

Chair Zerbe called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, Bruce, Cervantes, Creadon, Dye, Ercole, Eschker, Fultham, Geck, Karl, Meyer, Mola, Moyer, Orgeta, Pierce, Shaeffer, Shellhase, Snyder, Stubblefield, Thobaben, Tillinghast, Virnoche, Wrenn, Zerbe.

Members absent: Blake, Braithwaite, Gold, Lopez, Richmond.

Guests: Caldwell, Cunha S, Filce, Floss, Harrington, Karp, Paynton, Whitesides, Williamson, Zechman.

1. Announcement of Proxies

Cervantes for Ercole, Fulgham for Thobaben, Moyer for Alderson.

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S/U (Abell/Bruce) to approve and adopt the agenda without changes.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 11, 2014

M/S/P (Fulgham/Justice) to approve the minutes from the meeting of March 11, 2014 as written. Motion passed with one abstention.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Items for full senate need to be submitted to Senate office ASAP; only two more senate meetings this AY. New HSU President Rossbacher will be on campus next week.

5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (see also written reports)

Academic Policies Committee (APC) (Mola): A written report was included in today's agenda packet.

Q: How does the policy on cross-listed classes affect/interact with Title 5?

A: Regarding Title 5's requirement that grad programs have a minimum of 60% stand-alone grad courses; Title 5 says courses primarily for grad students needs to be organized primarily for graduate students. Monty will send out link to language of actual resolution.

Appointment and Elections Committee (AEC) (Ortega): A resolution is up for second reading today. The committee is reviewing various vacant committee seats and looking at possible

candidates for the vacancies.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC) (Bruce): The committee has nothing to report at this time.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) (Virnoche): A written report was included in today's agenda packet. No questions from the Senate Floor.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): A written report was included in today's agenda packet. No questions from the Senate Floor.

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) (Snyder): The URPC held a three hour meeting and approved a recommendation for the president for AY 14/15, the committee is still finalizing the language on the recommendation.

The recommendation includes base funding of: approximately \$600,000 to fund benefits shortfall in Academic Affairs; fund one position in Student Affairs; partial funding to Institute for Student Success base.

The recommendation includes on one time funding of: RAMP funding of student mentors; facilities remodel for summer around \$500,000.

Outside of the fiscal year 2014/15 budget there was a recommendation for this fiscal year (2013/14) to cover the shortfall in Academic Affairs salary and benefit for costs due to increased instruction of about \$900,000.

Statewide Senate (Creadon): Resolutions that were passed have been shared already. Note that the resolution regarding facilitation of communication between ASCSU and campus facility had a lot of the reasoning that was not related to HSU. Creadon thought the main point was that first readings should be disseminated to faculty for feedback to their respective representative for committee consideration.

Q: Title 5 recommendation – the senate supported this on a first reading – clarify that this was to have 60% of courses as grad courses?

A: Yes, 60% as grad courses and also 70% of courses have to be taken from the university that is offering the degree.

Q: How does the 60% rule apply to cross listed courses?

A: She did not get the sense that the 60% meant stand-alone courses.

Q: Do we want to create a resolution to the ASCSU regarding this?

A: If so, having a resolution at the next Senate meeting would be soon enough.

Associated Students (Cervantes): Voting on constitutional changes occurred and was approved. Comments from students included a request for more participation on the Senate.

Labor Council Delegate (Tillinghast): Full contract bargaining is ongoing, it feels like they are waiting for May revise before moving more.

California Faculty Association (CFA) (Shaeffer): CFA had a meet and confer regarding policy and procedure for allegations regarding student misconduct.

Provost Report (Snyder): The Library Dean search is in process; planning on going ahead with the Director of Institutional Research search as Honda has accepted a job in Hawaii. The Office of Academic Affairs' primary focus is budget and how many new faculty hires they can do; at this point it is between 10-15.

6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – April 1, 2014

Approved without objection

7. TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM – Open Forum for the Campus Community

There were two speakers for the Open Forum.

Fulgham spoke on Auxiliary Reorganization and made the following points:

1. I made strong comments at the Senate meeting on Feb. 25, 2014, some of which are in the minutes, especially pages eight and nine.
2. I have read the original charges and President Richmond's email deferring a decision to the fall under President Rossbacher.
3. I request that the Senate Executive Committee develop a resolution asking that the exploratory process be stopped immediately.
4. President Richmond's email on the postponement has a tacit implication that the process is fait accompli, with only the approval by President Rossbacher.
5. The original separation of the University Advancement and Sponsored Programs into individual units was done long ago as each one's mission is very different. Therefore the governing bodies of each have more-or-less different memberships to meet that bodies operational objectives.
6. The University Center was created in 1970 (or about then) and really is a student-centered operation, totally different than the two foundations.
7. My chief concerns are these:
 - a. Consolidation of the reserves of \$9 million and \$4 million to be available for more general use
 - b. Loss of identity to the missions of each foundation
 - i. Philanthropy
 - ii. Grants & contracts
 - c. I see no other reasons and the veil of operational efficiencies can be achieved without consolidation
 - d. The Working Group reports to a Foundation Task Force and the Vice Presidents on each Working Group are also on the Task Force.

