

**Academic Senate
November 10, 2015**

Present: Azevedo, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Garcia, Garone, Gerson, Gonzales, Guichard, Hoover, Larson, Loza, Manrique, McCulley, Miller-Antonio, Park, Nagel, Odeh Oluwarotimi, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Ringstad, Sarraille, Sims, Strangfeld, Strickland, Provost Strong, Stone, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wood, Young, Wellman and Zhang.

Excused: Advanced Studies, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Chan, Crayton, Filling, and Huang.

Proxies: Alison McNally for Ellen Bell.

Guests: John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Oddmund Myhre, Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Betsy Eudey, Lauren Byerly, Nan Austin from the Mod Bee and several more PACE students

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Second Reading Item:
13/AS/15/UEPC Baccalaureate Goals and Outcomes. Will return as a second reading item. Passed.

First Reading Item:
15/AS/15/UEPC Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System. Will return as a second reading item.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
December 8, 2015
2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:
Chris Nagel, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:04pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 27, 2015 (distributed electronically)

Approved.

4. Introductions

John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Oddmund Myhre, Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Betsy Eudey, Lauren Byerly, Nan Austin from the Mod Bee and several more PACE students.

5. Announcements

Gerson announced that in conjunction with international education week, FCETL will host a panel for faculty abroad. 5 faculty will be talking about their experiences. Wednesday, 18 November 12:30 to 2pm FDC 118.

Alvim distributed brochures for the minor in Portuguese offered by the Department of Philosophy & Modern Languages.

Byerly announced the Friday night Music Department opera scenes recital.

Chan noted a piano recital and master class Wednesday, 18 November, 1:30 to 3:30pm.

Speaker Thompson announced that recommendations from CIPSP were moving forward.

Provost explained it was being sent forward to the President, and that a memo would be forthcoming detailing responses to suggestions from senate.

Thompson announced that faculty status in Counseling Services continues to be discussed with the President.

PACE discussions are continuing. PACE students met with SEC and SEC has suggested that a group be established to work on moving this forward.

The Advising Task Force report will come out soon and should be an information item on the next senate agenda.

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)

FAC: Sims reported FAC is continuing to work on same items mentioned last time: gathering info about faculty status to provide to senate; concluding draft on EO 1096 for campus policy statement; college and department structure, with regard to department/program chairs/ coordinators/directors, to resolve inconsistency in practice. An additional item on the FAC agenda is establishing a discussion forum to replace Facnet.

FBAC: Peterson noted that they are continuing to discuss budget priorities. Guest from PACE discussed the value of the program with FBAC; they hope to have a resolution to present to senate later this semester.

GC: Ringstad reported that GC has been working on graduate learning goals, revising language to bring to senate. GC is also considering APR timeline revisions and catalog language related to culminating assignments. They also continued discussion of a centralized location for graduate education and a staff position. Upcoming is discussion of funding and policy regarding TA's and GA's, and fee waivers.

SWAS: Strahm announced that SWAS passed 7 resolutions. One called for suspension of CSU background policy Lamb, VC for HR acknowledged that background checks and criminal checks unfairly target people of color. A resolution passed supporting the addition of a retired faculty member of the BoT. Another resolution commended CSU system for support budget plan, recognizing that the CSU fiscal needs are greater than as represented in the governor's budget plan—including the need for more than a 2% increase in the faculty payroll pool. A resolution passed unanimously reaffirming the need for open presidential searches. 21 of 23 campuses had all approved similar resolutions. Finally, SWAS passed a resolution calling for establishing a task force regarding GE requirements for mathematics and quantitative reasoning, in response to a comment from the Chancellor that faculty are “one of many stakeholders.” SWAS reminded the Chancellor that the faculty are the primary stakeholders in the curriculum.

The Speaker noted that when we passed our resolution on presidential search transparency our vote was 38 to 1.

UEPC: Stone said UEPC will begin discussion of non-tenured track faculty in UEPC. Questionnaire is out to the standing committees about membership and voting rights.

