Tuesday, March 27, 2018, 3:00pm, Goodwin Forum (NHE 102)

Chair Julie Alderson called the meeting to order at 3:04pm on Tuesday, March 27, 2018 Goodwin Forum, Nelson Hall East, Room 102; a quorum was present

**Members Present**
Alderson, Black-Lanouette, Brumfield, Byrd, Creadon, Dawes, Dunk, Enyedi, Eschker, Gold, Johnson, Karadjova, Maguire, K. Malloy, N. Malloy, Mola, Moyer, Mularky, Oliver, Ortega, Rizzardi, Rossbacher, Pence, Thobaben, Wrenn

**Members Absent**
Michalak, Le, Bacio, Johnson, Virnoche

**Guests**
Lauren Carman, Daniel Evans, Lisa Castellino, Bethany Rizzardi, Jessalyn Giglio, Belem Sanchez, Peg Metzger, Shelia Rockar-Heppe, Kacie Flynn, Kim Comet, Steven St. Onge, Susan Glassett-Farrelly, Holly Martel, Amber Blakeslee, Cyril Oberlander, Craig Wruck, Rick Zechman, Duncan Robins, Janessa Lund, Elva Ortega, numerous students and community members

**Announcement of Proxies**
Mola for Michalak, Pence for Le, Wrenn for Virnoche

**Approval of and Adoption of Agenda**
M/S (Karadjova/Ortega) to approve the agenda

Motion carried unanimously

**Approval of Minutes from the March 6, 2018 Meeting**
M/S (K. Malloy/Ortega) to approve the Minutes of March 6, 2018

Motion carried unanimously

**Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair**
- Written report attached

**Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members**

**Academic Policies:**
- Written report attached

**Appointments and Elections:**
- Written report attached
Constitution and Bylaws:
- Written report attached

Faculty Affairs:
Senator Wrenn reported that the FAC did not meet during the break

University Policies:
- Written report attached

University Resources and Planning:
- Written report attached

Statewide Senate (ASCSU):
- Written report attached

Associated Students:
Senator Black-Lanouette encouraged attendance at upcoming AS events, one of which is a CPS mixer in UC South Lounge. AS President Mularky reported the IRA Application will be reviewed.

California Faculty Association:
Senator Byrd handed out the attached Informational flier

Administrative Affairs:
In addition to the attached written report, Int. VP Dawes reported Open Forums for two candidates for the AVP of Facilities Management position will be held on March 29 and April 3.

Provost’s Report:
Provost Enyedi announced the appointment of Dr. Enoch Hale as the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, with a start date of June 29, 2018 and thanked Chair Julie Alderson for her services as Director up until Dr. Hale’s start date.

Provost Enyedi reported the on-site WSCUC Accreditation site visit concluded on Friday, March 23, and extended his deep thanks to the University Community who attended the multiple Open Forums to help the review team gain a clear picture of HSU. Provost Enyedi concluded, noting the next steps in the reaccreditation process:
- April 20: “Rough draft” of the WSCUC’s report expected
- June 23: WSCUC’s Final report on length of reaccreditation expected

President’s Report:
In addition to her attached written report, President Rossbacher added her thanks to everyone who worked to make the WSCUC site visit happen as smoothly as possible.

Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee
It was noted there were no items for approval on the ICC Consent Calendar

**General Consent Calendar**
The following items received unanimous approval and are attached:
- Temporary Food Facility Policy

Senator Ortega explained certain policies identified by the UPC as not being significant enough to warrant a separate Resolution will be included on a General Consent Calendar. He noted other policies that demand attention and conversation will come to Senate as Resolutions, so that everyone affected by them can make positive change and provide extended feedback.

Senator Ortega reminded the Senate it has recourse to request items on the General Consent Calendar be pulled for discussion, after which they will be moved to the end of the agenda as posted, where they become a full Resolution.

Senator Ortega recognized Kim Comet, Director for Risk Management and Safety Services, in attendance to answer questions about the Temporary Food Facility Policy, but briefly noted the policy isn’t changing current operations on campus, but is meant to tightly connect HSU policy to county health code and regulations.

**TIME CERTAIN 3:15-3:30 PM – Open Forum for the Campus Community**
Alumnus Lauren Carman read from remarks (*attached*) regarding the HSU Children’s Center.

Student Daniel Evans, husband of Lauren Carman, spoke in favor of keeping the Children’s Center in its current form, noting that doing so may be a way to increase enrollment, specifically for non-traditional students, such as himself.

Student Jessalyn Giglio spoke in favor of keeping the Children’s Center in its current form, and shared her experience as a student who’d had trouble finding a place for herself when she first arrived at HSU, but that through her employment at the Children’s Center she was able to stay and thrive within a great community.

It was noted that Melissa Whipkey, who’d signed up to speak online, was not in attendance.

Student Belem Sanchez read from remarks (*attached*) regarding excessive enrollment WTUs.

**Resolution on Department Chair Compensation Equity Policy (15-17/18-FAC – March 27,**
2018) Second Reading

Senator Mola noted the resolution may require a friendly amendment to make the title of the policy and the resolution the same.

Senator Pence read a statement on behalf of Senator Le (attached) against the resolution.

Senator K. Malloy spoke against the resolution, noting that, in a time when lecturers are losing benefits and jobs, neither the policy nor the resolution includes recourse to delay implementation until the budget is healthier.

M/S (K. Malloy/Gold) to refer the resolution back to the FAC for further review.

Discussion ensued, and is summarized below:

- Senator Gold spoke in favor of the motion to refer back to committee, and in agreement with Senator Le, noting that staff are often overlooked.
- Senator Mola noted the formula is not meant to offend or imply that staff are a burden to department Chairs, but that there is extra work in the form of staff workload direction and writing staff’s work performance evaluations.
- Senator Byrd spoke in general favor of the resolution, noting that having a base formula makes sense for equity purposes in a time when Chairs’ salaries are negotiated with Deans individually, referencing current evidence showing a trend toward compensation inequality for women and persons of color. She concluded that a formula may mitigate those trends, but the current iteration may need evaluation.
- Senator Eschker spoke against referring it back to committee, noting the possibility to insert an amendment that recognizes the importance of staff.
- Senator Moyer spoke in favor of referring it back to committee, with the idea it should come back for consideration with recourse to delay implementation until doing so is affordable. She noted that the number of staff designated to a department is partially a proxy for complexity, which could be figured into the formula.
- Senator Frye spoke against referring it back to committee, and recognized some parties have been omitted in the policy, but considered it as a maneuver to amplify benefits for a certain class of professionals who are overworked (as many are). Senator Frye concluded with his support of an expansion of a similar equity formula to support other parties, and that the current iteration does need structural review, as it seems there is a conflict of interest in who operates in what capacity (regarding technical superiority of Deans, but Chairs have responsibility for hiring extensions and staff evaluations).
- Senator Rizzardi opined that transparent formulas for compensation are great, but the current policy includes a charge to increase staffing, which is a budgetary statement that needs to be addressed separately than the need for adjusting WTUs for chairs.

Senate vote to refer the Resolution on Department Chair Compensation Equity Policy (15-17/18-FAC – March 27, 2018) Second Reading back to committee passed
Ayes: Brumfield, Gold, Pence, N. Malloy, Moyer, Maguire, Black-Lanouette, Oliver, K. Malloy, Mularky, Ortega, Dawes

Nays: Dunk, Wrenn, Virnoche, Creadon, Karadjova, Eschker, Michalak, Frye, Mola, Thobaben

Abstentions: Enyedi

The resolution was referred back to committee and will return as a First Reading

Resolution on ICC Constitution Revision - GEAR (16-17/18-ICC/GEAR – March 27, 2018) Second Reading

Senator Oliver thanked Senator Le for his work with the ICC/GEAR to show misalignment between the ICC constitution and the University Senate Constitution.

M/S (Oliver/Dunk) to refer the resolution back to the ICC for further review

Senate vote to refer the Resolution on ICC Constitution Revision – GEAR (16-17/18-ICC/GEAR – March 27, 2018) Second Reading back to committee passed without dissent

Ayes: Enyedi, Dunk, Brumfield, Gold, Wrenn, Virnoche, N. Malloy, Moyer, Creadon, Maguire, Rizzardi, Karadjova, Black-Lanouette, Oliver, Eschker, K. Malloy, Mularky, Michalak, Ortega, Frye, Dawes, Mola, Thobaben

Nays: None

Abstentions: Le

The resolution was referred back to committee and will return as a First Reading

Resolution on Updating GEAR Program SLOs and Area Specific Content Criteria (17-17/18-ICC/GEAR – March 27, 2018) Second Reading

Senate vote to approve the Resolution on Updating GEAR Program SLOs and Area Specific Content Criteria (17-17/18-ICC/GEAR – March 27, 2018) Second Reading passed unanimously

Ayes: Enyedi, Dunk, Brumfield, Gold, Wrenn, Virnoche, N. Malloy, Moyer, Creadon, Maguire, Rizzardi, Karadjova, Black-Lanouette, Oliver, Eschker, K. Malloy, Mularky, Michalak, Ortega, Frye, Dawes, Mola, Thobaben

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

M/S (K. Malloy/Karadjova) to delay the 4:00 PM Time Certain for 10 minutes in order to finish
agenda item 13 (Approval of the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 Academic Calendars) and agenda item 14 (Approval of the University Senate Meeting Calendar for 2018/2019).

