



AGENDA:

Tuesday, April 15, 2014, 3:00-5:00 pm, Goodwin Forum (NHE 102)

1. Announcement of Proxies
2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of April 1, 2014
4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair
5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (No Written reports)
6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) –
7. TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM – Open Forum for the Campus Community ([Open Forum Procedures](#))
8. TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 PM – Resolution Establishing the Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (#39-13/14-EX) – Second Reading
9. Resolution on HSU Policy for Cross-Listing of Courses (#37-13/14-APC) – Second Reading
10. Resolution on Elimination of CWT Course Designation (#38-13/14-APC) – First Reading
11. Resolution on the Revised Course Evaluation Questions (#40-13/14-FAC) – First Reading
12. Resolution on Amendment to Appendix J: Electronic Identity Verification (#41-13/14-FAC) – First Reading
13. Resolution on the Perpetual Calendar (#42-13/14-EX) – First Reading w/Attachments
14. TIME CERTAIN: 4:00 PM – Resolution on Sexual Assault, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy (#46-13/14-EX) – First Reading
15. Resolution Establishing a Task Force to Investigate a Co-Curricular Transcript (#44-13/14-APC) – First Reading
16. Resolution Urging the California Faculty Association to Negotiate Confidential Course Evaluations (#45-13/14-APC) – First Reading
17. Informational Item: Course Evaluation Report
18. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:50 PM – Seating of Newly Elected Senators and Elections for Senate Officers
19. Resolution of Commendation

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE MEETING ON April 1, 2014

- Nominations for 2013/2014 Distinguished Faculty Awards (Faculty Awards Committee) received, accepted and forwarded as an Emergency Item.
- Resolution on Amendments to Appendix J Regarding Election of University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) Members (#34-13/14-AEC) – [Second Reading](#) ; [Attachment](#) – Passed Unanimously.
- Resolution to Amend the University Senate Bylaws and Eliminate the Campus Climate Committee (CCC) as a University Senate Standing Committee (#36-13/14-EX) – [Second Reading](#) – Passed.
- Resolution on Revision to the “Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU” (#10-13/14-ICC) – [Second Reading](#) ; [Attachment](#) – Passed.

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate Minutes

DRAFT
13/14:12
04/01/14

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

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

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

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

1. Announcement of Proxies

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

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

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

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

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

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

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

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

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

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

A: Regarding Title 5's requirement that grad programs have a minimum of 60% stand-alone grad courses; Title 5 says courses primarily for grad students needs to be organized primarily

for graduate students. Monty will send out link to language of actual resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following item was approved without objection: 13-437

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

There were two speakers for the Open Forum.

Fulgham spoke on Auxiliary Reorganization and made the following points:

1. I made strong comments at the Senate meeting on Feb. 25, 2014, some of which are in the minutes, especially pages eight and nine.
2. I have read the original charges and President Richmond's email deferring a decision to the fall under President Rossbacher.
3. I request that the Senate Executive Committee develop a resolution asking that the exploratory process be stopped immediately.
4. President Richmond's email on the postponement has a tacit implication that the process is fait accompli, with only the approval by President Rossbacher.
5. The original separation of the University Advancement and Sponsored Programs into individual units was done long ago as each one's mission is very different. Therefore the governing bodies of each have more-or-less different memberships to meet that bodies operational objectives.
6. The University Center was created in 1970 (or about then) and really is a student-centered operation, totally different than the two foundations.
7. My chief concerns are these:
 - a. Consolidation of the reserves of \$9 million and \$4 million to be available for more general use
 - b. Loss of identity to the missions of each foundation

- i. Philanthropy
- ii. Grants & contracts
- c. I see no other reasons and the veil of operational efficiencies can be achieved without consolidation
- d. The Working Group reports to a Foundation Task Force and the Vice Presidents on each Working Group are also on the Task Force.

Cervantes spoke on Auxiliary Consolidation; he asks the senate to develop a resolution to ask that the exploratory process be stopped. Students have not been part of the exploratory process. Students paid for the University Center with a fee that they approved; the board is supposed to be 51% or more student led.

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

M/S/P (Bruce/Moyer) that the University Senate enter into Executive Session, with the faculty co-chair of the Faculty Awards Committee invited to remain, for the reading of the nomination letters for the 2013/2014 Distinguished Faculty Awards.

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

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

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

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

Discussion included:

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

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

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

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

Q: with new president coming on board, what is the sense of the committee regarding

proceeding or putting it on hold until the new President starts.

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

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

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

Q: Item 5 second page, what sustainability issues really means? Understanding sustainable understanding of goods and services withsuggested language.

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

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

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

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

Q: What are our existing outcomes called?

A: HSU SLO outcomes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comment: Really consider some of the impact on the effect this will have on faculty across the university. Faculty have put a tremendous amount of time mapping SLO, program outcomes,

based on the current model we are using. The outcome of this will be a lot of grief because they just dialed in the SLOs, department outcomes, programs. Please consider how best to work with faculty as to minimize the faculty hours required.

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

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

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

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

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

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

; and be it further

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

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

; and be it further

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

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

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

votes cast to be elected. *Members of the UFPC will continue to be elected by the probationary and tenured members of the General Faculty*

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

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

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

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

11. Resolution to Amend the University Senate Bylaws and Eliminate the Campus Climate Committee (CCC) as a University Senate Standing Committee (#36-13/14-EX) – Second Reading

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

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

Strike from University Senate Bylaws:

11.8 Campus Climate Committee (CCC)

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

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

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

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

~~11.84 Duties:~~

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

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

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

Comments in favor: No one spoke in favor

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

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

12. Resolution on Revision to the "Guidelines for Approving New Degree and Credential Programs at HSU" (#10-13/14-ICC) – Second Reading

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Voting occurred; passed with one abstention

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: Guest Filce was asked to explain further how this will work. Filce has been consulted and has been exploring rolling FTE to instructor’s home department for cross-listed courses. FAD simply looks at the appointment data of the faculty and allocates FTE to department. SFR is contributed to the course subject area.

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

Q: What about Kinesology faculty teaching in ESM?

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

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

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

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

Response (Mola): explained the differences between the two bullets. #2 is a change to an

existing course and all courses wishing to be XL each need to signing up with the same signing documents.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item #14 was not discussed.

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

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

Resolution Establishing the Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct
#39-13/14-EX – April 1, 2014 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President the adoption of the attached “Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct,” dated March 2014.

RATIONALE: An audit by the Office of Research Integrity at the Department of Health and Human Resources revealed that Humboldt State University lacked the required policy document dealing with research misconduct. The proposed policy is drawn from similar policies in place at San Francisco State University, CSU Dominguez Hills, and San Jose State University and meets the requirements laid out by major federal granting agencies including the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health/Department of Health and Human Resources.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ICC Consent Calendar for April 15th, 2014 (Note: See the General Meeting Guide (posted online with senate packet materials) for process for approving ICC items on the Senate Consent Calendar)

Please review the proposal information below prior to the Senate meeting. If you have questions, please go to the Nolij site for additional information on the proposals.

To Access the Nolij site, go to: <https://nolij.humboldt.edu> and login through 'MyHumboldt'. Click on "University Senate" (folder) for all items for Senate review. Firefox is recommended to access Nolij.

[Instructions for Accessing Nolij](#) – Further step-by-step instructions.

If, after reviewing the proposal information on Nolij, you have further questions about items, contact Cindy Moyer, ICC Chair.

13-382 Social Work BA Area D Course of Study

Social Work proposes to have their major area of study count for Upper Division Area D GE. The department has prepared a very complete attachment demonstrating how various UD SW classes meet the various UDGE Area D SLOs. Policy at present allows them to make such a substitution and their paperwork demonstrates that the major meets the SLOs required.

13-438

Environmental Studies - Quantitative Analysis Core Competencies. Students who choose the Quantitative Analysis Core competency in the Environmental studies must have completed a pre-requisite of Math 115 or a Math code of 50. Now that Match 115 has an alternative of Math 113 and 114, the program wishes to alter the catalog language to accept Math 113/114 as an additional pre-requisite for the Core Competency.

13-442 Social Work BA Prerequisite Changes

In order to stream line the major and eliminate redundancies with GEAR requirements, Social Work proposes the following prerequisite changes: Eliminate: PSYC 104 (or equiv), SOC 104 (or equiv), HIST 110 or HIST 111 or NAS 200 (or equiv), PSCI 110 or equiv. Revise pre-requisite of ES 105 or NAS 104 to read ES 105, NAS 104, CRGS 108 or another course that is centrally organized

around a theme related to the experiences of marginalized groups.

13-458

MUS 340: Junior Recital - add "guitar performance" to the course description because both piano and guitar students have a junior recital requirement.

13-460

ANTH 303: Human Biology and Evolution - revise course description to better reflect course content.

13-461

ANTH 331: Paleoanthropology: revise the course description to better reflect course content

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate

**Resolution Establishing the Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research
Misconduct**

#39-13/14-EX – April 15, 2014 –Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President the adoption of the attached “Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct,” dated March 2014.

RATIONALE: An audit by the Office of Research Integrity at the Department of Health and Human Resources revealed that Humboldt State University lacked the required policy document dealing with research misconduct. The proposed policy is drawn from similar policies in place at San Francisco State University, CSU Dominguez Hills, and San Jose State University and meets the requirements laid out by major federal granting agencies including the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health/Department of Health and Human Resources.

POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR RESPONDING TO ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Issued: March 2014

I. PURPOSE

Humboldt State University (University) is committed to ethical principles and procedures regarding integrity in all forms of research activity for which the University is responsible. This policy is also intended to conform to the requirements of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS), the National Science Foundation (NSF) and Federal regulations including, but not limited to, the "Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct" [42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93] and the "National Science Foundation Regulations on Misconduct in Science and Engineering Research" [45 CFR, Part 689].

Members of the University community engaged in research and creative activities are not to: fabricate data or results; change or knowingly omit data or results to misrepresent results in the research record; or intentionally misappropriate the ideas, writings, research, or findings of others. All those engaged in research are expected to pursue the advancement of knowledge while meeting the highest standards of honesty, accuracy, and objectivity in their work in general and as authors. This standard extends to all publications. They are also expected to demonstrate accountability for sponsors' funds and to comply with specific terms and conditions of contracts and grants.

II. SCOPE

This policy applies to research conducted under an externally funded sponsored project that is awarded to the University or one of its auxiliary organizations, internally funded research and unfunded research conducted by faculty, staff, or students. Any individual who may work on or contribute to such a project, whether for monetary compensation or not, is covered by this policy. All members of the University community engaged in sponsored project activities are expected to conduct their projects with integrity and intellectual honesty at all times, to act responsibly with respect to the use of funds, and to ensure that they and those who work with them comply with all campus, system wide, agency, and government regulations.

The scope of this policy includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed or reported, or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for external funds resulted in an award. The scope of this policy does not apply to authorship or collaboration disputes. It applies only to allegations of research misconduct that occurred within six years of the date the institution or the sponsor received the allegation, subject to the subsequent use, health and safety of the public, and grandfather exceptions in 42 CFR 93.105(b).

III. DEFINITIONS

Allegation: A disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communications to a University or HHS official.

Complainant: A person who in good faith makes an allegation of research misconduct.

Conflict of Interest: The real or apparent interference of one person's interests with the interests of another person, where potential bias may occur due to prior or existing personal or professional relationships.

Deciding Official (DO): The person responsible for making the final decision on misconduct findings, administrative actions, and other items as listed in this policy and procedure. The Deciding Official will be the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and should have no direct prior involvement in University's inquiry, investigation, or allegation assessment. A Deciding Official's appointment of an individual to assess allegations of research misconduct, or to serve on an inquiry or investigation committee, shall not be considered direct prior involvement.

Evidence: Any document, tangible item, or testimony offered or obtained during a research misconduct proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact.

Fabrication: Making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

Falsification: Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

Good Faith as applied to a complainant or witness: Having a belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony that a reasonable person in the complainant's or witness's position could have, based on the information known to the complainant or witness at the time. An allegation or cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding is not in good faith if it is made with knowing or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or testimony. Good faith as applied to a committee member means cooperating with the purpose of helping University meet its responsibilities under any applicable federal regulations and this policy. A committee member does not act in good faith if his/her acts or omissions on the committee are dishonest or influenced by personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved in the research misconduct proceedings.

Inquiry: Preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding that meets the criteria and follows the procedures set forth in federal regulations.

Investigation: The formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record leading to a decision not to make a finding of research misconduct or to a recommendation for a finding of research misconduct which may include a recommendation for other appropriate actions, including administrative actions.

Misconduct in Research (Research Misconduct): Fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Misconduct in research does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Office of Research Integrity (ORI): The federal office to which the HHS Secretary has delegated responsibility for addressing research integrity and misconduct issues related to PHS supported activities.

Plagiarism: The appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

Preponderance of the evidence: Proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not.

Research: A systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research) relating broadly to a particular discipline or subject by establishing, discovering, developing, elucidating or confirming information about the discipline or subject of the research.

Research Integrity Officer (RIO): The RIO is responsible for: (1) assessing allegations of research misconduct to determine if they fall within the definition of research misconduct, are covered by federal regulations, and warrant an inquiry on the basis that the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified; and (2) overseeing inquiries and investigations and (3) the other responsibilities described in this policy. For this policy, the RIO is the Dean of Research, Economic and Community Development.

Research record: The record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided to a federal agency or University official by a respondent(s) in the course of the research misconduct proceeding.

Respondent(s): The person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a research misconduct proceeding. There can be more than one respondent(s) in any inquiry or investigation.

Retaliation: An adverse action taken against a complainant, witness, or committee member by the institution or one of its members in response to (1) a good faith allegation of research misconduct; or (2) good faith cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding.

IV. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

The Dean of Research, Economic and Community Development will serve as the RIO who will have primary responsibility for implementation of the institution's policies and procedures on research misconduct. The RIO's responsibilities include the following duties related to research misconduct proceedings:

- Consult confidentially with persons uncertain about whether to submit an allegation of research misconduct;
- Receive allegations of research misconduct either in writing or orally;
- Assess each allegation of research misconduct in accordance with this policy to determine whether it falls within the definition of research misconduct and warrants an inquiry;
- As necessary, take interim action and notify ORI of special circumstances, in accordance with this policy;
- Sequester research data and evidence pertinent to the allegation of research misconduct in accordance with this policy and maintain it securely in accordance with this policy and applicable law and regulation;
- Provide confidentiality to those involved in the research misconduct proceeding as required by 42 CFR 93.108, other applicable law, and institutional policy;
- Notify the respondent(s) and provide opportunities for him/her to review/ comment/respond to allegations, evidence, and committee reports in accordance with this policy;
- Inform respondent(s), complainants, and witnesses of the procedural steps in the research misconduct proceeding;
- Appoint the chair and members of the inquiry and investigation committees, ensure that those committees are properly staffed and that there is expertise appropriate to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the evidence;
- Determine whether each person involved in handling an allegation of research misconduct has an unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest and take appropriate action, including recusal, to ensure that no person with such conflict is involved in the research misconduct proceeding;
- In cooperation with other institutional officials, take all reasonable and practical steps to protect or restore the positions and reputations of good faith complainants, witnesses, and committee members and counter potential or actual retaliation against them by respondent(s) or other institutional members;
- Keep the Deciding Official and others who need to know apprised of the progress of the review of the allegation of research misconduct;
- Notify and make reports to ORI as required by 42 CFR Part 93 or any other relevant federal regulations and/or notify and make reports to the appropriate regulatory agency or sponsors as required by regulations and this policy;
- Ensure that administrative actions taken by the institution and ORI are enforced and take appropriate action to notify other involved parties, such as sponsors, law enforcement agencies, professional societies, and licensing boards of those actions; and
- Maintain records of the research misconduct proceeding and make them available to ORI in accordance with this policy.

B. Complainant

The complainant is responsible for making allegations in good faith, maintaining confidentiality, and cooperating with the inquiry and investigation. As a matter of good practice, the complainant should be interviewed at the inquiry stage and given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction. The complainant must be interviewed during an investigation, and be given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction.

C. Respondent(s)

The respondent(s) is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an inquiry and investigation. The respondent(s) is entitled to:

- A good faith effort from the RIO to notify the respondent(s) in writing at the time of or before beginning an inquiry;
- An opportunity to comment on the inquiry report and have his/her comments attached to the report; Be notified of the outcome of the inquiry, and receive a copy of the inquiry report that includes a copy of, or refers to 42 CFR Part 93 and the institution's policies and procedures on research misconduct;
- Be notified in writing of the allegations to be investigated within a reasonable time after the determination that an investigation is warranted, but before the investigation begins (within 30 days after the institution decides to begin an investigation), and be notified in writing of any new allegations, not addressed in the inquiry or in the initial notice of investigation, within a reasonable time after the determination to pursue those allegations;
- Be interviewed during the investigation, have the opportunity to correct the recording or transcript, and have the corrected recording or transcript included in the record of the investigation;
- Have interviewed during the investigation any witness who has been reasonably identified by the respondent(s) as having information on relevant aspects of the investigation, have the recording or transcript provided to the witness for correction, and have the corrected recording or transcript included in the record of investigation; and
- Receive a copy of the draft investigation report and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based, and be notified that any comments must be submitted within 30 days of the date on which the copy was received and that the comments will be considered by the institution and addressed in the final report.

The respondent(s) should be given the opportunity to admit that research misconduct occurred and that he/she committed the research misconduct. With the advice of the RIO and/or other institutional officials, the Deciding Official may terminate the institution's review of an allegation that has been admitted, if the University's acceptance of the admission and any proposed settlement is approved by ORI.

D. Deciding Official (DO)

The DO will receive the inquiry report and after consulting with the RIO and/or other institutional officials, decide whether an investigation is warranted under the criteria in 42 CFR

93.307(d). Any finding that an investigation is warranted must be made in writing by the DO and must be provided to ORI, together with a copy of the inquiry report meeting the requirements of 42 CFR 93.309, within 30 days of the finding. If it is found that an investigation is not warranted, the DO and the RIO will ensure that detailed documentation of the inquiry is retained for at least 7 years after termination of the inquiry, so that ORI may assess the reasons why the institution decided not to conduct an investigation.

The DO will receive the investigation report and, after consulting with the RIO and/or other institutional officials, decide the extent to which this institution accepts the findings of the investigation and, if research misconduct is found, decide what, if any, institutional administrative actions are appropriate. The DO shall ensure that the final investigation report, the findings of the DO and a description of any pending or completed administrative actions are provided to ORI, as required by 42 CFR 93.315.

At Humboldt State University, the University Vice President and Provost of Academic Affairs will serve as the DO.

V. General Policies and Procedures

A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct

All University members will report observed, suspected, or apparent research misconduct to the RIO. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct, he or she may meet with or contact the RIO to discuss the suspected research misconduct informally, which may include discussing it anonymously and/or hypothetically. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research misconduct, the RIO will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem.

B. Cooperation with Research Misconduct Proceedings

University members will cooperate with the RIO and other institutional officials in the review of allegations and the conduct of inquiries and investigations. University members, including respondent(s), have an obligation to provide evidence relevant to research misconduct allegations to the RIO or other University officials.

C. Confidentiality

The RIO shall (1) limit disclosure of the identity of the respondent(s), complainants and witnesses to those who need to know in order to carry out a thorough, competent, objective and fair research misconduct proceeding consistent with applicable laws and regulations; and (2) except as otherwise prescribed by law, limit the disclosure of any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified to those who need to know in order to carry out a research misconduct proceeding. The RIO should use appropriate mechanisms to ensure that there is no disclosure of identifying information.

D. Protecting Complainants, Witnesses, and Committee Members

University members may not retaliate in any way against complainants, witnesses, or committee members. University members should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation against complainants, witnesses or committee members to the RIO, who shall review the matter and, as necessary, make all reasonable and practical efforts to counter any potential or actual retaliation and protect and restore the position and reputation of the person against whom the retaliation is directed.

E. Protecting the Respondent(s)

As requested and as appropriate, the RIO and other institutional officials shall make all reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, but against whom no finding of research misconduct is made. During the research misconduct proceeding, the RIO is responsible for ensuring that respondent(s) receive all the notices and opportunities provided for in federal regulations and the policies and procedures of the University.

F. Interim Administrative Actions and Notifying ORI of Special Circumstances

Throughout the research misconduct proceeding, the RIO will review the situation to determine if there is any threat of harm to public health, federal or other sponsor funds and equipment, or the integrity of the PHS or other sponsor supported research process. In the event of such a threat, the RIO will, in consultation with other University officials and ORI or other appropriate regulatory agencies and/or sponsor, take appropriate interim action to protect against any such threat. Interim action might include additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of federal/sponsor funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of federal/sponsor funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results or delaying publication. The RIO shall, at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, notify ORI or any other appropriate regulatory agency and/or other sponsor immediately if he/she has reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:

1. Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;
2. HHS or other sponsor resources or interests are threatened;
3. Research activities should be suspended;
4. There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
5. Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;
6. The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and HHS action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or
7. The research community or public should be informed.

VI. Conducting the Assessment and Inquiry

A. Assessment of Allegations

Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the RIO shall immediately assess the allegation to determine whether it is sufficiently credible and sufficiently specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified, whether it is within the jurisdictional criteria of federal agencies, and whether the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct in this policy and any applicable federal regulations. An inquiry must be conducted if these criteria are met.

The assessment period should be brief. In conducting the assessment, the RIO need not interview the complainant, respondent(s), or other witnesses, or gather data beyond any that may have been submitted with the allegation, except as necessary to determine whether the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The RIO shall, on or before the date which the respondent(s) is notified of the allegation, obtain custody of, inventory, and sequester all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, as provided in the Notice to Respondent(s); Sequestration of Research Records section below.

B. Initiation and Purpose of Inquiry

If the RIO determines that the criteria for an inquiry are met, he or she will immediately initiate the inquiry process. The purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the available evidence to determine whether to conduct an investigation. An inquiry does not require a full review of all the evidence related to the allegation.

C. Notice to Respondent(s); Sequestration of Research Records

At the time of or before beginning an inquiry, the RIO must make a good faith effort to notify the respondent(s) in writing, if the respondent(s) is known. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional respondent(s), they must be notified in writing. On or before the date on which the respondent(s) is notified, or the inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, the RIO must take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory the records and evidence and sequester them in a secure manner, except that where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments. The RIO may consult with the appropriate regulatory agency for advice and assistance in this regard.

D. Appointment of Inquiry Committee

The RIO, in consultation with other institutional officials as appropriate, will appoint an inquiry committee and committee chair as soon after the initiation of the inquiry as is practical. The inquiry committee must consist of individuals who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry and should

include individuals with the appropriate scientific expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, interview the principals and key witnesses, and conduct the inquiry.

E. Charge to the Committee and First Meeting

The RIO will prepare a charge for the inquiry committee that:

- Sets forth the time for completion of the inquiry;
- Describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the allegation assessment;
- States that the purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the evidence, including the testimony of the respondent(s), complainant and key witnesses, to provide information to the RIO who will communicate to the DO whether an investigation is warranted, not to determine whether research misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible;
- States that an investigation is warranted if the committee determines: (1) there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and is within the jurisdictional criteria of the appropriate federal code; and, (2) the allegation may have substance, based on the committee's review during the inquiry.
- Informs the inquiry committee that they are responsible for preparing or directing the preparation of a written report of the inquiry that meets the requirements of this policy.

At the committee's first meeting, the RIO will review the charge with the committee, discuss the allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry, assist the committee with organizing plans for the inquiry, and answer any questions raised by the committee. The RIO shall be present or available throughout the inquiry to advise the committee as needed.

The respondent(s) shall be notified in writing by the RIO within ten (10) days of the receipt of the allegation or as soon as possible consistent with the need to assemble appropriate expertise and secure potential evidence that a complaint has been lodged and that an Inquiry has been initiated. The respondent(s) must be informed of the nature of the allegation and the procedures to be followed. The RIO shall invite the respondent(s) to make a written response to the allegation(s) and to comment during the course of the Inquiry. Those comments will be included in the final Inquiry Report.

F. Inquiry Process

The inquiry committee shall normally interview the complainant, the respondent(s) and key witnesses as well as examining relevant research records and materials. The inquiry committee shall evaluate the evidence, including the testimony obtained during the inquiry. After consultation with the RIO, the committee members will decide whether an investigation is warranted based on the criteria in this policy and in any applicable federal or other appropriate

regulations (42 CFR 93.307(d)). The scope of the inquiry is not required to and does not normally include deciding whether misconduct definitely occurred, determining definitely who committed the research misconduct or conducting exhaustive interviews and analyses. However, if a legally sufficient admission of research misconduct is made by the respondent(s), misconduct may be determined at the inquiry stage if all relevant issues are resolved. In that case, the University shall promptly consult with the ORI or appropriate federal regulatory agency to determine the next steps that should be taken. If a non-federal sponsor is involved without federal funds, the RIO will consult with appropriate University officials to determine the next steps.

G. Time for Completion

The inquiry, including preparation of the final inquiry report and the decision of the DO on whether an investigation is warranted, must be completed within 60 calendar days of initiation of the inquiry, unless the RIO determines that circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the RIO approves an extension, the inquiry record must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period.

The respondent(s) and all involved individuals are expected to cooperate by timely response to request for documents and/or information.

VII. The Inquiry Report

A. Elements of the Inquiry Report

A written inquiry report shall be prepared that includes the following information: (1) the name and position of the respondent; (2) a description of the allegations of research misconduct; (3) the funding support, if any, for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts and publications listing specific financial support; (4) the names and titles of the committee members and experts who conducted the inquiry; (5) a summary of the inquiry process used; (6) a list of research records reviewed; (7) summaries of any interviews; (8) the basis for recommending or not recommending that the allegations warrant an investigation; (9) any comments on the draft report by the respondent or complainant and (10) whether any actions should be taken if an investigation is not recommended. University counsel and/or other official with compliance background should review the report for legal sufficiency. Modifications should be made as appropriate in consultation with the RIO and the inquiry committee.

B. Notification to the Respondent(s) and Opportunity to Comment

The RIO shall notify the respondent(s) whether the inquiry found an investigation to be warranted, include a copy of the draft inquiry report for comment within 10 working days, and include a copy of or refer to the applicable federal or other appropriate regulations and the University policy on research misconduct.

Any comments that are submitted will be attached to the final inquiry report. Based on the comments, the inquiry committee may revise the draft report as appropriate and prepare it in final form. The committee will deliver the final report to the RIO.

C. University Decision and Notification

1. Decision by Deciding Official

The RIO will transmit the final inquiry report and any comments to the DO, who will determine in writing whether an investigation is warranted. The inquiry is completed when the DO makes this determination.

2. Notification to ORI

Within 30 calendar days of the DO's decision that an investigation is warranted, the RIO will provide ORI or other appropriate regulatory agency and/or sponsor with the DO's written decision and a copy of the inquiry report. The RIO will also notify those institutional officials who need to know of the DO's decision. The RIO must provide the following information to ORI upon request: (1) the institutional policies and procedures under which the inquiry was conducted; (2) the research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents; and (3) the charges to be considered in the investigation.

3. Documentation of Decision Not to Investigate

If the DO decides that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall secure and maintain for 7 years after the termination of the inquiry sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment by ORI of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted. These documents must be provided to ORI or other authorized HHS personnel upon request.

VIII. Conducting the Investigation

A. Initiation and Purpose

The investigation must begin within 30 calendar days after the determination by the DO that an investigation is warranted. The purpose of the investigation is to develop a factual record by exploring the allegations in detail and examining the evidence in depth, leading to recommended findings on whether research misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. In conducting the investigation, the RIO will pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion. If in the course of the investigation, the RIO determines there are additional instances of research misconduct, he or she will notify the respondent(s).

B. Notifying ORI and Respondent(s); Sequestration of Research Records

On or before the date on which the investigation begins, the RIO must: (1) notify the ORI Director of the decision to begin the investigation and provide any appropriate regulatory

agency or sponsor a copy of the inquiry report; and (2) notify the respondent(s) in writing of the allegations to be investigated. The RIO must also give the respondent(s) written notice of any new allegations of research misconduct within a reasonable amount of time of deciding to pursue allegations not addressed during the inquiry or in the initial notice of the investigation.

The RIO will, prior to notifying respondent(s) of the allegations, take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of and sequester in a secure manner all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceedings that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry. The need for additional sequestration of records for the investigation may occur for any number of reasons, including the institution's decision to investigate additional allegations not considered during the inquiry stage or the identification of records during the inquiry process that had not been previously secured. The procedures to be followed for sequestration during the investigation are the same procedures that apply during the inquiry.

C. Appointment of the Investigation Committee

The RIO, in consultation with other University officials as appropriate, will appoint an investigation committee and the committee chair within 10 days of the beginning of the investigation or as soon thereafter as practical. The investigation committee must consist of individuals who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the investigation, are not a complainant and, where practical, should include individuals with appropriate scientific or professional expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation. Individuals appointed to the investigation committee may also have serviced on the inquiry committee.

D. Charge to the Committee and First Meeting

1. Charge to the Committee

The RIO will define the subject matter of the investigation in a written charge to the committee that:

- Describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry;
- Identifies the respondent(s);
- Informs the committee that it must conduct the investigation as prescribed below in the Investigation Process section;
- Defines research misconduct;
- Informs the committee that it must evaluate the evidence and testimony to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, research misconduct occurred and, if so, the type and extent of it and who was responsible;
- Informs the committee that in order to determine that the respondent(s) committed research misconduct it must find that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that: (1) research misconduct, as defined in this policy, occurred (respondent(s) has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence any affirmative defenses raised, including honest error or a difference of opinion); (2) the research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and

(3) the respondent(s) committed the research misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and

- Informs the committee that it must prepare or direct the preparation of a written investigation report that meets the requirements of this policy and any applicable federal regulations (42 CFR 93.313).

2. First Meeting

The RIO shall convene the first meeting of the investigation committee to review the charge, the inquiry report, and the prescribed procedures and standards for the conduct of the investigation, including the necessity for confidentiality and for developing a specific investigation plan. The investigation committee shall be provided with a copy of this policy and any applicable federal regulations. The RIO shall be present or available throughout the investigation to advise the committee as needed.

E. Investigation Process

The investigation committee and the RIO shall:

- Use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of each allegation;
- Take reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practical;
- Interview each respondent(s), complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent(s), and record or transcribe each interview, provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record of the investigation; and
- Pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

F. Time for Completion

The investigation is to be completed within 120 days of beginning it, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to ORI or other appropriate regulatory agency or sponsor. However, if the RIO determines that the investigation will not be completed within this 120-day period, when appropriate, he/she will submit to ORI a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay. The RIO will ensure that periodic progress reports are filed with ORI, if ORI grants the request for an extension and directs the filing of such reports.

IX. The Investigation Report

A. Elements of the Investigation Report

The investigation committee and the RIO are responsible for preparing a written draft report of the investigation that:

- Describes the nature of the allegation of research misconduct, including identification of the respondent(s);
- Describes and documents the PHS and/or other support, including, for example, the numbers of any grants that are involved, grant applications, contracts, publications listing sponsor support, and any other documentation found;
- Describes the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;
- Includes the University policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, unless those policies and procedures were provided to ORI previously;
- Identifies and summarizes the research records and evidence reviewed and identifies any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed; and
- Includes a statement of findings for each allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation. Each statement of findings shall: (1) identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, and whether it was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; (2) summarize the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent(s), including any effort by the respondent(s) to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she did not engage in research misconduct because of honest error or a difference of opinion; (3) identify the specific financial support; (4) identify whether any publications need correction or retraction; (5) identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and (6) list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent(s) has pending with any federal agencies or other sponsors.

B. Comments on the Draft Report and Access to Evidence

1. Respondent(s)

The RIO shall give the respondent(s) a copy of the draft investigation report for comment and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based. The respondent(s) shall be allowed 30 days from the date he/she received the draft report to submit comments to the RIO. The respondent(s)'s comments shall be included and considered in the final report.

2. Confidentiality

In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the respondent(s), the RIO shall inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality. The RIO may require that the recipient sign a confidentiality agreement.

C. Decision by the Deciding Official

The RIO shall assist the investigation committee in finalizing the draft investigation report, including ensuring that the respondent's comments are included and considered, and transmit the final investigation report to the DO, who shall determine in writing: (1) whether the University accepts the investigation report, its findings, and the recommended institutional actions; and (2) the appropriate University actions in response to the accepted findings of research misconduct. If this determination varies from the findings of the investigation committee, the DO shall, as part of his/her written determination, explain in detail the basis for rendering a decision different from the findings of the investigation committee. Alternatively, the DO may return the report to the investigation committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis.

When a final decision on the case has been reached, the RIO shall normally notify both the respondent(s) and the complainant in writing. After informing the appropriate federal regulatory agency and/or other sponsors, the DO shall determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent(s) in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case. The RIO shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of funding or sponsoring agencies.

D. Notice to the Appropriate Federal Agency and/or Other Sponsor

Unless an extension has been granted, the RIO must within the 120-day period for completing the investigation prepare the following: (1) a copy of the final investigation report with all attachments and any appeal; (2) a statement of whether the institution accepts the findings of the investigation report or the outcome of the appeal; (3) a statement of whether the institution found misconduct and, if so, who committed the misconduct; and (4) a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondent(s).

E. Maintaining Records for Review by ORI

The RIO must maintain and provide to ORI, or other appropriate regulatory agencies or sponsors, upon request "records of research misconduct proceedings" as that term is defined by 42 CFR 93.317 or any subsequent regulations. Unless custody has been transferred to HHS or ORI has advised in writing that the records no longer need to be retained, records of research misconduct proceedings must be maintained in a secure manner for 7 years after completion of the proceeding or the completion of any PHS proceeding involving the research misconduct allegation. The RIO is also responsible for providing any information, documentation, research records, evidence or clarification requested by ORI to carry out its review of an allegation of research misconduct or of the institution's handling of such an allegation.

X. Completion of Cases; Reporting Premature Closures to Appropriate Regulatory Agency

Generally, all inquiries and investigations will be carried through to completion and all significant issues will be pursued diligently. The RIO must notify the appropriate regulatory

agency, specifically including ORI when required, in advance if there are plans to close a case at the inquiry, investigation, or appeal stage on the basis that respondent(s) has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent(s) has been reached, or for any other reason, except: (1) closing of a case at the inquiry stage on the basis that an investigation is not warranted; or (2) a finding of no misconduct at the investigation stage.

XI. Institutional Administrative Actions

If the DO determines that research misconduct is substantiated by the findings, he or she shall decide on the appropriate actions to be taken, after consultation with the RIO when required. The administrative actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where research misconduct was found;
- Removal of the responsible person from the particular project, letter of reprimand, special monitoring of future work, probation, suspension, salary reduction, or initiation of steps leading to possible rank reduction or termination of employment as guided by appropriate University officials and Collective Bargaining Agreements;
- Restitution of funds to the grantor agency as appropriate; and
- Other action appropriate to the misconduct.

XII. Other Considerations

A. Termination or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation

The termination of the respondent's institutional employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the research misconduct proceeding or otherwise limit any of the institution's responsibilities under applicable law (42 CFR 93). If the respondent(s), without admitting to the misconduct, elects to resign his or her position after the institution receives an allegation of research misconduct, the assessment of the allegation shall proceed, as well as the inquiry and investigation, as appropriate based on the outcome of the preceding steps. If the respondent(s) refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the RIO and any inquiry or investigation committee shall use their best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in the report the respondent(s)'s failure to cooperate and its effect on the evidence.

B. Restoration of the Respondent(s)'s Reputation

Following a final finding of no research misconduct and upon the request of the respondent(s), the RIO shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to restore the respondent's reputation. Depending on the particular circumstances and the views of the respondent(s), the RIO shall publicize the final outcome in any forum in which the allegation of research misconduct was previously publicized. Any institutional actions to restore the respondent(s)'s reputation should first be approved by the DO.

C. Protection of Complainant, Witnesses and Committee Members

During the research misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether it was determined that research misconduct occurred, the RIO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the position and reputation of, or to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any complainant who made allegations of research misconduct in good faith and of any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research misconduct proceeding. The DO will determine, after consulting with the RIO, and with the complainant, witnesses, or committee members, respectively, what steps, if any, are needed to restore their respective positions or reputations or to counter potential or actual retaliation against them. The RIO will be responsible for implementing any steps the DO approves.

D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith

If relevant, the DO will determine whether the complainant's allegations of research misconduct were made in good faith, or whether a witness or committee member acted in good faith. If the DO determines that there was an absence of good faith he/she will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the person who failed to act in good faith.

XIII. References

- Title 42 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 93* – Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct
- PHS Sample Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct <http://ori.hhs.gov/ori-policies>

Humboldt State University
University Senate

Resolution on HSU Policy for Cross-Listing of Courses

#37-13/14-APC – April 15, 2014 – Second Reading

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

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

Resolution on the Elimination of the CWT Designation

#38-13/14-XX – April 1, 2014 – First Reading

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (the Senate) recommends to the Provost that the designation of “Communication and Ways of Thinking” (CWT) will no longer be used to describe certain upper-division General Education (GE) courses in our catalog; and be it further

Resolved: That the Senate recommends the 309 course number be reserved only for those interdisciplinary courses which have been approved to satisfy *more than one* upper-division GE area’s Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); and be it further

Resolved: That the Senate recommends that any course currently designated as CWT *and* that has a 309 course number which only satisfies *one* upper division General Education area’s SLOs shall change its course number to 30X where X is a positive integer between 0 and 8.

Rationale: CWT courses may meet the student learning outcomes of more than one upper-division GE area, and thereby allows a student to choose which upper-division GE area requirement is satisfied upon completion of a given CWT course. This resolution would remove the CWT designation from the HSU Catalog but would not change anything about the courses (or future courses) which may still be used to satisfy any one of the multiple upper-division GE areas for which the course satisfies the student learning outcomes. This resolution also ensures that the 309 course number may only be used for courses that satisfy more than one upper-division GE area’s SLOs. Finally, elimination of the CWT designation will de facto eliminate any and all CWT guidelines and SLOs.

University Senate:

Provost Snyder:

Humboldt State University
University Senate

Resolution on Revising the Standardized Course Evaluation Form

#40-13/14-FAC-April 15, 2014 - First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached set of questions [date] be adopted as the core set of questions for use in every department; and be it further

RESOLVED: That each department may add department-specific questions to the University-wide Course Evaluation Form; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any rating-scale questions added by departments must use the same 5-point scale employed by the Course Evaluation Form; and be it further

RESOLVED: That course evaluation results should be supplemented by other methods of instructor evaluation in any personnel-related decisions, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the use of the new Course Evaluation Form begin in the Fall of 2015, with a review date of one year from implementation to allow for any needed changes by the University Senate.

Rationale:

Resolution #27-12/13 – FAC called for a Task Force to review the current course evaluation instrument in use since Spring semester of AY 2005/2006. A Task Force was convened in November 2013 comprised of Professors Jayne McGuire (Kinesiology), Marisol Cortes-Rincon (Anthropology), and Brandon Schwab (Geology) with Nancy Dye (Psychology) serving as liaison with Faculty Affairs.

The Task Force identified several areas for improvement of HSU's current course evaluation instrument.

First, questions on the 2006 instrument feed into a "student as consumer" sense of entitlement. This mentality enables students to rate their instructors positively on the specific items, and then negatively on "overall teaching effectiveness." Review of the literature and consultation with colleagues helped us formulate the need for an instrument that encourages students to make their decisions about teachers' effectiveness within the context of their own roles as learners. Thus we've added questions about students' participation in and commitment to the course.

Second, as online classes are increasingly represented among HSU course offerings, questions must be designed for applicability in face-to-face, online and hybrid courses. Item wording has been crafted for multiple applications.

Further, questions need to be designed that are much more useful for improving our teaching practices. We have designed open-ended questions to better serve this purpose.

Finally, the Course Evaluation Task Force asserts that the current evaluation instrument is a mismatch with HSU's stated values. Course evaluation items that emphasize students' "satisfaction" do not reflect "an environment of free inquiry where learning occurs both inside and outside the classroom," and an education that "prepare[s] students to take on the commitments of critical inquiry, social responsibility and civic engagement necessary to meet the challenges of the 21st century." We have added items that ask students' to self-assess their participation in the learning community, commitment to education and level of effort expended in studying.

University Senate:
President Richmond:

DRAFT Course Evaluation Instrument

INSTRUCTIONS

Student course evaluations are central to the continual improvement of curriculum and the quality of instruction at Humboldt State University. Completion of this questionnaire is voluntary. You are free to leave some or all items unanswered. All of your answers to this survey are confidential.

Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your instructor. *Please note that civil language and constructive comments are expected.*

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

My class standing is:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other

This course applies to (check all that apply):

- Major
- Minor
- GEAR
- Elective
- Other
- Don't Know

*GEAR = General Education and All University Requirements – GE, DCG, American Institutions

The amount of time per week I spent preparing for this course was...

1	2	3	4	5
< or = 3 hours	4-6 hours	7-9 hours	10-12 hours	13+ hours

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

1. I attended course meetings or accessed it online ...

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	Always

2. I was actively engaged in my learning.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	Always

3. I completed the assigned activities (e.g., readings, videos) prior to class...

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	Always

INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE EVALUATION

4. I understood what I was expected to learn through this course experience.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

5. I understood the grading procedures for this course.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

6. I experienced instructional methods (e.g., assignments, activities, discussions, group work, lectures) that aided my learning of course topics.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

7. The instructional materials (e.g., textbook, online course resources) enhanced my understanding of course concepts.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

8. Course sessions were organized in a way that facilitated my learning.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

9. The instructor exhibited a command of the course content.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

10. The instructor was able to clarify difficult material.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

11. The instructor created an **academic** environment that aided my learning.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

12. I felt welcome to seek help or advice from the instructor.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

13. The instructor showed respect for divergent points of view.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

14. The instructor demonstrated respect for students from diverse backgrounds (e.g., ethnicity, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, nationality, age culture, ability, religion, language, gender).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

15. The instructor encouraged me to reflect on my own learning (through oral or written feedback or in-class activities).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

16. The instructor inspired me to take greater interest in course concepts.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

1. What was the assignment or activity for this course from which you learned the most?
2. What would you identify as the strengths of this course?
3. What suggestions do you have, if any, to strengthen this course?

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate

Resolution on Amendment to Appendix J: Electronic Identity Verification

#41-13/14-FAC – April 15, 2014 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends the following amendment to Section VII.B.3.a of Appendix J, “Performance Review” (HSU Faculty Handbook) be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection in Spring 2014:

Appendix J,
Section VII. Performance Review

...

B. Evaluation Procedure

...

3. Documentation

a) ~~All materials used~~ Each evaluative submission in the Performance Review shall include the be identified by name of the document author, except for classroom evaluations. 11.3, 15.17a-b. The identity of a document author shall be verified by a signature (scanned images are allowed), secure digital signature (most document softwares including MSWord and Adobe Acrobat Pro have tools for creating and providing verification of these signatures), or system-based identity verification (document is uploaded by author into a system location and that process verifies author’s identity).

~~all-written evaluative materials addressing the candidate’s contribution in the RTP performance areas are to be included in the WPAF only if they contain the signature of the sender.~~

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy become effective for the AY 2014/2015 RTP process, subject to approval by the General Faculty.

RATIONALE: This revision makes explicit the types of written signatures allowed and expands the policy to include system-based identity verification. These changes support a fully electronic RTP process that begins with document generation and ends with document uploading into a faculty member’s electronic RTP file location. (Note: In a 2012 resolution we eliminated the “wet” signature requirement.)

University Senate:
General Faculty:
President Richmond:

Humboldt State University
University Senate

**Resolution on Revision of Perpetual Calendar
#42-13/14-EX – April 15, 2014 – First Reading**

RESOLVED: That the Humboldt State University Senate accept the proposed revisions of the PERPETUAL CALENDAR and recommends that the proposed revisions be forwarded to the Provost for implementation by the Office of Academic Affairs.

RATIONALE: During the past years the *ad hoc* Calendar Committee of the HSU University Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs has been working on a revision to the original Perpetual Calendar established by HSU Academic Senate Resolution #38-92/93-FA.

The development of state recognition of Veterans Day in the Fall Semester and Cesar Chaves Day in the Spring Semester necessitated changes.

The process of approving a year-by-year Academic Calendar by the University Senate is unnecessary as those past Academic Calendars have followed the rules, regulations, and constraints of the CO Executive Memorandum, the last one being HR 2014-01.

The *ad hoc* Calendar Committee was charged with the development of a set of perpetual calendars for Fall Semester, Spring Semester-Normal, Spring Semester-Leap, along with guiding principles in development of future Academic Year Calendars.

PERPETUAL CALENDAR

Fall Semester		August					September					October					November					December																					
		S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S							
A	2004	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
	2010	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	2021	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	26	27	28	29	30	31				
	2027	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	26	27	28	29	30	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	28	29	30																				
	2038	29	30	31																																							
B	2005	1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10								
	2011	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17							
	2016	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24							
	2022	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	25	26	27	28	29	30	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	27	28	29	30								25	26	27	28	29	30	31				
	2033	28	29	30	31				30	31																																	
C	2006	1	2	3	4	5	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9									
	2017	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
	2023	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23							
	2028	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	26	27	28	29	30								24	25	26	27	28	29	30		
	2034	27	28	29	30	31				29	30	31																															
D	2007	1	2	3	4	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8											
	2012	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15							
	2018	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22							
	2029	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	26	27	28	29	30								23	24	25	26	27	28	29		
	2035	26	27	28	29	30	31	30																																			
E	2002	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7																		
	2013	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	8	9	10	11	12	13	14							
	2019	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	15	16	17	18	19	20	21							
	2024	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	22	23	24	25	26	27	28							
	2031	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	29	30																																	
F	2003	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	7	8	9	10	11	12	13						
	2008	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	7	8	9	10	11	12	13							
	2014	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	14	15	16	17	18	19	20							
	2025	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	21	22	23	24	25	26	27							
	2031	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	28	29	30																															
G	2009	1	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7													
	2015	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12							
	2020	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19							
	2026	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26							
	2037	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	27	28	29	30	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	29	30						27	28	29	30	31										
		S T A R T W E E K H O P & 1st D A Y					B R E A K D A Y					B R E A K D A Y S					F I N A L S G R A D E D A Y S & D U E D A Y																										

PERPETUAL CALENDAR

PERPETUAL CALENDAR PRINCIPLES

CSU SYSTEM & STATE MANDATES:

1. Must have between 145-149 Instructional Days
2. Minimum of 170 and maximum of 180 Academic Work Days
3. Initial pay period for academic year employees cannot exceed 45 work days
4. Conform to HR 2005-12 Attachment 2: Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions (pages 2-3 on different days and what they mean)
5. HSU is considered by the State as an academic year campus that offers a summer session

FALL SEMESTER:

1. Must have two full grading and evaluation days in December prior to the 24th and excluding Sundays.
2. Finals Week must be held during a full week (M-F) prior to the two full grading and evaluation days.
3. Thanksgiving week is held the week in which the fourth Thursday occurs.
4. Veterans Day is November 11th which on Saturdays is taken on Friday and on Sunday is taken on Monday.
5. Labor Day is always the 1st Monday in September.
6. Count back 15 weeks of instruction excluding Finals Week and the week for Thanksgiving Break.
7. Cannot begin earlier than August 17th per CA Department of Finance.
8. The days for Advising, Meetings, etc. are the Tuesday (Wednesday?) through Friday of the week prior to the first week of instruction. Tuesday (Wednesday?) is the official start day with the succession of faculty meetings.

SPRING SEMESTER:

1. First day of instruction is the Tuesday following Martin Luther King Day Holiday.
2. The days for Advising, Meetings, etc. are the Thursday (Wednesday?) and Friday prior to the weekend of Martin Luther King Day Holiday.
3. The mid-semester break is at Week #09 after eight weeks of instruction.
4. Finals Week is after an additional seven weeks of instruction beyond the mid-semester break.
5. Graduation is held on the Saturday at the end of Finals Week.
6. End Spring Semester and move to Summer Session to begin next Academic Year.

SOME USEFUL HR2007-12 DEFINITIONS:

1. Instructional Days = M-F during regular term when class meetings are scheduled
2. Weekend Work Days = S-S within the period of instruction for a term and counted as an academic work day.
3. Examination Day = 8 days maximum set aside for exclusive purpose of exams
4. Registration Days = Any day where faculty member is on duty for advising, etc.
5. Other Day = 1 day where faculty member is on duty for meetings or curricular development.

6. Evaluation Day = 1 day for purpose of grading examinations or papers.
7. Grade Due Days = 2 days for purpose of turning in final grades.
8. Commencement = 1 day for purpose of graduation ceremonies.
9. Academic Work Days = all of the above that occur between beginning and end of the academic year or each term.

Sunday, April 6, 2014
K.O. FULGHAM
LURA HOLTKAMP




Date: January 6, 2014

Code: HR 2014-01

To: CSU Presidents

From: Gail E. Brooks 
Vice Chancellor
Human Resources

Ephraim P. Smith 
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Academic Officer

Subject: 2014/2015 Academic Pay Period Certification and Enrollment Planning and Reporting Calendars

Overview

Audience: Employees responsible for Academic Administration (e.g., Academic Calendar and Pay Period Certification, Retirement, Benefits and YRO Implementation, Norms and Definitions, Enrollment Planning and Reporting, and Academic Calendar Database Technical Support)

Action Item: Academic Calendar Pay Period Certification due by February 7, 2014

Affected Employee Groups/Units: Employees in Academic Year Classifications

Summary

Annually, each campus must establish and submit its Academic Calendar and Pay Period Certification, within the specified guidelines. The information is to be submitted electronically through a web-based Academic Calendar reporting system to Systemwide Human Resources Management (HRM) at the Chancellor's Office for approval.

The above-identified audience should review the remainder of the technical letter in its entirety.

In accordance with [Title 5, Section 42800](#), each campus must submit its Academic Calendar and Pay Period Certification in order to establish the 2014/2015 Academic Calendar. The Academic Calendar and Pay Period Certification process and Enrollment Planning and Reporting Calendar will be completed electronically through a web-based Academic Calendar reporting system. Campuses have been provided user identification, passwords, and user guide information to access and update their campus' Academic Calendar Database for 2014/15. The Academic Calendar Database report should be submitted via the database reporting system to Systemwide Human Resources Management (HRM) (attn: aycalendars@calstate.edu) by February 7, 2014. Systemwide HRM will notify the campus when the calendar has been approved, and the campus should then submit a hard copy of the calendar signed by the President.

The Academic Calendar Database as well as a user guide for the reporting system can be accessed through the following link: <https://csyou.calstate.edu/Tools/academic-affairs/acal/Pages/default.aspx>.

Distribution:

AVPs/Deans of Faculty Affairs
All Campus Vice Presidents
Human Resources Officers
Payroll Managers

Employee Relations Designees
Affirmative Action Officers
Business Managers
Auxiliary Organizations

Chancellor's Office Enterprise Systems has loaded enrollment planning, academic events, and pay period certification information into the Academic Calendar Database based upon campus information received for the 2013/14 academic year. This information will be used to help establish campus academic calendars for 2014/15. The output of this system will vary depending on whether the campus is a semester, quarter, or quarter system year round operation (QSYRO) campus (see Attachment 1). Three additional future years have been added to the database to enable campuses to use the system for multi-year planning (e.g., 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18). **Note, however, that future year calendars cannot be approved in advance.**

The Department of Finance (DOF) establishes the beginning and ending state pay period dates. Campuses should reference these dates when establishing their academic calendars. Information on the beginning and ending state pay period dates for each calendar year are available through the following website maintained by the DOF: http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/sam/SamPrint/new/m423sept13/chap_8500_sam/8512.pdf.

While the pay day for any given academic pay period is the same as the pay day for the corresponding state pay period and cannot be changed by the campus, the beginning date for the first pay period and the ending date for the last pay period of an academic term must conform to the beginning and ending dates of the academic term. The initial pay period of both the fall and spring terms may include up to **45** calendar days. As a result, the earliest permissible start date for the first pay period of the fall term is Sunday, **August 17, 2014** (for the September 2014 pay period), and the earliest permissible start date for the spring term is Thursday, **January 15, 2015** (for the February 2015 pay period). Classes for academic year 2014/2015 shall not commence prior to **August 19, 2014**.

Campuses should be aware that moving the first pay period of the spring term from February to January or from January to February will impact employee benefits. Campuses considering such a change should discuss the impact with Systemwide HRM.

Please note that summer term academic work days cannot overlap with the 2013/2014 spring term or 2014/2015 fall term. Likewise, there can be no overlap between any other academic terms including winter special sessions. As a reminder, employees cannot be paid in advance for work not yet accomplished.

It is essential that the calendars, academic work days, and pay period inclusive dates be reviewed for accuracy and that designated work days be compatible with established norms and definitions. These Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions are described in Attachment 2. Human Resources Officers and Payroll Managers are familiar with calendar requirements, and we urge that these individuals be included in the review process and receive copies of the completed calendar. Effective dates and work dates supplied by the campus are programmed into the state payroll system by the State Controller's Office (SCO). If changes to an academic calendar are needed after the initial certification and programming have been completed by Systemwide HRM and the SCO, Systemwide HRM must be notified immediately. Proposed adjustments are not final and cannot be implemented by your campus until Systemwide HRM has approved the adjustments for re-programming into the payroll system by the SCO. Changes that occur after the initial programming effort may cause delays in issuing faculty salary payments. Please be advised that the State Controller cannot make retroactive changes for payrolls already processed.

For accreditation purposes, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges defines a semester as 17 full weeks with at least 15 full weeks of academic class work or its equivalent in effort; a quarter is approximately 11 weeks, with 10 full weeks of academic class work. The Secretary of Education has defined "instructional time" as a period that includes examination periods and preparation for examinations. Therefore, campuses that use CSU minima for instructional days and examinations will be in compliance with Federal Title IV financial aid regulations.

Academic calendar information is also used to generate the Enrollment Planning and Reporting (EP&R) Calendar, which is generated from the "Classes Begin" and "Starting/Ending Cutoff" dates that campuses enter in the Academic Calendar Database. Campuses will be asked to review the generated EP&R calendar to ensure the correct reporting dates have been entered. Pursuant to coded memo [HR/Salary 2013-07](#), summer term employment dates should be entered only in the enrollment related fields in the Academic Calendar Database application.

Faculty who may be considering retirement at the close of the 2014/2015 academic year should be advised to coordinate their official retirement date with CalPERS and the campus, and should be alerted to a potential issue that may affect service credit toward retirement. One year of service credit is earned for 10 pay periods of service during a fiscal year. Those on leaves of absence without pay during July and August 2014 must complete 10 full pay periods on payroll status after their return in September in order to earn a full year of service credit for the 2014/2015 academic year. Those who may be affected should be reminded to schedule their retirements on or after July 1, 2015, rather than for the day following the close of the 2014/2015 academic year.

Please direct any questions you may have concerning information contained in this letter as follows:

Effect of Academic Calendar on Retirement and Benefits, YRO Implementation

Margaret Merryfield, Human Resources/Academic Human Resources (562) 951-4503

Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions

Christine Mallon, Academic Affairs/ Academic Programs and Policy (562) 951-4672

Academic Calendar and Pay Period Certification (Form SC-47)

Valerie Kerbs, Human Resources/ Human Resources Management (562) 951-4420

Enrollment Planning and Reporting Calendar

Monica Malhotra, Academic Affairs/Analytic Studies (562) 951-4763

Academic Calendar Database Technical Support, User Manual, and Campus User Names/Passwords

IT Support Center itsupportcenter@calstate.edu

- For new or updated account requests, campus contacts need to fill out the Academic Calendar Account Request Form located on [Academic Affairs Academic Calendar Database](#) website and submit the form through Service Now for processing. If you need assistance, an ACAL Account Request Procedure Manual is also posted on the website.
- For technical questions/issues, campus contacts need to fill out a Service Now ticket by calling the ITS Support Center at (562) 951-8500 or by accessing the Service Now function through the CSU Portal.

This letter is also available via Systemwide Human Resources Management's Web page at: <http://www.calstate.edu/HRAdm/memos.shtml>. Thank you.

GB/ES/mm

Attachments

**ACADEMIC CALENDAR
FORM DESCRIPTIONS**

Form SC47 Academic Calendar and Pay Period Certification

Form SC47 identifies campuses on a semester, quarter, or quarter system year round operation (QSYRO) as follows:

Semester campuses complete **SC47-1** only

Quarter campuses complete **SC47-2** only

QSYRO campuses complete **SC47-2 and SC47(A)***

CMA completes **SC47-1 and Cruise1 and Cruise2 (as needed)**

The web-based Academic Calendar reporting system will generate the appropriate completed forms based on data entered by the campus into the Academic Calendar electronic database.

* Form SC47(A) is a pay period calendar for QSYRO campuses that appoint instructional faculty for extra pay to classes 2368 (Extra Quarter Assignment), and/or 2390 (Summer Quarter Assignment).

ACADEMIC CALENDAR NORMS AND DEFINITIONS

To provide for the orderly development of campus academic calendars that are responsive to local needs and are basically consistent throughout the system, the Chancellor's Executive Council has adopted a number of norms and definitions. These are to be used in developing all academic calendars. The basic principle governing academic calendars throughout the system is that differences from campus to campus should be rationally based. They should not simply be chance occurrences.

NORMS:

Typical Year - The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days, or the equivalent in effort. From year to year and from campus to campus, a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible.

Minimum Work Days - There shall be a minimum of 170 academic work days, or the equivalent in effort, in the academic year.

Maximum Work Days - The work year of an academic year employee shall not exceed 180 workdays, pursuant to the California Faculty Association Collective Bargaining Agreement (Provision 20.4).

DEFINITIONS:

Instructional Day - Any Monday through Friday during regular academic terms when class meetings are scheduled on a regular and extensive basis for the purpose of instruction. During a summer term that satisfies the criteria to be equivalent to a full semester, designation of a Saturday as an instructional day will be approved by exception only.

Weekend Work Day - Any Saturday or Sunday that is within the period of instruction for a term and that is counted as an Academic Work Day.

Examination Day - Any day that is set aside for the exclusive purpose of administering final examinations for the term. When comparing campus calendars, institutions which integrate all or part of examination activity with regular instruction will be presumed to have four examination days per term. EIGHT (8) DAYS MAXIMUM MAY BE SCHEDULED.

Registration Day - Any day during the academic year during which faculty members are on duty for the purpose of advising, orientation, course enrollment, and similar activities. For purposes of counting work days, registration days which are also instruction or examination days will not be included a second time.

"Other Day" - Any day during the academic year when faculty members are on duty for such purposes as faculty and departmental conferences, committee meetings, faculty development activities, etc.

Grades Due Days - Any day(s) prior to or at the close of the term that is designated specifically for the purpose of turning in final grades. This day must be included when computing total academic work days. Campuses that schedule grades due over several dates may count up to two (2) days per semester or one (1) day per quarter as academic work days. One day is preferred.

Evaluation Day - Days that are set aside for the reading of examinations and papers and for submission of final grades. A maximum of one (1) day per term may be scheduled.

Commencement - Any day set aside for graduation ceremonies. Commencement is counted as an academic work day only if faculty participation is expected and normal, and if the day is not otherwise credited as an academic day. Campuses with school commencements extending over several days may count only one (1) day in computing total academic work days.

Academic Work Days - The total of all of the above that occur between the beginning and ending dates of the academic year.

Academic Holiday - Any day (Monday through Friday) occurring between the beginning and ending of the academic year that is so designated by the President. Except by special arrangement, faculty members are not expected to be on duty during academic holidays.

Faculty Vacation - The period from the end of one academic year to the beginning of the next, when all continuing academic year faculty members are on vacation status, except for those scheduled to teach in summer term or for those on duty by other special arrangement. For faculty members taking a quarter off in exchange for summer quarter teaching, the period extends from the end of the quarter preceding the quarter taken off to the beginning of the quarter succeeding the quarter taken off.

Starting/Ending Cutoff Dates - Dates between which the census date for a term must fall, for purposes of the Enrollment Planning and Reporting Calendar. When a census date falls between the starting cutoff date and the ending cutoff date for a term, the enrollment data collected "at census" are attributed to that term, and reporting deadlines for that term are applicable to the data. *Note: The actual starting date for a term may precede or follow the starting cutoff date; the census date always follows the starting cutoff date.* For all campuses, the starting cutoff date for a summer term is June 1, the ending cutoff date for a summer term is August 31, the starting cutoff date for a fall term is September 1, and the ending cutoff date for a spring term is May 31. A campus may set the other cutoff dates – those that distinguish between fall and spring terms or between fall and winter terms and winter and spring terms. The ending cutoff date for a term must be the day before the starting cutoff date for the next term. Once set, the cutoff dates are considered permanent.

Resolution on Sexual Assault, Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking Policy

#46-13/14-EX –April 15, 2014 – First Reading

Humboldt State University (HSU) is committed to maintaining and strengthening an educational, working, and living environment founded on dignity and social responsibility. Sexual misconduct (including **sexual assault** and **sexual harassment**), **intimate partner violence**, and **stalking** as well as acts of **retaliation** against survivors go against the standards and ideals of our community and will not be tolerated. HSU aims to eliminate these harmful actions through education, training, clear policy, and serious consequences for violations of this policy. **This policy applies to all university community members, including university employees, students, and third parties. (Examples of third parties include employees of auxiliary organizations, volunteers, independent contractors, vendors and their employees, and visitors.)** If a university community member is found responsible for committing sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking, they can face **criminal charges** and/or the appropriate HSU **conduct process** (*link to Student Conduct Policy*). HSU is committed to the well-being and rights of the person reporting the assault, while ensuring due process for the accused.

Follow **this link** <http://humboldt.edu/titleix/> for information on filing a report or accessing support services related to this policy.

Definitions

Consent – fully conscious, voluntary acceptance and agreement to engage in a sexual act. If force, fear, threat, coercion, incapacitation (including by alcohol or other drugs) or violence is used or someone takes advantage of an individual who is incapable of giving consent due to that individual's age or disability or by the use of coercion through one's position of authority, consent cannot exist. Consent cannot be inferred from a current or previous sexual, romantic, or marital relationship, nor can it be inferred from consenting to any other sexual acts. Consent can be taken away at any time.

Criminal charges – upon law enforcement investigation a report may be forwarded to the District Attorney's office, which is solely responsible for the decision of whether to file criminal charges.

Intimate partner violence – a pattern of power and control that results in physical, sexual, or mental harm, or other forms of abuse, by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of romantic or intimate nature, including spouses. This type of violence can occur among heterosexual or same-sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy.

Retaliation – adverse action taken against a person who has reported or opposed conduct which the person reasonably and in good faith believes is discrimination or harassment, has

participated in an investigation / proceeding, or has assisted someone in reporting or opposing discrimination, harassment or retaliation or is perceived to have done either of these things.

Sexual assault – any attempted or completed sexual act without **consent**, including unwelcome sexual touching, oral, anal, or vaginal contact and/or penetration. Rape is defined as sexual intercourse without consent, and is a form of sexual assault.

Sexual harassment –consists of both non-sexual conduct based on sex or sex-stereotyping and conduct that is sexual in nature which can be verbal, nonverbal, or physical. Sexual harassment also includes hostile behavior based on sex or gender stereotypes, or one’s sexual orientation or gender identity, even if that behavior isn’t explicitly sexual. This behavior has the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or learning environment, limiting one’s ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities or opportunities offered by the University.

Stalking (including cyber-stalking) – **a repeated course of conduct directed at a specific person that places that person in reasonable fear for his/her or others’ safety, or causes the victim to suffer substantial emotional distress.** This can encompass a range of behaviors, including following someone in person or otherwise monitoring them.

DRAFT

Humboldt State University
University Senate

Resolution to Establish a Task Force to Investigate a Co-Curricular Transcript

#44-13/14-APC – April 15 – First Reading

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (the Senate) establish a task force to investigate and recommend for implementation a co-curricular transcript to be employed by the Registrar's Office; and be it further

Resolved: That the membership of this committee will include: the Vice President of Student Affairs and/or designee(s), the Registrar or designee, the Director for the Center of Service Learning and Internships or designee, a member of the Academic Policies Committee, and two faculty members with significant experience working in co-curricular activities; and be it further

Resolved: That the Task Force be charged with:

1. Investigating current best practices in use of co-curricular transcripts
2. Recommending a particular co-curricular transcript model or other means of documenting co-curricular achievement for use at HSU
3. Drafting policy on what to be included on a co-curricular transcript

And be it further

Resolved: That the Task Force make their recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee at the first November Sen/Ex meeting.

Rationale: *Humboldt State University is unique in the number and variety of co-curricular activities available to our students. Currently there is no official mechanism for acknowledging those activities outside of course enrollment found on our traditional transcript. This Task Force will explore how to implement and what information to be included on a co-curricular transcript.*

**Resolution Urging the California Faculty Association Negotiate
for Confidential Course Evaluations**

#45-13/14-FAC-April 15, 2014 - First Reading

Resolved: That the University Senate request of the CFA bargaining team that it request to open negotiations on Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Section 15.17* with the intent of reviewing the clause that says that student evaluations shall be anonymous; or in the alternative to negotiate a side agreement to the effect that student evaluations at Humboldt State University may be confidential.

Rationale: The resolution was precipitated by an incident at HSU in which a faculty member received a student evaluation with hateful, sexist comments which the instructor found threatening. There was no way to identify the student given the anonymous nature of the evaluations. Thus, the current policy allows for students to anonymously threaten or harass instructors in student evaluations, and thus raises a concern for the safety of the faculty. Conversely, when there is a pattern of student complaints about a particular instructor's behavior in class, there is no way to identify the students in order to fully investigate the complaints.

*The resolution reads, in part, "Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section."