

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm on Tuesday, September 20, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Beyer, Blake, Ciarcia, Craig, Dixon, Ellerd, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Kelly, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Powell, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, VerLinden,

Members absent: Fiore, Nordstrom, Richmond, Shaeffer, Whitlatch, Yarnall.

Proxies: Van Duzer for Thobaben after 5 pm.

Guests: Grenot, M. Comella, Burges, Growe, Oliver, Ayoob, Fulgham, Jackson.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of August 23, 2011

M/S/U (Kelly/Mortazavi) to approve the minutes. There was no discussion. Minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

The proposed changes to governance structures, including the new University Senate passed in the recent General Faculty election. The Senate will begin the transition process as well as conduct regular business for the rest of the term. The Senate Executive committee has not discussed the details of the transition process yet, but if anyone is interested in serving on a transition team, let the Senate Office know.

The President is in Long Beach and Vice President Nordstrom notified the Senate Office that he would be unable to attend today's meeting.

Senators were reminded that the meeting notes for the University Executive Committee are available on the President's Office web site.

The senate packet includes a copy of a letter sent to the CSU Board of Trustees (BOT) from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The SEC handled the matter because there was not enough time to bring it to the Senate before the BOT meeting.

The SEC discussed senator Flashman's request made at the August 23 senate meeting. If further clarification of the term limits for the general faculty representatives to the statewide senate is needed, it will be handled by the new governance structure. Additionally, the SEC agreed that the Senate had already interpreted the Constitution as requested last spring, and there was no further need to re-visit the issue.

Senator Heise has agreed to represent the HSU faculty at an AAUP conference on shared governance in Washington, D.C. in November. He will report on the conference to the Senate when he returns.

Attention was called to the new Executive Order regarding SB1440 and the STAR Act.

Christine Ciarcia, a newly appointed student representative from Associated Students, was introduced and welcomed.

Proxies were announced.

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

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee is reviewing the Distance Education Policy. He requested that if anyone has specific issues that have come up under the current policy, they should be forwarded to the Committee. The current policy includes a Distance Education Coordinator position. Since the position no longer exists the policy will be changed accordingly. At this point, the Committee is inclined to make only some minor modifications and updates to the policy, since no significant issues have been identified. The Committee will be addressing issues related to SB1440 and institutions courses and bringing them to the Senate.

Q: Is the campus following the current Distance Education Policy? A: Parts of the policy are being followed.

It was noted that the recent plenary minutes of the Academic Senate CSU contain some guidance on the SB1440 issues.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Dixon): The Committee is discussing modifications to Appendix J, including some that were recommended by the University Faculty Personnel Committee.

Academic Senate CSU (Thobaben): A report on the recent plenary, written by John Tarjan, was sent to all senators. Saeed Mortazavi was introduced at the ASCSU as the new senator from HSU and was able to attend an orientation meeting for new senators.

Senator Mortazavi reported that the Chancellor and one of the BOT members attended the ASCSU meeting. Despite significant objections raised by statewide senators, and resolutions sent by 13 campuses, the change to the policy on presidential searches (that would not require campus visits by candidates) seems to be a *fait accompli*.

General Faculty (Powell): The General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee will be sending out a call for nominations for positions in the new governance structures this Friday, with a deadline within a week. The Committee may be asking colleagues to help recruit nominees. It was suggested by someone from San Diego State that involving the associate deans from the colleges might be helpful. The election will be October 10-13. Each college will need to elect two senators. The Committee talked about how to provide orientation for new

senators and identified some anticipated challenges for the transition. Memos will go to the Staff Council and Associated Students apprising them of the need to fill positions for the University Senate.

Q: Wasn't the Senate charged with dealing with the details of the transition? The General Faculty's elections committee is not a committee of the Senate.

M/S (Thobaben/Van Duzer) to have the current General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee be approved as the official elections committee for the purpose of conducting the necessary elections for the transition to the new senate.

Discussion:

The motion cannot be supported without knowing what is in the language of the current constitution.

The Senate can delegate tasks to groups it wants to. This was discussed at length at the past Senate Executive Committee meeting. It seems reasonable for this existing committee to oversee this process.

The newly elected general faculty president should be a part of the transition process, so elections need to happen first. The Nominating and Elections committee discussed at length how to distribute varying term lengths.

A request was made to clarify the concerns about the motion.

- The Committee is not a Senate committee.
- Two separate sets of responsibilities need to be defined and it should be clear about who will do them. It has been proposed that this elections committee be responsible for the transition, and it should not be. The new general faculty president/senate chair should be part of the transition process. It is reasonable that the elections committee be responsible for organizing the initial set of elections.
- The motion before the Senate is vague and not well-enough formed to vote on. The issue is not who runs the election, but how the election is framed. This elections committee does not have the authority to make decisions on what candidates are running for. Premises come from the constitution. The Senate may delegate if it wants to and to who it wants to. The election of the General Faculty President should go forward as soon as possible, but not the others.