Motion carried unanimously

**Discussion Item: Shared Governance Survey Results**
*Item undiscussed; it will return as a discussion item at the next meeting*

**Action Item: Approval of the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 Academic Calendars**
Senate vote to approve the 2019/2020 Academic Calendar **passed without dissent**

- Ayes: Enyedi, Dunk, Brumfield, Gold, Wrenn, Virnoche, N. Malloy, Moyer, Creadon, Maguire, Rizzardi, Karadjova, Black-Lanouette, Oliver, Eschker, K. Malloy, Mularky, Michalak, Ortega, Frye, Mola, Thobaben

- Abstentions: Dawes

Senate vote to approve the 2020/2021 Academic Calendar **passed without dissent**

- Ayes: Enyedi, Dunk, Brumfield, Gold, Wrenn, Virnoche, N. Malloy, Moyer, Creadon, Maguire, Rizzardi, Karadjova, Black-Lanouette, Oliver, Eschker, K. Malloy, Mularky, Michalak, Ortega, Frye, Mola, Thobaben

- Abstentions: Dawes

**Action Item: Approval of the University Senate Meeting Calendar for 2018/2019**
Senate vote to approve the University Senate Meeting Calendar for 2018/2019 **passed without dissent**

- Ayes: Enyedi, Dawes, Dunk, Brumfield, Gold, Wrenn, Virnoche, N. Malloy, Moyer, Creadon, Maguire, Rizzardi, Karadjova, Black-Lanouette, Oliver, K. Malloy, Mularky, Michalak, Ortega, Mola, Thobaben

- Abstentions: Eschker, Frye

**TIME CERTAIN: 4:00-4:10 4:10-4:20 PM – Action Item: Seating of New Senators**
Chair Alderson introduced and welcomed the following new Senators:

- Ara Pachmayer: At Large Delegate
- Lucy Kerhoulas: CNRS Delegate
- James Woglom: CAHSS Delegate
- Jeffrey Dunk: Lecturer Faculty Delegate
- Noah Zerbe: General Faculty Representative to the ASCSU
- Stephanie Burkhalter: University Senate Chair / President, General Faculty
Chair Alderson reminded the Senate that outgoing Senators do not take part in the Election of 2018/2019 Senate Officers, and announced the following proxies for incoming Senators:

Gold for Zerbe, Ortega for Pachmayer, Oliver for Kerhoulas

Chair Alderson solicited nominations for the office of Vice-Chair of the University Senate / Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Senator Mola was nominated.

Senate vote to elect Senator Monty Mola as Vice-Chair of the University Senate / Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee for 2018/2019 passed unanimously.

Chair Alderson solicited nominations for the office of Third Officer of the University Senate / Chair of the Academic Policies Committee. Senator K. Malloy was nominated.

Senate vote to elect Senator Kerri Malloy as Third Officer of the University Senate / Chair of the Academic Policies Committee passed unanimously.

Chair Alderson solicited nominations for the office of Co-Chair of the University Resources Planning Committee. Senator Rizzardi was nominated.

Senate vote to elect Senator Mark Rizzardi as Co-Chair of the University Resources Planning Committee passed unanimously.

Chair Alderson solicited nominations for the office of Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Senator Le was nominated.

Senate vote to elect Senator Michael Le as Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee passed unanimously.

Chair Alderson solicited nominations for the office of Chair of the University Policies Committee. Senator Maguire was nominated.

Senate vote to elect Senator Jennifer Maguire as Chair of the University Policies Committee passed unanimously.
Chair Alderson recognized Brandice Gonzalez-Guerra as nominee for the office of Faculty Representative on the Appointments and Elections Committee, and instructed Senators to vote aye to affirm or nay to deny her appointment.

Senate **voted unanimously to affirm** Brandice Gonzalez-Guerra as Faculty Representative (one of two) on the Appointments and Elections Committee.

Chair Alderson recognized herself, Julia Alderson, as nominee for the office of Faculty Representative on the Appointments and Elections Committee, and instructed Senators to vote aye to affirm or nay to deny her appointment.

Senate **voted unanimously to affirm** Julia Alderson as Faculty Representative (one of two) on the Appointments and Elections Committee.

---

**TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-5:00 4:40-5:10 PM – Budget Discussion Item: Update on AS Budget Open Forum and Administrators/Department Chairs Meeting**

Senator Black-Lanouette briefly reported on the AS Budget Open Forum, which was meant to increase student awareness/understanding of where student fees and tuition go, and to provide a safe situation for students to ask about the budget. Senator Black-Lanouette extended thanks to the ~75 students and 30-40 Faculty and Administrators who attended.

She reported a main concern from students is a lack of communication between administrators, faculty/staff, and students and that students want to have a better relationship with the people on campus who serve them.

Provost Enyedi gave a report on the department chair’s meeting with administrators. He shared his takeaway message that chairs want to collaborate, and they want administrators to appreciate that they interface specifically with faculty experience, and that department chairs are a remarkable resource that should be well integrated into the budget process, especially since they are the ones on the front lines interfacing with those who receive painful news.

Provost Enyedi concluded that the chairs see the current budget process as lacking transparency, and they expect the 2018/2019 budget process be improved to allow more input from chairs, and to work with administrators to produce rational and verifiable data. The chairs want administrators to work on the campus communication strategy to ensure information is disseminated in a meaningful way, which allows for reciprocity and information exchange.

Senator Moyer recommended the Senate return to the use of timers to keep speakers within allotted time limits, so that discussion items are more open to actual discussion, rather than pure report.
Chair Alderson pointed out that this year the Senate has implemented a lot more budget information exchange than previously, but that for the foreseeable future, the budget will continue to be discussed. She encouraged Senators to think about what they’d like budget conversations to look like in 2018/2019, and suggested the bulk of the last Senate meeting of 2018 (May 8\textsuperscript{th}) be spent reflecting on the way budget talks were handled this year, and on suggestions to the incoming chair for making further discussion more meaningful.

M/S (Mola/Creadon) motion to adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm
The Right of Discussion

“Each member of an assembly has the right to express his or her opinion freely without interruption or interference provided that the rules of debate and decorum, which are applicable to all members, are observed. This right to speak freely is as important as the right to vote.” (American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. New York: McGraw-Hill, c. 2012. 20.)

There was much debate after our March 6th Senate meeting about issues of decorum. In particular, calls for mea culpas from various members of our University community, myself included, regarding the exchange between Senator Gold and Interim Vice Provost Braithwaite. Rather than dedicating time at this week's meeting to further discussion of the incident, I am hopeful we can move forward and on to the current business at hand.

That said, I do want to stress that the manner in which we treat each other is, of course, extremely important. It is our shared responsibility to allow for broad discussion and to interact with one another from a place of respect and decency at all times. My sense is that campus overall is having a difficult time managing this at the moment, particularly in light of the tensions caused by the budget cuts. I am struck by the level of anger and blame I see all around me (faculty versus administration, which college is really responsible for our budget situation, etc.). Last week our CFA chapter President addressed the Board of Trustees, citing the "very difficult and disturbing situation" at HSU, while our students were themselves on campus physically menacing each other and the members of the WSCUC site visit team. We are certainly functioning in a time of heightened stress and anxiety, and it seems to be playing out everywhere.

Even in this moment of profound struggle, I found myself submitting a message to the WASC team’s confidential email address, in which I wrote very sincerely that I’ve never been more excited to be working at HSU. I feel that we are at long last on the cusp of true, transformative change here - creating a climate of accountability to our students in particular. I truly do see our problems as challenges to be faced, with the continued overarching goal of doing what we do even better.

My greatest disappointment in leading the Senate over the last few years, and honestly, the reason I decided not to pursue a second full term as Chair, has been my inability to break through the pervasive "us versus them" attitudes at HSU. As I’ve mentioned many times, our fairly unique Senate structure allows for the possibility of true shared governance. My hope for the full demonstration of that via the Senate has yet to manifest itself, and so I am making a conscious effort to put my energies into areas where I am hopeful that I can help make meaningful, significant change. I have found that taking positive, proactive action is more effective and personally satisfying than engaging in finger pointing, distraction and deflection. I sincerely hope that we can move through this period of discord and begin the serious work ahead, both as individuals and as a larger collective.

