

University Senate

Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, April 28, 2026

Goodwin Forum and Zoom, Meeting ID 818 1954 9462

Chair Harmon called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm. A quorum was present.

Members Present

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

Members Absent

Allison Govier, Banks, M. Thobaben

Guests

Michelle Caisse, Joice Chang, Adrienne Colegrove-Raymond, William Cook, Jeffrey Crane, Thomas Elliott, Bethany Gilden, Jason Gosch, Kendra Higgins, Mike Le, Heather Madar, Peggy Metzger, Cyril Oberlander, Raven Palomera, Humnath Panta, Sasheen Shailee Raymond, Brigid Wall, Kimberly White, Jeanne Wielgus, Michelle Williams, Travis Williams, Emily Worm, and 3 others

Announcement of Proxies

Frye for Banks, Jannetta for Lancaster, A. Thobaben for M. Thobaben, Evans for Tremain

CFA Interruption Statement

Senator Jannetta read the Interruption Statement from the California Faculty Association.

Approval and Adoption of Agenda

M/S (Evans/Geck) to amend the agenda to remove item 14.

Motion to adopt the agenda as amended passed without dissent.

Approval of Minutes from April 14, 2026

M/S (Pachmayer/Stelter) to approve the minute from April 14, 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

Academic Policies Committee (APC)

Written report attached

Appointments and Elections Committee (AEC)

Written report attached

Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CBC)

No report

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

Written report attached

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC)

Written report attached

University Policies Committee (UPC)

No report

University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC)

Written report attached

Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)

Written report attached

Associated Students (AS)

Written report attached

California Faculty Association (CFA)

No report

Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI)

Written report attached

Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (ERFSA)

Written report attached

Labor Council

Written report attached

Staff Council

No report

Executive Cabinet

Written report attached

General Consent Calendar

Senators Aghasaleh and Cruz requested that the 2025-2026 USFAC Space Allocations be removed from the General Consent Calendar for discussion and vote. No items were approved by general consent.

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

Dean Cyril Oberlander invited everyone to IdeaFest this Friday.

TIME CERTAIN: 3:30-3:45 PM – Seating of New Senators & Election of 2026-2027 Senate Officers

The new Senators were introduced and welcomed:

Humnath Panta, Tenure Line CPS Delegate

Chair Harmon solicited additional nominations for Officers. The results of the election were:

Senate vote to elect Senator Lisa Tremain as Vice-Chair of the University Senate and Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee for 2026-2027 ***passed without dissent***.

Senate vote to elect Senator Monty Mola as Third Officer of the Senate & Chair of the Academic Policies Committee for 2025-2026 ***passed***.

Resolution on 2025-2026 URPC Budget Recommendations

(24-25/26-URPC – April 28, 2026 – Second Reading)

Senators Lancaster, Young, and Fisher discussed the resolution. Senators Jannetta, McGuire, and Benavides-Garb spoke in favor of the resolution.

Senate vote to approve the Resolution on 2025-2026 URPC Budget Recommendations ***passed without dissent***.

Ayes (25): Banks, Benavides-Garb, Burkhalter, Cabot, Choi, Cruz, Fisher, Frye, Geck, Gray, Harmon, Holliday, Jannetta, Lancaster, McGuire, McKindley, Mola, Moyer, Pachmayer, Stelter, Sterner, A. Thobaben, M. Thobaben, Tremain, Young

Nays (0): none

Abstentions (6): Aghasaleh, Allison Govier, Cappuccio, Dschida, Evans, Virnoche

Resolution on Policy on Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning

(25-25/26-APC – April 28, 2026 – Second Reading)

Senator Evans discussed the resolution. Senator Gray spoke in favor of the resolution.

Senate vote to approve the Resolution on Policy on Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning ***passed without dissent***.

Ayes (27): Banks, Benavides-Garb, Burkhalter, Cabot, Cappuccio, Choi, Cruz, Evans, Fisher, Frye, Geck, Gray, Harmon, Holliday, Jannetta, Lancaster, McGuire, McKindley, Mola, Moyer, Pachmayer, Stelter, Sterner, A. Thobaben, M. Thobaben, Tremain, Young

Nays (0): none

Abstentions (4): Aghasaleh, Allison Govier, Dschida, Virnoche

Resolution to Update Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook Regarding summer term student feedback survey use in the RTP process (26-25/26-FAC – April 28, 2026 – Second Reading)

Senator McGuire discussed the resolution. Chair Harmon and Senator Lancaster spoke in favor of the resolution.

Senate vote to approve the Resolution to Update Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook Regarding summer term student feedback survey use in the RTP process ***passed***.

Ayes (17): Aghasaleh, Benavides-Garb, Burkhalter, Cappuccio, Choi, Geck, Harmon, Jannetta, McGuire, Mola, Moyer, Pachmayer, Stelter, Sterner, A. Thobaben, Tremain, Young

Nays (1): Evans

Abstentions (3): Dschida, Lancaster, Virnoche

Resolution on Revisions to the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (27-25/26-Ex – April 28, 2026 – Second Reading)

Resolution on Administrative-Academic Notice, Disqualification, and Reinstatement (28-25/26-Ex – April 28, 2026 – First Reading)

Senators Burkhalter and Virnoche discussed the resolution, that part of this policy never had its language changed to move away from carceral language.

The resolution will return for a Second Reading.

Resolution on Revision to the Syllabus Policy (29-25/26-APC – April 28, 2026 – First Reading)

Senator Evans discussed the resolution. The syllabus repository being public was discussed, and the needs of former students to have open access to all syllabi versus the potential for identifying faculty information, including controversial subject matters, being publicly available.

The resolution will return for a Second Reading.

Resolution on Fundraising Policy (30-25/26-UPC – April 28, 2026 – First Reading)

Travis Williams from University Advancement discussed the resolution bringing the policy in line with the Chancellor's Office and removing procedures.

The resolution will return for a Second Reading.

2025-2026 USFAC Space Allocations

M/S (Jannetta/Lancaster) to extend the meeting by 10 minutes.

Motion to extend the meeting passed without dissent.

Chair Harmon spoke in favor of the item, saying it went through the committee process and balanced long standing needs with the current physical state of campus. Senator Aghasaleh spoke against the item, saying that the new Dreamer Center and Q Center programs that submitted requests did not receive a space allocation, which is badly needed. Senator Cruz spoke against the item, saying specifically item 106 did not pass Associated Students' review of the proposals, as they did not see why the space needed to be closed to other student uses and does not align with the Strategic Plan.

Senate vote to approve the 2025-2026 USFAC Space Allocations ***passed***.

Ayes (23): Banks, Benavides-Garb, Choi, Evans, Fisher, Frye, Geck, Gray, Harmon, Holliday, Jannetta, Lancaster, McGuire, Mola, Moyer, Pachmayer, Stelter, Sterner, A. Thobaben, M. Thobaben, Tremain, Virnoche, Young

Nays (3): Aghasaleh, Cabot, Cruz

Abstentions (5): Allison Govier, Burkhalter, Cappuccio, Dschida, McKindley

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM

Submitted by Patrick Malloy

University Senate Chair Report

April 28, 2026

Hi Folks,

Welcome to the home stretch, two weeks of the semester left. Dig in, ya'll, we're almost there! If you haven't heard, the WSCUC visit was fantastic, and the exit interview was unprecedented. I believe we will hear a report on this from the Academic Affairs division, and if you have not seen Peggy Metzger's performance, it is a must-watch! I'm sure a clip is lurking around out there in the cloud.

We have a bevy of resolutions to consider and pass here at the end, and so far, I think everything has gone smoothly. Let's continue to model collegiality through this process. We have four second readings today, which ideally should result in voting, and three first readings, which may turn into voting for the last Senate meeting on May 12, 2026.

The Policy Modernization team met with PolicyStat vendors last week, and we received a demo of the platform. It is very cool! All of the areas we get tied up in, ranging from the review process all the way to the approval process, look so much easier to manage with this program. That being said, I do think there will be some pain points getting used to a new program, and we will likely have to deal with a whole new set of problems that we have no way of anticipating now; however, I am hopeful this will be an excellent fix once the dust has settled. I am planning a SenEx retreat before classes start, where the theme will be PolicyStat and our new workflow. Once the executive team has had a chance to chew on the program, we will open it up for more users to receive training and guidance. I also imagine we'll be revisiting the procedures for the Policy on Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines, but that is an exercise for another day.

Okay, folks, that's all I got. Apologies for the brief (and late) report; my professor side-gig has me really busy here at the end of the semester, just like some of you, I am sure.

Best

CH

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

University Senate Written Reports, April 28, 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), 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): 4/13/26 and 4/20/26

Meeting Details: No report.

Appointments and Elections Committee

Submitted by Jorge Monteiro, AEC Chair

Members: Ara Pachmayer, Jorge Monteiro, Michihiro Sugata

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: The third Call for Nominations was sent and we hope to fill the interim Senate seats before the end of the Spring. If you know someone who is a good fit, please nominate them.

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):

Meeting Details: no report

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: April 21, 2026

Overview of Meeting Details: The ICC held its final meeting of the academic year to review proposals and share updates. The committee approved two new CRGS courses (CRGS 102 and 103), *Writing for Social Change*, providing an additional pathway to fulfill written communication requirements, as well as ENST 482, an Environmental Studies internship course. The committee also reviewed a GEAR recommendation on the American Institutions requirement, maintaining current policy while clarifying catalog language. Discussion addressed ongoing challenges with course equivalencies and general education alignment, particularly the relationship between American Institutions courses and GE areas. Updates were shared on curriculum processes, including the A&P review (120 proposals) and a proposed shift in program review timelines from a five-year to a two-year cycle, with the meeting concluding in subcommittee reports on syllabus repository policies and planning for next year's PBLC initiatives.

Highlights of Note:

- **GEAR Committee Recommendation Regarding the American Institutions (AI):** Details about requirement and associated catalog language. After extensive review of CSU policy, campus practices, and potential alternatives, the recommendation is to maintain the current policy without substantive change. The proposed revision is limited to clarifying catalog language to better reflect existing practice and reduce advising ambiguity.

- **Important information from GEAR:** The committee offers here [a primer of sorts](#), summarizing “some of the ambitions, requirements, history, and ambiguities surrounding the State of California’s United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals requirement – commonly referred to as ‘American Institutions’ – for graduates of the CSU.” We collected the information contained here and have used this document to organize further deliberation on Humboldt’s current practices re: American Institutions.
- The clarified language specifies that one AI course taken at Cal Poly Humboldt may fulfill a single lower-division GE requirement (typically Area 4, or Area 6 for NAS/ES courses), while reaffirming that AI remains an All-University requirement rather than part of General Education. It also maintains the current limitation of double-counting to one course and confirms that any such course applies only to lower-division GE.
 - **Catalog Language:** *One American Institutions course taken at Cal Poly Humboldt may be used to fulfill one lower division GE requirement. In most cases, the course will fulfill the Area 4 requirement; however, if the American Institutions course prefix is NAS or ES, it may be used to fulfill the Area 6 GE requirement instead. Regardless of whether it is a lower or upper division, the American Institutions course will count for lower division GE, not upper division. NOTE: American Institutions courses are not GE courses; they are, however, an All-University Requirement.*
- This approach preserves alignment with Title V and existing campus policy, avoids increasing units to degree, and provides clearer guidance for students and advisors without introducing new requirements or restrictions.

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:** [04.21.26-ICC Meeting Agenda - Approved](#) (Humboldt Login Required)
- **DRAFT Meeting Minutes:** [04.21.26-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 Faculty Co-Chair.

Members:

Jaime Lancaster, Shawna Young, Dave Janetta, Ramesh Adhikari, Rosanna Overholser, Steven Margell, Nate Cacciari-Roy, Eduardo Cruz, Nate Herron, Bori Mazzag, Chrissy Holliday, Mike Fisher, Steve Carp, Carla Wharton, Melanie Bennenhausen, Kevin Furtado, Sarah Long, Kendra Higgins

Meeting Date:

Thursday, 4/16/26

Notes and Comments:

- WSCUC Review team meeting.
 - We received a suggestion that we include a phrase in the budget recommendation in which we recommended that a system of intra-divisional shared governance be developed to ensure/incorporate shared governance within each division. This is a large topic that pushes the bounds of URPC's charge, and we'll put it on the agenda to discuss at our Fall retreat.
-

Academic Senate of the CSU

Submitted by Stephanie Burkhalter and Mary Virnoche, ASCSU Senators

The final standing committee meetings and plenary for the academic year 25-26 will take place April 29-May 1. The Board of Trustees meeting will take place May 4-May 6 (see agenda [here](#)).

The Board will consider voting on proposed changes to Title V announced at their March meeting that would allow CSU campuses to offer specific types of 90-unit degrees. You can find the language of the proposed changes [here](#). If you would like to offer written or oral comments

about these proposed changes you can find instructions [here](#). Note that written comments must be received by May 1. The ASCSU is developing a position on these proposed changes that will likely support the flexibility of these specific 90-unit degrees with strong opposition to naming them “Bachelors” degrees. After careful consideration, the ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee concluded that naming them “Bachelors” will inevitably sow confusion among students and employers regarding the differences between the reduced-unit degrees and the typical 120-unit Bachelors of Arts and Bachelors of Science degrees.

On April 23, the Chancellor’s office issued an update to its interim Systemwide Time, Place and Manner policy. You can view the edits to the policy [here](#).

Associated Students

Submitted by Eduardo Cruz, AS President

Hey everyone, it’s me! I wanted to bring it to your attention that I have been working on a resolution for Associated Students focused on accessibility and advocating for support from the Chancellor’s Office. As the most rural campus in the CSU system, we deserve equitable funding, especially given our role as an anchor of economic mobility in Humboldt County.

Thank you to everyone who has taken the time to read and provide feedback on this resolution. I understand that I still have a lot to learn and engage with on this topic, and I truly appreciate your contributions and support.

Here is the link to the resolution: [Accessibility Resolution Shareable DRAFT](#)

The Board of Directors has approved the Associated Students budget for the 2026–27 academic year: we based our budget on a projected 4% enrollment increase; however, ongoing uncertainty has led us to take a more cautious approach, including the potential use of up to \$100,000 in reserves if necessary in the event enrollment falls below projections. Our reserves remain strong and stable, supporting this strategy. We received 13 new requests that directly align with our values and vision. The draft budget was crafted by the Subcommittee on Finance and reviewed by the Board of Directors. In total, we received \$1,587,116 in requests, which significantly exceeds the projected revenue of \$901,776. This gap underscores the growing demand for student services, programs, and support. In our conversations across campus regarding student wages, there is currently no equitable scale, as compensation varies widely across departments; further work and collaboration in this area will help determine funding for this criterion. Overall, our budget remains focused on student impact and student wages.

The Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Committee has approved the IRA budget for the 2026–27 academic year. The committee recognizes the need to advocate for reviewing IRA percentage splits and realigning them to better reflect student needs and our academic programs, as the current IRA fee is not equitably distributed. The committee also acknowledges that a significant amount of work is required and that the process needs to be better streamlined and structured; compared to other CSU campuses, our committee undertakes a greater workload, and with potential collaboration with the Provost and department chairs, we aim to streamline processes and reduce this burden. We received \$895,813 in requests, which required the committee to make difficult and strategic decisions, resulting in \$414,043 in reductions. The total IRA budget is \$481,770, including \$52,000 for new programs and \$402,500 for existing programs as part of the total program allocation, plus a 6% administrative fee of \$27,270.

We recognize the growing need for program support, especially as HM500 cuts are made each year. This raises important questions about how student fees are being spent and highlights the need to assess them for equity and ensure they are used in ways that create the greatest impact for the student body. With many programs relying on these funds, Associated Students is actively exploring ways to expand support and move this work forward. Additionally, within both the A.S. and IRA budgets, we are utilizing reserves to support more programs; while we recognize that using reserves can be a strategic short-term approach, it is not sustainable long-term. Nonetheless, this reflects our continued dedication to the student body and our commitment to increasing impact and opportunities on campus.

**Please note that these budgets still need to be presented to the Student Fee Advisory Committee on April 27, 2026, and must be approved by the University President in order to become officially adopted.*

I am honored and excited to announce our Board of Directors for the 2026–27 Academic Year:

President: Ayan Cabot

Executive Vice President: Roselyn Montanez

VP of Administration and Finance: Nate Heron

Officer of Social Justice, Equity and Inclusion: Ruth Worthington

Officer of Academic Affairs: Gabriel Elbert-Rasmussen

Officer of Environmental Sustainability: Paola Ferreyra

Officer of Student Affairs: Riley Hemenover

I am incredibly excited for this board, and I know they will continue the great work that Associated Students has set forward and remain strong advocates for our student body.

I am also excited to share that the California State Student Association elections took place on April 26, 2026. The results are as follows:

President: Artur Gafurov

Chair: Tia Saunders

VP of Finance: Brandon Trigo Foley
VP of Legislative Affairs: Rodrigo Rojas Garfias
VP of Systemwide Affairs: Ashley Smith

I will also be giving a quick recap of the CSSA Plenary from April 11, 2026:

Legislative Affairs Committee:

We voted yes for a support position on AB 2392 (Fong), Public Postsecondary Education Artificial Intelligence Products: Training.

We voted yes for a support position on AB 2422 (Caloza), Student Financial Aid: Delayed Financial Aid Awards: Extensions.

We voted yes for a support position on AB 2766 (Ahrens), Public Postsecondary Education Student Housing: Foster Youth and Homeless Youth.

Systemwide Affairs Committee:

We discussed two resolutions: a resolution opposing the recent increase in compensation for CSU Presidents, and a resolution on reforms to the CSU alternative consultation process.

Linked here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1YxGCh7xeSp7-4w_PWITA5ZsjtJjoC-wM/view and <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DrzRRPYC4wmLOrvJmswwBoHsLafTX3TK/view>

California State Student Association (CSSA) Board Meeting Report

Date: April 11, 2026, Online

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order in accordance with established procedures.

II. Roll Call

Roll call was conducted to confirm quorum.

III. Consent Agenda

The Board approved the Consent Agenda, which included:

- **Agenda Approval:** April 11, 2026
- **Minutes Approval:** March 21, 2026

Policy and Organizational Actions

Written Reports

Page 7 of 20

- **Revised Agenda Item Submission Policy** (approved by Internal Affairs Committee)
- **Revised Elected Officer Review Policy** (approved by Internal Affairs Committee)
- **Establishment of a CSSA Endowment** (recommended by the Finance Committee to support long-term financial sustainability and program funding)

Legislative Positions Adopted

The Board voted to **support** the following California State Assembly bills:

- **AB 2392 (Fong): Artificial Intelligence Training Requirements**
 - Requires CSU and other systems to provide training on institutional AI tools, including usage, policy, and data privacy considerations.
 - **AB 2422 (Caloza): Financial Aid Delay Protections**
 - Protects students from penalties (e.g., dropped classes, late fees) when financial aid is delayed due to administrative issues.
 - **AB 2766 (Ahrens): Housing Support for Foster and Homeless Youth**
 - Expands priority housing access, defers housing fees, and improves enrollment protections for vulnerable student populations.
-

IV. Liaison Reports

Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)

Updates were provided on faculty governance and systemwide academic priorities.

CSU Office of the Chancellor

Highlighted ongoing coordination with CSSA on advocacy, policy development, and system initiatives.

