

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate Minutes

11/12:12
03/27/12

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm on Tuesday, March 27, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

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

Members Absent: Blake, Ciarcia, Johnson, Kelly, Nordstrom, Richmond.

Proxies: Eschenbach for Virnoche.

Guests: Goodman, Ayoob, Cheyne, Grenot, Mullery, Whitlatch, Lee, Craig.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 6, 2012 [*distributed electronically*]

M/S/P (Mortazavi/VerLinden) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 6, 2012. Motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Proxies were announced.

Ruth Black, Executive Director of the CSU Online initiative will be on campus April 3 & 4. There will be an Open Forum on Tuesday, April 3, 3-4 pm [NHE 106]. Senators were encouraged to pass the information along to colleagues and to attend if possible.

General Faculty Runoff Election results were reported. Chris Hopper and Noah Zerbe were elected to positions on the HSU Sponsored Programs Foundation Board. There will be a second runoff for the ICC position.

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

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) (Mortazavi): The committee is in the process of reviewing and clarifying its charge. Proposed changes will be brought to the Senate.

4. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – There were no items

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

Senator Saner spoke about free speech issues and against the proposal to eliminate the Open Forum. The University Senate is a new organization and eliminating an opportunity for members of the campus community to speak to the Senate is not a good idea.

6. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:40 PM – Presentation on Branding (Frank Whitlatch, Interim VP for University Advancement)

Chair Van Duzer introduced Frank Whitlatch (interim Vice President for University Advancement) who he has invited to speak to the Senate, after hearing that efforts were underway to brand HSU as a science and natural resource university.

VP Whitlatch noted that the context for conversations about branding came out of the development of the Enrollment Management Plan, which includes a section on Marketing. Marcom (Marketing & Communication) is looking at how it can best support the admissions effort to bring in students from out of state. To determine what academic areas could be highlighted, Marcom used the Noel Levitz report, the HSU Strategic Plan, and other documents. Natural Resources and Sustainability (including social justice) were identified as areas to focus on.

In addition to highlighting these programs, HSU marketing efforts will talk about faculty-student interaction, hands on learning, the region's natural environment, and the close-knit campus community as special features of HSU. The 'brand promise' to prospective students is a combination of all of these factors.

Discussion:

Q: What does the research on students who are already here say about why they came here?

A: Primary reasons are the location and for the study of natural resources.

Q: Has any research been done that suggests what the impact is on other programs on campus when the university is sold based on the strength of a particular program? A: It is a crowded marketplace and getting noticed for something is better than not getting noticed at all. CalPoly is an example of a campus with a reputation of being solid in Engineering and Agriculture, yet it also has the aura of a campus with programs that are all of high quality.

Q: There are flow models that show what the 'feeder' majors are – has Marcom used this information? A: Yes – it shows that students from out of state overwhelming start as natural resource majors and feed into other majors.

Q: How does the Enrollment Management Plan (recently approved by the Senate), which suggest redirecting programming to less costly programs, balance with the idea of bringing in more students for more costly science programs? A: Marcom's focus is on trying to build name recognition, not necessarily attracting more majors in certain programs.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Resolution on HSU Policy on the Voluntary Reassignment of Faculty (#20-11/12-FAC) – 2nd Reading

Chair Van Duzer announced that the procedure for having three statements in favor and three statements against will be in effect for the debate.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that section A.2. of the policy be amended to include a statement to the effect that the chair of the current department would be given an opportunity to provide an analysis and response.

There was confusion on the floor of the Senate about whether or not amendments could be offered to the policy (a separate document attached to the resolution) as well as the resolution. It was stated that amendments to the policy are out of order.

It was noted that in the past, if there were substantive changes requested to the policy, it would go back to the committee that sponsored it.

When a committee has worked extensively on a policy, there may be issues the Senate is not fully aware of or informed of. It makes sense to send the policy back to the committee if it needs to be changed.

- In response to the suggested amendment, it was noted that the process of voluntary reassignment is similar to a faculty member choosing to leave HSU for a job at another institution. Section A.4 and A.5 of the policy provide for consultation with the department the faculty member is leaving. It was noted that the content of the policy should have been discussed during the first reading.

