

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, November 6, 2012, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, August, Bruce, Dye, Eschenbach, Eschker, Gold, Lapid, McElwain, Marschke, Moyer, Ortega, Pierce, Richmond, Saner, Shaeffer, Shellhase, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Virnoche, Young, Zerbe.

Members absent: Aronoff, Blake, Ercole, Johnson, Lopes.

Proxies: Marschke for Aronoff, Lutwen for Henderson, Thobaben for Yarnall.

Guests: Goodman, Burges, S. Smith, Zechman, Mullery, Lee, Grenot.

**1. Announcement of Proxies**

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

M/S/P (Zerbe/Bruce) to approve and adopt the agenda with 1 Abstention.

**3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of October 23, 2012**

M/S/P (Pierce/Lutwen) to approve the draft minutes from the meeting of October 23, 2012 as written, with 2 Abstentions.

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

The General Faculty and members of the University Senate are invited to a November 28 dress rehearsal of the play *Shakuntala*. The event is co-sponsored by the Department of Theatre, Film and Dance and the General Faculty.

**5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members ([Written reports](#) are included in the e-packet)**

Appointments and Elections Committee (Alderson): The General Faculty election is underway; voting continues through noon on Friday.

Campus Climate Committee (Gold): The Committee met with Provost Snyder to discuss whether or not to pursue the proposal to try and align the HSU academic calendar with local schools. The Provost and other vice presidents are not supportive of the idea so the Committee will not pursue the proposal. The Committee has also set aside its work on a campus climate survey since the CSU will be doing a survey for the entire system in March 2013.

Q: Will the CSU survey allow individual campuses to include customized questions? A: Senator Gold will find out.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (Young): The Committee is nearing the end of its work on cleaning-up the Senate Bylaws, which primarily includes reformatting and moving of information. It will move on to reviewing the Senate Constitution next. The changes will be submitted to the Senate for approval by the end of the semester, for action in Spring 2013. The Committee would like to have the Senate review and provide feedback first, before formally bringing the changes, via a resolution, to the Senate.

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) (Snyder): At its last meeting the URPC focused on FTEF and FTES projections and their associated revenue. A report on headcount projections was provided. All documents are available on the web.

Associated Students (Lutwen): The AS passed a resolution opposing the graduation incentives. Now that the election is over, AS will begin working on new projects.

President's Office (Richmond): The President encouraged members of the Senate to contribute to special State projects via the United Way. He specifically mentioned the Schools of Hope program and noted that the Humboldt County Office of Education is working with this program.

The President attended the Executive Council meeting at the Chancellor's Office last week. The Council is encouraging campuses to use system-wide contracts in an effort to save money. A group has been established to look into ways to leverage the size of the CSU to use resources as effectively as possible. Six CSU campuses remain on the quarter system and an effort is underway to shift them to the semester system. The pension reform legislation changes for existing employees, recently passed, will go into effect on January 1, 2013.

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

All Consent Calendar items were approved without objection:

- 12-094: FISH 476: Ecology of Running Waters
- 12-095: BIOL 345: Genetics with Population Emphasis
- 12-096: BIOL 383: Introduction to Undergraduate Research
- 12-097: BIOL 554: Plant/Animal Interactions
- 12-098: BOT 356: Phycology
- 12-099: ENGL 480: Special Topics
- 12-100: BOT 556: Phycology
- 12-101: STAT 630: Data Collection & Analysis
- 12-102: Communication
- 12-128 HIST 300M: Era of WWI Depth Experience
- 12-129 HIST 301M: Era of WWII Depth Experience
- 12-130: ENST 120: Intro Seminar in Env. Studies
- 12-137: FREN 420: French Peer Tutoring
- 12-138: Spanish Minor
- 12-140: SPAN 108: Level III Heritage Speakers

12-141: SPAN 208: Level IV Heritage Speakers  
11-206 PSYC BA Program Change  
10-157 PSYC 434  
12-024 PSYC 337D  
12-144 PSYC 412  
12-147: Environmental Management and Planning – Natural Resources Recreation Option  
12-149: PSYC 403 (Social/Organizational Skills)  
12-150: PSYC 435 (Psychological Study of Social Issues)  
12-151: PSYC 457 (Group Dynamics & Procedures) – suspend course  
11-423 Spanish Program Change  
11-500 GEOL 110  
11-501 GEOL 308.

