

## University Senate

### **Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, March 24, 2026**

Goodwin Forum and Zoom, Meeting ID 818 1954 9462

Chair Harmon called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. A quorum was present.

#### **Members Present**

Aghasaleh, Allison Govier, Banks, Benavides-Garb, Burkhalter, Cabot, Cappuccio, Carvajal, Choi, Cruz, Dschida, Evans, Frye, Geck, Gray, Harmon, Jannetta, Lancaster, McGuire, McKindley, Mola, Moyer, Stelter, Sterner, A. Thobaben, M. Thobaben, Tremain, Virnoche, Young

#### **Members Absent**

Fisher, Holliday, Pachmayer

#### **Guests**

Michelle Caisse, Joice Chang, Adrienne Colegrove-Raymond, Jeff Crane, Bethany Gilden, Rachael Gipson, Sara Hart, Frank Herrera, Kendra Higgins, Melissa Hutsell, Melody Jackson, James, Steve Karp, Mike Le, Laura Levy, Heather Madar, Peggy Metzger, Patrick Orona, Raven Palomera, Pearl Podgorniak, Sasheen Shailee Raymond, Connie Stewart, Mark Wicklund

#### **Announcement of Proxies**

Michelle Caisse for Fisher, Peggy Metzger for Holliday, McGuire for Pachmayer

#### **CFA Interruption Statement**

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

#### **Approval and Adoption of Agenda**

M/S (Virnoche/Choi) to adopt the agenda.

Motion to adopt the agenda passed without dissent.

#### **Approval of Minutes from February 17, 2026**

M/S (Evans/Allison Govier) to approve the minute from February 17, 2026

Motion to approve the minutes passed without dissent.

#### **Approval of Minutes from March 3, 2026**

M/S (Mola/Tremain) to approve the minute from March 3, 2026

Motion to approve the minutes passed without dissent.

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

Written report attached

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

M/S (Virnoche/Moyer) to accept the reports as written.

Motion to accept the reports passed without dissent.

**General Consent Calendar**

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

**Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee**

The attached consent calendar from the ICC was approved by general consent.

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

Senator Aghasaleh made the attached comments.

M/S (Choi/Stelter) to extend Senator Aghasaleh’s time.

Motion to extend passed without dissent.

**Resolution on Revision to the Assessment and Program Review Policy (22-25/26-APC – March 24, 2026 – First Reading)**

Senator Evans gave the attached presentation.

The assessment plans, annual protocols and reporting for the co-curricular programs are being brought in line with what we’re already doing with respect to the number of units conducting assessment and how often.

Signature assignments will no longer be required for recertification or lower division GEAR courses.

**TIME CERTAIN: 3:30-4:15 PM – Information Item: Community Resilience Steering Group**

Michelle Caisse gave the attached presentation.

The difference between administrative and judicial warrants was discussed, and UPD’s role in enforcing them. UPD’s practice is to escort anyone executing a warrant to their destination and then off campus.

Information was shared about communication strategies and rapid response groups. Associated Students is planning on putting out informational videos to reach students.

The role of UPD in crowd management in such an event was discussed, and the plan is to have de-escalation teams ready.

**TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:45 PM – Discussion Item: WSCUC Accreditation Site Visit**

Provost Young, Heather Madar, and Mark Wicklund gave the attached presentation.

**TIME CERTAIN: 4:45-5:00 PM – Faculty Session: Reading and Ratification of the Distinguished Faculty Awards Nomination Letters**

M/S (Virnoche/Moyer) to move the Senate into Faculty Executive Session.

Motion to move to Faculty Executive Session passed without dissent.

In accordance with University Senate Bylaws section 7.3, minutes were not recorded.

---

**Meeting adjourned at 5:06 PM**

Submitted by Patrick Malloy

**University Senate Chair Report**  
**March 24, 2026**

Hi Folks,

I hope you had a restful spring break! I know not everyone in the University Senate has spring break, so I hope the campus was calm and relaxing. We're halfway through the semester, and after spending time with my sister, brother-in-law, niece, and nephew, in Hawai'i of all places, I certainly feel ready to finish out this second half strong!

We have some important milestones coming up in the near future, and the big one on many folks' minds is our WSCUC accreditation visit running April 15-17. Please hold your calendars for a Senate visit with the accreditation team on April 15 from 3:30–4:15 PM. An invitation will be forthcoming. Additionally, you may have received a message from our WSCUC leadership team (Shawna Young, Heather Madar, and Mark Wicklund) about reviewing the slide deck to be presented at today's meeting. I hope you all will take the time, or have already taken the time, to review those slides and be ready for questions and discussion at our meeting today.

Progress continues on our Policy Modernization project. If you recall, we determined that an in-house solution would not do everything we want according to the project's goals; therefore, we will be moving forward with PolicyStat. The team met before spring break and made some decisions on key metadata that we will identify in our existing policies and how to best organize that data. Our next big step, which I am very excited for, will be test-driving PolicyStat with some software representatives. I expect we will roll this out next fall and get some training for those who engage with policies the most, likely the Senate Executive Committee and other key staff. I will report out on this once I have more information, after I have been trained myself.

Lecturers, please consider nominating yourself (or someone you think will be a good fit) for the ASCSU lecturer pool. We need to have nominees for the ASCSU by Thursday, March 26th. Yikes! That is coming up way too fast, so please reach out to anyone you know ASAP. Thanks very much! I would be happy to answer any questions about this service role. Additionally, our ASCSU senators (Stephanie Burkhalter and Mary Virnoche) would be more than happy to answer any questions about this as well.

We are cooking in the search committee for the VP of Administration/CFO. I know there are a lot of other search committees going on right now, so I hope ya'll be productive as well. There are a lot of moving parts to do this, according to our new MPP Hiring Policy, but I'm very grateful we are following this policy, as complicated as it is. The shared governance model we are exhibiting by doing this is really amazing work, and I'm inspired by everyone taking it seriously and following the letter of the law to a T! Great work, everyone.

Last, I want to give a general shout-out to my committee chairs. Everyone is demonstrating some really excellent leadership and self-motivation, and I've been really impressed with the reports on things ya'll are doing. Bravo!

Best

CH

# CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

University Senate Written Reports, March 24, 2026

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), Alexis-Harrelle Deshazier (Coordinator-Umoja Center), Tyler Evans (APC Chair), Frank Fogarty (Faculty-Wildlife), Jacob Garcia (AS Students), Stephanie McKindley (AS Students), Marissa O'Neill (Faculty-Social Work), Jenni Robinson Reisinger (Registrar), Mark Wicklund (Director-Assessment, AVP Academic Programs designee).

Meeting Date(s): 3/2/26 and 3/9/26

Meeting Details: 3/2/26: The committee compared notes from listening session #2. The committee received feedback on their revisions to the December draft, particularly regarding the role of program review in initiating discontinuance processes and concerns about the policy's timing and burden of proof. Participants discussed how to better align program discontinuance with existing campus frameworks while ensuring transparency and fair process, with suggestions to strengthen the connection to program review and clarify definitions around contested versus uncontested cases. The committee also considered how to balance administrative flexibility with faculty protections, acknowledging the ultimate authority of the campus president while striving to create a policy that earns broad campus buy-in. Some specific next steps are:

- Update the draft policy to address feedback, including clarifying language around interdisciplinary programs, contested/uncontested definitions, program review linkages, and burden of proof for initiators.
- Consider adding 15 academic days to section 5.2 to align the timeline more closely with the previous policy.
- Review and clarify the policy language regarding the role and responsibilities of ICC in leading the independent comprehensive assessment, including ensuring timely completion.
- Consider adding a definition or examples for "immediate and compelling circumstances" under section 1.3, or clarify the intent to avoid creating a perceived loophole.
- Review and potentially revise the language in sections 5.3.1.5 and 5.4.13 to ensure alignment and equal consideration of societal and workforce needs in both program and administrative responses.

- Add or clarify language regarding the burden of proof for the initiating party to strengthen transparency and accountability.
- Consider including a flowchart that explicitly shows decision trees, off-ramps, and points where a program could be retained, to increase clarity for all stakeholders.

3/9/26: The committee reviewed and discussed revisions to the Assessment and Program Review Policy to bring the policy into alignment with new GEAR program assessment processes. The revised policy has a first reading in the 3/24 Senate meeting.

---

## **Appointments and Elections Committee**

Submitted by Jorge Monteiro, AEC Chair

Members: Ara Pachmayer, Jorge Monteiro, Michihiro Sugata

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: The second call for nominations has been sent. Please, encourage your colleagues to participate.

---

## **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, Lisa Tremain, Ara Pachmayer, Ryder Dschida, Kim White

Meeting Date(s): March 4 and 11

Meeting Details: The committee focused on the topics during the last two weeks.

1. Summer Course Feedback Survey inclusion for the RTP process. We clarified the use of student evaluations for counselors and librarians to ensure our language accurately

reflects the current processes across campus. We then finalized the resolution to update Appendix J.

2. We continued reviewing feedback from faculty and are developing a summarizing document that captures feedback and allows us to ensure it reaches the appropriate committees.
  3. We discussed committee leadership for next year.
- 

## Integrated Curriculum Committee

Submitted by Sara Sterner, ICC Chair

**Members:** Paul Michael Atienza, Morgan Barker, Christine Cass, Joice Chang, Tom Cook, William Fisher, Paul Geck, Chris Guillen, Sara Hart, Alison Hodges, Sei Hee Hwang, JuEun Lee, Heather Madar\*, Bori Mazzag, John Meyer, Libbi Miller, Cindy Moyer, Justus Ortega, Meenal Rana, Jenni Robinson Reisinger, Joshua Smith, Sara Sterner (Chair), Anna Thaler, Melissa Tafoya, Mark Wicklund; Student Representative: Ayan Cabot, AS Executive Vice President; Curriculum and Catalog Specialist: Cameron Allison Govier; Curriculum and Assessment Analyst: Khristan Lamb; ASC, Office of Academic Programs: Geneva Samuelson

**Meeting Date:** March 10, 2026

**Overview of Meeting Details:** The ICC meeting focused on curriculum updates and policy refinements. Thirteen new curriculum submissions have been received, and departments are encouraged to continue identifying pipeline projects. Updates included revised certificate and minor forms to improve transparency and catalog accuracy, the renaming of the teaching plan to the C78WTU Agreement, and the postponement of the March 3 listening session. The committee also reviewed proposed clarifications to American Institutions (AI) and General Education (GE) requirements, including GEAR recommendations to maintain current AI double-counting policy while refining catalog language, alongside broader discussion about balancing student efficiency with the integrity of GE requirements.

