Lecturer Subcommittee of Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved Minutes of April 25, 2016 meeting

In attendance: Linda Dobb, Mark Karplus, Diane Mukerjee, Jeff Newcomb, Gretchen Reevy, Diana Wakimoto, Jessica Weiss

Absent: Keith Inman

Guest: Kim Geron

1. **Appointment of secretary for today’s meeting**
   Reevy volunteered to take minutes for the meeting

2. **Approval of agenda, as amended:** Move item number 6, Consideration of lecturer service on standing committees of the Academic Senate, up in the agenda to accommodate our guest, Kim Geron, chair of one of the standing committees (Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee)
   Karplus/Wakimoto/passed

3. **Approval of minutes of 2/16/2016**
   Wakimoto/Mukerjee/passed

4. **Consideration of Lecturer service on standing committees of the Academic Senate**
   Our guest, Kim Geron, chair of the Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee (FDEC), was present. We briefly updated Kim about our previous discussions regarding the possibility of lecturers serving on standing committees. We told him that a primary point of discussion was this: Should lecturers have dedicated seats on standing committees or should they run in the college elections along with tenure-line faculty for the seats? We explained that we were thinking that the Lecturer Electorate (but not all lecturers) would be eligible to serve. The Lecturer Electorate is those lecturers who have annual appointments of half-time or more. This is about 150-170 or so of the about 350-450 (or more) lecturers who teach at CSUEB each year. Kim stated that recently, many tenure-line faculty wish to serve on FDEC. Also, tenure-line faculty have service requirements as part of their job, and particularly, the untenured tenure-line faculty need opportunities to serve. Therefore, having dedicated seats for lecturers may be a better choice when considering the needs of untenured tenure-track faculty. The committee as a whole then began to think carefully about the implications of lecturers with dedicated seats.

   Following are some of the issues that we discussed and/or points that we made:
   - If Lecturers were elected to dedicated seats, most likely, they would be elected by the Lecturer Electorate.
   - If Lecturers serve on standing committees, any of the same Lecturers could serve on the Academic Senate. Nothing prevents a Lecturer from serving on both the Senate and one of the standing committees.
   - Karplus suggested that we discuss reasons why Lecturers should serve on particular committees (i.e., unique contributions that Lecturers could make to particular committees). Our ideas included the following: For CIC: Lecturers are
sometimes the primary or even the only faculty teaching particular classes; For FDEC: the equity concerns that affect faculty as a whole may manifest among lecturer faculty in ways that have yet to be explored/discussed; etc.

- What would be the term limits for Lecturers on standing committees? We suggested probably one year, and they could be re-elected for up to three more terms, then term out for a year.
- If a Lecturer was elected as a chair of a standing committee, s/he would receive the same WTU release that a tenure-line faculty member would receive.
- We discussed that the service that the Lecturer provides would be voluntary and usually uncompensated. We talked about whether the Lecturer should receive an official communication that their service is voluntary and/or whether they should sign a document acknowledging that their service is voluntary. We did not come to a conclusion about this issue.
- We discussed the issue of quorum requirements on standing committees, given that including a dedicated seat for a Lecturer would add an additional seat to the relevant standing committees. We decided that each standing committee could create their own policies about quorum. CIC and CAPR were mentioned as committees who may have good policies.

Reevy agreed to look carefully through the bylaws and make suggested changes as if we were going to argue for dedicated seats for lecturers. At the next meeting we will make a final decision about whether we will argue for dedicated seats or for lecturers running for seats along with tenure-line faculty.

5. **Report of the Chair**
   a. **14-15 FAC 15 on spring ballot. The election is April 26-May 9**
   Reevy mentioned that 14-15 FAC 15 will appear on the spring ballot again, after having appeared on the winter ballot. 14-15 FAC 15 was not settled on the winter ballot due to lack of quorum. We discussed various ways to “get out the vote” this time.

6. **Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty document for 15-16 ASCD 8 referral**
   We received this referral because of a need to modify our policy because of semester conversion. As we adapt the policy for semester conversion we will also update references to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and will make small changes to the policy for clarity. Linda Dobb agreed to make suggested changes to the policy. She will send her changes to Karplus and Reevy prior to the next meeting. The areas/types of changes that we discussed were the following:
   - Update CBA references throughout the policy
   - Clarify the type of evaluation that will occur in the 6th year of a Lecturers’ appointment (i.e., the year immediately prior to receiving the first 3-year appt) and in the 3rd year for continuing 3-year appointments
   - For 3-year appointments the evaluation should occur in the last year of the 3-year appt
   - In references to a peer review committee, the committee should be tenured but not elected
• Strike 2.1.4
• Delete the reference to the SJSU policy on page 2

7. **Adjournment**
Meeting adjourned at 11:30am by acclamation

Respectfully submitted,
Gretchen Reevy