

Chair Van Duzer called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, April 2, 2013, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Aronoff, August, Bruce, Dye, Ercole, Eschenbach, Eschker, Fulgham, Gold, Lapiz, Lutwen, Lopes, McElwain, Marschke, Ortega, Pierce, Richmond, Saner, Shaeffer, Snyder, Van Duzer, Virnoche, Yarnall, Zerbe.

Members absent: Blake, Johnson, Shellhase, Young.

Proxies: Zerbe for Alderson, Lutwen for Henderson, Gold for Moyer, Fulgham for Thobaben.

Guests: Goodman, Ayooob, Rizzardi, Zechman.

1. Announcement of Proxies

2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda

M/S (Fulgham/Ortega) to approve and adopt the agenda without change.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of [March 12, 2013](#)

M/S/P (Ortega/Bruce) to approve the minutes from the meeting of March 12, 2013 as written. Motion PASSED with 1 Abstention.

4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

A call for nominations for senate positions is included in the packet. Contact the Senate Office if you are interested in running for election for one of the positions. The election will be held, after the seating of new senators, on May 7, the final meeting of the Senate for Spring 2013.

There will be an open forum for the campus with Chancellor White, during his visit to the campus on April 9. It will be from 9:20-10:20 am in Goodwin Forum. Chair Van Duzer encouraged senators to attend and to let their colleagues know about the forum.

The end of the year Faculty Social will be held on May 13 at the Plaza Grill. Invitations will be coming out.

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

Chair Van Duzer encouraged people to turn in their written reports.

Appointments and Elections Committee (Alderson): The Committee is discussing establishing a new schedule for General Faculty elections as well as revising the draft election rules and

procedures document. It will also be reviewing and evaluating alternative systems for electronic voting in elections.

University Resources and Planning Committee (Eschker): The Committee met last Friday and will finalize its budget recommendations to the President this week. The Space and Facilities Working Group has been formed and has met.

Associated Students (Lutwen): AS elections are underway and there have been a lot of inquiries and interest.

HSU Labor Council (Saner): The Council met with President Richmond last week. Various issues and concerns were discussed, including the practice of hiring student assistants to backfill staff positions. Unit 4 staff addressed student retention efforts and how they can help.

ASCSU (Eschker): Due to a cancelled flight, Senator Eschker missed the 50th anniversary of the statewide senate celebration in Long Beach, but heard that it went quite well. At the most recent plenary, the ASCSU voted to forward two names for the Faculty Trustee position; one of the names was the current Trustee, Bernadette Cheyne. A report from the last plenary meeting was distributed via email to HSU Senate members.

President's Office (Richmond): The recent Scholar of the Year presentation by Professor Terry Henkel (Biological Sciences) was impressive. Dr. Henkel has worked with and involved a large number of students in his research on fungi.

2nd District Assembly member Wesley Chesbro recently met with President Richmond. Assemblyman Chesbro will be termed out in two years and he has suggested inviting to the area possible candidates for his replacement.

The President has invited Del Norte County Supervisor Martha McClure (an HSU alumnus) to visit the campus. She is also a member of the California Coastal Commission. The President also recently met with a group studying health care education; they are looking at opportunities for providing education and re-education.

Several topics from the recent Board of Trustees meeting were noted: 1) there will be a large turnover of leaders in the legislature next year; 2) a series of bills dealing with fee waivers, freezes, and bills similar to the Steinberg Bill are expected; 3) the Governor has expressed his desire that the CSU become a national leader in online courses, and will put funding toward that effort; 4) efforts toward reducing all programs to the 120 unit level are underway and HSU is doing well in the effort; 5) HSU is on the community service honor roll, 6) two Trustees are leaving the Board and will be replaced shortly; 7) there are currently two presidential searches underway, and 8) the CSU's long-term General Counsel is retiring.

