In attendance: Linda Dobb, Eric Engdahl, Ying Guo, Mark Karplus, Dawna Komorosky, Jeff Newcomb, Kevin Pina, Gretchen Reevy, and Jessica Weiss

1. Dawna Komorosky appointed as Secretary

2. Linda Dobb moves to approve agenda, Dawna Komorosky seconds. Unanimously approved
   
   a. Discussion: It was suggested that the committee discuss range elevation first, and if there is time, Range Elevation Policy

3. Linda Dobb moves to approve minutes of 2/14/2018, second by Eric Engdahl.
   
   Unanimously approved.

4. Report of Chair:
   
   a. Status of documents on the agenda under review by committee.
   
   b. During spring elections (April 20-May 11) faculty will vote on lecturer service on committees. The CFAEB Chapter will write an email of endorsement.
   
   c. Periodic Evaluation policy passed FAC without changes and will go to Ex Com on Tuesday, and then to Senate.

5. Range Elevation Policy
   
   a. Committee reviewed edits
      
      i. Language changes needed under “Eligibility” to include new criteria established in 2016.
ii. Suggestion was made to make document more comprehensible by directing readers to the electronic location of the salary schedule. The inclusion of a footnote in the document was well received by the committee.

iii. Suggestion was made to remove “him” and “her” to “their”

iv. There was a discussion regarding how “exemplary” should be defined, with consideration for teaching and administrative lecturers

b. Kevin made motion to look at most recent data/language from other CSU range elevation policies. Gretchen seconds. Unanimously approved.

6. Emeritus Policy

a. History: a referral was made to FAC to also include .8 lecturers who have 12 years of service. The resultant policy recommendations were approved by the Senate but not approved by the University President.

b. The committee discussed the possibility of developing a separate policy for lecturers for Emeritus status. Questions were raised about the goal or function of an Emeritus stats for lecturers? Emeritus status could be perceived as an honor for service. Currently, campuses are about equally split among those who offer Emeritus status and those who do not. There was interest among committee members to examine the Emeritus policy and revisit and place back on the agenda. Additionally, the language should be updated to reflect current practices (remove “Hayward,” include “email,” and add “A member of the faculty, including lecturer” throughout the document).

7. Compensation for lecture service on Senate and its committees?
   a. The committee discussed if lectures should receive compensation for committee service. Committee members recognize the value of lecturer voice. There were questions regarding funding, and if it should be part of range elevation, or part of the part-time faculty evaluation process, similar to RTP for regular faculty.

8. Adjournment