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**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: The following guests were welcomed: Tuedio, Duggan, Trevena, Rezendes, PACE student representative, Rodriguez, Kamali, Lindsay, Shimek, Byerly, Placido and Gonzalez.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:00pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Carroll noted that the staff compensation resolution is under consideration, staff will be arriving at 3pm in support of that resolution, and so that item will be a time certain.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 21, 2014 (distributed electronically)**

Approved with a slight edit.

1. **Introductions**

The following guests were welcomed: Tuedio, Duggan, Trevino, Rezendes, PACE student representative, Rodriguez, Kamali, Lindsay, Shimek, Byerly, Placido and Gonzalez.

1. **Announcements**

Strahm noted that next Monday the 10th there will be a screening of El Norte at the State Theater in Modesto. One of the screenwriters, Anna Thomas, will be leading discussions after the screening. There will be a special presentation by Thomas at 5:40, and after the screening a Q&A at 8:20pm. The movie screens at 6pm and is free. Encourage students to attend. The issue is very timely given the unaccompanied minors coming into our town now. It’s about teenagers from Guatemala escaping violence. It was filmed in 1983.

The Turlock Together Toy Drive started yesterday. The PACE program (in conjunction with the office of Service Learning, staff council, and others) ask that faculty and staff help PACE to try to get 700 toys for the upcoming holiday season. You can donate toys to the barrels on campus, or later this month at a faculty and staff party at which blue barrels will be available for donations. They are asking for brand new toys.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

Johnson noted that Faculty Affairs has the RPT report and will be bringing a resolution to the Senate, commending preparers of the report and supporting recommendations and deciding if more should occur at a later date. FAC is also bringing forward a recommendation for evaluation of the policy for student evaluation of 50% of faculty courses. They are also considering the role of contingent faculty, non-tenure track in faculty governance.

Strahm updated all regarding the resolution 12/AS/14/UEPC – Academic Change Policy for 90 Units and Beyond. The resolution that was a first reading at the October 21st Senate meeting was returned to UEPC and it’s in a holding pattern in UEPC until they hear back from Lisa Bernardo. She noted we have a couple of OIT maintenance days on Dec 29 and 30th where Bb will be impacted. Regarding the Academic Calendar, UEPC sent a letter to campus explaining the decision. They are recommending changes to 2016-17 and 2018-19 calendars. For 16/17 it is to move spring break to almost in the middle of the term, March 20-24, which is the week following the Chavez holiday. They are waiting to hear back from the rest of the approval process. For consultation on programs on co-developing language, they are waiting to hear back from college Curriculum Committee chairs.

Eudey stated that SWAS meets tomorrow and only have two second-reading resolutions before them. One is regarding improving the campus response to sexual violence, a topic Shimek shared with us, and something SWAS is addressing by commending actions and calling on faculty to participate. The other is protecting the academic freedom of CSU faculty facing harassment from outside groups. The resolution calls for administrators to do more to support faculty facing attacks and to promote academic freedom as it is exercised within and outside the classroom. She noted that this year is the first time the chancellor is inviting the entire SWAS to his house for a reception; he’s reaching out and trying to connect with them more than has occurred in the past. Regalado asked for Eudey to elaborate more on the pressure groups on Academic Freedom. Eudey noted she couldn’t do justice to the specifics given the materials she brought with her. She noted that recently faculty at several CSUs have faced challenges for making public statements about the Israel/Palestine situation and have had special interest groups calling for them to be fired or otherwise “disciplined.” At some campuses there have been delays before the administration has said that faculty have the right to speak about controversial topics while in class and on their personal time.

1. **First Reading Items**
	1. **13/AS/14/FBAC Resolution on Campus Staff Compensation**

Bill Foreman noted that at the request of SEC, FBAC did fact finding with staff and administration, and this resolution is the result of what they discovered. In addition to the negotiation process for contracts, staff can ask for individual raises. Very few applied for and were granted in last few years, but there has been a dramatic uptick in last year and a half.

Johnson asked the resolution to be read. Foreman read it aloud.

