

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

University Senate Written Reports, March 27, 2018

Standing Committees, Statewide Senators and Ex-officio Members

Academic Policies Committee:

Submitted by Kerri Malloy, APC Chair

Committee Members:

Michael Goodman, Stephanie Burkhalter, Ramesh Adhikari, Heather Madar, Michael Le, Rock Braithwaite, Mary Virnoche, Clint Rebik, Kerri Malloy, (recruiting for student members).

Meeting Dates for Spring 2018: Meeting time: 11AM-11:50 AM Meeting Place: BSS 402

January	24
February	7, 21
March	7, 21
April	4, 18
May	2

Committee Meetings Reports:

March 21

- Committee reviewed and requested clarifications on changes to the Classroom Disruptive Behavior Policy. Will be bringing to the full Senate at the next meeting.
- Committee started discussion on updates to the Academic Honesty Policy requested by the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities.

March 7

- APC did not meet.

February 21

- Initiated work on the definitions and guidelines for department and schools. Will continue this work at the next meet.
- Discussion on class attendance in response to an inquiry from faculty to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Discussion will continue.
- Work on the Classroom Disruptive Behavior Policy and the Academic Integrity Policy continues with the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

February 7

- Committee reviewed responses of to inquiries regarding the request from the College of Professional Studies to change the Department of Social Work to the School of Social Work. The committee forwarded the request to SenEx for placement on the University Senate agenda.
- Christine Mata from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities presented and took questions on recommended changes to the Classroom Disruptive Behavior Policy and the Academic Integrity Policy. Additional information and draft language will be forthcoming.

- Discussion on informational item regarding a change in the TOFEL score from the Office of the Provost that will be on a future University Senate agenda.

January 14

- Committee reviewed a request from the College of Professional Studies to change the Department of Social Work to the School of Social Work. Further information was requested before the recommendation is forwarded to the University Senate.
- Committee reviewed draft changes to the Disruptive Behavior Policy.

December 6

- Committee reviewed changes to the Syllabus Policy to incorporate accessible technology initiative requirements for accessible syllabi.
- Initiated discussion on a request to review Appendix R – Student Grievance for possible updates.

October 11:

- Committee reviewed the Course Numbering Policy via email and forwarded it on the ICC for reviews.
- Committee will be discussion revisions to:
 - Academic Honesty Policy proposed by the Dean of Students
 - Syllabus Policy as part of bringing the campus into compliance with the Accessible Technologies Initiative

September 27:

- Committee provided feedback and questions on the proposed Advising Policy.
- Committee will be sending forward revisions to the Course Numbering Policy to reflect the elimination of remedial course.

September 13:

- Committee completed the review, edited the Posthumous Degree Policy, and will be sending it forward to the Senate for a first reading.
- Committee reviewed the draft of the Advising Policy. This item took up the bulk of the meeting and will be the main item at the September 17 meeting.

August 30:

- Committee reviewed and discussed the Posthumous Degree Policy

Inquiries:

Add/Drop Date Report:

The Committee is gathering the necessary information to prepare and send to the University Senate the first annual report on the impacts of the decoupling of the Add/Drop from the Census date.

Add/Drop Date

Inquiry on the Add/Drop date being on holiday. Internal discussion on the number of exceptional add/drops that may be a result of this, the date not always being on holiday, and that student have access to their Student Center 24/7. Registrar indicates there has not been an uptick since due to the Add/Drop date landing on holiday.

Discussion with the Academic Technology Faculty Contributors (formerly known as the Canvas Faculty Contributors) to have global messages to students posted on dashboards that indicate upcoming academic deadlines:

- Add/Drop
- Credit/No Credit
- Final Day to Withdraw

Students would see the notice when they log into Canvas and would be posted a week before the deadline.

Also, there was a discussion with Academic Technology Faculty Contributors on integrating the academic calendar into the Canvas calendar for students and faculty.

Appointments and Elections Committee:

Submitted by Katia Karadjova, AEC Chair

Updated Spring 2018 General Faculty Election Results and AEC Appointments

Faculty Elected Positions:

GENERAL FACULTY President, 2 year term

Stephanie Burkhalter

GENERAL FACULTY Representative to the ASCSU, 3 year term

Noah Zerbe

INTEGRATED CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (ICC)

Chair, Standing Committee on General Ed & All-University Requirements (GEAR) Curriculum and Assessment

Julia Alderson – Faculty Member (At-Large), 3 year term

Subcommittee on Course and Degree Changes (CDC)

Ramesh Adhikari - Faculty Member (CNRS), 3 year term

PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (PCRSC)

Claire Till - Faculty Member from CNRS, 2 year term

George Wrenn - Faculty Member from the University Library, 2 year term

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE

- **Tenured** Faculty Member, 1 year term

Rae Robison

SPONSORED PROGRAMS FOUNDATION BOARD

Candidates are elected by faculty and recommended to the President for final appointment.

- Two Faculty Members, 4 year terms

Carly Marino

Harold Zald

UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (UFPC)

- Faculty Member (At-Large), 2 year term

Joshua Meisel

- Faculty Member CPS, 2 year term

Christopher Aberson

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Lecturer Faculty Delegate (Colleges, Library, Counseling, Coaches), 3 year term

Jeff Dunk

Tenure Line At-Large Faculty Delegate, 3 year term

Ara Pachmayer

Tenure Line **CNRS** Instructional Faculty Delegate, 3 year term

Lucy Kerhoulas

Tenure Line **CAHSS** Instructional Faculty Delegate, 3 year term

James Woglom

Appointment and Elections Committee Appointed Positions:

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 3 year terms

Kayla Begay

Michael Goodman

ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND OTHER DRUG PREVENTION COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member, 2 year term

Troy Lescher

APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (AEC)

- Two Faculty Members, 1 year terms

Brandice Gonzalez-Guerra

Julia Alderson

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING (formerly CSLAI)

- Faculty Member from CPS, 1 year term

Meenal Rana

- Faculty Member from CNRS, 1 year term

Sherrene Bogle

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RTP CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

- Faculty Member from CAHSS, 3 year term

Sondra Schwetman

- Faculty Member from CNRS, 3 year term

Yvonne Everett

- Faculty Member from CPS, 3 year term

Whitney Ogle

CONSTITUTIONS AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 2 year terms

Jeffrey Abell

Joice Chang

DISABILITY, ACCESS, AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member, 2 year terms

Jill Pawlowski

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

- Faculty Senator, 3 year term

Katia Karadjova

- Faculty Member (At-Large), 3 year term

Abeer Hasan

- Faculty Member (At-Large), 3 year term

George Wrenn

FACULTY AWARDS COMMITTEE

- Three Faculty Members, 1 year terms

Eugene Novotney

Whitney Ogle

Alexandru Tomescu

GEAR (General Ed & All-University Requirements) CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member from CAHSS, 2 year term

Cutchu Risling-Baldy

INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE (IRA)

The Appointments and Elections Committee recommend candidates to the President for final appointment.

