

University Senate

Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, March 11, 2025

Goodwin Forum and Zoom, Meeting ID 818 1954 9462

Chair Woglom called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm. A quorum was present.

Members Present

Aghasaleh, Banks, Benavides-Garb, Burkhalter, Deshazier, Capps, Cappuccio, Cruz, Evans, Fisher, Geck, Harmon, Holliday, Jannetta, Lancaster, Lepphaille, McGuire, McKindley, Miller, Pachmayer, Perris, Spagna, Stelter, Sterner, Tillinghast, Tello-Linares, A. Thobaben, M. Thobaben, Virnoche, Woglom

Members Absent

Ramsier, Silvaggio

Guests

Janelle Adsit, Jill Anderson, Jo Archibald, Anthony Baker Ortiz, Kayla Begay, Kacie Borquez-Hall, Allison Bronson, Carmen Bustos-Works, Leah C, Michelle Caisse, Loren Cannon, Catalina, Joice Chang, Barbara Clucas, Adrienne Colegrove-Raymond, Stephanie Corigliano, Dominic Corva, Andrea Delgado, Amanda Dinscore, Noelle Doblado, Yvonne Doble, Deserie Donae, Eden Donahue, Thomas Elliott, MJ Fabian, Alice Finen, Mira Friedman, Bethany Gilden, Rachael Gipson, Cameron Allison Govier, Bella Gray, Kendra Higgins, Nicole Jean Hill, Marissa Holguin, Jeff, Jordan, Erin Kelly, Khristan Lamb, Sarah Lasley, Mike Le, Gracie Leal, Elizabeth Lujan, Carly Marino, Bori Mazzag, Peggy Metzger, Kirby Moss, Cindy Moyer, Cyril Oberlander, Patrick Orona, Raven Palomera, Suzanne Pasztor, Elias Pence, Garrett Purchio, Meenal Rana, Armeda Reitzel, Dezmond Remington, Maxwell Schnurer, Jay Schock, Tani Sebros, Connie Stewart, Ronnie Swartz, Kristin T, Isaac Torres, Cade Webb, Kimberly White, Mark Wicklund, Marjie Wolfe

Announcement of Proxies

Virnoche for Ramsier

CFA Interruption Statement

Chair Woglom read the Interruption Statement from the California Faculty Association.

Approval and Adoption of Agenda

M/S (Lancaster/Virnoche) to amend the agenda to add a Time Certain at 3:30 pm to discuss the recent arrests on campus and the civil rights complaint made against our campus.

Motion to adopt the agenda as amended passed without dissent.

Approval of Minutes from February 11, 2025 and February 25, 2025

M/S (Lancaster/Aghasaleh) to approve the minute from February 11, 2025.

Motion to approve the minutes passed without dissent.

M/S (Aghasaleh/Harmon) to approve the minute from February 25, 2025.

Motion to approve the minutes passed without dissent.

Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee

It was noted that there were no items on the ICC Consent Calendar.

General Consent Calendar

It was noted that there were no items on the General Consent Calendar.

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

Academic Policies Committee (APC)

Written report attached

Appointments and Elections Committee (AEC)

Written report attached

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC)

The Committee on Committees is looking into the dissolution of the Campus Safety & Policy Committee and to form a new committee to oversee the processes and procedures of UPD.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

Written report attached

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC)

Written report attached

University Policies Committee (UPC)

Written report attached

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC)

Written report attached

Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)

Written report attached

Associated Students (AS)

AS participated in the California State Student Association where a resolution passed to establish a system-wide CSU undocumented student advisory council framework for comprehensive support.

California Faculty Association (CFA)

No report

Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI)

No report

Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (ERFSA)

Written report attached

Labor Council

Unions are involved in the meet and confer process about the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program.

Staff Council

Written report attached

President’s Administrative Team (PAT)

Written report attached

Chief of Staff Gilden reported that the Faculty & Staff Advisory Team for the Free Speech Support & Resource Team has begun meeting and it is going well.

Senator Geck asked Vice President Holliday about enrollment. VP Holliday said we’re tracking towards hitting the Fall enrollment targets. Deposits are currently up from last year, but applications are down.

Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

Written report attached

TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM – Open Forum for the Campus Community

Senator Harmon read the attached letter.

TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 – Recent Arrests on Campus and the Civil Rights Complaint Made Against our Campus

Senator Aghasaleh made the attached statement.

President Spagna expanded on the issues detailed in the attached Executive Cabinet Report to University Senate. He stated that first and foremost we are all committed to a healthy and safe learning environment. We have had twenty protests this year, and they were all conducted peacefully.

Related to the two arrests, President Spagna added that UPD’s role on campus is fact-finding. When an incident happens on campus, UPD is asked to respond and collect information. They send this information to the District Attorney’s Office, where the incidents are evaluated to see if a law was broken. The University has to be neutral in this. The only group that can file charges is the District Attorney, not UPD or the University.

Karisza Villalobos made the following statement:

Across the country, Palestinian students and their allies face institutional retaliation for speaking against genocide. I’ve actually been in a classroom where a professor said, “I don’t want this conversation [about Palestine] to be about who is pro-genocide and who is anti-genocide?”

How are we living in a time where our professors cannot lead classroom discussions which support anti-genocide sentiments? Genocide is not a neutral topic. Universities have become hostile environments where Palestinian students are criminalized, surveilled, and disciplined simply for existing, for grieving, and for resisting the genocide of their people. The weaponization of “safety” language has allowed white-led academic institutions to silence students of color—especially Palestinians—while protecting those who uphold settler-colonial narratives.

Speaking from personal experience, within this institution, there has also been a pattern of scrutiny and punitive measures directed at students who advocate for abolitionist and anti-carceral practices. Additionally, over the past year and a half, students who have spoken out in support of Palestinian liberation and against genocide have faced escalating disciplinary actions, exclusionary practices, and targeted scrutiny from their department’s administration. Despite repeated calls for accountability, the university has yet to implement protections for Palestinian students or address the growing climate of political suppression on campus.

Universities have a responsibility to ensure that Palestinian students and allies are not subjected to intimidation, harassment, political suppression, or institutional retaliation for expressing their beliefs. Academic spaces should foster open dialogue and critical thinking, yet the suppression of pro-Palestinian advocacy reflects a broader failure of leadership. Cal Poly Humboldt is supposed to be a hub of knowledge in this small, rural region, and depending on how it “moves forward” through this increasingly dark, political climate, shapes the culture of the greater community. If this university continues to remain “neutral” about genocide, we will see the ripple effects of that political stance.

So, I call upon students, faculty, and community members to demand concrete protections for Palestinian students. Political repression disguised as policy enforcement must be exposed and resisted. The university must take an unequivocal stance to safeguard the safety and well-being of Palestinian students on this campus—without compromise, without excuses. If institutions continue to allow targeted repression to go unchallenged, harm will escalate, disproportionately affecting the most marginalized members of our community.

The administration has a choice: to protect Palestinian students and uphold the principles of academic freedom or to remain complicit in the systemic suppression of voices calling for justice. The time for neutrality has passed.

Jamilla Hashem made the following statement:

To place myself in this conversation, my name is Jamilla Hashem, and I am a master’s of social work student here at Cal Poly. In line with the previous discussion of how the university plans to disseminate important information that needs addressing, I am here to speak aloud an issue that is very seriously interfering with many students' ability to be present on campus, especially given the pattern of anti Palestinian racism on this campus.

What we are witnessing today should terrify you. Mahmoud Khalil, a Palestinian Columbia University student and a green card holder, was abducted by ICE over the weekend. For speaking out against the genocide of the Palestinian people on campus. He broke no laws, yet

he was abducted on the grounds of deportation. Marco Rubio, the Secretary of State, personally intervened, claiming that Mahmoud's activism did not violate a law, instead, posed a potential threat to U.S. foreign policy interests. Since when is speaking truth to power a deportable offense?

This is part of a long, dark history of silencing dissent in this country. Malcolm X, Martin Luther King Jr., the Black Panthers members—murdered by the US for publicly speaking opinions contrary to US interests. The U.S. has a pattern of disappearing those it dislikes, of crushing voices that demand justice. And then we glorify and uplift those voices many years later when we should have taken action to protect them when it mattered most. And today, that pattern continues with Mahmoud Khalil and for Palestinians and countless others.

I don't like to draw these parallels but the following does drive my point: if this were to happen to a white Jewish student, would the response be the same? Would the outcry be as muted? Of course not. There would be immediate accusations of antisemitism, demands for accountability, and swift action. But when it comes to Palestinians, the silence is deafening. Violence against us is normalized, our suffering justified, and our voices and bodies erased.

If for example your sole concern is really to fight antisemitism and you do not care what happens to people of any other identity, you are literally paving the way for actual antisemites to gain more power by standing aside as Palestinians are kidnapped. By turning a blind eye to the abduction of Mahmoud Khalil, by allowing this to become a blueprint for targeting other student activists, you are complicit in a system that dehumanizes and destroys.

The university has made it glaringly clear that it does not care about its Palestinian students. I am saying this from 3 years of experience. We are punished for speaking out against the genocide of our people, especially for those of us who have family in Gaza, for daring to say that our people deserve to live. Your silence hurts us.

So I ask: What will you do? How will you stand up for your Palestinian students? What steps will you take to ensure that no more voices are silenced, no more lives upended? The time for silence is over. The time for action is now. Because if we do nothing, the abductions will not stop here

M/S (Aghasaleh/A. Thobaben) to amend the agenda to table item 12.

Motion to amend the agenda approved without dissent.

Kris read the attached statement from Students for a Democratic Society.

President Spagna spoke about the complaint filed by the Brandeis Institute to the Department of Education. The Department of Education would now decide whether to move forward with the complaint. He shared the two attached articles.

Resolution on Graduate Credit for Undergraduates (18-24/25-APC – March 11, 2025 – Second Reading)

Senator Evans gave an overview of the resolutions. Senators Lancaster, Benavides-Garb, and A. Thobaben spoke in favor of the resolution.

Senate vote to approve the *passed without dissent*.

Ayes: Aghasaleh, Banks, Benavides-Garb, Burkhalter, Cappuccio, Cruz, Deshazier, Evans, Fisher, Geck, Harmon, Holliday, Jannetta, Lancaster, Lepphaille, McGuire, McKindley, Miller, Pachmayer, Perris, Ramsier, Stelter, Sterner, Tello-Linares, A. Thobaben, M. Thobaben, Tillinghast, Virnoche, Woglom

Nays: none

Abstentions: Capps, Silvaggio

Resolution on Management Position Program Hiring Policy (19-24/25-CBC – March 11, 2025 – Second Reading)

Discussion Item: WASC Essay Review

The WASC essay is 70 pages and Senators are asked to read sections relevant to them and come to the next meeting with feedback. Of particular note are the sections about Integrity, Shared Governance, Responsible Stewardship of Funds, Academic Programming, and Student Support.

