

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm on Tuesday, October 9, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, Aronoff, Blake, Bruce, Dye, Eschenbach, Eschker, Gold, Johnson, Lapiz, McElwain, Marschke, Moyer, Nordstrom, Ortega, Pierce, Saner, Shellhase, Thobaben, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Young, Zerbe.

Members absent: August, Ercole, Richmond, Yarnall.

Proxies: Marschke for Aronoff (first part of meeting), Lutwen for Henderson, Eschenbach for Johnson.

Guests: Ayoob, Lee, Grenot, Burges, Zechman, Brown, Evans.

**1. Announcement of Proxies**

**2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda**

It was noted that Item #10 should be a 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, rather than a 1<sup>st</sup> Reading.

M/S/P (Ortega/Lapiz) to approve the agenda, as modified.

M/S/P (Zerbe/Marschke) to refer Agenda Item #13, "Resolution on Revision of Appendix U ..." back to the Faculty Affairs Committee. It has been brought to the Committee's attention that there may be another conflict in policies, and the Committee needs to review and resolve the issue before bringing it back to the Senate.

**3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of September 25, 2012 [*distributed electronically*]**

M/S/P (Bruce/VerLinden) to approve the minutes from the meeting of September 25, 2012 as written. Motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

**4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair**

There was no report.

**5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members** (Written reports for APC, FAC, ICC, and VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment were included in the packet)

Appointments and Elections Committee (Alderson): The Committee continues to make appointments and is preparing for a General Faculty election at the end of the month.

Campus Climate Committee (Gold): The Committee will review and discuss information received from the vendor of the climate survey they are considering at its next meeting.

University Resources and Planning Committee (Eschker): At the last meeting the Committee looked at enrollment estimates and forecasts. It also reviewed different budget scenarios, based on whether or not PROP 30 passes.

Associated Students (Lutwen): Associated Students has a full Council now. At least 338 students have registered to vote as part of the AS campaign, and events continue to promote voting and voter registration. AS is considering resolutions on two of the Propositions on the November ballot.

It was noted that the written reports submitted prior to the meeting were not linked on the web page with the packet materials. The written reports for the Integrated Curriculum Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Policies Committee and Student Affairs were read aloud for those who didn't receive printed packets.

#### **6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – see p. 2-4 of the agenda**

Professor Tyler Evan (Mathematics) requested the following change to the description of curriculum request #11-310:

##### **11-310 BS Zoology Program change**

Currently the Biology BS, the Botany BS and the Zoology BS require Math 105 or (Math 109 and Math 110). This change would require Math 105 or Math 109. ~~In the past Math 109 did not include integration. Math 109 now covers the same basic topics as Math 105. Math 109 covers all topics covered in Math 105.~~ The math department approved the change via included email.

The following Consent Calendar items were approved without objection:

- 11-133 COMM 472 Convention Experience NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
- 11-134 COMM 473 Conference Experience NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
- 11-140 ANTH 310: History of Anthropology
- 10-164 ART 372 Special Projects in Graphic Design COURSE CHANGE
- 11-308 BS Biology Program change
- 11-309 BS Botany Program change
- 11-310 BS Zoology Program change
- 11-316 NAS 490 Capstone Experience.
- 11-317 NAS Program Change.
- 11-444 Biology 105 Principles of biology prerequisite change
- 11-445 Botany BS Program Change.
- 11-446 Zoology BS program change
- 11-447 Botany BS program change
- 11-448 Biology BS General Biology emphasis program change
- 11-449 Biology BS Ecology and Biodiversity emphasis program change

11-450 Biology BS Science Education emphasis program change

12-016: ENGL 238: Structure of American English

12-018: Suspend Criminal Justice Minor

12-019: ENGR 399: Supplemental Work in

11-424 – 11-428 SPAN 110, 105L, 106L, 207L

11-429 – 11-433 GERM 110, 105L, 106L, 207L

11-434 – 11-438 FREN 110, 105L, 106L, 207L

11-439 – 11-443 CHIN 110, 105L, 106L, 207L.

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

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

**8. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:45 PM – Discussion with Frank Whitlatch, Interim Vice President for University Advancement**

Vice President Whitlatch spoke about HSU's fundraising efforts over the past few years and the HSU's upcoming centennial celebration.