Cervantes spoke on Auxiliary Consolidation; he asks the senate to develop a resolution to ask

that the exploratory process be stopped. Students have not been part of the exploratory process. Students paid for the University Center with a fee that they approved; the board is supposed to be 51% or more student led.

**8. Nominations for 2013/2014 Distinguished Faculty Awards (Faculty Awards Committee)
[Executive Session]**

M/S/P (Bruce/Moyer) 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 2013/2014 Distinguished Faculty Awards.

M/S/P (Mola/Creadon) to return the University Senate to formal session.

M/S/U (Stubblefield/Moyer) that the University Senate accepts all of the recommendations from the Faculty Awards Committee, with thanks to the Committee for its work.
Motion carries; 2 abstentions.

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

9. TIME CERTAIN: 3:45-4:00 PM - Discussion of Draft Baccalaureate Student Learning Outcomes (Elisabeth Harrington, Chair, GEAR Curriculum and Assessment Committee)

Discussion included:

Q: A request for clarification of process – last time discussion was for GE reform generally. How does this fit?

A: This is the first step; outcomes are intended to be broad. It doesn't presume anything specific about GE reform and how that will occur. Next step will be GE reforms.

Q: Ultimately we will be asked to assess these – correct?

A: Yes show how students are engaging in learning outcomes. Show how students engaged at the beginning and end – it will be different based on the program. Not all programs will engage in all outcomes equally.

Q: with new president coming on board, what is the sense of the committee regarding proceeding or putting it on hold until the new President starts.

A: We as a faculty can agree on a set of university wide baccalaureate outcomes before the end of the semester.

Q: There is a resemblance in preamble to HSU mission & vision, item 4 – understanding the effect of power and privilege – explain more about why that was included?

A: Committee felt it was important – multiple sessions at ASCSU and what we want students to be aware of.

Q: Item 5 second page, what sustainability issues really means? Understanding sustainable

understanding of goods and services withsuggested language.

A: Could you suggest wording that would be much more general? Suggestions wording would be great.

A: Resource conservation and sustainable productivity.....

Q: Item #5 language needs to be redone – does not agree with the suggestions made just now. Recommends sustainability and not “sustainable issues,” or “emphasizing the interconnectedness between the areas of economic, example, example.”

A: Perhaps introduction to ...sustainable...

Q: What are our existing outcomes called?

A: HSU SLO outcomes.

Response to answer: Please have a table comparing the old/new and explanation.

Q: For both 4 & 5, second suggestion (above) is a very good one. On Human Diversity.....are each of those different things? What is the relationship? Identify as four major components of ...

Q: Wording comment - #2 sciences and technology are lumped together – he doesn't understand why.

Q: Some of these are not worded the way the program outcomes are supposed to be worded. Ex: #5, how is that assessable? It will be difficult. Recommends calling them goals and not mapping these to learning outcomes rather mapping program outcomes to goals to fulfill the mapping requirements. These should be called something besides learning outcomes (except for the first one).

Q: Relative to crib sheet of old outcomes and new outcomes. Pg 3 – where does GE fit in with the baccalaureate outcomes, GE outcomes, program outcomes, department outcomes, etc.....

A: some overlapping – program outcomes should overlap with baccalaureate outcomes. Not everyone will map exactly the same way.

Comment: Really consider some of the impact on the effect this will have on faculty across the university. Faculty have put a tremendous amount of time mapping SLO, program outcomes, based on the current model we are using. The outcome of this will be a lot of grief because they just dialed in the SLOs, department outcomes, programs. Please consider how best to work with faculty as to minimize the faculty hours required.

Q: On #2, you cannot list ‘the sciences’ and ‘the social sciences’ use natural and physical sciences instead.

Response: The committee takes faculty time into consideration. The hope is to make mapping clearer. We're missing the larger framework so that there is a place for all the collective outcomes.

10. Resolution on Amendments to Appendix J Regarding Election of University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) Members (#34-13/14-AEC) – Second Reading ; Attachment

Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) Composition #34-13/14-AEC – April 1, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (Senate) recommends that Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2(b) be eliminated from the HSU Faculty Handbook:

b) The University Senate Appointments and Elections Committee shall nominate a minimum of two candidates for each vacancy. The General Faculty President will notify the faculty of the nominees and request further nominations. No candidate shall be nominated for more than one vacancy.

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Senate recommends that Appendix J, Section VIII.D.2(c) of the HSU Faculty Handbook be amended to read:

c) The University Senate Appointments and Elections Committee shall hold elections in the spring before teaching schedules for the following fall term are determined. Electors may vote for one candidate for each vacancy according to the rules governing the General Faculty Elections. All electors may vote for any vacancy. 15.40

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Senate recommends that these proposed changes be put to a vote of the General Faculty in Spring 2014; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, subject to approval by a vote of the General Faculty, these changes become effective for the 2014-15 academic year.

RATIONALE: The current requirement for the election of UFPC positions is that there must be a minimum of two candidates for each vacancy. Because some UFPC vacancies have been unable to get more than one nominee, the existing Appendix J rules have delayed or prohibited the election of some positions on the UFPC. This amendment will help to ensure that there will be at least one faculty member from each college on the UFPC by permitting a yes/no vote for any UFPC election in which there is a single candidate. Candidates must receive a simple majority of votes cast to be elected. Members of the UFPC will continue to be elected by the probationary and tenured members of the General Faculty

Mola – the only real difference between first and second reading is that comments regarding a small change to rational from the University Senate was made.

Comment in favor: Good idea, please consider making UFPC an appellate body in the future.

Voting passed on resolution #34-13/14-AEC occurred and Passed unanimously.

M/S/U (Fulgum/Abell) to make emergency item; passed unanimously.

11. Resolution to Amend the University Senate Bylaws and Eliminate the Campus Climate

Committee (CCC) as a University Senate Standing Committee (#36-13/14-EX) – Second Reading

Resolution to Amend the University Bylaws and Eliminate the Campus Climate Committee (CCC) as a University Senate Standing Committee
36-13/14-EX – April 1, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University approves the elimination of the Campus Climate Committee (CCC) as a Standing Committee of the University Senate and amending the Senate Bylaws by having the following section, and all other references to the Committee, removed:

Strike from University Senate Bylaws:

~~11.8 Campus Climate Committee (CCC)~~

~~11.81 Chair:~~ The Chair of the Committee shall be a senator, elected during the regular annual election within the Senate.

~~11.82 Membership:~~ The membership of the Campus Climate Committee shall be as follows:

- ~~• Two (2) Senators (at least one of whom is a faculty senator) appointed by the Appointments and Elections Committee~~
- ~~• One (1) At Large Faculty member, appointed by the Appointments and Elections Committee~~
- ~~• One (1) At Large Staff member, elected by Staff Council~~
- ~~• One (1) Student, appointed by Associated Students~~
- ~~• One (1) Representative of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion~~
- ~~• One (1) Representative of the Office of Human Resources.~~

~~11.83 Terms:~~ Elected and appointed members of the Committee shall serve two years.

~~11.84 Duties:~~

- ~~i. Support and promote a collegial, respectful, and responsive campus community;~~
- ~~ii. Review and recommend policy to the Senate that encourages and promotes opportunities for faculty, staff, students, and administrators to interact and exchange ideas, within the context of a shared campus community; and~~
- ~~iii. Identify issues and recommend policy or other actions regarding diversity, equity, and access in order to promote a more inclusive campus community.~~

Rationale: The CCC was suspended for AY2013/2014 by the University Senate (Resolution 31-12/13-Gold) because the CCC's charge duplicated duties performed by other groups in supporting diversity, collegiality, and inclusivity.

Comment (Tillinghast): Staff Council was consulted; they were reluctant to support this. They feel a campus survey should be done (note it will be coming out next week)

Comments in favor: No one spoke in favor

Comments against: There is no compelling reason to eliminate it; would rather keep it on the books a little longer as we do with courses which are not offered.

Voting on resolution #36-13/14-Ex occurred and Passed. Twelve votes in favor, eight votes against, one abstention.

12. Resolution on Revision to the "Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential

Programs at HSU” (#10-13/14-ICC) – Second Reading

Resolution on Revision of the “Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU”
10-13/14-ICC – April 1, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost the attached revised version of the “Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU” (March 2014) be approved, and be it further

RESOLVED: That use of the revised Guidelines shall begin in Spring 2014.

RATIONALE: The changes to the document appear with underline and include the addition of the following:

“All new degree programs will be housed in a department and given curricular oversight by qualified HSU faculty. Self-support programs may be housed administratively in the College of eLearning and Extended Education, but ideally their curricular oversight will be based in a state-side department with stateside tenured/tenure-track faculty.”

As budget realities are encouraging the University to create new self-support programs, the ICC has realized that we need to clarify that responsibility for the day-to-day oversight of curriculum remains centered in the faculty at HSU. Furthermore, it is our understanding that WASC (which must approve all online programs) and the CSU Chancellor’s office (which approves all new programs) look for evidence of oversight by permanent faculty when evaluating programs.