### Highlights of Note:

- ICC reviewed a proposed shift in curriculum deadlines from September 1 to April 15, formalizing a pilot model from this semester and establishing a spring review pathway to better support new (especially graduate) programs while aligning catalog timelines and managing workload. The change will affect planning for new GEAR courses, designations, and recertifications, with the goal of ensuring early communication and a smooth transition into the 2026–27 cycle. [ICC - Proposed Curricular Deadline Changes for 2026-27](#)
- Planning to submit curriculum updates for the 2026-2027 review cycle (Due April 15 for most proposals)? We need to hear from you: [2026 Curriculum Development Survey](#)

### Curriculum Development Decisions:

- **ICC-Approved Proposals Advancing to Senate on Consent:** See ICC Consent Calendar

- **ICC-Approved Proposals Advancing to Senate by Resolution:** None
- **ICC-Reviewed Proposals Determined to Require Further Development Prior to Advancement to Senate:** None

**Read More:**

- **Meeting Agenda:** [03.10.26-ICC Meeting Agenda - Approved](#) *(Humboldt Login Required)*
  - **DRAFT Meeting Minutes:** [03.10.26-ICC Meeting Minutes - DRAFT](#) *(Humboldt Login Required)*
  - **25-26 Curriculum Review Queue:** [ICC 2025-26 MCC Proposal Tracking](#)
- 

## University Policies Committee

Submitted by Sulaina Banks, UPC Chair

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

---

## University Resources and Planning Committee

Submitted by Jaime Lancaster, URPC Co-Chair

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

---

## Academic Senate of the CSU

Submitted by Stephanie Burkhalter and Mary Virnoche, ASCSU Senators

The ASCSU met for its committee meetings and plenary on March 3-6. The next standing committee meetings will take place on April 3 and the plenary will take place April 29-May 1. Resolutions passed at plenaries can be accessed on the ASCSU [Website](#).

**The following resolutions passed in second reading:**

AS-3774-25/Exec [Academic Senate of the California State University 2026-2027 Meetings](#)

Establishes the ASCSU's meeting schedule for 2026-2027.

AS-3775-25/[Exec Amending the Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws to Address Campus Closure and Integration](#)

Amends the ASCSU Bylaws to clarify the process for adjusting membership when an existing campus is closed or integrated.

AS-3776-25/[AA Consultation in the Process of Reviewing CSU \(Systemwide\) Chancellor's Office Policies](#)

This resolution enhances collaboration between the CSU and faculty by encouraging faculty participation in review of Chancellor's office policies with the goal of improving content and implementation. There are currently an estimated 350-400 Policies and each Policy is regularly reviewed about every two years. This resolution asks that the ASCSU be integrated into that review process when appropriate and where possible.

AS-3777-25/APEP [Update to Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws: Responsibilities of the Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee](#)

Updates ASCSU by-laws on the responsibilities of the Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee in response to historic changes to remediation and the separation of CSU GE (CSU program) from Cal-GETC (intersegmental transfer program).

AS-3778-25/[APEP Process for Appointment of Area 6 Ethnic Studies Discipline-Based Faculty Reviewers](#)

The intent is to clarify the processes and requirements for a CSU faculty member to be appointed as an Ethnic Studies discipline expert faculty reviewer for Cal-GETC Area 6.

AS-3779-25/FA Restoration Of Sane And Efficient Plenary Session Hours To Boost Ascscu Senate Health And Wellness

ASCSCU establishes plenary session times that are slightly shorter than recent practices (which are longer than historical averages) to provide more reasonable working conditions, and more effective use of time overall.

**The following are resolutions that were heard and passed with a first reading waiver**

AS-3788-25/FGA 2026 [Initial State Legislative Advocacy Positions Of The Academic Senate Of The California State University](#)

AS-3780-25/Exec/JEDI Commendation For Dr. Nimisha Barton

**The following resolutions have been introduced as first readings and will likely return for second reading.**

Please review and offer your feedback directly to Stephanie Burkhalter and Mary Virnoche so that we can share with the ASCSU committees bringing these forward. In particular, your feedback is requested

on the *\*draft\** paper [CSU 2040: Frameworks for the Future of the California State University](#) which is contained in the first reading resolution AS-3787-25/AA. This resolution and associated paper is likely to be voted on at the plenary scheduled in late April and we want to make sure that interested faculty on our campus have an opportunity to shape it.

#### [AS-3781-25/APEP Approval Process For Transfer Model Curricula \(TMCs\)](#)

This resolution maintains that intersegmental curriculum committee actions on approvals should be deliberate, endorsed by membership of the CCC and CSU faculty, and provide sufficient time and resources for deliberation. That ASCSU requests that the 'clock' for the 5-year review of programs approved by an email vote in June 2025 (African American Studies, American Indian Studies, and Asian American Studies) be advanced for an expedited review.

#### [AS-3782-25/AA Update To Ascsu Bylaws: Responsibilities Of The Academic Affairs Committee](#)

This resolution updates ASCSU Bylaws on the responsibilities of the Academic Affairs committee in response to recent changes in general education and the ability of different segments in California higher education to confer various degrees.

#### [AS-3783-25/APEP Opposition To AB-2236 \(Berman\) \[Postsecondary Education: Articulation Agreements \(2026\)\]](#)

Indicates ASCSU opposition To AB-2236 (Berman) [Postsecondary Education: Articulation Agreements (2026)] based on resources, curricular concerns, and inappropriate constraints of requiring rigid systemwide curricular implementation.

#### [AS-3784-25/FA/AA Support For California State University's International Programs By Funding Faculty Positions](#)

The resolution urges the CSU Chancellor's Office to restore, prioritize, and institutionalize sustained funding for faculty engagement in CSU International Programs, including the expansion of faculty leadership roles such as Resident Director positions, and to ensure meaningful faculty participation in international education.

#### [AS-3785-25/APEP In Support Of The Bachelor Of Education Degree In The California State University \(Csu\)](#)

In support of the CSU offering reduced-credit bachelor's degrees in education with recommendations for program development.

#### [AS-3786-25/FA ASCSU Support For Math Council's Resolution On The Use Of Mathjobs.org In The Hiring Of Academic Faculty In The Areas Of Mathematics And Statistics](#)

The ASCSU affirms the importance of broad and accessible academic job advertising and recognizes MathJobs.org as the primary platform for advertising doctoral-level positions in mathematics and statistics. The resolution urges the CSU Chancellor's Office to coordinate with the American Mathematical Society to allow departments to use MathJobs.org integrated within the CSU's CHRS.

#### [AS-3787-25/AA Discussion Paper CSU 2040](#)

This resolution offers a faculty-created document, [CSU 2040: Frameworks for the Future of the California State University](#) intended as a complement to *CSU Forward*, the *Student Success Framework*, and the *Strategic Enrollment Management Framework*, to explore opportunities and possibilities for the future of the CSU. The paper is titled ‘Frameworks’ because it does not support a one-size-fits-all approach, but rather advocates for a multifaceted view of the university depending on social, political, economic, and academic factors. The ASCSU is confident and optimistic that this vision and version of the CSU will help our students and therefore the state of California succeed.

#### [AS-3789-25/JEDI Support For Replacing “Academic Probation” With “Academic Notice” Across The CSU](#)

This resolution recommends that the CSU adopts systemwide terminology replacing “academic probation” with “academic notice” or similar asset-based language, affirms that such a change does not alter academic standards, and encourages systemwide guidance that reflects a supportive, student-centered approach consistent with the CSU Student Success Framework.

#### **Notes on plenary guests**

##### **Junius Gonzales, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; Nathan Evans, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Chief of Staff**

The legislative environment for CSU is challenging with state legislators all but giving up on the California Master Plan for Education that designates the missions and areas of service of each of the three post-secondary sectors: Community Colleges, the CSU and the UC. AVC Gonzales discussed the competitive pressures that the CSU is facing, noting strategic expansion of fully online programs in California by large institutions such as Arizona State and University of Arizona. The community colleges are aggressively advocating at the state level for 4-year baccalaureate degrees and have, at times, ignored CSU objections under the AB927 framework. Since that legislation was passed, the CSU has approved 81% of the programs proposed by the CCC’s. They are working with a new vice-Chancellor in the CCC on aligning programs and more coordination before CCC’s proposed BA programs. They will be presenting at the next Board of Trustees Education Policy Committee meeting to propose new types of degrees to meet student demand with fewer required units: Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Applied Studies and Bachelor of Professional Studies.

##### **Margarita Berta-Ávila, CFA President**

Discussed ongoing bargaining, including proposals (see [this link](#)), as well as bills that CFA is sponsoring in the current legislative session, such as [AB2523](#), [SB1101](#), [AB1831](#)

**CSU Trustees [Diego Arambula](#) & [Carson Fajardo](#):** These trustees shared their personal stories and why they are engaged in service as CSU Trustees. Trustee Arambula has an extensive background in K-12 education and currently serves as Vice Chair of the Board. He is invested in developing ways to partner with ASCSU to “get to yes” on enhancing the system’s ability to meet students where they are at and provide a high-quality, high value education. Trustee Farjardo is an up-and-coming leader who is a graduate student, alum and former president of Associated Students at CSU San Bernardino.

**Jodi Braverman, Executive Director, CSU Alumni Council, and Lori Brockett, Associate Vice President for Alumni Engagement and University Events (CSUSM), CSU Alumni Council Liaison Report**

Shared the [Alumni Council](#) strategic plan, which was passed at their February meeting. The three pillars of the plan 1) Amplify CSU Alumni; 2) Champion Lifelong Connection to the CSU; 3) Alumni as Partners

**Mildred Garcia, Chancellor of the CSU**

Chancellor Garcia spent the last 6 weeks on budget advocacy in Sacramento. On February 17, 2026, she provided testimony at a hearing on California State Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 3 on Education Finance. Her position is that the Governor's budget proposal is the right investment at the right time for the CSU and the state. She advocated for increased compensation for faculty and staff and funding for delayed maintenance and infrastructure needs. Due to the state's budget deficit, which may increase depending on economic uncertainty, competition for limited state resources will be fierce. The CSU needs everyone to advocate at the state level and at the federal level against proposed cuts to Pell Grants, which over 210,000 CSU students receive. There is a new platform called [CSU Voices](#) that facilitates CSU community members' contribution to advocacy.

The CSU is adopting a new systemwide intranet called CSU Connect that will replace CSYou at the end of June. This platform is expected to be much more interactive, with zoom capabilities (see [csuconnect.calstate.edu](https://csuconnect.calstate.edu)). Movement on the CSU Forward Strategic Plan: [AI Workforce Acceleration Board](#) has created a micro internship for students in AI as well as research and innovation award in AI. CO is currently in negotiation with OpenAI about ChatGPT contract renewal but nothing is certain at this point. There is a presentation at the next Board of Trustees meeting (Education Policy Committee) on a proposal for new degrees with reduced mandatory number of units, to meet student demand: Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Applied Studies and Bachelor of Professional Studies. In addition there is an information item on a proposal to apply any credit earned at any CSU as in *residence* credit for a degree at any CSU. Direct Admissions has been successful at increasing enrollment and is expanding. There is a coordinated intensive effort to maximize efficiency in business operations so that any savings can be redistributed to core functions, such as instruction. The [CSU financial transparency portal](#) has been updated so that information about CSU budget, spending and investments, can be widely shared. There is a move to increase compensation for faculty and staff based on data and peer comparisons; to that end, data will be provided from faculty and staff salary studies scheduled to be completed by June. The CO is also working on data-informed interventions to enhance positive and engaged workforce culture. They have worked to strengthen the CSU Civil Rights programming, particularly timely and effective response to discrimination and workplace misconduct. They have Improved the quality and consistency of investigations, created a shared platform for reporting and increased investigator reach by coordinating the work of investigators at the CO.