CSU Board of Trustees Reports

Student Trustee: Jazmin Guajardo

- Emphasized federal advocacy, particularly protecting the **Pell Grant**, which currently supports billions in student aid nationally.
- Highlighted CSU fiscal health monitoring, including responses to the **2025 Budget Act** and campus financial plans.
- Noted systemwide developments such as:
 - Expansion of the Office of Systemwide Philanthropy
 - Release of CSU AI survey findings
- Encouraged engagement through **CSU Voices** and public comment at upcoming Board of Trustees meetings.

Student Trustee: Carson Fajardo

- Reported on Board of Trustees committee participation and CSU system finances.
 - Key highlights:
 - CSU holds approximately **\$8.0 billion in cash and investments**, with limited discretionary reserves (~\$760 million).
 - Discussions on presidential compensation structures and funding sources not derived from tuition or student fees.
 - Major philanthropic investments:
 - \$29M (CSU Dominguez Hills) for mental health workforce development
 - \$48M (Cal State LA) for youth mental health programs and student support
-

V. Public Comment

Members of the public were given the opportunity to address the Board on statewide and campus-level higher education issues. Written comments were also accepted via CSSA's online platform.

VI. Reports of Staff and Officers

President: Tara Al-Rehani

- Leading **federal advocacy efforts**, including preparation for Hill Week with CSU leadership.
- Advancing visibility of student-led initiatives in areas such as affordability, AI, and workforce development.
- Supporting updates to the **Basic Needs Study**, building on prior efforts that secured ~\$23 million in funding.

Chair: Aaron Villarreal

- Continued revision of constitutional documents and policies.
- Preparing for **CSSA elections (April 26, 2026)** and development of a biennial policy agenda.

Vice President of Finance: Artur Gafurov

- Advancing **endowment development** to ensure long-term financial sustainability.
- Addressing **Student Involvement and Representation Fee (SIRF) opt-outs** and improving engagement.
- Leading **budget development efforts**, emphasizing transparency, student input, and strategic allocation.

Vice President of Legislative Affairs: Nikki Majidi

- Focused on **federal and state advocacy**, including bill analysis and legislative toolkits.
- Developing **one-pagers and civic engagement resources** to strengthen campus advocacy efforts.

Vice President of Systemwide Affairs: Katie Karroum

- Highlighted success of **CHES Advocacy Day** and continued legislative engagement.
- Participated in **AI policy discussions**, Title 5 amendments, and systemwide initiatives.
- Promoted continued dissemination of the **CSSA AI White Paper**.

Executive Director: Joe Nino

- Continued operational leadership and coordination across CSSA initiatives.

VII. New Business

A. CSSA Elections Process (Information Item)

An overview of the upcoming elections process was presented in preparation for the April 26, 2026 Board meeting.

B. Student Involvement and Representation Fee (Discussion Item)

The Board engaged in a discussion on SIRF, focusing on:

- Administrative opt-outs
- Student awareness and engagement
- Long-term sustainability and transparency of the fee

Key Takeaways & Student Impact

- **Strong advocacy momentum** at both state and federal levels, particularly around financial aid, AI policy, and housing access.
 - **Major focus on financial transparency and sustainability**, including endowments and SIRF reform—issues directly aligned with your priorities at Humboldt.
 - **Systemwide investments and policy shifts** (AI, housing, mental health) continue to shape the CSU student experience.
 - **Opportunities for student voice expansion**, especially through Hill Week, legislative advocacy, and research contributions.
-

Next Steps

- ~~CSSA Elections (April 26, 2026)~~
 - May Plenary Meeting
 - CSU Board of Trustees Meeting (May 4–6, 2026)
 - Continued development of CSSA budget and endowment strategy
-

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

April 28, 2026 (Include materials between February 4, 2026, and April 28, 2026)

Personnel Updates:

- ODEI ASC II Search has been postponed due to budget reductions. ODEI has begun discussions with OAA about a potential ASC II that would serve both units.
- ODEI Admin Analyst I, Special Projects Coordinator: Frank Herrera has been temporarily assigned to this position, but he will return to the position of Social Justice, Equity, and Inclusion Center coordinator starting May 1, 2026.
- ODEI will be searching for a temporary Administrative Analyst I assignment.

Initiatives Updates:

- Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Grant (DEIA): Preliminary Results and Process:
 - We received 18 applications with a total requested amount of \$79,000. The ODEI grant base for distribution is \$35,000.
 - The DEIA grant review committee was convened on Friday, April 17, and will reconvene on Thursday, April 30, to discuss recommendations to submit to the Provost for a final decision.

- Third Biennial CSU Juneteenth Symposium: ODEI, in partnership with Umoja and the Equity Fellow dedicated to Black Student Success (Dr. Kirby Moss), is convening and leading a steering committee to participate virtually in the CSU celebration. ODEI is also planning to collaborate with Equity Arcata, College of the Redwoods, and Humboldt County Office of Education to integrate local programming. Programming will be disseminated as soon as finalized.
- Spring Commencement and Cultural Performance Celebrations: ODEI, in partnership with OAA, is organizing the second cultural performance spring celebration. Participating groups include:
 - INRSEP Student Drum (COMPASS)
 - Ballet Folklórico de Humboldt (Student Club in partnership with the Dance Program)
 - Mariachi de Humboldt (Class in the Music Program)
 - Yolteotl Danza Azteca (Student Club supported by the Dance program)
 - Humboldt Taiko (Humboldt Community Members)
- Humboldt Equity Consortium (HEC): HEC is a cross-sector collaborative space that brings together campus, city, and community partners across Humboldt County to share knowledge, align efforts, and strengthen coordinated responses to community equity needs. It focuses on strengthening a sense of belonging, safety, and overall community well-being through partnership and alignment.
 - The group last met on Wednesday, April 1, 2026, at Cal Poly Humboldt Library 209 & Zoom.
 - This month's gathering focused on community safety and preparedness in response to ICE-related challenges. The event saw strong engagement from HCOE, Equity Arcata, campus leadership and faculty, and other community partners, including the NAACP, Centro del Pueblo, Queer Humboldt, Eureka City Schools, the Department of Health & Human Services, College of the Redwoods, the Human Rights Commission, and Cumbre Humboldt.
 - Participants shared resources, strategies, and updates, emphasizing communication, collaboration, and inclusive outreach (including Spanish-language access). The gathering strengthened partnerships and identified opportunities for shared outreach and coordinated support.
 - Overall, the session reinforced HEC as a key space for connection, collaboration, and collective action.
 - The next session will be at 2:30 PM on Wednesday, May 6, 2026, at Cal Poly Humboldt Library 209 & Zoom. Community members are invited to participate.

Collaborations:

- **IdeaFest and ODEI Collaboration:**

- DEIA Grant awardees will be participating in the IdeaFest for the first time. This is a new partnership with the Library that enables DEIA awardees to present their project results to the community. The following participants are volunteering their presentation this time. Moving forward, all DEIA grant recipients will be required to present at IdeaFest.

- Title: “2025 World AIDS Remembrance”

- Award Year 2025/2026: \$4,800 award
- Lead: Dr. Paul Michael L. Atienza (Faculty)
- A two-week DEIA-funded program raising awareness of the global HIV/AIDS crisis through speakers, films, and community events. Over 100 participants attended.

- Title: “Un-Dam the Klamath: The River Flows Freely”

- Award Year 2025/2026: \$3,500 award
- Lead: Sasheen Raymond (Staff)
- Indigenous Peoples Week panel on the Klamath River dam removal, highlighting Tribal advocacy, environmental justice, and ecological restoration.

- Title: “Ensuring Safe Soil for Indigenous Food Sovereignty”

- Award Year 2025/2026: \$5,000 award
- Leads: Derek Tremaine & Nicholas Verhey (Undergraduate Students)
- Soil testing at the Food Sovereignty Lab confirmed safe conditions for cultivating culturally significant foods, supporting Indigenous land stewardship.

- Two Undergraduate Mexican STEM students visit Cal Poly Humboldt: ODEI and the Library collaborate with the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) and Tecnológico de Monterrey:

- This collaboration expands IdeaFest to a global context by hosting two undergraduate STEM students from UNAM and the Tecnológico de Monterrey (Mexico), Jorge Luis Zavala and Jorge Luis Gomez. They will present “Freenergy: Smart Piezoelectric Speed Bumps for Clean Energy and Operational Intelligence.” This project converts vehicle motion into renewable energy and generates real-time traffic data. This visit strengthens international partnerships and highlights innovative, sustainable urban solutions.

- IdeaFest Reception and Poster Symposium

- Time: Friday, May 1, 2026 | 3:00–5:00 PM

- Location: Cal Poly Humboldt Library, 2nd & 3rd Floors
- ODEI is preparing a comprehensive campus and community activity schedule for these two outstanding undergraduate visitors.
- If you would like to meet these students, please contact ODEI.
- ODEI and the Department of Forestry have partnered to host a campus visit by Professor Michelle Farfan Gutierrez, a fire expert from the University of Guanajuato in Guanajuato, Mexico. She will be on campus from April 26 to May 2.
- KickBack Spring 2026 Event: This is our third annual end-of-semester, campus-wide gathering, in partnership with Human Resources (HR), Academic Personnel Programs (APS), and Equity Arcata. This event is designed to foster connection, belonging, and relationship-building among staff, faculty, and community partners in a welcoming, informal setting. All professional staff, faculty, and administrators are invited. If you would like to be a sponsoring organization, please contact ODEI.
 - Date: May 11, 2026, time: 12:00–1:00 PM, catered lunch.
 - Location: Kate Buchanan Room (KBR)
 - This event will also highlight 2026/27 DEIA Grant Recipients.
- Community Resilience Steering Group: ODEI and Administrative Affairs co-lead this steering group. During the Spring 2026 semester, the CRSG met with 19 groups across campus to discuss institutional preparedness to respond to a possible ICE presence on campus. In addition, these meetings served as an outlet for discussing critical concerns and sentiments within our community. The work of the CRSG will continue in the summer and fall, focusing on deeper preparations, including workshops and training available to all members of our community on safety and civic engagement. A number of action items emerged from the meetings with the community, and the committee is currently working on implementation.
- “Oaxaca Cultural Immersion Program for Educators”: ODEI, in collaboration with the Eureka City Schools District and the Cal Poly Humboldt School of Education, is moving forward with the pilot of the first cultural immersion program for high school educators. This pilot builds on more than 30 years of culture and language development programs offered by the former Cal Poly Humboldt Department of World Languages and Cultures in Oaxaca. This program, in partnership with Universidad Autónoma Benito Juárez de Oaxaca, will be offered from June 20-27, 2026.
- Equity Arcata: This is an ongoing partnership between the City of Arcata and Cal Poly Humboldt. If you would like to volunteer in this partnership, please contact ODEI. The following is a brief list of past, present, and future events and activities:
 - Hosted the 2nd Community Safety Planning Meeting on April 2
 - Gathered with APD Chief Ortega, Humboldt Sheriff Honsal, representatives from Humboldt County Office of Education, and

Humboldt Area Foundation to discuss community response in case of immigration enforcement action. Interest was expressed in meeting monthly to continue the conversation.

- Supported the California Indian Big Time & Social Gathering with outreach and the NAS 30th Anniversary Celebration, bridging the campus and the community.
- Fernando Paz, ODEI Campus and Community Development Coordinator, is participating in the “Reconnect Arcata Initiative” through Equity Arcata. This initiative focuses on reconnecting the geographically divided areas. Our participation is to ensure equitable outcomes for all community members in this process.
- We will be hosting the next Home-Away-From-Home on Sunday, April 26.
- Organizing has begun for this summer’s Equity Arcata Open House/Equity Day at the Crabs Baseball Game.
- Equity Arcata formally enters into collaboration with the International Latino Film Festival for Spring 2027.
- Equity Arcata will participate in this year's Juneteenth community events alongside the NAACP, Black Humboldt, and Cal Poly Humboldt.
- The STARS Report: GOLD rating. The Sustainability Office received the GOLD rating notification on Friday, April 24. ODEI and the Provost's Office contributed a critical, human-focused, ethics-of-care lens, strengthening the framing of sustainability through equity, belonging, and lived experiences. We celebrate this national rating with the Sustainability Office and all teams that participated in this significant endeavor.
- CSU STEAM Workforce Innovation and Preparation Grant: On March 27, CNRS, in partnership with ODEI, received a \$140,000 grant award to be completed in AY 2026/27. This grant was designed for hands-on professional internships to support retention and graduation success of all students and to close a multi-layered representation gap in STEM careers.
 - The grant will be led by Dr. Bori Mazzag, Associate Dean of CNRS.
 - The grant will fund 14 student fellowships.
 - The name of this grant is “Raices y Rutas: Roots and Routes to Careers (R2).
 - This grant is also part of a national HSI effort.
- CSU Chico inquiry about Cal Poly Humboldt Seal of Excelencia experience: Recently, the ODEI team met with a group of CSU Chico leaders to share our experience with the Seal of Excelencia application. We shared our application with them and established a support network.
- The UC Office of the President met with the Cal Poly ODEI team: The ODEI team met with the Director of Culture and Inclusive Excellence from the UC Office of the President. They wanted to learn how we operate our office of diversity, equity, and inclusion. They were genuinely surprised to learn about the office culture and the impact of our 64+

initiatives across the university, on- and off-campus, and in international communities. They were particularly impressed by our university's culture, which embraces equity and inclusion at all levels.

- College of the Redwoods (CR), Humboldt County Office of Education (HCOE), and the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion partnership: This spring 2026 semester, ODEI has convened monthly collaboration meetings with these organizations to develop coordinated efforts in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion impacting our region and educational systems. We are planning to share resources and build capacity for deeper efficiency and higher collective impact. A number of specific professional development collaborations are in a planning phase.
- ODEI is coordinating several summer retreats to plan AY 2026-27, including our annual productions calendar.

Emeritus & Retired Faculty & Staff Association

Submitted by Marshelle Thobaben, Senate Representative for ERFSA



2026 Grant Recipients: from left: James Woodhead, Gabi Kirk, Regina Jorgenson, Alana Chin, Justin Carlson, Leila Azimian, Jasper Leavitt, and Ricky Robles (not photographed Larisa Callaway-Cole)

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: Tue, Apr 14, 2026

Meeting Details:

CSUEU has new contract bargaining dates set as follows:

- Unit 15 Student Assistants: Wed, Apr 29, 2026
 - Units 2, 5, 7, and 9 Staff: Thr, May 7, 2026
-

Staff Council

Submitted by Senator Sulaina Banks

Members:

Meeting Date(s):

Meeting Details: no report

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

COMMUNITY

Community Resilience Steering Group: We continue our work with various groups across campus, learning much about our community and ways to strengthen our approach to this work. We have also had positive feedback around shared expectations of the University's prepared actions. As we move closer to summer, we will be reaching out and building a larger Community resilience team with stronger connections to those already doing this work in our community like the Rapid Response Network. We will work with the expanded team to understand interests and level of involvement. We will also create training and scenario building opportunities for this team as a means of preparedness. Lastly, we will create opportunities to operationalize this work with existing university groups that will hopefully lead to this knowledge being practiced in perpetuity. We want to thank all of our partners that have been involved with this work and the University Senate.

ACADEMICS

Transfer Student Registration: New transfer student registration is right around the corner. The first group of new Fall 2026 transfer students began the online registration tutorial on Monday April 27, with advising and registration kickstarting the following week, on May 4. Registration sessions will continue throughout the summer. We have over 490 students in the first session, and the Transfer & Graduation Counselor and Transfer Credit/Articulation teams have been busy processing transfer credit, evaluations, transcripts, updating degree audits (DARS), etc. in preparation of supporting students and the advising community during the upcoming session.

WSCUC Site Visit Debrief:

- THANK YOU for the incredible campus engagement in preparation for this culminating campus effort toward our reaffirmation of accreditation: reaching back to the writing of

the report facilitated by the WSCUC steering committee; prep sessions over the last 3 months; and all-campus commitment to showing up prepared, having thought about lines of inquiry with respective areas/teams/committees.

- The Review Team was impressed by campus engagement, preparation, and the progress on recommendations since the last reaffirmation of accreditation
- Some unprecedented aspects of the visit: all-time high staff participation in the staff open forum (as cited by the WSCUC liaison); some interesting schedule changes; Review Team request to join our Exit Meeting celebration to watch [Peggy's performance](#)
- This process allowed for incredible reflection as a campus, and sets us up well to engage in our university strategic planning process in a refreshed informed way

INCLUSIVE EXPERIENCE

Students

Late Night Breakfast: We are excited to announce that our Spring 2026 Late Night Breakfast is just around the corner, and we are in need of volunteers to help make this event a success. The Late Night Breakfast has become a beloved tradition on our campus, and our volunteers always make it that much more special. The form is linked [HERE](#). The event will be held on May 11, and **forms need to be submitted by Thursday, April 30!** Two shifts are available that evening. Thank you in advance, and we look forward to making this Late Night Breakfast a special one. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to reach out to Noel DiBenedetto at ext. 5698.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Enrollment update: The April 21 [Enrollment Target Progress Report](#) is now available. While application volume is still lower than targeted, there has been some improvement in application volume since last report. We are pushing towards the May 1 application deadline and national college decision day, so significant application and deposit activity is underway. The report includes details about the enrollment funnel, as well as interventions underway to push towards the enrollment targets. The campus community is encouraged to engage in these efforts to support continued enrollment growth.

Fall Space Reservation Requests Now Open: It's time to start planning for Fall 2026! Space reservation requests (submitted through 25Live) are now open. We encourage you to submit early to secure your preferred dates and locations. Need help getting started? Join CES weekly drop-in Zoom sessions every Monday from 2–4 PM through May 19, or reach out to Conference & Event Services at ces@humboldt.edu.

INNOVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

Our STARS rating has been returned and we have earned a renewed Gold status with a score of 73.87: Cal Poly Humboldt should be extremely proud of our campus-wide commitment to sustainability and the many ways it is put into practice. As you may recall, this report cycle represents a modest decrease from our 2023 score of 76.57 but several meaningful factors help explain this shift, most notably the transition to STARS version 3.0, which introduced new assessment questions and a large reorganization of the assessment framework. We continue to outperform our peers in many ways and maintain our leadership in sustainability throughout higher education. Overall, receiving confirmation of our renewed STARS Gold rating and affirmation of our strong sustainability performance is especially rewarding and timely as we wrap up Earth Week. This achievement is a direct result of the hard work of our numerous reporters across campus, led by Katie Koscielak from the Office of Sustainability. Thank you all for your contributions!

Faculty Affairs Committee, April 28

Submitted by Jayne McGuire, FAC Chair

Members: Claire Till, Melanie Michalak, Lisa Tremain, Ara Pachmayer, Ryder Dschida, Kim White

Meeting Date(s): April 15 and 22

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

1. Second reading for the Summer Course Feedback language clarification for Appendix J.
2. We are finalizing the responses we received from our Faculty survey. We will share the result with the Senate Executive Committee next week.
3. Nomination of committee member, Lisa Tremain as chair next year.

University Senate

Integrated Curriculum Committee approved 04/21/2026

Consent Calendar

April 28, 2026

Page 1 of 1

Consent Calendar

Department of Critical Race, Gender & Sexuality Studies

- [CRGS - 102 - 25-3107 - New Course - Writing for Social Change I](#). As a Hispanic Serving Institution, it is important that Humboldt expand its offerings of classes that explore literacy and languages; thus, this proposal for an Ethnic Studies-focused knowledge course 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.
- [CRGS - 103 - 25-3108 - New Course - Writing for Social Change II](#). This is the second semester of an introduction to collecting, analyzing, and critically interpreting texts and evidence to organize and develop writing that is situationally effective. Includes expository writing that advocates for social change. Ethnic Studies Focus. CRGS 103 is equivalent to CRGS 104.

