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Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:00pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved as distributed.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of August 26, 2014 (distributed electronically)** Approved as distributed.
2. **Introductions**

The following guests were welcomed:

James Tuedio, Oddmund Myhre, John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, Reza Kamali, David Lindsay, John Sarraille, Marvin Hooker, and Tim Held.

1. **Announcements**

Sarraille said that the CFA reached a tentative agreement with CSU management. The agreement requires a ratification vote by the membership which CFA hopes to run in the first week of November. There will be two information sessions planned for next week on Wednesday and Thursday from 11-12 in South Dining, and he will be there to present details of the tentative agreement and answer questions. Sarraille will be on hand Wed with other officers, and Filling will be there on Thursday. Challenging questions should be held until Thursday when Filling is present. More details to follow.

Petrosky said Nagel forwarded him information that outlines a new college ranking system called the Social Mobility Index. The purpose is to “highlight schools that do the best jobs helping disadvantaged students using criteria such as the tuition and salary of graduates. Free of crushing debt.” CSU Stanislaus was ranked as #10 in the nation, with Harvard and Yale near the bottom of the list. Applause.

Regalado asked with elections coming up he’s wondering if the Union has endorsed any local candidates. Sarraille said they endorsed Harwinder Grewal, the only local candidate.

Salameh reminded all that tonight is the Candidates Forum #2014 from 5-7 in the Carol Burke Lounge.

Carroll said he has circulated the recent resolution from Sacramento State in opposition to Student Success Fees. CFA passed a resolution in opposition to SSFs as well, and we ran a straw poll showing opposition to SSFs here. SEC will discuss whether to have a similar resolution from our campus.

Carroll noted that there are several things on the agenda including a spring break discussion. Given that, he will suggest a 30 minute limit on each item, with the option available to move to extend discussion. We will leave some time for the open forum at the end of the meeting.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

The FBAC report was circulated electronically.

1. **Information Item**
	1. **Graduation Initiative Summit Report (Provost Strong)**

Deferred to the next Senate Meeting when the Provost can be present.

1. **First Reading Items**

**a.12/AS/14/UEPC - Academic Change Policy for 90 Units and Beyond**

Strahm moved, Eudey seconded.

California State University, Stanislaus

12/AS/14/UEPC – Academic Change Policy for 90 Units and Beyond

Students who have reached 90 units and wish to change their major or add a minor or second major, are required to develop a plan to demonstrate they can complete the new major or minor by the time they reach 140 units.  This plan must be approved by the chair of the department for the new major or minor and the dean of that program’s College.  Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the new major or minor degree’s department chair and dean

AS:rle UEPC Approved 9/25/14

Strahm noted that we’ve discussed this before. This is asking students who wish to change majors, or add a minor or second major when they’ve hit 90 units to develop a plan that can demonstrate how they can complete it before earning 140 units. The resolution asks that this be approved by the Chair of the new department and the Dean of the programs’ college. Exceptions can be made if approved by the Chair and Dean.

Peterson strongly opposes the resolution. It’s a mistake to keep people from learning more about things they want to learn more about. Some are returning adults; others have degrees and want a new one. If they realize they want more knowledge from a discipline, or want to change majors, this should be the right decision for them and we shouldn’t make them jump through extra hoops. Most of the costs of such a decisions fall on them, including opportunity costs to time to graduation. If they think it’s worth it, she doesn’t think we should stand in their way.

Morris is wondering what data we have to back this up. What percentage of students is missing out because others have been around for a while and taken up registration space? Is this anecdotal or based on evidence?

Strahm said Bernardo hasn’t had the opportunity to bring the data to UEPC. Anecdotally there are a couple of programs that are impacted dramatically by this, including biology. There is an issue where someone who wanted to be a nursing major decides to be biology major. The problem isn’t the move, but at that point that student is junior/senior level and can jump ahead of people who have been majoring in biology all along, and the new majors are taking classes from majors who were in the pipeline. The information we have is anecdotal. Chairs and directors are stating that this is an issue.

Gerson said this anecdote has been an issue, but it’s being addressed within biology. They’ve made changes so that before declaring the new major students changing to biology or transfers need to have completed the prereq courses to show they have the fortitude to continue with the program and be successful. They haven’t had a problem with this once they made this change. We want students to have the right background to be successful in the major. We don’t need a new resolution to address this in Biology.