Voting on Resolution #20 (Resolution on HSU Policy on the Voluntary Reassignment of Faculty) and PASSED Unanimously.

Chair Van Duzer requested that the Senate body decide on the procedure for approving and/or amending resolutions and attachments versus sending them back to committee.

Comments on the amendment process:

- Suggested changes to a proposed policy should be made at the first reading.
- The Parliamentarian was asked when it would be proper to offer amendments to a motion and responded that amendments should be offered at the second reading. However, the Senate needs to determine what is contained in the motion, i.e., is it only what is contained in the resolution or does it include a separate document attached to the resolution?
- The policy stands alone. If it is to be changed, it needs to go back to the committee.
- In the case of Resolution #20, the same concerns raised today were raised at the last Senate meeting and the committee discussed the feedback. Due consideration was given to the comments and the committee made a decision.

- Senators need to learn to be clear on their support (or not) of a policy at the first reading.
- Some Senators thought that there would be opportunity to change the policy during the 2nd reading. The procedure needs to be clarified so that all senators can be informed.
- Q: Is it possible to amend the resolution itself to include a change in the policy? There has to be a place where senators can make amendments to the content of the policy.
- The existing policy should be voted up or down. An additional resolution would be needed to address suggested changes/amendments to the policy.
- One idea behind the new University Senate is to place the primary work on policies, etc. within committees to avoid having the Senate re-drafting policy on the floor of the Senate.

A straw poll was taken and senators indicated a preference for having the policy stand alone and simply voting a policy resolution up or down.

8. Resolution on HSU Policy on Field Trips (#21-11/12-APC) – 2nd Reading

Senator Marschke reported that the Academic Policies Committee made changes to the policy based on suggestions from the last Senate meeting.

Discussion:

- It was noted that HSU owns other boats in addition to the R/V Coral Sea, which is now mentioned in the policy. A suggestion was made that this kind of detail be worked out in the implementation of the policy as it is not possible to address all examples of campus properties in the policy.
- A request was made that once the policy is passed, implementation issues be addressed so that the process is simpler and easier than what is currently in place.

Discussion was interrupted for the scheduled Time Certain agenda item at 4:30 pm, and then continued.

- Q: Does the policy address concerns expressed by students that they have not had good experiences with field trips? For example, students have felt unsafe or have not been satisfied with the field trip as a learning experience. A: Those concerns have been discussed. The policy makes explicit reference to the student conduct policy, which covers many of the basic concerns. Beyond that, students need to report concerns to college deans.

Voting on Resolution #21 (Resolution on HSU Policy on Field Trips) occurred and PASSED Unanimously.

9. Resolution on HSU Internship Policy (#22-11/12-APC) – 2nd Reading

Discussion:

- Concern was expressed about the timeline and the need to have support structures on campus in place for implementation of the policy. It was noted that a plan is underway to re-locate the responsibilities for internships with an entity for which it is a primary focus.
- Clarification was requested regarding the 2nd bullet under Section IV.D. and it was noted that this is risk management policy. If a student is required to take an internship, the student does not need a Release of Liability form.
- #1 – For: The policy addresses the needed topics. Having a better policy will be a draw for students.
- Q: When constituents have concerns about implementation of a policy, where should they be directed? A: The policy states that implementation of the policy is the responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The policy will reside in a university-wide policy file.

Voting on Resolution #22 (Resolution on Policy on Internships) occurred and PASSED Unanimously.

10. Resolution on Policy Regarding Graduate Program Culminating Experience Requirements (#23-11/12-APC) – 2nd Reading

There was no discussion.

Voting on the resolution occurred and PASSED Unanimously.

11. Resolution on the Open Forum (#24-11/12-APC) – Second Reading

#1 – Against: The resolution makes it possible for the Senate to say it does not have time to listen to speakers. It is outrageous not to give people a chance to speak to the Senate.

#1 – For: There are plenty of opportunities for people to speak to senators and to exercise free speech on campus. It does not need to happen on the floor of the Senate.

#2 – Against: The Senate has wasted more time talking about the Open Forum than it would have taken to listen to speakers during all scheduled Open Forums. It is an insult to the entire campus community not to provide an opportunity for people to speak before the Senate.

#2 – For: The resolution is a compromise. Arguments against it are not effective. The best way to engage the Senate is via written documentation – this is a more reliable way to get action from the Senate on an issue. No one around the table takes responsibility for things said at the Open Forum.

It was clarified that the Open Forum is not being eliminated with this resolution; and that a process still needs to be determined for holding the Open Forum. The Forum would no longer be a standing agenda item if the resolution is passed.

#3 – For: Having the Open Forum as a standing agenda item with a time certain eliminates the possibility of scheduling other time certain agenda items. This resolution would allow the Senate business to move forward more expeditiously.

#3 – Against: It is worth the Senate's time to keep the Open Forum as it is.

It is not clear whether or not someone could come to a Senate meeting and request an Open Forum. Will that be possible? Will a decision be made on the basis of the topic? Will requests be vetted?

Voting on Resolution #24 occurred and FAILED with 7 Yes votes and 13 No votes.

Q: Could the current time for the Open Forum be amended to five minutes?

12. Resolution on Amendments Process for the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate* (#25-11/12-Constitution and Bylaws Committee) – 2nd Reading

It was clarified that a quorum is required and that "the previous regular meeting" could mean "a previous regular meeting," not necessarily the one immediately preceding the meeting at which the vote occurs.

Voting on Resolution #25 occurred and PASSED Unanimously.

13. Resolution on Amendments Process for the *Constitution of the University Senate* (#26-11/12-Constitution and Bylaws Committee) – 2nd Reading

M/S (Young/Thobaben) to postpone the resolution to the next Senate meeting. A question of jurisdiction (i.e., whether or not the entire university should vote to amend the Senate Constitution) has come up. The Senate Executive Committee will discuss at its next meeting.

The resolution was postponed without objection.

14. Resolution to Amend Section 4.0 "Proxies" of the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate* (#27-11/12-Constitution and Bylaws Committee) – 2nd Reading

There was no discussion. Voting occurred and the resolution PASSED unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

15. Resolution on Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution by the University Senate (#28-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – 1st Reading

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

Resolution on Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution
28-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee – March 27 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Constitution and Bylaws Committee recommends to the University Senate of Humboldt State University that the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate* (HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix F, Part 2) be amended with the addition of different language under 2.723 and the re-numbering of articles following under 2.7 as appropriate:

2.7 Committee on Constitution and Bylaws

2.722 Questions concerning interpretations of the text of a Senate-approved document shall be referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

~~2.723 Questions concerning interpretations by the Committee shall be reported in writing to the Senate and shall be considered binding unless reversed or altered by action of the Senate. of the text of a Senate approved document shall be referred to the Committee.~~

2.724 Requests for interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution shall be referred to the Senate Committee on Constitution and Bylaws which will forward its interpretation to the University Senate via the Consent Calendar. If any Senator objects, the interpretation will be put on the Business Calendar of the Senate for discussion and action.

RATIONALE: There is a need to have a process in place for interpreting the General Faculty Constitution. The previous General Faculty Constitution granted authority to the Academic Senate to interpret the Constitution. The current General Faculty Constitution does not contain such a provision. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is recommending (under separate resolution) that the following provision be added to the General Faculty Constitution: "Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution shall rest with the Faculty of the Senate's Constitution and Bylaws Committee, in accordance with rules specified in the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* for the University Senate."

Discussion:

Under the previous General Faculty Constitution, the Academic Senate was charged with interpreting the Constitution. The current General Faculty Constitution contains no language regarding interpretation and with the transition to the University Senate this needs to be clarified.

16. Resolution on the Delegation of Authority for the Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution (#29-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – 1st Reading

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

Resolution on the Delegation of Authority for the Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution
#29-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee – March 27, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Constitution & Bylaws Committee of the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Faculty Session of the University Senate the following amendment to the *Constitution of the General Faculty of HSU* (HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix E):

Add a new section:

10.0 INTERPRETATION

Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution shall rest with the Faculty of the Senate's Constitution and Bylaws Committee, in accordance with rules specified in the Bylaws and Rules of Procedure for the University Senate."

and be it further

RESOLVED: That if approved by the Faculty Session of the University Senate, this amendment to the General Faculty Constitution be forwarded to a vote of the General Faculty in Spring 2012.

RATIONALE: There is a need to have a process in place for interpreting the General Faculty Constitution. The previous General Faculty Constitution granted authority to the Academic Senate to interpret the Constitution. The current General Faculty Constitution does not contain such a provision. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is recommending (under Senate Resolution #28) that parallel changes are made to *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* for the University Senate.

Discussion:

Q: Should it be only the faculty on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee? Would the Committee make the interpretation?

Q: Where is the opportunity for the General Faculty to dispute an interpretation? Is there a mechanism for the faculty to come to the Senate?

It should be only the faculty interpreting the General Faculty Constitution.

The only two methods available to the General Faculty are to have a meeting (with a quorum) or to send something out to the General Faculty for a vote.

The proposed new section states that the interpretation will rest with the committee. It was clarified that this resolution (#29) is proposed in conjunction with #28, which outlines the change to the Senate Bylaws noted in the rationale.

The resolution will be changed to specify that it is the faculty who should evaluate the General Faculty Constitution.

It was noted the resolution #28 should specify that interpretations are forwarded to a Faculty Session of the Senate.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

17. Resolution on Academic Program Discontinuance Procedure (#31-11/12-APC) – 1st Reading

M/S (Marschke/Ortega) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Academic Program Discontinuance Procedure

#31-11/12-APC – March 27, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *Academic Program Discontinuance Procedure*, dated 9 March 2012, be adopted and implemented in Fall 2012, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that attached *Academic Program Discontinuance Procedure*, dated 9 March 2012, when it is implemented, replace the defunct *Discontinuation Procedure*, last updated AY 2007/08.

RATIONALE: HSU's current Discontinuation Procedure, last updated AY 2007/08 was a temporary policy and is now defunct. This new Academic Program Discontinuance Procedure generally retains the structure of the defunct Discontinuation Procedure, with only small changes and clarifications. This policy has been vetted by the Integrated Curriculum Committee.

Discussion:

The Academic Policies Committees was asked to write a new procedure for program discontinuance as the old procedure had expired. A policy is needed to deal with old programs that are defunct. The Committee began with the old procedure and updated and clarified it. A new step was added which provides a department involved in an involuntary procedure a last chance to argue against discontinuance.

- Q: Does discontinuance include suspension and elimination? There used to be multiple procedures. A: Program suspension is a separate process.
- This is a very complicated and laborious procedure. There should be as much concern about starting new programs as there is about ending programs. The procedure applies to minors and certificates. It seems like there should be a more streamlined process for these.

The procedure outlined is a 9-step process. If there is consensus, it can be quickly expedited in 10 days. It is modeled on the ICC's procedure for creating new majors, programs, and certificates. It was felt the same criteria should be used for both processes.

- It was recommended that both certificates and minors be removed from the procedure since neither is included in the academic master plan.
- It was suggested that the tone of the document be changed to avoid any implicit bias that discontinuing of programs is inherently bad. The campus has a problem with too many new programs without corresponding reduction of existing programs.
- The procedure needs to provide a balance between expediting the entire process and at the same time providing opportunity for those involved to be heard in a respectful and meaningful way.

It is much harder to start a program than to eliminate a program. The procedure is not intended to provide road blocks for discontinuing programs. The Committee felt it would be difficult to expedite the process and to allow enough time for everyone to have adequate input, including the Senate. The Committee needs feedback in the form of specific recommendations for changes to make it a more streamlined, efficient process that still gives due time and consideration to those who feel passionately about their programs.

- It was suggested that as programs go through the PREP process, alerts could be placed on probationary programs regarding specific issues, with deadlines for the program to address the issues.
- After 'extensive informal conversations' (Step 1) occur, is it necessary to provide 7 weeks to put together a PSR and an impact statement? Does the Senate need 6 weeks to discuss a proposal after it has already been through the ICC, etc.?

It was noted that the times given in the process are maximums and are intended to keep the process moving.

- The process needs to be as speedy and efficient as possible. It is very hard on the faculty of a program involved in a discontinuation process.

M/S/F (Zerbe/Pierce) to move on to the next agenda item. Motion Failed.

- The timeline for the old process was based on whether or not there was a current program review. With the PREP process, a program review is done very year. With that information readily available for all programs, this process can be compressed.

Senators were asked to send further comments to the Academic Policies Committee.

It was moved and passed that the Senate skip the next two agenda items and proceed to agenda item #20.

18. Resolution on Creating More Inclusive Membership of the Academic Policies Committee (#32-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – First Reading

Not discussed.

19. Resolution on Altering the Status of the Appointments and Elections Committee to a Standing Committee of the University Senate (#33-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – First Reading

Not discussed.

20. Resolution to Establish a Stand-Alone Major: B.S. in Marine Biology (#34-11/12-ICC)

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

Resolution to Establish a Stand-Alone Major: B.S. in Marine Biology
Resolution #34-11/12-ICC – March 27, 2011

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that the Marine Biology Emphasis of the B.S. in Biology be elevated to a stand-alone major: B.S. in Marine Biology as described curriculum form 10-364,; and be it further

Resolved: That the associated new course forms and changes to the existing Marine Biology emphasis described in curriculum forms 11-311, 11-312, and 11-313 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 Dean, and the Provost shall negotiate appropriate benchmarks for the program.

Rationale: Offering a new Major (or elevating an existing option to a stand-alone major) requires Chancellor's Office approval, which can take several years to receive. The Biological Sciences Department has been working towards a BS in Marine Biology for some time now. As an interim step towards elevating Marine Biology to a stand-alone major, in Fall of 2011, the Senate approved curriculum changes to the Marine Biology Emphasis of the BS in Biology so that the current curriculum would match that which was proposed for the new major (Resolution #09-11/12-ICC). Since that time, an external reviewer has read the new-major proposal; some of the recommendations from that review have been incorporated into the current version of the new major, and thus, the existing emphasis is also being changed to reflect those revisions. Once the chancellor's office approves the stand-alone Marine Biology major, the existing Marine Biology emphasis will be eliminated.

Current enrollment in the emphasis is over 200 students, with only about 20 graduating each year. The program has no desire to increase their enrollment. Instead the changes to the curriculum are designed to increase student success and retention, to increase integration with other marine programs on campus, and to allow the program to give students a research experience in a less costly and more effective format. The program has proposed a graduation target of 35 graduates each year.

The floor was given to Professor Sean Craig (Biological Sciences) to introduce the resolution. Elevating the option to a major requires relatively little change. There is one new course and it is hoped that this new course will help with student retention. A capstone course is also added.

The Senate approved these curriculum changes in the curriculum last Fall as part of the existing option. This proposal elevates the option to a stand-alone major.

Discussion:

Q: Once the major is approved at the Chancellor's Office, can it "act like a major", i.e., can students be enrolled, even before it gets into the HSU Catalog? A: Yes.

Q: If the curriculum is already approved, what is the advantage of having it be a major rather than an emphasis? A: The major has the ability to improve the whole program. Students can be more easily tracked in the major. It increases the visibility of the program to students and

may attract more students to the program. It makes HSU more competitive. And there is a synergistic effect on other programs.

Q: What is the downside to elevating this to a major? A: The only real downside is that it is fairly easy to eliminate an option while it is more difficult to eliminate a major.

Q: What is the overhead cost at the university-level for adding a major? A: The costs that support the option will support the major. There may be more students to better justify the costs. There will be more resources involved, possibly including a department chair. The campus may want to look at having a school of Marine Sciences in the future, independent of the Biology Department.

Voting occurred on Resolution #34 (Resolution to Establish a Stand-Alone Major: B.S. in Marine Biology) and PASSED unanimously.

21. Resolution on Guidelines for Adding Online Version of Existing Face-to-Face Programs (#30-11/12-ICC) – 1st Reading

Not discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.