

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:01 on Tuesday, February 8, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, August, Berman, Blake, Cheyne, Craig, Crowder-Fiore, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Kelly, Knox, Madar, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Powell, Rizzardi, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Yarnall.

Members Absent: Ellerd, Faulk, Richmond, Rodriguez, Tripp, Whitlatch, Yzaguirre.

Proxies: Craig for Reiss, Kelly for Wilyer.

Guests: Ayoob, Oliver, Burges, Rawal.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of January 25, 2011

M/S/P (Mortazavi/Heise) to approve the minutes from the meeting of January 25, 2011 as written. Motion passed with 1 Abstention.

2. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 1, 2011

M/S/P (Mortazavi/Knox) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 1, 2011 as written. Motion passed with 1 Abstention.

3. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Chair VerLinden announced that he will send an email regarding University Executive Committee minutes and recommended that senators take a look at them. They contain information that people may be interested in reading.

Jyoti Rawal, Associate Dean of Students was introduced and provided an update on the Graduation Rate Improvement Plan activities. Chair VerLinden reminded everyone that the committee's work will help the faculty to be able to better provide help for HSU students.

The Graduation Rate Improvement Task Force has been charged with increasing HSU graduation rates 12% by 2015 and increasing rates for underrepresented students by 15%. A comparison of HSU graduation rates to CSU graduation rates shows a widening gap; the task force is trying to bring HSU's numbers more in line with the CSU. A comprehensive plan for reaching this goal has been developed and is being implemented.

Several projects are underway. An early alert system is being developed, which will take the place of the hard copy mid-semester evaluations currently filled out by faculty. The system will allow faculty to provide feedback to a central place (e.g., the advising center). Another small group is working on creating a first year experience for students. There will be a pilot of the program for students needing

double remediation. Different ways of communicating with students are also being reviewed and evaluated; for example, a web site that provides students with the capability to do self-advising is being considered. Discussions are underway with Career Services and the Advising Center about ways of enhancing services for students.

Questions:

Q: Is the question of affordability for students being considered? A: Yes – it is being looked at as a retention issue.

Q: What is the timeline for implementing the early warning system? A: The published timeline says it will be up and running in Fall 2011. However, it needs to be ready to go and tested before then.

Jyoti and her staff were thanked for all of their work.

4. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee is working on three items which will be coming to the Senate: 1) a policy to allow departments to establish currency limits for courses, 2) development of a “no pass” list which would provide faculty with a list of students and the grades they received in pre-requisite courses, and 3) a policy that would not allow students enrolled in over 90 units to register unless they have a majors contract (revision of a policy passed on 05/06).

Faculty Affairs Committee (Knox): The Committee has items on the current agenda.

General Faculty Representatives to the Statewide Senate (ASCSU): No report.

General Faculty President (Powell): No report.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC met today as a full committee and approved items to be forwarded for the next Senate Consent Calendar. The Committee also discussed the guidelines for approving minors and continues to work on revising the document based on the Senate’s feedback last fall.

Associated Students (Kelly for Rodriguez): A.S. passed a “Resolution in Support of Affordable Education and the Student Referendum Results” challenging the recent IRA fee increase and recommending the separation of the fee into four separate fees.

Staff Council (Crowder-Fiore): The Council developed an earthquake preparedness flyer that new HSU employees will receive in the new employee packet.

Senate Finance Officer (Mortazavi): The University Budget Committee met on Friday. The Provost will provide information as part of his report.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): A search committee is being formed for a Research Dean. The position will begin July 1, 2011. Late last semester, the Provost asked college deans to talk to their councils of

chairs about the position. The position is needed to help re-build the Sponsored Programs Foundation. The Research Dean will be responsible for significantly increasing grant contract activity on campus. The position will be funded with one-time funding – it is not being built into base funding. Renewal will be contingent upon performance. Staff support for the Research Dean office will come out of existing staff support in Sponsored Programs.

Provost Snyder distributed a set of handouts to senators, in response to a request to have him report on HSU's SFR in comparison to other CSU campuses. The handouts include information on what reports are available online and where they can be accessed, so that individuals can look up information as needed, both at the system level and at the HSU campus level.

