

Senate Minutes
February 7, 2002

Abstract

Report from Chair. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes approved. First reading of FSAC's Proposal for Evaluation of Temporary Faculty. Resolutions from Senate Budget Committee - 2 tabled and 1 postponed to next meeting. Electronic voting approved. Reports from Vice President of Administration and Finance, Chair-Elect, Proxy for President of the Associated Students, Chair of APC and Chair of SAC. Two items for the Good of the Order.

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Peter Phillips, Victor Garlin, Wanda Boda, Debora Hammond, Catherine Nelson, Dale Trowbridge, Robert Girling, Edith Mendez, Heather Smith, Heidi LaMoreaux, Leilani Nishime, Perry Marker, Raye Lynn Thomas, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert McNamara, Gerryann Olson, Scott Miller, Steve Winter, Sunil Tiwari, Tim Wandling, Steve Wilson, Birch Moonwomon, Helmut Wautischer, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Travis Tabares, Jamie Holian, Art Warmoth, William Poe, Sam Brannen

Absent: Susan McKillop, Derek Girman, Duane Dove, Gillian Parker, Renee Deorsey, Ruben Armiñana, Bernie Goldstein,

Proxies: Travis Tabares will have permanent proxy for Remy Heng for the Spring semester.

Guests: Bill Houghton, Judith Hunt, Jacqueline Boman, Elaine Sundberg

Meeting began at 3:10

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Rick Luttmann

R. Luttmann - Before we start I'd like to tell you about some changes. We've decided Laurel should have the center seat as she has difficulty hearing and this will facilitate notetaking. On a related matter we talked at the Executive Committee about asking members to stand in hopes of encouraging Senators to speak up and speak less. That didn't go anywhere. However, there is a hierarchy of motions, and on occasion someone will want to introduce a superseding motion. We're going ask you to observe the following convention. If you have such a motion stand up and ask for the chair to recognize you. We have a couple of new members and/or reconstituted members. I'd like to introduce Sam Brannen from Math who has taken over as Chair of SAC from Michael Litle. We have a new student representative Jamie Holian, and finally Bob Coleman-Senghor who has been a member has taken over for Susan Moulton as Chair for APC. I'd like to remind you of something sent out over email about the meeting tomorrow to discuss land use north of campus. There are now plans afoot to develop these lands. If you are interested in a having say, this is the time get involved. Thanks to Scott Miller for organizing this meeting. He has invited several people including myself, Neil Markley, Sue Hayes, and David Stokes to make presentations and have discussion. It will take place at noon in Schulz 1121. There is also an opening on the Rohnert Park planning commission. If you wish to apply Jake Mackenzie is whose appointment it is. He would be delighted to here from you if you are interested.

Correspondences: None.

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda -

R. Luttmann - Larry Shinagawa is ill today and asked to have his report deferred until our next meeting. Chuck Rhodes has a conflicting obligation at this time. We have asked Larry to show his excellent power point presentation he prepared for the statewide academic conference. I've also been informed by Catherine Nelson that she proposes to move on behalf of the budget committee that the first two of three resolutions be deferred to our next meeting. There have been some changes in the budgetary situation since we considered these last time. Also in your packet are substitute resolutions that update the factual situation. I propose we consider agenda item #4 first at the request of some members that need to leave early.

Approved

Approval of Minutes - *Approved*

BUSINESS

Evaluation of temporary faculty proposal from FSAC - first reading - attachment

W. Poe - Judith Hunt and Bill Houghton are present to help answer questions on this. The primary motivation for this proposal is to come into full compliance with our collective bargaining agreement. In the many places you see strikeouts it doesn't always mean something was eliminated. It could mean that paragraph was placed in another topic somewhere. Boldface words are additions and I can't remember why F is in italics. These things are marking the history of the document. The primary change is in regard to the category of temporary faculty appointed for two semesters. People in this category will have a periodic evaluation that looks more like the RTP process for tenure track faculty. The faculty RTP committee will conduct the evaluations. FSAC was concerned about workload. Last semester there were seven such appointments in seven different departments. It is more work, but not a lot of work.

