HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate Minutes

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, August, Berman, Blake, Cheyne, Crowder-Fiore, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Kelly, Madar, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Powell, Reiss, Rizzardi, Rodriguez, Shaeffer, Thobaben, Tripp, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Wilyer, Yarnall, Yzaguirre.

Members Absent: Craig, Nordstrom, Richmond, Snyder, Whitlatch.

Guests: Oliver, Paynton, Rouse, Burges, McGuire, Borgeld, Webley, Eichstedt, Lee.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of December 7, 2010

M/S/P (Mortazavi/Heise) to approve the minutes from the meeting of December 7, 2010 as written. Motion passed with 2 Abstentions.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Chair VerLinden reminded senators that there will be a special meeting of the Academic Senate on Tuesday, February 1, to discuss the draft university senate constitution and bylaws. The entire meeting will be devoted to discussion of the documents.

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

Faculty Affairs Committee (Knox): Discussion of draft documents from the Committee will occur later in the meeting.

Statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU): Senator Thobaben reported that Senator Cheyne is one of four nominees who will be interviewed by the ASCSU for the Faculty Trustee position. Senator Cheyne was congratulated on this honor. Senator Cheyne will forward a written report on the recent plenary session, to be distributed to senators via email.

General Faculty President (Powell): No report.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (Moyer): The ICC is working with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Because of the accreditation procedures used by the Commission, the ICC may have to accept some of the Commission's curriculum decisions. It was noted that these changes may fall outside of the normal local processes and timelines.

Associated Students (Rodriguez): AS Council has changed its meetings to Fridays, 9 am-noon. There are several committees that still have vacancies, including the elections committee. Senators were asked to encourage students to run for positions in student governance.

Rodriguez attended the CSSA Conference in Dominguez Hills. In addition to discussing the budget situation, members prepared for the California Higher Education Summit.

Staff Council (Crowder-Fiore): No report.

Senate Finance Officer (Mortazavi): No report.

Academic Policies Committee (Van Duzer): The Committee is working on the following items: 1) requirements for minors (how many units should be unique from the major to allow counting for a minor), 2) establishing a requirement for time to graduation, 3) determining how long an RP grade is allowed to stand before it can be changed, 4) development of a report/list of students who do not pass pre-requisite courses.

Chair VerLinden introduced Peg Blake, the new Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, and welcomed her to the Academic Senate.

It was noted that both the Provost and the President were out of town on university business. Chair VerLinden stated that he would ask the President and the Provost to provide communication to the senate via email regarding the budget.

Senator Thobaben reported that unless the special tax initiative is passed, there will be severe cuts to the CSU.

Senator Cheyne reported that it was clear that interpretations of how the cuts will be taken vary greatly, based on reports from the CSU administration and from CFA.

4. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 – Open forum for the campus community

There were no speakers for the forum.

5. Resolution to Revise the HSU Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee (#18-10/11-EX) – First Reading

M/S (Van Duzer/Cheyne) to place the resolution on the floor as a First Reading.

Discussion:

There was discussion of whether or not the committee needed to be a voting committee or whether it could adopt a consensus model of decision-making.

Jeff Borgeld, current Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) noted that the proposed changes to the committee description are based on 1) a need to comply with and Executive Memo from the Chancellor's Office (CO) and 2) the elimination of the Athletic Compliance Committee and the incorporation of its duties into the IAAC.

Q: What are the benefits of combining the two committees? A: There was extensive overlapping membership between the two committees, the Athletic Compliance Committee met only once a semester, and this seemed a more efficient use of everyone's time.

There was discussion about who revises the resolution if changes are proposed and whether or not a second reading is necessary. The committee is an administrative committee, not a senate committee. It was noted that much of the language regarding the committee composition, etc. is driven by NCAA regulations, and cannot be changed substantively.

Suggestions for changes included: "The IAAC shall meet with the President at least once annually …" and that the IAAC shall meet with the Director of Athletics. It was noted that the Director of Athletics is a member of the committee.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Powell) to send the resolution back to the IAAC with comments and not have it return to the Senate

Discussion of the motion:

Q: Why did this come to the Senate? A: The Senate Executive Committee thought it should be brought to the Senate in case there were any problems with it.

Voting occurred and the motion PASSED with 1 No vote.

6. Draft Bias Incident Response Process (developed by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) at the request of the Provost and the President)

Radha Webley, Associate Director, Office of Diversity and Inclusion introduced the document. Following some incidents on campus during the past year it became evident that the campus was not well-prepared to handle bias incidents. The Provost and the President asked the ODI to develop a proposal to address this. A Bias Incident Coordinator was also appointed.

Professor Jennifer Eichstedt, the Bias Incident Coordinator, provided background on the proposal. The Diversity Action Planning Committee had also begun working on these issues over the past two years and this document stems from its work and research. Interviews were conducted with people around the country who have established different kinds of response teams. Different models were presented on campus at four large university town meetings and feedback was gathered from members of the campus community.

