1. Call to Order. The special Q2S Senate meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by S. Ligon.

2. Q2S. R. Fuller went over the PowerPoint presentation Dr. Arévalo presented to the Board and the report that was developed by G. Pratt. He stated the presentations were taken to the May 2010 Academic Affairs Board of Trustees meeting and Dr. Arévalo made his argument for a move from Quarters to Semesters. The issue was then placed on the full BOT agenda as referenced by the BOT minutes. He stated the full Board considered the issue of Q2S during their November 2010 meeting and the motion they passed was to move forward in consideration to a move to semesters. On January 21, 2011 Dr. Arévalo mentioned to the Board that the details of the plan would be developed over the next 18 months and that there would be another set of studies that would have to be made. He stated M. Voves chaired a committee comprised of all the budgetary officers of the university which included one member of FPAC and two members of Senate which found the estimated cost to move to semesters would be approximately $8.4 million and they expect it would take approximately 3-4 years for a conversion to take place. Approximately 80% of the cost would come out of Academic Affairs because a lot of the work surrounds academic advising and curriculum conversion with the primary cost being faculty time. The way he modeled it was to go to the contract to see if they bought out faculty time in the summer at the contractual rate and put together faculty teams around the various majors they had to decide how many groups of faculty would need to be working. He stated they added that up and came up with 2.2% of salary per credit with faculty appointments set at 5 credits or 11% of their salary. They evaluated this by the average salary by college and realize it may not be exact but they believe it is in the midpoint. He stated they expect to have a project manager that will help guide them through the process. They had project managers in the form of additional advisors because they believe they have to touch each student in a significant way which is different than they do now. He stated they reached out to the Community Colleges of Spokane to ask if they would convert if Eastern converts. The message from the very beginning is they believe we are an important partner and if we move to semesters they would give it serious consideration and would move if we did because there are so many students who transfer from the community colleges to Eastern. He stated that during this time he also met with FPAC, UAC, GAC, GECC and a few other committees to discuss “what ifs” of a conversion. In December 2012 a group of management and UFE met and discussed “what if” and looked at other systems including the CSU system in California which includes both quarters and semesters in a unionized environment. He stated there has been a lot of discussion around the “what ifs” of a conversion to semesters and he believes that due diligence has been done leading up to today’s meeting.

Dr. Arévalo stated that based on the information presented, the raw data and the results of the different committees his recommendation to the Board is to move forward to change the academic calendar to a semester calendar. He stated he would make that recommendation with the understanding that teaching workloads would not be increased for the faculty, that the positive
attributes of the semester calendar in terms of structure would be looked at as they look at what kind
of semester system they would implement and to also look at the ability of the university to fund the
change to semesters. The allocation of one-time resources they would use to support faculty
workload to ensure the conversion took place. During the seven years he has been here regardless of
being in a recessionary period or a non-recessionary period we have always carried forward
somewhere between $2.5 million and $3 million. He stated he believes the conversion will cost
between $6.5 million to $8.4 million because some departments will be able to do the conversion
easier than others so there will be differential expenditures. The fact that they have the carry forward
dollars means they won’t impact departmental budgets or university budgets, they won’t use new
resources to fund the conversion but they will use existing resources. Dr. Arévalo stated in terms of
trying to align the calendar with three other institutions that are on the semester system in our area
such as Whitworth, Gonzaga and Washington State University we would hopefully see an
improvement in the opportunities for our students to be involved in collaborative activities in terms of
internships. He stated he has heard from faculty in a variety of departments how they are impacted
because the organizations they work with are “semester functioned” and it is hard for them to have
their students do a semester internship when they aren’t around to supervise them so this would solve
some of those issues. He has heard issues from students that they get to the job market later than
others which creates a difficulty for some of our students. He stated this is the rational he will be
discussing with the Board of Trustees as he makes a recommendation for a conversion to semesters.

