Memorandum

Date: December 1, 2017

From: Cal Poly Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

To: Dustin Stegner (chair, Academic Senate), Academic Senate Executive Committee, Gladys Gregory (Academic Senate ASC)

Subject: Senate rules for resolutions with attachments

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee met November 17 and December 1, 2017, and at those meetings discussed the actions on the Senate floor on November 14 consisting of an effort to amend a resolution in such a way as to replace an attachment the resolution would have endorsed with a different attachment. That effort failed by a wide margin. The discussion on the Senate floor about this effort to replace an attachment to a resolution clearly revealed at least the following:

- Some Senate committee members and chairs strongly rely on the expectation that attachments to resolutions are protected from amendment by Senators on the Senate floor.
- Established Senate procedures concerning first and second reading, and engagement with attachments to resolutions are not sufficiently clear to many Senators.
- Senators want clearly formalized procedures.

One point made during and after this discussion was that the procedure of protecting attachments to resolutions from being deleted and replaced by amendment of the resolution by Senators (and thereby keeping attachments the property of the proposers of the resolution) is not a formal rule but instead a well-established Senate practice.

In light of these considerations, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate revisit section V, part D of the bylaws of the Academic Senate and determine whether the rules governing second reading of resolutions with attachments are sufficiently clear:

Second reading: the motion to adopt a resolution must be moved and seconded before debate ensues. It then belongs to the body and may be amended. Documents attached to a resolution are not amendable.

It may be that these rules are too thin, and in need of more robust definition of terms and articulation of procedure. We leave that determination to the Executive Committee with the general suggestion that clear description of the process of engagement with resolutions, including clear definitions of what counts as a document attached to a resolution helps smooth Senate processes and allows for more productive debate of controversial topics brought forth from Senate committees.

FAC can assist in drafting or provide feedback on any draft of a revision to this portion of the Senate bylaws.

Please feel free to distribute this memo to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and to any other interested parties.
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
December 1, 2017
Minutes

Attendees:
Acad Pers       Albert Liddicoat (ex officio, voting)
CAFES          Elvis Qenani
CENG           Hugh Smith
CLA            D. Kenneth Brown (chair)
CSM            Pat M. Fidopiastis
OCOB          Eduardo Zambrano
PCS            Brett Bodemer

Absent:
ASI            Harrison Tucker (ex officio, voting)
CAED           Gary Clay
Senate Chair  Dustin Stegner (ex officio, non-voting)

1) Charges:
   1) Discuss the publication of grade distribution data. Winter-Spring 2018
   2) Review college process for transitions between program chairs and programs heads and report to the Academic Senate. Academic year 2017-2018
   3) Commence university-level faculty personnel policies development. Fall 2017
   4) Update university-level personnel policies document. Academic year 2017-2018
   5) Work with Academic Personnel on electronic WPAF and work flow. Winter – Spring 2018

2) Reports
   a) Lecturer vote on chair/head (AI)
      i) AI explained the background and meaning of the establishment of the requirement that 12.12 lecturers participate in departmental voting procedures for determining departmental recommendation to deans for appointment of department chairs.
      1) “12.12 lecturers” refers to article 12 section 12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and covers lecturers with 6 years of continuous employment who are eligible for 3 year contracts.
      2) Such lecturers are by this new agreement considered faculty eligible to vote in departmental processes for determining departmental recommendations to deans for department chair appointments.
      ii) The chancellor’s office required that such matters be handled at the individual campuses rather than across the system.
      iii) AI explained that the issue with including lecturers in such departmental decisions is mainly concentrated in CLA
      iv) Ken asked if AI could arrange with the CLA Dean to visit with CLA chairs to discuss this issue with them, and AI agreed.
   b) Student evaluation of teaching reports
      i) Senate wants regular reports
      ii) Ken asked AI if his staff could assemble data into the same form as what Ken presented to the Senate earlier in fall.
      iii) AI said yes.
      iv) Also, we discussed briefly the new Portal notification to students of courses to be evaluated and for faculty to see in real time their response rates.

3) Criteria for Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students for 2018-19
   a) We need to update the policies for this program.
b) One issue: should students be invited through ASI to join the committee that recommends the assigned time?
   i) No student has ever done so
   ii) We discussed this and agreed that students should continue to be invited even if none wish to exercise this right.

c) Ken suggested that the policies should be rendered more date neutral since this program is now being renewed for a fourth and fifth year, and may well continue into the next contract cycle.

d) Ken asked if FAC members would be happy having him work with AI to formulate these revisions, and all the present FAC members agreed.

4) Memo to Ex Com on revising Senate bylaws concerning attachments to resolutions
   a) Ken explained the issue behind the memo concerning Senate procedures about attachments to resolutions.
   b) FAC makes regular use of attachments
   c) Senate bylaws are a bit fuzzy about the exact limits concerning revisions to resolutions containing attachments
      i) The actions in the Senate on 11/14 to amend a resolution to replace an attachment with another different attachment.
      ii) Neither Robert’s Rules nor our Senate bylaws explicitly limits such action
      iii) The Senate Chair (Dustin Stegner) wants to work with FAC to help clarify the Senate bylaws.
   d) We discussed this and agreed that Ken will work with Dustin to draft such bylaws and run them by FAC before having the Ex Com consider sending them to the full Senate.
   e) The goal is to formalize clear procedure to restrict editing of attachments or deletion of attachments to those who proposed the resolution. Senate actions to address attachments that seem problematic include tabling the resolution or voting it down.
   f) We discussed the memo, which needed some updating given new information about Senate procedures.
      i) Ken updated the memo, and it is attached. He will send it to Dustin Stegner at the end of the quarter.

5) Discuss UFPPP
   a) We discussed the status of the UFPPP.
   b) Ken and AI will get on agenda for Dean’s Council and Associate Dean’s Council to present the overall project of creating the UFPPP
   c) Next steps
      i) Ken and AI will meet just prior to Winter quarter to go over all the comments FAC has provided and revise the UFPPP accordingly.

6) Chair of FAC in 2018-2019
   a) Ken discussed his status as chair of FAC
      i) Termed out of the committee at the end of this academic year.
      ii) Senate leadership can reappoint Ken as chair despite being termed out (they have done this for the Sustainability Committee, for instance)
         1) If so, another representative from CLA would be sought to have voting rights and Ken would chair without voting rights.
   b) Ken is contemplating this option, and the members of FAC in attendance endorsed this idea.
      i) Ultimately, the decision rests wholly with the Senate Ex Com

7) Meeting schedule for Winter—default: Thursday, 2:10 – 3:30
   a) Choose: 1/11, 1/18, 1/25, 2/1, 2/8, 2/15, 2/22, 3/1, 3/8, 3/15
b) All dates will be put on the calendar. Committee members should accept or decline according to their own schedule.

8) Adjourn.
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