

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm on Tuesday, May 1, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

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

Members Absent: Kelly, Richmond.

Proxies: Mortazavi for Thobaben.

Guests: Goodman, Williamson, S. Smith, Bolick-Floss, Burges, Ayoob, Henderson, Koesterer.

1. Announcement of Proxies

Proxies were announced.

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

Senator Zerbe moved to add to the agenda (between items #9 and #10) two floor motions from the Faculty Affairs Committee. There were no objections.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of April 24, 2012 [*distributed electronically*]

M/S/P (Zerbe/Ortega) to approve the minutes from the meeting of April 24, 2012 as written. The motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

- President Richmond has approved the following policy resolutions:
 - #20-11/12-FAC – “Resolution on HSU Policy on the Voluntary Reassignment of Faculty”
 - #21-11/12-APC – “Resolution on HSU Policy on Field Trips”
 - #22-11/12-APC – “Resolution on Policy on Internships”
 - #23-11/12-APC – “Resolution on Policy Regarding Graduate Program Culminating Experience Requirements.”
- End of year reports from Senate standing committees will be available by early June and will be posted on the Senate web site.
- The General Faculty officers met and decided they would like to host a picnic for faculty and staff and families on September 15, 2012. [Note: the date has changed to September 22.]

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

There were no verbal reports.

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

The following curriculum proposals from the ICC were approved without objection:

- 10-338 CD 211S: Perspectives:
- 11-498 Liberal Studies Child Development:
- 11-499 Family Studies Minor:
- 11-505: FILM 475: Filmmaking IV
- 11-506: FILM 350: Writing for Film
- 11-508: TA 431: Scene Design Technology
- 11-509: TA 433: Lighting Design Technology
- 11-512: CS 335: Programming Languages: Principles and Paradigms
- 11-513: CS 310: Database for Non-majors paradigms
- 11-514: CS 373: Network Design & Implementation Paradigms
- 11-515 CIS 291 Data Structures in C++
- 11-516 CIS 315 Database Design & Implementation
- 11-517 CS 233 Computer Organization
- 11-518 CS 315 Database Design & Implementation
- 11-519 CS 234 Computer Architecture
- 11-520 CS 318 Programming Database Applications
- 11-521 CS 236 Algorithms
- 11-522 CS 372 Telecommunications
- 11-523 CS 334 Operating Systems and Architecture
- 11-524 CIS 235 Java Programming
- 11-525 CIS 260 Systems Analysis
- 11-526 CIS 180 Selected Introductory Topics in Computer Literacy
- 11-528 CIS 482 Internship
- 11-529 CIS 499 Directed Study
- 11-530 CIS 492 Systems Design & Implementation
- 11-531 CIS 373 Network Design & Implementation
- 11-532 CIS 372 Telecommunications
- 11-533 CIS 350 Computer Architecture & Assembly Language
- 11-534 CIS 480 Selected Topics in Information Systems
- 11-535 CIS 318 Programming Database Applications
- 11-536 CIS 450 Information Resources Management
- 11-537 CS 274 Operating Systems
- 11-539 CS 458 Software Engineering
- 11-541: EMP 309B: Environmental Communication
- 11-542: EMP 309: Environmental Conflict Resolution
- 11-550 CS 325 Database Design

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

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

OLD BUSINESS

8. Resolution on Revision of the HSU Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (#38-11/12-EX) – Postponed from April 24, 2012 (Time limit: 20 minutes)

Resolution on Revision of the HSU Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research
#38-11/12-EX – April 24, 2012

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (HSU) endorses the attached revision (February 2012) of the university's Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (2007); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recognizes and supports the need for campus-wide educational opportunities to inform faculty, students, staff, and administration of the changes in the Institutional Research Board's procedures and the need for compliance with Federal regulations, California State University, and HSU policy.

RATIONALE: The primary purpose of the policy is to protect human subjects involved in research. The policy exists to both support research endeavors and to protect the campus, and individuals on campus involved in research, from any adverse outcomes. The February 2012 revision of the policy has been widely shared and vetted campus-wide.