Concerning local IR data, it was noted that when a program transfers from one college to another, the historical data is also transferred.

Questions:

Q: Why has the SFR for Physical Education increased so much? A: The difference reflects a change made when coaches were pulled out, which caused the SFR to rise.

Q: HSU's increase in SFR between 2006 and 2010 is double the increase at other CSU campuses. Why have other campuses been better at protecting their academic programs? A: Other campuses did not have the number of expensive and unique programs that HSU did. HSU's accelerated increase reflects the fact that it is catching up to the CSU, not that other campuses were better at protecting their programs.

The Provost stated that he is paying attention to SFR where it is tied to specific issues, such as student success. Attention is being paid to class size on a course by course basis, for example, it appears that an increase in the size of a Mathematics course correlated to an increased student failure rate. That issue is being addressed. The conversation about SFRs needs to be in a context, not independent of other concerns, i.e., retention, etc.

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): Vice President Nordstrom provided an overview of the current budget situation and noted that it is changing on a daily basis. HSU will not be asked to return any of the budget it was allocated for 2011/12, as the university met its FTES target. The CSU has estimated that it will fall short of its FTES target by ca. 11,000 FTES, and so will have to pay back the State of California.

The Governor has asked the CSU to not raise tuition and at the same time to decrease FTES. For 2011, the FTES target is ca. 331,000, reflecting a 2.5% decrease from 2010. For HSU, this translates to a FTES target of ca. 7,000 for next year. With the tuition increase and a 2.5% reduction in students, the net reduction to the CSU is \$250 million dollars.

At a recent meeting at the Chancellor's Office (CO), ideas for new ways of 'doing business' were discussed, including: increasing regional inter-campus cooperation – not just for academics but also for administrative functions as well ; use of technology ; utility costs ; streamlining of degree programs ; review of fee waivers ; and review of organizational structures on each campus.

The base budget funding for 2011/12 will probably be the base budget for the next few years, even though mandatory costs will continue to rise. If the proposed tax extension does not pass in the spring, the State of California will make an additional \$1 billion dollars worth of cuts in funding.

The Provost provided a handout on the estimated impacts of the Governor's January 2011 budget proposal for HSU's budget planning purposes. HSU is looking at a \$4.5 million dollar budget reduction.

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

There were no speakers.

6. Resolution on Timeline for Review and Decision on Proposed New Governance Structure (#19-10/11-FA) – First Reading

M/S (Knox/Thobaben) to place resolution on the floor for discussion. Senator Knox suggested that someone may want to waive the second reading.

Resolution on Timeline for Review and Decision on Proposed New Governance Structure

RESOLVED: That the Humboldt State University Academic Senate recommends that the referendum vote on the proposed new university senate constitution and bylaws and the proposed revisions to the General Faculty Constitution be delayed to April; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Humboldt University Academic Senate recommends that senate terms ending Spring 2010 be extended through Fall 2011, for the current senate members who are able to continue to serve; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Humboldt State University Academic Senate recommends that if the new governance structures are approved by the HSU General Faculty, elections for new senators will occur in the Fall, prior to the establishment of Spring 2012 schedules, and that the new university senate be constituted at the beginning of Spring 2012; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Humboldt State University Academic Senate recommends that if the new governance structures are not approved, that elections be held at the beginning of Fall 2011 to fill vacancies in the existing Academic Senate.

RATIONALE: While work on the proposed university senate constitution and bylaws and the proposed changes to the General Faculty Constitution are proceeding systematically, it is important that there be thorough review of these documents before they are put forward for a vote and that there be an opportunity for the electorate to have an informed discussion of these documents before voting. There is not time to effectively achieve these goals and still hold the vote in time to also vote in Spring 2010 for new Senators should the new structure be approved. Holding the vote on the proposed changes in April will allow for a more thorough discussion prior to voting. Delaying elections until fall and making changes, if any, in Spring 2011 will mean that elected faculty, staff and student can plan Spring 2011 schedules with Senate responsibilities in mind.

M/S/U (Cheyne/Goodman) to waive the second reading. Motion passed Unanimously.

