

<p>Academic Senate December 7, 2010</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Burroughs, Contreras, Cotten, C. Davis, Drake, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Hauselt, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Noble, O'Brien, Pahal, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Provost Strong, Regalado, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Silverman, Stessman, Strahm, Stone, Wallace and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: John Mayer for Eric Broadwater, and Mark Thompson for Susan Marshall.</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Dean Goodwin, Dean Moore, AVPAA/ALO Kornuta, and student visitors.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>13/AS/10/UEPC Resolution Two-Pass Registration System Passed.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order

2:04pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of November 23, 2010

Approved

4. Announcements

Tim Held noted that the Library and the University Union would have extended hours for finals week. They will be open until midnight Sunday thru Thursday.

Provost Strong announced that the November 30th Graduation Initiative Team visit from the Chancellor's Office was very successful. Strong complimented us on our efforts and thanked all involved in the visit. The Chancellor's Office will send us a report which will be shared with the campus community.

Pamela Contreras announced that the ASI passed a resolution on SB 1070 last Thursday.

Jasek-Rysdahl discussed the questionnaire that was sent out last week. The intent of the questionnaire was for SEC to better understand what the feeling of this body was regarding the conversation at the last Senate meeting regarding the additional RSCA funds. This questionnaire was not intended to go to all faculty. A number of issues were brought up at the last Senate meeting, and the items on the survey reflected comments on the discussion. The vote wasn't overwhelming, and the survey was meant to get a sense of thoughts on those items. We wanted to know what we should or shouldn't be addressing.

The survey was sent out in a few colleges to all faculty with some statements that it might be biased or loaded. We never intended this to be a survey of all faculty, and the intent was to survey the Senators who were part of the discussion. If we were to send it to all faculty it would have been much different but that was not the intent. Jasek-Rysdahl shared some things with the Provost this morning when they talked, and the

Provost wasn't clear that it was only meant to go to the Senators. The Provost asked the Deans to recall the surveys that were sent to the faculty.

Jasek-Rysdahl was asked in all of this if there were negative ramifications the last time money was distributed to the colleges. He noted that there was not one action that led to a vote of no confidence last year. In his opinion, there were many big and small actions and a lot of things that lead to lack of conversation, consultation etc. The consequences of actions and decisions are significant. The Ad-hoc Trust Restoration Planning Group regularly discusses these issues, and we start conversations with a heightened sense of sensitivity. The consequences of this are that people are quick to make statements and listen less to each other. That is a concern and the consequence of this is that everything gets harder and we end up backtracking,

Two weeks ago there were 14 people who felt that the ad hoc committee's work should go forward, but very few people said anything in this meeting. Maybe it should be a concern that they didn't feel able to share their feelings. The consequence is that everything is harder on the campus. We waste time developing our positions on all of this and it's at a significant cost to everyone. Hopefully, as we move forward on this issue it will become a bump in the road and not another significant obstacle in the road. We are not close to being there, but in the future we hope that this will be the exception and not the normal operating procedure on campus.

Pahal said that they're setting up a roundtable to help finalize the student representation policy, and ASI is looking for a faculty representative. They are trying to set up a policy that will get more students involved in committees and task forces. Once they finalize the policy they hope to get more student engagement and not just from Senators but from folks throughout the campus. If you'd like additional information, you can reach Pahal at his email address asipresident@csustan.edu

Manrique noted that tomorrow there will be a meeting of the campus Emeritus Retired Faculty Association from 4-7pm. The ERFA President is not well, and was not able to attend. Dieter Renning is the Statewide President now, and is trying to get information out from as many campuses as possible about provisions for parking for retired faculty. Many campuses have had this privilege for so many years that they've forgotten when it began. One representative noted that if retired faculty members have the privilege of parking; they volunteer on campus and are more likely to donate funds to the campus. Manrique also noted that their Chapter provides funds for three campus scholarships.