Thanks, as always, for your service on the Senate.
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
University Senate Written Reports, March 27, 2018
Standing Committees, Statewide Senators and Ex-officio Members

Academic Policies Committee:

Submitted by Kerri Malloy, APC Chair

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

Meeting Dates for Spring 2018: Meeting time: 11AM-11:50 AM  Meeting Place: BSS 402
January  24
February 7, 21
March 7, 21
April 4, 18
May 2

Committee Meetings Reports:

March 21
• Committee reviewed and requested clarifications on changes to the Classroom Disruptive Behavior Policy. Will be bringing to the full Senate at the next meeting.
• Committee started discussion on updates to the Academic Honesty Policy requested by the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities.

March 7
• APC did not meet.

February 21
• Initiated work on the definitions and guidelines for department and schools. Will continues this work at the next meet.
• Discussion on class attendance in response to an inquiry from faculty to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Discussion will continue.
• Work on the Classroom Disruptive Behavior Policy and the Academic Integrity Policy continues with the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

February 7
• Committee reviewed responses of to inquiries regarding the request from the College of Professional Studies to change the Department of Social Work to the School of Social Work. The committee forwarded the request to SenEx for placement on the University Senate agenda.
• Christine Mata from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities presented and took questions on recommended changes to the Classroom Disruptive Behavior Policy and the Academic Integrity Policy. Additional information and draft language will be forth coming.
• Discussion on informational item regarding a change in the TOFEL score from the Office of the Provost that will be on a future University Senate agenda.

January 14
• Committee reviewed a request from the College of Professional Studies to change the Department of Social Work to the School of Social Work. Further information was requested before the recommendation is forwarded to the University Senate.
• Committee reviewed draft changes to the Disruptive Behavior Policy.

December 6
• Committee reviewed changes to the Syllabus Policy to incorporate accessible technology initiative requirements for accessible syllabi.
• Initiated discussion on a request to review Appendix R – Student Grievance for possible updates.

October 11:
• Committee reviewed the Course Numbering Policy via email and forwarded it on the ICC for reviews.
• Committee will be discussion revisions to:
  o Academic Honesty Policy proposed by the Dean of Students
  o Syllabus Policy as part of bringing the campus into compliance with the Accessible Technologies Initiative

September 27:
• Committee provided feedback and questions on the proposed Advising Policy.
• Committee will be sending forward revisions to the Course Numbering Policy to reflect the elimination of remedial course.

September 13:
• Committee completed the review, edited the Posthumous Degree Policy, and will be sending it forward to the Senate for a first reading.
• Committee reviewed the draft of the Advising Policy. This item took up the bulk of the meeting and will be the main item at the September 17 meeting.

August 30:
• Committee reviewed and discussed the Posthumous Degree Policy

Inquiries:
Add/Drop Date Report:

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

Add/Drop Date
Inquiry on the Add/Drop date being on holiday. Internal discussion on the number of exceptional add/drops that may be a result of this, the date not always being on holiday, and that student have access to their Student Center 24/7. Registrar indicates there has not been an uptick since due to the Add/Drop date landing on holiday.
Discussion with the Academic Technology Faculty Contributors (formerly known as the Canvas Faculty Contributors) to have global messages to students posted on dashboards that indicate upcoming academic deadlines:

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

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

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

---

**Appointments and Elections Committee:**

Submitted by Katia Karadjova, AEC Chair

*Updated Spring 2018 General Faculty Election Results and AEC Appointments*

**Faculty Elected Positions:**

**GENERAL FACULTY** President, 2 year term

  Stephanie Burkhalter

**GENERAL FACULTY** Representative to the ASCSU, 3 year term

  Noah Zerbe

**INTEGRATED CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (ICC)**

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

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

Subcommittee on Course and Degree Changes (CDC)

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

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

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

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE

- Tenured Faculty Member, 1 year term

Rae Robison

SPONSORED PROGRAMS FOUNDATION BOARD
Candidates are elected by faculty and recommended to the President for final appointment.

- Two Faculty Members, 4 year terms

Carly Marino
Harold Zald

UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (UFPC)

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

Joshua Meisel

- Faculty Member CPS, 2 year term

Christopher Aberson

UNIVERSITY SENATE

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

Jeff Dunk

Tenure Line At-Large Faculty Delegate, 3 year term

Ara Pachmayer

Tenure Line CNRS Instructional Faculty Delegate, 3 year term

Lucy Kerhoulas

Tenure Line CAHSS Instructional Faculty Delegate, 3 year term

James Woglom

Appointment and Elections Committee Appointed Positions:

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 3 year terms

Kayla Begay
Michael Goodman
ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND OTHER DRUG PREVENTION COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member, 2 year term
  Troy Lescher

APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (AEC)

- Two Faculty Members, 1 year terms
  Brandice Gonzalez-Guerra
  Julia Alderson

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING (formerly CSLAI)

- Faculty Member from CPS, 1 year term
  Meenal Rana
- Faculty Member from CNRS, 1 year term
  Sherrene Bogle

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RTP CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

- Faculty Member from CAHSS, 3 year term
  Sondra Schwetman
- Faculty Member from CNRS, 3 year term
  Yvonne Everett
- Faculty Member from CPS, 3 year term
  Whitney Ogle

CONSTITUTIONS AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 2 year terms
  Jeffrey Abell
  Joice Chang

DISABILITY, ACCESS, AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member, 2 year terms
  Jill Pawlowski

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

- Faculty Senator, 3 year term
  Katia Karadjova
• Faculty Member (At-Large), 3 year term
  Abeer Hasan

• Faculty Member (At-Large), 3 year term
  George Wrenn

FACTORY AWARDS COMMITTEE
• Three Faculty Members, 1 year terms
  Eugene Novotney
  Whitney Ogle
  Alexandru Tomescu

GEAR (General Ed & All-University Requirements) CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
• Faculty Member from CAHSS, 2 year term
  Cutcha Risling-Baldy

INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE (IRA)
The Appointments and Elections Committee recommend candidates to the President for final appointment.
• Three Faculty Members, 1 year terms
  Ramesh Adhikari
  Jamey Harris
  Aaron Donaldson

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (IAAC)
• Faculty Member, 2 year term
  Shelia Alcea

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
• Faculty Member from University Library, 3 year terms
  Katia Karadjova

• Faculty Member from CPS, 3 year term
  Jayne McGuire

• Two Faculty Members from CAHSS, 3 year terms
  Tony Silvaggio
  Garrick Woods
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS SCREENING COMMITTEE

- Three Faculty Members, 3 year terms
  
  Meenal Rana
  Katia Karadjova
  Ramesh Adhikari

PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 1 year terms
  
  Eugene Novotney
  Bo Burrus

STUDENT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member from CPS, 3 year term
  
  Taylor Bloedon

UNIVERSITY CENTER BOARD

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

- Two Faculty Members, 2 year terms
  
  Mark Rizzardi
  Armeda Reitzel

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Two Faculty Members, 2 year terms
  
  Mark Rizzardi
  Kerri Malloy

UNIVERSITY POLICIES COMMITTEE

- Faculty Member, 1 year
  
  Troy Lescher

UNIVERSITY SPORTS FACILITIES SCHEDULING ADVISORY GROUP

- Faculty Member, 1 year term
  
  Tony Silvaggio
AEC Continues to solicit nominations for the following positions:

Elected Position Openings:

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

- **ICC Chair**, 3 year term

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

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

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

Please refer to the following page for information regarding the duties of the UFPC: [http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/ufpc](http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/ufpc)

Appointed Position Openings:

**INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS SCREENING COMMITTEE**

- **Faculty Counselor**, 3 year term

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

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

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

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

Submitted by Michael Le, CBC Chair

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

Members Present:

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

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

New Items

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

Old Items

I. Policy on committees, task force, teams, and other groups convened to conduct business on behalf of the institution.
   a. Description: CBC has been asked for a Constitution and Bylaws Interpretation of who is included in the campus community and should be allowed to attend Senate Meetings. This evolved into the CBC is researching sunshine laws (Ralph M. Brown Act and the Bagley-Keene Act) about public and nonpublic meeting types. CBC was advised by Alison N. Kleaver, University Counsel that HSU committees are not subject to either of these laws as Ralph M. Brown Act applies to legislative bodies of local agencies and Bagley-Keene Act applies to units doing business on behalf of the state.
   b. Action: CBC is researching principles from these two laws and Peer CSU policies on defining Committees, Workgroups, task forces, Councils, associations, and other groups convened to conduct business on behalf of the university. In addition CBC is looking for guidelines for the “group’s” responsibility to be transparent (e.g., publish meetings dates/times, agenda, and meeting minutes).
   c. Action: CBC is researching principles from these two laws and Peer CSU policies on defining Committees, Workgroups, task forces, Councils, associations, and other groups convened to conduct business on behalf of the university. In addition CBC is looking for guidelines for the “group’s” responsibility to be transparent (e.g., publish meetings dates/times, agenda, and meeting minutes).
d. **Materials:**
   i. Discussion of Gribsby article: Committee, Task Force, Team: What’s the Difference? Why Does It Matter?
   ii. Discussion of current committee structure under Senate and how anything we come up with will affect it: [http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/committees](http://www2.humboldt.edu/senate/committees)

e. **Notes:** A special subcommittee meeting was called for Thursday, April 29th from 1-2:20pm in Library 208. This is a non-business meeting and will be used solely for collaboration of work.

