

<p>Academic Senate October 6, 2009</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Bender, Bice, Borba, Broadwater, Brown, Colnic, Cotton, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeCocker, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Fair, Filling, Floyd, Garcia, Hauselt, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Keswick, Littlewood, Lujan, Manrique, Marcell, McGhee, Vice President Morgan-Foster, Mulder, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Phillips, Regalado, Ringstad, Sankey, Schoenly, Silverman, Strahm, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: None</p> <p>Guests: Rick Albert, Andrew Brown, Lauren Byerly, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, L. DeKatzen, Brian Duggan, Ed Erickson, Dean Ruth Fassinger, P. Garone, A. Garza, Marina Gerson, Sara Hoek, Susan Marshall, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Roger Pugh, John Sarraillé, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Mark Thompson, Margaret Tynan, Associate Vice President Wendt, Associate Vice President Carl Whitman, Tammy Worthington</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>17/AS/09/SEC Resolution Thanking UEPC for Their Work on the Academic Calendar Report, APPROVED</p> <p>18/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution for Support of UEPC Academic Calendar Report, First Reading Moved & Seconded</p> <p>19/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution to Address the Additional Workload for Support Staff Due to Winter Term, First Reading Moved and Seconded</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, October 20, 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

2:34 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved with no changes.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 5, May 12, and September 22, 2009

Petrosky noted on May 12th minutes, page 2, paragraph 3, and line 3 says processes and eternal reviewers should be external. O'Brien noted that Bowman was the recording secretary so we'll pull her out of retirement. Dunham-Filson noted on September 22, page 5, first two words on top should be "he does." Eudey reminded that small grammatical errors can be sent to I. Pierce and B. Eudey and only substantive ones should be addressed in the Senate. All of the minutes were approved.

4. Announcements

Filling reminded we will have an additional Senate meeting on October 20th, at the regular time 2:30-4:30pm. This is an additional meeting and is not replacing the meeting on October 27th.

Filling announced that SEC will hold two forums to discuss shared governance, civility and change. The first is on Thursday October 8, from 10am – 1 pm, in FDC 118. The second forum is on Wednesday, October 14 from 2-5pm, in FDC 118. The CSU Senate chairs group has been preparing a compendium of what is occurring regarding winter and spring; some may find it handy when addressing admitting and not admitting students into programs.

Dunham-Filson announced that as a campus trainer she is available to attend department meetings or come to the Faculty Development Center for trainings. Also, the faculty development workshops are now on the campus training and professional development website so you can register for them at:

<http://www.csustan.edu/ctpd/PersonalDevelopmentTrainings/index.html>

Colnic reminded us about the conference for sustainable futures. A full schedule will arrive fairly soon in your mailboxes. It's taking place on Thursday, October 15th thru early afternoon on Sunday, October 18th. The events run mostly all day, every day.

T. Marcell reminded everyone about the RSCA week started on October 5th and will run all week. There will be faculty sponsored talks every evening in the Event Center. This event is organized by faculty for faculty. He strongly encouraged all to stop by the Event Center this week.

M. Bender reminded everyone that Director Snow will be here next Thursday October, 15th to speak on water resources, and that the kickoff for the Sustainable Futures conference will be held in the Snyder Recital Hall. Also, the Taste of the Valley event is the following week and he still has tickets for this event.

Brian Duggan reminded everyone that tomorrow is the Technology Fair being held in MSR, from 10am - 2pm. There will be 10 vendors' displays, and four faculty - C. DeVries, K. DeVries, S. Liu, and B. Eudey - will be showing off technology. Stop by to show appreciation and enter a drawing for prizes.

Eudey announced that applications for the 2009-10 faculty voices are due and the preferred deadline is to submit by this Friday, October 9th. Today you should have received the first edition of e-FDC, an online faculty development newsletter providing resources that supplement/complement the face to face offerings of the Faculty Center.

Filling noted the guests that are present today. Deans Moore, Fassinger, Novak, McNeil and Stefanco. Also, R. Albert, A. Brown, L. Byerly, AVP D. Demetrulias, L. DeKatzew, B. Duggan, P. Garone, A. Garza, M. Gerson, S. Hoek, S. Marshall, R. Pugh, J. Sarraille, M. Thompson, AVP T. Wendt, AVP C. Whitman, and T. Worthington.

Committee Reports

Schoenly announced that at the first FAC meeting of September 30, members spent most of the meeting time exchanging concerns about the current campus climate and senior management. Towards the end of the meeting, the committee unanimously agreed to ask Speaker Filling to provide FAC the document Filling and State-Wide Academic Senator O'Brien brought to the Chancellor's Office for FAC to frame and update and make available to the General Faculty as an information item.