Notable changes to HSU's current policy (2007) include:

- *Moving the responsibility for granting exemptions from department chairs to the Institutional Research Board (IRB)*
- *Increased membership for the IRB*
- *Updates and changes to reflect current Federal regulations and new requirements for training*
- *Clarification of responsibilities throughout the process, including faculty responsibilities for overseeing student research*
- *Creation of an online request process.*

Discussion:

Chair Van Duzer announced that because the scheduled discussion period is fairly short, if needed, the time for discussion will be extended.

[“TK” Koesterer (Chair, HSU IRB) and Rhea Williamson (Dean, Office of Research) were present to speak to the policy and offer information during the discussion.]

M/S (Mortazavi/VerLinden) to amend the first resolved clause to state “recommends” instead of “endorses,” because “the purpose of creating the University Senate was to create a single body to recommend policy to the President.” In the past, the Senate accepted documents and passed them along. The University Senate will not accomplish what it is supposed to, e.g.

become a single body making recommendations to the President, if it only 'endorses' proposed policies.

There was no discussion. Voting on the amendment occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

The amended first resolved clause reads:

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (HSU) recommends the attached revision (February 2012) of the university's Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (2007); and be it further

Discussion:

- The Senate should not recommend this policy – “it hinders education.” The actual process [for IRB] takes longer than the Senate has been led to believe. Students need a “more organic and open relationship with community members.” This policy would eliminate that.
- Getting IRB approval has not been an onerous process. However, faculty colleagues with concerns and/or strong opposition to the policy, have shared examples of the policy severely compromising certain types of student assignments. There have been threats that faculty will leave the university, or abandon certain class activities, rather than go through the process outlined in this policy. Also, concern has been expressed that class assessment would have to go through the IRB process, requiring training and approval every year.
- Copies of a flow chart from the federal guidelines were passed around. It was recommended that Chart 1 from the federal document be used instead of the flow chart that is currently Appendix A of the proposed policy. The flow chart appended to the HSU policy makes it look like everything would have to be submitted for approval.
- The HSU policy needs to go beyond the federal guidelines. The focus of IRB is to protect participants. It has evolved over time to protect also students and faculty who are conducting or sponsoring research and the institutions at which they study/work. The policy is meant to facilitate research, not to create a bottleneck. The CSU has a listserv for IRB that all 23 campuses participate in and members of the HSU IRB participate in a national listserv as well. The practices recommended in the proposed policy have been determined to be standard practices across many institutions.
- Q: Are there other types of authority that require more than the federal policy? A: The current HSU policy requires more than federal policy. The policy revision has been vetted with Risk Management, School of Business faculty, the Senate Executive Committee and others, and has been revised in response to feedback.
- The Office of Research & Sponsored Programs (RSP) will make every effort to streamline the IRB process and make it as user-friendly as possible. Ideally a staff person in RSP will oversee the process and most requests would be immediately turned around. Any that need further consideration would go to the faculty chair of the HSU IRB. The process needs to

be given a trial run. If it is overly burdensome, then it will be re-visited. Too many cases have been brought to the attention of the IRB that are of great concern; this cannot be ignored.

- Q: Is it possible for the Senate to get a report on how long it takes to turn around a request, what percentage of proposals are 'exempt,' etc.? Would it be possible to set up an expedited request process for more spontaneous activities, e.g. course-based research requests would be the first to be reviewed?
- At the national level, people in the social sciences have been dealing with the federal guidelines for years. There are worst-case scenarios, but most of the research being done is not at that level. Creating broad policy nets is not necessarily going to prevent all worst-case scenarios, but it will make life more difficult for everyone. The people who don't comply now won't comply under any policy. Someone at the national level looked at HSU's policy and commented that nothing the federal policy prohibits what is in the HSU policy, but noted that it goes beyond [the federal policy].
- The proposed policy seems to be a barrier to students' freedom of thought and exploration. It "guides the truth of the data," i.e., the types of questions that are asked will be influenced by the IRB approval process. The policy also directs the interpretation of the data. This type of regulation is discouraging to students; they don't like it. It will discourage students from being motivated and is an obstacle to their educational growth and development as researchers.
- The policy does not regulate the questions being asked. The purpose of the policy is to regulate what participants need to be informed of before asking questions for research purposes. It was clarified that IRB does not require approval of every single question to be asked. It does not require that class assessment or exit surveys be evaluated by IRB. It is not intended to be used to lead people to be false in their responses to research questions. There is no intent to include service learning and internships under IRB. IRB is about protecting students, staff and faculty and the university.

