

<p>Academic Senate October 20, 2009</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Bender, Bice, Borba, , Brown, Colnic, C. Davis, S. Davis, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Fair, Filling, Floyd, Garcia, Hauselt, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Littlewood, Lujan, Marcell, Mayer, McGhee, Vice President Morgan-Foster, Mulder, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Phillips, Regalado, Ringstad, Schoenly , Strahm, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: L. Dekatzew for Cotton, D. Olivant for DeCocker, P. Hodge for Keswick, D. Renning for Manrique, A. Nevala for Mulder, M. Johnson for Sankey and J. Sarraille for Silverman.</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, L. Brian Duggan, Ed Erickson, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Marina Gerson, Tammy Giannini, Neil Jacklin, Dean Roger McNeil, Roy McTarnaghan, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Dean Thomas Sandman, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Mark Thompson, Margaret Tynan, Associate Vice President Wendt, Carl Whitman.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>18/AS/09/SEC &amp; UEPC Joint Resolution for Support of UEPC Academic Calendar Report, Second Reading. Approved as Sense of the Senate.</p> <p>19/AS/09/SEC &amp; UEPC Joint Resolution to Address Workload for Support for Staff, Second Reading Moved and Seconded, Tabled to next meeting.</p> <p>20/AS/09/SEC Resolution on Academic Administrative Searches, First Reading Moved &amp; Seconded, Tabled to next meeting.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, October 27, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	--

**1. Call to order**

2:38 pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Addition of 6.c 20/AS/09/SEC Resolution on Academic Administrative Searches to First Reading. Agenda approved as amended.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 6, 2009**

Dunham-Filson thanked I. Pierce for typing in larger font. The minutes were approved.

**4. Announcements**

Filling noted that on the last page of the packet there is a list of the rules that the Academic Senate will try to operate under. These are a coagulation from Robert's Rules, operating rules of the Academic Senate of the CSU and local practice. Primarily in order to enable people to participate we'd like people to limit their comments to 3 minutes. The Speaker Elect will let you know when you have one minute left to speak. Please seek attention from the chair and direct your comments to the chair. We will try to ensure that everyone speaks once before others speak twice. Robert's Rules encourages not letting people speak more than twice, but we'll waive this unless people are having difficulty getting a chance to speak. Please confine your remarks to the issue at hand.

Filling noted as a public awareness item that there is a website called <http://www.coursehero.com/> that charges students for perusing the site which includes materials from several courses on this university. Some information includes keys from exams which are posted from this campus. If you visit and find your materials there, you may want to send a suggestion that they remove your intellectual property. Wendt noted that if you do find your materials on this website and you think your materials are copyright protected, please contact him as he has a template form letter already completed for you to send to this

website. He's found that if you respond to the website in a quasi legal fashion that will get their attention. He assured that people who have submitted similar letters have received prompt attention from the website. Filling asked Wendt to send this information to Dr. Stone.

Dunham-Filson announced that the CSUEU Executive Board has a resolution to distribute.

J. Mayer announced that he's been on campus for ten years and the production of *Machinal* by Sophie Treadwell is one of the best he's seen. He encouraged others to reserve tickets soon as seating is limited. It's a terrific show and a great example of what our students are capable of.

Eudey announced activities in FDC. She noted that immediately following this meeting there will be the annual reception for the recently promoted or tenured faculty. Stay afterwards and enjoy some food, beer, wine and conversation. She mentioned the upcoming workshops that will be sent out via Postmaster. Design Your Own Library/Research Workshop by Maryann Hight; Blackboard 9-The Grade Center, Assignments, Blackboard 9-Tools & Communication, the Fiction Book Club, and the Lecture Series in the Faculty Development Centers.

Dunham-Filson noted that you can go to the campus training website to sign up for these events.

Filling noted the guests that are present today. Deans Moore, Fassinger, Novak, McNeil Sandman, and Stefanco. Vice Provost D. Demetruvias, B. Duggan, E. Erickson, M. Gerson, T. Giannini, Helzer, Hodge, N. Jacklin, R. McTarnaghan, M. Thompson, AVP T. Wendt, and AVP C. Whitman.