Because FAC's charge/duties are limited to expediting concerns to the General Faculty on professional ethics, faculty morale, and certain personnel matters, and not about fiscal and curriculum matters, the committee further suggested UEPC, GC and FBAC consider joining FAC as co-sponsors of the information item that would then go out to the General Faculty. In other news, FAC members agreed not to meet on October 14th, so that they could attend the SEC open forum on the same day.

First Reading Item:

17/AS/09/SEC Resolution Thanking UEPC for Their Work on the Academic Calendar Report

Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus commend the members of the University Educational Policies Committee for their work over the summer, which culminated in the Report on The Academic Calendar delivered to the Academic Senate on 28 September, 2009, and note that all members of the committee, students,

staff, administrators and faculty, worked diligently to provide the best information and recommendation they could, and be it further

Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus thank the student member of UEPC, Rick Albert, who put forth an enormous amount of effort both in soliciting student input on the issue and in data analysis. We express our sincere gratitude for his efforts on behalf of our University and our community.

Rationale

The issue of the Academic Calendar was brought up by President Shirvani late in May at the conclusion of the spring term. UEPC Chair Littlewood and the members of UEPC took on the task of a review of the Academic Calendar over the summer, despite the reality that neither the chair nor the faculty members of the committee are contracted employees over the summer. While the UEPC experienced delays of an entire month in provision of some of the data requested, the committee managed to finish its analysis and complete its report within the original timeline established in early June. The survey data collected by UEPC included responses from almost 150 faculty, over 980 students, 73 staff and 9 administrators, clearly indicating that the members of UEPC were effective in soliciting responses from the University community.

Filling thanked UEPC for their report on the winter term and announced the first reading of this resolution. O'Brien moved and R. Floyd seconded.

O'Brien noted that the resolution is pretty straightforward, and that it likely won't be very contentious because we want to recognize that a lot of work occurred in the summer. SEC met frequently in the summer and UEPC was tasked at looking at the winter term. They held numerous meetings and SEC wanted this resolution to thank them for their work. O'Brien read the report aloud. The ASI Vice President, Internal, Rick Albert, was asked to stand and received an ovation for his participation on UEPC.

Jasek-Rysdahl moved the 17/AS/09/SEC resolution to a second reading. R. Floyd seconded. A voice vote was taken to consider the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Regalado joined others in thanking the committee for its hard work. He knows that it takes a lot of time to do this in addition to teaching and research. UEPC went into depth, conducted an extensive survey, addressed fiscal matters, and made reasonable recommendations. Their paving the path to the future, which good members of the academic communities do. They took the workload matters seriously, and that was nice to see. He was intrigued by the student response which begs the question about maintaining the winter term if the voice of the students is ready to support the UEPC recommendation in support of the constituency.

17/AS/09/SEC Resolution moved to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions. Ovation.

First Reading Item:

18/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution for Support of UEPC Academic Calendar Report

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 noted that he's borrowed some rules from the State Wide Academic Senate which allows us to limit remarks to three minutes. The speaker-elect, Jasek-Rysdahl, and Filling will try to give folks opportunities for first comments before recognizing others for second and third times. They will direct comments to the chair of UEPC, I. Littlewood, and at any point in time senators can be allowed to ask for a point of privilege for an open discussion and ask visitors to leave. S. Morgan-Foster objected to the request to ask visitors to leave since some members are ACAC members. Filling noted that this is a privilege that the senators have. He's not anticipating that this will happen, but it's in the universe of things that can happen.

Littlewood moved the motion, Eudey seconded.

Littlewood noted that everyone should have received copies of the UEPC Academic Calendar report, and he hopes that everyone had time to read through it. He chose not to review it in detail. UPEC spent a lot of time reviewing this from the fiscal point of view. From the support we got on campus for winter term; the survey conducted has alluded to the need for recommendations about addressing some workload issues associated with the winter term. He's happy to try to answer questions.

It was noted that the state support figures on page 2, and in appendix E, had a typo as it stated 79643 but the actual figure is 7964. Littlewood noted that the "3" is a superscript for the note below and is not part of the number. It's a footnote reference. Littlewood said that the first figure listed is what the President

mentioned at the September 10th state of the university meeting. The other figure of 7964 came from Financial Services. On appendix G, it appears that if you total all the numbers from Financial Services it's including the 7964.

S. Morgan-Foster would like to commend UEPC for their report. She enjoyed reading it and appreciates the sincere and thoughtful effort that went into it. The two committees saw the same data, but their Conclusions were different. She respects the recommendations made. She pointed out that one major difference is that UEPC is concerned that if winter term moves off of the state side that FTE might be lost overall. She shared that there is no way to completely predict this. The ACAC group assumed that students not taking winter classes would migrate to Fall and Spring. Similarly, there is no way to prove this assumption either. ACAC assumed this based on anecdotal observations about how students behave at other campuses. She noted that next year's FTE's will be 250 students lower, so if we're to make this change, now is the time. Now is not a bad time to lose FTE's because our target is being reduced. This is the primary difference between the two reports.