M/S/U (Mortazavi/VerLinden) to extend the discussion beyond the time limit.

- There is a great deal of confusion regarding what the policy covers. Clarification of the exact parameters for what the policy applies to would be helpful. It was suggested that a pilot test of the procedures be run to see where there are gaps in the process. There may need to be different kinds of protection set up for subjects versus researchers (with the latter falling more under risk management).
- There is a difference between classical research and classroom-type assignments involving research. Concern was expressed about how the word will get out to those who need to go through IRB for classroom-type assignments. Many instructors will not know that it is something they need to do.

- The way the policy is currently written, it is not clear which classroom activities need approval or not. For example, there are classroom assignments that would not be defined as research that would be disseminated.
- Q: There was a request for explanation of why class assessment would not go through IRB, based on the current flow chart. A: It was noted that Appendix B is somewhat clearer than Appendix A. It was noted that both appendices were added to the policy at the request of faculty groups that reviewed the policy; not by the IRB committee.
- The federal policy is quite clear. It can be clearly seen which classroom assignments would fall under the policy. The problems that have been reported at HSU that put the university at risk fall into a very narrow category (illegal activities, etc.).
- An overarching consideration is the question of dissemination of the research. For example, all student surveys (SNAP, etc.) are run through IRB because the faculty pull data from those surveys and publish it. Appendix B was taken from UCLA's web site and provides helpful examples. In some cases it is possible to collect data without IRB and later use it for published research.
- The primary consternation about the policy seems to focus on the appendices, especially Appendix A. There is no activity that does not require IRB, according to appendix A. It would be more helpful to provide a flowchart of what doesn't require IRB.
- The appendix isn't an official part of the policy. The area of the policy that needs to be addressed is section 2 "Activities Covered by This Policy," specifically:
 - "Data collection" – The current definition "collection and compilation of information about or from human subjects" is too broad. It should be struck and made consistent with the definition from the federal guidelines.
 - "public and private databases" are included under Data Collection – if there is no individually identifiable data, why can't they be used without IRB? For example, assessment data could be de-identified and used for research without requiring IRB.
- It was clarified that if individuals/subjects are being asked about their perceptions or thoughts and there is a desire to disseminate the information, then IRB is required. There are public databases that require IRB approval to use the information, even if the information in the database has been de-identified.
- The current IR Board is a stellar group. We're all on the same side of wanting to get the work done and at the same time ensuring that mistakes are not made that would penalize the university. It would be helpful if the policy could be re-written in a way that serves the original intent but does not cause so much consternation. The issue is not the intent of the policy but the way it is written – it needs to be more direct and more clearly written.

- Even though the policy revision has been vetted, it seems clear that there are a number of people who feel the document is incomplete and that the intent is not clear. It would be helpful of involve more people (especially those using IRB) in further vetting of the policy.
- Senators were reminded that this is a recommended revision of an existing policy. HSU has a tradition of writing policies and ignoring them. The current policy states that revisions are to be approved by the IRB. The policy did not need to come to the Senate. The current policy will be enforced until a revision is approved. A policy cannot be written that will speak to every situation; it is not reasonable to expect it to be exhaustive and precise. Implementation and application of the policy will provide further clarifications as needed.
- IRB intends to hold workshops, make available training materials for faculty and for classes to accompany the policy revision. Much of what is happening in IRB, in terms of tracking requests, etc., will be moved into the Office of Institution Research (IR), so the data will be available to evaluate the process. The policy revision process has been transparent and there have been meetings with many individual faculty members in respect to the requests for worst case scenarios and problems (as evidence that this policy is needed) – some of that information cannot be shared because it is too revealing. This is not just a federal policy; there are requirements from the Chancellor's Office and other conditions imposed outside of the federal guidelines that must be included in the HSU policy.

