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Executive Summary

Our team’s charge was to examine existing staff involvement in university governance, identify best practices for staff shared governance involvement, and recommend opportunities and mechanisms for expanding staff contributions and involvement in formal shared governance, including but not limited to, the Academic Senate and potential creation of a staff council.

Since the early 1980s, there has been no formal mechanism for involving the staff perspective in university governance and decision-making at Cal State Fullerton (CSUF). A staff council successfully operated at Cal State Fullerton in the 1960s and 1970s, but disbanded in 1981 with the advent of collective bargaining.

At present, only two percent of staff and approximately 40% of managers are recognized as constituents of the Academic Senate (based on Article III, Section I-e of the Senate constitution which states the “employees whose responsibilities are judged by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and by the President to be closely identified with the overall management of the University” may be included in the Senate electorate). In addition, currently, a small number of staff representatives serve on universitywide committees, including the Planning and Resource Budget Committee (PRBC). Staff are appointed rather than elected to serve in these capacities. There currently is no uniform mechanism for ensuring staff involvement or participation on universitywide committees.

The attached Staff Council Peer Comparison Matrix provides best practices data collected from several comparable universities throughout the country, many of which have staff councils, staff assemblies or staff senates. These comparable universities were chosen from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) based on a recommendation from the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies. Several universities in the California State University system are included.

Based on our research, we offer the following recommendations:

1. Form a staff council at CSUF, model it after CSULB’s staff council, consult with union stewards and key administrative and academic leaders at CSUF, and provide sufficient resources to ensure sustainability.

A staff council could strengthen the opportunities for shared governance at CSUF by providing an official voice and an official mechanism for staff participation in university decision-making and governance. Cal State Long Beach has been successful in creating and sustaining a staff council for years and it could be used as a model for use, as appropriate, at CSUF.

Discussions with union representatives and other decision makers at CSUF are necessary to gain additional perspectives. The additional perspectives may aid in the formation process. It is also important for a staff council to be provided with sufficient resources in order to ensure its success and sustainability.
2. **Suggest the Academic Senate consider adding staff as a constituency on the Academic Senate.**

If a staff council were formed, this group could also approach the Academic Senate with a suggestion to consider adding staff as a senate constituency. Each body could have representation on the other.

Adding staff as a constituency to the Academic Senate could serve as another means to provide staff with a voice and an opportunity for participation in shared governance on campus.

3. **Develop a formal process to appoint staff to campus committees.**

Whether or not a staff council is formed, or additional representation on the Academic Senate is feasible, a universitywide standard for the appointment of staff to committees should be established.
Introduction

Our team’s charge was to examine existing staff involvement in university governance, identify best practices for staff shared governance involvement, and recommend opportunities and mechanisms for expanding staff contributions and involvement in formal shared governance, including but not limited to, the Academic Senate and potential creation of a staff council.

Cal State Fullerton has a long and rich history of shared governance. However, staff are not included in formal shared governance structures. Staff is the only unrepresented constituency on the Academic Senate and CSUF does not have a staff council. Recently a Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation team visited our campus and requested a meeting with the CSUF staff council. As there is no such body at CSUF, they interviewed a small selection of staff and MPPs. The draft report from the WASC team stated the “university should examine both its formal institutional structures for decision-making and its actual decision-making practices in light of its mission and vision, to ensure that it can effectively and systematically address competing needs with full and appropriate participation.”

A staff council successfully operated at Cal State Fullerton in the 1960s and 1970s addressing issues such as a dress code for employees, flexible work hours, staff awards, payroll deductions for parking fees, and the expansion of the Faculty Development Center to include staff development. The staff council was disbanded in 1981 with the advent of collective bargaining. At that time, the Chancellor’s office directed CSU staff councils to cease operations.

At present, only two percent of staff and approximately 40% of managers are recognized as constituents of the Academic Senate (based on Article III, Section I-e of the Senate constitution which states the “employees whose responsibilities are judged by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and by the President to be closely identified with the overall management of the University” may be included in the Senate electorate). In addition, currently, a small number of staff representatives serve on universitywide committees, including the Planning and Resource Budget Committee (PRBC). Staff are appointed rather than elected to serve in these capacities. There is no uniform mechanism for ensuring staff involvement or participation on universitywide committees.

The attached Staff Council Peer Comparison Matrix provides best practices data collected from several comparable universities throughout the country, many of which have staff councils, staff assemblies or staff senates. These comparable universities were chosen from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) based on a recommendation from the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies. Several universities in the California State University system are included.

Our team conducted a universitywide staff survey in early April 2010, polling staff perceptions regarding staff involvement in shared governance at CSUF. An overwhelming
majority of respondents indicated they believe staff lacks a unified voice in university decision-making.

In this report, we provide an overview of the research we conducted to determine the existing level of staff involvement in university governance at CSUF. Based on our findings, we suggest recommendations that can potentially expand the role of staff on campus, providing a means to become active participants in shared governance at Cal State Fullerton.

Background

The university’s mission statement and goals indicate staff involvement in university governance is both advisable and welcome. The mission statement specifies that staff will work with faculty and students “in close collaboration to expand knowledge.” The university goals affirm the university’s commitment to freedom of thought, word, and speech. The goals also point out the university’s commitment to create opportunities in and out of the classroom for collaborative activities for students, faculty, and staff.

Research Questions

Our team set out to learn the historic and present role of staff involvement in shared governance at Cal State Fullerton, and sought answers to the following:

- What has been the role of staff in shared governance at CSUF?
- How could a staff council contribute to shared governance at CSUF?
- What kind of support might there be for a staff council?
- What challenges could arise from the formation of a staff council?
- Can staff be included as a constituency on the Academic Senate?

For the purposes of this report, our team utilized the following definitions.

**Definition of Staff**: Staff includes union represented staff not represented on the Academic Senate (1,087), confidential and excluded staff (79), and MPP staff not represented on the Academic Senate (131). This excludes students and graduate assistants.

**Definition of Shared Governance**: Shared governance includes a balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes on one hand, and administrative accountability on the other.¹ See Appendix A.

**Definition of Staff Governance**: Staff governance is the process where staff, both line and professional, are involved in institutional decision-making.² The process is reliant on administrative distribution of authority and is not based on legal standing. Subsequently,

---

staff governance is an important element in institutional organizational behavior, particularly when administrators and leaders attempt to make substantial decisions and chart courses that impact the future and existence of the university. See Appendix B.

**Definition of Staff Council:** Universities with staff councils define them in different ways. At Cal State Long Beach, the purpose of the staff council is to serve as the advisory body for staff matters. At Sacramento State, the staff council strives to strengthen staff contributions to the campus community, encourages representation on campus committees, and sponsors social events and staff recognition. At George Mason University, the staff council’s purpose is to promote honest and open communication between administration and staff, and to function in an advisory capacity.

**Process**

To determine the answers to our research questions, our team conducted a study of the role of staff involvement in shared governance at CSUF. We evaluated the current role that staff play in contributing to shared governance and explored the possibilities for expanding this role. We also gathered information from other state universities about their inclusion of staff in shared governance. Following are the data gathered to address the charge:

- CSUF staff council history
- Staff councils at other universities
- Staff council at CSULB
- CSUF staff and administrator perspectives
- CSUF union representative perspectives
- 1998 CSU Office of General Counsel memo on Staff Councils
- CSUF staff survey
- Academic Senate representative perspectives

**Findings**

**Previous CSUF Staff Council**

A number of CSU campuses, including Cal State Fullerton, had staff councils in the 1960s and 1970s. In the late 1970s, there was a shift to collective bargaining as a result of the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). This led to the formation of unions within the CSU system. Consequently, campuses were directed to disband their staff councils to avoid conflict of interest with collective bargaining units. CSUF disbanded its staff council in 1981.

**Appendix C** shows a 1979 memo from San Jose State University, which explains the impact of HEERA on the disbanding of the CSU staff councils. **Appendix D** shows minutes from an April 18, 1979 CSUF staff council meeting, which reflected the impact of collective bargaining on CSUF. Since the creation of HEERA and the advent of collective bargaining, three CSU campuses have reinstated their staff councils.
Staff Councils at Other Universities

A list of 22 universities of the approximate size and structure of CSUF were used as a basis for comparison in assessing the role of shared staff governance on other campuses. Each of these universities were evaluated to determine if they had staff councils and/or staff representation in other ways, such as through participation on the Academic Senate.

This list included seven CSU campuses:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>California State Polytechnic University, Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ ♦</td>
<td>CSU Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>CSU Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

- ☑ Have a staff council (3)
- ♦ Have voting seats on the Academic Senate (1)
- ■ Have non-voting seats on the Academic Senate (1)

A complete list of universities researched is included in Appendix E.

CSULB Staff Council Chair Perspective

An interview with the chair of the CSULB staff council revealed that, like many CSU campuses, Long Beach disbanded its staff council in the 1980s. However, in the early 1990s, members of the campus Academic Senate encouraged a reinstatement of the staff council. They proposed that since faculty had a voice on campus, staff should have one as well.

Today, the electorate for CSULB’s staff council consists of “all staff employees of California State University, Long Beach and its auxiliaries who are employed on at least a half-time basis for six months or more,” according to the organization’s bylaws. Each division on campus is entitled to one representative for each 25 staff members. A copy of the CSULB staff council bylaws is included as Appendix F.

The council also includes faculty representatives and ex-officio union representatives. Five staff members sit on the Academic Senate, including the staff council chair. Staff council members serve on a variety of committees throughout campus. The council meets monthly, and the CSULB President attends each meeting.

Issues addressed by the CSULB staff council include university strategic planning, staff development, event organization, budgeting, and fundraising. The council also organizes
forums where the vice president of administration and finance can share information with staff about university business. The staff council does not address any issues covered by the collective bargaining agreements.

CSUF Administrators Perspectives

Eight individuals holding administrative positions at CSUF were interviewed to obtain their perspectives on staff governance at CSUF and whether a staff council would impact shared governance at CSUF. Several noted that staff members do not appear to have sufficient input on campus matters. One interviewee noted that faculty have a voice through the Academic Senate and students have a voice through ASI; unions provide a means for some staff issues, but there are many important issues that fall outside the purview of the unions.