**Katie Karroum, CSSA Vice President of Systemwide Affairs**

[CSSA AI White Paper](#) published recently. She spoke specifically about the #1 concern expressed to her by students, which is that they have been falsely accused of using AI by instructors who have been using AI detection tools that are unreliable. These tools tend to be particularly hard on students whose first language is not English (see [this link](#) for analysis at Cal State Fullerton Faculty Development Center). The CSSA has forwarded to the Governor's Office names of three students they recommended to be the next

CSU Student trustee. At their first plenary of Spring at Sonoma State they discussed their disapproval of the BoT support for increased Executive Compensation and SF State Associated Students have passed a resolution to oppose the increased compensation. The next plenary to take place at Sacramento State before CHESS on Saturday March 21. Two bills they plan to advocate for: AB713 and SB961, and they are working with legislators on other bills. They continue to advocate for investment in 24/7 mental health telehealth access for students.

---

## **Associated Students**

Submitted by Eduardo Cruz, AS President

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

---

## **California Faculty Association**

Submitted by Ryder Dschida, CFA Humboldt Chapter President

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

---

## **Office of Diversity, Equity, 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:

March 12, 2026, **Acting Captain Kyle Weis** provided Humboldt-ERFSA members with a tour of the Cal Poly Humboldt research vessel, **R/V North Wind**, at the Woodley Island Marina.



Pictures taken by Emeritus Professor and Professional Photographer Mark Lasons

April 9, 2026, at Baywood Gold and Country Club **Brandon L. Browne**: Professor, Department of Geology, will present *Probing the subvolcanic magma plumbing systems of continental and oceanic basaltic volcanoes, examples from Medicine Lake volcano and the Axial Seamount*. Results of new geological research on the magma systems that underly two very different basaltic volcanoes located in the Pacific Northwest, including Medicine Lake Volcano in the California Cascades and the Axial Seamount submarine volcano on the Juan de Fuca Ridge. New evidence from geochemical and geophysical observations is advancing our ability to monitor and forecast volcanic eruptions, driving volcanologists to reimagine classical models of subvolcanic magma systems from simple, long-lived, and melt-dominated systems to complex, ephemeral, and crystal-rich systems.

## Labor Council

Submitted by Bella Gray, Labor Council Delegate

**Members:**

- APC (Unit 4): Tania Marin-Zeldin, Marissa Holguin, Ann Johnson-Cruz,
- CFA (Unit 3): Ryder Dschida, Loren Cannon, Mario Fernandez,
- CSUEU (Units 2,5, 7, and 9): Edwin Espinoza, Bella Gray, Steve Tillinghast,
- Teamsters (Unit 6): Phil Bradley, Ryan Moore, Jason Wiegandt.

**Meeting Date(s):** Tuesday, March 10th, 2026

**Meeting Details:** No report

---

## Staff Council

Submitted by Kathy Hudson for Senator Sulaina Banks

Members: Alex Culler, Alex Thorne, Annika Nelson, Aylea Maxwell-Miller, Chelsey Castiglione, Kathy Hudson, Michael Figlioli, Pearl Podgorniak, Raven Palomera, Sarah Sanders, Scott Harris, Sherry Beasley, Stephanie Whittlesey, Su Karl, Tianna Nourot, Xelha Puc

**Meeting Date(s):**

- Staff Council now conducts staff-wide elections to fill staff representative seats on MPP 3 and MPP 4 search committees. The election process has a two-week turnaround time. Reach out to SC Governance Chair Scott Harris & SC Chair Kathy Hudson for assistance.
- Submissions for the 2026 Staff Recognition Awards (non-MPP staff) are currently under review.
- 2026 Staff Appreciation Week is the first week in June.

## President and President's Executive Cabinet Report to University Senate

Richard Carvajal, President

Bethany Gildea, Acting Chief of Staff

Shawna Young, Interim Provost and VP for Academic Affairs

Michael Fisher, Interim VP for Administration & Finance and CFO

Chrissy Holliday, VP for Enrollment Management & Student Success

Steve Karp, Interim 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

### Countdown to our WSCUC Accreditation Site Visit!

There are **22 days** until our campus site visit from the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) Review Team. During their April 15-17th visit, the team will be meeting with more than 20 groups from our university community, including the Senate on **Wednesday, April 15, 3:40-4:25 p.m., NHE 102**. In addition to specific group meetings, our entire campus community is invited to participate in the visit through open forums. These open forums are an opportunity to share your experiences at Humboldt and help the team better understand our campus community. The forum schedule is as follows:

- **Staff Open Forum: Thursday, April 16, 2026 from 8:15 – 9 a.m.** in the Great Hall. Light refreshments will be served.
- **Student Open Forum: Thursday, April 16, 2026 from 1 – 1:45 p.m.** in the Native Forum, Behavioral & Social Sciences Room 162. Lunch will be served.
- **Faculty Open Forum: Thursday, April 16, 2026 from 2 – 2:45 p.m.** in the Great Hall. Light refreshments will be served.

One of the key [Lines of Inquiry](#) the team will explore is **Humboldt's Vision for the Future as a Polytechnic University**, including how our planning, facilities, academic priorities, and resource strategies support long-term student and institutional success. Your input is important. While your participation in the Senate-specific session is encouraged, you are also welcome to participate in an open forum. Additionally, you may submit feedback confidentially in writing directly to the WSCUC Review Team using their email address for this visit:

[humboldt@wscuc.org](mailto:humboldt@wscuc.org).

**University Senate**

Integrated Curriculum Committee approved 03/10/2026

Consent Calendar

March 24, 2026

Page 1 of 1

---

**Consent Calendar**

[CRGS - 104 - 25-2660 - New Course - Writing for Social Change](#) - Approved for GE Area 1A:

Written Communication. **Description:** Introduction to collecting, analyzing, and critically interpreting texts and evidence in order to develop writing that is organized and effective in a particular situation, including expository writing that advocates for a position. **Rationale:** There are currently no Ethnic Studies-related courses that meet the Golden Four Requirements. As a Hispanic Serving Institution, it is important that Humboldt expand its offerings of classes that explore literacy and languages; thus, this proposal for a course focused on Latinx knowledges ensures that students will be encouraged to explore the major theories and practices of the field of rhetoric and composition while drawing from their own wells of embodied knowledge regarding language, cultural rhetorics, and identity.

**Good afternoon,**

**Trigger warning:** The following remarks include references to violence.

My name is Rouhollah Aghasaleh. As I speak today, my heart is heavy. My parents, siblings, and fellow Iranians are currently under Israeli and American bombardment—what officials describe as a “preemptive de-escalation” operation. At the same time, thousands of Marines are being deployed to the region. Many of us know what it feels like to be powerless in the face of war. However, I want to draw attention to something similar happening here on our campus—something that is within our control.

Let’s listen for a moment:

<https://youtu.be/A5Y2ECTV8Sk?si=paI5LHtDgO39Bt-R&t=118>

This is the UPD dispersal warning issued on April 30, 2024. The same warning was broadcast again on the morning of February 28, 2026. It includes explicit threats of force—tear gas, rubber bullets, and other forms of violence—directed at students.

This institution has a long history of student activism, including the occupation of buildings and campus spaces. Prior to 2024, this level of law enforcement escalation and administrative overreach had not been documented here.

As someone who has survived both war and law enforcement violence, I want to be clear: it is unacceptable to deploy tactical forces to remove nonviolent student protesters from a building. Should we celebrate the “freeing” of Nelson Hall—but at what cost?

The administration went so far as to involve the State Attorney General to file criminal charges against one of our most ethical, engaged, and successful graduate students in Engineering. Should we celebrate the arrest of one of our best students? The confiscation of his laptop and phone? The disruption of his ability to complete his degree? How low are we willing to go?

Our students are not the enemy. They are a painful reminder that, despite our intentions, we remain complicit in systems that produce harm.

This is not about individual intentions. I recognize and appreciate the efforts of Chief of Staff Gilden, VP Fisher, Karp, and Holliday. But this is a systemic issue.

I have said this repeatedly: without transparency, these harms will continue. Under the current structure, in times labeled as “emergency,” the Emergency Operations Center—whose processes remain opaque—can bypass and override shared governance bodies such as the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Free Speech Support Team.

If this continues, I believe we will see protests occurring more frequently and with escalating tensions.

If ICE were to come to campus, students and community members would mobilize. In response, UPD may escalate—harassing protesters, making arrests, and confiscating property in the name of maintaining order.

To prevent this, I respectfully request:

- That the Emergency Operations Center become transparent and be held accountable for its decisions;
- That President Carvajal accept the request to meet with the Grassroots ICE Rapid Response Network;
- That, as previously discussed, a campus-wide oversight committee for UPD be established;
- That all criminal charges against students be dropped, and that internal conduct processes be followed instead.

Thank you.

**CAL POLY HUMBOLDT  
University Senate**

**Resolution on Revision to the Assessment and Program Review Policy**

22-25/26-APC — March 24, 2026 — First Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the President that the attached revision to the Assessment and Program Review Policy be approved; and further be it

**RESOLVED:** That the policy is to be implemented beginning in the Fall 2026 semester.

**RATIONALE:** These revisions align university assessment policy with current practice and introduce a sustainable model for general education assessment that meets CSU requirements.

# CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

## Assessment and Program Review Policy

[Policy Number]

Office of Assessment

**Applies to:** Faculty and staff

**Supersedes:** P22-02

### Purpose of the Policy

To promote continuous, evidence-based improvement in support of the university's statement of purpose, this policy outlines the requirements for assessment and program review **in academic programs, including the GEAR program, and co-curricular programs** at Cal Poly Humboldt. ~~All academic programs, co-curricular programs, and operational units are included in this policy in order to maintain a comprehensive institutional effectiveness program.~~

The practices of assessment and program review serve both external and internal needs at Cal Poly Humboldt, as the university is beholden both to the expectations of its external stakeholders and accretor and to its own internal standards of excellence.