Information Item: Strategic Plan for Graduate Studies (Carmen Bustos-Works)

Carmen Bustos-Works gave the attached presentation.

Chair Woglom stated that a Sense of the Senate Resolution is in the works in support of this plan.

Professor Erin Kelly stated that something to be aware of when making a common formula for graduate programs is that there is a difference between research-based programs where students are working one-on-one with a faculty and cohort-based programs where students are primarily taking courses. She also stated that exceptions should exist to programs starting in CEEGE, because that's not appropriate to all programs. Carmen Bustos-Works and Provost Capps replied that the formula will not be a "one size fits all" model, but have multiple models. They also added that clarity will be provided over what can be run through CEEGE and what should be state-side.

M/S (Harmon/Lancaster) to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 PM

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

University Senate Written Reports, March 11, 2025

Standing Committees, Statewide Senators and Ex-officio Members

Academic Policies Committee

Submitted by Tyler Evans, APC Chair

Members: Julie Alderson (Faculty-Art), Frank Cappuccio (Faculty-Chem), Harrelle Deshazier (Coordinator-Umoja Center), Tyler Evans (APC Chair), Jacob Garcia (AS-External Affairs Rep.), Marissa O'Neill (Faculty-Social Work), Jenni Robinson Reisinger (Registrar), Mark Wicklund (Director-Assessment, AVP Academic Programs designee). *Vacant: One Faculty Rep; AS Student 2nd Rep*

Meeting Date(s): 3/6/25

Meeting Details: The committee finalized the Graduate Credit for Undergraduates policy revision and resolution for inclusion in the Senate agenda for second reading on March 11. Regarding the Course Numbering Policy, APC discussed ICC's recommendation to remove sections on X,Y,Z-suffixes and multi-semester courses, as these are no longer relevant. This policy will be revised for second reading at the April 1 Senate meeting. The committee began exploring an ABC/NC grade mode policy, with Tyler assigned to gather feedback from the Councils of Chairs across the three colleges and the ICC to determine whether APC should develop this policy.

Next meeting: 3/27/25

Appointments and Elections Committee

Submitted by Jorge Monteiro, AEC Chair

Members: Ara Pachmayer, JOrge Monteiro, Michihiro Sugata

Meeting Date(s): 03/09/2025

Meeting Details: The committee discussed the candidates and open seats collected after the first call for nominations. The committee tries to maintain continuity in the committees and give opportunities for junior faculty to get involved in service. The committee also discussed the remaining openings, the second call for nominations, and the next Chair.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Submitted by Rouhollah Aghasaleh, CBC Chair

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

Faculty Affairs Committee

Submitted by Jayne McGuire, FAC Chair

Members: Claire Till, Melanie Michalak, Kimberly Perris, Lisa Tremain, Anthony Silvaggio, Kimberly White.

Meeting Date(s): 2/26 and 3/5

Meeting Details: The committee continued finalizing the language on the updated Post-Tenure review policy. At the next meeting, the PTR update will be presented to the Senate for a first reading.

Integrated Curriculum Committee

Submitted by Sara Sterner, ICC Chair

Members: Ramesh Adhikari, Paul Michael Atienza, Morgan Barker, Cindy Bumgarner, Carmen Bustos-Works*, Christine Cass, Eduardo Cruz, William Fisher, Chris Guillen, Sara Hart, Alison Hodges, Jose Marin Jarrin, Jamie Jenson, JuEun Lee, Heather Madar, Bori Mazzag, Cindy Moyer, Justus Ortega, Meenal Rana, Jenni Robinson Reisinger, Joshua Smith, Sara Sterner (Chair), Anna Thaler, Melissa Tafoya, Lisa Tremain, Mark Wicklund | GEAR Chair: Sara Hart | CDC Chair: Lucy Kerhoulas | APC Chair: Tyler Evans | Student Representative: Tadd Sexton, AS Legislative Vice President | Curriculum and Catalog Specialist: Cameron Allison Govier | Curriculum and Assessment Analyst: Khristan Lamb

Meeting Date: 3/4/25

Meeting Details:

Agenda Item	Items to Note
A. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of February 18, 2025	

Agenda Item	Items to Note
B. Approval of Meeting Agenda for 03/04/25	
<p>C. Information Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MCC/Curriculog Template Update: The AY25/26 MCC Templates are currently being updated and proposals cannot be launched on MCC during that process. The curriculum team has projected a re-launch date of March 11. They recommend that proposers work on any attachments (syllabi, MAPs, etc.) while they are processing this update. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PLEASE encourage the proposers you know to come to Curriculum Office Hours, especially during this time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Every Friday during Green Days, 1:00-3:00 PM, zoom, or by appointment (email curriculum@humboldt.edu). ● 🌸 #CLEANPROPOSALS is our goal moving forward ○ ICC Curriculum Development Planning 2025 Please share and encourage completion of the form to gather information about current and planned curriculum development for this submission cycle. 	
D. Consent and Voting Action Calendar - Voting Items Discussion + Voting - No Items	
<p>E. Information Gathering and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This is an opportunity to gather more information before the SOC 108 proposal review. Which is related to PSYC 109 conditional approval reporting requested by the Senate (which will be scheduled at a future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In preparation for that review, and in conversation with Carmen, the ICC has requested more information about the Quantitative Reasoning designation of two proposals PSYC 109 and SOC 108. ● For reference: EO 1110: Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support pathways considerations ○ Role of guided enrollment ● The questions that would be helpful for us to hear more information about is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why does the department want to teach GE Math? ○ What is the benefit to students in your major? ○ How does it support General Education for the university? 	<p>We had a robust conversation around these topics. We are preparing for a larger conversation with the Sociology and Psychology Departments scheduled at an ICC meeting after spring break. Through this discussion ICC recognized a need for additional guidelines (which may eventually be proposed as policy) to be drafted around conditional approvals, courses related to EO 1110, and golden four courses. The ICC tasked the APP subcommittee to start on that drafting process, which is scheduled for our 3/11/25 meeting.</p>
<p>F. Reports & Updates - 5 Minutes Each:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AP/Curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meeting with MCC/Curriculog this week to see about ways to keep tabs on the proposal process ○ CDC (CDC Assignments 2024 2025) ○ GEAR (GEAR Tracking 24-25 + GEAR Agenda & Minutes 24-25) ○ APP (APP Assignments 2024 2025 + Notes Folder: AY 24/25) ○ APC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Draft Course Numbering Policy Revision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● First Reading at Senate on 2/25; Revisions in process 	

Agenda Item	Items to Note
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Set for Second Read at Senate on 3/11 ● Feedback Sharing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GE: XYZ 	
G. Academic Planning Operationalization and Organization (Camie)	Tabled
H. Catalog Updates (Camie and Khristan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cal Poly Humboldt Catalog <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Go to Pull down Menu, 25/26 DRAFT is at the bottom of the drop down list ○ Responder link: 2025-26 Online Catalog Draft Review for Programs, Courses and MAPs 	Tabled - But of Note for Campus Community; See also Provost Communications
Next Up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Subcommittee Meetings:, March 11, April 1, April 15, April 29, May 13 ● Full ICC Meetings: March 25, April 8, April 22, May 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PSYCH 109 Department Presentation (following up from Senate) tentatively slated for the 3/25 agenda 	

University Policies Committee

Submitted by Chris Harmon, UPC Chair

Members: Sulaina Banks, Tawny Fleming, Heather Honig, Kijung Ryu, Chris Harmon

Meeting Date(s): 03.05.25

Meeting Details: UPC continues to engage with the Policy on Polices, Procedures, and Guidelines. We have a working draft that was looked over and discussed at SenEx. Based on this initial look UPC will continue to work on the draft as it is not ready for a first reading. We hope to have a final policy approved by the end of the semester.

University Resources and Planning Committee

Meeting Date:

2/28/25

Submitted by

Jaime Lancaster, URPC Faculty Co-Chair.

Members

Jenn Capps, Jaime Lancaster, Deave Janetta, Ramesh Adhikari, Rosanna Overholser, Steven Margell, Nathaniel Cacciari - Roy, Eduardo Cruz, Celena Tello-Linares, Jeff Crane, Chrissy Holliday, Mike Fisher, Mark Johnson, Carla Wharton, Melanie Bettenhausen, Kevin Furtado, Patrick Orona, Sarah Long, Kendra Higgins

Agenda from the 2/28 Meeting

1. Welcome and purpose of today's planning meeting (Jenn)
2. Divisional reduction presentations
 - o Academic Affairs: 12:40pm - 1:20pm
 - o Enrollment Management and Student Success: 1:20pm - 1:50pm
 - o Athletics: 1:50 pm - 2:20 pm
3. Debrief - 2:20 pm - 3pm

Resources from Divisional Presentations

The slide decks for the Divisional Reduction Plans from Academic Affairs, Athletics, and Enrollment Management & Student Success are now posted to the [URPC website](#), as is a full recording of the divisional presentations.

Upcoming Business

Over the next few meetings, we will be drafting the budget recommendation for the 2025-2026 Academic Year. The university will be facing tough reduction decisions and the URPC is working hard to draft an informed, equitable and strategic recommendation.

The schedule of our meetings and events for Spring Semester 2025 is attached below:

URPC (SBS 405 & Zoom)	Topic & Timeline
Thursday, Feb 6, 11:30-1:00, SAC 131	Budget 101+ Budget Update Open Forum
Friday, February 21, 2 hour	Divisional Reduction Plan Presentations Admin Affairs, Advancement, President, Univ Wide
Friday, February 28, 2.5 hour	Divisional Reduction Plan Presentations Academic Affairs, Athletics, EMSS
Friday, March 7, 1.5 hour	WASC Steering Committee Visit Working Session on Budget Recommendation
Friday, March 14, 1.5 hour	WASC Steering Committee Visit Working Session On Final Draft, issue to Sen Ex
Tuesday, March 25	Sen Ex Review
Friday, March 28, 1 hour	Review Sen Ex Comments
Tuesday, April 1	Senate First Reading
Friday, April 4, 0-1.5 hour (depending on Senate comments)	Working Session on Senate Comments
Tuesday, April 15	Senate Second Reading

Friday, April 18	Reserve for any work on Senate comments
Friday, May 2	Reserve just in case

Academic Senate of the CSU

Submitted by Stephanie Burkhalter and Mary Virnoche, ASCSU Senators

The March plenary and standing committee meetings will take place at the Chancellor's office and virtually on March 12-March 14.

