

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY  
Academic Senate Minutes

11/12:05  
11/01/11

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm on Tuesday, November 1, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Blake, Fiore, Dixon, Ellerd, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Powell, Snyder, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Yarnall.

Members absent: Ciarcia, Craig, Nordstrom, Richmond, Shaeffer, Whitlatch.

Proxies: Kelly for Beyer, Mortazavi for Thobaben.

Guests: Rowe, Grenot, Burges, Ayoob, Lee, Webley, Nagatsuka.

Proxies were announced.

### **1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of October 18, 2011**

M/S (Goodman/Heise) to approve the minutes from the meeting of October 18, 2011 as written. Motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

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

Members of the RTP Criteria and Standards Task Force were announced: John Powell (CAHSS), Joe Szewczak (CNRS), Brent Duncan (CPS), Claire Knox (UFPC), C.D. Hoyle (Faculty Affairs), and Colleen Mullery (Academic Affairs).

The members of the University Senate Transition Team will be: Eric Van Duzer and Bob Snyder, co-leaders, Marshelle Thobaben, Claire Knox, Noah Zerbe, and Richard Bruce.

President Richmond is in Arizona today.

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

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee is developing a common document/form to be used for service learning and internships. Recent directives from the CSU on what types of forms are to be used will help streamline the process at HSU and alleviate the necessity of negotiating workman's comp issues with outside organizations. It will come to the Senate before the end of the term.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Dixon): Chair Dixon spoke with the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) after the Senate's discussion of guidelines and templates for collegial letters for RTP. The UFPC will watch for and identify trends and/or best practices in current letters.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The Committee is discussing a draft revision

of the Distance Education Policy (from the Academic Policies Committee) and is discussing and revising the next round of curricular deadlines. A “priority deadline” will be added to encourage earlier submission of proposals.

Associated Students (Kelly): AS passed a resolution in support of Veteran’s Awareness Week (Nov. 7-11) and the inauguration of a 5K run on Veteran’s Day (11<sup>th</sup>) was announced.)

General Faculty (Powell): The results of recent General Faculty and Senate elections have been shared with the campus. Work on the transition process has begun.

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

Item 10-095 (Suspend Theater MA) was removed from the Consent Calendar and will return as a resolution.

The remaining Consent Calendar Items were approved without objection:

- 11-084: SW 555: Foundation Internship
- 11-085: SW 655: Advanced Internship
- 11-086: SW456
- 09-437 History Program Change to Core Requirements
- 10-088 HIST 329 New Course Proposal: Imperial China
- 10-089 HIST 349 Renaissance and Reformation
- 10-090 HIST 343 French Revolution and Napoleon
- 10-094 HIST 394 History Conference
- 11-044: Ethics and Values Minor Program Change
- 11-042: Economic Education Certificate Program Change.

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

There were no speakers for the open forum.

#### **6. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:45 – [Dissecting Diversity at HSU : 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Report, August 2011](http://www.humboldt.edu/diversity/reports.html), (available online at: <http://www.humboldt.edu/diversity/reports.html>) – Radha Webley, Director, Office of Diversity & Inclusion**

Radha Webley, Director, Office of Diversity & Inclusion (ODI) reported on key findings in the 2011 *Dissecting Diversity at HSU* report. Members of the faculty received printed copies of the report. The report is also available online.

The report is an update and is not meant to provide an assessment of progress. It is too early to assess whether or not progress has been made. It is important to keep in mind when looking at the report that the numbers represent only one year’s worth of data. Next year’s report will take a retrospective look and will assess progress.

Some of the serious issues highlighted in previous years' reports are still present, for example, there are still significant disparities in race and gender in the graduation and retention rates. The majority of gateway courses appear (again) with disparities across ethnicity and race. More detail is available in the PREP system and senators were encouraged to look at specific department data.

It was noted that students were aggregated into two groups this year – underrepresented students and non-represented students.

Key findings include:

- There are clear shifts in demographics. Specifically there is a notable increase in the Latino student population over the past two years. It has doubled over the past three years.
- There are significant shifts in faculty diversity when looking at new hires. Over a 10-year period (1999-2009) there was a 12% increase in underrepresented faculty and in the past two years the increase is 43%. There has been little change in the gender demographics.

The report includes some qualitative findings. The ODI provided summaries based on focus groups held with students, faculty and staff. A couple of themes stood out. Faculty and staff reported experiences of bias and discrimination, often around gender, which were described as "bullying" and "uncomfortable." The faculty focus group discussions mentioned the need for mentoring and the importance of mentoring to the success of new faculty at HSU. Over fifty faculty and staff participated in the focus groups.