There was no discussion of the resolution as a second reading.

Voting occurred and Resolution #19-10/11-FA and it PASSED Unanimously.

7. Drafts of Proposed University Senate Constitution and Bylaws and Proposed Revisions to the General Faculty Constitution from expanded Faculty Affairs Committee

Discussion:

Proposed University Senate Bylaws – draft (1/25/11):

Section 2.3. Academic Policy Committee (APC):

It was suggested that agenda items assigned to the Committee be assigned through the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), so that the SEC is kept in the information loop. The same would apply to all Senate standing committees. The relationship between the APC and the ICC needs to be clarified.

Often items from the APC that require feedback end up at both the ICC and the SEC at the same time. Both committee chairs (APC and ICC) sit on the SEC.

Concern was expressed that requiring all items for the APC to come through the SEC might slow the process down. It was noted that urgent requests could be handled via email.

The language in the draft bylaws is from the current bylaws; it has not been changed. It reflects language from the ICC Constitution.

There is a benefit for those outside of the senate to be able to go directly to a committee to propose an agenda item, rather than through the SEC. Committees should be able to undertake work without permission of the SEC; but should report fully to the SEC.

It was suggested that language be included stating that the Senate and the SEC must be kept fully informed about what is happening in committees.

It was suggested that committees could forward their agendas to the SEC.

Section 1.11.:

If the language “unbiased, appropriate and reasonable representation ...” is to be kept in this section, then the senate needs to think about formulating some standards and criteria for these terms. Senator Knox noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee is working on this and will bring it back to the Senate.

Section 1.14.:

The section states that each senator shall serve on a committee; this seems like a burden to ask of probationary faculty. Are all terms 3-year terms? Section 1.58 states that unless otherwise specific, terms are three years.

While committee service is included in faculty duties, it is not typically a part of staff duties. It will take some in-depth searching to find staff who care enough to give up a lot of their personal time in order to serve on these committees.

How many committees will be transferred over? Will there be unintended consequences, i.e., people wanting to serve on certain committees?

The section pertains to senate or senate-appointed committees. There are many university committees with senate-appointed members.

In order to encourage younger faculty to serve, there should be some kind of recognition of their service, i.e., a letter for their files, etc.

Constitution of the General Faculty of HSU – draft changes as of January 20, 2011

As it is written, there is only one officer (the chair of the senate). Language in the draft constitution indicates that the general faculty will continue to receive money, which suggests that a treasurer might be appropriate.

It was noted that the term limit policy has been ignored in the past; sometimes because it has been difficult to find people to run.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has discussed having a Senate Chair/Chair of the General Faculty and a Chair-Elect. Basically, the general faculty would be electing someone for two years as the Chair-Elect, who would then serve two years as the Chair. People would not be serving consecutive terms.

There was discussion about the pros and cons of having a chair-elect model. It was noted that the general faculty will be electing the senate chair and will not necessarily be familiar with an individual's experience on the senate.

A straw poll was taken to see how many were in favor of having a chair-elect. Only one person was in favor of having a chair-elect.

Thought needs to be given to how many officers are needed for the general faculty. Currently the draft constitution does away with the Treasurer and the Secretary. These officers serve on the Nominating and Elections Committee and the Treasurer keeps track of the finances and bank account. The Cabinet for Institutional Change recommended that some of the functions requiring financial support be taken over elsewhere (faculty socials, bereavement cards, retirement pins, etc.) but that hasn't happened yet.

Section 3.1 Functions:

This has changed dramatically. What do people think the function of the general faculty is? It was noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee has not finished working on this particular provision in the constitution.

The section is related to Section 6.0 *Relationship to the University Senate*. It is important to note the language that the general faculty “delegates” to the university senate.

This is a good compromise; it keeps the general faculty, but delegates its policy recommending responsibility to the University Senate.

This gives the faculty the ability to act as needed.

Senator Knox invited senators to provide additional input via email. The Committee will be revising all documents for the next meeting.

Chair VerLinden requested that senators use the senate listserv to provide input (senate@redwood.humboldt.edu).

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.