J. Hunt - I can comment on the background. We brought this to FSAC not because we wanted to go and make great new changes. We recognized that our procedures were not in keeping with our collective bargaining agreement. We realize that the collective bargaining agreement might not be as it is now, but the language has been the same for twenty years, so I don't think it will change.

R. Luttmann- The last page of your packet has the bargaining agreement language. This is a first reading.

B. Moonwomon - There are lots of things on my mind about this. The first is about RTP as it occurs in this and it has been pointed out to me that this seems like a move to make evaluation of lecturers more like the evaluation of tenure track faculty. I think evaluations probably do have a good effect on teaching and furthermore evaluation of lecturers legitimates that position and the work that is being done in a respectful way. Is this in some part not perhaps meant to be a boring into the tenure track positions? The other thing that concerns me when you are evaluated as a tenure track person would be, for those

people there is a reward for the person being evaluated. Lecturers evaluated under these terms do not lead to any reward except retention. You don't get fired, but don't get anything else either. Is it in my interest? A big area of concern is #4 in B. The first thing is items seemed to be snatched out of the student evaluation forms. These shouldn't be the only evaluation criteria of faculty teaching. There is nothing in any of these about what teaching is about, such as is there robust content, is there a lot of substance here, were students ever challenged to learn theory, method or description? It's just not here. Some of these are just not relevant to all kinds of teaching. #6, well that's ok if I'm teaching about language issues in society, but it means nothing if I'm teaching math.

W. Poe - The student evaluation forms are designed to reflect the criteria in the university RTP as it applies to tenured and tenured track faculty. Which doesn't speak to validity of them. The attempt here was to make it the basis for evaluation for instruction. Right now evaluation occurs for temporary part time faculty. Department chairs evaluate and Deans evaluate. To a great extent the evaluations in this document of all categories of temporary faculty looks like what happens now. The biggest change is in annual appointments. We thought it was appropriate that the same committee do the evaluation whether temporary or probationary faculty.

B. Moonwomon - To whom does the RTP committee review apply?

W. Poe - It applies to full time faculty on annual appointment. Full time in one department. People who have accumulated full time with more than one department are still part time. That's not our language.

R. Luttmann - Let me remind you this is a first reading and that we could discuss this on Senate-Talk.

T. Wandling - Concerning 1F - that being tenured would be a shift in our department. Our hiring committee is distinct from our RTP committee. Also a couple of years back the department split it into tenure track hiring, not on staffing to evaluate part time lecturers. Is that contractual or local?

J. Hunt - Contractual. We were out of compliance.

T. Wandling - There's also confusion between observation and evaluation in 3B. This says faculty may request and the faculty RTP committee may decide that peer observation may be conducted. We as a department wanted everyone to have observation. Is there any decision to make this a campus wide thing? If some departments don't want to do this workload, they will bury it.

W. Poe - Maybe we could change it to observation. What we are aiming at is the recognition that a temporary faculty person may request an observation. We wanted to make sure that the right to do that was included in the document. Anyone directly involved in the process could request an observation.

W. Boda - In 1B, appointments across department are not to be aggregated to full time status?

W. Poe - When you are a part time employee, you are employed by a department. If you have one appointment in one department and one in another, whether they add up to full time, you are still a part-timer.

P. McGough - That's in the contract.

V. Garlin - That's the Chancellor's office interpretation.

J. Hunt - It's my interpretation. The language in the contract applies to being appointed in a department. It's hard to see how it could be developed in to full time status for evaluations. In terms of benefits, yes.

R. Luttmann - If we think it is not a good idea to have this we need to address it at higher forum.

A. Warmoth - Judith, what department are freshman seminar faculty appointed in?

J. Hunt - Freshman seminar are all appointed in a department and assigned to freshman seminar. Some people have different appointments at different pay rates. You as faculty make independent decisions on that.