J. Durfee asked if the recommendation would be made at the June meeting. Dr. Arévalo stated his
intention is to make the recommendation at the May meeting of the Board. J. Durfee asked what the
timeline is for implementation. Dr. Arévalo stated it would mean they would start pre-planning
during the summer and spring quarter of next year which would mean they would look at bringing on
a project manager and then start working with deans to figure out which departments would be taking
on the task the 1st year, the 2nd year and then the 3rd year of the project.

R. Fuller stated they learned by looking at the example of other universities that have converted that
the first year is where you set up the process of the conversion. He stated conversations would have
to take place about what the curriculum process would look like, how will UAC and GAC run
alongside this effort, discussing whether to limit the number of changes or should a committee be set
up that would allow for curriculum change that is considered minor vs. a complete change in
structure which are all part of the conversations that would have to take place with the faculty
leadership and planning before the actual work is started.

T. Flinn stated he appreciates the information presented but there is an inadvertent absence in the
account of the conversion in that working conditions need to be negotiated with the UFE before they
can be implemented. Dr. Arévalo stated that is exactly correct. He stated he does want to move the
process forward in terms of the current negotiations and if the Board was to come back with a
recommendation to move forward with the conversion he would figure a timeline to relook at the
workload issue maybe even if they agree on a contract for the next three to four years.

D. Vander Linden asked Dr. Arévalo he has identified where the first $2 – 3 million would come
from but where would the remaining funding come from. Dr. Arévalo stated it would be the same
source because every year we have $2.5-3 million left so it would simply be using left over dollars
every year for the next three years. D. Vander Linden asked if the community colleges have the
resources to make this change. Dr. Arévalo stated in their conversations with them they indicated
dey do and they would do something similar to what we would do but they also realize that their
costs would be much less because they are only looking at two years of conversion as opposed to
four. D. Vander Linden asked if they could make the decision independent of the other community
colleges. Dr. Arévalo stated it is his sense they can and it is an opportune time for them because the
community college system is in the process of changing their student data system so it would be a
good time to diversify and separate the two processes.

K. Noble asked if Dr. Arévalo could be more specific as to where the carryover money would go
each year if the university didn’t convert to semesters or what would be sacrificed to fund a
conversion with carryover funding. Dr. Arévalo stated that usually 25% of the carryover funding is
swt into the university for redistribution. M. Voves stated it would go into the institutional savings
account or a rainy day fund. She stated that is what they have used over the past several years to buy
our way out of a number of the budget cuts. K. Noble stated they are all aware you can’t get anything
for nothing and some people are very concerned that although it may be a good idea but not at this
time because we may need rainy day funds for a rainy day soon. Dr. Arévalo stated there are a
number of sources of funds the university has. He stated they also keep a university reserve of about
$10 million dollars which is common practice across universities to keep a reserve fund that is
comparable to about 10% of their budget which is separate and apart from what M. Voves talked
about. K. Noble asked under what conditions would that $10 million fund be tapped. Dr. Arévalo
stated it would be tapped if the legislature refused to fund the university.

J. Thomson stated she heard through a grapevine that there are some reserve funds that the university
has in the range of $67 million. Dr. Arévalo stated he only gets $68 million from the state. J.
Thomson stated she brought this up to her faculty today and the faculty salary situation is abysmal so
the money used for this transfer could be potentially used to boost what are some of the lowest
salaries compared to comparable schools. She stated that on behalf of her department why isn’t that
issue being addressed. Dr. Arévalo stated these are one-time dollars that are taken off at the end of
the budget year so you can’t fund continuing expenses from part-time dollars which is the primary
reason they couldn’t do that. He stated he does agree with her and her colleagues in her department
that the faculty is grossly underpaid and that is why they are going to look very seriously this year
about how much of a large step they can take to correct that.

