

lecturers who might qualify for voting rights. This number is unknown, but Steven Olswang is researching it and will report to the Council.

In general discussion, Carol Landis observed that some departments (the Medical School, for example) use large numbers of lecturers for non-teaching positions – increasing the number of voting members may make it virtually impossible to achieve quorum for doing business in faculty meetings. Lack of quorum also forces email voting on pending issues, which may be in violation of the Open Meetings Act. Landis commented that the problems inherent in the varying ways lecturers are employed across campus speak to a larger issue than part-time lecturers being granted the vote.

Haley agreed, and cited governance issues as being part of this larger issue. "But behind this," he said, "is an attempt to improve the status of lecturers on campus and protect them from possible abuses." FCFA, Haley observed, can do little to forestall abuses, except to give lecturers more of a voice in the governance process. Most part-time lecturers do not want to be as involved in department matters as do full-time tenured faculty. By raising their status, however, they have more rights they can exercise if need be.

Dan Luchtel said that the closeness of the SEC vote indicates that the voting rights issue should probably be raised again. Haley agreed, and added that some SEC members who were not present said they were sorry they missed the meeting. Their comments (and arguably their votes) would have been much more positive.

Job security is a critical issue for lecturers, said Luchtel, citing a recent case where two lecturers' employment was terminated on very short notice. Haley said he had investigated that situation and found that the lecturers' appointments were not renewed as the result of a departmental vote against the recommendations for re-appointment made by the Chair." In addition, all lecturers were given official notice in November '01 that budget cuts had put their jobs in jeopardy. While job security is a valid issue, Haley said, the case of these two lecturers does not appear to be an example of abuse.

O'Neill summed up the current options with regard to part-time lecturer legislation:

- 1) If the subcommittee is to go forward, one or two new members should be appointed to replace those who have left.
- 2) Council should give some direction to the subcommittee:
 - a) Collect data, re-draft part-time lecturer legislation, and resubmit OR
 - b) Look at more comprehensive legislation for Lecturers

Alan Kirtley said the subcommittee should go forward, since the SEC vote was so close. In addition, some attention should be paid to the Lecturer legislation passed last year and how it is working. He thinks departments are applying such high standards to the new title of Principal Lecturer that it is almost impossible for anyone to achieve the title. Kirtley would like to see an official interpretation of the standards the administration is applying, then compare them with the Code and make changes as needed. Chip Haley said he has award-winning Senior Lecturers in the Business School whom he feels should be promoted to Principal Lecturer, but this has not

happened. He also feels it's worth the subcommittee's time to investigate how the new Code is being applied. Carol Green would like to see some statement in the Code as to when Lecturers are eligible for this title. Leah Ceccarelli recommended that subcommittee members be people who have experience with Lecturers in their departments. Luchtel was concerned that individual departments can (and do) unilaterally abolish all but one-year appointments for Lecturers, and thus can effectively ignore the legislation that was passed - this should be looked into.

O'Neill asked Dan Luchtel and Carol Landis to serve on the Lecturer subcommittee and to return mid-November with further information. At a minimum, Class A legislation appears to be needed to give the vote to part-time Lecturers and this should be submitted to SEC no later than March 29, 2003.

Unit Adjustment Policy

In the 2001-02 sessions, FCFA contemplated proposing Class C legislation to strengthen the commitment to Unit Adjustments for excellent departments that are seriously under-funded. Class C legislation, however, was not possible since the present commitment was made by Executive Order, which cannot be revised via legislation.

O'Neill would like to see legislation that:

- Makes explicit and public the minimum period of time when a unit can expect a review of its salaries
- Defines the connection between the Ten-Year Review and the Unit Salary Adjustment
- Establishes criteria for both.

After Debra Friedman's visit to FCFA last year, there doesn't seem to be any conflict with the administration on these points. What remains to be done is to draft legislation that makes the Ten-Year Review and its corollaries more clear.

Other Items/Subcommittee Appointments

Time being short, O'Neill suggested the Classroom Assignment policy be moved to the top of the agenda for next meeting. She will also contact Olswang and see how close he is to having data ready for a look into the Tuition Benefit Waiver issue.

Mona Lydon-Rochelle volunteered to serve on the B Salary subcommittee, Katharine Graubard volunteered to chair. Carol Green is interested in working on the collegiality issue, but (as an ex-officio member) does not think she should chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*