

**BUILDING THE CAPACITY FOR CHANGE:
IMPROVING THE STRUCTURE AND CULTURE
OF DECISION-MAKING AT HSU**

2 February 2010

**Report and Recommendations
of the Cabinet for Institutional Change**

Members: Adrienne Colegrove-Raymond, Randi Darnall Burke, Dan Davis, Mary Glenn, Matt Johnson, David Kornreich, John Meyer, Justus Ortega, Phillip Rouse, Steven Smith, Robert Snyder, Beth Weissbart, John Woolley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction1
Origin and Charge
Who We Are
Initial Steps
Developing Strategies and Recommendations
Changing Context for Action

The Big Picture.....3

Focus Area Recommendations.....4
Vision
Campus Governance
Student Success
Collegial, Respectful, and Responsive Community
Cultivate Evidence-Based Decision-Making

Conclusion.....18

Appendix A: Implementation Plans.....19

Appendix B: Interdisciplinary Programs.....31

INTRODUCTION

Origin and Charge:

The Cabinet for Institutional Change was formed to initiate comprehensive reforms at Humboldt State University to make us more effective and responsive. The need for comprehensive reform was clear in our current reaccreditation review and the report of an outside consultant (Keeling and Associates). In Fall 2008, an ad hoc campus leadership group representing the University Executive Committee, the Academic Senate, Staff Council and Associated Students was convened to review the consultant's report and this group directed the formation of the Cabinet.

Both reports describe a fragmented, decentralized and partisan decision-making environment that has made it difficult for our University to work toward common goals. The campus leadership group charged the Cabinet with identifying key areas for change and developing recommendations that will allow Humboldt to plan effectively and to tie resources to those plans.

Who We Are:

The Cabinet is composed of thirteen individuals: five faculty members, two students, two staff members, two administrators, one community member, and the Provost. The majority of us were once students at HSU (in addition to the present student members), and those deep ties inform our recommendations. Few of us had worked together before and we brought divergent perspectives to our deliberations. Yet we also share a commitment to working to enable our University to be far more successful at fulfilling its potential and being a place where we truly desire to learn and work every day. All recommendations in this report reflect a consensus among us.

Initial Steps:

The Cabinet initially defined five key areas of change on which to focus: University Vision, Campus Governance, Student Success, Culture of Evidence and creating a Collegial, Respectful and Responsive Community. We established weekly, and later biweekly, meetings to work toward our goals. In addition to our meetings, Cabinet members have held dozens of individual and small group meetings with members of the campus community, as well as open forums focused on collegiality, vision, and governance. We have communicated with many more people through the 'blog' and 'uservoice' features of our website (change.humboldt.edu). While we have met with established campus leaders from all constituencies, we have actively sought out the voices of other faculty, staff, and students from across campus in our deliberations. Through all these channels, we have been privileged to hear the concerns, suggestions, fears, and aspirations of literally hundreds of our colleagues across the University. While our recommendations cannot reflect all the input and advice we received, we have done our utmost to address pressing and recurring themes from our conversations and deliberations.

Developing Strategies and Recommendations:

Although the Cabinet broke into small groups to study and develop recommendations in the five key change areas, it became increasingly clear to us that these areas were not only interconnected but interdependent.

For example, student success is our goal as a university community, yet our efforts often have been uncoordinated and too rarely has progress been tracked or evaluated. Student success must be achieved within the framework of the institution's *vision*. The two cannot be separated. Without an inclusive campus *governance* structure that allows constituencies to work together effectively, we will not realize our vision nor be able to work toward agreed-upon goals for student success. In order to work together effectively, we must establish a more *collegial* working environment. Finally, we must be able to evaluate the success of our programs with thoughtfully collected *evidence*, without which we cannot plan effectively.

Similarly, HSU's most recent strategic plan includes a formal statement of the University's vision. Yet we have come to recognize that "vision" is often discussed on campus in ways that are removed from this statement. In the report by Keeling and Associates, for instance, they assert that they "could not detect a consistent *shared vision*, and there was little evidence of universality (the sense of common, shared purposes and goals – the idea that 'we're all in this together')." We conclude that while a well-crafted and well-integrated university vision statement is necessary to cultivate this sense of "shared vision," it will never be sufficient. Such a shared understanding also depends on a clear structure and effective practice of shared *governance* and upon cultivating greater *collegiality*, mutual understanding, and respect within and among the faculty, staff, students, and administration. Finally, it is our conviction that this shared vision must be rooted in a commitment to our *students' success*.

Changing Context for Action:

Two notable developments took place during the time of the Cabinet's work. First, in May 2009 the General Faculty Association passed a resolution of "no confidence" in President Richmond. Second, in the summer of 2009 the difficult budget environment for HSU and higher education in California became catastrophic.

While some might suggest that one or both of these developments obviate the charge of this Cabinet, we believe that both make our recommendations all the more critical. The no confidence vote is symptomatic of the mistrust and failed communication that the present decision-making environment has engendered. The massive budget cuts demand that the university community develop the capacity to make difficult and even painful decisions in a collegial and evidence-based manner that is consistent with the University's vision.

THE BIG PICTURE

A key source of tension and confusion on this campus is the lack of clarity about the appropriate roles for university administrators and faculty, staff, and student leaders in a shared governance process. There are numerous dimensions to this problem that impact many aspects of campus decision-making and culture. We learned from campus leaders at both San Diego State University and CSU-Long Beach that where campus decision-making is effective, there is a widely shared understanding of the distinction between policy recommendations and their implementation: Matters of university policy must be subject to broad campus consultation through university shared governance structures – operating under the auspices of a Senate. There must be a clear process for such policy recommendations to be made, and made in a timely manner. Once a policy recommendation is adopted by the President, its implementation is the responsibility of university administration acting at the direction of the President.

