

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, February 21, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

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

Members Absent: Johnson.

Proxies: Borgeld for Abell, Mortazavi for Thobaben.

Guests: Goodman, Powell, Cheyne, Burges, Ayoob, Mullery, Grenot.

Chair Van Duzer announced proxies for the meeting.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 7, 2012

M/S (Bruce/Marschke) to approve the minutes as written. Senator Bruce requested two changes. Voting occurred and the minutes, with suggested changes, were APPROVED with 1 Abstention.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

There was no report.

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

Written reports from the Academic Policies, Faculty Affairs, Constitution & Bylaws, and Appointments & Elections Committees, the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC), the Provost, and President were included in packet.

University Budget Committee (Mortazavi): The UBC met last Friday and reviewed draft budget documents (emailed to senators on Monday, February 20). Senators were invited to forward comments on any of the documents to the UBC before its next meeting on Friday, February 24.

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

The following ICC Curriculum Proposals on the Consent Calendar for the February 21, 2012 University Senate meeting were approved without objection:

- 11-223: EMP 309B: Environmental Communication
- 11-227: Environmental Science, Environmental Policy Option
- 11-229: ENV 350: Principles of Ecological Restoration
- 11-230: EMP 430: Natural Resource Management in Protected Areas

11-231: Environmental Management and Protection
11-233: Environmental Management and Protection, Environmental and NR Planning Option
11-234: EMP 454: Interpretation Practicum Oral
11-235: EMP 453: Envir Ed and Interp Practicum Graphic
11-236: EMP 415: Recreation Planning Workshop
11-244: Applied Technology/Industrial Technology
11-245: Special Education Level II
11-257: MUS 112: Piano 1
11-258: MUS 220: Studio Piano, Intermediate
11-259: MUS 221: Studio Voice, Intermediate
11-260: MUS 222: Studio Flute, Intermediate
11-261: MUS 223 Studio Oboe, Intermediate
11-262: MUS 224: Studio Clarinet, Intermediate
11-263: MUS 225: Studio Bassoon, Intermediate
11-264: MUS 226: Studio Saxophone, Intermediate
11-265: MUS 227: Studio Trumpet, Intermediate
11-266: MUS 228: Studio Horn, Intermediate
11-267: MUS 229: Studio Trombone, Intermediate
11-268: MUS 230: Studio Euphonium, Intermediate
11-269: MUS 231: Studio Tuba, Intermediate
11-270: MUS 232: Studio Percussion, Intermediate
11-271: MUS 233: Studio Violin, Intermediate
11-272: MUS 234: Studio Viola, Intermediate
11-273: MUS 235: Studio Cello, Intermediate
11-274: MUS 236: Studio String Bass, Intermediate
11-275: MUS 237: Studio Guitar, Intermediate
11-276: MUS 420: Studio Piano, Advanced
11-278: MUS 421: Studio Voice, Advanced
11-279: MUS 422: Studio Flute, Advanced
11-280: MUS 423 Studio Oboe, Advanced
11-281: MUS 424: Studio Clarinet, Advanced
11-282: MUS 425: Studio Bassoon, Advanced
11-283: MUS 426: Studio Saxophone, Advanced
11-284: MUS 427: Studio Trumpet, Advanced
11-285 MUS 428: Studio Horn, Advanced
11-286: MUS 429: Studio Trombone, Advanced
11-287: MUS 430: Studio Euphonium, Advanced
11-288: MUS 431: Studio Tuba, Advanced
11-289: MUS 432: Studio Percussion, Advanced
11-290: MUS 433: Studio Violin, Advanced
11-291: MUS 434: Studio Viola, Advanced
11-292: MUS 435: Studio Cello, Advanced
11-293: MUS 436: Studio String Bass, Advanced
11-294: MUS 437: Studio Guitar, Advanced
11-295: Minor in Education

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

Professor Michael Goodman (Philosophy) spoke to Senate about his opposition to the proposal to “eliminate the Open Forum.” In spirit, the Senate has always been a “university senate”

even though the members have been primarily faculty. The initiation of the Open Forum was a good idea even if it has been rarely used. It has not been misused. The Open Forum is designed to give members of the community, who have a social right, the opportunity to speak before the Senate. The Forum does not waste time. It has been suggested that members of the campus community should communicate with the standing committees. How does the campus community know what issues are before the committees? Committee reports lack enough information. The Senate should not eliminate the Open Forum.