Littlewood also had anecdotal information to share. He took the information to a GE course with 47 students and asked for a show of hands of how many were planning on taking a winter class, and 27 students raised their hands. He asked those 27 students if winter didn't exist would they take the class in fall or spring and only 10 students said they would. On that basis, we would lose 2/3 of FTE's of that class. If this translates to the students as a whole that's a big loss.

Eudey shared that she engaged in the same activity in her GE class which has 50 students and 0 students indicated that they would be able to add the course in the spring semester. Eudey had expected about half, but was surprised that none felt they could accommodate the courses. She asked why they couldn't take this on and the students reported they had too many hours of work, the students have family responsibilities and language issues. This was based on the population we're expected to have on this campus. Students all over the country are taking classes on semester systems by being successful, but our current students think it's a burden to do so, they think the current schedule serves them better. At the moment, at least in her class and Littlewood's class, they are not feeling comfortable with that transition We'll have a great deal of work ahead to make those students feel prepared. This will also add more effort needed in advising students. It may be that a majority will take it but she thinks that our advising burden will much greater.

O'Brien shared that he had perused the ACAC report initially but he methodically reread it during lunch today. He commended the ACAC for their report. He noted that he thinks that ACAC did an honest evaluation and they have a lot of caveats there. For him, one of the critical items that appear on the top of page two. "Focused on the cost benefit analysis of the 4-1-4 calendar" and he totally respects that. Given these uncertain budget times we owe it to the taxpayer that we're not squandering money. With that said, he thinks universities are places where strange and magical things happen. It's not always easy to put in a spread sheet or economic model. If we're really focused and driven by budget, we should call the facilities and tell them to shut off the sprinklers of this place to save money on water, fertilizer, grounds, mowing, etc. But do we want a brown campus? In this whole debate there are so many intangibles, and we try to weave our way through but it's a tough task. Do we want to put our money there? Is it worth it? I love the green campus but let's see what we think about winter term.

A. Strahm thanked both committees for their very hard work. She noted a big concern for the ACAC report. The question is where in this discussion is the impact on students? For example, our catalog on page 57 states someone needs to take 30 units a year. It's her understanding, that a lot of that includes units taken over the winter term. How do they do that if winter is eliminated? Secondly, she looked at the most recent

fact book from Institutional Research on page 51 under degrees awarded. The 4-year graduation rate is under 25%; it's between 20-23%. The 6-year graduate rate with the 4-1-4 is over 50%; which means that we have students with the certain conditions (i.e.: first generation college students) and we're already seeing an extended time period to get them through to graduation. We've seen from the Chancellor's Office that there will be sanctions for taking a long time to get through to graduation. So if that's the case, the question is if the sanctions are to happen and if we already have over half not graduating less than six years, how does reducing the time frame to take classes assist these students?

E. Peterson noted as a member the economics department, that she understands the difficulty of trying to do the analysis in these reports. The ACAC report didn't show any discussion of the benefits, which is what is missing. It seems to be assuming that it's easy to change everything. The UEPC report is better prepared as it avoids pitfalls of double counting, counting extra money from students, and the idea of extra financial aid, but most of it is not coming to us. The bottom line is that we'll get extra money if we don't lose FTE's over the year and we could end up with less money. If we are having problems, and we don't know how much money we have, then taking the risk that we'll have a drop isn't a good idea. Is our current schedule a good way to teach the courses? Resoundingly from the students and faculty perspective it is.

Filling noted that ASI passed an academic calendar resolution related to the academic calendar, distributed in print copy at the start of the AS meeting, and asked R. Albert to address it. R. Albert noted that this resolution is a reflection of information received from the ACAC and UEPC which was sent to all ASI senators, and it was discussed during ASI senate meetings. We understand we're in financial trouble, but as students we do have legitimate concerns. We need a sufficient number of classes and sections. We're concerned about the increase in tuition and fees and the workload to ensure less stress upon students. This is ASI's view on this matter, and this is where we stand as the students. Filling apologized for not putting this item at the front of the agenda.

McGee said we're looking at a long-term strategy to take care of a short term problem. Hopefully, the budget situation isn't a long-term problem. It's cyclical. Changing the calendar is a long term strategy that has impacts for years and decades. If we make a mistake if we change, it could be difficult to impossible to correct that mistake to take care of a short term financial problem.

S. Morgan-Foster provided additional information during the discussion. One of the observations ACAC made was that there were valid pedagogical reasons for teaching during the winter period. A state supported mini-mester could be offered, or winter could still be supported through extended education, as many universities do presently. It's also possible to offer the courses as the leading edge of spring semester ameliorating a separate fee issue. Morgan Foster also clarified several points in response to comments made: A strong predictor of student access and retention has to do with course schedule opportunities, as schedules will impact timely graduation. If you move to the semester model (with 50 min and 75 min courses) the gain is 100 extra sections in the course schedule, so you can add sections provided that the university has the funds to cover those sections. The average student doesn't take 15 units a semester here, rather the average unit load is 11.5-11.7 units. S. Morgan-Foster's experience when there have been cost additions to fees is that the average student unit load increases. It would be more likely to see our AUL increase to closer to 13 units.