Another interviewee observed that while staff members are appointed to serve on universitywide committees, the majority of these are search committees and the selection criteria for staff service on committees varies. A common practice is for division heads to appoint staff to committees.

The interviewees offered suggestions for a number of topics they believed appropriate for a staff council to address. Their responses included: university strategic planning, policy development, access to educational opportunities, committee service, and involvement in staff recognition events.

The majority of the administrators interviewed were intrigued by the idea of a staff council, and several said they would support the formation of a council at CSUF. Most cautioned that it would be crucial for a staff council to avoid addressing issues that are covered by the union collective bargaining agreements.

Union Representative Perspectives

Three union stewards representing CSUEU Units 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 were interviewed to obtain their perspectives. Two of the interviewees were very positive about the idea. One interviewee recognized different issues that the staff council would handle compared to the issues the unions handle. Another said that a staff council could help improve the flow of communication to the staff. The third interviewee expressed concerns about conflict of interest between the unions and a staff council. The individual noted that if there were a conflict, the union could potentially file an unfair practices grievance.

1998 Staff Council Decision Memo

Our team obtained a copy of the November 13, 199, Staff Council Decision Memo sent from the CSU Office of General Counsel to CSU Presidents which is included as Appendix G. This memo addresses the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) administrative law judge’s (ALJ’s) written opinion in the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo/Sonoma State University Staff Council case by listing the violations found and recommendations drawn from the Staff Council Decision. “The ALJ’s decision expressly
recognizes the fact that, under Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), Staff Council organizations may have a role to play in campus governance.

CSUF Staff Survey

We conducted a universitywide survey of staff and MPPs in April 2010. Surveys were sent to 1,770 individuals, including 1,225 full-time staff, 325 part-time staff, and 220 MPPs. A total of 149 individuals responded, for a response rate of eight percent (8%). The survey contained eight questions, including two open-ended questions that allowed respondents to add comments. A copy of the survey is attached as Appendix H.

Highlights from the survey indicated that more than two-thirds of the respondents (70%) believe staff do not have an adequate voice in university decision-making. One respondent observed, “The voice is not formalized. Informal means have their place, but a more formal method of getting input is highly desirable.” Another explained, “Few, if any, staff members – other than MPP administrative staff – are members of decision-making committees.” One longtime staff member said, “I have worked here over 30 years, and it seems that staff input is never solicited when making decisions on policy or procedure.”

A majority of respondents (88%) supported the development of a staff council to improve shared governance. One staff member noted, “I believe strongly that the individuals ‘on the ground’ have valuable expertise and perspectives that should be considered in university decision making.” Another said, “Staff representation would provide a more holistic perspective of the university, and staff would have a venue to contribute to solving some of the challenges as well as contribute valuable experience and ideas.”

One respondent mentioned having worked at another university that had both a faculty senate and a staff assembly. The respondent noted that the two groups worked well together and said, “Staff perspective complements faculty perspective.”

Survey respondents were asked to choose from a list of topics they believed a staff council should be involved with on campus. The flow of information directly to staff and staff “being heard” were revealed to be areas of most interest, followed by professional training and development, budget-related issues, campus improvement projects, and university strategic planning.

Academic Senate Representative Perspectives

Three individuals who have been CSUF Academic Senate chairs were interviewed regarding the role of staff involvement in shared governance at CSUF. The intention of these interviews was to determine whether there might be Academic Senate support for the formation of a staff council on campus. It was also important to assess whether there might be alternatives to the formation of a staff council, such as adding a staff constituency on the Academic Senate.
One Senate chair remembers when the CSUF campus had a staff council and believes that reinstating such a group would be beneficial to the university. This person stated something was lost when CSUF disbanded the staff council in 1981 and the Academic Senate should play a key role in supporting a staff council. It was suggested that CSUF would be wise to model its staff council as closely as possible after the council at Cal State Long Beach.

Another Senate chair expressed support for the overall concept of a staff council because staff are not given the respect they deserve and staff are caught in a hierarchy that puts faculty between them and administration and doesn’t necessarily address their specific needs.

Another interviewee explained that while many Senate committees have non-voting staff members, most of these individuals are MPPs. In May 2000, the Academic Senate conducted an opinion poll, which included a question about whether staff should be added as a constituency with representation on the Academic Senate. At that time, the majority of voters said no. The results of this poll are included as Appendix I.

Implementation Recommendations

Based on our research, we offer the following recommendations:

1. **Form a staff council at CSUF, model it after CSULB’s staff council, consult with union stewards and key administrative and academic leaders at CSUF, and provide sufficient resources to ensure sustainability.**

A staff council could strengthen the opportunities for shared governance at CSUF by providing an official voice and an official mechanism for staff participation in university decision-making and governance. Cal State Long Beach has been successful in creating and sustaining a staff council for years and it could be used as a model for use, as appropriate, at CSUF.

Discussions with union representatives and other decision makers at CSUF are necessary to gain additional perspectives. The additional perspectives may aid in the formation process. It is also important for a staff council to be provided with sufficient resources in order to ensure its success and sustainability.

2. **Suggest the Academic Senate consider adding staff as a constituency on the Academic Senate.**

If a staff council were formed, this group could also approach the Academic Senate with a suggestion to consider adding staff as a senate constituency. Each body could have representation on the other.
Adding staff as a constituency to the Academic Senate could serve as another means to provide staff with a voice and an opportunity for participation in shared governance on campus.

3. **Develop a formal process to appoint staff to campus committees.**

Whether or not a staff council is formed, or additional representation on the Academic Senate is feasible, a universitywide standard for the appointment of staff to committees should be established.
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Exactly What Is 'Shared Governance'?

By Gary A. Olson

At a recent conference of college administrators, several of us had an
impromptu discussion over lunch about the meaning of “shared governance.”
The consensus? That term is often invoked but much misunderstood by both
faculty members and many administrators.

"Some of my faculty believe that shared governance literally means that a
committee votes on some new plan or proposal and that’s it—it gets
implemented," said a seasoned department head. "There is no sense of
sharing, or who is sharing what with whom."

A dean chimed in that a faculty leader at her institution actually told her that
shared governance means that professors, who are the "heart of the
university," delegate the governance of their universities to administrators,
whose role is to provide a support network for the faculty. "He said, in all
seriousness, that faculty have the primary role of governing the university and
that administrators are appointed to spare them from the more distasteful
managerial labor," said the dean with incredulity.

That may be a more commonly held notion in academe than it at first appears.
I know several faculty senators at one institution who regularly refer to faculty
as "governance," as in "You're administration, and we're governance." That
expression reveals a deep misunderstanding of the mechanism of shared
governance—and presupposes an inherently adversarial relationship.

The phrase shared governance is so hackneyed that it is becoming what some
linguists call an "empty" or "floating" signifier, a term so devoid of
determinate meaning that it takes on whatever significance a particular
speaker gives it at the moment. Once a term arrives at that point, it is
essentially useless.

Shared governance is not a simple matter of committee consensus, or the
faculty's engaging administrators to take on the dirty work, or any number of
other common misconceptions. Shared governance is much more complex; it
is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and
decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative
accountability on the other.

The truth is that all legal authority in any university originates from one place
and one place only: Its governing board. Whether it is a private college created
by a charter, or a public institution established by law or constitution, the
legal right and obligation to exercise authority over an institution is vested in
and flows from its board. Typically, the board then formally delegates
authority over the day-to-day operation of the institution (often in an official
"memorandum of delegation") to the president, who, in turn, may delegate
authority over certain parts of university management to other university officials—for example, granting authority over academic personnel and programs to the provost as the chief academic officer, and so on.

Over time, the system of shared governance has evolved to include more and more representation in the decision-making process. The concept really came of age in the 1960s, when colleges began to liberalize many of their processes. In fact, an often-cited document on the subject, "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," was issued jointly by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in the mid-60s. That statement attempted to affirm the importance of shared governance and state some common principles.

The fact that the primary organization championing faculty concerns, the body devoted to preparing future academic administrators, and the association promoting best practices in serving on governing boards together endorsed the statement illustrates that university governance is a collaborative venture.

"Shared" governance has come to connote two complementary and sometimes overlapping concepts: giving various groups of people a share in key decision-making processes, often through elected representation; and allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making.

To illustrate the first notion of how shared governance works, I’d like to revisit a 2007 column, “The New Vice President Challenge,” in which I discussed the search process for academic administrators and attempted to explain why hiring committees are commonly asked to forward an unranked list of “acceptable” candidates. I wrote that shared governance, especially in the context of a search for a senior administrator, means that professors, staff members, and sometimes students have an opportunity to participate in the process—unlike the bad old days when a university official often would hire whomever he (and it was invariably a male) wanted, without consulting anyone.

"Shared" means that everyone has a role: The search committee evaluates applications, selects a shortlist of candidates, conducts preliminary interviews, contacts references, chooses a group of finalists to invite to campus, solicits input about the candidates from appropriate stakeholders, and determines which of the finalists are acceptable. Then it’s up to the final decision maker, who is responsible for conducting background checks and entering into formal negotiations with the front-runner, and who is ultimately held responsible for the success (or failure) of the appointment.

"Shared" doesn’t mean that every constituency gets to participate at every stage. Nor does it mean that any constituency exercises complete control over the process. A search cannot be a simple matter of a popular vote because someone must remain accountable for the final decision, and committees cannot be held accountable. Someone has to exercise due diligence and contact the front-runner’s current and former supervisors to discover if there are any known skeletons that are likely to re-emerge. If I am the hiring authority and I appoint someone who embezzled money from a previous institution, I alone am responsible. No committee or group can be held responsible for such a lack of due diligence.


5/13/2010
That's a good example of shared governance as it daily plays out in many areas of university decision making. No one person is arbitrarily making important decisions about the advice of key constituents; nor is decision making simply a function of a group vote. The various stakeholders participate in well-defined parts of the process.

The second common, but overlapping, concept of shared governance is that certain constituencies are given primary responsibility over decision making in certain areas. A student senate, for example, might be given primary (but not total) responsibility for devising polices relevant to student governance. The most obvious example is that faculty members traditionally exercise primary responsibility over the curriculum. Because professors are the experts in their disciplines, they are the best equipped to determine degree requirements and all the intricacies of a complex university curriculum. That is fitting and proper.