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

It was clarified that the appendices are not a part of the actual policy.

Voting on the Resolution on Revision of the HSU Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (#38-11/12-EX) occurred and FAILED with 6 Yes votes and 13 No votes.

M/S (Zerbe/Abell) to place the IRB policy revision on the agenda of the Academic Policies Committee (APC) for Fall 2012.

It was moved and seconded to end debate and vote immediately. Motion PASSED.

Voting on the motion to send the IRB policy revision to APC PASSED with 15 Yes votes and 6 No votes. [Note: see below, motion was later rescinded]

Q: It was noted that there is an existing policy. A choice can be made to revise or not. What is being recommended by this motion? A: Many faculty are interested in the policy. The APC is being asked to continue the conversation and improve upon the revision.

M/S (Marschke/Ortega) to send the policy [revision] back to the IRB. It is not an APC policy. It should be revised by the IRB.

Discussion:

- The IRB did not have to bring this policy revision to the Senate, but it did and it has listened to and considered the feedback offered. The Senate doesn't have the authority to do anything beyond what has already been done. It should not go to the APC. The Senate needs to trust the IRB to take the input that has been provided under their consideration.
- The University Senate has the authority to make another recommendation, i.e. to request the President change the Executive Memorandum. There is still a lot of confusion and it would be beneficial to the University to clarify the confusion.

The motion [to send the policy revision back to the IRB] was ruled out of order.

M/S (August/Ortega) to rescind the earlier motion to send the IRB policy to the APC.

Q: How would the IRB bring the policy Senate? Would it come back through the Senate Executive Committee or the APC? No answer was provided.

Voting on the motion to rescind the motion to send the IRB policy to the APC occurred and PASSED with 2 No votes and 2 Abstentions.

Chair Van Duzer encouraged the IRB to bring the policy revision back to the Senate.

9. Resolution on Academic Progress Rules for Undergraduate Programs (#39-11/12-APC) – 2nd Reading – *Revision was distributed electronically*

Resolution on Academic Progress Rules for Undergraduate Programs
#39-11/12-APC – May 1, 2012 – 2nd Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *Academic Progress Rules for Undergraduate Programs*, dated Spring 2012, be adopted and immediately implemented.

RATIONALE: *The purpose of this policy is to allow departments to create rules for identifying at risk students who are not making sufficient progress in their undergraduate academic programs for the purposes of intervention. Students so identified will be required to meet with academic advisors to develop a plan that will lead to successful completion of the existing program. If it is determined that successful completion of the existing academic program is not achievable, then the student will be dismissed from that program and guided to a more appropriate program.*

Senator Marschke reported the changes made to the document attached to the resolution, noting that language to emphasize that intervention is the first step of the process had been added.

Discussion:

- The policy doesn't require that milestones be based on evidence indicative of student success; it should at least strongly recommend this.
- When there is a hard and fast rule, it implies there is some mechanism for enforcement. That is not the case here. Advisory language [regarding basing milestones on evidence indicating student success] would be supported.
- Most of our policy decisions should be evidence-based. Who is in charge of providing the kind of evidence that is needed for these decisions?
- Additional language is not needed. Academic progress milestones will go through the ICC and the Senate for approval and the policy requires that milestones be consistent with graduation requirements and university policy.

Chair Van Duzer noted that there have been three speakers "opposed" and one speaker "in favor" so far and asked if there were any additional senators wanting to speak in in favor of the resolution.

It was explained that it will be the Provost's Office which will grant final approval to milestones submitted by departments and/or revised by departments.