Johnson said if this is really an issue that’s effecting a couple of majors, do we need to have a policy that is going to cause impediments to every major on campus when it could be addressed as it was successfully in the Biology Department?

Petrosky has difficulty seeing this as purely an anti-student suggestion because we have enrollment caps. If we allow some to persist beyond 130, 140 units we’re limiting the number of students who get to be CSU Stanislaus students.

Speaker Carroll raised the issue of access, this is a subset of broader problems of access. Morris said they had discussions in Graduate Council about enrollment numbers, but had no hard data and felt they couldn’t make a decision without data. If we’re going to propose something we should have data before we propose it.

Salameh agrees with the need for data. She noted UEPC had discussions about super-seniors. She believes there are over 100 students who are super-seniors so it may be something to look into.

Jaasma said in UEPC they discussed super-seniors and the numbers was so low that a specific policy for super-seniors was not warranted.

Strahm said there are excellent points being made, especially related to data if this is a problem impacting departments.

Regalado thinks there is merit to Peterson’s inquiry. There are legitimate reasons why someone would change a major late into the game that is it beyond their circumstances, so he can understand that position. He also wonders if someone who does that should be first in line in registration. Is this resolution calling for students who aren’t prevented from not changing the major, but if they need to do so they have to go to the back of the line again? The policy doesn’t say that.

Nagel thinks there is ambiguity in the policy. The second sentence doesn’t say approved for what - to add it, change it, etc. He assumes he understands the meaning, but it needs to be spelled out.

Jaasma said if students want to change their major and can’t accomplish that in 140 units they can get an exception for it. But it’s more of an advising issue. If you are at 90 units and want to change, you have to show it’s possible but not guaranteed. It’s an advising statement but not intended to stop the student from making a change.

Thompson thought maybe UEPC would think about who should be in the room when this comes back. Maybe Bernardo. This says the ERC requested UEPC consider this, and wondered if the rationales from ERC are in the current rationale or if there is some other reasons ERC gave that would support this.

Peterson says the policy says they must complete the degree by the time they reach 140 units, so if they have 120 units and decide they need more understanding of economics and should add that major, the policy is telling them no not unless they can get an exception and there’s no information about the basis for obtaining the exception. Under the current system they can add a new major because it’s a good thing. In this policy the purpose of the exception is unclear. Also, this has to be a very determined person to pursue the exception and our students may get discouraged.

O’Brien thinks Morris’ question about data is important. He also wonders about the approval process. The Chair’s signature makes sense, but he doesn’t understand why the dean is involved. Sociology tracks super seniors and wonders if there should be some consultative process for those thinking through this. He agrees with some comments that have been made, as some students may be making the change out of desperation. Are we going to deny them that? He wouldn’t.

Guichard said that if we are meeting with a student considering a change, is the policy referring to the semester in which the student earned 90 units or only if they have already passed 90 units. Strahm will check on this.

Tuedio says the policy answers that in part of first sentence with the phrase “reached” 90 units.

Hooker sat on ERC. Part of the discussion was tied to priority registration. After veterans and students with disabilities, those with the highest units get the first slot. If they don’t know what they’re doing, is it fair to take away a seat from someone who needs a course to graduate?

Peterson says part of the concern is priority registration, which this policy is not addressing, and part is tied to more advising. If we wanted to do that, we could have a very different resolution. If you wish to change you must have mandatory advising appointments. For those in this situation, place a mandatory hold on advising. This doesn’t stop them from doing anything, but it sets a meeting for advising. These are fundamentally different resolutions, priority registration and advising. She moved to table, but this was ruled out of order because we can’t table a non-action item.

Littlewood said another useful piece of information to gather is the number of students who do change their major after 90 units. He thought about Peterson’s example, if the student with 95 units wants to develop a plan for a new major that could be above 150 units. That student will need at least 45 units, or a year and a half of courses. Would you want to list out courses when he doesn’t know the schedule for the future?

Eudey noted that our depts. have roadmaps to graduate in 4-6 yrs. These are the guides to anticipate and just a guess. She’s not saying she’s agreeing on having this policy, but there are plenty of mechanisms in place to anticipate courses. She thinks in addition to investigating numbers of students who changed their major after 90 units, we also need to know how many added a second major. We need to look at second majors as well as how many changed majors and minors. Some of the CSU’s have had policies like this for while and many campuses do so nationwide. There is not an urgency to get this policy passed. She doesn’t recommend tabling it but encourages UEPC to bring it back only after they have received and reviewed the data we’ve requested. Is it really a change in number of units we’re concerned about or having good advising toward graduation? We want to do our best to help students have a clear path to graduation without closing out opportunities.