Revision to the [Curricular Guidelines for Minors at HSU](#): to bring the guidelines into compliance with the new [Major and Minor Combinations Policy](#). The change (on p. 2, under “Program Definition”) raises the minimum from six to nine for units of the minor that must be applied exclusively to a student’s minor requirements and may not be used to meet any other program requirements, with the exception of GE requirements

**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 – Question and Answer Session with Bob Snyder, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs**

The Provost answered questions about impaction and unit reduction. He is considering which programs to impact, in consultation with Enrollment Management, Institutional Research, and the Dean for CNRS. Some departments have been identified as candidates. Impaction takes 1 ½ years to implement and the campus is looking at it primarily in terms of transfers. The primary purpose is to match the number of students with the amount of resources available, but it also correlates with student success. The CNRS Dean, IR, and the potentially-affected departments will have to determine how many students the programs can accommodate and look at the number of freshmen and transfers.

The criteria for impaction can be fine-tuned, e.g. requiring transfer students to come in with certain units/courses, etc. He doesn’t anticipate being able to apply impaction at the freshmen level and still be able to meet enrollment targets.

Q: Will impaction keep students out of HSU or will they filter into other majors? A: There is concern that students won’t migrate to other majors. There is discussion about establishing pre-majors for freshmen.

Q: Will making it more difficult for transfer students hurt retention efforts? A: This would not impact enough students to make a difference.

Q: How prevalent are course scheduling problems within majors? Is it something most programs on campus have a problem with, or is it only a small minority? A: The Course Scheduling Working Group ran a lot of numbers and concluded that it is a general problem over

campus. The Provost randomly selected several departments to review, and did not find any without scheduling problems.

It was noted that there is also a tremendous amount of anecdotal evidence pointing to scheduling problems. For example, faculty preference for “prime-time” is making it difficult for students to get into GE courses.

The Department of Environmental Resources Engineering puts up a schedule for students to critique every semester. The Working Group on Course Scheduling is generating a list of best practices, to document this kind of idea.

Q: Does the 80 unit limit for transfers apply to lower-division transfers (with only 30 units)? A: No.

There were questions about the proposed fee modifications. The Board of Trustees meets next week and will decide. If passed, most of the implementation will fall to Administrative Affairs.

9. Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Removal of Wet Signatures Requirement ([#12-12/13-FAC](#)) – Second Reading ; [Attachment](#)

The Faculty Affairs Committee made one minor revision to the policy (attached to the resolution), deleting the phrase “including email and fax correspondence” from the proposed change.

M/S/P (Zerbe/Moyer) to amend the second resolved clause of the resolution as follows:

**RESOLVED:** That this policy become effective at the beginning of AY 2013/2014, subject to immediately upon approval by the General Faculty.

There was no discussion of the amended resolution. Voting occurred on Resolution #12-12/13-FAC and PASSED unanimously.

The approved resolution reads:

Resolution on Revision of Appendix J: Removal of Wet Signatures Requirement  
#12-12/13-FAC – November 6, 2012 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University approves the attached revision to Section VII.B.3.a of Appendix J, “Performance Review” (HSU Faculty Handbook) be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy become effective at the beginning of AY 2013/2014, subject to approval by the General Faculty.

*RATIONALE: The current language in Appendix J requires that all written evaluations include the original handwritten signature of the sender. This revision would permit the inclusion of facsimile signatures (e.g., faxed or scanned letters containing the sender’s signature), and remains flexible enough to*

*accommodate future developments in electronic signatures (e.g., Adobe Acrobat's secure digital signature).*

**10. Resolution on Revision of Policy on Graduate Program Culminating Experience Requirements (#13-12/13-APC) – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading ; [Attachment](#)**

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

Resolution on Revision of Policy on Graduate Program Culminating Experience Requirements  
#13-12/13-APC – 23 October 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached revision of the *Policy on Graduate Program Culminating Experience Requirements* (17 October 2012), be adopted as policy and become effective Spring 2013.

Note: This policy supersedes the policy dated December 5, 2011 (Senate Resolution #23-11/12-APC).

*RATIONALE: When the Policy on Graduate Program Culminating Experience (12/5/11) was approved last spring, it specified submission of both a paper copy and a digital copy to the library. The costs for binding were covered by charging a fee that was never officially approved and will be discontinued. Moreover, further study indicated that a number of other CSUs have either already gone to electronic-only submissions or are preparing to do so, and, while not without disadvantages, the shift to electronic archiving of theses and projects carries a number of advantages as well: cost to students is reduced, storage space requirements are diminished, and scholarly access to students' research is enhanced.*

Senator Marschke introduced the resolution, which changes the existing policy to no longer require a paper copy of a project or thesis.