Professor John Powell (Philosophy) reminded members of the University Senate that the President's evaluation letters are due on Friday [Feb. 24]. Professor Powell urged the Senate to develop a long-range plan for addressing issues and not just take up issues as they come along. The scope of the University Senate is larger than the former Academic Senate; the number of issues within its purview has increased. Examples given were Extended Education and Summer Session (and related curriculum issues), and the re-structuring of Native American support programs which raises issues regarding the University's relationship to the region's tribes.

OLD BUSINESS

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

M/S/P (Marschke/Moyer) to withdraw the resolution. According to the Registrar, implementation of the resolution is not currently possible (technologically) and it would be premature to institute this policy.

There will be further communication and consultation between the Registrar, the Enrollment Management Working Group and the Academic Policies Committee regarding the implementation issues.

Voting occurred and the motion PASSED with 1 abstention.

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

Resolution Dissolving the Senate Task Force on Appendix J
Resolution #17-11/12-EX – February 21, 2012 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the Senate Task Force on Appendix J created by floor motion at the Academic Senate meeting of October 18, 2011, with the charge to "investigate 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate directs the Campus Climate Committee to develop a proposal for a study to evaluate campus climate and workload issues at Humboldt State University.

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 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 direct the Campus Climate Committee, pursuant to the charge of that committee, to develop a proposal for a more comprehensive assessment of workload and climate issues at Humboldt State.

Senator Zerbe noted a change to resolution for the 2nd Reading: a 2nd resolved clause was added directing the Campus Climate Committee to develop a proposal for considering campus climate and workload issues.

M/S/P (Bruce/Zerbe) to amend the 2nd resolved clause as follows:

RESOLVED: That the University Senate directs the Campus Climate Committee to develop a proposal for a study to evaluate campus climate and workload issues at Humboldt State University, inclusive of faculty, staff, and administrators.

Voting on the amendment occurred and PASSED.

M/S/P (Virnoche/Mortazavi) to amend the 2nd resolved clause as follows:

RESOLVED: That the University Senate directs the Campus Climate Committee to investigate and, as appropriate, develop a proposal for a study to evaluate campus climate and workload issues at Humboldt State University, inclusive of faculty, staff, and administrators.

Discussion of amendment:

- The amendment encourages a more thoughtful process rather than just directing another body to do a survey.
- The amendment fits with what was intended by the committee.

Voting on the amendment occurred and PASSED.

Voting on Resolution #17-11/12-EX occurred and PASSED Unanimously.

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

Resolution on the Humboldt State University Enrollment Management Plan 2009 – 2016
(#18-11/12-EX) – February 21, 2012 – Second 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.

No changes were made to the resolution for the second reading.

M/S/F (Eschenbach/Gold) to amend the fifth bullet of the 3rd resolved clause as follows:

- Reduce the average cost of instruction ~~by controlling growth in high-cost programs and encouraging growth in low-cost programs.~~

It was clarified that the amendment would only change the wording of the resolution, not of the Enrollment Management Plan.

Discussion of the amendment:

- This changes the meaning and would be changing the goal as written in the Plan.
- If left unchanged, it is saying that there is only one strategy that is appropriate for reducing costs; there may be others that have not been considered.
- The goals that are listed in the resolution are from the EM Plan, so this would be changing the Plan. This is about the only strategy left, others have already been used.
- This is not a good strategy; HSU needs to focus more on keeping its high cost science programs.