## **5. Committee Reports**

Nainby noted that he doesn't have a specific report but wanted to clarify on the language on previous reports. He cited item J under senate rules refers to the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act. He asked if that act applies to just UEPC or to all faculty meetings. Filling said it does not apply to faculty committee work of any sort.

## **6. First Reading Items**

### **c. 20/AS/09/SEC Resolution on Academic Administrative Searches**

Jasek-Rysdahl moved the resolution and Schoenly seconded.

*Resolved that all Academic Affairs MPP searches conducted during the 2009-10 academic year be for interim terms, with the interim MPP receiving a salary no higher than that of the current/most recent MPP in that position. And be it further*

*Resolved that all Academic Affairs MPP searches be conducted as internal searches utilizing approved search policies, and involve an external search only if an internal search is unsuccessful.*

*Rationale:*

*1. There are many faculty and administrators on this campus with the talents, passions, vision, and commitment to successfully serve in the known vacancies on an interim (and in some cases permanent) basis. Internal candidates would be much more able than external candidates to "hit the ground running," as they are familiar with the campus mission and vision, the situation the campus faces within the CSU and broader contexts, and have connections to the community. Current employees would also have a better opportunity to engage in transitional work to boost understanding of issues or processes with which they are not yet familiar. This is a chance to expand the administrative experiences of our own colleagues while also supporting the needs of the campus.*

2. *National searches for MPPs have high cash costs – involving ads in national publications, phone calls for initial interviews, Human Resources communications with candidates, travel and meal expenses for face-to-face interviews and the pre-appointment re-visit to campus, photocopying costs of all application materials for all committee members, relocation costs, and the pattern of offering a higher starting salary than is paid to the sitting/vacating MPP. At a time of extreme fiscal crisis, avoiding these expenses is highly desirable. An internal search negates nearly all of these costs.*

3. *National searches consume an enormous amount of time, negatively impacting faculty, staff, and administrator's workload. There is much time spent creating, posting, and monitoring advertising; organizing candidate files and making copies for committee members; reading application materials of all who apply; committee members engaging in committee meetings, interviews, and reviewing campus feedback; conducting reference checks; organizing and hosting on-site interviews; campus participation in on-site interviews; etc. Given current workload and the required furloughs, engaging in these activities takes time away from other necessary work. An internal search will yield a much smaller applicant pool, and therefore will reduce the workload/human costs of conducting a search.*

4. *Given the conditions facing the State of California, the CSUs in general and CSU Stanislaus specifically, it may be difficult to attract candidates to these positions. We may have stronger national candidate pools if we delay the search for permanent positions.*

5. *Selecting interim MPPs affords our greatest flexibility at a time when flexibility is valuable. Without permanent commitments to positions, we have an opportunity to continue to review our organizational structure within Academic Affairs and the Colleges and make adjustments as desired.*

Jasek-Rysdahl said that the rationale has a number of items. It would help address the economic crisis as we have talent on campus and we should be recognizing that talent and saving resources by using it. Schoenly supports the resolution as it could cut some costs of national searches. He also would like to make sure that all the policies and procedures remain in place such as making sure that candidates provide their vitas online so we can see credentials related to the positions. Dunham-Filson asked if this resolution would include all MPP searches on campus. Eudey clarified that in SEC we've discussed that it's best that this body would refer to only academic positions. It seems slightly out of the scope for faculty to suggest on MPP positions in other areas.

S. Morgan-Foster said that this resolution does not include Student Affairs but in the spirit of collegiality it might be amended to say that the Academic Senate at CSU Stanislaus strongly encourages us to consider the following rather than it being a policy directive. She offered this as a point of discussion for others to take up as she would support it.

Brown said that he is in support of the resolution as it stands. He thinks that this is overdue as we entered a crisis mode last spring. From an organizational perspective this should apply to all MPP positions in the university. During a hiring freeze we should recognize that the bottom line is at stake and we should require an extreme justification to hire from outside. The top administration should do this automatically, but since their not, we need the resolution.

O'Brien welcomes this resolution and speaks to it as a first reading. He noted that we have a history of hiring from within on our campus. He recalled that when we were under the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, when the permanent dean left we brought in interim Deans June Boffman and James Klein. Also, Diana Demetrulias stepped in as Provost when D. Dauwalder had a heart attack. This was past practice and we survived.