**13/AS/14/FBAC Resolution on Campus Staff Compensation**

(Sense of the Senate)

**Be it Resolved: That** the Academic Senate recognizes and honors the role staff plays in all the functions of the university, particularly in regard to our primary mission, educating our students, and be it further

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus recognizes that the small compensation of campus staff, particularly staff who have been employed at the university for many years, has often been demotivating and even inadequate, and be it further

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate recognizes the negative effects of staff attrition on the university and its mission, since we lose the expertise of long-serving staff members and must train new staff more frequently, costing considerable time and effort, and be it further

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate commends recent improvements in the number and rate of individual in-range progressions granted to staff members who have applied for them, moving from a low of 6.9% in FY2012 to 84% over the last year. The Senate notes that more in-range progressions have been approved this year than in all years since FY2006 combined, and be it further

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate urges administration to communicate effectively with staff about compensation issues and opportunities, and to reward the efforts of individual staff members while following faithfully the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by staff unions.

**Rationale: According to Staff representatives, Staff** at CSU, Stanislaus are among the lowest paid on all CSU campuses under the just expired contract; their pay specifically compares unfavorably against the compensation of staff at our neighbor campuses with similar costs of living. As with faculty compensation, staff pay has not kept up with inflation, and as many as one-third of campus staff must supplement their incomes via second jobs or public assistance. Some staff members have spent many years at the bottom of their salary scale. Staff unions conducted a survey of staff members; it revealed that while 80% believed they qualified for an IRP, 55% believed they would be denied, while others did not know they could apply for an IRP.

Anecdotally, it is reported that staff members leave CSU Stanislaus for other campuses. Department chairs have recognized the problem that staff attrition creates, reporting to the Faculty Affairs Committee chair a year ago that “staff turnover has also created considerable additional work, as chairs…have to train new staff; expertise is often lost…which must be recreated.” Staff members made a presentation to the University Budget Advisory Committee and to the Senate in spring 2014 arguing for the long-term benefits of institutional memory gained by retaining staff.

Salameh asked if things were not communicated effectively. Foreman said that many staff didn’t know it was possible to apply for an increase, and other communication issues involved some feeling that they were inadequately told why they were turned down, and it seemed that it was something that could be clarified and it could be possible to make opportunities more apparent to staff.

Provost Strong thanks FBAC for their good work and supports the resolution.

Regalado supports the resolution. In authoring the resolution, we have a representative of staff in Senate, and asked if the staff member helped craft the resolution. Foreman said no.

Carroll said a group of staff came to FBAC to report on the situation and that the resolution is grounded in that report.

McCauley stated that she was in communication with the staff group so had some input.

Eudey is very supportive of this and heard last year of the salaries our staff are making. Obviously, staff and faculty are facing lower salaries than we should have. Our staff are underpaid and we lose our share of staff to community colleges, UC and private industry. Just as it is important to have tenure-track and full-time lecturer faculty for continuity, when we pay staff an appropriate wage we are more likely in maintain them. It’s very clear that staff are key components of student success, and paying them a fair wage is humane and just. Whatever we can do to support our staff, including advocating for better funding for them, it is our responsibility to do that.

Shimek wants to thank Foreman and members of FBAC for their work, as this shows they have listened to the staff. Shimek had an opportunity to meet with FBAC and share information. He fully supports this resolution, and thinks it’s the right thing to do. He echoes Eudey’s comments regarding the importance of staff to the academic mission, they are critical and we need to do everything we can to support them.

Hoover said that while it’s not specifically mentioned, we need to do whatever we can to help staff who are forced to reapply for their jobs every few months when temporary. Part-time, temporary secretaries have to keep reapplying and that’s very disrespectful.

Eudey thanked the staff for being here to support the resolution. The next Senate meeting is December 2 when this will return for a second reading.

* 1. **14/AS/14/SEC Resolution in Opposition to Student Success Fees in the CSU (Sense of the Senate)**

Carroll noted that a couple of meetings ago we fished for opinions about Student Success Fees (SSFs) generally because of a statewide group looking for opinions about this. The SEC wrote a letter to share with the Task Force and Trustees. At the last Senate meeting, he mentioned that Sac State developed a resolution opposing the SSFs. On the tail of those, SEC proposes a similar resolution, supporting Sac State’s with a couple of issues related to our campus thrown in. You have a copy of SEC and Sac State resolutions. The resolution was moved by Carroll, seconded by Eudey. This is a sense of the senate resolution.

