

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, February 7, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Abell, Alderson, Aronoff, August, Blake, Bruce, Cromatie, Dye, Eschenbach, Gold, Johnson, Kelly, Marschke, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Ortega, Pierce, Saner, Shellhase, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, Virnoche, Yarnall, Young, Zerbe.

Members Absent: Ciarcia, Richmond.

Proxies: Young for VerLinden, Powell for Shaeffer.

Guests: Fernandez, Goodman, Eichstedt, Cheyne, Ayoob, Burges, Kelso, Meisel, Flashman, Lee.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of January 24, 2012

M/S/U (Mortazavi/Virnoche) to approve the minutes from the meeting of January 24, 2012 as written.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Proxies were announced.

Curriculum item #11-201: ENGR 210 was withdrawn from the Consent Calendar.

The HSU Chapter of CFA is having a membership meeting on February 29 in the University Banquet Room.

A call has been put out for nominations for the upcoming General Faculty Election.

3. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (Written reports are included in packet)

Academic Policies Committee (Marschke): In addition to the written report, it was noted that the committee has completed work on policies for internships and field trips, both of which are ready to go to the ICC and then to the Senate.

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

11-187: PHYX 99: Supplemental Instruction – A question was raised about the numbering of supplemental courses (others are listed differently). The item was pulled from the Consent Calendar.

11-204: AHSS 309: Darwin and Darwinism – A question was raised: Is HSU developing curriculum based on one professor’s expertise? Dean Ayoob (CAHSS) explained the circumstances. The course is being suspended until an informed decision can be made about what to do with the course for the future.

The following Consent Calendar items were approved without objection:

11-188: CHEM 198: Supplemental Instruction
11-204: AHSS 309: Darwin and Darwinism
11-205: FISH 110: Introduction to Fisheries
11-210: ZOOL 214: Elementary Physiology
11-212: EDUC 377: Education of Exceptional Individuals
11-215: SW 480: Special Topics
11-216: SW 580: Special Topics
11-217: SW 680: Special Topics.

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

There were no speakers for the open forum.

6. Resolution on Establishing a New Major in Criminology and Justice Studies (#14-11/12/ICC)

M/S (Moyer/Zerbe) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Establishing a New Major in Criminology and Justice Studies #14-11/12-ICC – February 7, 2012

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that a new Major in Criminology and Justice Studies and all associated curriculum forms (11-013 to 11-017, 11-019 to 11-021, and 11-213) be approved, and be it further;

Resolved: That this Major will begin as a Pilot Program, which means that the curriculum may be offered for five years before Chancellor’s Office approval is required, and be it further;

Resolved: That before the final version of the new Major proposal is submitted to the Chancellor’s Office, the ICC and the University Senate must approve the proposal, and be it further;

Resolved: That approval of the final proposal by the ICC and the University Senate is contingent upon the program’s enrollment achieving appropriate enrollment benchmarks to be negotiated between the program, the CAHSS Dean, and the Provost.

Rationale: Criminology and Justice Studies is a growing field with high and expanding student enrollments in similar programs at other CSU campuses, and a clear link to HSU’s Vision including our claims to “be the campus of choice for individuals to seek above all else to improve the human condition,” and to “renown for social ... responsibility and action.” Because this is also a fairly low-cost program that is expected to have high enrollment, the addition of the CJS Major should also improve HSU’s balance of expensive and less-expensive majors. The proposal predicts that the major will have approximately 180 majors in five years.

The Academic Master Planning subcommittee of the ICC and the CAHSS Dean's office have worked with the program through a series of revisions to clarify student learning outcomes and be as certain as possible that the program will be attractive to prospective students. In addition, the program has responded to suggestions made by an outside reviewer. During the initial years of offering the program as a pilot, we expect that further revisions will be made as the faculty experience how students respond to the curriculum. At this time the ICC believes that the proposed new major has an excellent chance of being successful.

Senator Moyer provided background information on the development of the program. It is likely that it will be a large program (comparable programs in the CSU are large and growing quickly) and it is expected to be a popular and relatively inexpensive program.

The floor was yielded to Professor Meisel (Sociology) who has been working on developing the program since 2009.