But even in this second sense of shared governance—in which faculty members exercise a great deal of latitude over the curriculum—a committee vote is not the final word. In most universities, even curricular changes must be approved by an accountable officer: a dean or the university provost, and sometimes even the president. In still other institutions, the final approval rests with the board itself, as does for many curricular decisions in my own university and state.

Clearly, when it comes to university governance, "shared" is a much more complex concept than most people suspect. True shared governance attempts to balance maximum participation in decision making with clear accountability. That is a difficult balance to maintain, which may explain why the concept has become so fraught. Genuine shared governance gives voice to each constituency (but not necessarily ultimate authority) to concerns common to all constituents as well as to issues unique to specific groups.

The key to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication. When various groups of people are kept in the loop and understand what developments are occurring within the university, and when they are invited to participate as true partners, the institution prospers. That, after all, is our common goal.

Gary A. Okin is provost and vice president for academic affairs at Idaho State University. He can be contacted at careers@chronicle.com.
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Introduction

Colleges and universities provide both the human capital development and often the research backbone for the economy to function at a high level. Simultaneously, institutions provide a tremendous social benefit for graduates and other stakeholders who make use of their emphasis on the arts, entertainment, and cultural development. This multi-dimensional role, one in which Clark Kerr referred to as the “multiversity” (Johnson, Kavanagh, & Mattson, 2003, p. 11), often results in a conflicting notion of purpose and management, with competition for business-like accountability with public sector intangible service. Burgess (2009) noted that the result is the perspective of the public university as a quasi-governmental agency.

The conflicting perspectives of higher education’s role, and ultimately, purpose in serving the public good is highlighted in terms of how these institutions are governed, both internally and externally. Most public institutions make use of a politically appointed or elected governing board who manage by consensus (Borland, 2003). Historically, these governors have relied on a series of checks and balances that have included a clearly defined role for campus faculty and administrators (Borland, 2003). Other professionals on campus, typically termed ‘staff have also played a less visible, yet important role.

This body of staff in recent years has comprised the vast majority of higher education hiring. Staff members are classified as professionals working in such areas as advancement and alumni programs, athletics, business operations, and research and research compliance. As the faculty role has become increasingly segmented, these staff positions have taken on a greater importance in institutional operation. And although these positions have grown in importance, their conduit for access to decision-making has remained constricted to traditional notions of staff governance (Morris, Miller, Nadler, & Miles, 2008).

Staff governance is the process where staff, both line and professional, are involved in institutional decision-making (see Stacey, 1999 for an example of this definition). The process is reliant on administrative distribution of authority and is not based on legal standing, and subsequently, is an important element in institutional organizational behavior, particularly when administrators and leaders attempt to make substantial decisions and chart courses that impact the future and existence of the university (see Leach, 2008 for a general discussion of these elements).

The current study was designed to explore how staff governance and administrative leaders perceive a more effective use of their efforts in institutional decision making.

Background of the Study

Shared governance has been one of the hallmarks of higher education, allowing various stakeholders opportunities to provide input into the decision-making process (Miller, 2003). This activity of shared governance has been dominated by discussions of faculty involvement in governance, student participation in governance, and even trustees and overseers participation in institutional decision-making. Yet, the largest segment of higher education labor and investment has become, among various definitions, staff members. Whether staff members include traditional line staff, such as secretaries, administrative assistants, and accountants, or professional administrative staff in development, and athletic administrators, these individuals have become a major force on college campuses. Despite this rise in presence and prominence, little understanding of their role in shared governance has been explored (Morris, Miller, Nadler, & Miles, 2008).

Conceptually, shared governance is the process of involving many different actors in making decisions or choosing outcome directions that serve the best interest of the whole (Rivera, 2008). A variety of perspectives have been offered on shared governance, including many criticisms that shared governance no longer is appropriate for the corporate-responding college (Waugh, 1988). Other perceptions of shared governance suggest a pro-rated approach to delegated authority, where the level of autonomy to make decisions, or have input into decisions, is correlated with a negotiated level of delegation (Miller, 1999).
There is some evidence, then, that supports the concept that the more constituents are involved in making decisions, the more they are likely to accept and support the decision outcome (Rivera, 2008; see also Taylor, 1911; Thompson, 1967). Additionally, there is added value in having staff involved in the decision-making process, as often they are the most directly involved in working with students, providing off-campus services, and support research activities. Staff members are also more likely to be available on campus for consultation and decision making on a regular basis, regardless of summer or holiday calendars. The potential shortcomings of involving staff in governance activities include the potential for less institutions investment and a greater likelihood of changing jobs and institutions, the potential for the inability to see the broader perspective of campus activities and mission, and a highly disaggregate definition of what constitutes “staff” (adapted from Worthington & Swalmhey, 1999).

Research Methods

Data were collected for the study through a researcher developed survey instrument. The instrument content was derived from statements identified by an expert panel of 15 staff governance leaders at land-grant universities around the country. These 15 staff governance leaders participated in a three-round Delphi study where they were asked to identify and rate their agreement with strategies for effective staff involvement in governance. A total of 14 of the 15 staff governance leaders participated in all three rounds of the Delphi instrument, and strategies that had the strongest agreement about their potential effectiveness were then placed in an electronic survey. These 15 items were structured onto a survey instrument that was then pilot tested with one staff senate of 23 members. They provided narrative feedback and completed the survey, rating each item on a 1-to-5 Likert-type scale where 1= Strong Disagreement that the strategies would be helpful in making a more effective staff governance, progressing to 5= Strong Agreement that the strategy would make the staff governance unit more effective. The pilot test had a reliability alpha of .7298.

The survey was then sent, via email in the winter of 2008-2009, to 225 randomly selected staff government individuals who had been identified through staff governance website portals. Four-year institutions were randomly identified by consulting the 2007 Higher Education Directory (Burke, 2007), with up to three staff senators identified at any given institution. Ultimately, 115 institutions were identified and searched online to produce a sample of 225.

Findings

A total of 181 surveys were returned for a 71.5% response rate. This response rate was achieved by utilizing three reminder email messages to non-respondents. These individuals rated all 15 items on the survey instrument, and the average of the mean ratings was 4.31. The high ratings were consistent with the development of the survey instrument, meaning that the 15 items included had high levels of agreement from the expert panel that created the strategies.

Five items had overall mean ratings above 4.0, indicating the strongest levels of agreement by study participants. These items were perceived to be the most effective staff governance strategies. As shown in Table 1, these included having dealing with important issues that are relevant to campus (mean 4.76; SD 4.43), having a staff governance unit that is visible to the campus community (mean 4.71; SD .4972), making use of a system that retains strong leaders (mean 4.67; SD .2891) and a system that has smooth systems in place to deal with issues (mean 4.69; SD .5748), and a staff governance environment that has support from higher administration on initiatives to improve campus environments for staff (mean 4.6; SD .3489).

Two items had agreement levels below the 4.0 (agreement) threshold, including that staff governance effectively involves both line and professional staff (mean 3.89; SD .3788), and the culture of faculty on campus supports collaboration with staff (mean 3.90; SD .2887). The remaining eight strategies were rated by respondents within the 4.00 and 4.51 range, indicating that as a group staff senators agreed that the strategies identified are important elements in an effective staff governance unit.

Discussion

This is an initial, descriptive study of what can make staff governance bodies work better. The survey creation, and to a large extent validation through this administration, reflects priority areas that academic leaders can emphasize in improving collaborative governance. These items, consistent with their positive ratings for potentially improving the effectiveness of staff governance bodies, could be categorized into three areas: the context of shared staff governance, the protocol used to implement staff governance, and those who participate.

The context suggested to in the findings represents a need for mutual respect and communication by all layers of
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administration on a college campus. This is not unique to staff governance, but might be highlighted due to the surface-level disparities in titles, salaries, visibility, etc. If academic leaders, however, are interested in building collaborative, team-based environments for decision making, they will have to look at contextual areas such as providing support to improve the campus environment for staff, support efforts to improve work environments, providing important and relevant issues to staff senates to work with, and helping to promote a culture that values staff input.

Protocol issues reflect the systems that staff governance units have in place and make use of to accomplish their business. These involve a smooth system of work, proper recognition of participants, a critical mass of staff involved in governance, and dealing with important issues.

The third area supported by participant ratings had to do with the staff members participating in shared governance on behalf of the staff. Staff governance bodies must find ways to identify, involve, and retain qualified, strong leaders who will command the respect of their peers, and others on campus.

Ironically, in such tumultuous financial times, virtually all of the strategies identified are low to no cost activities. Some of the strategies, such as recognition of staff members, might have actual monetary costs tied to them, but for the most part, the strategies staff members identified as most important to making their governance body work had to do with communications, respect, and an intangible commitment on the part of the institution to a democratic process of decision-making. As academic leaders are forced to address multiple business related issues (tuition, fees, capital costs, legislative relations, etc.), they have at their discretion the ability to significantly improve the decision-making process, and potential morale, on their campuses through the recognition and stronger involvement of key constituents such as staff through identifiable strategies such as those presented in this study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff governance deals with important issues that are relevant to campus</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff governance unit is visible to the campus community</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system of staff governance retains strong leaders</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system of staff governance has smooth systems in place to deal with issues</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from higher administration on initiatives to improve campus environments for staff</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff governance unit members are well qualified to hold their posts</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff governance members recognize the importance of representing their peers</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus leadership turns to staff governance unit for personnel to appoint to committees</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system of staff governance involves the best and brightest from campus</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from higher administration on initiatives to improve work environments for staff</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus staff are seen as peers/equals with faculty</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff governance unit deals with issues relevant to the campus community</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system of staff governance has a practice of encouraging participation</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff governance effectively involves both line and professional staff</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The culture of faculty on campus supports collaboration with staff</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 4, 1979

MEMO TO: Members of the Support Staff

FROM: Gail Fullerton
President, SJSU
and
Karen Burdick
President, Support Staff Council, SJSU

SUBJECT: SUPPORT STAFF COUNCIL

The Support Staff Council was created on this campus more than a decade ago to represent support staff employees in university governance. The constitution of the Support Staff Council states in part: "The purpose of the Council is to seek recognition of the support staff, participate in the development of policy which may affect support employees...[seek] improvement of working conditions...."

A.B. 1091 Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) becomes law on July 1, 1979. This act provides a formal collective bargaining framework within which employees may choose whether or not to select an exclusive representative to bargain with management on such matters as wages, hours, terms, and conditions of employment. These are areas in which the Support Staff Council has been active in the past.

Section 3571 of the HEERA states that: "It shall be unlawful for the higher education employer to:

(f) Consult with any academic, professional, or staff advisory group on any matter within the scope of representation for employees who are represented by an exclusive representative, or for whom an employee organization has filed a request for recognition or certification as an exclusive representative until such time as such request is withdrawn or an election has been held in which "no representative" received a majority of the votes cast.... For the purposes of this subdivision, the term 'academic' shall not be deemed to include the academic senate."

Since it is probable that on or shortly after July 1, 1979, various organizations will file requests for recognition or certification as the exclusive representative of CSUC support staff employees, it will not be lawful after that date for the President or
Other members of the campus administration to consult with the Support Staff Council on any matters that are included within the scope of A.B. 1091. This prohibition will last "until such time as such request is withdrawn or an election has been held in which 'no representative' received a majority of the votes cast...."

The Support Staff Council has met with the President to discuss what functions, if any, the Council could retain on campus next year. At this time the Council could play only a narrowly restricted role, primarily one of planning social functions such as the annual barbeque or Christmas party.

The reluctant consensus was that this limited role was not sufficient to warrant holding elections for membership on the Support Staff Council for next year. If in the future some support staff classes choose "no representative," the Support Staff Council can be reactivated as the voice of those classes in university governance.

We are sad to preside at the "mothballing" of the Support Staff Council, but the times--and the law--have changed.

cc: Academic Vice President
    Executive Vice President
    Dean, Student Services
    Director, Information Systems & Computer Services
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Jess Lopez,
Chair (80)
Carol Haines,
Vice Chair (60)
Marjorie Faier,
Sec. (79)
Kathy Morris,
Rec. Sec. (79)
Patt Williams,
Treasurer (79)

Members:
Norma Arena (81)
Juana Bejarano (79)
Helen Carter (79)
Niela Christensen (79)
Chris Christoffersen (81)
Hershe Collette (79)
Virginia Davis (81)
Cheryl Evans (79)
Roy Gardner (79)
Laela Hardy (61)
Marguerite Hrabetin (81)
Lynn Kannard (80)
Gert Kearney (60)
Joe Maynard (81)
Vicki Newman (80)
Barbara Perkins (79)
Jan Renison (80)
Toby Shumaker (80)
Charles Sowers (80)
Janet Spurgeon (61)
Bertnyce Stilwell (80)
Pat Surrat (80)
Teddi Tweedale (81)
Mary Wise-Aguilar (81)
Seymour Scheinber,
Faculty Council Rep.
L. Donald Shields,
President
Richard Schultman,
Personnel Director

TO: ALL STAFF
Meeting Number 8, 1978-79
April 18, 1979
2:00 P.M., L-280

MINUTES

Present: Arena, Carter, Christensen, Collette, Davis, Fair, Kearney, Kannard, Lopez, Morris, Perkins, Renison, Scheinberg, Schultman, Sowers, Spurgeon, Stilwell, Tweedale, Surrat, Williams, Wise-Aguilar

Absent: Bejarano, Christoffersen, Evans, Garza, Haile, Hrabetin, Maynard, Newman, Shumaker

Proxies: McDonald for Handy

I. Announcements

A. Personnel Advisory Group

The April 10, 1979, memo from M. L. McCarty, Principal Personnel Analyst, Faculty and Staff Affairs stated:

Clarification of status of Staff Councils after July 1, 1979. Stan Hartnick stated that after July 1, 1979, it is the present belief that Staff Councils will cease to exist in the same fashion as they do now. It is likely it would be unlawful to deal with Staff Councils on any matters dealing with terms and conditions of employment. The threat of unlawful labor practices would be quite prevalent. An FSA will be issued informing campuses of the status of Staff Councils and the many related issues involved.

Dr. Wagner said that clarification and guidelines are needed as to the kinds of committees on which Staff Council representatives are serving, and on what kinds of committees they might be able to continue serving. As soon as there is clarification, campuses will be advised. Dr. Wagner said this is one of the many areas which have to be dealt with on an
ad hoc basis. She said after the April meeting of presidents, a definitive memo will be issued.

B. Upcoming programs

George Roth, Library Computer Services, is giving an introduction to computers for staff to help understand computers, their language, programs, problems, and advantages on four Fridays (April 20, April 27, May 4, and May 11), L-206, 12 noon-1:00 P.M. Staff are encouraged to attend.

II. Minutes of the March 14, 1979, meeting

It was MSP (Williams, Renison) to approve the minutes with the following corrections:

1. Remove Section V, G from the minutes.

2. Section V, F should read: It was MSP (Renison, Handy) that Jan Spurgeon serve as the staff member for the Search Committee for Math, Science, and Engineering.

III. Committee Reports

A. Staff Development Committee

The following is a report on the activities of the Staff Development Committee made by Elaine Messenger, Chair.

As you know, the Staff Development Committee sent out an Interest Questionnaire asking staff personnel to indicate interest in subjects for staff development workshops and noontime programs. We received 112 replies from some very interested and enthusiastic people.

As a direct result of the response to this flyer a number of programs have been offered by University groups: The Faculty Development Center is using its resources to offer a series of noontime lectures on understanding the computer, culture shock of foreign students, and resume writing; a disco dance program is being given at the University Center; other programs are in the making. Members of the Staff Development Committee contributed a good many hours of hard work to some of these programs. We are pleased to have been instrumental in their development and grateful for the response of Dr. John Bedell of the Faculty Development Center and others.

Although the members of the Committee can work only on their own limited time, we also hope to personally sponsor some requested programs in the immediate future.

It was MSP (Renison, Davis) to extend Staff Council's appreciation to the members of the Staff Development Committee, Elaine Messenger, Chair, Norma Arena, Lee Miller, Rafael Rivera, and Pat Surrall, for doing extensive work on their own time and for completion in a very short amount of time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Do they have a Staff Council?</th>
<th>When was the Staff Council formed?</th>
<th>How many Board Members are on the Staff Council?</th>
<th>What is the purpose of the Staff Council?</th>
<th>Are staff represented on the Academic Senate?</th>
<th>What issues and/or events are addressed by the Staff Council?</th>
<th>How often does the Staff Council meet?</th>
<th>What is the term length of a Board Member?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Pomona, CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>To engage in service to the campus community and enhance the recognition and worth of each staff member through its community service efforts. All officers shall be nominated by the Nominating Committee and elected by the membership of Staff Council at the May meeting of Staff Council.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Staff Senate Scholarship and Service Awards, Rose Fest, Sunset, Publicity, Newsletter, New Staff Welcome Reception, New Staff Orientation, Fundraising, Community Outreach, and Staff Appreciation Day.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Long Beach</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>196b-1963</td>
<td>1 for each 25 staff per unit</td>
<td>The Mission of Staff Council is to actively support the role of the University and to develop, maintain and encourage positive relationships and communications with our campus community, students, faculty, students, and Outreach staff. Recommendations shall be elected by secret ballot, by the electorate in each area.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Monthly (September-June)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Northridge</td>
<td>Northridge, CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Staff Council serves to strengthen staff contributions to the campus community; encourages representation on campus wide committees; and sponsors social events and staff recognition.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Four non-voting positions on the Academic Senate. Fundraising, homecoming, Halloween Decorating Contest, Winter Social, Staff Recognition Luncheon, and Staff Picnic.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To provide formal structure for representation of all University support employees, as an issue, and provide forum for discussion. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>The Academic Senate. Outstanding UPSF employee committee, personnel program, welfare, and public service. Winter costs for Physical Plant employees, social and membership on various campus committees, and leadership in the Military Scholarship Program.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>To promote honest and open communication between Administration and Staff, and function in an advisory capacity. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Executive Committee, Administrative Committee, Campus Sustainability Committee, Community Relations Committee, Communication Committee, Staff Development and Advancement Committee, Staff Recognition Committee, and Work Life Committee.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1 for each 36 staff per 12 Senators</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>The Academic Senate. The Operating Staff Council is an integral part of the university governance system through its participation, communications, deliberation, and assistance on the resolution of issues and the formulation of policies relevant to the general welfare of Operating Staff employees. Staff compensation, performance awards, educational opportunities and scholarships, staff satisfaction survey, employee communications, fundraising.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant, MI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To provide formal structure for representation of all University support employees, as an issue, and provide forum for discussion. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Four non-voting positions on the Academic Senate. Fundraising, homecoming, Halloween Decorating Contest, Winter Social, Staff Recognition Luncheon, and Staff Picnic.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To provide formal structure for representation of all University support employees, as an issue, and provide forum for discussion. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>The Academic Senate. Outstanding UPSF employee committee, personnel program, welfare, and public service. Winter costs for Physical Plant employees, social and membership on various campus committees, and leadership in the Military Scholarship Program.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Masons University</td>
<td>Fairfax, VA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>To promote honest and open communication between Administration and Staff, and function in an advisory capacity. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Executive Committee, Administrative Committee, Campus Sustainability Committee, Community Relations Committee, Communication Committee, Staff Development and Advancement Committee, Staff Recognition Committee, and Work Life Committee.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To provide formal structure for representation of all University support employees, as an issue, and provide forum for discussion. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Four non-voting positions on the Academic Senate. Fundraising, homecoming, Halloween Decorating Contest, Winter Social, Staff Recognition Luncheon, and Staff Picnic.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Kent Campus</td>
<td>Kent, OH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>To communicate the concerns of the operating staff to the other administrative bodies vice-president(s), president of the university and the Board of Trustees. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Four non-voting positions on the Academic Senate. Fundraising, homecoming, Halloween Decorating Contest, Winter Social, Staff Recognition Luncheon, and Staff Picnic.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>Delaware, PA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>To communicate the concerns of the operating staff to the other administrative bodies vice-president(s), president of the university and the Board of Trustees. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Four non-voting positions on the Academic Senate. Fundraising, homecoming, Halloween Decorating Contest, Winter Social, Staff Recognition Luncheon, and Staff Picnic.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University, San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos, TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>To communicate the concerns of the operating staff to the other administrative bodies vice-president(s), president of the university and the Board of Trustees. Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Four non-voting positions on the Academic Senate. Fundraising, homecoming, Halloween Decorating Contest, Winter Social, Staff Recognition Luncheon, and Staff Picnic.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Do they have a Staff Council?</td>
<td>When was the Staff Council formed?</td>
<td>How many Board Members are on the Staff Council?</td>
<td>What is the purpose of the Staff Council?</td>
<td>How are members determined?</td>
<td>Are staff represented on the Academic Senate?</td>
<td>What issues and/or events are addressed by the Staff Council?</td>
<td>How often does the Staff Council meet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Lubbock, TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>To provide IT staff members with a voice in decisions being made that affect them.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. They do not appear to be.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Fee waivers, Employee Wellness, Pay Raises, Benefits for part-time staff, Parking Fee Structures, Reporting Time Worked, Use of PCs, Staff Scholarships, Telecommuting, Employee Mobility, Pedestrian Traffic, Campus Maps, ADA Compliance, and Childcare</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>To build communications, trust, and integrity within the diverse community.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. They do not appear to be.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Marketing, Fundraising, Research, Scholarships, Special Events, Employee of the Month, and Sponsorship</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>As an advisor body to the University of Houston Administrators and to promote recognition of the staff contribution and involve the staff in decisions affecting their activities.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. Staff Council President may attend Academic Senate meetings but has no voting rights.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Staff Council Scholarships, Staff Survey, Oasis Memo and the Campus Accessibility Tour, Grad First Impressions, New Staff Welcome Cards, Staff Barbecue Dinner, Spring Egg Hunt, and staff representation on numerous university committees</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>Denton, TX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>To refer issues and inform the university administration of items that are of interest and/or relevant to staff members. To continue to improve the delivery of services to the university’s constituencies. To foster communication within the campus community and to advance the university’s mission.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. No representation on faculty Senate.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Issues include the need for and creation of compensatory leave, continuation of the Faculty and Staff Scholarship program, increasing the reclassification allocation for staff, revisions to the campus smoking policy, and administrative leave as a staff reward program.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>To provide an avenue for employees to voice concerns, make recommendations and provide input to university governance involving the classified workforce.</td>
<td>Self nominations then appointment by the VP’s. They do not appear to be.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Leadership Development Conference Series, Walk-a-thon, and the Pride Ambassador Campaign</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Morgantown, WV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>To provide the classified staff employees a means of conveying their concerns on employee-employee relations.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. They do not appear to be.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Campus-wide Committee Participation, Staff Tuition Assistance Program, Hearts &amp; Hands, Employee Appreciation Committee, and Blood Partnership</td>
<td>Twice a Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>Kalamazoo, MI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>To provide the classified staff employees a means of conveying their concerns on employee-employee relations.</td>
<td>Open nominations and elections. They do not appear to be.</td>
<td>No representation on Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Campus-wide Committee Participation, Staff Tuition Assistance Program, Hearts &amp; Hands, Employee Appreciation Committee, and Blood Partnership</td>
<td>Twice a Month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: CSULB Staff Council Bylaws