J. Mayer seconded the suggestion from S. Morgan-Foster. He put it forward as a recommendation as opposed to a firm policy or statement. He noted that he believes that the opinion of the faculty will be clear that in terms of collegiately it's a better way to voice concerns about the issue. He encouraged a change in language of the resolution.

Sarraille distinguished between policy resolutions and statements of the sense of the senate. He asked what was the intent of this resolution. Jasek-Rysdahl said that he was putting this forward as a recommendation on how administration should handle these searches and yes, this will be forwarded to the President as policy. Sarraille said then the wording should stand. If submitting as a policy then it seems appropriate to use definite verbs in the statement.

McGhee spoke in favor of the resolution as "it is" worded. He thinks it needs to be more forceful, as Dr. Brown said this is common strategy in this type of situation. He doesn't think a nudge will be appropriate, but something more formal and more direct is appropriate at this stage.

Dunham-Filson agrees with what we're trying to accomplish, but she doesn't agree with the use of the current wording as a policy. She's also more apt to vote in favor of this resolution if it was a recommendation putting it into policy for all areas on campus and not just the academics.

J. Mayer said the reason this is being put forward is in some sense a reprimand to the very person we would want to have sign this as policy and that seems strange to him. It's important as faculty for us to make our feelings known and not create situations that continue to further a divide that exists or that could end discourse in the issues that are important to us.

Regalado spoke against changing the language on the resolution because these comments suggest that the problem extends from the faculty. He doesn't understand how the wording is less collegial. To him it makes sense to present it in this manner. As O'Brien noted, in the past when we've had internal people serve and they did good job. We had great stability, great relations with faculty and administration because people had a greater stake in the University. He likes the resolution as it stands.

J. Mayer stated that he was not suggesting that because he's asking for an amendment that he doesn't agree with the policy. He's saying that the way it's delivered is of interest to him. He could not agree more that the past interims have been terrific. He's more concerned that the processes work, and he's more concerned with the delivery of the concern.

Garcia spoke in favor of the resolution as it is written. He pointed out that he only wishes it had come from UBAC long ago, and he hopes that UBAC will consider this along with expanding it to other divisions. McGhee amplified on what Garcia said as he thinks there are good reasons for UBAC to look internally but no recommendations have been made at UBAC meetings.

Dunham-Filson asked if it is appropriate for the Senate to tell UBAC to put together a resolution that incorporates all areas? Filling said we can ask the faculty who sit on UBAC to take that forward. As the President says it's his committee so we can't tell it what to do, but Filling, Garcia, Sarraille and McGee can take that forward.

Eudey asked for a second reading. She noted that there are already committees in place for the Dean's and Provost's search, and we'd like to have a decision sooner than later on this resolution. We meet again next week so it may not be necessary to have a second reading today. She asked the senators if their ready to discuss it now or next week?

O'Brien noted that in the first sentence we say Resolved that all Academic Affairs MPP searches conducted during 2009-10 academic year be for interim terms. He suggested a slight word change to begin with so that this policy will be useful into the future and not just for this current academic year. It seems that we want it in place this year and also for future years. Changing that wording would make it applicable in the future and not solely for this year. Sarraille thinks you're going to have to do a more extensive rewrite that would say all new searches would be for interim people. J. Mayer asked for clarification regarding friendly amendments. R. Floyd asked about the speakers list being followed.

Strahm asked if we have to start out with a resolved in these resolutions. O'Brien said yes. Sarraille is not extremely familiar with this resolution as he hadn't looked at it until recently. Although he doesn't think this has much of a chance of being signed into policy, it might be best to get it out there ASAP during a time when it would do the most good if adopted. Since we do have searches taking place he would like to speak in favor of moving this to a second reading. Sarraille moved to a second reading. E. Peterson seconded. Motion passed by voice vote.

Marcell asked if the second reading can include discussion of both options as you can propose amendments in second readings. Novak said prior to moving to a second reading; he would suggest that since his college is one that is immediately affected he'd like to take some time to see if how his College feels about it. He noted that the department chairs had met with the Provost, they recommended committee members, and there was a feeling amongst the chairs that there should be an external search. He thinks that this vote may be premature.