Associated Students

Submitted by Eduardo Cruz, AS President

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

California Faculty Association

Submitted by Anthony Silvaggio, CFA/Humboldt Chapter President

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Submitted by Rosamel Benavides-Garb, Campus Diversity Officer

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

Emeritus & Retired Faculty & Staff Association

Submitted by Marshelle Thobaben, Senate Representative for ERFSA

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: If you do not plan to submit a written report, please write "no report" in the meeting details space of this document, just so I know not to wait on your committee/division

You're invited to attend: **this Thursday, March 13, 2025**, Humboldt-ERFSA Luncheon Presentation at Baywood Golf and Country Club, 3600 Buttermilk Ln, Arcata , CA **Noon**: Special Guest: **Lisa E. Feldman**, Assistant United States Attorney, Cyber and Intellectual Property Crimes Section, U.S. Department of Justice, United States Attorney's Office, **is making a special trip to Cal Poly Humboldt to give a talk on "Cyber and Intellectual Property Crimes" for Humboldt-ERFSA members, the Cal Poly Community and Community members**. She will be speaking about the latest sophisticated cyber-crimes and how to avoid them. She will also discuss cases involving intellectual property crime.

Humboldt-ERFSA Small Grant Program for Tenure-track Faculty, Lecturers, and Staff: Applications are due by Thursday, March 27, 2025, at 3 p.m. PST.

<https://www.humboldt.edu/emeritus-and-retired-faculty/grant-program-tenure-track-faculty-lecturers-and-staff> Sponsored by the Humboldt-Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association, grant awards are intended to help tenured-track faculty, lecturers, and staff with less than 5 years employment at Cal Poly Humboldt seeking to expand professional qualifications.

Humboldt-ERFSA 2023 Grant Recipient will present: April 10, 2025: Sarah Lasley, Cal Poly Humboldt Art & Film Assistant Professor. **"No-budget Independent Filmmaking for Change"**. *Humboldt-ERFSA 2023 Grant Recipient* Sarah Lasley will discuss her latest no-budget film "Welcome to the Enclave", an experimental short that screened at 27 international film festivals, 4 of them Oscar-qualifying, won multiple awards, and was reviewed in major media publications. She will also present her upcoming film "Climate Control" which was created in close collaboration with her Cal Poly Humboldt Film students. Two of these students traveled to Germany with her, with the generous support of her 2023 ERFSA grant, to shoot the documentary portion of the film.

<https://now.humboldt.edu/news/slamdance-film-festival-gives-professor-lessons-share-students>,
<https://now.humboldt.edu/news/humboldt-film-tool-advocacy>

Labor Council

Submitted by Steve Tillinghast, Labor Council Delegate

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

Staff Council

Submitted by Senator Sulaina Banks

Members: Aylea Maxwell-Miller, Hallie Lepphaille, Janeth Serrano, Kathy Hudson, Noel

DiBenedetto, Sherry Beasley, Sulaina Banks

Meeting Date(s): 3/5/2025

Meeting Details:

A system-wide discussion is currently underway within the CSU System regarding the establishment of a CSU System-wide Staff Council Group, which includes advocacy for staff representation on the CSU Board of Trustees. Further updates will be provided in the coming weeks, including efforts to seek support from the University Senate.

Executive Cabinet Report to University Senate

Michael Spagna., President

Bethany Gilden, Chief of Staff

Jenn Capps, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs

Michael Fisher, VP for Administration & Finance and CFO

Chrissy Holliday, VP for Enrollment Management & Student Success

Mark Johnson, VP for University Advancement

Nick Pettit, Executive Director of Intercollegiate Athletics & Recreational Sports

Adrienne Colegrove-Raymond, Special Assistant to the President for Tribal & Community Engagement

Connie Stewart - Executive Director of Initiatives

COMMUNITY

Information Item - Renewed Relationship with Compass Credit Union

Compass Credit Union was formed in 1951 by a group of professors and employees of Humboldt State College, so it's fitting that we have a renewed relationship with the credit union for the benefit of faculty and staff. Compass wants to offer several benefits exclusively for Cal Poly Humboldt employees at no cost to our employees or to the university:

- \$325 cash bonus when you open a checking account
- .25% rate discount on consumer loans
- \$350 off mortgage closing costs
- \$75 member referral bonus

Next steps in this renewal process are to advertise the proposed benefits on campus and consider inclusion in the University's employee benefits package.

Current Events/News Topics:

In response to a [media inquiry](#) regarding two individuals who were arrested:

University Police can confirm that they were arrested for Vandalism, Conspiracy, and Masked While Committing a Crime. (To be clear, wearing a mask itself is not a crime or a violation of University policy, but it becomes both when doing so for the purposes of concealment of identity when violating the law.)

The University not only supports freedom of speech—regardless of the content of that speech—but we protect it and encourage all voices to be heard. The CSU's interim Time, Place, and Manner policy (TPM), which the University has shared widely with the campus community and explained in multiple announcements, exists to protect everyone's First Amendment rights while also protecting the right to learn and work in a safe environment.

Understanding that balance is key. We've seen a number of protests on campus with dozens of people in attendance since the beginning of the school year where participants have followed TPM policy. In the case of the Jan. 21 event, the two individuals were arrested for the alleged criminal activity on campus, not because they were engaged in free speech. Beyond that, we cannot comment further on an ongoing investigation.

In response to [news of a complaint submitted](#) to the Office of Civil Rights:

Cal Poly Humboldt is reviewing the federal complaint and will, of course, fully cooperate with the Office of Civil Rights in any investigation.

Hatred or discrimination in any form, including anti-semitism, is contrary to our core

values. The University unequivocally condemns all acts of hatred, bigotry, and violence, and we are committed to keeping safe our students, staff, and faculty of all religions. We will continue to work together to foster a learning and working environment where we can all feel safe, included, and respected.

ACADEMICS

Early Academic Feedback for Student Athletes

It's that time of the semester again! Starting today, faculty will begin receiving requests checking in on the academic progress of any student athletes enrolled in their classes. Please do respond with this information as it's a critically important part of our strategy to support student athletes academically, and it is key to ensuring that they remain eligible to participate with their teams and represent Cal Poly Humboldt in their sport. We continue to refine the process to make it as easy as possible for faculty to respond.

Call for Feedback - WSCUC 2025 Accreditation DRAFT Essays

Cal Poly Humboldt's [Accreditation Steering Committee](#) has prepared four essay **DRAFTS** for the university's WSCUC 2025 accreditation institutional report, and the committee is requesting collegial feedback from the entire campus community.

These are first drafts, and thus every piece of feedback will offer a valuable opportunity to revise and improve the story our campus is telling. **Feedback forms will remain open until April 11, 2025**, and we will share what we heard at the University Senate before the end of the spring semester

The four essays correspond to WSCUC's four accreditation standards:

1. Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity
2. Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success
3. Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures
4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement

Through these essays, we endeavor to tell the story of Cal Poly Humboldt —where we are succeeding, where we are challenged, and where we want to go. After reading the final version of this report next fall and visiting campus the following spring, an evaluation team will conclude the process by making recommendations to WSCUC leadership, including how long to extend our accreditation and whether or not to schedule any interim visits or required reporting.

At the [Submit Comments](#) page on the university's accreditation website, you will find links to the **DRAFT** essays, each of which includes a link to submit feedback.

ENROLLMENT

Spring Enrollment - VP Holliday's [spring enrollment message to campus](#) last week celebrated the continued enrollment growth we experienced this spring, highlighted strategic lessons from this cycle, and called for campus action in support of our fall enrollment growth efforts.

Enrollment Target Progress - The March 4 [Enrollment Target Progress report](#) provides insight into our fall enrollment cycle to date. Some highlights:

- Applications are trending slightly behind last year, but are in line with the targets set for this cycle, given the anticipated boost in yield (for example, we are at 98% of target for FTUG apps) and should meet app volume targets during the remainder of the cycle.
- We have surpassed the annual Admit target for FTUG and are pacing well for other student types.
- Deposits are trending 11% ahead of this time last year, with most of the growth coming from UD Transfer, which is 19% higher than this time last year. In total, 1,050 new students have deposited for fall, 102 more than last year at this time. This number is extremely volatile right now - in recent weeks, it has been over 20% higher YTD, with significant daily variations.
- Significant work is underway (details in the report) to continue to drive both application volume and deposits/yield, as we drive towards our headcount goal of 6,347 for fall.

Hey Cal Poly Humboldt!

Hope all y'all are well.

My report for this week is an invitation to a collaborative writing assignment. Briefly, I was recently talking to a colleague in an administrative role about our efforts to pursue policy that set guardrails to define and preserve expectations for democratic norms in anticipation of our incoming University President. The colleague suggested that in focusing on constraining the work of someone we have yet to meet, I was solely defining our parameters for their performance by what we didn't want them to do. While I remain committed to our slate of legislation underway, and have a wishlist for other things I would hope we can accomplish, I take their point.

They proposed that another tact we might consider, in tandem with our resolutions, is an open letter to the eventually hired president. She advised that we collaboratively write a sort of "vision statement" that describes who we are, who we aspire to be, and what kind of relationship we hope to foster and maintain with the person in their role.

To this end, I'd like to propose that we collaborate on a document that we would provide to the incoming president, through which we would help to describe a number of things about ourselves. For instance:

- What are our expectations in relation to shared governance?
- What are we excited about in relation to our polytechnic transition? What aspects of the change are still scary or discomfiting for us?
- How do we expect to be engaged in the budget processes/announced reductions underway? What does transparency regarding resource distribution look like to us?
- How can we collaboratively maintain and support a long history of activism on campus?

These are just a couple of the ideas we can cover and convey, and I am just one (deeply fallible) person, so please, help me to think about how we can greet and collaboratively guide our new colleague and leader.

We are heading into (and maybe already have arrived at) deeply weird times in higher education, and we need to develop a coalition of willing collaborators to protect and steward this educational space that means so much to so many.

jim

DATE: March 5, 2025

TO: James Richards, Manager for Chartwells
Todd Larsen, Senior Director of Enterprise Services

FROM: Concerned Faculty and Staff at Cal Poly Humboldt

SUBJECT: Bottled Water on Campus

Cc: President Spagna
Provost Capps
Morgan King

We are writing to express our concern regarding the current sales of Proud Source spring water in metal bottles on campus, which we believe undermines the spirit and intention of Humboldt's pioneering bottled water initiative established in 2011. Adding insult to injury, the university is not only selling this bottled water but actively promoting it with signage in multiple campus locations including the Library, the Depot, and the Marketplace.

As you may recall, Cal Poly Humboldt made a landmark environmental commitment in Fall 2011 when it became the first public university in California and just the third public university in the nation to phase out the sale of plastic water bottles on campus. This decision was driven by strong student advocacy through the "Take Back the Tap" initiative and represented our campus community's deep commitment to sustainability and environmental stewardship.