There was no discussion.

**11. Resolution in Support of the January 17, 2013, Institute for Student Success ([#15-12/13-Bruce](#)) – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading**

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

Resolution in Support of the January 17, 2013, Institute for Student Success  
#15-12/13-Bruce – November 6, 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) declare its support for the Institute for Student Success on January 17, 2013; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU encourage all staff, faculty and administrators to attend; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU request that Human Resources encourage supervisors to make provisions for staff to attend this important event; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU request that departments abstain from scheduling meetings and other events during this time.

*RATIONALE: Improving the success and supporting the learning needs of students from all backgrounds is one of the University's core commitments. While achieving these goals requires a collective, university-wide effort that exceeds any individual role, each one of us on campus must play a part in this work. Whether staff, administrator or faculty member, this Institute is designed to offer the tools needed to participate in this process.*

*Additionally, much of the information offered during the Institute is applicable to not only student interactions. The tools presented create an overall more inclusive campus climate.*

*Finally, there are many internal scheduling conflicts. Departments schedule meetings during the event, and not all supervisors release staff members to attend for various reasons, and we seek to get participation from all divisions on campus.*

Senator Bruce introduced the resolution. The primary purpose is to show Senate support for the Institute for Student Success. The planning group for the Institute has noticed that it is more difficult to get staff input, especially from non-academic units, for programs like this, and felt it was necessary to help recognize the importance of staff participation. In addition, departments are being asked to not schedule meetings or other events that conflict with the Institute.

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

Voting on Resolution #15-12/13-Bruce occurred and PASSED unanimously.

[On November 13, the Senate Executive Committee made the resolution an Emergency Item for immediate transmittal to the President.]

**12. Resolution on Revision of Appendix U: Statement on Professional Ethics ([#07-12/13-FAC](#)) – 1st Reading (Revised) ; [Attachment](#)**

M/S (Zerbe/Virnoche) to place the resolution on the floor. The resolution is a revision of the first "1<sup>st</sup> Reading."

Resolution on Revision of Appendix U: Statement on Professional Ethics  
#07-12/13-FAC – November 6, 2012 – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading (Revised)

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends the attached revisions to Appendix U, "Statement of Professional Responsibility" (HSU Faculty Handbook) be forwarded to the General Faculty for ratification or rejection; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these revisions shall become effective immediately upon approval of the General Faculty.

RATIONALE: A statement on sexual relations between faculty and students was approved by the Academic Senate Resolution #13-91/92-FA (passed on 12/11/91) but was dropped from Appendix U when it was revised the following year. Similar language already appears in the Humboldt State University Policy Against Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault, adopted January 2005. The proposed language would restore a slightly revised version of that policy to Appendix U.

The attachment contains the entire Appendix U. Most of the changes bring the AAUP's "Statement on Professional Ethics" into alignment with the current, electronic version of the document. The only substantive change is the addition of "A Statement on Consensual Relationships Between Faculty and Students." The statement is based on language from earlier versions (1965 and 1995) of the AAUP document. A paragraph has been added to address pre-existing relationships and the need to avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

There was no discussion.

**13. Resolution on Professional Responsibility Committee ([#16-12/13-FAC](#)) – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading ; [Attachment](#)**

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

Resolution on Revision of Faculty Handbook: Professional Responsibility Committee  
#16-12/13-FAC – November 6, 2012 – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends the attached revisions to Section 800 of the HSU Faculty Handbook be forwarded to the General Faculty for ratification or rejection; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these revisions shall become effective immediately upon approval of the General Faculty.

RATIONALE: The Professional Responsibility Committee was suspended during the revision of Appendix U. This resolution would reinstate the committee and revise its structure.

The Professional Responsibility Committee was suspended in 09/10 and the resolution reinstates it and changes the membership to three full professors who are to be elected.

Discussion:

Q: Why are the members elected versus appointed? A: The Committee felt that given the nature of the work, there needed to be some mechanism of accountability.