---

**University Policies Committee:**

Submitted by Justus Ortega, UPC Chair

1) Discussed HSU Policy Website ([https://policy.humboldt.edu/](https://policy.humboldt.edu/)) and policies for revision or removal.
   a. Based on recommendations from Mary Watson (Senate Office) and Kay Liboldt (President’s Office), the UPC is reviewing old policies that have been superseded or otherwise considered outdated/unneeded. These old policies are currently being reviewed by the UPC and recommendations for removal will be forwarded onto the Senate via Consent calendar.
   b. Policy Website has been updated for easier upload of new policies, easier searching of policy by title.
   c. Kay Liboldt recommend and UPC agreed to minor changes of Policy proposal template and instructions to make easier to implement on Policy website and to make documents accessible.

2) Reviewed updates to *Temporary Food Policy*. Minor changes were recommended and UPC voted to send revised version to Senate for 1st reading.

3) Discussed policies that will be coming to the UPC including *Time, Place and Manner Policy* and *Alcohol Policy*.

4) As per the policy on policy, UPC has started a review of the efficacy of the implementation and processes outlined in the Policy on Policy. An efficacy report will be submitted to the Senate for review and comments.

---

**University Resources and Planning Committee:**

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

The URPC met Friday, March 9. In that meeting, the URPC discussed the Cabinet's February 22 memo on budget decisions ([https://www2.humboldt.edu/pmc/node/3505](https://www2.humboldt.edu/pmc/node/3505)). The URPC co-chairs, with input from the other URPC members, wrote President Rossbacher a letter ([http://budget.humboldt.edu/sites/default/files/budget/documents/FY17-18/urpc_letter_to_president_re_feb22_decisions.pdf](http://budget.humboldt.edu/sites/default/files/budget/documents/FY17-18/urpc_letter_to_president_re_feb22_decisions.pdf)) providing URPC feedback about the Cabinet's memo.
The URPC also met on Friday, March 23. The first item was to final discussion and approval of the Space Management Policy Implementation Process (see attached policy & summary), as drafted by the University Space & Facilities Advisory Committee (USFAC). The USFAC, formerly the Facilities Working group, serves as the space and facilities advisory body of the URPC.

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

The third and final topic of the March 23 meeting concerned campus budget communication. The Budget Office is updating its website to keep the campus informed on reduction updates and providing a budget FAQ. The communication discussion then moved on to the importance of a unified "Students First" message to assure students that their access to required classes is the University's top priority.
Date: March 19, 2018

TO: President Rossbacher, Humboldt State University

FROM: University Resources & Planning Committee (URPC) Co-Chairs

Alex Enyedi, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mark Rizzardi, Professor of Mathematics

RE: URPC Feedback Concerning Cabinet's February 22, 2018 Budget Memo

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

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

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

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

➢ Objective 4.1: Develop and implement a unified, transparent, and evidence-based budget model that reflects institutional priorities and the actual cost and size of programs;
➢ Objective 4.2: Reduce operational costs and reallocate funds to areas as defined by the strategic plan; and
Objective 4.3: Expand resources to support the University's mission, including identifying new resources, finding efficiencies, and being good stewards of existing resources.

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

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

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

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

Communication with faculty, staff, and students should be increased with regard to final decisions and their impact. Open budget forums held this past year have been a great start keeping the University's members informed, and for gathering feedback. Now that decisions are being implemented, additional approaches are needed. Change management should be utilized to help facilitate details of what the changes should be, and how to put them into effect. Where
allowable, details of "what", "why" and "how" should be shared with the campus community to quell uncertainties and rumors. Furthermore, URPC members recommend that the Budget Office website include a summary of implemented actions, realized dollar savings (one-time or General Fund base dollars) and/or efficiencies realized (e.g. reduction in unnecessary work duties, combining units, eliminating redundancies, streamlining processes).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Every California student should have the opportunity to obtain quality public higher education. Join us on April 4 at the State Capitol as we demand that lawmakers #FundTheDream and #FreeTheCSU.

Sign up: freethecsu.org
1. The Governor’s budget proposal of just $92 million more for the CSU next year does not even keep up with inflation. This means it is a budget cut and would cause more tuition increases, course cuts, and delay students’ graduations.1

2. Gov. Brown says the students and the CSU should “live within their means” – showing how out of touch he is with today’s college students. A recent study found 10.9% of CSU students experienced homelessness and 41.6% reported food insecurity.2

3. California has money! According to the Governor’s own Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst Office, the California’s fiscal outlook for 2018 and 2019 is positive.3,4

4. The LAO predicts a discretionary surplus of $7.5 billion by the end of 2018-19 but Gov. Brown would rather stash it away into a Rainy Day Fund – billions more than required by law!5

5. But, as CSU Trustee John Nilon said at a recent Board of Trustees meeting, “The governor chooses to put those funds in a rainy day fund, thereby creating the rainy day for CSU.”6

6. As a result, the CSU Trustees are considering another tuition increase of 4% for next year, on top of a 5% increase this year.1

7. Gov. Brown’s budget has NO FUNDING for enrollment growth. Chronic underfunding of the CSU means the university is turning away tens of thousands of qualified, eligible students. This year, more than 30,000 students were denied a spot in the CSU and this has been going on for years.5

8. Meanwhile, the CSU is serving 70,000 more students today than during the Great Recession in 2010.7

9. California spends 41% less on each CSU student today than 30 years ago, when the student body was predominantly white. Today, 72% of CSU students identify as students of color and tens of thousands are first-generation college students; they too deserve a fully-funded university.8,13

10. By continuing to underfund the CSU, even after the state has recovered from the Great Recession, Gov. Brown’s budget offers today’s diverse students an education on the cheap.9

11. Supporting the CSU is a good financial investment. CSU-related spending has an economic impact of more than $17 billion and supports 150,000 jobs in the state.9

12. For every $1 invested by the state, the CSU generates $5.43 for California’s economy.9

13. State funding has not kept pace with growth in student enrollment. Though the CSU student body has grown by 67% since 1985, the CSU budget has actually decreased by about 3%, when adjusted for inflation.10

14. CSU Chancellor White is threatening to cut at least 2,380 courses if Gov. Brown does not increase the CSU budget.1

15. If CSU had resources (state funding plus tuition) it did in 1985, there would be $773 million more dollars in the CSU operating budget to serve today’s students.10

16. California has more billionaires than any other state in the nation and more than all but two countries in the world. California can afford to invest in public higher education.11

17. There are 158,000 more students in the CSU today than there were in 1985, but the same number of full-time, permanent faculty positions. This means fewer faculty to mentor, teach, supervise projects, and develop academic programs.7,12

18. Today, a majority of the faculty (60% by headcount) are hired on temporary, part-time teaching contracts. Our faculty deserve better jobs and our students deserve teachers who will be around to see them earn their degrees.12

19. If the state of California supported today’s students at the level of 1985, state funding for CSU in 2015 would have been almost $2 billion higher.13

20. In just 12 years from now, the demand for college educated workers in California is expected to exceed the supply of workers with Bachelor’s degrees by 1.1 million. To avoid this gap, the state needs to act today and increase funding for the public universities.14

21. More than 2/3 of Californians think the current level of state funding for public colleges and universities is inadequate. And 70%, across all parties, say they do not support increasing tuition to fund higher education.14

22. The cost to attend a CSU has skyrocketed. In 1985, students paid $666 per year in tuition and fees. This year, they are paying 933% more. If tuition had kept pace with inflation, students would be paying $1,519 instead of $6,881 this year.13

23. A college education is a critical step in achieving upward, inter-generational economic mobility for working class and lower income families. A recent national study found many of the CSU campuses are ranked among the best universities in the whole country in terms of upward mobility and offering a pathway to better economic security for low-income families.15

References @ www.calfac.org/FreeTheCSU

#FREE THE CSU

APRIL 4 - STATE CAPITOL - RALLY TO #FREETHECSU

#FUND THE DREAM
University Administrative Standard:  
Space Management Policy Implementation

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

Procedures for Implementation of the Campus Space Management Policy

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

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

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

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

3. Requests for Reallocation of Existing Division Space
All requests for reallocation of existing space within a Division may be initiated by the requesting Department or Division and shall be submitted by the respective Key Advisor via the Space Change Webform. Such form will be routed to the MBU lead administrator and Division lead
administrator for approval. The lead administrators are encouraged to obtain a space utilization analysis and recommendation from Facilities Management to assist with ensuring all University space is used efficiently and optimally. MBU and Division lead administrators may not reallocate space across divisions without USFAC review and approval. Once space changes have been approved, the form is routed to TNS and Facilities for action. Based on data collected by the Space Change Webform, all space reallocations will be reported to USFAC by Facilities Management on a regular basis.

