

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm on Tuesday, October 18, 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, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Yarnall.

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

Proxies: Powell for Thobaben.

Guests: Reitzel, Zoellner, M. Comella, Growe, Burges, Ayoob, S. Smith.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of October 4, 2011

M/S/U (Goodman/Mortazavi) to approve the minutes from the Meeting of October 4, 2011 as written.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Proxies were announced.

Information on CSU Online was sent to senators via email and is included in the packet.

President Richmond approved the *Resolution on Policy for Awarding Certificates of Achievement and Posthumous Degrees (#01-11/12-APC)* and the *Draft AY Calendar for 2012/2013*.

3. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (written reports may be found in the packet immediately following the agenda in the senate packet)

Written reports from Academic Policies Committee and Staff Council were included in the packet.

General Faculty (Powell): An issue has been raised regarding one of the ballots in the current General Faculty election and the Nominating and Elections Committee is addressing the issue. College elections for college senators are underway.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): More curriculum proposals were approved by the ICC and will be coming to the Senate. The ICC is advising the Academic Policies Committee on two projects which will be coming to the Senate. The current version of student learning outcomes for GEAR has been sent out to departments, as requested at the last Senate meeting.

Associated Students (Kelly): The AS passed a resolution in support of the Occupy Humboldt group and the right to protest on campus.

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

The following curriculum proposals were approved without objection:

11-030: BA 415: International Business Essentials
11-053: International Studies
11-054: PHYX 310: Space-time and Relativity
11-057: GEOL 344: Geobiology
11-059: MUS 370S: String Techniques I
11-60: 407S: MUS 407S: String Chamber Music
11-61: MUS 109S: Strings
11-62: MUS 371S: String Techniques II
11-63: MUS 108S: Beginning Strings
11-064: MUS 107S: String Chamber Music
09-440 Program Change International Studies (Interdisciplinary Studies)
10-281 Program Change – Kinesiology Exercise Science
09-441 Course Change – KINS 455 Exercise Prescription/Leadership
10-387 Program Change – Environmental Management & Protection - Environmental & Natural Resources Planning Option
10-295 Program Change – Environmental Science – Environmental Policy Option
09-465 ENGL 320: Practical Criticism
10-360 Fisheries Biology Program Change
10-348 ECON 470: Sustainable Rural Economic Development
10-349 ECON 570: Sustainable Rural Economic Development
10-350 ECON 470S: Sustainable Rural Economic Development NEW COURSE
10-351 ECON 570S: Sustainable Rural Economic Development NEW COURSE

(See the meeting agenda for descriptions of individual items.)

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

Senator Heise spoke about the re-structuring of the Senate and shared a suggestion from an article he recently read online (“No More Rambling On” by Elizabeth Murphy). The article suggests setting time limits for speakers in order to make discussions more efficient and effective. In addition to endorsing this idea, Senator Heise also made the following suggestions for senate meetings: formulate the agendas so that the time-sensitive issues are at the beginning of the agenda; clearly label agenda items as “information only” versus action items; for information only items, provide a contact name for senators to send additional feedback to; and keep the current room set-up with the tables closer together.

Professor Armeda Reitzel, current HSU representative to the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP) shared information about the resident director positions that are available to full-time members of the faculty, and asked senators to share the information with colleagues.

There are five 12-month positions available, in China, France, Italy, Japan, and Spain. She encouraged faculty to apply for the positions. There are language requirements, and the web site [www.calstate.edu/ip/faculty] has application forms and other information. The application deadline date is December 1, 2011. All materials must be received in the Office of International Programs (CSU) by that date. Interviews will be conducted in February 2012.

6. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:40 – Resolution on Appendix J and Soliciting Student Letters (#04-11/12-FA) – First Reading

M/S (Dixon/Heise) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution regarding Appendix J and Soliciting Student Letters
#04-11/12-FA – First Reading – October 18, 2011

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the following be added to Appendix J, “Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion,” Section VII.A.2. (Performance Review, Student Evaluation), as a new part c):

- c) Due to the potential for the perception of a conflict of interest, candidates shall not request signed student letters from current students or from students working under them. It is the responsibility of the IUPC to make requests for signed student letters on behalf of the candidate. A candidate shall not be penalized for the lack of such letters; in such a case, anonymous student course evaluations shall be considered as sufficient student commentary on teaching.

And be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that this change to Appendix J be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote during the 2011/2012 academic year.