W. Boda - There should be some interdisciplinary way of getting them full time. One of the great reasons for having lecturers being evaluated by more than one person is they could become tenure track and might have received the wrong advice. It's more fair to have the evaluation process done by more people.

S. Wilson - Not only is this document objectively discriminatory to part timers, I think 1B is unenforceable and should be scraped.

R. Girling - My impression over the years is our evaluation of temporary faculty is uneven. It's easy to see we are trying to tidy this up. There is a good reason and that is to have good quality lecturers and the fact is that in some departments the hiring process for permanent faculty is somewhat more rigorous than for temporary faculty. It's terribly important to have a clear process of evaluation. Some aspect of peer evaluation too. There is too much responsibility of the department chair rather than committee of the department. I would include some form of observation. The evaluation is exclusively a summation not formative. Here are the ways in which you can improve so you can have a long term position on campus. It would be good to have some element like that included in this.

V. Garlin - Bill, is there currently a lecturer on FSAC? Did FSAC consult with any lecturers who are on the Senate as part of this process?

W. Poe - The process was completed before we had lecturers on the Senate.

V. Garlin - If it is to conform to the MOU, CFA was not consulted either. **I move that this matter be referred back to FSAC and that FSAC consult with appropriate bodies.** The lectures were not consulted, it was designed to conform to the MOU and CFA was not consulted. Lecturers and CFA see it for a first time here at the Senate!

R. Luttmann - It is our standard policy we do not do motions on first readings. I will accept this if there is a 2/3 vote. Part of problem is that we have only folklore on the difference between first and second readings. Coincidentally, this happens to have been discussed at

Structures & Functions and will shortly come to the Senate and require us to place it in our by-laws what is proper to do and not to do at a first reading. There is no authority we can appeal to here. It is not in Robert Rules.

V. Garlin - It seems to be in the interest of the house if matters are brought to the body that are not ready and need to be sent back to the committee.

R. Luttmann - I'm ruling Victors' motion is out of order.

V. Garlin - Appealed

Second.

Vote in favor of overriding ruling - Failed

P. Phillips - There are two serious problems with this. The concept of full time faculty here year after year and not having the benefits of an RTP process. The motion before us is out of order. It contradicts a policy this body established years ago. We rejected standardized evaluations on this campus as we could not show there was no discrimination for student bias. Each department has the right for determining evaluations with its own criteria. **I move to table the motion.**

R. Luttmann - Overruled.

W. Poe - Which items are you talking about?

P. Phillips - Each department has the right to use standardized or not standardized.

W. Poe - These are from the campus RTP evaluation policy.

R. Coleman-Senghor - It is very important we establish the contractual relationship since our local CFA has a different interpretation than our local representative from administration. It is a statement in the MOU that part time faculty will be evaluated. The split is between the status of part timers. I do agree with one point - this federated document has enough room for departments to decide standards and criteria for their departments. By using the RTP policy, this is a document that every department had to review as it is compatible with the MOU and university wide policy. The university wide policy should make sure department status is separate from the evaluation process.

R. McNamara - I'm concerned by the fact that lecturers were not part of the process. I'm also concerned about the fact that RTP language is used without the benefits that come from RTP and tenure. A clarification on 3A - student evaluations from the previous two semesters. How many student evaluations, all?

W. Poe - Evaluation of two courses is in the RTP policy. There's not a specification here, no minimum or maximum. With regard to 3A, there was no intent with regard to a specific number.

P. Marker - In #3, are their materials governed by the MOU? Can you only put materials in this evaluation file that are stated in the MOU or can you put other things in there?

W. Poe - The same rules apply that covers the WPAF in all evaluations.

P. Marker - There is no voice of the person being evaluated here. One piece of information is a reflective piece that people write about their teaching effectiveness. It would be good to incorporate that is if it doesn't go against the MOU. They can describe how they teach, how they've grown, etc. I encourage FSAC to think about that.

