

Chair Zerbe called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm on Tuesday, February 11, 2014, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Braithwaite, Bruce, Cervantes, Creadon, Dye, Ercole, Eschker, Geck, Gold, Karl, Lopes, Meyer, Mola, Moyer, Ortega, Pierce, Richmond, Shaeffer, Snyder, Stubblefield, Thobaben, Tillinghast, Virnoche, Wrenn, Zerbe.

Members absent: Blake, Shellhase.

Guests: Burges, Paynton, Zechman.

1. Announcement of Proxies

Moyer for Alderson, Thobaben for Fulgham.

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S/U (Ortega/Bruce) to approve and adopt the agenda as written.

3. Approval of Minutes from the [January 28](#) & [February 4](#), 2014 Meetings

M/S/U (Creadon/Dye) to approve the minutes from the January 28, 2014 as written.

M/S/P (Bruce/Ortega) to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2014 as written, with two Abstentions.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair (see written reports)

Chair Zerbe provided a written report.

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

Academic Policies Committee (APC) (Mola): The Committee is looking at fee schedules for students who are fully off campus. The campus has no control over the fees for state supported instruction – the fee schedule is dictated by the Chancellor’s Office. Extended Education charges a fee by unit; there are no additional fees. The Committee discussed, with the Registrar, the possibility of creating a policy for students who want to change majors and

move into an impacted program. The Committee decided to let current impactation issues shake out first before attempting to draft a policy.

Q: What is the timeline for impacted programs? A: The campus receives authorization to impact a major and then is allowed year by year to determine the criteria for the number of students that can be let into the program. There is flexibility from year to year.

Appointments and Elections Committee (AEC) (Moyer): Candidates are still needed for the University Faculty Personnel Committee. Following the runoff for the current General Faculty Election, the results will be announced.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) (Virnoche): The group working on revising the current standardized core evaluation form expects to have a report to the FAC by the end of the month and a revised form for the Senate to consider in April.

The Committee is close to making a decision on a system for the electronic RTP process. It has completed a series of interviews with faculty regarding FolioWeb and has had discussions with local IT staff regarding Nolij. Work with new faculty on the process of preparing electronic files will begin soon.

The Committee on Faculty RTP Criteria and Standards has begun reviewing new standards and previously approved standards that are due for a five-year review. The FAC will be considering a proposal for faculty development at its next meeting.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): Senators were encouraged to read the proposal regarding GEAR courses that is included in the Senate packet. The proposal allows departments to propose innovative types of GE pedagogies while the process of GE reform is underway. It would be a good time to explore possibilities for meta-disciplinary approaches to GE. Departments will be asked to share what is learned from each pilot.

University Resource and Planning Committee (URPC) (Eschker): The Committee heard presentations from each of the three vice presidents at its last meeting. It will rank and prioritize the budget augmentation requests. There was a total of over \$2 million dollars requested for budget augmentation.

Associated Students (AS) (Ercole): AS passed a resolution to have students' birthdates printed on Student ID Cards. This will provide undocumented students with a legal form of ID. AS is asking the Library to consider extending its hours on Fridays and Saturdays to accommodate students who work. A lot of work is going into the preparation for a new election system which will allow ranked choice voting. Work on the AS budgets has begun. Special pins have been created for the Centennial graduation class.

HSU Labor Council (Tillinghast): The Council met with President Richmond and thanked him for facilitating the transfer of staff from probationary to permanent appointments. They also

discussed with him the serious need for staff raises and talked about the process. The Council shared a document from Chico – a professional code of conduct for employees – with the President and asked that he consider initiating something similar for HSU.

California Faculty Association (CFA) (Shaeffer): The local chapter met with President Richmond to discuss equity three raises. They were declined because of budget issues.

Academic Affairs (Provost Snyder): A working group has been put together to look broadly at advising on campus. The Provost is putting together another working group to look at ‘right-sizing’ programs to help the campus become more intentional in its approach to growing the university. Issues to be considered will include: what is the optimal size for costly programs, how to optimize capacity, how to address cost issues, etc. The working group will be comprised of the college deans, someone from Institutional Research, and faculty members. The group will complete its task by the end of the semester. If the Senate is interested in a presentation from either working group, let the Provost know.

After further consideration of the unit cap, it has been decided that the campus will return to the old process. Most petitions are being signed and there are enough controls in place to help manage unnecessary units with the unit cap.

President’s Office (President Richmond): The President attended Super Sunday at an African American church in San Mateo. There were a number of CSU alums in the congregation. The work of HSU in the community was recognized by both the Eureka and the Arcata Chambers of Commerce at their recent meetings.

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

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

7. TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 PM – Report on the University Budget (Joyce Lopes, Vice President for Administrative Affairs)

Vice President Lopes shared a PowerPoint presentation, highlighting general budget information, noting Federal and State budget trends, and the Governor’s 2014/15 budget proposal.

The University’s headcount and FTES are all trending upwards. This year’s budget is slightly lower than projected, but still higher than last year. It is anticipated that revenue will be \$400-500,000 less than projected. The campus has done well in terms of its targets and considering its budget of \$120 million dollars. The largest portion (82%) of the budget is salaries and benefits. Salaries are going up slightly and benefit costs are increasing at a greater rate.

Financial aid costs are slightly less, even though the overall funding for students has gone up. The latter is due to the fact that HSU students are receiving more funding from state and

federal resources.

The URPC is looking at budgets over multiple years for planning. The budget for 2014/15 is expected to be a balanced budget. The Committee has agreed to look at a tuition model of funding which would roll back money to the Divisions. It is also considering a reserve policy proposing a reserve between 4-5%.

The URPC introduced a resource request process for 2014/15 which aligns allocations with priorities and is more transparent. It uses the PREP process. Requests include measurable outcomes and there will be follow-up review.

An interactive scenario planning tool has been developed; VP Lopes showed an example of how the tool works. Different figures can be plugged in and it will show how one-time and base requests can impact future years.

The Governor is proposing that the base facilities debt be rolled into the operating budget. This is encouraging, but it will take a while to implement. HSU would receive \$7-10 million dollars. The money would be used for improving existing structures only; not for new facilities. The campus has requested funding for seismic retrofit projects for the Library and for Van Duzer and it appears there is a good possibility of receiving it.

The Facilities Working Group has developed a process to collect and review campus projects. Thirty-three projects were received, totaling \$3.7 million dollars in requests. The projects have been ranked. The Group forwarded a proposal with ca. twenty projects to the URPC, requesting funds to implement the proposal as a whole. If the proposal cannot be funded as a whole, the Group requested to know how much money would be available so it can determine which projects to do, since some of the projects are interdependent.

The URPC will forward its budget recommendation for 2014/15 to the President in March. The President will review and approve or request changes in April. The campus will be notified as soon as possible, sometime before May.

8. Series of Proposed Revisions to the HSU University Senate Constitution and Bylaws

a. Resolution on Forwarding the Proposed Revision of the *Constitution* of the University Senate of Humboldt State University (#21-13/14-CBC) – [Second Reading](#)

Resolution on Forwarding the Proposed Revision of the *Constitution* of the *University Senate of HSU*
21-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the attached revision of the *Constitution* of the University Senate of Humboldt State University be forwarded to the electorate defined in Senate Resolution #20-13/14-AEC for ratification in Spring 2014.

RATIONALE: The Constitution as originally adopted in Spring 2012 sufficiently laid the groundwork for the organization and charge of the Senate. This change is the second step (the first was approval of the Bylaws changes in March 2013) to eliminate redundancies between the University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure and to make the Constitution a clearer and more readable document. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee offered suggested changes to the campus community in Spring 2013 and, after additional changes again in Fall 2013 for feedback. After many committee discussions, the proposed text is expected not to alter the content of the document, but to provide a clearer foundation for future changes, through improving its organization; reducing internal redundancies, conflicts, superfluous text, and vagueness; and eliminating redundancies and conflicts with the Bylaws.

Second Reading:

There were no changes made from the First Reading. There was no discussion. Voting occurred and Resolution #21-13/14-CBC Passed Unanimously.

b. Resolution to Amend the *Constitution* of the University Senate of HSU to Authorize Recall of Elected Senators (#22-13/14-CBC) –[Second Reading](#)

Resolution to Amend the *Constitution* of the University Senate of HSU to Authorize Recall of Elected Senators

22-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the attached proposed amendment to the *Constitution* of the University Senate of HSU be forwarded to the electorate defined in Senate Resolution #20-13/14-AEC for ratification in Spring 2014.

RATIONALE: Senator recall is a common provision in many CSU Senates, as well as Senates outside the CSU. The power for recall is left to the constituency; this amendment to the Constitution establishes this power and, where no procedures exist, delegates procedures to the Bylaws.

Proposed Amendment (change indicated by underline):

Current *Constitution*:

4.0 Membership and Electorate

4.2 Elected Members

4.3 Recall of Senators – Any elected member of the University Senate may be recalled by procedures established by the governing documents of the electorate or, if no procedures exist, by those specified in the *Bylaws*.

Note: If the Proposed Revision (10/30/13) of the Constitution is ratified, this language will appear as 4.7, under 4.0 Membership.

Second Reading:

There were no changes made to the First Reading. There was no discussion. Voting occurred and Resolution #22-13/14-CBC PASSED Unanimously.

c. Resolution to Establish Recall Procedures in the *Bylaws of the University Senate* (#23-13/14-CBC) – [Second Reading](#)

Resolution to Establish Recall Procedures in the *Bylaws of the University Senate*
23-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (Senate) approves the following amendment to the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* (changes indicated by underline):

12.3 Nomination, Recall, and Election Procedures:

12.33 If no procedures for recall exist in a constituent body's governing documents, a recall election is initiated by a petition of one-fourth of the electorate. A majority vote of those voting in the Senator's electorate recalls that Senator.

;and be it further

RESOLVED: That this amendment is provisional on the passage of the amendment to the *Constitution* on senator recall as presented in Senate Resolution #22-13/14-CBC; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate encourage all constituent bodies (Staff Council, Colleges, Associated Students, and the General Faculty) to review their governing documents to include language for recall of elected senators.

RATIONALE: This change creates procedures for recalling a Senator, a power that belongs to the Senator's constituency. Where no recall procedures exist, this establishes recall procedures.

Second Reading:

No changes were made to the First Reading. There was no discussion. Voting occurred and Resolution #23-13/14-CBC PASSED Unanimously.

d. Resolution to Amend the *Constitution* of the University Senate of HSU to Authorize Censure of Senators (#24-13/14-CBC) – [Second Reading](#)

Resolution to Amend *Constitution* of the University Senate of HSU to Authorize Censure of Senators
#24-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the attached proposed amendment to the *Constitution* of the University Senate of HSU be forwarded to the electorate defined in Senate Resolution #20-13/14-AEC for ratification in Spring 2014.

RATIONALE: The Senate needs procedures to reprimand members for unprofessional behavior. This amendment would grant the Senate authority to intervene with established procedures in the Bylaws.

Proposed Amendment (change indicated by underline):

Current *Constitution*:

2.0 Duties

2.6 The Senate shall hold the authority for censure of its members. The Senate shall follow procedures specified in the *Bylaws*.

Note: if the Proposed Revision (10/30/13) of the *Constitution* is ratified, this language will appear as section 2.7.

Second Reading:

Based upon discussion at the last Senate meeting and further reading of Sturgis' *Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*, changes made to the resolution included removing impeachment and expulsion from the process for reprimand.

A body has the inherent right to remove its officers, so there is no need to authorize this process in the Constitution. Since censure and expulsion are different processes, the latter was split off and put in a separate resolution (#31-13/14-CBC).

It was clarified that recall is removal of an elected delegate to the Senate by the body that elected the delegate. Removal of an individual elected by the Senate (one of its officers, chairs, etc.) would follow a different process. The two would overlap if an electorate recalled an individual serving on the Senate who was also elected by the Senate to serve as an officer or chair.

Voting on Resolution #24-13/14-CBC occurred and Passed Unanimously.

e. Resolution to Establish Procedures in the University Senate *Bylaws* for Censure (#25-13/14-CBC) – Second Reading

Resolution to Establish Procedures in the University Senate *Bylaws* for Censure
#25-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University approve the amendment to the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* as attached.

RATIONALE: According to Sturgis, the Senate has the ability to censure its members based on criteria she [Sturgis] lists. The attached procedures set a two-step process where the Senator is made aware of the issues and invited to attend proceedings, as well as set a two-thirds vote for passage.

Amendment on Censure:

12.6 Censure of Senators. Any accusations for censure proceedings shall be initiated in the Senate Executive Committee; the Senate Chair, or Vice Chair if the Chair is part of the proceedings, will notify parties about the accusations prior to any and all formal meetings. The Senate may censure a Senator by a two-thirds vote of those voting, provided the resolution for censure has been presented at the previous regular meeting. Consequences of censure must be summarized in a resolution presented by the Senate Executive Committee and should only be used for issues of misconduct.

Second Reading:

All language referring to impeachment has been removed (per the previous resolution). The procedure still ensures due process for any individual involved, to be initiated by the Senate Executive Committee.

M/S/U (Tillinghast/Thobaben) to amend the resolution by adding a second resolved clause stating that the proposed Bylaws amendment is provisional on the passage of the amendment to the Constitution to authorize Censure as presented in Senate Resolution #24-13/14-CBC.

Voting on Resolution #25-13/14-CBC occurred and Passed unanimously. The amended resolution reads:

Resolution to Establish Procedures in the University Senate *Bylaws* for Censure
#25-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University approve the amendment to the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* as attached; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this amendment is provisional on the passage of the amendment to the *Constitution* on authorizing censure as presented in Senate Resolution #24-13/14-CBC.

RATIONALE: According to Sturgis, the Senate has the ability to censure its members based on criteria she [Sturgis] lists. The attached procedures set a two-step process where the Senator is made aware of the issues and invited to attend proceedings, as well as set a two-thirds vote for passage.

f. Resolution to Establish Procedures in the University Senate *Bylaws* for Removal from Elected Positions in the Senate (#30-13/14-CBC) – [Second Reading](#)

Resolution to Establish Procedures in the University Senate *Bylaws* for Removal from Elected Positions in the Senate
#30-13/14-CBC – February 11, 2014 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University approve the amendment to the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* as attached.

RATIONALE: According to Sturgis and based on criteria listed in Sturgis, the Senate should have the ability to remove Senate-elected officers. The attached procedures set a two-step process where the Senator is made aware of the issues and invited to attend, as well as sets a two-thirds vote for passage.

Amendment on Removal from Elected Positions in the Senate:

12.52 Removal from Elected Positions in the Senate – Any accusations for proceedings that would result in removal from an elected position in the Senate shall be initiated in the Senate Executive Committee; the Senate Chair, or Vice Chair if the Chair stands accused or initiated the accusation, will notify parties about the accusations prior to any and all formal meetings. A resolution to remove a

senator from an elected Senate position must pass by a two-thirds vote of the other members of the Executive Committee before being presented to the full Senate. The resolution must then pass the Senate by two-thirds of those voting after having presented the resolution at the previous meeting.

Second Reading:

The language for removal of elected positions was previously included in Resolutions #24 and #25 and is now presented separately. It conveys what was intended by the term impeachment.

Discussion:

Q: How does this apply to the Senate chair? A: It would not apply, as the Senate Chair is elected by the General Faculty, not the Senate.

M/S/U (Abell/Tillinghast) to amend the language of the proposed Bylaws amendment as follows:

12.52 Removal from Elected Positions in the Senate – Any accusations for proceedings that would result in removal from an elected position in the Senate shall be initiated in the Senate Executive Committee; the Senate Chair, or Vice Chair if the Chair is part of the proceedings, stands accused or initiated the accusation, will notify parties about the accusations prior to any and all formal meetings. A resolution to remove a senator from an elected Senate position must pass by a two-thirds vote of the other members of the Executive Committee before being presented to the full Senate. The resolution must then pass the Senate by two-thirds of those voting after having presented the resolution at the previous meeting.

Voting on Resolution #30-13/14-CBC occurred and Passed Unanimously.

g. Resolution to Establish Procedures in the University Senate *Bylaws* for Expulsion (#31-13/14-CBC) – [Second Reading](#)

The language for expulsion was originally included in Resolutions #24 and #25. According to Sturgis, a body does not have the authority to expel members it has not elected or who are elected by another constituency. There was no objection to withdrawing the resolution.

M/S/P (Ortega/Eschker) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 4:11 pm.