RATIONALE: A concern has been expressed that there is the potential for the perception of a conflict of interest when a faculty member requests letters from current students for his/her personnel file. These students might feel compelled to write a complimentary letter, because they may have to take a course from that faculty member in a future semester, or because they are doing research (or hoping to do research) under that faculty member.

Probationary faculty, on the other hand, might feel compelled to make such a request if their IUPC does not do an effective job soliciting such letters, because of the perception that signed student letters are required for a successful RTP application.

This change is intended to warn probationary faculty against making such requests and to provide them protection if their IUPC's efforts to solicit these on their behalf do not result in any such letters.

Discussion:

The issue stems from a concern raised by the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) about students being pressured to write letters while taking a professor's class. Of equal concern is the desire to not penalize a candidate for a potential lack of letters in her/his file. The floor was yielded to Bob Zoellner, a current member of the UFPC. The resolution doesn't provide adequate protection for the RTP candidate who must deal with the same Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) every review cycle, and may end up with no letters in his/her file. Files are stronger with letters from students and even if the candidate is not penalized for a lack

of letters, the file will be perceived as weaker. The Senate needs to tell the IUPCs to do their job. It is not enough to put up a couple of posters soliciting letters from students. In addition, there must be a mechanism for the IUPC to solicit letters, e.g., obtain student email addresses, etc.

Appendix J outlines the IUPCs responsibilities, including making sure that all needed documentation for a candidate is provided in the file.

It was suggested that the IUPC's letter of recommendation include information on what the IUPC did to solicit letters.

It was suggested that a member of the IUPC could visit the candidate's class and ask students to write letters.

7. TIME CERTAIN: 4:40-4:50 – Continued discussion of Developing Guidelines for Collegial Evaluation of Classroom Teaching (samples included in the packet) – Chip Dixon, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

The Faculty Affairs Committee may not develop a resolution, but thought it would be helpful to continue the discussion, especially after discovering that departments take different approaches to writing collegial letters. Some write separate classroom observation letters, and some combine everything into one letter.

Discussion:

General evaluation letters should be separate as they include strengths that may or may not be included in the classroom observations.

A classroom observation is very different than writing a letter on teaching effectiveness. The latter is more valuable than a single observation. It is more effective if a number of observations are done.

There should be a standard number of observation letters required by a department, for example, a minimum of three, so that all candidates are treated fairly.

Writing collegial letters is difficult and it would be helpful to have some guidelines on what is expected in a letter. Most faculty learn to write letters based on the letters in their own file. It would be helpful to know what kinds of things the review committees are looking for. For example, is it perceived as a good or bad thing if a faculty member offers extra work to students?

How are online courses affected, i.e., where there is no physical classroom to observe?

It seems like the student evaluations should be taken more seriously, rather than having a colleague sit in and observe a class. It was noted that everyone takes student evaluations very seriously; but that Appendix J states that peer evaluation is primary.

Often there are trends that appear in the student evaluations that are not addressed by a single classroom observation letter, and neither the candidate nor the peer evaluations address these trends. They need to be addressed by the candidate and the peer evaluation committees.

Some departments don't provide access to candidates' student evaluations for the writing of collegial letters. RTP candidates have the option of making student evaluations available to colleagues. It is helpful if faculty can put student evaluations in context; certainly the IUPC can do this.

It was noted that any type of guidelines for writing letters, if developed, would only be recommended, not required. This discussion should be shared with the UFPC members to see what they think. It was recommended that advice from previous UFPC members be solicited, not the current UFPC members.

There is a wealth of data for assessing students' responses to an instructor's work. There is very little compiled data from colleagues and what exists is not well-organized or consistent. Using a template for classroom observations can help build a database of evidence that balances against the student data. It could be codified in a standardized form and used to compare between departments, colleges, etc. It would provide information from which assessment could be built on, rather than just having a scattering of opinions. It would be systematically and routinely compiled and reviewed in a consistent way.

Further thoughts and comments may be shared with Senator Dixon, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

8. Resolution on Time Limit for Undergraduate Report in Progress (RP) Grades (#06-11/12/APC)

Senator Van Duzer reviewed the rationale for the resolution.

It was noted that the current HSU Catalog already states that there is a one-year time limit for completing coursework for an RP for undergraduate students.

Currently there is no consequence in place, if a student doesn't complete the required work within a year, which is what the resolution is attempting to do.