Carroll provided guidelines on tabling if desired for the future.

Littlewood noted that his program has a roadmap, but Chemistry has never offered the classes on the roadmap in semesters indicated on the roadmap. The roadmap is based on enrollment and availability of faculty, so it is not very reliable. Students would create an unreliable plan based on the roadmaps.

Strahm noted an impetus on some campuses is the number of units federal financial aid will cover. Can’t remember the number – its 150 completed, 180 attempted, so that’s part of the issue.

Petrosky said we looked over another option which is they can take the diploma and go to graduate school for further education.

Regalado said another factor is that the university may not have classes available to earn their major by the time students became seniors. Due to cuts the courses they need may not be there for them, or not for another year, so the availability of courses may cause them to make a switch to a different major. In the History Department, there were certain courses cut in past years that caused a serious change in program for several students.

Phillips noted the language is confusing with and/or. If adding a major and minor it could require three different signatures. Change “the” to “each” new major and minor. He thinks you want each one to sign off.

Sarraille said that access is the question here. It bothers him the overriding access question. We can go along conforming day to day, but the bigger question is what are the citizens committed to do in response to that. Will we just let access dictate and maybe reduce the number of majors? We can go along with current constraints of the day and slip and slice here and there and conform to the big wheel rolling over us, but at some point we need to look at the wider question that access to the university is winding down. What are we willing to do in response to that? Will we allow it to get narrower? Is it okay to take one of five majors, and that’s good enough for everyone. How low do you go?

Tuedio sympathizes with Sarraille. This is something faced when we had the 17 unit cap and there was pressure to keep enrollments under a well-defined cap in tight budgetary times. There is little wiggle room or we pay the fine. One of the things they’re trying to do with a policy is to address the access question. We have very little control over how many admitted students actually attend. There is some uncertainty, but if students have high unit loads or students add a new major or shift to continue studying, this could impact the university by pushing FTEs above caps. We are trying to reduce this possibility to allow those with a plan to stay, but encourage others to leave.

Petrosky said it hurts him to say this, but access to education is finite. We’re allowed so many students. We end up hurting somebody. We may be helping current students by allowing them unlimited units, but hurting potential students who can’t get in. Who do you want to hurt?

Salameh said as a first generation student who changed majors, a lot of students just want to be exposed to different opportunities to find a direction in life. Some take intro courses that could give them exposure, but agrees with Peterson that advising plays a big role with students, especially mapping out the route to graduate on time, including which courses to take and which cross-count with GE etc. There are things to put in place to help with the situation mentioned in the policy.

1. **Second Reading Items**

**a. 11/AS/14/UEPC – Mission Statement for General Education**

UEPC received comments from two senators with suggested changes, and they were pretty much the same. In line 1 of the mission statement, a request was made to change “heart” to “foundation” and this change was made. In line four, changed “a sense” to “knowledge.” Line three changed “introduces” to “fosters” appreciation. “Sense of” history and culture was changed to “understanding of.”

Carroll noted that if we suggest changes to the resolution, consider these one at a time, and we’ll determine if friendly or not. If not, we’ll debate that proposed changed before moving to the resolution as a whole.

Thompson moved to amend to change in the first line “foundation” back to “heart.” Eudey seconded. Thompson says the term has more heart. Salameh respects rationale behind heart, but thinks foundation is a stronger word for GE, just her view as a student. Foundation is a stronger word. Noted at the last AS meeting Price thought the language suggested a value judgment of the ranking of the major and GE.

Foreman noted a foundation sits under, and this suggests things are supported or undergirded by the GE program. Fiction may not be a foundation of a study in science. The heart is in the center and circulates vital fluids to other parts. The heart is in the center and connects all the tissue, and thus he thinks “heart” is a better metaphor.

Sarraille said to extend the metaphor, the heart brings enrichment and nourishment to other parts. This seems more in keeping with the function of GE.

