FAC Subcommittee on Lecturers  
Academic Senate  
California State University East Bay  

Meeting Minutes  
Date: 18 February 2014  
Location: SA 3200A  
Time: Noon – 1:30 pm  

Members present: Gretchen Reevy, Chair; Liz Ginno; Keith Inman, Mark Karplus; Diane Mukerjee; Jeff Newcomb, Carl Stempel. Linda Dobb joined the meeting at 1 pm.

The previous meeting’s minutes from January 18 were approved, as amended.

Gretchen Reevy opened a discussion concerning the current state of lecturers’ right to participate and vote in meetings of department faculty in each college across the University. Practices vary among the colleges. Diane Mukerjee described her experience in Teacher Education, where at least for the last five years, lecturers have been considered in the quorum for voting on any matters, including voting for department chairs. To vote, lecturers express explicit interest in casting a vote on an issue, and being available during the day when voting is conducted. Other members reported that their experience with Lecturer participants was quite different than that reported by Teacher Education.

It was noted that the AAUP supports lecturer participation in faculty decisions, recommending a “one person, one vote” policy for faculty voting. Gretchen Reevy has a “cheat sheet” of information about treatment and practices for lecturers outside CSUEB.

The discussion turned to the proposal before the FAC to allow lecturers the right to vote for department chairs. Liz Ginno advised that the Subcommittee should be aware of all the issues surrounding this proposal. Carl Stempel said that the FAC meeting tomorrow (February 19) should be ready to address the proposal, given the ratio of lecturers to tenure-line faculty on campus. Liz Ginno will forward the AAUP document, recommending “one person, one vote,” to the FAC for consideration.

Diane Mukerjee will attend this FAC meeting, prepared to describe the on-going voting practices in place for treating lecturers in Teacher Education. Mark Karplus and Jeff Newcomb will also attend the FAC meeting as observers.

A labor arbitration decision at Cal State Fresno, in favor of the grievant Judith Scott, in part addressed faculty voting rights specific to department chairs. The impact of the arbitration ruling on lecturers’ rights is to be clarified.

The meeting turned to revising University election procedures for choosing lecturer representatives-at-large to the Academic Senate. Gretchen Reevy introduced a choice of two plans (Plan A and Plan B) to revise ambiguities in the current language prescribing the lecturer election process.
Plan A, the more ambitious of the two plans, increases the number of lecturer representatives-at-large from four to six and clarifies election procedures. Plan A will require amendment to Article V of the Constitution and change to Article IX of the By-Laws, and as such, requires approval by both the President and the Academic Senate. Plan B would clarify election procedures and require only a change to Article IX of the By-Laws.

The Subcommittee agreed to pursue Plan A as the more viable option, reflecting a unanimous interest for increasing the representation of lecturers in the Academic Senate. In forming new election language, Carl Stempel urged that we retain the “at-large” status of lecturer representatives, and avoid having lecturers represent specific colleges. Keith Inman noted that the present language is unclear as to whom lecturers represent in the Academic Senate; we need an equitable solution.

After substantial discussion of the original draft of new language prepared by Keith Inman, the Subcommittee settled on changes to the lecturer representative election process, as follows: The lecturer candidate in each the four colleges receiving the most at-large votes of any candidate from their college will be seated as a Senator, for a total of four Senate seats. A fifth Senate seat goes to the lecturer candidate, not from one of the four colleges, who received the most at-large votes of any non-college candidate. A sixth Senate seat goes to the lecturer candidate with the most at-large votes who has not yet been seated in the above process.

During the meeting Keith Inman emailed revised language to Article IX of the By-Laws. Liz Ginno moved to conduct an email vote among the Subcommittee members in March to approve Plan A as the final revised language for Article IX, and to send only Plan A to FAC for consideration. The motion was seconded by Mark Karplus, and approved unanimously by the Subcommittee.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Newcomb
Acting Secretary