Heredia said that under item 3 it talked about national searches consuming an enormous amount of time and the affect on the faculty, staff and administrators workload. She noted that students serve on these committees as well and suggested that we insert students into item 3. This amendment was approved as a friendly amendment.

J. Mayer proposed a friendly amendment to have the following language added "Resolved that the faculty senate strongly encourages that all Academic Affairs MPP searches etc.." Dunham-Filson seconds. The Friendly amendment failed. J. Mayer moved to make an amendment, Marcell seconded.

Thompson said it has been stated that this is not a sense of the senate resolution, it's something to send forward for the President's signature. Dunham-Filson asked for a roll call vote on the amendment. S. Davis asked for clarification from Dunham-Filson on whether she was asking for a roll call on the amendment or a vote. Dunham-Filson indicated that she was asking for a roll call vote on the resolution. J. Mayer asked for a secret ballot on the amendment. 26 no, 20 yes. Motion fails.

R. Floyd requested that instead of a roll call vote on these amendments we should have a secret ballot. Filling noted that a request for a secret ballot trumps a request for a roll call because of presumed impact on senators' comfort and safety, so we will proceed with a secret ballot when we vote.

J. Mayer is concerned about moving an item from a first to second reading so quickly. He'd like more time to share this resolution with the colleagues in his department, especially since it's a strongly stated resolution. He noted that when we move too quickly without appropriate deliberation that is a concern for him. Filling understands his concern, but ruled this out of order. E. Peterson noted that she's been concerned with other past resolutions with a time certain. She asked if this resolution could be tabled until the next meeting. Seconded by S. Davis and passed by voice vote. This resolution will be tabled to the next meeting.

## **7. Second Reading Items:**

a. **18/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution for Support of UEPC Academic Calendar Report [vote no later than 3:25]**

*Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus strongly recommends that the current Academic Calendar format [4-1-4] continue to be in effect, and be it further*

*Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus echo the sentiments expressed in the report of the Committee for Review of Academic Calendars [CROAC] in 2002:*

*As numerous, similar academic calendar proposals and the corollary reviews of the academic calendar have consumed a great deal of work on the Stanislaus campus in the last quarter century, CROAC strongly recommends that no calendar reviews or proposals for change be undertaken unless arising from the Faculty and grounded in compelling reasons regarding improved teaching conditions and enhanced learning outcomes.*

*Rationale*

*The Senate Executive Committee has concluded that the University Educational Policies Committee completed a more thorough and reasoned analysis of the costs and benefits of getting rid of the winter term than the committee formed by the President. The potential lost revenue from lower FTES, longer time to graduation, accreditation losses, costs to restructure programs, loss of a special identity of the university, and lower student satisfaction would happen if winter term were ended. The UEPC analysis showed that these costs would more than offset any revenue gain from higher fall and spring fees. The survey data gathered by UEPC also provides conclusive evidence of very strong support for the current calendar configuration across the campus community.*

*The Academic Calendar has been the subject of at least 14 reviews on the Stanislaus campus; All but one of those reviews has recommended retention of the 4-1-4 format. The 2009 UEPC review, which focused on current data, provides additional support for the aforementioned 13 recommendations. It is the conviction of the Academic Senate that the Academic Calendar is, and should continue to be, an integral component of the curriculum and thus within the exclusive purview of the faculty*

Filling asked senators' consent to a shift of the voting deadline to somewhere a little after 4 pm. Agreed by consent.

J. Mayer noted that he read both reports thoroughly a couple of times and certainly from the standpoint of the theater department winter term works well for them. One thing that was not discussed but was suggested in the ACAC report was the possible financial benefits for moving winter term to some sort of UEE intersession that could generate capital for the campus in the long term. It's interesting to note that Chico had an interesting model with a lead in intersession as part of spring but they have discontinued that. He'd like to see this as part of the discussion as we move forward. He doesn't think that we can make a decision today and it ends here. The discussion needs to continue because we need to continue to consider revenue sources and a UEE intersession that could be a benefit to us. Filling noted he spent time with the Senate chairs from other campuses last week and that the Chico chair said they were told by the provost that there would be no winter session from UEE effective next year, so he's not sure how that helps us.