Tuedio thinks we want to be clear on what we’re trying to say, the position we’re trying to take with GE. He suggests we reorder wording to note that GE is “fundamental to university education, and develops foundational skills.” We will come back to this, as it’s a proposal not connected to the current motion.

Petrosky says the heart is a dumb pump that works at the behest of another organ, so he’s in favor of heart.

Johnson does not think Tuedio’s statement is a separate one, because it’s dealing with the word foundation and can’t talk about one without the other. The change Jim proposed seemed to assume foundation is the accepted term. It’s not for non-senators to propose a change. And it wasn’t offered as a proposed amendment. Two ways not on the floor. Like to have the resolution be disposed of one way or another.

Broadwater understands heart as the core, but when he thinks of heart he thinks of passion and passion is usually where students go with their major. To him that seems to be the major. He thinks the passion, the heart, is the major.

Vote. 14 Yes 23 no 3 abstain. The word “foundation” remains.

Gerson moved to amend the statement to flip “foundation” and “fundamental” as recommended by Tuedio. The wording would now say GE is fundamental to a university education. GE develops foundational…” Seconded by Nagel. There were no objections, so it was incorporated into the final resolution.

Petrosky wondered if spiritual should be in there as well. Gerson noted it’s personal. Not a serious inquiry.

Vote. 39 Yes; 1 No; 1 Abstain. The resolution Passed as follows:

California State University, Stanislaus

11/AS/14/UEPC – Mission Statement of General Education Program

**Be it Resolved**: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the following General Education Mission Statement:

 “General education is the fundamental of a university education.  General education develops foundation communicative, quantitative and critical thinking skills.  It promotes an understanding of history and culture, fosters appreciation for the arts and humanities, and encourages a broad knowledge of social issues and scientific inquiry.  Attaining a general education means that students understand that all learning is connected and enriches all aspects of life: personal, civic, and professional.”; and be it further

**Resolved**: That the Mission Statement for General Education be effective immediately and be included in the next University catalog.

**Rationale**: General Education is a cornerstone of a rich educational experience. CSU Stanislaus is revising its General Education goals in compliance with Executive Order 1065. The first step in revising the General Education goals is to ensure the Mission Statement for General Education reflects the collective voice of CSU Stanislaus.

The University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), the General Education Subcommittee of the UEPC, and the General Education Ad Hoc Committee endorse the revised Mission Statement for General Education.  The UEPC recognizes the sensitive nature of the changes to the CSU Stanislaus General Education goals, and applauds the General Education Ad Hoc Committee and the General Education Subcommittee of the UEPC for its work on developing the mission statement as part of the process of revising the goals.

AS:rle UEPC Approved 9/25/14

1. **Discussion Items**

**a. Spring Break Survey (Ann Strahm)**

The results of the Spring Break Survey were included in the Senate materials.

Nagel inquired as to the spring break dates for 2016/17, and Strahm searched for the exact dates.

Salameh placed this issue on the ASI BOD meeting agenda but they didn’t have a large discussion about the survey. They applauded UEPC and Ann Strahm for getting 31% of the campus community responding to the survey. She applauded them for the hard work getting the response rate.

Strahm noted that spring break is April 17-21, with 4 weeks of classes and finals. The next one falls more typically – 2017/18 right now has April 2-6, with 5.5 weeks before finals. But this has not yet been approved. They were concerned about 16/17 and 18/19 which goes back to the last full week of April without 3 full weeks of classes before finals.

Regalado does not see TUSD as the one indicator of our break. They have no say, we shouldn’t follow them. They should follow us or we should not consider it. We’re separate entities. It shouldn’t be a factor at all.

Salameh noted that the ASI BOD wondered if we could have a flexible clause in the policy. Could we include a clause if we were to run into this situation in the future, that the university has discretion if spring break passes a certain date in April we can move it earlier in the term.

Littlewood said when they did the survey last time, they had the clause as an option and it was a distant third, it wasn’t a popular option at all. Littlewood says it goes beyond simply moving the date, as they don’t want to have the office open during break and closed during the term if the administrative assistant needs to take off to care for children, that’s an issue.

Strahm has no horse in the race. It’s her understanding that this campus has a lot of activities that we offer as part of our community outreach during our spring break that community members attend during spring break. We won’t have math camps here because no one will show up. Sports camps as well for the community. Those community members won’t be attending if we have a different spring break. If we do make the change, they need to be notified of the change.