- Three Faculty Members, 1 year terms

Ramesh Adhikari

Jamey Harris

Aaron Donaldson

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (IAAC)

- Faculty Member, 2 year term

Shelia Alcea

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member from University Library, 3 year terms

Katia Karadjova

- Faculty Member from CPS, 3 year term

Jayne McGuire

- Two Faculty Members from CAHSS, 3 year terms

Tony Silvaggio

Garrick Woods

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS SCREENING COMMITTEE

- Three Faculty Members, 3 year terms

Meenal Rana
Katia Karadjova
Ramesh Adhikari

PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, busiun 1 year terms

Eugene Novotney
Bo Burrus

STUDENT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member from CPS, 3 year term

Taylor Bloedon

UNIVERSITY CENTER BOARD

Candidates are recommended by the Appointments and Elections Committee for final approval from the UC Board.

- Two Faculty Members, 2 year terms

Mark Rizzardi
Armeda Reitzel

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 2 year terms

Mark Rizzardi
Kerri Malloy

UNIVERSITY POLICIES COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member, 1 year

Troy Lescher

UNIVERSITY SPORTS FACILITIES SCHEDULING ADVISORY GROUP

- Faculty Member, 1 year term

Tony Silvaggio

AEC Continues to solicit nominations for the following positions:

Elected Position Openings:

INTEGRATED CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (ICC)

Faculty serving as the ICC Chair, will receive 6 units of Assigned Time per year. Please note: candidates for ICC Chair must be faculty with previous experience serving on the ICC, the University Senate, the Academic Policies Committee, the GEAR Committee, or as a department chair.

- **ICC Chair**, 3 year term

ICC Chair also serves on the University Senate Executive Committee and as Chair of the Academic Master Planning Subcommittee.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (UFPC)

Faculty serving on the UFPC will receive 6 units of Assigned Time per year. Please note: faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program are eligible for nomination after receiving approval from the Provost.

- Faculty Member (**CNRS**), 2 year term

Please refer to the following page for information regarding the duties of the UFPC:

<http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/ufpc>

Appointed Position Openings:

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS SCREENING COMMITTEE

- Faculty Counselor, 3 year term

Duties: Review applications, interview applicants, and submit recommendations to the Chancellor's Office.

GEAR (General Ed & All-University Requirements) CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member (**CPS**), 3 year term

Duties: Provide ongoing review & improvement of GEAR learning outcomes in conjunction with GEAR faculty; provide guidance and coordination for the GEAR assessment of those outcomes; collate and interpret aggregate GEAR assessment data and report results to the ICC; provide recommendations for GEAR curricular and instructional changes based on assessment results

Constitution and Bylaws Committee:

Submitted by Michael Le, CBC Chair

Wednesday, March 21, 1:00pm – 1:50pm; Nelson Hall 119

Members Present:

- Jeremy Shellhase, Faculty (2016-2018)
- Joseph McDonald, Student (2017-2018)
- Joice Chang, Faculty (2016-2018)
- Mary Watson, Parliamentarian, Staff (2016-2018)
- Michael Le, Staff Senator, Chair (2017-2018)
- Leena Dallasheh, Faculty (2017-2019)

Quorum: Yes: majority of committee members with at least one representative from the faculty and at least one representative from either staff or students.

New Items

- I. ICC Constitution Proposed Revisions
 - a. **Description:** The ICC proposed the creation of a new committee, but in doing so they submitted their constitution for review. CBC Chair Le discovered several inconsistencies. Suggestions were submitted to the Chair of the ICC for consideration.

Old Items

- I. **Policy on committees, task force, teams, and other groups convened to conduct business on behalf of the institution.**
 - a. **Description:** CBC has been asked for a Constitution and Bylaws Interpretation of who is included in the campus community and should be allowed to attend Senate Meetings. This evolved into the CBC is researching sunshine laws (Ralph M. Brown Act and the Bagley-Keene Act) about public and nonpublic meeting types. CBC was advised by Alison N. Kleaver, University Counsel that HSU committees are not subject to either of these laws as Ralph M. Brown Act applies to legislative bodies of local agencies and Bagley-Keene Act applies to units doing business on behalf of the state.
 - b. **Action:** CBC is researching principles from these two laws and Peer CSU policies on defining Committees, Workgroups, task forces, Councils, associations, and other groups convened to conduct business on behalf of the university. In addition CBC is looking for guidelines for the “group’s” responsibility to be transparent (e.g., publish meetings dates/times, agenda, and meeting minutes).
 - c. **Action:** CBC is researching principles from these two laws and Peer CSU policies on defining Committees, Workgroups, task forces, Councils, associations, and other groups convened to conduct business on behalf of the university. In addition CBC is looking for guidelines for the “group’s” responsibility to be transparent (e.g., publish meetings dates/times, agenda, and meeting minutes).

- d. **Materials:**
 - i. Discussion of Gribbsby article: Committee, Task Force, Team: What's the Difference? Why Does It Matter?
 - ii. Discussion of current committee structure under Senate and how anything we come up with will affect it: <http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/committees>
 - e. **Notes:** A special subcommittee meeting was called for Thursday, April 29th from 1-2:20pm in Library 208. This is a non-business meeting and will be used solely for collaboration of work.
-

University Policies Committee:

Submitted by Justus Ortega, UPC Chair

- 1) Discussed HSU Policy Website (<https://policy.humboldt.edu/>) and policies for revision or removal.
 - a. Based on recommendations from Mary Watson (Senate Office) and Kay Liboldt (President's Office), the UPC is reviewing old policies that have been superseded or otherwise considered outdated/unneeded. These old policies are currently being reviewed by the UPC and recommendations for removal will be forwarded onto the Senate via Consent calendar.
 - b. Policy Website has been updated for easier upload of new policies, easier searching of policy by title.
 - c. Kay Liboldt recommend and UPC agreed to minor changes of Policy proposal template and instructions to make easier to implement on Policy website and to make documents accessible.
 - 2) Reviewed updates to *Temporary Food Policy*. Minor changes were recommended and UPC voted to send revised version to Senate for 1st reading.
 - 3) Discussed policies that will be coming to the UPC including *Time, Place and Manner Policy* and *Alcohol Policy*.
 - 4) As per the policy on policy, UPC has started a review of the efficacy of the implementation and processes outlined in the Policy on Policy. An efficacy report will be submitted to the Senate for review and comments.
-

University Resources and Planning Committee:

Submitted by March Rizzardi and Provost Alex Enyedi, URPC Co-Chairs

The URPC met Friday, March 9. In that meeting, the URPC discussed the Cabinet's February 22 memo on budget decisions (<https://www2.humboldt.edu/pmc/node/3505>). The URPC co-chairs, with input from the other URPC members, wrote President Rossbacher a letter (http://budget.humboldt.edu/sites/default/files/budget/documents/FY17-18/urpc_letter_to_president_re_feb22_decisions.pdf) providing URPC feedback about the Cabinet's memo.

The URPC also met on Friday, March 23. The first item was to final discussion and approval of the Space Management Policy Implementation Process (see attached policy & summary), as drafted by the University Space & Facilities Advisory Committee (USFAC). The USFAC, formerly the Facilities Working group, serves as the space and facilities advisory body of the URPC.

In the March 23 meeting, the URPC also discussed and approved a Budget Oversight Policy. (see attachment). The Chancellor's Office specified in October, 2017 (<https://www.calstate.edu/icsuam/documents/Section2000.pdf>) that each campus must establish policies and procedures to monitor campus budget performance. Therefore, the URPC developed a campus budget oversight policy that will be useful in helping HSU be more aware of its expenditures and to more proactively address financial concerns.