Wood reported that the campus safety committee met. Two items were discussed. OIT came to talk about assessment needs and how to improve cell-phone reception in MSR. According to that report, it will cost \$200 to \$300K to improve the reception in a number of buildings. Secondly, OIT asserted the need to hire an information security officer to develop a formal policy for dealing with sensitive documents, including discarding them.

Sarraille noted that there are phones hanging on the wall in some buildings that are not in working order. Those phones should be maintained. He mentioned in particular the phone across the hall from DBH 100.

7. Information Item:

a. Student Success and Completion Initiatives Plan

Thompson stated he appreciated the remark in the cover memo regarding the importance of consultation.

Provost noted that in late July or August the campus received a charge from the CO to complete the student success plan based on six initiatives in BoT 2014 budget. The university was budgeted \$800k in based funding to make progress on those six. The program provided a short timeline to come up with a plan to submit to CO, due August. Provost plans to have at least three open forums, will talk to SEC and other groups more as the admin operationalizes a plan. University plan has been accepted by the CO, but it is sufficiently broad that it needs some additional operationalization.

Espinoza highlighted the six areas that are generally outlined. The greatest share of funding appropriated went to tenure-track faculty hiring. Second is advising; third is to address bottleneck courses; fourth is student preparation, and given work in early start, university is well-positioned; fifth relates to high-impact practices, and some things in advising spill over into high-impact practices; sixth is data-driven decision making, and the admin hopes to improve advising by purchasing software systems for advising.

Provost pointed out the distribution of funding across six priorities mirrors CO funding ratios, except in preparation, where the university had sufficient budget in that area.

This is base budget funding, so until base budget is cut, the funding is present.

Sims asked, regarding initiative 2, about hiring additional academic advisers, what it means.

Espinoza replied that one issue in the report on advising will note the issue of capacity of the institution and being short-staffed.

Sims asked for clarification if these would be advisers working in MSR?

Espinoza said that was one type, but other supporting in departments.

Sims asked if the funding could also pay for assigned time for faculty to advising.

Espinoza replied this is an initial allocation.

Sims asked if the point in the plan meant hiring new staff in advising.

Provost explained that it was to increase number of academic advisers in the ARC.

Sarraille asked what is ARC. What category of employee? Is it unit 4?

Espinoza replied she believed it was.

A PACE student asked whether the PACE mission statement and its advising objectives are similar to what is in the plan.

Garone asked about initiative 1, first, how closely it is linked to bullet point p2 which says hire key faculty... Are these the faculty to be targeted? How will this process be put into place? How will it be decided which departments will have the new hires? By whom?

Provost replied that there is a connection, that replacement hiring is also part of it, and that he asked the chairs for information about faculty that would meet that initiative. There could be about 8 faculty that hired based on initiative #1.

Strahm asked the meaning of the second bullet, p3, "affinity groups."

Provost stated that there is a well-developed literature stating that students in affinity groups have higher retention and graduation rates; the university has done this already, and want to continue this practice.

Espinoza stated it would be great to have affinity groups so that incoming students could choose one based on major or career interest. The program was modeled on a recommendation from a consultant that came to campus last year. It is a model from U of Texas, where students are assigned to an affinity group.

A PACE student asked if the affinity groups could be named.

Provost listed STEM grant, Housing and the Faculty Mentor Program. Espinoza added the Honors program.

A PACE student reported that in fall 2014 a study of PACE 2011 fresh cohort, 92% of Hispanic students vs. 78% persisted. 79% in PACE cohort persisted to 4th year compared to 61% in non-PACE. In both instances, this was a statistically significant difference.

Speaker Thompson asked if the administration sees PACE as an affinity group and are PACE practices to be funded by that \$809K?

Provost said that PACE is an affinity group, and that the practices from PACE that work well are among those that the plan would put forward. There are many good results from PACE, but this is also true about STEM, faculty mentor, supplemental instruction, and other programs. Almost all of those have had positive impact. It is necessary to look at all activities that have improved student success and consider how best to allocate resources for those activities. This is a plan, a starting point, and the details are being filled in.

Sims asked about initiative 3, the bottleneck solutions initiative that overlaps with initiative 6. This involves hiring an analyst. Is this a new position? Is it a college or university based position?

Provost replied it is a new position and would be in the provost's office.

