**For**

Second reading of 10/AS/14/UEPC Resolution for Minimum GPA for Minors. Passed.

First reading 11/AS/14/UEPC Mission Statement for General Education. Will return for a second reading.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 21, 2014

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 1, 2013

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

Academic Senate

October 7, 2014

**Present:** Bettencourt, Burroughs, Brodie, Carroll, Crayton, Dorsey, Edwards, Eudey, Foreman, Gerson, Guichard, Hoover, Huang, Johnson, Littlewood, Lore, Manrique, Miller-Antonio, Mulder, Nagel, Parks, Peterson, Petrosky, Phillips, Strong, Powell, Price, Silverman, Strahm,

Thompson, and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Chris Roe, Pengtao Li.

**Proxies:** Eudey for Filling, Price for Olivant, Robin Ringstad for Greg Morris.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: James Tuedio, Oddmund Myhre, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, Stanley Trevena, John Sarraille, and Lauren Byerly.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:04 pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved as distributed.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 23, 2014 (distributed electronically)** Approved as distributed.
2. **Introductions**

The following guests were welcomed:

James Tuedio, Oddmund Myhre, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, Stanley Trevena, John Sarraille, and Lauren Byerly.

1. **Announcements**

VP Dennis Shimek congratulated the best FDC Director, Betsy Eudey, on six years of exceptional service to the Faculty Development Center. Shimek presented Eudey with flowers and chocolates. Speaker Carroll noted that Eudey has done a bang up job and hers will be big shoes to fill, but look at how nicely you will be treated if you apply for this position.

Provost Strong noted that we had a successful WASC visit. Four issues were successfully dealt with. There were three commendations, and three recommendations. We also had a successful EdD visit. The Provost thanked all of the faculty, staff, and administrators who worked very hard to address the items from the March 7th letter, as it’s been a long process since summer 2010. The EdD has been in place since 2008. The work on both of those has gone on for a period of time. He offered heartfelt thanks for everyone’s efforts leading to such a good day on Friday.

Salameh reminded all that the candidate’s forum will be on Tuesday, October 21st from 5-7pm in the Carol Burke Lounge. There will be local and state congressional candidates on campus at that time. All are invited to attend and, ASI is targeting students and the campus community.

Salameh noted that they had a great discussion at SBAC and that the Speaker and VP Espinoza were there. They discussed the University’s Catalog and how it’s updated within the university. They were especially discussing how courses are publicized for students enrolled in the program or who are applying to CSU Stanislaus, as this could be misleading. It was felt that it is not updated enough because there are core classes or electives that don’t exist anymore but are listed in the catalog. Salameh would like to see a discussion about the updating of the catalog and how we can remove that misleading information from the catalog.

Jaasma noted that the campus applied for a Chancellor’s Office grant for Scaling High Impact Practices (HIPs). Fullerton has developed a way to track HIPs and wanted other campuses to participate in a pilot. We submitted a successful proposal. We identified First Year Experience, Service Learning and the Faculty Mentor Program as the HIPs we would especially address this year. Provost Strong added that 14 campuses applied, and 7 were selected. This is a positive event for the campus and reflects the CO sense of our work on student success.

Salameh asked what the process for updating the catalog is. Jaasma said that there is a prescribed and formal process done once a year. Jaasma asked Salameh to send information about what she thinks is outdated to her office, as she was not sure what part of the process Salameh thought was falling down. Salameh thinks it’s an issue that Jaasma isn’t aware of there being a problem. She noted that in the History Dept. there are courses listed that aren’t offered on a regular basis. What is the best practice we have to be aware campus wide? Jaasma said the process in place at the catalog level is to send the copy to the departments annually. If there are problems in the department’s catalog copy, they are supposed to let her know. It’s up to the departments to make it happen. Department chairs are ultimately responsible for the catalog copy.

Nagel noted two university choir concerts tonight at 7:30 pm. They’re awesome.

Carroll noted that the RPT survey issue has been forwarded to FAC.