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

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

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

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

6. Allocation of Vacated Space
Space vacated by a physical move or made available due to renovation or new construction is allocated back to the University for reallocation. Likewise, space vacated due to a reduction in program size, reduction in workforce or program elimination is also allocated back to the University for reallocation. The Key Advisor of the department to which the space was originally
allocated will submit such information in the Space Change Webform. Vacated space will be held as such in the University space database and shall be reallocated in accordance with other sections of this Standard and shall be administered by USFAC through delegation from the URPC pursuant to P15-03 Space Management Policy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FM: Facilities Management and all of its individual units.

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

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

MBU: Major Budget Unit

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

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

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

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

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

**TNS:** Telecommunication & Network Services

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

**USFAC:** University Space & Facilities Advisory Committee, subcommittee to the URPC
Humboldt State University Budget Oversight Policy

[Policy Number]

University Budget Office

Applies to: Faculty, staff

Purpose of the Policy

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

Definitions

Policy Details

Overview of Financial Reviews

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

Frequency of Reviews

Reviews will occur quarterly.

Action Taken to Address Financial Concerns

If there is a financial concern (e.g. budget shortfall/anticipated year-end deficit) that the MBU cannot resolve internally within the MBU, a formalized one-time funding request submitted by the MBU lead administrator must be made to the divisional level and include written details regarding research to be conducted, a resolution plan, and expected and final completion dates. If the financial concern cannot be addressed within the division, a formalized request must be submitted by the division Vice President to the University Resources & Planning Committee (URPC) for one-time funding consideration. The URPC will make a recommendation to the President, who will then approve the funding request or determine an alternate course of action.
**Documentation**
Detailed documentation, including the financial reviews and the activities outlined in the Action Taken to Address Areas of Concern section, will be retained electronically within HSU’s enterprise budgeting system (currently Questica) and summarized documentation will be posted on the Budget Office website.

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

**References**
ICSUAM Section 2002.00 – Budget Oversight Policy
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Overview
Facilities Management is asking for final review of the Draft Space Management Policy Implementation as attached to this summary. The following are major points of the implementation are outlined to capture specific items of review that were discussed in the presentation given to URPC and other feedback from campus group. These items are meant to aid overall review of the document.

Procedures for Implementation of the Campus Space Management Policy

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

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

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

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

5. Temporary Space Reallocation
This section should be reviewed in context with the defined term of “temporary” established in the glossary

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

7. Requests for Changes in Existing Space Type, Square Footage, or Capacity
The section establishes process and authority over this space change by URPC-USFAC in consultation with Facilities Management

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

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

Chair Miller’s current and other past chair reports can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/)
2. Excerpts from Other Reports
   a. **Academic Affairs** discussed the following topics.
      i. Resolution on State University Grants
      ii. Resolution on Student Success
      iii. WestEd Evaluation Study of EO 1110 implementation. WestEd plans to visit several campuses to collect data.
   
   b. **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed the following topics.
      i. Resolution on admissions and participation in peaceful protests.
      ii. Resolution on equitable admissions processes.
         1. Local admission preferences
         2. Problems arising from incorrect entering of HS transcript information
      iii. Teacher preparation partnership in Bakersfield.
      iv. Next Generation Science Standards

c. **Faculty Affairs** discussed the following topics.
   i. Faculty numbers and hiring
   ii. Impact of technology and on-line instruction on faculty
      1. Potential reconstitution on the CSU Commission on On-Line Education
   iii. Advocacy for the CSU (CFA)
   iv. Faculty Innovation Awards
   v. Resolution on Counseling Support Services
   vi. Resolution on Intrusion of Outside Groups into the Development of Curriculum
   vii. Resolution on Protecting Faculty from Attacks from Outside Groups
   viii. Resolution on Appreciation of AAUP Support of Shared Governance in the CSU
   ix. Tenure Density/Tenure Density Task Force Report (pending receipt)

d. **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics.
   i. Tracking a lengthy list of potential legislation (narrowed 400 bills to be tracked to circa 30 for which we may wish to take a position)
   ii. Potential tuition increase
   iii. Funding the CSU

e. **GE Advisory Committee** discussed the following issues.
   i. GE Reviewer Guiding Notes (used by CCC GE course proposers and GE course reviewers
      1. They should be used to clarify or explain policies, not to set policy
      2. The notes relative to the “Golden 4” were discussed last week and other sections will be discussed in May
   ii. Status of CSU campus GE assessment
      1. Looking for best practices and the state of assessment by campus
      2. Chair Baaske has requested that the senior Senator from each campus provide information about their campus’ GE program review.
f. ITL Advisory Committee
   i. Is providing training on quantitative reasoning through the Center for Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning and written communication training through the Center for Advancement of Reading.
   ii. Is coordinating faculty development across the system through the Faculty Develop Council (comprised of campus faculty development staff).
   iii. 20th Annual Symposium on University Teaching will be held at Pomona and its theme will be Productive Disruption.
   iv. The BOT will have a presentation on community engagement (this year is the 20th anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement).
   v. Academic Human Resources—the need for training for new department chairs and faculty.

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

h. Tenure Density Task Force (from reports above)
   i. Their report will be available soon pending completion of review by the Chancellor (see summary of Chancellor’s remarks below.).

3. Faculty Trustee Sabalius reported on his activities since our January plenary and planned activities for the near future. He will visit CSUSB beginning Friday and CSULA soon. He particularly enjoyed the Super Sunday activities (outreach to predominantly Black churches around the state). Next week at BOT, two new presidents will be introduced (CSUB and CSUDH) and admissions policy will be discussed. However, the CSU budget will likely dominate the discussions. The Governor’s proposed budget represents an actual total increase (all sources of stateside funding) of less than 1%, even as costs and enrollments are
increasing more rapidly. There is concern that this situation may result in a need for a tuition increase. A complicating factor is a threat from our Governor to decrease our allocation by the amount of any tuition increase.

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

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

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

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

7. We introduced the following resolutions that will be considered for adoption at our May plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
b. **Endorsement of the “White Paper on Student Success”** presents a white paper including a literature review of the dimensions of student success and factors leading to success and introduces a broad definition of success to be used by ASCSU (“The degree to which students possess the skills, knowledge, habits, attitudes, values, and credentials necessary to attain their academic, career, and other life goals”)

c. **Condemning the Intrusion of Outside Groups into the Development of Curriculum** asserts the important faculty role in curriculum, urges the CSU administration to be transparent about sources of curricular changes such as those embodied in EOs 1100 and 1110, and argues for sufficient time and research needed to assess the potential effectiveness of proposed curricular changes.

d. **Equity and Responsibility in Admissions to the Distinctive Universities and Campuses of the California State University System** argues against legislative intrusion to the admissions process and supports a balance of in- and out-of-area students on our campuses.

e. **The State University Grant Program: A Call for Full Funding from the State** recognizes the severe burden the lack of funding for this program places upon the CSU and its students and requests full funding. It also requests an LAO investigation on the impact of underfunding State University Grants.

f. **Protecting Faculty from Attacks by Outside Groups** calls for the formation of a committee to draft a policy to address professionally or politically related attacks on CSU students and faculty.

g. **Appreciation for the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) Support of Shared Governance at the California State University (CSU)** expresses gratitude for their letters addressing the implementation of EOs 1100 and 1110.

8. **Trustees Adam Day (Vice Chair) and Jane W. Carney** shared their views on the importance of a higher education and how important professors are in the lives of our students. In response to questions and comments: They defended the practice of closed presidential searches but are open to feedback on the issue. The underfunding of State University Grants (and Cal Grants, which if fully funded would make SUGs unnecessary) is something we can try to address but problems like homelessness, unequal income distribution, etc. stem from issues at the state level and need to primarily addressed at that level. We need to charge leadership and staff with evaluating the impacts and effectiveness of programs and policies, including EO 1110. They are willing to meeting with department chairs and visiting classes on their campus visits. The Board appreciates the role of faculty in curriculum and welcomes the ideas of all groups, including outside groups, in developing policy to benefit our students. Trustee Carney shared some valuable insights based upon her experience on the Irvine Foundation board. The best foundations try to support innovation and ideas rather than advocate for specific approaches and solutions. Those foundations can be great partners. We agree that we rely too heavily on lecturer faculty. The Board affirms the importance of ethnic studies in the educational experience of our students. We need to all advocate for the CSU, now more than ever. Our philanthropic
donors could be an important part of that effort. We are open to exploring alternative employment models for our lecturers.

