

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, August 28, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

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

Proxies: Bruce for August, Lutwen for Henderson.

Guests: Goodman, Burges, Fernandez, Lee, Ayoob, S. Smith.

1. Announcement of Proxies

Two proxies were announced.

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of May 1, 2012

M/S/P (Bruce/Gold) to approve the minutes from the meeting of May 1, 2012 as written. Motion PASSED with 2 Abstentions.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Chair Van Duzer announced the Faculty/Staff BBQ on September 22. He invited people to bring musical instruments and is hoping to make a fun time for families. It will be considered a "no-work zone" with fines (25 cents) assessed for each work conversation. Everyone will receive postcard invitations which may be put in for a drawing at the end (for the fines amassed). Senators were asked to help spread the word. All HSU employees, staff, administrators, and faculty are invited.

5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (Written reports from the ICC and Academic Affairs were included in packet)

President's Office: President Richmond reported on the following:

- Proposition 30: The CSU's budget will be reduced by \$250 million if Proposition 30 is not passed in November. HSU (along with other CSU campuses) has contributed ca. \$300,000 to the California Coalition for Public Higher Education. He emphasized that contributions have not come from the state-side of the budget.
- The search for a new Chancellor of the CSU is underway; it is anticipated that a new

Chancellor will be selected by the end of the semester.

- The President encouraged faculty to vote to ratify the new bargaining agreement contract.
- The Chancellor's Office (CO) is proposing a change to the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) program that will no longer count WUE students as in-state students. The change should benefit HSU, which has the largest number of WUE students in the CSU.
- The Executive Council unanimously approved a Data Center Initiative to develop a cloud-based system intended to reduce the number of expensive local campus data center. An RFP has gone out.
- The Cal-State Online initiative is progressing well and the program will be launched in Spring 2013. HSU has both an undergraduate and a graduate program in the initiative. The President is a member of the board of directors for Cal-State Online.
- The President noted that he has been getting to know the new President of the College of the Redwoods and is looking forward to working together with her.
- The University Executive Committee, in response to a recommendation from the Cabinet for Institutional Change on improving communication on campus, is inviting a faculty member to come to a meeting. Professor Beth Eschenbach has been invited to attend the next University Executive Committee meeting.

Administrative Affairs: Vice President Nordstrom reported that the HSU Operating and Capital Budget Book is available electronically via the University Budget Office's web site (<http://www.humboldt.edu/budget/>). The summer was busy for facilities staff with several projects accomplished including: East Gym energy project, parking signage, West Gym renovation (paid for by the University Center) to create a student wellness center; a number of classroom refreshes including Founders Hall 118, renovation of Fulkerson Recital Hall and the first floor of the Library. In addition, there were several ongoing maintenance projects (exterior painting, replaced roofs, etc.).

Student Affairs: Vice President Blake reported that the biggest accomplishment (and change) in Student Affairs has been the implantation of the RAMP (Residential Academic Mentoring Program). It is a 2-year pilot which pairs every new freshman student with an upperclassman who has proven to be academically successful.

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

The following items were approved without objection:

- 11-207: Kinesiology Program Change
- 11-335: HED 444: Worksite Health Promotion
- 11-551: Kinesiology: Physical Education Teaching
- 11-552: Kinesiology: Exercise Science
- 11-553: Liberal Studies Child Development Minor Program
- 11-566: Environmental Science: Ecological Restoration Option Program Change
- 11-568 BIOL 340: Genetics
- 11-569 BIOL 330: Principles of Ecology.

TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 PM – Open Forum for the campus community
There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

7. Area E Concept Discussion (handout in packet)

Chair Van Duzer invited Vice Provost Burges to join the discussion.

HSU is the only CSU campus to make Area E an upper-division requirement. The proposal is to create a first-year experiential course that would fill the requirement for Area E. The proposal would not affect transfer students; for the most part, they have already fulfilled the Area E requirement prior to transferring to HSU. HSU is currently running a pilot.

National research shows that first-year seminars have proven to be one of the most high impact practices. A consistently beneficial result supports the idea of making the first-year experience a requirement which counts toward graduation. Focus of such courses tends to be providing students with the tools they need to take responsibility for themselves as students as well as post-university life.

Currently HSU has a number of 1-unit “add-on” courses. Area E (Lifelong Learning and Self-Development) has outcomes and a focus that is in line with the freshman seminar concept. The issue has two parts: 1) Is HSU willing to re-think how Area E is framed for students? And if so, 2) what would that look like? Vice Provost asked the members of the Senate of focus on the first question for the purpose of the discussion. If there is general agreement to support the concept, then there will be further discussions regarding the details of implementing it.

Discussion:

Q: Who would teach the courses? A: It would depend on how the course is structured – practices vary widely and there are many different models. This should be part of the 2nd part of the discussion.

Every freshman students should be required to have some kind of disaster preparedness course or lectures built into a course. If a major earthquake or other disaster occurs ‘after hours’ it will be the students on campus who need to handle it.

