Chair Noah Zerbe called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm on Tuesday, October 1, 2013, in the Native American Forum (BSS 162). A quorum was present.

Members present: Abell, Alderson, Blake, Bruce, Creadon, Dye, Eschker, Fulgham, Geck, Gold, Karl, Meyer, Mola, Moyer, Pierce, Shaeffer, Shellhase, Snyder, Thobaben, Virnoche, Wrenn, Young, Zerbe.

Members absent: Braithwaite, Lopes, Richmond.

Guests: Cheyne, Burges, S. Smith, Ayoob, Hwu, Glenn.

1. **Announcement of Proxies**

Proxies: Gold for Ortega, Abell for Stubblefield, Cox for Bloom, Guillen for Tillinghast.

Chair Zerbe introduced and welcomed Professor John Meyer (Dept. of Politics), one of the two recently-elected faculty senators.

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

M/S/U (Thobaben/Bruce) to approve and adopt the agenda.

3. **Approval of [Minutes from the Meeting of September 17, 2013](#)**

M/S/P (Thobaben/Bruce) to approve the minutes from the meeting of September 17 as written. Motion PASSED with 2 Abstentions.

4. **Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair**

The Chair's report is included with the written reports. Chair Zerbe announced that the General Faculty Election results will be published after the completion of the runoff election.

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

Academic Policies Committee (APC) (Gold): The Committee is working on an administrative-academic disqualification policy which will be coming to the Senate.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC) (Bruce): A report was submitted with the written reports. Senators were invited to offer input to the Committee on any of the items it is addressing.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The ICC met today and approved curriculum proposals. It did not approve the final CCAT course (Herbalism) that was part of the group of courses that were not approved by the Senate at its last meeting. There has been communication with the

environmental science faculty and the sustainability coordinator and it was recommended that the courses come back as proposals to become part of the curriculum. The ICC also approved a new online, self-support Master's degree in Anthropology, amendments to the ICC Constitution, and a revision to the Guidelines for majors. These items will be presented to the Senate at its next meeting.

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC): The Committee is meeting once a month, so there has been no meeting since the last Senate meeting.

ASCSU (Eschker): The ASCSU met two weeks ago. There is continuing concern about the lack of an appointment of a Faculty Trustee. Chancellor White spoke at the plenary meeting, and stated he is in favor of a model with two trustee representatives, one voting and one non-voting. The ASCSU unanimously approved a resolution on allowing only the CSU and the UC to offer baccalaureate degrees. The resolution was in response to talk about the possibility of the Community Colleges offering BA degrees. The Fiscal and Government Legislative Committee has developed a set of legislative principles designed to help the CSU be more flexible and respond more quickly to proposed legislation. A wave of new initiatives directed at the CSU is expected this year. It will be an important year for advocacy and senator Eschker expressed a desire help to coordinate efforts on the HSU campus.

6. **Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) – October 1, 2013**

The following items were approved without objection:

13-192 – SW 356: Field Preparation
13-234 – WS 301: The Artist: Women Artists
13-235 – CRGS 410: Internship
13-236 – WS 199: Life/Work Options for Women
13-237 – Women's Studies Minor
13-243 – Liberal Studies - Recreation Administration

7. **TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM – Open Forum for the Campus Community** (Open Forum Procedures)

Casandra Kelly (student) from the Campus Center for Appropriate Technology (CCAT) spoke to the Senate's process for informing the campus about its agenda items. Several CCAT courses were not approved at the last Senate meeting; and there was no opportunity for students and CCAT members to respond. While CCAT is aware that the courses may go forward by another route, she expressed concern about the lack of notification and requested that, in the future, people are notified in advance when items such as this are on the agenda.

8. **TIME CERTAIN: 3:30-3:45 PM – Post-Census Update and Re-structuring of Co-curricular and Academic Support Units (Jacque Honda, AVP for Retention & Inclusive Student Success)**

Jacque Honda, AVP for Retention & Inclusive Student Success was invited by the Senate Executive Committee to talk about the census data. A handout, "HSU Fall 2013 Census" was distributed.

As of Fall, 2013, HSU has been certified as a Hispanic-serving institution, with Hispanic-Latina/o students comprising 25.6% of student enrollment. The status means the campus will be eligible to apply to the U.S. Department of Education for funds under Title V, as well as for other resources.

Since 2009, the campus has undertaken efforts to increase graduation and retention rates. This year HSU's first-year retention rate improved from 73% (a year ago) to 77.5% - the highest rate since 1993. It is cause for celebration. Raising graduation rates is a process, and this improvement in retention is a step in the right direction.