Discussion: First reading was a number of weeks ago. This is a revised version based on past suggestions.

Voting occurred; passed with one abstention

13. Resolution on HSU Policy for Cross-Listing of Courses (#37-13/14-APC) – First Reading

M/S (Mola/Abell) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on HSU Policy for Cross-Listing of Courses
37-13/14-APC – March 25, 2014 – First Reading

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (the Senate) recommends to the President that the attached “HSU Policy for Cross-listing of Courses” (draft, March, 2014) be approved and become effective immediately.

Rationale: A cross-listed course is a single course that is offered in two or more academic subject areas with the same title, credits, mode of instruction, description, and prerequisites (e.g. WS 317 & ANTH 317). The attached policy details the conditions under which new cross-listed courses will be approved.

Mola introduced. No cross-listed policy existed at HSU; a policy needed and is the resolution on the floor currently.

Q: Regarding the second bullet, clarification needed – FTE roll up –

A: Guest Filce was asked to explain further how this will work. Filce has been consulted and

has been exploring rolling FTE to instructor's home department for cross-listed courses. FAD simply looks at the appointment data of the faculty and allocates FTE to department. SFR is contributed to the course subject area.

Q: If we have a proliferation of cross-listed courses, will Institutional Research's resources be able to accommodate the additional workload?

Q: What about Kinesiology faculty teaching in ESM?

A: That's an artifact of CO report in FAD.

Q: Consider that tenured faculty who teach a stand-alone course in another subject will have the FTE earned by the subject count to the home of the department the faculty is associated with.

A: Filce believes IR resources will be sufficient to make this change.

Comment (Snyder): There are some dangers in having "in-house" (FAD) and "out-house" (another tracking system) numbers. There are cross-listed and there are interdisciplinary programs and he feels those are two distinct and different areas. Two issues: one was accounting (being discussed) and the other was the transcript issue, which we haven't discussed much. He feels a true approach to interdisciplinary is to show on a transcript that courses have been taken in multiple departments. Please speak to the transcript issues & bullets #1 and #2.

Response (Mola): explained the differences between the two bullets. #2 is a change to an existing course and all courses wishing to be XL each need to signing up with the same signing documents.

Comment: We need to keep in mind that interdisciplinary courses are interdisciplinary programs are different. Environmental Studies courses and GSP courses are interdisciplinary. One strategy we have used is to come up with an interdisciplinary title for it.

Comment: Who would be reading the transcript and be confused by this? Mola indicated that there are courses in other universities that have cross-listed courses – who would be especially stumped?

Filce: Two things Mola consulted with John on – This mechanism will make explicit the enforcement that will work with Institutional Research's requirements (example: cross listed courses are required to have the same mode).

Q: Shall we replace with FTEs with FTESs – should they be replaced with FTES and FTEF?

Comment: Second sentence on first paragraph of the policy should be rephrased.

Concern: Educational opportunity is stymied by the accounting process – should not be a concern.

14. Resolution on Elimination of CWT Course Designation (#38-13/14-APC) – First Reading

Item #14 was not discussed.

M/S/U (Fulgham/Tillinghast) to move item #15 ahead of item #14 due to time restrictions and guests in attendance ready to speak to item #15.

15. Resolution Establishing the Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (#39-13/14-EX) – First Reading

M/S (Fulgham/Tillinghast) moved the motion.

Williamson discussed the motion. An audit by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) identified HSU as one of several campuses that has no policy for responding to allegations of research misconduct. Several other CSU policies were reviewed and various pieces were integrated into the policy we see before us today. Mullery was and has been in contact with CFA regarding any comments and concerns related to implementation of this policy.

Motion to waive the first reading was made (Fulgum), there was no second to the motion. Discussion continued.

Q: Page 8 – questions regarding not talking to the respondent yet you need to get their documents from them – yet if you do not talk with the respondent, does this make sense?

A: While you are not required to talk to respondent, you are not prohibited from doing so. What's really important is to protect the rights of all involved and the information while determining whether or not to create an inquiry.

Comment: In a number of situations, deciding whether or not to conduct an inquiry, and the inquiry itself, are very different. The inquiry has very specific rules.

Q: Can you highlight the flashpoints amid all the boilerplate contracts that you can speak to?

A: San Francisco, Dominguez Hills, and San Jose State policies were reviewed. Each component in the HSU policy matched to the checklist of components that should be in the regulations. The goal is to have the policy written broadly to encompass every kind of misconduct regulation. This goes right from PHS checklist, and everyone wanted to make sure that this policy covered that.

M/S/P (Fulgham/Geck) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 4:51 pm.