

B. Berkley, O. Bernal, G. T. Haight, C. Selkin, K.W. Tsai

ABSENT

T. Barkley, S. Bowman, M. Diaz, N. Koch, R. Vellanoweth

EXCUSED ABSENCE

J. T. Anagnoson convened the meeting at 1:37 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. 1.1 The Chair's Announcements:

1.1.1 During the Spring Quarter, 2003, Kevin Baaske, who serves as member-at-large of the Executive Committee, will not be on duty. In accordance with the *Constitution*, we will be electing an alternate member at next week's Senate meeting. The liaison assignment for this seat on the Executive Committee is to the Fiscal Policy Committee, which meets the second and fourth Mondays of the month from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. In addition, since no more than three voting members of the Executive Committee shall be from any one college, for this election Senators from the College of Natural and Social Sciences are not eligible. Please come to next week's meeting prepared to nominate potential candidates.

1.1.2 The University Librarian, Doug Davis, who is a member of this Senate, will be giving the State of the University Library Address next week at our meeting March 11<sup>th</sup>.

1.1.3 I am very pleased to introduce Dean Calvo, Executive Director of UAS, to present a few remarks on the state of the new UAS building.

Dean Calvo presented a report on the status of "The Golden Eagle" building. A brief question and answer period followed.

1.2 Senator Schaeffer announced: I wanted to make sure that all of you know you are invited to a memorial for Therman Swann, a staff member who passed away. This is next Wednesday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, 3:00 p.m. in Library North room B530.

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

2. 2.1 Senator Roden announced his intent to raise the following questions of the Vice President and Chief Technology Officer:

I tried sending an email from off campus. It was regarding last week's research competition, and the subject line read, "Judges Needed!!"

That email was returned as undeliverable with the message: "SMTP error from remote mailer after end of data: host calstatela.edu [130.182.1.1]:553 5.0.0 We don't appreciate exclamation marks. Resend without them if it is that important."

Later that day, I found out that the campus mail servers have a series of filters on them, and the double exclamation point was rejected. I am concerned that faculty don't know the extent of mail filters, and that the rude message that was sent could be misinterpreted by some national committees that often send me urgent emails.

My questions are:

1. Who decides what should be filtered? How is this decision made?
2. What are the types of messages that are filtered out?
3. Who decided to issue that rude response, and is a similar response made on other rejected messages?

2.2 Senator Hechler announced his intent to raise the following question of the Vice President for Administration and Finance:

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS  
(Continued)

This kind of picks up on the rude response issue; I am not sure how much of this is a question, but I will put a question mark at the end of it. Last Thursday one of our part-time faculty members came to me around 9:30a.m. He had forgotten his wallet that morning and needed a code or a key to get into a protected classroom. He called the campus police to see if they could open the room for him but they told him they couldn't help him because he needed a One-Card or a driver's license or some other form of ID - which he didn't have because he had forgotten his wallet. He asked me to go to the police office with him to vouch for his being an instructor here. I went with him. He spoke to a student who was at the desk and explained his ID situation, his inability to get into the classroom because he didn't have his One-Card, and the fact that 45 students were waiting for his class. He asked if there was anything that could be done. The student went up to a window that is not available to the general public and raised the question to someone in the back, presumably in charge. The student popped out again with a single word - "Denied." So the instructor asked: "What am I supposed to do with my class?" The answer was, "Use your own discretion." He had 45 students waiting to get into a room for class! I saw him again this morning (Tuesday), and asked him how things had turned out last Thursday. He told me he went to the office that makes the One-Cards and told them what had happened. They made him a new card. It would seem that we have one office that couldn't (wouldn't) do anything to help without an ID and another office that needs no ID.

There are secure rooms that are open all the time - some with wastebaskets jammed in the doorway, others propped open with chairs. I have a class this quarter with two doors; one has the One-Card lock and the other just has a key lock. Often the door with the key lock is unlocked, so students can just walk in if I haven't yet arrived to swipe the card.

My question is this: What kind of message is it that we send? "We don't really care about your students, we care more about maintaining the rules that have been set up?"

2.3 Senator Beer announced his intent to raise the following question of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

Of particular concern to all of us is the hiring and retention of tenure-track faculty. Hard data would assist the Senate to appreciate where problems are most severe. Can the Administration provide the Senate with a summary table showing on a department-by-department basis:

1. The number of classes taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty in Fall 2002;
2. The number of classes taught by non-tenure track faculty in Fall 2002;
3. Authorizations to hire tenure-track faculty during the 2002-2003 academic year?

2.4 Senator Dewey announced his intent to raise the following question of the Vice President for Administration and Finance:

As the size of our vehicles increase and become trucks, and obviously our driving competence does not increase accordingly, what is police policy when trucks and SUVs straddle two parking spaces? When I've left on the windshield a thoughtful but nasty admonition about getting driving lessons, if the truck is still there when I return I routinely see my note but not the parking ticket that one would expect

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3. It was m/s/p (Baaske) to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 18, 2003 (ASM 02-11).

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

4. It was m/s/p (Garcia) to approve the agenda.

AD HOC ADVISORY SELECTION  
COMMITTEE FOR THE DEAN OF  
EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES -  
ELECTION OF FOUR FACULTY  
MEMBERS

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
RECRUITMENT OF FACULTY,  
FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI  
(02-11) *First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
PERSONNEL COMMITTEES, FACULTY  
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI  
(02-12) *First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRM-  
ATIVE ACTION FACULTY HAND-  
BOOK, CHAPTER VI (02-13)  
*First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
CONSULTATION, FACULTY HAND-  
BOOK, CHAPTER VI (02-14)  
*First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
STATEMENT ON DIVERSITY AND,  
INCLUSIVITY, FACULTY HAND-  
BOOK, CHAPTER VI (02-15)  
*First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
POLICY ON NEPOTISM, FACULTY  
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (02-15)  
*First-Reading*

CSULA ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLU-  
TION ON IMPLMENTATION OF THE  
CAMPUS BUDGET (02-17)  
*First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:  
THE STUDENT OPINION SURVEY ON  
INSTRUCTION, FACULTY HAND-  
BOOK, CHAPTER V (02-10, -10.1)  
*Second-Reading*

ADJOURNMENT

5. The election was held.
6. It was m/s/ (Gutierrez) to approve the recommendation (02-11).
7. It was m/s/ (Gutierrez) to approve the recommendation (02-12).
8. It was m/s/ (Gutierrez) to approve the recommendation (02-13).
9. It was m/s/ (Gutierrez) to approve the recommendation (02-14).
10. It was m/s/ (Gutierrez) to approve the recommendation (02-15).
11. It was m/s/ (Gutierrez) to approve the recommendation (02-16).
12. It was m/s/ (Taiz) to approve the resolution (02-17).
13. It was m/s/p (Taylor) to refer the issue back to the Faculty Policy Committee to develop and test an instrument and to bring the results of the test instrument and and the test back to the Senate before we continue with this document (02-10).
14. It was m/s/p (Faust) to adjourn at 2:51 p.m.