We find such a distinction absent on this campus. The result is that even with the best of intentions, both administrators and faculty (and to a lesser extent staff and students) often feel that the other has overstepped their bounds. Without a clear and reliable channel for formulating policy through governance committees and the Senate, administrators can precipitate conflict when they make policy decisions without appropriate consultation. Conversely, faculty, staff, and students can foster conflict with university administrators when they devote energy to detailed questions of policy implementation.

No shared understanding of the distinction between policy and implementation will wholly alleviate tension or confusion. Indeed, no bright line consistently distinguishes the two. Nonetheless, we believe that by working toward such a shared understanding, university decision-making can be substantially improved.

We conclude, therefore, that the *power* to recommend university policy should be much more consistently vested in a reconstituted University Senate and related shared governance committees. With such power comes the need for greater *responsibility, accountability, and perspective*. Responsibility requires that decisions be made in a timely manner. Accountability requires all decision-makers to draw upon the best available evidence in arriving at recommendations. Finally, perspective requires that the Senate be structured to include voices – and votes – from all campus constituencies: students, faculty, staff, and administrators, all focused on promoting the good of Humboldt’s students. Administrative actions must then be aligned with the policies and priorities that are adopted and reflect an abiding commitment to the University’s vision. Numerous recommendations in the following sections aim to advance these conclusions.

FOCUS AREA RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Vision:

The University's most recent articulation of its vision and mission was developed in the 2003-2004 campus strategic planning process.* This process was inclusive, consisting of a steering committee and eighteen "focus groups" with approximately 200 faculty, staff, and student members. The resulting five year plan was presented as an effort to advance the mission and vision.

Despite this, it is the unanimous view of those we consulted across campus that the detailed plan itself has not been a central or effective guide for campus decision-making. The Cabinet concludes that this failure is in significant part the result of its encyclopedic nature and absence of clear priorities in a context where resources are always limited. The mission and vision statements could also be more focused and prioritized. Yet, based upon our consultation, we conclude that at present they remain the clearest and best statement we have to guide campus decision-making. Thus it is imperative that budget allocation and other administrative decisions be explicitly guided by the existing statement of vision. We also urge policymakers to develop a regular planning process rooted in the vision and to initiate an inclusive process that will revisit and refine the vision, with a commitment to ensure that it is a clear and concise statement that can be readily acted upon.

It is clear that there has been increasing recognition of the need to integrate the vision into key decisions entailing the allocation of resources. The Academic Program Prioritization process, for instance, explicitly included the university vision in its evaluation rubric. Yet other campus efforts have not. In some cases, even where statements recognizing this need are made (such as the statement of budget reduction principles by the President and VPs in May 2009), there has been frank recognition by the parties involved that "we are... struggling to match decisions with vision" ("Response from the President and Vice Presidents to the CIC," August 15, 2009). Given the magnitude of reductions imposed by the State of California, this is understandable. Yet budgetary decisions made now are among the most crucial determinant of the sort of University we will be for years to come.

* **Mission:** Humboldt State University is a comprehensive, residential campus of the California State University. We welcome students from California and the world to our campus. We offer them access to affordable, high-quality education that is responsive to the needs of a fast-changing world. We serve them by providing a wide array of programs and activities that promote understanding of social, economic and environmental issues. We help individuals prepare to be responsible members of diverse societies. These programs and the experience of a Humboldt State education serve as a catalyst for life-long learning and personal development. We strive to create an inclusive environment of free inquiry, in which learning is the highest priority. In this environment, discovery through research, creative endeavors and experience, energizes the educational process.

Vision: Humboldt State University will be the campus of choice for individuals who seek above all else (1) to improve the human condition and our environment. (2) We will be the premier center for the interdisciplinary study of the environment and its natural resources. (3) We will be a regional center for the arts. (4) We will be renowned for social and environmental responsibility and action. (5) We believe the key to our common future will be the individual citizen who acts in good conscience and engages in informed action. (6) We will commit to increasing our diversity of people and perspectives. (7) We will be exemplary partners with our communities, including tribal nations. (8) We will be stewards of learning to make a positive difference.

The Cabinet has identified both short-term *administrative* actions and longer-term recommendations for *policymaking* regarding the University Vision.

Recommendations:

1.1 *The new Office of Institutional Research and Planning (see below) must be actively involved in helping to develop measures and assess progress in ensuring that programs that advance our vision are protected and advanced in the budgetary process.* Our conversations suggest that these measures must first be applied where budgets are developed – *at the divisional (Vice Presidential) level*. It can then be reviewed by the University Budget Committee.

1.2 *A component of the campus enrollment management plan must evaluate programs' centrality to the vision.* This new plan will help shape the size and mix of academic programs at HSU – and funding for these programs -- for years to come. Vision is key; for academic programs, the scoring on the “vision” component of the program prioritization report is one measure that ought to be utilized.

1.3 *Policymakers must identify – on an annual or biannual basis – specific priorities and projects that will advance vision.* This planning process is vital in good budget times and bad. In the latter, the emphasis may be upon which programs to consolidate or protect from cuts based upon their consistency with the vision.

Initiating such plans must start now. We've begun this process below, recommending adequate support of university-wide sustainability and diversity planning efforts, as well as other actions. Identifying and advancing other projects should be an ongoing priority of campus governance.

