session.

M/S/U (Fulgham/Powell) to accept the Faculty Awards Committee's nominations for Lecturer of the Year, Outstanding Service, Scholar of the Year, and Outstanding Professor. The Committee was thanked for its work. Voting occurred and the motion **PASSED** Unanimously.

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

**7. Resolution on Elimination of the California Studies Minor (#22-09/10-EX)**

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

Resolution on Elimination of the California Studies Minor  
#22-09/10-EX – March 9, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the elimination of the California Studies Minor in the Department of Politics.

*RATIONALE: The HSU Academic Senate makes this recommendation based on the attached Memo, dated February 24, 2010, from the Integrated Curriculum Committee.*

Discussion:

Resolutions #22 and #23 are the last items of the items resulting from the prioritization process to be forwarded to the Senate from the ICC. Prioritization recommended that the Department of Politics review some of its low-enrolled minors and the Department made the recommendation to eliminate the California Studies Minor.

Voting occurred by secret ballot and **PASSED** with 16 Yes votes, 1 No vote, 1 Abstention, and 1 recused.

**8. Resolution on Suspension of the International Relations Minor (#23-09/10-EX)**

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

Resolution on Suspension of the International Relations Minor  
#23-09/10-EX – March 9, 2010

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the suspension of the International Relations Minor in the Department of Politics.

*RATIONALE: The HSU Academic Senate makes this recommendation based on the attached Memo, dated February 24, 2010, from the Integrated Curriculum Committee.*

There was no discussion. Voting occurred by secret ballot and **PASSED** with 18 Yes votes, 1 No vote, 1 Abstention, and 1 Recused.

Chair Mortazavi presided over the remainder of the meeting.

**9. 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.**

The motion was made at a previous meeting and the discussion was postponed.

Senator Van Duzer stated that there are programs that have been “taken off the table” so that regardless of how the Senate votes, those programs will not be eliminated. It is not known what the programs are. Either everything should be on the list or there should be expressed reasons for why some programs should not be included on the list. The Senate reviewed Rangeland Resources last Fall and recommended that it be given a probationary period during which it would transform itself. There are a number of programs on campus that have been recently restructured, making it difficult to know how to evaluate them at this point. There is no guarantee that the Senate will not be continuing the program elimination process next year. Are the same programs going to be at the bottom of the list year after year, paralyzed and unable to move forward, because they know they will continue to be at the bottom of the list? The Senate has already discussed Range; it doesn’t make sense to consider it again when there hasn’t been enough time to evaluate the changes that are in progress.

The Range program made its presentation to the Senate last Fall with the understanding that it was being considered for elimination. The Senate recommended putting the program on probation and the Provost and the President approved the recommendation. Since last Fall, work has been done on curriculum revisions and the shortened program review process has been done. It seems like double jeopardy to have the program put on probation and then brought back for consideration for elimination. The program should be taken off the list and treated separately. If it doesn’t reach the established benchmarks during its probationary period it will be eliminated.

There were quite a few programs in category four from the prioritization process. Some of them made it through the process and some did not. Those that did not are on the current list. Are they being penalized because of timing? Is Range lucky because of timing? The current process is a very different process. Are all programs slated for elimination going to be given an opportunity to re-write their curriculums and make convincing arguments that they shouldn’t be eliminated? This is a unique situation and the different perspectives are understandable. But there are programs that have not and will not be getting the same chance; the motion is not supported.

The Senate learned a lot about Range last Fall. But at that time, programs were not being discussed relative to one another and the Senate did not have the cost savings information. It doesn’t seem fair to remove Range from the list. The Senate can vote not to eliminate it; but it should still be considered with all of the other programs. The timing may be unfortunate. On the other hand, Range has had more opportunity to present its case than any of the other programs will have.

The floor was yielded. Professor Susan Marshall provided a handout and noted that the current process does not take into account the criterion of “uniqueness.” The motion on the floor deals with programs that are so new they can’t be evaluated, i.e., category five. The Range program’s efficiency (student enrollments) continues to rise. A proposal for a federal challenge grant has been submitted which would provide HSU the opportunity to participate in a project to re-evaluate Range Management education in the United States. Proposed curriculum changes include merging two options so that more students are taking the same courses which will increase SFR and decrease the overall required number of units for the major.

Of the category five programs from the prioritization process, two are still in consideration for program elimination: French and Environmental Science. These would be considered as having curriculums too new to be evaluated. There was Senate action in the Fall regarding program suspension and elimination. Range was not given the option for suspension; yet the programs that were suspended are not on the current ranked list.

How will the Senate conduct business if it doesn't agree that once it has made a decision that the decision will stand? Why would programs on the bottom of the list expend energy on improving if they know they will just be on the list again next year?