The need for more community building opportunities on campus was expressed by every focus group. And most groups expressed uncertainty about how to respond to instances of bias, etc.

Many questions were raised about how to support underrepresented students and there appears to be engagement for trying to figure out what to do and how to do it. The ODI will be looking at what kinds of resources can be provided for the campus.

Questions:

Q: Is the data collected analyzed by instructor? If so, could it be used for personnel actions? Would that be legal? A: It is legal, but it is not done at HSU because of a campus decision. The Senate would have to make a decision to publish that information.

It was noted that it is possible for a faculty member to request their own data from IR.

Q: What about staff diversity? A: It is included and shows that it has not changed much. New hires will be looked at next year. The same types of ethnic and racial disparities are seen in the staff numbers, but they are more equal in terms of gender.

Q: Does the data analysis include how students are admitted? Students are recruited in different ways, e.g., academics, athletics, etc. Is diversity being parsed equally between

different recruitment modes? Is this analyzed? A: The students who are admitted as “exceptional admits” (i.e., they didn’t meet the CSU requirements for admission) have been tracked the data shows that they have not done well. For this reason, HSU is minimizing the number of “exceptional admits.”

If senators have further questions, they were invited to email Radha.

**7. TIME CERTAIN: 4:45-5:15 – [Leading Indicators Study of Academic Progress, Spring 2011](http://www.humboldt.edu/irp/leading_indicators.html) (available online at: [http://www.humboldt.edu/irp/leading\\_indicators.html](http://www.humboldt.edu/irp/leading_indicators.html)) – Jacqueline Nagatsuka, Director, Institutional Research & Planning**

Dr. Nagatsuka encouraged senators to attend the workshop being held tomorrow with Tyrone Howard on strategies for closing the achievement gap in higher education.

The Institutional Research & Planning (IR) office has mined data over many years and work has been done over the past year to put together data to support the graduation rate improvement initiative. The CSU has set a goal of increasing graduation rates for all students by 12% by 2015, as well as to close the gap for under-represented students. To stay on track, HSU needs an 80% FTF retention rate.

HSU fell from a ranking of 37 to 48 in the *US News & World Report* and it fell out of the top ten (from 10<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup>) for Western Region Publics. The primary reason was because of graduation rates.

Dr. Nagatsuka gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting some of the major findings.

- The composition of the freshmen class has changed greatly. There is an increase in the under-represented minority student population with 44% coming from southern California.
- Second Year retention was 60%; it should be at least 74%
- 50% of students at HSU (and CSU) need remediation.

Two key retention issues are remedial students and probationary students. Remedial students (primarily first-time freshmen) need to have better articulation of courses and need to have student learning outcomes. Dual remedial students are 17% less likely to graduate than other remedial students. Interventions for remedial students include: mandatory first year freshmen experience, course transformations in remedial Math and English, use of Learning Center for tutorial services and supplemental instruction, and Early Start (to identify for college readiness).

Half of all probationary/disqualified students drop out after their first year. Probationary students are more likely to be male and/or underrepresented minority students. Interventions for probationary students include: identify FTF on academic probation after 1<sup>st</sup> semester, enroll in Intrusive Academic Probation Counseling, measure the number of students who go off academic probation at end of first year, and track those who remain on probation.

It was noted that the numbers on a yearly basis are volatile, and it is necessary to look at them on a five-year basis.

Some of the recommended retention measures are:

- Measure subsequent course success for students who have gone through remediation
- Provide supplemental instruction
- Provide intervention for students on academic probation
- Need major advising for undeclared students
- Train students to create academic plans
- Provide undergraduate research opportunities
- Look at peer mentor opportunities
- Limit exceptional admits.

The data shows that of students who leave, 36% go to a community college and 14% to another CSU. Students leave primarily for academic and/or financial reasons. First time freshmen say that it is hard to find jobs locally.

More research and data is needed. Students need to be tracked to know where they are and more advising, supplemental instruction, and student financial aid are needed. There is a need to find out why seniors are not graduating (1300 seniors did not graduate last year).

Discussion/questions:

What are these conclusion based on? While HSU is increasing the number of under-represented minority students, the number of low income students has gone down. In K-12, it has been concluded that income is more of an indicator of success.

Students are asked when they leave HSU what their reasons are for leaving. The data shows that students who come from farther away are more likely to leave.

It was suggested that the data include confidence intervals.