Sims asked how that relates to improving course scheduling.

Provost replied that hiring an analyst is one step, and another is hiring someone for scheduling. The first task is to look at the schedule in integrative fashion. Current practice is departments build schedules, without as much integration across the entire schedule. Most CSU campuses have someone in the provost's office that looks at the schedule from the broadest perspective to see how the pieces fit together, especially in GE, so that the schedule best meets student need and demand and best utilizes university resources. We need to improve scheduling, building schedule, and we can't do that without an additional staff person and some additional tools for scheduling and budgeting. These tools would permit departments to reach FTES targets and balance assigned time

Sarraille said what the provost outlined sounded complicated and vague. Is this coming from below up, and a synthesis of needs that have been expressed at department and dean level, or is this something top-down?

Espinoza replied that these recommendations came from analysis of student comments and concerns.

Sarraille queried if students were asking for better software and a person to be hired for management of the schedule, or asking for better availability of courses?

Espinoza said the student comments were about conflicts.

Sarraille asked if it occurred to the admin that increasing the resources might improve the situation?

Provost replied that the university had increased resources. This is a response to department demand for managing assigned time while hitting an FTES target in a given budget and make trade-offs. This requires tools to make this possible.

Sims asked a follow up on initiative 3. How will support for course redesign address bottlenecks?

Provost replied that one driver for bottlenecks is high D, W, F rates. CO has initiative to improve pedagogy and student engagement in courses that will improve D, W, F rates.

Sims asked what it would mean: how does redesigning the course achieve this?

Jaasma stated that some faculty have been funded for course redesign by CO, for instance, course pre-lab to prepare students for lab; kinesiology funded purchase of instrument used in the field. The aim is getting more students through successfully so they don't have to take the course over again. The idea is to get students to pass on first attempt.

Gerson said she thinks the idea is to get students to pass the course in the first round.

Speaker Thompson asked, regarding initiative 2, enhanced advising, whether all of the bullets listed are in line with advising task force recommendations, or come from them?

Espinoza replied that the report was being written at the same time as finalizing the advising report, so some are but some are not.

Provost asserted that they are definitely in line. Some are, some are not, but overall they are. He went on to discuss improving scheduling, that this has to do with software that students use to match scheduling to their own personal and work lives.

Jaasma: We are looking at adopting schedule planning software to help students complete their schedule and to plan their future at the university, and that the university could use to map future course needs.

A PACE student asked if the idea behind advising is to allow the students to work and take classes. The major need is for course availability. Majoring in Kinesiology, he still hasn't taken anatomy. It's always waitlisted. The problem is the amount of courses offered.

Espinoza stated that there are multiple problems. One is that sciences are a critical area, where the university has had difficulty finding a faculty member for anatomy.

Sarraille stated that an overriding principle of scheduling is that it is easier to schedule if you have more resources. Instead, the principle that appears to be followed is reducing available resources to the least possible. It's not an obscenity to have additional resources. In fact it is a necessity.

Tuedio said that (scheduling consultant) Ad Astra made it clear that the university has become too efficient in compact course delivery. 95% of classes are at their capacity. They are saying that the healthy range is more like 80%. With more breathing room in the schedule, students will have more flexibility. That is about number of sections, and for that we need classrooms and time modules. Sarraille is right that the basic need is for class sections. The software the university is thinking of buying, to measure demand, is a tool to help determine pent up demand for certain areas, based on information in student transcripts, to know what faculty to hire.

Provost agreed that the university needs the right schedule, and the university is under-scheduling. For upper division major courses we had 17% capacity. For lower division GE the schedule is too tight. The course scheduler will be helping us put resources where we need to maintain an assertive growth strategy, because that will bring additional resources to the campus to help us scale up. It's about getting it right, not about making it smaller. We've had budgetary challenges for years now. This position will help us to justify having a schedule that the students need.

Speaker Thompson stated that the senate will continue this as a discussion item at the next meeting.

8. First Reading Item:

a. 15/AS/15/UEPC Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System

Stone moved and seconded by Strahm.