Carroll indicted that when accessing SharePoint to select courses for IDEA evaluation, the courses showing on his link were not the correct courses for him. Authorities are aware of this problem and are correcting this in a day or two. This may be an issue that some of you may have, so be careful not to choose last year’s courses for evaluation.

Carroll noted that because of a busy agenda, he will be using the Speaker’s discretion, holding debate at 30 minutes for action items and 20 minutes on discussion items unless there is a vote to extend.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

Nagel had two questions for UEPC. The first relates to the draft policy on students who take a second major or minor after taking 90 units. He’d like to know whether those students are guaranteed they can complete the degree within 140 units. Nagel asked how many students are affected and what the data says. He was also looking at the 2016-17 calendars and unclear whether part of the impetus for the spring break survey is that spring break is late that year, and he wondered how late it was.

Strahm said they haven’t gotten data yet on number of students affected, but are trying to do so. Lisa Bernardo is getting help from Harold Stanislaw to review data from PeopleSoft to see how often students change majors. Stanislaw, IR and Bernardo are working on the historical data.

Strahm noted that finalization of the academic calendar is being held off because of the spring break issue. That is why UEPC sent out the survey about the preference for spring break. The survey closes today and they’ll be reviewing the data. Littlewood asked if the results will be reported out by type of respondent. Strahm said yes. Salameh said that this survey was placed on the ASI BOD agenda, and some asked if we could push back the time period to get more responses. They thought it was a rush. Strahm said they had two weeks to complete the survey. Salameh noted that BOD perspective was to advocate for the community to make a rational decision about it. They wanted more time to get their opinion on it. Strahm noted the calendar must be set two years out. The ASI BOD wondered why we were pushing for their input so quickly.

Regalado wants to know where he can get the complete transcript of the deliberations from the last few SEC meetings. Eudey noted that SEC is engaging in notes and not detailed minutes. Regalado asked for detailed minutes from here on in. He requests that the minutes to be made available to him.

1. **First Reading Items**

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

Strahm moved, seconded by Eudey. UEPC has put forth a resolution in support of the mission statement for GE. The statement was read aloud. The language is not verbatim from EO 1065, but it comes from there.

California State University, Stanislaus

11/AS/14/UEPC – Mission Statement for General Education

General education is the heart of a university education. General education develops fundamental communicative, quantitative and critical thinking skills. It provides a sense of history and culture, introduces appreciation for the arts and humanities, and ensures 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.

AS:rle UEPC Approved 9/25/14

Eudey noted that additional information in the rationale that states: *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.* She reminded all that we are significantly delayed and out of compliance with EO 1065 and there’s need to be in compliance. We need to adopt the LEAP (Liberal Education and America’s Promise) framework for our GE program and we haven’t done that. This is the first step to complete to be in line with this EO. We’re 6-7 years out of compliance among 2-3 other campuses that are also out of compliance\.

Nagel asked what the repercussions are for the University being out of compliance with EO 1065. Jaasma is not seeing any now. WASC is coming in 4 years and this is the first step. We need an interim report to address this next year; we’re hoping the interim report will be waived. If yes, the next report is due fall 2018.

Johnson noted that the last APR for GE, recommended that a mission statement be adopted, and this is not the one in the report. There was a recommendation to develop a new set of goals and this process has been ongoing for at least 5 years. There have been goals and objectives brought forward several times before that were not successfully approved. The year before last, UEPC held a GE forum that many attended. One recommendation was to create an ad hoc GE committee which was formed to discuss GE and help move forward the development of mission and goals. This is part of that process. Johnson is one ad hoc committee member. They had conversations with a number of depts. which is still ongoing. They talked to them about issues they had with the goals and objectives and mission statement. The primary concern was with the mission statement brought forward before. They wanted it to be more inspirational than those brought forward last year. The attempt is to provide something that gives a better picture to students about what the purpose of a general education is and the benefits. We’re supposed to have an APR this year, which was postponed a year so that we could get something in place to review. She’s not sure if there are CO repercussions, but there could be WASC repercussions if there is no progress since the last visit.