W. Poe - This list is examples. Departments ought to be making those decisions.

H. Wautischer - It appears to me that the current reading of the proposal of FSAC is a nice example in sociology of institutionalized cruelty. There is no awareness of the situation lectures are confronted with. I strongly recommend that in any discussions about this part time faculty need to be included. Regarding appointment and part time / full time status for part time faculty - who is the employer of a lecturer, a department or the university?

W. Poe - The university is the employer.

H. Wautischer - What is the justification of appointments across departments not being considered full time?

W. Poe - This document doesn't speak to this at all. As Judith pointed out that the appointment process is instituted by the departments that make independent decisions where to appoint a specific person. We are talking about people who independently acquire courses in this department and that department. Then the question for evaluations is who does the evaluation? What we say in this document is that each department chair does evaluations in that department. If you change the rule, so that you have an amalgamated position and now it becomes full time, that raises the question who does the evaluation? Do the Chairs get together to do it, their committee? Status is outside the scope of this.

H. Wautischer - It's not outside the scope because of the basic question. If the employer is the department it is appropriate that the department evaluates. It depends on which answer you use for employment status who would be making the evaluation. Any program that requires interdisciplinary study, faculty willing and capable would be condemned to a life time of part time teaching. One of the shortcomings of the evaluation itself is that the current document is derived from RTP policy. Many experiences of full time faculty in relation to job performance would be different from part time faculty simply on basis of what kind of courses are being taught. Language may not be necessary to 100 level course that part timers are teaching. Several aspects in the criteria flatly contradict the contacts with part time faculty. We are paid by class time and one office hour or two. The ambiguity in language adds a little extra work, and creates a hostile work environment. I have worked at five different campuses in the CSU. Clarification of the language would help the working environment. Is the committee going to look in to a reinterpretation?

W. Poe - I will take all concerns to the committee.

H. Wautischer - #8 needs to be amended in regard to office hours, not expecting us to spend additional time.

W. Poe - Probation refers to the instructional assignment, it's the same for part time faculty. Consulting concerns direct institutional assignment. You still have office hour obligations.

H. Wautischer - It is uncertain about the office hours. Are part time faculty expected to except expenditures at conferences? There are no funds for lecturers to participate in such activity. The reality of it is, to my knowledge I have never met a lecturer who received funding for conferences, even though it is a performance criteria requirement for tenure.

W. Poe - In my department we expect lecturers and probationary faculty to engage in professional development to have classroom effectiveness. It's a broad category and I'm leery of narrowing the category. We see all faculty as professionals who engage in professional development.

H. Wautischer - Shouldn't that also be reflected in the MOU and contracts with faculty? Perhaps this can be brought up at a different location. On page 3 of 7, #1 it says faculty members may request that a peer observation be done. In the world of department lecturers, what does "may request" mean? Should I ask the chair for evaluation and be perceive as a troublemaker or do I not ask for an evaluation? Clear language would make it better for anybody to request. "May request" gives power to those who have power anyway.

W. Poe - If the chair or the committee want peer observations they can request it. If the faculty member wants one, they have the right to one. I'm leery of the committee requiring that they have to have peer observation. I'm more leery if they can't have peer observation.

H. Wautischer - Can a clause be added that lack of such requirement by a department or a temporary faculty member cannot be interpreted in negative way? Can it be worded so that is leaves discretion?

V. Garlin - Point of order about this level of discourse. We are hearing the powerless for a change. However, it is not appropriate for this conversation to take place here, better to take place at the level of FSAC.

R. Luttmann - We have others matters today. Can we terminate the discussion?

P. McGough - I'd like to make a suggestion that FSAC have some introductory document about what are the changes made, in FSAC's judgement, that we are out of compliance with the MOU. And in several places it talks about departments. What departments? Members? Committee? A majority of the department?

D. Trowbridge - In 1E - I'm not sure whether FERP faculty are eligible for RTP committees for tenure track faculty. My understanding is they are not. If that is true, this is confusing.