Some of the disparities in ethnicity, race and gender are national trends. Is there a developed literature on gender disparity which has become more marked in the past ten years? It was noted that gender difference has been a long-term trend in K-12.

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

Resolution on Time Limit for Undergraduate Report in Progress (RP) Grades  
#06-11/12-APC – Second Reading – November 1, 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 the conditions for removal of the RP shall be reduced to writing by the instructor and made available to the student with a copy placed with the appropriate campus officer until the RP is removed or the time limit for removal has passed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That failure to complete the coursework within one year from the end of the term 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. Providing a form that parallels the current form for an incomplete grade will provide efficient communication between the student and faculty member to ensure clear understanding of the conditions for replacing the RP grade.*

Senator Van Duzer, Academic Policies Committee Chair spoke to the resolution. During the first reading of the resolution, a question was raised about whether or not a written contract is needed. It was determined that it is needed, so a new second resolved clause was added. Until a form can be developed in PeopleSoft, the contract will be in written form.

**Discussion:**

Q: Can a student graduate with an RP? A: Yes- that is one of the problems being addressed. RPs are not calculated in the requirements for graduation.

Q: What happens if an RP is resolved after a person graduates? Does it change the student's grade point average?

The policy from the HSU catalog was read out loud. It was clarified that RPs are not calculated in the grade point average. This is not a change from the current policy, and it hasn't been a problem to date. Very few students would be affected. The same situation exists with Incompletes. It was agreed it was not worth having the committee look into.

Voting on Resolution #06 occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

## 9. Resolution on Appendix J and Soliciting Student Letters (#04-11/12-FA) – Second Reading

Resolution regarding Appendix J and Soliciting Student Letters  
#04-11/12-FA – Second Reading – November 1, 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 HSU 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 the following be added to Appendix J, "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion," Section VIII.B.3. (Peer Review Committees, IUPC, Procedures), as a new part b), with following sections re-lettered:

- a) The IUPC shall invite written statements from all available members of the unit at the rank of professor to ensure that there is adequate substantive collegial evaluation of candidates. Other faculty members of the unit will be notified of the deadline for receipt of these written statements, but are not required to provide such a statement.

(1) Statements from colleagues shall be based upon direct observations and analysis of a candidate's effectiveness and contributions in each performance area.

b) The IUPC shall invite written statements from the candidates' current HSU students and current student employees to ensure that there is adequate notification and opportunity for substantive student evaluation.

cb) The IUPC may provide a meeting where faculty and students can personally consult with the committee. All comments received shall be submitted or summarized in writing and identified by name before placement in the WPAF. 15.16, 15.17b

de) Recommendations of the IUPC shall be based primarily upon written evaluations of candidates made by colleagues in the unit. Evaluations by colleagues within the unit shall be substantiated by other evidence such as written statements from colleagues outside the unit, peers outside the university, former students, and student classroom evaluations.

ed) The IUPC shall include in the WPAF a written description of procedures employed in making its recommendation.

fe) For candidates holding a joint appointment, evaluation shall be obtained from all affected IUPCs. 15.13

And be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that Appendix J, "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion," Section VIII.B.3.d (Peer Review Committees, IUPC, Procedures), be revised as follows:

ed) The IUPC shall include in the WPAF a written description of procedures employed to solicit collegial letters and student letters and procedures employed making its recommendation.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, No underline

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 HSU 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 assert that it is the IUPC's responsibility to solicit letters from candidates' current students and current student employees on behalf of the candidate.

Discussion:

Senator Dixon, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee reported that the committee addressed concerns expressed at the first reading by adding new language in the second resolved clause to provide similar wording under the responsibilities of the IUPC.

Q: Is there a consequence? A: It is not necessary; there exist mechanisms throughout the review process to identify problems.

Voting on Resolution #04 occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

M/S (Van Duzer/Goodman) to adjourn.

A question was raised about the task force on Appendix J changes, established by a motion at the past Senate meeting. Senator Van Duzer is trying to identify a new senate member who may be willing to chair it. Right now, it is a lower priority than the existing transition issues. It is hoped the task force will be in place by December.

It was announced that the Provost Snyder, President Richmond, Senate Chair VerLinden, and Senate Finance Officer Mortazavi have agreed that the current University Budget Committee will continue its work on the 2012/2013 budget and that the new University Resources and Planning Committee under the University Senate will be formed in the spring, but not participate in the budget process for AY 2012/2013.

The meeting adjourned at 5:26 pm.