1. **Appointment of secretary for today's meeting**
   Wakimoto volunteered to take minutes for the meeting

2. **Approval of agenda**
   Inman/Wakimoto/passed

3. **Approval of minutes of 1/25/2016**
   Inman/Wakimoto/passed with modification
   For the second sentence under 7, change to “It may be inadvisable to argue for service on FAC and COBRA as seats on these committees are reserved for tenured faculty.”

4. **Report of the Chair**
   Reevy opened up the discussion on the failure to pass 14-15 FAC 15: Lecturer Subcommittee Recommended Changes to the CSUEB Bylaws in the Winter Election. Karplus shared numbers provided by Sophie on the voting and lack of quorum. There are approximately 362 regular faculty members of whom 112 voted in the Winter Election. Only 109 voted on the Recommended Changes with 68 in favor, 19 opposed, and 22 abstained. Although the threshold for passing was not met, it was close. Reevy asked for clarification of next steps for getting this Recommended Change on the Spring Election ballot. Karplus recommended contacting the Chair of the Senate to determine if it needs to go through ExCom and the Senate again or can be rolled over. Harris suggests creating flyers to put into regular faculty mailboxes to get more visibility about the election. Reevy suggests that she could write a shorter background context segment for the Recommended Changes; the committee is in favor of this.

5. **Consideration of Lecturer service on standing committees of the Academic Senate**
   Reevy prepared and shared before the meeting a draft of proposed changes to Article XVI and XVII of the Bylaws. Discussion ensued about the pros and cons of having designated seats for lecturers on the standing committees and clarification that only those lecturers in the Lecturer Electorate would be eligible to serve. The committee favors having eligible lecturers run against tenured/tenure-track faculty members in the colleges as opposed to having designated seats in order to treat both equally.

   Inman suggested that instead of all the changes proposed in the bylaws, if lecturers are elected via colleges then we would only need to change the final sentence of Section 2 of Article XVI to read “Faculty members of Standing Committees shall be regular members of the University Faculty or members of the Lecturer Electorate.” The committee agrees this would be an elegant
solution and leave more discretion to the colleges for elections. Karplus questions whether Section 1 of Article XVI would also need to be changed to account for possible differences in representation when including the Lecturer Electorate.

Harris shares that she serves on many committees in her department and that we serve out of “doing the right thing.” Being eligible to serve on standing committees would provide another opportunity to serve the university, especially as it can be difficult to fill seats on committees and subcommittees.

Dobb suggests having a Chair from one of the standing committees (CR, CIC, CAPR, FDEC) come to the next meeting to discuss how it would work for their committee. Reevy agrees to reach out to the Chairs and arrange for one to come to the next meeting (time to be determined).

Inman brings up the issue of uncompensated time for lecturers on committees and suggest using a similar form to the one that is signed when supervising independent studies, etc. that states the faculty members knows they will take on uncompensated workload.

6. Lecturer emeritus (See item 6b on today’s ExCom agenda)
   Lacking sufficient time, the committee did not have time to discuss this item in depth. Karplus notes that ExCom has referred the Faculty Emeritus Policy back to FAC and suggests putting forward a Lecturer Emeritus Policy before a revised Faculty Emeritus Policy, if there will be two policies.

7. Adjournment
   Meeting adjourned at 5:26 pm by acclamation

Minutes respectfully submitted by
Diana K. Wakimoto