14/AS/14/SEC- Resolution in Opposition to Student Success Fees in the CSU (Sense of the Senate)

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus endorse and echo the resolution approved by the Faculty Senate at California State University, Sacramento on October 2, 2014 in opposition to the imposition of the type of Category II fees commonly referred to as Student Success Fees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus express its appreciation that CSU, Stanislaus has not sought to initiate the process of considering the imposition of Student Success Fees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be distributed to President Sheley, the Academic Senate of the California State University, campus senate chairs, the California State Student Association, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and the CSU Trustee Workgroup on Student Success Fees.

Tuedio posed a hypothetical about how a position like this might affect discussion that might follow. If we were having an election that involved a significant number of students voting and they reached the point of recognizing there are things they’d like the campus to provide that are not within budget and could help them succeed, how would this body’s resolution reflect on that situation? It’s a strong statement that says we shouldn’t do this, and how much is tied to ambiguities in way the fees are approved.

Carroll says nothing in the resolution forbids us from adopting fees in the future; technically this is just a sense of the senate resolution.

Strahm says the CO and Espinoza have a document that indicates how fees are approved and it provides opportunities for students to decide for themselves the kinds of things they would like to have on this campus. There are mechanisms for students to put forth their views. There is nothing in the sense of the senate that would preclude those things from occurring. Espinoza noted there is a process by which students or others can propose a fee.

Sarraille says what we’re trying to address here is that fees that go around caps on tuition and charge students directly for things that should be provided for by state funding can be a problem. There are extra kinds of things that could be appropriate, like at Sac State they fund a day care center or whatever it may be, that’s not what the resolution is about. He doesn’t see a problem with the way things are worded, but if they want different wording or to clarify the distinction it might be useful. He’s concerned that many campuses already have these fees and it makes them privileged. Our students can’t afford these fees, he doesn’t think, and it seems likely they aren’t as able to support them as folks in other areas, and he wonders if we can call upon the CSU to level the playing field. He would prefer that somehow, even though it’s difficult logistically, that the right thing to do is to equalize the funding first. In the public schools with local control funding formulas, the money is channeled to where it’s needed. It might be good to add something like that, that state funding should be redistributed to be fairer to folks in situations like this.

Nagel said in response to students asking to create such a fee, EO 1054 notes the Chancellor has the authority to set the fees. The Chancellor is required to have consultation with a fee committee but it doesn’t seem that a group of students on their own volition would vote to have a fee imposed on themselves. The Chancellor will impose the fee.

Thompson said that this resolution talks about the appreciation for not having fees on this campus. This is specifically about SSFs in the CSU, with approval at the system level, and there is a task force that is reviewing this topic and we want to inform that discussion, after they determine if there will be SSFs, we can do something more specific related to this campus. This is about a system wide decision.

Eudey said that some of the questions are to find out how student success fees factored into budgets for campuses and how they were taken into account alongside the budget. Currently, there are no answers yet. It appears that it’s possible the special task force could recommend maintaining or removal of fees. So a resolution like this helps to inform the conversation. Some campuses have problems with the way creation of fees has been handled. These fees are pricing out some students. Some are not getting aid or lower income students are hurting, and this is ticking off some members of the legislature. It’s good to say we don’t like this either. It’s a tough call, much like when we play with enrollment situations. This says that and we don’t want to create an end around to the legislature’s call for to freeze tuition levels, and that we need to work together to appropriately to fund schools. Yes, we may not get some of the funds but we need to hold firm on this and tell the CSU and legislature that we need to find a way to do it out in the open.

It was clarified by Nagel that EO1054 is about how the fees are established, who controls them, and the authority for setting those fees. The Chancellor has to consult with a fee advising committee, but it’s the Chancellor who establishes the fee.

Provost Strong said there is a significant difference in funding for campuses across the CSU for a variety of factors including historical reasons. There is quite a bit of difference in how funding occurs. He looked at chart of SSF and multiplied out the total amount and student’s fees at one campus was $51 million at one campus if memory serves right. We have some fees as well, but some have 2-3 times more than others and it advantages them. Our campus has received recognition of late on some notable lists for affordability and access and that’s to our credit because our fee levels are reasonable compared to other campuses.

Ghuman said we don’t know if these fees have a positive effect, if it provides a comparative edge to campuses. Do we think that if campuses do have these fees they become more competitive because they provide these services? Do we want to say not at all when there can be benefit to it?

Strahm says the median personal earnings in San Joaquin Valley for Latinos is $18K. We’re a Hispanic serving institution large proportion of students who come from families with such earnings. She shared additional information about average incomes for other groups. Given personal earnings of people in our area, these are additional costs that impact trying to attend college. A lot of these folks who come from poorer backgrounds get Pell Grants and such, however, at minimum 2% of our population is undocumented and they are already squeezed because they have to pay cash. As we add fees, going around the legislature to whom we pay taxes who should fund us, we’re telling the legislature we can take a pound of flesh from the students and we squeeze them out.

Wisniewski noted that the justification for fees is that many get financial aid and this is seen as endless pot of money but it pays for books, gas, and feeding children. She gets a Veteran’s fee waiver, but pays $600 out of pocket. More fees is less for books, as she has to get money from somewhere. Financial Aid is not an endless pot of money.

Regalado agrees with Strahm’s take on legislators and the rather callous position when it comes to fees and such. The reason they do that is because they know students don’t vote in elections so there is no pressure on them. They can take such liberties which is unfortunate.

Johnson has concerns with using fees to supplant things that should be provided by tuition. It’s disingenuous and lacks transparency. Legislators place a cap on tuition and it causes people to think there aren’t additional costs. When we tack fees on, we circumvent the intent of legislation in a way that is not transparent. It ends up being dishonest in treatment of students, and because of this Johnson finds SSFs objectionable and unethical. If we want to have increased cost to our students because activities are worthwhile and can’t be funded otherwise, we increase our tuition and call it such. It may have political consequences, and it should. If students disadvantaged, maybe that creates pressure to increase funding. Addressing Tuedio, this is a more minor point, fees are there in the future, so students affected who don’t have an ability to have a say.

Ward asked if SSFs have sunset clauses to them. It was unknown. Carroll noted at SJSU there is a move there to rescind the fees.

Eudey proposed a second reading. Strahm seconded.

37 Yes 4 No 1 Abstain – moved to second reading mode.

Ghuman likes what Johnson says about calling a spade a spade. Where will he find information about the campuses that have SSFs, how have they succeeded, and how to be more competitive. What do these fees do, does it improve campuses? What improvements would we suffer by not having them?

Foreman noted that if you look at list of campuses that instituted SSFs, almost all are in densely populated areas that gives them competitive advantages. Students tend to live at home, and they have larger populations to draw from. Someone nearby can pay the fee. SLO has the largest fees, and they recruit from a pool of students who would otherwise go to UCs and pay higher fees. Whether it makes them competitive or not, FBAC has 5 items where we ask administration to find money to do good work. Student fees would allow us to fund things the campus needs, and we have needs that aren’t being funded. They are competitive and privileged because they are in an economically advantageous position that we do not share.

Eudey thinks that’s true. In response to Umar, some campuses are using these fees for many years and other imposed these fees recently and we don’t yet have systematic information about the impact of that. They may have hired more counselors etc. but haven’t indicated how that’s impacting student success. She thinks it’s true that more money does allow campuses to offer more programs and services, but that’s not the only consideration. Just as campuses have chosen not to take money from Big Tobacco or other interests even if the funding could be useful, she thinks it’s morally, ethically wrong to create new fees for students to pay to do things that should be funded via tuition and state support.

Salameh prefers for this not to go forward until we could hear from ASI on this. ASI board of directors has talked about the fee and how not implemented on the campus. They are working on a resolution for campus community about student input about fees on our campus. Doesn’t know the rationale for looking at Sacramento’s resolution, but we should look at how students feel here as well before acting on this.

Price noted that even if there is a high return on investment, would that be an argument for more student fees, or that it’s something the state should provide because a high return on investment. The better argument is for the state to provide for these initiatives because they are effective.

Foreman noted that money is fungible, it can be moved around a lot and it’s easy to do. Even if someone claims they invested in a particular way, he’s not sure he would trust that that is true.

Byerly follow up with Salameh about ASI, asking if they had already discussed with the student body what your thoughts are on fees. Salameh said it has been a discussion item at the board meeting. Those on the BOD represent constituencies so they reach out. They have been talking about it since start of semester and thinking about resolution. Byerly asked if there was an informal sense for ASI? Salameh said as a group they are more opposed to it due to a lot of reasons but they are continuing a discussion and once they have written a resolution the campus will receive it.

Johnson said we’re interested in student input, but the reason to move forward on this is not because of lack of interest but the timeline to get information out.

Carroll speaks strongly in favor of the resolution because of concerns about administration, the unethical nature of this practice, the demographics of students, and because it seems an end-around of tuition cap which sends the wrong message to the state about how they should be supporting us. On top of that, at SJSU they are considering rescinding SSFs. The statewide work group is indicating this is not inevitable and we shouldn’t treat them that way. It suggests this is a fluid policy, and could be undone, reversed, stalled and we can have an impact on that. That and the timing of the working group reporting to BOT on Tuesday of next week, so he’s moving to a second reading today to have this behind them when reporting to BOT.

Wisniewski said the CO website has recordings from the working group’s open forums if we want to see what fees are used for. Some campus sites show what fees are used for. Not all seem tied to student success but the uses include such areas as library hours, counseling services, etc. All recordings available to see.

Carroll said the resolution is addressing our particular campus. SEC decided the second resolved in our resolution addressed the specific campus situation.

37 Yes

2 No

3 Abstain

Motion carries and the resolutions passes.

1. **Discussion Items**

**a. SharePoint update**

Trevena brought John Rezendes the programmer with him. He stated that they had 412 complete the process of selecting courses, and only 20 faculty called the help desk for assistance. Half were browser related issues, others issues tied to problems with the program, and all were handled pretty quickly. Beyond the 20, he’s not aware of what other people are experiencing. Development started a year ago, they went through several beta tests, and released it to faculty at the beginning of October. One of the first confusions was when the announcement went out, the URL was wrong and a change done in the back end to allow wrong address to take you to the program. As OIT is made aware of difficulties, they tried to address them as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Rezendes said in terms of course selection, the first pass when he designed the pilot used Business and Finance, course selection seemed to work, and they used that model for the wider version. When getting results, they used PicWeb to choose fall and spring courses and that wasn’t as accurate as PeopleSoft when it rolled out. The list of courses and how they were selected had to be tweaked to work for all appropriately. There are complexities as to how faculty work across departments, cross listed courses, reporting to multiple chairs and this didn’t get raised until we had a larger audience. They are addressing issues as quickly as they can. Some faculty’s selections showed the wrong person to report to and an incorrect list of courses.

Rezendes noted the misunderstanding about how to choose courses and what that means. Faculty can choose required and voluntary evaluation by students. The order of selecting courses is how they are displayed as required or voluntary. This process was a way to show faculty members if they met the threshold for 50% of courses for the process, but does nothing beyond that. If they hit the threshold, any selected after that will show as voluntary. This does help inform dept. chairs when approving, as they see the choices to see if threshold is hit. Helps to inform correspondence between dept. chair and faculty. He wishes it had rolled out better than it did, but tried to work it out as quickly as possible.

Rezendes noted various browsers could lead to failure. The only browsers that do not function at all are very old versions of Internet Explorer. If you have a modern browser it should work as they’ve tested in each browser. If faculty called the help desk, it was resolved quickly. He’s not aware of outstanding new issues.

Eudey appreciates the work going into this, and Isabel, Whitney and OIT are trying to make it work and respond to questions raised. Department Chairs have been serving as a stop gap and they have stopped OIT from getting many calls about problems. Many didn’t alert OIT about them, but it’s important to know there were far more than 20 with issues. Perhaps with the updating of things those have been resolved for most people. Some we will work on it in the spring. You will probably see another round of questions come forward.

Trevena said they switched to PeopleSoft for the course selection process; everything for spring is still a best guess as the schedule may change. If anything is not correct now, it needs to be resolved thru PeopleSoft. It will take overnight to get it fixed with the class schedule.