Thompson thanked S. Morgan-Foster for starting the conversation where it should be focused, on the students. His department had a different survey in two sections of freshman composition as first papers were due, and they found that students were stressed out already. He noted that the first time he met S. Morgan-Foster she went to a conference on student success before starting this job. If you increase the

workload 20-25% and the students in classes today are already bouncing off the walls how will they flourish? It's about making students flourish as a benefit to set against the cost.

Petratos noted that the ACAC report does not address from which source of funding the budget of the state supported winter term will be replaced every single year. Even if half of the students do not enroll the University net loss is \$ 3,900,000 (see UEPC report Appendix E page 18, [Table A2](#))

A. Strahm asked how much it costs for students to take UEE classes. Eudey replied around \$750 for a 3-unit class. Strahm said that most of her students are poor working class students some of whom still have parents working in the lettuce fields. On her wage Strahm can't afford \$750 a class. The increased credit 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?

O'Brien wanted to get back to the ACAC report and referenced page 8 under the first recommendation. He noted the section after the lined part, down 4 lines to where UEE is mentioned in parenthesis as a leading session at the start of the state-support semester. He asked if S. Morgan-Foster could speak to this.

S. Morgan-Foster noted that she had done only a little research on this option. It appeared to her that Chico had this model, but they were in the process of eliminating this option. Her understanding is that the CSU Chico campus offers some UEE courses over the winter period as well. Under the model, a leading edge of Spring was offered, with registering for spring like they usually would. They could register for a class that started on January 1, but most began later in January. The grading period for the lead classes was the same as the others. From what S. Morgan-Foster understood from her conversations with a Chico colleague, the problem with the CSU Chico model is that the section was low enrolled. They have a different campus population than we do. At Chico, when the last fall exam was given all the students returned home and very few took the early lead semester. Our campus is different. Students already have a pattern of behavior where 59 - 60% of the students takes winter term. It could be risky, but it sounded like it could be worth looking at. S. Morgan-Foster noted that this would be consistent with the UEPC report about having two main registration periods (rec. #4).

Eudey indicated that there are several concerns with either a UEE or extended semester model. We should not be moving core program courses to UEE during winter term. We cannot require students to take UEE classes, nor require faculty to teach these classes since it's not work on the contract. We cannot expect students to pay extra fees and faculty to teach an overload in order to offer what we think students need for their program. We have to be able to offer all needed courses within the stateside schedule. If we eliminate winter term as an official term, we must move to 15 week fall and spring semesters. If we extend the spring term by a few weeks at the start to allow for UEE or lead-in classes, that delays the start of spring and makes it last later into the summer. Fall will start earlier than now, which could leave us with a much shorter summer break, which means that we have a shorter summer term, and less time between fall and spring which is a time when students engage in paid work and faculty complete research or rejuvenate.

R. Pugh said that the majority of the world is on a 15 week session, and we could start on January 23rd and be out by mid May. Summer could start in early June and be out by mid August. The 15 week session won't start until February 15 like we do now. That's what he's guessing.

Littlewood indicated that there is a staff issue if we eliminate winter term. He noted that we have some 10/12 staff contracts who are off during the summer and they want to be off when their kids are not in school. If we start the fall semester on August 15 and end mid to late June, staff will need time to wrap up

the office work after the classes end. Therefore, staff will probably only be able to take one month in the summer and have to take more time off in January when children are in school. Wendt says that this does occur at other schools, and it's not just hypothetical.

Dean Novak's experience with rest of the world is based on the fact he has a conference at the end of May, and it appears that Stanislaus faculty are returning to campus for exams while most everyone else has already finished their semesters, so the observation that the longer semester would run as late into the spring does not seem correct. He's seen adjustments with winter term all the time. With respect to the end of May conference he attends. Out of the 4000 attendees at the conference, he's one of few that has to return to finish up classes or grading. In many cases some have been off since early in May. It's predicated that most of the other campuses start spring in the middle of January after they've had a month break. The 15 weeks sessions works nicely for them. This fits with R. Pugh's written comments that one of the biggest issues on this campus is the change in winter term. What has happened is that we have evolved to match student patterns. We've moved from nearly all winter courses being special courses and migrated to when almost everything is a major course or GE course. A course we've been teaching for 13 weeks is now being put into a four week term. What has happened is that special quality of winter term has evaporated.