The third and final topic of the March 23 meeting concerned campus budget communication. The Budget Office is updating its website to keep the campus informed on reduction updates and providing a budget FAQ. The communication discussion then moved on to the importance of a unified "Students First" message to assure students that their access to required classes is the University's top priority.

Date: March 19, 2018
TO: President Rossbacher, Humboldt State University
FROM: University Resources & Planning Committee (URPC) Co-Chairs
Alex Enyedi, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mark Rizzardi, Professor of Mathematics
RE: UPRC Feedback Concerning Cabinet's February 22, 2018 Budget Memo

This letter provides you with URPC feedback concerning budget reduction decisions outlined in the University Cabinet's February 22, 2018 memo. In particular, you requested that URPC members focus on how Cabinet's decisions align with fiscal priorities and the University's vision and strategic plan.

The hard choices outlined in Cabinet's letter were necessitated by HSU's current fiscal dilemma which can largely be attributed to: 1) deficit spending over multiple years, 2) depleted central reserve fund, 3) decreased student enrollment and retention since fall 2015, 4) increased salary and benefit costs, and 5) the Governor's proposed 2018-2019 budget that does not provide a State funding increase adequate to cover CSU goals and promised salary increases. Furthermore, one can argue that our predicament has been amplified because, as repeatedly noted in the 2010 WASC report, HSU has demonstrated a pattern of "finding ways to avoid hard decisions."

The URPC was pleased to see bold fiscal decisions that are strategic in nature as opposed to being simply "across the board", dependent upon optimistic revenue generation, or relying on an unlikely increase in student enrollment during the 2018-2019 academic year. The URPC is appreciative that hard decisions are no longer being avoided by HSU leadership. The challenges and impacts of some of these decisions underscore the importance of developing a clear communication plan as the University moves forward with budget reductions. Also, despite the need to direct current focus on finding near-term budget solutions, the Committee encourages Cabinet to keep HSU's long-term strategic goals in mind while moving forward in building a sustainable budget model.

The 2015-2020 Strategic Plan began with a letter from the planning committee co-chairs that stated: "... a sustainable budget will enable HSU to implement this strategic plan..." Therefore, budget decisions that move the University toward a sustainable budget are in alignment with HSU's strategic plan. In fact, Goal 4 of the Strategic Plan listed three objectives:

- Objective 4.1: Develop and implement a unified, transparent, and evidence-based budget model that reflects institutional priorities and the actual cost and size of programs;
- Objective 4.2: Reduce operational costs and reallocate funds to areas as defined by the strategic plan; and

- Objective 4.3: Expand resources to support the University's mission, including identifying new resources, finding efficiencies, and being good stewards of existing resources.

The creation of the URPC, numerous open forums in the past twelve months, and public-oriented components of the University Budget Office's website (<https://budget.humboldt.edu/>) represent significant movement toward transparency. Use of FIRMS expenditure codes to compare HSU to other CSU campuses represented one aspect of evidence-based budgeting. As a whole, Cabinet's budget decisions appeared to focus on reducing operational costs, finding efficiencies, and demonstrating responsible stewardship of existing resources.

Moving forward, the URPC urges Cabinet to develop a clear communication plan. Uncertainty surrounding budget reductions will feed rumors which negatively impact morale. The importance of morale cannot be understated at a University which depends upon human capital - students and employees. Ideally, the communication plan should inform campus constituents about: what decisions are being made, why the decisions are being made, how they will be implemented, and the expected or realized savings and benefits.

Student misinformation and morale are significant concerns to the URPC. Students are fearful that reductions in academic spending will impact their access to courses and negatively affect the quality of their education. Rumors about potential loss of student employment (for example in Housing and the Children's Center) also feed students' fear of becoming unable to afford their education. Obviously, the success of the University depends upon the success of its students, and vice-versa. A "Students First" message needs to be continually broadcast to reassure students that their success is *genuinely* the University's foremost priority. Building a "Students First" narrative connected to the budget process informs the students that their success is top priority, and provides focus and vision to future budget planning.

Relations and communication with the off-campus community is also important. The public letter writing campaign to save the Third Street Gallery provides evidence that more effective communication is needed. Some members of the URPC did not understand the details behind the decision, so the URPC can assume the public also lacked understanding of the rationale. Not knowing relevant details may have exacerbated the public's negative reaction to the proposed closing. Furthermore, HSU should make a concerted effort to inform the off-campus community of the University's many positive contributions, many of which are made by HSU students. In general, we should be vigilant that the University not risk isolating itself from the general community.

Communication with faculty, staff, and students should be increased with regard to final decisions and their impact. Open budget forums held this past year have been a great start keeping the University's members informed, and for gathering feedback. Now that decisions are being implemented, additional approaches are needed. Change management should be utilized to help facilitate details of what the changes should be, and how to put them into effect. Where

allowable, details of "what", "why" and "how" should be shared with the campus community to quell uncertainties and rumors. Furthermore, URPC members recommend that the Budget Office website include a summary of implemented actions, realized dollar savings (one-time or General Fund base dollars) and/or efficiencies realized (e.g. reduction in unnecessary work duties, combining units, eliminating redundancies, streamlining processes).

Because the URPC is composed of administrators, staff, faculty, and students, committee members hold different perspectives and opinions about Cabinet's decisions. This letter represents concerns voiced by the majority of the URPC members. Committee members with individual concerns have been encouraged to write to you directly. Topics raised by more than one URPC member were: the Children's Center, impacts on teaching/instructional delivery, and Athletics.

Many URPC members had questions about the search for alternative pathways to deliver Children's Center services. Questions revealed concerns about the impact to student employment, students with children, Children's Center employees' collective bargaining agreements, external grants, and the potential for being placed within an auxiliary. Recognizing the significant expense of the Center, the URPC is not critical of the decision, but many details remain to be flushed out on the Children's Center topic.

There was concern expressed by a few URPC members about the search for savings in instruction/academics. Many faculty are wary that the measures being directed from administrators have the potential to harm students by restricting access to required classes. Faculty desire that flexibility be employed when invoking change. Open communication channels between faculty and administrators is necessary so that, when needed, timely corrections can be made. In the long run, a strategic academic master plan should be explored to help guide changes that ensure student success and achieve the goals of the Graduation Initiative 2025.

The URPC noticed that Athletics, although mentioned several times in the letter, was not targeted for budget cuts in the Cabinet's letter. We acknowledge that the Athletics budget situation is fluid, however, we request being kept informed about where Athletics stands in regard to impacting the University's budget planning for the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

Moving forward beyond the Cabinet's letter, the URPC has several suggestions. The campus should continue to build a participatory budget process for strategic budgeting and include a clear communication plan. We also propose the Cabinet employ thoughtful cost-benefit analysis practices to help articulate the costs and values of all campus programs and services. Cost-benefit analyses could also benefit campus strategic decision making. The Budget Oversight Policy should provide necessary tools for quarterly monitoring revenues and expenditures, so difficult situations, such as the current CNRS overspend (deficit), do not arise in the future. The University should also continue the use of FIRMS expenditure codes to benchmark how we spend and invest resources relative to other CSU campuses. Finally, once

HSU has achieved fiscal stability and has resources to invest, we will need to increase our search for new and creative avenues to generate revenue.