Department of Environmental Studies

- [ENST - 482 - 24-2716 - New Course - Internship](#). 1-4 unit internship course. ENST students often desire to have an internship experience and it's essential for their baccalaureate training to offer hands-on experience. Since it's difficult to find paid internships, we seek to offer this important professional development opportunity to students as a course for credit.

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate

Resolution on the URPC Budget Recommendation 2026-2027

24-25/26-URPC — April 28, 2026 — Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends that Chair Harmon forward the University Resource and Planning Committee's Budget Recommendation to President Carvajal in keeping with the CBC Guidance that outlines URPC Recommendations.

RATIONALE: The URPC has developed a budget recommendation based on existing budget assumptions and ask that this recommendation be forwarded to the President in order to inform budget decisions for the 2026-2027 fiscal year.

Date: April 28, 2026
TO: Senate Chair and General Faculty President Christopher Harmon, Cal Poly Humboldt
FROM: Shawna Young and Jaime Lancaster – Co-Chairs of the URPC
CC: URPC Committee Members
RE: 2026-27 Budget Recommendation to the President

Chair Harmon,

Below, please find the University Resources and Planning Committee's (URPC) Budget recommendation for FY 2026-27. After review and input from the Senate, we ask that you forward its contents to President Carvajal in order to inform his decisions regarding budgeting for next year, in accordance with the [CBC Guidance on Senate Ratification of URPC Recommendations](#).

Executive Summary

Cal Poly Humboldt enters the FY 2026–27 budget planning cycle during a period shaped by both statewide investment and systemwide change. At the state level, Governor Newsom's January 2026 budget proposal includes a significant investment in the California State University (CSU) system of more than \$509 million to support student success, workforce development, and institutional capacity across the CSU. While this proposal reflects strong support for public higher education, it remains subject to the state budget process, and the CSU will continue coordinated advocacy efforts throughout the spring as the Legislature works toward adoption of the State's final budget in June 2026.

At the CSU system level, funding changes and fiscal conditions continue to shape how resources are distributed across campuses. Under the CSU's enrollment target and budget reallocation framework, funding is increasingly tied to resident full-time equivalent student (FTES) enrollment levels. Because Cal Poly Humboldt remains more than 10% below its system-funded enrollment target, the campus continues to experience enrollment-based funding reallocations that reduce existing operating resources even as the CSU receives additional investment from the state.

Despite these systemwide pressures, Cal Poly Humboldt has built strong momentum in recent years, including four consecutive years of enrollment growth and an overall increase of almost 10% since receiving its polytechnic designation. During this same period, the campus has expanded its academic portfolio with new programs aligned with workforce needs and the polytechnic mission. With President Carvajal joining the campus in January 2026, the campus community will begin shaping the next phase of strategic planning to build on this momentum and support Humboldt's continued growth.

The University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC) plays a central role in the campus budget process. As a standing committee of the University Senate, URPC works with the University Budget Office and campus leadership to review fiscal conditions, engage the campus community, and develop recommendations regarding the allocation of General Fund resources. Each year, URPC provides a recommendation to the President, through the Senate Chair, to help inform campus budget decisions.

Current budget projections for 2026-27 range from a modest surplus of approximately \$290 thousand to a potential gap of up to \$5.27 million. The University's baseline planning assumption, based on current information, reflects a projected gap of approximately \$2.75 million, or about 1.5% of the total operating budget, while recognizing that conditions may shift. To ensure the campus is prepared, divisions were asked to plan for reductions up to the highest end of the projected range.

Through a strategic and collaborative review process, URPC worked to identify potential reductions that could be implemented while minimizing impacts to the committee's budget priorities. This process included divisions planning for reductions across the full range of projected scenarios and ultimately identified approximately \$2.6 million in reductions that could be implemented without significantly impacting these priorities.

Based on this analysis, URPC recommends a total reduction up to approximately (\$2.6 million) or (1.5%) of the University's total operating budget, allocated across divisions as follows:

- President's Office (\$0) or (0%);
- University Advancement (\$64 thousand) or (1.4%);
- Academic Affairs (\$1.68 million) or (2.0%);
- Administrative Affairs (\$256 thousand) or (1.2%);
- Enrollment Management & Student Success (\$230 thousand) or (1.5%);
- Athletics & Recreation (\$69 thousand) or (2.0%);
- University Wide (\$316 thousand) or (3.8%).

Percentages at the divisional level are calculated based on adjusted operating budgets, which exclude financial aid, self-generated revenue, first-year new base allocations, and centrally held funds (e.g., GI 2025, Polytechnic funding, and compensation).

URPC recommends that if the budget deficit is less than the proposed level of reductions, divisions would still implement the full amount of proposed reductions, and the difference between the actual budget gap and the reductions would be allocated to divisions as 2026-27 one-time funding. The ongoing difference would be held centrally for strategic use and considered through the University's established budget planning and shared governance processes.

URPC further recommends that if the budget deficit is more than the proposed level of reductions, one-time funding from prior roll forward, intentionally set aside for anticipated multi-year budget gaps, may be used to bridge any remaining difference.

In the event of a budget surplus, URPC recommends that divisions would not be required to implement the proposed reductions, and any excess resources would be held centrally for strategic use and considered through the University's established budget planning and shared governance processes.

Together, these recommendations reflect [URPC's guiding principles and budget priorities](#), centering student experience, supporting academic programming and enrollment growth, sustaining essential services, and advancing transparent, data-informed, and fiscally resilient resource decisions aligned with the [University's Strategic Plan](#).

Budget Recommendation

Guiding Principles, Priorities, and Planning Approach

This year's recommendation reflects the University's current fiscal environment, including enrollment, revenue, expenditure, and reserve assumptions. While navigating ongoing financial constraints, the University continues to benefit from state investment in polytechnic initiatives and sustained enrollment growth driven by both new students and improved retention. Together, these factors require a balanced approach that aligns fiscal responsibility with continued strategic growth.

In developing this recommendation, URPC applied a set of guiding principles and planning parameters to support a budget that is sustainable, aligned with the University’s Strategic Plan, and responsive to evolving fiscal conditions. This framework is data-informed, incorporates an equity lens, promotes efficiency, and reflects the University’s Purpose, Vision, and Core Values.

URPC’s approach centers on the student experience while supporting key institutional priorities, including academic programming, enrollment growth, and essential services. Within this framework, the committee prioritizes student success and well-being, seeks to minimize impacts to personnel, promotes long-term financial resiliency, and values transparent and meaningful campus engagement throughout the budget process.

To guide reduction planning, URPC established the following parameters:

- Reductions will be implemented strategically rather than applied uniformly across divisions.
- All divisions will be considered as part of the planning process.
- Units will be supported in planning efforts, with the goal of avoiding mid-year reductions whenever possible.
- Communication and engagement with the campus community will remain timely and transparent.

Budget Transparency and Communication Efforts

Since August, URPC has developed and shared its guiding principles and budget priorities to establish a clear framework for decision-making. In partnership with the University Budget Office, URPC supported the development and communication of budget planning scenarios to inform campus understanding of the University’s fiscal outlook. Throughout this process, URPC engaged the campus community to gather input through coordinated communications, open campus forums, and presentations to groups including the University Senate, Budget & Finance Group, Council of Chairs, and Executive Cabinet.

Communication & Engagement Activity	Timing
Budget Memos & Communications	August, September, December 2025; February 2026
Budget Open Forums	October 2025; February 2026
Budget Office Updates & Presentations	Monthly (August–November 2025; January–February 2026)
Divisional Budget Presentations	October–November 2025; March 2026

Budget Summary

As outlined in this table below, and discussed in more detail in [Appendix A: Budget Planning Assumptions](#), the University anticipates an ongoing budget deficit of up to approximately \$5.27 million in 2026-27. The University’s baseline planning assumption includes a projected deficit of approximately \$2.75 million, or about 1.5% of the total operating budget, while recognizing that actual outcomes may vary as the state budget process continues. This range informs the planning and reduction approach outlined below.

This year’s committee grounded its approach in the University’s baseline planning assumption, informed

by planning across the full range of projected scenarios, and focused on reductions aligned with the most likely outcome while remaining fiscally prudent and preserving the University’s ability to continue advancing its polytechnic designation. This approach reflects the guiding principles and priorities outlined above and allows the University to manage uncertainty while ensuring that any deeper reductions, if needed, are considered thoughtfully and in alignment with the University’s strategic priorities and the development of its next strategic plan.

2026 - 2027	Baseline	High
Incremental Changes	Increase (Decrease)	Increase (Decrease)
Prior Year Revenue/Sources Budget	\$175,270,821	\$175,270,821
State General Fund:		
Restoration of 2025-26 Cut to CSU	\$3,040,000	\$3,040,000
Enrollment Reallocation	(\$3,378,000)	(\$3,378,000)
Polytechnic Allocation	\$3,729,000	\$3,729,000
Compact Funding to CSU	\$4,549,000	\$2,031,000
Tuition: Enrollment Growth	\$2,681,000	\$2,681,000
Tuition: 6% Rate Increase	\$1,969,000	\$1,969,000
Other Tuition & Fees	\$26,000	\$26,000
Total 2026-27 Revenue/Sources Budget	\$187,886,821	\$185,368,821
Prior Year Expenditure/Uses Budget	\$175,270,821	\$175,270,821
CSU Mandatory Costs & Program Earmarks	\$9,558,000	\$9,558,000
Polytechnic Allocation	\$3,729,000	\$3,729,000
Campus Mandatory Costs & Priorities	\$2,079,000	\$2,079,000
Total 2026-27 Expenditure/Uses Budget	\$190,636,821	\$190,636,821
2026-2027 Projected Base Budget Surplus (Deficit)	(\$2,750,000)	(\$5,268,000)

Budget Reductions

As outlined in the Budget Summary section, the University anticipates an ongoing budget deficit of up to \$5.27 million in 2026–27, with a baseline planning assumption of approximately \$2.75 million. Consistent with this assumption, the University is proposing reductions aligned with the most likely

scenario. If the deficit exceeds this level, one-time funding from 2023–24 roll forward, with approximately \$3.75 million available, may be used to bridge the gap.

Following divisional planning and discussions, the URPC proposes the following distribution of reductions across divisions for 2026–27:

Division	2025-26		2026-27	
	Implemented Reductions		Proposed Reductions	
Presidents Office	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
University Advancement	\$219,000	5.6%	\$64,000	1.4%
Academic Affairs	\$5,091,000	6.0%	\$1,678,000	2.0%
Administrative Affairs	\$1,037,000	5.2%	\$256,000	1.2%
Enrollment Management & Student Success	\$656,000	5.0%	\$230,000	1.5%
Athletics & Recreation	\$242,000	7.0%	\$69,000	2.0%
University Wide	\$425,000	5.0%	\$316,000	3.8%
Total Reductions	\$7,670,000	5.7%	\$2,613,000	1.9%

Percentages shown at the divisional level are calculated based on adjusted operating budgets, which exclude financial aid, self-generated revenue, first-year new base allocations, and centrally held funds.

The proposed reductions reflect the strategic budget planning efforts of each division and are guided by the URPC’s guiding principles and priorities. These reductions were developed through divisional planning, campus engagement, and discussions with campus leadership, with a focus on identifying actions that minimize impacts to student experience, academic programming, enrollment growth, and essential services.

While the total proposed reductions of approximately \$2.6 million do not align exactly with the baseline planning assumption, that figure is an estimate, and the proposed reductions reflect the outcome of a planning process that evaluated the full range of scenarios and prioritized impact over achieving a specific dollar amount. Each division evaluated potential reductions to determine which could be implemented without significantly affecting these priorities, and this process informed the distribution of reductions across divisions. University Wide reductions reflect areas where the full target could be achieved without compromising core priorities, while other divisions balanced reductions with operational considerations and existing commitments.

Given its relatively small budget and limited flexibility, the President’s Office will not implement reductions in 2026–27. While the division did identify potential reductions, these were personnel-related and not feasible without significantly impacting core operations. This approach reflects the scale and structure of the division and is consistent with the University’s strategy to prioritize reductions where they

can be absorbed with the least impact.

Given projected budgetary shortfalls in the coming years, the committee recommends that the President's Office consider opportunities to contribute to future reductions, particularly through natural attrition or vacancy management, where feasible.

If needed, one-time funding from 2023–24 roll forward, with approximately \$3.75 million available and previously set aside for anticipated multi-year budget gaps, may be used to bridge any remaining gap between the proposed reductions and the final budget outcome.

University Budget Allocations

Roll Forward and One-Time Resource Planning

Each year, the University generates a level of one-time funding, referred to as “roll forward”, due to differences between budgeted and actual expenditures. These variances are driven by factors such as position vacancies, timing of hires, and underspending in operating expense budgets. As a result, unspent funds accumulate at year-end and are carried forward as one-time resources that can be used to support institutional priorities.

As each division may be asked to participate in reductions next year, it is important that any remaining available roll forward be returned to that division. Thus, the URPC recommends that the campus adheres to the [University Operating Fund Roll Forward Guidelines](#).

The University increased its operating reserve by \$162,435 in accordance with the University Roll Forward Guidelines. The reserve remains compliant with the minimum balance recommended under the CSU Policy on Designated Balances and Reserves. A portion of the 2025–26 roll forward, as calculated by the Guidelines, may be allocated to the reserve. If final 2026-27 budget outcomes result in additional operating reserve requirements, additional roll forward funds will be directed to the operating reserve to ensure continued compliance with CSU policy. Please see the [Reserve Assumptions](#) in Appendix A below for additional discussion.

Polytechnic Funding

The University will receive the final \$3.7 million installment in spring 2026, representing the last portion of the State's \$25 million ongoing base funding commitment associated with its polytechnic designation. This investment continues to support the University's transition through capital development, measured enrollment growth, and the expansion of new academic programs. As these efforts advance, it will be essential to align implementation with long-term financial sustainability and institutional priorities.

Additional Budget Requests

Despite the anticipated need for budget reductions in 2026–27, a call was issued to divisions for both ongoing base budget needs and one-time funding requests. While the University must remain disciplined in addressing its projected budget gap, this process ensures that critical needs and strategic opportunities are identified and considered.

These requests fall outside the URPC's established review timeline and will be evaluated separately. As

such, URPC recommends that one-time funds be used, whenever possible, to support approved strategic investments. For any requests that may require ongoing base funding, URPC requests that the committee be informed and provided an opportunity to offer feedback.

URPC Budget Planning Activities

Multi-Year Budget Planning Process

The University Budget Office (UBO) continues to develop and refine multi-year budget scenarios over a three-year planning horizon to inform planning and decision-making. These scenarios integrate financial projections with key variables, including state funding, enrollment trends, and anticipated cost increases, and are updated throughout the budget cycle as new information becomes available.

They are used to align resource planning with CSU system direction, state budget developments, and institutional priorities, and are regularly shared with campus leadership, the URPC, and the broader campus community through budget forums, meetings, and online resources.

The baseline scenario reflects where planning is currently focused based on available information, assuming that state and CSU funding levels generally align with current expectations and that enrollment continues to grow at a sustainable rate. Additional scenarios help ensure the University is prepared to respond as conditions evolve.

Given the projected budget gap in 2026–27 and continued pressure in subsequent years, multi-year planning remains essential. This approach allows the University to proactively identify strategies, phase in adjustments, and support divisions in planning for potential reductions over time. Establishing preliminary planning targets also provides divisions with the opportunity to evaluate operational changes, such as reorganization or restructuring, while maintaining flexibility as budget conditions evolve.

Conclusion

The University's budget planning assumptions are based on the most current information available, including campus enrollment projections, anticipated mandatory cost increases, guidance from the Chancellor's Office, and the Governor's January budget proposal. While the State budget remains subject to change through the legislative process, it is necessary to move forward with a 2026–27 budget recommendation based on current assumptions and planning scenarios.

Should there be any significant changes to the State of California budget or subsequent CSU allocations, URPC requests to be informed in a timely manner so that any necessary adjustments can be considered.

We appreciate your review of this recommendation and welcome your feedback and comments.

APPENDIX A

Budget Planning Assumptions

Enrollment Outlook & Trends

The University continues to make steady progress toward its long-term enrollment goals, with sustained growth across recent terms. Since Fall 2022, enrollment has increased each semester, including a 4.1% increase in Spring 2026 over Spring 2025 (+227 students), with Fall 2025 headcount enrollment reaching 6,276, the highest since Fall 2020. Growth has been driven by both new and continuing students, with continuing undergraduate enrollment increasing 4.2% (+201) and new student enrollment increasing 4% year-over-year.

Key enrollment indicators remain strong. Deposits for Fall continue to trend positively, with approximately 1,400 students committed and additional gains expected ahead of the May 1 national decision date. Yield rates have improved, with 88% of deposited students enrolling at census, and transfer enrollment continues to grow, including a 10.8% increase in new transfer students in Spring. These trends reflect the impact of targeted recruitment strategies, expanded transfer pipelines, and increased emphasis on affordability and student retention.

While these indicators are encouraging, enrollment projections used for budget planning remain conservative to account for potential variability. The University is currently budgeting 7.7% headcount enrollment growth for Fall 2026–27, consistent with the [Strategic Enrollment Plan](#), and includes a 3% contingency to account for potential variation. The University will continue to monitor application, yield, and retention trends as the budget cycle progresses.

Looking ahead, updated multi-year enrollment targets include a Fall 2026 goal of 6,837 students and a long-term goal of exceeding 11,000 students by Fall 2034. This trajectory reflects a measured and sustainable approach aligned with the University's polytechnic mission and capacity.

Despite this growth, the University is currently below its CSU-funded resident FTES target. In 2025–26, the target was reduced by 3% to 7,154, resulting in a funding decrease of approximately \$2.1 million. For 2026–27, the CSU will reduce the target by 5% to 6,796, with an associated funding reduction of approximately \$3.4 million.

For budget planning purposes, enrollment assumptions are translated into full-time equivalent students (FTES) using historical ratios of headcount to FTES and revenue generated per FTES.

Strategic efforts to increase resident FTES include the Green & Gold Guarantee, transfer outreach to targeted academic programs and feeder community colleges, and new direct admissions programs across seven school districts. In addition, the transition of summer to state-supported instruction allows summer FTES to count toward the annual target, helping to mitigate future enrollment recalibrations.

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	Actuals	Actuals	Budget
Total Fall Headcount	6,045	6,276	6,837
Annual CSU Funded Target Resident FTES	7,375	7,154	6,796
Annual Resident FTES	5,045	5,241	5,851
% Shortfall from CSU Funded Target Resident FTES	-32%	-27%	-14%

Revenue Assumptions

Under the baseline planning assumption, the University’s 2026–27 revenue outlook reflects a combination of new state investment and ongoing systemwide funding pressures. While the Governor’s January 2026 proposal includes significant funding for the CSU system, much of this support is allocated toward systemwide costs, resulting in limited new discretionary resources at the campus level.

