

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm on Tuesday, March 12, 2013, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Alderson, Aronoff, August, Bruce, Dye, Ercole, Eschenbach, Eschker, Fulgham, Gold, McElwain, Marschke, Moyer, Ortega, Pierce, Richmond, Saner, Shaeffer, Van Duzer, Virnoche, Yarnall, Young, Zerbe.

Members absent: Abell, Blake, Johnson, Lapiz, Lopes, Snyder.

Proxies: Lutwen for Henderson, Young for Shellhase, Eschker for Marschke, Fulgham for Thobaben, Zerbe for Virnoche (1st part).

Guests: Goodman, Zechman, Burges, Ayoob, Lee, Hwu.

1. Announcement of Proxies

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S (Fulgham/Ortega) to approve and adopt the agenda. Senator Young requested that the order of items #16 and #17 be reversed. Agenda was approved as changed.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of February 26, 2013

M/S/U (Zerbe/Ortega) to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 26, 2013 as written.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members ([Written reports](#) are included in the e-packet)

Appointments and Elections Committee (Alderson): A list of committee vacancies has been sent out. Faculty were encouraged to volunteer to serve and/or to help recruit colleagues.

University Resources and Planning Committee (Eschker): The Committee met last Friday and reviewed the complete list of requests for one-time finds. It will forward a recommendation to the President. The Committee will then look at developing a procedure for requests for next year.

Q: Is there a mechanism for input from the campus? A: Committee members are available for questions, etc. All documents are posted on the budget web site.

Senate Executive Committee (Van Duzer): [At a meeting on October 16, 2012, the Senate Executive Committee made the decision to form a Strategic Planning Task Force (comprised of Senate standing committee chairs, AS student representative, and the Provost) that would make recommendations to the President.] The task force has discussed initiatives and priorities for AY 2013/2014, including current structural barriers to taking a more cross-disciplinary approach to curriculum. The [ICC] GEAR committee is looking at this.

Associated Students (Lutwen): AS released election packets on Monday. The food pantry project is progressing – a facility has been located on campus and Mira Friedman will act as a coordinator for the project. A grant is being written to help with the purchase of non-perishables for the pantry and to help get it up and running.

President's Office (Richmond): Chancellor White will be visiting the campus on April 8-9. A meeting with the Senate Executive Committee will be included in the schedule and there will be an open forum for all faculty and staff. The President welcomed ideas for plans for the visit.

Last week the President was in Washington, D.C. for the annual "Hill" day for the CSU and had the opportunity to talk with staff members in Senators Feinstein's and Boxer's offices. CSU representatives focused on advocating for the continuation of Pell grants and there was a general sense of support from the California senators for this. HSU will be affected by sequestration. By 2018, 63% of the jobs in the U.S. will require higher education. This forecast is generating various topics of discussion, including giving students credit for prior learning experience, blurring the lines between K-12 and higher education, etc. David Brooks of the NY Times spoke on the effects of technology in higher education and his concern that students have less interaction with people, and the idea that liberal arts is becoming more important. He emphasized the need for faculty to lead the change in higher education and the need to develop rewards for faculty efficiency and for faculty who are finding ways to improve their students' learning.

HSU Labor Council (Saner): The Labor Council will meet with the President on March 26. The Council has elected a new delegate to the University Senate, Steve Tillinghast.

6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – No items for March 12.

7. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 PM- Open Forum for the Campus Community

Professor Michael Goodman (Philosophy) addressed one of the items on the agenda – Resolution #24-12/13-CBC "Resolution on Amendment to General Faculty Constitution Regarding the Election of the General Faculty and Senate Officers." The proposal that the General Faculty president be elected by the Senate is not a good idea. It would result in the General Faculty becoming less involved in shared governance. The argument that the Senate Chair needs experience on the Senate isn't appropriate; experience on the Senate is not necessary for someone to be able to chair the Senate. He urged the Senate to vote "No" on the resolution and not to send it to the General Faculty for a vote.

Senator Fulgham requested that Chair Van Duzer report on the letter received from the Chancellor's Office (CO) (email to senators 3/12/13) in response to Resolution #28. The CO did not approve HSU's request for an extension to the deadline for curricular revision of programs requiring 121-129 units.