Provost Strong said that the CO expects the campus to be in compliance with all executive orders. If we are found not in compliance, they would expect a good reason and that we are making progress to become compliant. If we are working on this diligently, that would be a reasonable response. If it’s an inordinate response, we will have to provide additional explaining as to why it took such a long time. It behooves us to move this forward.

Regalado asked what the penalties for not being in compliance are. What is the worst case scenario? Jaasma said we were supposed to have an interim report due next year, if the interim report is waived, we’ll have to address this in 2018. If we haven’t done anything we’ll get another special visit.

Strahm, at the risk of sounding cranky, while she appreciate the questions, she would like us to discuss the mission statement.

Eudey thinks that there is benefit to us having a mission statement that we believe in. We have invested a lot in our GE program. It’s to our benefit to have a strong GE program. Approximately 80% of our departments depend on a strong GE program for FTEs and skills building, and we want GE to be strong here. There is no reason not to do this even if there’s no penalty to us. She’s interested in hearing people’s thoughts on the merits on this mission statement for the program.

O’Brien thanks Johnson for their history and thinks this is fine. He echoes what Eudey said. For us to have a statement about something so many of us do is important. He’s less concerned with the penalty than having something to guide us. He will take it to his department, and will be shocked if they have any problem with it.

Regalado agrees with O’Brien. This is a harmless statement. He’s been here longer than Eudey and seen mission statements come and go. And the next will be critical as well.

Petrosky never ran into a faculty member who wanted us to become a trade school. He doesn’t see anything that would be objectionable in this statement. Hearing that having a mission statement would help provide impetus to creation of goals, he moves to waive the rules of the Senate and proceed to a second reading. O’Brien seconded.

Foreman thinks it’s better to move in the regular order. This is nothing so timely that it can’t be addressed in two weeks. That gives us time to look at it and allows the faculty to be genuinely informed. There is no harm to vote in two weeks. Nagel agrees. Coming from humanities, says it’s nice to be appreciated, but appreciation doesn’t seem to have the strong ring that words like knowledge or “sense of” for history. He wonders if his department may have some comment on the text of this.

Salameh agrees and will add it to the future ASI BOD agenda for discussion. Thompson offered an argument in support of Petrosky’s motion, suggesting if you don’t like this one you’ll never like one.

Hoover wondered if we thought about changing the words “introduces and appreciate” about the humanities, and thinks that “encourages” might be more accurate.

Result of the vote to move to a second reading, 22 yes, 18 no, this is not 2/3 so the rules are not waived.

Johnson wonders if “fosters” is better than “encourages.”

Petrosky noted that comments could be sent to UEPC directly instead of word smithing on the floor. There will be a UEPC meeting before the next Senate meeting. Since the mission statement is an attachment, it can’t be changed on the floor of the Senate in a second reading.

Brandon Price doesn’t like the word “heart” – it makes a judgment about its priority over the academic major. He’s not sure if the sentence is necessary. Maybe rewording it to call it an “essential component” rather than saying it’s more important than the discipline would be helpful. It’s vaguer than the “central component.”

Foreman likes the word “heart,” which is the organ that pumps blood and connects all the rest. He thinks it’s more than essential. Heart also speaks to the question of love and a love of learning for its own sake is part of what a university education is about, not just about becoming more employable. He thinks GE promotes a love of learning and he speaks in favor of leaving in the word “heart.”

Salameh agrees with Price, and thinks we’re just fluffing this mission statement. In a mission statement it should be direct, not just fluffing it.

Regalado suggested in the third sentence that reads “Sense of history,” we should change “sense” to “knowledge of” history.

Johnson wants to support keeping the word heart. As an accountant, GE is what distinguishes us from a trade school. It’s the heart of our university education because it’s what everyone here has in common. Some take accounting, nursing, LIBS, but all of our students participate in the GE program. That’s what distinguishes CSU Stan. It doesn’t mean the disciplinary studies aren’t important, but the heart is the GE.

Carroll suggests “foundation” as a substitution for “heart.”

1. **Second Reading Item**

 **10/AS/14/UEPC –Resolution for Minimum GPA for Minors**

Speaker Carroll reminded us that we can’t change the policy on the floor.