Externally, rigorous practices of assessment and program review are essential for Cal Poly Humboldt, both as a public trust expected to create, preserve, and disseminate knowledge for the public good and as a WSCUC-accredited university subject to numerous review criteria. To maintain and improve the university's accreditation, Cal Poly Humboldt's **degree programs and co-curricular** programs/units are charged with assuring the quality and continuous improvement of **the education and all services they provide that support the university's vision, values, and beliefs**. Among other things, the university's accretor looks for evidence of an infrastructure to assess student learning at program and institutional levels, effective co-curricular programs designed to support all students' personal and professional development, and a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, ~~including systematic review of all programs offered.~~

Assessment and program review also serve internal needs. While compliance with accreditation expectations is vital, robust processes of assessment and program review are also indispensable components of Cal Poly Humboldt's goals to foster excellence, creativity, and innovation. Faculty, staff, and administrators are united in their commitment to continuous improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Importantly, this commitment is motivated not by the pursuit of compliance but by the pursuit of excellence.

## Definitions

**Academic assessment** is the process of measuring and improving student learning in **academic programs**. Faculty define their expectations via learning outcomes, collect empirical data to evaluate student attainment, and reflect on findings to improve learning.

An **academic program** is a sequence of courses leading to a degree.<sup>1</sup> Some academic programs constitute an entire department, some share department designation with other academic programs, and some span multiple departments. Additionally, the university's GEAR program is treated as an academic program, in accordance with Executive Order 1100, which requires assessment of GE learning outcomes and "regular periodic reviews of GE program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer."<sup>2</sup>

**Co-curricular** refers to student activities, programs, and learning experiences that complement what students learn through the academic curriculum. These programs primarily have direct engagement with and/or impact on students and their learning. This category includes academic support programs/units, initiatives, activities, and services and can demonstrate impact on student retention, persistence, and/or graduation. Other campuses may refer to this as student affairs assessment. Examples include Housing and Residence Life, the **Academic Advising Center, and the individual Cultural Centers for Academic Excellence**. ~~Center for Community Based Learning, and Campus Recreation.~~

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this policy, academic programs do not include certificates or credentials.

<sup>2</sup> California State University, Executive Order No. 1100, *CSU General Education (GE) Requirements*, PolicyStat No. 13059034, Calstate.policystat.com (accessed March 11, 2026), <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/13059034/latest/>.

**Co-curricular assessment** is the process of measuring and improving the effectiveness of student-support programs/units, whether that is by measuring student learning or impact on student success.

~~**Operational** units serve administrative functions that maintain the institution and are essential to its operations. These units may include operational, structural, and/or organizational programs, initiatives, activities, and services. Other campuses may refer to these units as administrative, nonacademic, or educational support units. Examples include Facilities Management, Marketing and Communications (MarCom), and Information Security.~~

~~¶~~

~~**MBU** refers to major budget unit. For budgeting purposes, MBUs are smaller than divisions and larger than departments. MBUs are at the same level as colleges.~~

~~¶~~

~~The above characteristics are offered not as formal university definitions but to clarify their use in this policy document and to guide programs/units in developing and implementing their assessment structure. Some programs/units may have activities that have overlapping purposes. Academic, co-curricular, and operational activities may not be mutually exclusive for an individual program/unit. For example, place-based learning communities (academic and co-curricular) and Financial Aid (co-curricular and operational) serve more than one function.~~

## Policy Details

### I. Guiding Principles of Assessment

~~The following guiding principles are necessarily general in that they apply equally to all forms of assessment (academic, co-curricular, and operational) and all areas on campus. The following principles implicitly respect and support shared governance, drawing on the subject-matter expertise of our faculty, staff, and administrators. Our assessment activities are guided by Cal Poly Humboldt's collective purpose, vision, and values. Assessment is aligned with all phases of our university strategic plan, and it affirms our commitment to continuous improvement and inclusive excellence.~~

1. **Student Centered:** Assessment should be conducted with the goal of improving the student experience.

2. **Prioritized and Supported:** Quality assessment is a vital component of university integrity. Resource allocation should support its practice — and should prioritize innovations that result from it. Leaders from all principal stakeholders must support good practice as an ongoing and dynamic effort that is sensitive to change. This includes recognizing and rewarding examples of best practice.
3. **Meaningful:** Assessment should be useful and significant. Results should answer questions that are important to the program or unit doing the measuring while also informing overall institutional quality. Efforts should compare findings with desired outcomes and objectives — not with the findings of other programs or units.
4. ~~**Integrated:** Assessment is part of an agenda for excellence and should be integrated in the functions of all university work, from conceptualization to development and implementation.~~
5. **Formative:** Assessment is a formative process where various ongoing assessments yield insights that inform program changes in real time, including the action of making no change.
6. **Summative:** Assessment examines results over an entire cycle, which allows for summative reflection on the effectiveness of practices followed by evidence-informed changes.
7. **Inspirational:** Insights from earnest assessment can prompt bold re-envisioning and transformational action. Assessment should be seen as an opportunity to identify alternative pathways to achieving desired outcomes. It should yield actionable results — results that should never be used punitively.

## II. Annual Assessment

### IIa. Academic Assessment in Degree Programs

#### Responsible Parties:

Expectations of learning assessment in degree programs are communicated under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with year-to-year coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the dean of undergraduate and graduate education, department chairs, and program coordinators, and the GEAR Committee chair.

## What Programs Do:

Programs will structure their faculty workload in such a way that ensures that they are fulfilling the following learning-assessment activities in support of evidence-based continuous improvement:

- Programs maintain six-year assessment plans<sup>3</sup> posted on the university's assessment web page. Plans are structured according to the CSU's expectations, with student learning outcomes (SLOs) aimed at demonstrating achievement of program learning outcomes (PLOs), which, in turn, are aligned with the university's institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). All PLOs shall be assessed at least once per six-year cycle.
- Programs collect and analyze data according to the schedule identified in their assessment plans.
- Programs submit annual assessment reports to the director of assessment describing the findings, discussions, and actions resulting from their assessment activities.

## Timeline:

Each fall, programs will submit a report describing the learning-assessment activities of the previous academic year.<sup>4</sup> These annual assessment reports are due on November 1st. A template identifying report specifics as well as submission and archival procedures is located on the university's assessment web page.

## IIb. Academic Assessment of General Education

The CSU policy on [General Education \(GE\) Requirements](#) states that “campuses shall develop an assessment plan that aligns the GE curriculum with campus GE outcomes; specifies explicit criteria for assessing the stated outcomes; identifies when and how each outcome shall be assessed; organizes and analyzes the collection of evidence; and uses the assessment results to make improvements to the GE program, courses and pedagogy.”<sup>5</sup> In accordance with this expectation, Cal Poly Humboldt endeavors with this policy to establish a sustainable protocol for annual assessment of student learning in

---

<sup>3</sup> Plans align to the university's seven-year program-review cycle by outlining six years of assessment activity followed by program review in the seventh year.

<sup>4</sup> This is the strongly recommended timeline, though it is not required. Programs are free to perform assessment activities in the fall shortly before reporting.

<sup>5</sup> CSU Executive Order 1100, PolicyStat No. 13059034.

general education. Attempts to measure learning will focus on student achievement of Cal Poly Humboldt's institutional learning outcomes (ILOs).

**Responsible Parties:**

Expectations of GE learning assessment are communicated under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with year-to-year coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the dean of undergraduate studies, university faculty, and the GEAR Committee.

**What Programs Do:**

Academic departments seeking certification or re-recertification of upper-division general education courses must participate in program assessment practices whenever those courses are offered. Participation entails the following:

(Re-)Certification of an upper-division GE course requires identification of a signature assignment designed to elicit student demonstrations of the skills and knowledge necessary to achieve one of the seven ILOs. (The course outline submitted in the (re-)certification process requires this description for upper-division GE courses; signature assignments are not required of other GEAR-certified courses.) The degree of room for individual faculty personalization of a signature assignment will vary according to the degree of specificity communicated in the course outline.

To maintain certification of an upper-division GE course, faculty teaching each iteration of the course must deposit copies of all student signature assignment submissions in the university's GE signature assignment repository by the end of the semester's faculty work days. Anonymization of submissions is not required, as the repository will meet university requirements for protection of student identification, but faculty may remove such identification.

**What the GEAR Committee Does:**

Annual assessment of learning in GE will occur in the GEAR Committee each spring. Committee members will score student artifacts via a rubric designed to measure learning of skills and knowledge necessary to achieve one of the seven ILOs.

Assessment protocols will be described in more detail (i.e., rubric authorship, inter-rater reliability, etc.) in the ICC bylaws for the GEAR Committee.

## Timeline:

The GEAR Committee chair and the director of assessment will present annual spring assessment findings and committee recommendations to the university the following fall.

## IIc. Co-Curricular and Operational Assessment

### Responsible Parties:

Expectations of assessment are communicated under the authority of the vice presidents of Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management & Student Success, with year-to-year coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with program/unit directors and coordinators. ~~Expectations of annual co-curricular and operational assessment are communicated under the authority of the President's Administrative Team, with coordination with the Integrated Assessment and Planning Working Group. More specific year-to-year coordination and oversight is provided by the university's associate director of institutional assessment in collaboration with vice presidents, provost, college deans, major budget unit (MBU) directors, and department managers.~~

### What Programs/Units Do:

Programs/Units will structure their staff workload in such a way that ensures that they are fulfilling the following assessment activities in support of evidence-based continuous improvement:

- Programs/Units maintain six-year assessment plans posted on the university's assessment web page. Plans are structured according to the expectations set forth by the WSCUC expectation that the university "assesses the effectiveness of its student support and co-curricular programs and services and uses the results for improvement"<sup>6</sup>. ~~Integrated Assessment and Planning Working Group, with unit objectives aimed at demonstrating achievement of division outcomes, which, in turn, are aligned with the university's strategic planning goals.~~
- ~~Assessment plans should be reviewed and approved by the unit's MBU director, dean and/or divisional VP every seven years.~~

---

<sup>6</sup>WASC Senior College and University Commission, *2023 Handbook of Accreditation*, (Alameda, CA: WSCUC), Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs), CFR 2.14, accessed March 11, 2026, <https://www.wscuc.org/handbook2023/>.

- Programs/Units collect and analyze data each academic year (~~summer, fall, and spring~~) according to the schedule identified in their assessment plans.
- Programs/Units submit annual assessment reports to the director of assessment and divisional leadership describing the findings and discussions resulting from their activities.

~~The unit is responsible for designating a team or person to write and submit its annual assessment report. Reports are due June 30 each summer. Departments, MBUs or divisions that oversee one or more units are expected to establish internal processes and deadlines for their units regarding the submission, review, and collection of final drafts of their units' annual assessment reports. After an initial review of the unit assessment report has been completed by the associate director of institutional assessment and all feedback has been addressed, a final draft should be submitted to the division before October 1st.~~

#### **Timeline:**

Each co-curricular program/unit is responsible for designating a team or person to write and submit its annual report describing the assessment activities of the previous academic year. These annual assessment reports are due on ~~June 30th on October 1st~~. A template identifying report specifics as well as submission and archival procedures is located on the university's assessment web page. ~~The divisions are responsible for ensuring that the Office of Assessment has access to all their units' annual assessment reports, including accompanying evidence.~~

### **III. Program Review**

#### **IIIa. Academic Program Review: Degree Programs**

##### **Responsible Parties:**

Academic program reviews shall be conducted under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) and the Office of Institutional Research, Analytics, and Reporting (IRAR).