Constitution and Bylaws

1. **1.000 Organization**
   1. **1.100** The name of the organization shall be the “Staff Council (SC) of California State University, Long Beach.”
   2. **1.200** Purpose and Role
      1. **1.210** The Council shall represent the electorate and shall serve as the advisory body for staff matters to the Associate Vice President of Budget and Human Resources Management or his/her designee.
      2. **1.220** The Council shall be concerned with the viewpoint and interests of staff on university or community issues not covered by collective bargaining. There may be occasions where Staff Council is asked to provide advice on faculty or academic-related matters. The Council will maintain the flow of communication from Staff Council to the rest of the university community and likewise from the university community back to Staff Council.
   3. **1.300** Electorate

The electorate shall be comprised of all staff employees of California State University, Long Beach and its auxiliaries who are employed on at least a half-time basis for six months or more.

4. **1.400** Membership of the Council
   1. **1.410** Eligibility. All staff employees, managers (except those with academic retreat rights), and staff of CSULB auxiliaries who are employed on a half-time basis, or more, with an initial appointment of at least six months or more are eligible to serve as a member of Council.
   2. **1.420** Elected representatives must be a member of the organizational unit which they represent. Each organizational unit shall be entitled to one (1) representative for each twenty-five (25) eligible staff members or fraction thereof.
   3. **1.430** Representation shall be as listed below:
      1. **1.431** Ex-officio Members (nonvoting):
         - Associate Vice President, Budget and Human Resources Management
         - Director of Benefits and Staff Human Resources
         - Staff Employee Relations Manager
         - Director, Equity and Diversity
         - Faculty Academic Senators (1)
         - Staff Academic Senators (5)
         - Staff Emeriti (1)
         - Immediate Past Chair of the Staff Council
         - Associated Students President or designee (1)
         - University Ombuds or designee (1)
         - Local Staff Unions Representatives (1 each)
         - Union of American Physicians and Dentists (UAPD)
         - California State University Employees Union (CSUEU)
         - State Employees Trade Council (SETC)
         - Statewide University Police Association (SUPA)
         - Academic Professionals of California (APC)
      2. **1.432** Elected Members (Number of representatives to be based on the number of employees in each unit):
         - Academic Affairs
            - College of the Arts
            - College of Business Administration
            - College of Education
            - College of Engineering
            - College of Health and Human Services
            - College of Liberal Arts
            - College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
            - Library
            - University College and Extension Services
            - Carpenter Performing Arts Center
            - Graduate and Undergraduate Studies
3. **1.433 Members Pro Tem**

Elected members who are unable to attend a regular or special meeting may appoint a staff pro tem person from their area who will have full voting and speaking privileges. If no staff person from the area is available, the Staff Council member may appoint an at-large pro tem university staff person who will not have full voting and speaking privileges. At-large pro tem members will not be counted in computation of a quorum.

4. **1.434 Members-at-large**

When a Staff Council officer, or committee chair, moves from the division or department where he/she was elected to the Council, that individual shall become a member-at-large to the Staff Council with full floor privileges and shall retain any voting privileges previously held.

- A Staff Council officer shall serve until the end of his/her current term in office.
- A committee chair shall serve for one year or until the end of his/her original SC membership, whichever is less.
- A staff council member shall serve for the completion of the Staff Council year.

4. **1.440 Term of Office**

Each representative shall be elected for three years, with the term beginning in September; Representatives may succeed themselves if properly re-elected.

5. **1.450 Method of Electing Representatives**

Representative shall be elected in spring each year, by secret ballot, by a plurality of the votes cast by the electorate in each area. New representatives shall be seated on the Council at the September Council meeting. Nominees shall be solicited from each area prior to the election. Nominees must have their supervisor’s approval to run and to serve.

6. **1.460 Vacancies**

Should the seat of a representative on the Council become vacant, the staff person with the next highest number of votes shall have first right of refusal to serve for the balance of the term. The
Vice-Chair of the Staff Council shall be notified immediately by the representative when a vacancy occurs.

1. **1.461** If the refusal is exercised, the SC members of that area shall conduct an election to fill the vacant position for the remainder of the term

7. **1.470** Recall

An election for the recall of a council member shall be held upon petition of at least 25% of the electorate in the area concerned. Notification of intention to hold a recall election shall be given to the Chair of the Council by presentation of the said petition. A recall election shall be supervised by a five-member Ad Hoc Elections Committee (none of whom shall be from the constituency concerned). A majority of the electorate in the area concerned must have voted or such recall election shall be declared null and void, and recall of the Council member shall be effected only if at least 75% of those voting in the election favor his/her recall.

8. **1.480** Areas of Responsibility

The area of responsibility of each Council member shall extend to include attendance at Council meetings, service as liaison officer between the Council and area represented and by example, promotion of the good and welfare of the University.

5. **1.500** Officers

1. **1.510** The elected officers shall be the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary and Treasurer.
2. **1.520** All officers of the Council will serve a one-year term and may succeed themselves if properly re-elected. Officers will be elected in May each year and will begin their terms in June.
3. **1.530** Vacancies

In the event any Staff Council officer other than chair should become vacant prior to the expiration of the term of office, the Council shall conduct a special election during the meeting at which the vacancy is declared. Special elections shall be conducted by the Nominating Committee of the Staff Council.

4. **1.540** When the position of Chair of SC becomes vacant, the Vice Chair assumes the Chair position for the remainder of the term. If the Vice-Chair is unable to fill the position, a special election will be held immediately for a new Chair.
5. **1.550** A majority vote of the Council members shall be required to elect any officer or a replacement for any officer of the Council.
6. **1.560** Recall of Officers

An election for the recall of an officer shall be held upon petition of 51% of the electorate. The recall of the officer shall be affected only if 75% of the Council representatives vote in favor of his/her recall.

7. **1.570** Responsibilities of Officers

1. **1.571** The Chair shall preside at meetings of the Staff Council, represent the Council at all university functions and perform other responsibilities as deemed necessary.
2. **1.572** The Vice-Chair will assume the duties of the Chair when the latter is temporarily absent, or when requested to do so by the Chair. The Vice-Chair will represent the Chair upon request, at official university functions to which the SC Chair is invited. The Vice-Chair will take attendance and determine quorum at General Council and Executive Committee meetings. The Vice-Chair shall act as chair of the Membership Committee.
3. **1.573** The Secretary will take minutes at SC meetings, prepare agendas, reserve rooms for meetings and perform the duties normally required of a secretary of an organization.
4. **1.574** The Treasurer is responsible for all money acquired by SC. The Treasurer shall present a monthly report to the SC and pay all bills authorized by the Staff Council.

6. **1.600** Appointees and Consultants

1. **1.610** Parliamentarian
The parliamentarian(s) of the SC shall be appointed by the Chair with the approval of the Staff Council. The term shall be for one year. The Parliamentarian(s) does not have to be a university employee.

7. **1.700 Committees**
   1. **1.710** The Executive Committee will be comprised of:
      1. **1.711** Voting members: elected officers of the Council, the standing committee chairs and two at-large members elected from the regular membership of the SC.
      2. **1.712** Ex-Officio members: the immediate Past SC Chair, one Staff Academic Senator and the Director of Budget and Human Resources Management and/or designee.
   2. **1.720** Standing committees of the SC are: Nominating Committee, Special Events Committee, Staff Development Committee, Membership Committee, Bylaws, Policy and Procedure Committee, and Ways and Means Committee.
      1. **1.721** Membership: The Chairs of standing SC committees must be SC members. Remaining membership may be any interested staff.
      2. **1.722** Committee chair or designee will report on their activities to the SC at its regular or special meetings.
      3. **1.723** The Executive Committee is empowered to take action for committees on urgent issues needing Council approval in between general Council meetings.
   3. **1.730** All Chairs of SC committees will serve a one-year term and may succeed themselves if properly re-elected. Chairs will be elected by the June committee meeting or earlier should a vacancy arise. Chairs will begin their terms immediately after election.
      1. **1.731** All members of the Bylaws, Policies and Procedures Committee and the Nominating Committee must be SC representatives.
   4. **1.740** Other committees shall be established as deemed necessary to implement the work of the Council.

8. **1.800 Staff Academic Senators**

The staff Academic Senators shall choose from among themselves who will serve as a staff representative to university budget and financial (currently the RPP and FAC) committees, as well as administrative review committees; the Nominating Committee of the SC shall nominate staff, subject to the approval of the SC, to serve on such other standing and ad hoc university committees as need may arise.

2. **2.000 Procedural Rules**
   1. **2.100** Robert’s Rules of Order (current edition) shall prevail at Staff Council meetings, unless otherwise specified in this document.
   2. **2.200 Meetings, Regular**
      1. **2.210** Regular meetings of the Staff Council shall be scheduled at least once a month during the months of September through June.
      2. **2.220** Agenda
         1. **2.221** The agenda for the Staff Council meetings shall be formulated by the Executive Committee. Items placed on the printed agenda must be in the hands of the Executive Committee at their meeting prior to the next regular Staff Council meeting.
         2. **2.222** The agenda shall be distributed to the Council members at least three (3) days before each meeting.
         3. **2.223** Agenda items which involve visitors who have been asked to make presentations to the Council should be set as Special Orders, Time Certain on the agenda.
         4. **2.224** Additional items may be added to the agenda by Council members at the meetings.
         5. **2.225** The agenda for each Staff Council meeting shall include an item for report from each one of the Standing and Ad Hoc Committees, one of the Staff Academic Senators, and Staff representatives on university and auxiliary boards and committees. The Staff Academic Senators shall choose one of their members to attend the SC meeting and report on Academic Senate business to the SC.
   3. **2.300 Meetings, Special**
      1. **2.310** Special meetings of the Council may be called by the Executive Committee when the need arises, or by petition of any three (3) members of the Council.
      2. **2.320** The agenda for special meetings of the Council shall cover only the items specified in the letter of call and shall not be subject to change by Council members’ at the meetings. In all other instances, the agenda rules for regular meetings shall prevail.
   4. **2.400** Transaction of Business at Council Meetings
      1. **2.410** A quorum must be present in order to transact any official Council business. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the Council.
2. **2.420** Official motions and resolutions shall contain a recommendation for transmittal with specification for implementation, and/or request for further dissemination of information.

3. **2.430** Motions and resolutions shall require a majority vote of those voting members present to pass unless otherwise specified within this document.

4. **2.440** With the exclusion of the minutes and the agenda, all motions shall be presented in written form if requested by any member.

5. **2.450** Discussions and Debate
   1. **2.451** Discussion on agenda items without an implementing motion shall be limited to fifteen (15) minutes.
   2. **2.452** Debate on a motion before the Council shall be limited to ten (10) minutes.

5. **2.500** Visitors at Meetings

Meetings of the Staff Council and Executive Committees shall be open to visitors; floor privileges shall be extended to visitors by a two-thirds (2/3) favorable vote of the voting members present, or by special invitation given prior to the meeting—either by previous action of the Council, or by the Executive Committee. Such floor privileges shall be extended for purposes of presenting material germane to a specific agenda item or items.

6. **2.600** Minutes of Meetings
   1. **2.610** Minutes of Council meetings shall be as detailed as is necessary to be informative to the electorate.

3. **3.000** General Guidelines
   1. **3.100** The Council shall have ten meetings per year and the Executive Committee shall operate on a year-round basis.
   2. **3.200** There shall be an annual review of the Bylaws as well as Policies and Procedures. Recommendations for amendment shall be brought to the Council for consideration as appropriate.
   3. **3.300** The Constitution and Bylaws of the Staff Council, or any part thereof, may be amended at any time by a majority vote of the Council members present at a regular meeting or special meeting of the Staff Council.
   4. **3.400** Communication with Constituency
      1. **3.410** Members of the Council are responsible for keeping all possible channels of communication open between themselves and their constituency; methods of communication should be flexible and geared to the means available to each Council member and to the needs of each area concerned.
      2. **3.420** Council members should seek opinions, advice, and counsel from members of their constituency concerning those matters, which will require action by the Council. The personal convictions of each Council member should be secondary to the wishes of the majority of the electorate in each area, insofar as they can be determined.
   3. **3.430** Elected members are expected to attend SC meetings. Elected members who are unable to attend may appoint a voting member pro tem from their area. If no staff person from their area is available, the SC member may appoint a non-voting university member pro tem. (See section 1.433) A member who has three unexcused absences within a semester shall be reminded by the Vice Chair that attendance is expected. A member who has three further unexcused absences in a calendar year will be dropped from Staff Council membership. An excused absence is one in which the member notifies the Chair, Vice-Chair, or Secretary, in advance, that he/she will be unable to attend the meeting. If the member pro tem attends the meeting, the absence is also excused. An unexcused absence is one in which the member does not notify an officer and/or notify their member pro tem.

5. **3.500** Support Services for the Council
   1. **3.510** In general, the Benefits and Staff Human Resources Office shall provide necessary clerical assistance for the Council, both in the preparation and dissemination of information to the electorate and to the members of the Council and in the conducting of election.

6. **3.600** Council as Nominating Committee
   1. **3.610** The Staff Council shall act as a Nominating Committee for staff representatives to university committees, boards of directors, councils, etc.

7. **3.700** Council Funds
   1. **3.710** All funds generated by the Staff Council or any of its committees belong to the Council. Each committee of the Council shall submit an annual budget to the Executive Committee for consideration. The Treasurer will present, on behalf of the Executive Committee, the annual budget to the Council for approval.
Appendix H: 2010 CSUF Survey

**Staff Involvement In University Governance**

**Results Overview**

1. Do you believe that Cal State Fullerton staff members have an adequate voice in university decision-making?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you support the development of a Staff Council with University-wide representation to improve shared governance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What issues do you think a Staff Council should be involved with on campus? Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff communication</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-improvement projects</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget-related issues</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee housing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional training and development</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy development</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social event/program planning</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How should representatives on a Staff Council be selected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>through a university-wide election</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through appointment by department managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on a volunteer basis</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If a Staff Council were established at CSUF, would you be interested in serving on it?
### 8. What is your employment status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/Lead</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPP (Management Personnel Plan)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Involvement In University Governance

Results Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel that I can freely express suggestions regarding decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No real opportunities for staff to become involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There does not seem to be very many opportunities for the open discussion of ideas/concerns. Particularly during &quot;work hours&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They are not represented. Only MPPs are heard, and they do not represent staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management tells us what to do and generally does not ask or want our feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New systems/methods are imposed without asking about problems with the existing system. Needing one more signature on a document does not make anything easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don’t really know the answer but I imagine with all of the surveys taken, someone is listening and taking the staff’s consideration when decisions are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It may differ in different areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Perhaps my perspective as an Admin IV colors my response. :-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unless personally invited I don’t see staff being included in those governing bodies. A lot of the same people get recycled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>We are never asked -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I’m not usually consulted as to how our college is managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am not sure we are ever asked to voice our thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We don’t have a voice in university decision-making because there’s no representation for staff and administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The voice is not formalized. Informal means have their place but a more formal method of getting input is highly desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Decisions are made that adversely affect staff and upper management appears to be surprised when it does. If management had asked for input from staff, the adverse outcomes could have been avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Few if any staff members—other than MPP—administrative staff—are members of decision-making committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Limited to no representation on any campus-wide planning committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Because I haven’t had a need to make any major decisions, I may only conclude that our adequacy to do so is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In my department we are given the chance to provide our input on matters that will affect us as staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>There is rarely a committee or organized program through which staff can comment on issues when faculty are regularly consulted, put on committees, and surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Priority is to faculty, then students, then lastly staff… not much depends on what the staff wants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It is rare that staff are asked for their opinions or suggestions before decisions are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Because the implementation of new practices are just dictated to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Staff on campus do not have an equal voice especially if they are in a lower level. This school is very faculty friendly but does not about their staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I’m not sure if we do, since at my level we don’t get to make any major decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel staff members are given a voice when deemed appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ultimately, it seems as though decisions are handed down by Executives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I believe that many of the issues that concern staff members are discussed and decided upon by management. Often times, those that are affected, or the ones left to actually carry out policies, are the last to know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Most staff members are represented by the union which conducts votes concerning decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think staff are often left out of the loop and taken for granted.

They keep staff informed of any updates and changes to salary. However, there is a long delay between decision making and implementation.

Staff frequently get little opportunity to provide input on a larger scale - an example is how faculty have the Academic Senate.

Not sufficient representation in the Academic Senate.

No one really listens to staff members' suggestions, even when they are valuable, positive suggestions.

No one has ever asked

I have never been asked my opinion prior to any decision being made.

I have seen program developed, such as the MA onc Comm with the Hong Kong students, and the staff was not adequately involved resulting in a poorly run program. Management seems to make decisions without looking at the details of how programs will run and there seems to be little or no input from the people that actually run the programs. I also see that admissions and records is extremely shorthanded, but the upper management continues to receive huge salaries.

I believe most of us feel that only faculty are taken seriously and that staff opinion doesn't really matter. We're not often asked for input in campus decision-making.

If they choose to be involved committees are open to all.

We have no specific mechanism for input that I am aware of.

Staff is not routinely included in top level discussions.

Bureaucracy

Higher level management are the ones involved

Many times we have been told of things that may happen, but when we give an opinion, it is looked at as unimportant feedback. Nothing comes of it.

If they do, then I am not aware. When decisions are made by the "big-wigs" sometimes we wonder, how did they come to this decision? Was a representative of staff there to provide input?

Staff are not considered at all. We are expendable.

Staff are not routinely asked for their opinions regarding decision making, i.e. 4/10 schedule, etc.

It often feels as if we are last on the totem pole, even though we support both faculty and students.

There have been some large decisions made related to the budget and purchasing. Hope and I don't feel there was enough, if any, staff involvement in those decisions.

It is my impression that campus staff have a lot of respect for the higher leadership, and this allows university leaders to make decisions with less consultation than is expected at many institutions. As an aside, the CSUF leadership has a strong record of responsible and effective decision making.

Most staff have the option of being part of a union and they can vote on things like furloughs.

There are opportunities for staff to provide input via staff meetings, all university meetings, etc.

Most decisions are made by PAB -- sometimes w/ significant input of others -- often without

No, but it depends on what type of decision making. They are not involved when we bring the "university community" together to talk about priorities, etc. But this type of planning may also be outside the scope of their positions.

I think that the university is controlled mainly by the interests of faculty, administration, and student representatives. The bargaining groups for the staff help somewhat, but I would prefer more direct decision-making consultation with a representative selection of staff members regardless of union affiliation.

I said no, but there are some decisions that many of us are not qualified to be making. I know there are times we are asked to give our opinions about different changes that are being made in the academics that don't directly effect my job. Most of us on campus are part of a union which are suppose to give us a voice on our jobs. I have found information isn't always accurate from that source that made people make poor decisions.

We find out about changes after the fact.

If a staff member belongs to a union, they have that avenue to provide input. MPPs are generally a part of the decision-making loop.

I have not been involved with CSUF to notice any different.

Staff at CSUF are not appropriately represented on university wide committees along with faculty and students.

For example, with furloughs, it was expressed that the days chosen by the president were the days we must take. However, I later learned from the union that we could actually change the days based on needs and approval from our supervisors.
There is opportunity for participation on committees across campus, within departments, --although it may vary according to staff level -

I feel that there is some access through the organizational structure, but it varies by division and sub-division.

have served on committees with no outcome

From my 3 decades of service, I have rarely been involved with any decision making processes at the department level, let alone school, or university wide.

As any corporations, final decisions are made by adminin

There is no representative body for staff to provide a voice.

The same handful of staff and faculty are included in all committee work over and over, while 90 % of the campus is not invited to share their thoughts and experience. Decision-making is biased and stale.

I do not believe that staff need a voice. Staff carry out the directives of the institution as set forth by the Trustees and campus administration.

They are a part of many committees on campus and their voices are heard.

The decisions are primarily made by the senior management often without staff input.

I don't know much about staff involvement in university decision making so I don't know if staff has an adequate voice.

Most of the decision making is done in the administrative level (MPP) or other and we only get the results of their decisions.

management do not listen to staff members.

In my experience staff members are the last to know

I have worked here over 30 years and it seems that staff input in never solicited when making decisions on policy or procedures.

Other than union meetings and/or e-mail surveys, I don't see two way communication occurring happening. There is no voice from the ground up.

The involvement of staff is done "as needed" and not part of a structured and ongoing process. Additionally, there are thoughts the union representation is adequate for the staff, when union representation is typically centered around contractual agreements.

I am not sure - if staff members are actively involved in university decision-making, I'm not aware. Are there staff members in PKBC for example? I have more questions than answers.

I know I've never been consulted about university decisions

I think that staff and faculty are represented at major committees and decision making bodies as well as administrators.

Most decisions are presented as "completed" policy.

As an ASC staff member, there is a feeling of separateness from the university. In all matters of substance, ASC employees seem to be excluded.

Not a defined forum or process in which to solicit staff input.

Decision making is handled by management, faculty and/or a union. By the time it gets to us, the decision seems to be already made.

I can understand about involving to many people in the decision making, but an opportunity to give an opinion on areas that directly affect staff should be awarded.

Decision makers are not aware of the interconnection of tasks and duties. Sweeping changes are made without consideration of how one decision impacts other areas.

Management seems to be top down.

I've been offered an opportunity to participate in or be a part of committees, panels to look at specific issues affecting the university to give my input.

Cal State Fullerton provides various ways for staff to voice their opinions.

Seems that there are many opportunities to express concerns and voice opinions and I have generally found the administration to be open to input.

Administration encourages input

I feel that MPPs (other than VPs) are not represented in any governance forum and that no one stands up for us (for instance, why do we pay twice what union-represented personnel pay for parking? why doesn't anyone stand up for us? It's not fair, and we certainly don't all earn what the VPs earn.)

I believe my Vice President represents our best interest.
I think most decision making is left to administrators and “higher ups”.

As a new staff member, it seems the staff just have an average voice in university decision-making.

Most major decisions are made from above and trickle down from upper management. (Examples of good work: furlough decisions, CMS function and access, and air in buildings.) These people do not usually assist the students at the front counter and see how decisions impact them.

Decisions made in vacuum at Chairs, Deans, PAB and among elite Acad Senate members driven to implement their ideas........What voice do staff have to provide such a voice?

for an institution of this size, the channels provided to be involved are adequate.

I believe that most decisions made at CSUF are decided for political reasons and the good of the students or staff is not at the top of the priority list. On a bad day I believe that management on this campus is comparable to high school clicks. Unless you are aligned with certain key players, you will not be heard or even considered to be a player.

