

<p>Academic Senate March 13, 2012</p> <p><b>Present:</b> Baker, Bice, Bettencourt, , Buhler-Scott, Burroughs, Deaner, Drake, Espinoza, Foreman, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Held, Keswick, Khodabandeh, Lindsay, Manrique, Marshall, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Silverman, Strahm, Stone, Tan, Vang, Wallace, Werling</p> <p><b>Proxies:</b> Dennis Shimek for Provost Strong, Al Petrosky for Steven Filling, Ann Strahm for Paul O'Brien, Bill Foreman for Dave Colnic and Elaine Peterson for Dave Colnic.</p> <p><b>Excused:</b> Coach Representative, Eric Broadwater, Mira Mayer.</p> <p><b>Guest:</b> Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Mariam Salameh, Shauna Keeler, Gabe Bolton, Reza Kamali, Robert Marino, Kathy Norman, James Tuedio, Ron Noble, John Sarraille, Betsy Eudey, Brian Duggan, Wendy Smith, Michelle Legg, Russ Giambelluca, and Tom Carter.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First Reading of 2/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System, CSU Stanislaus. Moved to a second reading and the resolution passed with slight revisions.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 27, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Chris De Vries, Clerk</p>
---	--

1. **Call to order**

2:02pm

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved revised agenda.

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 28, 2012**

Approved.

4. **Introductions**

Guests were Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Mariam Salameh, Shauna Keeler, Gabe Bolton, Reza Kamali, Robert Marino, Kathy Norman, James Tuedio, Ron Noble, John Sarraille, Betsy Eudey, Brian Duggan, Wendy Smith, Michelle Legg, Russ Giambelluca, and Tom Carter.

5. **Announcements**

a. **Survey on College Reorganization Committee #2**

Gomula stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc Committee on College Reorganization was charged by Provost Strong on February 14, 2012 to evaluate the recommendations of the 1<sup>st</sup> Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by Dr. Ian Littlewood. There will be a survey sent to the campus community with a short timeline. To complete the charge of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc Committee on College Reorganization, we are asking for your help by requesting your feedback to this important survey. We ask you to please respond to this brief and time-sensitive survey. The deadline to

complete this survey is Friday, March 23, 2012. Your responses are anonymous and will be kept completely confidential. The survey includes your role in the University and asks you to rank the 6 proposals that you have in front of you today.

Burroughs noted that if we are thinking about reorganizing, how many colleges are going through a dean search. We are kind of concerned if we should be proceeding with searches given that we are having numerous conversations on this.

Speaker Stone noted that this is more of an open forum topic.

Petrosky announced that Danielle Fletcher has won the 2012 National Society for Human Resource Management Undergraduate Scholarship Award. This is the top award given to any undergraduate HR major in the nation. Danielle holds the unique distinction of being a two-time winner for this award, and she wins \$2,500 for this prize. Applause.

Regalado noted that our softball coach has won her 500th game as a coach. That is a big accomplishment in any sport, and it is important to know that our coaches, like Jan Schefkowitz do good things. Not only is she a good coach, but a good teacher and role model. She is an asset to this University.

Eudey announced that the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center was dedicated on May 9, 2002, and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the Faculty Development Committee will be hosting a 10-year anniversary celebration in early May. We will be creating a special edition of Faculty Voices - Volume X this year that will include essays, poems, letters, statements, pictures, etc. in which current and former members of the CSU Stanislaus faculty, staff, and administration will reflect upon the value of the FDC – personally, for a specific population, or the campus at large. We hope this will be an opportunity for us to express our appreciation for having this dedicated space for faculty development, and to share our stories about the ways in which our engagement in activities at the Center has impacted students, improved our professional practices, enhanced the quality of the campus community, and/or allowed us to better serve our mission and vision. Final submission deadline is Wednesday, March 21, 2012 at 1:00pm.

Eudey noted that this building gets used a lot, and we greatly benefit from its existence. We want to show that to the rest of the campus community and the Rogers family. Please write brief statements to celebrate this Center. We would like to include as many things as we can about what this space means to us. If you have any questions contact Eudey or Ximena Garcia at X3216.

Khodabandeh shared that they held the ASI march for higher education last Monday. They had over 10,000 students from all the Community Colleges, UC's, and CSU's and they were joined by many CSU faculty. He was given the tag "political threat maker" by the media. He appreciates everyone's support.