The original decision eliminated approximately 50,000-80,000 plastic water bottles per year from our waste stream. Student calculations at the time showed that the production, transportation, storage, and disposal of 80,000 plastic water bottles required about 43 barrels of oil and released over 35,000 pounds of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. This was a significant environmental achievement that reflected our university's values. See [this article](#).

However, the current sales of Proud Source spring water in metal containers appears to be circumventing the spirit of this policy by simply changing the container material while continuing many of the same environmentally problematic practices:

1. The water is being shipped from Idaho, creating a substantial carbon footprint through transportation.
2. The production of metal containers, while different from plastic, still requires significant energy and resource consumption.
3. The practice continues to commercialize water, a basic human need, when high-quality alternatives are readily available (tap water from Baduwa't).

The prominent promotional signage for bottled water across campus locations directly contradicts the educational messaging that was meant to accompany the original ban.

Despite claims of recyclability, it's important to note that a significant percentage of recyclable containers, including metal ones, actually end up in landfills. According to data from the

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), only about 34.9% of aluminum containers and packaging were recycled in the United States (EPA, "Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2018 Fact Sheet," 2020). More recent data from the Aluminum Association and Can Manufacturers Institute shows that while the situation has marginally improved, only 43% of aluminum cans shipped in the United States in 2023 were ultimately recycled—with recycling rates at their lowest point in decades (Aluminum Association, "Amid Recycling Rate Decline, Aluminum Beverage Can Remains Most Recycled Drinks Package," December 5, 2024). Simply switching from plastic to metal does not solve the fundamental waste problem.



Humboldt County is fortunate to have exceptional tap water quality provided by the Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District. Our local water consistently meets or exceeds all state and federal drinking water standards and originates from the Baduwa't River watershed. The district maintains rigorous testing protocols to ensure safety and quality. When students led the original bottled water ban initiative, the high quality of our local water was a key factor in their advocacy.

The original decision to ban bottled water was based on several principles:

- Environmental sustainability and reducing waste
- Promoting access to affordable drinking water as a human right

- Reducing fossil fuel consumption associated with bottled water
- Supporting public water infrastructure
- Taking a stand against the commodification of natural resources

We respectfully request that the university administration review the current practice of selling bottled water in metal containers and consider extending the ban to include all forms of commercially bottled water, regardless of container type. This would truly honor the environmental commitment made in 2011 and the student activism that drove that change.

The campus has already invested in water bottle refill stations and "Hydration Stations" to provide chilled, filtered water across campus. However, it appears that some of the hydration stations on campus are currently broken and not being maintained. This lack of maintenance directly contributes to the problem by forcing community members to purchase bottled water when the free, sustainable alternative is unavailable.

We strongly urge the university to prioritize the maintenance and repair of existing hydration stations as an immediate action item. Additionally, continuing to expand this infrastructure would better serve our community while staying true to our environmental values.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter. We believe that by addressing this issue, Humboldt can once again demonstrate leadership in campus sustainability.

With hope for change,

Eileen Cashman, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Barbara Clucas, Department of Wildlife

Jo Archibald, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Charles Chamberlin, Emeritus Professor, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Erin Kelly, Department of Forestry, Fire, and Rangeland Management

Tess Weathers, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Justin Luong, Department of Forestry, Fire and Rangeland Management

Monty Mola, Department of Physics & Astronomy

Kerry Byrne, Environmental Science & Management, former co-chair, Humboldt Advisory Committee on Sustainability

Harper Lacey, Humboldt Advisory Committee on Sustainability, Green Campus Team Lead

Bonnie Ludka, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Matt Hurst, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

Tyler Evans, Department of Mathematics

Qualla Ketchum, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Margaret Lang, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Lonny Grafman, School of Engineering

Claire Till, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

Pascal Biwole, School of Engineering, Energy Systems Engineering

Kjirsten Wayman, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

Alison Hodges, Academic Advising Center

Peter Alstone, School of Engineering

Chris Harmon, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

Brandon Wilcox, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

Alison O'Dowd, Department of Environmental Science & Management

Morgan Barker, Library

Elizabeth A. Eschenbach, School of Engineering, Environmental Resources Engineering

Jennifer Kalt, Department of Environmental Science & Management

Jacky Baughman, Department of Geology

Laura Levy, Department of Geology

Jeff Dunk, Department of Environmental Science & Management

Jonae Calderon, CNRS Dean's Office

Michelle Selvans, Department of Geology

Cristina Tusei, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Jenn Tarlton, Department of Environmental Science & Management

Jennifer Marlow, Department of Environmental Science & Management

Roxann Schroeder, Biological Sciences, ESM, and Faculty Accessibility Fellow

Craig Benson, Department of Environmental Science & Management

Chrissy Backman, School of Engineering

Meeting Date: 03.10.25

Meeting Attendees: Eileen Cashman, Katie Koscielak, Kyle McEdward, Todd Larsen (note, James Richard from Chartwells, did not show up to the meeting).

Action Items discussed:

1. Remove all bottled water promotions/marketing from retail outlets (Depot, Library, CCMP, Cupboard)
2. Reduce our water bottle inventory to one vendor, perhaps Mountain Valley due to it being in glass containers. Or at least only 1 aluminum vendor. (*We will sell down our inventory on hand to just one vendor*)
3. Find a supplier to provide us with empty, refillable screw-top aluminum bottles that we can sell for a low price/low markup to customers, including all campus guests, and direct them to our water sources at soda fountains and water refill stations.
 1. Sell the refillable with screw-top empty aluminum bottles at retail outlets and all concessions (where we have water refill stations available—we know Redwood Bowl has one).
4. Reduce shelf space to minimal in the coolers to only have one brand chosen for campus and not promote it.
 1. Marketing promo message idea: at bottled water locations in outlets let customers know we sell reusable aluminum water containers (*once sourced*) that can be filled up at the soda fountain water tap or refill stations around campus.
5. We need to chat with catering to discourage bottled water use. We should all be setting an example in our roles when we can.
6. We need to continue to replace plastic bottled beverages with aluminum or glass at every opportunity available. Perhaps we stop carrying some of the drinks, ie: vitamin, energy, if there's an aluminum or glass alternative brand to them.
 1. We've had great success reducing the # of plastic bottle items in our vending machines and retail on campus which will also help us earn a plastic reduction certification for our campus. We'll continue to find alternate solutions to improve further.

Dear Chair, Senators, and Campus Community Members:

Good afternoon,

I am speaking today to call attention to the alarming and ongoing pattern of student criminalization at Cal Poly Humboldt. Last Tuesday, Redheaded Blackbelt reported two recent arrests of student protestors by University Police in January. The two students were arrested in connection with their alleged participation in the “F Trump” protesting activities the day following President Trump’s inauguration. The recommended criminal charges are “felony conspiracy to commit a crime, vandalism, and unlawful use of a mask”. On the same day, President Trump posted that “American students will be permanently expelled or, depending on the crime, arrested. NO MASKS!”

This is disappointing that we should learn about this through a news article two months after the event. This does not align with our values of collegiality and shared governance. Moreover, this disturbing trend of law enforcement being used to silence dissent and suppress student voices on our campus in the new political climate of the country is both disheartening and dangerous. According to a press release, in the days leading up to the arrests, UPD engaged in surveillance tactics—appearing outside a local house at night, shining flashlights into parked cars, and even knowingly deadnaming a trans student. In another instance, an Arcata Police cruiser and a Humboldt County Sheriff’s vehicle were seen staking out a street corner near the same residence, later tailing a student home. These are intimidation tactics, plain and simple.

This is not the first time UPD has been involved in the aggressive targeting of students. Let's not forget the mass arrests and violence in April 2024, when dozens of students were arrested for protesting—and what was the result? Bad publicity and shame for Cal Poly Humboldt and eventually every single one of those police reports was ultimately rejected by the District Attorney. If the cases didn't hold up, what does that say about the justification for those arrests in the first place? And why are we continuing down this same road of criminalization?

An independent review conducted by OIR Group, an entity that serves as the City of Eureka's Independent Police Auditor in July 2024 characterized the University Police Department as suffering from a "Lack of Effective Planning and Command" and described their actions as "Regrettably Deficient." When a law enforcement agency is publicly called out for incompetence, it should be a wake-up call, yet we see no meaningful reform, no structural changes—just more of the same failed tactics. Why aren't we learning from the past? Why do we continue to escalate tensions instead of de-escalating them?

Let's be very clear: Our students are not criminals. Yes, they may make mistakes, as all young people do, but they are not violent, they are not dangerous, and they are not threats to this campus. What they are is passionate, engaged, and deeply frustrated that they are being told—by their deans, by administrators—that they cannot even discuss oppression in their classrooms. Instead of being heard, they are being watched. Instead of being engaged, they are being arrested.

This ongoing pattern of student criminalization must stop. That is why I am calling on this body to dissolve the inactive Campus Safety and Policing Committee and form an independent oversight committee composed of students, faculty, and staff to hold UPD accountable for its actions.

This would not be without precedent. In 2024, a Humboldt County Grand Jury recommended the formation of a Citizen's Oversight Committee named "Sheriff's Advisory Council" to advise on "process and procedure" and "building connections in the community," for the Sheriff's Office, recognizing the need for transparency, community trust, and meaningful oversight.

We must do the same for UPD. According to the UPD website, the Campus Safety and Policing Committee has been inactive (last minutes from 2022) and the membership has not been updated. It is also evident that the Committee does not report to the shared governance.

At its core, a university should be a space for learning, for questioning, for pushing boundaries—not for surveillance, intimidation, and fear. If our own police department is actively disrupting the educational mission of this institution, then it is time to rethink the role they play on this campus. It is time to stop criminalizing our students and start engaging with them.

The pressure created by new federal government actions, executive orders, and ongoing attacks on civil rights presents a moment of reckoning—an opportunity for justice-seeking communities and campus leaders who claim allegiance to freedom and justice to stand out, take a side, and finally materialize the values we so often speak about. This is not the time for silence, neutrality, or empty rhetoric; it is time for meaningful action.

Thank you.

<https://lostcoastoutpost.com/loco-media/loco-media/blog/post/39883/FINAL - OIR Group Review of Incident at Cal Poly Humboldt.pdf>

<https://lostcoastoutpost.com/2024/jul/26/independent-review-finds-lack-effective-planning-a/>

<https://kymkemp.com/2025/03/04/student-activists-assert-cal-poly-university-police-are-suppressing-dissent-following-arrests/>

<https://kymkemp.com/2024/11/06/sheriffs-advisory-council-will-consider-humboldt-police-oversight/>

March 10, 2025

The Attempt to Destroy Columbia

The Trump administration has the symbolic fight it wants, Brian Rosenberg writes.

By [Brian Rosenberg](#)



We-Ge/iStock Unreleased/Getty Images

The sheer volume of the vindictiveness and lawlessness flowing daily from the Trump administration makes it difficult to focus on any one transgression. Nevertheless, we should take special note of the extraordinary spectacle of the federal government trying aggressively to destroy Columbia, a major American university. Almost any sentence about Trump can begin with the words “never before,” but still: Never before has anything like this happened in the history of the republic.