- The policy has been greatly improved. The discussion is providing useful notes to take back to the ICC so that it can check for evidence-based decisions.

Chair Van Duzer noted that if there are concerns about the language of the policy, it will have to go back to the committee.

- Senators were encouraged to vote in favor of the policy. It seems self-evident that decisions should be based on evidence-based data. The purpose is to create a process that allows departments to create these milestones and have them vetted; not to tell departments how to create the milestones. The goal of the policy is to keep the process as open-ended as possible.

Chair Van Duzer noted that the three "for" and three "against" arguments had been used.

M/S/F (Abell/Mortazavi) to extend the debate beyond the 3 speakers "for" and 3 speakers "against." Voting occurred and motion FAILED with 11 Yes votes and 11 No votes.

Voting on Resolution #39-11/12-APC occurred and PASSED with 18 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

Additional comments:

- If the ultimate goal is to have every department do this, then departments should be provided with necessary data from the Office of Institutional Research.
- It was noted that this policy is different from programs that need/want to establish benchmarks, but don't want necessarily to dismiss students. It might be better for programs that are less restrictive to go through the PREP process.

M/S/P (Pierce/Moyer) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President. Motion PASSED with 3 Abstentions.

New Agenda Item:

M/S/P (Zerbe/Moyer) to suspend the *ad hoc* Faculty Development Committee pending consultation between the Senate Executive Committee and the incoming Faculty Development/Assessment Director in Fall 2012.

This is a housekeeping matter for the Senate. In 1982 the Senate created an *ad hoc* Faculty Development Committee for the purpose of seeking candidates for positions in faculty development and assessment. It was not originally intended to be a permanent committee.

It was noted that there were later modifications to the committee.

Voting occurred and the motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

New Agenda Item:

M/S/P (Zerbe/Moyer) to clarify Resolution #37-11/12-FAC (passed on April 24, 2012) that the intent of the Senate was that the work of the new committee to approve departmental RTP standards would begin following approval of the revisions to Appendix J by the General Faculty in AY2012/13, and that approved department standards would be effective AY 2013/14.

As a result of various conversations it became evident that a clarification was needed: while new standards will not become effective until 2013/14, the committee to review the standards will be struck following approval of proposed revisions by the General Faculty (Fall 2012). There will not be a year during which nothing is being done.

Voting occurred and the motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

10. Area E Concept Discussion (Time limit: 20 minutes) – Not discussed.

11. Major and Minor Combinations – discussion of proposed guidelines from Academic Policies Committee (Time limit: 15 minutes) – Not discussed.

12. Senate Elections

Chair Van Duzer thanked the outgoing senators for their service on the Senate. He personally thanked Senator Mortazavi for serving as an exemplary model for individuals who are willing to participate in shared governance.

Outgoing senators were Bryan Kelly, Christine Ciarcia, Austyn Cromatie, and Saeed Mortazavi.

New senators were introduced and welcomed to the table: Ellyn Henderson (newly elected President, Associated Students) and Erick Eschker (newly elected General Faculty Representative to the Statewide Senate (not present)).

Chair Van Duzer called for nominations for the Co-Chair (faculty senator) of the University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) for a 2-yr term.

Motion (Marschke) to nominate Erick Eschker (in absentia). There were no further nominations.

Voting occurred and Erick Eschker was elected to serve as Co-Chair of the URPC, contingent upon his accepting the position. If he does not accept the position, an election will be held at the first Senate meeting of the fall semester.

Chair Van Duzer called for nominations for a faculty senator to serve on the URPC for a 2-yr term.

There were no nominations. Chair Van Duzer volunteered to serve as an interim in the position until another faculty member volunteers. Voting occurred and PASSED.

Chair Van Duzer called for nominations for the Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to serve a 1-yr term. The position will carry 3 WTUS for the academic year.

Motion (VerLinden) to nominate Greg Young (who was absent but had agreed to the nomination in advance). There were no further nominations. Voting occurred and Greg Young was elected to serve as the Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for 2012/2013.