The charge to the Nominating and Elections Committee is very narrow. The Senate Executive Committee discussed this in detail. The question of determining staggered terms is not that important of an issue.

M/S/U (Dixon/Mortazavi) to amend the motion on the floor by substituting the following wording: The Senate charges the General Faculty Nominating and Elections Committee with conducting the elections for the new governance structures and determining the method to be used for staggering terms.

Discussion:

Q: Does the charge include how elections are held by the colleges? College elections are not run by the GF Nominating and Elections Committee.

Voting occurred on whether or not to amend the motion and **PASSED** unanimously.

The amendment was declared a new 'main motion'.

There was no further discussion.

Voting on the new main motion (i.e., amendment to the motion) occurred and **PASSED** unanimously.

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

Integrated Curriculum Committee (Moyer): GE Assessment – by the end of the academic year, every GE class will have a document that describes how learning outcomes are taught and an example of class project or assignment that will be used for assessment. It is not intended to be a huge task; only 1 sample of teaching & 1 sample of assessment is needed. It will be overseen by the ICC Program Planning and Assessment subcommittee. The committee will not be evaluating what is turned in – just confirming that the task is completed. The committee will hold a Saturday workshop on how to effectively create assignments that meet assessment goals.

The intention is that the departments will discuss the assignments and how students are engaging with the process. The departments need to own this.

The ICC is also wrestling with how to do GE assessment in a completely different way than how it is currently being done, which is not working well. Department assessment seems to be more valuable.

Associated Students (Kelly): The Council met yesterday and had a respectful and thoughtful discussion resulting in consensus on three questions for the meeting with the Chancellor on Thursday. Committee vacancies are being filled.

Academic Affairs (Snyder): Provost Snyder provided a brief update on enrollment. A handout was distributed with numbers that were not census figures, but were close. The FTE is high throughout and the unit load has come up considerably.

Q: What issues are raised by the high head count? A: According to the CO, HSU can go 3% over or under without penalty (the penalty would be withholding of student fees and tuition). The system is funded on growth. HSU chose not to grow in the 1990's when system had money. The Provost is choosing to grow HSU now.

Student/faculty ratios are not included in the handout because the data for this year isn't available yet. The Provost will find out what the definition of "transitory" students is.

4. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC)

The following curriculum proposals were approved without objection:

10-108: KINS 450: Exercise Testing
10-195: BA 470: Management Theories
10-282: EMP 471: Spatial Analysis Lab Projects
10-494: Psyc 404: Industrial/Organizational Psychology
10-495: English Minors catalog clean-up
10-497: MBA 600: International Economics
10-498: MBA 620: Managerial Accounting
10-501: ENGL 314: Creative Writing: Nonfiction
11-004 PSCI 371: Vital Issues in Contemporary Politics
11-005 PSCI 437: Sexual Diversity
11-009: ENGL 325: History of the English Language
10-038: FOR 285: Department Seminar
10-057 to 10-059: Secondary Education Program Changes
11-011: WLDF 309: Case Studies in Environmental Ethics
11-012: WLDF 311: Wildlife Techniques
10-352 Anthropology Program Change Major
10-353 Anthropology Program Change Minor
10-354 ANTH 395 Mesoamerican Archeology
10-355 ANTH 494 Senior Colloquium

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

Senator Flashman asked the Senate to observe 20 seconds of silence. Then he spoke about the recent General Faculty election. He interpreted the silence from the majority of faculty as a telling sign of the [lack of] engagement of colleagues in the changes to the university. He expressed concern that it may be a sign of despair and hopes that the changes will engage more people.

5. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:45 – Recommendation to have the Faculty Awards Committee submit its nominations to the Senate on February 28, 2012, instead of at the "first Senate meeting in March," which is March 20. This year's awardees will be honored at a University-wide celebration tentatively scheduled for April 20, 2012, sponsored by Development and Alumni Relations.

M/S/P (Powell/Heise) to change the faculty awards timeline and have the Faculty Awards Committee forward its nominations for the Senate meeting on February 28, 2012.

Discussion:

Laura Jackson, AVP for Development and Alumni Relations, explained why the request was made to move the timeline of the faculty awards process up. Her office is planning a university-wide celebration, tentatively scheduled for April 20, 2012, and would like to honor the recipients of the 2011/2012 faculty awards at the event. In order to be included on invitations and other promotional materials, the names are needed by March 1.

Q: What would be the challenges if the date is moved up?

There isn't a need to join the faculty awards with other awards. It takes time to assemble nomination portfolios – this would put pressure on nominated faculty and the awards committee. The current date of March 20 should allow plenty of time.

It was noted that nominations are due before the end of Fall semester.

Voting occurred and the motion passed without dissent and with 1 abstention.