California State University, Stanislaus

10/AS/14/UEPC – Minimum GPA for Academic Minors Policy

To qualify for the academic minor, students must complete the required number of units in the academic minor with a minimum GPA of 2.0 (C).

AS:rle UEPC Approved 9/11/14

AS:rle UEPC Revised and Approved 9/25/14

Strahm has four points to share. First, you’ll note that they did not do the survey that was intended because when UEPC met after the Senate they decided, based on Suzanne Espinoza’s information from the open forum that anything below a 2.0 is in the academic probation area, so they changed the minimum GPA to a 2.0. They deleted the last sentence that had been “unless the program has higher requirements” because 2.0 is the highest requirement for Chemistry and Business Administration, and it would be odd to have a higher GPA requirement than a major. UEPC had put it there originally because the minimum was 1.7. The minimum GPA of 2.0 is the minimum for the major. They got the relevant language from the catalog, and mirrored it in the minor policy. They also added in the term “academic” to “minor” because there are some policies going in to place about minors by age, and they needed to clarify the difference between academic minor and little humans.

O’Brien was happy to see UEPC made the change. The dept. was unanimous that 2.0 should be the floor. His dept. fully supports this.

Peterson is confused by the phrasing. Does this mean that if a department wanted it to be a C-minus they couldn’t do that. Strahm indicated that was correct. Peterson noted general apathy about the issue in her department, but they do have some very hard classes they’d like to encourage people to try. The consensus was that they would prefer a C-minus although they didn’t feel very strongly about it. Sounds like that choice would be eliminated for Economics and for others as well.

Strahm asked Espinoza to speak to that as it is one of the discussions they had at UEPC. Some departments might like to be able to have students to feel okay about taking challenging classes, but then looking at the policy raised about probation, it seems that anything lower than that is heading toward academic disqualification. Could Espinoza talk to that?

Espinoza says there’s a difference between a C or C-minus in one or two courses and a GPA below a 2.0. The way the rules are, the closer the student is to graduating, the closer they must be to a 2.0. If they take too many courses at less than a 2.0, it is harder to raise it up. It’s about helping students to understand how important it is to maintain a GPA above a 2.0.

O’Brien noted we’re talking about the minor, not individual classes. When taking a challenging class and you get a C-minus, hopefully they’ll do better in something else. Strahm noted if a freshman, below 1.5, sophomore if below 1.5, junior 1.85, senior 1.95 they can be academically disqualified. Espinoza noted that this is a system rule, not a campus rule. The GPA requirement is an overall GPA, so a minor below a 2.0 could put a student in jeopardy.

Johnson noted that a major or minor is conferring an indication that they have some level of expertise and knowledge about the subject. C-minus as we talked about is passing, but barely. It’s fine to have a standard that doesn’t require an exceptional amount of expertise, but she wouldn’t like an indication of expertise on someone with barely enough knowledge to meet requirements for the courses in a particular subject matter, then have an indication on their transcript that they have knowledge about the topic.

Salameh reminded us that a lot of students have different factors in their lives, doing full time work or other obligations. They could be single mothers. The bare minimum could be their only way of passing due to other personal obligations.

Regalado concurs with Johnson. Sometimes people are hired based on their minors. If they’re in a classroom and the expectation is teaching in the minor area, he would hate that someone is teaching while meeting minimum standards. This raises a good point.

Wisniewski agrees with Salameh. Grading is subjective, and you can still learn even if turning in the bare minimum. This doesn’t mean you are not learning or your knowledge of topic is subpar or you have done a disservice to the institution. Students can learn and earn lower grades due to reasons outside of abilities they can control.

Hoover said we’re getting away from reality. We are not talking about an individual class, but a GPA. Just because someone earns a C-minus doesn’t mean learning didn’t occur, but a C- in all classes is a different thing. Students should be able to get a C-minus and still get a minor, as they could only need this as an average. While he wants to be compassionate to people, the argument is that it’s harder for some people than others. If they have so much going on outside of school they shouldn’t try to get a minor.

Park had students start with a major and struggle. Overall, their minor GPA is about 1.9. The first choice is always the major and doing well. Sometimes the minor is a previously intended major.

