

Executive Committee Minutes

February 14, 2002

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Susan McKillop, Bernie Goldstein, William Poe, Sam Brannen, Tim Wandling, Ruben Armiñana, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Phil McGough, Catherine Nelson, Peter Phillips

Absent: Art Warmoth

Guest: Richard Senghas

Meeting began 3:05

Approval of the Agenda - Additions proposed to the agenda: Invite a representative of Brookfield to the Senate (a memo was passed out reporting from the meeting about development last week from Scott Miller), that the Senate to do something to honor Jim Meyer, Richard Senghas' discuss of proactive Senate view on labor actions, and the proposal that faculty do an annual evaluation of the President. - *Approved*.

Approval of Minutes - *Approved* with small changes recorded.

Correspondence Received - None.

REPORTS

Chair of the Faculty - (R. Luttmann)

No report

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

R. Armiñana - Is this the time you wanted to use for the discussion about the search committee?

R. Luttmann - Actually no, I didn't think you would be here, if we have time we will.

Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)

B. Goldstein - I thought you would be interested to see what other campuses have done on the 120 unit BA. We look pretty good here. I'm just giving this out for your pursual. On the diversity implementation, we are going ahead. The vision was adopted by the Senate, and we are working closely with APC to make sure the next step of implementation is followed through. We are talking about a couple of elements; another retreat in two parts. One on the issue of being a residential campus, and what do we want to look like in terms of distribution of different ethnic groups in 5, 10, 15 years. Do we want to look like Rohnert Park, our six county area, the entire state? Once we have an idea/consensus then we can talk about programs we want to put together. We're working with community colleges to put together a grant proposal to bring migrant workers here. We'll see if we can increase diversity doing

that. We have good ties with Solano Community College. CJA and Nursing might be able to get grant money at the state level for that. These retreats are being talked about with APC. We will be able to accomplish a lot in that area.

R. Luttmann - Will you be calling together the Diversity Steering committee?

B. Goldstein - Yes, and Campus Climate and Senate leadership. Plans are there and we just need to figure out the dates for the retreats.

R. Luttmann - A lot of people are eager to see us move forward.

P. Phillips - Thank you, Bernie, for what you've done so far. I'm pleased to see it. I'd like to focus on reactions to two things in your report. The 10-15 year time frame seems long, we'd like to see improvement immediately. In your discussions in regard to whom should we look like should be based on the students coming here. Two-thirds of our students are coming from out of our service area, so really need to be looking not at Sonoma County, but broader to statewide. Our goals need to be relative to our student population.

B. Goldstein - That is the debate. What can we look like, what is possible.

S. McKillop - I was at the Finance and Facilities meeting yesterday which I will talk about in my report, but one thing that came up is that the legislature wants to know what we do with the money we get. And in terms of tolerance to diversity, I cannot be other than I am, but I can be caring and tolerant of diversity. There are some tests that look at attitudes toward tolerance and are very good. If one gave the test to freshmen and when they graduate, gave the test again, then you'd have a baseline about how much you have moved to tolerance or acceptance of diversity. Headcount is important, but how have I change from being a freshmen? If you want to ask ten years out how it is now you've been in the workplace, we could have a good picture of how we made a difference on this campus.

R. Coleman - Senghor - I'm struck by what you said. Our task in this body is always how we can frame discussions. How this discussion on diversity will be framed is important. The Executive Committee has an important role in framing the discussion and how to insure the quality of outcomes of the discussions and that we do touch upon the main objectives. I want to make sure it is framed more effectively than the first retreat on this issue. That retreat allowed people to air different points of view. We need to frame it this time to support certain outcomes.

B. Goldstein - I did learn two major points from that retreat. We need co-curricular activities, and curriculum change in light of diversity. I'm not seeing a lot of talk about that issue yet.

Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)

S. McKillop - I was in Sacramento twice this week for meetings of working groups - the Governance group, and the Finance and Facilities group. The Finance and Facilities was a thrilling meeting. There were two people from the UC's President's office and from the Community Colleges and the Claremont consortium. It was a

wonderful range of higher education at all levels. Among the things that have come up are access, affordability and choice, current unmet needs, enrollment management and how to get a realistic approach to higher education in general. The first thing everybody talked about was stabilizing funding. When you get the see-sawing, how do you plan? There's been a decline on our percentage of the state budget. They want to expand partnerships of all types. The legislature is interested now in performance funding. They want certain aspects. They want to know, if the state is paying for us, what are they going to get for it. They want them to have general goals instead of narrow lines. Another issue was funding for electronic technology. CMS is breaking our back now. Student fees increase is an option of that group despite what the Governor says. They think that is the wrong way to go to have low fees because we send tons of money back to the federal government. The Cal Grant B should do all rest of its funding in that area. There are so many more ways to get money now than awhile ago. Structurally, there is high support for higher fees. People could pay more where they could and if not, money is available. Funding for facilities - there is not enough office space. How to divide the money if a bond issue works? They talked about a 1/3 and a 1/3 and a 1/3. There was lots of discussion at that meeting. They want to attempt to make the division themselves and not leave it to the Governor and legislature. I found discussion marvelous. The reports are coming about one week now. All working groups' reports will be out this week. It is a very interesting process. I hope some of it is what we like to hear.

R. Coleman -Senghor - In your report you mentioned student tracking. . .

S. McKillop - There is great interest in following by the student, a kind of voucher system for us. The very strong aspect of that, is the idea that we should be one system not segments, we should blend our relationships with the Community Colleges. On the way out the door I hit up Pickens. He wrote that book about how the master plan was made. I told him if I got one piece of that I would want to see a blending between the CSU and the UC. So I made a small pitch that they really think about softening on that a little bit. I do think on this campus we believe in excellence and if we are rowing against the stream its hard to do. Freshman seminar is again asking for money, why should they be the only ones. I did at least have a chance to speak.

Proactive Senate Response on Labor Actions brought by Richard Senghas

R. Luttmann - In deference to our guest can we do Richard Senghas' issue now? Let's remember as the Executive committee we are not constituted to discuss issues per se, but to discuss how we should approach them and how they should go to the Senate.

R. Senghas - Basically my idea is that we bring up as a discussion item in the Academic Senate: what are the academic implications of any job action? I think we need to discuss this now rather than later. I want the Academic Senate and faculty to form a curricular and instructional point of view addressing the issue. It is complex enough, and in order to be proactive we need to start soon. The reason I raise this at this point is that, as a program coordinator, what do I tell my lecturers? They ask, what is going to happen to me if I strike? Will my pay be docked? What about alternative assignments? I don't think it is a moot point. I think we need a discussion and I'm not sure if we will come to a unified statement. This is without precedent.

Things get especially heated in a job action. I want to talk while the blood pressure is down.

R. Luttmann - We could talk about it at the Senate as a committee of the whole as it is not a proposal for action. If the wisdom of the Executive Committee is that this is appropriate at the Senate, how would it be structured? Do we want certain people to make a presentation, that sort of thing.

C. Nelson - With all due respect to you Richard, I'd like to echo what was said in the Social Science Council of Department Chairs meeting today. With our ex-officio members on the Senate we are in the presence of management and I would be uncomfortable having this discussion in the presence of management. We have a labor union and this is a union issue. I understand what you are doing and I support your request to do. I just want to express my opinion.

R. Coleman-Senghor - At this table it is an academic affairs issue and a faculty issue. I see this as a question of how we as faculty respond to members of the faculty if a job action occurs, and how are we going to respond to students. We have a faculty responsibility to think about it. It's the same as if we were having a toxic train coming through the area. I'm with you, Richard, we need to talk about this issue. I would like to see it go to the Senate.

P. Phillips - This is a sensitive issue and speculation about something that may happen. Planning some sort of appropriate response for eventualities is difficult - I don't think we need to do this now, or should. Individual instructors would inform their class if they are not going to be in class. If that is case, it becomes an individual thing. I don't see this as a major Senate function to figure out what people's responsibility is here. It doesn't seem like something we should be getting ourselves into.