Kevin Nemeth announced that he is the campus liaison for communication between our campus and the Cal State Online. If you have questions or concerns about this initiative, you can route them to him or go to the Cal State Online website and review the documents and use the feedback link. He encourages all of you with an interest or concern to check out the website and documents and provide your comments and feedback. Refer to the following link for information on the Online Initiative: <http://www.calstateonline.net/>

**6. Committee Reports/Questions**

None

**7. Information Item**

**a. 2:15pm Time Certain for Amy Thomas and Steve Jaureguy to share concerns about Warrior Day**

Speaker Stone noted that this is just a presentation, and the students will be given an opportunity to respond. There will not be a Q&A.

Espinoza noted that her concerns are attached to the agenda, and she wanted to review them. Warrior Day has been here for many years and is a much loved tradition. It has grown to be 5,000 students and 1,500 external visitors or friends that are invited. Each year students are allowed to drink alcohol at this event. She is concerned with the level of abuse. Last year, several students were hospitalized and one had a blood alcohol level above 0.3. This is a serious level which poses a huge risk. Last year we had an accident, a student with a 0.2 blood alcohol level drove across campus and hit another car and doesn't recall the incident. Espinoza has begun a dialogue and would like the Chief of Police, Steven Jaureguy, to share his concerns as well.

Steven Jaureguy read the following statement:

We're here to share with you serious concerns associated with Warrior Day that threaten not only our student's academic success but the health and safety of our students as well as the public.

Over recent years it has become clear that the frequency of serious incidents, the severity of the problem, and the negative consequences associated with Warrior Day continue to grow in magnitude and presents an **unacceptable threat to our students**.

**Mitigation Efforts:**

Each year ASI and the campus make an effort to **manage and mitigate** the increasing damage to our students and the public which result from WD. Some of the mitigation efforts have included;

1. Providing free food prior to WD
2. Free food and non-alcohol drinks during WD
3. Wrist bands and ID confirmation to better identify underage drinkers
4. Setting up a Health Center medical station in WD
5. Variations in sizes of cups used to serve beer
6. Changing the number of cups of beer served
7. Sending a letter to the surrounding community alerting them to WD
8. Adjusting the time frame that alcohol is served (service stops 1 hour before the end of the event)
9. Changing hours of the event (currently 2 – 7 p.m.):

- a. to allow free food prior, however last year it was **Beer Batter** pancakes!
  - b. there was a belief that it was better not to have **our drunk students** drive away at 5 p.m. on a Friday endangering the community
2. Improved screening at entrance gate
  3. Increased number of security personnel
  4. Better monitoring of ticket sales
  5. Improved warning signage prior to entering event
  6. Improved ticket and promotional material warnings
  7. Increased number of police officers inside and outside of the event
  8. Administered 1,000's of free breathalyzer tests inside the event
  9. Implemented alcohol server training
  10. Modified alcohol service area with better controls
  11. Increased number of police officers in the City of Turlock before, during, and after WD
  12. Provided on site alternative activities
  13. Increased number of undercover police officers
  14. Conducted annual debrief sessions
  15. This year we've been requested to further beef up entrance security with additional police for the purpose of turning away and arresting even more of the intoxicated attendees

Since 2003 your UPD alone has donated over \$25k in an effort to mitigate the effects of **binge drinking at WD** in the form of free food, water, non-alcoholic drinks, give-away incentives, and other efforts to protect our students.

Yet all of these efforts combined have **failed to address the serious root problems** associated with WD or to adequately **protect our students** and the hundreds of non-students that attend this event each year.

**Bigger Picture/Impact:**

Our department WD summary's which have expanded in detail each year are **only a snap-shot of the bigger picture**. We only capture and record arrests and those incidents that are reported to us.

Therefore, it's imperative that you understand each year **hundreds more** young adults, both students and non-students, are either **under the influence** or so **impaired** that they;

- are unable to make it to WD;
  - turned away at the gate;
  - helped out of the event by friends;
  - they abandon friends and somehow manage to leave the event on their own;
  - sit, lay down, or "fall asleep" at the event, parking lots, or other areas on campus in an effort to recover;
  - or...they are escorted out of the event by **persons unknown to that impaired student**
  - They engage in high risk behaviors
  - become sick
  - get into fights
  - drive while impaired or under the influence
- We call Mothers and Fathers to **come to this campus** to pick up their sick or impaired Sons and Daughters

- **Two weeks before Commencement** far too many students receive a criminal record, \$100's in fines, a trip to the jail, or even a trip to the hospital courtesy of WD.