- The goal is not intended to be disrespectful of high cost programs. It is necessary because HSU cannot afford to continue to have only high cost program. The campus must find a way to manage high cost programs and be more selective.
- A number of strategies have been employed towards this goal; but there may be others that have not been tried and/or thought of yet.
- It was requested that the minutes reflect that regardless of amendments to the resolution, the Senate is not voting against these goals.
- What is the implication of having the Senate support these goals? Is it worthwhile to be considering these issues?
- It doesn't make sense to receive the Plan and support the goals, and then change them by amending the resolution. The Senate should trust the committee and the work it's done.

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

Voting on the amendment occurred and FAILED.

M/S/F (Bruce/Marschke) to remove the 3rd resolved clause entirely.

Discussion:

- The Senate was encouraged not to remove the 3rd resolved clause. The Senate needs to buy into the broader issues and have some say in the goals.
- Regardless of whether or not senators agree with every goal, the final resolved clause recognizes the EM Plan as a living document. The language of the primary goals is likely to change over time. It would be better to leave the language that the Senate supports the primary goals in the document and strike only the bulleted list in the 3rd resolved clause.

M/S/P (Mortazavi/August) to end debate and vote immediately.

Voting on the amendment to remove the 3rd resolved clause occurred and FAILED.

M/S (Zerbe/Ortega) to strike the bullet points from the 3rd resolved clause, and to change the clause as follows:

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

Discussion of the amendment:

- Is it the intention of the Senate to agree with whatever the Enrollment Management Working Group wants? Does this mean the Senate supports the goals regardless of what they may become?

- If the Senate supports the Plan's primary goals, does it matter whether they are delineated here or not?
- If the entire resolved clause is removed, then the Senate has not taken any position on the Plan at all. Senators may not agree with all of the primary goals and may want to have further discussion, but the Senate doesn't want to 'not' take a position at all.
- Removing the bullets does not give the EM Working Group *carte blanche*. The final resolved clause contains the expectation that implementation will be part of a consultative process and that a dialogue will continue providing the Senate with opportunity to participate.
- The goals will change and be modified over the course of the Plan. It makes sense to remove the bulleted goals.
- It was noted that these are the only goals in the Plan; the use of 'primary' is a poor choice of words.

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

Voting on Resolution #18-11/12-EX, as amended, occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

9. Election of Faculty Senator to serve on the University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC)

Chair Van Duzer emphasized the importance of the committee's work. There were no nominations or self-nominations from the floor.

It was suggested that any senators currently not serving on a committee be asked to serve on the URPC.

10. Approval of Senate Standing Rules for 1) Procedure for Approval of Items for the ICC on the Consent Calendar and 2) Readings of Resolutions

1. Procedure for Approval of Items from the ICC on the Consent Calendar
 - When the question of general consent is put by the Chair, one objection shall remove the proposal from the consent calendar. The objector shall offer a brief explanation of the grounds for the objection. One person may briefly respond to the objection. Following this brief discussion, the Senate immediately votes to either approve the proposal or send it back to the committee so that concerns may be further addressed. All remaining items are approved without objection.
 - Items removed from the Consent Calendar are placed at the end of the current business agenda. If they are not addressed during the current meeting, they return as resolutions from the ICC.

NOTE: For the procedure for all other Consent Calendar items, see Senate Bylaws 7.0.

2. Readings of Resolutions

First Readings:

- are placed on the floor by a member of the committee with a motion and a second
- are intended to provide feedback and advice to the committee ; no amendments are made during a First Reading

A Second Reading may be waived by 2/3 vote of the senate. A member of the senate needs to make a motion to waive the 2nd reading. If the second reading is waived, then the Senate proceeds as if it is a second reading, i.e., amendments may be made, etc.