Strahm thanked J. Mayer for bringing this up. She appreciates talking about the big issue of money, but she's very concerned that UEE classes do not fall under the financial aid granted to students. If this is something that this body is seriously interested in, we need to understand the significant burden on our

students. The per unit cost for UEE without access to financial aid, and the students that can only get private loans if they qualify. She noted that we need to be aware of this.

Heredia said that she was going to take a UEE course in the summer and financial aid was going to be granted to her. They were able to help her out, but she didn't take the class. She also noted that if the classes were to go under UEE that some of the money could go towards scholarships for students.

Nainby noted that another issue for the UEE model is in respect to control in the UEE term. It's his understanding that administration controls the curriculum and hiring for these UEE courses and not the department. Dean Stefanco said that she has signed MOUs for UEE programs and all hiring and curriculum remains with faculty in the department. She wouldn't support UEE courses where that wasn't the case.

Marcell noted that he has tried to design a UEE program for Kinesiology for a certificate program. You can make it curricular based through the curriculum committee and call it a certificate. The other option is not to go thru the Curriculum committee, but you can't call it an academic course. Sarraille said if courses are offered for academic credit in UEE, it's a matter of law to go thru traditional curricular process for the stateside.

McGhee said there are programs for financial support that UEE will exclude, including fee waiver programs, someone attending school thru the veterans program, county office, etc. UEE will not be covered for some students. If tuition is provided via special programs it will be excluded.

S. Morgan Foster offered more information. In talking to the Director of Extended Education in Chico in regards to the academic calendar. They offered both UEE and state support intersession at the same time. They have eliminated the state support due to their need to reduce FTE's as we are currently on this campus.

Eudey noted that her understanding is that if you're enrolled in the UEE program there are the exceptions that McGhee mentioned. She's concerned that to move courses to UEE we'd have 15 week sessions, and we'd have to shorten summer term. If we move to semesters and add an intersession, we're going to lengthen the length of spring term and this may cause difficulty for the 10/12 month staff that are off in the summer.

Strahm noted that she may have been looking at the wrong place on the UEE website and apologized if that was the case. Dean Stefanco said that she didn't know what portion of the website Strahm mentioned but it might be tied to CEU credits and not academic credits. If the course is being taken for academic credit then financial aid is available.

McGhee said we've talked about moving to the semester model which has 15 weeks. Why couldn't the semester be as it is currently and same contact hours as currently. Doesn't it exceed a regular semester? When talk about need for 15 week semester, is that written in stone? Assume there should be flexibility in length of semester, tied to contact hours.

Dean Stefanco noted that if we could shorten the intersession or eliminate the break between intersession and so that we could still end the 15 week semester when we do now.

Filling reminded senators to stay focused on the resolution.

Sarraille pointed out that as far as moving courses into UEE; there are rules and laws that have to be followed including a curricular approval process. He's not clear that it would be legal for us to move things even if we would like to.

Petrosky supported the main motion noted that he's spoken to each department member and they unanimously support it. He mentioned that there were staff members from his College that attempted to go to the CSEU Executive Board meeting to share their support of the UEPC resolution but they were turned away and told that this was a closed meeting. He also said that the ASI Senator for Business also expressed support for this resolution and his students also seem to support it.

R. Floyd noted that she's said this before and that she would be brief. She urged her fellow senators and esteemed colleagues to see the big picture of this resolution. She noted that the process was unique and orchestrated in a manner that pitted us against each other as a campus community. If you have the conviction that the academic calendar is part of the curriculum and under the purview of the faculty, then you should seriously consider supporting this resolution as it is a result of the work of the faculty.

Dunham-Filson spoke to the comment from Petrosky regarding the staff members that were turned away from the CSEU meeting. She noted that they were told that it was a closed meeting, and they were invited by someone who knew it was a closed meeting. They did not turn them away because they didn't want to hear their opinions as it was not their intent to turn anyone away. She noted that if you read the resolution put forth by their Chapter it doesn't state that they want to eliminate the winter term. It states that they're in favor of an academic calendar that addresses the workload issues for staff.

Nagel said that as the Philosophy senator that his department showed unanimous agreement with the resolution. He wanted to look at the smaller picture as the resolution and rationale speak to a narrow set of concerns about whether to retain or abandon winter term due to fiscal concerns. He noted that this should give us pause as educators. Even if we set aside any pedagogical reasons to retain the winter term, it's important to note that it isn't clear from the ACAC report that eliminating the winter term will have the benefits it's assumed to have. If we're concentrating on the small picture it doesn't make sense to vote for anything besides keeping winter term.