Provost Strong supports the resolution.

Gerson says biology supports the 2.0 but she wanted to point out that a D-minus is passing and C-minus is satisfactory.

Foreman noted the degree is the same as anyone in major and minor. The value of major is dependent on quality of work, and public knowledge of others who hold the degree matters. It’s a kind of currency. It is possible for currency not to hold its value. We will not allow the degree not to have value. We ensure that value is by setting a minimum GPA.

Wisniewski thinks that is a reasonable expectation to have a 2.0 in the minor, but she also wanted to speak toward attitudes faculty have toward struggling students. It sounds almost sarcastic. If only working toward the Cminus is not respected, it is a problem.

Foreman said that almost everyone in this room has had that same experience. Given the experiences he’s had in higher education, he finds the faculty here is less sarcastic, more understanding, and rallies for students as much as anyone anywhere and that’s why he’s proud to be a faculty member at this institution.

Speaker Carroll said grading can be subjective, but grading does represent the faculty member’s evaluation of work turned in. We need to be careful. Setting a floor is respecting the judgment of the faculty of the level of knowledge the student has achieved.

Petrosky says we have standards for a reason when we confer a major or minor we say they have lived up to the standard regardless of life’s circumstances. We don’t say “they did pretty well considering they were working 60 hours.” We need to maintain the standards.

Johnson says it’s not that we’re not sympathetic, but there is value to the diploma for those who successfully attain it. Our assessment methods aren’t perfect, and some students are acquiring knowledge we don’t recognize, but we can’t give the minor to someone just for attending. They have to do the best they can and we have to do our best to assess knowledge. It may be imperfect, but it’s a way to have a level or standard that gives the degree meaning.

Speaker Carroll noted students face life situations. This is where a faculty member might step up and ask, “what I can do to help you succeed in my course?” We cannot lower the standard and give a minor anyway.

Salameh says have you all have to be aware that there may be other factors as to why students do the bare minimum. Petrosky says students should address those factors rather than expect to get something they haven’t earned.

Results of the vote, 41 yes, 1 no. The resolution passes.

1. **Discussion Items**
	1. **Title IX (Dennis Shimek and Julie Johnson)**

Shimek and Johnson have been meeting with as many faculty, depts., chairs, deans, students, club sports, athletes and coaches as possible to pass on word of Title IX. They have heard and read many stories of sexual assault, harassment, and rape; these are terrible stories. They are trying to share information about the law and Executive Orders, but as the president noted we need to create an environment on our campus of awareness and support for one another. They take this as an important matter, and the area of law is changing. McCaskill is proposing more legislation and Boxer too. Governor Brown approved the affirmative consent law and this means more EO’s will be forthcoming. This is really important and allows us to create a safe, supportive environment on our campus.

Shimek noted that data shows 1/5 of coeds during their term in the academy are sexually assaulted. Yet, the overwhelming majority does not report that something happened. We know that many don’t report for very personal reasons, and we respect that. But a large number don’t report because they don’t trust the institution to investigate, take action, follow up, and provide support. We are working on this. Beginning November 1st, we will have a full-time victim’s advocate on campus to provide the kind of support and confidentiality to a victim to know their rights and available resources. We are very encouraged by the statewide academic senate resolution that we talked about at the last meeting. Senates across the system will be asked to review the resolution and he hopes we support it. He believes the resolution sends an important message and he asks for AS support for the resolution.

Julie Johnson distributed a brochure for Faculty/Staff summary of responsibility from 1095 and 1097 EO’s. We’re the first to receive these, so please provide feedback to Julie Johnson and Dennis Shimek using the contact information on the Title IX website. She wants to distribute this information throughout campus. EO1095 requires that every faculty and staff member knows what to tell a student and where to refer them to seek resources and see if the complaint and investigation process suits their needs. In addition to the faculty brochure, there is also one for students. We want to make it so they can get this information discreetly from locations around campus and also directly from an individual from whom they sought help. The EO requires a notice of nondiscrimination and a summary of rights and options. The document is 16 pages, but it is condensed into the brochure. She reiterated the desire for feedback on the brochures.

