Minutes
FAC Subcommittee on Lecturers
Meeting of January 28, 2014

In attendance: Linda Dobb, Liz Ginno, Keith Inman, Mark Karplus, Jeff Newcomb, Gretchen Reevy, Carl Stempel.

1. Approval of the agenda

There was agreement that Karplus would serve as secretary and take minutes for the first part of the meeting, followed by Newcomb. There was agreement to table Item 6 as the topic is being discussed at the Statewide Academic Senate. M/S/P (Stempel/Ginno) to approve the agenda as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of 11/13/13

M/S/P (Ginno/Stempel) to approve. There was an abstention.

3. Report of the Chair of the FAC Subcommittee on Lecturers (What happened with our quorum recommendation?)

Reevy read from 13-14 FAC 1. The subcommittee’s quorum recommendation is what was agreed to by FAC. The document will be on the agenda of the next Senate meeting.

4. Consideration of bylaws language for election of lecturer representatives to the Academic Senate

Reevy discussed the referral from ExCom. She stated that at San Diego State there are four lecturer senators elected at large with no constraints, unlike section 2.D of Article IX of the CSUEB Bylaws. She introduced a two-page handout that she previously emailed to the subcommittee entitled, “Possibilities for Article IX in the Bylaws: Representation of Lecturers in the Academic Senate,” consisting of four possibilities.

There was discussion of increasing the number of lecturer representatives from four to five or six. It was noted that there has been discussion at FAC of reducing the size of the senate and seats on standing committees. There was also discussion of current 2.D and how there can be different conflicting interpretations.

Who lecturer senators represent was a topic of discussion. It was suggested that since they are elected at large by the lecturer electorate and the title of Article IX is “Representation of Lecturers in the Academic Senate,” lecturers represent lecturers, rather than their college or another constituency. The importance of having an up-to-date list of the lecturer electorate was discussed.

M/S/P (Ginno/Stempel) that Inman, Karplus, and Reevy draft language for Possibilities 1 and 4, to be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting. Possibility 1 would strike 2.D. Possibility 4
would increase the number of seats to six and modify 2.D to provide a seat for general studies lecturers, coaches, and librarians; and a seat for the highest vote-getter not yet seated.

5. Consideration of broader representation for lecturers in Senate, especially service on standing Committees

(Newcomb took minutes for the rest of the meeting.)

Chair Gretchen Reevy began the discussion by noting that lecturers’ increased representation on standing committees would require only a by-laws change by the Senate. It was noted by subcommittee members that several, but not all standing committees of the Senate would be open to lecturers’ service – some committees are only for tenured faculty.

Liz Ginno referenced a proposal before the Senate from Fall Quarter to reduce the overall size of the Senate, as well as its standing committees, due to increasing demands on tenure-line faculty time. In response, Mark Karplus offered that, if tenure-line faculty service is going down, why not have lecturers fulfill the need? Linda Dobb cautioned that lecturers offer their time for Senate service only on a strictly voluntary basis. But for tenure-line faculty, such service is an essential part of RTP.

Carl Stempel suggested that the way be opened for lecturers voluntarily to serve on Senate committees, but without designated lecturer seats. Carl also noted that his department would be healthier with fuller integration of lecturers.

6. Lecturer emeritus (This item was tabled during approval of the agenda.)

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Karplus, Substitute Secretary