6. TIME CERTAIN: 4:45 – Approval of the draft AY Calendar for 2012/2013

M/S/P (Mortazavi/Goodman) to approve the draft AY Calendar for 2012/2013.

Discussion:

- Q: What is the significance of the faculty development days that are marked out?
- Professor Fulgham explained the constraints on this particular calendar cycle where the first day of the semester falls on a Friday. In order to meet the CO's instructional days norms, two Saturdays were identified that could be used to meet the requirements for faculty development days.
- It was noted that courses on Mondays will lose two days in the Fall term. This is especially hard if it is a course that meets only once a week.
- This is unavoidable this cycle because of the Veteran's Day holiday. It was noted that one option is not to schedule one-day classes on Monday for Fall term 2012.

Voting occurred and the motion passed without dissent and with 1 abstention.

7. Resolution on Policy for Awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees (#01-11/12-APC) – First reading

M/S (Van Duzer/Mola) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Policy for Awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees
#01-11/12-APC – September 20, 2011 (First Reading)

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *Policy for Awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees* be adopted.

Rationale:

On those occasions where a student's death occurs while attending Humboldt State University, it is valuable to the family and to the university to recognize the student's contributions and efforts at HSU. The proposed policy reflects the central tenets of similar policies at other campuses and provides a clear process for awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees.

Attachment to Resolution:

Policy for Awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees

Draft 8/30/11, Academic Policies Committee

The following policy outlines procedures and criteria for awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees.

Criteria

- In order for students to qualify for a posthumous degree they must have been seniors when they last attended courses at HSU and successfully completed more than half of their major's courses.
- Students must be in good standing and have been enrolled at HSU within the past three semesters.
- Students who do not qualify for a posthumous degree, may be awarded a Certificate of Achievement if the student was in good standing and had been enrolled at HSU within the past three semesters prior to his/her death.

Process

- The process for awarding a posthumous degree or Certificate of Achievement is initiated with a letter from the major program to the provost identifying the student and requesting action.
 - Letters from other constituents (e.g., family) requesting a posthumous degree will be directed to the academic program faculty for consideration.
- The Provost or his/her designee will review requests from the major programs and make a determination that the application satisfies the criteria and then authorize the Posthumous Degree if warranted under the terms of this policy.
- In the case of a student who does not have a major, or other circumstances that makes it difficult for the program faculty to initiate the process, the provost may determine that the situation warrants a Certificate of Achievement and issue one independently.
- The provost or designee will communicate with the family to determine the optimal manner in which to confer the Posthumous Degree or Certificate of Achievement (in person, at commencement, by mail, etc.).

M/S/P (Mortazavi/Mola) to waive the 2nd reading. Motion passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

Voting occurred and the resolution passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

8. Preliminary Discussion of HSU Ratio of Tenure-Track Faculty to Lecturers

Provost Snyder distributed a handout of 'trend' data. The senate packet includes a handout on one year data. He noted that this is payroll data and so the tenure track percentages may be understated. There is a difference in the numbers depending upon whether or not teaching associates (graduate students) are counted; this data does not include them. In looking at CSU comparison, HSU is at the top of the list.

ACR 73 was passed in 2011 and at that time it was agreed in the CSU that the goal to aim for was a 75/25% ratio. A funding plan was developed, but the funding did not come about.

Almost every department has more lecturers than they want; the concern is getting department business done, i.e. committee work, advising, etc. There needs to be a discussion with a university-wide perspective of how HSU is going to increase the number of tenure track faculty on campus.

It would be helpful to have data on the number of students being served by lecturers versus the number of students being served by tenure track faculty. It would help to have more tenure track faculty teaching larger lower division courses.

The 20-year data shows that the number of faculty has remained fairly stagnant whereas the number of students has increased dramatically. Perhaps in discussing the faculty student ratio, the faculty retirement plan needs to be re-considered.

ACR 73 set a student/faculty ratio of 18/1. Everyone agrees that would be more beneficial, however the question is how to finance it. It became clear with ACR 73 that once you got above 65% tenure track faculty, you needed additional money to finance it.

This is a student degree quality issue and a faculty workload issue. It is a good time to talk about some creative solutions. We need to think about how we can do best by our students here at HSU.

Another discussion that is needed is the criteria being used to decide which departments may hire new faculty; there are different criteria being used in each college.

Advising issues can be addressed in different ways. HSU can't afford to have the entire university at 75% tenure track faculty. What is the methodology for deciding on percentages in each college? Advice from the Senate would be welcome.

Both the hiring process and the way positions are defined make a difference in the kind of faculty that are hired. Faculty seem more concerned with teaching upper division majors.

It becomes a retention issue; if HSU can retain more students, it will retain the funding which helps to solve some of the problem.

Chair VerLinden urged current senators to consider running for a position on the University Senate.

Meeting adjourned at 5:53 pm.