

<p>Academic Senate May 5, 2009</p> <p>Present: Bell, Bice, Black, Brown, Colnic, Cotton, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeVries, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Filling, Hejka-Ekins, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Keswick, Manrique, J. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Russell, Senior, Silverman, Sniezek, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxies: Filling (Campbell), Young (Hall)</p> <p>Guests: Lisa Bernardo, Brian Duggan, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Roger Pugh, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Steve Stryker, Associate Vice President Wendt</p> <p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>8/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Amendment to Principles, Criteria and Procedures for RPT Review, Section II, APPROVED</p> <p>9/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Process for Review of Elaborations (sense of senate), UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>10/AS/09/FBAC—Local Policy Governing Special Session Program operated by UEE, APPROVED</p> <p>12/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Policy on Course Withdrawals, FIRST READING</p> <p>13/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Policy on Repeated Courses, FIRST READING</p> <p>14/AS/09/FAC—Amendment to 2/AS/08/FAC—Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy, FIRST READING</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, May 12, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order

3:33pm

2. Approval of Agenda

No changes requested

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 28, 2009

S. Davis under discussion of a 11/as/09/UEPC credited with saying “including frenzied discussions in the NW corner...” – take out of minutes.

No other changes

4. Announcements

Dunham-Filson would like to thank Nagel, Bice, and Covino about supporting her comments about wanting to change the meeting time to not overlap with the Employee Recognition. She wanted to clarify what was being said in her email. First, she would not have supported a waiving of a first reading. She feels like Academic Senate is trying to push forward all of these resolutions before the end of the year rather than concentrate and make sure we're getting the necessary information for those. She thinks it might have been better to re-prioritize the resolutions regarding what could be done this term. If we have operated without a policy for this long operating without one for a few more months wouldn't hurt. In her email she didn't mean to imply the faculty didn't support the staff, but when push comes to shove, the date might have been changed more aptly if it had coincided with a faculty event.

Dunham-Filson is holding information forums on Friday afternoon in regards to a course she is trying to bring to campus at the end of May/early June on budgeting. She distributed a handout about the meetings.

ASI announced that Warrior Day is Friday beginning at noon with a pre-event BBQ, and Warrior Day running from 2-7. The Spring Reunion 09 is Saturday.

Filling announced that Beer B Que tickets are out.

Taniguchi noted that on Thursday on the Main Stage Theater Phi Kappa Phi and CHSS is sponsoring an anarchism workshop. The keynote speaker is the co-editor of the Emma Goldman papers from UC Berkeley

Mayer noted that Mamet's Speed the Plow opens Thursday, and runs for a couple of weeks.

Covino announced that the Faculty Awards reception is tomorrow at 4 in the FDC. Several recipients are in this room. Mayer asked what goes on there. Covino noted that Wendt is the master of ceremonies.

Bell announced that the commencement committee is asking faculty members to RSVP so that they can set up the faculty section of the platform to best meet faculty needs.

Thompson said that there was a request to governance committees to include in their written reports any discussion on the 66 WASC items. Please include all progress in your written report, but you don't necessarily need to include this in the oral report at General Faculty.

Thompson asked Covino if there is an update on the risk management issues related to the observatory and other sites. Covino indicated that Chief of Policy Jauregui and ASVP Robert Gallegos are proceeding on this. Covino has given them information on faculty committees and contacts. They are moving with all deliberate speed on this.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

None

6. Action Items

- a. 8/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Amendment to Principles, Criteria and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure Review, Section II. Review Criteria

Hejka-Ekins noted that FAC didn't make any changes to the resolution or rationale at this point. The resolution can be changed, but not the attachment. Thompson noted that if this passes senate it will go to a faculty vote. DeVries raised a point that teaching was narrowly defined, not including laboratory instruction. Why was a decision made not to broaden the definition of teaching? Hejka-Ekins said that we might be able to change these in fall, but would not be able to make additional changes at this time.

Peterson noted that part of the point of the resolution was to allow departments to elaborate in their criteria the importance of laboratories or other criteria. It might not be listed here, but could show up on the elaborations. It supports that it would be important to have in the elaborations and is not needed in the statement. DeVries notes that only the teaching section is more prescriptive, while the others are just titles. It would be better not to prescribe it or be more inclusive.