### **What Programs Do:**

Each program undergoing review (see below for exceptions for externally accredited programs) will prepare a self-study in which program faculty engage with institutional data identifying program performance in metrics reflecting university priorities, summarize and reflect on the cycle's assessment activities, create a new six-year assessment plan, and draft an action plan for the coming cycle. The self-study template is located on the university's assessment web page.

Self-studies are submitted to the ICC for university-internal peer review according to ICC bylaws<sup>7</sup> and according to the deadline in place for that academic year. Programs will reflect on peer recommendations prior to sending their self-studies to external reviewers.

After receiving its ICC peer review, the program in review will send its self-study to an external reviewer in advance of the reviewer's campus visit.<sup>8</sup> External reviews shall be conducted in the spring of the review year. The specifics of the external reviewer's report are contained in a template available on the university's assessment web page.<sup>9</sup>

### **What Administration Does:**

After reading a program's self-study and internal and external reviews, the provost, college dean, department chair, and program lead (where applicable) will bring the process to a close via an action plan by the end of the following fall semester. These plans identify actions and responsible parties for the coming cycle.

### **Schedule of Academic Program Review:**

Reviews of academic programs occur every seven years. Program cycles comprise six years of learning assessment and other actions, followed by review and planning in year seven. Actions performed over the six years (beyond annual assessment expectations) are determined by the action plan that ended a given program's previous review cycle.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cal Poly Humboldt, *Faculty Handbook*, **Appendix G: Integrated Curriculum Committee Bylaws and Rules of Procedure** (updated August 2023), in *Faculty Handbook*, Academic Affairs, California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt, <https://www.humboldt.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-handbook> (accessed March 11, 2026).

<sup>8</sup> Virtual external reviews are subject to dean approval on a case-by-case basis.

<sup>9</sup> Cal Poly Humboldt, *Assessment & Program Review*, accessed March 11, 2026, <https://www.humboldt.edu/academic-programs/assessment-program-review>.

The director of assessment establishes and maintains the sequence of program reviews, which is posted on the university's assessment web page. Postponements or accelerations are granted only **at the discretion of the director in consultation with the college dean and associate vice president for academic programs** ~~for the direct of circumstances.~~

### **Externally Accredited Programs:**

Program review for externally accredited programs diverges somewhat from the protocol for other Cal Poly Humboldt programs. Accredited degree programs undergo periodic reviews with their accreditors, and, given the significant workload that these reviews involve, these programs are not required to prepare the standard program review self-study for the university. However, the process of accreditation still comprises a self-study, an ICC peer review, an external review, and an action plan upon completion.

The year preceding an accreditor's evaluation shall be considered the program review year for an externally accredited program. The accreditor determines the self-study format (diverging from Cal Poly Humboldt's standard self-study) and serves as the external reviewer. The ICC will conduct its peer review by reading the self-study prepared for the accreditor; the deadline for submission to the ICC will be determined by the deadline for the accreditation paperwork.

The action plan concluding the process will identify a timeline of actions and responsible parties for the coming (in this case, accreditation) cycle. As with non-accredited programs, the action plan will be agreed upon by the program, the college dean, and the provost. The accreditor's requirements and recommendations may determine much of the action plan's content.

### **IIIb. Academic Program Review: GEAR Program**

[Executive Order 1100](#) states that "campuses shall provide for regular periodic reviews of GE program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should address the meaning, quality, and integrity of the campus GE program and how ongoing assessment informs improvements to the delivery of and student learning experiences in GE."<sup>10</sup> In accordance with this expectation, the university establishes expectations, with this policy, for periodic comprehensive reviews of its GEAR program.

---

<sup>10</sup>CSU Executive Order 1100, PolicyStat No. 13059034.

### **Responsible Parties:**

GEAR program reviews shall be conducted under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with coordination and oversight by the dean of undergraduate studies, the GEAR Committee chair, and the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) and the Office of Institutional Research, Analytics, and Reporting (IRAR).

### **What Responsible Parties Do:**

Elements of a GEAR program review are free to evolve from cycle to cycle. A recommended timeline of steps for future iterations is given:

- gather IR data (spring)
- conduct campus surveys for information desired beyond available IR data (spring)
- contract with external reviewer (summer-fall)
- prepare self-study in advance of external review (summer-fall)
- external review (winter)
- add conclusions and recommendations after the external review (spring)
- present conclusions and recommendations to the ICC and University Senate (following fall)

### **Schedule of GEAR Program Review:**

Given the number of programs offering general education courses, GEAR program reviews involve significant coordination across the university. In light of the extensive planning and labor, GEAR program reviews will occur every ten years, less frequently than the seven-year review cycle for degree programs.

### **IIIc. Co-Curricular ~~and Operational~~ Program Review**

WSCUC and CSU expectations for quality assurance and continuous improvement of co-curricular programs are captured in WSCUC's criterion for review 2.14: *The institution assesses the effectiveness of its student support and co-curricular programs and services and uses the results for improvement.*

Annual assessment endeavors fulfill this expectation, and, thus, the university has no systematic program review requirements for co-curricular programs. The divisions of Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management & Student Success are free to establish

expectations for periodic reviews of their co-curricular / student-support units as they see fit.

~~Co-curricular programs and operational units conduct program reviews under the authority of the President's Advisory Team, with coordination and oversight by the university's associate director of institutional assessment in collaboration with the Integrated Assessment and Planning Working (IAPW) Group and the Office of Institutional Research, Analytics, and Reporting (IRAR).~~¶

### ~~What Programs Do:~~¶

~~Each program undergoing review (see below for exceptions for externally accredited programs) will prepare a self-study in which they engage with data identifying program performance in metrics reflecting university, division, and diversity and inclusion priorities, summarize and reflect on previous assessment activities, and create a new six-year assessment plan that also aligns with the institutional strategic plan. The self-study template is located on the university's institutional assessment web page.~~¶

~~Self-studies are submitted to the IAPW for university internal peer review according to the deadline in place that year. Programs and units will reflect on peer recommendations prior to sending their self-studies to external reviewers.~~¶

~~After receiving its IAPW peer review, the program in review will send its self-study to an external reviewer in advance of the reviewers' campus visit. External reviews shall be conducted in the spring of the review year. The specifics of the external reviewer's report are contained in a template available on the university's institutional assessment web page.~~¶

### ~~What Divisions Do:~~¶

~~After reading the program's / unit's self-study and internal and external reviews, the vice president or provost will meet with the MBU or department manager and bring the process to a close via an MOU identifying actions and responsible parties for the coming cycle.~~¶

### ~~Schedule of Co-Curricular and Operational Program Review:~~¶

~~Reviews of co-curricular programs and operational units occur every seven years. The cycle comprises six years of annual assessment and actions followed by review and planning in year seven. Actions performed over the six years (beyond annual assessment~~

expectations) are determined by the MOU that ended a given program's previous review cycle.¶¶

The associate director of institutional assessment establishes and maintains the sequence of program reviews, which is posted on the university's institutional assessment web page. Postponements or accelerations are granted only for the direst of circumstances.¶¶

### **Externally Accredited Programs:¶¶**

Program review for externally accredited programs diverges somewhat from the protocol for other Cal Poly Humboldt programs. Accredited programs like the Health Center and the Child Development Center are required to report periodically with their accreditors, and, given the significant workload that these reports involve, these programs are not required to prepare the standard program review self-study for the university. However, the process of accreditation still comprises a self-study, an IAPW peer review, an external review, and an MOU upon completion. The accreditor determines the self-study format (diverging from Cal Poly Humboldt's standard self-study) and serves as the external reviewer. As with non-accredited programs, the MOU will serve as an action plan agreed upon by the program, the college dean, and the provost. The accreditor's requirements and recommendations may determine much of the MOU's content.

## **History**

Reviewed by Academic Policies Committee: 03/09/2026

Reviewed by University Senate: 03/24/2026

Approved by President: MM/DD/YYYY

# CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

## Assessment and Program Review Policy

[Policy Number]

Office of Assessment

**Applies to:** Faculty and staff

**Supersedes:** P22-02

### Purpose of the Policy

To promote continuous, evidence-based improvement in support of the university's statement of purpose, this policy outlines the requirements for assessment and program review in academic programs, including the GEAR program, and co-curricular programs at Cal Poly Humboldt.

The practices of assessment and program review serve both external and internal needs at Cal Poly Humboldt, as the university is beholden both to the expectations of its external stakeholders and accreditors and to its own internal standards of excellence.

Externally, rigorous practices of assessment and program review are essential for Cal Poly Humboldt, both as a public trust expected to create, preserve, and disseminate knowledge for the public good and as a WSCUC-accredited university subject to numerous review criteria. To maintain and improve the university's accreditation, Cal Poly Humboldt's degree programs and co-curricular programs/units are charged with assuring the quality and continuous improvement of the education and services they provide. Among other things, the university's accreditors look for evidence of an infrastructure to assess student learning at program and institutional levels, effective co-curricular programs designed to support all students' personal and professional development, and a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas.

Assessment and program review also serve internal needs. While compliance with accreditation expectations is vital, robust processes of assessment and program review

are also indispensable components of Cal Poly Humboldt's goals to foster excellence, creativity, and innovation. Faculty, staff, and administrators are united in their commitment to continuous improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Importantly, this commitment is motivated not by the pursuit of compliance but by the pursuit of excellence.

## Definitions

**Academic assessment** is the process of measuring and improving student learning in academic programs. Faculty define their expectations via learning outcomes, collect empirical data to evaluate student attainment, and reflect on findings to improve learning.

An **academic program** is a sequence of courses leading to a degree.<sup>1</sup> Some academic programs constitute an entire department, some share department designation with other academic programs, and some span multiple departments. Additionally, the university's GEAR program is treated as an academic program, in accordance with Executive Order 1100, which requires assessment of GE learning outcomes and "regular periodic reviews of GE program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer."<sup>2</sup>

**Co-curricular** refers to student activities, programs, and learning experiences that complement what students learn through the academic curriculum. These programs primarily have direct engagement with and/or impact on students and their learning. This category includes academic support programs/units, initiatives, activities, and services and can demonstrate impact on student retention, persistence, and/or graduation. Other campuses may refer to this as student affairs assessment. Examples include Housing and Residence Life, the Academic Advising Center, and the individual Cultural Centers for Academic Excellence.

**Co-curricular assessment** is the process of measuring and improving the effectiveness of student-support programs/units, whether that is by measuring student learning or impact on student success.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this policy, academic programs do not include certificates or credentials.

<sup>2</sup> California State University, Executive Order No. 1100, CSU General Education (GE) Requirements, PolicyStat No. 13059034, Calstate.policystat.com (accessed March 11, 2026), <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/13059034/latest/>.