Mayer noted that "It's a Wonderful Life" is playing at the Gallo Center this weekend and it's co-sponsored by CSU Stanislaus. They have sold 200 seats and it should be great.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Filling attended the Foundation Board public portion of the meeting. Given the honorary faculty members' reticence to provide a report to the Senate, Filling offered a report. President Shirvani reported that, "We have 4 endowed chairs and three more in progress. Endowed chairs are provided \$25K per year intended to cover additional research costs in excess of what endowed faculty are allowed." For Filling, it was insulting the way President Shirvani referred to these positions as "A Founding of Excellence" and an attempt to acquire scholars of national or international renown who distinguished themselves at another institution. It's sad that the President is not acknowledging scholars at this institution. The Foundation Board is reworking the bylaws, in part due to the co-mingling of state and non-state funds. Also, Roy McTarnaghan is back as a mentor and consultant to Deans and AVP's. The President remarked that last year things were bad; faculty were upset but this year things are much better. Filling asked the Foundation Board faculty members if they would attend the Senate and make a report, and they said no.

6. Information Items

a. Faculty Trustee Nomination

O'Brien sent an email to all faculty regarding a nomination for a Faculty Trustee on the Board of Trustees. He thinks this member is very important to represent all of us in Long Beach. The nomination process for a new trustee is currently underway. O'Brien thought Mark Thompson would be a good representative from our campus given his background in shared governance, having been Speaker twice, and a member of SWAS for 4-5 years. He thinks Thompson would be a good choice, and he sent out an email for response if faculty would support a petition. As of now, he has 63 names and about 5 more not yet updated. That clearly meets the minimum of the 50 faculty needed. Also, there were 3 FERP's who support this nomination but weren't sure if they had the right to vote, so he put their names at the end to acknowledge their expression of support. This nomination needs to be at the Statewide Academic Senate on December 20th. Nominees will give a presentation to the full Statewide Senate in January, and the full SWAS will give two names to the Governor, from which one will be selected. O'Brien is seeking a blessing from this group to send Thompson's name forward. Filling moved this motion and McGhee Seconded.

Thompson noted he is not here for the information item but as a proxy. He is happy to step out of the room if the Senate is going to talk about this. O'Brien noted that the policy asks that the local Senate send it forward. Thompson left for the vote and discussion. No discussion was desired. By voice vote it was approved sending forward the nomination.

Thompson returned and noted that he thinks there is strong competition and is not starting to make plans to go to Long Beach. Even if the snowball remains frozen in Hell, still the esteem of one's colleagues is more important than the outcome of the process. Ovation.

7. Action Items

a. Second Reading 13/AS/10/UEPC Resolution Two-Pass Registration System

Jasek-Rysdahl reminded all of the rules of the Senate. Note that comments and questions should be routed through the Speaker as we discuss this. We may extend discussions beyond 30 minutes if needed, and we may stop to allow student comments as a group. This is now a second reading item.

Mayer offered an amendment to the resolution following the 3rd Resolved as follows:

"That student athletes be allowed to register for an additional 3 units beyond the 9 unit first round limit with their appropriate priority group, and be it further"

Seconded by Routh

Mayer read the following statement:

I ask that you pass this amendment today, because it is the right thing to do for our student-athletes! We are the only school in our conference that does not have registration accommodations for student-athletes. We are the only school in either the CSU or UC that offers NCAA athletics that does not have such a policy. This is standard practice across the nation. Why is this? In my letter, put before the senate last meeting and in your minutes; the most vital elements of which were not allowed to be read, in their entirety, due to unwritten time guidelines, I stated:

There is a clear bottom line in this debate, and despite the myriad of reasons I could state emphatically to support the resolution, there is one that rises above the rest and crystallizes the issue squarely on the side of student-athletes. CSU Stanislaus made an institutional decision to become a member of NCAA Division II