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

Resolution on Time Limit for Undergraduate Report in Progress (RP) Grades #06-11/12-APC – First Reading – October 18, 2011

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that a policy be adopted to require undergraduates to resolve a RP (Report in Progress) grade by completing required coursework within one year; and be it further

RESOLVED: That failure to complete the coursework within one year will result in a RP grade being administratively changed to a grade of F (Failure) or to a grade of NC (No Credit) depending on the grade mode of the course, and be it further

RESOLVED: That under special circumstances, as approved by the instructor and with the submission of a Petition of the Student, the time period can be extended, and be it further

RESOLVED: That once the RP grade has been changed, the grade will be included in the student's grade point average.

RATIONALE:

Currently there is no policy regarding the length of time a RP grade can remain on a student's record. There have been 447 students who graduated with pending "RP" grades since 1991 (ca. 22 per year). For graduate students who are engaged in thesis work, the seven year limit on coursework provides an adequate framework. However, for undergraduate students a time period comparable to an Incomplete will provide the needed flexibility for yearlong courses or combinations of courses where grading would be inappropriate after the first half of the coursework. For undergraduates, there are currently 1,544 "RP" or "SP" (earlier designation of the same thing) grades pending that are more than a year old.

Students sometimes graduate with RP grades unresolved. At other times these grades linger and are only addressed at the eleventh hour, just in time to graduate. Students will not be penalized by this change, as RP grades are not included for the purposes of degree checks. The changes made by this policy align RP grading with the current standards for Incompletes.

Discussion:

For Incompletes, there is a required form to fill out that explains the expectations for completion. Is there anything to track for RPs?

9. Resolution Regarding Appendix J, Section VIII: Procedures for Peer Review Committees (#02-11/12-FA) – Second Reading

**Resolution Regarding Appendix J, Section VIII: Procedures for Peer Review Committees
#02-11/12-FA – Second Reading – October 18, 2011**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the procedures for Peer Review Committees, cited in Appendix J, "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion," Section VIII.A.3.g) be modified as follows:

Copies of recommendations made by higher level committees and administrators shall be sent to ~~lower level committees~~ previous review levels.

And be it further,

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that this modification to Appendix J be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote during the 2011/2012 academic year.

RATIONALE: Recommendation letters are sent to "lower level committees." This is a long-standing established procedure; there has not been any reported confusion on this procedure. Rebuttal statements are sent to "previous review levels," which by definition includes department chairs when chairs write a recommendation letter. Because department chairs are not a "lower level committee," they do not receive the recommendation letters to which candidates are responding or providing a rebuttal. This does create confusion for department chairs who receive responses/rebuttals but have not received the recommendation letter which is the object of the response/rebuttal. This resolution

will result in a consistent practice regarding the distribution of recommendation letters and responses/rebuttals to recommendation letters.

Current Language in Appendix J (bolded text is for emphasis):

VII. Performance Review B.3. Documentation

- a) All material used in the Performance Review shall be identified by name, except for student classroom evaluations. 11.3, 15.17a-b All written evaluative materials, including email and fax correspondence addressing the candidate's contribution in the RTP performance areas are to be included in the WPAF only if they contain the original handwritten signature of the sender.
- b) All submitted statements shall be accurate, relevant, and timely. 11.1
- c) The end product at each step of a Performance Review shall be a written recommendation which is placed in the WPAF. 15.43
 - (1) Candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation containing decision rationale. 15.5
 - (2) Within ten (10) days of receipt, candidates may submit a rebuttal statement and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation. 15.5
 - (3) A copy of the rebuttal statement shall be placed in the WPAF with copies sent to previous review levels. 15.5**

VIII. A. 3. Procedures (for Peer Review Committees)

- a) Recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of committee membership. 15.42
- b) Department and higher level peer review committee(s) may rank-order faculty unit employees recommended for promotion. The end result of a promotion ranking shall serve as a recommendation to the President. 15.41
- c) Recommendations shall include supporting rationale. 15.5
- d) All deliberations shall be confidential. 15.10
- e) Candidates shall be given a copy of the committee recommendation at least ten (10) days before it is forwarded to the next level of review. 15.5
 - (1) Within ten (10) days of receipt, candidates may submit a rebuttal statement and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation. 15.5
 - (2) A copy of the rebuttal statement shall be placed in the WPAF with copies sent to previous review levels. 15.5**
- f) Committee recommendations, along with any candidate response, shall be forwarded to the next level of review as part of the WPAF.
- g) Copies of recommendations made by higher level committees and administrators shall be sent to lower level committees.**

The Faculty Affairs Committee decided not to change the proposed wording in the resolution, but more information was added to the rationale to help clarify the proposed change.