At the campus level, revenue assumptions are driven by the following key factors:

- **State Appropriation (+\$7.6 million)**
 - State funding remains the most significant source of revenue variability. While the Governor’s proposal restores prior reductions and includes new compact funding, a portion of this funding is deferred and largely absorbed by systemwide mandatory costs. As a result, limited new discretionary funding is available to support campus operations.
- **Enrollment-Based Reallocation (-\$3.4 million)**
 - Under the CSU’s enrollment target and budget reallocation framework, funding continues to be redistributed based on resident FTES performance. Because Cal Poly Humboldt remains more than 10% below its enrollment target, the campus continues to experience reductions in base funding.
- **Tuition & Fee Revenue (+\$4.7 million)**
 - Tuition revenue is projected to increase due to the systemwide tuition rate increase of 6% and enrollment growth assumptions. This funding is also largely absorbed by systemwide mandatory costs.
- **Polytechnic Funding (+\$3.7 million)**
 - The University will receive the final \$3.7 million installment of the State’s ongoing \$25 million base funding commitment associated with its polytechnic designation.

Expenditure Assumptions

The University’s 2026–27 expenditure outlook, under the baseline planning scenario, reflects a combination of systemwide mandatory cost increases, campus-specific cost pressures, and strategic investments. While some costs are offset by corresponding revenue, others represent ongoing impacts to the University’s operating budget.

At the campus level, expenditure assumptions are driven by the following key factors:

- **CSU Mandatory Costs (+\$9.6 million)**
 - As noted in the State Appropriation and Tuition & Fees Revenue section above, the University will receive additional funding to support CSU-mandated cost increases, including the State University Grant (SUG), compensation, utilities, insurance, and health premiums. These costs are determined at the system level and funded through corresponding state appropriation and the systemwide tuition rate increase, resulting in a net neutral impact to the University's operating budget, as the revenue is provided specifically to cover these required expenditures.
- **Polytechnic Funding (+\$3.7 million)**
 - The University will receive the final \$3.7 million installment of ongoing funding associated with its polytechnic designation. These funds support continued implementation of polytechnic initiatives, including academic program development and institutional capacity.
- **Campus Mandatory Costs (+\$725 thousand)**
 - Campus-specific cost increases include utilities, projected to increase by approximately \$600 thousand (10%), and insurance, projected to increase by approximately \$125 thousand (4%). These costs represent ongoing budget pressures that must be absorbed within the University's operating budget.
- **Campus Strategic Investments (+\$268 thousand)**
 - The University will invest approximately \$268 thousand to support the Green & Gold Guarantee, a campus initiative that guarantees eligible California students' tuition and mandatory fees are fully covered after financial aid. By reducing financial uncertainty, the program supports access, enrollment, and student success.
- **Enrollment Contingency (+\$1.1 million)**
 - A 3% enrollment contingency of approximately \$1.1 million is included to provide flexibility in the event enrollment assumptions are not met or conditions change during the fiscal year.

For 2026–27, the University anticipates a budget deficit based on current revenue and expenditure assumptions. The proposed reductions, while aligned with the most likely scenario, do not fully eliminate the projected gap. Consistent with this approach, one-time funding from 2023–24 roll forward may be used, as needed and up to \$3.75 million, to bridge any remaining difference.

This reflects a deliberate strategy to align reductions with institutional priorities while maintaining flexibility to respond to final budget outcomes.

Reserves Assumptions

It is the goal of the campus and URPC to work toward establishing reserves at the levels outlined in the [University Operating Fund Reserve Policy](#) in the following categories: Equipment Reserve, Maintenance Reserve, and Operating Reserve. With the exception of the Operating Reserve described below, campuses have the authority to determine target levels based on individual needs and plans. Current reserve balances for each category are provided below for reference.

Reserves Category	Ending Balance		
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Capital Reserves	\$1,109,686	\$1,109,686	\$2,149,218
Equipment Reserves	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$402,435
Maintenance Reserves	\$616,716	\$616,716	\$1,104,021
Operating Reserves - <i>Reserve for Economic Uncertainty</i>	\$8,126,935	\$8,907,068	\$9,069,503
<i># of days supported by Operating Reserves</i>	19	18	18

The 2026–27 Operating Reserve, referred to as the Reserve for Economic Uncertainty under the CSU Policy on Designated Balances and Reserves (June 2, 2025), is projected to begin at \$9 million, or approximately 5% of the projected Operating Fund Budget. This meets the CSU’s minimum requirement. However, this level would cover only 18 days of annual operating expenditures, compared to the CSU’s recommended reserve level of three to six months.

The Reserve for Economic Uncertainty provides flexibility to absorb temporary changes in fiscal conditions and to support mission-aligned investments. Insufficient reserves can create cash flow challenges and limit the University’s ability to make strategic, long-term decisions. Any use of Operating Reserve funds should include a plan for replenishment.

The University Operating Fund Reserve Policy will be updated to align with the [CSU Policy on Designated Balances and Reserves](#), which replaced ICSUAM Section 2001.00.

**CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate**

Resolution on Policy on Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning

25-25/26-APC — April 28, 2026 — Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the President that the attached revision to the Policy on Academic Internships be approved; and further be it

RESOLVED: That the policy be implemented effective immediately upon approval.

RATIONALE: California State University Executive Order 1064, *Student Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning* (October 2025), establishes updated systemwide requirements governing academic internships. The Executive Order explicitly allows campuses either to develop a campus-specific policy or to formally adhere to the EO.

Adopting a referential campus policy that affirms adherence to EO 1064 ensures that Cal Poly Humboldt remains fully aligned with current CSU policy while avoiding redundancy and the risk of inconsistency between campus and systemwide requirements.

This approach promotes clarity for faculty, staff, and students by directing them to a single, authoritative source of requirements, and supports efficient policy maintenance as future updates to EO 1064 will not require additional campus policy revisions.

In addition, designating the Center for Community Based Learning as the coordinating office provides clear administrative responsibility for implementation, oversight, and guidance, thereby strengthening institutional compliance and support for high-quality academic internship experiences.

Policy on Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning
[Policy Number]

Center for Community Based Learning

Applies to: Faculty, staff, students,

Cal Poly Humboldt supports academic internships and community engaged learning (including service learning) as high-impact educational practices that integrate academic learning with practical experience. The university ensures that all academic internships and community engaged learning (including service learning) courses are conducted in accordance with applicable California State University policies and standards.

Supersedes: VPAA 10-07*

Purpose of the Policy

This policy establishes the university's adherence to California State University Executive Order 1064: Student Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning (October 2025), and affirms institutional responsibility for ensuring compliance with systemwide requirements governing academic internships.

Policy Details

Cal Poly Humboldt shall adhere to the requirements of California State University Executive Order 1064: Student Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning, including any subsequent revisions.

All academic internships and community engaged learning (including service learning) courses offered for academic credit shall comply with the provisions, definitions, and requirements set forth in EO 1064.

Responsibility for the dissemination, implementation, and ongoing oversight of this policy is delegated by the President to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and administered through the Center for Community Based Learning, which serves as the coordinating office for academic internships and community engaged learning (including service learning) courses.

The current CSU policy may be accessed at:
<https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/18674533/latest/>

Related Policies:

- CSU Executive Order 1064: Student Academic Internships and Community Engaged Learning

History

APC: 04/06/2026
Reviewed by University Senate: MM/DD/YYYY
Approved by Provost/President: MM/DD/YYYY

DRAFT

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate

Resolution to Update Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook Regarding summer term student feedback survey use in the RTP process

26-25\26-FAC — April 28, 2026— Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends the following changes to Appendix J be forwarded to the General Faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That adding details to Appendix J regarding the use of summer term student course feedback surveys will help to clarify the expectations for faculty and provide guidance to personnel committees; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That consistent use of the name, student course feedback survey, adds clarity to Appendix J; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That prospective faculty shall be made aware of RTP processes, including the use of summer term student feedback surveys by the appropriate department chair and Academic Personnel Services. and be it further,

RESOLVED: That these changes become effective at the beginning of the 2026 fall semester.

RATIONALE:

Faculty have requested updates to Appendix J after identifying that the existing language is unclear and not fully aligned with current electronic RTP practices. The purpose of this revision is to provide clearer guidance regarding expectations for demonstrating teaching excellence within the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process. Specifically, the proposed language clarifies when summer term student feedback surveys must be included in the RTP file and how they will be reviewed as part of the evaluation process. The revisions also ensure consistent use of the term student course feedback survey throughout the document to promote clarity and alignment with current institutional terminology.

Early Tenure Language

Changes to Faculty Handbook - Pages omitted that aren't implicated in the change.

[Text in blue is new (p. 10). Yellow-highlighted text indicates minor language changes that promote consistency in terminology and accuracy with current electronic practices. Yellow highlighted strikethrough indicates removal of inconsistent language.]

Section

Appendix J

V. Personnel Action File

A. File Custodian

B. File Access

C. File Additions

1. A faculty unit employee shall have the right to submit material to his/her PAF. 11.2
2. All material placed in the PAF shall be identified by source, except for student feedback surveys collected in accordance with standard procedures. 11.3, 15.16

D. File Corrections

E. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

1. The WPAF is prepared for a Performance Review (See Figure 1). 15.8
 - a) It contains all required forms and documents, candidate generated material, evaluative materials and recommendations and candidate's rebuttals, if any. 15.8
 - b) WPAF materials submitted by a faculty unit employee shall be deemed incorporated by reference into the PAF, but need not be physically placed in the file. 11.7, 15.9

2. Materials shall be in an online portfolio with 9 sections. Material in each section shall be in reverse chronological order, most recent material first.
 - a) Section 1 - Index of materials submitted for evaluation. 11.7, 15.9
 - b) Section 2 - Pertinent documents concerning original appointment, subsequent retention, tenure and promotion; evaluations of leaves intended to count as time in academic rank; and clarification of the terminal degree status if not readily apparent. Tenured faculty shall include material since the submission of their last successful application for promotion.
 - c) Section 3 - Initiating unit and college personnel policies and procedures, and Department/Unit RTP Criteria and Standards.
 - d) Section 4 - Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) and Professional Development Plan (PDP).
 - e) Section 5 - Evaluation materials provided by evaluating committees and administrators rather than the candidate. 15.12a
 - f) Section 6 - Evaluative letters that address areas of performance from faculty and professional colleagues (on and off campus), administrators, staff, and other relevant individuals (non-students).
 - g) Section 7 – Evidence of teaching effectiveness/librarianship/counseling effectiveness (in addition to collegial letters).
 - (1) Student letters, identified by name. 15.17b
 - (2) Student feedback survey data collected as part of the **student feedback survey process**. 15.17a
 - (3) Any other relevant evidence.

VI. Periodic Evaluation

- F. In an academic year or work year in which a candidate is not subject to a Performance Review for retention, probationary faculty unit employees shall be subject to a Periodic Evaluation (See Figure 1). 15.31
- G. Periodic Evaluations shall be conducted by the IUPC of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator. There shall be consideration of the Professional Development Plan, **student feedback surveys** (when teaching duties have been assigned and **student feedback surveys are available**), peer reviews, and administrative reviews. 15.21, 15.32

VII. Performance Review

- H. **Evaluation by Peers, Students, and Administrators**

The Performance Review shall consist of an evaluation of a candidate's performance areas by peers, students, and administrators. 15.38

1. **Peer evaluation**

2. **Student Feedback**

a) All classes (unless exempted) taught by faculty shall gather student feedback in the form of student feedback surveys, including quantitative or a combination of quantitative and qualitative questions. (15.15, 15.17).

- (1) Candidates shall not be present when questionnaires are administered.
- (2) Questionnaires shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. 15.17a
- (3) Space may be provided on the quantitative form for student comments. 15.17a
- (4) Summaries of student questionnaires shall be prepared by regularly employed staff, not student employees. These shall contain appropriate tabulations and compilations of student comments.
- (5) The University recognizes that student feedback is subject to bias, and research has shown that this bias disproportionately impacts faculty of color and faculty who identify as femme, trans, women or non-binary.
- (6) Questionnaire summaries shall be placed in the Personnel Action File and shall not be available to candidates until after class grades have been submitted.
- (7) Candidates are encouraged to comment in writing on student questionnaires including such information as required course status, grade point distribution, rigor, or course objectives.
- (8) Candidates who find bias in their student feedback (or other content in their file) can appeal to the Dean, in accordance with Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- (9) Summer term appointments (College of Extended Education [CEE] or stateside) are distinct from tenure-line, academic year appointments. Inclusion of course student feedback surveys from summer term appointments in the WPAF is optional \ and, at the faculty's discretion, will be included in the Teaching Effectiveness table (section IIa) of the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS). If courses taught during summer are part of a faculty member's academic year appointment via "work spreading," student feedback surveys must be included in the WPAF.

VIII. Peer Review Committees

I.

J. **Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC)**

1. Function

- a) Evaluate candidates for RTP, not serve as advocates.
- b) Assist candidates in preparing WPAFs that contain supporting materials which address RTP performance criteria and standards. 15.12a
- c) Advise candidates on materials which are necessary or beneficial for WPAF inclusion.
- d) Make recommendations to the next higher peer review committee.

2. Organization

- a) The IUPC shall be composed of at least three members elected each spring by the initiating unit. If there are insufficient eligible members, the initiating unit shall elect members from related academic disciplines. 15.40
- b) Each initiating unit may determine its own policies and procedures consistent with university policies and the CBA.

3. Procedures

- a) For candidates holding a joint appointment, evaluation shall be obtained from all affected IUPCs. 15.13
 - (1) After considering recommendations from affected Deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall inform candidates and committees which IUPC will serve as the primary committee.
 - (2) The **primary** IUPC shall assist candidates in WPAF compilation.
 - ~~(3) Other IUPCs shall forward their recommendations to the primary IUPC.~~

IX. Areas of Performance for RTP

A. General Criterion

B. Assessment of the Areas of Performance for RTP

All faculty are expected to create inclusive learning environments and ensure that students are provided with equitable opportunities for success. Faculty may also make contributions toward equity and inclusion in scholarly/creative activities and service aspects of their duties. These contributions to equity and

inclusion can take a variety of forms including but not limited to those listed below, and should be identified in the appropriate section of the WPAF:

4. Effectiveness

- a) Teaching effectiveness is essential for retention, tenure, and promotion. Effective teaching demands the clear communication of disciplinary/subject matter knowledge and the transformation and extension of that knowledge to a diverse student population.
 - (1) It is expected that faculty will continually improve their understanding of student learning, increase their knowledge of pedagogy, increase their understanding of accessibility and of universal design, and strengthen teaching skills throughout the probationary period, and will demonstrate clear, precise communication as well as effective application of that knowledge in teaching.
 - (2) Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated through understanding and current knowledge, including the use of measures of student learning, in such activities as:
 - (3) Faculty are expected to participate in professional development activities that enhance teaching effectiveness for the purpose of:
 - (4) Teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of **student feedback surveys** by peers. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from colleagues within the candidate's academic discipline(s). The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observation can take place in a variety of ways, such as classroom visitations, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes.
 - (5) Other academic contributions to teaching effectiveness to be evaluated by colleagues include but are not limited to: course syllabi, learning outcomes, exams, course accessibility, classroom accessibility, and other learning activities.
 - (6) Constructive and professional relationships with students are important for a strong academic program, therefore, it is expected that faculty demonstrate sound academic advising, effective counseling of students on course-related matters, the ability to work with a diverse student population, ensure equitable learning opportunities and activities, and availability of the faculty member on a regular basis to assist the academic needs of students.
 - (7) Assessment by the candidate's colleagues shall be substantiated by other evidence such as written comments by colleagues not in the candidate's area of service, **student feedback**

surveys, degree of achievement of and supporting statements from former students.

[Unamended Appendix J](#)

History

FAC: 04/06/2026

Reviewed by University Senate: MM/DD/YYYY

Approved by Provost/President: MM/DD/YYYY

Approved by Faculty

DRAFT

**CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate**

**Resolution on Revisions to the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of
Research Misconduct**

27-25/26-EX — April 28, 2026 — Second Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the President that the attached revision to the Policy and Procedure for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct be approved; and further be it

RESOLVED: That the policy be implemented effective immediately upon approval.

RATIONALE: The proposed revisions update the University's Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct to align with the 2024 revisions to 42 CFR Part 93, which govern federally funded research misconduct proceedings effective January 1, 2026. The changes are primarily technical and compliance-based, clarifying definitions, timelines, and documentation requirements. Adoption ensures continued alignment with federal regulations and preserves eligibility for external research funding while maintaining a clear and consistent process.

**Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research
Misconduct
[Policy Number]
[Responsible Office Name]**

Applies to: Faculty, Staff, Students

Supersedes: P16-04

Purpose of the Policy

Cal Poly Humboldt (University) is committed to ethical principles and procedures regarding integrity in all forms of research activity for which the University is responsible. This policy is also intended to conform to the requirements of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS), the National Science Foundation (NSF) and Federal regulations including, but not limited to, the "Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct" [42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93] and the "National Science Foundation Regulations on Misconduct in Science and Engineering Research" [45 CFR, Part 689].

Members of the University community engaged in research and creative activities are not to: fabricate data or results; change or knowingly omit data or results to misrepresent results in the research record; or intentionally misappropriate the ideas, writings, research, or findings of others. All those engaged in research are expected to pursue the advancement of knowledge while meeting the highest standards of honesty, accuracy, and objectivity in their work in general and as authors. This standard extends to all publications. They are also expected to demonstrate accountability for sponsors' funds and to comply with specific terms and conditions of contracts and grants.

Table of Contents

- I. POLICY AND PURPOSE
- II. SCOPE
- III. DEFINITIONS
- IV. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
- V. Process and Procedures
- VI. Conducting the Assessment and Inquiry
- VII. The Inquiry Report

- VIII. Conducting the Investigation
- IX. The Investigation Report
- X. Completion of Cases; Reporting Premature Closures to Appropriate Regulatory Agency
- XI. Institutional Administrative Actions
- XII. Other Considerations
- XIII. References

Definitions

Allegation: A disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communications to a University or HHS official.

Assessment: Assessment means a consideration of whether an allegation of research misconduct appears to fall within the definition of research misconduct; appears to involve PHS-supported biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or research training; and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The assessment only involves the review of readily accessible information relevant to the allegation.

Complainant: A person who in good faith makes an allegation of research misconduct.

Conflict of Interest: The real or apparent interference of one person's interests with the interests of another person, where potential bias may occur due to prior or existing personal or professional relationships.

Deciding Official (DO): The person responsible for making the final decision on misconduct findings, administrative actions, and other items as listed in this policy and procedures. The Deciding Official will be the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and should have no direct prior involvement in University's inquiry, investigation, or allegation assessment. A Deciding Official's appointment of an individual to assess allegations of research misconduct, or to serve on an inquiry or investigation committee, shall not be considered direct prior involvement.

Evidence: Evidence means anything offered or obtained during a research misconduct proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact. Evidence includes documents, whether in hard copy or electronic form, information, tangible items, and testimony.

Fabrication: Making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

Falsification: Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

Good Faith as applied to a complainant or witness: Having a belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony that a reasonable person in the complainant's or witness's position could have, based on the information known to the complainant or witness at the time. An allegation or cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding is not in good faith if it is made with knowing or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or testimony. Good faith, as applied to a committee member means cooperating with the purpose of helping the University meet its responsibilities under any applicable federal regulations and this policy. A committee member does not act in good faith if their acts or omissions on the committee are dishonest or influenced by personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved in the research misconduct proceedings.

Inquiry: Preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of § 93.307 through § 93.309.

Institutional Record: The institutional record comprises:

(a) The records that the institution compiled or generated during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on. These records include, but are not limited to:

(1) Documentation of the assessment as required by § 93.306(c).