S. McKillop - Can I ask a general question? You're talking about people who don't want to teach during a strike? Is there going to be retribution of people don't share that point of view?

T. Wandling - I share some of Richard's concerns as Chair of my department, but I haven't given them as much thought. Over this issue we will all be wearing different hats. I suppose I'm not in favor of having this in the Senate. I'm sure the conversation should happen: one thing is being said by the union, one thing by management. It is a good point - what do academics want to say about this? It would be good to have real clarity from faculty leadership. But I'm not sure if we need to do this at the Senate.

P. McGough - I do not want to discuss this at the Senate. A work action is the worst of a battle move and war, you don't know what's going to happen. If we have a work action, Chairs would be in the worst position. All administrative decisions will be made on their side. That's their prerogative. It's not ever appropriate to discuss this in the Senate. A labor union - once you're in battle, they are the commanders.

N. Byrne - When I first read Richard's memo I thought it had considerable value. Since then I have had the benefit of the discussion in the Council of Department Chair and I agree with Tim's point. There is much merit in a discussion but it is not clear that the

Senate is the proper forum for the discussion. What can the Senate do? Discussion can occur. I don't know if it can establish what would really be the responses of administration - sanctions? What's proper and improper? My final point is that Randy Dodgen said as Chair he would simply tell faculty to do - what they would do anyway - act according to their conscience.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I truly hope we are not being hypocritical here. I cannot count the times CFA issues have been raised at the Senate that I've had qualms about. I'm not interested in work issues; my concern is what is going to happen to students. We have at least to have some discussion about what we do in emergencies. The question is where will this discussion take place and how will the leadership of the faculty be involved. If you place it in somewhere other than the Senate, it makes the Senate removed. I'm on the Senate for three years and you won't be able to raise CFA issues at the Senate again if you disallow this.

R. Senghas - CFA has too much power in curricular issues. I'm fearful of precedent. Who signs the Teaching English as a Second Language certificate? My name is on it and that says that person can do TESL. If my name is on a certificate that this person can do TESL and they haven't had the full curriculum it takes for my certificate program, what is my name worth, what is SSU's accreditation worth? I understand some aspects that are not appropriate, but these are essential curricular issues. I keep seeing it polarized between the administration and the union. Our constitution does not talk about the union.

T. Wandling - You made a good point, but I agree with Phil. You are talking about what damage is going to need to be fixed. We have to see the damage first. If we miss three weeks of class do we halve units? But I don't think we can decide that ahead of time. I don't agree it is muddled at the Senate, we are always have to be very careful about distinguishing between academic and budget relevance and union issues. Victor, both as a Senator and as CFA Chapter President, often makes that distinction. It is our job to protect the curriculum. I agree with the point raised by Noel about following your conscience. Ultimately, if you don't feel good about that certificate, don't sign it.

R. Senghas - I have students who plan to finish the program this semester. It is affecting their careers and job offers. By accepting their fees we have a contract between us and the student. We've got notice of a strike authorization vote. I don't want lecturers and students being blindsided. They've invested money and time. If a strike is going to happen, how are we going to mitigate that?

C. Nelson - Lord, I hope it does not get to that. One thing Susan said about retribution. I hope everybody is civil. If we can't stay civil we are not a community. I include everyone around this table. Secondly, if there is a strike, you are going to hurt people. There is no way to avoid that. If there is a strike and we go out for three weeks or two days, it is the point of a strike, that there will be consequences. There are short-term negative consequence to mitigate long-term positive consequences. There are going to be negative ramifications for everyone around this table if there is an affirmative strike vote. There is no way to avoid that. The idea is that those who are going on strike are trying to convince others that this is the price that has to be paid.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I had friends and colleagues teaching in Rochester, NY. They had a severe snow storm that froze things up for a month and a half. The faculty got together about how they were going to respond to that happening. That is all we are discussing.

R. Luttmann - We still seem divided on this. I suggest that one or more who would like to discuss this at the Senate propose in more detail the format it might take: what issues would be discussed and how they would be presented. Any thoughts on this?

R. Senghas - I can clear my afternoon calendar to be there. I can talk to you about some of the issues that would make sense.

T. Wandling - Would it be acceptable to you to make sure the Senate reviews the curricular impact of any action by union or management?

R. Senghas - I just want the faculty voice, not the union voice.

R. Luttmann - Bear in mind things are going to move pretty rapidly this semester. If we don't discuss it now we might not discuss it at all before events have overtaken us.

R. Coleman-Senghor - This body does not have to bring this. Any Senator can. I will do that. The body can vote it down. I can speak as an independent faculty member.

P. McGough - It seems to me during Vietnam and Cambodia military actions in the 60's and early 70's, weeks and weeks of classes were missed at campuses. Students that lost a lot of class time were not handled on a rationalized basis. You cannot rationally deal with damage; if it happens, then you deal with it. Strikes are a battle. Both sides have weapons and power and will use it. Often the outcomes are unpleasant.

S. Brannen - With respect to your analogy at NY, faculty had a meeting after the snow storm occurred. I don't think the analogy holds if you want to have the discussion before the emergency. We react to something once it's happened.

R. Senghas - We have an evacuation plan for earthquakes here in California. We know there is a clear and present danger. Now that it has been brought to our attention, we need it. I plan my semester a long time in advance. I don't think we need to wait. We can act in advance. I urge you to. I'm glad to have this much discussion.

R. Luttmann - We are not all in agreement. Here's the situation as I understand it. My impression is that we have more support for not doing it, but a statement from Bob Coleman that he will ask the Senate at the next meeting to add it to the agenda, if we defer. I think we should vote on this. Can I have a motion?

R. Coleman - Senghor - I move to ask the Senate to discuss the curricular impact of a strike action.

P. McGough - How about to discuss Richard's memo at the Senate?

Second.

Vote for including Richard's memo in the Senate agenda - Approve = 2, Opposed = 6, Failed

There was clarification of how agenda items can be brought to senate by faculty other than Senators - a motion is made to alter the agenda at the time the Chair calls for approval.

P. McGough - (to Coleman-Senghor) Are you going to make the motion at the Senate?

R. Coleman - Senghor - I'll make motion at the Senate more precisely.

P. McGough - Can we have a note in the packet that says Bob Coleman will present a minority view and include appropriate attachments?

T. Wandling - On Phil's point, could we include the minutes from here that reflect the reasons why we voted against this topic?

Approved.

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (N. Byrne)

N. Byrne - Structures & Functions have brought forward three matters that are included your in packet. Please see #1. This is an amendment to our by-laws describing the distinction between first and second readings. Article 4 - 1.9 - reads "All action items shall receive two readings. Before any item may be received for a first reading, it must be distributed to the Senators two days before the Senate meetings. These rules may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Senate." The proposal is that prior to that final sentence be added: "Since a first reading is meant to introduce a topic to the Senate, an action item may not be amended, tabled, referred, or postponed at its first reading. Discussion at the first reading shall be limited to no more than 15 minutes." The second proposal follows immediately beneath this and refers to a modification of the duties of Secretary. " We propose expanding the duties of the Secretary of the Faculty, as described in by-laws, Article III, section 1.5. "The following text would be in addition to the three duties already listed there: d) serving as the Senate's Press Officer in making the University community and the wider public aware of the activities of the Senate; e) serving as the Senate's liaison to the Enterprises Board, the Associated Students, and the President's Cabinet or Extended Cabinet." The third proposal refers to release time for faculty governance. Our recommendation is that the distribution of the 54 units that are currently allocated be readjusted such that units that have been allocated to the URTP Chair, Scholarship and Sponsored programs be reduced from 3 to 2 units and each Senate Lecturer receive one unit of release time.

R. Luttmann - The first and second of these items are proposed for Senate action. They involve changing the by-laws. The third one's status is a little bit vague because as you may recall from discussions last fall, we're not sure whose jurisdiction it is to allocate these units. Some people feel the Senate has jurisdiction and some people feel this body has jurisdiction. Under the circumstances at very least we want to report to the

Senate what this body decides. We're not sure we need to present this to the Senate for ratification.

R. Armiñana - I have a procedural question - Are the three items in a single motion or three separate motions?

N. Byrne - Three separate motions.

T. Wandling - Are we going to go through each one?

P. McGough - The first two are going to the Senate. Our job is to pass them through. The third is an action item at the Executive Committee meeting.

R. Luttmann - Is there any objection to sending the first two to the Senate

No objections.

T. Wandling - About advocacy on a first reading - I thought you couldn't do that?

R. Luttmann - This was the subject of some discussion at Structures & Functions. We were divided on the subject when we voted. We decided to leave debate out, so debate is not proscribed. The limit to 15 minutes was intended to accomplish the same goals - to limit debate. We expect this to be controversial. When Noel talks about this he will make clear that we are divided. Keep in mind this has been oral to this point. This will codify it. As one who has had the experience of being pressured to decide where something was debate or not, I can tell you it is a very difficult call to make. We felt it was best to eliminate that. I thought it is probably more useful to have some points of view on floor at the first reading.

T. Wandling - On number three since it is limited to not beyond the next academic year - and there is no explicit thing in our constitution, is it the job of Executive Committee to make this determination? Since splitting units in this way doesn't fit with most people, how might people get that compensated? Some Senators are going to teach 3 unit classes. How are 2 units going to be compensated to them?

R. Luttmann - They will have to work with Bernie's office to figure it out.

S. Brannen - This is not intended to have these things become defacto. Will we really redefine this every year? This reminds me of what our previous chair did. So I'm worried about people in the next year.

N. Byrne - When we deliberated at Structures and Functions, one of the issues that concerned us is the one constraint we have which is the matter of 54 units total. We're in opposition to expanding that in a way that might not recognize that the immediate past chair might merit release time. We just recognized it, but didn't feel we could resolve it with these constraints.

S. Brannen - Future Past Chairs I think will in fact experience prejudice if there is opposition to obtaining units.

S. McKillop - I'm wondering if the timing of three is appropriate until the expanding of the duties of secretary are settled. In case this doesn't pass, do the units go to the Past Chair or someone else, should we not have more than 54 units? I think we might wait until we know it is going to happen.

P. McGough - Ditto. When I was chair last year one or two past chairs brought this up and I realized I would be uncomfortable being the chair to decide this. That is a problem and we completely finessed it.

R. Coleman-Senghor - The first question to be answered is what is the authority of this body to make this determination? The Senate might bring some thing to this debate. If the whole Senate speaks, who knows where it will land. Once that is settled that politicizes this body in an interesting way. I would like to keep it out of this body. It should go to the Senate as a separate issue.

R. Luttmann - My sense from Structures and Functions is that in the last footnote it says in the event that the Senate doesn't agree to the by-law change there 's some significant feeling that the 3 units to the secretary is too much. All those might go back to the three committees where we are removing them.

N. Byrne - Your statement is correct.

R. Luttmann - This list is all that came to be expected for the Chairs of the last three committees.

P. McGough - There is a piece missing. The secretary historically got units because the secretary took minutes at this committee and the Senate.

R. Coleman-Senghor - The secretary now is an honorific position?

P. McGough - The secretary reviews and oversees the minutes.

R. Luttmann - There are three clauses about what the secretary does, but in fact the amount of work done is minimal.

R. Armiñana - I have a procedural question. Doesn't a change to the by-laws of the Senate require Presidential approval? That might be something to research.

R. Luttmann - Do you want to send this to the Senate for its ratification?

C. Nelson - Departments need to make their schedules. If we have to change the by-laws that will take a month.

N. Byrne - I very much appreciate the point you are making. I am agreement with your point about time. Who does have authority? We can't assume we can usurp that authority and we can't proceed if we do not know.

R. Coleman-Senghor - We can present it as a constrained action. The Senate would be the main place of action. The authority question would be set aside.

R. Luttmann - The units are possibly a problem and possibly not. Notice, by the way, these are annual numbers and can be taken at the discretion of the incumbent. We can bring up different issues rather than hold that to another time. Do we want this to go to the Senate as an action item?

S. Brannen - Can we put in dependent clause in the third one that if the secretary duties are not changed. . .

R. Coleman-Senghor - Procedurally, we could present three before two.

P. McGough - Are you willing to amend it as Sam recommends?

N. Byrne -Yes and I will rely on you to provide correct formulation to Laurel.

Approved to go to the Senate.

Vice President, Admin. & Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I'd like to brief you on next week. I'd like to brief the Senate on the situation with utilities on campus. There's been a lot of publicity about Enron and I can talk about what that means to our campus and the budget implications. This is also in relation to utility issues with natural gas and sewage. On the 22nd the CRC agenda will be available to Professors to see what on the docket. Then my third proposal is to talk about the university district, and the public offer about the university's plans. Those would be my three topics.

Chairs, Standing Committees - (Coleman-Senghor, Warmoth, Brannen, Poe)

APC

R. Coleman-Senghor - Catherine came to our APC meeting today to talk about the item of APC's recommendations. One of the things we did discuss was the issue of requiring faculty to be on the President's cabinet and we came to the conclusion that we were going to ask the President to invite us when issues of academic planning come up. We are going to move forward to the development an AIR and also we are developing a culture of planning. Our proposal will be to host two forums, with aim of looking at residency and the next one PB views.

BUSINESS

Emeritus Dinner

R. Luttmann - I've been asked to find out how you feel about a subcommittee to deal with questions about the emeritus dinner, so Laurel doesn't have to come back here with questions. Is anyone interested to be on a subcommittee to deal with the emeritus dinner?

L. Holmstrom - We need help deciding on the venue and the program for the evening. We have narrowed it down to two places we would recommend.

R. Luttmann - I'm hoping we can get a smaller group.

S. Brannen - Personally, I'm very comfortable letting Laurel decide.

T. Wandling - I'll make a similar suggestion. We can let you decide.

P. Phillips - I think this falls under the duties of the Secretary.

Inviting Brookfield to the Senate

R. Luttmann - Do I have this body's blessing to invite Brookfield to the Senate?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - That is the Senate's prerogative , but you would not be acting in any official way for the University. We are in official negotiations with Brookfield.

R. Armiñana - We have sent Brookfield a very definitive letter with an offer which has amounts and it says that they must reply by March 4th. I have no idea how that will be accepted. It is a definitive offer with a new date.

R. Luttmann - Bear in mind we are talking about the broader issue of development north of campus.

P. McGough - Would having Brookfield at the Senate interfere with negotiations?

R. Armiñana - It is premature before March 4th.

R. Luttmann - The faculty and administration are often at odds on issues, but this is one where we have full agreement. My thinking here is that by inviting Brookfield to make a presentation of their plans to the Senate, it sends a message that the faculty are watching.

R. Coleman-Senghor - We can make the point after March 4th.

P. McGough - I don't think you should invite them until after March 4th. What do we have to lose?

R. Luttmann - Things are moving down at City Hall. They've already had an informal presentation at the Planning Committee and City Council. Then there will be a formal hearing at the Planning Committee and City Council. I'm afraid if we wait too long the more cast in concrete people's ideas get .

R. Coleman-Senghor - They will have to send out a letter to all the folks near that.

R. Luttmann - Ok, I'll wait.

Discussion of revised SBC resolutions - C. Nelson

C. Nelson - The Senate Budget Committee has gone back to our resolutions and further debated the marginal cost in budget cuts and the development office issues. The SBC directed me to go ahead with the marginal cost resolution with acknowledgment of information from conversations with Vice President Schlereth. There are minor wording changes that reflect that information. We have decided to request the development office funding resolution be tabled for a couple more weeks or perhaps taken off until we can finish our investigation. There's lots of information we want to get our hands on to understand the implications of the resolution.

R. Luttmann - So this material will go forward to the agenda but this is a heads up from Catherine that she will move on behalf of the SBC to delay consideration of first resolution and point out minor changes in the other.

T. Wandling -I was trying to look up Evaluations of Temporary Faculty in our policies and I found a policy about budget consultation with faculty. The VPBAC and the PBAC are supposed to report to this body. What we need is a consultative place to weigh and think about budget matters. A decision is made and we do not have input. Maybe we can look at that language and include those other members to this body. I bring this up because of Bill Poe's comment last time about discussing the SBC resolutions with the President here.