The number of students of color has increased exponentially. Currently, 48% of freshmen students are students of color. Over the course of the year, there will be focused efforts on closing the achievement gap between students of color and other students.

Q: Is there comparable data from other CSU campuses regarding First Generation students? A: AVP Honda wasn't aware of data, but offered to find out.

Q: Some instructors are reporting seeing an increased achievement gap between freshmen and sophomores. What is your perspective on possible methods to limit the achievement gap course by course? A: Analytics would need to be run to collect some data to determine the extent of this problem.

Q: Now that HSU is a Hispanic-serving institution, how do faculty learn about special funding that is available? A: Sponsored Programs will have a workshop on October 8 on applying for federal funds.

AVP Honda's office will be applying for funds; approximately $2.5 million over the next five years.

9. **Resolution on the CSU Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents (#05-13/14-EX)**
    Attachment: CSU Policy

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

<div align="center">

Resolution on the CSU Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents
05-13/14-EX – October 1, 2013

</div>

RESOLVED: that the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) strongly encourages the Chancellor and the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) to schedule official campus visits for the finalists in the search for a new president of Humboldt State University in the academic year 2013/14; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the USHSU encourages the CSU Board of Trustees to revisit their Policy for the Selection of Presidents of September 20-21, 2011 (attached) and once again make official campus visits for finalists in presidential searches mandatory; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the USHSU urges the CSU Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor include a representative from the campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President as a full member of the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the USHSU affirms that the incoming president of Humboldt State will ultimately be judged *not* on the procedures by which she or he was selected *but* on her or his performance as president.

RATIONALE: The CSU Board of Trustees will be conducting a search for a new president of Humboldt State University in the academic year 2013/14. The CSU Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents of September 20-21, 2011 states that "the Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP determine whether to schedule campus visits, which are optional, or to schedule campus visits on a modified basis, depending on the circumstances of the search." That same Policy affirms a "deep commitment throughout the process to the principles of consultation with campus and community representatives." Candidate campus visits would increase the transparency in the search process and reinforce the trust between the University and the public in the outcome of the search. Such visits also provide the CSU Board of Trustees and the TCSP as well as the University and the public important insight into the candidates' knowledge of, and ability to lead, the students, faculty, staff, and administration of Humboldt State. Further, given the unique characteristics of Humboldt State as a relatively remote campus in the system, campus visits provide the only vehicle through which any candidate can develop a real sense of the strengths and challenges faced by the campus. While we welcome efforts by the Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor to ensure an active role for the campus advisory committee in the search process, we also believe it is important to include a member of the campus community in the decision making process itself.

Discussion:

The language of the resolved clauses needs to be more forceful, for example, change "strongly encourages" to "requests that," to convey the concern that even if the system policy doesn't require campus visits, HSU is requesting them.

The Senate should request more than one representative from the campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee.

The purpose of the fourth resolved clause is not clear. It was noted that the HSU resolution is based on a resolution from CSU Long Beach which was written at the end of their presidential search process.

M/S (Virnoche/Moyer) to amend the first resolved clause as follows:

RESOLVED: that the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) requests that ~~strongly encourages~~ the Chancellor and the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) to schedule official campus visits for the finalists in the search for a new president of Humboldt State University in the academic year 2013/14; and be it further

M/S/P (Fulgham/Abell) to end debate. Motion PASSED with 1 No vote.

Voting on the amendment to the first resolved clause occurred and PASSED with 3 Abstentions.
M/S (Fulgham/Virnoche) to delete the fourth resolved clause.

M/S/P (Fulgham/Abell) to end debate. Motion PASSED with 3 No votes.

Voting on the amendment to delete the fourth resolved clause occurred and PASSED with 1 No vote and 1 Abstention.

M/S (Moyer/Gold) to amend the second and third clauses by substituting "requests that" in place of "encourages" (2nd clause) and "urges" (3rd clause).

Discussion:

There is a difference in the two amendments; the second and third clauses are directed at policy changes. It may not be the place of the Senate to request policy changes, but it should strongly encourage.

Voting on the amendments to the second and third clauses occurred and PASSED.

Voting on Resolution #05-13/14-EX as amended occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

The amended resolution reads:
<div align="center">05-13/14-EX – October 1, 2013</div>

RESOLVED: that the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU) requests that the Chancellor and the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) schedule official campus visits for the finalists in the search for a new president of Humboldt State University in the academic year 2013/14; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the USHSU requests that the CSU Board of Trustees revisit their Policy for the Selection of Presidents of September 20-21, 2011 (attached) and once again make official campus visits for finalists in presidential searches mandatory; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the USHSU requests that the CSU Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor include a representative from the campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President as a full member of the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President.

RATIONALE: The CSU Board of Trustees will be conducting a search for a new president of Humboldt State University in the academic year 2013/14. The CSU Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents of September 20-21, 2011 states that "the Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP determine whether to schedule campus visits, which are optional, or to schedule campus visits on a modified basis, depending on the circumstances of the search." That same Policy affirms a "deep commitment throughout the process to the principles of consultation with campus and community representatives." Candidate campus visits would increase the transparency in the search process and reinforce the trust between the University and the public in the outcome of the search. Such visits also provide the CSU Board of Trustees and the TCSP as well as the University and the public important insight into the candidates' knowledge of, and ability to lead, the students, faculty, staff, and administration of Humboldt State. Further, given the unique characteristics of Humboldt State as a relatively remote campus in the system, campus visits provide the only vehicle through which any candidate can develop a real sense of the strengths and challenges faced by the campus. While we welcome efforts by the Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor to ensure an active role for the campus advisory committee in the search process, we also believe it is important to include a member of the campus community in the decision making process itself.

M/S/U (Fulgham/Bruce) to make this an emergency item for immediate transmittal to the President as an information item. Chair Zerbe will write a cover letter to the Chancellor for forwarding of the resolution.

10. Resolution Regarding the Election of Faculty Representatives to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees' Committee for the Selection of the President (#06-13/14-EX)

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

Resolution Regarding the Election of Faculty Representatives to
the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President
#06-13/14-EX – October 1, 2013

Resolved: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University (USHSU), acting in accordance with the California State University Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents, decides that the candidates for the position of faculty representative to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) meet the following criteria:

1. Candidates shall be tenured and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor.
2. One candidate shall be selected from among the faculty of the College of Professional Studies (CPS) and one candidate shall be selected from among the faculty of the College of Natural Resources and Sciences (CNRS).

and be it further
Resolved: That the USHSU decides that the election of two faculty representatives be conducted according to the normal election procedures established under the Constitution of the General Faculty with an electorate comprised of all members of the General Faculty; and be it further
Resolved: That the criteria for the selection of the faculty representatives to the ACTCSP, laid out in this resolution, apply only to the present search.

Rationale: The California State University Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents requires the election by the faculty of two faculty representatives to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President. The Chair of the University Senate is included as a member of the advisory committee and is a faculty member in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. By selecting two additional faculty members from CPS and CNRS, we ensure equal representation of the three colleges in the advisory committee.

Discussion:

-   It was clarified that the resolution addresses the current process and will not become a standing policy. A date (2013/2014) will be added to the title to make this clear.

-   Philosophical problems with the resolution were voiced. Who does the Senate Chair represent – the Senate, the General Faculty, or the faculty of the College of Arts and Humanities? Is the premise that the most effective representation of the faculty is having one faculty per college? There are many other criteria that could be more important which are not addressed in the resolution, for example, diversity. This encourages faculty representatives to think and act on behalf of colleges rather than the broader general faculty.

-   This is the most equitable way to do it. Otherwise, representatives from all parts of campus would have to be elected. This ensures a balance.

- The faculty being elected are representing the university, not the colleges. The election requires that all faculty vote; taking a partisan approach is way off-base. Rather than using the designation of colleges as a criterion, use the desire to have a breadth of knowledge in the disciplines (across the arts, humanities, social sciences, sciences, etc.). Gender and diversity balance is important, but may be difficult to build into an election process.

- Ensuring a diverse group of nominees will help with the balance. Colleagues need to be encouraged to run.

- Rather than not including a third of the faculty from being considered, have the nominees make their case individually and let the faculty determine who it elects. Trust the faculty to elect talented and capable people.

Voting on Resolution #06-13/14-EX occurred and PASSED with 2 No votes and 4 Abstentions.

M/S/P (Fulgham/Virnoche) to make this an emergency item to be forwarded to the President as an information item.

The call for nominations will go out immediately, with an election to be held within a week. The election will be shortened, to allow time for a runoff election if needed. A statement regarding diversity will be added to the call for nominations. Senators were asked to encourage colleagues to self-nominate.

11. Resolution to Clarify Term Lengths for the Constitution & Bylaws Committee Members (#03-13/14-CBC)

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

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University amend the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* as follows (insertions underlined and deletions indicated by strike-out):

> 11.61 **Chair:** The Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall be a senator, elected during the regular annual election within the Senate, for a one-year term.

> 11.62 **Membership**: The membership of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall be as follows:
>
> > • Chair of the Committee (elected by the Senate)
> > • Three (3) Faculty members, appointed by the Appointments and Elections Committee
> > • One (1) non-MPP Staff member, appointed by Staff Council
> > • One (1) Student member, appointed by Associated Students.
> > The Senate Parliamentarian, appointed annually by the Senate Executive Committee, shall also serve on the Committee. Any member of the Committee (listed above) may also serve as Senate Parliamentarian, or the Parliamentarian may be an additional member of the Committee.

> 11.63 **Terms:** Elected and appointed members shall serve 2two-year terms except the committee chair as stated above and the student member, who shall serve a one-year term.

 and be it further;

RESOLVED: that this change be applied to the current year once approved.

> *RATIONALE: This change is to reconcile the discrepancy with the chair's term in sections 11.61 and 11.63 and to make the student term consistent with most other Senate committees.*

Discussion:

The amendment corrects a couple of discrepancies in the existing Bylaws without changing the content.

Discussion:

Q: Would the number of committee members change depending on whether or not the Parliamentarian is a member of the Senate? A: Yes.

The resolution will return to the Senate as a second reading in two weeks. If senators have additional comments, they should be sent to Richard Bruce.

12. Resolution to Fill Vacant Senate Seats in Special Election (#04-13/14-CBC)

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

<div align="center">

Resolution to Fill Vacant Senate Seats in a Special Election
#04-13/14-CBC – October 1, 2013 – First Reading

</div>

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University amend the *University Senate of Humboldt State University Bylaws and Rules of Procedure* as follows (insertions underlined and deletions indicated by strike-out)

> **12.3 Nomination and Election Procedures:**
>
> 12.31 The regular annual elections to the Senate normally shall occur during the spring. There shall be no elections to the Senate during the summer. ~~Elections to fill uncompleted terms shall be conducted as part of the regular annual elections.~~
>
> **12.4 Vacancies**
>
> 12.43 Any vacancy which may occur between regular elections among delegates to the University Senate shall be filled by a special election. Any person so elected shall represent the appropriate academic unit and shall serve ~~only until the next regular election, provided that any remaining portion of the term so vacated shall be filled at the next regular election~~ <u>the remainder of the vacated term</u>.

and be it further

RESOLVED: that, since all changes to the *Bylaws* are immediate after approval by the Senate, this change will be in effect for any upcoming special elections.

> RATIONALE: The current practice is to hold a special election to seat vacated during the fall semester. According to the Bylaws, another election for that seat must be held during a regular election held in the spring semester to elect a senator to finish the term. This resolution, supported by the AEC, aims to reduce streamline the elections process and give senators the opportunity to serve the remainder of term instead of part of a year.

Discussion:

Currently, two elections are required to fill a vacancy; a special election to fill the vacancy until the next regular election is held, and then an election to fill the remainder of the vacancy. This would reduce the number of elections needed and give the person filling the vacancy an opportunity to learn more of the roles and responsibilities.

It was suggested changing the term "Delegates" in 12.43 to "elected senators" so that it does not include ex-officio delegates.

The resolution will return to the Senate as a second reading in two weeks.

13. Information Item: Progress Report on Electronic RTP Files (Virnoche)

The Faculty Affairs Committee is working with Phil Rouse (Quality Improvement Analyst, ITS Project Office) on the development of an electronic retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) process. Phil has collected information on the current processes and is building a system model to provide the basis for building an online submission process for Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) and other RTP process documents.

Two handouts included in the packet are a written overview and analysis of the process and a flowchart representing the system process.

Discussion:

There may be some differences in current procedures and what is actually required by current policies. The Committee is concerned about building what is required into the online system process, not necessarily what has been put into practice over time.

It is not critical that every bubble in the flowchart is correct; it is just a map for the computer programmers to know who to allow access to information at certain points in the RTP process.

The justification for doing this (3.1) needs to include more of the big picture and more compelling reasons than just the cumbersome aspect of putting pieces of paper in a binder. In the short term, figuring out the new process will be just as cumbersome. The rationale needs to be strengthened.

The easiest grievance to win is a challenge to the process. This needs to be beta tested.

Q: How will issues of confidentiality be addressed? Is there a plan to provide all faculty a way to generate digital signatures? A: Personnel processes on campus are already using SharePoint, which

provides confidential access from anywhere. Currently there is no university policy in place or institutional practice for digital signatures.

Q: What about the issue of required sign-in for everyone who accesses an RTP file? A: The AVP for Faculty Affairs is looking at those issues.

People may still print documents to read, which will need to be shredded. It would be good to have a 'best practices' guide to accompany the transition.

14. **Information Item: Proposed Changes to University Senate Constitution (Bruce)**
    Attachment: Proposed Changes (9/18/13) from CBC
    Attachment: Proposed Changes (9/18/13) from CBC w/changes accepted
    Attachment: Summary of Changes made since Spring 2013

Senator Bruce provided background on the proposed revision of the University Senate Constitution. The revision was presented to the Senate late in the term last Spring and forwarded to the campus community for review. The document was pulled due to lack of adequate time for review.   The document is ready for review and will be posted on the senate website for campus feedback. The CBC will review comments and feedback, and will bring the document to the Senate for two readings and action. A list of changes made since the document was forwarded last spring is included in the packet.

Discussion:

The Committee has done a good job with this.

The VP for Advancement is not included in the membership of the Senate and should be added. Under section 5.5, it is not clear if the Parliamentarian has a vote or not.

It was noted that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee is aware of both issues and will take under consideration for possible future amendments. The current proposed revision is intended only to clean-up and re-format the document, not to make major changes.

In books on parliamentary procedure, it is usually the presiding officer who chooses the parliamentarian.

Q: What was the Committee's thinking behind the change to the amendment process? A: The reason for the higher threshold (increase from a majority to a 2/3 majority) vote is that members of the Senate Executive Committee (last year) felt it should be more difficult to amend the Constitution than the Bylaws.

The original University Senate Constitution was voted on by the General Faculty as part of the process of establishing the University Senate. The way the section on Amendments is currently written, it is unclear who voted on amendments and what the amendment process is. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee took this to the Senate Executive Committee [2011/2012] and it was agreed that proposed amendments would go to the campus constituencies with delegates on the Senate for comment, but that the Senate would vote to amend.

Q: What is the rationale for making the immediate past chair of the Senate a member of the Senate?
A: For continuity.

The difference between 6.12 and 6.4 was clarified. Section 6.12 addresses the attendance record that is kept for each meeting. Section 6.4 addresses the quorum requirements.

Section 7.2 is in conflict with section 2.5 – it seems to be redundant.

Senators were invited to send additional feedback to Richard Bruce.

**15. Information Item: Report on the Spring 2013 Online Evaluations Pilot (Virnoche/Bruce)
      Attachment: Report**

Senator Virnoche reported that based on the report and input gathered from the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and the Senate Executive Committee. The Committee is preparing a resolution for the Senate to adopt the process permanently.

Senator Bruce provided a summary of the report (included in the packet) on the Spring 2013 pilot of online evaluations, which went very well. The goal was to implement the online evaluations in such a way as to ensure the highest return rate possible. Everything possible was done to get the highest response rate, including methods tried in an earlier pilot in CAHSS. The return rate dropped only by ca. 2.1%. The number of evaluations that were processed increased substantially and there was a significant reduction in the amount of paper used.

Discussion:

Q: Where is the oversight? A: Faculty Affairs will oversee the administration of the process. Each college does its own evaluations. It will be recommended that each college designate a person to administer its evaluations. Other issues the Faculty Affairs Committee has discussed and considered include:

- the need to reduce the number of emails, both to faculty (reports on response rates, etc.) and to students (reminders, etc.)
- the need to build in ongoing assessment of teaching evaluations (request that IR do the assessment, paying attention to responses and collecting more comparative data (size of labs, etc.)
- the possibility of the 'online culture' lending itself to more threats from students (based on reported grievances by faculty).

Senator Bruce was thanked for his report and excellent research.

Q: Is there a way to shut off the reminders to students once the evaluation has been completed? A: Yes.

Q: Could the median be included in the results? It might be useful in cases where there are only a few disgruntled students.

It would be helpful for Faculty Affairs to distinguish between the policy issues and the implementation issues. For example, while providing comparative may be helpful, it isn't necessarily something that should be included in a policy.

The evaluation process is critical to RTP, and the implementation issues are very important. The Committee needs to address the issue of timing of the evaluations, the number of emails that students received, and other important implementation issues.

Caution was advised regarding considering using software to look for specific 'inflammatory' words in students' comments. Those words, in different context could be complimentary or derogatory. HSU is 10-15 years behind the rest of the CSU in implementing this; other campuses may have already figured this out.

It was suggested that providing incentives for students to complete evaluations in a timely manner may be more conducive than a barrage of email reminders.

The process needs to be implemented in a uniform manner across the colleges.

Q: Is there a way a student can begin an evaluation and save it for review/completion at another time?

It was noted that some campuses require a student to fill out an evaluation before receiving a grade. There was a question of whether or not Appendix J would allow this.

Appendix J requires that the evaluations are anonymous.

It was suggested that students be given an opportunity to "opt in" or "opt out" of the evaluation, as a way of reducing the number of reminders that are sent.

Motion to adjourn (Fulgham). The meeting adjourned at 4:52 pm.