(2) If an inquiry is conducted, the inquiry report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the inquiry, including, but not limited to, research records and the transcripts of any transcribed interviews conducted during the inquiry, information the respondent provided to the institution, and the documentation of any decision not to investigate as required by § 93.309(c).

(3) If an investigation is conducted, the investigation report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the investigation, including, but not limited to, research records, the transcripts of each interview conducted pursuant to § 93.310(g), and information the respondent provided to the institution.

(4) Decision(s) by the Institutional Deciding Official, such as the written decision from the Institutional Deciding Official under § 93.314.

(5) The complete record of any institutional appeal consistent with § 93.315.

(b) A single index listing all the research records and evidence that the institution compiled during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on.

(c) A general description of the records that were sequestered but not considered or relied on.

Intentional: To act intentionally means to act with the aim of carrying out the act.

Investigation: The formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of §§ 93.310 through 93.317.

Knowingly: To act knowingly means to act with awareness of the act.

Research Misconduct: Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Office of Research Integrity (ORI): The federal office to which the HHS Secretary has delegated responsibility for addressing research integrity and misconduct issues related to PHS supported activities.

Plagiarism: The appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

(a) Plagiarism includes the unattributed verbatim or nearly verbatim copying of sentences and paragraphs from another's work that materially misleads the reader regarding the contributions of the author. It does not include the limited use of identical or nearly identical phrases that describe a commonly used methodology.

(b) Plagiarism does not include self-plagiarism or authorship or credit disputes, including disputes among former collaborators who participated jointly in the development or conduct of a research project. Self-plagiarism and authorship disputes do not meet the definition of research misconduct.

Preponderance of the evidence: Proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not.

Recklessly: To act recklessly means to propose, perform, or review research, or report research results, with indifference to a known risk of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.

Research: A systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration, or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research) relating broadly to a particular discipline or subject by establishing, discovering, developing, elucidating, or confirming information about the discipline or subject of the research.

Research Integrity Officer (RIO): For this policy, the RIO is the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs or other appropriate administrator delegated by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The RIO is responsible for: (1) assessing allegations of research misconduct to determine if they fall within the definition of research misconduct, are covered by federal regulations, and warrant an inquiry on the basis that the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified; and (2) overseeing inquiries and investigations and (3) the other responsibilities described in this policy.

Research record: The record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and

electronic progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided to a federal agency or University official by a respondent(s) in the course of the research misconduct proceeding.

Respondent: The person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a research misconduct proceeding.

Retaliation: An adverse action taken against a complainant, witness, or committee member by the institution or one of its members in response to (1) a good faith allegation of research misconduct; or (2) good faith cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding.

Policy Details (optional)

I. POLICY AND PURPOSE

Cal Poly Humboldt (University) is committed to ethical principles and procedures regarding integrity in all forms of research activity for which the University is responsible. This policy is also intended to conform to the requirements of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS), the National Science Foundation (NSF) and Federal regulations including, but not limited to, the "Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct" [42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93] and the "National Science Foundation Regulations on Misconduct in Science and Engineering Research" [45 CFR, Part 689].

Members of the University community engaged in research and creative activities are not to: fabricate data or results; change or knowingly omit data or results to misrepresent results in the research record; or intentionally misappropriate the ideas, writings, research, or findings of others. All those engaged in research are expected to pursue the advancement of knowledge while meeting the highest standards of honesty, accuracy, and objectivity in their work in general and as authors. This standard extends to all publications. They are also expected to demonstrate accountability for sponsors' funds and to comply with specific terms and conditions of contracts and grants.

II. SCOPE

This policy applies to research conducted under an externally funded sponsored project that is awarded to the University or one of its auxiliary organizations, internally funded research, and unfunded research conducted by faculty, staff, or students. Any individual who may work on or contribute to such a project, whether for monetary compensation or not, is covered by this policy. All members of the University community engaged in sponsored project activities are expected to conduct their projects with integrity and intellectual honesty at all times, to act responsibly with respect to the use of funds, and to ensure that they and those who work with them comply with all campus, system wide, agency, and government regulations.

The scope of this policy includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported, or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for external funds resulted in an award. The scope of this policy does not apply to authorship or collaboration disputes. It applies only to allegations of research misconduct that occurred within six years of the date the institution or the sponsor received the allegation, subject to the subsequent use, health and safety of the public, and grandfather exceptions in 42 CFR 93.104(b).

IV. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

The RIO will have primary responsibility for implementation of the institution's policies and procedures on research misconduct. The RIO's responsibilities include the following duties related to research misconduct proceedings:

- Consult confidentially with persons uncertain about whether to submit an allegation of research misconduct;
- Receive allegations of research misconduct either in writing or orally;
- Assess each allegation of research misconduct in accordance with this policy to determine whether it falls within the definition of research misconduct and warrants an inquiry;
- As necessary, take interim action and promptly notify ORI of special circumstances, in accordance with this policy;
- Promptly sequester research data and evidence pertinent to the allegation of research misconduct in accordance with this policy and maintain it securely in accordance with this policy and applicable law and regulation;
- Provide confidentiality to those involved in the research misconduct proceeding as required by 42 CFR 93.106, other applicable law, and institutional policy, and appropriate discretion;
- Notify the respondent(s) and provide opportunities for him/her to review/ comment/respond to allegations, evidence, and committee reports in accordance with this policy;
- Inform respondent(s), complainants, and witnesses of the procedural steps in the research misconduct proceeding;
- Appoint the chair and members of the inquiry and investigation committees, ensure that those committees are properly staffed and that there is expertise appropriate to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the evidence;
- Determine whether each person involved in handling an allegation of research misconduct has an unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest and take appropriate action, including recusal, to ensure that no person with such conflict is involved in the research misconduct proceeding;
- When applicable, take all reasonable and practical steps to protect or restore the positions and reputations of good faith complainants, witnesses, and committee members and counter potential or actual retaliation against them by respondent(s) or other institutional members;

- Keep the Deciding Official and others who need to know apprised of the progress of the review of the allegation of research misconduct;
- Notify and make reports to ORI as required by 42 CFR Part 93 or any other relevant federal regulations and/or notify and make reports to the appropriate regulatory agency or sponsors as required by regulations and this policy;
- Ensure that administrative actions taken by the institution and ORI are enforced and, take appropriate action when legitimate need has been determined by the Deciding Official or University, to notify other involved parties, such as sponsors, law enforcement agencies, professional societies, and licensing boards of those actions; and
- Maintain the institutional records of the research misconduct proceeding and make them available to ORI in accordance with this policy.

B. Complainant

The complainant is responsible for making allegations in good faith, maintaining confidentiality, and cooperating with the inquiry and investigation. Although not required, the complainant can be interviewed at the inquiry stage and given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction. The complainant must be interviewed during an investigation and be given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction.

C. Respondent(s)

The respondent(s) is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an inquiry and investigation. The respondent(s) is entitled to:

- A good faith effort from the RIO to notify the respondent(s) in writing at the time of or before beginning an inquiry;
- An opportunity to comment on the inquiry report and have their comments attached to the report; Be notified of the outcome of the inquiry, and receive a copy of the inquiry report that includes a copy of, or refers to 42 CFR Part 93 and the institution's policies and procedures on research misconduct;
- Be notified in writing of the allegations to be investigated within a reasonable time after the determination that an investigation is warranted, but before the investigation begins (within 30 days after the institution decides to begin an investigation), and be notified in writing of any new allegations, not addressed in the inquiry or in the initial notice of investigation, within a reasonable time after the determination to pursue those allegations;
- Although not required, the respondent can be interviewed at the inquiry stage and given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction;
- Be interviewed during the investigation, have the opportunity to correct the recording or transcript, and have the corrected recording or transcript included in the record of the investigation;
- Have interviewed during the investigation any witness who has been reasonably identified by the respondent(s) as having information on relevant aspects of the investigation, have the

recording or transcript provided to the witness for correction, and have the corrected recording or transcript included in the record of investigation; and

- Receive a copy of the draft investigation report and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based, and be notified that any comments must be submitted within 30 days of the date on which the copy was received and that the comments will be considered by the institution, included in the institutional record, and addressed in the final report.
- Have an opportunity to continue their research throughout the inquiry process unless the RIO has determined that Interim Administrative Actions are required per Section VF.

The respondent(s) should be given the opportunity to admit that research misconduct occurred and that they committed the research misconduct. With the advice of the RIO and/or other institutional officials, the Deciding Official may terminate the institution's review of an allegation that has been admitted, if the University's acceptance of the admission and any proposed settlement is approved by ORI.

D. Deciding Official (DO)

The DO will receive the inquiry report and after consulting with the RIO and/or other institutional officials, decide whether an investigation is warranted under the criteria in 42 CFR 93.307(f). Any finding that an investigation is warranted must be made in writing by the DO and must be provided to ORI, together with a copy of the inquiry report meeting the requirements of 42 CFR 93.309, within 30 days of the finding. If it is found that an investigation is not warranted, the DO and the RIO will ensure that detailed documentation of the inquiry is retained for at least seven years after termination of the inquiry, so that ORI may assess the reasons why the institution decided not to conduct an investigation.

The DO will receive the investigation report and, after consulting with the RIO and/or other institutional officials, decide the extent to which this institution accepts the findings of the investigation and, if research misconduct is found, decide what, if any, institutional administrative actions are appropriate. The DO shall ensure that the final investigation report, the findings of the DO and a description of any pending or completed administrative actions are provided to ORI, as required by 42 CFR Part 93.

V. Process and Procedures

Nothing in this policy shall be construed to limit any rights that a faculty member may have to file a grievance, including a grievance filed pursuant to a Collective Bargaining Agreement or a statutory right. Nothing in this policy shall be construed to limit any rights that a faculty member may have related to a disciplinary procedure in place pursuant to a Collective Bargaining Agreement, statute, or university practice or policy.

If it is found that an inquiry or an investigation is not warranted under this policy, or if there is no finding of research misconduct under this policy, no documentation regarding allegations, inquiries, or investigations pursuant to this policy shall be placed in the personnel file or Personnel Action File of a respondent without the written consent of the respondent.

A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct

All University members will report observed or apparent research misconduct to the RIO. If an individual is unsure whether an incident falls within the definition of research misconduct, they may meet with or contact the RIO to discuss the suspected research misconduct informally, which may include discussing it anonymously and/or hypothetically. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research misconduct, the RIO will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem.

In cases where the subsequent use exception is applied, the reasons for making that determination will be documented.

B. Cooperation with Research Misconduct Proceedings

University members will cooperate with the RIO and other institutional officials in the review of allegations and the conduct of inquiries and investigations. University members, including respondent(s), have an obligation to provide evidence relevant to research misconduct allegations to the RIO or other University officials. It is not expected that respondents halt research or surrender items critical to continuing research during an investigation.

C. Confidentiality

The RIO shall (1) limit disclosure of the identity of the respondent(s), complainants and witnesses to those who need to know in order to carry out a thorough, competent, objective and fair research misconduct proceeding consistent with applicable laws and regulations; and (2) except as otherwise prescribed by law, limit the disclosure of any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified to those who need to know in order to carry out a research misconduct proceeding. The RIO must use appropriate mechanisms to ensure that there is no disclosure of identifying information.

D. Protecting Complainants, Witnesses, and Committee Members

University members may not retaliate in any way against complainants, witnesses, or committee members. University members should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation against complainants, witnesses or committee members to the RIO, who shall review the matter and, as necessary, make all reasonable and practical efforts to counter any

potential or actual retaliation and protect and restore the position and reputation of the person against whom the retaliation is directed.

E. Protecting the Respondent(s)

As requested, and as appropriate, the RIO and other institutional officials shall make all reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, but against whom no finding of research misconduct is made. During the research misconduct proceeding, the RIO is responsible for ensuring that respondent(s) receive all the notices and opportunities provided for in federal regulations and the policies and procedures of the University.

F. Interim Administrative Actions and Notifying ORI of Special Circumstances

Throughout the research misconduct proceeding, the RIO will review the situation to determine if there is any threat of harm to public health, federal or other sponsor funds and equipment, or the integrity of the PHS or other sponsor supported research process. The RIO may, in consultation with other University officials and ORI or other appropriate regulatory agencies and/or sponsor, take appropriate interim action to protect against any such threat. Interim action might include additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of federal/sponsor funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of federal/sponsor funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results or delaying publication. The RIO shall, at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, notify ORI or any other appropriate regulatory agency and/or other sponsor immediately if they have reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:

Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;

HHS or other sponsor resources or interests are threatened;

Research activities should be suspended;

There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;

Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;

The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and HHS action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or

The research community or public should be informed.

VI. Conducting the Assessment and Inquiry

A. Assessment of Allegations

Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the RIO shall promptly assess the allegation to determine whether it is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence

of research misconduct may be identified, whether it is within the jurisdictional criteria of federal agencies, and whether the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct in this policy and any applicable federal regulations. An inquiry must be conducted if these criteria are met.

The assessment period should be brief. In conducting the assessment, the RIO need not interview the complainant, respondent(s), or other witnesses, or gather data beyond any that may have been submitted with the allegation, except as necessary to determine whether the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The RIO shall, on or before the date which the respondent(s) is notified of the allegation, obtain custody of, inventory, and sequester all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, as provided in the Notice to Respondent(s); Sequestration of Research Records section below.

B. Initiation and Purpose of Inquiry

If the RIO determines that the criteria for an inquiry are met, they will immediately initiate the inquiry process. The purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the available evidence to determine whether to conduct an investigation. An inquiry does not require a full review of all the evidence related to the allegation.

C. Notice to Respondent(s); Sequestration of Research Records

At the time of or before beginning an inquiry, the RIO must make a good faith effort to notify the respondent(s) in writing, if the respondent(s) is known. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional respondent(s), they must be notified in writing. The notification to respondent(s) will be included in the institutional record.

On or before the date on which the respondent(s) is notified, or the inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, the RIO must take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed including those ultimately not relied upon, to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory and index the records and evidence, and sequester them in a secure manner, except that where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users or are required by the respondent to continue their research during the inquiry. In such cases, custody will be limited to substantially equivalent copies of the data or evidence on such instruments. The RIO may consult with the appropriate regulatory agency for advice and assistance in this regard.

In the event that additional respondents are identified after an inquiry has begun, the University will: (a) add the additional respondents to the ongoing case; or (b) conduct a separate inquiry process for the additional respondents.

D. Appointment of Inquiry Committee

The RIO, in consultation with other institutional officials as appropriate, will appoint an inquiry committee and committee chair as soon after the initiation of the inquiry as is practical. The inquiry committee must consist of individuals who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry and should include individuals with the appropriate scientific expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, interview the principals and key witnesses, and conduct the inquiry.

E. Charge to the Committee and First Meeting

The RIO will prepare a charge for the inquiry committee that:

- Sets forth the time for completion of the inquiry;
- Describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the allegation assessment;
- States that the purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the evidence, including the testimony of the respondent(s), complainant and key witnesses, to provide information to the RIO who will communicate to the DO whether an investigation is warranted, not to determine whether research misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible;
- States that an investigation is warranted if the committee determines: (1) there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and is within the jurisdictional criteria of the appropriate federal code; and, (2) the allegation may have substance, based on the committee's review during the inquiry.
- Informs the inquiry committee that they are responsible for preparing or directing the preparation of a written report of the inquiry that meets the requirements of this policy.

At the committee's first meeting, the RIO will review the charge with the committee, discuss the allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry, assist the committee with organizing plans for the inquiry, and answer any questions raised by the committee. The RIO shall be present or available throughout the inquiry to advise the committee as needed.

The respondent(s) shall be notified in writing by the RIO within ten (10) days of the receipt of the allegation or as soon as possible consistent with the need to assemble appropriate expertise and secure potential evidence that a complaint has been lodged and that an Inquiry has been initiated. The respondent(s) must be informed of the nature of the allegation and the procedures to be followed. The RIO shall invite the respondent(s) to make a written response to the allegation(s) and to comment during the course of the Inquiry. Those comments will be included in the final Inquiry Report.

F. Inquiry Process

Although not required, the inquiry committee will normally interview the complainant, the respondent(s) and key witnesses as well as examining relevant research records and

materials. The inquiry committee shall evaluate the evidence, including the testimony obtained during the inquiry. After consultation with the RIO, the committee members will decide whether an investigation is warranted based on the criteria in this policy and in any applicable federal or other appropriate regulations (42 CFR 93.307(f)). The scope of the inquiry is not required to and does not normally include deciding whether misconduct definitely occurred, determining definitely who committed the research misconduct or conducting exhaustive interviews and analyses. However, if a legally sufficient admission of research misconduct is made by the respondent(s), misconduct may be determined at the inquiry stage if all relevant issues are resolved. In that case, the University shall promptly consult with the ORI or appropriate federal regulatory agency to determine the next steps that should be taken. If a non-federal sponsor is involved without federal funds, the RIO will consult with appropriate University officials to determine the next steps.

G. Time for Completion

The inquiry, including preparation of the final inquiry report and the decision of the DO on whether an investigation is warranted, must be completed within 90 calendar days of initiation of the inquiry, unless the RIO determines that circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the RIO approves an extension, the inquiry record must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 90-day period.

The respondent(s) and all involved individuals are expected to cooperate by timely response to request for documents and/or information.

VII. The Inquiry Report

A. Elements of the Inquiry Report

A written inquiry report shall be prepared that includes the following information: (1) the names, professional aliases, and positions of the respondent; (2) a description of the allegation(s) of research misconduct; (3) the funding support, if any, for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts and publications listing specific financial support; (4) the names, titles, and subject matter expertise of the committee members and experts who conducted the inquiry; (5) Inventory of sequestered research records and other evidence and description of how sequestration was conducted; (6) Transcripts of any transcribed interviews; (7) Timeline and procedural history; (8) Any scientific or forensic analyses conducted; (9) the basis for recommending or not recommending that the allegations warrant an investigation; (10) any comments on the inquiry report by the respondent or complainant and (11) any institutional actions taken, including communications with journals or funding agencies. University counsel and/or other officials with compliance background should review the report for legal sufficiency. Modifications should be made as appropriate in consultation with the RIO and the inquiry committee.

B. Notification to the Respondent(s) and Opportunity to Comment

The RIO shall notify the respondent(s) whether the inquiry found an investigation to be warranted, include a copy of the draft inquiry report for comment within 10 working days, and include a copy of or refer to the applicable federal or other appropriate regulations and the University policy on research misconduct.

Any comments that are submitted will be attached to the final inquiry report. Based on the comments, the inquiry committee may revise the draft report as appropriate and prepare it in final form. The committee will deliver the final report to the RIO.

C. University Decision and Notification

Decision by Deciding Official

The RIO will transmit the final inquiry report and any comments to the DO, who will determine in writing whether an investigation is warranted. The inquiry is completed when the DO makes this determination.

Notification to ORI

Within 30 calendar days of the DO's decision that an investigation is warranted, the RIO will provide ORI or other appropriate regulatory agency and/or sponsor with the DO's written decision and a copy of the inquiry report. The RIO will also notify those institutional officials who need to know of the DO's decision. The RIO must provide the following information to ORI upon request: (1) the institutional policies and procedures under which the inquiry was conducted; (2) the research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents; and (3) the charges to be considered in the investigation.

Documentation of Decision Not to Investigate

If the DO decides that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall secure and maintain for 7 years after the termination of the inquiry sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment by ORI of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted. These documents must be provided to ORI or other authorized HHS personnel upon request.