8. Approval of Academic Calendar 2014-2015 ; [Draft Calendar](#) ; [Norms & Definitions](#)

M/S (Fulgham/Zerbe) to approve the draft Academic Calendar for 2014/2015.

Discussion:

Q: Is a perpetual calendar being developed? A: Yes – it is possible that it will be forwarded to the Senate by the end of the semester.

Voting occurred and the draft Academic Calendar Passed with 1 Abstention.

M/S/U (Fulgham/Ortega) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.

9. Resolution on Change to Policy on Second Bachelor's Degree ([#22-12/13-APC](#)) – Second Reading ; [Attachment](#)

There was no discussion. Voting occurred and the resolution PASSED with 1 No vote and 3 Abstentions.

Resolution on Policy on Second Bachelor's Degree

#22-12/13-APC – March 12, 2013 - Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that students be dissuaded from concurrently pursuing two bachelor's degrees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the HSU catalog be changed (as marked on the attachment to this resolution) regarding the second bachelor's degree, as noted in the attachment.

RATIONALE: *This change would contribute to student success. Currently, students who are ineligible to declare a double major can pursue a "second bachelor's degree" instead. This change would close that loophole.*

*These changes would **not** affect the availability of post- baccalaureate STEM coursework for prospective graduate students.*

10. Resolution on Amending the University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure ([#26-12/13-CBC](#)) – Second Reading ; [Attachment](#) ; [Current Senate Bylaws](#)

There was no discussion. Voting occurred and the resolution PASSED unanimously.

Resolution on Amending the *University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure*
#26-12/13-CBC – March 12, 2013 — Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the Constitution and Bylaws Committee recommends to the University Senate of Humboldt State University that the *University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* be amended to include the changes indicated in the attached revision of that document.

Rationale: The Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate as originally adopted sufficiently laid the groundwork for the processes of the Senate. They are, however, organizationally taxing, somewhat repetitive, in some places unclear, and in some places in conflict with other foundation documents. The revision attached seeks to clarify the Bylaws, to better reflect current practice, and to make the Bylaws consistent with the University Senate Constitution.

11. Resolution on the Pilot of Electronic Anonymous Student Evaluations of Teaching [#27-12/13-FAC](#) – Second Reading

There were substantial changes made to the first reading of the resolution based on feedback that was received. The Faculty Affairs Committee is now recommending that a pilot be conducted in Spring 2013, rather than making an immediate permanent change. In addition, a report on the impact of the pilot is requested for next Fall, so there will be opportunity for additional discussion. The composition of a task force for implementation has been specified in the resolution.

Resolution on the Pilot of Electronic Anonymous Student Evaluations of Teaching
#27-12/13-FAC – March 12, 2013 – 2nd Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) recommends to the President that electronic anonymous student evaluations of teaching (course evaluations) be piloted in the Spring 2013 semester; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU will create a task force comprised of three faculty, two staff, and one administrator to oversee the implementation of a university-wide pilot of electronic course evaluations; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the implementation task force will deploy electronic evaluations in such a way as to ensure the highest response rate possible during the pilot; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the implementation task force and the Office of the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs brief all levels of personnel review on the impact of electronic course evaluations, particularly with respect to the overall mean scores and response rates; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the implementation task force report back to the Senate on the effects of this change no later than first regular Senate meeting of October 2013, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU create a task force, comprised of three faculty, to review the current standardized student evaluative instrument, recommend changes to the instrument, and report back to the Senate no later than the first regular Senate meeting of April, 2014.

RATIONALE: The new Collective Bargaining Agreement mandates the evaluation of all courses for teaching effectiveness every semester. This change to the CBA results in an increase in both staff workload and use of resources. Electronic submission of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness

(SETs) has been used for many years at other campuses successfully. This resolution would establish a pilot to test the effectiveness of electronic course evaluations across campus at Humboldt State. To alleviate the concerns over reduced numerical scores and fewer student comments on electronic SETs compared to in-class pencil and paper SETs, all instructors will be required to use electronic SETs and administrative and faculty committee personnel reviewers shall be briefed on the impact of the use of electronic SETs so as to minimize comparisons between paper and electronic course evaluations for the Spring 2013 pilot.

