Members Present: Jim Murray (chair), Jesus Diaz-Caballero, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Cathy Inouye, Yi Jiang, Evelia Jimenez, Jim Murphy, Susan Opp, Glen Taylor, Holly Vugia

Guests: Don Sawyer, Kevin Bristow, Jiansheng Guo, Rosanne Harris, Marguerite Hinrichs, Sara Judd, Mike Mahoney, Sally Murphy, Glen Perry, Angela Schneider

1. Approval of Agenda
   M/S Fenno-Smith/Opp; Passed 10/0/0

2. Approval of February 6, 2012 minutes
   Not yet distributed via email; will approve at next meeting.


4. Information item regarding grading option policy
   Existing academic policy is that students cannot take any course that will show up on major check as CR/NC unless the course is only offered as such. A few sentences are being added at the beginning of every major’s list of degree requirements in the catalog. They read:
   No course in your major department, regardless of course prefix, may be taken CR/NC unless that is the only grading pattern of the course. Any exceptions to this general policy will be made at the major department's discretion.

5. Discussion of Priority Registration Policy
   Background: Concern that so many students/groups are requiring priority registration (PR), pushing numbers above the 5% cap. Dilemma is how to manage this challenge, without making “priority registration” moot yet be responsive to student needs.

   Committee viewed data from PR for spring and fall 2011. A lengthy discussion followed.
   • Sara Judd explained data reflects athletes who are freshman at registration time, but who will be sophomores by the time of the actual enrolled quarter. She summarized critical scheduling needs of athletes (practice, travel, meeting NCAA “progress toward degree” requirements.
   • Based on fall 2011 (709 students), the rank order of programs based on the number of students referred for PR from greatest to least were: 1) SDRC, 2) athletes, 3) veterans, 4) honors students, 5) Orientation Team, and 6) Renaissance (former foster youth).
   • Attention called to the important registration needs of graduating seniors (Opp).
   • Sally Murphy requested that peer mentors be considered for PR to guarantee schedule availability with their assigned freshman cluster class. She also suggested that freshman who receive earlier registration to guarantee cluster courses, could perhaps be moved farther down the queue since cluster classes are reserved already. Currently, after PR,
registration is in the following order: graduating seniors, graduating graduate students, freshman, and then other seniors.

- Kevin Bristow, working with former foster youth, explained his program prioritizes needs for PR within the foster youth group already; resulting in the following order of PR: 1st) sophomores, 2nd) juniors, 3rd) non-graduating seniors, and 4th) graduating seniors and freshman. Students must maintain a 2.0 GPA. He pointed out that some students may be in more than one PR category, thus resulting in duplicates in data.

- Marguerite Hinrichs, representing the Orientation Team, explained that PR is an important incentive for these year-round volunteers who receive a small one-time stipend. They must attend summer trainings and a specific recreation class.

- James Murphy pointed out that programs mandated by legislation to be PR eligible (SDRC, veterans, foster youth) account for the majority of PR students (about 4.5% in the allotted 5%). Since all groups seem deserving with solid reasoning for PR, he suggested that the current 5% PR cap be increased to 7%. He also suggested a clear definition be developed about what is meant by “graduating seniors” and “incentive groups.”

- Don Sawyer offered a historical view, that this PR problem is not new. However, he suggested that the new mandated categories change the whole picture. In addition, he anticipates veterans will increase in the next few years.

- Glen Perry explained that PR has historically been an important incentive for volunteers and recruitment. He suggested mandated groups be removed from the PR cap calculation, since there is no choice in the matter of PR for these groups; then the cap PR numbers could be reserved for graduating seniors, followed by other priority groups.

Sue Opp made motion to remove mandated groups (SDRC, veterans, foster youth) from the 5% PR cap calculation and have a separate 5% cap for other total PR, including graduating seniors, athletes, peer mentors, and others as an incentive.

Kyzyl Fenno-Smith offered friendly amendment to the motion: Extract mandated groups from the 5% cap; then have athletes, freshman peer mentors, etc. receive PR with a 5% headcount trigger that notifies the Academic Senate chair of the situation.

M/S Fenno-Smith/Inouye; Defeated 1/8/1

Yi Jiang proposed to extract mandated groups from PR cap, and have all other PR groups (need and incentive) trigger notification of the Academic Senate chair if 3% cap is reached.

M/S Yi/Opp; Passed 10/0/0

Sue Opp moved that honors students, orientation team, and EOP be provided incentive of early registration, not PR, after graduating seniors and graduate students; with proviso to notify Academic Senate chair if numbers go above 2%.

M/S Opp/Inouye; Passed 8/0/2

Remaining discussion point:
Concern for reducing graduation time. Sue Opp said Student Success Assessment Committee (SSAC) is exploring this issue, Chair Linda Dalton. Josh Guo pointed out challenge of GE class size caps and impact on graduation rates. Discussion of graduation success of some but not all cohort programs (Glenn Taylor, Sally Murphy). Jim Murray to contact SSAC to facilitate information sharing on this subject.

6. “From the Floor”
   None.

7. Adjournment
   M/S Opp/YI; Passed 11/0/0

   Next CIC meeting, Monday, March 5, 2012, 2:00pm

Respectfully submitted,
Holly Vugia
February 20, 2012