Eudey suggested that there will be opportunities to update these documents next year as we continue to engage in consideration of our elaborations and future changes to RPT policy that comes from this. Through the fall we should be able to address the language of teaching, and Dean Fassinger's questions from last meeting about the service component. The language as offered here is what we have been using for years without any great concern by faculty, so we should be able to continue with this until we have had more time to discuss the scope of the changes we'd like to see. Eudey encouraged the future review of the document for changes, but also believed that we should approve this resolution now to affirm the primacy of teaching and the need for elaborations in all areas.

Hejka-Ekins said this is one resolution we can't afford not to consider for WASC. If we don't pass this and allow faculty to vote on it, we're saying to WASC that we don't care about this. While she agreed with Eudey about making changes later, if she had to pick one document to vote on for this year, this would be it. We've said we're taking responsibility to WASC to do something about RPT that we feel is worthy of our efforts, so this is an extremely important resolution, and the next sense of the senate resolution, are the basic elements for us to respond to WASC. We're in a vulnerable position with WASC with regard to what they said to us if we don't pass this. We need to recognize the priority of this proposal.

Tan is okay with the wording of A because if she was to make her RPT file with the words like preparation it would alert her to say something about preparation, and advising, how many ways she has advised students. She sees this as indicating what she could add in her RPT file. Just talking about item A, Tan doesn't have a problem with it.

Tuedio suggested that there are two words missing under B and D and knows they are implied with the various types of things that could be factored in when determining the things of value. But under B regarding scholarship or creative activities, he wonders why research isn't in there given that there is in some sense some research that isn't necessarily something that leads to a published article in ways that are significant so he would encourage research to be there. In D, he would be more comfortable with University and Professional Affairs. He would not like to see this left open to a very narrow reading of what a department would consider appropriate. He would like to force the focus on more professional affairs, which would include community service.

Tan responded to Tuedio, suggesting that it depends on how one defines University. It could relate to department service, and if you think of the university it could imply professional service. Rather than a narrow definition of university, it can be broader and imply department, college and profession. It could encompass a variety of service one can perform. Tuedio responded that it ties to the university mission rather than the university itself. The mission incorporates all aspects, but Tuedio thinks it leaves the possibility of a narrow reading. He has heard some define this only about committee service, how many committees one needs to be on in order to satisfy the criteria. Tan attended some of the RPT workshops about how to prepare the RPT file, and in service they do mention a broad range, not just committees. Tan comes from that broad background. Tuedio says that's good as long as the department elaborations address that. Thompson noted that what he sent around is what was in elaborations.

DeVries indicated that it's okay that it's so vague that it doesn't push us in one direction, but the problem is that the RPT candidate

and the people reviewing them have to agree on some common ground. If we want to leave that to the departments or want to guide the process is something we have to consider. This is part of the wider debate we have to consider. It can be acknowledged by looking at the minutes that we could read these any way we want and have no sense of commonality. S. Davis suspects it's true, but as alluded to it speaks to the next item on the agenda.

Ballot vote. 32 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention

b. 9/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Process for Review of Elaborations (sense of senate)

Hejka-Ekins noted two changes from the prior version. They incorporated Novak's suggestion that we change the first line from "autonomy" to "primacy," and the other suggestion was under the second resolved that Schoenly suggested "before or during" the fall semester. To repeat, this is the general action plan for the next phase and it will be up to the next SEC to set the timelines and choose the groups that will conduct the events, but this is the general game plan for the next year. URPTC and FAC will play some role with regard to gathering the data that comes out of department discussions and working that into some kind of a survey that will lead us to new directions.

S. Davis asked if it was not appropriate to ask departments to report back to URPTC the tenor of the meetings. Hejka-Ekins said that it would be a part of it. Thompson said that there has been discussion about what a communication from URPTC might look like this spring that would come in the wake of these resolutions and they could address that.