VIII. Conducting the Investigation

A. Initiation and Purpose

The investigation must begin within 30 calendar days after the determination by the DO that an investigation is warranted. The purpose of the investigation is to develop a factual record by

exploring the allegations in detail and examining the evidence in depth, leading to recommended findings on whether research misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. In conducting the investigation, the RIO will pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion. If in the course of the investigation, the RIO determines there are additional instances of research misconduct, they will notify the respondent(s).

B. Notifying ORI and Respondent(s); Sequestration of Research Records

On or before the date on which the investigation begins, the RIO must: (1) notify the ORI Director of the decision to begin the investigation and provide any appropriate regulatory agency or sponsor a copy of the inquiry report; and (2) notify the respondent(s) in writing of the allegations to be investigated. The RIO must also give the respondent(s) written notice of any new allegations of research misconduct within a reasonable amount of time of deciding to pursue allegations not addressed during the inquiry or in the initial notice of the investigation.

The RIO will, prior to notifying respondent(s) of the allegations, take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of and sequester in a secure manner all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceedings, including those ultimately not relied upon, that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry. The need for additional sequestration of records for the investigation may occur for any number of reasons, including the institution's decision to investigate additional allegations not considered during the inquiry stage or the identification of records during the inquiry process that had not been previously secured. The procedures to be followed for sequestration during the investigation are the same procedures that apply during the inquiry.

C. Appointment of the Investigation Committee

The RIO, in consultation with other University officials as appropriate, will appoint an investigation committee and the committee chair within 10 days of the beginning of the investigation or as soon thereafter as practical. The investigation committee must consist of individuals who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the investigation, are not a complainant and, where practical, should include individuals with appropriate scientific or professional expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation. Individuals appointed to the investigation committee may also have served on the inquiry committee.

D. Charge to the Committee and First Meeting

Charge to the Committee

The RIO will define the subject matter of the investigation in a written charge to the committee that:

- Describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry;
- Identifies the respondent(s);
- Informs the committee that it must conduct the investigation as prescribed below in the Investigation Process section;
- Defines research misconduct;
- Informs the committee that it must evaluate the evidence and testimony to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, research misconduct occurred and, if so, the type and extent of it and who was responsible;
- Informs the committee that in order to determine that the respondent(s) committed research misconduct it must find that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that: (1) research misconduct, as defined in this policy, occurred (respondent(s) has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence any affirmative defenses raised, including honest error or a difference of opinion); (2) the research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and (3) the respondent(s) committed the research misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
- Informs the committee that it must prepare or direct the preparation of a written investigation report that meets the requirements of this policy and any applicable federal regulations (42 CFR 93.313).

First Meeting

The RIO shall convene the first meeting of the investigation committee to review the charge, the inquiry report, and the prescribed procedures and standards for the conduct of the investigation, including the necessity for confidentiality and for developing a specific investigation plan. The investigation committee shall be provided with a copy of this policy and any applicable federal regulations. The RIO shall be present or available throughout the investigation to advise the committee as needed.

E. Investigation Process

The investigation committee and the RIO shall:

- Use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of each allegation;
- Take reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practical;
- Interview each respondent(s), complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent(s), and record or transcribe each interview,

provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record of the investigation; and

- Pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

F. Time for Completion

The investigation is to be completed within 180 days of beginning it, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to ORI or other appropriate regulatory agency or sponsor. However, if the RIO determines that the investigation will not be completed within this 180-day period, when appropriate, they will submit to ORI a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay. The RIO will ensure that periodic progress reports are filed with ORI, if ORI grants the request for an extension and directs the filing of such reports.

IX. The Investigation Report

A. Elements of the Investigation Report

The investigation committee and the RIO are responsible for preparing a written draft report of the investigation that includes the necessary requirements of 42 CFR 93.313. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Describes the nature of the allegation of research misconduct, including identification of the respondent(s);
- Composition of investigation committee, including name(s), position(s), and subject matter expertise;
- Describes and documents the PHS and/or other support, including, for example, the numbers of any grants that are involved, grant applications, contracts, publications listing sponsor support, and any other documentation found;
- Describes the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;
- Includes the University policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, unless those policies and procedures were provided to ORI previously;
- Identifies and summarizes the research records and evidence reviewed and identifies any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed; and
- Includes a statement of findings for each allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation. Each statement of findings shall: (1) identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, and whether it was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; (2) summarize the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent(s), including any effort by the respondent(s) to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that they did not engage in research misconduct because of honest error or a difference of opinion;

(3) identify the specific financial support; (4) identify whether any publications need correction or retraction; (5) identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and (6) list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent(s) has pending with any federal agencies or other sponsors.

B. Comments on the Draft Report and Access to Evidence

Respondent(s)

The RIO shall give the respondent(s) a copy of the draft investigation report for comment and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based. The respondent(s) shall be allowed 30 days from the date they received the draft report to submit comments to the RIO. The respondent(s)'s comments shall be included and considered in the final report.

Confidentiality

In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the respondent(s), the RIO shall inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality. The RIO may require that the recipient sign a confidentiality agreement.

C. Decision by the Deciding Official

The RIO shall assist the investigation committee in finalizing the draft investigation report, including ensuring that the respondent's comments are included and considered, and transmit the final investigation report to the DO, who shall determine in writing: (1) whether the University accepts the investigation report, its findings, and the recommended institutional actions; and (2) the appropriate University actions in response to the accepted findings of research misconduct. If this determination varies from the findings of the investigation committee, the DO shall, as part of their written determination, explain in detail the basis for rendering a decision different from the findings of the investigation committee. Alternatively, the DO may return the report to the investigation committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis.

When a final decision on the case has been reached, the RIO shall normally notify both the respondent(s) and the complainant(s) in writing. After informing the appropriate federal regulatory agency and/or other sponsors, the DO shall determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent(s) in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case. The RIO shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of funding or sponsoring agencies.

D. Notice to the Appropriate Federal Agency and/or Other Sponsor

Unless an extension has been granted, the RIO must within the 180-day period for completing the investigation prepare the following: (1) a copy of the final investigation report with all attachments and any appeal; (2) a statement of whether the institution accepts the findings of the investigation report or the outcome of the appeal; (3) a statement of whether the institution found misconduct and, if so, who committed the misconduct; and (4) a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondent(s).

E. Maintaining Records for Review by ORI

The RIO must maintain and provide to ORI, or other appropriate regulatory agencies or sponsors, upon request “records of research misconduct proceedings” as that term is defined by 42 CFR 93.318 or any subsequent regulations. Unless custody has been transferred to HHS or ORI has advised in writing that the records no longer need to be retained, the institutional records of research misconduct proceedings must be maintained in a secure manner for seven years after completion of the proceeding or the completion of any PHS proceeding involving the research misconduct allegation. The RIO is also responsible for providing any information, documentation, research records, evidence or clarification requested by ORI to carry out its review of an allegation of research misconduct or of the institution’s handling of such an allegation.

X. Completion of Cases; Reporting Premature Closures to Appropriate Regulatory Agency

Generally, all inquiries and investigations will be carried through to completion and all significant issues will be pursued diligently. The RIO must notify the appropriate regulatory agency, specifically including ORI when required, in advance if there are plans to close a case at the inquiry, investigation, or appeal stage on the basis that respondent(s) has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent(s) has been reached, or for any other reason, except: (1) closing of a case at the inquiry stage on the basis that an investigation is not warranted; or (2) a finding of no misconduct at the investigation stage.

XI. Institutional Administrative Actions

If the DO determines that research misconduct is substantiated by the findings, they shall decide on the appropriate actions to be taken, after consultation with the RIO when required. The administrative actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where research misconduct was found;
- Removal of the responsible person from the particular project, letter of reprimand, special monitoring of future work, probation, suspension, salary reduction, or initiation of steps leading

to possible rank reduction or termination of employment as guided by appropriate University officials and Collective Bargaining Agreements;

- Restitution of funds to the grantor agency as appropriate; and
- Other action appropriate to the misconduct.

XII. Other Considerations

A. Termination or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation

The termination of the respondent's institutional employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the research misconduct proceeding or otherwise limit any of the institution's responsibilities under applicable law (42 CFR 93). If the respondent(s), without admitting to the misconduct, elects to resign his or her position after the institution receives an allegation of research misconduct, the assessment of the allegation shall proceed, as well as the inquiry and investigation, as appropriate based on the outcome of the preceding steps. If the respondent(s) refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the RIO and any inquiry or investigation committee shall use their best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in the report the respondent(s)'s failure to cooperate and its effect on the evidence.

B. Restoration of the Respondent(s)'s Reputation

Following a final finding of no research misconduct and upon the request of the respondent(s), the RIO shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to restore the respondent's reputation. Depending on the particular circumstances and the views of the respondent(s), the RIO shall publicize the final outcome in any forum in which the allegation of research misconduct was previously publicized. Any institutional actions to restore the respondent(s)'s reputation should first be approved by the DO.

C. Protection of Complainant, Witnesses and Committee Members

During the research misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether it was determined that research misconduct occurred, the RIO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the position and reputation of, or to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any complainant who made allegations of research misconduct in good faith and of any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research misconduct proceeding. The DO will determine, after consulting with the RIO, and with the complainant, witnesses, or committee members, respectively, what steps, if any, are needed to restore their respective positions or reputations or to counter potential or actual retaliation against them. The RIO will be responsible for implementing any steps the DO approves.

D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith

If relevant, the DO will determine whether the complainant's allegations of research misconduct were made in good faith, or whether a witness or committee member acted in good faith. If the DO determines that there was an absence of good faith they will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the person who failed to act in good faith.

XIII. References

- 42 CFR Part 93, as revised by the Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct Final Rule (2024), applicable to proceedings initiated on or after January 1, 2026.

Expiration Date:

History

Approved by the University Senate on this date: 04/15/2014

Month/Year Posted, Last Reviewed: 05/2016

Approved by Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs on this date: 08/24/2016

Updated February 23, 2024, with institutional name changes.

Effective Date: 01/01/2026

SenEx: 03/10/2026

Reviewed by University Senate: MM/DD/YYYY

Approved by Provost/President: MM/DD/YYYY

Template Updated: February 28, 2024

Research Misconduct Policy Comparison: Executive Summary

1. Definition and Scope

Area	Current Policy	Revised Policy	Significance
Definition	FFP + other deviations	FFP only	Narrows scope
Exclusions	Less explicit	Explicit exclusions	Clarifies boundaries
Scope	Broad	Clarified + 6-year limit	Aligns with federal rules

2. Federal Alignment

Area	Current	Revised	Significance
Regulations	Older CFR	2024 CFR update	Ensures compliance
Proof Standard	Implied	Explicit	Improves defensibility

3. Investigation Standards

Area	Current	Revised	Significance
Elements	Less defined	3-part test	Standardized decisions
Scope	General	All leads pursued	Expanded obligation

4. Documentation

Area	Current	Revised	Significance
Documentation	General	Highly detailed	More admin work
Records	Less defined	Formalized	Audit-ready

5. Roles

Area	Current	Revised	Significance
RIO	Defined	Expanded duties	Centralized authority
Committees	Standard	More requirements	Improved integrity

6. Rights

Area	Current	Revised	Significance
Respondent	Basic rights	Expanded rights	Stronger due process
Retaliation	Present	Operationalized	Reduced liability

7. Evidence & Timelines

Area	Current	Revised	Significance
Evidence	General	Detailed handling	Stronger defensibility
Timelines	90/180 days	Same + stricter	More accountability

Key Takeaways

The revised policy aligns with updated federal regulations, narrows the definition of misconduct to FFP only, adds significant procedural and documentation requirements, strengthens due process protections, and increases administrative burden while improving compliance and risk management.

Category	Difference	What changed (old → revised)	Practical impact
Substantive	Regulatory alignment	Adds explicit applicability of revised 42 CFR Part 93 (2024 Final Rule) for proceedings initiated on/after Jan 1, 2026	Drives which federal procedural requirements govern cases going forward
Substantive	Timelines extended	Inquiry: 60 → 90 days; Investigation: 120 → 180 days	More time to complete stages; slower resolution, potentially more thorough record-building
Substantive	Institutional record requirement	Adds defined “ Institutional Record ” with detailed contents + index and description of sequestered-but-not-relied-up on materials	Increases documentation burden; improves auditability/ORI review readiness
Substantive	Sequestration scope expanded	Sequester/obtain custody of evidence including items ultimately not relied upon ; requires inventory + indexing	Stronger evidence preservation; reduces spoliation challenges
Substantive	Inquiry report requirements expanded	Adds required elements: aliases, committee expertise, sequestration inventory/method, transcripts, timeline/procedural history, forensic analyses, institutional actions/communications	Much more detailed inquiry report; higher compliance workload
Substantive	Interview requirement softened at inquiry	Inquiry interviews described as “ not required ” (though “normally” conducted)	Gives discretion to omit inquiry interviews; may shift fact development to investigation stage

Substantive	Plagiarism carve-outs clarified	States plagiarism excludes self-plagiarism and authorship/credit disputes ; adds “common methodology phrasing” nuance	Narrows what qualifies as misconduct; reduces misclassification risk
Substantive	Assessment role broadened	Assessment can be done by RIO or designated institutional official	Operational flexibility; changes who may perform initial triage
Substantive	Additional respondents handling	Explicit options: add respondents to existing case or run separate inquiry	Procedural clarity for multi-respondent situations
Minor	Definitions expanded/modernized	Adds explicit mens rea definitions (intentional/knowing/reckless) and expands “Evidence”	Improves clarity; little change to outcomes unless disputed intent is central
Minor	Notification/record phrasing	Respondent comments explicitly included in institutional record and addressed in final report	Clarifies handling; modest process tightening
Minor	Shared instruments evidence standard	“Copies” described as “substantially equivalent copies”	Small wording change that supports defensibility of copied data
Minor	“Shall” vs “may/when applicable”	Some protections/restoration/interim action phrasing becomes more conditional	Slightly more discretion; may affect expectations but not core structure
Editorial	CFR cross-reference cleanup	Updates CFR section numbers/refs (incl. “subsequent use” citation)	Housekeeping to match newer rule text; minimal day-to-day impact

Editorial	Terminology/consistency	Edits like “promptly,” wording consistency, minor grammar	Readability only
Editorial	Name/branding updates	Institutional naming updates already noted in header; revision continues consistent naming	No procedural impact

**CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate**

**Resolution on Administrative-Academic Notice,
Disqualification, and Reinstatement**

- 25/26-SenEx — April 28, 2026 — First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommend to the Provost the indicated changes to the Cal Poly Humboldt Policy on Administrative-Academic Notice, Disqualification, and Reinstatement; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University Senate request, upon approval, that the Provost direct relevant offices to update documentation including but not limited to the University Catalog and related websites.

RATIONALE: Updates policy to remove carceral language of “probation” and replace with language of “notice.” This language change aligns current policy ([#12 13/14 APC](#)) with early changes made elsewhere to adopt “notice” language. No substantive changes. This will align campus policy with pending Humboldt report to ASCSU that we have removed “probation” language from our local policy.

**Administrative-Academic Notice Probation and,
Disqualification, and Reinstatement
Policy #
Office of the Provost**

Applies to: All Students

Supersedes: This policy supersedes language in the Humboldt catalog and websites.

Purpose of the Policy: This policy outlines Cal Poly Humboldt policy on administrative and academic notice and disqualification.

Definitions:

Policy Details

1. **Administrative-Academic Notice Probation**

A student may be placed on administrative-academic notice for any of the following reasons:

1. Withdrawal from all or a substantial portion of a program of studies in two successive terms or in any three terms. (Note: A student whose withdrawal is directly associated with a chronic or recurring medical condition or its treatment is not to be subject to Administrative-Academic Notice ~~Probation~~ for such withdrawal.)
2. Repeated failure to progress toward the stated degree objective or other program objective, including that resulting from assignment of 15 units of NC (No Credit), when such failure appears to be due to circumstances within the control of the student.
3. Failure to comply, after due notice, with an academic requirement or regulation, as defined by campus policy which is routine for all students or a defined group of students (examples: failure to complete a required CSU

or campus examination, failure to complete a required practicum, failure to comply with professional standards appropriate to the field of study, failure to complete a specified number of units as a condition for receiving student financial aid or making satisfactory progress in the academic program).

When such action is taken, the student shall be notified in writing and shall be provided with the conditions for removal from notice and the circumstances that would lead to disqualification, should notice not be removed.

2. Administrative-Academic Disqualification

A student who has been placed on administrative-academic noticeprobation may be disqualified if any of the following occur:

1. The conditions for removal of the administrative-academic noticeprobation are not met within the period specified.
2. The student becomes subject to academic noticeprobation while on administrative-academic noticeprobation.
3. The student becomes subject to administrative-academic noticeprobation for the same or similar reason that the student has previously been placed on administrative-academic noticeprobation, although the student is not currently in such status.

When such action is taken, the student shall receive written notification, including an explanation of the basis for the action in a timely manner.

3. Special Cases of Administrative-Academic Disqualification

In addition, an appropriate campus administrator in consultation with academic department, Dean of the College, and/or other appropriate parties, may disqualify a student who at any time during enrollment in a program leading to professional licensure or credential, has demonstrated behavior so contrary to the established standards and criteria of the profession for which the student is preparing as to render the student unfit for the profession. In such cases, disqualification will occur immediately upon notice to the student, which shall include an explanation of the basis for the action, and the campus may require the student to discontinue enrollment as of the date of the notification.

4. Consequences of Disqualification

Students who have been disqualified, either academically or administratively, may not enroll in any regular campus session (e.g., open university), and may be denied admission to other educational programs operated or sponsored by the

University.

5. Appeals

Students placed on Administrative-Academic Notice~~probation~~ or Disqualification may appeal their status within 10 business days of the date of their notification. The appeal must be submitted to the Office of the Registrar and will be considered by a committee composed of: the Chair of the appropriate department, the Dean of the College, the Vice Provost, the Dean of Students and/or any other appropriate parties. A written response from the review committee with a decision on the appeal must be forwarded to the student within 15 business days of receipt of the appeal.

6. Reinstatement

Students who have been disqualified under this policy may petition for reinstatement. Reinstatement will be approved only if compelling evidence is provided, indicating their ability to complete a degree program. Students who petition for reinstatement and have not attended for more than one regular term must also apply for admission to the University, meeting all deadlines and requirements for admissions eligibility. [See reinstatement procedure described under Academic Disqualification.]

7. Graduate Student Administrative-Academic Notice~~probation~~

All of the above-stated reasons for administrative-academic notice~~probation~~ shall apply to graduate students. In addition:

1. Students may be placed on administrative-academic notice~~probation~~ by the Dean of Graduate Studies, following a request from the program/department and consultation with other appropriate offices, for failure to comply, after due notice, with a requirement or regulation, as defined by campus or program policy which is routine for all students or a defined group of students (e.g., demonstrating consistently disruptive behavior, hostile or abusive behavior, failure to advance to candidacy, failure to abide by standards set by approved external placements, etc.). The student on notice shall be informed in writing by the graduate dean (with a copy provided to the department/program).
2. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall inform the Office of the Registrar when students have been placed on or removed from administrative-academic notice~~probationary~~ status so that student records can be updated. When a student is placed on academic or administrative-academic notice~~probation~~, the student must work with the program coordinator to develop a plan for remediation, including a timeline for completion. In the case of an administrative-academic notice~~probation~~, the remediation plan must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies, who will send a letter to the

student documenting the plan. A student cannot be advanced to candidacy if the student is on either academic or administrative-academic noticeprobation.