In summary, URPC is pleased to see hard decisions being made that are strategic in nature versus simply “across the board” horizontal budget cuts. We commend the Cabinet for initiating action. Although not every individual decision was supported by every URPC member, the general consensus was one of support and relief that decisions are finally being made and acted upon. We encourage a clear communication plan be developed. The communication plan, where feasible, should clearly inform people of the "what", "why", and "how" of each decision. A communication plan should not overlook the importance of keeping students accurately informed. Using a tactic of transparent cost-benefit analyses could aid future strategic budgeting. The URPC is looking forward to an era where fiscal stability allows the University more opportunities to focus on growth and self-investment.

University Administrative Standard: Space Management Policy Implementation

Overview

Space is a central and critical University resource. It is our collective responsibility to manage and steward it well. The allocation and use of space shall be conducted in a consistent manner designed to optimize the use of this resource and advance the mission and strategic priorities of the University. To ensure such, the University has implemented P15-03 Space Management Policy. The procedures established herein are intended to guide the campus toward successfully achieving implementation of said policy.

Procedures for Implementation of the Campus Space Management Policy

1. Jurisdiction & Authority

Oversight for development and implementation of P15-03 Space Management Policy and the procedures established herein is provided by Facilities Management in collaboration with University Division lead administrators and based upon the review and approval of the University Space & Facilities Advisory Committee (USFAC - formerly the Facilities Working Group) which serves as the space and facilities advisory body to the University Resource & Planning Committee. Divisions are responsible to comply with the overarching policy and procedure established herein but may further develop internal divisional processes.

Divisions recognized within the campus include the President's Office, Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Student Affairs, and Advancement.

2. Assignment of Existing Space Allocations

Space is allocated for use by departments and operating units. Day-to-day responsibility for the assignment of spaces to specific occupants and uses within a department rests with the Director or Chair of that department with the understanding all such assignments must be approved by the Dean of the College or lead administrator for the Major Budget Unit (MBU) in which the department is located. Space assignments will be updated by the Department Key Advisor via the Space Change Webform. Occupancy change information will be routed to TNS and Facilities Management for action.

Should space assignment conflicts exist which cannot be resolved within the Department, the respective Dean or Lead Administrator for the MBU shall finalize the decisions associated with the assignment of space. Should the department or operating unit have a need to change a space type within their existing space allocation, refer to "Requests for Changes in Existing Space Type" below.

3. Requests for Reallocation of Existing Division Space

All requests for reallocation of existing space within a Division may be initiated by the requesting Department or Division and shall be submitted by the respective Key Advisor via the Space Change Webform. Such form will be routed to the MBU lead administrator and Division lead

Facilities Management

administrator for approval. The lead administrators are encouraged to obtain a space utilization analysis and recommendation from Facilities Management to assist with ensuring all University space is used efficiently and optimally. MBU and Division lead administrators may not reallocate space across divisions without USFAC review and approval. Once space changes have been approved, the form is routed to TNS and Facilities for action. Based on data collected by the Space Change Webform, all space reallocations will be reported to USFAC by Facilities Management on a regular basis.

4. Requests for Additional Division Space

All requests for additional space shall first follow the procedure outlined in the section above titled "Request for Reallocation of Existing Division Space". Should the division be unable to meet department space needs, a request for additional space may be submitted to the USFAC by the division lead through the Key Advisor via the Space Change Webform. The USFAC will review such requests in accordance with the following:

- University Strategic Plan - Space needs resulting from approved strategic initiatives in alignment with the University's priorities.
- University Budget Plan - Space needs resulting from inclusion in the University's budget.
- Academic & Student Support Program Planning - Space needs resulting from curricular and program development as well as enrollment management plans and student support program development.
- Personnel Recruitment Planning - Space needs resulting from approved faculty and staff recruitments.
- Administrative Planning - Space needs to support the administrative functions of the University.

Facilities Management will provide a space needs analysis, when appropriate, to address whether the request is in compliance with University and California State University requirements. A recommended action will accompany the space needs analysis for the USFAC's review. Possible outcomes of this review may be a cross divisional reallocation, reallocation of University held space, or no available space identified. A summary of space change requests/approvals will be provided to URPC annually, or upon request.

5. Temporary Space Reallocation

Temporary space reallocation beyond a duration of six months or which require space modifications will be managed at the division level and will require the completion of the Space Change Webform. A temporary space reallocation **across divisions** beyond a duration of six months or which require space modifications may not proceed without USFAC review and approval.

6. Allocation of Vacated Space

Space vacated by a physical move or made available due to renovation or new construction is allocated back to the University for reallocation. Likewise, space vacated due to a reduction in program size, reduction in workforce or program elimination is also allocated back to the University for reallocation. The Key Advisor of the department to which the space was originally

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Facilities Management

allocated will submit such information in the Space Change Webform. Vacated space will be held as such in the University space database and shall be reallocated in accordance with other sections of this Standard and shall be administered by USFAC through delegation from the URPC pursuant to P15-03 Space Management Policy

7. Requests for Changes in Existing Space Type, Square Footage, or Capacity

All requests for changes in space type, square footage, and/or capacity shall be endorsed and supported by the Division lead administrator on the Space Change Webform. Applicable changes in space include those associated with the primary function, assignable square footage, or seating capacity of a room. For instance, if a space was initially classified as self-instruction computer lab, and a division wished to convert it to a teaching space for scheduled classes, the Space Change webform would be used to request approval of such space type change by the USFAC.

Facilities Management shall review space change requests and provide a space utilization analysis and associated recommended action to the USFAC, where appropriate. This analysis will highlight whether the space change request is in compliance with HSU and California State University space classification and utilization standards. The USFAC shall consider all such requests and render a final decision.

8. Facility & Space Data

Facilities Management shall be responsible to maintain detailed records for all facilities including an inventory of all space utilized by the University. This includes maintaining an inventory of space assignments (AKA Occupancy), tracking changes in room function, physical alterations, and station count or capacity as well as conducting periodic space audits for all buildings owned or leased by the University to ensure accuracy of the data.

As the University's facility and space data reporting authority with the Chancellor's Office, Facilities Management shall be responsible to maintain the University's data in the California State University system-wide Space & Facilities Database. Facilities Management will coordinate with and work collaboratively with Academic Scheduling and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness so as to ensure space information aligns with academic scheduling programs and the Academic Planning Database.

9. Effective Space Utilization

Per 15-03 Space Management Policy, all University space shall be managed to ensure effective and efficient utilization of space over time.

Facilities Management shall conduct space utilization analyses for the purpose of summarizing existing University space utilization in consideration of strategic and programmatic goals as well as operational needs. Such studies also include recommendations for improvements and/or changes ensure the most effective utilization of University space. Space utilization analyses shall be conducted in consultation and partnership with the associated Division, College, Department

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Facilities Management

or Unit. Studies are generated in response to requests for new space, reallocation of existing space, alterations of space, and changes in space use.

Lecture and teaching laboratory space utilization is of utmost importance. As such, priority for assignment or allocation of existing or new space shall be made in a manner designed to ensure space utilization is maximized. Requests for allocation of existing or new space for lecture or teaching laboratories shall be prioritized where California State University space utilization standards are exceeded.

Research space shall be assigned in a manner aligned with California State University space standards. Priority for use of research space shall be granted to those faculty currently conducting funded research. Requests for assignment or allocation of existing or new research space shall follow those guidelines set forth herein.

Administrative, office and other defined space types shall be assigned in a manner aligned with California State University space standards. As part of the consideration of space assignments for these space types, the preservation of departmental or operating unit integrity is a high priority and the nature of the occupant's work shall influence whether an individual is assigned a private office. The assignment of more than one office to a specific individual is highly discouraged and requires approval of the individual's Division lead administrator. Part-time faculty, graduate teaching assistants, research assistants and support staff should expect to share space unless specific needs require otherwise.

References

- 15-03 Space Management Policy California State University Administrative Manual, Section V, Measurement Devices for Campus Physical Planning (9045- 9050)
- California State University Administrative Manual, Section VI, Standards for Campus Development Programs (9060- 9079)
- California State University Space Standards Chart, SUAM Appendix B

Glossary

Allocation: Designation of space to a particular department, organization, or program for use and stewardship

Assignment: Designation of occupancy within a space (i.e. faculty/staff/student assigned to occupy that space for University business)

Campus Space Analyst: Individual responsible for maintaining campus the space database. The database is used for reporting requirements to the Office of the Chancellor as well as in data-driven decision making both at the campus and system-wide levels. This analyst currently works in Facilities Management and uses FacilitiesLink (MetaBIM, Inc.) to track space use, allocation, and assignment at Humboldt State University. Individual will administer the Space Change Webform and produce Space Utilization Analyses & Recommendations.

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Facilities Management

Division: Business branches of Humboldt State University, including Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, President's Office, Student Affairs, University Advancement

FM: Facilities Management and all of its individual units.

Key Advisor: Contact person regarding department requests to campus service providers, including TNS and FM. The Key Advisor is assigned to this role by the Lead Administrator of the Department, Organization, College, or MBU. This person has knowledge of department budgets or works closely with the department account manager for service cost approvals. This person will review billing information frequently enough to resolve any problems - if a budget analyst reviews the data, they must go through the KA for changes. This person is responsible for ordering services, budget approval, and passing on training information from TNS and FM. Potential service orders include: Occupancy updates for space, phone, and computer jack assignments; Directory updates; Phone services; Asset location updates for S-tagged equipment; Key and access requests; Moving support and boxes.

Lead Administrator: Individual possessing signature authority for the Organization, Department, MBU, or Division. Examples include: Directors; Department Chairpersons; Deans; VPs; President.

MBU: Major Budget Unit

Space Change Webform: Webform used by Key Advisors to request any change in space assignment (occupancy), allocation, type/use, capacity, or size. This webform includes fields necessary for FM, ITS, TNS, and Asset Management services associated with a move requests. It is administered by Campus Space Analyst.

Space Capacity: The number of occupants that may occupy a space at one time. Space capacities are calculated using the square footage of the space and the Office of the Chancellor's standards for the associated space type or derived from California building code. Where conflicts exists, the more restrictive will be applied.

Space Utilization: A measure of use of a room or indoor space with respect to capacity standards specific to that room's assigned Space Type. Space Utilization is benchmarked against CSU standards.

Space Type: Functional category for a room or indoor space based on the design and use of that space. Space types are defined by the Office of the Chancellor of the California State Universities. Examples include: Lecture; Research; Conference room. All indoor University rooms/spaces are associated with a single space type by the Campus Space Analyst. Various space types are associated with different space capacity standards, also set by the Chancellor's Office.

Temporary Space Allocation: Designation of space to a department, organization, or program for a duration of no more than two years

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Facilities Management

TNS: Telecommunication & Network Services

URPC: University Resources & Planning Committee, standing committee of the University Senate and defined by the Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure

USFAC: University Space & Facilities Advisory Committee, subcommittee to the URPC

Humboldt State University Budget Oversight Policy

[Policy Number]

University Budget Office

Applies to: Faculty, staff

Purpose of the Policy

Effective October 12, 2017, the Integrated CSU Administrative Manual (ICSUAM Section 2002.00) formalized and established a systemwide policy on budget oversight and specified that each campus must establish policies and procedures to monitor campus budget performance. As required by the system policy, this policy provides an overview of the financial reviews that will occur, frequency, action to be taken to address financial concerns, documentation, and reporting requirements.

Definitions

Policy Details

Overview of Financial Reviews

Financial reviews will compare budgeted and actual revenues and expenditures, including year-to-date activity and projected activity through the end of the fiscal year, if applicable. All University departments are required to perform financial reviews in accordance with Humboldt State University's Quarterly Budget Oversight Procedures. Financial reviews will be consolidated at the Major Budget Unit (MBU) level for evaluation, reporting, and to address any financial concerns that may arise during the review process. All financial reviews must be signed off on by the MBU lead administrator (e.g. Dean, AVP, Director).

Frequency of Reviews

Reviews will occur quarterly.

Action Taken to Address Financial Concerns

If there is a financial concern (e.g. budget shortfall/anticipated year-end deficit) that the MBU cannot resolve internally within the MBU, a formalized one-time funding request submitted by the MBU lead administrator must be made to the divisional level and include written details regarding research to be conducted, a resolution plan, and expected and final completion dates. If the financial concern cannot be addressed within the division, a formalized request must be submitted by the division Vice President to the University Resources & Planning Committee (URPC) for one-time funding consideration. The URPC will make a recommendation to the President, who will then approve the funding request or determine an alternate course of action.

Documentation

Detailed documentation, including the financial reviews and the activities outlined in the Action Taken to Address Areas of Concern section, will be retained electronically within HSU's enterprise budgeting system (currently Questica) and summarized documentation will be posted on the Budget Office website.

Reporting

The University Budget Office will provide summarized reports at the Major Budget Unit (MBU) level to the President, Cabinet, and the URPC on a quarterly basis. In addition, the reports will be posted on the Budget Office website.

References

[ICSUAM Section 2002.00 – Budget Oversight Policy](#)

History

Issued: MM/DD/YYYY

Revised: MM/DD/YYYY

Edited: MM/DD/YYYY

Reviewed: MM/DD/YYYY

University Administrative Standard: Space Management Policy Implementation URPC Review

Overview

Facilities Management is asking for final review of the Draft Space Management Policy Implementation as attached to this summary. The following are major points of the implementation are outlined to capture specific items of review that were discussed in the presentation given to URPC and other feedback from campus group. These items are meant to aid overall review of the document.

Procedures for Implementation of the Campus Space Management Policy

1. Jurisdiction & Authority

This section establishes the authority of administration of the implementation process by USFAC as delegated by URPC and that all divisions are subject to the policy and implementation.

2. Assignment of Existing Space Allocations

This section is meant to describe that day to day operations will be still operate as normal. The only change is that assignments will need to be approved by the “Dean of the College or lead administrator for the Major Budget Unit”. Space reporting will be through the web form.

3. Requests for Reallocation of Existing Division Space

This section provides a process for “reallocation of EXISTING division space”. The authority for reallocation rests with the “MBU and Division lead administrators”. “MBU and Division lead administrators” may not reallocate across divisions without USFAC approval. Space reporting will be through the web form.

4. Requests for Additional Division Space

All requests for additional space shall first follow the procedure outlined in the section above titled “Request for Reallocation of Existing Division Space”. If that proves infeasible USFAC will evaluate based on stated criteria. Also establishes authority over this space by URPC-USFAC

5. Temporary Space Reallocation

This section should be reviewed in context with the defined term of “temporary” established in the glossary

6. Allocation of Vacated Space

This sections describes our process for how we will handle “Vacated Space” and establishes authority over this space by URPC-USFAC

7. Requests for Changes in Existing Space Type, Square Footage, or Capacity

The section establishes process and authority over this space change by URPC-USFAC in consultation with Facilities Management

8. Facility & Space Data

This section explains the process, importance, and responsibility of Facility & Space data.

9. Effective Space Utilization

This section explains the process, importance, and responsibility of Effective Space Utilization. Also this section offers examples and general philosophy regarding space utilization.

Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU):

Submitted by Mary Ann Creadon, ASCSU Representative, via John Tarjan

Report from ASCSU March 15-16, 2018

- 1. Chair Miller** reported on Executive Committee discussions with the administration dealing with shared governance. She also allowed other members of the Executive Committee to share their impressions of the process. The talks have resulted in “marked progress.” The discussions began at a general, philosophical level and have now progressed to more specific issues, many of which have been contentious at times. The foundation of shared philosophical principles enables the talks and shared governance going forward to be more productive. The Executive Committee prepared a statement of principles of shared governance that all parties involved are using as a framework to proceed. The wording of the document is being jointly perfected. Important issues being discussed include the meaning of “joint decision-making,” when it is important, when consultation is imperative, etc. It is anticipated that standing committees will meet in executive session (faculty members only) during the April 13 interim meetings to provide feedback on a draft of the document. First year senators will have a chance to meet virtually with the Chair to discuss the document during the same time frame. Once feedback from committees and individuals is received, the Executive Committee will continue working with the administration to hopefully come to an agreement on wording by the end of the academic year. Senator Krabacher reports he began the process with some skepticism and found the first few meetings to be relatively difficult but indicated that he is now very optimistic of a good outcome. Senator Aloisio is also optimistic. Definitions are being agreed to. Circumstances that may impact the appropriate form of consultation, timing, joint decision-making, etc. are being explored. Effective consultation presumes the ability to influence the ultimate decision being considered. Senator Collins stresses the need to view faculty concerns as legitimate and motivated by concerns for our students and mission. Vice Chair Nelson is hopeful but not fully optimistic, pending actions by the administration. Agreement about what “joint decision-making” implies is critical in our attempts to make shared governance more effective going forward. She stressed the importance of adequate time to engage in consultation. Chair Miller finished her remarks by stating how proud she is of the Executive Committee and the job they are doing in representing the faculty in these discussions and is gratified by the willingness of members of the administration to work on these issues. One Senator pointed out that while there may be a desire not to “re-litigate the past,” many groups have weighed in negatively since November about the Executive Orders. Another Senator complained that the administration is not listening to our concerns about the implementation of the EOs. Chair Miller highlighted several other items contained in her written report.

Chair Miller’s current and other past chair reports can be found at

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/

2. Excerpts from Other Reports

- a. **Academic Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - i. Resolution on State University Grants
 - ii. Resolution on Student Success
 - iii. WestEd Evaluation Study of EO 1110 implementation. WestEd plans to visit several campuses to collect data.
- b. **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed the following topics.
 - i. Resolution on admissions and participation in peaceful protests.
 - ii. Resolution on equitable admissions processes.
 - 1. Local admission preferences
 - 2. Problems arising from incorrect entering of HS transcript information
 - iii. Teacher preparation partnership in Bakersfield.
 - iv. Next Generation Science Standards
- c. **Faculty Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - i. Faculty numbers and hiring
 - ii. Impact of technology and on-line instruction on faculty
 - 1. Potential reconstitution on the CSU Commission on On-Line Education
 - iii. Advocacy for the CSU (CFA)
 - iv. Faculty Innovation Awards
 - v. Resolution on Counseling Support Services
 - vi. Resolution on Intrusion of Outside Groups into the Development of Curriculum
 - vii. Resolution on Protecting Faculty from Attacks from Outside Groups
 - viii. Resolution on Appreciation of AAUP Support of Shared Governance in the CSU
 - ix. Tenure Density/Tenure Density Task Force Report (pending receipt)
- d. **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics.
 - i. Tracking a lengthy list of potential legislation (narrowed 400 bills to be tracked to circa 30 for which we may wish to take a position)
 - ii. Potential tuition increase
 - iii. Funding the CSU
- e. **GE Advisory Committee** discussed the following issues.
 - i. GE Reviewer Guiding Notes (used by CCC GE course proposers and GE course reviewers)
 - 1. They should be used to clarify or explain policies, not to set policy
 - 2. The notes relative to the “Golden 4” were discussed last week and other sections will be discussed in May
 - ii. Status of CSU campus GE assessment
 - 1. Looking for best practices and the state of assessment by campus
 - 2. Chair Baaske has requested that the senior Senator from each campus provide information about their campus’ GE program review.

f. ITL Advisory Committee

- i. Is providing training on quantitative reasoning through the Center for Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning and written communication training through the Center for Advancement of Reading.
- ii. Is coordinating faculty development across the system through the Faculty Develop Council (comprised of campus faculty development staff).
- iii. 20th Annual Symposium on University Teaching will be held at Pomona and its theme will be Productive Disruption.
- iv. The BOT will have a presentation on community engagement (this year is the 20th anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement).
- v. Academic Human Resources—the need for training for new department chairs and faculty.

g. GE Task Force

- i. Have been meeting for almost a year (9 meetings to date).
- ii. Have a broad agenda with wide-ranging discussion.
- iii. Is broadly constituted including students, CCC, trustees, faculty.
- iv. Will receive a presentation on new approaches to a core GE at their next meeting.
- v. Has consensus on the following issues.
 1. GE should be student-centric
 2. GE programs should be coherent
 3. GE should be designed with intentionality
 4. GE should be contextualized in terms of student experience, society, etc.
- vi. More difficult topics include
 1. Should options be broad or narrow (broadness can lead to a lack of perceived coherence)
 2. Which GE model would be appropriate for the CSU
 3. Role of American Institutions (EO 1061)
 4. The importance of upper-division GE
 5. Grouping of requirements and distribution of requirements across groupings

h. Tenure Density Task Force (from reports above)

- i. Their report will be available soon pending completion of review by the Chancellor (see summary of Chancellor's remarks below.).

3. Faculty Trustee Sabalius reported on his activities since our January plenary and planned activities for the near future. He will visit CSUSB beginning Friday and CSULA soon. He particularly enjoyed the Super Sunday activities (outreach to predominantly Black churches around the state). Next week at BOT, two new presidents will be introduced (CSUB and CSUDH) and admissions policy will be discussed. However, the CSU budget will likely dominate the discussions. The Governor's proposed budget represents an actual total increase (all sources of stateside funding) of less than 1%, even as costs and enrollments are

increasing more rapidly. There is concern that this situation may result in a need for a tuition increase. A complicating factor is a threat from our Governor to decrease our allocation by the amount of any tuition increase.

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml

4. The following second reading item has been withdrawn.
 - a. **Resolution Opposing the Governor's Proposal for a State Mandated Online Learning Lab**

5. We passed the following resolution upon second reading.

<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/>.