Memo from Phil McGough re: CPEC budget analysis - attachment

P. McGough - CPEC had for the first time reps from three systems talking about the implications of governors budget. The report focuses on definitions of quality and student fees. Both systems have asked CPEC to set up meetings which would begin to move to a rational policy for fees, and reimbursement for students. The Governor is adamant that fees not be raised.

McKillop- That was reinforced in the Finance and Facilities committee. There are a lot of issues. Everyone is in agreement about the Governor. There were incredible successes with YRO, three times the number of students showed up.

FSAC's Evaluation of Temporary Faculty Proposal

W. Poe - Sometime ago when we are discussing the Academic Freedom subcommittee, the Senate asked me to inquire if any investigation of faculty was conducted on campus without that faculty member being aware of it. I'm told by A & F not only is the faculty notified of exactly what the charge is, but is also provided the name of the person who is issuing the complaint.

N. Byrne - What about the instance of emeritus faculty?

W. Poe - All investigations through HR work that way regarding complaints about faculty. I am told there were was at one time in the past such investigations. FSAC met today and we discussed the evaluation of temporary faculty. Steve Wilson was present at the meeting. We made a few changes. For the confusion around using the term RTP committee, it now reads Temporary Faculty Evaluation committee. If a

department wants it to be their RTP committee, that's fine as it is still elected by the department. The sentence in item 9 about criteria for teaching effectiveness - "engages in professional development to enhance teaching effectiveness," we amended the introductory paragraph to clearly state where a faculty person is assigned to teach the evaluation shall be restricted to teaching. We had a long discussion about aggregating part time to full time positions. The contract clearly provides for joint appointments, but it is extremely rare, because departments don't want to do it. Judith Hunt's interpretation of the contract language is that you don't simply aggregate part time positions. This is outside of our jurisdiction. Should it continue to be an issue at the Senate, I will ask to strike the sentence. FSAC took the position that in area 9 of teaching effectiveness there shall be one list. The list applying to temporary and applying to RTP and probationary faculty will be identical. People did not want to meddle with the list as we would have to go back to the RTP document as well.

N. Byrne - I might have misunderstood. Didn't Myrna Goodman a while back establish a contract where she teaches for Women's and Gender Studies and Sociology? She's arranged to have two courses on alternating semesters. I assume that's not regarded as a joint appointment?

W. Poe - It's possible for a person to have series of appointments and positions. On initiation of the department a person can have a joint appt which could become a full time appointment.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I recommend against it. We are out of compliance at this moment. If anything is needed it is a policy that can help a lot of part timers be able to be hired as new tenure track faculty.

W. Poe - There shall not be a difference in criteria for part time faculty. A class taught by a qualified faculty member should have the same criteria for each teacher. I will urge if we need to meddle with the list in number 9, we would have to visit both documents.

S. Brannen - I don't understand this completely, but probationary and tenure track are hired on different criteria than part time faculty, why can't they be judged by different criteria.

W. Poe - This is only in reference to teaching effectiveness.

P. McGough - The next step in your department would be to replace all tenured with part timers.

W. Poe - That is a not logical step. It implies that teaching classes is all that is done.

R. Luttmann - What is the formal status of this that will go to the Senate next week?

W. Poe - For the packet we have a history of the document. The second document strips out all the history and is easier to read. Bill Houghton created a document that compares present criteria for evaluation of temporary faculty with the proposed changes and with the MOU in three columns. I will propose a small amendment at the beginning.

Senate Agenda

Resolutions from Senate Budget Committee - second reading - attachments: proposed amendments

Evaluation of temporary faculty proposal from FSAC - second reading - attachments: proposed amendments

Proposal from S&F - *by-laws amendment*: first and second readings - first reading - attachment

Proposal from S&F - *by-laws amendment*: expansion of secretary duties - first reading - attachment

Proposal from S&F - faculty governance release time for 2002-03 - first reading - attachment

ADJOURNMENT 5:00

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom