

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, April 10, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

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

Members Absent: Blake, Ciarcia, Kelly, Richmond.

Proxies: Bruce for August, Mortazavi for Thobaben.

Guests: Burges, Ayoob, Cheyne, Lee, Mullery, Grenot.

1. Announcement of Proxies

Proxies were announced.

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S/U (Moyer/Pierce) to move item #15 on the agenda (Resolution on Revision of the ICC Constitution) to the beginning of the agenda, preceding "Old Business."

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 27, 2012 [*distributed electronically*]

M/S/P (Bruce/Gold) to approve the minutes of the March 27, 2012 meeting as written.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Senate minutes will be distributed in electronic form from now on in an effort to reduce paper usage. If it poses a difficulty, senators were asked to notify the Senate Office.

The next Senate meeting will be on April 24 and the final meeting of the term will be 1 week later, on May 1. This is so that the final meeting of the Senate will not occur during Finals Week. On April 24, the Senate will adjourn early (5:15 pm) so that senators may attend the reception at Baywood.

Door cards, for the purpose of identifying senators to the campus community, were provided in senators' packets, and senators were asked to post them on their office doors.

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

Written reports were included in the packet. There were no additional reports.

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

There were no Consent Calendar items.

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

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

8. Resolution on Revision of the ICC Constitution (#35-11/12-ICC) – First Reading (originally item #15 on the agenda)

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

Resolution on Revision of the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) Constitution
#35-11/12-ICC – April 10, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the attached revised version of the Integrated Curriculum Committee Constitution be approved, and be it further

RESOLVED: That use of the revised Constitution shall begin in Fall 2012.

RATIONALE: After nearly three years, members of the ICC can identify some aspects of the present committee structure that are not ideal. In particular, the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) subcommittee has struggled to define its role, and to have the manpower and expertise to complete its tasks. In addition, the Course and Degree Changes (CDC) subcommittee feels that it could benefit from one more person to share the extensive workload.

The primary changes in this document are

- Elimination of the PPA as an ICC Subcommittee. This committee will be replaced by a GEAR (General Education and All-University Requirements) Curriculum and Assessment Committee. The GEAR committee will be a standing committee (rather than a subcommittee) of the ICC: of the eight members of the GEAR Curriculum and Assessment Committee, only the GEAR Committee Chair and the Vice Provost will hold a joint appointment with the ICC. Some of the non-GEAR work of the PPA has been assigned to the Academic Master Planning (AMP) subcommittee. We expect the Coordinator of Teaching and Learning Assessment to respond to annual departmental assessment reports; the AMP subcommittee will consider the five-year overview of those reports in the process of commenting on the PREP MOUs.*
- The PPA subcommittee had three faculty – one elected from each college. In the revised Constitution, three faculty are elected at large (from any college). One serves as the GEAR Committee chair, another serves as an additional CDC member, and the third serves on the AMP subcommittee.*
- While we were making changes, we also did some clean-up (changing “Academic Senate” to “University Senate” and adjusting language to address the actual practice of the ICC as it has developed in the past three years.*

ICC Chair Moyer provided a summary of the proposed changes to the ICC Constitution. In addition to minor editorial clean-up, significant changes include the elimination of the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) subcommittee and its replacement with a GEAR (General Education and All-University Requirements) Curriculum and Assessment Committee and creation of more overlap in the faculty membership of the subcommittees and the ICC.

The revised Constitution in the packet reflects changes made two weeks ago. A new draft sent via email today reflects additional changes, including: removal of all language regarding elections and nominations (which is contained in other governance documents), and further editorial clean-up.

Senators were asked to send any further changes to Chair Moyer. It was noted that the first revision was made to an earlier version of the ICC Constitution. The new revised document is based on the approved ICC Constitution currently in effect. The differences between the two versions were not significant.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the document clarify the difference between a standing committee and a subcommittee, and be more specific about decision-making processes.
- Under the release time, it was suggested that it should be possible for the GEAR committee chair be given release time, even if it not likely to occur.
- Clarification was requested regarding the last sentence of #2.

OLD BUSINESS

9. Resolution on Creating More Inclusive Membership of the Academic Policies Committee (#32-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – 1st Reading

Marschke/Abell to place on the floor

Resolution on Creating More Inclusive Membership of the Academic Policies Committee

#32-11/12—Constitution and Bylaws Committee – March 27 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That The Constitution and Bylaws Committee recommends to the University Senate that the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate* be amended in the following way so as to include a staff position among the membership of the Academic Policies Committee.

2.3 Academic Policy Committee (APC)

2.31 Membership (10)

2.311 Ex officio: The Chair elected by the Senate, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, and the Registrar or designee

2.312 Appointed: ~~two faculty senators and three faculty members at large~~ **Four faculty members appointed** by the Appointments and Elections Committee of the Senate, ~~and two students appointed in accordance with procedures established by the Associated Students Council,~~ **and one non-MPP staff member who is either a staff Senator or is nominated by the Staff Council.**

Rationale: The Academic Policy Committee (APC) currently has no position for a staff representative within its membership. Adding a staff member will ensure that another important electorate is represented and will provide important input to the APC in their decision making processes. The Academic Policies Committee has reviewed this issue and concurs.

There was no discussion.

Vice Chair Zerbe chaired the remainder of the meeting, in Chair Van Duzer's absence.

10. 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) – 1st Reading

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

Resolution on altering the status of the Appointments and Elections Committee to function as a Standing Committee of the University Senate

#33-11/12-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 Appointments and Elections Committee be recognized as a Standing Committee of the University Senate, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University approve the following changes to the *University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure*:

2.0 Committees

~~2.1 There shall be seven standing committees of the Senate. These shall be composed of a majority of faculty and may include administrators, students, and staff as described in these bylaws. These committees shall be (a) the Executive Committee, (b) the Academic Policy Committee, (c) the Faculty Affairs Committee, (d) University Resources and Planning Committee, (e) the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, (f) the Integrated Curriculum Committee, and (g) the Campus Climate Committee. Other committees deemed essential for university business shall be designated Senate-appointed university committees.~~ **The standing committees of the University Senate shall be those listed in Section 7.1 of the University Senate Constitution and other Senate appointed university committees deemed essential for university business.**

~~2.225 The Appointments and Elections Committee shall be a subcommittee of the Executive Committee.~~

2.61 ~~The Appointments and Elections Committee (AEC) shall be a subcommittee of the Executive Committee.~~

~~2.647 The [Appointments and Elections] Committee shall conduct all referenda to amend the Constitution.~~

Rationale: As currently included in the *Bylaws* of the Senate the Appointments and Elections Committee is listed as a subcommittee of the University Senate Executive Committee. The Transition Team has suggested, and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee concurs, that Appointments and Elections should be recognized as a Standing Committee of the University Senate and report to the Senate as a body. Under this resolution the University Senate Executive Committee would still appoint the Appointments and Elections Committee and have the decision ratified by the Senate. The resolution would also eliminate Bylaws 2.647. That function of the Committee is no longer needed as per earlier action that clarified the amendment process.

University Senate Constitution, Section 7.1

7.0 Committees of the Senate

7.1 Committees of the Senate shall include the Executive Committee, the Academic Policy Committee, the Appointments and Elections Committee, the Constitution and Bylaws committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Integrated Curriculum Committee, the University Resources and Planning Committee, the Campus Climate Committee and other ad hoc or pro tempore committees as specified in the Bylaws.

There was no discussion.

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

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

Resolution on Guidelines for Adding Online Versions of Existing Face-to-Face Programs

#30-11/12-ICC – March 27, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the attached *Guidelines for Adding Online Versions of Existing Face-to-Face Programs (date)*, developed by the Integrated Curriculum Committee be adopted for use by the ICC.

RATIONALE: The initial charge to the ICC included developing clear criteria and processes for making curricular decisions. As more programs are interested in moving towards online pedagogy, clear guidelines for making the change are increasingly necessary.

This proposal specifically refers to existing programs that will be converting to online pedagogy. Senate and ICC approval are required only for the Letter of Intent (Step One), because that is the stage in the process where the University approves the change in pedagogy. The ICC envisions its role in step two as assisting the program in preparing to offer a top-quality online program. The exhaustive WASC review of the Substantive change proposal will serve as the final evaluator of the program's ability to provide students with an excellent education through online pedagogy.

Senator Moyer introduced the resolution. The ICC is currently testing the guidelines. It is receiving a significant number of requests for programs to move online.

Discussion:

Q: What are the WASC requirements? A: They are very strenuous which is why the ICC is asking that completion of the WASC Substantive Change Proposal be included.

Q: Is evidence of student demand for an online course required? A: All programs are asked to ensure that there are students who are interested in the online version of the program. It is especially important because many of the online programs being created are through self-support; they need enrollment to be viable.

Q: Would the programs that are self-support charge differently? A: They could potentially be charging more for smaller class sizes.

Q: How is accessibility determined or included as a criterion? A: This needs to be more explicit.

Q: The criteria seem challenging; is this set of criteria used for other courses? A: Yes; the criteria is essentially what WASC is going to be looking at.

Q: Will faculty members of the ICC be capable of evaluating all of this? A: As the ICC works through proposals it will be finding out.

It was suggested that under Criteria, the 2nd bullet be re-phrased to require evidence that there are adequate expectations for time spent on course work, since it is not possible to provide evidence of how much time students actually spend on course work.

12. Resolution on Amendments Process for the *Constitution of the University Senate* (#26-11/12-Constitution and Bylaws Committee) – 2nd Reading (postponed from 03/27/12 meeting)

Senator Young requested to withdraw the motion, since a recent decision made by the Senate Executive Committee is not in accordance with the resolution. The suggestion has been made that the Senate Bylaws be amended by a simple majority vote and that the Senate Constitution be amended by a 2/3 vote.

There were no objections to withdrawing the Resolution #26-11/12-Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

13. Resolution on Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution by the University Senate (#28-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – 2nd Reading

Senator Young requested to withdraw resolutions #28 and #29. Given that the Senate Bylaws are going to be easier to amend than the Constitution, it would be preferable to have language in the Constitution regarding interpretation.

There were no objections to withdrawing Resolution #28-1/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee.

14. Resolution on the Delegation of Authority for the Interpretation of the General Faculty Constitution (#29-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee) – 2nd Reading

There were no objections to withdrawing Resolution #29-11/12-Constitution & Bylaws Committee.

15. Resolution on Academic Program Discontinuance Procedure (#31-11/12-APC) – 2nd Reading

Senator Marschke requested to postpone the resolution to the next Senate meeting (4/24/12). The Academic Policies Committee is still revising the draft which the Senate reviewed two weeks ago.

Q: If the committee is revising the policy substantially, would it be a good idea to bring it back as a 1st Reading again? A: The Senate Executive Committee will discuss this.

NEW BUSINESS

16. Resolution on Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU (#36-11/12-ICC) – First Reading

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

Resolution on Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU
#36-11/12-ICC – April 10, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the attached “Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU,” developed by the Integrated Curriculum Committee be adopted for use by the ICC.

RATIONALE: The initial charge to the ICC included developing clear criteria and processes for making curricular decisions. Having guidelines for the process and standards for approving new programs should make the process more clear and transparent for everyone involved.

These guidelines have gone through extensive revision – much of it based on the experience the ICC has had in approving new majors in the last year. Hopefully, the three steps will allow this process to be more streamlined than our current process, so that any concerns about the focus or philosophical underpinnings of a program can be resolved before the proposers spend a great deal of time completing the details of curriculum forms.

Senator Moyer explained that the guidelines have been tested by the ICC since a number of requests have come to the ICC while the guidelines have been in the process of being drafted. The guidelines reflect a more efficient and effective process than what the ICC began with initially. Senators were invited to offer feedback.

- It was suggested that some of the titles in the document be pluralized (dean(s), etc.) to reflect that some requests may be cross-college.

17. Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (#37-11/12-FAC) – First Reading

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

Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Resolution #37-11/12-FAC – April 10, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached proposed revision to Section IX of Appendix J, “Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion” (HSU Faculty Handbook) be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that if this revision is passed by a vote of the General Faculty, it will become effective for the AY 2013-2014, Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) cycle and will be applicable to all RTP candidates, subject to the provisions outlined in Section IX.

RATIONALE: In its letter dated March 4, 2011, The University Faculty Personnel Committee raised several concerns regarding the application of department/unit RTP standards outlined under Appendix J, Section IX. An Academic Senate Task Force was struck and reported to the Senate on December 5, 2011. No action was taken was taken by the Academic Senate, and the report was forwarded to the University Senate for consideration.

The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed these issues and consulted with the UFPC in the development of this new policy. The proposed revisions to Appendix J, Section IX make several important changes in an effort to address the concerns expressed by the UFPC. They provide a mechanism for the approval of department/unit standards in limbo since the dissolution of the previous task force. They provide a mechanism to revise existing standards. They also charge the Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards (to replace the dissolved task force) specifically with ensuring department/unit standards are not overly complex or prone to misinterpretation, a central concern expressed by the UFPC.

In the attached proposed revisions, deletions are noted by strikethrough and additions are underlined.

Senator Zerbe introduced the resolution which attempts to address concerns raised by the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) expressed in their memo to the Provost (attachment #3). The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) also reviewed the report from the Senate task force submitted at the conclusion of the Academic Senate in December, 2011 (attachment #4).

The FAC felt that re-establishing the original ad hoc university committee that was charged with reviewing department/unit RTP criteria and standards would provide a mechanism for both the review of new department/unit documents and the ongoing review of existing documents.

Discussion:

- Q: One of the concerns that have been expressed is that some departments' standards are too lax to the point of being almost meaningless. How will these changes address this concern? A: The intent is both to encourage departments to develop their own standards and to maintain fairness to all candidates. The standards would be reviewed every five years by the department and the review committee. Any problems with lax standards and/or overly rigid standards would be addressed.
- Under 1.h. it says that any level of review may suggest revisions for certain reasons. There may be other reasons, for example the standards don't meet the intent of Appendix J. There is no mention of the standards being discipline-specific.
- There is no mechanism to make the department comply with suggested revisions. It was clarified that 1.h. does not apply to review of standards, but is part of the candidates' review process. For example, the UFPC may provide feedback to the department on its standards.
- The proposed review committee will have the authority to request that a department change its standards, within reason.
- Q: What are the implications of 1.b. "Department/unit criteria and standards do not substitute for the University's policy on RTP (Appendix J)"? In the case of a grievance, what does this mean? A: It is related to 1.i. and means that the department standards and criteria must be compatible with the Appendix J, i.e., they cannot contradict Appendix J. It was suggested that the language be changed to clarify this.
- Q: Is there any provision for the review committee to look at documents in a holistic way? The previous process did not allow for the committee to develop its own set of criteria for reviewing documents. A: It is hoped that by permanently establishing this review committee, it will be able to operate more effectively.
- It was suggested that charging the committee with looking for a balance between department standards (so none are overly rigorous or lax) be included under 1.d.
- It was suggested that the language in 1.c. be changed from "approval" to "positive recommendation" to address the prior concern that departments may be unwilling to change their documents as recommended.
- It was suggested under 1.h. to insert "RTP" to clarify which review process is being discussed.
- It was suggested that language about minimum requirements be included in 1.b.

- It was noted that each department is being asked to develop a set of RTP criteria and standards that is discipline-specific; the review committee is not being asked to develop its own set of criteria and standards.
- Q: Would it be possible to connect the required 5-year review with the PREP process as a way to flag and keep track of review cycles for departments? It might be a way to get more buy-in from the departments. A: The FAC discussed this idea but rather than including it in Appendix J, felt it would be better to add to the process once it is operationalized.
- Q: Should probationary faculty serve on the review committee if they are not eligible to serve on the UFPC?
- It was stated that it was not the intention of the FAC that developed the idea several years ago of having department/unit standards, that department's come up with their standards without any oversight. There was a desire to be as fair as possible.
- There has been an enormous range of interpretation in the process of developing standards; it is hoped that the new committee will be able to clarify and provide guidance to departments as they develop and review standards.
- It is unclear when the five-year review process begins. It was suggested that language be added to the resolution to clarify when the review cycle commences.
- It was suggested that Appendix J define both minimum and maximum standards (not just minimum).
- The question of which standards apply to candidates going through a review cycle is important. One year is not enough lead time (especially for publication). Some flexibility is recommended, especially in the beginning before the new process is fully established. If department standards are changing drastically during a revision, then something was wrong in the first place.
- It was suggested that, given the complexity of RTP and potential legal issues, a letter of intent be written to accompany the resolution that will provide guidance to those who have to interpret this in the future.
- The Senate has discussed the issues of department/unit standards many times and concluded that the area of scholarship and creative activities is discipline-specific, e.g., there is no way to uniformly define criteria and standards across the university.

M/S (Marschke/Ortega) to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.