After Trump and others intimated for some time that the government planned to go after Columbia, the Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, and Education, along with the General Services Administration, announced on Friday the “immediate cancellation” of \$400 million in grants to and contracts with the university. Like most announcements coming from the administration, this one was vague, probably unlawful and ominously threatening, hinting at further, even larger reductions in funding to follow. Cuts of the magnitude hinted at in the announcement would at least cripple the university and potentially render it unable to operate in anything like its current form.

The purported reason given for this move is “the school’s continued inaction in the face of persistent harassment of Jewish students.” Noteworthy even among the outrages of recent months has been the sudden care for Jews professed by people wholly comfortable with white supremacists and neo-Nazis but shocked beyond words by the actions of campus protesters. Antisemitism is real, but it is not limited to higher education and not something about which Donald Trump and the people around him genuinely care. It exists at Columbia; it exists across the country and around the world; it exists in Congress and the White House. As, I should add, do racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia and other ingrained biases.

Most Popular

Education Department to reduce staff by nearly half

Education Dept. warns 60 colleges under investigations

How standardized tests became part of the DEI debate

Any attempt to make sense of the Trump administration's Javert-like pursuit of Columbia needs to begin with the recognition that it is not, in any real sense, about Columbia. Neither is it about antisemitism or free speech. It is not even at its root about education.

It is, rather, about the exercise of raw power to intimidate, enforce obedience and silence dissent. This is how authoritarian regimes work and—as a template for the federal government's approach to journalism, business and pretty much every sphere of life—it should matter even to those who are indifferent to the fate of Columbia or higher education.

Like many of the actions and proposed policies of the current administration, the attack on Columbia is the product of a group of institutes—American Enterprise, Manhattan, Claremont—that have over the past decade moved from being homes for conservative intellectuals to being sites for something much more radical and disruptive. Claremont, for instance, transitioned from being what one of its former fellows described as a “quirky intellectual outfit” to “one of the main intellectual architects of trying to overthrow the republic.” What was started by students of philosopher Henry Jaffa, a follower of Leo Strauss, became the home of John Eastman, the legal mind behind “stop the steal.”

The foundation for the targeting of Columbia and indeed the blueprint for the administration's approach to higher education can be found in a piece written this past December by Max Eden, senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, entitled “A Comprehensive Guide to Overhauling Higher Education.” Linda McMahon may be the secretary of education, but people like Eden and Christopher Rufo—who turned the letters “DEI” into a political cudgel with which to beat progressives—are the actual architects of higher education policy in the United States.

Rufo, a deeply dangerous figure who combines political adeptness with a ruthless passion to destroy those he perceives as enemies, advocated in a recent interview for policies that “would mean bankruptcy for many universities ... And they should do it. They should

actually follow through on the threat in at least one symbolic fight that will then change the incentives everywhere and send people scrambling to comply with the law.”

That symbolic fight is with Columbia.

It appears that the ideas floated by thinkers like Eden and Rufo have been adopted pretty much wholesale by the Trump administration. People have wondered why the proposed cap on indirect costs for National Institutes of Health grants is 15 percent: That is the number that Eden suggests. The Dear Colleague letter that goes far beyond any court ruling in declaring diversity work illegal? Eden and Rufo got there first.

Eden again: “The most interesting actions, though, wouldn’t require Congress. To scare universities straight, McMahon should start by taking a prize scalp. She should simply destroy Columbia University.”

Let’s pause for a moment. Full disclosure: Long ago I received my Ph.D. from Columbia, though it has not in the years since been an institution to which I have been in any way connected. It is among the oldest universities in the country, founded as King’s College in 1754. It enrolls more than 35,000 students—a tiny fraction of whom protested against the war in Gaza—and employs about 20,000 people. It operates law and medical schools, among others, and is affiliated with New York–Presbyterian Medical Center. It is an indispensable part of the business and health-care ecosystems in upper Manhattan.

So: Let’s destroy it to prove that we can.

Editors' Picks

Trump Order Could Overhaul PSLF Program

Contract Cuts at Columbia Raise Concerns

What Republican Voters Want for Higher Ed

To date the administration has not taken up another of Eden's recommendations—drumming up reasons to indict its former president, Lee Bollinger—though no doubt some are both tempted and amused by his observation that “college presidents could learn a valuable lesson from the sight of him in an orange jumpsuit.” Indeed. These are not people interested in having any sort of serious discussion about education policy.

Columbia is rendered especially attractive as a target because it is in New York, a city whose power brokers have long viewed Trump with contempt and over which, therefore, he wants to exercise as much power as possible. Killing Columbia is another version of killing congestion pricing in Manhattan, which has to date been a remarkable success and which, therefore, Trump is attempting to end. As he put it on Truth Social, “Long Live the King!”

So far, Columbia has remained relatively quiet and compliant in response to the governmental assault, though this might change as the assault intensifies and the battle—like the battles over firing federal workers and cutting foreign aid and reneging on contracts and forbidding words like “diversity” and “gay”—plays out in the courts.

Columbia's interim president, Katrina Armstrong, said in a statement that the university is “committed to working with the federal government to address their legitimate concerns,” the key word in that sentence, of course, being “legitimate.” Sooner rather than later, I hope, the university's leadership will recognize that the goal of these actions is not compliance but destruction and plan accordingly. Meanwhile, other institutions and organizations, inside and outside higher education, might want to think carefully about their stance of self-protective silence in the face of a government that covets the

unchecked power of authoritarianism. Any university, any business, any news organization, could be the next Columbia in the ongoing quest to scare us all straight.

Brian Rosenberg is president emeritus of Macalester College, a visiting professor at Harvard Graduate School of Education and author of [Whatever It Is, I'm Against It: Resistance to Change in Higher Education](#) (Harvard Education Press, 2023).

Written By

Brian Rosenberg

Copyright © 2025 Inside Higher Ed All rights reserved. |



Op-Ed

A Comprehensive Guide to Overhauling Higher Education

By Max Eden

Washington Examiner

December 06, 2024

Five years ago, President [Donald Trump](#)'s education secretary, Betsy DeVos, stood all but alone against the Democratic drive for student loan forgiveness. The conventional wisdom at the time was that free-college-for-all was a sure-fire winning issue for the Democrats. Why wouldn't Trump's [education](#) secretary simply allow a polite, quiet surrender?

How the times have changed. America has spent the past four years under an [administration](#) that governed according to university-created woke ideology. In the past year alone, college presidents kowtowed to pro-genocidal campus quad glampers. All of this has totally flipped Republicans, and so many people in general, against our universities. No one is wondering whether Trump's new education secretary nominee, Linda McMahon, will politely and quietly surrender to the college cartel. Everyone instead is wondering how the former World Wrestling Entertainment executive will give them the body slamming they deserve.

There are so many moves that McMahon could pull to rein in America's universities. Here are just a few.

Cutting Off Federal Funding

First, let's start with what Congress could do to higher education finance. Trump vowed on the campaign trail to raise taxes on Ivy League university endowments. If you or I were lucky enough to make \$500,000 a year, we'd pay a federal tax rate of 37%. Yet universities pulling in hundreds of millions of dollars a year from their multibillion-dollar endowments pay 1.4%. Universities should pay their fair share — the same share everyone else pays.

Similarly, universities get an insanely cushy deal on research grants from the federal government. Research grants tend to cover both the direct costs of the research project and "indirect" costs, which are supposed to cover overhead expenses but are actually used as a slush fund for diversity, equity, and inclusion and who knows what else.

Congress used to cap this slush-fund share at 8%. Billionaire foundations tend to cap them at 15%. As the Heritage Foundation's Jay Greene has documented, right now, for every dollar colleges can get for research, they get about another 60 cents for a slush fund account. The taxpayer shouldn't get a worse deal on research grants than the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Capping overhead costs at 15% would save billions a year.

The most interesting actions, though, wouldn't require Congress. To scare universities straight, McMahon should start by taking a prize scalp. She should simply destroy Columbia University.

Columbia was, perhaps, the worst offender in indulging the pro-Hamas campus radicals. The Education Department's Office for Civil Rights should initiate a compliance review of every single decision Columbia made. To do that, OCR would need the identities of every single foreign student who supported the protests, actions the Trump administration could deem material support of a terrorist organization. Border czar Tom Homan could

then revoke every single one of the foreign protesting students' visas.

If Columbia doesn't cooperate, McMahon could cut off its research grant funding.

If they do cooperate, she'll surely find the evidence necessary to cut off its Title IV funding. That would mean that Columbia would become ineligible to receive federal research grants and subsidized student loans, which would jeopardize nearly half of its revenue.

Removing Foreign Money from Higher Education

Speaking of foreign influence, McMahon could also pick up where DeVos left off in scouring the finances of Columbia University for every single cent of unreported foreign donations, and levy the maximum penalty for every dollar on the university.

And while the Trump administration is looking into Columbia, the Justice Department should thoroughly explore indicting former Columbia President Lee Bollinger for fraud if he, through commission or omission, played a role in Columbia's submission of inaccurate data to *US News and World Report*. Bollinger submitted the data to boost Columbia's rank in the report. Once the true data were reported, Columbia's rank fell from second to 18th.

College presidents regard Bollinger as perhaps the greatest college leader of the 21st century. He should be regarded as the worst. Perhaps the college presidents could learn a valuable lesson from the sight of him in an orange jumpsuit.

The second target should be the University of California, Los Angeles. UCLA's pro-Hamas mob physically took over the campus, calling for the genocide of Jews while physically barring them from entering the quad. When UCLA was sued, it argued in court that it had no duty to prevent the pro-Hamas mob from physically excluding Jews. It would be fascinating to find out if UCLA President Michael Drake holds that position as a consistent institutional standard, or whether it reflects illegal discrimination.

The Education Department's Office of Civil Rights could do a compliance review seeking an answer to one simple question: If a mob of white supremacists took over the quad, called for the lynching of black students, and physically barred black students from walking freely, would Drake have directed his lawyers to insist that this was fine and he had no duty to stop it?

If Drake were willing to attest, under oath, that he would have permitted white supremacists free rein, then that would be one thing. If he wouldn't be, then, clearly, his institution treated anti-Jewish racism differently than it would have treated antiblack racism. If UCLA wanted to keep its federal funding, it could settle that investigation by firing Drake.

That shouldn't be all for UCLA, though. As the *Washington Free Beacon* has documented, UCLA prioritizes race over merit in medical school admissions. This could literally cost untold lives. Allowing UCLA to continue to govern admissions to its medical school is a public health hazard. It should no longer be permitted to make its own admissions decisions.