Regalado has also experienced problems and contacted his chair and had the stop gap Eudey mentioned. He appreciated the Office of the Senate doing their best to try to work things out. Felt he was wasting time and had a deadline in front of him. Didn’t want a seminar on how to work something out when facing a deadline. It should have been worked out before being foisted on faculty. Not necessary blaming people in OIT for that, but things should already be in play before the faculty has to deal with it or respond and face deadlines to satisfy the needs for information. No one in dept. could get through the system at first try, and 400+ probably didn’t get completed on the first try. He doesn’t know why we have a system with so many snags foisted on faculty before kinks and snags are taken care of. He’s happy to participate when the car is running adequately.

Trevena said once it became available to the wider community new concerns became apparent, there is no standard that cuts across everyone. Some of our systems are primitive and don’t interact well. This is a very large community with diversity of browsers and we can’t make a program that works with every browser, but we tried.

Sarraille used the system but doesn’t remember now whether this is true. When in the system, is there a message to say who to call if you’re having a problem? Rezendes said he doesn’t think so but will make sure it’s there. Sarraille thinks that part of the problem is that people don’t know what to do, and want to know someone is ready to respond. At risk of being pedantic, part of the reason this happens is due to the budget. If we had more funding, maybe we could have a more extensive testing process, and this is the kind of thing that does happen when people are scrambling and working with limited resources and users get some of the job of testing it. Some percentage of the testing that does get done by people.

Rezendes noted in every organization he’s worked for, having some testing, quality assurance, people testing software has been invaluable. This is a small shop, and they don’t have that luxury. Thy try to iron out details, but they’re working under a small amount of resources to build a sophisticated system. They tried to do their best, fell short, and tried to work on as many issues as possible Trevena noted he’s been interim for 3 months and may not have upfront resources but they respond quickly to anything that impacts faculty or students. That’s the focus of his effort while interim. They are agile enough a group to correct things right away. If nothing else, will see responding quickly to issues.

Thompson appreciates OIT. Interactions with OIT and librarians have been responsive and supportive. Question how the system will work with Individual Study classes since generated by a sheet of paper. Will an IS show up? If generated after the spring semester begins, how will this be selected?

Rezendes said only courses that will show are those in PeopleSoft. Some possible ways to handle ad hoc things was to provide an area to add things not in the system. Faculty can type in directly and add those to the list. They’re looking to add this in for the next round.

Johnson appreciates that there are going to be kinks while moving forward. In spring we used to be able to go back and repick classes, will we do that again? Rezendes said you can make selections in fall for fall and spring, and as spring begins you can go back and revise for spring and they would get resubmitted for spring. Johnson asked if we need to initiate things ourselves to redo in spring. Pierce said reminders will be out in spring for updates.

Strahm also loves OIT. But, what she experienced and saw personally and through colleagues, what happened because of budgetary constraints having limited resources to figure out kinks, costs got distributed throughout the entire campus because time and energy were being spent on figuring this out. Ashley Eaton in Sociology was made crazy by having to sit with faculty individually to help them, and calling Whitney who couldn’t do other tasks. This ends up costing the campus community in ways that aren’t observable on a spreadsheet but really are there. She’s pointing out to this body that lacking these resources does come around and hurt us all.

Eudey noted that this is part of a bigger issue of lack of technology infrastructure and staffing that impacts advising and other services. As Strahm noted, this lack of staffing and support is why we don’t have online roadmaps to use in advising, which would be an extreme time saver and promote student success. There are many things we are waiting on OIT to do that they can’t do due to lack of staff. Each of us is wasting time because we don’t have some of the technology and support. OIT is strapped and that’s our collective fault for not designating funding to areas of need.

Trevena said it’s not only that. He has had programming positions approved, and recruited three times and can’t find a programmer. He’s having trouble getting an experienced programmer. They even met with a company to get one. Outside of academe they’re paying fresh graduates out of college $120-150K to get on staff. There is a shortage. We can’t blame this only on funding, because we have been unsuccessful recruiting. Programmers are hard to come by. We are lucky to have the ones we have.

Ward wondered if we had extended the deadline for submitting the request. Classes he requested are not the ones he asked for. He has no clue how what was required or voluntary was assigned. Problems are continuing and likely he’s not the only one, and he’s one of the “successful” ones and not satisfied with it. Rezendes will be happy to work with him, as would the help desk. Ward asked at what point is the dept. chair responsible for approving the selection of courses. It’s possible the chair has already approved the selections, so will she reapprove the new request? Rezendes said there is nothing in the system to prevent you from resubmitting and chair re-approving. However you want to define that. Nothing in the system that limits or defines it.