Sarraille said that the ideal would be if the school district had decided first to make its spring break in the middle of the term. He also has no dog in the show, but wants to recognize that if we don’t align ourselves with the spring break of children in the school district, it does put a hardship on those who need child care, struggling income-wise to deal with situations like this. We can’t declare this to be a non-issue.

Foreman suggests a way to operationalize this. This was a close vote. Maybe we can say that we will align with TUSD so long as it doesn’t fall any earlier than the 5th week or later than the 10th week of the term. We would align with TUSD within a window of five weeks when it will tend to be. We won’t lose most years, but it’s a compromise.

Regalado noted he would not want to get on wrong side of an ASA, but on the flip side, if the school district is the lead, what if they have their break really late. We could return to a schedule from last spring. When we set the curriculum, we set deadlines with sense of equity to spring break and weeks in semester. If you have a break in the center of the term, it’s better to plan for, there’s equity for days to get work done. Otherwise we have to follow a school district which has no relation to students we are trying to teach.

Hoover likes what was said originally about the tail wagging the dog. Ann made good points. Math camps are scheduled when the children’s break is, not ours. He is confident Math would hold its camp during their break. Ian, good point about ASAs and if want to know what it’s like to not have an ASA, ask him because his program has been without for 5 years.

Eudey suggested that a group meet with TUSD. While she doesn’t have children it matters when we have the breaks. We all have a stake in this issue of the curriculum; we all have a horse in the race. And the timing of break is not just camps etc. We have lots of students that work in K12 classrooms, and we have lots of service learning connection to the schools. If we aren’t in session for a week different from the week the K-12 schools are out, we could effectively lose two weeks of interaction. It was suggested to have some reps from university work with school districts and that is the most likely place to start now. We should see if we can influence their decisions and enhance our partnerships with K-12 schools as we try to meet our goals. Don’t change our policies until we exhaust opportunities to change with the schools.

Salameh agrees with the points made about challenges, and Eudey’s points about talking to TUSD. This will be a battle, because a great factor is religious reasons. She thinks compromising is great by putting in the clause discussed earlier. She noted the effects of late spring break on students, especially having mental breakdowns, depression, etc. When there is a late break, it is an issue. Having spring break late in the semester is stressful on students, several mental breakdowns and depression because of the timing of break at the end of semester, and then coming back from break facing finals and papers. She wants us to consider the impact of late spring break and its effects on students.

Strahm thanked everyone for the comments. She had several responses. First, with regard to a policy notation, we already have in the academic calendar policy the statement *“During spring term there shall be a one-week holiday – spring break. Best efforts shall be made to align spring break to coincide with Turlock Unified School District’s spring break."*  It clearly says “shall” and says “best efforts” will be used. We don’t need to create new policy to change the date; we just need to follow best efforts. Second, the TUSD reason connected with Easter isn’t because TUSD are religiously oriented, TUSD receives funding from the federal government for each child they can count. When have a population that tends to leave to celebrate festivals, if you don’t align your break you’re operating but not paid near what you should for the operation you’re doing. At issue is the fact that families leave and that impacts TUSD financially. Either choice we make is a curriculum issue and has positive and negative connotations. It becomes a mental health issue for many of our students who are stressed because there are not enough breaks in the spring term. There are more frequent breaks in fall term. In spring we go a long time without breaks. It becomes stressful if break is late, but then we have only a few weeks after break before finals and it’s hard to get back into the scholarly groove in time. But faculty, staff and students who are parents or caregivers who are in school, if break is not aligned with their children’s breaks they now have other stressors on their lives that impact the ability to teach, learn and do their work on the campus. Either way, somebody is going to get hurt in whatever decision we make.

Nagel pointed out the same line in the policy. UEPC sets the calendar and makes the best efforts to align. He doesn’t remember UEPC ever offering a calendar different from TUSD. Its UEPC’s job to do it and to do it in a manner that makes sense to UEPC. Strahm says it was this body that had requested that we deal with the issue, and UEPC as a body believed it would be appropriate to bring it to the Senate so all know what UEPC is dealing with.

Dorsey appreciates it. He would like break in middle of the term, but as a parent of small children it imposes costs and scheduling issues he’d rather not address. He is for aligning the break to TUSD.