It was noted that the Theatre Arts MFA is on the list and it was a category 5 program. It was understood that category 5 programs were not exempted from the list. Clarification was requested – are category 5 programs included on the list or not?

The Senate gave the program probation and it seems like it would be going back on its word to include it again for consideration for elimination. They may be separate processes, but there is overlap, especially when the prioritization rankings are being used in the program elimination process. If the Senate had known that this program elimination process was going to occur, it might not have made the same decision earlier – but it didn't know. The program should get the benefit of the doubt.

Are there any other programs that should be taken off the list, besides those that are suspended? If a program is suspended, are the cost savings made up already?

There are no other programs in the category the Senate is debating about putting Range in. The programs that are suspended will be phased out over two or three years. For all intensive purposes they are gone. The only difference between elimination and suspension is that suspension means they can be brought back without Chancellor's Office approval. The intent is that they will be phased out.

What is the definition of this category of things "that are too new to be evaluated?" The logic applies to other programs on the list, so it would be helpful to have it defined.

A more appropriate evaluation of the program can be done when the results of the ongoing work can be seen. It should be taken off the list.

The original intention was that everything would be on the list and senators would have the option to vote against eliminating any program on the list. This is just opening a can of worms. The Senate has just heard a second presentation by a program proposed for elimination. Unless the Senate wants to provide equal opportunity to all of the other programs in category four or five, it should leave the list as it is.

Many category three programs have been directed to plan revisions for their programs to make themselves more effective. The ICC has received the first of those curriculum proposals. It has not yet received the curriculum forms for Rangeland. Category three programs are not being evaluated based on their proposed changes; they are being evaluated as they are now. Rangeland is in the same place in making changes as all of the category three programs.

Voting on the motion occurred and **FAILED** with 12 Yes votes, 11 No votes, and 2 Abstentions. Chair Mortazavi provided the tie-breaking vote.

### **10. Program Elimination**

The budget reduction target for undergraduate programs is \$998,100. The Senate will consider 200% of that (ca. \$2 million dollars) in the first round of the process. The budget reduction target for graduate programs is \$110,900 (200% will be ca. \$221,800).

Beginning from the bottom list of undergraduate programs, every program up to and including Philosophy will be on the list for consideration. Beginning from the bottom of the list of graduate programs, every program up to and including Theatre Arts will be included.

Chair Mortazavi asked if there were any programs on the list that anyone would like to remove from consideration.

M/S (Powell/Faulk) that the following programs, in three groups, be taken off the Undergraduate Programs list being considered for discontinuation, without prejudice regarding whether those programs might later be reduced in size or combined with other programs for budgetary or other strategic reasons.

#### CSU Foundation Program subject areas:

Anthropology  
Art  
Biology  
Chemistry  
Economics  
English  
Foreign languages  
Geography  
Geology  
History  
Mathematics  
Music  
Philosophy  
Physics  
Political Science  
Psychology  
Sociology  
Speech/Communication  
Theatre Arts/Drama.

#### HSU Programs crucial to our reputation and service to the region and the state:

Business Administration  
Environmental Resources Engineering  
Fisheries Biology  
Forestry

Natural Resources Planning and Interpretation  
Nursing  
Oceanography  
Rangeland Resource Science.

Programs crucial to our efforts regarding diversity:

Ethnic Studies  
International Studies  
Native American Studies  
Religious Studies  
Women's Studies.

*RATIONALE: Programs in the first group are not listed because of their being on the list included in the Chancellor's Office Coded Memo, but because of the reasons for supposing that in fact they do belong among any university's subject areas. Others might be able to make a similar case. These are all disciplines which are part of a traditional liberal arts education, and availability of in-depth study of them is a crucial tool for prevention of provincialism. The subject areas are part of what mark a university as more ambitious than a trade school, and committed to engagement with an education in the liberal arts. Programs in the second group are major attractions for statewide recruiting efforts and are responsible for our reputation among environmental and natural scientists in the state of California and throughout the West. Programs in the third group are walking point for us in our work to achieve diversity and to prepare our students for a diverse world, and our commitment to them will be our evidence to regional tribes, to women, and to the state of California that we are in fact serious about the goals we have long proclaimed regarding diversity.*

Discussion:

It was noted that Environmental Science is not listed in the second grouping and it was asked if this was an oversight. The response was "maybe."

It appears then that what is left on the list is: Recreation Administration, Social Work, Journalism, Zoology, Child Development, Environmental Science, Botany, Liberal Studies-Elementary Education, Computer Information Systems, Computer Science, Wildlife, and Kinesiology. It is possible to cut \$1.5 million out of what is left.

Essentially the list is telling the Senate how to vote by telling it what 'not' eliminate.

Wildlife has been left off, which was the number one ranked program in the prioritization process, and is arguably one of the best programs in the nation in that discipline. It was noted that Geology was also left off. How was this list formulated?

Amendments to the list were welcomed.

Clarification was requested regarding the first group and whether or not those are programs that every single campus in the CSU has to have. It was explained that the list represents core disciplines that universities offer and so the Chancellor's Office (CO) will approve a program in

the areas listed without requiring extra paperwork. Not all campuses of similar size have all of these programs; they are not required by the CO.

Senators were encouraged to read the Coded Memo which includes this list and also states that “societal need and student demand” are not the preeminent criteria. It is reasonable to read it to mean that it is not just about permission to initiate programs in these areas. The newer campuses in the CSU lack some of these programs, for example, Philosophy is not included as a major on four campuses.

It was noted that several programs which are crucial to HSU’s reputation and service in the local area are not included in the second group: Liberal Studies/Elementary Education, Child Development, Kinesiology, Social Work, etc. These are all crucial to employment in this area. The Senate needs to come up with another strategy.

The Senate needs to deal with the process and procedure that is in place rather than spending too much time on this and delaying the timeline. It was suggested that the debate be ended.

There was disagreement expressed regarding ending debate; debate and speech by senators should not be limited.

It was requested that the language in the Coded Memo from the CO be clarified as to its meaning and interpretation; departments need to know whether or not it can be used as an argument against elimination.

The floor was yielded. AVP Burges received an email from the CO clarifying the meaning of the memo, i.e., “that not all campuses have to have these programs”; she will forward that to the Senate.

The list in the motion on the floor limits the Senate, but so does the list that was prepared with the cost savings data. It was noted that seven of the ten programs at the bottom of the list are from the College of Natural Resources and Sciences. This would dramatically change the makeup of the college.

Chair Mortazavi noted that consideration for elimination is not limited to the programs at the bottom of the list. If a program is removed from the list, the Senate will just move further up the list to include the next program for consideration.

The floor was yielded. It was observed that the three groupings in the motion are creating new criteria that were not included in the original criteria.

M/S/F (Rizzardi/Van Duzer) to end debate. Voting occurred and motion **FAILED** with 13 Yes votes, 8 No votes and 4 Abstentions.

Discussion continued:

If the Senate doesn’t change the objective criteria which has already been established, then it should just automatically eliminate the programs from the bottom up and there is no need for



further discussion. How can a program be removed from this list without adding new criteria? This is an important discussion to have before considering each program, i.e., are there grounds for keeping or removing a program outside of the established criteria.

The floor was yielded. It was noted that the figures in the column "Total of Scaled Rankings" (on the lists containing the cost savings data) are not in the correct order. It was explained that they are sequenced correctly, but formula in the column is not correctly adding the numbers from the previously columns.

The hidden agenda behind the motion on the floor is to make clear to the Senate that the criteria it has endorsed will not suffice if there are programs on the list that the Senate will not be allowed to eliminate. Senators will have opportunity to vote on each program using their own criteria and will have to think it through.

Issues have been raised regarding the objective criteria that were used to rate and rank the programs. It is important for every senator to realize that there already is subjective criteria in HSU's mission, vision, and core values. Programs have been ranked according to the objective criteria; however the subjective vision and mission of HSU needs to be included in every decision that is made regarding these programs.

The Senate really needs to be having a conversation about what criteria individuals will be using in making decisions, beyond the cost savings. How does the program fit with the vision and mission? What impact will there be on the community if the program is eliminated? What impact would elimination of a program have on HSU's future ability to recruit students? How much does the program impact diversity on campus? What is best the mix of programs in terms of the big picture? A handout distributed earlier shows that HSU has more major programs than campuses of comparable size, and HSU has a lot of expensive programs. Other considerations need to be made as well so that senators can vote intelligently when the time comes.

Another handout that was distributed illustrated that two of the current criteria for program elimination are highly correlated and both are related to cost (cost per FTES and SFR). The current rankings weight the cost of programs relative to the quality of programs seven times more. The Senate needs to consider much more than just cost.

This route of program elimination is not going to save HSU much money, either in the short term or the long term. Additional criteria needs to be brought in. It was suggested that the prioritization rankings be used; it was a careful and reasonable process carried out by the faculty. A reasonable way to start the conversation is to take all category one and two programs (from prioritization) off the table, and consider the remaining programs.

M/S/P (Fulham/Goodman) to postpone the motion indefinitely. There was no discussion. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 18 Yes votes, 5 No votes, and 3 Abstentions, thus killing the main motion.

Chair Mortazavi announced that the department chairs of programs on the list for consideration will be asked to prepare a two-page rebuttal for the Senate.

Senator Cheyne noted that the cost savings data for the Theatre Arts graduate programs is incorrect and provided a handout explaining and clarifying fiscal information for the program.

It was asked if other programs will have the opportunity to provide clarification on their data as well.

Meeting adjourned at 6 pm.