I FEEL DECISIONS ARE MADE BY THE HIGHER UPS PRIOR TO A MAJOR DECISION AND A FORMALITY OF ASKING STAFF THEIR OPINION IS JUST A COURTESY.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Please explain why or why not</th>
<th>_resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think it would be beneficial for staff members to have a staff council who can voice positive communication and issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staff representation is a good thing for the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It would be a step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I don’t see another council or committee as changing anything but why not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Someone has to be in charge, but that entity should consult only individuals affected by a decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We have enough councils and the unions do a good job of representing staff interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Another level of bureaucracy. Input would only be advisory. Enough vehicles for seeking advice already exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morale is too low - this might improve things a bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Would be helpful to have representation from many employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>This is a good idea that is being implemented in various other universities, including some in the CSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The university needs input from people in the trenches to avoid pitfalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>As long as the Staff Council contains NO AUPP staff, it’s about time staff can share their ideas that would benefit the university and not merely the upper echelon groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Do not think we need to add additional groups; but rather add staff to existing groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Although I don’t see a need currently, I do believe a Staff Council would only make improvements; therefore I am in favor of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I have to say no because I don’t know what it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Especially during these difficult economic times, I’m sure there are staff who could provide some valuable input. Especially when it comes to waste in our processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It couldn’t hurt...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I think there is adequate opportunity to participate now and the campus does not need another committee/group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Staff have a vested interest in the success of the university and their voices should be heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>To streamline processes and save money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>But I highly doubt it will happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Only if it’s going to make a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I would wholeheartedly support the development of such. Students, faculty, and management all have “voices”. It is just as important for staff to have the same opportunity. The Union voice is important for the masses, however, we need something more localized to deal with things that affect/may affect just CSUP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>This would give an additional avenue to voice concerns or have input into decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Staff play a very important role in the “functioning” of the university. Without staff, programs could not operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>This would give staff as a whole a larger voice and more opportunity to express viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Although I support this concept, a concern is how “power” will be shared with the Academic Senate, if at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Our voices need to be heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>If they make sure to get the right people in the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It would be good for staff to have a voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Absolutely. Staff is not represented equally and fairly and this would give us the opportunity to voice our opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>We should all have a chance for input and to be taken seriously. We have a faculty senate, why not a staff council?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33 More opportunities will yield greater participation
34 Such a Council will help provide for the needed mechanism mentioned above.
35 We have too much bureaucracy as it is. No need for yet another one. I will support Staff Council if the Academic Senate is dissolved.
36 It would give voice to an underrepresented group of employees.
37 Waste of time
38 The upper management personnel are seldom aware of the issues that staff face “in the trenches.” A staff council would allow staff voices to be heard.
39 Perhaps staff would be heard and taken more seriously.
40 It would be nice to have a voice
41 It would behoove the University to take staff ideas into account. They are the ones on the front line serving students.
42 It is important to hear all voices.
43 Depending on what they would do, it may be useful.
44 I believe strongly that the individuals “on the ground” have valuable expertise and perspectives that should be considered in university decision making.
45 It doesn't hurt to have extra support.
46 I think it would be good to have a group to go to for input and advice.
47 Couldn't hurt
48 This would be positive as long as it did not primarily focus on employment issues, like a board of Union reps.
49 Staff sometimes have insights and concerns that are not reflected by or known to other interest groups.
50 The staff union does not provide the collaborative function necessary for such input.
51 I would hope it would make information more available and more accurate and hopefully without the politics that have been occurring in the recent past.
52 More ideas for the university.
53 I think this would be a great place to have the staff voice represented and to encourage more staff involvement.
54 Formalized input is always a good idea.
55 Not exactly sure what this means but involvement and teamwork are top priorities to me.
56 Staff representation would provide a more holistic perspective of the University and staff would have a venue to contribute to solving some of the challenges as well as contribute valuable experience and ideas.
57 In many ways it feels as though staff are the bottom of the university concerns. However, if there weren't staff, most faculty and administrators would not get their job done and they would feel when it comes to compliance. This is evident in the fact that staff are offered 2 tickets to Front and Center when faculty are offered 4. Also faculty pick their tickets up at least two weeks earlier than staff are allowed to pick up their tickets. Little things that are to support the moral of the campus sometime hinder when you look at small things. Additionally, I support the staff council based on the idea that staff have a different perspective on what students needs are. Several times I have encountered situations where the Dean and Associate Dean of our college made decisions that lacked any insight from a staff member and in return caused inefficient and ineffective results.
58 At a private university where I previously worked there was the faculty senate and staff assembly giving both a voice related to their specific concern areas. Worked well. Staff perspective complements faculty perspective.
59 It would improve dialog across campus and generate more input to the decision making process.
60 Staff should have some input into the University
61 Staff have a unique perspective in the daily operations of the university. Finding out about changes after the fact is frustrating and many times inefficient in the implementation of new policies. Staff do not know of changes soon enough to make appropriate plans, or speak up for alternatives.
62 It can provide a way for staff to communicate issues of collective concern or need.
63 More voices, more ideas.
64 see #2
65 Uncertain as to the role of this council. We have many boards and councils presently. I would want to know more about the goals and mission of a council.
66 It will provide an opportunity for broader staff representation.
67 Not sure if this will work at all. Will everyone be represented and how we will know that these individuals representing us do not have their own interest at heart?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>This way staff member can have input that goes beyong the supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Maybe this would help staff have a voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>If it's developed with care to share and not cause stalemates in discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>There is little downside to this. Specifically there would be some continuity to representation in university wide committees and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Just as faculty and students have formal structures for discussion and decision-making (Academic Senate and student governance), staff should be provided equal opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I'm all for representation, and staff can have valuable input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>If faculty have shared governance, staff should also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I think that this would enable staff to feel that they are holding more of a stake in what is decided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>The perspective of the front line employees of any organization should always be considered. There is insightfulness that you cannot get from an overview that will aide in forming more effective policies and procedures. It's also a morale booster when your workforce believes that their issues are being heard and acted upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>If it gives staff a voice w/o the union, I would be for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>It will give the staff the opportunity to be heard in those decisions that affect them the most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Yes, if you truly want our input. BUT if this is just an excuse to say you've solicited our representation, then &quot;no&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>I think a more informal approach would be beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>I would say any expanded representation for governance in theory is a good thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>All organizations can benefit from hearing about all facets of it's employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Too many Chefs ruin a good meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>If it encourages others to become actively involved, it would be a good thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>There may be other employees on campus who do not feel they are well represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>This might help staff feel that they are a part of the decision process on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>If people have time and are willing, it could be a great way to encourage more staff responsibility for CSUF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Important steps are often missed when procedures are implemented from too high a committee who do not handle the actual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>That's the only way to afford staff an opportunity to share experiences with students--our number one priority on campus...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>as a non-union staff member, I often wonder who represents me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>This would depend on the efficacy of the group. To what degree would the council's efforts and recommendations be considered and by whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>I DONT KNOW WHAT THAT IS, I'VE NEVER HEARD OF THIS COUNCIL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please add any additional comments:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thank you for considering an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This survey presupposes that the responder supports staff councils, as followed up in questions 5, 6, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I think it would be important to have staff representation from each of the academic colleges and this includes someone from the Irvine campus as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication is really dismal in my department (library) so I suppose it’s no different campus wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am hopeful that the final outcome of this survey will result in staff being granted a voice. I believe it is highly necessary to have people involved in issues that concern them as opposed to things being routinely decided for them. I believe that most would take pride in knowing that they played an important role in the decision-making process and many would welcome the opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like for us to develop and implement a required professional development training program for management level employees. Some managers lack very basic management, administrative, and leadership skills which can be demoralizing to staff. The &quot;Fullerton Way&quot; needs to be abandoned as it is very dysfunctional!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We are on furlough, prospects of lay offs and other serious employment actions are looming on the horizon, and we do not need another bureaucracy. Why in the world are you bringing this matter up at this time. GO AWAY...until the state recovers from its present afflictions. GO AWAY....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thank you for soliciting our input, and best wishes for your report and presentation!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A Staff Council would also provide leadership and a space for upward mobility opportunities where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am not sure that I liked any of the choices for picking representatives as they all have drawbacks. Perhaps local elections or (volunteers) from groups that represent different interests would be better than campus-wide choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Staff Council member should have 2-3+ years experience at this University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Many CSUs have Staff Councils. I am surprised CSUF does not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I realize the Academic Senate at CSUF has permitted staff participation -- what is most important if there is a staff council is that somewhere there is a formal body that brings the faculty and staff concerns together so they are not just parallel organizations that never intersect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I’m willing to learn more about establishing this council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I think employees should have a voice in which new employees are retained, as is done by Whole Foods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>As I stated it would be a good thing to have expanded representation. Currently, I would not volunteer to participate, since my workload currently is excessive, and to add any additional responsibility would add to already heightened stress levels that I'm currently experiencing. Respectfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Staff should also be formally represented on the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mid range supervisors and Department secretaries often manage the daily workflow. They could be key members of decision making bodies. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>#7 WOULD BE A MAYBE, DEPENDING ON TIME INVOLVEMENT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: 2000 CSUF Academic Senate Poll

CSUF ACADEMIC SENATE

Date: May 12, 2000
To: Faculty Electorate
From: Harry P. Jeffrey, Chair
Senate Elections Committee

Subject: RESULTS OF MAY 2000 ALL-UNIVERSITY ELECTION – S-O-O Section

STATEMENTS OF OPINION

1. Part-time faculty should be a constituency with representation on the Academic Senate.
   64 Strongly Agree
   64 Agree
   53 Disagree
   55 Strongly Disagree
   10 No Opinion

   PRO: The Senate now includes representatives from full-time faculty, students, and the administration. Since the Senate votes on policies which directly affect them—FMI policies and Personnel Guidelines for Part-time Lecturers come to mind—it is only fair that they be afforded the opportunity to have their voices heard. Many of our other policies indirectly affect them in various ways. Part-time lecturers make up a sizeable and growing proportion of the campus population. It is time that their voices are heard.

   CON: Adding part-time faculty to the Academic Senate as full members does not accomplish anything in terms of giving these groups a voice that they do not already have. This is true because committees do much of the work of collegial governance and because unions represent these groups with regard to employment conditions. Further, the long term academic stature of the University depends on the involvement of the permanent full time faculty, working closely with the administration. Part-time faculty do not have the commitment to the campus that full-time faculty have. This would make the Senate itself a larger deliberative body and likely expand the time necessary to conduct business. It would also create a new constituency.

2. Staff should be a constituency with representation on the Academic Senate.
   36 Strongly Agree
   44 Agree
   77 Disagree
   29 Strongly Disagree
   11 No Opinion

   PRO: The Senate now includes representatives from full-time faculty, students, and the administration. Staff make up a sizeable and growing proportion of the campus population and many engage in regular and important interaction with faculty and students regarding academic policy. They are knowledgeable about the campus and its needs. It is time that their voices are heard.

   CON: Adding staff to the Academic Senate as full members does not accomplish anything in terms of giving these groups a voice that they do not already have. This is true because committees do much of the work of collegial governance and staff are included ex officio on relevant committees. This would make the Senate itself a larger deliberative body and likely expand the time necessary to conduct business. It would also create a new constituency.
3. All full and part time instructors should be required to post, or submit for posting, each semester, their course syllabi on a CSUF-hosted Web server.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRO:** All instructors are currently required to distribute a syllabus to their students in the first classroom session of the semester. In addition, all instructors are required to submit a copy of that syllabus to their department for access by other instructors, students, and administrators. Converting syllabi to electronic form, accessible on the World Wide Web is simply a routine activity that is consistent with the university's project concerning the implementation of a campus-wide, integrated electronic document management system.

**CON:** Some instructors do not wish to publicly display their syllabi because they are concerned that their availability on the World Wide Web may lead to unauthorized copying of their work by other instructors. In addition, the posting, indexing, and cross referencing all syllabi each semester will require the commitment of inordinate resources that might better be utilized elsewhere.

4. If "YRO" state-supported instruction in the summer is fully funded and essentially takes the place of our current fee-supported "summer school," CSUF should move to a trimester calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRO:** Done right, this could be a win-win-win for faculty, students, and the citizens of California. Faculty could choose extra pay for extra work or, intriguingly, might work "year-around" for (let us say) four trimesters, and then take two consecutive terms off. The opportunities for research, creative activity, and/or travel seem inviting. Students could move quickly through academic programs featuring course selections more extensive than we now offer in summer school, creating institutional capacity. Taxpayers would gain capacity without building many new buildings.

**CON:** A trimester calendar boils down to running a longer term in the summer. But flexibility is the hallmark of summer sessions currently, and we'd lose it with trimesters. Presently, we can have many sessions within a summer term, well designed to meet the needs of particular clientele. Class A might begin June 15 and run six weeks; Class B might begin July 5 and run four weeks; etc. Note also that public school teachers both need our summer instruction (for credential maintenance and salary advancement), and probably could not begin early in June--their school years don't end that early. It seems that trimesters would not serve them. Losing intersession, moreover, disadvantages faculty who seek to engage in other endeavors, and students who wish to accelerate their progress to the degree. And just how much can we battle the very familiar American pattern of "summers are different?"
5. The Senate Forum has been a publication of the Academic Senate focusing on campus issues of interest for more than a decade. In some years it has been published twice a semester while in other years it has only been published once a semester (but in a longer format). Please respond to the following questions:

a. Do you regularly read all or part of Senate Forum? Yes 170 No 72

b. Do you think that the Senate should continue publishing the Senate Forum? Yes 181 No 41

c. If your answer to b. is "Yes", what is your preference regarding the form of publication?
   Hardcopy (paper) only 40 Electronic format 62 Both Hardcopy & Electronic Format 77

d. What suggestions do you have for improving the Senate Forum? 27 suggestions

6. The student withdrawal policy should be changed to allow students to withdraw from a class with a W without demonstrating a serious and compelling reason, but require instead payment of a substantial fee for withdrawing from a course after the third week of the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRO: The current system places a significant enforcement burden on department chairs and/or associate deans. It is not clear that the policy is consistently enforced. There are good reasons why a student would drop one course and not all courses, yet the current policy strongly discourages dropping a single course after the third week. A substantial fee would signal to students that enrolling in a course and not completing it is not costless and should not be treated as trivial.

CON: Students who enroll in courses and drop them generate significant costs to the university and to other students (who could have had the vacated seat). Although the current system creates additional paperwork, it is worthwhile because students do understand that a W is not automatic and that courses cannot be dropped for flimsy reasons. Many of our students are already financially constrained and an additional fee would be unfair.