Discussion:

Since it is a second reading, senators were asked to clearly state whether their arguments were for or against the resolution.

- Q: Could there be some kind of indication (asterisk) when scores do not meet a minimum of 15-20%? A: This would be the responsibility of the implementation task force to determine.
- Q: Given the short timeline, is the task force going to have time to think about these kinds of implementation questions? A: It is hoped the resolution will be forwarded as an emergency item, and that the folks selected to serve on the implementation task force will already be up to speed on electronic evaluations.
- There was a statement in favor of the resolution. Q: Could the task force consider implementing the pilot only for full professors?
- There was a statement against the resolution. There is nothing in the resolved clauses that prevents evaluations gathered during the pilot from being used in the RTP process. The resolution cannot be supported as written – the timeline is too rushed. It is begging for a bargaining grievance.
- There was a statement in favor of the pilot, though concern was expressed about the timeline. The methodology needs to be thought through.

Senators were reminded that the only change the pilot is making is the method by which the evaluations are conducted. A recent survey of Economics students revealed that 75% of them had some type of electronic device in class. Electronic evaluations can be done in classes with devices students already have in class.

- Considering the workload from the new requirement to evaluate all courses, there really isn't a choice whether or not to do electronic course evaluations. A pilot is unnecessary. Some departments have been doing electronic course evaluations already – the results are typed and readable and an improvement. Other campuses are already doing this and have already worked through possible grievance issues.

Chair Van Duzer called for a vote. Senator Fulgham requested a hand vote. Voting occurred and PASSED with 15 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

M/S (Zerbe/Dye) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President.
Motion PASSED with 1 No vote.

12. Resolution on Electronic Working Personnel Action Files [\(#25-12/13-FAC\)](#) – First Reading

M (Zerbe/Dye) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Electronic Working Personnel Action Files #25-12/13-FAC – March 12, 2013 – 1st Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the following policy revision be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University, subject to passage by the General Faculty, recommend to the President that an electronic Working Personnel Action File system be implemented, and be it further

RESOLVED: That if this policy is passed by the General Faculty and approved by the President, it become effective for the AY 2014-15 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) cycle, and be it further

RESOLVED: That current probationary faculty candidates be given the choice to move to an electronic WPAF or retain a paper WPAF, and be it further

RESOLVED: That current tenured faculty candidates seeking promotion be given the choice to move to an electronic WPAF or retain a paper WPAF during the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 cycles only; thereafter tenured faculty candidates would submit electronic Working Personnel Action Files, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the implementation of an electronic Working Personnel Action File system be conditioned on the development of procedures assuring the security and privacy of the files.

RATIONALE: Electronic WPAFs offer the possibility of easier file management, improved organization, and resolve problems of file access and management by various levels of review. We have consulted with the UFPC, members of the personnel committees for the three colleges, and the CAHSS Council of Chairs in the development of this policy.

The resolution from the Faculty Affairs Committee proposes to move the paper Working Personnel Action Files to electronic files. It permits candidates in early phases to have the option of using paper or electronic. There are several interesting systems available for this.

Discussion:

- Q: What problem is this attempting to solve? It is easier to flip through paper files when serving on personnel committee. This will dramatically increase the workload of RTP committees.
- There is no task force assigned to implement this or rules and procedures spelled out regarding how it will be done. It was noted that an implementation task force will be added to the resolution for the second reading.

This is not an attempt to solve a problem. A request came from the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC) to consider this. There are programs already available on campus (for example, Nolij) which are set up precisely for this kind of task. Files can be marked, notated, etc. online.

It was noted that faculty have also requested this; younger faculty are used to operating in new environments. Some faculty have put their files online for external reviewers and made it easier to solicit external reviews.

- This is going to happen, so the sooner the better. The current process is wasteful in terms of paper. Electronic files will be easier for candidates to maintain over the years.
- If implemented correctly, this could add to uniformity among faculty files rather than having each faculty member recreating a file. Templates are helpful and this has the potential to ensure that stronger, more complete files are put together and that there is more consistency between departments.
- Students are being asked to develop electronic portfolios in many programs; this is just the faculty version of that. A lot of professions expect this now.