**These unreported “statistics” of WD more accurately illustrate the nature and magnitude of the problem that alcohol abuse and binge drinking are having on our students every year at this traditional University supported event.**

**\*Last WD, this University served our students nearly 500 gallons of beer in 4 hours.**

2007 – 23 kegs or nearly 350 gallons of beer were served

2008 –20 kegs

2009 –22 kegs

2010 –24 kegs

2011 –33 kegs or nearly 500 gallons of beer (@ 15 gal ea. =495 gallons)

*Total 122 kegs (24.5 avg. or 368 gallons)*

**Medical:**

- The presence of Paramedics and an ambulance **have become a necessity** in order to immediately respond to medical emergencies and provide for more rapid transport to the Hospital.
- Red Cross Volunteers are now required to work WD due to the number of first aid needs.

**CSU:**

It is well documented that for over a decade the CSU has **taken the lead nationally** to address alcohol abuse and binge drinking at our campuses.

Today, **no other CSU campus hosts or promotes an event** where so many students suffer from alcohol related health and safety problems.

- In past years campuses throughout the CSU including Stanislaus would send UPD Officers as part of the CSU’s Critical Response Unit or CRU Team to both Chico State and Cal Poly SLO for large events that had similar alcohol related problems.
- Because of the decision by those campuses to address the underlying causes of the destructive behaviors and binge drinking associated with their events, the problems and subsequent arrests have seen a dramatic decrease. Last year SLO didn’t even need the CRU Team and at Chico State, the CRU Team made only a few arrests for alcohol offenses.
- We now at Stanislaus have earned the distinction of more arrests, jail and hospital transports related to our one day University event than either Chico or SLO. **No CSU sponsors an event** with outcomes that are comparable to our WD.
- Because of the predictable outcomes of WD and the large amount of resources needed to deal with its’ impact, it is foreseeable that I will request our President contact the Chancellor of the CSU for a deployment of the system-wide Critical Response Team here at Stanislaus. The CRU Team would be in addition to the numerous officers already assisting from multiple agencies whose resources are already spread thin.

**Regional LE Agencies:**

Because of the growing problems associated with WD including higher BAC levels, we’ve seen an increase in both the need and participation of law enforcement agencies from throughout the region.

- For years, ABC Agents from Fresno to Stockton have been assigned and deployed at WD. Because of the continuing problems with underage drinking and other alcohol related offenses, ABC Agents have identified WD as an annual deployment for enforcement and training of other ABC Agents.
- The twelve (12) law enforcement agencies of Stanislaus County have been receiving Grant funds from the OTS to address DUI and impaired driving as well as underage drinking. WD has now become an annual assignment for this Task Force. Officers from multiple agencies will be on and around our campus and in the City of Turlock specifically to address the effects of alcohol associated with WD. They will engage in proactive enforcement to prevent serious injury or death related to drinking and driving. The Task Force has in the past and plans to continue use of Saturation Patrols (explain) before, during, and after WD and a DUI checkpoint in Turlock.

**Arrests:**

Every arrest we make is a **last resort in the effort to protect our students** and the public’s health and safety. And when a student or other young adult is transported to jail, know that it’s because that’s where we must place them to ensure their safety. Think about that for a moment, jail presents less of a threat to those students than remaining at an event on our campus!

- Because of the volume of intoxicated, impaired, and arrested persons, we’ve now established an expanded arrestee processing station in the parking lot adjacent to WD. Students and others from WD are brought to the processing station by officers of the multiple police agencies.
- Beginning last year, a Prisoner Transport Van and support personnel were provided by the Sheriff of Stanislaus County. Due to the number of arrests and the impact on our County jail the Sheriff’s expanded involvement is necessary for better efficiency in moving the volume of arrestees to jail and keeping the maximum number of officers at the event. This transport van is stationed next to our WD processing center near the entrance to WD.

**\*There was an average of 24 arrests made at each of the last three WD!** But remember that’s just the tip of the iceberg.

Number and severity of arrests:

2004 – 16	
2005 – 21	(+5)
2006 – 19	(-2)
2007 – 10	(-9)
2008 – 20	(+10)
2009 – 31	(+11)
2010 – 14	(-17)
<u>2011 – 27</u>	<u>(+13)</u>

**Average of 20 arrests per year**

158 Arrests since 2004 on track to reach 200 total arrests by 2013.

- Each year, this event brings pain and harm to far too many of our students and seriously threatens the health and safety of so many more.
- The **damage to our students** is undeniable, unsustainable, and unacceptable.

- Based on all the facts, WD has become ***the single biggest threat*** to ***the largest number of students*** at our University. It is foreseeable that many more of our students will again suffer harm at this University event. If it is predictable it is most definitely preventable.
- Therefore, in order to protect our students **I strongly recommend that VP Espinoza take action to safeguard our students and eliminate Warrior Day** at CSU Stanislaus.

The damage is undeniable, and it has become the single biggest threat at our University. If it is predictable it is preventable. Jaureguy suggests that VP Espinoza eliminate Warrior Day at Stanislaus. Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns.

Amy Thomas hopes that Senators and students will comment to UPD/Safety & Risk Management about any recommendations that you can make to help make this event safer. As the Risk Manager, she believes that all our efforts have failed, and she hopes that this year will be different.

Speaker Stone asked for clarification if we are talking about eliminating Warrior Day because it was presented to SEC that this was about eliminating alcohol at the event.

Jaureguy replied yes, that he'd like to see Warrior Day eliminated.

Espinoza said that this is Jaureguy's recommendation and they are discussing it.

Khodabandeh read the following statement:

**ISSUE:Students Arriving at the Amphitheater Intoxicated**

**Solution:** Along with our responsible alcohol drinking education campaign, which will include "Don't Show up Drunk," ASI will work with Campus Police Services to have stricter enforcement at the gate by University Police. ASI will include within its MOU with Campus Police, the expectation to either keep-out or arrest students for public intoxication (this will be emphasized in the "Don't be that Idiot" campaign)

**Outcome:** Increased number of ticket holders not being permitted to enter the event, resulting in higher numbers of people not getting in.

**ISSUE:Consumption of Alcohol (Binge Drinking)**

**Solution:** Reduce, per hour, the total number of alcohol tickets which can be purchased by each person of legal age to drink alcohol. Below is an example of a time and ticket sales schedule:

1:00pm-2:00pm -5- beer ticket limit

2:00pm-3:00pm -4- beer ticket limit

3:00pm-4:00pm -3- beer ticket limit

4:00pm-5:00pm -2 - beer ticket limit

5:00pm-6:00pm -1- beer ticket limit – Last Call between 5 and 6 pm

6:00pm-7:00pm No Alcohol tickets sold or beer served

**Outcome:** Less accessibility to alcohol, minimizing the opportunity to binge drink

**ISSUE: Underage Drinking/ Providing Alcohol to Minors**

**Solution:** Restrict the area within the Amphitheater where people can drink, commonly known as a Beer Garden. Security Guards will be posted around the perimeter of the Beer Garden to stop any possibility of drinks being handed-off to others.

**Outcome:** No minor in possession of alcohol sold at Warrior Day

**ISSUE: Responsible use of Alcohol**

**Solution:** “Don’t Be That Idiot” Campaign prior to Warrior Day Show photos, “Don’t Ruin the Warrior Day Tradition” slogan, statistics, rules of alcohol, etc.

**Solution:** Expand on Sober Important People (SIP) Garden; fully reward students for remaining sober throughout Warrior Day. Enhance the amount of incentives given to those allowed to enter because of being sober.

**Outcomes:** Increase number of people attempting to enter in the SIP Garden, begin documenting how many people are eligible to enter and how many are denied.

Decrease number of out-of-control parties being broken up by Turlock City Police Force and decrease number of arrests for public intoxication.

**ISSUE: Reduce the number of arrests for public intoxication and fights within the Amphitheater on Warrior Day**

**Solutions:** Reduce the number of guests attending Warrior Day by no longer selling tickets at the gate on Warrior Day. All free student tickets and all paid guest tickets will have to be in hand by the end of the day prior to Warrior Day.

**Outcomes:** Reduce number of arrests within the event.

Khodabandeh said that the majority of the arrests are not our students, but the student’s guests. These are pretty much the general ideas we’ve at ASI. He noted that this is the first year we have had a serious discussion about this. He thinks that students have a responsibility to drink responsibly. He also thinks that the issue we are dealing with is binge drinking, and that is not a Warrior Day problem. He has been asked to deal with this problem, and he is working on this situation.

**8. First Reading Item**

**a. 2/AS/12/UEPC- Resolution for Two Pass Registration System, CSU Stanislaus (Revised by UEPC 3/8/12)**

Foreman moved the following resolution and Strahm seconded.

***2/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot)  
California State University, Stanislaus***

***Be it Resolved:*** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve a two-pass registration system; and be it further

**Resolved:** That the two-pass registration system allow students to register for 9 units during the first round of registration, which shall include appointment times for individual students and last for approximately 10 days; and be it further

**Resolved:** That this first pass be followed immediately by a second, open registration period that shall continue for at least 15 business days and should continue until 11:59pm of the day before the first day of instruction. It is the intention of this resolution that all students be afforded an opportunity to register each semester for the normal limit of units, so they may make timely progress toward their degrees, and be it further

**Resolved:** That the registration priority change to reflect a new order by class level. Priority of registration is to be determined by units completed within class level in the following order: seniors, master's and credential students, juniors, sophomores, freshmen, and unclassified post baccalaureate students; and be it further

**Resolved:** That the two-pass registration system be effective beginning with Fall 2012 registration cycle and be used for one year, Academic Year 2012-13; and be it further  
**Resolved:** That a review be conducted following the registration cycle for Spring 2013 to evaluate 1) how effectively this two-pass registration system allows students to register for the courses they most need each semester in order make progress toward their degrees and 2) how well it allows administration to effectively manage enrollment.

**Rationale:** As our course offerings have become more limited and our student population has grown, the registration process has become more difficult for both students and administration. Students frequently are unable to enroll in courses they need as prerequisites to other courses, and students are often prevented from making progress toward their degrees as a result. Additionally, economic uncertainty has made it difficult for administration to manage enrollment, since we have seen significant fluctuation in the enrollment choices made by students whom we have accepted. A two-pass system would allow better management of enrollment. Using waitlists from the first pass allows colleges to offer more sections of courses in response to the demonstrated needs of students.

Much debate has gone into the choice between a 9 and a 12 unit first pass. We believe that at 9 units, students are more likely to sort themselves effectively into their top-choice courses and less likely to take up space in the wrong courses during the first pass. This policy will need to be widely advertised to ensure all students complete the second pass and sign up for all the available courses they need to make timely progress toward degree and secure complete financial aid.

The order of registration is also changed in this resolution. UEPC believes that the current registration order, which puts sophomores rather than freshmen last among regularly enrolled students, is unusual. The resolution would allow regularly-enrolled undergraduate students to register in reverse order of seniority.

*WF:rlc – UEPC approved 2/23/12*  
*SEC approved 3/6/12*  
*UEPC revised and approved 3/8/12*

Foreman said that we spoke about this at our last Senate meeting. It has not substantively changed, but we have selected 9 units which we believe will prioritize those 2 or 3 courses.

Strahm moved to a second reading because we've already worked on this last year. Seconded by Petrosky.

Gerson is opposed to a second reading because this is a change from last week's resolution, and she would like to bring this to her department. Her department is concerned about the 9 unit limit. It has been suggested by a couple of people in her department that 10 is a better number because with only 9 units, students can take a 4 unit biology class plus one more class and will be stuck at 7 units without the possibility of getting another class.

Espinoza said that they need to have a decision by tomorrow so they can prepare students.

Eudey noted just as a point of information that if the Senate passes this resolution today there is still a waiting period until the President reviews and signs it.

Espinoza asked if we can talk to the President to speed up the process of this resolution.

Eudey said that the waiting period is so the general faculty can have time to object to it.

Nagel asked what would be the latest date that this could be implemented for fall registration.

Espinoza said the sooner the better. It would be great to have it in place for processing.

Bolton encourages us not to proceed with a second reading because this has substantial impact on athletes, and we have to look at the impact. We surveyed our students and found that 69% of our students do enroll in classes they don't need in order to maintain eligibility. We have a lot of questions we need to have answered because our students need to remain eligible well before the semester starts.

Burroughs would like to see it moved to a second reading because we had a lot of conversations last year. This does not limit students to 9 units, just to enrolling in 9 units initially.

De Vries spoke in favor of not moving to a second reading. This is a curricular matter and not the same proposal as what we had last year. He is not comfortable not taking it back to his department.

Foreman would like to echo Burroughs comments; he thinks that this is similar to what we addressed last year.

Bolton noted that this does not solve the issue they are having in Athletics. He is not against a two-step system, but this does not solve their problem.

Results of the vote to move item to second reading, 28 yes, 11 no, 2 abstained. Resolution moved to a second reading.

Forman stated that after the UEPC met, a concern was brought to him that in the last resolved there is no deadline and no entity named to do the review. He moved the following sentence: *this review shall be undertaken jointly by the University Educational Policy Committee and the Vice President for Enrollment and Student Affairs and shall be completed by March 1, 2013.*

Espinoza asked if the resolution says that we were obligated to use the two-pass system, or that we would be forced to use it.

Foreman said that this would commit us for one year to use the two-pass system.

Speaker Stone asked if there were any objections to this friendly amendment. No objections offered so the amendment is approved

Mariam Salameh, ASI Director of Diversity, noted that she understands that each student is guaranteed 9 units, but she prefers to see the opportunity given for students to enroll for up to 12 units. She doesn't want to put this into effect if they can't get all 12 units.

Foreman noted that the third resolved mandates a second pass which starts immediately and lasts for at least three weeks. The intention is to give every student the opportunity to get a full course load.

McGhee stated that given our current system if you are the last person to enroll then you don't have a guarantee of one class, but this system gives everyone the chance to get the courses they need for graduation and a second chance to fill their schedule. In that 2nd pass, they can sign up for 18 or 20 units if they have authorization. He is concerned right now that athletes take 9 units of courses they don't need, and under this system they will get more of the courses they need.

Bolton asked how wait-listed classes are handled in this system.

Espinoza said that it's a little ambiguous. She asked Foreman if UEPC addressed that in the committee.

Foreman said that they asked if waitlists would count against units and Lisa Bernardo said no.

Espinoza said that with 9 unit waitlists become more problematic.

Bolton clarified that a student can enroll in 9 units and be waitlisted in an unlimited number of classes. Then we will still have a similar issue because classes will still be used as placeholders. Are freshman still being given a schedule.

Espinoza said that they will still be working with freshman students to prepare their schedules.

Gerson appreciates the careful wording and would like to suggest 10 units.

Foreman accepted this amendment as friendly and McGhee seconded.

Strahm noted that the feeling on UEPC is that this would provide the opportunity for one class and at least one other class.

McGhee said that for areas with 4 or 5 unit classes it would be very important to accommodate them to get 2 or 3 courses in the first round.

Nagel would like to know if anyone feels their students would be adversely affected by this resolution.

Shauna Keeler, ASI University Affairs Representative, said that if you are going to go with 10 units you might as well go with 12 units. The chances are evenly distributed, but there is nothing to say that those 9 units are going to be useful to your degree. She is a business major and feels that she can only get 1 class that she needs.

Bice is in support of moving to 10 units because our calculus courses are all 4 units, and we go through a lot of students trying to get into Calculus 1 and Calculus 2.

Foreman would like to address Shauna Keeler. A smaller number is better for your concerns because the reason you can't get into those classes is because students are taking those spots.

Keeler is still uneasy with it being only 9 units which are so much less than full time.

Bolton asked about just making it three courses instead of just units.

Foreman said that our first suggestion was 9 units plus a course, but it was not technically feasible.

Eudey noted that there is also the concern that some courses have 1 unit add-ons which are second courses, such as labs. She thinks that 10 is a good number because we have a lot of 4 unit or 5 unit courses. She thinks that very few students would be harmed by changing it to 10 units and some would be helped.

Ron Noble said that PeopleSoft is not smart enough to tell units from classes.

Sarraille said that PeopleSoft is a programming language and it can implement any rules. The programmers can put any rule into the system.

Espinoza said that we have to have the programmers who can do the work, and we don't have all the patches that other campuses have. We implemented a vanilla system. Every new patch requires the ability to upgrade our patches as well, so at the moment we are not there.

Speaker Stone clarified that we are still talking about 10 units.

Result of the vote to amend to 10 units, 39 yes, 2 no. The second resolved clause of the resolution now reads:

*Resolved: That the two-pass registration system allow students to register for 9 units during the first round of registration, which shall include appointment times for individual students and last for approximately 10 days; and be it further*

Marshall is not an expert on the two-pass registration system, but she has used the San Francisco State system and waiting lists do count. In San Francisco State you register for 9 units and if 3 units are on a waitlist then that counts. It seems like it would skew the second round. Someone might explain why it wouldn't count.

McGhee said that the waitlist is used when the class is full, so if a person is on the waitlist they are not getting their units. The purpose of a waitlist is to let a department be informed so they can open a new section.

Espinoza said that being on a wait list you're setting yourself up on the queue in the order of the class. We have to decide to allow students to have priority in the queue, and they get auto added if a spot becomes available.

De Vries said that to address the issue of the problem with wait lists is simple. For example, freshmen currently go last. Perhaps classes are filled up and the freshmen are last on the wait list, so they could find a whole bunch of courses they could add. The 2nd pass opens and the seniors would find themselves behind the freshman. That's the problem with the order of this; freshmen would enroll ahead of seniors. When queried about his feelings on this priority inversion, De Vries indicated his position was neutral.

Jaasma agrees that if we are going to allow waitlists they should be counted now. We shouldn't allow people who have more than 10 units.

Strahm said that if she recalls, waitlist do count for financial aid purposes.

Espinoza said that this is not true.

McGhee asked how many classes end up being waitlisted as a percentage. Espinoza is not sure, but probably about 40%

Gomula noted that in the Art Department all but 2 classes were waitlisted.

Jaasma said that the waitlist is set up currently that if the seat is open the first eligible person gets it, so if you are ineligible you get passed over.

Nagel noted that since this document is silent on waitlists, he would like to call the question. Seconded by Sarraille.

Results of the vote to end debate, 29 yes, 10 no, 2 abstained.  
Vote on the revised resolution, 38 yes, 4 no. The resolution passes and will be forwarded to the President for approval.

## **9. Discussion Item**

### **a. Tom Carter, Discussion of FTES Data Analysis**

Carter noted that over the years he has been interested in data analysis. After seeing the holistic program review process cranking up it occurred to him that people use data in different ways and interpret data in various ways. He thinks that Kim Tan brought to John Sarraille a document about SFR's and campus expenditures for instruction, and John gave it to Carter to review. Before he looked at it, he decided to look at the concerns. He first looked at the holistic program review charge and it seems like a lot has to do with faculty productivity and efficiency. He thought it would be interesting to explore some metrics of faculty efficiency and productivity and that leads to the classic metric which is SFR's.

He got this question in his head about how the computer views SFR's and what it means. The first three links are the three emails he sent out in the past week and a half. Below that is a bunch of links for data sources that are available and that he referred to and the places that you can find the data.

Suppose you want to advertise our campus as a good place to send your child. What sort of good things would you like to see for your students? First is a high number for instruction per student, SFR's, student services, recruiting etc. Time passes, and the budget is in a crisis mode. Does anyone have information about SFR's and budget per student? Should we use this data? His understanding is that this exact table was brought to UBAC a few years ago. Is this good data? That was the question he looked at. Look at these SFR numbers. They range from 21 for Bakersfield to 36 for Northridge. Northridge is close to double what Bakersfield is. Is that really the range? Where are the lazy faculty? Clearly, Stanislaus are slackers compared to Northridge. Where does this data come from and can we trust it?

There is an integrated postsecondary data system called IPEDS which is a federal data system which every campus in the US that offers any form of financial aid must submit any form of financial data to this system. That is how they qualify for financial aid. So in particular campuses will be careful for submitting correct data. So this is really just a view into the IPEDS database, from that story one would think this should be good data. There is big money in federal financial aid, so is this good data.

Carter showed the APDB database page.

This is a particular page (2007/2008) which has data drawn directly from PeopleSoft and summarized here. It has a per campus report. The first column is FTEF, the second is FTES, and the third is SFR. Let's look at the situation. This is the same year as the IPEDS data, so now what do we see. Stanislaus is at 23.11 and how does it fit into the overall pattern. First off, no one is near 36. The range is 20–24. Only Monterey Bay is higher than Stanislaus. So where are the lazy faculty? Where is there slack in the system? So, how can these two data sets be so very different from each other? We do take care in the IPEDS.

Angel Sanchez noted that a lot of IPEDS are different than our own definitions.

Carter said than we have a problem, which is the precise definition and the other is how we analyze and massage the data after. What is the definition of SFR? The number of students divided by faculty. How do we define students? One way is to take the total headcount of all students, just total students. Another way is just the total headcount of full-time students, but we just had a discussion about what is a full-time student. Do they take 12 units for financial aid purposes? For certain VA benefits 10 units is full time, or if we are doing a Fall snapshot 15 units, or maybe 12 or 13 on a 4–1–4 campus, or 7 units? If you pay full tuition at CSU, 7 units is full time. Any student taking 7 or more units pays full tuition.

Maybe we want an equivalency number for full time students. Take the total student credit hours and divide it by 30, which is how the Chancellor's office does it. If you are doing a semester you are doing 15 (Fall FTES). What if you are a 4–1–4 campus? Shouldn't it have been 13 for fall, 4 for the winter, and 13 for the spring? Another way to do it is full time head count plus a third of the part time head count. So you don't look at the units, just part-time status.

So that's the student part, what about the faculty? Is it the total head count of all faculty full and part time? Full time only? Full time faculty plus total wtu's of part time faculty? A gnarly calculation based on direct instruction teaching load is what the Chancellor's office uses for the ATDP.

It turns out that the IPEDs thing doesn't look at how many credits the students are taking. For students they are limiting the table to only undergraduate and headcount of full time undergraduates plus 1/3 of part time undergraduates. The denominator is headcount of full-time faculty. As you saw from the other table, the real SFR for the CSU is pretty constant in terms of direct instruction. Faculty teach classes at about the same rate across the campus, so why are these numbers so widely varying. Do we have an inverse variate? Look at the percent of full-time faculty, which is inversely related to SFR. Why are Stanislaus and Bakersfield so high for full-time faculty? If you are in an urban area it is easier to hire faculty, and in rural areas it is harder to retain faculty. The IPEDS SFRs don't really tell us much about the teaching or efficiency or anything. So the variance of the SFR is almost entirely the variance of the FTEF percentage. So how do we do effective data analysis? It's a nontrivial exercise to dig in there and disambiguate this.

San Marcos has an interesting subcommittee. It's the Data Reconciliation and Analysis Subcommittee. Their job is sorting this stuff out. "There is a committee of people who are charged with looking at "Student Faculty Ratio and Related Issues."

Let's look at the information Carter has collected. He has emails and a variety of relevant resources that you can look at, and one of those is the APDB, which is a regularly maintained database that has consolidated information across campuses. It has information on a per-discipline bases.

Carter showed the APDB slide 2007–2011.

This is direct from the APDB for our campus. These are fall snapshots of data for our campus. This shows the average class size, SFR, FTES actual FTES target, net budget, and FTEF. He normalized everything to 2007. As we move across each successive data point it shows the deviation from 2007. Our average class size went up 9% in 2008. Between 2007 and 2011 our average class size went up by 25%. Our SFR also went up 25%. Our FTEF is down by 15% over that same time period. So this is just a quick snapshot picture of how our campus has changed. You can see things like what a disaster 2009 was. We knew that. It's not a surprise to anyone here. Now comes the question, is this a fair way to present the data? That's another piece of this data analysis and usage question.

So, is 2007 a good year to start this? What would it look like if he started, because remember every single data point has the 2007 value as it denominator, so what would it look like if we went back to 2005. Was 2007 an anomalous year that skewed the data set? Why did I pick 2007?

Carter noted that 2008 was the crash, so he bracketed things. 2007 was a very low year for average class size, so by picking 2007 he is picking a small denominator for class size, so it makes the change look dramatic. If one is picking a way to visualize data, are you likely to pick data which supports your arguments? He's got the plausibility of 5 years and it brackets the crunch. How many of us do this? How many of us choose the most dramatic data? What reviewer will challenge that?

Another kind of choice is how many years do we show? Carter mentioned that a number of small classes are not on here, but he observed that the number of small classes is way down. Why didn't he include it, because it messes up the scale. Notice that it would have the effect of compressing the scale.

Speaker Stone thanked Tom Carter for his presentation. Applause.

Carter encourages us to look at the information at this link.  
<http://csustan.csustan.edu/~tom/admin/budgets/data-analysis.html>

## **10. Open Forum**

## **11. Adjournment** 4:03pm