Nagel thinks it is true that some winter term courses are likely inappropriate for winter term pedagogically, but the marker is not that they're specifically winter term courses. He teaches a GE course in winter term that is much like a fall and spring class, but he teaches it differently during winter term. We need a more fine-toothed analysis of what goes on in winter term classes.

Thompson responded to the point Dean Novak made. Thompson chaired the last winter term committee. The students are correct when they pointed out a change in the nature of us moving away from the special topics model. What wasn't mentioned is that that change was because of the request from students. If you go back to earlier reports and read past reports, the changes came about through the student's desires. Also, the special quality that remains is the single focus available in winter term and students saw that as a special element of the term.

Regalado noted that he also attends a Memorial Holiday weekend conference and can only do this because he can do the research needed during winter term. This allows him the time to be able to share information and has helped in his career. He taught one class, worked with graduate students and found that the winter term allowed him to advance his scholarship

Brown said that he's not familiar with the history of winter term, but he reminded us that it is something that makes us unique and provides a different experience. Behind it all was a desire to find something that would make us unique and different, especially for the smaller campuses. If you've been to the big campuses, you'll see the culture, sports and concerts they offer and we fight for something to make us stand out. Monterey and the Channel Island campuses have location but we don't have that. We have to be careful in how we proceed. There may be reasons to get in line with the other campuses. We'd start like the others do, finish like the others do, but do we want to give up what makes us unique even if there's some cost savings? We need to consider what makes us unique and be mindful of this.

R. Floyd stated she has served on UEPC for ten years. She has chaired the committee also. She feels she has the experience to speak to this debate, which is truly unique. One of her roles on campus is to point out the process issues underlying the content of most debates. She realizes that we will all have to go back to their departments and discuss the details of each report, but doesn't want anyone to lose sight of the process issues--or the bigger picture.

Floyd noted that when UEPC began their work on this issue in May, she realized they were up against something very different. She knew this analysis of the calendar was different in that we were facing a situation that had been orchestrated such that we may have to face a certain inevitability. Floyd knew that the president's committee consisted of staff and faculty that care just as much about the university as the members of the UEPC. She knew they would write a stellar report and of course, they have. She noted that the constituencies on campus are arguing their cases against each other which is different than any other debate about the calendar. Since it is her conviction that the academic calendar falls entirely under the purview of the faculty, she encourages senators to support the UEPC report because it is a crystal clear example of the work involved in preserving the faculty voice.

Schoenly asked everyone to try to look ahead if winter term is eliminated. We're wondering if we're going to be asked to take another furlough. He's not looking forward to having to create two more labs for every combination lecture/lab course. He's not sure where will have time to do that. This is yet another thing we'll be asked to do. We should project forward and think about the workload we'll be facing if we eliminate winter term.

Filling noted that in terms of furloughs, the Vice Chancellor's at SWAS have unanimously reported that the Chancellor has no interest in furloughs next year as they're not worth the gain.

M. Hight noted the overwhelming student support for winter term. She's curious from an economic model, why we'd take a successful customer-based model and eliminate it. It's really a no brainer. Our best way to bring in students and convince them that this is a great place is to keep the winter term as it's a marketing tool. She finds it odd that this discussion is not getting enough weight. This is a strong marketing tool and it appears that students are strongly in favor of it.

T. Worthington spoke on behalf of some staff. She noted that there are benefits to positioning and marketing ourselves, but the administration of this calendar is something that has to be taken into consideration. Our computer system does not fit with the 4-1-4 calendar. How we currently deliver financial aid is different than all the other CSU campuses and has to be explained and defended repeatedly to the Chancellor's office. Maybe this is not the only reason to not have the calendar, but please take this into consideration. When problems occur with the system, that none of us chose but we have to work with, we have to fix these problems ourselves. We are understaffed and are likely to be cut even more. We cannot use the fixes other campuses have created because they do not fit our calendar, we have to create our own every time. This may not be a driving force, but it's a factor to take into consideration. She's not had an opportunity to read the UEPC report, so maybe it did address some of these concerns.

Filling noted that we asked it be sent to all users, but maybe that was the wrong place.

Regalado echoed what R. Floyd had said earlier. That this is an issue of the faculty voice as the winter term is a curricular matter. This is a slippery slope for losing faculty voice, it can't be lost. He hopes everyone keeps that in mind.

McGee said in the ACAC report there was data and perhaps ACAC was looking at past rates for fall, winter and spring. He noted that winter has the best pass rate, and that students are succeeding more in winter term. Here again it's an echo of what students via the ASI have voiced about their concern about their workload. This should be the driving factor here; no matter what we do to try to take care of a budget situation. He noted that when he was in school he didn't have any money. Then he got a job and made more money but had less to spend. Changes won't necessarily provide us with more resources if his experience holds. He had more money as a student than as a faculty member. There are things we can do to help staff

with the workload related to winter term. There may be a lack of concern from the Chancellor's office to provide fixes to our computer system like they do for the other campuses. Just because we're different doesn't mean they shouldn't take care of us.