HSU's centennial celebration will occur over the next academic year (August 2013 – May 2014). Advancement will coordinate events on campus overall, but most will activities will occur at the unit/college level. Information can be found at <http://www.humboldt.edu/centennial/>. A campus advisory committee is being formed to serve as a sounding board for ideas and activities.

Q: What are the goals of the centennial celebration? A: The primary goal is to build community pride by looking at what has been accomplished as well as looking to the future and to find good ways for people to celebrate HSU.

Q: Is there a campaign for a special centennial fundraising? A: There will not be a centennial fundraising campaign – for that to occur, planning should have begun six years ago. Certain areas have been designated as priorities to focus fundraising efforts, including scholarship, applied learning, and renovation of the Green and Gold room to turn it into a study area and events venue.

VP Whitlatch distributed a handout with information on fundraising and gifts over the past five years. There has been increase in money given to HSU over the past five years, especially after 2010. The chart on the handout shows both donations received as well as pledges, indicating the difference between what was raised (pledges) and what was received.

Highlights from last year (AY 11/12) included a gift from the Smullin Foundation for undergraduate business internships, the completion of a \$1 million endowment fund for scholarships, and an Osher Foundation gift to create a scholarship fund for transfer students from California Community Colleges (ca. ten \$2500 scholarships each year).

HSU's endowment is about \$22 million dollars. The largest single area funded on campus is the Schatz Center which has received about \$2.5 million over the past two years.

Compared with other CSU campuses in the same peer group of smaller campuses, HSU has more donors than students and is the highest in its peer group and 7<sup>th</sup> overall in the CSU. The participation rate of alumni (with known addresses) averages 1-2 % in the CSU. HSU has ca. an 8-9% participation rate every year. The campus has very loyal alumni who generously give to the institution. Numbers have remained high even during the recession.

Q: Is there anything the Senate can do to help with the Centennial and/or fundraising? A: Advancement is looking at faculty involvement in fundraising as a next step. Currently a search is underway for a permanent Vice President of Advancement and the office is short-staffed. When it is fully staffed again, a gift officer will be assigned to each college, to work with departments. These efforts will continue to develop over the next 2-3 years.

Q: Does the information on HSU alumni include current employment? A: Finding out where people work is one of the trickier things to keep current in the database. Currently there are ca. 55,000 alumni in the database.

Q: Some departments need to contact alumni to perform required assessment activities post-graduation. In the past Advancement has been protective of the data. If this kind of information is required more and more, how can access to it be improved? A: Advancement has been working with the Vice Provost and two questions have been added to the alumni survey that will help with program review, including asking alumni to specify the department they graduated from.

VP Whitlatch noted that the data has become easier to obtain from Advancement, and encouraged departments to request information and see if it is working.

Q: Is there a fundraising cycle so that requests are not made all at once? A: There is no indication that alumni have reached a point where they are tired of hearing from HSU, so efforts are ongoing year-round. Anyone who is doing fundraising is encouraged to fill out a short form notifying the Advancement Office of the activity, in case there are any concerns about the timing, etc.

Q: What percentage of alumni does Advancement reach? And can Advancement help departments figure out better ways to reach alumni? A: Advancement receives data dumps from the Registrar's Office and then uses a commercial firm every other year to update the information (addresses, etc.). The office welcomes help from departments with updating and maintaining the information.

It was noted that it has become much easier to share information on alumni back and forth between departments and Advancement.

Q: How often is the database updated with new graduates? It is helpful for departments to know when the updates are done. A: The office may wait for a period of time after Spring graduation, but it wasn't known exactly when the update occurred.

**9. TIME CERTAIN: 4:45 PM – Resolution on Changing Standards for Admission of International Students (#09-12/13-APC) – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading**

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

Resolution on Changing Standards for Admission of International Students

#09-12/13/APC – 9 Oct. 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the minimum score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) for the admission of undergraduate international students be raised from 500 to 525, effective Fall 2013, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the minimum GPA from secondary education for the admission of undergraduate international students be lowered from 3.0 to 2.5, effective Fall 2013, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the HSU Center for International Programs be instructed to track the effect of this change on student success and to report the results to the University Senate in Fall 2015.