Garcia reminded everyone that FBAC did look at both reports and in responding we did not see enough credible financial benefits to eliminate winter term. The cost savings are based on assumptions of how students might behave, and basing actions on assumptions is not in the best interest of the university.

D. Renning is here as retired faculty member. He said that it seems to him that there are only two reasons that need to be addressed when discussing eliminating winter term. One reason was just addressed; the financial reasons may be powerful enough to argue to eliminate winter term. The other reason has to be academic. He hasn't read, or heard any arguments that are persuasive that there are academic reasons not to keep winter term. If that is the case, why are we talking about getting eliminating winter term? He doesn't see any justification for doing it. He was on campus when the 4-1-4 model was adopted and throughout those years the winter term was highly regarded by students as well as faculty. It provided a lot of good things for the students that the regular semester could not offer them. There was a good reason to adopt it in the first place. Even though it has been reviewed, the final decision has always been to keep it as it's something special. There is no reason today why that should be looked at in a different way. He's very much in favor of this resolution to keep the winter term.

Peterson said sometimes decisions are hard because you have a case that something may be more expensive but it's really good. The decision should be easy. Based on the UEPC report there is wide support from students and faculty that it works well pedagogically, and from their analyses there is a possibility that we

could lose a great deal of money if we eliminate. While we need to address workload problems and ways to deal with registration and grading, keeping winter term is an important and a very easy decision.

Thompson addressed an idea that also supports the winter term. There have been discussions on campus recently that would say that faculty are anti-entrepreneurial or anti-online and those discussions are being included in the support of eliminating winter term. He's personally not opposed to being entrepreneurial, and is developing an online course for spring. Concerning innovations in the curriculum, one argument is that we're one of the few campuses left with a 4-1-4 and this difference is an argument against eliminating winter term. Just because everyone else isn't doing it and it's been around for a while doesn't mean it's not innovative.

Littlewood noted that UEPC said that financial reasons were the rationale for consideration, but the other pedagogical issues that have been dealt with in the past are still as valid now as they were then and they didn't need to be reinvestigated.

S. Davis said English overwhelmingly supports the 4-1-4 calendar and exclusively for academic and pedagogical reasons. People may think that we don't care about finances, but based on this discussion that is untrue. He noted the CROAC report and the [add: second] resolved clause. While this issue has been studied 14 times with the same conclusion, it also has [dele: 14] failed to address staff workload issues 14 consecutive times. He hopes that we bring the same conviction to address these workload issues as we do to retaining the 4-1-4 calendar.

Dunham-Filson said we keep talking about money and that students won't take classes based on polls, but for financial aid purposes students are required to take a number of units per academic year. Those units would be moved to the fall and spring in order to give them the financial aid. Her understanding is that the winter term was created to implement education to offer unique class's students wouldn't be able to take normally. Now her understanding is that those are not the classes being offered so where is the uniqueness of winter term? What are the numbers, she would like to see the numbers.

Morgan Foster noted that her comments at the least meeting were extensive and their included in our packets. She would like to disagree with those who don't think there will be significant financial savings. We need to look at this as not eliminating winter term but still finding a way to retain winter term. Do we continue to have a 4-1-4 model if that model disadvantages us with classes, workload and money we can collect? There are ways to accommodate those if the new calendar is designed.

Petratos said the faculty and staff of CIS unanimously support the resolution, and that all the students he surveyed also support it.

Strahm repeated what she said at the previous Academic Senate meeting. Most of her students are poor working class students some of whom still have parents working in the lettuce fields. The increased credit unit load assumes a traditional student cohort. From the Institutional Research data we don't have traditional student cohorts; we have a lot of non-traditional, first generation college students etc. If we do increase the class workload, what kind of strain does that put on the poor working class student? What will happen to the students that are adding more courses per semester in order to get through to graduation? If you have to take 30 units per year, how does that impact those human beings we are here to serve?

Colnic echoed Strahm's points speaking to the uniqueness of the winter courses. We do offer several unique classes or structures that are difficult to replicate over other semesters. It's not a matter of numbers. GE classes have a different feel while maintaining their course descriptions in winter term. Entrepreneurialism has been brought up and if we take only a financial look at entrepreneurialism we missing much in being

innovative.

M. Johnson said that many in his department would like more time in the semester and winter term is difficult so they really don't use it much. Academically the change is sound, but most of the departments on campus agree that although they may have personal reservations about it they will vote for the resolution because other departments find it more valuable. Although, for some departments it doesn't work as well as for others.

Mayer said that the Theater department unanimously supports this resolution. Dunham-Filson again calls for a roll call vote, but Filling noted call for secret ballots overrides the call for a roll call vote.

Marcell said that the FBAC recommendation that was emailed had a strong comment that there are serious concerns with the 4-1-4 about workload, etc. Ted Wendt's report was also very informative about the costs that occur. If we vote to accept the 4-1-4 how do we address this major problem? It's a problem for staff workload and for financial aid. If we want to keep its uniqueness how do we address the problems raised so we don't have a need for additional resolutions on the winter term topic.

E. Peterson noted that the next resolution addresses this. Marcell said he didn't think it did enough to cover these issues.

Novak said an answer to Marcell's question is that the CROAC report had serious recommendations and saw some of the same issues that arose here about workload, etc. There was a request to form a task force to address these issues. As is typical with reports and analyzing winter term and going into a period of latency that says nothing has been done. People may exhume the CROAC report and look at the body of information there.

Filling noted that it is time to vote as we are out of comments. He's pretty impressed that half of the senators contributed to the discussion and it was not controlled by a few members. The vote was 39 yes, 6 no, 2 abstained. The 18/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution for Support of UEPC Academic Calendar Report Resolution passes as a sense of the senate and will be communicated to the President. Ovation. Filling encouraged all to express appreciation to St. Morgan-Foster and Littlewood for a sometimes thankless task. Ovation. Littlewood thanked the student representatives on both of these committees. Another ovation.

**b. 19/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution to Address Workload of Support Staff  
(Revised version 10/12/09) [vote no later than 4:15]**

*Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus request that the Provost and the Vice President for Enrollment Management establish a task force, to work closely with the relevant faculty governance standing committees, focusing on mechanisms for reducing the workload problem heightened by Winter Term, and be it further*

*Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus request that the task force consider the following suggestions, as well as anything else they believe would be relevant:*

- exclusive use of permission numbers to add students to a class*
- exclusive use of the online grade entry system*
- development of an online grade change system*
- development of an online census roster system*
- admission/graduation for Fall and Spring rather than having three separate admission/graduation*

*cycles*

- *development of models that further automate the financial aid amount calculation, approval and disbursement process*
- *use of service learning students or graduate student independent study projects to assist staff with re-engineering of business processes surrounding faculty workload/payroll systems*
- *systematic re-engineering of the processes surrounding entering, updating and maintaining student records*

*Rationale*

*The UEPC report notes that Winter Term exacerbates extant workload problems for staff, particularly those in Enrollment Services, Financial Aid, Student Accounts Receivable and Faculty Affairs. It seems prudent to treat those problems as an issue separate from the Academic Calendar since the majority of those problems will occur regardless of our calendar configuration. It is also the case that we routinely seek to use technology to solve resource contention issues, and it seems logical to utilize technology in this situation as well. The bullet points above were drawn from discussion at the Academic Calendar forums and provide a starting point for further discussion and analysis rather than a comprehensive enumeration of issues needing attention.*

*The standing committees of the Academic Senate agree that this process will be a priority on their agendas, and that we may need to act expeditiously to modify extant policies and procedures.*

-----

Filling noted that the new version includes mark ups with suggestions from staff and senators and hopefully it is clear what was changed. Open for discussion.

Dunham-Filson wishes to change the wording in the first resolved to say after Enrollment Management “work closely with areas that are severally impacted and with the relevant faculty standing committees focusing on ..... ” replacing “establish a task force.” Filling read this amendment aloud.

O’Brien said fine, but are we removing the task force. Dunham-Filson said that if administration just talked to the people who do the work and have done so for years and years that they could provide good suggestions for business processes. O’Brien asked where is accountability for a report on what was done, and who will take that role? Dunham-Filson said she assumes the areas who are impacted would take that forward.

Marcell said without a task force the responsibility defaults to administration or an unknown body. Noting the areas impacted is fine wording, but we still need a phrase denoting responsibility for carrying this out.

S. Davis said that a task force may not be the way to go, but we can't think of a substitute mechanism. He shared concerns about there being someone who is in a position of responsibility thinking of a way to make it better and encouraging administration to listen to their staff and make things better.

Colnic appreciates the workload issues that others raised. A task force has the collaborative effort of bringing people together. The interaction, collaboration and oversight are all important.

Nagel said if the amendment had been accepted as friendly, the first resolved gives responsibility to the Provost and Vice Provost for enrollment management. If those are the appropriate administrators to work with staff maybe that is the right way to go and doesn't exile the task force.

Sarraille noted that he wasn't around when this resolution was conceived. One of the issues to identify is whether you can talk about a task force or a report with or without a task force. Perhaps they can work on a time certain report and identify the person expected to give the report.

D. Olivant noted that there may be a problem with staff not being listened to by administrators, but it's not the role of faculty to tell administrators how to work with their staff. This is outside of the faculty role.

Schoenly noted that we have seen other reports with staff concerns. He asked what were the mechanisms used in prior reports, and does this go beyond what the other reports recommended for resolving the staff issues.

Dunham-Filson said that she doesn't want her comments to be taken in a negative aspect. Staff appreciates what the faculty are trying to do. Although, the majority feel it's not the faculty's place to figure out how staff and administration work out their issues. While there should be a mechanism put into place to evaluate how the workload is distributed, we don't feel it is the faculty's responsibility to address this. The resolution itself addresses your support of staff workload and it is appreciated.

B. Fair said that ASI has been working with faculty and administration in regards to a possible solution. It's similar to Chico where we'd move to two enrollment periods that assists with the staff workload but still allows an early spring option. Students would have the opportunity to register for both ESO and the spring semesters at the same time. This is centered around the Chico model, and we'll have to decide between 13-15 week semesters that will remain on stateside. He thinks that this may solve some of the issues we're encountering.

Eudey said that faculty are affirming that they are willing to make changes. That they will move to online grade systems, using submission numbers etc. She's been in contact with other campuses that are shifting some of their responsibility off of staff to faculty and in the long run it has saved the faculty member work also. Faculty are willing to say that they are willing to assist in alleviating some of the staff workload that will address some of the problems. Thompson echoed Eudey.

O'Brien noted that we don't want to lose what Dunham-Filson said, but he wonders if by inserting the following "*write a final report after working closely with the areas that are severely impacted and the relevant faculty governance standing committees*" and also include what Dunham-Filson said. Moved by O'Brien and seconded by Sarraille.

T. Wendt noted some of the comments regarding staff workload affected by the winter term included his staff, HR staff, payroll, and enrollment management services staff. He noted that the statements administrators made to the two committees regarding this process were reflective of their staff opinions regarding the workload that winter term creates. The problem isn't that the managers ignored their staff or didn't want to listen to their concerns. The bottom line is that the winter term creates additional workload and as long as it's here the workload will remain. This is not about him or whoever leads Human Resources, payroll and enrollment management services, not listening to staff concerns on their workload.

Eudey moved for an extension of 5 more minutes for a vote. Agreed.

S. Davis was concerned that the amendment on the floor would put too many actions into one resolved. He suggested that rather than packing an action into the resolved that we add a third resolved that would ask for a report. O'Brien deferred to S. Davis' motion to add a third resolved.

Nainby said that in terms of the language for the amendment, it seems that we need more discussion regarding who will write the report, for whom it is issued and how it is evaluated, etc. If we want to strengthen this resolution we'll need a written report. He noted that it feels like we're rushing through this and if we want this to have impact we need to word it carefully. He doesn't feel ready to vote on this.

Littlewood spoke as a private senator and not as the chair of UEPC. He noted that when he talked with Blake Fair and Rick Albert that the issue is not that managers are not listening to staff but that there might be other means of reducing the staff workload without eliminating winter term. Nainby requested to table this resolution to the next meeting. C. Nagel seconded. Unanimous.

### **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn at 4:37pm