

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

Members Present: Altschul, Berman, Bolick-Floss (2nd half), Cannon, Chapin, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Heise, Margell, Meiggs, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Olson, Paynton, Powell, Reiss, Richmond, Rizzardi, Rodriguez, Snyder, Van Duzer, VerLinden.

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

Proxies: Fulgham for Thobaben, Ellerd for Knox, Craig for Yarnall.

Guests: MacConnie, S. Smith, Burges, Ayoob, Fernandez, Mullery, Kircher, Borgeld, Hankin, Kinziger, Oliver.

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

M/S/P (Cheyne/Goodman) to approve the minutes from the meeting of March 2, 2010 as written. Voting occurred and **PASSED** unanimously.

2. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 9, 2010

M/S/P (Powell/VerLinden) to approve the minutes from the meeting of March 9, 2010 as written. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 2 Abstentions.

3. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Proxies were announced.

A Moodle site has been set up for the program elimination process. Senators' names have been added. Names of representatives from the programs under consideration for elimination will be added. The purpose of the site is to economize on the time needed for discussion. Senators will post questions and program representatives will respond with answers.

For the meeting on April 3, each program will be invited to send one faculty member and one student representative to participate in a Q & A panel. Senators will have an opportunity to ask questions of the program representatives during the meeting. There will not be assigned times for each program. The meeting is scheduled from 9 am to 1 pm.

It was asked if the deadline for the program rebuttals could be extended to the following morning. It was agreed to extend the deadline to Thursday, 9 am. Notice of the extended deadline will be sent out.

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

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee is considering three recommendations from the Enrollment Management Task Force report: 1) conditions for allowing changes in majors, 2) conditions for allowing second majors, and 3) changing the deadline for withdrawing from a course. Resolutions on these will be coming to the Senate in a couple of weeks. Chair Mortazavi has sent additional recommendations for the Committee to consider, including the number of units required prior to declaring a major.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Goodman): The Senate Executive Committee has not assigned the Committee any work at this point.

Academic Senate CSU (Cheyne): The graduation initiative (aka 'deliverology') has been a major topic at the statewide senate. There is ongoing concern about the lack of a faculty trustee. Nothing has been heard so far.

General Faculty (Powell): The general faculty election is currently underway – ballots have been distributed. Everyone should have received an email notice. If you did not receive an email notice, let Powell know.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC met today and discussed an "in process" draft plan for how Area C and D assessment will occur next year. The tentative plan is to reduce the workload for GE assessment by evaluating only one section (when there are double sections taught by the same professor) and having departments that teach a large number of GE courses select only five courses to evaluate each year, rotating through the courses over a period of time so that all are eventually evaluated. Assessment will be done by small groups with one representative from the department which is responsible for the course being evaluated. Details of the plan are still being worked out.

Associated Students (AS) (Chapin): Between 10,000-15,000 students participated in the march to the Capitol and rally in Sacramento, put together by CSSA and the SCCC. Due to the timing of spring break, only about 15 students from HSU attended. In conjunction with the march, CSSA has undertaken a "Made in the CSU" campaign; wristbands, t-shirts, etc. are available. Samples were handed out for viewing. AS is still looking for students to run for election.

Senate Finance (Paynton): The President approved the University Budget Committee's recommendations on the budget for AY 2010/2011. The report was emailed to all senators.

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

Senator Van Duzer is seeking input on a study he is doing on the reallocation of funds from academic programs to other areas of the university over the past seven years and the effect this has had on the quality of education at HSU. He has been mining data at both the campus and system level to see what the consequences have been. He is still looking for information on faculty morale and commitment to the institution. The only quantitative data he has considered so far in this regard is the level of faculty volunteerism. Recommendations for data

that would help evaluate the argument that the shift in funding from academic programs into increases in administration (which is the basis for the claim that HSU is under-administered) would be welcome. He would like to be as fair and open in the analysis as possible.

Comments and suggestions were made regarding types of data, availability of data, etc.

6. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30 – Faculty Input on Draft Policy for Storing Confidential Data on Desktop/laptop Computers (Anna Kircher, CIO, Information Technology Services)

Anna Kircher, CIO, Information Technology Services thanked the Senate for taking the time to review the draft policy on *HSU Implementation of the CSU Data Classification Standards*. In January, it was discovered that a computer on someone's desk had been breached from the outside; the computer contained files with social security numbers. 3,500 people had to be notified that their SSNs had possibly been compromised. This was an example of old archived data which had remained on a computer and been forgotten after it was no longer being used. In the process of checking around campuses, other similar instances have also been discovered.

Anti-virus software is not 100%. The draft policy is not intended to keep people from having data they need to do their work. It is designed to deal with data that is no longer needed for work by either moving it, if it is no longer needed, and/or storing it elsewhere. The policy takes into account that faculty need to keep data for the current term on their computers and need to be able to archive students' test scores and grades over a long period of time. When the policy is put in effect, information will be provided on how to survey your computer to find out what is on it and suggested strategies for getting rid of what doesn't need to be there. Feedback on the draft policy was welcomed.

Questions/discussion:

Data from previous terms can be kept, but it should be kept someplace safe such as a CD in a locked drawer. Don't keep it on a hard drive that is connected to the network, which could be subject to a virus.

The statement on page 2 about not storing data on devices "not owned by the university" is problematic. Kircher replied that she would be amenable to removing "Level 2" data from that paragraph.

What is the cost of encryption software? It will be part of the tool set that will be provided when the policy becomes effective, along with instructions on how to use it and support from ITS.

The list of Data Classification Standards was taken from CSU system-wide security policy that is under development. While some of the Level 2 data is commonly available, there is a difference between an individual releasing the information (i.e., a personal telephone number) and the institution releasing the information.

The university will continue to store grades on Moodle and provide protection for that data. The policy is intended to address local hard drives and work stations, because they are inconsistently managed and subject to more risk than servers under the university's control.

It was noted that drafts and letters written as part of the RTP process are confidential and possibly should be considered Level 2 data. Kircher will look into this. It was noted that "employee evaluations" is included under the list of Level 2 data.

How much energy should faculty expend to go through old files and try to pull out Level 2 data? It would be a matter of to what degree someone feels comfortable telling all former students that a hacker has accessed all of their test scores and all of their grades.

Storage on CDs is problematic; in a few years it may not be readable. Better storage devices are needed. It was noted this will be a constant challenge.

Level 2 data is data that the university does not have a legal obligation to protect. Level 2 data can be data the university chooses to be protective of out of respect for the owners of the information. It was noted that the CSU Security Training states it differently. Kircher said she would follow up on.

It was suggested that wording be changed to say that Level 2 data "should" be protected, rather than "must" be protected, since it is not a legal mandate.

The university now supports central storage for faculty; files stored centrally are off of desktop computers and do not fall under this policy. All of the data will be encrypted.

The tool that will be provided will find SSNs in temporary files as well. It was noted that everyone should be aware that when using email at a kiosk at a conference any confidential file that is opened will leave a copy in a temporary file. When not at a trusted computer, confidential files should not be opened.

The policy will be revised based on feedback from the Senate and other groups on campus and re-circulated to the Senate Executive Committee and others; then it will be taken to the University Executive Committee.

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

President's Office (Richmond): President Richmond reported on the recent Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting at the Chancellor's Office (CO). A new student trustee was introduced; she is a student from Sacramento State. The CSU Provost announced that efforts are underway to develop a common course numbering system to be used throughout the CSU that would facilitate student transfers between campuses. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor visited the London offices of Standard & Poor's to ensure that the bond rating for the CSU was not reduced and were successful in their effort.

HSU's University Advancement won several awards from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). An award was received for the magazine *Humboldt* and an award was received for the "Meet Humboldt" web site.

The President offered congratulations to CSSA - its President, Steve Dixon (HSU student) gave an excellent presentation to the BOT, including the 'Made in the CSU' campaign. The CSSA has developed a web site with information on what the CSU does for the State of California.

A suit was filed against the CSU by a partner of a former president of the CFA claiming injustices in the assignment of responsibilities to FERPing faculty members. The court found the suit to be valid and the CSU will have to pay ca. \$15 million dollars. The money will come from the academic side of the university.

HSU had been involved in the creation of COAST (Council of Ocean Affairs, Science and Technology). Funding for the group will continue and at least two HSU faculty members have received funding from that effort.

HSU was asked to engage in some synergy projects initiated by the CSU Chief Information Officer. The President is interested in the projects; they have substantial potential to save the university money in the area information technology. HSU will participate in several, including the virtual network operations, regional data center development, learning management systems, and IT procurement projects.

7. Program Elimination – Discuss Process, Timeline, and Format for April 3 Meeting

Chair Mortazavi reported that the Senate Executive Committee struggled with the question of whether or not it should recommend a strategy for voting to eliminate programs. The Committee decided not to make any kind of recommendation. The Program Elimination Task Force recommended a process and the Committee felt the Senate should honor that process. Today's discussion is an opportunity for senators to discuss different aspects of the process.

Discussion:

It would be valuable for the Senate to articulate some general principles, or a list of programs that it would not consider eliminating under any circumstances. It would be advantageous for the Senate to discuss, in a civil way, the programs that are essential to the mission of the university and the outlook of the future, and not require those programs to have to "justify" themselves. The Provost was asked that if he has a list of 'untouchable' programs, that he share it with the Senate.

Chair Mortazavi reminded everyone that if any program is removed from the list today, other programs will have to be added. All programs on the list have been notified already and asked to submit rebuttals.

Senator Moyer has drafted a list of principles which were sent to the Senate Executive Committee. The document will be sent out to the entire Senate.

Are all programs on the list 'on the table' for consideration for elimination? It was noted that no criteria for excluding programs has been established.

It was clarified – all programs on the list are potential candidates for elimination. However, the process is to begin from the bottom and identify enough programs to reach 200% of the budget reduction needed, as the first round to be considered. They have been informed and asked to submit a 2-page rebuttal. If any of the programs in the first round are removed, then other programs will need to be added and notified.

M/S/F (Reiss/Faulk) to remove all programs in Prioritization categories 1 and 2 from the list of programs to be considered for possible elimination.

Discussion:

The Prioritization Process involved faculty who reviewed a lot of data in order to evaluate the strengths of the programs at HSU. Based on both numerical ratings and considered judgment, programs placed in Category 1 were considered to be strong programs with the potential to grow and deserving of some enhancement, and programs in Category 2 were considered strong programs that should be maintained. These programs should be removed from the list and the program elimination process should focus on programs that were seen as weaker in the Prioritization process.

Which of the ten undergraduate programs on the list does this include - Oceanography, Fisheries Biology and Environmental Resources Engineering?

The motion is not supported. Category 1 programs should be excluded, but not Category 2 programs. The assignment of programs to Category 3 programs was flawed; some programs in this category should have been changed to Category 2, given the responses the programs submitted. The final analysis was not thorough enough. There is too much overlap between Categories 2 and 3, so Category 2 programs should not be taken off the list.

Some programs are in multiple categories which makes it challenging to know where to put them. The current process is about dealing with budget problems. Expensive programs need to be cut so that what remains is a mix a programs with enough inexpensive programs to support the expensive programs. If programs in Category 1 & 2 are pulled from the list, are there enough left to work with to solve the budget problem?

In the list put together by Senator Reiss there would be \$2.2 million dollars worth of undergraduate programs, including a mix of expensive and inexpensive programs.

The motion is not supported. Many of the Category 4 programs have been suspended already. The data for Category 3 programs is old now; after a year's worth of changes, many would be ranked entirely differently now. There isn't time to re-rank everything now.

The Program Elimination Task Force intentionally developed the criteria that it originally proposed so that some expensive programs would be included in the list for consideration for elimination.

The Prioritization process was not intended to say that Category 3 programs were “weak” programs. Some of them are very good programs. To take away Category 1 and 2 programs suggests that programs in Category 3 weren’t very good; this would be an incorrect interpretation of the work that the Prioritization Task Force did. Prioritization was not focused on elimination of programs. Realities have shifted and the approach needs to shift as well. The motion is not supported. Assumptions are being made that are not accurate.

The Senate has voted on and approved a program elimination process and criteria. Concern was expressed about the introduction of new criteria and processes when the Senate has already voted. Senators need to consider the ranked lists and criteria. Other factors may come into play in terms of individual votes of senators. Introducing new criteria and procedures throws a wrench into what the Senate has already approved.

The Senate should articulate some principles that senators may consider as they cast their votes program by program. This would be an alternative to the motion on the floor. Suggestions for principles to consider included: eliminating a small number of programs is better than a large number; programs which fulfill essential parts of the university’s mission should be considered for keeping; programs which add to HSU’s statewide reputation should be carefully considered.

Prioritization was about programs; the data on the current list is about departments. An unresolved question is whether or not certain parts of programs should be kept and/or eliminated.

The motion is supported. The Prioritization process spent a considerable amount of time identifying the best programs on campus. The best programs on campus deserve our support. This is an important decision that will impact the future of the institution. The current process is not adequate. The Senate needs to consider diversity, reputation, uniqueness, etc. The list is stacked against those programs that are costly.

The motion is not supported. It is an atrocity to have to cut any programs. The Prioritization process did not say that Category 1 programs were “star” departments; they were the strongest in what they do. The program elimination criteria has been established and the Senate needs to move forward, starting at the bottom of the list, and holding everything up to the university’s vision and mission.

The Provost stated that it puts him in a difficult position if the Senate just votes and the rationale for the vote is not clear. The Provost needs a uniform rationale in agreeing with the Senate’s list of programs to eliminate and to be able to make his own recommendations. It is important for the Senate to work through and adopt some general principles and strategies.

Seven of the programs identified in the list of ten undergraduate programs are from the College of Natural Resources and Sciences. The data would look differently if the criteria that was removed (uniqueness and revenue-generation) were reinstated. In retrospect, all of the criteria originally proposed by the Program Elimination Task Force should have been kept.

Concern was expressed about the validity of the prioritization results and using that to make certain programs “untouchable.” The data has been confused by using department data rather than program data.

Of the programs that would remain after eliminating Category 1 and 2 programs, relatively few have substantial cost savings.

It is important for the Senate to provide a rationale for its recommendations. Applying different criteria individually and subjectively does not provide a basis for voting to the Provost. What is being considered needs to be clearly stated. Every time a vote is taken, it must be done using with the same criteria. The Provost needs to be able to justify his actions as well.

The motion is not supported. Prioritization was not about program elimination. The Senate needs to slog through and make some difficult decisions. It would be helpful in that effort to identify what the Senate values.

The Senate cannot provide a single rationale for the elimination of a program. There may be multiple rationales, articulated by various senators. A list of arguments made by senators could be compiled as a rationale for each vote. These would be available through the minutes.

M/S/P (Flashman/Van Duzer) to end debate. Voting occurred and **PASSED** with 18 Yes votes, 6 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

Voting on the motion “to remove all programs in Prioritization categories 1 and 2 from the list of programs to be considered for possible elimination” occurred and **FAILED** with 3 Yes votes, 22 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

It was suggested that the Senate Executive Committee work with the document on standards (begun by Senator Moyer) and bring it to the next senate meeting.

It was suggested that the colleges should have more of a role in deciding how they see their future in terms of the budget. How can the Senate dictate to the colleges what needs to be done?

Senator Moyer shared the draft document she has created, which includes the HSU mission and vision. Other factors for consideration include prioritization scores, community impact, enrollment, prioritization ranking, diversity (majors successfully graduating diverse students), uniqueness, quality, mix of programs, etc.

Concern was expressed about how these examples of criteria would be interpreted and weighted. The Senate should be looking at this as primarily a budget issue.

Meeting adjourned at 6 pm.