## Policy Details

### I. Guiding Principles of Assessment

The following principles implicitly respect and support shared governance, drawing on the subject-matter expertise of our faculty, staff, and administrators. Our assessment activities are guided by Cal Poly Humboldt's collective purpose, vision, and values.

1. **Student Centered:** Assessment should be conducted with the goal of improving the student experience.
2. **Prioritized and Supported:** Quality assessment is a vital component of university integrity. Resource allocation should support its practice — and should prioritize innovations that result from it. Leaders from all principal stakeholders must support good practice as an ongoing and dynamic effort that is sensitive to change. This includes recognizing and rewarding examples of best practice.
3. **Meaningful:** Assessment should be useful and significant. Results should answer questions that are important to the program or unit doing the measuring while also informing overall institutional quality. Efforts should compare findings with desired outcomes and objectives — not with the findings of other programs or units.
4. **Formative:** Assessment is a formative process where various ongoing assessments yield insights that inform program changes in real time, including the action of making no change.
5. **Summative:** Assessment examines results over an entire cycle, which allows for summative reflection on the effectiveness of practices followed by evidence-informed changes.
6. **Inspirational:** Insights from earnest assessment can prompt bold re-envisioning and transformational action. Assessment should be seen as an opportunity to identify alternative pathways to achieving desired outcomes. It should yield actionable results — results that should never be used punitively.

## **II. Annual Assessment**

### **Ila. Academic Assessment in Degree Programs**

#### **Responsible Parties:**

Expectations of learning assessment in degree programs are communicated under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with year-to-year coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the dean of undergraduate and graduate education, department chairs, and program coordinators.

#### **What Programs Do:**

Programs will structure their faculty workload in such a way that ensures that they are fulfilling the following learning-assessment activities in support of evidence-based continuous improvement:

- Programs maintain six-year assessment plans<sup>3</sup> posted on the university's assessment web page. Plans are structured according to the CSU's expectations, with student learning outcomes (SLOs) aimed at demonstrating achievement of program learning outcomes (PLOs), which, in turn, are aligned with the university's institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). All PLOs shall be assessed at least once per six-year cycle.
- Programs collect and analyze data according to the schedule identified in their assessment plans.
- Programs submit annual assessment reports to the director of assessment describing the findings, discussions, and actions resulting from their assessment activities.

#### **Timeline:**

Each fall, programs will submit a report describing the learning-assessment activities of the previous academic year.<sup>4</sup> These annual assessment reports are due on November 1st. A template identifying report specifics as well as submission and archival procedures is located on the university's assessment web page.

---

<sup>3</sup> Plans align to the university's seven-year program-review cycle by outlining six years of assessment activity followed by program review in the seventh year.

<sup>4</sup> This is the strongly recommended timeline, though it is not required. Programs are free to perform assessment activities in the fall shortly before reporting.

## **IIb. Academic Assessment of General Education**

The CSU policy on General Education (GE) Requirements states that “campuses shall develop an assessment plan that aligns the GE curriculum with campus GE outcomes; specifies explicit criteria for assessing the stated outcomes; identifies when and how each outcome shall be assessed; organizes and analyzes the collection of evidence; and uses the assessment results to make improvements to the GE program, courses and pedagogy.”<sup>5</sup> In accordance with this expectation, Cal Poly Humboldt endeavors with this policy to establish a sustainable protocol for annual assessment of student learning in general education. Attempts to measure learning will focus on student achievement of Cal Poly Humboldt’s institutional learning outcomes (ILOs).

### **Responsible Parties:**

Expectations of GE learning assessment are communicated under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with year-to-year coordination and oversight by the university’s director of assessment in collaboration with the dean of undergraduate studies, university faculty, and the GEAR Committee.

### **What Programs Do:**

Academic departments seeking certification or re-recertification of upper-division general education courses must participate in program assessment practices whenever those courses are offered. Participation entails the following:

(Re-)Certification of an upper-division GE course requires identification of a signature assignment designed to elicit student demonstrations of the skills and knowledge necessary to achieve one of the seven ILOs. (The course outline submitted in the (re-)certification process requires this description for upper-division GE courses; signature assignments are not required of other GEAR-certified courses.) The degree of room for individual faculty personalization of a signature assignment will vary according to the degree of specificity communicated in the course outline.

To maintain certification of an upper-division GE course, faculty teaching each iteration of the course must deposit copies of all student signature assignment submissions in the university’s GE signature assignment repository by the end of the semester’s faculty work days. Anonymization of submissions is not required, as the repository will meet

---

<sup>5</sup> CSU Executive Order 1100, PolicyStat No. 13059034.

university requirements for protection of student identification, but faculty may remove such identification.

### **What the GEAR Committee Does:**

Annual assessment of learning in GE will occur in the GEAR Committee each spring. Committee members will score student artifacts via a rubric designed to measure learning of skills and knowledge necessary to achieve one of the seven ILOs.

Assessment protocols will be described in more detail (i.e., rubric authorship, inter-rater reliability, etc.) in the ICC bylaws for the GEAR Committee.

### **Timeline:**

The GEAR Committee chair and the director of assessment will present annual spring assessment findings and committee recommendations to the university the following fall.

## **IIc. Co-Curricular Assessment**

### **Responsible Parties:**

Expectations of assessment are communicated under the authority of the vice presidents of Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management & Student Success, with year-to-year coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with program/unit directors and coordinators.

### **What Programs/Units Do:**

Programs/Units will structure their staff workload in such a way that ensures that they are fulfilling the following assessment activities in support of evidence-based continuous improvement:

- Programs/Units maintain six-year assessment plans posted on the university's assessment web page. Plans are structured according to the expectations set forth by the WSCUC expectation that the university "assesses the effectiveness of its student support and co-curricular programs and services and uses the results for improvement"<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup>WASC Senior College and University Commission, 2023 Handbook of Accreditation, (Alameda, CA: WSCUC), Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs), CFR 2.14, accessed March 11, 2026, <https://www.wscuc.org/handbook2023/>.

- Programs/Units collect and analyze data each academic year according to the schedule identified in their assessment plans.
- Programs/Units submit annual assessment reports to the director of assessment and divisional leadership describing the findings and discussions resulting from their activities.

**Timeline:**

Each co-curricular program/unit is responsible for designating a team or person to write and submit its annual report describing the assessment activities of the previous academic year. These annual assessment reports are due on June 30th. A template identifying report specifics as well as submission and archival procedures is located on the university's assessment web page.

**III. Program Review**

**IIIa. Academic Program Review: Degree Programs**

**Responsible Parties:**

Academic program reviews shall be conducted under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with coordination and oversight by the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) and the Office of Institutional Research, Analytics, and Reporting (IRAR).

**What Programs Do:**

Each program undergoing review (see below for exceptions for externally accredited programs) will prepare a self-study in which program faculty engage with institutional data identifying program performance in metrics reflecting university priorities, summarize and reflect on the cycle's assessment activities, create a new six-year assessment plan, and draft an action plan for the coming cycle. The self-study template is located on the university's assessment web page.

Self-studies are submitted to the ICC for university-internal peer review according to ICC bylaws<sup>7</sup> and according to the deadline in place for that academic year. Programs will reflect on peer recommendations prior to sending their self-studies to external reviewers.

After receiving its ICC peer review, the program in review will send its self-study to an external reviewer in advance of the reviewer's campus visit.<sup>8</sup> External reviews shall be conducted in the spring of the review year. The specifics of the external reviewer's report are contained in a template available on the university's assessment web page.<sup>9</sup>

### **What Administration Does:**

After reading a program's self-study and internal and external reviews, the provost, college dean, department chair, and program lead (where applicable) will bring the process to a close via an action plan by the end of the following fall semester. These plans identify actions and responsible parties for the coming cycle.

### **Schedule of Academic Program Review:**

Reviews of academic programs occur every seven years. Program cycles comprise six years of learning assessment and other actions, followed by review and planning in year seven. Actions performed over the six years (beyond annual assessment expectations) are determined by the action plan that ended a given program's previous review cycle.

The director of assessment establishes and maintains the sequence of program reviews, which is posted on the university's assessment web page. Postponements or accelerations are granted only at the discretion of the director in consultation with the college dean and associate vice president for academic programs

### **Externally Accredited Programs:**

Program review for externally accredited programs diverges somewhat from the protocol for other Cal Poly Humboldt programs. Accredited degree programs undergo

---

<sup>7</sup> Cal Poly Humboldt, Faculty Handbook, Appendix G: Integrated Curriculum Committee Bylaws and Rules of Procedure (updated August 2023), in Faculty Handbook, Academic Affairs, California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt, <https://www.humboldt.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-handbook> (accessed March 11, 2026).

<sup>8</sup> Virtual external reviews are subject to dean approval on a case-by-case basis.

<sup>9</sup> Cal Poly Humboldt, Assessment & Program Review, accessed March 11, 2026, <https://www.humboldt.edu/academic-programs/assessment-program-review>.

periodic reviews with their accreditors, and, given the significant workload that these reviews involve, these programs are not required to prepare the standard program review self-study for the university. However, the process of accreditation still comprises a self-study, an ICC peer review, an external review, and an action plan upon completion.

The year preceding an accreditor's evaluation shall be considered the program review year for an externally accredited program. The accreditor determines the self-study format (diverging from Cal Poly Humboldt's standard self-study) and serves as the external reviewer. The ICC will conduct its peer review by reading the self-study prepared for the accreditor; the deadline for submission to the ICC will be determined by the deadline for the accreditation paperwork.

The action plan concluding the process will identify a timeline of actions and responsible parties for the coming (in this case, accreditation) cycle. As with non-accredited programs, the action plan will be agreed upon by the program, the college dean, and the provost. The accreditor's requirements and recommendations may determine much of the action plan's content.

### **IIIb. Academic Program Review: GEAR Program**

Executive Order 1100 states that "campuses shall provide for regular periodic reviews of GE program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should address the meaning, quality, and integrity of the campus GE program and how ongoing assessment informs improvements to the delivery of and student learning experiences in GE."<sup>10</sup> In accordance with this expectation, the university establishes expectations, with this policy, for periodic comprehensive reviews of its GEAR program.

#### **Responsible Parties:**

GEAR program reviews shall be conducted under the authority of the vice president of Academic Affairs, with coordination and oversight by the dean of undergraduate studies, the GEAR Committee chair, and the university's director of assessment in collaboration with the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) and the Office of Institutional Research, Analytics, and Reporting (IRAR).

---

<sup>10</sup>CSU Executive Order 1100, PolicyStat No. 13059034.

### **What Responsible Parties Do:**

Elements of a GEAR program review are free to evolve from cycle to cycle. A recommended timeline of steps for future iterations is given:

- gather IR data (spring)
- conduct campus surveys for information desired beyond available IR data (spring)
- contract with external reviewer (summer-fall)
- prepare self-study in advance of external review (summer-fall)
- external review (winter)
- add conclusions and recommendations after the external review (spring)
- present conclusions and recommendations to the ICC and University Senate (following fall)

### **Schedule of GEAR Program Review:**

Given the number of programs offering general education courses, GEAR program reviews involve significant coordination across the university. In light of the extensive planning and labor, GEAR program reviews will occur every ten years, less frequently than the seven-year review cycle for degree programs.

