

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, February 26, 2013, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, Aronoff, August, Bruce, Dye, Eschenbach, Eschker, Fulgham, Gold, Lapid, Lopes, McElwain, Marschke, Moyer, Ortega, Saner, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, Van Duzer, Virnoche, Yarnall, Young, Zerbe.

Members absent: Blake, Ercole, Richmond.

Proxies: Lutwen for Henderson, Eschenbach for Johnson, Bruce for Pierce, Young for Shellhase.

Guests: Cheyne, Burges, Mullery, Lee, Ayoob, Hwu, Grenot, Cummings, Tucker.

1. Announcement of Proxies

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S (Zerbe/Ortega) to approve the agenda. Senator Thobaben requested that agenda item #14 (Resolution #28) be moved to an earlier place in the agenda. Voting occurred and the agenda was approved with item #14 becoming item #10.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of [February 12, 2013](#)

M/S (Bruce/Moyer) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 12, 2013 as written. Motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

A proposal from the First Year Experience Task Force will be forwarded soon for review to various committees across campus.

The Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) steering committee met recently and discussed ways to revive interest and participation in accessibility initiatives on campus. They will be asking for cooperation in helping promote activities.

Senator Fulgham announced that Emeritus Professor Dale Thornburgh passed away over the weekend.

The HSU chapter of CFA and the General Faculty will co-host an end-of-the-year faculty social on May 13.

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 recent General Faculty election has successfully concluded. The Committee will be meeting soon to discuss election issues, etc.

University Resources and Planning Committee (Eschker/Snyder) – The Committee met and reviewed budget data and is considering a proposal to not recommend any base augmentations for next year. It will consider one-time requests. Some one-time requests have been submitted. The Committee will meet again when all one-time requests have been submitted.

Academic Senate CSU (Thobaben) – The 50th anniversary of the ASCSU is coming up.

Associated Students (Lutwen) – AS continues to work on its various projects that are in progress.

HSU Labor Council (Saner) – The Labor Council has scheduled its regular once a semester meeting with President Richmond to discuss campus issues, etc.

California Faculty Association (Shaeffer) – The Chapter election will be held soon.

Administrative Affairs (Lopes) – One-time budget requests are being prepared. The facilities working group is looking at summer projects for 2013, to be forwarded to the URPC for review. The division is working on customer service training for employees.

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

The following items from the Consent Calendar were approved without objection:

- 12-196: MATH 308B: Mathematics for Elementary Education
- 12-197: MATH 308C: Mathematics for Elementary Education
- 12-212: EMP 430: Natural Resource Management in Protected Areas
- 12-213: ENVS 450: Applied Ecological Restoration
- 12-215: ENVS 350: Principles of Ecological Restoration
- 12-220: JMC 150: Desktop Publishing.

A question was raised about calling a course a General Education (GE) course when it is restricted to a certain major. It was noted that there are currently no policies on this. It was suggested that the Senate have a general discussion about whether or not it is okay to have GE courses that are for specific majors.

7. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15 – Conversation with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost invited questions on the three handouts in the packet. The charge to the Advising Working Group is broad and would include work on plans to implement the early alert system, in particular, the policy issues involved.

Q: What is the role of the faculty in the implementation of the Early Alert System? A: The Senate may want to consider having a presentation done at a Senate meeting or for department chairs on the system. Roles and responsibilities will need to be figured out and designated by the working group.

Referring to the organizational chart handout, the Provost explained that the AVP for Retention and Student Success will oversee entities from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in order to provide university-wide retention planning and oversight.

Q: Is there any relationship between the local Advising Working Group and advising efforts at the system-wide level? Q: There has been discussion of analytics for tracking students at the system-wide level; the Provost is skeptical about how well it can be organized at that level.

Q: How is the proposed cultural academic resource center different from EOP or Native American support programs? A: EOP is not culturally based and Native American support programs are only for Native American students. The cultural academic resource center is a broader model, encompassing overarching support for underrepresented students.

Q: Is the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) included in this reorganization? Is faculty development included? A: ODI has a broader mission and it is not included under the AVP for Retention and Student Success. The Provost indicated that he is inclined to leave faculty development in academic programs, since it is primarily focused on the departments.