R. Fuller stated that 80% of the cost of conversion would come out of Academic Affairs and the
majority of that cost is for faculty salaries that do work in the summer so it is an opportunity for
alternative assignment and pay for faculty in the summer for those that are able to work. He stated
the bottom line is there would be more faculty on fulltime assignment rather than a partial assignment
which would be at least a short term boost for those faculty that are working on that process.

D. Vander Linden stated it was mentioned that 25% of the carryover dollars would go into a rainy
day fund but in the past two or three years where did the remaining 75% go. Dr. Arévalo stated it
goes back to the departments that generated those funds and it is usually departments like Student
Affairs, Business Affairs, some funds from Academic Affairs, etc. M. Voves stated in Business
Affairs last year in Business & Finance because they were holding a lot of money for budget cuts in
2012 they generated $358,000 of savings or carry forward dollars. She stated 25% of that went to the
central reserves and the rest comes back to her which is true in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs
which is why the provost was able to push out some equipment money this year. Generally that is 
one-time money so the only thing you can use that money for is one-time purchases; they can’t use it 
to increase their base budget so they used the money to buy equipment like a new man-lift and a 
police car which is equipment you can’t purchase with operating dollars throughout the year. She 
stated the money that goes back to Academic Affairs gets pushed back out in the colleges.

D. Vander Linden stated he would like a breakdown or percentage of what has gone to Academic 
Affairs that has gone back to departments to help support the purchase of equipment and to help 
support faculty. M. Voves stated that Academic Affairs make up about 54% of the carry forward 
dollars which makes sense because they are the largest portion of the university budget so in the past 
several years $1.4 - $1.5 million went back into the colleges to fund one-time purchases and support 
faculty. D. Vander Linden stated then that money would not be available during the transition. R. 
Fuller stated that some colleges even use that money for part-time overload expenses during the 
adademic year. He stated they may recall they actually swept all the carry forward dollars during the 
depths of the recession and that was a strategy that made good sense then but last year at the peak of 
all the colleges and they had a gross carry forward of about $400,000 and they netted something 
around $230,000 - $240,000 with the vast majority of that used for instructional assistance in key 
areas. He stated that during the recessional periods when the colleges don’t have that he becomes 
the funder of last resort to allow them to deliver the curriculum. In addition to equipment purchases 
they made a significantly large investment last year with the grand piano that are investments that 
will pay back over years and years to come. They make choices but in Academic Affairs they make 
the key choice to make sure there are people in the classroom and all the colleges have different 
stories of how they staff their particular courses and where loads are changing in a way that are a 
surprise in some cases. D. Vander Linden asked what the plan is for the next few years as we make 
the transition and that money is used someplace else to fund those slots. R. Fuller stated they are 
talking about getting those dollars they capture centrally and not stripping it from the colleges. He 
stated the idea is over a multiple number of years they should be able to set aside that salary. For 
example, in his budget planning for this biennium, he has set aside uses of Ledger 2 balances which 
is a sort of checking account from which the carry forward dollars have been used historically and to 
now earmark that for conversion should they need to. He stated he wouldn’t go to the deans and say 
he was going to reduce their net by this certain amount but rather he would get the funds centrally 
within Academic Affairs along with the president’s central reserves. D. Vander Linden asked if he 
was saying there would still be funds to help departments get that extra part-time person if there is 
another recession. R. Fuller stated they realize we have to continue to teach courses and that will 
ever always be the high priority.

A. Scholz asked if they have an idea what the time frame is in terms of when we would be on 
semesters. Dr. Arévalo stated his sense is they are looking at least three years down the road or 
probably 2017-18 or 2018-19 depending on what kinds of difficulty they have in getting some very 
complex departments converted over. R. Fuller stated that is the projected date of what they actually 
teach in the fall which is what he is referring to. He stated the other piece is that can be timed to 
match the conversion discovery process but they can set a date once they get into the process and 
figure out whether it can be accelerated or not. He was asked by some of the chairs in the “what if” 
meetings if he would consider different dates for different departments. He stated he hasn’t 
discussed this with the president yet but he would like to have a launch date that is consistent for
everyone which makes great sense in terms of ease of transition and lessoning the complexity they
might experience around the campus.