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

10. **EVC Loren Blanchard** discussed the Board agenda, including the following items related to Academic & Student Affairs.
    - Enrollment Management (including impaction and redirection)
      - Local application preference via credit in eligibility index
      - Applicant redirection to open campuses
      - LAO reaction to the Eligibility Study (we are currently admitting more than the top 33.3% of HS graduate state target) to reduce admissions to the target.
- Public Policy Institute—position is that we should continue to admit the top 40+%
- CA HSs are making great progress in increasing the number of students completing the a-g coursework required for UC/CSU admission.

- Resident tuition for adult school graduates
- DNP Title 5 revisions
  - Degree requirements
  - Admissions requirements
- The roles of both graduate and undergraduate education in our mission.
- Degree planning (consider campus academic master plans, including 43 new degree programs, removal of 39 pilot and other programs)
  - The Board may question how we can move forward with new programs given our funding challenges,
- Academic preparation, placement, EAP, Early Start, etc.
- Expenditure of campus Student Success supplemental funding
- Faculty and counselor hiring and increase in course sections offered. (Mandated report to legislature)

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

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

Advocacy in Sacramento will continue to be a high priority. We are holding a number of roundtable discussions with members of the legislation. CSU, Sacramento hosted a conference last month on student basic needs (including food and housing insecurity). Both student needs and campus responses were discussed and highlighted. Discussions with the Executive Committee on shared governance are ongoing. Some of the discussions are difficult but we are making good progress and are hopeful of a good outcome. We are trying to be diligent in pursuing all 6 pillars of GI 2025. We have an important responsibility to the state and our students to reach our goals. We invite all to help us via feedback and other means to make this a success. In response to questions: There are discussions with legislators regarding the top 33.3% of all CA HS graduates admissions guideline. Some provosts are requesting one-time funding for EO 1110 implementation. He will ask his staff to address concerns relative to the most recent FAQ on EO 1110 implementation. The presidents and other groups are very concerned about the potential impacts of eligibility changes on underserved groups. We are still developing metrics to assess the success of EO 1110 implementation and welcome your input. Pass rates of introductory English and math courses will be looked at closely, including potential differential pass rates by different groups. We are making much too little progress on tenure density. It will be difficult to increase enrollment while our campuses are above capacity and we are not receiving state support (only tuition) for far too many
students we are serving. All students are disadvantaged in terms of quality when our funding falls short of needs. He intends to do some research on the group Complete College America. We need to continue to work so that our programs and student choices can meet the needs of employers in CA. There will be a report to the Board on graduate education. We have seen a growth over the last 10 years system-wide in the number of graduate programs offered. They are responsive to state needs. (Reported by Dr. Christine Mallon)

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

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

Administrative Affairs:

Submitted by Doug Dawes, Interim Vice President of Administrative Affairs

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

Procurement
- Year-end deadlines will be shared shortly.
- Next fiscal year’s requisition period will open early again this year; so users will be able to enter future year requisitions starting May 1st.
• PeopleSoft Finance (CFS) will be down starting April 26th at 5:00 pm, and will be down all of Friday the 27th (no requisitions/POs, no checks or payments, no student financial aid, no journal entries, etc.).
• The ProCard reconciliation period for April’s reconciliation will be shorter due to the PeopleSoft CFS upgrade (users will have from April 17th – April 23rd).

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

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

President’s Office:

Submitted by Lisa Rossbacher, President, Humboldt State University

Dear colleagues –

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

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

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

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

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

Revenue options
   Short term
       Increase state funding
       Increase tuition
       Some combination of these
   Long term
       Develop a multi-year budget plan with small, predictable tuition increases
       Expand public-private partnerships
       Increase philanthropic donations to the CSU

Expenditure options
   Short term
       Defers hiring faculty and staff
       Adjust institutional financial aid (the State University Grant, or SUG)
       Defers investments in the Graduation Initiative, enrollment increases, and infrastructure
   Long term
       Change retirement policies and post-employment programs (shift more of the benefits costs to retirees)
       Enrollment management (freeze or reduce enrollment)
       Program realignment and elimination

Many of these options are ones that must be determined at the system level, not by an individual campus; I believe that HSU is already addressing the options over which we have control.  I want to
thank the University Resources and Planning Committee for their thoughtful comments about the February 23 budget proposal. The revised plan, incorporating many of the URPC’s suggestions, is scheduled to be complete on March 29.

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

As always, I am available to answer questions.
Temporary Food Facility Policy
Policy Number 17-xx
Supersedes EM:P10-02
Risk Management and Safety Services

Applies to: all members of the university community and external groups wishing to serve food on campus.

Purpose of the Policy

To ensure the safe handling of food in temporary food facilities in order to protect people from injury or illness that may occur from the sale and/or distribution of food and beverages from temporary food facilities. The observance of this policy by your organization is essential in achieving this goal.

Definitions

- **Certified Commercial Kitchen**—means a room or building which meets all the requirements of the applicable California Health and Safety Code and is not a residential kitchen.
- **Nonprofit charitable organization**—Groups that are tax exempt, they do not pay income tax on the money that they receive for their organization. They can operate in scientific, research or educational settings.
- **Open Forum**—for the purposes of this policy is one which provides consumables to members of the campus community or general public, whether for free or for sale. Some examples include: art exhibits, offering samples, symposiums, quad tabling, and department luncheons which are advertised to the campus community.
- **Processing food in a commercial kitchen**—means the manufacturing, processing or packaging of food in a commercial kitchen for the purpose of distribution.
- **Potentially hazardous food**
  - means a food that is natural or synthetic and that requires temperature control because it is in a form capable of supporting the rapid and progressive growth of infectious or toxigenic micro-organisms, the growth and toxin production of Clostridium botulinum, or, in raw shell eggs, the growth of salmonella enteritidis.
  - **Potentially hazardous food** includes a food of animal origin that is raw or heat-treated, a food of plant origin that is heat-treated or consists of raw seed sprouts, cut melons, and garlic-in-oil mixtures that are not acidified or otherwise modified at a food processing plant in a way that results in mixtures that do not support growth as specified in the paragraph above.
  - **Potentially hazardous food** does not include any of the following:
    1. A food with an aw* value of 0.85 or less.
    2. A food with a pH level of 4.6 or below when measured at 75°F.
    3. A shell egg that is not hard-boiled but has been treated to destroy all viable salmonellae.
    4. A food in an unopened, hermetically sealed container that is commercially processed to achieve and maintain commercial sterility under conditions of non-refrigerated storage and distribution.
(5) A food that has been shown by appropriate microbial challenge studies approved by the enforcement agency not to support the rapid and progressive growth of infectious or toxigenic microorganisms that may cause food infections or food intoxications, or the growth and toxin production of Clostridium botulinum, such as a food that has an aw* and a pH that are above the levels specified under paragraphs (1) and (2) and that may contain a preservative, other barrier to the growth of microorganisms, or a combination of barriers that inhibit the growth of micro-organisms.

(6) A food that does not support the rapid and progressive growth of infectious or toxigenic micro-organisms, even though the food may contain an infectious or toxigenic micro-organism or chemical or physical contaminant at a level sufficient to cause illness.

* "aw" means water activity that is a measure of the free moisture in a food, is the quotient of the water vapor pressure of the substance divided by the vapor pressure of pure water at the same temperature, and is indicated by the symbol aw.

Policy Details

Nonprofit Charitable Temporary Food Facilities (hereafter: Temporary Food Facilities) means either one of the following:

- a temporary food facility that is conducted by a nonprofit charitable organization,
- or an established club or organization of students that operates under the authorization of a school or other educational facility.

NONPROFIT CHARITABLE TEMPORARY FOOD FACILITIES ARE REGULATED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA UNDER THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE, CHAPTER 10.5, [114332-114332.7].

The enforcement of these regulations shall be the responsibility of the Humboldt State University office of Environmental Health and Safety (Ext.3302) and under the guidance of the Humboldt County Department of Health Services. The Food Safety Program Enforcement Officer (hereafter: Food Safety Officer) shall be the EH&S Specialist.

The Office of Environmental Health and Safety has the authority to enforce this policy and all Federal, State and local regulations pertaining to the sale and distribution of food and beverages on the HSU campus by non-HSU entities.

GUIDELINES
Temporary food facilities must obtain a permit from the office of Environmental Health and Safety before commencing operations involving the sale, or other distribution, of food.

Only commercially prepared baked goods or baked goods prepared in a certified commercial kitchen may be offered for sale, or other distribution, from permitted temporary food facilities.