AVP Mullery spoke to the work of the Committee, which is charged with implementing Appendix U. It will address issues that may arise between faculty members (not covered by the Collective Bargaining Unit). For example, if a faculty member feels another faculty member has acted unprofessionally, the matter may be referred to the Committee. It has been used rarely in the past.

Q: What about rulings – does the Committee have any authority? A: If an investigation determines a policy has been violated, then the Committee would forward the matter to the appropriate body.

Q: How is this prevented from becoming a vigilante group?

Q: How does this get implemented? For example, discrimination complaints get sent to HR. There need to be some guidelines on what matters are referred and to whom. A: Appendix U contains a section on implementation that addresses the kinds of events that would come forward to the group and how they would be handled. And there are documented past practices.

Q: Was there consideration of making the ombudsperson the Chair of the committee? A: The Committee discussed this, but decided to go with what the AAUP recommends as a best practice. In addition, Appendix U references an elected faculty body.

Q: What would the outcome of the Committee's deliberations be? What can it actually do? A: The Committee cannot discipline a faculty member; however it can express an opinion and forward that to an appropriate administrator. For example, if a faculty member feels another faculty member has plagiarized, the Committee would look into the matter and make a ruling. It may or may not forward the report further.

14. TIME CERTAIN: 5:20-5:50 PM – **Resolution on Revision to HSU Catalog Regarding Institutions Requirement (#14-12/13-APC) – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading**

It was agreed to begin the discussion early, at 5:00 pm. If guests arrive later, information will be shared with them.

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

Resolution on Revision to HSU Catalog Regarding Institutions Requirement

#14-12/13-APC – 23 Oct. 2012 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the HSU Catalog be revised as follows, to be adopted and implemented in the 2013-2014 HSU Catalog:

From 2012/2013 HSU Catalog, p. 68 (shaded box) [changes marked with strikeout and underline]:

Though the American Institutions requirement is separate from General Education, ~~one~~ lower division Institutions courses can count in Lower Division GE Area D. One upper division course can count in Upper Division GE Area D.

*Rationale: This change will support student success by allowing students greater flexibility in meeting HSU's graduation requirements.*

The Academic Policies Committee is suggesting this change, based on its reading of the current Catalog language.

Discussion:

- It was stated that this was a misreading of the Catalog and that double-counting at the upper division level has not been allowed.

Senator Marschke shared the following statement from Professor Monty Mola (Chemistry):

- “Here are my thoughts on the double counting of Institutions for either 2 LD Area D courses or 1 LD & 1UD Area D course. I don't think anyone on this campus *wants* to see our students taking fewer of the courses which broaden their worldview I do think it is unfortunate that we have designated some special courses as *General Education* or *Institutions* or *Diversity and Common Ground*. It seems to me that if a particular course satisfies the student learning outcomes for a specific area requirement, then the course should count. The way we have divvied up our GE offerings leads to turf battles and a reflexive opposition to change. From my outsider perspective, GE area B, C & D each require 4 courses (3 LD and 1 UD), the Institutions requirement adds another 6 units of area D(ish) courses (really only 3 since 1 course can double count). So areas B & C each require 4 courses and area D(ish) requires 5. I freely admit to my ignorance of all things area D(ish), but I do not understand how the student learning outcomes for Institutions is so very different (or at least so mutually exclusive such that there is no relevant overlap) as to not allow for double counting within area D. It seems silly to me that the SLO's are close enough for one to count but not two. I realize that this was a compromise made some time ago and that there are folks who would be more than happy for there to be no double counting. However, looking around at our nearest neighbor CSU's (Chico and Sonoma), we ask our students to take more GE units (HSU = 52, CSUC = 48 & SSU = 50 , including Institutions). This is fine if the extra GE does not come at the expense of the majors courses, but unfortunately, it looks like it will in the near future for a number of programs on this campus. It has been suggested that the programs with a high unit count simply petition to have various requirements waived. We can certainly go through this process but I personally would much rather have a logical, comprehensive GE program that applies to all rather than piecemealing it such that each program plays by a different set of rules.”
- Arguments on both sides are appealing. The main problem is that GE is a train wreck and needs to be fixed.
- GE is an important part of students' education but HSU has not done a good job of structuring it. It needs to be fixed.
- The GEAR Curriculum and Assessment Committee is working with Ed Nuhfer, Director of Educational Effectiveness, on developing a process to change the culture of GE among students and faculty. The change in culture will be in the direction of making it more important, and not secondary to majors and minor. It was suggested that Dr. Nuhfer be invited to speak to the Senate.
- Double-counting is supported, but not for Institutions, since the learning outcomes are completely different. An upper-division Institutions course does not satisfy upper-division Area D.
- Most transfer students come in with an Institution courses double-counted, so HSU is treating native students differently. Counting and Institutions course for an upper-division

requirement is a small part of this. A look should be taken at whether or not the lower-division Area D requirements can be fit into the Institutions requirement.