A student guest noted that he does better on winter term classes but doesn't get as quality an education because things are left out of the course. Although, he noted that it is nice to just focus on one topic.

P. Garone asked us to keep in mind that serving the students is in our best interest. Although, UEPC discusses it on page 7, we've not addressed one issue that needs attention. We've talked about moving some courses to spring and fall, but we need a reminder that some winter courses simply cannot exist except in winter term. For example, field courses, courses that go all day long, and course that are required in January due to the climate. Some are not GE's in winter. They are distinctly winter term courses and will cease to exist and will do a disservice to students.

Cotten asked how this might impact RPT for faculty; especially junior faculty who use winter term for a research period. That has an impact on faculty producing RSCA to come up for promotion and tenure. If we change to 15 weeks per term, where is there a chunk of time to do research? Narrowing this to one month may narrow the ability to do quality research and impact RPT.

R. Pugh said when hiring the next AVP we should include in our marketing that student reasons for selecting CSU Stanislaus with a winter term. Once they're here they get used to it and feel strongly about it. He cautioned all that most people have been through a semester system. It's no different in the clientele in Fresno and Humboldt and winter term is not used as a marketing tool.

Petratos asked if demographics are different in those campuses. Our students are commuters with families and children to support, they have to work. A great number of students have to work fall, winter and spring to pay for their University education. Other students take full time classes in winter term and faculty do research during winter term. In many cases the ACAC report is well crafted but there should be information about a net loss (see UEPC report Appendix E page 18, [Table A2](#)).

Heredia said when she first came to campus she didn't know about winter term until she found out it was something you had to do. Then she found out later that you didn't have to. She took two winter terms and should have been able to graduate in the summer. She's not saying it isn't good, but it's easier than the junior colleges. It was a lot of work but the courses weren't challenging. She also hears from other students that winter term courses are not as challenging. Although, if there were more classes offered she would take more. She asked what will be offered this coming winter for students.

Bender said that he appreciated the committee's work on the ACAC report. He noted that UEPC offered information to use to frame the direction that UEPC was taking. When you get down to it, it is all about risk. Maybe there is something special about this campus that includes student success, retention, and time to graduation which accommodates this different/special student, and maybe winter term is part of that. Do we want to risk retention, student success, and time to graduation? If not, then the monetary gain is not worth it. Additionally, there are lots of financial analyses, but the bottom line is that if we lose FTE's in winter, and students don't migrate to fall and spring semesters, we'll lose state funding for those lost FTE's. It doesn't take much to realize that before long we'll have millions less in state support. Panos and Bender looked into this, and unless 90% take an equivalent number of courses in longer fall/spring semesters we'll be in a further deficit. Are we willing to take that risk?

Colnic seemed to recall a discussion that occurred last year that noted that given our population and

demographics, our retention and graduation rates were higher than we would have expected. Perhaps one of the reasons we are doing this is because we have an unusual calendar. He's not sure but is it worth the risk of changing our calendar.

Nagel said our student representatives mentioned that they believe that winter term is not as rigorous. It's difficult to measure or quantify. If people are making courses easier to pass and lower in educational quality, this is a serious concern. If that's related to winter term, then that's something UEPC should look into. Otherwise, anecdotally it's not enough to present as a piece of evidence. He's not sure how to go about studying this.

A. Brown noted that he visited our campus over four years ago and met with the student outreach folks. They explained the calendar and he decided to come to this campus because of our calendar. He found that he was able to focus on a class just for his major and take it for however long. The quality of the class depends on what you take and what you want to get out of it. He has five kids and is not able to change his schedule because someone eliminated something that no one discussed until the start of the term. He's noted that he's one of those people that we're here to help. He said that he had less than a week to take the survey, and he knew some people who didn't have enough time to take the survey. He said that he spent his first week hoping to be added into a class but they had too few sections.

M. Tynan noted that she missed the first part of discussion, but said there is a cost to making this change. The Social Work department would have to be revamped. It's accredited so it will take time and cost to do this. She's sure this is true among various programs and we don't want lose sight of that. Personally she likes the semester model but we need to keep students in mind.

A. Strahm noted to A. Brown that he is not "just" a student. She wanted to point out as someone who recently graduated from college; she used to take math classes in the off quarter because she's really bad at math. Taking it when not in a regular session was good because she could focus on it and didn't have to do other homework. It can seem easier because there aren't other things burdening your time and that could be one of the issues about winter term seeming easier. Also, on page 10-11 there are recommendations, and #4 seems kind of reasonable. She doesn't know if the staff who deal with this could speak to it. She would like to know if someone would speak to some issues that impact staff. If we could have simultaneous enrollment could that ease the burden. Could the recommendations resolve some of the issues?

