

Vice Chair Zerbe called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm on Tuesday, April 30, 2013, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, Aronoff, August, Blake, Bruce, Dye, Ercole, Eschenbach, Eschker, Fulgham, Gold, Lutwen, Lapiz, Marschke, Moyer, Ortega, Pierce, Saner, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, Virnoche, Ross, Young, Zerbe.

Members absent: Johnson, Lopes, McElwain, Richmond.

Proxies: Lutwen for Lapiz (1<sup>st</sup> half), Young for Shellhase, Zerbe for Van Duzer.

Guests: Hwu, Borgeld, Mola, Ayoob, Burges, Grenot, Mullery, Collen, Mays, Lane, Darnall Burke.

### **1. Announcement of Proxies**

Proxies were announced and Emeritus Professor Sheila Ross was introduced. She is completing the remainder of Jack Yarnall's term (through Spring 2013) as the Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association's delegate.

### **2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda**

M/S (Young/Fulgham) to approve and adopt the agenda.

M/S/P (Marschke/Abell) to withdraw item #13 (Resolution on Senate GEAR Reform Task Force - #34-12/13-EX). Senator Marschke, author of the resolution, and others who were concerned about the progress on GE reform, were satisfied with the report and discussion at the Senate meeting on April 16 regarding the GEAR Curriculum and Assessment Committee's work on GE reform. The GEAR Committee has promised to forward recommendations to the Senate early Fall 2013. Another task force is not needed at this time. Motion passed with 1 Abstention.

The agenda, as modified, was approved unanimously.

### **3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of [April 16, 2013](#)**

M/S/P (Thobaben/Fulgham) to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 16, 2013 as written. Motion passed with 1 Abstention.

### **4. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of [April 23, 2013](#)**

M/S/P (Bruce/Thobaben) to approve the minutes from the meeting of April 23, 2013 as written. Motion passed with 1 Abstention.

## 5. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

The chairpersons of Senate standing committee were asked to send in their year-end reports to the Senate Office.

The Provost, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, has approved the appointment of Sondra Schwetman to the Libraries of the Future (LOFT) campus task force.

The Provost's Office is still seeking a faculty member to participate in the Graduation Initiative Workshop in Sacramento on June 30. Let the Senate Office know if you are interested.

The next meeting of the Senate will be only one hour long. New (incoming) senators will be seated and elections will be held. Nominations are open; if interested, forward your name to the Senate Office.

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

Appointments and Elections Committee (Alderson): The Committee is in the process of making appointments to fill committee vacancies. The General Faculty Election dates have changed; the election will now be held during Finals Week (May 13-17). Election information will be sent out and posted, along with the Senate roster, so that faculty may get in touch with senators regarding questions. It was noted that the timing is not ideal, but that care will be taken to get information out and encourage faculty to vote in the election.

- Comments have been received from faculty constituents who are not happy with the decision to hold an election for a General Faculty president on such short notice; they feel the timeline for the call for nominations is too short.
- Has the current General Faculty president (Van Duzer) resigned and do faculty know that? It was noted that a letter of resignation has not gone out to the faculty. The members of the faculty need to be notified about what is happening. Concern was expressed about faculty perception of what is going on. A clear explanation needs to go out along with an apology regarding the short timeline.
- It is not fair to senators to have to deal with this kind of late decision-making, especially at such a busy time of the year. Four days is not a long enough period to get nominations for the position of General Faculty president. Why can't the election wait until the beginning of Fall 2013?
- From an administrative/staffing point of view, it's better to fill the vacant position now.
- Have the other General Faculty officers supported this election? Messages should be going out from the GF officers, not the Senate.
- It was noted by a guest that faculty don't have a clue about what has happened in the Senate or what is going on with the upcoming election.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The Committee continues to work on curriculum proposals. It is close to finalizing guidelines for certificates. The guidelines will be brought to the Senate for review. The ICC is also reviewing the proposal for First Year Experience courses and plans to respond to the proposal soon.

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) (Eschker): The President has adopted the Committee's recommendation for next year's budget. At its last meeting, the URPC discussed applying the PREP and its software to the budget process, e.g., in order to gather meaningful feedback for making budget decisions.

Associated Students (AS) (Lutwen): A group of students have initiated a redwood clean-up project for the end of the year (in the Community Forest, etc.). Student interns have gathered research which will be used to develop a proposal for a student food pantry on campus. The proposal process will carry over to next year. AS elections are underway; there are three run-offs. About 17% of the student body participated in the election, which was an excellent turnout. Senator Lutwen has been talking about student governance issues with incoming students, and passing along his experience and knowledge.