Julie is working with students via the Warrior Watch program. She’s getting good feedback that students are starting to realize there is a situation where they should intervene and take action on behalf of vulnerable students, especially when alcohol is in use. They are holding monthly stop abuse luncheons in South Dining, providing some food and refreshments. If campus turnout is strong, we may need to move the location or provide more food. This is meant for everyone. The first session was conducted by the campus counselors talking about issues beyond what the university’s resources are and getting into issues of social media, marketing and alcohol and sex appeal. The next one is tomorrow in S. Dining at 12:30, hosted by Megan Rowe, health educator.

Strahm is hearing a lot of great things with brochures and meetings and is so glad. She wonders if much of this is reactionary rather than preventative. A more proactive stance would be, what are we doing to socialize people who might commit these acts in such a way to reduce them in the first place? What about in general teaching young people how to not behave that way in the first place?

Johnson agrees. Legislation and changes have been rapid. The stop abuse luncheons, which are bringing in speakers and supporting our student organizations are designed to take on other issues than basic reporting and response. This is not mandatory. All student organization leaders attend one Title IX and one alcohol poisoning awareness sessions. They are talking about offering online training for every student, with a registration hold occurring if not completed. They’re still working out the details. They’re finding that when talking to students, they aren’t receiving information about consent, relationships, the cycle of violence, and what are power and control. We are trying to be proactive. In doing work with residential students, Megan and Julie held a game show for residents in the first couple of days. We are making those efforts, and starting to get noticed. Sessions are beyond the EO and what is consent. One session that Theta Xi sponsored is about respect and the male perspective. They are trying to take a holistic, healthy approach, not reactionary to an incident.

Nagel asks where to get more information about mandated reporter status. Julie Johnson stated this comes from the EO. CSU Stanislaus is committed to ensuring a safe environment for everyone on campus and takes complaints of sexual misconduct seriously. CSU EO 1095 prohibits sexual and dating/domestic violence. [WWW.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1095.html](http://WWW.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1095.html) Campus community members are mandated reporters and must report. Policy sets it out what to do. Reporting goes to Dennis Shimek.

O’Brien thanked Julie for coming to AS and thanked Dennis for coming to dept. meetings. He asked for clarifications about mandatory reporting. Johnson noted that we are all mandated to report incidents of discrimination or harassment or retaliation of students of any protected category. This does not mean that we are mandated reporters of a situation that doesn’t involve a student. At this point, it is only for students. Some high profile incidents aren’t about sex or gender, and the requirement covers all protected statuses. Disability discrimination complaints are also included.

Regalado thanked the presenters for the great advertisement for Title IX because his department’s featured speaker will be talking about Title IX in February. He’s been telling classes about this well before this year, and will continue to do so. He applauds the work on this, and inquired of Shimek what kind of faculty support he had in mind when speaking of this at the start of the discussion.

Shimek was referring to the system wide resolution that articulates the issue in a way that captivates the faculty. He would like to encourage and see more faculty members begin to talk about it and see how it fits in their particular class. There is some information on how to include information about this in their syllabus so it is available to students. He thinks we have great support on the campus, but when we talk about this it’s a community issue so the more input and involvement from all of us is going to achieve the kinds of things we’re talking about there. He asks for and welcomes support.

Salameh said she had an issue with imposing registration holds to make it mandatory for all students to obtain training. Putting a hold on registration will start chaos. She knows that this is an important topic, but a hold will cause issues, as there are already problems with holds on advising before registration. Julie Johnson said the group working on it is the campus safety committee, which includes student members. They will get some faculty on the committee and will work through the details. Across the CSU system, it is standard practice to put registration holds during a student’s initial semester – they will have from the time they indicate their intention to attend Stanislaus until midway through fall term to complete the training. There is a similar system for mandatory training for employees. The training can be done in starts and stops in 15 minute increments. It’s becoming the best practice to ensure all students receive this important information. They will have a large timeframe from summer to mid-fall, and she will get feedback from the committee on when that can be, when to retest, level of passage, etc. Initially, this is for incoming students, but how do we get all students to address this topic?