There seems to be a gulf between student support units and instructors, e.g. an “us and them” mentality exists. It would be good to get faculty on the same team as others in these support services.

Q: Is this a new position (AVP for Retention and Student Success) requiring new resources? A: It depends on how you look at it; existing positions are changing as part of the reorganization (some are being downgraded, some are being upgraded). It is not clear yet whether or not the AVP position will require new resources; current resources are being re-distributed.

8. Discussion Item: Provide Feedback to the Provost on whether or not to keep the 17-unit cap in place

The Provost asked the Senate for feedback on whether or not to keep the 17-unit cap in place. Currently, students are restricted to 17 units during registration. When everyone is registered, the 17-unit cap is released and the additional units lead to graduation. This year, the system is not mandating the 17-unit cap, so it will be a local decision. The Provost is inclined to keep it in place, partly from a resource standpoint.

The other part of the question is how to get the campus focused on increasing graduation rates and getting everyone to take seriously the need to get students through their academic careers in a timely way. The campus is under tremendous pressure to increase graduation rates. Future funding will be tied to the success of these efforts. There needs to be a change in the culture on campus.

Discussion:

It was suggested that the exception rule (to lifting the 17-unit cap) be broadened to consider units that are part of an IRA or enrichment program.

Support for eliminating the 17-unit cap was expressed, because it may turn away some outstanding students that HSU wants to attract. If the cap stays in place, there should be an automatic exemption for students with a declared major, on track to graduate in 4 years, and with a GPA of 3.0 or higher. These students could register last.

People respond to incentives – what can we do to make it more costly? Make it explicit that it will be more expensive for students going over 150 units. This would force the student to make the decision while giving them a choice.

Has the 17-unit cap been effective so far? Has it changed students' time to graduation? There needs to be some kind of assessment.

Q: Has the 17-unit cap been effective in regard to the load-balancing issue, i.e., have there been changes in behavior? A: Yes – students are no longer over-enrolling and then dropping courses.

There should be exceptions for students who are excelling; it could be offered as a reward.

It was suggested that HSU consider offering special recognition for those students who graduate in four years.

The Provost thanked senators for the feedback and ideas, particularly the ideas of providing incentives and special recognition. The effort does need to be assessed to determine if it is effective.

It was noted that those classes requiring a critical mass of students to go forward (but would not be cancelled for lack of enrollment), e.g. The Lumberjack, music ensembles, etc. need to be considered.

9. TIME CERTAIN: 4:45 PM – Nominations for 2012/2013 Distinguished Faculty Awards (Faculty Awards Committee) [Executive Session]

M/S/P (Fulgham/Virnoche) that the University Senate enter into Executive Session, with the faculty co-chair of the Faculty Awards Committee invited to remain, for the reading of the nomination letters for the 2012/2013 Distinguished Faculty Awards.

M/S/P (Young/Marschke) to return the University Senate to formal session.

M/S/U (Fulgham/Zerbe) that the University Senate accepts all of the recommendations from the Faculty Awards Committee, with thanks to the Committee for its work.

M/S/U (Yarnall/Fulgham) to make the recommendations an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

10. Resolution Requesting Partial Extension of the Deadline for Curricular Revision of Programs Requiring 121-129 Units (#28-12/13-EX) – First Reading

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

Resolution Requesting an Extension of the Deadline for Curricular Revision to Programs Requiring 121-129 Units
#28-12/13-EX – February 26, 2013 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) recommends that Chancellor White grant the Humboldt State University campus an extension for compliance with Coded Memorandum AA-2013-2 for all programs with regard to the deadlines associated with those having 121-129 units; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU recommends that Chancellor White establish the deadline of January 30, 2014 for compliance with Coded Memorandum AA-2013-2 which is consistent for all programs with greater than 130 units; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU directs the University Senate Chair to send a copy of this resolution to Chancellor White, to Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne, to HSU President Rollin Richmond, to HSU Provost Robert Snyder, to Diana Guerin, Chair ASCSU, and to the Chairs of all campus Senates.

RATIONALE: The Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento, has produced a leading and exemplary document dated February 12, 2013, requesting this form an action by Chancellor White. Humboldt State has 15 Campus Specific Majors/Concentrations having greater than 120 units. Any meaningful and thoughtful curricular revisions will require faculty deliberations longer than the short timeline currently mandated of April 2013 would allow.

Discussion:

The following correction was made to the Rationale:

... requesting this form ~~an~~of action by Chancellor White ...

The rationale for requesting an extension of the deadline from Sacramento State was that they were in the process of revising their General Education and that process would be impacted. That is not the case at HSU and the rationale does not present a good argument.

Chair Van Duzer clarified that the 2nd reading is being waived as the resolution should not have been a first reading.

It makes sense to request the extension of the deadline. The changes will have to go through the ICC for approval and then back to the Senate; HSU would not be able to meet the April 2013 deadline.

Voting occurred and Resolution #28 PASSED with 1 Abstention.

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

11. Resolution on Change to Policy on Second Bachelor's Degree ([#22-12/13-APC](#)) – First Reading ; [Attachment](#)

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

Resolution on Policy on Second Bachelor's Degree
#22-12/13-APC – 26 February 2013 - First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that students be dissuaded from concurrently pursuing two bachelor's degrees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the HSU catalog be changed (as marked on the attachment to this resolution) regarding the second bachelor's degree, as noted in the attachment.

RATIONALE: *This would contribute to student success. Currently, students who are ineligible to declare a double major can pursue a "second bachelor's degree" instead. This change would close that loophole.*

*These changes would **not** affect the availability of post- baccalaureate STEM coursework for prospective graduate students.*

The resolution is self-explanatory. There were no questions or discussion.

12. Resolution on Addendum to Existing Policy on Academic Probation ([#21-12/13-APC](#)) – Second Reading ; [Attachment](#)

There were no changes to the resolution from the first reading. There was no discussion. Voting occurred and Resolution #21 PASSED unanimously. The resolution reads:

Resolution on Addendum to Existing Policy on Academic Probation
#21-12/13-APC – 26 February 2013 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that students be allowed to remain on academic probation for no more than two sequential semesters. After two semesters on academic probation, students must either return to good academic standing or be disqualified. Exceptions can be made for students whose term GPA is 2.0 or above, even though their cumulative GPA does not reach 2.0.

RATIONALE: *Students must have a 2.0 GPA to graduate. Allowing students to remain on academic probation indefinitely makes it less and less likely that they will be able to graduate.*

This policy would allow students two chances to redeem themselves after being placed on academic probation.

This policy is an addendum to existing policies on academic standing, probation, and disqualification (see page 37 of the 2012-2013 catalog, and VPAA 11-04, attached).

13. Resolution on Amending the *University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* ([#26-12/13-CBC](#)) – First Reading ; [Attachment](#)

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

Resolution on Amending the *University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure*
#26-12/13-CBC – February 26, 2013 — First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Constitution and Bylaws Committee recommends to the University Senate of Humboldt State University that the *University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* be amended to include the changes indicated in the attached revision of that document.

Rationale: *The Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* of the University Senate as originally adopted sufficiently laid the groundwork for the processes of the Senate. They are, however, organizationally taxing, somewhat repetitive, in some places unclear, and in some places in conflict with other foundation documents. The revision attached seeks to clarify the *Bylaws*, to better reflect current practice, and to make the *Bylaws* consistent with the *University Senate Constitution*.

Senator Young introduced the resolution on the proposed revision of the Senate Bylaws. The proposed revision of the Bylaws was sent to Senate members a few weeks ago to review and provide comment. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC) reviewed and responded to feedback and comment received, some of which is incorporated into the proposed revision presented today.

The CBC carefully reviewed the Bylaws (a time-consuming enterprise) and is presenting a revision of the Bylaws as a whole. The intent was not to fix everything or to make any substantive changes. It is a first “cleaning” as an attempt to “clear the clutter” in order to have a more user-friendly document for the future. A glossary has been included as an Addendum; it is not a part of the Bylaws.

Discussion:

It was noted that section 11.6 is named “Cocktails and BonBons Committee” and includes mention of green M&Ms.

It was suggested that a Table of Contents be created and included in the document.

Concern was expressed about the lack of connectivity to the issue raised in Resolution #24 (concerning election of the Senate chair). It was clarified that Resolution #24 concerns the General Faculty Constitution and will be decided by the General Faculty. If there are changes made to the General Faculty Constitution, any subsequent changes that are needed will be made in the Senate Constitution and the Senate Bylaws (according to Resolution #24).