Existing critical thinking courses already fulfill what is being proposed. How is this different from Area A objectives related to human integration? A: The focus of the freshman seminar is to provide a broader range of resources and strategies in areas for personal finance, health and wellness, study skills, etc. The purpose is to provide it earlier in students’ academic career. Connecting students with these skills early on (as freshmen) has proven successful.

There is a great difference between a first-year student’s and a senior’s ability to integrate information. Putting this into a freshman course will require re-defining Area E. There are practical concerns as well, e.g. a lot of HSU majors have integrated Area E courses into majors so they can be double-counted. Would we need to think about waivers?

There is even more evidence that linking freshman year experience courses with lower-division major courses is a more powerful approach. Many campuses enrich the freshman experience by linking it with another course (English, Communication, Critical Thinking) and develop learning communities. This should be considered as an alternative model.

Concern was expressed that this does not turn into a FIG. Q: Is there data to indicate that this proposal would have a higher success rate than what HSU has been doing?

A: It is hard to compare a course that doesn't satisfy a requirement with a course that does. National data shows that requiring the course is a more successful approach. HSU data is still being reviewed.

The Engineering department conducted its own retention studies which indicated that FIGS were successful. Colleagues have expressed concerns about the cost-benefit analysis. Increased retention would have to make the increased costs (of having more Area E courses taught) prove to be a benefit. The issue requires two approaches: "fix the student" and "fix the faculty." Focus should be on the student and the idea of re-thinking Area E is supported. But more faculty development and faculty involvement in the process of developing a sustainable model is needed to bring faculty along.

Any changes to Area E will have to go through the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC); there will be plenty of faculty input. Current HSU retention rates are pretty mediocre; national data shows that a well-done first year experience improves retention.

Q: Why is a course being proposed versus an 'experience?' Are there any models that require an experience that is not part of an overall degree? Why does it have to be done for credit?

A: There are non-credit models for orientation. HSU has HOP and other activities that occur for new students. However, first-generation students and students coming from different backgrounds need a lot of 'scaffolding' that is ongoing and requires some depth. This is not about giving student information; it involves providing them with resources and putting them in learning experiences where they have to use those resources. University credit is the 'coin of the realm.' If the course is not required and/or for credit it won't catch every student.

From a student perspective, making Area E a lower-division requirement makes sense. It also puts all HSU students on more equal footing. In terms of cost/benefit – how many students currently take Area E? How many freshmen?

There would be a lot more students needing the course and it will be more expensive. The RAMP program spent \$225,000. Retention is a major concern and the campus needs to the money one way or another to increase rates.

Retention rates for FIGS at HSU were 8-9% higher – clearly FIGS worked on that level. The disciplinary focus and link is essential. A course on "How to be a Student - 101" is not inspiring to students. The course needs to be engaging to both students and faculty. Wildlife, Art, and Biology (departments with large numbers of majors) have been having conversations about

linking critical thinking courses with disciplinary courses.

If the freshman seminar is linked to a discipline, there would need to be sections for undeclared students. For science majors, the number of pre-requisites might make taking a required additional 3-unit course more difficult. Student feedback has not indicated that Area E courses were helpful. It would be better to focus this momentum into the RAMP program.

Anything that increases retention is supported. It needs to be based on model that shows solid success for the students.

FIGS created learning communities which is not the same thing as a course. The vision needs to extend beyond course transformation; it needs to change how HSU sees and thinks about first-year students.

There seems to be general agreement with the basic goal (to improve retention). The issue is how to make it work best. How would departments be impacted by this? What do faculty need in terms of professional skills needed to develop courses, etc?

There is an emerging consensus that we need to undertake some kind of re-thinking. Did this document go to the ICC and did the ICC endorse it? What is the Enrollment Management (EM) Working Group looking for from the Senate?

The Academic Master Planning subcommittee of the ICC discussed the document, but was unsuccessful considering the proposal in the abstract (i.e., the conversation got bogged down in the detail). It did not go any further.

The EM Working Group is looking for the Senate (as the body that recommends curricular policy) to recommend how to proceed with this. The ICC has been a roadblock.

The EM Working Group did not want to proceed with developing a course without having this general conversation first.

Concern was expressed about the costs. Small class size would be beneficial, but SFR would have to be made up; are we willing to raise class sizes elsewhere? In terms of the overall efforts focused on retention, is this something that would be worthwhile?

The ideas of transforming the freshman experience and increasing retention are supported. It is not clear why it has to be tied to changing the upper-level Area E requirement.

If Area E is required at the lower-division, then the upper-level requirement would go away. If departments wanted to keep the course as an upper-level course, they could re-number it.

M/S (VerLinden/Zerbe) to refer the proposal to the Academic Policies Committee (APC) for a recommendation to be made back to the Senate.

- The proposal should go back to the full ICC for review; it is not an academic policy issue.