Petratos thinks that "freedom" is a better term than "primacy" His suggestion was to change the word formerly autonomy, now primacy, to freedom. It was presented as friendly, and there was objection to the change. It was then considered as a formal motion, and Tuedio seconded. Petratos thinks in an academic environment we should have the academic freedom to do this. Tuedio likes putting the word out there because it makes us stop for a moment to think about the force of elaborations with respect to URPTC's review of files and their review of the criteria as we present them for our elaborations. It's not clear that they'll approve them just because we submit them. What will happen as URPTC proceeds? If freedom is there it suggests we have to proceed delicately. Ultimately it would be coming out of us, but he's not sure how freedom works as a word.

S. Davis spoke against the change because he likes the word freedom and all it represents alongside academic, but in this case the departments don't have practical freedom, including the limit Tuedio offered regarding URPTC review. To assert a freedom we don't actually practice is an empty gesture. S. Davis likes the word Novak suggested, primacy asserts priority and the first word and the deference that should be given to a departmental decision. Novak said he suggested primacy because that's what's in the RPT procedures and is part of the preamble that comes from the AAUP which establishes the rights of departments to have the first and most important say. As part of a university, we have some responsibility to the rest of the academic community. In a voice vote the proposed amendment failed unanimously.

A paper ballot was used for the vote on the resolution, resulting in 36 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions. The resolution passed unanimously.

c. 10/AS/09/FBAC—Local Policy Governing Special Session Programs operated by University Extended Education (UEE)

Tan noted the resolution is on page 6 of the bundle from last week. The last meeting was a first reading and senate offered comments that were considered by FBAC. The only change that FBAC agreed to make was on page 8, on the 6th line from the top, where Nagel suggested removing the designation of the application fee, so this will be deleted from the policy. They also looked at the other comments received but FBAC decided it was not necessary to make additional changes. Tan reminded senators that throughout the year FBAC has been sending information about how they have been working on this since the beginning of fall 08. They have met many times and sometimes had to delay discussion because of other budget items, but they went through the policy line by line, it went to the Dean's Council twice because sometimes they raised an issue that the Deans needed to see. Also they received comments from UEPC, UEE, and CFA, so they have had a lot of discussion about this. They finally reached the stage that it's ready to move forward. One senator thought the support fee was on the low side, but these numbers came from the Provost, these weren't numbers generated by FBAC. This kind of policy is not consistent university to university; this is a local policy that is a guide for those who are thinking about setting up a UEE program.

DeVries noted on the bottom of page 10 it also indicates a current figure, in light of deleting the \$55 application fee, it seems that this acknowledges the changeability of the fee, it might be smart to take this out as well. Tan said looking at the fact that we deleted "normally \$55" that it is reasonable to also delete this, but she will leave it up to discussion. Thompson questioned whether it is more than an editorial change. It appears to be more than an editorial change so he doesn't think we can remove that. Nagel asked if we can move to waive the rules and allow us to change the document. Thompson ruled that out of order and allowed the chair to be challenged. DeVries removed his comment.

Dunham-Filson noted that there was a statement that there was no policy in effect, when in fact UEE already has a policy in place. UEE being an independent operation has the right to create a policy and everyone who does business with them has a right to do business with them. She questions where faculty sit on this. Being a cohort in your department, this is voluntary for faculty, faculty are not mandated to teach special sessions. She is not supporting the policy because there is already a policy in place and faculty don't have any place to put that policy out there. She knows that the percentages are the provost's decision, but you have to keep in mind that UEE takes 100% of the risk of the special sessions, and doesn't think that 20% is enough in the long run.

Covino says the UEE has prior to this local policy been working in conformity with CSU system policy on extended education and using more or less conventional measures to proceed. There was not a local well specified policy about special sessions programs. In that way, we were distinct from other campuses that had a range of policies for special sessions programs. It is the case that the policies at other

campuses are not commonly regarded as an item for approval by the faculty senate. It is and can be considered a policy that is established by an auxiliary organization that does operate apart from faculty approval to a certain extent. However, in this case there are elements of this policy that bear upon the role of the faculty in curricular decisions and staffing decisions, etc. that are arguable elements of academic policy. There are also elements of the policy that are not arguably elements of academic policy and in other campuses would be considered quite apart from academic policy, and these are largely the fiscal elements. When we discussed this in FBAC we discussed who the authority for determining fiscal elements as opposed to or along with the authority for determining academic elements. This policy contains both to some extent and contains some phrases that try to sort that out. Covino won't be voting for it because it doesn't sufficiently address some of that separation and is problematic in that respect, but does want to speak to his understanding of the policy and the discussion with regard to sorting out academic from fiscal or auxiliary policy.

Dunham-Filson thinks it should not be an academic senate vote, but the concerns should be brought forth to UEE and have them put it into their own policy.

Tan said that when this policy came to FBAC it came from the Provost. Tan thinks the interim UEE director did two presentations to FBAC so FBAC did get a lot of information about the UEE operations, but also looked at the programs that are currently offered like the EMBA and the Masters in Finance joint program, and looked at the spreadsheets and the MOU about the role of UEE and the colleges, and they saw a lot of concerns about setting up the program without the faculty involvement. What UEE offers now is those certificates, like learning software, and we're talking about a degree program here and that requires faculty from the college. When looking at the policy, we think of it as a college/UEE joint venture. SFSU UEE is physically separate from the SFSU campus. We don't have that kind of set up here. Sometimes when we talk about what other universities do, we have to look at our campus differently. What kind of role does UEE play, are they totally separate from the University or not? Tan would encourage all to support this policy. It provides local guidance to colleges and departments who are looking at setting up programs. It provides guidance about where money will go, what to do with any surplus, etc. This provides guidance to our departments and colleges.

Filling noted that it may alleviate concerns that Bob Bechill had before he left and Criswell-Bloom after she arrived were involved in the creation of the policy. It has had repeated exposures and input from UEE, the Provost and Deans.

Voice vote. Passed.

7. First Reading Items

a. 12/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Policy on Course Withdrawals

It was MS Petrosky/filling

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate approves the attached policy on course withdrawals, in replacement of 4/AS/05/UEPC, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the suggested copy replace current Faculty Handbook and CSU Stanislaus Catalog copy referencing said withdrawals, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the policy and copy changes take effect upon the approval of the President.

RATIONALE: The CSU Chancellor's Executive Order 1037 mandates CSU campuses meet certain minimal criteria regarding student withdrawals by August 2009. The language of the proposed policy reflects those minimal criteria, without imposing any more stringent targets, to afford or students the maximal flexibility in pursuit of their education.

Discussion:

Petrosky noted that these follow in direct response to EO 1037. After deliberation in UEPC and inviting in Bernardo to help with interpreting the order, we do need to implement some changes to be in compliance. It's an EO not an Executive Suggestion. What UEPC suggested is what they believe to be the least restrictive reading of the EO's intentions. We are allowed to be more harsh, but we cannot be more lenient. This is what they believe to be the least restrictive reading.

Black had questions about section A. He asked if that was part of the EO? Petrosky indicated yes it was in the EO. Nagel said under C it refers to using an add/drop form. Is enrollment services phasing out the form? Perhaps that language is ill-advised. Perhaps it should say "Documented appropriately." Dunham-Filson supported Nagel's suggestion.

Black asked about the EO and wondered if it is legal to limit students withdrawing for medical reasons from withdrawing from a certain number of courses. Bernardo noted that there is a statement about accident or serious illness, and read that portion from the Executive Order. Tuedio questioned if the inclusion of that statement within D should be moved to another location. Colnic suggested moving that to A so as not to be confused about when the withdrawal occurs.

Demetrulias noted that the policy should be for undergraduate students only.

Black asked whether graduate students are not covered by any such EO?

Young found no separate policy for graduate and undergraduates for withdrawal, and they referenced a clarification memo. Bernardo

noted that the clarification memo said that there is no language that differentiates undergraduate and graduate for withdrawal, but there is language for repeated courses. Demetrius indicated that the EO does specifically indicate undergraduate. Taniguchi then wanted to know what the withdrawal policy is for graduate students.

Young found no difference in the catalog between undergraduate and graduate. In the clarification memo it did not have language that differentiated. Bernardo clarified in the original EO it said undergraduate. Eudey indicated that SEC asked this same question.

Young asked if this should be an undergraduate policy only and next year GC make a policy for grads only? Demetrius noted that 18 units of a 120-140 unit degree program is different from 18 units of a graduate program. It's an important distinction. In her brain it was always undergraduate and would not apply to graduate students.

Jones had a question on the second sentence on D, unclear what that means. Petrosky noted that you can do one or more courses but if you've done enough work you can get an incomplete. Tuedio can imagine a case where a student might have a night class that they couldn't get to, but a day class could be allowed. Nainby says the sentence links to unrelated concepts. Doesn't understand why the term except is there. The sentence as constructed doesn't seem to speak to the issue of how this is syntactically sensible.

S. Davis suggested that what it's saying is that the instructor has the discretion to assign a grade other than W. Thompson noted that UEPC meets Thursday at 1 if you have additional comments.

d. 13/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Policy on Repeated Courses

It was Moved by Petrosky, Seconded by Eudey

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Policy for Repeated Courses (13/AS/09/UEPC) which replaces the Policy for Improvement of Grades (4/GF/73 Approved March 9, 1973, 4/AS/05/UEPC Amended and Approved May 19, 2005) and be it further,

RESOLVED: that the suggested copy replace current Faculty Handbook and CSU Stanislaus Catalog copy referencing said repeated courses, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Policy on Repeated Courses 13/AS/09/UEPC take effect upon approval by the President.

RATIONALE: Many times students perform poorly in a class and do not take full advantage of the resources available to help them perform to their full academic potential. They retake the course and again do not take advantage of resources available and end up with the same result in the course. This cycle continues through three and four attempts at a course. This should help facilitate graduation in a more timely manner, and in turn help reduce the impact repeating students would have on impacted courses. There are a significant number of students choosing to repeat courses. In many courses, repeat students negatively impact the ability of first-time students to register for courses. As a consequence, first time students have to take other courses in their program. This is especially troublesome when students are unable to register for the courses that are pre-requisites for more advanced coursework and are forced to take longer to complete their programs. There has been an attempt to alleviate this problem by increasing course caps and adding sections, but this usually results in a larger pool of repeat students. Requiring more seats for certain courses has required the use of larger classrooms, which would seem to reduce the student-instructor interactions for all the students which are important for success for all the students in the class.

This change in policy will facilitate graduation in a more timely manner without removing the ability of students to repeat courses and encourage students to complete courses successfully on their first attempt. It should also help alleviate some of the stresses on resources that impacted courses have on departments and programs.

Note: This policy change could be implemented in most cases by the instructor signing an add form signifying their permission for the student to retake the course. This would give the instructor a chance to discuss with students strategies and resources that may help them be more successful in the course. This also gives the instructor a chance to track closely the repeating students and allows the instructor to manage enrollment in impacted courses.

Discussion:

Petrosky noted that this is out of EO 1037 and again it is what they deem the least restrictive reading. The least restrictive reading is a C, and they envisioned that there would be occasional instances when as student might want to repeat a C- or would be at the end of their senior year and needed to do so to get about the 2.0 hurdle. This is the least restrictive reading overall.

Dunham-Filson drew attention to page 27 in the "note" paragraph that "or by using their permission number" should be added since we're trying to go away from the add form. She had a question about why in 2B do we allow them to take a class three times? Petrosky indicated that this is the least restrictive reading of the EO.

Black would like to encourage a more restrictive policy. Taking a class three times is a waste of resources. What is the rationale for allowing more? Peterson favors keeping it as loose as we can. Occasionally students have bad luck more than once. She's had students with a death one term, and an accident another and they wanted to take it a third time. They were willing and of course she would want them to try again. Black appreciates that terrible things happen, but what the students should do is withdraw from the class. Peterson says that they could get their D. Black would encourage them to drop.

Young wanted to clarify that this is for undergraduates because there is a different policy for grads. She suggested including the term undergraduate in the policy. Nagel noted that one exception could be someone not passing because of academic dishonesty under 2 c), but could take it under 3. Petrosky will take it to UEPC.

Filling responded to Black, the net effect of withdrawing is no different than getting a low grade and repeating. The students feel viscerally about this policy, and take strong stands on this and he suggested we try to stay as attuned with this as possible.

Jones questioned the fourth sentence of the rationale – not sure what the “this should help facilitate graduation” is related to.

Cotton had a general question about taking a course over and over. Students will sometimes pass only a portion of the course. Will students be encouraged to mediocrity by telling them they can take courses over and over until they get the grade they desire? Are we not encouraging them to do their best every time? S. Davis thinks that were not encouraging mediocrity, but allowing for it if it happens.

Novak noted that in one area where this is an issue occurs in the nursing program, especially in the prerequisites. They run into problems with students not passing science prereqs and taking them again with very little likelihood of getting into the nursing program because of grade problems.

Colnic thinks we may be encouraging mediocrity, but allowing students who want to work and take it again and opportunity to succeed. Some things are harder for people than others. He sort of likes this. We have students who struggle and can eventually make sense of things if they're presented differently.

Thompson reminded all that UEPC meets on Thursday if anyone wants to send more comments.

e. 14/AS/09/FAC—Amendment to 2/AS/08/FAC—Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy

It was Motion by Hejka-Ekins and seconded by Nagel

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached revised CSUS Range Elevation Policy to replace 2/AS/08/FAC, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that this policy become effective upon approval by the President, and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

RATIONALE:

- 1) The policy is out of compliance with the latest version of the Unit 3 CBA;
- 2) It contained numerous errors;
- 3) It no longer reflects actual departmental practices;
- 4) It needed to more appropriately address Lecturer concerns.

Discussion:

Hejka-Ekins noted that we heard from Wendt that our current policy regarding temporary faculty was out of date. FAC had numerous meetings with Nagel and Wendt to discuss updating the policy. It's on pages 32-35 of the prior agenda. Hejka-Ekins encouraged Nagel and Wendt to speak to the changes made to update the policy and make it feasible.

Nagel noted that recent experiences with temporary faculty range elevation suggested guidance for eligibility. There was a conflict in the language from range A to B, that a lecturer might need to have a terminal degree (which was unspecified) and in other locations it was not a requirement but one way to show eligibility. The conflict of language allowed denial and then a grievance was granted. They studied policies from other campuses, and found 14 other policies that didn't refer to terminal degrees at all. Secondly, as shown on page 33, our current policy doesn't indicate things they do to demonstrate qualifications for range elevation. The items on page 33 are ripped off from Long Beach policy with a list of things to be considered.

Wendt wanted to thank FAC for a thorough reworking of the policy. He thinks that 99% makes a lot of sense and helps him implement policy. The issue of terminal degree is one that faculty should look at closely. The salary range for lecturer B is precisely the same as for Assistant Professors, and range C is precisely the same as Associate and D is same as full professor. You're voting on the possibility that a different floor will be established for lecturers than is established for tenured and tenure-track faculty. We would not hire at the assistant professor range without the terminal degree, but you could get promoted from Range A to B without it. From Wendt's perspective as a once and future faculty member, that seems inequitable to him.

Thompson asked if we can extend the meeting for 10 minutes in case we need it. There were no objections.

Thompson reminded all that we do have a second reading for argument and debate. Nagel wanted to suggest that there is a difference in the way a lecturer becomes eligible for range elevation. For range B, it would take about 11 years to achieve. Petratos noted that now we are creating a new route.

Tuedio didn't know we had A, B, C, D. Does this policy do away with that? They all seem to be crossed out? Nagel noted that they are in the contract. Tuedio noted that the term "normally" is indicated for the terminal degree. If it's not "absolutely" does that mean someone could be a range D without a terminal degree? Yes was the response.

Thompson asked if that was correct. He thought he heard in FAC that the terminal degree was retained for C and D. Nagel thought that was the agreement as well. Petratos says if you look closely where it is crossed out it used to say that, but now it's open.

Filling pointed out that this policy typically applies to people who are on our faculty as practicum faculty, for instance social work when the terminal degree was indeed master's level and this applies to them. It doesn't grant them tenure, it's still a very different track. We don't run a risk of aligning the two.

Hejka-Ekins noted that FAC is on call to review these comments. Thompson thanked all for attendance and participation.

8. Open Forum

9. Adjournment at 5:30pm.