J. Hunt - FERP faculty are not eligible for RTP committees.

Resolutions from Senate Budget Committee - second reading

C. Nelson - I'd like to give a brief explanation of these three resolutions. This first is what's left over from our debate last semester. SBC had submitted two resolutions on the search for the Vice President of Development. In the first resolution the second and third whereas were updated to reflect the current budget situation. With regard to the first two

resolutions, we sent them to the Executive Committee last Thursday and this morning in conversation with President Armiñana and Larry Schlereth information was made available to me that we now want to table these resolutions. We would like to go back to the committee on this matter to make sure we are being accurate. **That is the reason for the motion to table first two until our next meeting.**

Second.

R. Coleman-Senghor - What's at issue?

C. Nelson - With regard to the first resolution - the cost of operating the development office. Apparently there is a CSU systemwide policy that has some bearing on this. We need to get hold of that policy. The second resolution about the marginal cost formula - there are some numbers and implications that are important to look at. There are different interpretations of marginal cost formulas. Another point has to do with whether or not in the future the President is going to use the marginal cost formula. We don't want to recommend something already being done or not being done.

R. Luttmann - Are there any objections to tabling these motions?

No objections.

C. Nelson - I move to replace the motion in packet for the resolution in the previous packet.

Second.

C. Nelson - We are substituting this for the one we introduced previously. The number in the first whereas clause, in my understanding it is now that the 1.4% is changed to 1.2% or 639 thousand dollars. Also in terms of the intent of the motion, I talked in the last Senate about how the budget committee was given circumstances to contemplate anywhere from 5% to 10% budget cuts. A lot of discussion was going on among PBAC, VPBAC members, about what to do and what policy and criteria to use if faced with these kinds of cuts. SBC still asks that limited enrollment be used to help the budget crisis situation. There are reports from the legislative analyst office that the Governor's budget is optimistic and does not have a mechanism put together to deal with the 12 billion dollar debt. Evidently, the budget is not on solid ground. There is an emerging sense that it is entirely possible that we might get 4% for enrollment growth and he could turn around and say he wants another 1% in cuts. SBC is very concerned about this issue. We want the Senate to express a point about the principle of about how to deal with a budget crisis.

R. Luttmann - So change 1.4% to 1.2%.

P. McGough - Is this in addition to the per capita state support?

R. Luttmann - That was in the original.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I object to the language of the "first world," why not use the good old USA?

W. Poe - In dealing with language in last paragraph to the first resolution clause - "without a decrease in quality", the size of my classes is not a function of the quality of my classes. Could we change "quality" to "instructional effectiveness?" I'm not going to tell the Governor that the quality of my work will change because it will not.

Numerical change of 1.4% to 1.2% - *Approved.*

S. Brannen - I also have problems with using "first world", would developed world work or should we use USA?

R. McNamara - "First world" is so outdated. Say United States.

R. Luttmann - Are there any objections to changing "first world" to "United States?"

No objections.

R. Luttmann - Are there any objections to changing "quality" to "instructional effectiveness?"

J. Hunt - I apologize to show you a pet peeve I have, but in the last whereas quality is not used correctly.

R. Luttmann - Any objection to putting in "high quality?"

P. McGough - High quality applies to a used car.

R. Luttmann - I was under the impression that words could be different parts of speech from time to time.

T. Wandling - I'd like to speak to the issue of representation. I support the people who have sat down and thought this through and presented this to us. That's why we created a budget committee. There is a lot of work that needs to be done. We need to figure out effective ways to come together to speak effectively to the administration. I really want to thank the committee for putting this together. We need to think of ways of building consensus between our committees.

R. McNamara - Do we need the "as it is" in that same clause?

P. Phillips - I had to read this second resolved clause several times to tell what it means. I think I got it, but it's not easy. I really don't like limiting access. One and three make the point quite clearly. I'd like to drop the second resolve or reword it.

S. Wilson - I might have a solution. The problem I have is, if we limit access and there's a decrease in support, we could end up laying people off. Let's limit access without a decrease in services we're providing right now.

