Academic Senate Meeting
October 14, 2003

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:34 pm. She asked that Item 7 a) be moved before Item 6 a). The agenda was then approved as amended. The Minutes of September 30, 2003 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. If you have not done so, please send your email address to Diana for the Asnet list.
2. Last week, Aronson, Filling and Sarraille attend an AAUP Conference on Faculty Governance. Anyone wanting information from the conference, please contact them.
3. Flu shots are available $7 students, $10 for faculty and staff.
4. Nominations for Outstanding Professor, Outstanding Researcher, and Outstanding Community Service Professor are due in the Academic Senate Office by October 17.
5. Filling reported there is a CFA General Meeting this Friday from 4-7 pm in the JSRFDC Reference Room. Refreshments and information will be provided

REPORTS

Aronson reported that when Asnet has been updated, committee reports will be sent through Asnet. For now, they will be sent out over Facnet.

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Sarraille)
Sarraille reported that FBAC is discussing recommendations from the Lottery Fund Task Force. They have recommended a new policy and procedures for distribution of lottery funds. Susan Macdonald, Chair of the task force, has been invited to the next FBAC meeting to answer questions.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Floyd)

Floyd advised that items before the committee are: developing a Conflict of Interest Statement, developing a review policy for Interdisciplinary Chairs, looking at the role of FAC in mediation and internal affairs.

Statewide Academic Senate (O’Brien/Thompson)

No report

Provost/VPAA (Dauwalder)

No report

The ASI is having a meeting in Stockton tonight.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. First and Second Readings-Resolutions

Aronson briefed senators about the first and second reading process. She referred to the packet from the last meeting, page 7 that details the process.

ACTION ITEM
Floyd explained that at the last Senate meeting, there was concern about the definition of what an administrative position includes. FAC added ‘associate dean and above’ which addresses that concern. No other changes were made.

Zarling suggested a friendly amendment to change ‘associate’ to ‘assistant.’ This was accepted as friendly.

Oppenheim voiced concern that technically, administrators are members of the General Faculty if they have retreat rights. He asked what percentage would be appropriate if a person had dual roles, one of faculty member and one of administrator? Floyd advised that not all administrative positions are faculty positions. Some are MPP, not in Unit 3. Anyone in Unit 3 would be considered faculty.

Dauwalder referred to Article 13.16 in the MOU which reads “The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in an administrative position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by the appropriate department. Criteria and standards for recommendations shall be those established in accordance with procedures on that campus.” The language in the document is consistent with the MOU.

Sarraille noted that in Article IV, Section 1.1 reads “The URPTC shall be composed of five full-time tenured voting faculty members at the rank of full professor, librarian, or counselor….” It does refer to full-time faculty.
Feldman suggested it say “teaching a minimum of 12 WTUs per academic year.”

Oppenheim noted that directors and coordinators are lower than assistant dean.

Aronson suggested the discussion get back to the underlined language.

Aronson noted that there are directors at the administrative level (MPP) and there are directors that hold faculty positions. Dauwalder agreed stating that it depends on the classification at time of employment.

One suggestion was to put language in indicating ‘instructional faculty.’ Nagel stated that if you state ‘instructional faculty’ you rule out librarians and counselors. He suggested using administrative positions as defined in HEERA.

Floyd stated that we have got off the subject of the amendment. This amendment gives more people the right to serve on the URPTC. This allows some department chairs to be elected.

It was MS Oppenheim/Sarraille: faculty members serving in non MPP positions and who are teaching at least 12 WTUs for the academic year may serve on the URPTC.

Concern was voiced that we not widen it by adding faculty that are not tenured. It was again noted this language would exclude librarians and counselors.

Zarling urged the door not be open to allow faculty serving in a part time administrative position to serve. The whole idea of not allowing administrators to serve is to keep them distinct. Floyd
agreed that if faculty serve in any administrative position, they should not be eligible to serve on the URPTC.

Carroll suggested making a list of who is or is not included, but it was noted that there would be so many variations on administrative appointments, if would be difficult to list them all.

It was MS Dauwalder/Nagel to amend Article IV, Section 1.1 a) to read “Faculty members serving as administrators as defined in Article 2.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the CFA and the Board of Trustees of the CSU, shall be ineligible to serve on the URPTC.

This was ruled out of order because there was an amendment on the floor.

Oppenheim and Sarraille withdrew their amendment.

It was then MS Dauwalder/Nagel to amend Article IV, Section 1.1 a) to read “Faculty members serving as administrators as defined in Article 2.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the CFA and the Board of Trustees of the CSU, shall be ineligible to serve on the URPTC.” Definition reads “The term ‘administrator’ as used in this Agreement refers to an employee serving in a position designated as management or supervisory in accordance with HEERA.”

Nagel suggested this language clearly separates Unit 3 employees from management employees.

Feldman suggested a friendly amendment to add the date of the contract which is May 14, 2002-June 30, 2004. This was accepted as friendly.
Savini stated that this amendment still does not address concerns voiced and that is the difference between classification and assignments.

Sarraille asked that the amended language be added to Article V. B. of the URPTC Procedures and this was accepted as friendly.

Zarling stated that he is more confused than before. There is a difference in a faculty appointment and an administrative appointment. His intent, he stated, is that anyone that is serving in an administrative position cannot serve on URPTC.

Sarraille clarified the wording stating it says ‘faculty members serving as administrators.’

Oppenheim reminded Senators that the fact remains that being eligible to be nominated or serve and being elected are two different things.

Poole agreed that faculty serving in any administrative position should not be eligible to serve.

There being no further questions, a vote was taken on the amendment and it passed by voice vote.

Provost suggested dropping the language “faculty members serving as administrators” and add “Administrators as defined in Article 2 of the MOU shall be ineligible to serve.

Sarraille voiced opposition to that language.

There being no further discussion, Nagel called the question.
Vote on 15/AS/03/FAC as amended passed by voice vote. This will go to a faculty vote. FAC will prepare the Pro argument and Savini volunteered to prepare the Con argument.

RETURN TO DISCUSSION ITEMS

b. Senators Communication with Departments

Aronson reminded Senators that their job was to provide information to their department, have an open dialogue with them, and bring that information back to the Senate. She asked Senators how they are communicating with their departments and what things have been helpful to them:

Senators comments:

--Senator made weekly reports to department. Asked for their guidance when crucial issues came up.
--Senator stated Senate report is on the department’s agenda.
--A Senator commented that their department meets only once a month, so there is a problem with communicating with them on issues.
--One Senator emails department faculty when important issues come up.
--It was noted that Senate minutes are available on the Senate web page. Bowman will send agenda and minutes over Facnet. Departments also get a hard copy for posting. On the agenda is listed the web address for agenda and minutes.
--One Senator commented that the powerpoint presentation was helpful.

Aronson stated that information sessions will be held throughout the year. She encouraged Senators to communicate with their department. The decisions made here are important.
Helzer explained that as a new Senator, there have been times she has not had the history behind an issue, so was unable to answer questions her department had. Aronson stated that there are a lot of complex issues to deal with, so if she has questions, she may contact the Chair of the Committee sponsoring the resolution, Diana or herself.

Peterson suggested double checking with new faculty if they are getting mail. Reprographics does not get an updated faculty distribution list until late in the semester. In particular, new faculty may not have received a student evaluation form.

Aronson stated that we are trying to update Asnet so Senators can have discussions over email. Send your email address to Diana if you haven’t done so.

Savini suggested listing acronyms at the end of the minutes.

OPEN FORUM

a. Nagel announced that October 27-31 is International Campus Equity Week, recognizing the plight of contingent academic labor. This coming week he and Dan Bratten are trying to get in touch with lecturers here and on the Stockton campus. He encouraged Senators to advise lecturers in their department about this and to get in touch with them for further information.

   b. Aronson welcomed Vice President Stephens.

   c. The Provost was thanked for refreshments.
d. Carroll suggested having microphones, since it is difficult to hear everyone speak. Oppenheimer agreed, asking if the Senate Office could provide them. Bowman replied there is no money in the budget for this, but she would follow up. One possibility would be to have the Faculty Center go in on the purchase with the Senate.

e. Feldman inquired about the Add policy. There is a problem in that students can add a class without the instructor’s signature, and courses are becoming overloaded. And if a student doesn’t attend until the second or third class, the instructor does not know what has happened. He inquired if there is a policy regarding this and can it be changed. Aronson advised there is a policy.

Tan asked if there is a way to stop students from enrolling electronically by a certain date?

Cunha advised that when a student enrolls through Stan or otherwise, the computer is suppose to not enroll them if the class is full. Feldman stated the problem is when he signs an add form for a student, but the form is not filed until two or three days later. The class shows there is room, but there really is not.

Sam stated we should change the policy to read that no student can add a class after the first day of class without approval of the instructor. Feldman agreed stating once the class is closed, it is closed. O’Brien advised that Stan lets students in because it is continual.
Savini stated that prioritizing should be brought back. GE students can take a course at any level without prerequisites and that fills classes up so the majors cannot get in.

It was suggested to ask Roger Pugh to attend the next Senate meeting to answer these questions. After that, maybe draft a resolution based on input here. Feldman suggested the Senate should come up with a reasonable resolution and then let Pugh respond to it.

Cunha stated the need to have a drop box available for evenings and weekends, for those students unable to hand in forms during the day. Feldman agreed.

Feldman will take the input from this discussion and draft a resolution.

Meeting adjourned at 3:53 pm.