Minutes of November 15, 2006

Members present: Dee Andrews, Mayling Chu, Carol Lauzon (Chair), Tony Lima, Ann McPartland, Fund-Shine Pan, Xeno Rasmussen, David Stronck, Arthurlene Towner (Presidential Appointee)

Members absent: Jennifer Laherty

Guests: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith (University Library), Lisa Daitch (The Pioneer)

Meeting convened at 2:45pm.

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P to approve the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of last meeting
   Not available. Senate will distribute for next meeting.

3. Report of the Chair
   Lecturer representatives will be attending the December 6 to discuss Academic Senate representation.
   Committee should aim to complete Senate Membership and Administrative Review document referrals by end of this quarter, before proceeding on to New Business.

   No report.

5. New Business
   a. Referral regarding the need for a Policy for the Faculty Award Endowment
      To be discussed at subsequent meeting.
   b. Range Elevation Submission Dates Referral
      To be discussed at subsequent meeting.

6. Old Business
   a. FAC Subcommittee Memberships

      The following will be members of Outstanding Professor Subcommittee:
      Jane Lopus, current Outstanding Professor;
      Carol Lauzon, ex officio;
      Nan Chico, Director of Faculty Development, ex-officio;
      Mayling Chu, FAC representative;
And Chair Lauzon will nominate 3 additional faculty and 1 student for FAC to vote on by email.

b. Academic Senate Membership Referral

Professor Lima, referring his “Report on Lecturer Representation on Academic Senates, CSU Campuses” distributed earlier to the committee, explained the range of forms of lecturer representation on the other CSU Academic Senates. CSU Chico’s version probably is closest to CSUEB’s. Lecturers’ now have 2 representatives out of 45 faculty representatives on the Senate (out of a total of 57 Senators). Lecturers now = 3.5% of the entire Senate.

Discussion focused on whether or not to distinguish between full-time lecturers and part-time, as some, but by no means all, the other CSU do for purposes of representation. It was tentatively decided not to pursue altering the Constitution, which defines lecturers’ eligibility to hold office (Article 9, Section 1: permits office-holding for lecturers teaching at half-time or more, who have served for at least one year, and who are then eligible to be office-holders for up to six years). Lecturers’ representatives now comprise 5.57% of all representatives on CSU Senates.

Four alternate proposals were aired:

1. Don’t change, especially since numbers of lecturers is likely to decrease with increase in tenure-track hiring (CSU Chico model).

2. Four representatives: 1 from each college. Composition = 6.78% of Senate (CSUN and other models). This = a “federal” approach, making no effort of representation by numbers of lecturers on campus, since this is likely to change over time.

3. Five representatives: 1 from CBE, CEAS, and CSI; and 2 from CLASS. Composition = 8.33% of Senate (CSULB model). This is the approach traditionally used for faculty representation on our campus, though whether or not CLASS has the largest numbers of lecturers has not been determined by the committee.

4. Five representatives: 1 from each college; and 1 at large. Composition = 8.33% of Senate (SFSU model). This combines federal approach with idea of one overall representative for all lecturers on campus, without regard to nos. in the colleges.

The Associate Provost said she would provide FAC with approximate numbers of lecturers hired by each college in the last year.

Motion approved to return to subject at next meeting.
b. Appointment and Review Document Referral

Two handouts were distributed: Librarian Laherty’s chart with proposed changes to appointment and review committee composition; and Professor Andrews’s response. Andrews also supplied information received from Provost’s Office regarding changes in administrators’ titles and addition of new positions.

Librarian Fenno-Smith stood in for Laherty, who was not able to attend. Andrews explained that her basic concerns with Laherty’s changes were two: in the use of the term “college” to refer to the Library; and in dropping the faculty members for the search committee for University Librarian, since the Library represents such an important service function for the faculty. Fenno-Smith responded that some documents already refer to the Library as a college; and that the Library should be able to run its own affairs just as the colleges do.

Members generally agreed on two principles:

that the colleges and library should have guaranteed representation on search committees, while review committees might be more flexibly organized;
that the size of review committees should not be reduced, not least of all out of fairness to the administrator being reviewed.

7. Adjournment: 5:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dee Andrews
Secretary