13. Feedback on First Year Seminar Proposal from the First Year Experience Task Force ; [Attachment](#)

[The following charge for the First Year Experience Task Force was approved by the Senate Executive Committee on October 16, 2012:

The FYETF will develop a set of student learning outcomes that reflect best practice in both Area E and in the student success literature. FYETF will consult with stakeholders and other campuses to identify models that effectively promote those outcomes. On the basis of this research, the task force will develop a New Course Proposal that utilizes Area E courses as a mandatory first-year experience. In addition to the course proposal, the FYETF will recommend an implementation plan that clarifies issues such as who administers the course and how faculty are selected to teach the classes. The task force will report and enlist Senate feedback prior to making a final recommendation. A final recommendation should be made to the Senate by early March for ICC deadlines.]

The preliminary draft proposal (2/26/13) represents a framework developed by the task force. It has a set of guiding principles and a set of outcomes. There is some guidance in terms of types of assignments, but the content of the course will be left up to the individual college putting on the course. Feedback is welcome. A formal proposal will be put forward next month.

Discussion:

Q: What will happen to existing Area E courses? A: There will be some overlap, but basically the whole campus will change over to this model.

Q: So faculty who teach Area E courses at the 400 level should look forward to having them phased out?

Q: What is the time frame for implementation? A: A final proposal will go forward in a month, and then it will depend upon the ICC's timeline.

A: Is this the outcome of the Senate discussion last Fall regarding having a freshman experience to increase retention rates? A: This came from the Enrollment Management Working Group. The idea was it would be an opportunity to make this more than a one-unit "add-on" course on how to be a college student. A three unit course can accomplish more, according to the best practices literature.

A student spoke in favor of the proposal. Having taken something similar, it was felt to be a valuable experience.

There are a few programs that have an Area E course that counts as a requirement toward the major and they need the content for the major. Careful consideration will need to be given to this.

Q: Will this course have a consistent course title across the university? Or will the ICC be looking at approving 30-40 new courses with their own syllabi? Will the courses have different prefixes based on the departments they are taught in and/or whether or not they are focused for majors? Will there be limited enrollment in the courses focused for majors?

There is an expectation that there will be a common assessment built in across all of the courses.

A majority of CSU campuses satisfy the Area E requirement with lower division courses. HSU is the only campus that has upper division 400 level Area E courses. There needs to be some individuality in the courses. It would not be good to have a universal prescribed course for all students, handled in the same way by one department.

The task force is concerned that these courses not evolve into introductory courses for different programs. It needs to be an opportunity to provide a foundational experience.

Q: Who has been consulted in this process? This needs to be clearly articulated, in order to get stronger buy-in and an idea of who this may affect.

The proposal needs to include a limit of class size. It was noted that class size would be limited to 25, based on best practices. This should be written into the proposal.

The idea of common assessment to show that the class is meeting the area E outcomes is paramount. The content is left up to instructor.

Q: What happens to transfer students who don't have Area E? Do they take this first year experience? A: The task force will need to find out how many transfer students don't have Area

E. It may be possible to use any 400 level courses that are maintained as part of a major for transfer students.

The Task Force welcomes additional feedback and comments via email. It meets weekly on Friday, 1 pm, Gist Hall 212.

14. Resolution on the Student Evaluations of Teaching in Low Enrollment Courses ([#29-12/13-FAC](#)) – First Reading

M/S (Zerbe/Virnoche) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on the Student Evaluations of Teaching in Low Enrollment Courses
#29-12/13-FAC – March 12, 2013 – 1st Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that course sections enrolling three or fewer students be exempted from the requirement for student evaluations, and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy become effective immediately upon approval by the President.

RATIONALE: The new Collective Bargaining Agreement mandates the evaluation of all courses but also mandates that student anonymity be protected in the course evaluation process. In small course sections, these two requirements are at odds. This change would generally protect student anonymity, by exempt very small courses enrolling three or fewer students from mandatory course evaluations. Faculty teaching those courses could still request course evaluations as needed, but the default assumption would be that very small courses would not be evaluated.

The Collective Bargaining Unit (CBA) now mandates evaluation of every course in addition to the mandate for anonymous student evaluations. In consultation with the CFA union representative to the Faculty Affairs Committee, and AVP Mullery, this resolution is proposed and is based on consensus reached between all parties.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the exemption be expanded to include 699 courses as well as conclave classes (e.g. students on a competition team, etc.). These type of courses don't need to be evaluated.
- Q: Will this cause any potential problems for probationary faculty? Is it optional? A: The rationale emphasizes that this is only an exemption from the CBA requirement; not a requirement itself.
- It was suggested that this permissive aspect be included in a resolved clause rather than the rationale.
- It is important to have workshops, debate teams, etc. evaluated – they are counted as part of the teaching load. For example, Forensics is categorized as a workshop.

- Conclave evaluations are always very high and tend to mask what else is occurring; they are not reliable course evaluations. It was suggested that it should be the job of the candidate and the personnel committee to put those kinds of evaluations into context.
- Issues that are unique to individual departments (for example, Music has a number of sections with fewer than three students enrolled) should be resolved between the Department, the college Dean, and the AVP for Faculty Affairs.

15. Resolution on Course Numbering (#30-12/13-APC) – First Reading ; [Attachment](#)

M/S (Zerbe/Ortega) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Course Numbering Policy
#30-12/13-APC – 12 March 2013 - First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached Course Numbering System be adopted.

RATIONALE: The current course numbering system is part of VPAA 95-01, "Guidelines and Policies Concerning Course Credit Units, Class Schedules, and Course Numbering," which is being superseded by the new scheduling system.

This new course numbering system simply combines into one document the rules regarding course numbers from VPAA 95-01, as well as subsequent rules VPAA 10-02, and VPAA 10-05. No substantive changes are being made. Only minor changes have been made for the sake of clarity.

The resolution was developed in response to the new course scheduling policy. It supersedes and updates previous policies (VPAA 95-01, VPAA 10-02, and VPAA 10-05), bringing them together into one policy aligned with the new course scheduling policy. There has been some clean-up overall and service learning has been added. There are no substantial changes.

Discussion:

Q: Is there a numbering system for freshmen and sophomore seminars? For example, one department currently has a 285 seminar. A: There is no restriction, but it would be nice to have some consistency. There is no CSU policy that say x85 courses are seminars.

Q: Music also uses the letter "Z" – would existing courses have to change their numbering system to conform to this? A: Yes.

TIME CERTAIN: 5:29 PM - Faculty Session:

16. Resolution on Amendments to General Faculty Constitution Regarding Eligibility and Term Limits for the Position of General Faculty Representative to the Statewide Senate (#23-12/13-EX) – First Reading

M/S (Young/Zerbe) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Amendments to the General Faculty Constitution Regarding Eligibility and Term Limits for
the Position of General Faculty Representative to the Statewide Senate
#23-12/13-EX – March 5, 2013 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That a Faculty Session of the University Senate of Humboldt State University consider the following amendments to the *Constitution of the General Faculty of HSU* (HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix E) (insertions underlined):

4.0 Officers and Elected Representatives of the General Faculty

4.5 Representatives to the ASCSU (Statewide Senate) shall be elected by the General Faculty

4.51 Any full-time tenure-line member of the General Faculty is eligible to serve as the HSU General Faculty Representative to the ASCSU.

4.52 Term limits for other officers and elected representatives of the General Faculty shall not apply to HSU General Faculty Representatives to the ASCSU (Statewide Senate)

and be it further

RESOLVED: That if approved, these amendments will be forwarded to the HSU General Faculty for a vote in Spring 2013, following notification of the General Faculty of the proposed amendments at least seven days prior to the election.

RATIONALE: A motion from the May 5, 2011 Academic Senate meeting stated the need for an amendment to the General Constitution to clarify the question of term limits for ASCSU senators from HSU. In Spring 2012, the question was raised regarding eligibility for the position of General Faculty Representative to the ASCSU. The Constitution of Academic Senate CSU provides the following rules governing campus elections of statewide representatives:

Section 3. Eligibility to Serve as a Campus Representative: Only those persons eligible to vote for campus representatives shall be able to serve as campus representatives, provided that the faculty of the campus may, at its discretion, establish additional requirements for service as a campus representative.

Section 4. Eligibility to Vote for Campus Representatives: All members of the faculty at each campus shall be eligible to vote for campus representatives to serve in the Academic Senate. Each campus shall determine which members of the campus community are considered to be faculty.

Section 5. Elections of Campus Representatives: Campus representatives represent the entire faculty of a campus, and not the campus academic senate and shall be elected at each campus in a campus-wide election. In any year in which such an election is held, the election results shall be certified to a designated officer of the Academic Senate by the principal elected officer of the faculty of that campus.

Discussion:

This is a recommendation to amend the General Faculty Constitution, in order to clarify answers to issues that have been raised in the past regarding term limits for General Faculty Representatives to the ASCSU and eligibility for the same.

Discussion:

- In the Academic Senate CSU there is no way to move up to a leadership position if there are term limits for campus representatives. This is essential for maintaining any influence at the statewide level.
- It was noted that the eligibility requirement [full-time tenure-line] does not preclude anyone from standing for office while they are on leave.

17. Resolution on Amendment to General Faculty Constitution Regarding the Election of the General Faculty and Senate Officers (#24-12/13-CBC) – First Reading

Chair Van Duzer turned the gavel over to Vice Chair Zerbe in order to participate in the conversation.

M/S (Young/Ortega) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution Regarding the Election of the General Faculty and Senate Officers

#24-12/13-CBC — March 12, 2013 - First Reading

RESOLVED: That a Faculty Session of the University Senate of Humboldt State University consider amending to the *Constitution of the General Faculty of HSU* (HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix E) as follows (insertions underlined and deletions indicated by strike-out):

4.0 OFFICERS AND ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

4.1 Officers of the General Faculty: ~~—The elected officers of the General Faculty shall be a President who shall also be the Chair of the University Senate, and a Secretary/Treasurer.~~

4.11 The Chair of the University Senate shall serve as the President of the General Faculty.

4.12 The Vice Chair of the University Senate shall serve as Vice President of the General Faculty.

4.13 The Faculty Co-Chair of the University Resources and Planning Committee shall serve as Secretary-Treasurer of the General Faculty.

4.14 The selection of the Chair of the University Senate, Vice Chair of the University Senate, and Faculty Co-Chair of the University Resources and Planning Committee shall be conducted according to the *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate*.

~~4.11—The General Faculty President and the Secretary/Treasurer shall be elected by majority vote of the General Faculty members in residence.~~

~~4.12—The Vice President of the General Faculty shall be the Vice Chair of the University Senate and shall serve as a voting ex-officio member.~~

~~4.2 Members Eligible to Hold Office—Any member of the General Faculty in residence is eligible to be President after three years of employment by the University prior to taking office. Any member of the General Faculty in residence is eligible to serve as Secretary/Treasurer after one year of employment by the University prior to taking office.~~

~~4.2 Duties of Officers: 4.51~~ The elected officers of the General Faculty, ~~together with the Vice Chair of the University Senate~~ shall serve as the Executive Committee of the General Faculty and shall perform its administrative functions.

4.521 The General Faculty President (1) shall preside over meetings of the General Faculty; (2) shall be ~~ex-officio~~ Chair of the University Senate and shall preside over the meetings of the University Senate as provided in the Constitution of the University Senate and the Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate; (3) shall carry out the directions of the General Faculty; (4) shall supervise General Faculty elections; and (5) shall perform the duties customarily performed by presiding officers, including making all arrangements for meetings of the General Faculty.