6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – No Items for April 2

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

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

8. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:45 PM – Brief Introduction and Demonstration of Nolij (Bethany Rizzardi)

The Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) has been working closely with ITS to automate the process for ICC's review and tracking of curriculum proposals. The content management system *Nolij* was chosen to replace SharePoint.

Instructions for accessing *Nolij* are included in packet materials. Senators will need to access *Nolij* to review (as needed) curriculum proposals forwarded from the ICC via the consent calendar.

Bethany Rizzardi (Project Coordinator, ITS Project Office) provided a demonstration of how to access *Nolij* and find curriculum proposals. Currently, only new proposals are in *Nolij*. Older proposals are archived in SharePoint, and will be moved over at some point.

Discussion:

Q: How was this system selected? A: Several workflow systems were reviewed and it was felt this was one of the most 'customizable' systems for each needed workflow.

9. TIME CERTAIN: 4:45-5:00 PM – Conversation with Vice President of Administrative Affairs, Joyce Lopes

Vice President Lopes distributed a handout on "HSU Budget Planning" to senators. Factors influencing the budget planning include evaluation of national and state trends (in terms of economic conditions), the AY 2012/13 actuals, and consideration of budget proposals for AY 2013/14.

Sequestration could bring about another economic downturn. The California State budget has had a structural deficit for the last five years. PROP 30 provided some stability in funding for the current year and the next; but no additional funding. There is considerable revenue volatility. In California, education makes up half of the expense budget.

HSU's current year budget is "on track" for the fiscal year after some revenue revision (PROP 30) and expense revision.

- Q: What has happened with the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) student fees? A: Nothing has changed with the fees. However, as of 2014/15, WUE students will no longer count as resident students, so the campus will have to meet enrollment targets in other ways.

Vice President Lopes responded to several specific questions about the budget figures on the handout.

A summary of the University Resources and Planning Committee's (URPC's) draft budget for 2014/15 is included in the handout. It shows revenue projections and expenditures, as well as a list of one-time initiatives. Most of the base budget adjustments are mandatory. The campus will receive some money for the faculty equity increase. The only recommended base budget increase that is not mandatory is the \$38,000 for the Early Alert Project. It is not known yet if the campus will be responsible for covering the increase in benefits; the Governor has offered a number of proposals.

Proposals for one-time expenditures include funding to continue the RAMP program for another year, for the purchase of names to be used for student recruitment, and eLearning.

- Q: What does it mean to buy names for recruitment? A: The campus contracts with a vendor to provide names of high school sophomores and juniors. HSU sends recruitment materials to these students. Based on the increase in number of applications, it appears to be working well.
- Q: Is it true that HSU is impacted? A: Impaction has been declared for freshmen and will be imposed next year. The campus now has sufficient numbers of applications it can begin to manage the process more carefully, including slightly raising the GPA for admission.

The budget proposal maintains a fairly large reserve. It will be finalized at next week's URPC meeting.

The Provost explained that one third of the Faculty Equity Increase is being funded by the CSU and the other two thirds will be funded by Academic Affairs. The division has salary savings that will be re-invested for this purpose. The Equity Increase is a 'catch-up' from four years ago. Decisions as to who will receive pay increases were made by the Chancellor's Office and the California Faculty Association (CFA). The campus has no local control over this; it is just implementing the list that has been provided.

The May Revise Budget from the Governor will provide updated revenue projections. At this point in time, a 'normal' process and relatively 'on time' budget is expected.

Given that the HSU's budget proposal is pretty 'steady state' for next year, the URPC will turn its focus to governance issues.

Vice President Lopes was thanked for her presentation and for providing transparency to the budget process.

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

Resolution on Electronic Working Personnel Action Files
#25-12/13-FAC – April 2, 2013 – 2nd 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 Lecturer Range Elevation Portfolios (REPs) use the same system developed for electronic WPAFs, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Affairs Committee, working with the University Faculty Personnel Committee and in consultation with the College Personnel Committees, the Councils of Chairs, and other interested individuals, be charged with overseeing implementation of the 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: At the request of the UFPC, Faculty Affairs reviewed the current use of paper Working Personnel Action files. 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 in the development of this policy, and the CAHSS Council of Chairs in the development of this policy.