The curriculum being proposed reflects an interdisciplinary approach. The program is intended to serve students who want to go into a variety of Criminal Justice related fields. It is intended to target students who have an interest in working in law enforcement fields. The program will provide a broad perspective, helping students build fundamental skills for a variety of types of work. It is not a vocational training program and will not compete with College of the Redwood's program. There is an enormous demand for degrees in Criminology or Criminal Justice and this program is responding to that demand. It is modeled most closely on the program at CSU San Marcos and is intended to fit in with the strengths and mission of HSU, i.e. concern for environmental issues, teaching students to become responsible citizens, etc.

Discussion:

- It needs to be made clear to incoming students that this is not a major that leads to a career in law enforcement.
- Q: The last resolved clause says that benchmarks will be established and the rationale predicts that the major will have ca. 180 majors in five years. Is this a realistic benchmark?
A: This is not a benchmark; the benchmarks will be established, taking into consideration viability and efficiency. It is difficult to predict the potential number of majors, but the models that were developed and used as part of the proposal estimate 180 majors in five years.
- Concern was expressed that most of the courses are 4-unit courses, which is unusual.
- Q: Is this going to be an online program? A: Not initially. Q: Is this competitive with an online CSU program? How many are there? A: HSU is one of four CSU campuses that doesn't have a major in Criminology. Information about online programs was not known.

Chair Van Duzer suggested that when resolutions of this type are brought forward that as much information as is possible be provided, such as in a presentation. The ICC has vetted these proposals and many of the same questions have been asked and answered.

- Q: Does the ICC look at the impact on courses with increased enrollments? A: Yes and the Chancellor's Office (CO) forms will request all of that information.
- Q: Does approval of this major obligate the administration to sign off on positions requests? A: Yes. One additional faculty members is needed. The planned date for beginning the major is Fall 2013 – and will be contingent upon having the faculty to teach the program.
- Q: Shouldn't the benchmarks be in place before the program is approved? What if it doesn't meet the benchmark and faculty have been hired? A: Benchmarks are part of the implementation of the program and not something the Senate should be involved in. If the benchmarks are not met and the program is not working, then it will go through the program elimination process involved collective bargaining, etc.
- Q: Do any of the benchmarks include measure of quality? A: It will be assumed that the department is going to put on a quality program which will be measured through the PREP process.
- There should be a more formal presentation from a department requesting a new program. This would be helpful so the Senate doesn't end up re-deliberating issues.

M/S/P (Marschke/Gold) to end debate and vote immediately.

Voting on Resolution #14, as written, occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

7. Resolution on Establishing a New Stand-Alone Major in Theatre Arts (#15-11/12-ICC)

M/S (Moyer/Virnoche) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Establishing a New Stand-Alone Major in Theatre Arts

#15-11/12-ICC – February 7, 2012

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that a new stand-alone Major in Theatre Arts as described in Curriculum form 10-389 be approved; and be it further

Resolved: That new the Major will be available to students beginning with the first year that it appears in the HSU Catalog and that the new Major will be included in the HSU Catalog as soon as possible after Chancellor's Office approval; and be it further

Resolved: That the program, the CAHSS Dean, and the Provost shall negotiate appropriate PREP benchmarks for the program.

Rationale: Currently HSU has a major in Theatre, Film, and Dance with a core curriculum and emphases in Theatre and Film (and formerly Dance). The department has concluded that the single major is not working well – either in terms of curriculum or visibility for recruiting. The Dance component of the current major has already been split off into the Interdisciplinary Studies-Dance major. In Fall of 2012, the Senate approved a revised curriculum for the existing Theatre Arts emphasis. Now, this resolution

begins the process of requesting Chancellor's Office approval to elevate the revised curriculum to a stand-alone major.

The Senate approved the curriculum changes paving the way for this major in Fall 2011.