Turlock isn’t the only school district with a spring break. If you propose a change, it’s just the start of it. Most schools align with the same week. The timing of the break can affect parents financially and in regards to time with their kids. Sometimes break is a quality week with kids.

Thompson said that regarding educational effect, he wants the data. Is effect on students is something we’ve documented in some way, or just an idea of what happens? Does counseling services have a record of this regarding a mid-semester break and end-of-term break? Bettencourt says counseling doesn’t have hard numbers of data. In terms of being able to offer students a week for catch-up, if it happens earlier rather than later, it’s better for students but no hard data to support it.

Salameh said that Renae Floyd has been vocal about it and has seen the effects. Thompson said some might want a break two weeks before the term ends to rest up for finals. If we want data for things, this sounds more anecdotal.

Regalado said if we allow TUSD to determine when break is, and they base theirs on Easter, when Easter is late, our break will be late. When that happens, we’ll be revisiting this scenario again. And students aren’t only one’s stressed out. We will have this same discussion again. This will happen in 16/17 and 18/19. We’re going to be at the same dance and continue to go deep into the spring semester and deal with stressors because we’re following the lead of the school district. It doesn’t make any sense.

Petrosky said we come to this impasse nearly every year. Fewer than 20% of US colleges align their break before or after Easter; most of CSUs don’t align it. Do Christian’s disappear outside of the central valley? Where do we go next?

Strahm said many of the CSUs are not located in small, rural locations like this one and are closer to larger city centers and they put it in the middle of the tem. For years we have decided that given our small community that we’re a part of, we would align our calendar with TUSD. Petrosky said we’ve done for 17 years and keep coming to the line, TUSD is too big to worry about. We can’t talk to them. Let’s talk to them

Salameh pointed out that we deal with it now or later. This body could have a meaningful conversation about how to move forward on this topic. She wants to point out that we are one of the few CSU campuses that aligned our break with school districts. Many campuses schedule spring term in the middle of the term. If the vote is so close our campus, and many want the middle, the best choice is a compromise.

Phillips said that we love to move dates around on the academic calendar, and we celebrate few holidays when they actually occur. Perhaps a consideration is that we extend the term a few days and have a mid-semester holiday to have both a fit with TUSD and a mid-semester break. We sometimes have an extended time between finals and graduation anyway, so could add a few days.

Carroll noted there were numerous suggestions for compromise, and no policy is needed to move spring break from TUSD from time to time as circumstances require. After discussion, UEPC gets to decide what “best efforts” mean.

Wood said if we start later in January and end in early June, that could work. There is some policy about start and end dates that may prevent this.

Strahm asked for a straw poll to see if we preferred always aligning with TUSD, always having in the middle, or to align with TUSD but move it if the break appears too late in the term.

13 A – always with TUSD

7 B – always in the middle

19 C – encourage UEPC to move if it appears to be coming at an inconveniently early time.

1 Abstained

Plurality wants a compromise.

Strahm notes that for 2016/17, will you come at me with pitchforks and knives if we make one choice or another. She would like some insight for the 2016/17 AY. Do we place it in the middle or keep with TUSD?

Espinoza is curious about the survey. Why would you do the survey if you weren’t going to follow it? If we went against the outcomes of the survey, that could make things muddy. It’s not clear what it means to follow the survey, because there is an underwhelming majority, and people who respond to the survey weren’t privy to the discussion that considers issues in more detail. We are being asked to give our impressions based on the discussion held today. It’s an important gauge to consider, which differentiates the straw poll from survey.

We will allow UEPC to do its deliberative work. Eudey noted all the traffic on Facnet about the survey. There was no requirement in UEPC to survey, and no obligation to follow this poll but they can use it to inform and plan for an outcome. This is very informative but not directive and we need to allow UEPC to do its work.

Hooker thinks this issue of having spring break late has brought on such a discussion we know it has brought on an issue. Why allow it to occur again if we’re having this long a discussion.

Salameh noted the best route to take is to compromise. This body should consider a compromise.

Guichard reminded all that these results reflect a 31% response rate, so 70% of the views are not reflected. Some have no confidence that this is a reliable sampling of anyone. The people most impacted might be those least likely to complete the survey because they didn’t have time to complete it.

Strahm said methodologically speaking, if we survey an entire population, how is that not a valid survey. They didn’t get a panel from a random sample. They sampled the entire population. Guichard said all had the opportunity to reply. If UEPC is going to make a decision, maybe some demographics about the population could be helpful.