R. Ruotsalainen stated in the PowerPoint presentation only mentions the benefits of semesters but not
for quarters. He stated that another argument has to do with alignment and although we are aligning
globally, nationally and countywide but we seem to be losing our alignment statewide. In G. Pratt’s
report which he looked at briefly G. Pratt indicated there was statewide consideration by the HECB
when it still existed. He stated the purpose of that review seems to be that there were some who
believed that WSU should convert to a quarter system to be in sync with everyone else in the state.
The assessment of the HECB was to leave everything alone and they were not convinced that the cost
of a conversion for WSU would merit the synchronization with the other colleges in the state. He
stated when he sees a very strong counter argument to our conversion and although he has had an
occasional student from Gonzaga who transferred to EWU and maybe 1-2 students who attended
Whitworth but he has had several students over the years who transferred from Western and Central
not to mention other community colleges that we have ever increasing ties namely Bellevue and
Clark College in Vancouver so please excuse his skepticism.

B. Zinke stated that one thing that was mentioned was a “J” term or “N” term but where in the
process would you decide when or if we adopt one of those alternative semester type models. R.
Fuller stated that could be part of next year if they were to move forward with the study of the
blueprints or rules of engagement for a conversion that would definitely be one of those things that
would have to be discussed. He stated if you look at other states and local campuses that are on
semesters it naturally already creates that natural time at the end of fall and the beginning of spring if
you simply adjust those days slightly you end up with a significant number of class days. That is a
design feature that could be evaluated and still graduate in a way that keeps the students meeting the
other benefits they referred to in the presentation. Dr. Arévalo stated it isn’t a design feature that
every department would want to take advantage of because of the unique curriculum that maybe
wouldn’t fit a three week sort of delivery of material.

R. Toor stated the faculty do a lot of work during the summer for promotion and tenure but don’t get
paid for it but the conversion will take a lot of work in the summer so will they be changing the
expectations for faculty activity so they can work on the conversion during summer instead. R.
Fuller stated the assumption is the faculty would volunteer to work on the conversion although they
would be paid for the work. He stated the argument he made in his estimation was that faculty could
balance out teaching one course, do some other stuff or maybe be part of the conversion team and not
teach so they may need to make some adjustments in their teaching schedule although he is
convinced there are enough faculty available if they are willing to volunteer to work and be paid for
it. He stated if they don’t get enough faculty who volunteer for the conversion team then it could
take longer than expected to do the work necessary for the conversion during the summers. The
notion that was rejected without any debate or opposition was they could do the conversion during
the normal academic year.

J. Durfee stated on one of the big issues that came up in his department is they have some distance ed
courses plus he knows the university has quite a few that are located on the other side of the state and
they don’t plan to switch to semesters so they will have two calendars running anyway and they will
have to have people working two different schedules. He stated that some of those courses will
require Graduate Assistants and there will be a mismatch of when they are working and when they may need them. He stated the community college calendar won’t be the same. R. Fuller stated that historically Bellevue was on a different calendar but they are the same now but those are transition issues. He stated the community colleges are there 365 days, 24/7 and the question is can they negotiate access for those courses in that way will be a challenge. They have had students at Riverpoint be involved in taking courses in a semester world and then taking quarter courses as well so it may not be easy but it is manageable. J. Durfee stated their Electrical Engineering runs both directions. R. Fuller stated that program may be the complexity he referred to which may take longer to convert than a course that is explicitly in Cheney and more straightforward.