*athletics, and as a result has committed our student-athletes to the strict academic guidelines that the NCAA sets forth. Further, fellow members of our faculty, the coaches, have in many cases, aggressively recruited these student-athletes to attend our institution. We have made a promise to them to help them secure a quality education. As the rationale of the resolution so clearly states, our student-athletes are differentially impacted by our present registration policy. According to NCAA guidelines, our student-athletes must maintain a 2.0 GPA (**actually the CCAA goes a step further and requires a 2.5 GPA of all its student-athletes**), they must always be enrolled in 12 units per semester, and make progress toward degree in order to be eligible to participate in athletics at an NCAA member institution.*

*Make no mistake; the ongoing debate regarding priority registration, and its predecessor, the discussion about an attendance policy has nothing to do with whether or not one supports the need for athletics on a college campus. That is a debate for another time perhaps, because our institution **has** made the commitment, and as a result we must support, not penalize our student-athletes.*

With all due respect to my colleagues who suggest that the issue of student-athlete priority registration is a separate item for future consideration – I strongly disagree. This issue would not be on the floor today were it not for the impassioned appeals I, and others have made over the past few years to the UEPC and earlier leadership of the faculty senate. We have come so far in this debate, and as a result a resolution is now offered today that almost gets us where we need to be. Now is the time and this resolution, which asks for very little additionally to the present resolution is the right answer. The resolution in its present form does not specifically acknowledge student-athletes and that is what brought this issue to the floor in the first place. The rationale for this resolution is misleading in suggesting that student-athletes are the reason for this policy, because this resolution is not what was originally presented. – with the addition of this resolution – the rationale will fit.

I am passionate about student-athlete welfare. I make no apologies for that. I never called student-athletes the “most noble” I said these students were “among the most noble – and you know what – they are! It astounds me that we continue to debate this issue, because the answer seems so clear. An answer that is clear to everyone else in our conference and throughout the NCAA involved CSU and UC campuses. Another reason for adding this amendment was pointed out in the recent survey conducted by Institutional research here on campus and completed by 60% of our student-athletes, one statistic jumped out at me and that is – 55% of our student athletes admitted to taking a class that they did not need to fulfill the NCAA 12 unit participation requirement. This is senseless, and we can help change this by passing this resolution with the added 3 unit amendment for our very deserving student-athletes.

Routh would like to build upon Mayer’s comments. He is a strong supporter of the amendment. The amendment puts forth a reasonable and needed accommodation. At the heart of this is that student athletes are trying to access the full range of curricular offerings this University offers. This is about coursework and intercollegiate competition. The critical difference between student athletes and others who have problems such as employment, commuting and family issues is that student athletes have University rules, budget constraints and faculty unwilling or unable to accommodate their athletic competition schedules. This is a reasonable and doable accommodation. As Mayer noted there is a list of other universities in conference with these politics, such as Pomona, East Bay, Los Angeles, Chico, San Francisco State University, Sonoma, etc. Why we are the only ones not accommodating student athletics is illogical to him. Inevitably some are concerned of unfair privileging of student athletes and he doesn’t see that. What is seen is the University ridding itself of an inconsistency in terms of policy in light of the University mission--this is a structural pathology that needlessly impacts a group of students trying to engage in the full range of curricular

offerings. He commends Mayer and his efforts.

Petrosky speaks in opposition to the amendment. It sets up a class system, as many students have other responsibilities outside the classroom. Most students work and more have to work with the increasing tuition fees. The main motion serves the purpose for all students with responsibilities outside the classroom. That and better planning with coaches and academic administration in Athletics will help students as well.

Marcell supports the motion. It's clear that we still have to consider that all of us as students had to work our way through obligations, but those students who choose to be athletes have requirements forced upon them. Some of the students he advised this week had additional units beyond what is required to graduate. They take our 60+ units plus 12-18 additional units. Units taken should count towards graduation. It shouldn't be required of students to take a three-unit elective that doesn't count. He's in favor of letting student athletes into the classes they need, as this is a small concession to make.

Regalado supports tabling the amendment to the resolution until more data is available. Regalado pointed out that Mayer had indicated that athletes have higher GPAs or graduation rates than the rest of the student body, but offers no data to support this claim. Some calls for data stem from when we dealt with this issue in the previous academic calendar, but we have not gotten any information at all for this request. Regalado thinks it's unreasonable to support the passage of any resolution without adequate information.