HSU Labor Council (Saner): The Council will hold its monthly meeting tomorrow. Steve Tillinghast has been elected the new Labor Council delegate for the University Senate, and will be seated at the meeting next week. Senator Saner expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the University Senate.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC) (Young): The Committee was asked to review the motion regarding the Senate Chair which was made and approved at the Senate meeting on April 23. The following report on the Committee's findings was included in the Packet:

**Constitution and Bylaws Committee Report (April 25, 2013)**

Gregory Young, Chair ([gwy1@humboldt.edu](mailto:gwy1@humboldt.edu))

A request has been made that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee review the HSU University Senate Resolution entitled "Resolution Removing the Senate Chair, Eric Van Duzer" passed by the University Senate 23 April 2013. This is consistent with *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* 14.0 which reads

Requests for interpretations of Senate actions or Senate-approved documents shall be forwarded to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The Committee's rulings shall be reported in writing to the Senate and shall be considered binding unless rejected by a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

The Committee met on Wednesday, April 24 and upon reviewing the Resolution and the governing documents to which it pertains has concluded that the University Senate of Humboldt State University has standing to remove the Senate chair.

Justification for our findings follows.

- The Constitution of the General Faculty states at 4.52

The General Faculty President (1) shall preside over the meetings of the General Faculty; (2) *shall be the 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; . . .*

- The above mentioned *Constitution of the University Senate* addresses the circumstance under which the Chair should *not* preside over the meetings of the University Senate at 5.2 which reads
  - . . . The Vice Chair of the Senate shall preside as the Chair of the Senate should the Chair be unable to fulfill the duties of the office until such time as the General Faculty shall elect a new President . . .
- The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has concluded that the current Chair is “unable to fulfill the duties of the office” for the following reasons
  - For one to serve in a leadership position that directs or facilitates decisions and decision making processes in an organization, they must have the consent of the membership of that organization. Without such consent and in a climate of significant discord the fundamental duties of leadership cannot be fulfilled.
    - An absolute majority of the University Senate has approved a motion that states, in part, that the “University Senate of Humboldt State University finds that Eric Van Duzer is ‘unable to fulfill the duties of the office’ as Chair of the Senate.” The majority of the Senate therefore does not consent to having the current Chair serve as a leader.
    - Additionally, as the controversy over whether the Chair should continue to serve in that capacity has unfolded, the nature of the discourse has created a climate that is combative and at times hostile. Such a climate, we find, creates a context for discourse in which the Chair shall no longer be able to lead discussion and argument over issues before the Senate. Thus, it is our position that Professor Van Duzer is “unable to fulfill the duties of the office” as Chair and that the Constitutions of the General Faculty and the HSU University Senate support the ability of the University Senate to reach such a conclusion and thus to remove Professor Van Duzer from that position.

#### Comments:

- Faculty constituents have noted that members of the Senate who voted to approve the motion also sit on the CBC, which is a conflict of interest. Is this the appropriate body to consider decisions made by the Senate? There is a perception that the game is rigged.
- The vote in the Senate was 16 to 7 in favor. There are only four members on the CBC. The report was done professionally.
- Concern was expressed about the barrage of emails resulting from Professor Flashman’s blog that are disruptive and destructive.

- The CBC is charged with interpreting Senate actions. The fact that the current members are also serving as senators is a result of the lack of volunteers when the Committee was formed. It was noted that the report was written by the CBC Chair, who did not support the resolution.
- The CBC Chair and committee members were thanked for reviewing the Senate action. The findings and interpretation seem correct.
- In the future, the Senate should consider adding a process to the Bylaws for challenging and/or removing Senate officers.
- Q: Is the President of the University ultimately responsible for resolutions passed by the Senate? A: All resolutions are forwarded to the President, but not all resolutions require his approval. For example, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate requires no further action.
- Q: Does the Senate action affect the wages and working conditions of the Senate Chair? A: There is no change in his position as a result of the action. It will change the assignment of release time in the Fall, which is why it is better to hold the election this Spring.

## **7. Consent Calendar from the ICC**

The following items were approved without objection:

- 13-082: AIE 340: Educational Experiences
- 13-092: SW 255: Beginning Social Work Experience
- 3-093: SW 356: Field Preparation
- 13-094: MUS 407Z: String Chamber Music
- 13-095: MUS 108Z: Beginning Strings
- 13-096: MUS 109Z: Strings
- 13-097: MUS 107Z: String Chamber Music
- 13-098: MUS 370Z: String Techniques I
- 13-099: MUS 371Z: String Techniques II
- 13-100: MUS 108A - Beginning Afro-Cuban Percussion
- 13-101: MUS 338: Vocal & Instrumental Scoring
- 13-102: MUS 371W: Woodwind Techniques II
- 13-103: MUS 370W: Woodwind Techniques I
- 13-104: MUS 407W: Woodwind Chamber Music
- 13-105: MUS 107W: Woodwind Chamber
- 13-106: MUS 109W: Woodwinds
- 13-107: MUS 108W: Beginning Woodwinds
- 13-121: Physics - Applied Physics Option
- 13-125: PHYX 111: General Physics III: Optics, Modern Physics
- 13-126: PHYX 315: Introduction to Electronics and Electronic Instrumentation
- 13-127: PHYX 316: Electronic Instrumentation & Control Systems
- 13-128: PHYX 320: Modern Physics

13-129: PHYX 324: Analytical Mechanics  
13-130: PHYX 325: Thermal Physics  
13-133: PHYX 420: Optical Systems Design

Comments:

It seemed a waste of time to require a department to submit paperwork for approved changes that were already in the Catalog and only needed to be added to PeopleSoft. Q: Is there a rule that requires this? A: There is no rule, but having the form provides a record of when the change was made.

It was suggested that in the future a memo, to cover all instances of such a change, be written to create the needed paper trail, rather than requiring a department to complete paperwork for each change.

It was noted that using Nolij is cumbersome and not very intuitive. Q: Will usage features be improving? A: It is still being developed. In general, just double-clicking on numbered proposals will open the PDF file with the full curriculum proposal.

#### **8. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 PM- Open Forum for the Campus Community**

There were no speakers for the Open Forum.

#### **9. TIME CERTAIN: 4:30-4:45 PM – Conversations with Vice Presidents Peg Blake and Bob Snyder**

Vice President Blake (Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) made the following announcements:

- The beginning implementation stages for the Early Alert System will be in place for Fall 2013.
- The Division is finalizing a demand study for additional student housing on campus; it is believed there is sufficient demand to add to the current housing inventory.
- The CSU sponsors an annual conference on best practices in alcohol and drug prevention efforts and HSU will host the conference in 2014.

Provost Snyder welcomed any questions senators might have.

Q: At this point, based on meeting with the new Chancellor and attendance at statewide meetings, etc., is there any indication of initiatives the Chancellor may be thinking about that the campus could plan ahead for? A: The Chancellor seems to be serious about consultation on issues with campuses in the system and is following through on consolidating the increasing number of Executive Orders (EO's) and memos that have sent out. In general, the direction seems positive for the CSU.

It was felt that the Chancellor gained a good sense of the HSU campus during his visit. The Chancellor has first-hand experience with similar types of campuses and understands the differences between the needs of residential versus commuter campuses.

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

As discussed at a previous meeting, the responsibilities of the committee seem to be taken over by other university entities. Everyone on the committee is in agreement with the proposed suspension.

Pro and Con arguments:

Q: Who makes the faculty appointments to the two groups mentioned in the rationale of the resolution? A: One of the committees is not an ongoing committee. They were included to show that the university is making efforts in these directions.

Q: Hypothetically, if there were to be a Senate action that created controversy on campus, would this be under the purview of the Campus Climate Committee? A: The Committee could be reinstated if needed. It is being suspended, not dissolved.

Voting on Resolution #31-12/13-Gold occurred and PASSED with 1 No vote. The approved resolution reads:

Resolution on Suspension of the Campus Climate Committee  
#31-12/13-Gold – April 16, 2013 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the Campus Climate Committee, a standing committee of the University Senate (*University Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure*, Section 11.8), be suspended for AY 2013-2014; and be it further

RESOLVED: That current members of the Campus Climate Committee be notified of the Committee's suspension and thanked for their service; and be it further

RESOLVED: That in Spring 2014, the Senate Executive Committee review and determine the need for the Committee to continue as a University Senate standing committee.

**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.*

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

Discussion:

- The resolution is confusing; it seems to be “the cart before the horse.” Wasn’t the resolution generated in response to the proposed Steinberg legislation? It isn’t clear how it fits in.
- There are multiple pieces of legislation out there. Other CSU campuses have issued resolutions. The first resolved clause is the most important – it reinforces the importance of faculty involvement with approval of the curriculum.

Voting occurred on Resolution #32-12/13-EX and it PASSED unanimously.

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

**12. TIME CERTAIN: 5:00-5:15 PM – Presentation on Intercollegiate Athletics’ “Drug Education and Screening Program” (Dan Collen, Director, Athletics) ; [Attachment](#)**

Dan Collen, Director of Athletics introduced Stephanie Lane (Assistant Director, Athletics), Professor Jeff Borgeld (Faculty Athletic Representative), and Professor Thomas Mays (Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee (IAAC)).

After meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, Director Collen was asked to bring the document to the Senate as an information item for discussion. He stressed that the document did not come about because of the incident last Fall. It has been vetted with coaches, the IAAC, and the Senate Executive Committee.

This is a three-phase program with an emphasis on education and preventative behavior. The NCAA conducts random drug testing in the Fall and random drug testing is already in place at NCAA competition events.

It was reiterated that this is not a direct reprisal because of the incident in the Fall. The document itself was voted on the previous academic year. It is based on best practices at sister institutions and has been thoroughly vetted. It will be forwarded to the CSU Counsel.

Discussion:

Q: Is information from HSU screening shared with the NCAA? HSU seems to have different requirements regarding suspension from an activity. A: It was not known for sure if or how information would be shared.

Q: What is the cost of implementing this program? A: The exact cost is not known yet, but it will be costly. Money to fund it will be taken from fundraised dollars in Athletics.

Q: Does the HSU policy have any language regarding medically protected substances, like the NCAA policy does? A: There is an appeals process, and certain situations may be justified. With regard to medical marijuana, campus policy and NCAA standards will be followed.

It was suggested that language could be included in the document regarding disclosure practices and perhaps additional clauses included to address concerns about use of substances for religious purposes, etc.

Q: Are students are being educated about what substances they should not be taking in terms of supplements? A: Yes, student athletes need to know what substances are banned.

It was suggested that students need to be educated about the danger of taking certain drugs to cover up usage of banned substances. It was noted that students are given a 24 hour notice for testing so they don't have time to take something to counteract a banned substance.

Q: If a prescription medication contains a banned substance, can a student be exempted from the appeals process? A: Students who are taking prescriptions are in communication with a trainer.

There should be a process in place, not just a reliance on good communication. It was noted that the HSU process differs from the NCAA process in that it offers education first, before suspension.

Q: It sounds like the HSU procedure goes above and beyond what the NCAA or other sister institutions do; will this affect HSU's recruitment of student athletes? A: The coaches are in favor of this and the student athletes are not opposed. In general, the feeling is that this will have a positive effect on recruitment efforts. It ensures that there are enough opportunities for students to get help if needed.

Q: If HSU discovers that a student is using a banned substance and does not suspend that student, and the student plays in a NCAA competition, could the entire team be put in jeopardy of being suspended by the NCAA?

Q: Does the information go on a student's record? A: Yes.

During the past twelve years at HSU, there has been only one case of steroid use in all the NCAA testing. The focus of concern is with street drugs and the severe ban the NCAA has on marijuana.

Senators were invited to send further comments or concerns to Director Collen.

### **13. Resolution on Senate GEAR Reform Task Force (#34- 12/13-EX) – [First Reading](#)**

The resolution was withdrawn at the beginning of the meeting.

**14. Resolution on Revision of the HSU Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (#33-12/13-Gahtan) – [First Reading](#) ; [Attachment](#)**

M/S (Gold/Fulgham) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on Revision of the HSU Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research  
#33-12/13-Gahtan – April 16, 2013 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) recommends the attached revision (April, 2013) of the University’s “Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU recommends the attached revision (April, 2013) of the University’s “Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research” supersede the following three documents:

- *Policy for Protection of Human Subject in Research* (HSU, Office of the President) (Sept. 2007, rev. July 2010) (this policy is also referred to as the “IRB Policy”)
- *Implementation of the Policy for Protection of Human Subjects in Research* (Sept. 2007, rev. July 2010)
- Executive Memorandum P98-3: “Human Subjects in Research” (May 4, 1998)

; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the USHSU supports the campus-wide educational opportunities, provided by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) in conjunction with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, to inform faculty, students, staff, and administration of the changes in the Institutional Review Board’s procedures and the need for compliance with Federal regulations, California State University, and HSU policy.

RATIONALE: Two policy documents currently apply to Institutional Review Board (IRB) activities at HSU, both approved in September, 2007. One is the IRB Policy itself (addressed in the first resolution listed above), the other is an “implementation” or “procedural” guide to the Policy (addressed in the second resolution listed above). The policies are out of date with current IRB practice at HSU and at other academic institutions, for example, by not including standardized training for human subjects researchers, and by requiring department chairs to decide when IRB policy applies to research done in their department. Both of the 2007 policy documents must therefore be revised. The revision of the policy (April, 2013) is shorter (4 pages versus 42 pages) because it does not replicate information from federal policy documents that is now contained in a mandated, standardized IRB training course. The revision of the policy (April, 2013) contains a procedural guide to assist IRB applicants in the application process, so the current stand-alone “implementation guide,” aside from containing outdated information, is no longer needed. This revised IRB policy has been reviewed and approved by all current members of the IRB. The USHSU voted to reject an earlier version of this revised policy on May 1, 2012 (Resolution #38-11/12-EX), thereby leaving the 2007 IRB Policy in place. The current revision differs from the May, 2012 revision in several important ways: it (a) explicitly states an exception for teaching exercises within courses, (b) omits the previous companion “flow chart” for determining what activities require IRB review, since this flowchart contained errors, and (c) states the requirement to act in accordance with Tribal regulations when applicable. In addition, IRB members worked collaboratively to make wording changes throughout the document to improve its clarity and usability for IRB applicants.

Discussion:

The presentation on the revised policy at the previous Senate meeting was very convincing and the Senate should pass this resolution. However, the question of why the definition of *Human subject* includes the language “about whom or from whom” still needs to be answered.

It was stated that there have been a number of examples that have come through IRB where individuals have been asked questions about other individuals (who may or may not know that the information is being solicited). Last week a complaint was received from a faculty member about a protocol for a survey of parents about their children. The complaint was about the academic rigor of the protocol.

Q: How does a journalistic study (for example, an article in the Lumberjack) work with IRB? A: The policy is not written or intended to be broad enough to cover every example. A quick phone call to ask is advised. IRB has a lot of guidelines in place. Typically, journalism is not covered under IRB.

It is too easy to interpret this language differently; it needs to be clarified.

The first question to ask is it part of a research effort? If so, the IRB would like to see it. Language is needed to prevent situations that have occurred in the past, e.g., projects that should have had IRB approval but did not. There will be information posted on the web site to help.

It sounds like everyone basically agrees in principle that this is about human subjects, though the language may not capture the principle in a way that everyone agrees with. The policy should be passed, and further work done on coming to agreement on the definitions.

Currently, responses from IRB are fast and clear. These particular words make the least difference overall in terms of applying the policy.

It was suggested that concerns about respondent burden need to be addressed as well. IRB has asked to collaborate with Institutional Research (IR) in terms of the timing of surveys, etc. to avoid survey fatigue.

A wording change to clarify that all four conditions (research, generalizable knowledge, data collection, human subject) must be met would help with the different interpretations.

**15. Resolution on Online Certificate in Institutional Research ([#35-12/13-ICC](#))**

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

Resolution on Online Certificate in Institutional Research  
#35-12/13-ICC – April 30, 2013

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the Provost that a new on-line Certificate in Institutional Research and all associated curriculum forms (12-231, 12-223, 12-

224, and 12-225) be approved; and be it further

Resolved: That Academic Oversight for the Certificate in Institutional Research will reside with the Psychology Department.

*Rationale: The ICC is convinced that the curriculum for this certificate is sound, and that there should be sufficient student interest in the program. Furthermore, the Provost has determined that all new Certificate programs must be offered through the College of e-Learning and Extended Education, which means that if enrollment is not sufficient, the program will not be offered.*

*The ICC has considered a number of questions and implications about this certificate and certificate programs in general. The most relevant of these questions and answers are provided below.*

- *What are the implications for our current stateside students who might want to enroll in these Extended Education Certificate courses?* Students will have to pay extra fees to enroll in the courses for this certificate, and these courses will not count toward an HSU MA. Alex Hwu, Associate Vice-President of the College of e-Learning and Extended Education, intends to keep the fees for a limited number of current HSU students (5 for the first cohort) lower than the fees that non-HSU students will pay (initially \$100 a unit, vs. \$399 for outside students). Current stateside students may use their Financial Aid to pay for Extended Ed courses, and these courses will count towards the graduate Financial Aid cap (which is 125% of the maximum units required for the degree).
- *Who are the target students for this Certificate?* Post-baccalaureate students with degrees in social science and/or mathematics fields. In many cases, the students may already be working in Institutional Research offices. Some of the students are expected to be HSU Psychology MA students; the Psychology Department expects to help students use the Internship part of the IR Courses to collect data for their Psychology MA Masters Projects/Theses.
- *What is the schedule for offering these courses?* Each new cohort will begin in the Spring, and take one course per semester for three semesters. This schedule makes sense, because most of the students for this certificate will either be working or in grad school, and thus would not have time to take more than one course at a time.
- *Are there faculty to teach these courses?* Jacque Honda plans to teach at least in the initial semesters, plus we have at least two other local people who are qualified to teach. In addition, because this is an online program, the College of e-Learning and Extended Education in conjunction with the Psychology Department, could hire additional faculty as needed, even if those faculty do not live in Humboldt County.

All new certificate programs are being run through Extended Education. The ICC is establishing a process for approving them. The ICC feels that the Certificate in Institutional Research (IR) is a good one and that it will attract students. It recommends approval.

Discussion:

Concern was expressed about Director Honda's multiple commitments and workload. It was noted that she is committed to the program and feels it will serve to reduce her workload by providing more trained people to do the research that needs to be done.

It was noted that there are other qualified people to teach the program as well; it is not solely dependent upon Director Honda to be able to teach.

Voting on Resolution #35-12/13-ICC occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

16. **Resolution on Anti-Hazing Policy (#36-12/13-EX) – [First Reading](#) ; [Excerpt of Report from Working Group](#) ; [Attachment \(Policy\)](#)**

M/S (Gold/Bruce) to place the resolution on the floor.

Resolution on the Humboldt State University Anti-Hazing and Initiation Policy  
#36-12/13-EX – April 30, 2013 – First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University commends the work of the Anti-Hazing Working Group; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends approval of the attached Anti-Hazing and Initiation Policy to the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Anti-Hazing and Initiation Policy become effective upon approval of the President.

RATIONALE: In response to hazing incidents involving two university Intercollegiate Athletic teams in fall 2012, President Richmond and Vice President Blake directed the Dean of Students to form an Anti-Hazing Work Group to address gaps in the university's Anti-Hazing programming and policies. The working group was charged with revising Humboldt State's anti-hazing policy and bringing it into compliance with Title 5 of *The California Code of Rules and Regulations*, section 41301 Student Code of Conduct and to establish a policy expressing greater uniformity across athletics, clubs, and residential life. Areas for review included: the university hazing policy; lesson plans for anti-hazing training for students; calendar for anti-hazing student training; and anti-hazing training for coaches, advisors, student families, and alumni.

The Anti-Hazing Work group has drafted a single, university-wide anti-hazing policy with reference to the Title 5 conduct standards regarding hazing. (Attached) The draft has been reviewed and edited by the CSU Office of General Counsel. The policy shall appear verbatim in both the Intercollegiate Student Athlete participation agreement and the Club Student participation agreement effective fall semester 2013. This will ensure that every student athlete and every student club member, including members of Sports Clubs and Intramurals, will sign an agreement confirming that they will abide by the university's anti-hazing policy. Such a participation agreement shall be adopted by the Office of Residential Life for student participants in Residence Life organizations. The new anti-hazing policy shall also appear in the HSU Catalog, Club Handbook, Residential Life Policy Handbook, and on the Student Rights and Responsibilities web site.

Randi Darnall Burke, Dean of Students, spoke to the new policy. This policy unifies two policies already in place into one Anti-Hazing Policy and makes reference to the Title V section on student conduct.

Discussion:

It was suggested that including an example, or suggestion that certain usage of electronic social media is prohibited under the policy, would be helpful.

Q: Does the policy cover school events? A: No.

Suggestions were made for language changes under the section on permissible initiation activities. It was clarified that sponsoring or hosting these activities is permissible. However, it is not permissible to require anyone to do them – this is the message that needs to be reiterated throughout the document. Some of the activities (e.g., hiking, camping) are also covered under risk management.

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 pm.