Except where all food and beverage is prepackaged, hand-washing, and utensil washing facilities approved by the Food Safety Officer shall be provided within (or near proximity to) temporary food facilities.

Facilities for the sanitary disposal of all liquid waste shall be subject to the approval of the Food Safety Officer.

At least one toilet facility adequate for all food workers shall be provided within 60 meters (200 feet) of each temporary food facility.

Food contact surfaces shall be smooth, easily cleanable, and nonabsorbent.

**Temporary Food Facility Permits**

Temporary food facility permits shall be issued to a representative of each entity that is requesting permission to sell and/or distribute food and/or beverages. The individual submitting the permit request shall be the designated responsible person (hereafter called the “responsible person”) and shall have oversight responsibility for the entity’s food and/or beverage operation.

The Food Safety Officer shall require the responsible person of each temporary food facility to complete and submit a “Temporary Food Facility Permit Application” in duplicate to the office of Environmental Health and Safety, Student and Business Services Building Rm 311 (ext.3302)

The length of time a permit is valid will depend on the circumstances of the requested operations and will be at the discretion of the Food Safety Officer. All permits shall expire at the end of each semester.

Permits will be revoked if the permitted facility is found to be out of compliance with any part of this policy.

Permits may be revoked at any time at the discretion of the Food Safety Officer.

For the purpose of inspection, it is recommend that the approved permit should be on site during vending operations. Alternatively, the responsible person may demonstrate compliance if they are able to access the permit electronically upon request.

**Food Preparation**

No potentially hazardous food (see definition below) or beverage stored or prepared in a private home may be offered for sale, sold, or given away from a temporary food facility. Potentially hazardous food shall be prepared in a certified commercial kitchen or on the premises of a temporary food facility. (Subject to approval by the Food Safety Officer.)
The Food Safety Officer shall have the authority to prohibit the sale or distribution of any potentially hazardous food.

Employees preparing or handling food shall wear clean clothing and shall keep their hands clean at all times.

Where appropriate, tongs, forks, ladles, and other food service utensils shall be managed and protected to ensure that they remain in a sanitary state. Utensils used to manage potentially hazardous foods shall not be used to manage other foods to avoid cross-contamination.

Food containing raw meat and/or fish may not be sold or distributed under any circumstances.

All food and beverage shall be protected at all times from unnecessary handling and shall be stored, displayed, and served so as to be protected from contamination.

Potentially hazardous food and beverage shall be maintained at or below 7 degrees Celsius (45 degrees Fahrenheit) or at or above 57.2 degrees Celsius (135 degrees Fahrenheit) at all times.

Ice used in beverages shall be protected from contamination and shall be maintained separate from ice used for refrigeration purposes.

All food and food containers shall be stored off the floor/ground on shelving or pallets located within (or close proximity to) the facility.

All garbage shall be disposed of in a sanitary manner. Garbage shall be placed in trash bags and placed in the appropriate containers.

Except as indicated below, live animals, birds, or fowl shall not be kept or allowed in, or near proximity to, temporary food facilities.

Exception: The above paragraph does not prohibit the presence, in any room where food is served to the public, guests, or patrons, of a guide dog, signal dog, or service dog, as defined by Section 54.1 of the Civil Code, accompanied by a totally or partially blind person, deaf person, person whose hearing is impaired, or handicapped person, or dogs accompanied by persons licensed to train guide dogs for the blind pursuant to Chapter 9.5 (commencing with Section 7200) of Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code.

The animal prohibition does not apply to dogs under the control of uniformed law enforcement officers or of uniformed employees of private patrol operators and operators of a private patrol service who are licensed pursuant to Chapter 11.5 (commencing with Section 7580) of Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code, while these employees are acting within the course and scope of their employment as private patrol persons.

The persons and operators described in the above exceptions are liable for any damage done to the premises or facilities by the dog. Said dogs described in the exceptions above shall be excluded from
food preparation and utensil wash areas. Aquariums and aviaries shall be allowed if enclosed so as not to create a public health problem.

All garbage shall be disposed of in a sanitary manner.

Employees preparing or handling food shall wear clean clothing and shall keep their hands clean at all times.

Where appropriate, tongs, forks, ladles, and other food service utensils shall be managed and protected to ensure that they remain in a sanitary state. Utensils used to manage potentially hazardous foods shall not be used to manage other foods to avoid cross-contamination.

The Food Safety Officer may establish additional structural or operational requirements as necessary to ensure that food is of a safe and sanitary quality.

Open-air barbecue facilities may be operated adjacent to temporary food facilities, and shall be subject to the requirements of Article 9, commencing with Section 113980, et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code.

Barbecues, grills or other equipment approved for outdoor cooking may be located adjacent to the temporary food facility if local building and fire codes prohibit cooking inside the temporary food facility.

Grills and barbecues or other approved cooking equipment shall be separated from public access by using ropes or other approved methods to prevent contamination of the food and injury to the public.

Barbecues requiring briquettes are only allowed to be used in permanent barbecues.

Exception: The above paragraph does not prohibit the presence, in any room where food is served to the public, guests, or patrons, of a guide dog, signal dog, or service dog, as defined by Section 54.1 of the Civil Code.

The animal prohibition does not apply to dogs under the control of uniformed law enforcement officers or of uniformed employees of private patrol operators and operators of a private patrol service who are licensed pursuant to Chapter 11.5 (commencing with Section 7580) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code, while these employees are acting within the course and scope of their employment as private patrol persons.

The persons and operators described in the above exceptions are liable for any damage done to the premises or facilities by the dog. Said dogs described in the exceptions above shall be excluded from food preparation and utensil wash areas. Aquariums and aviaries shall be allowed if enclosed so as not to create a public health problem.

The Food Safety Officer may establish additional structural or operational requirements as necessary to ensure that food is of a safe and sanitary quality.
Nothing in this policy shall prevent a local enforcement agency from performing inspections of, or requiring permits for, any temporary food facility to ensure compliance with food safety provisions contained in this chapter.

PROCEDURE

Any club, organization, group and/or individuals who wish to operate a temporary food facility on the HSU campus must submit a Temporary Food Facility Permit Application to the office of Environmental Health and Safety at least five (5) working days prior to the preparation and/or dispensing of any food items. Upon receipt of the application, the Food Safety Officer will review the application and will either issue a one-time use permit or return the application with one of the following notices within forty-eight (48) hours:

- **Approved** – no further action required.
- **Denied** – proposed food items are not allowed under the HSU Temporary Food Facility Policy
- **Pending** – Food Safety Officer needs to consult Humboldt County Dept. of Health Services or requests further information.

Prior to approving a temporary food facility permit, all persons who will take part in any food preparation, acquisition and/or sales/distribution shall complete food safety training and provide proof of completion.

Exception to food safety training requirement: Any club, organization, group and/or individuals who intend to offer only non-temperature-controlled items such as pre-packaged food, candy, single-serve, unopened beverages and store bought baked goods do not require completion of a food safety course. For Clubs, this type of permit approval will be processed at the Clubs office.

NON-COMPLIANCE WITH POLICY

Any club, organization, group and/or individual who neglects to obtain a Temporary Food Facility Permit will be directed to immediately cease serving food.

Repeat non-compliance (more than two times) of the temporary food policy will result in the refusal of a temporary food facility permit for the period of at least one year.

Failure to comply with the legal requirements may constitute a misdemeanor under section 114395 of the California Health and Safety Code, punishable by a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars ($25) or more than one thousand dollars ($1000) or by imprisonment in the county jail for a term not exceeding six months, or both fine and imprisonment.

History

Supersedes EM:P-02 Temporary Food Facilities/Food Sanitation Policy dated June, 2010

Issued: 03/MM/27/DD/2018

Revised: MM/DD/YYYY
To the University Senate:

My name is Lauren Carman and my two year old twins attend the program at the HSU Children’s Center in the Younger Toddler Classroom. I am a local educator and first through third grade elementary teacher and attended Humboldt State University in the early 2000s, earning a BA in LSEE in 2005. My husband is currently enrolled at HSU full-time and is doing well in the Environmental Resources Engineering Program with a 4.0 GPA.

Our family returned to Humboldt County and HSU a decade later because I had such a wonderful experience here in the past. The community focused environment and support was meaningful to me and the Elementary Education Program was inspiring and high quality and ended up serving me well throughout my career, giving me a foundation I could build upon. I knew that when we decided to return to the North Coast with the intention of starting a family and a new part of our lives, we’d be reconnecting with a special place where our new family could thrive and our children would be loved.

We were shocked to learn that we were pregnant with not one but two babies in 2015 and welcomed them into the world, seven weeks early, in March of 2016. They had a rough start but pulled through beautifully and we had previously contacted the HSU Children’s Center about enrolling them in the Infant Program. I remember the day I learned about how affordable the program would be for us, and the relief that rushed over me. They joined us, and we celebrated; then, everything changed. When the twins were five months old I was diagnosed with an aggressive form of hereditary breast cancer and we relocated to the Bay Area for a very difficult and sad year of surgeries, chemotherapy and radiation. With the support of friends and family, we made it through. The Center kept in contact with us and checked in on me while I was sick, in classic HSU fashion.

There were two reasons we felt confident returning to Humboldt County after that; my school community had been wonderful and waited for my return, and the HSU Children’s Center was going to be there to support our twins and foster their growth in a caring environment. We came home in August of last year and I returned to my classroom full-time, my husband to HSU full-time, and the babies to the Children’s Center, also full-time.

Our twins, Charlie and Clementine, thrived. After all of the changes and sadness and instability for the first year and a half of their lives they finally had a place that was their own, with people who loved them and had their best interest in mind. They had a high-quality program to attend every morning that they looked forward to, and spent their days with people who were there because they wanted to be there, not because they had to be there. I greatly appreciate that the program has an educational basis and that students are learning by working with my children; of course as an educator this is a meaningful aspect of the program for me. They continue to thrive. They continue to grow every day in a joyful environment where I feel that they are safe and loved and given opportunities to try new things and meet new friends, while their father and I work hard to change the world for them and their friends at “school”—the future.
If the Children’s Center were to close, became privatized, or if funding were shifted I fear that the quality and accessibility would suffer. I fear that we would not be able to afford to send them somewhere else for their care, and, most importantly, I don’t want them to have to say goodbye to their teachers and friends. The program has been a source of stability and peace for our family and I don’t know what we would do if it were taken from beneath us. We could not afford to send them to another program of the same quality, and we may have to move out of state, pull my husband out of HSU, and otherwise completely uproot our little family that has been through so much already.

There are so many families who rely on the Children’s Center for the exceptional care of their children! I am horrified that the place that I found so caring, so community-minded, so supportive of students’ success, would consider cutting such a valuable and special program in the wake of budget cuts. This is the last place that should be considered for adjusting the budget! Budgets should not be balanced on the backs of our children! Is this what has become of the Humboldt State I know and love, the place I hope my children will attend college; the place many of my students will attend college? I certainly hope not. I want to tell my children when they are older, and my students, that Humboldt State and the Children’s Center Program were instrumental in my success and our success as a family, and an essential part of our growth, health and sense of security.

Please allow the Center to continue functioning as-is, and give the staff and families there what they deserve. Celebrate what a wonderful asset this is to HSU and our greater community! Be the University that retains, maintains, and progresses in its efforts to bring us all to a better place where we can help others and change lives! This is the goal! Remember that the children at the center are depending on the stability and the care that they receive every day when they go to school.

When Clementine and Charlie sit down in front of our front door every morning and strap on their shoes to “go to school with Daddy”, they are excited about what the day will bring. When we go to pick them up, they often do not want to leave. This is the kind of program you are supporting, and now considering to cut. Please don’t let our family and other families down by stripping down or otherwise changing something that needs to be built up instead of broken down.

I want to continue to proudly tell people that we are an HSU Family, all four of us. Are you going to come through for this HSU Family?

With Gratitude and Hope,

Lauren Carman, Daniel Evans, Clementine and Charlie
Evidence-based Decision Making, Excess Enrollment Units, Work load, and Contribution to Teaching at HSU

Dear University Senate,

Ever since HSU administrators started talking about eliminating excess enrollment WTUs across the board, I thought the "one-size-fits-all" policy (regarding doing so) was a really bad idea. I come to the issue of excess enrollment WTUs as a recipient of them for many years. I’m not sure how the people who made this decision actually see these units (i.e., as some unreasonable gift to people who don’t really work hard enough to begin with, as an easy “hey, we can save money by cutting those”, or something completely different – because I’ve never heard or read a word about the underlying rationale other than the economic “benefit” to HSU of eliminating them). Personally, I see getting these units as a rational response to, and acknowledgment of, the increased workload that comes with teaching large classes.

As with most topics, context matters. Herein, I will attempt to provide context and perspective from a faculty member, a lecturer - me. For probably the last 10 years, in an “average” semester I teach four different courses (ESM 105, 210, 400, and 430), for a total of around 250 students, and one of the classes (ESM 105) is a large lecture course with ~115 to 128 students. That is the course I regularly get excess enrollment units for. However, last semester I taught those 4 classes plus a lab/second lecture of a fifth class (but some were team taught). Next semester I’m scheduled to teach five classes as well (SCI 100, ESM 105, 210, 303, and 430). Largely, I’m happy with my job. The excess enrollment units have had a positive impact on all of my courses, not just the one large-lecture that I receive them for. If I receive 3 excess enrollment units, I can give essay exams (that’s all I’ve ever done in my career), require essays and research papers and provide feedback to the students. Without the excess enrollment units I will need to teach another course to maintain full-time employment. For me, this 20% increase in workload turns an average 55 hr work week into a 66 hr work week. This will impact all of my students, because I can only do so much work. When the decision to simply cut all excess enrollment units was made, I was very upset, for me, other faculty, and our students. I thought, perhaps, there could be a more nuanced way to deal with them rather than the “they will no longer be offered at all” approach. I’m a scientist, I like evidence, I like data, and when it’s available, I really like evidence-based decisions.

A little while ago I was forwarded a copy of the Fall 2017 FAD report (I don’t really know what the acronym stands for). I became more interested in it as the budget cuts needed to balance HSU’s budget came to our college and our department. I became more interested in what was happening in other departments and what other faculty (in general) were doing. I’m a big fan of fairness, and shared sacrifice during budget reductions is to be expected. I started evaluating some of the data in the FAD. I became interested in the Student Credit Units that faculty taught, because I thought it was a reasonable indicator of their/our teaching workload. That is, teaching the same class (say three lectures per week) to 24 students is not the same as teaching that same set of lectures to 90 students – in terms of grading, visits to office hours, emails from/to students, etc. Faculty with more students have more grading to do, more emails to answer, more “by appointment” office hours, more personal accommodation requests to deal with, more “life coach” sessions, more letters of recommendations, more requests to serve as a job reference, etc.

The FAD, on page 242, notes that there were 661 total faculty appointments during Fall 2017. I know that many of those are probably very part-time faculty who teach one course. Nonetheless, the total
was 661. With what follows, I admit that there could be some minor errors – as I had to enter the data from a PDF to a spreadsheet. Nonetheless, I compiled some of the data from the report and found that 59 of the 661 faculty members taught more than 400 student credit units (SCUs) during Fall 2017, and the total number of SCUs they taught was 30,332. The total number of SCUs taught by all faculty during Fall17 was 117,920.7. This means that 8.9% of the faculty taught 25.7% of the SCUs last semester. Please note, I know that many faculty have other duties in addition to teaching – my points solely focus on teaching loads and excess enrollment WTUs. Six of the 661 faculty taught more than 700 SCUs, with the “grand champion” teaching 1032 – with the other 5 all teaching between 707 and 775. Perhaps you won’t be surprised to learn that I’m in the top 5 faculty members who taught the most SCUs on campus (finally a one percenter, but not in a good way!); I’m also in the top 10% of those faculty who taught >400 SCUs.

I am sure there are other faculty, like me, who put a huge effort into their teaching and see the removal of excess enrollment WTUs much like I do. I think that I’m more than carrying my weight around here, and the policy of “one-size-fits-all” removal of excess enrollment WTUs comes across to me as an insult. I am sure it wasn’t meant to be personal, but it is, and its implementation says to me “You weren’t doing enough, and you need to do 20% more to earn the same salary you were earning.” I’m left thinking “What more could they possibly want from me?” I have a huge teaching load, I’m on the Senate (for free), I’m active in my department, I have an active research program and bring in money to HSUSPF, I serve on graduate thesis committees. In order for me to make up for those lost units, I will need to teach another course (I estimate I’ll teach 770 SCUs next semester). If there was a 20% across-the-board budget reduction, then I’d understand that this would be “just doing my part” and sharing in the collective sacrifice. To the administrators and President’s Cabinet members who think that this is a reasonable decision – consider whether you’d think that if all of you were told that starting next year you’ll need to increase your work load by 20% in order to earn the same salary you earned this year. I can’t say definitively that I am speaking/writing for other faculty on campus, but I would guess that many would agree with me. I am asking the administrators with the power to do something about this to take a more nuanced approach to the excess enrollment issue. Like the issue before the Senate today on Department Chair compensation, come up with a reasonable and fair approach to this issue, not “those units are eliminated.” For instance, you could consider class size, number of preparations, and total SCUs in a simple formula. I appreciate your listening to me, and hope that what I have said will move you to act.

Thank you,

Jeff Dunk