P. McGough - I don't understand the first resolve. I hope Larry Schlereth can help me. The Governor proposes funding our 4% growth and on the other hand there are cut backs in budgets in all the agencies including the CSU. It is unreasonable for us to educate more students with no increase in fees or increase in funding per student. If that's unreasonable, if we are going to have a decrease in quality at same rate of revenue, why is there going to

be a decrease in quality? They are fully funding new students. What is the intention of this resolution?

C. Nelson - The intent of the resolution is to propose limiting access as a principle to the Governor and the Board of Trustees as a way to deal with difficult budget times rather than increasing the number we have to teach while decreasing funding. We have no idea what is going on with the Governor's budget.

P. McGough - So you want him to take the 4% out of his budget?

C. Nelson - The original impetus was we were being asked to accept an increase in students and up to a 10% budget cut. What that would mean is we would have 4% FTE and increase in everyone's workload. SBC thinks this would have a disastrous impact on instructional effectiveness.

P. McGough - He has given us a 4% increase. This is a confused and confusing resolution.

R. Luttmann - Can we terminate our discussion now or shall we extend the meeting?

C. Nelson - We can hold this until the next meeting.

No objections.

Electronic Voting - second reading - attachments

R. Luttmann - We need to get the election started. You may recall that there's a brief recommendation that had come to you before. It isn't really that we need to come to this body, but for such a major change in how we hold elections, it seems appropriate for the Senate to approve it. In our discussion at the last meeting various concerns were raised concerning secrecy and so on. I stress to you that I don't see that we are losing anything by going to electronic voting. Even as it stands now we have a system with room for abuse. It functions on the basis of trust that that doesn't happen. **The proposal is that we conduct our next election by electronic means.**

R. Coleman-Senghor - Can we put in a sunset clause of review, to put in to place electronic voting and have the Senate return to it and reaffirm it as a process in three years.

R. Luttmann - We could do that. I assume we will hear a report from Noel about how it goes.

R. Coleman-Senghor - If we look in a three year sequence, we confirm we looked at it and affirmed it as process.

Second

Scott - I think I need to know voting on that can we reasonably expect in the process problems will come up and the matter will be returned to the senate anyway. Do we need this?

N. Byrne - I would bring before the Senate any possible glitches and address continue the voting or whether to modify it.

R. Luttmann - Are there any objections to the amendment?

No objections.

H. Smith - In terms of the response rate, is it possible to include a rating scale question for comments?

P. McGough - After the election we could send it out on Senate-Talk.

Vote to approve electronic voting - *Approved.*

R. Luttmann - Noel, will you give us a quick briefing on what we will be voting on?

N. Byrne - We will call for nominations for a number of positions - chair-elect, secretary, at large senator, statewide senator, the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion committee, and a member for the SBC.

R. Luttmann - We will open nominations tomorrow. I encourage you to talk it up among your colleagues available for positions and urge them to nominate themselves or others. On a related matter, I suggest all elections that need to happen for next year take place as soon as possible, such as elections at school level committees because we are asked to come up with next years schedule earlier and earlier and we need to know who is doing what. Some people get units for these positions and if not, they still need to schedule meetings, etc.

REPORTS

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

No report.

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)

No report

Vice President/Admin. and Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I have two items to speak to you about briefly. One is the proposed land use plan north of campus. I'm very pleased that the meeting is happening tomorrow so as many campus people can be informed as possible. The Faculty/Staff Housing committee is helping to send an appropriate letter to the City Council. What is happening on our northern border has significant implications for the campus community to be engaged in understanding. I have asked Professor Hayes to come to this committee to report more in detail about the Faculty/Staff Housing committee. Second, I am pleased to report that some difficulties because of the budget issues with faculty workstations have changed. Now that the budget has eased somewhat we are proceeding with the 2001-02 faculty workstation program. There is \$130,000 for faculty workstations which will take care of 80 professors, which is about 1/3 of all tenured faculty. The IT Advisory committee will decide based on the age of the faculty members computers and work with the Deans.