The second reading of the resolution contains two new resolved clauses: one regarding Range Elevation Portfolios and one regarding implementation.

There was no discussion. Voting occurred and Resolution #25 PASSED unanimously.

M/S/U (Zerbe/Fulgham) to make it an emergency item so that it can be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote before the end of the semester.

11. Resolution on the Student Evaluations of Teaching in Low Enrollment Courses (#29-12/13-FAC) – [Second 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 thesis courses (numbered 490 or 690), comprehensive examination courses (numbered 491 or 691), baccalaureate and master's project courses (numbered 492 or 692), senior and master's field, applied, and directed research course (numbered 495 or 695), and independent study courses (generally numbered 199, 299, 399, 499, 599, 699, or 799) also be exempted from the requirement for student evaluations, and be it further

RESOLVED: That faculty teaching courses exempted from the requirement for evaluation under this resolution be permitted to request student evaluations of exempted courses provided steps to ensure student anonymity are taken, 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 exempting very small courses enrolling three or fewer students from mandatory course evaluations

The second reading of the resolution contains two new resolved clauses: one on numbered courses and one allowing exempted courses to be evaluated (language previously in the Rationale was moved).

Discussion:

- The resolution needs to exclude conclaves because the student evaluations for these courses are not critical enough to provide accurate evaluations for instructors.
- It was suggested that perhaps this speaks more to the fact that these conclaves should not be courses.
- Q: Have any concerns been expressed that a student would want to evaluate a course and wouldn't have the opportunity to do so because it was a low-enrolled course? A: The challenge is to balance the CBA requirement to evaluate all courses with the requirement to maintain students' anonymity. A student could still submit a review for the course; but it would not be an anonymous review. The resolution does not prevent students from submitting signed letters/evaluations.
- Students need to be notified that at any time they can write an evaluative letter for a course; but this is an issue that needs to be addressed separately.

Chair Van Duzer requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee address this concern with another resolution, e.g. a resolution proposing standard language for use in course syllabi.

- It was also suggested that the ICC require something to be placed in syllabi.

M/S (Marschke/Gold) to end debate and vote immediately. Voting occurred and motion PASSED.

Voting on Resolution #29 occurred and PASSED with 4 No votes.

M/S (Zerbe/Bruce) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President. Motion PASSED with 2 Abstentions.

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

Resolution on Course Numbering Policy
#30-12/13-APC – April 2, 2013 – Second 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.

Discussion:

It was noted that most programs are already in compliance with the course numbering policy.

Q: Can numbers in the 200-209 range be reserved for General Education without causing problems? A: It was confirmed that there are no 200 level GE courses defined in the HSU Catalog.

Voting on Resolution #30 occurred and PASSED unanimously.

13. Resolution on Suspension of the Campus Climate Committee (#31-12/13-Gold) – [First Reading](#)

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

Resolution on Suspension of the Campus Climate Committee
#31-12/13-Gold – April 2, 2013 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the Campus Climate Committee (*University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, Section 11.8*) be suspended for AY 2013-2014.

RATIONALE:

Whereas there are now two new separate campus committees dealing with Diversity and Inclusion, these functions have superseded those of the Climate Committee. These new committees include the Working Group on Underrepresented Student Support, and the Diversity and Inclusion Campus Advisory Council, and

Whereas the CSU is doing a systemwide climate survey, and

Whereas HSU now has monthly faculty, staff, mixers along with a faculty, staff, student, mixer every semester, the primary duties of the Climate Committee are now being done by other groups, there is no longer a need for a Campus Climate Committee in AY 2013-2014.

Senator Gold introduced the resolution. The Campus Climate Committee has not met this semester and does not expect to meet during the remainder of the semester or next year. Some of the tasks the committee was formed to do have been undertaken by other campus entities or at the CSU system level.

Discussion:

- Q: Is the balance of representation among members of the campus climate committee reflected in other campus committees now doing the work? A: Yes.
- It was noted that this was the only Senate standing committee that a staff member would be eligible to chair.
- It was noted that it is unusual to suspend a standing committee for a lack of agenda and that it would be advisable to include a resolved clause calling for a formal review to either continue the committee or strike it from the Senate Bylaws as a standing committee.
- Concern was expressed that suspension of the Committee has the appearance of the Senate pulling out of diversity and inclusion work on campus. The Senate may want to establish some kind of liaison to other entities doing this work.
- The Committee was important to the creation of faculty, staff, and student cohesion on campus.
- The Staff Council already undertakes some of the efforts that people thought this Committee would do. It was suggested the Senate establishing liaisons with Staff Council, which is already an effective group.
- It is unclear to what extent this has been explored with the campus. One of the goals of the Cabinet for Institutional Change was to break through the "silos" that have been perceived on campus and create a more cohesive campus community. The Senate should take the time to talk with Associated Students, Staff Council, and other faculty to determine whether or not there is a need for this Committee.

- It was recommended that the second resolution include a clause citing Section 10.78 of the Senate *Bylaws*, the rule for dissolution of standing committees. The *Bylaws* do not provide for suspension of standing committees.

It is important to bring back the sense of the campus. Senators were encouraged to solicit feedback before the next meeting.

14. Resolution on Legislation Requiring HSU to Accept Courses Delivered by Private Corporations ([#32-12/13-EX](#))

Resolution on Legislation Requiring HSU to Accept Courses Delivered by Private Corporations
#32-12/13-EX – April 2, 2013

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University expresses its concerns about the effect of legislation that would provide the opportunity for unaccredited, for-profit companies, to create, manage and deliver courses that every CSU campus would be required to accept for full credit; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the HSU Senate Executive Committee will monitor and periodically report to the University Senate of HSU on legislation that would result in the loss of campus oversight and discretion in accepting courses for academic credit; and be it further

RESOLVED: That representatives of the HSU Senate Executive Committee and the California Faculty Association, HSU Chapter meet and discuss this issue with the area's state representatives.

RATIONALE: Legislation has been proposed that would require CSU campuses to accept courses created and delivered by for-profit private companies. These courses would be required for acceptance by any campus in the CSU. This raises the concern that the quality, competence and effectiveness of these courses will reflect the profit motive over the educational value of the experience. It also eliminates campus discretion in accepting courses that match the specific needs of the local curriculum, potentially leaving students underprepared for subsequent classes.

Chair Van Duzer introduced the resolution which addresses legislation that is being created to ease the difficulty of students getting General Education courses. There is a proposal to form a group to evaluate courses from private, for-profit organizations. The resolution expresses concern and unhappiness with this approach and calls for a meeting with local representatives to discuss local issues.

Discussion:

- In a recent article from *Inside Higher Education*, there is a prediction that younger faculty will be looking for courses to teach because they will all be outsourced if this trend continues.
- The curriculum belongs to the faculty and no one else; there is a need to ensure that remains the case.
- It was recommended that the issues be approached thoughtfully and to be careful of the rhetoric that is used. Opposition based on perceived threats to job security is not the best

approach. The quality of the courses (not where they come from) and whether or not they satisfy requirements are what need to be evaluated. A primary concern is that the evaluation is being done at the system level, rather than at the disciplinary level, which has been the long-standing tradition.

- Concern was expressed about the loss of oversight of the curriculum if programs are forced to accept courses that they wouldn't have otherwise.
- The CSU has centrally reviewed community college courses for articulation and they include a broad group of General Education courses.
- The proposed legislation is based more on the needs at the system-level, where things have gotten out of hand. The problems addressed by the proposed legislation don't necessarily exist at the campus level, at least not at HSU.
- The resolution should focus on the concern for oversight by experts in the field, and the concern about having curriculum that does not meet the needs of students and programs.
- The Steinberg Bill proposes a system-wide committee with only nine faculty; it won't even have all disciplines represented on it.
- There is already a process for reviewing courses at the system-level; this proposes to bypass what is currently in place.
- The legislation is pushing everything to online. The CSU should be asking the legislature to re-invest in the CSU, rather than moving to privatization.
- When vendors can offer General Education courses for \$60-100 per student, it looks pretty appealing to legislators who are primarily concerned about the budget. Strong arguments about why this is not a good way to proceed will be needed to counter this proposed legislation.
- How would HSU branding occur in these courses? It sets a very bad precedent and is a disservice to students to increase emphasis on large classes and online classes.
- On March 30, an opinion piece was published in the *New York Times* that was extremely critical of California's higher education system. It is important that faculty retain oversight of courses and faculty interaction with students is critical. Online education needs to be facilitated by what happens on this campus.
- Q: Would accepting courses from unaccredited institutions be of concern for an agency such as WASC? A: Institutions like WASC don't accredit courses; they accredit institutions and programs. Needless to say, vendors who are offering these courses would like to see the accreditation process moved to the course level.

- From a student perspective, it would set students back in their progress toward graduation if the General Education courses they take prior to coming to HSU do not serve them well at HSU.

Chair Van Duzer requested that senators send suggestions for changes to the resolution to him. The resolution will return as a second reading.

It was moved, seconded and passed to go into Faculty Session to discuss the following two agenda items.

15. 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) – 2nd Reading

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 – April 2, 2013 – Second 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:

- One senator shared a college colleague's opposition to removing term limits for the ASCSU senators.
- Q: Why is the Senate proposing amendments to the General Faculty Constitution? A: The amendment process on the General Faculty Constitution states that proposed amendments are presented at a Faculty Session of the Senate for passage of a resolution calling for the amendment to be forwarded to a vote of the General Faculty.
- One senator spoke in favor of the resolution: It has been noted that term limits would not allow the opportunity for statewide senators to move up into statewide leadership positions.
- One senator spoke in opposition of the resolution: Term limits are necessary in order to get more people involved and knowledgeable about governance processes.
- One senator spoke in favor of the resolution: It takes time to learn about what goes on at the statewide senate level.
- One senator spoke in favor of the resolution: Term limits are not a good idea for any position – they undermine the effectiveness of legislation. Term limits are effectively in place already through the election process.
- It was suggested that information be included on the ballot for the General Faculty election, for example, whether or not other campuses have term limits.

M/S/U (Gold/Zerbe) to end debate and vote immediately.

Voting on Resolution #23 occurred and PASSED with 1 No vote.

16. Resolution on Amendment to General Faculty Constitution Regarding the Election of the General Faculty and Senate Officers (#24-12/13-CBC) –[2nd Reading](#)

M/S/P (Fulgham/Marschke) to extend the meeting for five minutes.

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

#24-12/13-CBC — April 2, 2013 – Second 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:

Chair Van Duzer stated that he had received two emails in support of the resolution and several emails in opposition to it. Ultimately, the resolution is disrespectful to faculty.

- One senator spoke in opposition to the resolution. At some level it communicates disrespect for the faculty and it would be better to not pursue it.
- One senator spoke in favor of the resolution. It should go to the faculty for a vote. The change would clarify the relationship between the General Faculty and the Senate, and highlight the fact that the General Faculty organization doesn't serve a purpose any more.

- The question is about moving the amendment to the General Faculty for a vote. It is poor practice to influence a vote of the General Faculty.
- Q: Would it be possible for the resolution to go to the General Faculty for a vote, accompanied by a recommendation from the Senate?
- One senator spoke in opposition to the resolution. It is disrespectful and will send the wrong message.

Voting occurred on Resolution #24 and PASSED with 8 Yes votes, 5 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

The meeting ended at 6:00 pm.