Minutes of the FSEC Meeting, May 6, 2011

Members present: Jerry Saviano, Rob Edmondson, Evelyn Green, Steven Chu, Vern Takebayashi, Karen Hastings, Jean Maslowski, Judy Sokei, Mike Rota, Shioko Yonezawa, Diane Caufield, Ross Egloria, Sally Dunan, Jeff Stearns

Guests: Eric Shaffer, Sam Rhoads, Cynthia Smith, Irene Mesina, Preshess Willets-Vaquilar

Minutes prepared by: Jeff Stearns

Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Judy Sokei requested that the minutes add the phrasing: “It was explained that a tabled motion may not be discussed until it is removed from the table and must stay off the table.” The members voted to approve the minutes with the change included.

Recognition of Sam Rhoads

Jerry Saviano distributed to the committee a resolution recognizing Sam Rhoads for his contributions to the FSEC and HCC. Sam is retiring. Jerry said the resolution honors Sam who was an “inspiration to students and faculty.” The FSEC members unanimously approved the resolution.

Campus Reorganization

The committee began discussion of the campus reorganization. A diagram of the organization changes was distributed to the committee, which Jerry Saviano said was a draft put together from an informal discussion with Erika Lacro.

Mike Rota noted that the Tech Users Advisory Group (TUAG) was discussing the idea of consolidating technical services under a single position, and the diagram distributed to the FSEC of the new organization did not reflect that proposal. The TUAG proposal would put the IT group under the Dean of Academic Planning and Services.

This change in the structure of technical support would add a new executive position. Mike said that adding a new executive position would be nearly impossible to get approved, and HCC would have to make the best use of current positions.

Vern Takebayashi distributed a document outlining his concerns about the TUAG discussion of the reorganization of technical services. One concern was whether the campus staff and students would buy into the changes in computer services. Other issues involved the problem of predicting the needs for campus hardware and software, and the loss of synergy of the Information Technology Center (ITC) and PCATT (Pacific Center for Advanced Technical Training).

There was some committee discussion about the job-protection and authority of the new proposed position. Sam Rhoads and others brought up the issues that the leader might have less authority in discussions with the administration without having a faculty status and that the position may not be permanent if the new technical services leader were given an APT instead of a faculty position. Mike said that after two years an APT position has job security anyway, so after two years it would not be an issue.

Mike reiterated that the new technical position cannot be a new approved position, but one that must come from “fixed resources.”
Sam and others voiced opinions that with the organization not clear, it was too early for the FSEC to make a decision on reorganization. Jerry stated too that under the lack of clarity about the reorganization (which awaits a decision by the TUAG) the FSEC would not be ready to issue an endorsement or non-endorsement.

Asked about the timing of the reorganization, Mike said discussions, including those with the unions, would continue into the fall, but he would like to wrap everything up by then.

Before the discussion ended, Irene Mesina noted that the current organization chart on the intranet was dated 2006 and called for an update of the chart before resuming further discussions about the reorganization.

**Proposed Changes to the Senate Constitution and FSEC Charter**

Jerry Saviano said that some of the proposed changes to the Senate Constitution would update the charter to read “approval by the Chancellor” instead of “approval by the Provost,” and include a statement that the FSEC meetings would follow Robert’s Rules of Order. A further change would relax the approval of a revised constitution to a majority vote instead of two-thirds.

The discussion then focused on whether the charter should state that lecturers be representatives of the FSEC and on the requirements for lecturers to be representatives. A sticking point was the phrase “faculty included in the collective bargaining unit,” which would include only lecturers with a certain class load and be problematic because lecturer class loads usually change from semester to semester.

Judy Sokei said that the FSEC should have lecturers represented, but noted that it was hard to find those willing to be on the committee with appropriate course loads. She noted the issue that some might be able to serve a semester but might not teach enough credits the next. They also might not be willing to be on the committee the following semesters.

Mike Rota said that one way to get around the issue would be to eliminate the contentious phrase and put the operational details in an attached appendix, which could be easily modified without a constitutional change.

It was proposed that “included in the collective bargaining unit” be eliminated, leaving the phrase to read that FSEG members would be “faculty.” The change would then include lecturers not teaching enough classes. Sally Duncan noted that all faculty are members of the Senate.

Jerry motioned that the revised constitution be submitted to the faculty for a vote. Vern Takebayashi seconded the motion, but suggested before the vote that the proposed revisions of the constitution be highlighted so faculty would know what they were voting for. The motion to submit the constitution for a faculty vote carried.

**Ranking of FSEC Budgeting Priorities**

(The results of this discussion were issued separately by Jerry Saviano.)
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