1. Approval of the agenda:

   The Chair requested that a new item, “Number from Each School to be elected to the 2001-2002 University Promotion and Tenure Committee” be designated A under “New Business.” Item A now = item B; and Item B = Item C. Motion to add (Behzad/ Helgren-Lempesis) approved unanimously. Revised agenda approved unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 18, 2001:

   The Minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair:

   The Chair followed up on the question: can the presidential appointee to FAC vote and make motions? He conferred with the Senate Office, the heads of the other standing committees, and, wherever possible, presidential appointees, who all confirmed that these powers were bestowed or withheld as suited each committee. The Senate Chair expressed the opinion that appointees should not vote and make motions, but in a number of cases the appointee does have an “empowering” vote. The motion (Helgren-Lempesis/Stine) to recommend that this item be placed on a future agenda in 2001-2002 passed unanimously.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development:

   The Director was absent.

5. Report of Subcommittee on Lecturer Policies and Procedures:

   Prof. Andrews, FAC liaison to the Subcommittee, introduced the report, referring especially to the responses of other CSU Senate Chairs regarding lecturers’ service and compensation. Prof. Trumbo corrected the information in the Report on 1.0 lecturers in the School of Science, noting that one has assigned time, two have assigned time for specific tasks, and one has no assigned time. Prof. Helgren-Lempesis stressed that in SEAS, 1.0 lecturers receive 3 wtu’s assigned time out of 15. Dr. Herndon pointed out that as it stands, lecturers are too cheap for anybody’s good; compensation for service would make them less competitive with the regular faculty. Prof. Stine noted two basic
problems: the lack of money for funding assigned time for part-time lecturers, and the ease with which departments exploit lecturers. Prof. Stine suggested it might be better to have a policy disallowing service by part-time lecturers altogether, as had been suggested at the FAC discussion several meetings ago. Prof. Vincenzo stressed that the administration has stated there will be no funding for assigned time for part-time lecturers, and an additional issue was whether such lecturers’ apparent willingness to volunteer might lead to later grievances of coerced work. Dr. Herndon noted the importance of the word “obligate” in proposal # 4 in the Report. Prof. Stine stressed that volunteering might lead to false expectations. Prof. Trumbo stressed that there are no true volunteers when there is no job security; and that money for assigned time will not be forthcoming as long as there are volunteers.

Prof. Trumbo went on to critique the 4 proposals in the Report. He found # 1 acceptable; in # 2, he suggested that the word “return” was misleading and the word “suitable” took away the effectiveness of the proposal; in # 3, the first sentence was acceptable, but the 3rd sentence needed clarifying; and in # 4 he suggested that the word “obligate” be changed to “permit.” Prof. Helgren-Lempesis noted that proposal #3 included items that regular faculty did not receive assigned time for. Prof. Andrews explained that the word “suitable” in # 2 referred to the sense of last year’s Senate Committee A Report on tenure-track faculty hiring; that with minor additions, the wording in # 3 was taken from CBA section 20.3.b, as discussed in an earlier FAC meeting on this subject; and that the word “permit” provided greater flexibility in the kinds of service that lecturers might seek to perform for professional development. Ms. Smith returned to the matter of the word “obligate” versus “permit,” suggesting that this was acceptable if the wording remained open for service relating to lecturer representation on campus, such as on the Academic Senate and on department FMI committees. Prof. Stine asked Ms. Smith whether 1.0 lecturers might be able to serve as representatives, and did lecturers believe they needed to be on university committees in order to have their voices heard. Ms. Smith explained that there were very few such lecturers on campus. Prof. Andrews also responded that the lecturers’ survey cited in the report showed that many lecturers, the great majority not 1.0 appointments, wanted to do this work. Prof. Trumbo summarized his sentiments by noting that with every so-called victory the part-timers actually undercut their status, including with 3-quarter in a row appointments, and now setting themselves up for doing voluntary or compensated work that would not help them get full-time jobs. True professional development, he stressed, had to be achieved in the greater professional sphere.

Prof. Behzad moved that FAC accept the Report, and discuss the proposals as an agenda item at a later meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

6. Old Business: Non-Grade-Related Student Complaints

The Chair reported on an email memorandum from the Chair of the Senate, dated May 1, re: this subject. In the memo, Prof. Stoper noted that the Assistant Vice President of Instructional Services was not content with FAC’s proposals for non-grade related complaints at the Committee’s last meeting. She approved of his suggestion that the “Senate appoint 2 faculty members to serve along with him on a panel to hear student complaints that have not been resolved at the department or School level. This panel would have no powers, other than to make recommendations to the Dean (who is empowered to discipline faculty under the CBA).”

Prof. Stine reviewed the history of this request this year, and expressed some puzzlement as to why it seemed to change with each meeting, and that having had our proposal for an ombudsman shot
down by ExComm, we were now being asked to have two ombudsmen. Prof. Behzad expressed the concern that with the motion pending from last week that we might be implicitly expanding the powers of the Fairness Committee. Prof. Stine objected strongly to the implication that resolution of these problems might require disciplinary action: and for this reason, also expressed misgivings about the pending motion. Prof. Andrews suggested that we simply leave the policy as it stands. Prof. Helgren-Lempesis drew a stream-chart to suggest the possible scenarios for dealing with these complaints. An alternative motion was discussed, placing responsibility in the hands of one faculty member working in consort with the Assistant Vice President.

7. **New Business**

   A. “Number from Each School to be elected to the 2001-2002 University Promotion and Tenure Committee”

      Motion to approve (Trumbo/Stine) passed unanimously.

   B. Religious Holidays

      Held over to next meeting.

   C. Faculty Award

      Held over to next meeting.

8. **Adjournment:**

   Motion to adjourn approved unanimously at 5:18 PM.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Dee Andrews (Recorder)