Jasek-Rysdahl stopped to clarify whether the motion is to table to a specific date. He clarified that tabling indefinitely would allow for discussion, but tabling for a time certain would not allow for conversation. Motion to table for a specific date failed, continued discussion.

Ann Strahm read a statement by Chris Nagel as follows:

Pardon me for having a written statement. I've asked A. Strahm to read this statement for me, because I've basically lost my voice. I appreciate and share John's commitment to our student-athletes. I do not support providing an additional class registration opportunity only to student-athletes, for two basic reasons.

First, although student athletes do indeed contribute to the University and take on extracurricular burdens, I don't believe that only student athletes do so. I have not been told why it is fair to treat athletes in this different way, alone among the many different identifiable groups of students (to say nothing of individual students) who also make contributions to the University and take on extracurricular burdens.

Second, and moreover, we have been presented no evidence at all that student athletes are affected by the difficulty of registering for classes more than any other identifiable groups of students. What I feel I lack are data demonstrating that student athletes systematically and generally experience a significantly greater difficulty registering for classes than non-athlete students, or other identifiable groups of students. Without that evidence, it's not clear that there is a problem specific to student athletes – and so it's not clear that providing the additional registration opportunity to student-athletes will do anyone any good.

Pahal asked if the student athletes would be allowed to speak. He said that a survey was conducted in the last 2-3 weeks, but he is not sure how many responded. He is not sure if the data is here today, but there is some data that could be concrete evidence. Mayer may have some of that data.

Strahm noted that when comparing us to other CSU's it is problematic because the data shows that we don't have a traditional college base that we serve, and many of the students on this campus find attending college to be extraordinarily challenging. Why increase their burden for the benefit of another group.

McGhee said we need to remember that this is a competitive environment we inhabit. These students have opportunities to attend other universities, and what other universities offer have an impact on where they attend. They do benefit the reputation of the university and help with prestige. If we consider this a prestigious activity, we should support this motion by Mayer. Since their requirements are slightly different than other students outside of Financial Aid requirements, we are in a situation of needing to help them to make sure they can at least meet the requirements to help the university. Sports do bring in revenue and recognition. Even though it's not exactly the same, there are other people on this campus who get recognition or favorable treatment for what they are doing. For instance, the Employee Fee Waiver to take classes up to 6 units is a benefit to those providing a service to the university. We shouldn't ignore these students from a standpoint that all students have troubles. A lot of us have troubles, worked a lot of hours, but weren't doing things to enhance the university's reputation.

Student athlete McClean spoke. She runs track and plays soccer. She came to campus in 2006, and due to practice time complications it delayed her registration for needed classes causing her to graduate a semester later. She will graduate at the top of her class, and she has worked thru college and paid her own tuition. To bring up things like data and other students is difficult to discuss. Not only do they have to deal with athletics but also their own practice times. She felt that their hard work and efforts deserves to be treated in a way so they can graduate in four years. Athletes represent students and the university very well, and they deserve to be treated the same as as all students or maybe better.

Filling wonders if the data is present to show that the problems mentioned here can be resolved with a solution offered or if it's due to scheduling for practices and competitions competing with classroom schedules. It's unclear if giving priority access to classes taught may improve access, as it won't solve that part of the problem. There should be some data looking at the practice and competition schedules in comparison to class schedules and try to resolve them. The 4-year graduation rate is 33%; the six-year is around 50%. It's far from clear that most students expect to graduate in 4 years.

Garcia is in favor of the amendment. At some level we're starting to fool ourselves when requesting more data. We may be losing the perspective of what we're trying to do here. We're getting lost in the discussion of fairness, acting on principles of 3rd or 5th graders. Fairness is not treating all the same. It's appropriate to look at other CSU's as we need to try to meet all of our students' needs. For student athletes to have to do something a little bit different means that they are a specific group that needs attention. He's not sure how this burdens the university or puts them at an advantage. He's glad the students brought this up as many student athletes are faced with the same issues as other students such as having difficulties getting to campus, paying bills, working, and first generation college students.

Charles, the ASI Senator for Athletics spoke. Student athletes are not complaining because of something we chose to do because we love it. We practice for years to pursue a college career. In no way are we complaining, but we would like to excel both on the court and classroom. The spring registration date is tomorrow, and he has five classes he needs. Based on availability, three of the five are waitlisted and others are full. He's hoping he can wedge a way in, or he will have to take a filler class for 12 units to be eligible to play sports. He plays only for one season but practices are all year around. Dedication and commitment is required all year. We're students first and athletes second. He works two jobs, pays rent, and pays bills.

Sarraille asked about Routh's comment. Do all the campuses Routh mentioned allow athletes to register for all their units before anyone else? Exactly what do they do?

Mayer said that the amendment is based on the two-pass system on the Sonoma policy. It allows athletes and those in university sanctioned activities to go first in the two-pass system. We recommended them going

with their cohort.

Thompson said we need to keep in mind all the students who have trouble getting classes. A call for data came in response to claims made over and over. If claims are made over and over, it is reasonable to call for data. The idea of comparisons, those made to other students began with the proponents. Changes have been on the table and reviewed at length over the years by a committee of peers. We put a lot of stock in the committee's recommendation. Other campuses make allowances for those other than athletes, including Presidential Scholars. He heard that a survey was done, but we need to keep in mind that we're only hearing from one set of students and we need to hear from others that are struggling as well.

Mayer noted that from the survey that he thinks he can find the data as there is plenty of circumstantial evidence to support this amendment. He did an IR survey, and over 60% of the student athletes responded. There is not a policy about student athletes. Approximately 55% admitted to taking classes they didn't need to fulfill NCAA rules. The comparison is that other students are not required by NCAA to be enrolled in 12 units. This is a small thing that we're asking, three more units for 2.5% of our students.

Regalado doesn't like seeing students making arguments in class without evidence, and would hope that we carry that model into the Senate.

Garcia spoke to the Senate, but he's not sure how to discuss this without comparing to others. We need to concern ourselves with those who might get shut out of classes is because they're not athletes. In terms of Routh's arguments to compare us with others, sometimes standing alone isn't always a bad thing. It speaks to our integrity and treating students equally.

Pahal supports the resolution with Mayer's amendment. He sees this as pro-student. With athletes taking classes that they don't need to meet unit requirements; they're taking classes that other students may need. This is only adding three more units. This can allow student athletes to take fewer classes towards graduation and supports all students. He wants to remind everyone that this university says we're committed to student athletes. We made the commitment, and it's our turn to take the next step to fulfill that. These students are competing in sports, doing their best and doing it for the campus. We need to support this to show our commitment. This will help all students to allow them to work towards graduation in a more efficient manner. He highly recommends that we don't get into this argument about what is really fair, images of athletes etc. and see it for what it is.

Silverman has respect for all student athletes as they work hard for themselves and the university. Regardless of how this ends up, they still have his respect, and he suspects that many faculty feel this way.

Tuedio wonders if it might make sense to consider the second resolved to change it from 9 to 12 units for all students. We have financial aid students and student athletes have a 12-unit threshold. Changing the general number to 12 might be better.

Sarraille pointed out that many other students need to get 12 units, not just athletes. Students need 12 units to qualify for financial aid, which is extremely important to them. There are other possible compelling reasons. He was troubled by the characterization of student athletes as doing something for the benefit of others, and non-athletes as just attending the university for their own benefit. He sympathizes with college athletes, but we should recognize that non-athletes also come to the university to serve others - for example to help their families and their society. Sarraille asked that there be a secret ballot on the amendment under discussion.

Noble noted that students don't need 12 units to qualify for financial aid. The 12 units funds them at a different level but it doesn't disqualify them for financial aid.

Provost Strong thinks the amendment is reasonable and supports it.

O'Brien returned to Tuedio's comment about increasing to 12 units. He asked UEPC why they went with 9 units.

Stessman said they were working on the increase of course load to 18 units, and the thought was that half of that would be nine units. They used simple math. They had discussions about other numbers, but they thought that half the maximum made sense.

Petrosky spoke in favor of amendment. He reminded all that other groups that need special consideration are disabled students, and they need priority registration.

Stessman said that students with disabilities and veterans already have federally mandated special permissions.

Melissa Bishop, sophomore on the volleyball team spoke. Personally, she has taken two classes that she didn't need to take after she fulfilled her GE requirements. She did so to be eligible to play volleyball. She also had to drop three classes because she was told by her teacher or coach that she would miss too much sport time. This caused her to have to rearrange her classes. She's a Kinesiology student and Biology is a prerequisite. She still hasn't completed the biology courses because she was not able to enroll the first time due to her late registration date, and the second time the only open labs were during practice time. This term she got into these classes, but was told that if she missed too many classes that she should drop the course. Priority registration would help. She doesn't consider herself as different but does have more obligations than others. She works, goes to school, and can't work around her school schedule. The Coach says this is your schedule, so make it work. She can't do anything about this. She recognizes that they choose to play sports and put the time into it, but they can't choose when to do it. She might not be able to take major courses because of this.

Filling called the question on the amendment. Seconded. By paper ballot the amendment does not pass, 17 yes, 22 no, 3 abstentions.

Mayer does not think we can pass the original resolution as it is written; it is not the resolution as initially requested.

O'Brien said he'd like to make a motion to change the second resolved from 9 to 12 units, seconded by Pahal.

Thompson would like to hear more about UEPC's rationale for 9 and not 12 units. Stessman doesn't recall discussing 12 units. The feeling was that they wanted students to get a part and not a full portion of their classes in the first pass. They didn't talk about 12 units.

Marcell speaks against the new amendment and asked for Lisa Bernardo's insight. What percentage of our student body is currently taking around 12 units relative to 15 units? Bernardo said the average undergraduate load is 12.4 units. Marcell said with that data it makes no sense to have 12 units as it defeats much of the two-pass system.

Petrosky asked what the median would be. Bernardo didn't have that information.

Moore said we're talking about minimums and mediums. Every student on this campus has an issue getting classes. It seems that with all due respect to the committee, the decision wasn't totally arbitrary. There is not a lot of deliberation beyond half of the maximum. If we're looking at graduation rates, no one here feels good about not meeting the four-year rates. It used to be that you could graduate in four years. Nationally, the norm for a BA degree was reduced to 120 to get thru in four years. We need to do all we can to make that a possibility for all students. If we increased the maximum to 18 units, it makes sense to change this to 12 units to benefit all of the students. He supports a move in that direction.

Eudey supports the lower 9 units to help those later in the priority resolution order to have a chance at getting desired classes.

O'Brien would like to suggest reviewing this next year, not just every one to two years. Jasek-Rysdahl noted that we won't address this until after this resolution is addressed.

Thompson says even though he seconded this, based on the conversation he now opposes it.

Mayer would support the resolution if the rationale were changed. He thinks the resolution does not respond to the student athletes directly and what brought it here in the first place. Changing the 9 units to 12 units might make this easier, and so would the earlier review of the policy.

By voice vote, the amendment does not pass.

Filling recommends that we return this item to UEPC and it return as a time certain at the next Senate meeting. Voice vote does not support the tabling of this item.

C. Davis said that the current resolution already indicates a spring 2012 review.

Held asked UEPC who is sponsoring the resolution now or originally? Jasek-Rysdahl noted that this is a UEPC resolution.

The question was called on the original resolution. Seconded. By paper ballot the resolution passed, 32 yes, 7 no, 2 abstained. The original 13/AS/10/UEPC Resolution Two-Pass Registration System passes and will be forwarded to the President.

Jasek-Rysdahl thanked all for their comments and discussion.

8. First Reading Items

a. 3/AS/10/RSCAPC/GC—Amendment to Policy on Human Subjects Research

It was requested to move this item to the next meeting. Deferred to the January 25, 2011 Senate meeting.

9. Discussion Items

a. Early Start (2:30pm Time Certain for Tom Abram and Scott Davis)

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that we've invited Drs. T. Abram and S. Davis to discuss the Early Start topic with us. Our campus has submitted our Early Start proposal, and we wanted to get some information from the two main departments about what has been proposed and where we are in the process. Jasek-Rysdahl noted that he's asked both Abram and Davis to give overviews and then address questions.

Abram noted that Math proposed three different pathways to satisfy math remediation. There is a 15 hour math workshop for those within 6 points of passing the ELM. At the conclusion of the workshop students would retake the ELM. The hope is that after taking the workshop students would pass the ELM and no longer need remediation. The second path is for those students not close to passing the ELM to take the appropriate current 4- unit Math remediation course (Math 0103/0106.0110). These workshops and courses are available not only in the summer, but also during the spring of the student's senior year. We're hoping the Chancellor will allow for earlier ELM testing and we will have scores before January, so students can take advantage of remediation in spring semester instead of summer. The third pathway is Summer Bridge. These students would take a 30-hour Math/ELM preparation workshop and take the ELM at the conclusion of the workshop. Math chairs met in October and worked out reciprocity for campuses. All for Math is pretty much worked out.

S. Davis said that the English proposal is similar to Math's. English proposed an evaluation apart from the English Placement Test (EPT). It's a diagnostic essay that directs students into one of three options: a two-semester "stretch" first year composition course; directed self-placement into either the freshman composition courses, the developmental Intro to Comp course, or the ESL program; or direct placement directly into freshman composition (ENGL1001). There is a one-unit summer workshop for students needing specific improvement. Summer workshops and the "stretch" first year composition are the two new features of the approach.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked about where we are in the process and if there are any concerns we should be aware of.

Abram doesn't know the timeline for acceptance. One concern for Math is that the program has been successful in the past with 13 and 15 week terms. Trying to cram this into a 4-5 week summer will be intense, because sometimes in math students need time to work problems and digest material and content. One reason why we are proposing a spring option is that we are hoping that this can be carried out to give students more time to learn the content. Another concern was getting faculty to teach several sections of 4-unit courses in the summer. The third concern is the cost for students. We've been told students can apply for grant money and use some in the summer and not deplete the academic year funds. Costs are always a concern.

S. Davis said English shares the same concerns as Math regarding timing and cost. English has designed a pilot for this summer to test the proposed program for usability and scalability and hope to be allowed to observe that process and scale it up as is warranted. The English Dept. opposed the mandatory nature of the Early Start program in a resolution forwarded to Senate in September. Many things come down to us from the office of the Chancellor, but that's not the specific mandatory nature that the English Dept. is most opposed to. English is opposed to Early Start constituting an additional admissions burden, a de-facto admission. This position was shared by the English Council in their own long and detailed resolution. S. Davis deferred to Thompson to clarify or add to this.

Thompson would add that it is one more in a series of burdens put on some of the students that we are proudest of teaching: first generation college students and underrepresented students. The system has a history of placing additional burdens on these students who are most at risk, and the requirement to attend in the summer to maintain admission is just one more in the series of sanctions.

Provost Strong said that the Executive Order states that students cannot enroll if they have not completed Early Start, but they can be admitted to the university but cannot enroll. That might be a fine point, and certainly doesn't speak to the fact that it's a burden. He pointed out the technical difference in the Executive Order.

O'Brien had a question for Tom Abram. You said that based on Early Start, we have reciprocity with other campuses and that Math Chairs are happy with that. If a Humboldt student comes to Stanislaus, how are we to work it out?

Abram said that several campuses offer workshops, and at the end of the session students retake the ELM and we take the best of the scores. Almost all campuses have beginning and intermediate algebra. The main problem are the students who go from quarter to semester or the opposite, this gets a bit muddied. They might need to repeat the course even if they passed 2/3 of it. For most of the semester campuses it's not a problem.

S. Davis understands that reciprocity is built into the process. He's only seen the San Jose State University proposal.

Sarraille said he wanted to say something to help make sure that everyone would have a concrete understanding of the possible harmful effects of making participation in the program mandatory. He said people should keep in mind the example of the student who has a low income and who needs to work in the summer. Then because of the mandatory nature of this Early Start program the student has to enter the program, perhaps at a rather distant location, so the student will lose the opportunity to make money in the summer, and possibly incur significant additional expenses. In spite of the person going through remediation and increasing his or her knowledge of math and/or English, for economic reasons, that person may not be able to attend the University in the fall semester.

Flores has been attending the K-12 consortiums; talking about ways to help students to meet early requirements before coming to us. There's a meeting this week, and he encourages us to work with K-12 to address this before they come to our campus.

Eudey said that it's important to keep in mind the many students test for remediation in English and Math simultaneously. There may be 2 activities during the spring in their high schools. These students are competing in high school courses and possibly working in the summer. There is also the time burden; especially if they enter these programs and find out they can't begin the classes in the fall. First generation college students may not always be paying attention to the information, so we all can do our part by talking with the community and remind them to watch for remedial activities coming up. Note that we can admit students that don't engage in those programs, but they won't be allowed to attend in the fall. We need to do our best in helping these students.

Thompson said you can think of Early Start's consequences in the context of Deliverology—the CSU system at war with itself: isn't it clear that denying students the opportunity to enroll in classes hinders both retention and progress to degree.

Silverman believes that some students do need help to become ready for college. To alleviate the conflict between students who need to work and the Early Start, perhaps the university can do a survey and find out when (morning, day, evening) it would be mutually convenient for students and instructors to give these classes. If there is enough students then maybe the classes can be spread around morning, day, and evening, so students can choose.

Strong said there is no date for feedback from the Chancellor's office, but he assumes it will be before the start of the spring semester. There is a Provost meeting on the December 18th, so he should have an update then. He reiterated part of the Math plan. High School students can get engaged in some workshops to meet the start requirement. That may not negatively impact their ability to work, at least in the summer. One of

the issues for students is when they don't take a senior year of Math they get rusty, and maybe this will have a positive impact in that regard and not slow folks down. He doesn't think that English had that.

S. Davis added that Math and English are not the only ones involved. This is a university-wide problem with a university-wide effect. He appreciates the Senate for having the discussion. Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that the Senate will continue to be involved, and he thanked Abram and Davis for sharing information.

10. Open Forum

McGhee is teaching a 4-unit class this fall, and there is no Finals time slot set for 4-unit classes. He may show up for his final next week, and there may be someone teaching a class in his classroom. There is another faculty member with a final scheduled for the same time period, but they taught at a different starting time than McGhee. Someone needs to look into this and offer some guidance, as we don't want our students to get caught in the middle of this.

Strahm knows that this will sound like a broken record, but all the discussion had one common thread and that is the need for more classes. We can fiddle around with this and that, but we have to figure out a way to have more classes for everybody. Ovation.

ASI is looking for a new faculty representative, as this is David Colnic's last semester. They're looking for a representative for ASI which meets on Tuesdays from 5-7pm. It would be great to have someone who is involved and able to attend all the meetings. Jasek-Rysdahl asked Pahal to share this information with Renae Floyd, Chair of Committee on Committees.

C. Davis reiterated the need to review the changes to the Human Subjects Policy. If you have questions in advance, she'd be happy to gather them and address them before the discussion so it can be a productive discussion. She noted that the (UIRB) University Institutional Review Board will meet before the next Senate meeting.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked folks to complete the survey on the Additional RSCA Funds.

Eudey reminded all that the next meeting occurs the Tuesday before classes start in January. The Constitution requires that we meet during each month in which we have classes, so we will meet on January 25th before classes start.

11. Adjournment 3:55pm