8. Graduate Student Administrative-Academic Disqualification

A student who has been placed on administrative-academic noticeprobation may be disqualified from further attendance by the Dean of Graduate Studies if any of the conditions for disqualification apply. In addition, In the event that a student fails the thesis/project defense, the student may repeat the thesis/project defense once. Failure at the second thesis/project defense will result in disqualification from the program. The thesis/project committee will specify the time period and/or conditions of the repeated defense. A student may repeat a comprehensive examination once. Failure of the second comprehensive examination results in disqualification from the program. The comprehensive exam committee will specify the time period and/or conditions of the repeated examination. Students who are disqualified at the end of an enrollment period should be notified by the Dean of Graduate Studies before the beginning of the next consecutive regular enrollment period. Students disqualified at the beginning of a summer enrollment break should be notified at least one month before the start of the fall term. In cases where a student ordinarily would be disqualified at the end of a term, save for the fact that it is not possible to make timely notification, the student may be advised that the disqualification is to be effective at the end of the next term. Such notification should include any conditions that, if met, would result in permission to continue in enrollment. Inability to contact a student does not create the right of a student to continue enrollment.

9. Graduate Student Appeals

Graduate students placed on Administrative-Academic Noticeprobation or Disqualification, may appeal their status within 10 business days of the date of their notification. The appeal must be submitted to the Office of the Registrar and will be considered by a committee composed of: the Chair of the appropriate department, the Dean of the College, the Vice Provost, the Dean of Students, and/or any other appropriate parties. A written response from the review committee with a decision on the appeal must be forwarded to the student within 15 business days of receipt of the appeal.

10. Graduate Student Reinstatement

If the student is disqualified, either academically or administratively, the student may petition for reinstatement. Reinstatement must be based upon evidence that the causes of previous low achievement have been removed. Reinstatement will be approved only if the student is able to provide compelling evidence of the student's ability to complete the degree. If the candidate is disqualified a second time, reinstatement will normally not be considered. Students who petition for reinstatement must also apply for admission to the University, meeting all deadlines and requirements for admissions eligibility. Students should submit a

petition requesting reinstatement to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The petition, along with recommendations from the student's graduate coordinator, department chair, and thesis committee, will be forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies, who has final authority to approve reinstatement. These letters must evaluate the probable impact of circumstances beyond the student's control (e.g., an unresponsive or unreasonable thesis chair) on previous unsatisfactory performance. If the student is approved for reinstatement, the Dean of Graduate Studies will send a letter granting reinstatement that specifies the conditions and time frame for achieving good standing. Students must achieve good standing to advance to candidacy and to be eligible to graduate. Reinstatement for credential students may be handled by a separate process and thus not governed by this document.

Related Policies

- **[CSU Policy: Minimum Requirements for Probation and Disqualification, as authorized by Section 41300.1 of Title 5.](#)**

Expiration Date: None

History

University Senate: Date 202x

President Carvajal Date Approved 202x

University Senate #12-13/14-APC: Passed Unanimously, 3/11/14

President Richmond: Approved 5/27/2014

**CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate**

Resolution on Revision to the Syllabus Policy

29-25/26-APC — April 28, 2026 — First Reading

WHEREAS: The Syllabus Policy establishes expectations for course syllabi as a central tool for communicating course structure, expectations, and learning outcomes to students; and

WHEREAS: The Integrated Curriculum Committee has revised the course proposal and revision process such that course outlines, rather than full syllabi, are now the required curricular documents submitted for approval; and

WHEREAS: The university is transitioning away from maintaining a publicly accessible repository of course syllabi, necessitating corresponding updates to policy language regarding syllabus collection and dissemination; and

WHEREAS: The proposed revisions preserve the essential role of syllabi in supporting student success while updating procedures to reflect current institutional practices and infrastructure; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the Provost that the attached revision to the Syllabus Policy be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the revised policy be implemented effective immediately upon approval.

RATIONALE: The proposed revision updates the Syllabus Policy to align with recent changes to curriculum processes and institutional practices.

In addition, eliminating references to a public-facing syllabus repository aligns the policy with current campus practices while maintaining requirements that ensure students have timely and equitable access to course information.

Overall, these revisions improve consistency across institutional processes, reduce administrative burden, and maintain clear expectations for high-quality, accessible syllabi that support student learning.

Applies to: Faculty, Staff, Students

Supersedes: ~~P23-04 Syllabus Policy, P18-01 Course Syllabus Policy, P16-03 Syllabi Policy, and VPAA 07-02 HSU Policy on Content of Syllabi~~

Purpose of the policy:

Syllabi at Cal Poly Humboldt are the anchor for intellectual work in the classroom and must showcase learning outcomes, clearly communicate course expectations, and help students to successfully navigate the courses in which they enroll. This policy provides guidelines for required and recommended aspects of syllabi for all credit-bearing courses.

Policy Details

I. Introduction

- A.** A syllabus must exist for every credit-bearing course. Typically, it shall be the responsibility of faculty to create a full syllabus for each course that they teach. However, at the discretion of department chairs, some courses (e.g., supervision, independent study, and peer-taught courses with [classifications](#) S or C-77) may have a blanket syllabus developed at the department level and applied across multiple offerings. When using a blanket syllabus, instructors shall notify students in writing of any components that differ for the particular offering.
- B.** Each syllabus must comply with and include, but is not limited to, the information included in this policy.
- C.** Colleges, schools, departments, or programs may specify additional syllabus requirements for their courses beyond what is included in this policy.
- D.** ~~Faculty should be cognizant that syllabi are publicly available documents.~~

II. Resources

- A.** The Office of Academic Programs shall maintain a Syllabus Resources website with updated information about syllabus requirements, accessible templates, a link to the

syllabus policy and the Syllabus Addendum website, and other relevant information.

Current URL: <https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-resources>

- B. The Center for Teaching and Learning, in consultation with the Accessibility Resource Center, shall provide accessibility guidelines and an accessible syllabus template on the center's website, in Canvas, and on the Syllabus Resources website. The template and guidelines shall be designed to help faculty meet pertinent requirements of the Accessible Technologies Initiative, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act.
- C. The Office of Academic Programs shall maintain a Syllabus Addendum website to house information about relevant campus policies, commitments, procedures, and resources for students in one central location. The site shall include links to information pertinent to syllabi across all courses, such as: institutional and program learning outcomes; registration forms and policies; academic honesty policy; attendance and disruptive behavior policy; emergency procedures; Title 5 standards for student conduct; Title IX and discrimination, harassment, and retaliation prevention; procedures for reporting complaints; animals on campus policy; resources for students with disabilities; Learning Center; Academic & Career Advising Center; Counseling and Psychological Services; Office of the Dean of Students; Financial Aid; IT help; Cal Poly Humboldt institutional commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility statement; and a university land acknowledgement. Current URL:
<https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-addendum>

III. Information that must be included in the course syllabus:

All items listed below shall be included in each syllabus, except where not applicable such as in the case of blanket syllabi for courses with classifications of S and C-77 (see Section IA).

- A. Course information:
 - 1. Number, title, and section if applicable
 - 2. Semester and year
 - 3. Mode of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, online asynchronous, online synchronous, hybrid, hyflex)
 - 4. Meeting days, times and location (e.g. rooms or online platform)
 - 5. Final exam day, time and location (this information can be found at the [Office of the Registrar website](#) and in Faculty Center)
 - 6. A note directing students to the official course learning management system, currently Canvas
 - 7. A note directing students to regularly check their Cal Poly Humboldt email for course updates and announcements

- B. Instructor information:**
1. Name
 2. Cal Poly Humboldt email address and office telephone number
 3. Office hours and location, or a website link to where this information is available
- C. Course description:**
1. Course description from the university [catalog](#), identified as the catalog description
 2. Pre-requisite and corequisite courses, if applicable (also found in the catalog)
- D. Course materials and fees (e.g., textbooks, supplies, technology), including:**
1. If they will be provided or if students are expected to acquire them
 2. Any university facilities/platforms available to support these requirements for students who cannot purchase materials
 3. How to access instructor-provided materials such as PDFs, linked resources, etc., for example “*Additional readings/materials will be provided on Canvas*”
 4. Information on any fees required other than for typical stateside tuition/registration, for example for field trips or labs
- E. Learning outcomes & competencies:**
1. Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs): These are specific to the course and are the primary outcomes that the course aims to help students meet. All courses must have and list CLOs—there is no minimum or maximum number, though 4-8 is generally considered a best practice.
 2. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs):
 - a. At minimum, include the following or an equivalent statement, removing the GEAR reference if not a GEAR course: “*If this course is a requirement for a program, it contributes to the achievement of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). This course counts as [insert GEAR area(s)*]. Review learning outcomes and competencies at the [syllabus addendum website](#).*”
 - b. Optionally, also list PLOs and/or ILOs that are particularly relevant, and/or describe the GEAR area.
 - c. *Regarding GEAR, be sure to search for the course in the [catalog](#) to confirm if it has any current GEAR designations. Be specific when listing the GEAR areas. For example, rather than just “Area 2B”, specify “Lower Division GE Area ~~2B~~4: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning” or “Upper Division GE Area ~~3B~~: Arts and Humanities ~~Math & Science~~”. For DCG, specify “Diversity and Common Ground: Non-Domestic” or “Diversity and Common Ground: Domestic.”
- F. Course topics & schedule:**

1. Include at least a list of topics in the general order of expected coverage, approximate dates of major exams or assignments, final exam date and time, and the deadline add/drop classes without a serious and compelling reason (this information may be found on the university [calendars](#)).
 2. If a more detailed schedule is located elsewhere (e.g., on the learning management system) indicate so and provide a link.
- G. Course structure & modality:
1. A description of the general course structure and modality (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab, virtual, asynchronous, synchronous...).
 2. A statement about the minimum hours of student work expected as per the number of units and the official C-classification, as per the [Credit Hour Policy](#). C-classification can be found using the [Catalog Search Tool](#). See the [Credit Hour Tool](#) for help. One example statement is below - additional examples shall be provided/linked on the Syllabus Resources website and/or syllabus template.
 - a. Example statement for a 3-unit course: *"This is a 3-unit course, and thus students should expect at least 135 hours of work during the semester, which equates to an average of at least 9 hours per week between in-class/instructional activities and out-of-class work."*
- H. Assignments:
1. Include at least a general description of assignment types/categories and how assignments are typically to be submitted.
 2. As relevant, also include either further details that students need to complete assignments or a note that indicates how detailed assignment information will be provided.
 3. If students will be required to post course assignments on the internet, outside the university learning management system, this should be included in the syllabus with possible alternative arrangements or assignments. *Publicly viewable faculty review of student work may constitute a FERPA violation and should not be undertaken without careful consultation with the registrar.*
- I. Attendance/participation policy that includes, at minimum, whether/how attendance and participation will be tracked and/or graded. This information should be integrated with assignments/grading information if it will affect the course grade.
- J. Grading information:
1. Basis for assigning a course grade, including at least the portion of course grade attributed to various assignment types and the relationship between percent/points earned and final course grades (i.e. grading scale).
 2. Grade mode: Indicate ~~the grade mode for the course. whether a course is offered for a letter grade only, mandatory credit/no credit, or optional (letter grade or~~

~~credit/no credit) — this~~ information on available grade modes is available in the [catalog](#) for each course. For optional grade mode, include a statement specifying that *“to count towards fulfilling major requirements, this course must be taken for a letter grade.”*

3. If applicable, a reminder that to count for GE Area 1A / Area 2B: Written Communication / Math or the GWAR writing requirement (for W courses), the course must be passed with a C- or higher.
 4. If applicable, a statement on minimum grade requirements for prerequisites or courses in a major.
- K. Late/make-up policy - include general or detailed information. For any course that uses a partially or fully online format, also include expectations for situations such as personal or large-scale technology breakdowns.
- L. Policies, Procedures & Resources:
1. A statement that students are responsible for knowing information on the campus Syllabus Addendum website and include the link to the website. A concise statement with the link is recommended in lieu of links to the individual policies; however, as relevant, faculty may choose to also elaborate/discuss particular aspects.
 - a. Suggested statement: *“Students are responsible for knowing the information about campus policies, procedures, and resources on the Syllabus Addendum website linked below. The site includes topics such as learning outcomes; registration policies; academic honesty policy; attendance and disruptive behavior policy; standards for student conduct; prevention and reporting of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation; animals on campus policy; emergency procedures; resources for students with disabilities; learning and advising resources; counseling and psychological services; financial aid; IT Help; and more.*
<https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-addendum>”
 2. A reminder that it is the student's responsibility to notify the instructor in advance of the need for accommodations and to provide university ([SDRC](#) or [Dean of Students](#)) documentation.
 3. For courses that include any online communication, a statement reminding students that university regulations regarding [disruptive behavior](#) extend to the online environment, and that appropriate online behavior (i.e., netiquette) is expected.
- M. Other information essential to the course, for example safety information, classroom expectations, technology use guidelines, and information about assignments that must be accomplished at off-campus locations (e. g., field trips or service learning).

- N. Any additional items required, for example by [University Senate Policy](#) or for programs with external accreditation.
- O. A note that information on the syllabus is subject to change with notice, and how changes will be communicated.

IV. Co-listed Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

Syllabi for courses listed for both undergraduate and graduate credit must have separate syllabi for both the undergraduate and graduate course numbers. Students receiving graduate credit for the course are expected to perform at a higher level than those receiving their undergraduate credits, and the graduate syllabus must demonstrate the higher expectations for such students in compliance with the [campus co-listing policy](#).

V. Syllabus Format, Use, and Dissemination to Students

- A. The syllabus must meet pertinent requirements for the Accessible Technology Initiative, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. An accessible syllabus template shall be available on the Syllabus Resources website.
- B. The syllabus must be available to students through the course's site on the university learning management system (LMS), currently Canvas, by the first day of instruction (first course meeting or, for online/hybrid courses, the first day that the course opens).
 - 1. The syllabus must be in a standard file type (e.g. Word Doc, Google Doc, website, PDF, or LMS page). All file types must be accessible.
 - 2. The syllabus shall be prominently labeled/linked on the course landing page and/or the syllabus link in the main course navigation, ideally in both locations.
 - 3. The syllabus may also be provided to students in other ways (e.g., email or print), but not in lieu of providing on the LMS. If a printed and/or partial syllabus is given to students, it should include a prominent note at the beginning directing students to view the full version on the LMS to review important course information and linked sites such as the syllabus addendum website.
 - 4. Faculty planning to co-create elements of the syllabus with their students must still provide a syllabus on the first day - on the syllabus, faculty shall indicate which elements will be co-created.
- C. By the first day of instruction, faculty shall notify students how to locate the syllabus on the LMS. The announcement shall be in some manner that will be seen by students who are not yet aware of the LMS, ideally via email and in-class announcements.
- D. During the term, changes to the information in the syllabus are ~~only~~ permitted **only** if they do not inadvertently penalize/disadvantage students or require students to

purchase materials not disclosed at the beginning of the term. If there are any substantive changes, the instructor shall:

1. Place a revised syllabus on the LMS, with the changed components clearly identified (e.g., highlighted and a note included), and
2. Notify students in writing, at minimum via an email or an announcement through the LMS.

~~VI. Shared Course Outline ¶¶~~

~~¶¶~~

- ~~A. A shared course outline is a document that is separate from a syllabus itself—it is not provided to students. A shared course outline is used to inform the creation of a syllabus for a specific course. The purpose of a shared course outline is to support reasonable consistency in topical coverage and learning outcomes across offerings of a course, which is important for multiple reasons, such as to ensure that students are prepared for subsequent courses in a sequence, to ensure that students achieve program learning outcomes, and to support course transfer articulation/equivalency. ¶¶~~
- ~~B. Departments shall develop a shared course outline for each course that is a program requirement and/or a prerequisite to another course. At their discretion, departments may but are not obligated to develop shared course outlines for other courses, such as elective courses regularly taught by different faculty. ¶¶~~
- ~~C. A shared course outline shall include all information that should not change between offerings of a course, such as the course information (e.g., number, description, units, pre/co-requisites, GEAR designations), grade mode, grade requirements for students to count the course for program credit and/or to qualify to take any subsequent courses in a sequence, course classification and associated credit hour expectations, and minimum expectations for coverage of content (i.e., list of essential course learning outcomes and topics). The extent to which the minimum expectations are general or specific shall be at the discretion of the department; however, departments are advised not to specify more than is necessary to ensure reasonable curricular consistency. Expectations are for minimum coverage, meaning that faculty may cover applicable outcomes and topics in addition to those specified on the outline. ¶¶~~
- ~~D. Shared course outlines shall be developed and updated as needed by faculty subject-matter experts. Approval will be at the level determined by the department, for example a department curriculum committee, program leader, or chair. ¶¶~~
- ~~E. Shared course outlines shall be kept on file by departments, and department chairs should ensure that faculty are aware of and abide by them. ¶¶~~
- ~~F. Departments that feel that shared course outlines are not appropriate for their programs/courses should discuss this with their college dean, who shall maintain~~

~~authority to modify this requirement per department/program for just cause. The dean shall inform the Academic Policies Committee chair of exceptions made, including the extent and duration.¶~~

- ~~G. A recommended shared course outline template shall be made available on the Syllabus Resources website.~~

VII. Documentation & Compliance

- A. Prior to the start of each term, the Office of Academic Programs shall remind all faculty of this syllabus policy and provide a link to the Syllabus Resources website and the accessible syllabus template.
- B. At the beginning of each term, department chairs shall remind faculty to post a syllabus (following the syllabus policy) to the learning management system (LMS) site for each course and to ensure that the LMS and syllabus are published (live) and available to students.
1. Chairs may request that faculty submit syllabi to the department prior to the start of instruction (as early as the first green day) for review of compliance with the syllabus policy.
- C. By the first Friday of instruction for the term, faculty shall provide a copy of the syllabus to the office of the department in which the course is taught.
1. ~~Faculty should be cognizant that syllabi shall be publicly available. ¶~~
 2. The format must be a standard file type that can be stored and shared (e.g., a Word Doc or PDF, not a Google Doc or website), and the document needs to be accessible.
 3. ~~By the third Friday of instruction for the term, d~~Departments shall post collected syllabi to a shared repository maintained by Academic Programs, where syllabi shall be retained for the length of time determined by WSCUC and [CSU Policy](#) (currently ~~seven years~~ permanently).
- D. Syllabus information shall be incorporated into new faculty orientation and added to the faculty, administrative, and department chair handbooks.
- ~~E. The Integrated Curriculum Committee shall review syllabi and, if applicable, shared course outlines provided for new and revised courses.~~
- ~~F. As part of the program review process, all departments and programs will be required to provide evidence of compliance with the syllabus policy.~~
- G. On an ongoing basis, if students, faculty, or staff have questions, concerns, or feedback about a syllabus for a particular course, the first place to direct inquiries should typically be the course instructor, and then, as need be, the chair of the department that offers the course.

Related Policies:

Expiration Date: n/a

History:

Academic Policies Committee: 4/21/2023

Reviewed: University Senate: 5/9/2023

Reviewed: Provost: 5/12/2023

Revised: Academic Policy Committee: 4/23/26

Reviewed: University Senate: X/X/2026

Reviewed: Provost

Applies to: Faculty, Staff, Students

Supersedes: P23-04 Syllabus Policy

Purpose of the policy:

Syllabi at Cal Poly Humboldt are the anchor for intellectual work in the classroom and must showcase learning outcomes, clearly communicate course expectations, and help students to successfully navigate the courses in which they enroll. This policy provides guidelines for required and recommended aspects of syllabi for all credit-bearing courses.