A. Scholz read a letter from a Biology faculty member who attended the University of Utah when they converted from quarters to semesters in 1998. The faculty member stated the move was pitched as a way for the students to save money for the institution with fewer registration periods, there would be comparable numbers of instruction hours and the students would benefit from having 15 weeks with a course rather than 10. She wrote she was going into her fourth year and it was supposed to be her last year however it took an additional year because the Department of Biology stopped offering many of their elective courses. She stated that most faculty members were teaching one or two core courses and then one or two electives on the quarter schedule but on the semester schedule the faculty taught core courses but did not offer the electives and lab-based electives disappeared completely. In terms of the number of instruction hours multi-quarter sequences in the Biology core were compressed with the conversion and the students were assured that three quarters equaled two semesters in terms of contact time so the faculty didn’t alter their course content. She stated that in 1998 out of 300 students nearly 30% failed the first semester of the new core. Because it was semesters the course wasn’t offered until the following year which pushed the new students onto the five-year plan. Any student who was only partway through the require three-quarter sequences of supporting courses (3 quarters each of Calculus, General Chemistry and Organic Chemistry) had to restart the sequence which cost students in extra time and tuition costs. She stated that quite a few students were caused economic hardship because they had to pay half a year’s tuition at the beginning of fall rather than 1/3 and book costs up front were higher because students were taking five courses instead of three. She concluded the concept that students will do better and learn more on semesters was compromised because the administration insisted that contact hours wouldn’t change so the faculty didn’t alter the content of their courses. She stated she doesn’t believe they learned the material better while on the semester system. A. Scholz stated there are things that have to be looked at very carefully when a transition is made. Dr. Arévalo stated that is correct and that is why they want to make sure to increase the number of advising opportunities that a student has and they work with faculty and students to make sure they understand the process. He stated his thought about how the University of Utah converted from quarters to semesters is they didn’t put enough time and thought into the process of converting because it isn’t just carrying the content of one course from one quarter to one semester. They will have to readjust how much is covered.

B. Zinke asked in terms of summer term would you anticipate the summer term increasing and will there be more time between the end of spring semester and the beginning of summer term. Do you still anticipate that courses will be offered during the summer term during the conversion process? R. Fuller stated they would still offer course during the summer term while the conversion process is in process. He stated they will still have a summer schedule but the key question will be how many people will they have willing to work on the projects and from there they can make choices or
decisions. His experience with semester schools is the summer term is not all that different than at quarter schools. He stated they ran 4 weeks, 6 weeks and 8 weeks at the schools he has been at in two different states in terms of semesters and they were all choices departments made regarding the intensity of the course, how often they met, student’s ability to master the material, etc.

E. Renshaw stated she is the Director of the Asia University America Program on campus and their program coincides with the semester system in Japan. She stated they get their students for one semester at a time for about 20 weeks twice a year and they have been part of the university since 1989 or for 24 years. Their students, as part of the contract, are told that they will do their very best to get them in the dormitory with English speaking roommates. If the end of the quarter is in May and our students are here till mid-July their contract could very well be in jeopardy with Asia University because there are two other universities that also have this program, Western and Central, which would not be on this schedule. She stated she is a little concerned that if we may no longer be able to give students this experience they may go elsewhere after 24 years.

K. Noble stated the letter that A. Scholz read described an unfortunate situation and she would describe that as one of the many transitional situations that are bound to arise in any transition. She stated they had a very heated faculty meeting around this issue and the vote in her department was 21 votes for semesters and 2 votes for quarters. Their main concern is pedagogical and they recognize there are a lot of transitional issues and there will be tragedies which are regrettable but she believes Dr. Arévalo was eloquent in his response that if we prepare sufficiently hopefully they wouldn’t have so many issues. They have a new Music Department Chairman from South Africa coming on board and her goal is to expand the program throughout the world and not all systems will be compatible whether they are on semesters or quarters. She stated that right now 21 faculty members in the Music Department favor the semester system not only for a variety of pedagogical reasons but because most of the other states in the United States are that way. They recognize it won’t be easy, they recognize there will be casualties, they recognize that some faculty might have to actually volunteer their time in addition to all the other things they already do to make this happen but the Music faculty believe that the benefits as outlined by the president and the provost and the pedagogical benefits that the Music faculty have mostly agreed upon are worth the cost both financially as well as the transitional difficulties that may ensue. S. Ligon stated the proposal is not to have faculty volunteer their time they would get paid for the work they will be doing.