*Rationale*

*HSU seeks to increase the number of international students on campus (currently less than 1% of the student body) as a means of increasing the diversity and cosmopolitanism of the HSU campus.*

*Lowering the minimum GPA for international applicants is equitable because secondary education grade inflation is much less common in other countries. International students are generally well prepared to succeed at HSU, as borne out by their above average retention and graduation rates.*

*Level of English proficiency is a better predictor of the success of international students than their GPA, so HSU would increase the minimum undergraduate English language requirement of a score of 525 on the TOEFL or its equivalent.*

Senator Marschke yielded the floor to Rebecca Brown, Director, HSU International Center, who introduced the resolution and provided background information. Currently the TOEFL requirement is 500 (which was passed by the Senate several years ago). This is too low; raising it to 525 will be a better predictor of academic success. In addition, the resolution proposes to reduce the required GPA from 3.0 to 2.5. In general, there is much less grade inflation coming out of international schools. The rationale for the proposed changes is to increase diversity on campus by increasing an international presence among students. On the practical side, these changes will help to expand recruitment efforts for international students.

Discussion:

It was noted that the current HSU Catalog lists the TOEFL score as 525, so as a matter of practice that is already in place.

Q: Is there any indication that current international students end up with a higher GPA here at HSU? A: HSU has the smallest number of international students in the CSU and unfortunately, the number is so low that the data for degree-seeking matriculated students is not very useful or representative.

Q: The TOEFL is becoming an exclusively internet-based test. Should something be added to the resolution regarding computer-based equivalencies? Are students aware of the equivalencies? A: Director Brown stated she would check on this.

Q: Does the internet-based test have a speaking component? Is there a sense of how students do with it and/or if it would be a disadvantage? A: The aural part of the test is good and superior to other tests.

For countries that use different grade-point scales, there are professional resources for making the conversion to the American GPA.

It was noted that on the national level, the TOEFL was a much better predictor of student success than the GPA.

Q: What is the expected yield from this change? A: Currently there are ca. 70 international students on campus. The hope is to quadruple the number in the next 3-4 years. This is only one part of an overall look at strengthening recruitment efforts. Work is also being done to strengthen the International English Language Institute (IELI) as part of a broader initiative.

The time-sensitive nature of the resolution was noted, since October is a big recruitment season.

M/S/U (Zerbe/Marschke) to waive the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading.

Voting on the Resolution #09-12/13-APC occurred and PASSED unanimously.

M/S/U (Marschke/VerLinden) to make the resolution an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

#### **10. Resolution on Academic Calendar 2014/2015 (#04-12/13-EX) – 2nd Reading**

M/S/U (Marschke/VerLinden) to refer Resolution #04-12/13-EX to the Campus Climate Committee.

The Senate Executive Committee felt that the resolution should be referred to the Campus Climate Committee. It was noted that the Campus Climate Committee briefly discussed it and will work on it if the Provost supports the idea.

## 11. Resolution on Distance Education Policy (#05-12/13-APC) – 2nd Reading

### Resolution on Distance Education Policy

#05-12/13-APC – October 9, 2012 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *General University Policy on Distance Education*, dated Fall 2012, be adopted and implemented immediately, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached *General University Policy on Distance Education*, dated Fall 2012, when it is implemented, replace the existing *General University Policy on Distance Education*, dated 2006.

#### *Rationale*

*The existing "General University Policy on Distance Education," c. 2006, is generally obsolete, redundant, and irrelevant.*

*Most of the concerns regarding distance education courses/programs can be addressed by handling them the same as face-to-face courses (regarding rigor, workload, curriculum, intellectual property, academic integrity, accepting transfer units). This new statement of policy seeks merely to clarify several issues unique to distance learning courses/programs.*

*This policy has been vetted by the Integrated Curriculum Committee.*

As a follow-up to questions that were raised at the past Senate meeting, Senator Marschke reported that the term Distance Education includes Online courses, but not vice versa. The method of delivery is what distinguishes them. The policy pertains to the broader category of Distance Education.

#### Discussion:

Q: Why is the 2006 policy no longer working? A: The APC felt that it was obsolete and redundant (i.e., it deals with issues that are now dealt with in other contexts).

Q: Section A.2. of the new policy is difficult to decipher. A: It is a tricky issue; WASC requires any program that is potentially 50% or more online to go through the proposal process.

It was suggested that it be made clear in the policy that the threshold is 50% of the required coursework.

Putting a course online is not a curriculum change and can be done without going through the ICC. Section A.2. Is specifically a WASC issue, and at that point the ICC will be involved. It takes about 8 months to do the WASC paperwork. Courses will not go online until the paperwork is completed.

It was suggested that the word "impacted" in Section 2.A. really means "affected."