**15/AS/15/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System
California State University, Stanislaus**

Be it resolved: That the Two-Pass Registration System be continued; and be it further

Resolved: The Two-Pass Registration System allows students to register for 12 units during the first pass registration and includes appointment times for individual students; and be it further

Resolved: The first pass priority registration will be followed by a second pass priority registration period that includes appointment times for all eligible individual students, to be followed by an open registration period; and be it further

Resolved: A joint review by the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) and the Vice President of Enrollment and Student Affairs will be conducted during Fall 2020.

Rationale: The UEPC recommends continuing the Two-Pass Registration System as it is currently implemented. Based on the review of available data on the Two-Pass Registration System, there is no evidence to suggest that any group of students is systematically

disadvantaged by the current Two-Pass Registration System. The data do not suggest any relative disadvantage for students based on their registration priority. Registration priority is based on classification and number of units. While individual students may experience challenges in adjusting their personal, work, and academic schedules to accommodate course availability, there are no groups of students who are systematically disadvantaged by the Two-Pass Registration System. It was the consensus of the UEPC that enough data has been collected to respond to President Sheley's concern: Are freshmen and sophomores, even if satisfied, disadvantaged by the current system? There is no indication that freshmen or sophomores are disadvantaged. There is no indication that upper classmen are making seats unavailable to lower classmen. The data show that with the exception of Biology, there are open seats in all GE areas after the open registration period. Further analysis also shows open seats in major's courses. Due to changing conditions in both enrollment and budget, the Two-Pass Registration System Policy will be reviewed in 2020 to determine if student needs are being met.

**15/AS/15/UEPC – Two-Pass Registration System Policy
California State University, Stanislaus**

The Two-Pass Registration System allows students to register for 12 units during the first pass of registration, which will include appointment times for individual students. The first pass priority registration will be followed by a second pass priority registration period that includes appointment times for all eligible individual students, to be followed by an open registration period. A joint review by the University Educational Policies Committee and the Vice President of Enrollment and Student Affairs will be conducted during Fall 2020 to determine if student needs are being met.

For reference, here is the former policy and resolution:

**9/AS/14/UEPC – Two-Pass Registration System
California State University, Stanislaus**

The two-pass priority registration allows students to register for 12 units during the first round of registration, which will include appointment times for individual students. During the first pass, all eligible students will be given an appointment to register for classes. The first-pass priority registration will be followed by a second-pass priority registration period, to be followed by an open registration period. The two-pass registration system will apply to 2014-15 and 2015-16 Academic Years. Prior to registration for fall term 2016, a joint review will be conducted by the UEPC and Vice President of Enrollment and Student Affairs.

Approved by UEPC 8/28/14

Approved by the Academic Senate on 9/9/14

Approved by President Joseph F. Sheley on 9/26/14

**9/AS/14/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System
California State University, Stanislaus**

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the Two-Pass Registration System; and be it further

Resolved: That the Two-Pass Registration System be effective for the Spring 2015 through Spring 2016 registration cycles; and be it further

Resolved: That due to the constantly changing conditions in both enrollment and budget, the Two-Pass Registration System Policy will be reviewed prior to the Fall 2016 registration cycle to determine if student needs are being met.

Rationale: The Two-Pass Registration System was approved as a one-year pilot for Spring and Fall 2014. President Sheley signed the revised two-pass resolution on October 25, 2013, but indicated that it would only apply to two registration cycles (for Spring and Fall 2014). President Sheley also requested that a joint review of the two cycles be undertaken by the UEPC and the VPESF by December 31, 2014. The review was conducted to evaluate how well the system allowed students to register for the courses they need most to make progress towards their degrees and to allow administration to effectively manage enrollment. Results of the review conducted for Spring 2014, prepared by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), showed that a large majority of students who responded were satisfied with registering with 12 units in the first pass (Q#16) and preferred priority registration during both passes (Q#17).

Approved by UEPC 8/28/14

Approved by the Academic Senate on 9/9/14

Approved by President Joseph F. Sheley on 9/26/14

Stone said UEPC has conducted analysis of current two-pass system, and input from Espinoza and Strong, and all concur that current system works, and should continue. This new resolution calls for joint review in 2020, to make sure it continues to work.

Strahm said she did not want to go back to the mess we had before, and asked if there is a timeliness issue.