Enforcing *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*

This brings us to the Supreme Court's *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard* decision banning affirmative action, which Trump has promised to implement to the hilt. The first step should be forcing Harvard University to comply. Right after the decision was issued, Harvard all but publicly vowed to do everything in its power to violate the spirit of the Supreme Court's ruling and the 14th Amendment on which it was based.

McMahon should initiate a never-ending compliance review to ensure that Harvard follows the law. She should assign Office of Civil Rights employees to the Harvard admissions office and direct the university to hold no admissions meeting without their physical presence. The Office of Civil Rights should be copied on every email correspondence, and Harvard should be forced to provide a written rationale for every admissions decision to ensure nondiscrimination.

If OCR finds a shred of evidence of racial discrimination, Harvard should lose its Title IV funds. If Harvard wants this monitoring to end, it can voluntarily agree to relinquish all discretion over its admissions process. It can select students by a weighted lottery based on standardized test scores and grade point averages. After all, Harvard swore that if it couldn't discriminate based on race, the "diversity" of its class would plummet. It didn't. Either Harvard misled the Supreme Court or it's violating the law. Either way, it has lost the privilege of picking its own students.

And so many other universities have essentially forfeited the privilege of picking their own professors. So-called DEI statements have become ubiquitous in faculty hiring and promotion. These are, facially, ideological litmus tests. They are also, nearly as obviously, tools used to discriminate against white faculty applications. Institutions such as the University of Washington and the University of Illinois Chicago have been explicit about discriminating against white faculty members. This is illegal under Title VII.

What can the Trump administration do?

Well, the Biden administration notoriously forced the city of Durham, North Carolina, to settle on a racial discrimination claim because it tested prospective firefighters on whether they knew anything about firefighting. More black applicants failed and weren't hired. The Biden administration declared this was illegal racial discrimination and forced Durham to pay nearly \$1 million in back wages and hire 16 firefighters who couldn't pass the test. This was, of course, an absurd legal abomination.

But it would be a reasonable and just application of federal civil rights law to do the exact same thing to universities. DEI statements have no logical or rational connection to job performance and are straightforward tools for racial discrimination. The University of Washington and UIC should be forced to pay back wages to every single white applicant they declined to hire over a DEI statement and hire as many as would still like to work there.

It's not like those two universities are unique in any regard other than that they were caught red-handed by journalists. The Trump administration wouldn't have time to investigate and sanction every college that discriminated against white faculty members. However, it could demand all documents and correspondence on hiring in every university faculty department that implemented DEI statements. It could then train an artificial intelligence model to sort through the records and flag likely discrimination. Trump staffers could then send internal, FOIA-able correspondence regarding hot spots of likely discrimination.

This would effectively subsidize discovery for civil litigation on employment discrimination. Enterprising trial attorneys could team up with starving adjunct professors, and universities could be liable for hundreds of millions of dollars in settlement fees. That would teach them a painful lesson: Hiring based on race rather than academic merit comes at a very high cost.

How Trump can Destroy DEI on Campus

If Trump wants to fulfill his promise to totally dismantle the power of radical Marxists on campus, he can implement *Students v. Harvard* in a way nearly no one appears to have anticipated: He can use it to totally destroy DEI on campus. Here's how.

Take a look at that decision and "control-F" for "stereotyp[ing]." You'll find 43 mentions of how the government can't engage in that practice or with DEI's odious "assumption that 'members of the same racial group ... think alike.'" DEI is literally nothing except for institutional stereotyping. Whiteness, blackness, "white privilege," "antiblackness" — it's all stereotyping. DEI violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment when stereotyping is institutionalized and promoted in an educational institution receiving federal funding — or so the Trump administration should hold and enforce.

This would do several amazing things.

First, it would force colleges to disband their DEI apparatuses. To be sure, many colleges would just try to do the same things under

a different label. But the label isn't the legal question — the stereotyping is. You can't do DEI without stereotyping, so if you can't do stereotyping, you can't do DEI.

Second, McMahon could also prohibit colleges from requiring DEI coursework for graduation. As Speech First has documented, two-thirds of colleges require students to take DEI-infused courses to graduate. To do well in these courses, students must parrot the stereotyping tenets of DEI.

To assure compliance with the 14th Amendment, McMahon could task accreditors with ensuring that students aren't forced to take DEI-infused courses to graduate. This would, essentially, take Florida's policy of removing DEI from general education requirements national. When students aren't forced to take these courses, far fewer will, and the radical Marxists will lose students and influence.

Third, almost all college orientation programs that include DEI violate the Constitution. About 90% of college orientation programs promote DEI, whereas only about one-third even mention free speech. The OCR could initiate a slew of compliance reviews, forcing colleges to cut their DEI-infused orientation programs and replace them with programming on the First Amendment and the Constitution.

McMahon could also champion college students' First Amendment rights by forcing colleges to dismantle their so-called "Bias Reporting Systems." More than half of colleges encourage students to snitch on each other for saying something "biased," and students suspected of wrong speak are then hauled in front of a campus tribunal of DEI administrators.

Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas declared that the Supreme Court should have taken up the question of whether these systems violate students' First Amendment rights last term. They obviously do, and the Trump administration should not wait for the Supreme Court to say so. McMahon should simply force

colleges to disband these systems by threatening to withhold money unless they do.

McMahon can not only make campus speech free again — she can make college fun again. Who could forget the iconic photo of the University of North Carolina fraternity brothers defending the flag from pro-Hamas protesters? Yet, fraternities have come under sustained legal and administrative assault from their universities. College administrators want to destroy every vestige of community camaraderie and replace it with the faux “inclusion” offered by DEI departments.

This has been particularly apparent at Stanford University, which confiscated property from campus fraternities. McMahon should initiate an investigation of Stanford’s unconstitutional DEI administrative bureaucracy and threaten to withhold Title IV and research grant funding until it returns the property it expropriated from fraternities.

Shaking Up College Accreditation

Back to more dry matters, Trump has called college accreditation his “secret weapon.” Accreditors serve as gatekeepers for federal funds. They serve no particularly useful function in terms of academic quality control but have effectively prevented new colleges from launching and have imposed DEI on existing colleges.

Trump suggested he would simply fire all the existing accreditors. That could prove prohibitively difficult. But Trump could easily decimate the worst of them: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Florida recently sued the Biden administration, claiming the accreditation system was unconstitutional because it effectively gives the power of the purse to a nongovernment actor. More states under the SACS could join the case, and then the Trump administration could settle it by expediting approval for any college under the SACS to join another accreditor. The SACS

would fold, and other existing accreditors would be scared straight.

Trump could also easily expedite the approval of additional accreditors. These accreditors could provide a much more streamlined, cost-effective, outcomes-oriented paradigm than the existing set. They could also specialize in helping to launch new colleges, such as the University of Austin, and even newer ones that no one has dreamed up yet. Musk University? Thiel Technical College?

A New Kind of Public College

What about the American Academy?

Experts laughed when Trump proposed launching a new, federally backed college. But former President George Washington wanted one.

Moreover, the best argument against inserting a “public option” into a marketplace is that it will unfairly crowd out existing competitors. That’s exactly what we should want to happen in the higher education market.

At absolute minimum, the American Academy could offer a two-year, high-quality core curriculum, and sympathetic states could mandate their flagship universities accept transfer credit. The Universities of Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and the like could Hoover up students who might otherwise have spent far bigger bucks on a private university with a similar prestige level. Think about the choice families would face: Spend \$250,000 to get a degree from George Washington University, or take two years of courses for free at the American Academy and finish up at the University of Florida at an overall sticker cost of \$13,000.

How many students will pay \$237,000 more for zero status or economic value-add? Sorry, professors, what you’re sure to deride as Trump University could actually prove an existential threat to your cartel.

These are just some ideas, and they're just mine. And, of course, there's far more the next Trump Education Department should and can do — it just wouldn't be prudent to broadcast those ideas ahead of time, lest universities take defensive measures.

I don't know what McMahon's team is planning, but I think it's safe for colleges to plan on facing an administration that will govern on what it campaigned on. Promises made, promises kept. Hopefully all of the above — and more.



Max Eden 

Senior Fellow

Latest Work

[December 30, 2024](#)

Post

One Small Cut for ED, One Giant Leap for DOGE-Kind

[December 09, 2024](#)

Op-Ed

DEI Is Unconstitutional

[December 09, 2024](#)

Op-Ed

How Trump Can Target Transgenderism in Schools

Tags:

college | Donald Trump | Higher Education Reform | James Q. Wilson
Program in K-12 Education Studies

Related

Op-Ed



October 16, 2024

Washington Examiner

Trump Should Use the Education Department, Not Abolish It

By Max Eden

Op-Ed



July 25, 2024

Washington Examiner

Trump and Vance Promise to Go Henry VIII on Universities

By Max Eden

Op-Ed



October 30, 2023

Washington Examiner

Will the Supreme Court Reaffirm Its Decision to End Race-Based Admissions?

By Max Eden | Anthony Pericolo



Donate

Subscribe

About

- About AEI
- Organization and Purpose
- Leadership
- Annual Report
- AEI Archive

Contact

American Enterprise Institute
1789 Massachusetts Avenue,
NW Washington, DC 20036
Main telephone: 202.862.5800
Main fax: 202.862.7177

Policy Areas

- Economics
- Foreign and Defense Policy
- Health Care
- Education
- Politics and Public Opinion
- Opportunity & Social Mobility
- Society and Culture

Scholars

- Find a scholar by policy area:
- Agricultural Policy Studies
 - Center for Technology, Science, and Energy
 - Economics
 - Education
 - Foreign and Defense Policy

Technology and Innovation

Health Care

Legal and Constitutional Studies

Housing

Legal and Constitutional

Opportunity and Social Mobility

Politics and Public Opinion

Society and Culture

© 2025 American Enterprise Institute | Privacy Policy

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate

Resolution on Graduate Credit for Undergraduates
18-24/25-APC – March 11, 2025 – Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the Provost that the University adopt the attached revision to the catalog language on Graduate Credit for Undergraduates.

RATIONALE: This revision extends the eligibility period for undergraduate students taking graduate-level courses from their final semester to their final year of undergraduate studies. Currently, students may only register for graduate courses during their final semester before graduation. Many graduate-level courses are offered only once per academic year, which limits students' ability to access relevant coursework. This change would provide students greater flexibility in course selection while creating smoother pathways into graduate programs. The revision maintains the existing nine-unit cap on graduate credits for undergraduates, ensuring continued compliance with [California Code of Regulations Title 5, § 40510](#), which governs graduate education requirements.