Salameh is not aware of a reporting structure on campus, are we defining that? How are we informing students about the reporting structure. Julie noted that instruction is being provided to faculty and staff to know what is covered by the CO, and letting them know that they are mandated reporters. Training with students is about resources, confidential resources, and who to go to if they want to make a report. They can go to the police, psychological counseling, Dennis, Julie, and others. All employees are mandatory reporters. Salameh wonders if people are being referred to new locations for information about issues.

Espinoza noted if you hear about an incident, it puts the university on notice, and we have timelines that we must comply with in terms of the investigation and responding to the victim. If you hear about something, it’s mandatory that you report it in a timely way. And it applies to issues related to students who disclose that they have disabilities and they are seeking accommodations –they need to be referred to DRS. We are required to provide students with accommodations and document that. Don’t try to accommodate on your own without DRS. To Salameh, if you can think of a better way to meet the requirements and find a way that all students can get training, we’re all good with suggestions.

* 1. **Student Success Fee**

Speaker Carroll said that Steve Filling asked for some feedback by Thursday to go to the state-wide academic senate. This is a chance to offer feedback. Speaker Carroll noted that we don’t have any student success fees (SSFs) currently, but with the sunset of Prop 30 pressure may increase. He asked what we think about these in general as well as in relation to our campus. We are soliciting feedback on student success fees.

Salameh asked if we’re writing a letter or resolution. We are writing a letter. Salameh attended an open forum on SSFs at Sonoma State. It was a great turnout and one of the most successful open forums. Seven student leaders from student government attended. They discussed how there needs to be more efficient student consultation in the process, and the process for how these fees are passed. If we look at all fees, they were often passed in an alternative consultation process. If these fees are easily passed, we need to look into how we are educating the campus community about fees. They also talked about how the system is losing the focus of a public institution, and how we are not putting enough effort into advocating for more funding or using other methods to get money for the CSU. The ASI doesn’t agree with the fees. This is like putting a band aid on a wound to provide resources or education needed because we are not receiving enough state funding for a quality higher education. It’s more about accountability of the process and student consultation within the process. Does the campus community know what they are getting themselves into in creating a fee and opening doors for more fees?

Carroll intends to hold a straw poll on the issue. He will ask if you are in favor, or opposed, or undecided about SSFs at CSU Stanislaus at the end of this discussion.

Steve Wood wants to know what the fees are used for. Are they for administration, teaching, what is it used for?

Eudey said that these fees are being used for all sorts of things. There is not enough clarity. Some of the funds are being used to offer more classes, more academic advising, writing centers, supplemental instruction etc. There are at least two campuses that created these fees before we had the budget problems. They created a flat fee and stopped charging additional lab fees. They created an average fee so it didn’t cost any more to take an Art vs Biology vs Philosophy class. There are lots of different ways these fees can be used. She wasn’t aware of some of these different uses until a few days ago, and is being careful about calling them all bad. Some were done with good intentions, and in some cases students were surprised with these fees. Primarily, these activities should be funded in the base budget and not via add-on fees that work around the agreement not to raise tuition. We are doing a lot of good advocacy to get more funding for the CSU, but are still not getting the funding. Do we try to find more ways to get funding or do we go with backdoor ways to fund essential and useful services and courses?

Nagel’s big concern is that SSFs appear to be a way to evade restrictions and to evade no raise of tuition. The legislature is concerned about the CSU doing that even if they’re not giving us funding. There is a lack of control and a lack of accountability and transparency of how these funds are approved and what they’re used for.

Johnson wants to address what Eudey said about letting services drop or provide funding through a back-door means. She is sympathetic to trying to find more money, but to the extent we do that we do a disservice to students because they are creating a fee that should be part of tuition and labeling it something else. This backdoor approach has effects on the funding being so limited and is not transparent. If we are getting fees someplace else and still providing services on the students’ backs, it will not be obvious to legislators as they will not be hearing about the impact on campuses because of decreased funding.

Strahm wishes to associate herself with those comments. It’s interesting that we earlier had a discussion about minimum GPA’s for students and issues were raised that we often have students who are working and doing other things to survive to go to school and then we are talking about raising these costs for students.