Stone replied there is no rush.

This will be a second reading at the December 8th Senate meeting.

9. Second Reading Item:

a. 13/AS/15/UEPC Baccalaureate Goals and Outcomes

In response to Strahm and Garone about adding language relating to local issues, UEPC thinks that the words diverse and global are sufficient and left it as is.

Motion carries 35 yes 1 no. Resolution Passes.

10. Discussion Items:

a. Protection of Minors policy

Shimek noted these are in draft form, and are brought for comments and suggestions for revision. Thompson noted that, per Shimek last senate, some of these are consolidations of policy, and are here for senate to weigh in on or take action in response. Thompson asked if meet and confer has taken place.

Shimek replied on second round of meet and confer. Current drafts reflect many comments received during the first round. Protocol is, to extent comments are made in meet and confer, and policies revised, the revised versions will come before the senate.

Speaker Thompson noted, regarding the definition of minor, that a person can be younger than 18, but enrolled as a student, would not be considered a minor. Shimek replied in general that's the case; however, there can be an occasion that the individual may find themselves with an allegation of abuse and we'd have to handle that.

Thompson asked about definition of "authorized adult," about which the policy states that such can only be designated by the president. How does that work in reality?

Shimek: The designation is not directly from the president. He envisions working with the deans and vice presidents regarding programs that include minors.

Strahm said that the definition of minor is confusing; because of the way a person enrolled in the university and at a high school could be defined.

Sarraille made the remark that if the documents are in a form that is not searchable; it makes them hard to work with. If it could be sent in a form that permitted searching, or changing wording, that would permit making suggestions. Too often they are pictures of documents that are not very user-friendly. Thompson agreed; he could not simply add page numbers.

Espinoza said the complication will be that we often have students on campus under 18. The intent is not to complicate interactions related to classroom instruction. It is intended for programs that bring in individuals that are not students.

Strahm clarified that an enrolled student under 18 would not be a minor.

Stone wondered how this will affect Service Learning that involves grade school children.

Shimek replied that he assumes that programs that involve minors would go through a process to authorize people, that wouldn't be complicated. He said he would like to come up with a simple, efficient process that would not deter faculty from such programs.

Stone remarked that it's already a lot of work to get the program going.

Gerson said she is on the cusp of deciding about a service learning project. Her students who would host the project are uncomfortable if the parents are in the class with them, plus there is insufficient space. If the students are all supervising minors then she'd be supervising those supervising minors.

Shimek suggested meeting with those with such programs to walk through what needs to be done.

Thompson reminded that the goal is for specific feedback on the policy.

b. Drug-free Campus and Workplace policy

Strahm offered a short version of her response to the policy. If we have someone that falls down a lot or has a chronic illness we help that person get their health needs without sanctions. When we consider drug-related issues, they are not treated quite as much as health problems. People may use drugs due to a need and it is a health care issue and mental issue. We don't have enough help on this campus to help students much less a faculty member. We are going to sanction faculty, students, staff and even administrators may have pain in their lives and she's concerned about what seems like zero support for staff that may feel the need to use drugs.

Shimek replied that this was a difficult and complicated issue. The first effort is to reach out to the employee to help, through medical care, EAP. It is not to initiate disciplinary action. It's how we respond to the cases you identify. He would not suggest that we have enough staff to assist in this but through EAP (Employee Assistance Program) we in fact have handled many cases on this campus proactively.

Sims asked if the university is compelled to follow federal law as a campus and as a system. One gap is that in the state of California for almost 20 years marijuana has been used legally for medical reasons. If a student in the dorm with a license for medical marijuana is using it, are we compelled to go with federal law, or can we go with state law?

Shimek replied that as an institution that receives federal funds, we are in fact required to follow federal law in this policy. This is an issue in which federal law may in fact trump state of California law.

Tiemann-Gonzalez asked if we do have cases of students using, and if they are not allowed to have it in the dorms.

Noble replied that this is written into their housing contracts. They can't possess or use it in the dorms.

Guichard noted that, unlike the protection of minor's policy, which talks about mandated reporting, she saw nothing in the drug policy about anyone being a mandated reporter. Is it correct that we would not be under that obligation?