It was suggested that Section 2.A. be separated into two parts, to distinguish the 'vetting' aspect versus the 'approval' aspect.

Q: There must be a strong level of communication between departments when courses are being converted to online. Is that level of communication established or being developed through the ICC or elsewhere? A: There are five conditions that have to be met for a course to go online; this sequence of approval provides the necessary oversight.

It was suggested that “confirmation” be used for the steps, rather than “approval.”

Q: How does A.2. tie into a department’s decision? Does the department have to seek approval? A: It would be the Office of Distance and Extended Education (DEE) that would set up the approval process.

Q: How does it go to the DEE? A: Section A is basically a checklist. These are the questions the Director of DEE will ask before giving approval. He is typically working a semester or two ahead.

It was noted that this is a 2<sup>nd</sup> reading, and the Senate had previously agreed to entertain three statements in favor and three statements opposed as part of the process. The question needs to be either called or the policy referred back to the committee.

M/S/P (Young/Pierce) to close debate [and vote immediately].

No vote occurred.

M/S/F (Pierce/Abell) to refer the resolution back to committee for clarification of questions and consideration of suggested changes to language in the policy.

The motion was questioned and it was ruled that the proper motion would be to postpone [to a certain time].

Voting on the motion to refer back to committee FAILED.

M/S (Zerbe/Eschenbach) to table the resolution to the next Senate meeting. Voting occurred and the motion PASSED with 1 No vote.

12. Discussion on Identifying Class Standing - *The Retention Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Work Group has proposed a change that would base class standing on the number of units needed for graduation rather than the number of units taken, at least for purposes of determining registration priority (e.g. change the definition of what it means to be a senior, junior, etc.). Sacramento State currently does this. This is not changing the policy on priority registration.*

Vice Provost Burges provided background on the proposal. A speaker at a WASC conference mentioned that Sacramento State University is pursuing this idea of redefining class status. The Enrollment Management Work Group has discussed it as a means to keeping students focused on their progress and working toward a particular goal. The proposal is to define a student’s

class standing based on the student's distance from the completion of their degree (rather than the work that has been completed to date).

Discussion:

It sounds very exciting. Concern was expressed about the effect on priority registration. It was clarified that the policy on priority registration would not change. However, for example, the definition of a senior would change.

Q: How would this affect double majors; would it put them further back in class standing? A: Yes.

Some students don't declare a change of major in order to game the system. This proposal would address that problem. Students don't show progress if they haven't declared the new major.

It seems like a more fair system. Q: What about students getting a dual degree rather than a double-major? A: The policy needs to be worked on; currently a student can get a 2<sup>nd</sup> degree with an additional 30 units.

Additionally, the policy on changing majors will need to be revised if this is adopted.

This will penalize students if they change majors, either based on personal choice or because they may not be doing well in one major and need to switch to another.

DARS needs to be fixed before it can be relied on to accurately track units. This proposal may not work well for high unit majors.

It is a good goal to encourage people to move along in their academic career. It is complicated and will need to be carefully thought out in terms of how it will impact all programs. To address concerns about students who switch majors, there could be a stipulation that a student doesn't revert back to the beginning. And there is nothing wrong with rewarding the low unit majors.

Students are not being discouraged from changing majors. This is just a different model from the old social model of progressing through grades in primary school. It is a way of rewarding students who are working intentionally through their program. The premise is that it represents a student's progress in a much more realistic way in order to help students understand the impact of their decisions.

It shouldn't affect students too much in the first couple of years when they are mostly taking GE. Perhaps a percentage of units toward the degree could be counted rather than the number of units.

It was noted that Sacramento State is still in the discussion phase of doing this.

As long as attention is being paid to the process and how it works most concerns can be addressed on the implementation side (advising, workloads, etc.). It's hard to anticipate how it will impact people across campus, but it is a good idea.

Concern was expressed that this would privilege students who are pre-destined to do well and harm students who are not doing well.

It is a good idea and the "devil will be in the details." For financial aid purposes, students have to show they are making progress toward a degree.

This has been highlighted as a best practice in terms of significantly improving retention rates.

**13. TIME CERTAIN: No later than 5:29 PM: FACULTY SESSION: Resolution on Revision of Appendix U: Statement on Professional Ethics (#07-12/13-FAC) – 2nd Reading**

See motion to refer back to committee under Agenda item #2, Approval and Adoption of the Agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 pm.