The floor was yielded to Professor Kelso, Chair of the Theatre, Film and Dance department. Originally Theatre Arts was a major program with 2 minors (dance and film) before all three were integrated into an innovative program. As part of the program elimination process, Dance became an interdisciplinary studies program. The Department needed to re-vamp the existing program and determined that with only a few changes needed, it made more sense to create two separate majors. It is less confusing for Film students (to be independent of Theatre Arts) and does not require any additional resources in terms of faculty. Two Film courses will be added; however a large number of Theatre Arts classes were eliminated, so there is a net decrease in classes.

M/S/F (Marschke/Gold) to end debate and vote immediately.

Discussion:

- The degrees would be in Theatre Arts or Film and the proposals are resource neutral. It makes sense for the program to be structured this way.
- The floor was yielded to Dean Ayoob (CAHSS). Film, Dance, and Theatre worked very closely together and are confident that this makes for stronger programs in all three areas. The college supports the proposals.

M/S/P (Marschke/Gold) to end debate and vote immediately.

Voting on Resolution #15, as written, occurred and PASSED unanimously.

8. Resolution on Establishing a New Stand-Alone Major in Film (#16-11/12-ICC)

M/S (Moyer/Virnoche) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Establishing a New Stand-Alone Major in Film

#16-11/12-ICC – February 7, 2012

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that a new stand-alone Major in Film as described in Curriculum form 10-388 be approved; and be it further

Resolved: That new the Major will be available to students beginning with the first year that it appears in the HSU Catalog and that the new Major will be included in the HSU Catalog as soon as possible after Chancellor's Office approval; and be it further

Resolved: That the program, the CAHSS Dean, and the Provost shall negotiate appropriate PREP benchmarks for the program.

Rationale: Currently HSU has a major in Theatre, Film, and Dance with a core curriculum and emphases in Theatre and Film (and formerly Dance). The department has concluded that the single major is not working well – either in terms of curriculum or visibility for recruiting. The Dance component of the current major has already been split off into the Interdisciplinary Studies-Dance major. In Fall of 2012, the Senate approved a revised curriculum for the existing Film emphasis. Now, this resolution begins the process of requesting Chancellor’s Office approval to elevate the revised curriculum to a stand-alone major.

M/S/P (Marschke/Gold) to end debate and vote immediately.

Chair Van Duzer commented that there is some value in at least providing an opportunity for conversation.

Voting on Resolution #16, as written, occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

9. Resolution on Modifying the Enforcement Mechanism for the Timely Completion of an Application for Graduation (#13-11/12-APC) – First Reading

M/S (Moyer/Gold) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Modifying the Enforcement Mechanism for the Timely Completion of an Application for Graduation

Resolution #13-11/12-APC – February 7, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that students enrolled in excess of 90 units be required to submit an application to graduate, including a major contract which identifies the remaining courses required to graduate and provides a schedule for completing those requirements in a timely manner, prior to registering for the following term, and be it further

RESOLVED: That an advisor’s/registrar’s hold be used to enforce the requirement described in the first resolve, and be it further

RESOLVED: That departments can decide to use their major contract or an alternate planning form to meet the planning document requirement.

RATIONALE: *In 2005/06 a policy was approved to ensure the timely completion of the major contract (Resolution #01-05/06 –EP 11/29/05). The approved method of enforcing the major contract requirement has not been successful and given current software is untenable. Therefore, this policy authorizes the Registrar to place a hold that prevents students who have exceeded the 90 unit limit from registering for additional units until the application to graduate (including a major contract or an alternate planning form) is submitted to the registrar.*

Completing the application to graduate (including the major contract) in a timely fashion will improve time to graduation by ensuring that students have planned their coursework in an efficient manner. A standard form will ensure that all of the required information is available to the student and that the Office of the Registrar can conduct efficient graduation checks. Departments would still be empowered to use their major contract in conjunction with the application to graduate.

The purpose of the resolution is to put the onus on students to work with an advisor and to create a plan for completing degree requirements.