There was no discussion. Voting on the Second Reading of Resolution #02 occurred and Passed Unanimously.

10. Resolution to Establish a Task Force to Address Issues with Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards (#03-11/12-EX) – Second Reading

Resolution to Establish a Task Force to Address Issues with Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards
#03-11/12-EX – Second Reading – October 18, 2011

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to address issues regarding the development and implementation of department/unit RTP criteria and standards in Appendix J, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the membership of the task force will include: a member University Faculty Personnel Committee, a faculty member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, a member from each College Personnel Committee, and the AVP of Faculty Affairs, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the task force be charged with investigating and making recommendations for specific actions on the following issues:

1. Clarity, or lack thereof, of the approval process of department/unit criteria and standards
2. Value of a periodic review of department/unit criteria and standards
3. Standards that may be overly complex and/or prone to misinterpretation
4. Consistency across department/units or lack thereof
5. Investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08, including removal of the 'equal and compensatory' language.

And be it further

RESOLVED: That the task force review these issues, recommend whether or not to continue the use of department/unit RTP criteria and standards, and propose revised Appendix J language commensurate with the task force's recommendation. Recommendations shall be forwarded to the University Senate Executive Committee by Monday, March 5, 2012.

RATIONALE: In Spring 2011, the University Faculty Personnel Committee identified a number of issues in regard to the requirement in Appendix J for department/unit criteria and standards for the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process. The memo from the UFPC is attached as part of this rationale. The General Faculty approved changes in Appendix J in 2006/07 for implementation in 2007/08. Now that the university has had experience with the changes it is prudent to find out what the faculty's experiences with the new RTP criteria are and what effect those changes have had. Those views may affect the recommendations regarding RTP criteria and standards.

Discussion:

The UFPC memo does not recommend eliminating the use of department/unit RTP criteria and standards and so this language should be removed from the fourth resolved clause. The current problems with department/unit RTP criteria and standards are a serious issue for the RTP process. The UFPC has requested that a small task force recommend clarifications to Appendix J language; there are not a lot of options and this can be done fairly easily. The task force should be encouraged to separate these issues from the task of surveying the faculty, etc., so that recommendations on changes to Appendix J can be made and forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote this year and work can begin in the spring on the department/unit criteria and standards.

The reason for having the fifth charge in the third resolved clause is the previous four. The criteria should be clarified. But in the process it could be codified in such a way that HSU moves even further away from the teaching mission. The root cause of the problems needs to be dealt with.

The wording in the fourth resolved clause, “whether or not to continue the use of department/unit RTP criteria and standards,” should be removed. In regard to the use of the language “vetted” in Appendix J – it seems implausible that anyone could take the word “vetted” to mean anything other having gone out for consultation. It does not mean approval.

There is a small but serious set of issues that the task force needs to address first.

It was noted that department criteria were in place in Appendix J when the equal and compensatory language was in place.

M/S (Moyer/Goodman) to amend the fourth resolved clause as follows:

RESOLVED: That the task force review these issues, ~~recommend whether or not to continue the use of department/unit RTP criteria and standards,~~ and propose revised Appendix J language commensurate with the task force’s recommendation. Recommendations, at least regarding items 1-4, shall be forwarded to the University Senate Executive Committee by the end of Fall, 2011. Monday, March 5, 2012.

Discussion of amendment:

Concern was expressed about the shortened timeline.

It was noted that the task force is not being charged with reviewing the department/unit criteria. Its task is to recommend clarification of Appendix J and propose a continuing process.

Voting occurred and the amendment PASSED with 1 Abstention.

Discussion of the main resolution:

There is a need for two different task forces – one to address immediate issues and one to survey the faculty. It is important to find out what current faculty are thinking about in terms of the RTP process.

M/S (Yarnall/Moyer) to remove item five from the third resolved clause:

RESOLVED: That the task force be charged with investigating and making recommendations for specific actions on the following issues:

1. Clarity, or lack thereof, of the approval process of department/unit criteria and standards
2. Value of a periodic review of department/unit criteria and standards
3. Standards that may be overly complex and/or prone to misinterpretation
4. Consistency across department/units or lack thereof.

5. ~~Investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08, including removal of the 'equal and compensatory' language.~~

Discussion of the amendment:

The maker of the motion intends to offer a second resolution.

M/S/P (Powell/Goodman) to table the discussion of the amendment to the main motion until a subsequent resolution has been decided. Voting occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

M/S (Yarnall/Van Duzer) that the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to address the issue of "equal and compensatory" in Appendix J.