- A consequence of AB 1440 (an agreement with 109 community colleges and 23 CSUs) is that almost all of the transfer packages will double count Institutions courses for Area D. But community colleges cannot guarantee that Institutions course requirements will be met. Some departments have been able to finesse this.
- The Environmental Resources Engineering program already double-counts two Institutions courses. It was noted that UC transfers don't even have a requirement of Institutions if they went to high school in California. It doesn't seem fair to native students.
- The pressure from above makes this an interesting time to fundamentally re-think GE. For example, Chico has an interesting GE structure – students choose pathways thematically linked around topics. HSU is stuck in a mode of doing things the way they've always been done. A group should be charged with coming up with some different models for GE and reporting back to the Senate with different options. This would be a way to consider some creative alternatives for GE rather than just applying a bandage.
- The discussion needs to move beyond talking about GE. Almost 2 years-worth of GE (60 units) is currently being required. Currently prescribed GE at HSU limits students' freedom to explore.
- This seems to be a good time to take on GE reform as there aren't other major initiatives underway at the moment.
- It needs to be done and implemented in a manner that meets the goals of the university and in a manner that is best for students.
- The Senate was encouraged to take a look at curricular reform in general, including looking at majors and GE and streamlining in a way to achieve learning outcomes and get students to graduation on time. Work being done by Ed Nuhfer on connecting course outcomes with program outcomes is exciting.
- The resolution proposes a change for the 2013/14 Catalog. Someone has suggested allowing double-counting in areas that are in the student's major – is that being done?
- It is not clear what the resolution is "fixing." What is the problem and what is the consequence of the resolution?
- It was noted that while the wording in the Catalog changed, the policy has not changed. The resolution would change the policy to allow double-counting at the upper-division level.
- It was suggested that the policy be left alone and the ambiguity of the original policy clarified.

- It was suggested the resolution be changed to state “up to two Institutions courses” (since there are three types of Institutions courses) and the references to lower-division and upper-division be eliminated.
- Professor Beth Wilson was given the floor and spoke to several issues. History professors have expressed concern over content – even if the courses could be certified as Area D GE, it couldn’t be done effectively. There is unwillingness for these courses to be certified as GE. There is a rich array of GE courses. This policy gives Area D a very narrow focus and takes away a student’s opportunity to have a broader view of Area D. In addition, Area D courses focus on human society, relationships, etc. Institutions courses don’t capture this in the same way that Women’s Studies, etc. do. This policy would limit choices significantly. There are other ways to deal more effectively with the need to curtail high unit majors, rather than considering a university-wide policy. A more holistic solution is needed for the vast majority of students.
- HSU’s problem is curricular complexity; an overall approach needs to be considered. The debt-load of students needs to be considered. There are fairness issues for students as well.
- Q: What happens if the resolution fails? A: The Catalog language will revert back to the previous version; there will be no change in policy.

Senator Zerbe requested that a straw poll be taken to get a sense of the Senate.

M/S/F (Marschke/Gold) to waive the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading and bring the resolution to a vote.

The motion was opposed. Faculty may want another opportunity to speak to the resolution. Voting occurred and the motion to waive the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading FAILED.

Senator Zerbe asked how many senators would support the resolution when it comes to a vote. There were 3 votes in favor.

M/S (Thobaben/Abell) to table the resolution indefinitely. This purpose would be to allow the resolution to die at the end of the meeting, and not spend in further time on it. It was ruled that this motion is no longer used by the Senate.

M/S/P (Thobaben/Abell) to table [postpone temporarily] the resolution. It was ruled that if discussion of the resolution is not resumed by the meeting, the resolution dies [sic]. Voting on the motion occurred and PASSED with 4 No votes. It was ruled that the resolution would not be returned to the Senate.

M/S/P (Zerbe/Marschke) to instruct the SenEx to strike a task force to look at developing options for GE reform and bring them back to the Senate. Voting occurred and motion PASSED.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.