### **IIIc. Co-Curricular Program Review**

WSCUC and CSU expectations for quality assurance and continuous improvement of co-curricular programs are captured in WSCUC's criterion for review 2.14: *The institution assesses the effectiveness of its student support and co-curricular programs and services and uses the results for improvement.*

Annual assessment endeavors fulfill this expectation, and, thus, the university has no systematic program review requirements for co-curricular programs. The divisions of Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management & Student Success are free to establish expectations for periodic reviews of their co-curricular / student-support units as they see fit.

## **History**

Reviewed by Academic Policies Committee: 03/09/2026

Reviewed by University Senate: 03/24/2026

Approved by President: MM/DD/YYYY

# Assessment and Program Review Policy Revision

## First Reading



# ➤ Why the revision?

There are two factors driving these policy revisions:

1. Address changes in university assessment and program review practices for co-curricular programs and operational units
2. Propose new protocols for assessment of student learning in the university's GEAR program

## ➤ Changes in university assessment and program review practices

The scope of institutional assessment of co-curricular programs and operational units was narrowed after the 2023 departure of the university's associate director of institutional assessment.

Current practices, which meet all WSCUC and CSU expectations and obligations, are now reflected in the **changes suggested** in the new revised policy.

## ➤ New protocols for assessment in the university's GEAR program

The **new policy content** is the result of the GEAR Committee's response to the recommendations included in the external reviewer's report that was submitted as part of the recent GEAR program review.

With these policy additions, the GEAR Committee proposes new protocols for the assessment of learning in general education. These proposed protocols for periodic GEAR program review are *narrower in scope* and *more sustainable in practice* than previous unrealized aims:

- Signature assignments will be collected from all upper-division GE courses (no other GEAR courses will be required to feature a signature assignment)
- Faculty will submit ungraded student work, which will be scored for ILO achievement on annual basis by the GEAR Committee

# Building Connections for a Resilient Community



# **Community Resilience Steering Group (CRSG)**

Members:

Rosamel Benavides-Garb

Michelle Caisse

Eduardo Cruz

Michael Fisher

Chrissy Holliday

Heather Honig

Roberto Mónico

Brenda Perez

# > **CRSG Charge**

Identify existing groups on campus to create a unified network of preparation and response. This network will serve as the central touchstone for promotion, campus communication, presentation, and community feedback.

Two areas of focus and coordination for the network include:

- **Formal** - Institutional response to immigration enforcement activity on campus.
- **Informal** - Campus Community Response - how we can help shape this as a civic and educational experience

## ➤ **Two Areas of Focus**

- **Formal: Institutional Response During an Event on Campus**

What we can do to protect our community. Understanding Campus Protocols, Rights, and Responsibilities (Based on CSU Policy & California Law).

- **Informal: Preparing our Community Before and After an Event on Campus**

What we can do **RIGHT NOW** to ensure we have a community ready to respond AND recover from ICE actions. This is where we learn together.

## ➤ **Response During an Event: Communication**

**Cal Poly Humboldt is committed to our principles:** The safety of our students and employees, preventing discrimination based on immigration status, protection of privacy rights, compliance with California law, and following CSU systemwide policy

- Provide clear, factual guidance
- Explain Cal Poly Humboldt's legal obligations
- Clarify roles of employees and University Police
- Reduce fear and misinformation

# ➤ Response During an Event: Enforcement

## Who Enforces Immigration Law?

Immigration law is enforced by the federal government, including:

- ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement)
- CBP (Customs and Border Protection)
- Other DHS-authorized federal officers

## Who Does not Enforces Immigration Law?

- Local jurisdictions, including UPD, APD City sanctuary ordinance **DO NOT** enforce immigration law
- Humboldt County sanctuary ordinance (Measure K) 2018
- California Law, Senate Bill 58, “California Values Act” 2018 largely establishes protections outlined in sanctuary ordinance.

# ➤ **Response During an Event: UPD**

## **Role of University Police (UPD)**

- California Values Act (Law SB 58, 2018) limits use of state resources for federal immigration enforcement
- UPD **will not** investigate, detain, or arrest individuals solely for immigration violations
- UPD **will not** conduct joint immigration enforcement operations
- UPD **will not** enforce federal immigration law
- UPD **will not** detain individuals based solely on suspected immigration status

# ➤ **Response During an Event: ICE**

## **Can ICE Come Onto Campus?**

Yes — but with limits.

Because Cal Poly Humboldt is a public university:

- Public areas of campus are open to federal officers
- Non-public areas are restricted, entry into non-public areas requires a **judicial warrant**

# ➤ **Response During an Event: Space**

## **What Are Public Areas?**

University Quad and Balabanis Art Quad are our two designated public spaces. Additionally, public streets sidewalks and pedestrian thoroughfares are considered public areas.

## **What Are Non-Public Areas?**

*All University Buildings and Residence Halls.* This includes but is not limited to faculty and administrative offices, classrooms, research labs, locker rooms, maintenance facilities, building hallways and restrooms.

# > Response During an Event: Diversity Housing?

For residence halls and campus apartments:

- Individuals have privacy rights
- Administrative warrants do NOT authorize entry without consent
- Specific Judicial warrants may authorize entry

Housing staff must:

- Contact the campus designated official
- Contact UPD
- Avoid interfering with law enforcement

# ➤ **Response During an Event**

## **Types of Warrants**

### 1. Administrative Warrant

- Issued by DHS
- NOT signed by a judge
- Does NOT allow entry into private areas without consent

### 2. Judicial Warrant

- Signed by a federal judge
- May authorize entry and arrest
- Must specify location or individual

# ➤ **Response During an Event:**

## **Records**

**Privacy of Student & Employee Records:** Employees should refer requests to the designated campus official.

Student and employee records are protected by:

- FERPA
- California Education Code § 66093.3
- Information Practices Act
- HIPAA (if applicable)
- CSU privacy policy

Federal immigration officers:

- Must provide a valid subpoena for records
- Do NOT have automatic access

# ➤ **Response During an Event**

## **International Students (F-1, J-1, M Visas)**

CSU participates in:

- SEVIS (Student & Exchange Visitor Information System)
- Certain visa-related data must be shared with DHS under federal regulation

However:

- FERPA protections still apply
- Only designated officials (DSOs) should respond to requests, HR and Registrar are responsible for employee and students respectively.

# ➤ **Response During an Event**

## **Employment Records (I-9 Inspections)**

If ICE issues a Notice of Inspection:

- CSU must notify affected employees within 72 hours
- Notice must follow California Labor Code § 90.2
- Managers should immediately notify Human Resources and campus counsel.

# ➤ Response During an Event: ICE on Campus

When there is enforcement activity on campus...

If you are approached:

- Remain calm and professional
- **Do NOT** grant access to non-public areas
- Inform the officer you must contact the **designated campus official** (ext.3626) or (707-826-3626)

If exigent (emergency) circumstances:

- Immediately notify University Police (911) OR
- Immediately notify Human Resources (ext.3626) or (707-826-3626)

# ➤ **Response During an Event**

Employees **should** NOT:

- Put themselves in physical danger

Employees **ARE** required to:

- Maintain privacy laws
- Contact designated officials

Employees **must** NOT:

- Destroy or conceal records
- Interfere with lawful arrests

# ➤ Response During an Event: Intentionality

**Addressing Misinformation.** Not every ICE presence on campus is enforcement-related.

ICE may visit for:

- Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP) compliance
- Administrative matters
- Career fairs (which campuses cannot prohibit)

False rumors can cause unnecessary panic. Please report observations to the **designated campus official** (ext. 3626) or (707-826-3626)

# **Response During an Event**

## **Campus Support Resources**

Cal Poly Humboldt provides:

- Designated campus point of contact for immigration-related inquiries
- Access to free CSU immigration legal services (systemwide program). The Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA)
- Dream Center and undocumented student support services
- University Police assistance
- Please Visit the website located on the Cal Poly Humboldt banner.

# How to Prepare and Recover

## -Learning Together-



# ➤ What we are Currently Doing

## Campus Support Resources

- Making resources easily accessible (QR Codes Immigration and Rights website)
- Notification Templates - timely communication
- Building a community response network.
- Access to free CSU immigration legal services (systemwide program). The Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA)
- Dream Center and undocumented student support services
- University Police assistance
- Please Visit the website located on the Cal Poly Humboldt banner.

# ➤ **What should we be doing**

## **Collective discussion topics:**

- What are areas that are of major concern to you?
- What have you heard in our community that we should be addressing?
- Where should we go next?
- What community groups do you think could benefit from this presentation/conversation?
- Who we can learn from?

**On Behalf of the Community  
Resilience Steering Group (CRSG)  
and the University Senate**

**THANK YOU!**

*Rooted & Rising Together*  
**WSCUC Accreditation  
Site Visit:**

*April 15th - 17th, 2026*

*University Senate*



**H.**

# Outline

- Review of the 2018 Commission Recommendations & Our Responses in Our 2025 Report
- Response to 2025 Institutional Report Submitted in September
  - Off-site Review Commendations
  - Site Visit 2026 Lines of Inquiry
- In Conclusion
  - Reflections: Future Focused
  - Sustaining the Polytechnic Vision
- Discussion



# Review

Since the **2018 Commission** and **2021 Special Visit action letters**, Cal Poly Humboldt has demonstrated sustained, measurable progress across all major recommendation areas, culminating in a strong **2025 Institutional Report**.

# Institutional Responses to Recommendations



# **Response to 2018 WSCUC Recommendation: Support a Diverse Student Body**

**Recommendation:** “Strengthen and sustain evidence-based academic and student support services—tutoring, advising, housing, financial aid, disability services, career services, and multicultural centers—to meet the needs of a more diverse student population, particularly students from urban areas adjusting to Humboldt’s rural context, while ensuring adequate staffing, funding, and attention to belonging, safety, and student concerns.”

## **Responses articulated in 2025 Institutional Report:**

1. Rebuilt advising and support systems using data-informed interventions
2. Expanded culturally responsive programs, learning communities, and student success initiatives
3. Strengthened multicultural centers and community partnerships
4. Leveraged HSI/MSI status to drive sustained, systemic equity-focused transformation
5. Advanced an inclusive, place-based polytechnic model grounded in sustainability and Indigenous knowledge

# **Response to 2018 WSCUC Recommendation: Financial Sustainability and Enrollment Strategy**

**Recommendation:** “Adopt realistic budgeting and enrollment management practices, diversify revenue sources through strengthened fundraising and private partnerships, and provide clearer strategic planning detail to address enrollment, retention, graduation, and equity gap targets.”