B. Alvin stated her main concern is the students will need to take more courses per term. She stated if students are taking classes that meet three days a week instead of four or five days a week in order to have a full load and get done in four years that instead of taking three or four classes they would have to take five or six classes so the length of time in a semester may help students catch up or may allow them to drop off. Regardless, on a weekly basis they will be attending to more classes and more assignments but that isn’t a transitional issue but rather an ongoing issue.

M. Heady stated faculty would be meeting with more students individually per quarter so that would be less intense. She stated she is with English Language Institute and they have the same concerns as AUAP with going to semesters because they would also have difficulty coordinating with other universities so they prefer to stay on the quarter system. The other concern that was raised in her department was the breakdown of shared governance because the Senate had voted to not move forward with a transition to semesters at this time.
D. Vander Linden asked Dr. Arévalo the change to semesters has been discussed at this university for a number of years but he is curious what the driving force was that caused him to push this thing forward. Dr. Arévalo stated it has to do with a variety of things. He stated we have a unique student population that the other six state agencies don’t have, he believes that we are in a market where our competitors are on a semester basis, they are trying to increase the possibility of our students to be engaged in more service work, internships and mentorships and it becomes difficult when our schedules don’t match up with what business and industry want our students to be able to do in a longer period of time and he believes we create more disadvantages for ourselves than we create advantages.

M. Moore stated she was at Utah State and she finished right before they switched to semesters but one of the issues she is glad they are considering is the timeline. She stated the three years mapping it out is encouraging because it is going to take time to figure it out some of these issues so they can avoid some of the bad issues that Utah faced.

S. Ligon stated he is concerned about moving forward. He stated that W. Repovich started the Student Success and Retention Committee in our response to our failure with Q2S. W. Repovich’s idea was the faculty need to deal with these calendar issues as well as a bunch of really positive things. He stated this committee turned into the joint committee that is now doing all the work with Gen Ed Review, First Year Experience, etc. and it is a really positive committee. He is very encouraged when Dr. Arévalo says they want to move this away from current bargaining and put it away. He stated he is worried about things like pay issues that have been talked about in the Senate or a whole lot of other issues getting muddied by what is going to happen with Q2S because before we can move forward with anything about Q2S it has to be bargained; load has to be bargained so he finds it encouraging. They have been able to collaborate in various committees such as SSRC and ASAC and bring in a lot of different stakeholders to talk about problems facing the university.

T. Flinn stated this is subject to bargaining which means the working conditions which are totally different than the conversion costs and the curricular changes but the working conditions which is what the load would look like can’t happen until this portion of the contract is ratified by the UFE membership and the Board of Trustees. He stated on the other hand bargaining in good faith means that they are working toward the same goal of reasonable workload and whatever works out for the students which will be the combined goal. They will be protecting the workload to make sure it doesn’t get out of hand and he believes the current administration is aware of that and agrees they are shared concerns. He stated if it happens because one thing that Chairman Tanaka was clearly ambiguous about was not just when but whether the board will vote one this issue. He encourages everyone to be thinking about the issues and problems, how it would work and encourage everyone to talk with the UFE. S. Ligon stated they are going to block out a significant amount of time at the May 13th meeting so we can continue this discussion.

S. Ligon stated they pointed out there is a committee called GERR or General Education Review and Reform Committee which is a subcommittee of the SSRC. He stated this issue becomes significant when you talk about curricular review so if that committee comes back with a plan for Gen Ed they are going to need to know where we stand on the calendar whether it is quarters or semesters. This issue will be discussed further at the May 13th meeting.
3. Good of the order. None.

4. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on May 13, 2013.