Existing catalog language:

Graduate Credit for Undergraduates

Undergraduate students may earn graduate credit by petition under the following circumstances:

- Only courses taken in the final semester of the senior year are applicable;
- No more than 6 units remain to complete requirements for the bachelor's degree;
- Cumulative GPA is 2.5 or higher;
- Applicable courses are upper division or graduate level and, if being used for graduate credit, are not also being used for undergraduate credit;
- Application for graduation (degree check) is on file with the Registrar;
- No more than 9 units taken as an undergraduate may be applied to the master's degree;

Students must complete the Petition for Graduate Credit (To be Earned in Final Semester of Senior Year) form available on the [HSU Forms website](#).

Draft Revision with markup

Graduate Credit for Undergraduates

Undergraduate students may earn graduate credit by petition under the following circumstances:

- Cumulative GPA is 2.5 or higher;
- Applicable courses are upper division or graduate level and, if being used for graduate credit, are not also being used for undergraduate credit;
- Application for graduation (degree check) is on file with the Registrar;
- Only courses taken in ~~the final semester of~~ the ~~senior year~~ final undergraduate year are applicable;

- ~~No more than 6 units remain to complete requirements for the bachelor's degree;~~
- No more than 9 units taken as an undergraduate may be applied to the master's degree unless the student has been admitted to a Combined Bachelor's and Master's Pathway in which case the number of transferable units is governed by [VPAA 24-05](#);

Students must complete the [Petition for Graduate Credit](#) ~~(To be Earned in Final Semester of~~ during the final undergraduate year. It is recommended that students complete this form in consultation with their advisor. ~~Senior Year) form available on the HSUCal Poly Humboldt Forms website.~~

Draft Revision without markup

Graduate Credit for Undergraduates

Undergraduate students may earn graduate credit by petition under the following circumstances:

- Cumulative GPA is 2.5 or higher;
- Applicable courses are upper division or graduate level and, if being used for graduate credit, are not also being used for undergraduate credit;
- Application for graduation (degree check) is on file with the Registrar;
- Only courses taken in the final undergraduate year are applicable;
- No more than 9 units taken as an undergraduate may be applied to the master's degree unless the student has been admitted to a Combined Bachelor's and Master's Pathway in which case the number of transferable units is governed by [VPAA 24-05](#);

Students must complete the [Petition for Graduate Credit](#) during the final undergraduate year. It is recommended that students complete this form in consultation with their advisor.

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate

Resolution on Management Position Program Hiring Policy

19-20/21-Constitution and Bylaws Committee — March 10, 2025 — First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the President to adopts this Management Position Program Hiring Policy; and be it further;

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Handbook Section 700 (Article 701 and 708) be amended to reflect this policy

Current Language:

701. CONSULTATION RELATED TO APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

The University observes a policy of collegiality that includes the participation of faculty, staff, and students (where appropriate) on search committees that review the applications of persons applying for administrative positions in the University. These committees will have access to documents relating to the candidates, will participate in the interview process, and make their recommendations known to the President or other administrator, who is responsible for making the appointment. Unless specified otherwise below, all search committees for administrative positions not under the Division of Academic Affairs, at the level of Associate Vice President or higher, will have a minimum of two General Faculty members, appointed by the President in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee (Academic Senate Resolution #19-05/06-EX, March 7, 2006)

708. PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The search committee for the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs position shall consist of:

- Faculty members, one from each college and one from the University Library, **elected by the faculty of the Colleges and the University Library.**
- One or two non-academic staff members **selected by the President or designee.**
- One or two deans appointed by the President or designee.
- One vice president appointed by the President.
- Two students, one undergraduate and one graduate, selected by the Associated Students.
- The President or designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate. These members will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.

- The President or designee will appoint the chair of the search committee.

708.1. VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND DEAN OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDIES

The search committee for Staff Deans (Dean for Research, Graduate Studies and International Programs and Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies) shall consist of:

- Faculty members, one from each college and the University Library, elected by the faculty of the colleges and the University Library.
- One non-academic staff member selected by the President or their designee.
- One or two deans appointed by the President or their designee.
- One student member selected by the Associated Students.
- The President or their designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive committee of the Senate who will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or designee will select the chair of the search committee from among the faculty elected to serve on the committee.

708.2. DEANS OF COLLEGES

The search committee for the dean of a college shall consist of:

- Six faculty members to be elected from the college.
- One non-academic staff member selected by the President or their designee.
- One or two deans appointed by the President or their designee.
- One student member selected by the Associated Students.
- The President or their designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive committee of the Senate who will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or their designee will select the chair of the search committee from among the faculty elected to serve on the committee.

708.4. DEAN OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The search committee for the Dean of the University Library shall consist of the following:

- Faculty members, one from each college, elected by the faculty of the college.
- Two members of the University Library faculty elected by the University Library faculty.
- One University Library staff member elected by the University Library staff.
- One or two deans appointed by the President or their designee.
- One student member selected by the Associated Students.

- The President or their designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate who will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or their designee will select the chair of the search committee from among the faculty elected to serve on the committee.

Amended Language:

701. CONSULTATION RELATED TO APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

The University follows the *Management Position Program Hiring Policy* as the guiding framework for hiring administrative positions. In alignment with the University's commitment to collegiality, faculty, staff, and, where appropriate, students participate in search committees that review applications for administrative roles. These committees will have access to relevant candidate documents, engage in the interview process, and provide recommendations to the President or the appropriate administrator responsible for making the appointment.

708. PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The search committee for the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs position shall consist of:

- Faculty members, one from each college and one from the University Library, appointed by the Senate Appointment and Election Committee.
- One or two non-academic staff members appointed by Staff Council.
- One or two deans appointed by the President or designee.
- One vice president appointed by the President.
- Two students, one undergraduate and one graduate, appointed by the Associated Students.
- The President or designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate. These members will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or designee will appoint the co-chairs of the search committee.

708.1. VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND DEAN OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDIES

The search committee for Staff Deans (Dean for Research, Graduate Studies and International Programs and Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies) shall consist of:

- Faculty members, one from each college and the University Library, appointed by Senate Appointment and Election Committee.
- One non-academic staff member appointed by Staff Council.

- One or two deans appointed by the President or their designee.
- One student member appointed by the Associated Students.
- The President or their designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive committee of the Senate who will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or designee will select the chair of the search committee from among the faculty elected to serve on the committee.

708.2. DEANS OF COLLEGES

The search committee for the dean of a college shall consist of:

- Six faculty members appointed by Senate Appointment and Election Committee.
- One non-academic staff member appointed by Staff Council.
- One or two deans appointed by the President or their designee.
- One student member appointed by the Associated Students.
- The President or their designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive committee of the Senate who will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or their designee will select the chair of the search committee from among the faculty elected to serve on the committee.

708.4. DEAN OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The search committee for the Dean of the University Library shall consist of the following:

- Faculty members, one from each college, appointed by Senate Appointment and Election Committee.
- Two members of the University Library faculty appointed by Senate Appointment and Election Committee.
- One University Library staff member appointed by Staff Council.
- One or two deans appointed by the President or their designee.
- One student member appointed by the Associated Students.
- The President or their designee may select one or more members in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate who will serve to represent areas or issues not represented by the above.
- The President or their designee will select the chair of the search committee from among the faculty elected to serve on the committee.

RATIONALE: To establish a structured, transparent, and equitable process for recruiting, selecting, and onboarding management personnel. This policy ensures compliance with legal and institutional regulations, promotes diversity and inclusion, and upholds shared governance by involving faculty, staff,

and students in hiring decisions. It strengthens leadership accountability and aligns hiring practices with the university's mission and strategic objectives.

Management Position Program Hiring Policy
[Policy Number]
Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Applies to: Faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

This policy establishes a transparent hiring process for management positions, ensuring compliance with regulations, equity principles, and strategic goals. It outlines structured recruitment, selection, and onboarding procedures while emphasizing diversity, fairness, and accountability. Regular reviews maintain alignment with best practices and institutional priorities.

Supersedes: #19-05/06-EX

Purpose of the Policy

The purpose of this policy is to ensure a transparent, equitable, and structured hiring process for management positions that align with the university’s mission, strategic goals, and commitment to diversity and inclusion. By establishing clear guidelines for recruitment, selection, and onboarding, the policy upholds best practices, regulatory compliance, and shared governance principles while fostering effective leadership and institutional accountability.

Definitions

Search Committee: A group of representatives tasked with overseeing candidate evaluation and selection.

Equity Advocate: A committee member responsible for promoting fairness and impartiality in the hiring process.

Onboarding: The process of integrating a new hire into the university, including orientation, training, and ongoing support.

Policy Details

1. Introduction and Scope

1.1 The purpose of this policy is to establish a structured and transparent framework for hiring qualified management personnel who will uphold and advance the university’s

mission and strategic objectives. Recognizing the critical role that effective leadership plays in fostering academic and organizational success, this policy is designed to ensure that hiring processes align with best practices, university policies, and equity principles.

1.2 Management Personnel Program (MPP) refers to a classification of employees who serve in management, supervisory, and leadership roles. MPP employees are exempt from collective bargaining and have responsibilities that include policy development, program administration, budget oversight, and personnel management.

MPP positions are categorized into four levels:

MPP Level 1 – First-line supervisors and entry-level managers.

MPP Level 2 – Mid-level managers with broader oversight.

MPP Level 3 – Senior managers, including associate/assistant vice presidents.

MPP Level 4 – Executive leadership, such as some deans, and vice presidents.

MPP employees are subject to CSU policies rather than union agreements, and their employment is at-will, meaning they serve at the discretion of the CSU administration.

1.3 The policy covers all stages of the hiring process for management positions, from position identification to onboarding, to support a robust, consistent, and fair approach to recruitment and selection.

2. Authority and Compliance

2.1 The Human Resources department and designated hiring committees oversee the hiring process and maintain transparency and adherence to regulatory and policy standards.

2.2 All hiring practices must comply with relevant federal and state regulations, including but not limited to:

- Equal Employment Opportunity laws, such as the Civil Rights Act.
- The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).
- Any applicable state labor laws.

2.3 University policies regarding hiring, anti-discrimination, and conflict of interest must be strictly followed, ensuring an impartial process that aligns with institutional values.

2.4 Shared governance policies, resolutions, guidelines, and procedures must be upheld by involving diverse university community members, including faculty, staff, and students, in hiring decisions to maintain accountability and trust.

3. Position Identification and Justification

3.1 The hiring authority shall conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to identify gaps in management and justify the need for a new or vacant position. This assessment should clearly outline:

- Specific departmental and institutional needs that the position will fulfill.
- Alignment with strategic goals, including examples of anticipated impacts.
- Cost-benefit analysis of creating/filling the position versus other solutions (including the cost of the search itself, See Section 4.4).

3.2 The hiring authority shall submit a detailed justification for the hiring to the Senate Executive Committee that includes:

- An explicit description of the job's responsibilities.
- Expected outcomes and measurable objectives.
- An explanation of how the role supports the university's strategic priorities.