## **Responses Articulated in 2025 Institutional Report:**

- Recalibrated enrollment projections using realistic, data-driven capacity and yield analysis
- Integrated enrollment management and fiscal planning through structural leadership changes
- Expanded fundraising capacity and strengthened private, state, and federal partnerships
- Increased research activity and external funding to support budget resilience
- Leveraged polytechnic expansion and public investment to drive sustainable growth and targeted workforce, sustainability, and health equity initiatives



# Response to 2018 WSCUC Recommendation: Leadership Communication

**Recommendation:** “Strengthen university leadership communication across campus, including continued transparency regarding budget challenges, and invest in change management training to support informed decision-making and prioritization among multiple institutional initiatives.”

## **Responses articulated in 2025 Institutional Report:**

- Increased transparency and participation in campus decision-making
- Institutionalized collaborative budget planning through the University Resources & Planning Committee (URPC)
- Improved consistency and accessibility of communications around academic and financial decisions
- Strengthened shared governance, professional exchange groups, and structured feedback forums (e.g., Community Conversations)
- Advanced data-informed program review and cross-divisional consultation to support coordinated change



# Response to 2018 WSCUC Recommendation: Assessment Reform

Recommendation: “Implement a comprehensive university assessment plan developed by faculty so that effective assessment is consistent across the institution, and widely shared among faculty, staff, and students. Improving the assessment of GEAR and consistently embedding the expectations for student learning in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work are components of effective assessment.”

Comment From the Fall 2025 WSCUC Offsite Review:

“The team commends the institution for ... commitment to quality assurance through significantly improved academic and student success assessment and program review.”

- The team addressed the lack of institutional GE learning assessment in their lines of inquiry.

# **Response to 2018 WSCUC Recommendation: Faculty and Staff Diversity and Cultural Competence**

Recommendation: “Prioritize diversification of faculty and staff to better reflect the diversity of the student body, and expand cultural competency professional development to support student achievement and institutional educational objectives.”

## Responses articulated in 2025 Institutional Report:

- Embedded equity considerations into faculty and staff recruitment and hiring processes
- Expanded professional development focused on inclusive pedagogy and cultural competence
- Leveraged HSI/MSI designation to strengthen equity-minded hiring and retention strategies
- Increased attention to mentoring, onboarding, and faculty support structures
- Acknowledge progress is incremental and sustained effort is required to achieve meaningful demographic change

**2025  
Institutional Report  
Submitted in  
September**



# › Off-Site Review Commendations

Based on review of the institutional report submitted in September 2025, the WSCUC review team commended the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:

1. **Living out its mission through its commitment to public good**, as well as being an effective steward of place through active engagement with local communities;
2. **Strong educational practices** (e.g., place-based learning communities, first year experience, improved advising, supplemental instruction) that facilitate student learning;
3. **Commitment to quality assurance** through significantly improved academic and student success assessment and program review;
4. **Improved data infrastructure** leading to effective collection, dissemination, and utilization of data for decision-making and institutional improvement; and
5. **Reflecting a culture of continuity** during a period of leadership transition.

# Lines of Inquiry & Response Talking Points



# Lines of Inquiry

The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Site Visit:

1. Humboldt's Vision for the Future as a Polytechnic University
2. Recruitment, Enrollment, and Retention
3. Financial Sustainability
4. General Education





# Line of Inquiry #1

## *Humboldt's Vision for the Future as a Polytechnic University*

1. What are the **short and long-term goals** toward achieving the polytechnic vision?
2. What will the **change in senior leadership** mean for the strategic plan?
3. How will the new strategic plan **energize the on-campus and local community** around its vision?
4. What is the vision for the **campus master plan** and how will that be funded?
5. What is the **academic master plan** for the institution and how is it consistent with its polytechnic ambitions?
6. What are the **organizational and cultural barriers** to fulfilling the new purpose?

# Line of Inquiry #1

## *Humboldt's Vision for the Future as a Polytechnic University*

*–Talking Points Content from the Institutional Report*

### Leadership Transition & Strategic Continuity

- Established planning and assessment infrastructure
- Shared governance bodies active and stable
- Cross-divisional leadership teams remain intact
- Polytechnic is not a rebrand – its curricular, structural, and cultural
- Phased implementation and intentional pacing

# Polytechnic Program - Phases

Phase 1 Programs (2023)	Phase 2 Programs (2024-2026)	Phase 3 Programs (2027-2029)
Cannabis Studies BA	Applied Humanities BA	Forestry MF (2027)
Applied Fire Science & Management BS	Critical Agriculture & Agroecology BA	Nursing MS (2029)
Data Science BS	Media Arts BFA	Speech Pathology MS (2029)
Energy Systems Engineering BS	Applied Anthropology MA	
Geospatial Information Science & Technology BS	Biochemistry BS (Elevation)	
Marine Biology BS (elevation)	Community Health BA	
Mechanical Engineering BS	Health & Medical Science BS	
Software Engineering BS	STEM Education MA	
Engineering & Community Practice MS		

# ➤ Line of Inquiry #2

## *Recruitment, Enrollment, and Retention*

1. Given the new polytechnic status, in what ways, if any, have **enrollment goals, strategies, and resources** changed?
  - a. Are there any updated enrollment goals for 2025–2035?
  - b. What is your level of confidence in your enrollment projections?
  - c. What evidence do you consider to give you confidence that your enrollment goals are realistic?
2. What steps have been or will be taken to **close the gap in retention rates**?
3. How are **enrollment shortfalls** being addressed and corrected?
4. What progress has been made on **improving the coordination** between the Division of Enrollment Management and Student Success and the Division of Academic Affairs?
5. How will the institution **ensure the appropriate size and composition of faculty** to support the pedagogical needs of new programs and the study body it serves?

# Line of Inquiry #2

## *Recruitment, Enrollment, and Retention*

*–Talking Points Content from the Institutional Report*

### Enrollment Goals & Data

- Updated enrollment projections: 2025–2035
- Hanover market research findings
- IRAR admissions-to-matriculation dashboards
- Program-level yield analysis

### Retention & Equity Interventions

- Place-Based Learning Communities (PBLCs)
- Reduced advisor-to-student ratios
- GI2025 investments
- Disaggregated retention and graduation tracking
- Aligned recruitment and advising strategies
- Shared dashboards and metrics
- Regular cross-divisional planning meetings



## Line of Inquiry #3

### *Financial Stability*

1. What **budget planning scenarios** (budget models) have been generated to address potential shortfalls?
2. Given fluctuations in funding from the state, how does the institution characterize its **depth of support from other sources**?
3. How is the **expanded fund-raising capacity** mentioned in your report progressing?
4. How is **revenue diversification** progressing?
5. Are there more **anticipated budget cuts** coming?
6. What is the status of **capital improvements**?
7. What approaches have been and will be used to help **keep the budget balanced**?
8. What has been the **effect of the 2025 Voluntary Separation Incentive program** on the budget?
9. What progress has been made on the **CSU Enrollment Target and Budget Reallocation Plan**?
10. What progress has been made in intentionally linking academic planning, resource allocation, program review, and student success metrics through **shared infrastructure and clear, continuous feedback loops**?

# ➤ Line of Inquiry #3:

## *Financial Stability*

*–Talking Points Content from the Institutional Report*

### **Budget Scenarios & Financial Planning**

- Multi-year budget modeling
- Enrollment-based re-allocation planning
- Reserve policy alignment
- Proactive base reductions

### **Revenue Diversification & Stability**

- Record sponsored research funding
- Boldly Rising campaign outcome
- Auxiliary partnerships (housing, dining, services)
- Philanthropy aligned with purpose priorities

### **Governance & Budget Transparency**

- URPC guiding principles
- Open budget forums
- Campus-accessible budget dashboards
- Equity lens in allocation decisions

# ➤ Line of Inquiry #4

## *General Education*

1. In what ways has Humboldt acted on the findings from its **comprehensive GEAR program review**?
2. What decisions, if any, have been made to **reduce the number of PLOs** in General Education?
3. In what ways has the **assessment of General Education improved** since the submission of the institutional report?
4. In what ways, if any, have **cross-disciplinary assessment practices** been implemented?
5. In what ways has the institution attempted to **achieve faculty unity** on the importance of general education?

# Line of Inquiry #4

## General Education

*–Talking Points Content from the Institutional Report*

### General Education Review Findings

- Comprehensive GEAR program review completed
- External reviewer recommendations
- Faculty governance engagement underway
- Assessment challenges clearly identified

### General Education: Next Steps & Timeline

- Potential reduction in number of PLOs
- Development of clearer GE identity
- Improved assessment infrastructure
- Faculty-led implementation timeline

# In Conclusion



# Reflections: Future Focused

## (Executive Cabinet August 2025)

- **Integrated, data-driven strategic planning:** The next strategic plan (2026) will link goals to assessment, enrollment, and budget modeling, ensuring ambition is grounded in institutional capacity.
- **Adaptive academic portfolio:** Program development will emphasize flexibility, streamlined approvals, sunsetting low-alignment programs, stackable credentials, and systematic tracking of graduate outcomes.
- **General education reform:** GEAR will be re-envisioned to align with Humboldt's polytechnic identity, strengthen coherence and equity, and establish sustainable, cross-disciplinary assessment practices.
- **Structural equity and inclusion:** The university will address persistent equity gaps through redesigned advising, improved BIPOC faculty and staff recruitment and retention, and embedding equity indicators in decision making.
- **Infrastructure, technology, and place-based commitments:** Continued investment in facilities, digital infrastructure, and formalized Tribal partnerships will support student success, sustainability, and Indigenous-informed place-based learning.

# ➤ Sustaining the Polytechnic Vision

The polytechnic transition has moved from aspiration and launch to portfolio management and sustainability planning. The institution is not declaring arrival—it is demonstrating disciplined, data-informed momentum consistent with CSU system priorities.

## **Cal Poly Humboldt enters reaffirmation:**

- Having addressed all major 2018 recommendations.
- With external commendations affirming progress.
- Demonstrating fiscal discipline amid CSU reallocation pressures.
- Embedding equity and inclusive excellence structurally.
- Integrating academic planning, enrollment strategy, and fiscal oversight.
- Positioned for a new strategic planning cycle under stable governance.
- Committed to being the polytechnic with a liberal arts heart.

## Discussion & Possible Questions from WSCUC

- What are the ways in which you see this body having contributed to our progress in any of these areas?
- How do you see shared governance functioning across campus?
- What is working well and where are there opportunities to improve?
- What additional topics might you want to share with the Review Team?

- WSCUC Review Team Site Visit:
  - Wednesday – Friday, April 15–17, 2026
- University Senate Meeting w/ the Review Team:
  - Wednesday, April 15, 3:40 – 4:25 pm
- Open Forums: Thursday, April 16
  - Staff Open Forum: 8:15 – 9 am, Great Hall
  - Student Open Forum: 1 – 1:45 pm, BSS Native Forum
  - Faculty Open Forum: 2 – 2:45 pm, Great Hall
- Confidential email address to the WSCUC Review Team:
  - [humboldt@wscuc.org](mailto:humboldt@wscuc.org)