We plan to go to the Deans and say these 32 professors in your school are entitled to new machines, advise us what machine that professor would like to have. Hopefully, by the end of April it will all be done. If you have an old machine, God willing, you will get a new one.

C. Nelson - Can you respond to what a faculty member mentioned to me? That IT is going to discontinue the dial up program, is that accurate?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I think that is accurate. We have the equivalent of AOL and up to this point there's been no cost for that machine. But the machine has become obsolete and the cost to replace it is \$150,000, so we cannot afford to do that. We did discuss this on the CDC and the consensus was to move away from providing service.

R. Luttmann - I thought we were doing it so that professors wouldn't have to buy access.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - If that is wish of the department. If the faculty or staff are working from home and can make a compelling argument then it is a legitimate expense.

H. Smith - Is there a calendar on this?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I'm sure there is, but I don't have it. We won't just turn it off. We'll keep it going as long as the machine holds out, and will try to give you projected date.

V. Garlin - What you're telling me is that it will be impossible it read campus email from home or we have to pay. How would that be billed through a local service provider?

P. McGough - What you would have to pay for is if you can't have a service provider.

W. Poe - In addition, this was discussed by the IT Advisory committee and among things of priority in computing, this was the lowest on the list. It had the least negative impact on instruction.

T. Wandling - Can we refer this matter to some other committee? Such budget decisions are going to impact a lot of our teaching. I don't want to debate it here.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - That is why we didn't disband the IT Advisory committee, so we could get a sense of the faculty perspective on this issue.

R. Luttmann - I will work with Larry and clarify with Larry.

R. Coleman-Senghor - Is there direction to part timers in the new workstation policy? Should we not evolve a policy that some workstations go to part timers?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - The intent of the program is for tenured and tenure track. The budget is not sufficient to include lecturers. I will look at it.

President of the Associated Students - (R. Heng)

T. Tabares - Remy will not be attending the Senate this semester. He had a class conflict last semester. So I will be sitting as his proxy. We are dealing with the CMS implementation. It is a big concern with us. We have a full board now, that 's great. AS has been informed

about the general plan of Rohnert Park. More is coming to the Board to get information. We will be working closely with Neil Markley. And we'll be there tomorrow. There will be a blood drive by the Jump program the Wednesday and Thursday.

S. Miller - We need to think of ways to get students more conscious about development issues.

T. Tabares - Yes, we need to be able to inform the Board more officially.

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

N. Byrne - Several items from Structures & Functions will go to the Executive Committee - a modified distribution for faculty governance release time, a proposal for revising the description of duties of the Senate Secretary position, and as Rick said, we really don't have a formally codified guideline with respect to first and second readings and what is allowable. This is not in Robert's Rule or the MOU or any other document. We propose guidelines that will go to the Executive Committee and then this body.

Statewide Senators - (S. McKillop, P. McGough)

No report.

Chairs, Standing Committees -

APC

R. Coleman-Senghor - In very general terms APC is moving toward a plan to developing a planning culture in coordinating with APC, EPC and the SBC. We are looking at moving forward in concerted way.

EPC

No report.

FSAC

No report.

SAC

S. Brannen - We had our election as per your instructions. Karen Thomson will be our new chair for next year. We are reviewing the student recruitment policy as it relates to our diversity vision, not sure there is a problem. We invited Lou Levy who talked to our committee at the end of last semester and what he reported was quite positive. We are still reviewing the policy.

Items from the Floor - None.

Good of the Order-

T. Wandling - A very exciting symposium is happening on Feb 22 for service learning. The last day to register is tomorrow. Over 100 people are coming, but a small percentage are faculty. A lot connects to what we talked about at the retreat. I'd like to see more faculty there. If you can come or send someone for your department I would appreciate that. Email me or Amy Stafford. It will be held in the Cooperage.

S. Miller - I implore you to come tomorrow at noon. The little I've learned of the development, it really will change the culture of this area for good or ill for the next several years. I think what faculty staff and students know is really important.

Adjournment 5:06

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom