R. Garcia convened the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

1. The Chair’s Announcements:

   1.1 Distributed today at the back of the room are two documents, 05-1.1, an amendment to the RTP document prepared by Senator Cleman replacing the document distributed last week, and a document from Senator Hunt that is not numbered but will be numbered 05-1.2.

   1.2 I am pleased to report that Stephanie Nelson, Department of Technology, has agreed to serve as an alternate for Jennifer Faust on the Intercollegiate Athletics Board for the Fall Quarter, 2005.

   1.3 Once again, I would like to encourage anyone who has not already done so to register for the Faculty Retreat that will be held on November 4th at the Westin Pasadena.

2. Senator Dewey announced: The Emeriti Association at CSULA has already sent out to all Emeriti a recommendation for a “no” vote on propositions 75 and 76. The Statewide Emeriti and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) last Saturday passed resolutions urging their members to vote “no” on propositions 74, 75, 76 and 78 and just to show that we are not entirely negative, a recommendation for a positive vote on 79. This is a point where you should look to your elders for leadership.

2.1 Senator Klein announced his intent to raise the following question of Steven Garcia, Vice President for Administration and Finance:

   In these times of shrinking resources, faculty, department chairs and deans across the University are working feverishly to manage resources so that both the department and the students will continue to flourish during these lean times. As such, it is intolerable that reports on the status of our UAS accounts, including a regular accounting of balances, deposits and expenditures, haven’t been sent to the account holders on any regular basis for well over a year. My question is, how are we supposed to manage our fiscal responsibilities without regular and ongoing fiscal information emanating from the offices under your direction? While realizing that some of this problem will undoubtedly be attributed to our ongoing and painful transition to PeopleSoft, how about devising some interim procedures that will allow all needed parties to receive a regular accounting of their account activities?

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

   I believe we are now entering the third year with no Center for Effective Teaching and Learning director and no effective Center operating, aside from the technology help available through FITSC, recently renamed e-Learning Programs and Support or ELPS.

   I was reading a copy of the Senate newsletter from Cal State Fullerton, and there was an article about faculty who have left the campus to accept another job. Many of the points were as predictable as such a survey would be on our campus - that is, the salaries were too low and the housing prices were too high - but there was a point of some interest - I quote: “Existing faculty commended the types and level of technical and computer support faculty receive here and specifically mentioned the Faculty Development Center and its staff as being of great help to them.”
Last year a small committee composed of myself, Ethan Lipton, and Marilyn Elkins recommended that our CETL center be reconstituted as a Center for Faculty Development, specifically to do more than just help people with their computer problems. We are the only campus in the CSU that, faced with the budget problems of the last 3 years, chose to abolish its Center for Effective Teaching and Learning, and I think we are missing something because of it.

Could we please know what the administration's plan is for reconstituting the Center, or have they decided that we are somehow the only campus in the system that does not need a faculty director for faculty development?

3. It was m/s/p (Koch) to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 11, 2005 (ASM 05-3).

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

5. Lillian Taiz, Vice President CFA and Chapter President CFA-LA, presented a PowerPoint presentation on propositions 75 and 76.

6.1 It was m/s/ (Koch) to amend page 2 of document 05-1 by inserting the following language after line 29: A SUMMARY STATEMENT SHALL BE USED TO SUMMARIZE AND INDIVIDUAL’S PERFORMANCE IN EACH CATEGORY AT ALL LEVELS OF REVIEW. THE SUMMARY STATEMENT, PURSUANT TO CONTRACT LANGUAGE, SHALL READ AS FOLLOWS: THE COMMITTEE FINDS PERFORMANCE IN THIS CATEGORY TO BE: ☐ SATISFACTORY OR BETTER ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

6.2 It was m/s/p (Anagnoson) to close debate on the Koch amendment.

6.3 The Koch amendment was approved.

6.4 It was m/s/p (Dewey) to amend line 7, on page 2 of document 05-1 by deleting the words at least the promise of and inserting the words POTENTIAL FOR.

6.5 It was m/s/p (Hunt) to amend line 10 on page 2 of document 05-1 by deleting the word appropriate.

6.6 It was m/s/f (LaPolt) to reconsider the Koch motion.

6.7 It was m/s/ (Hunt) to approve document 05-1.2 as an amendment to page 3 of document 05-1, replacing the language on lines 19 through 40.

6.8 It was m/s/p (Zepeda) to continue this item on the agenda as a second-reading item next week.

6.9 It was m/s/p (Baaske) to close debate on the Hunt amendment.

6.10 The Hunt amendment failed.

7. It was m/s/p (Koch) to adjourn at 3:11 p.m.