 - a. **Revisions to Faculty Trustee Recommendation Criteria and Procedures** is in response to suggestions regarding criteria and procedures from prior ASCSU Trustee recommending committees and commends a set of "best practices" to future committees. Minor modifications have been made to the recommended language based upon ASCSU feedback.
 - b. **Tuition Increases in the California State University** opposes tuition increases in principle and argues that any tuition increases be based upon a long term strategy and be predictable.
 - c. **Counseling Support Services and Student Success** asserts a strong relationship between mental health and student success. It also argues for adequate funding for counseling support.
 - d. **2018 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University** proposes positions on a number of bills which might include support, support in concept, no position, oppose, oppose unless amended, watch closely, etc. Positions proposed by the Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee were discussed by the entire body. In several instances, the positions were amended.
 - e. **Call for Continued Advocacy for Adequate Funding of the California State University in Lieu of a Tuition Increase** reminds readers that we have recently had a 5% tuition increase and calls for joint advocacy for adequate state funding.

6. We passed the following resolution without a second reading due to its timely nature (responding to events occurring this week).
 - a. **Participation in Peaceful Protests** endorses the following statement released by Chancellor White this week in response to the nationwide student walkout opposing gun violence. "Peaceful participation in demonstrations will have no impact on applicants for admission to California State University campuses. As a university, we encourage the peaceful exchange of diverse viewpoints and are committed to free speech rights."

7. We introduced the following resolutions that will be considered for adoption at our May plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
 - a. **Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2018/2019 Meetings** is self-explanatory.

- b. **Endorsement of the “White Paper on Student Success”** presents a white paper including a literature review of the dimensions of student success and factors leading to success and introduces a broad definition of success to be used by ASCSU (“The degree to which students possess the skills, knowledge, habits, attitudes, values, and credentials necessary to attain their academic, career, and other life goals”)
 - c. **Condemning the Intrusion of Outside Groups into the Development of Curriculum** asserts the important faculty role in curriculum, urges the CSU administration to be transparent about sources of curricular changes such as those embodied in EOs 1100 and 1110, and argues for sufficient time and research needed to assess the potential effectiveness of proposed curricular changes.
 - d. **Equity and Responsibility in Admissions to the Distinctive Universities and Campuses of the California State University System** argues against legislative intrusion to the admissions process and supports a balance of in- and out-of-area students on our campuses.
 - e. **The State University Grant Program: A Call for Full Funding from the State** recognizes the severe burden the lack of funding for this program places upon the CSU and its students and requests full funding. It also requests an LAO investigation on the impact of underfunding State University Grants.
 - f. **Protecting Faculty from Attacks by Outside Groups** calls for the formation of a committee to draft a policy to address professionally or politically related attacks on CSU students and faculty.
 - g. **Appreciation for the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) Support of Shared Governance at the California State University (CSU)** expresses gratitude for their letters addressing the implementation of EOs 1100 and 1110.
8. **Trustees Adam Day (Vice Chair) and Jane W. Carney** shared their views on the importance of a higher education and how important professors are in the lives of our students. In response to questions and comments: They defended the practice of closed presidential searches but are open to feedback on the issue. The underfunding of State University Grants (and Cal Grants, which if fully funded would make SUGs unnecessary) is something we can try to address but problems like homelessness, unequal income distribution, etc. stem from issues at the state level and need to primarily addressed at that level. We need to charge leadership and staff with evaluating the impacts and effectiveness of programs and policies, including EO 1110. They are willing to meeting with department chairs and visiting classes on their campus visits. The Board appreciates the role of faculty in curriculum and welcomes the ideas of all groups, including outside groups, in developing policy to benefit our students. Trustee Carney shared some valuable insights based upon her experience on the Irvine Foundation board. The best foundations try to support innovation and ideas rather than advocate for specific approaches and solutions. Those foundations can be great partners. We agree that we rely too heavily on lecturer faculty. The Board affirms the importance of ethnic studies in the educational experience of our students. We need to all advocate for the CSU, now more than ever. Our philanthropic

donors could be an important part of that effort. We are open to exploring alternative employment models for our lecturers.

9. Chancellor Timothy White reported that our DACA students and employees continue to have residency status. It looks like the court ruling will push back any consequences of the expiration of DACA for some time, pending court action. We continue to try to support these individuals in any way we can. We have begun intensive lobbying activities related to the budget. We had representatives from ASCSU, CSSA, CFA, CSUEU, the administration, etc. all visiting legislative offices together in Sacramento last week. It was a great collaboration. We have friends in the legislature who are supporting us in our budget request. However, we should recognize that barring increases in our state allocation or other resources, campuses will face an almost 1% effective cut to their budgets (due to mandatory costs, negotiated employee compensation increases, etc.). The increase in faculty compensation over the past few years has just kept pace with the rate of inflation, after many years with very small or no increases. Unfortunately, unlike state agencies, compensation increases in the CSU are not matched by automatic increases to our state funding. It appears that the Governor is unlikely to change his funding recommendations significantly so that we need to focus our efforts on making CSU funding one of the top priorities of Senate and Assembly leadership. Under this budget, we may have our first year of stagnant enrollment in years, despite increased student demand. The tenure density report is ready to be released. (Dr. White symbolically handed Chair Miller the first hard copy.) Tenure density has been decreasing from 80% in the early 1990s to the upper 50% range currently. How can we reverse this trend? We have some sobering financial realities that we have to face. To get back to where we were in the 1990s, we would need a \$1 billion dollar budget increase. It may be more appropriate to have campus or department level goals rather than aggregate system goals. Rural campuses, small departments, certain disciplines face different challenges. The Chancellor welcomes a broad-ranging discussion of how we can move forward and discuss ways to approach the new realities of funding and faculty staffing. In response to questions/comments: We have insufficient mental health services to meet our student needs. County services are also beyond capacity in many places. Expansion of these services are included in our budget request. Our lecturers are very valued and we should explore ways to increase the permanence of these faculty. Feedback on the recent EO's is still welcome but EOs 1100 and 1110 are likely to stand.

10. EVC Loren Blanchard discussed the Board agenda, including the following items related to Academic & Student Affairs.

- Enrollment Management (including impaction and redirection)
 - Local application preference via credit in eligibility index
 - Applicant redirection to open campuses
 - LAO reaction to the Eligibility Study (we are currently admitting more than the top 33.3% of HS graduate state target) to reduce admissions to the target.

- Public Policy Institute—position is that we should continue to admit the top 40+%
- CA HSs are making great progress in increasing the number of students completing the a-g coursework required for UC/CSU admission.
- Resident tuition for adult school graduates
- DNP Title 5 revisions
 - Degree requirements
 - Admissions requirements
- The roles of both graduate and undergraduate education in our mission.
- Degree planning (consider campus academic master plans, including 43 new degree programs, removal of 39 pilot and other programs)
 - The Board may question how we can move forward with new programs given our funding challenges,
- Academic preparation, placement, EAP, Early Start, etc.
- Expenditure of campus Student Success supplemental funding
- Faculty and counselor hiring and increase in course sections offered. (Mandated report to legislature)

Dr. Blanchard reported that our budget priorities include the following.

- Compensation
- Student Success
- Increasing enrollment capacity
- Maintenance of infrastructure

Advocacy in Sacramento will continue to be a high priority. We are holding a number of roundtable discussions with members of the legislation. CSU, Sacramento hosted a conference last month on student basic needs (including food and housing insecurity). Both student needs and campus responses were discussed and highlighted. Discussions with the Executive Committee on shared governance are ongoing. Some of the discussions are difficult but we are making good progress and are hopeful of a good outcome. We are trying to be diligent in pursuing all 6 pillars of GI 2025. We have an important responsibility to the state and our students to reach our goals. We invite all to help us via feedback and other means to make this a success. In response to questions: There are discussions with legislators regarding the top 33.3% of all CA HS graduates admissions guideline. Some provosts are requesting one-time funding for EO 1110 implementation. He will ask his staff to address concerns relative to the most recent FAQ on EO 1110 implementation. The presidents and other groups are very concerned about the potential impacts of eligibility changes on underserved groups. We are still developing metrics to assess the success of EO 1110 implementation and welcome your input. Pass rates of introductory English and math courses will be looked at closely, including potential differential pass rates by different groups. We are making much too little progress on tenure density. It will be difficult to increase enrollment while our campuses are above capacity and we are not receiving state support (only tuition) for far too many

students we are serving. All students are disadvantaged in terms of quality when our funding falls short of needs. He intends to do some research on the group Complete College America. We need to continue to work so that our programs and student choices can meet the needs of employers in CA. There will be a report to the Board on graduate education. We have seen a growth over the last 10 years system-wide in the number of graduate programs offered. They are responsive to state needs. (Reported by Dr. Christine Mallon)

11. Ryan Brown (CSSA Liaison—supported by Brandon, a CSSA staff member) reported that on CSSA activities. He appreciated our openness in our interaction with our Trustee guests earlier in the day. CSSA passed a resolution in support of campus veteran resource centers and will be advocating for the expansion or establishment of centers. CSSA is advocating for a 1-1000 mental health counselor to student ratio on all campuses and increased and more prompt access to students facing difficulties, including underserved students. They hope to increase faculty training in identifying and helping students with mental health issues. They are looking at campus safety issues. They are meeting with gubernatorial candidates to advocate for support for the CSU. They are working to support formerly incarcerated individuals on our campuses. A successful CHES conference was recently held in Sacramento to train students in advocacy and to allow student leaders from across the state to engage in lobbying at the capitol. CSSA is engaged in rolling out a pilot program (3 campuses) providing emergency student housing loans. It will be funded through existing related program funds. CSSA's legislation position process and conventions was shared.

12. Jay Swartz (ERFA Liaison): ERFA has voted to allow staff member and will be considering a corresponding name change. They continue in advocacy on behalf of the CSU.

Administrative Affairs:

Submitted by Doug Dawes, Interim Vice President of Administrative Affairs

Facilities

- Two candidates for the Associate Vice President of Facilities Management will be on campus for interviews on March 29 and April 3.
- The University Space and Facilities Advisory Committee (USFAC) presented the Space Policy Implementation Process to the University Resource Policy Committee (URPC).

Procurement

- Year-end deadlines will be shared shortly.
- Next fiscal year's requisition period will open early again this year; so users will be able to enter future year requisitions starting May 1st.

- PeopleSoft Finance (CFS) will be down starting April 26th at 5:00 pm, and will be down all of Friday the 27th (no requisitions/POs, no checks or payments, no student financial aid, no journal entries, etc.).
- The ProCard reconciliation period for April's reconciliation will be shorter due to the PeopleSoft CFS upgrade (users will have from April 17th – April 23rd).

Accounting

- Three audits in process: Information Security (Auditors currently here), Extended Ed (In response mode) and Centers and Institutes (beginning in May).
- All auxiliary and ancillary audits will begin May 7th: Associated Students, Foundation, Sponsored Programs, University Center, KHSU and the Children's Center.
- The Year End cut off Memo will be going out next week and posted to the Accounting website.

Payroll

- A new Payroll Technician, replacing a retiring employee, will start April 9, 2018

President's Office:

Submitted by Lisa Rossbacher, President, Humboldt State University

Dear colleagues –

Thanks to everyone who helped support the visit by the WASC/WSCUC visiting team last week. In their exit meeting with the University community, the team members complimented HSU on a well-written self-study report, and they offered five commendations and seven recommendations. My brief summary of these items is below, but these represent my interpretation. We will receive a draft of the team's report in a few weeks, and the formal decision about reaffirmation of accreditation will come next summer, after the Commission meeting in late June.

The commendations:

- Our programs are aligned with our stated priorities and institutional values; student commitment to environmental responsibility, sustainability, and social justice was particularly noteworthy.
- The academic programs actively engage students.
- Interdisciplinary programs include an alignment with cultural perspectives (the Klamath Connection was noted as a wonderful example of this).
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is doing a great job of collecting, analyzing, and presenting data that are valuable in making decisions.
- The strategic planning process clearly established student success as a priority and is a valuable guide for resource allocation.

The recommendations:

- HSU needs to be doing more to serve our diverse population of students with appropriate funding and staffing for the programs that serve them.

- The admission efforts need to incorporate more information about the challenges, as well as the opportunities, for students considering HSU (i.e., present the realities of limited housing, safety concerns, racism in the community, etc.).
- The University leadership needs to improve communications on campus and incorporate change management training.
- Student learning outcomes need to be assessed regularly, consistently, and comprehensively.
- HSU needs to be doing more to serve the diverse population of students by providing appropriate academic and student support services (i.e., more funding and more staff. (This is similar to the first recommendation, but this recommendation is connected to a different criterion for review.)
- HSU needs to prioritize adding more faculty of color in the hiring process and training faculty and staff in “cultural competency.”
- HSU must create a sustainable budget stabilize enrollment, and raise more money – from public and private sources – to augment state funding.

With the exception of the second recommendation, all of these are already part of the University’s strategic plan, and I am confident that, as a community, we can address these goals.

Last week, the CSU Board of Trustees discussed system-level options for dealing with budget reductions. I was both reassured and disappointed that the ideas suggested were all familiar, based on our efforts here at Humboldt State. (Reassured that we haven’t missed any of the logical options, but disappointed because I was hoping to hear some great solution that we hadn’t discovered yet.) Here is a general summary of the options that were discussed:

Revenue options

Short term

- Increase state funding
- Increase tuition
- Some combination of these

Long term

- Develop a multi-year budget plan with small, predictable tuition increases
- Expand public-private partnerships
- Increase philanthropic donations to the CSU

Expenditure options

Short term

- Defer hiring faculty and staff
- Adjust institutional financial aid (the State University Grant, or SUG)
- Defer investments in the Graduation Initiative, enrollment increases, and infrastructure

Long term

- Change retirement policies and post-employment programs (shift more of the benefits costs to retirees)
- Enrollment management (freeze or reduce enrollment)
- Program realignment and elimination

Many of these options are ones that must be determined at the system level, not by an individual campus; I believe that HSU is already addressing the options over which we have control. I want to

thank the University Resources and Planning Committee for their thoughtful comments about the February 23 budget proposal. The revised plan, incorporating many of the URPC's suggestions, is scheduled to be complete on March 29.

The CSU is also tracking a large number of bills that have been introduced in the state legislature. The Chancellor's Office of Advocacy and State Relations has identified several notable trends in the legislation that may affect the CSU and the individual campuses. The major themes in these bills support affordability of higher education, student well-being, and prevention of sexual harassment and assault.

As always, I am available to answer questions.