Shimek replied that there is no requirement for mandated reporting. It becomes a matter of judgment and your option of talking to them or contacting someone in Counseling, but nothing that mandates. There is an obligation on our parts to look out for our staff, faculty and students.

Garcia reminded the senate that this is an institution of higher learning, and of restorative justice principles. We've become a society that throws people away. If a thinker concerned about restorative justice had an opportunity of writing the section of the policy on accountability and sanctions, Garcia suspected that it would look a lot different.

Espinoza added that the Health Center is also a resource to faculty, staff and students.

Strahm replied that she wouldn't refer students there because of privacy concerns. She asked what the process is that HR goes through. Is there some way to meld that into this policy? We cannot guarantee that future VP FA/HR will be reasonable in the way Shimek is, so we need it written into the policy. Could the first set of policy be first responses? Could there be a flow chart for the next people?

Shimek replied that was a good point, and noted that under accountability and sanctions, there may well be a place to put something in that adds to the discussion of referral.

Garone asserted that in approximately a year California will likely legalize marijuana. In that case, how will we be defining "substance abuse" problems? If, 13 months from now, students come to class high, does that in itself mean they are "abusing a substance"? If we had students coming to campus high and they got high off campus what would campus personnel be expected to do?

Shimek replied that the administration is already thinking about it and he's in conversations on how to deal with that issue.

Larson asked about VII A 2. Is the sanction of being placed on probation to follow after the student would be referred to police, or would this be internal? What does probation mean?

Shimek referred to Jill Tiemann-Gonzalez, who stated it would be disciplinary probation.

Sarraille asked about legal drugs: there are things people do to harm themselves with drugs that are legal. This policy wouldn't cover that, correct? And for those cases, would the university deal with that as people just generally harming themselves?

Shimek noted that was a legitimate point to address.

Wellman asked, because this is dealing with accountability and sanctions, about section VII B 1— discipline up to and including dismissal. What kind of evidence would be sought? Would it be through searches? Drug testing?

Shimek said it could be any of those. A trained investigator would build evidence to support an action the administration would take.

Wellman who would be handling the violation? UPD or a third party?

Shimek noted he has accessible to him several trained attorneys and can attain a trained investigator.

Wellman asked, what if the drug is legal but affecting the person's performance?

Shimek responded that the university would find authoritative medical experts who could determine what was abuse of legal drugs.

Wellman asked if a faculty member teaches online or if staff are telecommuting, how will this policy apply. In other words, how would it apply to doing university work not on the physical campus?

Shimek replied that is a good question and it would have to do with what had occurred that might seem to be a violation of policy.

Provost asked if the policy was limited to illegal drugs or also covers legal prescription drugs.

Shimek recalled that under federal law and the EO, legal drugs are included, but it will have to determine where they would fit.

Wood followed up Wellman with the hypothetical of a faculty member smoking weed while responding to university email or uploading something to Blackboard, would that lead to some kind of investigation?

Shimek said he would hope those who administer the policy would use good judgment whether something rises to the level that it is covered by the policy. Another example could be someone working on the weekend and sending email. He won't define "way out" cases. Will have to use reasoned judgment if some activity is covered.

Will continue discussion at the next Senate meeting.

c. Time, Place and Manner of Free Expression policy

Deferred.

d. Use of Unmanned Aircraft policy

Deferred.

11. Open Forum

PACE Student Ingrid Saavedra statement.

Generational Status and College Achievement

Because of increasing diversity in college and university systems, there is a growing concern for the identification of underrepresented groups who may be at risk of poor academic performance. This is true for first generation students who have displayed more difficulties academically when compared to continuing generation students (Aspelmeier et al., 2012). Consequently, generational status will be the main focus of this study, in relation to other variables which previous research has deemed relevant.