Salameh agrees with increasing response, but this is impressive for our campus to have this kind of response. If we look at other surveys or student elections, they could barely get this many responding.

Silverman said there is an IR representative here and he can say how this is representative of the votes on campus. Tillman said the survey indicates that a majority wanted the break mid-semester.

1. **Open Forum**

Regalado is interested in a letter by the ASI President in which students are disgruntled with attitudes on the part of the university; it cast a wide swath with respect to how students are treated. The conclusion is that we have forgotten what it means to serve students. Having made a public statement, Regalado asked if our friends in ASI can elaborate on who they think is insensitive, who they mean by university, and can put specifics on what was quite a charge to make.

Salameh thanked Regalado for bringing that up. The letter was written to have a meaningful conversation. The letter was addressed to all, but not targeted to any specific group on campus. It specifically states administration, faculty and staff, and is addressed to whole community not one group. She encourages everyone to read the letter throughout. She understands that not everyone has forgotten how to serve students and she does applaud those who haven’t forgotten.

Hooker noted currently he doesn’t want to call anyone out, so they wrote a letter. They both have experienced frustrations as student leaders over the years. This is not tied to a specific instance. They’ve been mulling this over for a couple of months, looking for a correct way to express this. He does applaud those who are supportive of the student leadership, and they do know people doing everything for students and in the best interest of students.

Salameh noted every individual person on this committee is welcome to contact them to have a one on one conversation. Contact them through email if you want to talk to them.

Johnson appreciates the invitation. The problem as a faculty member is that it is very concerning that you had this feeling, but it is difficult to identify anything that might have caused or contributed to the feeling, or to understand what to do to alleviate it if it doesn’t have more details as to why you felt that way.

Hooker says it’s hard to do without calling anyone out, and he doesn’t want to do that. Salameh and he sit on many committees on the campus. A lot of the times during discussions they are getting checked off on the list, being heard but not listened to. They’re doing their job to get opinions from students about issues that are important, they’re talking to directors and constituents and they bring that information to committees. They feel knowledgeable and bring ideas after gathering information, but are brushed off to the side. It’s disrespectful. They have been elected by students, and why are we doing what we’re doing if our concerns not being addressed?

Salameh said for her, when sitting in a university-wide committee, it is important. She’s not referring to the AS but another one. She sat there for 30 minutes to talk about stakeholders of the university and students were not mentioned once and this was frustrating. She loves the university; the university gave her a lot of opportunities as a fist generation college student. A lot of people forgot the existence of the university. She wants to see more campus unity on this campus. Everyone has separate agendas. One thing we have in common is that we are here for the best interests of all students. She doesn’t want to go extensively into this, so wants to have a meaningful conversation. You’re more than welcome to contact her. She wants a more personal, intimate level conversation. Reread the letter, as there was nothing to target one group, but instead it was for the campus community.

Carroll said of course you are free to ask SEC to put this on an AS agenda for further discussion. Salameh thanked him.

Hoover said things mentioned about the committees and the stakeholder conversation was very good and specific and for what it’s worth, these are the types of things he would recommend to put in a letter like this. It was written to the whole university. When read by the whole university, we wonder what is that about? And then it is dismissed because there is no context. If you want your concerns to be heard, it’s important to have specifics in the letter. And if it is so specific you can’t mention it without calling someone out, then in that case that it doesn’t need to be with the whole university but with that one person.

Regalado thinks most faculty would agree that it’s good to improve relations or avoid disrespect. The core of the letter suggests that student leaders have been disrespected too many times. You’re in AS right now, and he would like to know 2 things that we are lacking in or where we can improve in terms of relations with students.

Salameh noted frustrations started in university-wide committees, and everyone has observed it. They have been calling to be heard, but nothing has been addressed, and this was a method to be heard and to have a meaningful conversation with everyone. From her perspective, this is for all students, but she is just speaking from a leadership role. Students want to be heard. She challenges everyone on this committee to have a conversation with students and ask them these questions. She has her own opinions, but cannot address the whole student population.

Regalado said he would settle for one suggestion, or should he take that to mean the Senate has treated you with respect?

Salameh said it is 100% not from the Academic Senate; it’s from the whole university. Other examples she has are not related to university wide committees specifically.

1. **Adjournment**

4:00pm.