- Agreed – this is a project that should be assigned to a task force. A task force connected with the ICC's new GEAR standing committee was recommended.
- The concept of the proposal needs to be accepted first before charging a task force with working out a detailed plan that the ICC will question.
- A group could put together options to bring to the Senate.
- What is the sense of the Senate? Does the Senate support the concept?
- Senate VerLinden spoke to his motion. It doesn't matter if the proposal goes to the ICC, the APC, or elsewhere. It needs to go to a group to write a recommendation/make a motion (rather than trying to do it on the floor of the Senate). The discussion is going around in a big circle.
- The proposal never came to the full ICC; it should go to the ICC for vetting.
- What criteria are needed to reach what the solution should be able to do? Multiple options should be provided.

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

Voting on the motion to refer the proposal to the APC occurred and FAILED.

M (Marschke) that the Senate authorize the Vice Provost or the Provost to create a task force. Motion failed for lack of a second.

It was recommended that the proposal be sent to the Senate Executive Committee. The SenEx can discuss how best to approach this and come back with options. There were no objections to taking this approach.

8. Major and Minor Combinations – discussion of proposed guidelines from Academic Policies Committee (handout in packet)

Senator Marschke introduced the guidelines and handed out a revision of the guidelines. The guidelines apply only to students who want to combine a major and a minor in the same degree program, which is currently not allowed. The issue was raised by the Environmental Management & Protection (EMP) program.

Discussion:

It was generally agreed that the revision (reversing numbers 1a and 1b with number 2) was an improvement.

The minimum number of units required for a minor is set by system policy.

There were philosophical differences on what a minor is. Some felt that the minor field should complement the major field. Some felt that the minor needed to be distinctly different.

For science majors, often the pre-requisites overlap with another area. A lot of majors have electives which encourage students to get minors.

There is an existing set of rules and exceptions; can a set of criteria be developed that works for exceptions across the board?

The ICC requested that the Academic Policies Committee create a policy, rather than making ad hoc exceptions. Currently, exceptions are made for English and Art, and those would continue. The policy would apply to everything else.

Several senators spoke in favor of the policy.

Concern was expressed that getting a minor should be more rigorous and that there should be one policy (no exceptions) for all.

The policy would be easier to read if #2a were deleted.

It was noted that the ICC developed guidelines about minors which were approved by the Senate two years ago. If this proposed policy passes, the ICC will revise its guidelines.

9. Resolution in Support of Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding (#01-12/13-EX) – First Reading
M/S (VerLinden/Virnoche) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution in Support of Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding

Resolution #01-12/13-EX – August 28, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) supports Proposition 30: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU encourages faculty, staff, students, alumni, families, and friends to support Proposition 30; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the California State Student Association, the California Faculty Association, and the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) be commended for their support of Proposition 30 and for their commitment to educate and mobilize CSU students, faculty and staff to support Proposition 30; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU supports Proposition 30 and adds its endorsement to the “Yes on Prop 30” website (www.yesonprop30.com).

RATIONALE: At the July 17, 2012 meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees, the importance of Prop 30 for the CSU was made clear. According to AVC Robert Turnage, campuses are already struggling with the effects of the \$750 million reduction in state support last year. The failure of Prop 30 on the November 2012 ballot would guarantee another \$250 million trigger cut to the California State University system. If this trigger cut is implemented, annual state support for the system will fall to approximately \$1.8 billion, a loss of annual funding of almost \$1.2 billion, or 39 percent, from the peak level of state support of nearly \$3 billion in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

On that day, the Board of Trustees approved a resolution endorsing Proposition 30 "given its direct relationship to the systems' fiscal stability and funding levels in 2012-2013 and beyond." (<http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/Resolutions/Jul2012.pdf>). The California State Student Association had previously unanimously approved "A Resolution in Support of Governor Brown's Tax Initiative Proposal" (CSSA-06-12) on July 15, 2012. The California Faculty Association and numerous other education, public safety, business/community groups, and labor organizations also endorse Prop 30 (<http://www.yesonprop30.com/index.php/endorsements>).

The USHSU joins others in supporting funding for public education and safety. We recognize the importance of investing in the future of California, and that such investment includes funding for the education of California's citizens. Should Proposition 30 fail, the CSU will again be forced to cut enrollments and leave those seeking an education with fewer affordable and accessible options, severely limit programs and services that impact the quality of education provided to those enrolled, more severely limit the quality and scope of research and service that impacts our campuses and broader communities, and lose even more employees. Ongoing budget cuts diminish the ability of the CSU to fulfill our mission and obligation to enhance the quality of life for our students and to improve conditions throughout the state and beyond. Predictable state support is critical to control tuition costs for students and their families.

Discussion:

M/S/U (Zerbe/Thobaben) to waive the 1st reading.

Senators were encouraged to consider sending letters, writing opinion editorials for the newspapers, etc. as sign them as members of the community.

Voting on Resolution #01-12/13-EX occurred and PASSED with 1 abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.