We urge careful consideration of the model used by CSU - Long Beach for the development of such priorities, as described here: http://daf.csulb.edu/offices/univ_svcs/budget/docs/rpp08-09/. We recommend such a model be adapted and adopted at HSU. Progress on such priorities ought to be tracked by the University Budget Committee.

Among the early priorities for such a process, we recommend the reform of General Education, to be sharply focused on core themes of our vision. While this project may provoke groans among those who have seen such efforts fizzle in the past, we believe that the combination of an effective governance process and a renewed focus on the university vision could provide a framework for pursuing this successfully.

1.4 *Jump-start the planning process recommended above (#3) with the following immediate administrative actions:*

1.4.1 *Provide adequate support and funding to university-wide efforts to track and advance diversity and sustainability -- two central themes addressed throughout our vision statement.*

- a) *Campus-Wide Diversity Plan and Office Devoted to Implementation.* The recent “Dissecting Diversity” report produced by this office is an example of a best practice that can and ought to be replicated by other university efforts: an example of sound institutional research, it provides an unvarnished assessment of our strengths and weaknesses. As a result, it provides clear targets for strategic initiatives and benchmarks for measuring their success or failure. This is necessary to advance vision point number 6, our commitment to “increasing our diversity of people and perspectives,” while also providing a necessary foundation for the advancement of most other points in the vision statement (e.g., “social... responsibility and action;” “exemplary partners with... tribal nations;” “learning to make a positive difference”).
- b) *Campus-Wide Sustainability Planning and Office Devoted to Implementation.* These efforts must address both the curriculum and the physical campus environment, thereby centrally addressing points 1, 2, and 4 (“improving the human condition and our environment;” becoming “the premier center for the interdisciplinary study of the environment and its natural resources;” and being “renowned for social and environmental responsibility and action”) as well as 5 and 8 (fostering the “citizen who acts in good conscience and engages in informed action” and being “stewards of learning to make a positive difference”).

Many successful programs and initiatives already exist at HSU, but a systematic effort to coordinate such efforts, track progress and setbacks, and identify opportunities requires a coordinated effort by the campus community. At present, the campus employs a sustainability coordinator, has developed a website, recently formed a president’s advisory committee, and has an early and incomplete draft of a campus plan. These efforts must be prioritized and given the resources and leadership necessary for success (including “director” status for the office head). Done right, these efforts ought to produce substantial benefits for the University: integrating curriculum; ensuring that we ‘walk the talk’; elevating our national profile.

It is vital that this effort not be narrowly focused upon the campus physical plant. Important though such efforts are, planning for sustainability must also have a central focus on curricular support and integration, research, as well as student initiatives and activities. It is because such efforts transcend individual colleges and university divisions that they require planning and activity at the university-wide level.

- 1.4.2 *Grant-seeking and fundraising criteria to advance the vision must be developed.* University Advancement – in cooperation with others – must be proactive in prioritizing its fundraising resources on efforts explicitly tied to the University’s vision. The Sponsored Programs Foundation must also identify resources to help individuals develop grant applications and seek contracts for programs and activities that advance our vision.
- 1.4.3 *Resources must be explicitly identified and devoted to marketing, recruiting, and communication projects that advance the University’s vision.* There must be clear and coordinated guidelines so that programs and departments understand when their vision-related projects might receive university-funded support.
- 1.4.4 *Structural barriers to interdisciplinary academic programs and collaboration must be lowered* – to enable fields of study that cross boundaries between academic disciplines. Interdisciplinarity is explicitly highlighted in vision statement #2 (being “the premier center for the interdisciplinary study of the environment and its natural resources”), and is also relevant to other aspects of the vision. Moreover, in an era of budget retrenchment, serious interdisciplinary collaboration may be one of the few attractive ways to strengthen academic programs.
- a) We urge the adoption of the recommendations of the Program Prioritization Task Force. These are designed to ensure that where student and faculty interests cannot be met through disciplinary programs, interdisciplinary programs are placed on a level playing field. They include a call for a transparent appointment policy and clearly identified faculty; unique course codes; OE allocation; back-up resources to “home” departments of participating faculty; and access to course evaluations (see Appendix B).
 - b) The University should prioritize grant-seeking for interdisciplinary programs and collaboration. Preliminary research on grant opportunities for interdisciplinary initiatives has been conducted at the request of the Cabinet. Where promising opportunities are identified, resources must be devoted to providing faculty and staff with the time to collaborate and develop successful grant applications.
- 1.4.5 *The University should establish measurable criteria for “Exemplary Community Partnership, Including Tribal Nations” (#7).* We need to develop a shared understanding of what we hope to accomplish as community partners and then assess our progress on a regular basis. We need to determine ways in which these partnership advance community priorities and at the same time deepen the skills and values of our students.
- 1.4.6 *The University should work to create a comprehensive and highly visible seasonal arts calendar.* This should focus on the many venues, departments and offerings at HSU. Central to #3 in the vision statement (being a “regional center for the arts”), this can be initiated, for now, within the larger campus calendaring plan described in Section 5 of our recommendations (below).

1.5 *In the near future, the Senate should initiate a campus process to streamline and focus the vision in a manner that leads clearly to operational plans.* This process should work to ensure broad support, clarity and distinctiveness. We recommend a process that is quite distinct from the last strategic planning process. That process began with numerous, sometimes incommensurable, and lengthy plans that were later distilled into a vision statement, with the resultant failures described above. Here, we recommend an inclusive process of streamlining the vision statement itself, followed by the ongoing development of operational plans to prioritize and implement that vision.

This recommendation is important, but should not be viewed as a panacea, nor a justification to avoid the steps recommended above until such a process had been concluded. Any vision statement will be challenging to implement and the stakes for any future vision statement will only be clear once the current one becomes the basis for action on our campus.

2. Campus Governance:

The WASC Visiting Team Preparatory Review report noted, “governance and decision-making processes at the University are complicated, cumbersome, and difficult to understand. HSU seems to take a fragmented approach to institutional decision-making which creates internal confusion and sometimes unclear results.” The report by Keeling and Associates emphasized the difficulty faculty and administrators have working together toward common goals. In its words “the campus is ‘stuck’, lacking in trust and resistant to change, mired in a culture largely of its own making.” The report also noted that while all constituencies were “fatigued, if not demoralized” there was “a perceptible hunger for renewal. . . We heard far more evidence of willingness to move forward than of intentions to obstruct growth and renewal. Humboldt has the ability and the will to change its institutional culture.”

We believe that the campus governance structure must be changed significantly in order to change our institutional culture. The campus needs a clear message that administrators, faculty, staff and students are ready to work collaboratively toward common goals.

In order to help us think about how to restructure the university decision-making process, the Cabinet asked representatives from two sister campuses, San Diego State University and CSU Long Beach, to come to Humboldt to describe their governance structures. We also consulted extensively with existing campus governance groups. Our recommendations are based on a combination of those presentations and consultation.

The campus needs to acknowledge and promote a shared vision. The University has a vision statement and a well-defined commitment to student success. These should guide our actions. The CSU Long Beach team emphasized that in their deliberation they asked “Is it good for students?”

Both San Diego and Long Beach drew a strong contrast between recommending and implementing policies, a distinction we emphasized above. Like those universities, we believe that all constituencies should be directly involved in developing policy that reflects shared goals, and that policy proposals should be fully developed by the time they reach the full Senate for review and recommendation to the President. The Administration should approve and implement policy, and while the Senate can take up any matter it chooses, it should not become entangled with implementation. Moreover, we recommend that all constituencies communicate regularly, have access to the same information and work cooperatively toward common objectives that are good for the University.

Recommendations:

2.1 *Restructure the existing Academic Senate into a University-wide Senate.*

We believe the best way to encourage a new cooperative institutional culture is to create a *university* senate that bring students, faculty, staff and administrators together to develop and recommend all major policy to the President. Faculty should continue to be the majority group on the Senate but all four constituencies should have voting representation. This is the governance model utilized effectively at San Diego State. This Senate should be action oriented rather than primarily a

debating body. Policy details should be hammered out and vetted at the Council level (see below) to ensure broad support for recommendations before they reach the Senate floor. Senators themselves must be represented, and active, at this level.

Specifically:

- 2.1.1 *Establish a policy file: a comprehensive collection of all policies recommended by the Senate and approved by the President. This file should include all revisions as well as past policy decisions.*
- 2.1.2 *To encourage broader participation among faculty and staff, Senators should be limited to two terms of three years each with a minimum of one year separation before they run for election again (except for ex officio seats – held by virtue of one’s position).*
- 2.1.3 *Senators’ terms should be staggered to ensure that a mix of experienced and new representation.*
- 2.1.4 *The Senate should designate a person or a committee to be in charge of recruitment, with specific attention to recruiting new associate professors.*
- 2.1.5 *All student, faculty, staff, and administrative members of the Senate should have voting rights. It is important that all constituencies are participants in the process of developing and recommending policy.*
- 2.1.6 *The Senate should not allow proxies.*
- 2.1.7 *All new senators should receive an orientation.*
- 2.1.8 *Faculty representatives from the Senate should attend meetings of the Associated Students.*
- 2.1.9 *A parliamentarian should be designated to assist the Senate Chair at every meeting and parliamentary procedures should be used to expedite the decision-making process.*
- 2.1.10 *The amount of time spent on reports at Senate meetings should be limited.*
- 2.1.11 *Action items should appear first on the agenda.*
- 2.1.12 *The Senate should take responsibility for communication to campus and should employ a standard operating procedure for communication to and from the Senate with all constituencies. A blog and contact links should be established for the Senate webpage.*
- 2.1.13 *A first- and second-reading structure for all resolutions should be utilized.*

2.1.14 *Meetings should continue until the agenda is completed, and if necessary, meetings should be extended to another day during the same week.*

2.2 *Restructure the university committee system.*

A new committee structure should be developed at the same time that the Senate is restructured and the bylaws revised in order to create a coordinated university governance structure. During the development and transition of this new governance structure, essential committees should be retained but all committees should be reexamined to determine if they should continue, be revised, combined, or disbanded. The Cabinet called for a similar review of all committees this year. That process should be a basis for the recommendation made here. All committees must have clear charges, reporting lines and duties. Membership should reflect the commitment to bringing all constituencies together to develop policy recommendations. Committees should provide annual or semi-annual reports and be regularly assessed to determine if they are effective and still necessary. Whenever possible, committees should be action oriented rather than informational; they identify specific issues, gather and analyze data to address the issue and create report(s) or make recommendations. Committee membership should be staggered so that there are always experienced individuals on committees. Committee chairs should have clear responsibilities and be held accountable by the Senate for the work of the committee.

The new organization of committees should consist of:

- 2.2.1 *Councils.* Councils are the primary policy and oversight bodies for the University and will report directly to the Senate, replacing its current standing committees. The Senate can create standing committees that report to Councils. As noted above, Councils should draft and vet policy recommendations before they reach the Senate floor. These Councils should each have Senate representation (e.g., San Diego State requires every Senator to be a member of at least two Councils or committees). Placing Senators on Councils involves them in the development of policy before it reaches the Senate floor and helps to ensure that policy is well understood when it reaches the Senate floor. Examples of these Councils would include the Integrated Curriculum Committee and Faculty Affairs.
- 2.2.2 *Standing administrative committees.* Standing committees report to an appropriate administrator and are primarily informational or advisory, often helping to implement approved policy. The Senate, in consultation with the appropriate administrator, will establish these committees, developing the charge, membership, and method of selection. The Senate should ensure that the number of standing committees is kept at a minimum. Examples include the Professional Leave Committee, the University Executive Committee and the Student Affairs Council.
- 2.2.3 *Temporary committees (task forces).* Task forces can report to either the Senate or an appropriate administrator. They can address issues as needed. All policy recommendations must go to the Senate for recommendation to the President. They

are formed in consultation between the Senate and the appropriate administrator. These temporary or 'disappearing' committees should be used whenever possible because they are task focused and of limited duration.

2.3 *Eliminate the General Faculty Association.*

The General Faculty Association predates the creation of the Academic Senate and its function has not been clear since the Senate's formation. No other campus in the CSU has both. Representatives from San Diego and Long Beach noted that having an Academic Senate structure and a General Faculty Association, with a Senate Chair and a General Faculty President, created confusion. The General Faculty President is elected by the faculty but has no clearly defined responsibilities or governance structure independent of the Academic Senate. And although the General Faculty President sits on the Senate and takes part as a voting member in its deliberations he or she is not bound by Senate recommendations and can take independent action that is contrary to the Senate's recommendations. This is a clear example of Humboldt's "fragmented approach to institutional decision-making which creates internal confusion and sometimes unclear results." Historically, the General Faculty Association has also served as a benevolent association; in Section 4, we recommend that this function be incorporated into a university-wide group.

3. Student Success:

Through the reaccreditation process, Humboldt developed student learning outcomes and committed itself to ensuring academic excellence for traditionally underrepresented students. From these university-wide goals, the Cabinet was charged with developing recommendations that support the implementation of the University's Student Learning Outcomes and the work to create an inclusive academic experience that welcomes and supports the success of historically under-represented students. Much of the work required to achieve these goals was well underway by the time the Cabinet was formed.

For example, the Education Effectiveness Review Committee (EERC) has developed an integrated university-wide plan for achieving the university's student learning outcomes and ensuring academic excellence for traditionally underrepresented students. The EERC has identified how each student learning outcome may be achieved through the general education and major curriculums. In coordination with the EERC, the curriculum oversight process has been transformed from a fragmented model to a university-wide model that brings all constituencies together to oversee curriculum and ensure that student learning outcomes are achieved. We find that the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) also provides a model for how to restructure campus governance.

Inclusive academic excellence requires that Humboldt increase access, persistence and graduation rates for traditionally under-represented students. Academic and support services departments have been working with the "Making Excellence Inclusive" group to develop strategies to improve success for underrepresented students. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion has developed a set of university-wide metrics for measuring progress towards student success as well as progress towards hiring and retaining a diverse faculty and staff.

Although several meaningful steps have been taken toward achieving student success, the Cabinet, believes it is vital that these be seen as university-wide initiatives – not divisional efforts. These must continue to be prioritized and plans must be implemented, evaluated, and revised on an ongoing basis to maximize success.

Recommendations:

3.1 *Reinstatement of a university Enrollment Management Task Force.* The Cabinet recommended and supports the reinstatement of a university Enrollment Management Task Force, and its efforts to establish university-wide plans to improve student success and persistence to graduation. The Task Force is comprised of retention and recruitment work groups that have faculty, staff, and student representation. These work groups are developing recruitment and retention plans to increase diversity on campus and to help HSU students persist to graduation.

3.2 *Initiative to increase graduation rates.* The Cabinet also supports the recently announced system initiative to increase graduation rates to the top quartile of our national comparison institutions.

4. Collegial, Respectful and Responsive Community:

Humboldt has struggled to develop a collegial, respectful and responsive decision-making environment. Difficult issues become highly partisan, characterized by a lack of civility, personal attacks and an inability to move beyond disagreements. While we believe a change in governance structure will help, it is critical that Humboldt develop an environment that allows faculty, students, staff and administrators to feel comfortable discussing difficult issues in an informal way and without demonizing each other's motives. We recommend a set of actions that can cultivate community bonds and help foster an environment in which healthy dialogue is the norm, rather than the exception.

Recommendations:

- 4.1 *Establish Open Time on Fridays.*** In order to come together as a community, there must be community time. There is currently no time set aside for enabling service to the university and holding university-wide activities. We believe having such a time is not only practical but also vital to the development of understanding among the community. We recommend that a weekly three-hour block of time be designated (such as Fridays 11-2) when no classes shall meet. This time period will be used for university-wide activities such as general interest lectures, professional development activities, plenary meetings of the Senate, and other university-interest events to be arranged approximately once a month. When such events are not scheduled, this time will ease the coordination and inclusion of faculty and students at meetings and other university service activities. We recommend all nonessential offices to close during university-wide activities to maximize participation.
- 4.2 *Create a University "Benevolent Association."*** New forms of interaction are required if we wish to catalyze new collaborations and a new sense of community. We recommend the institution of a campus benevolent association, with financial support from the University. The association charge would include planning and promoting social events and mutual understanding among faculty, staff, and administrators. Examples include:
- Monthly gatherings similar to the current annual "welcome" barbecue
 - Smaller dinners at restaurants in the community
 - Lecture series welcoming speakers of broad interest to faculty, staff, and administrators
 - Promotion of faculty/staff/administrator clubs on campus, such as running and book clubs.
- 4.3 *Faculty and Staff Club.*** As a long-range goal, we propose that if the benevolent association in recommendation (3) is successful, that a central social space for faculty, staff and administrators, be reinstated. The club could both serve as a central location for regular organized social events and as a meeting space. We recommend serious consideration of a remodeled Green and Gold room dedicated for this purpose.

4.4 *Campus Calendar and Effective Networking.* There is confusion on campus about the roles and responsibilities of decision-makers, no effective means of communication other than e-mail and limited central means by which campus events are advertised. We recommend that an in-house facebook-style networking be implemented as a central means of communication.

- Centralized Calendar including arts, sporting, and academic events.
- “Pages” for committees and campus announcements that can be subscribed to by community members to receive their communications, thereby reducing e-mail lists that clog mailboxes
- “Tweets” to announce new content
- Generate lists for classes and committees with names and associated pictures

4.5 *Mentorship as an Expectation.* Too often, employees starting work or beginning a new assignment are left on their own without support or direction. We recommend all administrators, staff, and faculty beginning new responsibilities receive mentorship and that the expectation of effective mentoring be written into job descriptions and further emphasized as a necessary component of the RTP process.

5. Cultivate evidence-based decision making:

For many years the campus has generated and posted data reports through the Office of Analytic Studies. This office is located in the division of Academic Affairs and relies on the excellent cross-divisional collaborative efforts of a number of data analysts. While the campus has access to an abundance of qualitative and quantitative information, we have not established a culture of consistently basing our planning decisions on critical analyses of available evidence. We have also failed to examine routinely-collected information sufficiently to assess progress toward goals and modify actions to improve efficiency and performance. In part, these deficiencies are because we have lacked the capacity to centralize, organize and analyze institutional data. For these reasons, the Cabinet, working with others on campus, recommended that we establish a new Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP), for which a director has recently been hired. The following recommendations are meant to empower the campus to build a widespread culture of evidence-based decision-making and expound on the role of the OIRP in advancing this goal.

Recommendations:

- 5.1 *Proposals must clarify use of evidence.*** Consistently employing institutional evidence to make decisions requires a *cultural shift* in the way decisions are made, a scenario similar to that described earlier in this report for aligning decisions with the university's vision. Having high quality research is necessary for this shift, but not sufficient. To help ensure leaders remain attentive to the use of institutional evidence, future proposals for initiatives, policies, programs and other changes must include plans for implementation. An implementation plan, written in consultation with the OIRP, should identify useful performance measures and a process for assessment and modification. This should include benchmarking expected outcomes, a methodology for collecting the benchmark data, and review process at a predetermined point in time, during which the benchmarking data are used to gauge the success or needs of the program. Changes should be based on this review process.
- 5.2 *The Office of Institutional Research and Planning should serve the entire campus; entire campus should make use of this office.*** The OIRP will assist all divisions of the campus in providing standardized definitions and reporting formats. This requires the establishment of a robust, responsive, and comprehensive data library, which will also facilitate prompt delivery of information and reports to the campus community.
- 5.3 *Ensure the Office of Institutional Research & Planning communicate with and coordinate efforts among existing data sources and analysts across campus.*** This can be accomplished either by maintaining positions and functions within their existing units (embedded model), or collecting and housing positions within the OIRP (collected model). In either case, the Director of OIRP will provide oversight and maintain communication, and will respond to requests from and report back to decision-makers and planning bodies on campus, such as the University Senate, University Executive Committee, Council of Deans, Space and Facilities Committee,

Budget Committees, or other bodies that may be established through changes in campus governance.

- 5.4** *We recommend that the Director or a staff member of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning be routinely included in campus policy and planning efforts.*

CONCLUSION

In the Cabinet's deliberations, conversations, and meetings, our aim has been to identify a viable path forward for our University. Our recommendations are not a panacea, but they aim to help build a campus community with greater capacity to advance widely shared goals; to disagree forthrightly yet constructively; to cultivate collegiality and respect even – or especially – when congeniality is hard to come by. These capacities are important under the best of circumstances, but become especially vital when our community is stretched to the limit by dire budgetary pressures.

As a Cabinet, our primary charge was the production of this report and recommendations. We do envision a scaled-back, but important, role for the Cabinet in the months ahead. In particular, we expect to continue to meet with campus groups to explain our recommendations and to monitor, aid, and publicize progress toward their implementation.

Yet it is now up to the campus community as a whole to decide how to respond. We ardently hope that our recommendations are taken seriously and addressed promptly. Key decisions about our recommendations will be made by the Academic Senate, the President and Vice Presidents, as well as other campus leaders. But everyone on campus has the opportunity to play an important role – in conveying their views to these leaders, in helping to facilitate the changes proposed, and in participating in the revitalized governance structures and campus activities envisioned here.

APPENDIX A: IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

The following tables outline steps that need to be taken in order to implement the recommendations described in this report.

VISION

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed
Establish measures and assess progress in ensuring that departments advance our vision (1.1)	Office Institutional Research and Planning	Vice Presidents Provost	January 2011	Input from all departments.
Develop an evaluation rubric and criteria to plan enrollment, retention and graduation of students. (1.2)	Enrollment Management Task Force AVP of Enrollment Mgmt. Dean of Students	Vice President of Student Affairs Provost	May 2010	Working groups will establish criteria for rubric.
Establish a process to identify campus priorities and projects that will advance vision. (1.3)	All Divisions	Vice Presidents Provost Chair of Academic Senate President	January 2011	Appoint a task force.
Vision Priority: Revise Diversity Plan and begin Implementation (1.4.1)	Office of Diversity & Inclusion	Provost	December 2010	An advisory committee will be established to revise existing plan.

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed
Vision Priority: Establish campus-wide Sustainability Plan including curriculum, initiatives and activities. (1.4.1)	All Divisions	Vice Presidents Provost President	March 2011	Campus sustainability committee will work with Curriculum Committee to develop implementation steps.
Vision Priority: Develop criteria for grant-seeking and fundraising to advance the vision. (1.4.2)	AVP for Development and Alumni Relations Director of Sponsored Programs	VP Advancement Provost President	November 2010	Meeting with Executive Council to determine needs of the campus and targets of opportunity.
Vision Priority: Identify resources explicitly identified and devoted to marketing, recruiting, and communication projects that advance the university's vision. (1.4.3)	AVP Marketing & Communications Enrollment Management	VP Advancement President Provost	September 2010	
Vision Priority: Lower structural barriers for interdisciplinary academic programs and collaboration (1.4.4)	Deans of Colleges	Provost	May 2011	

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed
Vision Priority: Provide resources and time for faculty & staff to collaborate and develop successful grant applications to advance interdisciplinary programs.(1.4.4)	Dean of Colleges	Provost	August 2010	Select interested faculty.
Vision Priority: Design a seasonal arts calendar for campus. (1.4.6)	AVP Marketing & Communications Theatre & Art Department Faculty, Students and Staff.	VP University Advancement	August 2010	
Guide the campus community in a process to streamline and <i>focus</i> the vision in a manner that leads clearly to operational plans. (1.5)	All Divisions	President Provost	January 2011	Campus retreat.

CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Restructure University Governance in Accordance w/ CIC Recommendations (2.1-2.3)	President's Office Senate Exec Associated Students Staff Council UEC CIC	Provost and CIC Governance subcommittee	Noted Below	Noted Below
Formal meeting of leaders of key governance groups to review CIC Governance Recommendations	Academic Senate Associated Students Staff Council UEC CIC	Provost and CIC Governance subcommittee	By February 8, 2010 <i>(Would allow for review at the full Senate meeting on the February 9th)</i>	CIC to conduct meeting and facilitate review
Key governance groups review CIC report and vote whether or not to endorse it as a framework for restructuring shared governance	Academic Senate Associated Students Staff Council UEC	Provost, Senate Chair, AS President, Chair Staff Council	By February 26, 2010	Bob Snyder to coordinate with governance leaders in these areas
Develop a University Policy File (2.1.1)	President's Office Provost's Office Academic Senate Office	Special Assistant to the President, Vice Provost, Senate ASC	From February 26 to June 1, 2010	Working group to locate and collect all policies, including changes in policies, into one repository

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Develop model for the University Senate with Councils and standing committees (2.2)	Academic Senate Associated Students Staff Council UEC	Senate Chair, Provost	By March 12, 2010	Working group to develop the details of the new Senate structure
Begin review of the campus committee structure to determine which committees will continue to operate during the transition, which will be disbanded immediately and what the new committee structure should be after the transition	President Academic Senate Associated Students Staff Council UEC CIC	Senate Chair, Provost	Begin March 22, 2010	The President, Senate Chair and Vice Presidents will identify which committees will continue to operate during the transition. All committees not needed during the transition will be disbanded. A working group will be formed to recommend a new committee structure for the University.
Constitution and bylaws rewritten to reflect the new Senate structure and the elimination of the General Faculty governance structure (2.3)	Academic Senate	Senate Chair, President General Faculty, CIC rep. (D. Kornreich	By April 2, 2010	Working group to develop details of the new constitution and bylaws

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Academic Senate resolution to send new governance structure and constitution/bylaws changes to a vote of the faculty	Academic Senate	Senate Chair	By April 13, 2010	
Vote of the faculty to adopt new constitution and bylaws	Academic Senate	Senate ASC	From April 26 to May 7, 2010	Allows time for a sample ballot followed by official vote
Elect transitional Senate officers for fall 2010 semester	Academic Senate	Senate Chair	On the last meeting of the Academic Senate in 2010	
Plan Campus Elections for University Senators and first call for nominations	Academic Senate	Senate ASC	May 14, 2010	Working group from appropriate constituencies
Implement University Governance in Accordance with New Governance Policy and Structure	President Senate Exec Associated Students Staff Council UEC CIC	CIC Governance subcommittee, Provost	<i>Noted Below</i>	<i>Noted Below</i>
Conduct Campus Elections for University Senators (including staggered terms planning)		Transitional Senate Chair, Senate ASC	From September 13, 2010 to Sept.24, 2010	

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Plan and provide Training for Newly Elected Senators	HSU Training Collaborative	Transitional Senate Chair	By November 1, 2010	Content specific to policy development, new policy file, role, expectations, and process
Recommendation on new University Committee Structure	President's Office Academic Senate Associated Students Staff Council UEC	Senate Chair, Provost	By November 12, 2010	Recommendation will go to campus for discussion and will wait approval by the new Senate
Convene new Senate	Faculty Students Staff Administrators		Beginning of spring semester 2011	