4.522 The General Faculty Vice President ~~Chair of the University Senate who is ex-officio Vice President of the General Faculty~~ shall exercise the powers and duties of the President in the absence of or at the request of the General Faculty President. ~~in his or her absence or at his or her request.~~

4.523 The General Faculty Secretary/Treasurer shall serve as the faculty co-chair of the University and Resources Planning Committee as provided in the Constitution of the University Senate. The Secretary/Treasurer shall see that records are kept of General Faculty meetings. Such minutes shall be distributed to the General Faculty as soon as practicable following each meeting and shall be available from the Senate Office. The Secretary/Treasurer shall certify the eligibility of faculty University Senators as defined in the University Senate Constitution and University Senate Bylaws and other General Faculty representatives as described in the Faculty Handbook. The Secretary/Treasurer shall also have responsibility for the oversight and management of any funds received or disbursed by the General Faculty. The Secretary/Treasurer shall submit an annual financial report to the General Faculty. The accounts of the Treasurer shall be audited annually.

and be it further

RESOLVED: That if approved by a Faculty Session of the University Senate, then the aforementioned amendment will be forwarded to the HSU General Faculty for a vote in Spring 2013, following notification of the General Faculty of the proposed amendments at least seven days prior to the election; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University amend the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* (Appendix F, Part 2, *HSU Faculty Handbook*) and the *Constitution of the University Senate of HSU* (Appendix F, Part 1, *HSU Faculty Handbook*) in keeping with the above changes.

RATIONALE: The power of the General Faculty is exercised through the General Faculty itself, ratifying or rejecting recommendations from the University Senate. The officers of the General Faculty exist to facilitate that function, and their roles are consequently resultant from their offices in the Senate. The Vice President of the General Faculty is already selected by the University Senate in the procedure outlined above. This resolution brings the selection of the other General Faculty officers into alignment with that process.

Discussion:

Vice Chair Zerbe read a letter from Professor Knox. Additional comments from faculty members were distributed previously to Senators via email.

- For newer senators, it is not clear why the Senate votes for a vice president of the General Faculty but not the president. It is not clear why the chair of the Senate has to be the General Faculty president. What is the role of the General Faculty on this campus? What is the role of the Senate?
- The roles of the General Faculty and the University Senate need to be clarified. This resolution would go to the General Faculty for a vote; the Senate does not determine a change to the General Faculty Constitution. There was no intention that this be a referendum on current leadership. It is being presented as a comparative advantages case. What if, in the future, the Senate doesn't get a Senate chair with the qualities needed for the position?
- The faculty used to have dual representation (on committees, etc.) when there was a General Faculty president and a Senate chair. That is no longer the case with the University Senate. The General Faculty has become primarily ceremonial. Either do away with the General Faculty completely or resurrect it and reinstate the dual representation.
- While there is something to be said for the Senate chair being elected by the members of the Senate, the faculty can become unhappy with the Senate and need a recourse. It is important to have the General Faculty and a way for faculty to express their views. It does no harm to have a General Faculty separate from the Senate.
- The blending of the General Faculty president and the Senate Chair positions was the result of a compromise between creating a University Senate and getting rid of the General Faculty (GF). At the time it was unclear who was speaking for whom (in terms of the GF and the senate). There are distinctly different views held by the faculty versus the Senate. The resolution is not supported.
- It seems like there are some reasonable solutions, i.e. the GF president could be a member of the senate and be a voice on the senate.
- It was stated that one of the reasons for combining the GF president and Senate chair position was to save on the amount of assigned time.

- The idea of the University Senate was to get the campus to work together towards a common goal. Creating divisions like this is asking for trouble. The strength of the University Senate is that everyone is in the same room together. It is the same concept as the European Union or the United States. It is more civil with everyone working together. The faculty need to come to the Senate if they have issues.
- If this goes forward to the General Faculty for a vote and is defeated, would it create a problem?
- Q: What does this fix? A: One thing it would do would be to ensure that the Senate elects someone who understands the issues and the Senate processes.
- In the past, faculty forums have been held to help gather input from the faculty to the Senate. The GF president used to meet monthly with President Richmond. The idea of returning to two distinct bodies that interact was suggested. Q: Who elects the other officers of the General Faculty?
- It used to work well to have separate organizations (faculty, staff, students) with liaisons to the Senate.
- The General Faculty is a constituency that needs a vote; this resolution should not go forward.

The resolution will come back as a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:53 pm.