Discussion:

- It was clarified that at the time of registration, the student already has or is presently enrolled in 90 or more units.
- Q: Does this apply to transfer students? A: Yes, no distinction is being made.
- There is a separate policy for students who have double or triple majors. There is nothing in this policy that prohibits students from declaring two or three majors.
- Transfer students from community colleges may transfer only 70 units. Transfer students from 4-year institutions may transfer all units.
- Q: How would this impact science majors who typically have a higher unit load? A: The application to graduate requires declaring a major; anyone who is a senior should declare a major. If a student is going to graduate with 130 plus units, it is especially important to have a plan in place for completing requirements in a timely manner.
- Q: Is there a fee with the application to graduate? A: Yes – but it is a one-time fee, unless a student becomes inactive.
- Q: How many students will this impact? A: There are over 1500 students with more than 90 units and who have not declared a major.
- Concern was expressed that transfer students often don't get connected quickly enough with HSU and this may affect their ability to register for the classes they need. It was noted that transfer students will be registering as new students; this can be worked out.
- Questions about the mechanics of placing holds and lifting holds were raised. It was suggested that the Committee work with the Registrar on resolving some of the implementation issues/questions before the second reading of the resolution
- Q: Why is it necessary to allow for an alternate planning form (3rd resolved clause)? A: The ICC suggested providing a choice of forms since some departments already have a worksheet in place. The point is to get the student to come up with a plan to graduate, not just list the courses they need.

Senators should forward additional suggestions for revisions to Senator Marschke.

10. Resolution Dissolving the Senate Task Force on Appendix J (#17-11/12-EX) – First Reading

M/S (Zerbe/Moyer) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution Dissolving the Senate Task Force on Appendix J
#17-11/12-EX – February 7, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Senate task force created by floor motion at the Academic Senate meeting of October 18, 2011, with the charge 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*” is hereby dissolved.

RATIONALE: *The decision to establish a task force on Appendix J was made as a floor motion during debate of a broader Academic Senate resolution to Establish a Task Force to Address Issues with Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards (#03-11/12-EX). The motion required the Appendix J task force to report back to the Academic Senate by April 1, 2012.*

Although the motion was approved by the Academic Senate, no work was undertaken towards establishing the task force, the composition of the task force was never specified, and the mission and goals of the task force were established in the motion. It is also clear that although the task force was established by the Academic Senate, the University Senate would be responsible for carrying out a significant action. Given that goals, parameters, and likely outcomes of that action are not well developed in the motion, it is appropriate that the current University Senate dissolve the task force and, if the sentiment still exists, reauthorize a new task force with a clearer mandate.

Senator Zerbe provided background on the resolution. At the October 18, 2011 Academic Senate meeting two task forces were created. A task force to review issues surrounding department/unit retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) criteria and standards was created via a resolution. A second task force was created via a floor motion to investigate the faculty views of Appendix J changes made in 2007/08. The latter task force has not been convened and no membership for the task force was specified in the motion. It involves a significant undertaking. If the Senate wants to undertake this, then a resolution should be developed with a charge, membership, and revised timeline.

Discussion:

- After Senator Virnoche was approached to lead the task force, she spoke with colleagues across the country soliciting information on this type of effort. There was a strong sentiment that if the process involves surveying the faculty, an adequate length timeline is needed and the process requires the support of administration. If the Senate is going to do this, then adequate time should be provided to do it well.
- The second task force was created by a floor motion because it was initially included as part of the resolution establishing the first task force. The rationale for it was that several years ago HSU made a significant shift in its RTP process and it seems clear that shift has had a significant effect on faculty work. The question is what effect has it had? Is it working well or not? More information should be gathered as this has had a substantial effect.

Q: What is a first reading intended to do? A: It provides feedback to the committee on the content. The Senate also has the option to waive a 2nd reading with a 2/3 vote.

- The resolution should be passed. The new version of Appendix J is too new to be able to determine how it is working. The Senate has other issues to deal with that are more important.
- The idea of surveying the faculty is supported, but not within the narrow confines of Appendix J. It should be done in a broader context of faculty workload, etc.

M/S/F (Zerbe/Marschke) to waive the 2nd reading.

Senators should forward suggestions for revisions to Senator Zerbe.

11. Resolution on the HSU Enrollment Management Plan: 2009-2016 (Draft) (#18-11/12-EX) – First Reading)

M/S (Thobaben/Zerbe) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on the Humboldt State University Enrollment Management Plan 2009 – 2016 (#18-11/12-EX) – February 7, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University commend the work of the Enrollment Management Working Group; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University receives the *Enrollment Management Plan 2009 – 2016* and transmits it to President Richmond; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University supports the following primary goals identified in the *Enrollment Management Plan 2009 – 2016*:

- Improve student persistence and graduation rates.
- Reach the enrollment goals established by the University each year, including attempting to achieve the planned mix of student types.
- Increase the enrollment of international students at Humboldt State University.
- Utilize available scholarship and financial aid dollars in the most effective manner for recruitment and retention purposes.
- Reduce the average cost of instruction by controlling growth in high-cost programs and encouraging growth in low-cost programs.
- Strengthen and promote the identity, achievements and core values of the university through innovative and effective communications. Identify and understand our target audience. Develop and execute integrated strategic marketing and communications programs to enhance the institutional image in the eyes of our prospective and current students, as well as other key constituents;

And be it further,

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to President Richmond that the *Enrollment Management Plan 2009 – 2016* be considered a living document and guide for Humboldt State University during the next five years and implementation of its goals, strategies and intended outcomes be part of a consultative process.

RATIONALE: *Humboldt State University is committed to promoting equal opportunity and academic success for all of its students. The Enrollment Management Plan 2009 – 2016 is an enabling document to guide the campus into the future in a manner of reasoned and planned growth.*

Senator Thobaben introduced the resolution which states that the Senate receives the report and agrees with the primary goals in the Plan, as well as recognizes that the Plan is a living document.

Discussion:

- It was explained that by receiving the report, the Senate is not “approving” it, so does not have to agree with everything in the report. The resolution states that the Senate wants to be part of the consultation process as the Plan is implemented. This is a model of how to write a resolution for reports and projects of this type.
- Concerns were expressed about the need for more time to vet the document with colleagues. It was suggested that specific concerns about strategies in the document be forwarded to the Enrollment Management Working Group (EMWG). There has been extensive input and consultation on the documentation so far, and this group would be able to address questions and concerns.
- It was suggested that the document be put up on a web page with a place for people to send comments. Senators could forward this to colleagues.
- The last resolved clause should specifically state that the University Senate will be consulted. The faculty seems to be missing in this process; there are not many faculty on the EMWG.
- It is not possible to articulate all of the people that will need to be consulted. The EMWG is not going to implement this; implementation will be through other groups on campus.

If Senators have any suggestions for modifications, they should be sent to the Senate Executive Committee.

12. TIME CERTAIN: 5:30 pm – Discussion of ICC Review Process (Moyer) (See Draft “ICC/Curriculum Change Evaluation Process”)

The Senate resolution that created the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) called for a review of the ICC in Fall 2012. Because the ICC will be very busy in the Fall dealing with curriculum proposals before the HSU Catalog deadline (end of Fall term), it has begun to discuss the review process not. The draft process proposes that the ICC will undergo a self-evaluation process this Spring. The resulting information will be sent out to department chairs, deans, etc. and there will be a call for input on how the ICC and its processes are working. The ICC would review input and write a report for the Senate. The ICC has provided a suggested list of criteria in the draft process. Senator Moyer asked if senators agreed with the proposed strategy and/or criteria that have been suggested.

Discussion:

- It would be helpful to consider the broad level of organization of the ICC: the organizational model, workload, processes, etc.
- When the ICC was created, the dissolving of the college curriculum committees was a matter of contention. It would be helpful to address find out if this is still a concern.
- It would be helpful to ask the deans to have a discussion with their council of chairs regarding the criteria. Having criteria that people agree with from the start will help the evaluation process.
- Interacting with department curriculum committees through the deans and council of chairs to develop the criteria would be good to do earlier in the process.
- The ICC self-study should be given to department coordinators to review, since they are involved with curriculum processes. Senator Bruce offered to gather information on the criteria from department coordinators and forward it to the ICC.
- Rather than send the draft review process out to suggested sources, it was recommended that meetings be held where people could come to agreement, rather than compiling a huge list of suggestions. It was suggested the department coordinators be invited to the council of chairs meetings, to simplify the information gathering process.

Chair Van Duzer adjourned the meeting at 5:40 pm.