Comparative studies have demonstrated unique difficulties that first generation students likely encounter both in being admitted into college and actually staying in college. Bui (2002) gave insight into some of these unique factors which included: belonging to ethnic minorities, coming from a lower socioeconomic background, and speaking a language other than English at home. Bui also reported that first generation high school students had lower SAT scores on average. These lower scores are concerning, especially if they carry over to college academic performances. Despite this alarming pattern, Ruthig, Haynes, Perry, and Chipperfield (2007) reported optimistically biased students had better GPA's, which lead the authors to believe that self-perception might buffer the negative effects of poor GPA related to first generation status. Furthermore, Wang and Castaneda-Sound's (2008) study noted that first generation students not only had lower levels of self-efficacy than continuing generation students, but also experienced more stress related to low social support. Taking previous research into consideration, the authors examined generational status in relation to social support, self-efficacy, and self-perception of success.

Generational Status

Generational status refers to whether a college student falls under the category of first generation or continuing generation. The federal definition as outlined by the Higher Education Act of 1965 recognizes a first generation student as being an individual whose parent(s) did not receive a baccalaureate degree. For the purpose of this study, a continuing generation student is an individual who has at least one parent who has received a baccalaureate degree. Past literature (De Freitas & Rinn, 2013; Vuong, Brown-Welty, & Tracz, 2010) has also referred to continuing generation students as non-first generation students or second generation students when referring to the exact number of generations which have passed with parents completing a baccalaureate degree. However, in this study, the term continuing generation will encompass all students who are not considered to be first generation. Although there are variations in these definitions (Billson & Terry, 1982; Hertel, 2002), we have used the federal definition because it is parsimonious and is widely used in the academic arena (for scholarship and program eligibility).

Social Support

Social support is the extent to which an individual perceives receiving various types of support including tangible support, appraisal, and belonging. This is measured with the Interpersonal Support Evaluation Survey (ISEL) which has been used for its reliability and validity in culturally diverse populations as demonstrated by Merz, Roesch, Malcarne, Penedo, Llabre, Weitzman, and Gallo (2014). Cohen, Kamarck, and Mermelstein (1985), the creators of ISEL, found that social support has been found to act as a buffer to stress. Thus, social support is an area of importance when looking at college student populations who may experience unique stressors.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to accomplish a task or goal. According to Bandura (1977) self-efficacy comes from mastery of experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and reduction of stress reactions. Having theorized a comprehensive, behaviorist self-efficacy model, Bandura believed that self-efficacy was learned, much like an individual's self-perceptions.

Self-perception of Success

Self-perception of success is an individual's attitude or emotion toward their success based on inferences from their own behaviors and circumstances. Similar to Bandura's Theory of Self-Efficacy, Bem's (1972) theory of self-perception is a behaviorist theory. Bem found that an individual's personal state or belief towards themselves is just as interpretable by them, as by an outside observer. For this reason, individuals can erroneously judge their own circumstances in the same way that an outside observer could. In the present study, we will be applying Bem's self-perception theory to the self-perception of success.

Hypothesis and Rationale

Taking previous research into consideration, we hypothesized that first generation college students would perceive being less academically successful, have lower levels of self-efficacy,

and receive less social support than continuing generation college students. Skinner (1953) mentions that an individual cannot identify something in themselves until they are trained to do so by reinforcers and punishers in their environments. Because both self-perception and self-efficacy are learned and “trained”, they may be incorrect and cause negative repercussions such as poor academic achievement in college. For example, Patall et al. (2014) found that perceived academic potential had a positive relation with academic outcome. Similar to our hypothesis regarding first generation students having lower levels of perceived success, Vuong et al. (2010) found that negative beliefs regarding college experience affected first generation students who were academically outperformed by continuing generation students. Although past research has demonstrated academic beliefs affecting academic performance, previous research did not assess college students’ perceptions of what academic success is to them. The present study will delve into this and compare results to first and continuing generation students.

Supported by Wang & Castaneda-Sound’s (2008) study, we hypothesized that first generation students would have lower levels of self-efficacy than continuing generation students. Vuong et al. (2010) also found that in all students’ (first and continuing generation) self-efficacy had an effect on GPA. This meant that when a student exhibited lower self-efficacy, they were more apt to have a lower GPA than individuals with higher self-efficacy.

