

Senator Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm on Tuesday, November 16, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, August, Berman, Cheyne, Craig, Crowder-Fiore, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Heise, Knox, Madar, Mortazavi, Moyer, Powell, Reiss, Richmond, Rodriguez, Shaeffer, Snyder, Van Duzer, Yarnall, Yzaguirre.

Members Absent: Nordstrom, Rizzardi, Tripp, VerLinden, Webb, Whitlatch.

Proxies: Rodriguez for Kelly, Shaeffer for Goodman, Rodriguez for Wilyer, Cheyne for Thobaben, Powell for Mola, Reiss for Craig (1<sup>st</sup> half).

Guests: Burges, Lee, Ayoob.

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

Senator Van Duzer announced that President Richmond approved the Resolution on Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) Grade Mode Policy (#05-10/11-APC) and the Resolution on Allocation of Area C & D General Education in Compliance with EO 1033 (#13-10/11-APC). Provost Snyder has approved the Resolution on Revision of the Rangeland Resources and Wildland Soils (RRW) Curriculum (#11-10/11-ICC).

The Senate will meet during Finals Week if needed. The meeting time will be adjusted to accommodate the finals week schedule. Senators were asked to keep Tuesday, December 14, 5:00-7:00 pm available.

The Senate Executive Committee proposes the following a revised procedure for ICC Consent Calendar items:

- Consent Calendar items are listed on the senate agenda and posted for review by the Friday before the Tuesday Senate meeting at which they are approved.
- The Senate Chair will ask if there are objections to any items on the Consent Calendar.
- If any voting member of the Senate has an objection, he/she will state which items are to be pulled from the calendar and explain the objection.
- Following the explanation, one person may respond briefly, and then the Senate immediately votes either to approve the item *or* to send it back to the committee so that the concerns may be further addressed.
- All remaining items are approved without objection.
- Items sent back to committee are added to the business agenda of the next meeting.

Proxies were announced:

Senator Mortazavi provided a report from the University Budget Committee (UBC). The President presented the campus' strategic initiatives and priorities: 1) student success, 2) fiscal stability and revenue enhancement, and 3) service to the North Coast community. The President asked the UBC to develop a conservative budget. The UBC reviewed the current quarterly management report.

## **2. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of November 9, 2010**

M/S (Reiss/Heise) to approve the minutes from the meeting of November 9, 2010 as written.

- A request was made to strike the third bullet under "Discussion" on page 2. After discussion, it was agreed that a fourth bullet would be inserted. Senator Flashman will provide the comment to be inserted.
- Clarification was requested regarding the level of detail in the minutes. The Senate agreed to a new approach this year that would entail not recording every comment. After additional discussion, the matter was tabled, with the suggestion that there be further clarification of what the minutes should contain.

Voting on the minutes from the meeting of November 9, as amended, occurred and **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

## **3. Resolution on Guidelines for Approving Minors at HSU (#04-10/11-ICC)(Second Reading)**

The resolution was carried over from the previous meeting, with the following amendment on the floor:

1. The minor supports the University Vision.
2. The benefits of the minor program to students are articulated in one or ~~more~~ both of the following contexts:
  - The minor offers students complementary learning opportunities for one or more majors
  - The minor provides professional preparation for students in one or more majors
  - ~~The minor enables students to pursue additional intellectual growth.~~
3. There are positive indications for current and/or potential demand from students for the minor. Once established, a viable minor program averages at least 3 completions per year.

Discussion of the amendment:

- The speaker who raised the original concern was not in favor of the amendment. It does not answer the original question about the criteria that will be used for measuring these factors and how the criteria would be applied.

- It was suggested that rather than pursuing the amendment, it would be better to send the policy back to the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) for clarification.

M/S/U (Powell/Cheyne) to send the policy back to the ICC for clarification.

It was noted that the resolution will return to the Senate as a second reading.

#### **4. Resolution on Faculty-Initiated Drop for Non-Attendance (#12-10/11-APC) (Second Reading)**

Resolution on Faculty-Initiated Drop for Non-Attendance  
#12-10/11-APC – November 16, 2010 – Second Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the following “Faculty-Initiated Drop for Non-Attendance Policy” be adopted and implemented by Fall 2011:

##### ***Faculty-Initiated Drop for Non-Attendance Policy***

##### **Faculty-Initiated Drop for Non-Attendance Policy to Take Effect Fall 2011**

Students who have been absent from a class or lab session within the first week of instruction, without notifying the instructor before the absence, may be dropped from the course by the instructor. Any student dropped by the instructor during this period will be notified of the action by an e-mail from the Registrar until an automated process is developed. A student who wishes to be reenrolled in a course from which they have been dropped must receive a permission number from the instructor and reenroll in the course prior to the semester census date.

Not all instructors will drop students on the basis of non-attendance. Students are responsible for making sure the correct courses are on their schedules prior to the census date. If they do not properly drop a course, they will receive a "WU" (withdrawal unauthorized), which counts as an “F” in their grade point average.

***RATIONALE:*** *Currently, faculty can give away an absent student's seat in the first week, however faculty cannot formally drop the absent student, which can result in over-enrollment. A great deal of time goes into dealing with retroactive withdrawals as a result of students enrolling, and forgetting to withdraw from classes. This creates time consuming and costly petitions for retroactive withdrawal. Adopting this policy will encourage faculty to add students in courses once the non-attending students have been dropped.*

Vice Provost Burges spoke to the resolution. The language of the resolution has been revised to reflect the process as it is outlined in the HSU Catalog. The catalog policy is being extended to include the provision for a faculty member being able to initiate the drop under the same conditions.

Discussion:

- Q: Is there any time constraint on when the instructor should initiate the drop in order to do it in a timely manner?

- Q: Does the language need to be cleaned up now or can it be taken care of in the implementation process? A: The policy will not appear word for word in the Catalog as it is written. It can be taken care of during implementation.

M/S/U (Cheyne/Flashman) to amend the policy as follows:

Students who have been absent from a class or lab session within the first week of instruction, without notifying the instructor before the absence, may be dropped from the course by the instructor no later than the end of the second week of instruction.

Voting on the amendment occurred and **PASSED** Unanimously.

Voting on Resolution #12-10/11-APC as amended occurred and **PASSED** with 2 No votes.

## **5. Discussion of Draft Documents for University Senate Constitution and Bylaws (Faculty Affairs Committee)**

Four documents were posted on the Senate web site, under "Reports and Documents," and were distributed for Senators to review:

[Draft Components of Proposed University Senate](#) - 11-15-10

[University Senate Committee Structures, Draft 3](#) - 11-15-10

[University Planning and Resources Committee Charge, Draft 4](#) - 11/09/10

[Comparison Chart for UPRC](#) - 11/09/10

The Senate web site is also linked on the Change Steering Committee's web page, where there is a form for providing online feedback. Senators were asked to encourage their colleagues to review the materials and to provide feedback.

Senate Knox reported that the first of two Town Hall meetings was held today and the committee received good feedback.

The "**Comparison Chart for the University Planning and Resource Committee**" (UPRC) (draft 4) was reviewed and commented upon. Since the last meeting, the Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed and compared the current composition of the University Budget Committee and the Senate recommendations made following the Budget Task Force report in 2008, and has provided an updated proposal for the UPRC.

### Discussion/Comments on Membership:

- It was recommended that the "Dean of Library" and "Chief Information Officer" be removed from the membership of the proposed UPRC. Individuals representing special units should be invited as needed for consultation, but they should not be permanent members. Both these individuals report to the Provost; the Provost can represent those areas. Having them both on the committee will dilute the voice of the faculty on the committee.

- The areas of information resources and the technology that moves them comprise ca. 10% of the total university budget. They are pervasive across all aspects of the university. It was advocated that they be kept as members.
- It was suggested that having a faculty librarian appointed to the committee would be an appropriate way to have the Library represented in budget discussions.

Discussion/Comments on Charge:

- Number 4: It was recommended that the wording be changed from “set fiscal priorities...” to “recommend fiscal priorities ...” in order to be consistent with other language in the charge.
- Number 7: Concern was expressed about the wording and whether or not it would include identifying personnel cuts. It was clarified that the UPRC would be discussing the degree to which layoffs may occur, but not discussing layoffs of specifically identified areas or individuals.
- It was noted that after notice is given to employees, it would be appropriate to provide information to the UPRC.
- Q: What does number 10 mean? A: It is intended to say that the committee would review internal and external reports, such as the Maddox report. The term “fiscal mission” comes from the Maddox report. It is the university’s long-range plan for creating its future based on its vision and mission, i.e. a fiscal vision.
- Number 10: It was recommended that the wording be changed from “fiscal mission” to “long-term fiscal strategy.”
- Q: How will time be allocated for staffing of the committee? Will there be assigned time for faculty engaged in this work? It is an important committee for the University and has workload implications that need to be recognized.
- SDSU has a block of assigned time for university governance and the Senate assigns it as needed. Currently assigned time for governance at HSU is negotiated between the Senate Executive Committee and the Provost.

Senator Knox noted that if the Senate wants to address more detail, the process of developing the proposal is going to be pushed back. The other option is to have the proposed Constitution and Bylaws Committee continue work on addressing details of committees after the proposal is approved by the faculty.

The “**University Senate Committee Structures**” (draft 3) was reviewed. Senator Knox noted that this will be the last review before putting it into Bylaws language.

Discussion/Comments:

- The issue of proxies was raised and it was stated that use of proxies does not serve the process very well. The Statewide Senate is struggling with the issue of attendance and proxies, in addition to some other organizational issues. It was noted that either Long Beach or SDSU chose not to use proxies.
- The number of people engaged in committee work and the workload is an issue that needs to be addressed. Has the committee considered how much time will be involved for the chairs and the members of these committees? Even if the committee structure is re-scaled to size, HSU may not have enough people to populate all of these committees.

Proposed Campus Community Climate Committee:

- Q: The charge is vague and broad – what kind of tasks will they take on? A: The Faculty Affairs Committee is still working on a more specific charge. It is proposing to eliminate the Student Affairs Committee and move issues such as student judicial process policies to this group, as well as other kinds of policy issues related to student life. Recommendations from the CIC on increasing ways for campus community to come together would fall under this committee.
- Q: Would all areas of the campus be included under this committee, including areas that don't usually come to the Senate (i.e., auxiliaries, athletics, etc.)?

**Discussion of "Draft Components of Proposed University Senate":**

The current wording indicates that the Chair of the Senate will also be the Chair of the Faculty, and elected by the faculty at large. It should be stated in reverse, that the Chair of the Faculty is the Chair of the Senate to make it clear there is still a general faculty organization. It will still be possible to have a meeting of the faculty senate and a meeting of the general faculty.

Drawing a parallel with the Staff Council and Associated Students organizations is not justification for a separate faculty group; the faculty is still predominant in the proposed university senate. Is the intent to maintain governance structures that may have different points of view? It is not clear how this will work from a governance or structural standpoint.

Senator Knox stated that there needs to be a mechanism by which the faculty as a body can make a recommendation to the senate, or take a position on issues that the senate has decided. For example, if the faculty needs to work on the Retention, Tenure and Promotion process, this would provide a mechanism for the faculty to do so, without involving the entire university senate. Anything done by the faculty outside of the senate would be reported to the senate. This is the structure at San Diego and the language has been taken from the SDSU Constitution.

Q: What is the role of the Chair of the Senate? Could there be a conflict if the chair takes orders from different groups? Having executive roles to play with two different groups could be problematic.

It should be made clear in this document that the current General Faculty Constitution is to be negated. Otherwise, the general faculty should get together and form a new faculty constitution in conjunction with this proposed university senate constitution.

6.5.1 (Faculty Session): There should be a provision for the faculty to be able to go into a closed (executive) session. The faculty needs to have the opportunity to have a private conversation in order to prevent the formation of rump faculty groups.

It was suggested that the language articulate some of the reasons for having general faculty meetings as well as how recommendations from the faculty are forwarded.

5.21 (General Faculty Meetings) doesn't mention any restrictions on voting faculty; is this intentional? A: The language comes from the SDSU Constitution.

5.0 (Officers and Parliamentarian) doesn't mention a parliamentarian. Response: It was a cut and paste error. However, members of the Faculty Affairs Committee didn't feel that the senate needed a parliamentarian. Instead, there was a suggestion that the Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee serve as the parliamentarian.

5.3 (Secretary of the Senate) lists duties that the position doesn't do. It was suggested that unless the position does these duties, it would be better to call it something other than "Secretary." The name "Officer at Large" was suggested.

It was suggested that this may be an opportunity to re-think having the senate vice-chair and senate secretary serve simultaneously as committee chairs of Faculty Affairs and Academic Policies respectively.

M/S/P to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:52 pm.