Second Readings:

- Second Readings are considered 'on the floor' already, no motion/second is required
- Amendments may be made on the 2nd reading; however prior discussions should not be re-visited.

Debate is limited to 3 pro and 3 con arguments, unless a motion is made to extend debate. Motion to extend debate must pass by 2/3 vote of the senate. Questions for the purpose of clarification are not counted.

There was no discussion on either standing rule. Both standing rules were approved unanimously.

11. Resolution to Change the Order of Business (Bylaws 6.) for University Senate Meetings (#12-11/12-EX) – First Reading

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

Resolution to Change the Order of Business for University Senate Meetings #12-11/12-EX – February 21, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends the following changes (additions in underline, deletions in strike-out) to the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate* (6.0):

6.0 Order of Business

Announcement of proxies

Presentation of Approval and adoption of agenda and approval of minutes

Open Forum

Reports, announcements, and communications of the chair

Reports of standing committees, statewide Senators and Ex-officio members

Consent Calendar

Old Business

New Business

RATIONALE: The Open Forum was initiated in 2005 at a time of considerable tumult at HSU to provide an opportunity for members of the campus community to address the senate with their concerns. Despite the intentions to make the senate more inclusive and available to the broader community, the Open Forum has not been used as intended and has created uncertainty in terms of scheduling the work of the Senate.

Over the past five years the principal use of the Open Forum has been to allow senators the opportunity to present to the senate as a whole. While this has had some value, the belief is that the senate can use the time more effectively. With the new University Senate, much of the work previously done as a

committee of the whole will now be completed in subcommittees. As such, the subcommittees will make time available for members of the campus community to present their concerns to the subcommittee working on that issue.

The current agenda has omitted the ICC Consent Calendar, and will be modified to restore that portion of the agenda.

The University Senate Transition Team recommended the proposed changes to the order of business in the current Senate Bylaws, including removing the Open Forum as a standing agenda item.

Discussion:

- The Open Forum should not be eliminated for the following reasons: 1) HSU is a public university, 2) the forum provides an informal way for people to address the Senate, 3) most of the senators around the table are new and haven't had enough experience on the Senate to assess the Open Forum, 4) the Senate is a democratic institution – democracy is not efficient, dictatorship is efficient.
- The Forum should not be eliminated; everyone has a right to speak to the Senate.
- The Senate should provide opportunity for campus input, but it needs to find a better way to do so. The Open Forum for the past several years has not been an effective way for members of the campus community to bring issues to the Senate for Senate action.
- The Open Forum should be removed. Philosophically, the new University Senate is a representative democracy; it doesn't have to allow everyone on campus an opportunity to speak before it at will.
- There are members of the campus who want to be more proactive. How do they make their voices heard?
- The question is not whether or not the Senate wants to hear from people; it's about at what point in the process this should happen. The University Senate has shifted consultation to earlier in the decision-making process, i.e., to the standing committees, rather than waiting until a resolution is on the floor to gather input.
- The intent of the Open Forum was to make the Senate a proactive institution. City Councils, School Boards, etc. are representative bodies and they provide an opportunity for people to address them.

Response to a straw poll indicated that it was okay to bring the resolution back as a 2nd reading and to remove the Open Forum from the resolution.

12. TIME CERTAIN: 5:20 pm: Discussion of Faculty Responsibilities for Curriculum Issues

Chair Van Duzer explained that a question has been raised regarding the Senate vote on curricular issues (i.e. the ICC Consent Calendar and resolutions regarding curriculum) and

whether or not only faculty senators should be voting on curricular issues. All non-faculty members of the Senate were invited to speak, before the Faculty Session of the Senate began.

- While anyone on the Senate may address [curricular] issues during discussion, only faculty should vote. There are regulations that state that curriculum is the province of the faculty.
- Unless there is some type of legal restriction, all voting senators should vote on curricular issues. Curriculum affects everyone across the board.
- What is the point of having a discussion with all members if only the faculty members vote?
- How would curriculum issues be defined? Would this lead to others carving out territory for decision-making that would not include the Senate?
- If the University Senate is an inclusive body, then everyone should vote. Anyone who feels lacking in expertise on an issue may abstain from voting.
- How broadly will curriculum issues be construed? The University Senate was established to promote and increase shared governance. It seems odd that this is the first thing being considered.
- At the system level there has been faculty concern expressed about the overstepping of the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees in terms of curriculum matters. But at the campus level at HSU it has not been a problem. This seems like an unusual path to take. It has the potential of damaging collegiality.

**13. TIME CERTAIN: 5:30 pm: Faculty Session (Elected Faculty Members of the Senate) –
Discussion of Faculty Responsibilities for Curriculum Issues**

Clarification was requested regarding members of the Faculty Session. According to the University Senate Constitution [6.5] only elected senators comprise the Faculty Session. Ex-officio members, including General Faculty Representatives to the ASCSU, were not included in the list that was distributed.

Chair Van Duzer read the following statement:

[In March 1985, the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) approved "Collegiality in the California State University System," a statement that includes the following regarding the curriculum]:

... The faculty, therefore, have primary responsibility for making curricular recommendations to the president. Normally, the president will accept the advice and recommendations of the faculty on curriculum matters. Faculty appropriately have this responsibility because they possess the expertise to judge best whether courses, majors, and programs adhere to scholarly standards.

Among curricular decisions for which faculty should have primary responsibility are:

1. The initiation of new academic courses and programs, and the discontinuance of academic courses and programs;
2. Course content, including choice of texts, syllabus design, assignments, course organization, and methods of evaluating students;
3. The designation of courses as degree or nondegree applicable, lower or upper division, or graduate level;
4. The content of the general education program within system wide guidelines. Faculty should designate appropriate courses and establish the requirements for completion of the program. Faculty should be responsible for review and revision of the program;
5. The adoption, deletion, or modification of requirements for degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs;
6. The establishment of minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students, and the approval of degree candidates; and
7. Recruitment decisions affecting curriculum.

Discussion:

- The Integrated Curriculum Committee model allows all members to vote.
- It is a terrible idea [to limit voting to only faculty]. The University Senate is a recommending body. To not include all members in voting would be divisive and there would be of no benefit. It would alienate individuals that faculty need to hear from and to work with.
- It is not being suggested that everyone cannot be part of discussions.
- A vote is considered a voice.
- It is not a good idea as it sets up an inequality among senators. At what point does this become a broader issue, faculty versus staff issues, etc.? The ASCSU statement says that the faculty has 'primary' responsibility (not exclusive) for the curriculum. Faculty has 80% of the vote on the Senate which constitutes primary responsibility. The Constitution of the University Senate clearly states that "the Senate shall have the power to act for the faculty on matters within the scope of the faculty ... [1.0 Authority]. This clearly spells out the intent of moving towards a vision of shared governance. All senators should vote on everything.
- Faculty have a majority voice on the Senate and on the ICC. This would be contrary to the idea behind the new University Senate. It may be worthwhile to discuss, but in light of the Senate's other pressing agenda items, this matter should be sent to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to handle.
- The General Faculty made a statement about this issue when they voted in the new University Senate Constitution.
- This discussion has been held twice already – with the ICC Constitution and the new University Senate. The institution has spoken.

Chair Van Duzer noted that the issue was raised by a couple of faculty members and he felt an obligation as the General Faculty President to bring it forward for discussion.

It was noted that it was a good exercise to have the discussion; otherwise it might have been the elephant in the room for the future.

M/S/P (Gold/Ortega) to end the discussion.

A question was asked regarding the process of a Faculty Session. It was noted that no action has been taken.

M/S/P (Marschke/Gold) to re-affirm the University Senate as an inclusive body.

Chair Van Duzer adjourned the meeting at 5:50 pm.