The Senate Executive Committee shall review and provide feedback on level 3 and 4 MPP position justifications. Level 1 and 2 MPP position justifications should be information items for the Senate Executive Committee.

3.3 The hiring authority shall obtain approval from relevant oversight bodies, such as the Board of Trustees or senior administration, to ensure consistency with the university's mission and resource allocation priorities.

3.4 The hiring authority shall follow Human Resources procedures and paperwork regarding an MPP Position Description.

4. Search Committee

4.1 The hiring authority shall form a search committee with diverse representation, including:

4.1.1 Chair:

- A tenured faculty or an administrator at the same rank or higher than the vacant position.
- For MPP III and IV hirings a faculty member and an administrator shall co-chair the search committee.

4.1.2 Membership:

- Members appointed by the Senate Appointment and Election Committee, Staff Council, Associated Students, and administration.
- Subject-matter experts appointed by the hiring authority.
- A trained Equity Advocate (non-voting).
- The composition of the search committee should ensure that administration-appointed and ex-officio members together do not constitute a majority.
- If the Senate Appointment and Election Committee, Staff Council, or Associated Students are unable to make appointments to the committee, they shall inform the hiring authority in writing so that the hiring committee can consider executive appointments.

4.2 The university Human Resources shall provide mechanisms (e.g., via the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) for training all search committee members, covering:

- Methods to mitigate unconscious bias.
- Objective evaluation techniques.
- The role of an equity advocate is to ensure the fair treatment of all candidates.

4.3 The search committee shall specify standardized procedures for screening applications:

- Use a scoring rubric to evaluate candidates against the required qualifications.

- Apply the same criteria consistently to each application, maintaining confidentiality and impartiality throughout.

4.4 The search committee may consider the option to engage a recruitment firm when the position requires specialized expertise or for roles with limited candidate pools.

5. Recruitment and Selection Criteria

5.1 The search committee shall develop a recruitment plan outlining specific internal and external channels for reaching qualified candidates, including:

- University and CSU job portals and internal postings.
- Professional networks, associations, and higher education recruitment platforms.
- Targeted industry publications and diversity-focused job boards.
- Campus-wide communications to encourage internal applicants.

5.2 To promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in recruitment, the hiring process shall:

- Advertise in media and associations that serve underrepresented groups.
- Set targets for outreach to increase diversity in candidate pools.
- Measure recruitment effectiveness through detailed reporting on candidate demographics, applicant response rates, and documented success in attracting and including underrepresented populations. Periodic reviews shall assess compliance and outcomes.

5.3 To ensure transparency in the hiring budget, the Search Committee shall report to the Senate Executive Committee (SenEx) for level 3 and 4 MPP positions with a detailed breakdown of allocated funds for contractors and recruitment activities, including advertising, outreach initiatives, timeline, travel, receptions, and equity-focused strategies. Periodic audits shall be conducted to monitor adherence to budgetary guidelines and institutional priorities.

5.4 The position vacancy announcement shall include a job description and clear, role-specific qualifications based on required skills, competencies, and experience, including:

- Description of major responsibilities and specific duties.

- Minimum educational requirements (e.g., master's degree in a relevant field).
- Relevant professional certifications (e.g., Project Management Professional, Certified Public Accountant).
- Required years of experience in a similar role, specifying any management or leadership experience needed.

5.5 Selection criteria shall align with essential competencies and skills, such as:

- Technical expertise in financial management, project management, or team leadership.
- Leadership attributes, including effective communication, team building, and strategic planning skills.
- Commitment to diversity and inclusion, with demonstrable experience in fostering inclusive environments.

5.6 All qualifications and criteria shall be documented in the job description and screening materials to maintain consistency in evaluation.

6. Interview and Assessment

6.1 The search committee shall develop an interview procedure to ensure a fair and thorough evaluation:

- Use a structured interview format with a pre-set list of questions to assess essential competencies and skills.
- A comprehensive list of interview questions and task-oriented prompts shall be submitted to Human Resources for approval.
- Interviewers should include all members of the search committee.

6.2 The search committee shall provide specific guidelines for candidate assessments, such as:

- A scoring rubric for assessment aligned with the job description qualifications and responsibilities.

7. Reference and Background Checks

7.1 The search committee shall conduct a minimum of three reference checks for each final candidate to verify:

- Previous employment, including dates, role responsibilities, and overall performance.
- Professional competencies and ethical standards relevant to the position.
- Alignment with the university's values and standards for conduct.

7.2 Human Resources shall perform background checks including:

- Criminal record checks as legally permissible.
- Verification of educational credentials and employment history.
- Financial or credit checks relevant to the responsibilities of the role.
- Review of the candidate's background related to discrimination, including any involvement in Title IX cases, both as a respondent and in their handling of such cases under their leadership.

8. Offer and Negotiation

8.1 Hiring authority shall provide candidates with a detailed employment offer, including:

- Base salary in line with internal pay structures and comparable external positions.
- Clear description of benefits, such as health insurance, retirement plans, and leave policies.
- Outline of role expectations, reporting structure, and initial objectives.

8.2 Hiring authority shall ensure transparency in salary negotiations, following the university's compensation guidelines and allowing for equity adjustments where applicable.

8.3 The hiring authority shall provide a defined timeline for offer acceptance and a clear process for negotiating terms within established university parameters.

9. Onboarding and Orientation

9.1 Hiring authority shall facilitate a comprehensive onboarding program, which should include:

- An orientation to university policies, values, and culture.
- Department-specific training on key job responsibilities and expectations.
- Introduction to role-specific systems and tools required for job performance.

9.2 Hiring authority shall designate department contacts responsible for the new hire's orientation, providing support and mentorship during their transition.

9.3 The hiring authority shall outline an integration plan, with milestones for performance reviews, feedback sessions, and role-specific training.

10. Policy Review and Amendments

10.1 The Senate Executive Committee should schedule a review of this policy every five years to ensure that it remains aligned with best practices, legal requirements, and the university's evolving needs.

10.2 The Constitution and Bylaws Committee should solicit feedback from search committee members, Human Resources staff, new hires, and other interested parties to identify improvement areas and integrate suggestions.

10.3 All amendments shall undergo formal approval by the University Senate, and the President before implementation.

Related Policies:

Technical Letter HR/Appointments 2013-03: Recruitment and Hiring Guidelines for MPP and Staff (Non-represented and Represented) Positions

<https://www.calstate.edu/hradm/pdf2013/TL-APPT2013-03.pdf>

History

Constitution and Bylaws:	03/10/2025
Reviewed by University Senate:	03/10/2025
Approved by Provost/President:	MM/DD/YYYY

Graduate Studies Task Force Update



› Provost's Charge

- To develop a five year strategic plan (2024-2028) for graduate studies at Cal Poly Humboldt.
- The plan will center the success of students and guide the Office of Graduate Studies and campus leadership on investments and decisions for graduate education over the next five years.
- The strategic plan will outline our goals, objectives, initiatives, and priorities to support graduate education.
- It will be guided by the unique culture at Cal Poly Humboldt, graduate policies of the CSU, and relevant external changes in the national and international graduate education landscape

➤ The strategic plan should include a review and recommendations in a minimum of the following areas:

- Purpose, vision and values for graduate studies at Cal Poly Humboldt
- Graduate student cultures
- Alignment of existing graduate programs with interests and needs of the university and the local, regional, national, and disciplinary communities that we serve.
- Graduate admission process
- Graduate program enrollment/targets
- Graduate program business plan/resource allocation
- Equity in graduate faculty compensation

Members - Thank you!

- **Rouhollah Aghasaleh**-Assistant Professor School of Education
- **Cindy Bumgarner**- Dean of College of Extended Education and Global Engagement
- **Carmen Bustos-Works**- Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate Programs
- **Priscilla Ceja**-Graduate Student, Zoology
- **Terri Fisher**-Graduate Studies Specialist
- **Tristan Gleason**-Associate Professor and School of Education Graduate Program Faculty Coordinator
- **Margaret Lang**-Professor and Environmental Resources Engineering Graduate Program Faculty Coordinator
- **Kyle Morgan**- Librarian and Graduate Thesis Formatting Advisor
- **Aolany Navas-Griggs** Interim Director of Admissions
- **Kaitlin Reed**-Assistant Professor and Environment and Community Graduate Program Faculty Coordinator
- **Jenni Robinson Reisinger**-Registrar
- **Amy Spowles**-Associate Professor and Faculty Associate Dean of Graduate Programs
- **Andrew Stubblefield**-Professor and Natural Resources Graduate Program Faculty Coordinator
- **Janet Winston**- Professor and English Graduate Program Faculty Coordinator

Strategy

- Craft Draft Purpose, vision and values for graduate studies at Cal Poly Humboldt in collaboration with the Graduate Council (2/5, 3/4, 4/1, 5/6)
- Collect Input from Campus Stakeholders:
 - Graduate Students (2/15)
 - Faculty, Staff, Students and Administration (3/28)
- Collect Institutional Data
- Collect Information about Community/Workforce Needs
- Present Recommendations and Outline to Campus 4/25
- Write plan Summer '24

➤ **What have we learned from our current graduate students?**

- Range of Reasons for Choosing a Cal Poly Humboldt Graduate Degree
 - Access
 - Reputation
 - Program Availability
 - Recruited by Faculty Member
- Graduate Faculty are Supportive
- Lack of graduate courses specific for graduate students (500 and 600)
- Student Concerns about limited Financial Support
 - Scholarships
 - Fee Waivers
 - GA/TA Positions
 - Paid Internships
- Differences in Graduate Student Understanding of timelines, deliverables, and financial support. These seem to correlate with programs.

Vision and Purpose Statement:

Vision

Over the next five years, Cal Poly Humboldt will bolster the Office of Graduate Studies and establish a dedicated graduate school. This initiative aims to empower individual programs to offer relevant and sustainable curricula that align with student interests and produce skilled professionals to meet California's workforce needs. Cal Poly Humboldt is committed to helping our graduate students achieve their professional and academic aspirations.

Purpose (Mission) Statement

“Graduate education at Cal Poly Humboldt fosters an inclusive community where all students can thrive. By providing transformative programs, we equip students with the knowledge of their disciplines to advance research knowledge and professional practices and positively impact our communities, state, and world.”



Goals over the next 5-years

- **Goal A. Ensure Academic Excellence and Sustainable Graduate Programming**
- **Goal B: Enhance Graduate Student Financial Support**
- **Goal C. Expand Professional Development, Career Support, & Networking Opportunities for Graduate Students**
- **Goal D. Enhance capacity for the Office of Graduate Studies to deliver quality support.**

What is Next?

- Provost Capps will wrap up the process
- Share with Senate for approval
- Use the SP as a working document to structure the work that this group does
- Review and revise each year