The CBC intentionally separated out non-controversial changes in order to not tie up a “housecleaning project” with anticipated heavily debated changes.

If the “Cocktails and BonBons Committee” remains, the current Senate may go down in history as the Senate with the most humor. However, it was agreed, that all hilarity should be removed from the Bylaws.

14. Resolution on the Use of Electronic Anonymous Student Evaluations of Teaching ([#27-12/13-FAC](#)) – First Reading

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

Resolution on the Use of Electronic Anonymous Student Evaluations of Teaching
#27-12/13-FAC – February 26, 2013 – 1st Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that electronic anonymous student evaluations of teaching (course evaluations) be implemented beginning in the Spring 2013 semester, and be it further

RESOLVED: That electronic evaluations be structured in such a way as to ensure the highest response rate possible, and be it further

RESOLVED: That all levels of personnel review be briefed on the effects of implementing electronic course evaluations, which usually include both lower response rates and lower overall evaluations, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the existing evaluative instrument be reviewed, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate recommends to the President that the effects of this change be tracked and reported back to the Senate in Fall 2013.

RATIONALE: The new Collective Bargaining Agreement mandates the evaluation of all courses for teaching effectiveness every semester. This change to the CBA results in an increase in both staff workload and use of resources. Electronic submission of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETs) has been used for many years at other campuses successfully. To alleviate the concerns over reduced numerical scores and fewer student comments on electronic SETs compared to in-class pencil and paper SETs, all instructors will be required to use electronic SETs and administrative and faculty committee personnel reviewers shall be briefed on the impact of the use of electronic SETs so as to minimize comparisons between paper and electronic course evaluations. Thus, norms of teaching effectiveness in each department across campus will need to be reestablished using the new SET.

Senator Zerbe introduced the resolution. This is an issue that has received considerable attention and much debate. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) now requires that all courses must be evaluated every year. The Faculty Affairs Committee has tried to address the practical considerations of the enormous amount of workload that is being created by this change. The resolution provides a framework. It intentionally leaves open the possibilities for different methodologies for increasing response rates, and other implementation issues. The resolution calls for all personnel committees to be briefed on the transition process and the effects of the change as data has shown that rates and evaluations tend to go down. Of the CSU campuses queried: eight are currently using electronic SETs, six are in the process of moving to online, and five are still using paper.

Discussion:

The system in use (ClassClimate) is set up to do online evaluations. Currently, the online evaluations are being printed out, given to students, and then scanned back into the system.

Electronic evaluations would be supported if it could be stipulated that they would not be anonymous, except to the faculty member being evaluated. AVP Mullery responded that the CBA requires anonymous student evaluations.

Q: What is the intent of the fourth resolved clause? A: The intent was to clarify that while this is an opportunity to re-visit the instrument, there is no expectation that the instrument will be reviewed this semester (as a pre-condition to online evaluations).

The instrument does need to be reviewed at some point – it focuses more on what the instructor is doing rather than what the student is learning.

The resolution doesn't address whether or not a faculty member may elect to continue the current paper process. Is that an option?

The Committee discussed this and the issues involved. For example, some universities allow faculty to opt out of online evaluations – so then do you then have to know who is doing online versus offline for the RTP process, since scores are not necessarily comparable? The Committee felt the resolution should establish whether or not online evaluations will be done; and the implementation should be left to those charged to do so. However, the Committee welcomes the sense of the Senate on this issue.

One of the Committee's reasons for not including an 'opt out' clause is that one of the desires overall is to create a culture on campus where students expect to complete an electronic evaluation. Research shows that 'how' the instructor presents the evaluation and administers it can influence the outcome and response rate.

If professors are instructing students on evaluations, then it won't be uniform. Response rates for classes in computer labs will be higher.

There are lots of possibilities for implementation. A vast majority of students already have phones, computers, or table devices in class already and could log on to complete an online evaluation. If there are cost savings (decreased paper usage), perhaps this savings could go towards purchasing tablets, etc. These are issues to consider as part of the implementation process.

Concern was expressed that the problem of low response rates hasn't been solved.

It was noted that some departments are already evaluating all of their courses. The RTP process needs to be protected. The students should be looking at the instructor when doing the evaluation.

The meeting ended at 5:50 pm.