We also hypothesized that first generation students would perceive having lower levels of social support due to difficulties their support group might have in empathizing with the college experience. Students whose parents did not receive an education received less familial support than those whose parents did (Bartels, 1995; Billson & Brooks-Terry, 1982). Furthermore, Dennis, Phinney, and Chuateco (2005) found that poor GPA was related to lack of social support in first generation students. Witkow and Fuligni’s (2011) findings demonstrated that high school students who received high levels of social support in the form of encouragement actually finished college prep classes and were more likely to go on to a university. Because social support has had such a profound effect on students, just as self-efficacy, it is of importance to find if these factors are correlated as well. These topics are of particular importance because they can lead to tailored interventions towards at-risk college groups in the future.

PACE provides this type of support. Why is it not worth saving as this aligns?

Samuel Mendoza, PACE student said that Provost Strong stated in the meeting about PACE that there was a plan for an exit strategy for PACE. Why did forming an exit strategy take this long? This is the 6th year and it should have come up about 3 years ago. The plan for student success initiatives correspond to PACE program. During the meeting, Espinoza said PACE was a successful program. Then there should be PACE 1.0 and 2.0. They would like to continue it and open it to other students but instead they want to see best practices kept. PACE works side by side with the CSU Stanislaus mission. PACE is doing all the right things for student success. PACE wants to remain a community. The community of first generation students is what makes the program strong.

PACE

Our Mission

Program for Academic & Career Excellence (PACE) is consistent with the university's mission of creating a learning environment, which encourages expansion of intellectual, creative, and social horizons. Our mission is to ensure that all students regardless of individual differences acquire the self-knowledge, educational, occupational, and career development competencies needed to make self-directed, realistic, and responsible decisions. We are committed to individual uniqueness, an understanding of multicultural diversity, the development of human potential, and a passion for life-long learning.

CSU Mission

The faculty, staff, administrators, and students of Stanislaus State are committed to creating a learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative, and social horizons. We challenge one another to realize our potential, to appreciate and contribute to the enrichment of our diverse community, and to develop a passion for lifelong learning. To facilitate this mission, we promote academic excellence in the teaching and scholarly activities of our faculty, encourage personalized student learning, foster interactions and partnerships with our surrounding communities, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and artistic enrichment of the region.

To achieve our mission and vision:

We inspire all members of the campus community to demand more of self than we do of others to attain new knowledge and challenge assumptions. We challenge one another to be fully engaged, responsible citizens with the ethics, knowledge, skills, and desire to improve self and community.

We value learning that encompasses lifelong exploration and discovery through intellectual integrity, personal responsibility, global and self-awareness, grounded in individual student-faculty interactions.

We are a student-centered community committed to a diverse, caring, learning-focused environment that fosters collegial, reflective and open exchange of ideas.

We, as students, create the collegiate experience through initiative, participation, motivation, and continual growth to meet the demands of self and others.

We, as faculty, elicit, nurture, and enhance the different voices of ourselves, students and communities through deliberate engagement, continual discovery and ongoing transformation.

We, as staff and administrators, contribute to the learning environment by demonstrating the knowledge, skills and values that serve and support the University's mission.

Strangfeld commented that other groups that are affinity groups are not on the chopping block, as is PACE, and that speaks volumes.

Strong said he never said the admin was planning an exit strategy, but instead a transition plan. PACE was funded by federal funds and the challenge for the university is to allocate funds to many such programs for the benefit of all the students. He's particularly concerned about the STEM grant that has been very successful, sending students to conferences to observe their peers presenting research. That grant is also running out of funds as well and all other student success plans. The issue is resource allocation. PACE has been a successful program but the challenge is that we don't have the federal funding and need to find best ways to utilize best practices of PACE. The administration will have a transition plan at the end of the semester. There are other programs and students that are impacted by the decisions he'll make regarding PACE.

Speaker Thompson thanked the students for coming. He was talking to his daughter about academic grit and it does show some grit for the PACE students returning.

A PACE student said that the assertion that we don't have a lot of resources on our campus is wrong; the issue is that the funds are not allocated properly. His PACE experience has been great. A couple of years later he sees smiles on people faces. He mentioned a student's concern about his brother coming to campus, and he wished that PACE program will be here for him.

Shimek asked that faculty send him questions on the two remaining policies.

12. Adjournment

4pm