Policy Details

I. Introduction

- A.** A syllabus must exist for every credit-bearing course. Typically, it shall be the responsibility of faculty to create a full syllabus for each course that they teach. However, at the discretion of department chairs, some courses (e.g., supervision, independent study, and peer-taught courses with [classifications](#) S or C-77) may have a blanket syllabus developed at the department level and applied across multiple offerings. When using a blanket syllabus, instructors shall notify students in writing of any components that differ for the particular offering.
- B.** Each syllabus must comply with and include, but is not limited to, the information included in this policy.
- C.** Colleges, schools, departments, or programs may specify additional syllabus requirements for their courses beyond what is included in this policy.

II. Resources

- A.** The Office of Academic Programs shall maintain a Syllabus Resources website with updated information about syllabus requirements, accessible templates, a link to the syllabus policy and the Syllabus Addendum website, and other relevant information. Current URL: <https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-resources>

- B. The Center for Teaching and Learning, in consultation with the Accessibility Resource Center, shall provide accessibility guidelines and an accessible syllabus template on the center's website, in Canvas, and on the Syllabus Resources website. The template and guidelines shall be designed to help faculty meet pertinent requirements of the Accessible Technologies Initiative, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act.
- C. The Office of Academic Programs shall maintain a Syllabus Addendum website to house information about relevant campus policies, commitments, procedures, and resources for students in one central location. The site shall include links to information pertinent to syllabi across all courses, such as: institutional and program learning outcomes; registration forms and policies; academic honesty policy; attendance and disruptive behavior policy; emergency procedures; Title 5 standards for student conduct; Title IX and discrimination, harassment, and retaliation prevention; procedures for reporting complaints; animals on campus policy; resources for students with disabilities; Learning Center; Academic & Career Advising Center; Counseling and Psychological Services; Office of the Dean of Students; Financial Aid; IT help; Cal Poly Humboldt institutional commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility statement; and a university land acknowledgement. Current URL:
<https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-addendum>

III. Information that must be included in the course syllabus:

All items listed below shall be included in each syllabus, except where not applicable such as in the case of blanket syllabi for courses with classifications of S and C-77 (see Section IA).

- A. Course information:
 - 1. Number, title, and section if applicable
 - 2. Semester and year
 - 3. Mode of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, online asynchronous, online synchronous, hybrid, hyflex)
 - 4. Meeting days, times and location (e.g. rooms or online platform)
 - 5. Final exam day, time and location (this information can be found at the [Office of the Registrar website](#) and in Faculty Center)
 - 6. A note directing students to the official course learning management system, currently Canvas
 - 7. A note directing students to regularly check their Cal Poly Humboldt email for course updates and announcements
- B. Instructor information:
 - 1. Name

2. Cal Poly Humboldt email address and office telephone number
 3. Office hours and location, or a website link to where this information is available
- C. Course description:
1. Course description from the university [catalog](#), identified as the catalog description
 2. Pre-requisite and corequisite courses, if applicable (also found in the catalog)
- D. Course materials and fees (e.g., textbooks, supplies, technology), including:
1. If they will be provided or if students are expected to acquire them
 2. Any university facilities/platforms available to support these requirements for students who cannot purchase materials
 3. How to access instructor-provided materials such as PDFs, linked resources, etc., for example *“Additional readings/materials will be provided on Canvas”*
 4. Information on any fees required other than for typical stateside tuition/registration, for example for field trips or labs
- E. Learning outcomes & competencies:
1. **Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs):** These are specific to the course and are the primary outcomes that the course aims to help students meet. All courses must have and list CLOs—there is no minimum or maximum number, though 4-8 is generally considered a best practice.
 2. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs):**
 - a. At minimum, include the following or an equivalent statement, removing the GEAR reference if not a GEAR course: *“If this course is a requirement for a program, it contributes to the achievement of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). This course counts as [insert GEAR area(s)*]. Review learning outcomes and competencies at the [syllabus addendum website](#).”*
 - b. Optionally, also list PLOs and/or ILOs that are particularly relevant, and/or describe the GEAR area.
 - c. *Regarding GEAR, be sure to search for the course in the [catalog](#) to confirm if it has any current GEAR designations. Be specific when listing the GEAR areas. For example, rather than just “Area 2,” specify “Lower Division GE Area 2: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning” or “Upper Division GE Area 3: Arts and Humanities.” For DCG, specify “Diversity and Common Ground: Non-Domestic” or “Diversity and Common Ground: Domestic.”
- F. Course topics & schedule:
1. Include at least a list of topics in the general order of expected coverage, approximate dates of major exams or assignments, final exam date and time, and

the deadline add/drop classes without a serious and compelling reason (this information may be found on the university [calendars](#)).

2. If a more detailed schedule is located elsewhere (e.g., on the learning management system) indicate so and provide a link.

G. Course structure & modality:

1. A description of the general course structure and modality (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab, virtual, asynchronous, synchronous...).
2. A statement about the minimum hours of student work expected as per the number of units and the official C-classification, as per the [Credit Hour Policy](#). C-classification can be found using the [Catalog Search Tool](#). See the [Credit Hour Tool](#) for help. One example statement is below - additional examples shall be provided/linked on the Syllabus Resources website and/or syllabus template.
 - a. Example statement for a 3-unit course: *“This is a 3-unit course, and thus students should expect at least 135 hours of work during the semester, which equates to an average of at least 9 hours per week between in-class/instructional activities and out-of-class work.”*

H. Assignments:

1. Include at least a general description of assignment types/categories and how assignments are typically to be submitted.
2. As relevant, also include either further details that students need to complete assignments or a note that indicates how detailed assignment information will be provided.
3. If students will be required to post course assignments on the internet, outside the university learning management system, this should be included in the syllabus with possible alternative arrangements or assignments. *Publicly viewable faculty review of student work may constitute a FERPA violation and should not be undertaken without careful consultation with the registrar.*

I. Attendance/participation policy that includes, at minimum, whether/how attendance and participation will be tracked and/or graded. This information should be integrated with assignments/grading information if it will affect the course grade.

J. Grading information:

1. Basis for assigning a course grade, including at least the portion of course grade attributed to various assignment types and the relationship between percent/points earned and final course grades (i.e. grading scale).
2. Grade mode: Indicate the grade mode for the course. Information on available grade modes is available in the [catalog](#). For optional grade mode, include a statement specifying that *“to count towards fulfilling major requirements, this course must be taken for a letter grade.”*

3. If applicable, a reminder that to count for GE Area 1A / Area 2: Written Communication / Math or the GWAR writing requirement (for W courses), the course must be passed with a C- or higher.
 4. If applicable, a statement on minimum grade requirements for prerequisites or courses in a major.
- K.** Late/make-up policy - include general or detailed information. For any course that uses a partially or fully online format, also include expectations for situations such as personal or large-scale technology breakdowns.
- L.** Policies, Procedures & Resources:
1. A statement that students are responsible for knowing information on the campus Syllabus Addendum website and include the link to the website. A concise statement with the link is recommended in lieu of links to the individual policies; however, as relevant, faculty may choose to also elaborate/discuss particular aspects.
 - a. Suggested statement: *“Students are responsible for knowing the information about campus policies, procedures, and resources on the Syllabus Addendum website linked below. The site includes topics such as learning outcomes; registration policies; academic honesty policy; attendance and disruptive behavior policy; standards for student conduct; prevention and reporting of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation; animals on campus policy; emergency procedures; resources for students with disabilities; learning and advising resources; counseling and psychological services; financial aid; IT Help; and more.*
<https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/syllabus-addendum>”
 2. A reminder that it is the student's responsibility to notify the instructor in advance of the need for accommodations and to provide university ([SDRC](#) or [Dean of Students](#)) documentation.
 3. For courses that include any online communication, a statement reminding students that university regulations regarding [disruptive behavior](#) extend to the online environment, and that appropriate online behavior (i.e., netiquette) is expected.
- M.** Other information essential to the course, for example safety information, classroom expectations, technology use guidelines, and information about assignments that must be accomplished at off-campus locations (e. g., field trips or service learning).
- N.** Any additional items required, for example by [University Senate Policy](#) or for programs with external accreditation.
- O.** A note that information on the syllabus is subject to change with notice, and how changes will be communicated.

IV. Co-listed Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

Syllabi for courses listed for both undergraduate and graduate credit must have separate syllabi for both the undergraduate and graduate course numbers. Students receiving graduate credit for the course are expected to perform at a higher level than those receiving undergraduate credit, and the graduate syllabus must demonstrate the higher expectations for such students in compliance with the [campus co-listing policy](#).

V. Syllabus Format, Use, and Dissemination to Students

- A. The syllabus must meet pertinent requirements for the Accessible Technology Initiative, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. An accessible syllabus template shall be available on the Syllabus Resources website.
- B. The syllabus must be available to students through the course's site on the university learning management system (LMS), currently Canvas, by the first day of instruction (first course meeting or, for online/hybrid courses, the first day that the course opens).
 1. The syllabus must be in a standard file type (e.g. Word Doc, Google Doc, website, PDF, or LMS page). All file types must be accessible.
 2. The syllabus shall be prominently labeled/linked on the course landing page and/or the syllabus link in the main course navigation, ideally in both locations.
 3. The syllabus may also be provided to students in other ways (e.g., email or print), but not in lieu of providing on the LMS. If a printed and/or partial syllabus is given to students, it should include a prominent note at the beginning directing students to view the full version on the LMS to review important course information and linked sites such as the syllabus addendum website.
 4. Faculty planning to co-create elements of the syllabus with their students must still provide a syllabus on the first day - on the syllabus, faculty shall indicate which elements will be co-created.
- C. By the first day of instruction, faculty shall notify students how to locate the syllabus on the LMS. The announcement shall be in some manner that will be seen by students who are not yet aware of the LMS, ideally via email and in-class announcements.
- D. During the term, changes to the information in the syllabus are permitted only if they do not inadvertently penalize/disadvantage students or require students to purchase materials not disclosed at the beginning of the term. If there are any substantive changes, the instructor shall:
 1. Place a revised syllabus on the LMS, with the changed components clearly identified (e.g., highlighted and a note included), and
 2. Notify students in writing, at minimum via an email or an announcement through the LMS.

VI. Documentation & Compliance

- A. Prior to the start of each term, the Office of Academic Programs shall remind all faculty of this syllabus policy and provide a link to the Syllabus Resources website and the accessible syllabus template.
- B. At the beginning of each term, department chairs shall remind faculty to post a syllabus (following the syllabus policy) to the learning management system (LMS) site for each course and to ensure that the LMS and syllabus are published (live) and available to students.
 - 1. Chairs may request that faculty submit syllabi to the department prior to the start of instruction (as early as the first green day) for review of compliance with the syllabus policy.
- C. By the first Friday of instruction for the term, faculty shall provide a copy of the syllabus to the office of the department in which the course is taught.
 - 1. The format must be a standard file type that can be stored and shared (e.g., a Word Doc or PDF, not a Google Doc or website), and the document needs to be accessible.
 - 2. By the third Friday of instruction for the term, departments shall post collected syllabi to a shared repository maintained by Academic Programs, where syllabi shall be retained for the length of time determined by WSCUC and [CSU Policy](#) (currently seven years).
- D. Syllabus information shall be incorporated into new faculty orientation and added to the faculty, administrative, and department chair handbooks.
- E. On an ongoing basis, if students, faculty, or staff have questions, concerns, or feedback about a syllabus for a particular course, the first place to direct inquiries should typically be the course instructor, and then, as need be, the chair of the department that offers the course.

Related Policies:

Expiration Date: n/a

History:

Academic Policies Committee: 4/21/2023

Reviewed: University Senate: 5/9/2023

Reviewed: Provost: 5/12/2023

Revised: Academic Policy Committee: 4/23/26

Reviewed: University Senate: X/X/2026

Reviewed: Provost

**CAL POLY HUMBOLDT
University Senate**

Resolution on Recommend Approval of the Revised Fundraising Policy

XX-20/21-UPC — April 28, 2026 — First Reading

RESOLVED: That the University Policies Committee, University Senate of Cal Poly Humboldt recommends to the President that the revised Fundraising Policy, administered by University Advancement, be approved as presented; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the revised policy aligns with systemwide requirements under ICSUAM 15701.00 by clearly establishing authority for fundraising oversight within University Advancement and affirming the role of the Vice President for University Advancement in approving fundraising activities.

RESOLVED: That the policy establishes clearer definitions of fundraising activities, including fundraising events, charitable solicitations, and charitable sponsorships; and

RESOLVED: That the revised Fundraising Policy removes procedural and operational details better maintained outside of the policy.

Fundraising Policy

DAR 11-08

Office of University Advancement

[POLICY ON POLICIES](#)

Applies to: Faculty, staff, student employees, and students

Purpose of the Policy

According to ICSUAM 15701.00, each campus is required to develop written procedures for approving fundraising activities. This authority is delegated to the Chief Advancement Officer, which at Cal Poly Humboldt is the Vice President for University Advancement. The purpose of this policy is to define fundraising and fundraising events and to reference the current approval procedures.

Policy Details

University Advancement is responsible for overseeing fundraising and charitable giving at Cal Poly Humboldt. The Vice President for University Advancement is delegated authority to accept gifts on behalf of the University. All gifts are accepted through the Cal Poly Humboldt Foundation, a separate 501(c)(3) organization. Fundraising events, charitable solicitations, and sponsorship requests must be approved in advance by University Advancement.

Definitions

Fundraising Event – An event conducted for the sole or primary purpose of raising charitable funds, where participants may make a charitable contribution and/or pay the fair market value for goods or services. Examples include dinners, dances, door-to-door sales, concerts, carnivals, golf tournaments, auctions, casino nights, and similar activities.

Fundraising events do not include:

- Activities substantially related to the CSU's educational purpose, including those that receive sponsorship
- Unrelated trade or business activities that generate fees for service
- Raffles in which prizes have only nominal value and do not require reporting as taxable income (giveaways)

Charitable Solicitation – Any request for money, property, or other donations made to the public, groups, or individuals.

Charitable Sponsorship – A mutually beneficial arrangement in which a business or individual provides money, goods, or services to a nonprofit organization in exchange for marketing benefits, brand recognition, or public acknowledgment. Sponsorships typically involve a contractual agreement (e.g., logo placement at events).

Definitions are defined by Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedures

Fundraising activities require coordination across multiple campus departments. Detailed procedures and guidelines are maintained by University Advancement can be [found here](#).

Related Policies

[CSU Fundraising Event Policy](#)

[Cal Poly Humboldt Foundation Gift Acceptance Policy](#)

[Charitable Contribution Acceptance Policy](#)

Expiration Date *(if any; optional)*

History *(required)*

All changes must be listed chronologically in the format below, including all edits and reviews. Note when the policy name or number changes. Note if an edit or revision date is exclusively for the policy section or the procedure section:

Issued: MM/DD/YYYY

Revised: MM/DD/YYYY

Edited: MM/DD/YYYY

Reviewed: MM/DD/YYYY

Updated: March 8, 2018



University Space and Facilities Advisory Committee (USFAC)

Academic Year 2025-2026 Space Requests Recommendations and Rationale

Space Allocation Recommendations as Voted by USFAC Quorum February 13, 2026; updated April 10, 2026

Request Number	Request Title	USFAC Weighted Score (1-4 possible; incl. AS)	USFAC Recommendation	Rationale
105	Dreamers Center	2.79	Recommend approval of the proposal contingent on identifying space	<p>This proposal requests a student-centered resource hub with shared work areas for the Dreamers Center that will support meetings, programming, student advising, and academic support services that focus on the needs of undocumented and minority students. The center expects to serve ~45 students.</p> <p>Due to a lack of vacant space across campus, the USFAC was not able to recommend a space allocation. Should suitable vacated space become available, the Dreamers Center’s needs will be prioritized as a reflection of their weighted score. Facilities Management will look for any available space that meets the qualifications and requested proximity.</p>
106	Wrestling Practice Facility	2.75	Recommend approval of the proposal for use in RWC 126	<p>This proposal requested allocation of Recreation & Wellness Center room 126 to be solely used for the wrestling team. The specialty mats located in the space are akin to specialty equipment in a science lab, which are used for a sole purpose/program. Associated Students expressed concern that the approval of this space recommendation will limit the ability for recreational sports and others to introduce broader student programming that could utilize limited specialized</p>

Request Number	Request Title	USFAC Weighted Score (1-4 possible; incl. AS)	USFAC Recommendation	Rationale
				<p>space such as RWC 126. The USFAC recommends that Conference & Event Services work to understand future needs of this kind of space and present requests to USFAC as a follow up on the impact of this allocation. The USFAC recommends the space allocation change from All School to Athletics. Any potential reservations that can utilize this specialty equipment under the provisions set by Athletics for use and care may be requested through Athletics and not Conference & Event Services.</p>
107	RAMP Center Upgrade	3.53	Recommend approval of the proposal contingent on identifying space	<p>This proposal requests a larger space to accommodate RAMP’s growing program. Due to a lack of vacated space across campus, the USFAC was not able to recommend a space allocation. Should suitable vacated space become available, RAMP’s needs will be prioritized as a reflection of their weighted score. Facilities Management will look for any available space that meets the qualifications and requested proximity. In the short term we recommend that RAMP utilizes reservable space to accommodate large sessions or times that require individualized meetings as described in the proposal.</p>
108	Q Center	3.68	Recommend approval of the proposal contingent on identifying space	<p>This proposal requests a student-centered space for LGBTQ under Cultural Centers for Academic Excellence. Due to a lack of vacant space across campus, the USFAC was not able to recommend a space allocation. Should suitable vacated space become available, The Q Center’s needs will be prioritized as</p>

Request Number	Request Title	USFAC Weighted Score (1-4 possible; incl. AS)	USFAC Recommendation	Rationale
				<p>a reflection of their weighted score. Facilities Management will look for any available space that meets the qualifications and requested proximity.</p>
109	Micromobility Vehicle Locker	3.24	Did not recommend approval of the proposal	<p>An enclosed alternative transportation shelter is supported by the USFAC. Parking facilities (vehicle, bicycle, and alternative transportation vehicles) on campus are not subject to space allocations, and are managed and maintained by Parking and Facilities Management. Therefore, this request does not currently fall under the USFAC purview. The USFAC recommends the requestors work with Facilities Management regarding moving their request forward as a minor capital project.</p>
110	Cal Poly Strategic Space Moves	3.80	Recommend approval	<p>This proposal offers a series of move sequences to align locations for administrative and academic departmental offices, as well as supporting previously-submitted space requests. The following departments are included: Campus Bookstore, Extended Education, Human Resources, Place Based Learning Communities, Department of Communications, Office of Sustainability, Title IX, North Coast Rape Crisis Team, and Transfer Student Center.</p> <p>Buildings affected by the moves include: Campus Store, Student & Business Services, Stewart, Siemens Hall, Telonicher House, Facilities Management, Feuerwerker House, Gutswurrak Student Activities Center, Library, and</p>

Cal Poly Humboldt.

Request Number	Request Title	USFAC Weighted Score (1-4 possible; incl. AS)	USFAC Recommendation	Rationale
				Little Apartments.