Sarraille adds that this should be a holistic process at the state level to take into account all the factors. Some of these fees come in when they are instituted, and they are quite often for reasons and uses that appear to be good in the estimation of people around, but there is not much to prevent those fees from being misused later. Part of the problem of not having a holistic process, is lack of more oversight of spending in the CSU. Even if it is good there are not enough people looking them over beforehand. When things like lottery money or fees come into a system, and get flushed into another wing of the system, the state withdraws some funding which puts institutions back where they were before the state has taken more of its commitment away. These elections or choices or processes by which fees are put in, sometimes they include students or faculty more or less, but never include students who aren’t there yet, those who will have to pay the fees throughout their college career. Who speaks for them? A more holistic process could better represent those people.

Salameh said these are great points about affordability when sending messages to legislators and the governor. We needed to push for the additional $95 million in system and we failed. If we start advocating for student success or mandatory fees, it sends the message that we don’t need the funding to sustain our public institutions. What kind of oversight is there for the fees? Is there any stability? She feels like now there might be some stability, but post Prop-30, she predicts tuition will go up and more fees will go up. Students will reconsider if they need a degree to survive.

Foreman thinks we should oppose these fees for all of the CSU system. These fees creates a price competition between the CSUs. It won’t be just do I go to college, but which do I attend? This will advantage some over others. If in a urban area with more people, or have higher income in an area, they can charge more. The CSU Stanislaus campus is inherently disadvantaged by this policy.

Provost Strong says it depends on the price elasticity of demand as to what kind of impact. SLOs student success fees of $780 fee has helped them. Since their enrollments are robust, it’s not a problem for them but with their number of students that amount of money is significantly more funding they have than we do, and the more competitive have an advantage.

Wood wants to stop the university from raising these fees. In some ways we’re increasing the cost of tuition and calling it a student success fee. What stops these fees from being raised every year?

Espinoza believes they have to be approved by the BoT and the Chancellor. Provost Strong says it’s been difficult to get fees approved, and now there is a moratorium. Those who got grandfathered in early are in a better position to raise revenue to serve students. It’s difficult to take these things away from campuses that already have them. In a perfect world, a holistic approach should be the approach. We have more complications than that.

Nagel said CFA passed a resolution in opposition to student fees. Posted at http://www.calfac.org/resolution/cfa-resolution-opposing-student-success-fees-and-other-campus-based-fees

Espinoza said some campuses are charging more and you’d think that’d keep students away because they’re charging more. Stanislaus would be disadvantaged, but we are not seeing a stampede because we are less expensive, but are at a disadvantage because we don’t have the resources. From what we see what is paid for are things students’ value and they want, so this is a tough problem.

Price asked if these fees are covered by financial aid. Espinoza noted it increases the cost of attendance.

Thompson said one example is that a local application would be if students wanted more robust career counseling services that might be a reason to support a fee.

Strahm reminded all that the vast majority of our students receive Pell Grant assistance, so they are poor. We’re placing more and more of that burden for a common good on the backs of individuals rather than trying to force legislatures and the governor to refund the system. We can get there thru practical implications, but we are talking about allowing the people making these decisions to be able to say” it’s okay we don’t need to fund them because they can raise tuition rates.”

Provost Strong said we have Pell and SUGs, but other grants as well. Espinoza notes those eligible for Pell are also eligible for SUG, so are getting $10,000-$11,000 to pay tuition and fees and some money to live on without taking on loans. Those with greater need get more SUG money, so there is a redistribution of tuition within CSU. They did an analysis and most of our students receive grant aid and don’t pay it back, so having these fees covered by grants might make some sense. The Provost is not in favor of us having fees or not having fees. The governor rejected the $50 million in small repairs/general maintenance that was supported by the legislature. This is not a good sign.

Straw poll – 5 support student success fees, 25 do not support student success fees on our campus, and 11 were undecided.

1. **Open Forum**

Strahm apologized for being ingratious and snarky to Salameh earlier in the meeting.

1. **Adjournment**

4:04pm