STUDENT SUCCESS

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Develop a three-year university-wide Comprehensive Enrollment Management Plan that directs and coordinates activities across divisions and departments. The plan will address both recruitment and retention, including a recommended strategy for balancing enrollments of freshmen and transfer students across specific majors. (3.1)	Offices Academic Affairs, Student Affairs	Chair, Enrollment Management Task Force	October 2009	<i>Noted Below</i>
Develop draft of university wide recruitment plan (3.1)	Office of Enrollment Management; Academic Senate; Academic Affairs	Recruitment Work group, Chaired by Director of Admissions	Draft to Enrollment Management Task Force by January 2010 with March implementation	
Develop recommendations for the implementation of strategies to improve student retention and academic success. (3.1)	Academic Affairs, Student Affairs	Vice Provost and Retention Work Group Chair	Draft to Enrollment Management Task Force by December 2009 with March Implementation	

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Develop recommendations for ensuring student persistence to graduation (CSU Initiative) (3.2)	Academic Affairs, Student Affairs	Provost and Chair of Work Group	Work Group established November 2009. Report to the Chancellor's Office and Campus by January 2010	

COLLEGIAL, RESPECTFUL AND RESPONSIVE COMMUNITY

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Institute an "Open Friday" Policy (4.1)	Academic Senate President	Senate Chair, President	To be implemented for the 2010/2011 academic year	
Identify Open Friday event coordinator (4.1)	Senate Exec President	Senate Chair, President	To begin at the same time as policy effected	Compensation to be negotiated between Senate Exec and President
Establish Faculty/Staff "Benevolent Society" (4.2)	Senate President General Faculty Staff	Senate Chair, President, and Rep. from Staff and Faculty	To be implemented for the 2010/2011 academic year	Discretionary funds for event planning and underwriting
Establish Faculty and Staff Club (4.3)	Senate	Senate Chair, President, and President, Faculty Rep.	Long range	Identify a space (perhaps Green and Gold Room) and resources to implement
In-House Social Network & All-Campus Calendar / Messaging System (4.4)	IT Programming	Chief Information Officer	To be implemented for the 2010/2011 academic year	Programmer Time
Mentorship written into job descriptions and emphasized in RTP (4.5)	Senate President	Senate Chair, President	To be implemented for the 2010/2011 academic year	

CULTURE OF EVIDENCE-BASED DECISIONMAKING

Action	Participating Units	Point People to Oversee and Coordinate Action	Targeted Time	Resources Needed and Notes
Hire Director for the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP)	Provost	Search Committee	Start Date 1 February 2010	Funded
Formally establish OIRP	Provost	Director OIRP	February 2010	Funded
Incorporate the use of outcomes and assessment in all campus planning processes (5.1)	All campus divisions	Provost, OIRP Director	February 2010; expect full implementation by Fall 2010	This will be an ongoing practice aimed at moving campus culture forward
OIRP serves the campus (5.2)	Provost Office/OIRP	Director OIRP	February 2010; expect full implementation by Fall 2010	
Ensure the Office of Institutional Research & Planning communicates with and coordinate efforts among existing data sources and analysts across campus (5.3)	OIRP and Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Enrollment Management, Facilities Planning, Office of Business Services, Academic Computing	Provost, Director OIRP	February 2010	
OIRP included in campus policy and planning efforts (5.4)	President, Divisions, OIRP	President, Provost, Director OIRP	February 2010; expect full implementation by Fall 2010	This will be an ongoing practice as the campus embraces the culture of evidence

APPENDIX B: ACADEMIC PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

At 1.4.4a (p.7), the Cabinet urges the adoption of the following recommendations of Academic Program Prioritization Report (excerpt from pp. 25-26)

... A University commitment to interdisciplinary programs would ensure that, for each interdisciplinary program, there is:

A clearly identified set of faculty who are responsible for and/or are invested in the program;

A transparent policy about the appointment of these identified faculty to the particular interdisciplinary program;

A unique identifying course code that allows cost accounting and demand assessment;

A program-specific OE allocation;

A procedure for providing departments that contribute faculty resources to interdisciplinary programs to be provided with back-up resources when one of their faculty members participates in an interdisciplinary program. This procedure needs to be standardized and transparent.

A commitment to ensuring that interdisciplinary programs are staffed primarily by tenure-track faculty rather than by non-faculty or mostly part-time faculty members.

A commitment to providing adequate faculty support for the programs. Interdisciplinary programs should not be developed on the assumption of faculty overloads for advising and capstone/thesis work (e.g., Environment and Community MS degree, and Environmental Science undergraduate degree).

Additionally, the PTF discussed the timeliness for considering the following additional issues related to interdisciplinary programs:

A commitment to make “strategic hires” to provide leadership, oversight, and accountability for interdisciplinary programs. Where this has been done, programs have noticeably higher quality than where this has not been done.

A provision for Chairs or leaders of interdisciplinary programs to have access to course evaluations for courses taught by faculty involved in their program but affiliated with another department.

A commitment to ensure that interdisciplinary curricula have courses designated as theory, methods, knowledge-based, writing-intensive, and capstone, etc., so that students and participating faculty can better understand the structure and objectives of the interdisciplinary curriculum.

A defensible number of GE courses within interdisciplinary curricula (a maximum of two upper division GE courses seems defensible) and interdisciplinary curricula should NOT directly compete with other majors (e.g., Environmental Science and IS Dance).

Finally, we believe that development of interdisciplinary programs should always be motivated by the following basic questions: (1) "Why do we need this program?" and (2) "Can the students' needs be met within an existing department?" Only when student needs cannot be met within existing departments and where the University has indicated a willingness to commit institutional resources necessary to support an interdisciplinary program, should HSU move forward with program development.