Regalado noted the deadline to select courses was Oct 30. He’s wondering if we experience similar problems again, and hope we don’t, is there a way to request a grace period to allow faculty more time if experiencing problems. Things pile up on us, and if this isn’t working properly, we have other things to take care of and if deadline is so fixed and we can’t meet it, the whole thing is for naught. Can a dept. chair make a request for an extension?

Whitney Placido said evaluations start the weekend of Thanksgiving, which is only two weeks from now. We need all forms to the dept. a week in advance. They have this week and next to get all the forms together and to faculty. So if you are having issues, we left it open to fix things, but if you’re having issues you need to call and have this resolved to get the forms you need.

Regalado said all is well and good, but by doing so, other things get backed up. The trouble is that all of a sudden we’re in trouble. It can’t be fixed quickly.

Placido said OIT and others have been so helpful, and when they’ve called it’s resolved the same day or next. It’s running correctly and everyone is being very responsive. You’re our special case, and your administrative assistant can see your courses. The only way to get it fixed is by having you troubleshoot it.

Johnson asked if there is a way to get a lot of advance notice for spring and maybe an artificial deadline earlier than the real deadline that would be helpful. She expects she may be failing as a department chair. She expect hers were successfully through, but some spring dates said 2014, so she approved all that were correct for fall and will fix in spring. Looked for a class selected in the fall and hit approve, and will readjust in spring.

Eudey said the most important thing to keep in mind is your fall selections so if you can find a way to get your fall courses selected so they can get things out to you to make things work for fall that’s key. While we want to have an earlier date for spring keep in mind that this can’t be done until the schedule is finalized. Keep in mind that our policy is very clear to make our best efforts to evaluate 50% but if something hinky happens that was beyond our control it won’t be used against faculty or chairs. We will try to trust one another.

OIT is under the impression there are no more people with problems. Pierce noted about 200 faculty have not yet entered if 419 have been submitted. We’ll send a reminder again to those faculty members.

Hoover clarified what Regalado mentioned and he is concerned that the main point is missed is that it’s not Regalado’s problem. He has put time into this. What needs to happen is the university needs to get it fixed and tell him it’s fixed to allow him to make his selections.

Petrosky spoke to some department chairs; there are some student assistants on the list who need to be removed.

Burroughs asked whether the 419 that have been submitted are also approved by chairs, or just ones that have been submitted. In her case, some have submitted but they are not accurate so she had to send the back with a note so several need to be revised and if that is counting as submitted/approved items it’s misleading. John said 400 entered in the system, but it’s not recording how many have been approved. In terms of chairs trying to solve problems, they haven’t reached out to OIT about this, so some not yet resolved and are being managed internally to follow the policy. Burroughs hears the call to just do fall, but if they’re thinking about the full 50%, they should have the availability to choose from all the courses because the system didn’t allow them to select accurately. If they changed teaching assignments, make revisions, but just picking one may make them do 3-4 in spring when fall would’ve been a better choice.

Carroll said obviously we need to move to the future, and can’t perpetuate archaic ways in the future. Spring is a litmus test. Contractual issues here, not just a technological issue.

**b. Graduation Initiative 2025 (Provost Strong)**

Provost strong attended a conference on the graduation initiative. He passed around a document and a PowerPoint was shown on the screen. On Oct 25, the President, Filling, Espinoza and Strong were reps to a meeting that the Chancellor’s Office to discuss the graduation initiative 2025. This is a continuation of the Grad Initiative from 2009, working on improving graduation rates. There was an interesting presentation by Haycock from Ed Trust, and the provost recommends going to the Ed Trust website to look at it. It’s about access and the impact over last 30 years of policies related to access. For the lowest quartile of US family income, 7x less likely to have a child graduate from college than the upper quartile. Presented with some goals to be achieved by 2025, most of these are measures we have been using in the past. We have been tracking our 6-year graduation rate since 2003, and plan for improving grad rates. Aware of this for a long time. 6 year rate, goal for 2025 is 55%; last year we achieved 51.5%. The baseline rate for the system was 49% for similar schools, our peer group was 45%, so 55% for us to achieve is very achievable. 4-year graduation rate, first time the CSU has focused on 4-year rates. A new measure. This will be more challenging. If we felt they were unrealistic, we have an opportunity to ask for them to be changed. Baseline rate was 18%, and some significant improvement for us at 26%. Next is 4-year rate for transfer students, which is similar to 6-year rate for starting. Another new rate is two-year rate for transfer students. Next rate, which we’ve been working on, is URM/NURM gap closure, and we’re already at the goal. Average in CSU is 14%, and we’re one of the leaders in the CSU in this area. There is a 6-year Pell/no Pell grad gap we haven’t measured before.