Discussion of the new motion:

It was noted that the language "equal and compensatory" is not currently in Appendix J.

The motion was withdrawn.

M/S (Yarnall/Van Duzer) that the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08, including removal of the 'equal and compensatory' language.

Discussion of the new motion:

This is putting the cart before the horse. This should come back to the Senate as a resolution with a rationale. The original resolution needs to be decided first and then this can be dealt with.

The motion says "to investigate" and doesn't include anything about making recommendations.

The issues identified in 1-4 or the original resolution are time sensitive; why not just add the March 5, 2012 deadline to the fifth issue in the original resolution?

M/S (Moyer/Powell) to amend the motion by adding "and recommend changes to Appendix J if the investigation warrants changes." The proposed amendment was read as follows:

That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08, including removal of the 'equal and compensatory' language and recommend changes to Appendix J if the investigation warrants changes.

Discussion of the amendment:

The motion should address all of the changes made to Appendix J, not just one particular change; this prejudices the process.

Voting on the amendment occurred and PASSED with 2 Abstentions.

Further discussion on the motion as amended:

M/S (Powell/Van Duzer) to amend the motion to include “by April 1, 2012.” The proposed amendment was read as follows:

That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08, including removal of the ‘equal and compensatory’ language and recommend changes to Appendix J if the investigation warrants changes by April 1, 2012.

Discussion:

Q: Where are the recommendations going? A: This is a task force appointed by the Senate, so the recommendation would come back to the Senate.

Voting on the amendment occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

Voting on the amended motion occurred and PASSED with 2 Abstentions. The final approved motion reads as follows:

That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08, including removal of the ‘equal and compensatory’ language and recommend changes to Appendix J if the investigation warrants changes by April 1, 2012.

Discussion returned to the tabled resolution, and the motion on the floor to amend the resolution be removing item #5 in the third resolved clause:

Q: If the separate task force that was just established recommends re-instating the language of “equal and compensatory” does that affect this task force’s work? A: It is possible, but it will take a longer time for the task force that is to investigate the faculty views of Appendix J to complete their work. The other task force needs to go ahead.

The bigger issue is the Boyer model of scholarship. If the recommendation is that the Boyer model is too complex and difficult to apply, then that might change the content of the department/unit RTP criteria and standards.

Senator Heise moved to end debate and vote immediately. Voting occurred and the motion PASSED with 1 No vote and 1 Abstention.

Voting on the amendment to remove #5 from the third resolved clause occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

M/S (Heise/Moyer) to remove the language inserted in the final resolved clause (“at least regarding items 1-4”) and change “University Senate” to “Academic Senate.” Voting occurred and motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

Voting on Resolution #03-11/12-EX, as amended, occurred and PASSED with 1 No vote.

The final resolution reads:

Resolution to Establish a Task Force to Address Issues with Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University establish a task force to address issues regarding the development and implementation of department/unit RTP criteria and standards in Appendix J, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the membership of the task force will include: a member University Faculty Personnel Committee, a faculty member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, a member from each College Personnel Committee, and the AVP of Faculty Affairs, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the task force be charged with investigating and making recommendations for specific actions on the following issues:

1. Clarity, or lack thereof, of the approval process of department/unit criteria and standards
2. Value of a periodic review of department/unit criteria and standards
3. Standards that may be overly complex and/or prone to misinterpretation
4. Consistency across department/units or lack thereof.

And be it further

RESOLVED: That the task force review these issues and propose revised Appendix J language commensurate with the task force’s recommendation. Recommendations shall be forwarded to the Academic Senate Executive Committee by the end of Fall 2011.

RATIONALE: In Spring 2011, the University Faculty Personnel Committee identified a number of issues in regard to the requirement in Appendix J for department/unit criteria and standards for the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process. The memo from the UFPC is attached as part of this rationale.

The General Faculty approved changes in Appendix J in 2006/07 for implementation in 2007/08. Now that the university has had experience with the changes it is prudent to find out what the faculty’s experiences with the new RTP criteria are and what effect those changes have had. Those views may affect the recommendations regarding RTP criteria and standards.

It was suggested that someone from administration serve on the task force. The AVP for Faculty Affairs will serve on the task force.

Senator Heise noted that an article appeared recently in the Chronicle of Higher Education on the use of the Boyer model and some of the challenges and difficulties. He recommended that the task force look at the article: ‘Scholarship Reconsidered’ as Tenure Policy (October 2, 2007) Chronicle of Higher Education. [the link for the article was forwarded to members of the Senate]

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 pm.