Discussion:

Concern was expressed that proposed processes could infringe on freedom of expression and free speech. Response: It is important not to infringe on free speech when setting up this kind of process and there is no desire to set up "speech codes." This process focuses on responding appropriately to incidents and recognizing the importance of community and collective responsibility in terms of preventing incidents. Schools that have the best functioning response systems also have ongoing public conversation about issues of free speech, hate speech, etc.

It was suggested that the procedure after an Incident Report is filed include notification of the University Police Department (UPD), if the report has not already been filed with UPD, since UPD is responsible for tracking hate crimes.

There is difference between bias incidents and hate crimes and clarification was requested on and whether or not the UPD wants to have bias incidents reported to them as well.

Q: At what point will a decision be made regarding whether or not an incident will be handled by the Bias Incident Response Team (BIRT)? A: This is addressed in the narrative and will partly depend on the type of incident. Some incidents will remain private and some will go further through the process. In general, when a report comes in, the Coordinator will consult with 2-3 other individuals before a decision is made.

It was suggested that the document include a definition of bias incidents and a comparison with hate crimes.

Q: What is the procedure for an incident that occurs off campus and what does "community education" entail?

A: The ODI is interested in working with the local community (Arcata, Eureka, McKinleyville) to create partnerships and figure out ways to address these issues. The goal is to provide support to individuals when incidents occur, regardless of where they happen.

A: Community education includes putting on events that educate people on issues such as, the difference between bias incidents and hate crimes, what free speech looks like, etc. There needs to be ongoing conversations on many different topics.

When the system is put into effect, there will be broad publicity and education. An online reporting system will be in place. It was noted that most schools with this type of program in place receive 90% of the reports online.

Q: How many people will be involved in the process and at what level? A: There will be about 63 people trained for the process, but not everyone will be involved with every incident.

Q: How many reports are currently being received and if more incidents are reported, will case managers become full-time or will more staff be needed? A: Currently there is no official mechanism for reporting, unless it is a major incident. There are at least 3-5 a year, and more that don't get reported anywhere. No new positions will be created; the work is being added into existing positions.

Additional resources will be needed to support this. There are alternatives for funding, for example, Oregon provided funding for a graduate student intern (paid tuition and stipend) to manage the day-to-day operations.

A suggestion was offered for working with local communities. It would be worth checking local policies online to see that they are in compliance with Federal and State laws regarding free

speech and hate speech. If they aren't, this can be brought to the attention of city councils. All should have policies in place and reporting mechanisms; a partnership, involving students, could be established to help bring local policies into compliance as needed.

Q: How will people be protected in this process from wrongful accusation, etc. Where are the safeguards built into the process so that claims of bias cannot be made too easily and so that free speech is protected? A: Criteria has been established for bias and discrimination; they are not completely flexible categories. Evidence is reviewed and must meet certain criteria.

It was suggested that the history of the terminology be part of the educational process. This might address some of the concerns being expressed.

Issues of confidentiality were discussed, both for the person who reports the incident and for the accused in any incident. For the latter, safeguards need to be in place to protect individuals from misinformation being spread that harms or disparages the character of the person charged.

Professor Eichstedt noted that she is happy to present information at department meetings and/or walk anyone through the proposed process in more detail.

7. Draft of Proposed University Senate from expanded Faculty Affairs Committee (to be distributed via email)

Senators received three documents for review: 1) Draft constitution of university senate, 2) Draft of changes to a faculty constitution, and 3) Draft of proposed university senate bylaws.

The Faculty Affairs Committee felt that the best response to the Senate's charge and to the recommendations from the Cabinet for Institutional Change (CIC) was to suggest the creation of a University Senate independent of the General Faculty and to create a General Faculty Constitution defining the relationship between the two.

The challenge is to come up with something to offer for a vote of the faculty. The Senate needs to determine the point at which it is comfortable with taking any of these documents to the faculty for a vote. The Senate is not 'approving' any of these documents. It is making a decision on whether or not the documents are ready to be forwarded to a vote of the general faculty.

A set of FAQs will be ready by next Tuesday. It was suggested that a summary be provided as well.

Discussion and comments:

A member of the Faculty Affairs Committee named the following benefits to the proposal: 1) the University Budget Committee will become a Senate committee, 2) the prose style of the document is much cleaner, and 3) each senator will serve on a major committee. Serious issues remaining are 1) whether or not the chair of the Senate is elected by the faculty at large and 2) whether or not the general faculty officer positions should continue to exist.

Suggestions for changes to the draft University Senate constitution:

- Section 3.0 (Special Meetings of the General Faculty) – Remove.

- Section 2.4 – Expand to include staff and students in the sentence on communication.

- Section 6.4 – Add "special" to precede the word meetings.

It was noted that Associated Students has its own governing system with a structure for bringing things to the Academic Senate.

There needs to be something more specific about how senators interact with their colleagues to bring matters forward for senate review. Senators may need to use discretion in bringing issues forward to the Senate.

Concern was expressed that the process of reviewing these documents and deliberating is being rushed.

M/S (Goodman/Cheyne) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:51 pm.