There is a site on CSU Dashboard to look at our data alongside other campus data. For 6 year graduation rate, we seem to be #10 at 50.4 based on 2006 we improved to 51.5 last year. We’re right in middle of the pack. Campuses have different demographics.

The next slide shows the 4-8 year grad rates for first-time freshmen. Next is overall 4-year grad rate for the 2008 cohort. We’re #9 out of 23 campuses. With what we’re doing with Student Success initiatives we’re in a position to improve these rates and need everyone’s help to improve this. These rates are a university-wide issue, and have many initiatives we’re using to improve rates. We are part of a group with Fullerton to evaluate HIPS which should help us focus our funds on HIPS that make the most difference. HIPS engage students beyond the average involvement in their education and if involved in 2 HIPS, it has significant impacts on success and graduation. There is an RFP from the Chancellor’s Office to improve sophomore to junior retention rates, and this is an area with some weakness. We don’t pay as much attention to sophomores. We’re also working on a proposal to improve information systems and data integrity to better measure students and engage in more effective predictive analytics to see who has problems, when they have problems, and earlier interventions.

Rest of presentation, which will be sent, will show CSU Stanislaus’ overall 4 year graduation rates over a breadth of measures. Comparisons to overall system offered. Then data for transfers, and an overview of our demographics, and a chart of comparison campuses. The purpose of meeting was to kick off the 2025 graduation initiative and begin the process of dialogue about improvement in rates, which we’ve done a good job here, especially the URM gap.

Salameh asked if the CO looked more at bottleneck courses? Strong said last semester there were some initiatives related to bottleneck courses and course redesign workshops by the Chancellor’s Office. They continue to look at courses that appear to be bottlenecks.

Eudey noted that there are a variety of Chancellor’s Office initiatives targeted toward bottlenecks including Promising Practices, Proven Practices and Course Redesign initiatives, as well as Quality Assurance in online courses, e-advising, and CourseMatch systems to assist students in locating online courses at other campuses. Strong said we’ve received a 100K grant for an e-advising program to better analyze student demand based on courses they’ve taken already and better automate the process. They will be responding to those bottle neck courses.

1. **Open Forum**

Regalado had a question about the petition CFA brought to the president about salaries. Regalado also pointed out a story in the Signal about a golfer who was prevented from being released to a Division 1 university, and the athletic department apparently tried to kill the story and he wanted to congratulate the Communication Dept. for teaching their students about the importance of the free press, good ethics, and not practicing censorship on the campus. It was also good for administration for not preventing the story from coming out. Glad we’re practicing good principles for journalism on this campus.

John Sarraille said the long and short of it is that the President stated that he wanted to wait until we had a contract in place before beginning to address the salary issues. Basically, it gives him a reason not to start now, but to wait until the outcome of the ratification process. Once we have a contract he will then look at the issue about running an equity program. Can ask again, but said he wouldn’t make movement until then.

Salameh said last AS there was a question if AS ever disrespected her in any way. She didn’t have time to elaborate on an answer. She doesn’t feel disrespected in AS, everyone has their own responsibility, everyone can agree to disagree, and that’s why we’re part of a community. At times she does feel dismissed. She is a student on University-wide committees and gives input and feels at times dismissed. She’s not disrespected but dismissed. When we were having a meaningful conversation last time, she noted giggles around the table. She is disappointed in this committee. Email her if you want to talk to her about the committee. She is meeting with campus community members and will meet with SEC soon. Feel free to reach out to her or the directors.

1. **Adjournment**

 4pm