Nagel really didn't want to talk about this, but will as the lecturer faculty representative. I. Pierce circulated a document from T. Wendt that was sent to ACAC about some of the technical problems alluded to earlier about Faculty Affairs dealing with temporary part time faculty contracts. It's a technical problem. Nagel noted that T. Wendt's information is pursuant to a grievance filed by CFA three years ago and is just now under arbitration. Essentially it had to do with denial of part time faculty benefits; refusing to provide benefits if there was no winter term assignment. The Chancellor's office has told Faculty Affairs to basically jump in a lake. This is a problem, but a technical one having to do with the CSU system and Controller's office problem with the 4-1-4 schedule affecting colleagues. Nagel said he is somewhat conversant with the underlying issues if anyone wants to talk to him about it.

Thompson returned to the point about declining FTE's next year. We want to make sure that the language from the previous CROAC report is not lost as follows: *"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."*

Thompson noted that in the previous CROAC report the administration promoted winter term. Once it was promoted and after Shirvani got here and we were trying to increase FTE's and administration saw an opportunity to increase FTE's with winter term. Now we are we in a continuing FTE decline but what if we ever want to build FTE again. Winter term can be used for this.

Silverman noted that he has some issues with computer systems. He went on the web and did some research. He found that there are consultants with PeopleSoft experience who could be hired for computer assistance and he might be happy to do this. If interested in solving the computer system problems, contact R. Silverman. He's thinking of charging the campus \$3 million [a reference to a UC consultant in the news] and we can pay the consultant \$100K to fix the system. Silverman will take the rest to retire to Hawaii.

First Reading Item:

19/AS/09/SEC & UEPC Joint Resolution to Address the Additional Workload for Support Staff Due to Winter Term

19/AS/09/SEC & UEPC

Joint Resolution to Address Additional Workload Support for Staff due to Winter Term

Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus request that the Provost and 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 roster system*
- *enrollment for Fall and Winter/Spring rather than processing each semester separately*
- *development of models that 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 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.

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.

Jasek-Rysdahl moved and Schoenly seconded. Jasek-Rysdahl read the resolution aloud.

Dunham-Filson would like to address the first three items in the recommendations. She thinks that the first two will be appreciated by the staff that handle the online grading. She noted that giving the faculty an option was implemented because we were in a transition period and didn't want to disrupt the process. They will be appreciative that faculty want to be exclusive in using these, and she hopes that all faculty are in agreement and won't complain about not having paper copies. As for online grade changes, it's important to take into consideration whether the PeopleSoft system will allow us to do certain things. We may not have the ability to make the changes to the system because we do not have the support from the Chancellor's office on a lot of this. She asked a question about the task force as it seems likely that staff are being asked to be a part of a task force and/or a committee. Doesn't this put an additional workload on the staff?

Nagel noted that regarding using service learning students to look into a system involving faculty workload/payroll systems may present a problem with this being confidential information. Depending on how that will be played out, we need to see what that would mean. Can you make sure people don't have access to data? Filling said that students in systems classes could do that as a process, and not use live data.

T. Worthington said she listened to the resolution and the only item that dealt with financial aid is something we are already doing. She noted that we're the only campus on this calendar system in California, and the Cal Grants system does not work with our calendar. A lot of her job is manually inputting everything into the Cal Grant system. Why would they change their system for one school? Some of the items noted on the resolution might fix some things, and as staff we do appreciate your support, but some of these create more workload issues for staff. If we're doing things online and not on paper, it still requires secretaries to print out the data just shifting the workload problem. She noted that the staff do appreciate the faculty support addressing this issue because it's long overdue. Although, in Financial Aid we're not sure if the workload will change unless you lobby for extra people to do the work. We have to comply with federal and state regulations and our computers don't work with the 4-1-4 calendar for financial aid purposes. There are only ten to twelve schools in the country with our 4-1-4 calendar. She does appreciate the workload resolution, but it will make a very small dent in a huge problem.

O'Brien would like to follow up. Not to put T. Worthington on the spot, but can we turn things around? If winter term is eliminated wouldn't we logically need less staff? T. Worthington said that she's heard this concern mentioned at other meetings, and she appreciates faculty not wanting to lose staff. If we got rid of winter term, there are things we aren't currently doing that we could do or do better. We could provide better and timelier customer service for one, and we would not need to let go of any staff. Some of the numbers in the reports address this. There will still be Cal Grant work to be done, but there will be time to conduct more High School workshops, award students, etc. She doesn't think we'd have any reason to reduce staff and hopefully no one above us would use that as an excuse to do so. Although, she does appreciate the thought

Petratos indicated that we can spend one-time money to fix the system.

S. Davis said this is tied closely to the prior resolution. If 18/AS/09/SEC-UEPC Joint Resolution for

Support of UEPC Academic Calendar Report fails or is superceded, will this be dissolved. Has there been any attempt to bring together ACAC and UEPC?

Littlewood said no, there has been on direct discussion. We have communicated between committees but we have not met to discuss. He would want both resolutions # 17 & 19 to stay even if #18 fails. The reduction to staff workload via adds, grades, etc. is the best way to deal with this. We live in a technological age and there is no reason why faculty shouldn't be able to give out permission numbers or turn in grades online.

Filling said part of the reason there was not communication between the committees is that he felt the issues Floyd raised were on target. The problem is with the President's attempts to take curriculum from the faculty preview. Filling reminded all to consult with colleagues on this.

Discussion Items

Vote of No Confidence

Filling noted this requires more than 7 minutes and moved to the next item.

Open Forum

S. Morgan-Foster noted that she left some spreadsheets from the ACAC Report. Filling noted that on the Academic Senate website there is a link to the UEPC and ACAC reports including the scanned ACAC documents or links to items that were already posted on the web.

Thompson wanted to bring an issue on behalf of the English Department. They had a unanimous vote and sent a message to Facnet and the "faculty-only" listserv in support of the statement made on behalf of another department. English tried to send the message to Postmaster and staff, and the response was that Postmaster was not intended to facilitate a campus dialogue that seems like a monologue. Thompson would like some feedback on this. He'd like to request some follow-up on what are the rules for Postmaster and what is seen as the dialogue being facilitated?

C. Whitman said Postmaster is not intended to carry on a dialogue. It's for posting announcements of general interest to the campus. Procedures require submission to your respective Vice President for approval then it's sent to OIT for transmission. Thompson asked if an academic program wants information sent out for staff to see, why is that not of general interest to the campus? Thompson thought that the statement was of interest beyond Facnet and faculty only. He asked what the criteria is for sending out Postmaster emails. Filling asked if Interim Provost Lujan could enlighten us about this. Lujan said it's a one-way announcement. You send it to Lujan and he'll forward it to C. Whitman for posting. Lujan said that Facnet is a list serve and he's not sure there is one for staff. C. Whitman said there can be a list serve for staff but there may be better mechanisms for sharing information and dialogues.

R. Floyd asked C. Whitman if Postmaster is intended for the entire campus community – faculty and staff. C. Whitman said yes and for students as well. R. Floyd asked if an academic department can send something to the Provost to go to faculty and staff. C. Whitman said yes. Thompson said his response is non-responsive. The question is about criteria. If a department makes a unanimous statement to go to all in the community, what is the criteria for the rejection for a statement an academic department feels is of general interest to the academic community?

E. Peterson said on June 9th when UEPC had a meeting, she wanted to send information regarding winter term to the general population because the staff has requested a discussion list but has been told they can't have one. The President says communication between faculty and staff is important so Peterson was

pleased to hear it would be easy to set up and said a list would be helpful. She spoke to F. Borelli and he has a staff union list that can only be used for union matters and not campus issues. One problem is that we don't have smooth communication between faculty and staff. She thinks it would not be difficult to set up a list but they were just told not to. She's not sure why that is. Perhaps the Provost could ask why this is. Perhaps this is a way to improve communication and diversity of perspectives we'd like to have.

C. Whitman said he's never been asked to create a staff listserv. To his knowledge no one has asked for it. He noted that staff are also on Facnet, and suggested a possible name change to something like "Stannet" since it's not in fact a faculty only list. Regalado said he's still waiting to hear an answer to Thompson's question. C. Whitman said he wasn't the denier of the request but the answer is that the post was an attempt to continue a dialogue for which Postmaster is not appropriate. This leads to an overwhelming file traffic that limits its usefulness. Some delete Postmaster to not see these emails. The best place for this type of email is a voluntary list serve which would be more effective to achieve what we want, and it's readily available with or without help from his office.

Saraille said what C. Whitman has is plausibility. It seems that what Thompson was trying to do was an announcement rather than having much to do with a discussion, follow up, and debate. Another aspect, is that Saraille maintains a list serve which forwards items to faculty, and the Senate has a problem that they should address. There's no standard way to send information to every member of the faculty. There is a list that Thompson maintains for every senator and Saraille has one every faculty member, but this is something that the university should support. Saraille having to forward things to all faculty should be more of an exception than the rule in an ideal situation.

McGee asked the difference between the email Thompson was requesting to go out to Postmaster and the emails he receives from Azkazarian. It was noted that those emails must have come from some other source as Postmaster is a state resource and is not politically tinged.

Dunham-Filson asked whether there is a way to send to staff the email that people use to subscribe to Facnet. She asked for information on how to sign up. Filling asked C. Whitman if he could send out an email with the information on how to subscribe to Facnet. C. Whitman said he would do this. [Clerk's note: to subscribe to Facnet, go to the following website <http://lists.csustan.edu/mailman/listinfo/facnet-l>]

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:30.