



FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, **October 1, 2025**, 2:00-4:00pm via Zoom

[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#)

APPROVED MINUTES

Present: Jim Murray, Lyn Scott, Stephanie Alexander, Duke Austin, Tian Zhou, Silvina Ituarte, David Fencsik, Kevin Pina, Claire Valderama-Wallace, Ekin Alakent

Guests: Mark Robinson

Absent: Jessica Weiss, Kourosh Shafi

1. Introductions
2. [Elect Secretary](#)
 - a. Thank you Stephanie
3. Approval of the agenda
 - a. Jim moves, no one objected or abstained. Agenda approved.
4. Approval of [9/17/25](#) minutes
 - a. Thank you David for taking the minutes from our last meeting.
 - b. Stephanie motioned to approve the minutes. No discussion of the minutes. No one objected or abstained. Minutes approved.
5. **Reports:**
 - a. [Report of the Chair](#) (Duke)
 - i. Two calls for Task Force representation. Duke emailed the Senate Officers for further clarifications about the task forces (why not refer this work to standing committees?) and potential tasks for those task forces. Note there is no mechanism for compensating a lecturer on a task force, but there is on standing committees. The Officers felt that the tasks for these task forces were bigger than something usually sent to a standing committee. Pina mentioned how enrollment issues are “all hands on deck” – there are cross-campus groups working/serving in support of enrollment efforts, but there is limited time and energy to go around; would like to see more lecturer representation on these types of efforts.
 - b. Report of the Presidential Appointee
 - i. October 14 3pm MPR – Faculty Award and Recognition - tenure and promotion + Outstanding Professor. Dates going out in newsletter + flyers soon.
 - ii. Sabbatical application deadline is November 3rd.
 - iii. Sophie Bloch is no longer with the university, and interviews are happening for her replacement. Staffing is thin so please be patient with Silvina’s group.

- iv. Question about if range elevation notices have gone out yet – Silvina is checking to see if they have. If the notification is delayed, the deadline will be extended. A joint range elevation workshop is usually offered after the notifications go out as well.

6. Information:

- a. [25-26 FAC Guidelines](#) (approved)
 - i. No further discussion.
- b. [25-26 FAC Priorities Ranking Poll](#) (approved)
 - i. No further discussion.

7. Appointments/Approvals

- a. Regular FAC subcommittee interest. (See [25-26 Committees](#))
 - i. Duke has reached out to all former committee members highlighted in red and is getting responses; will then put out a call for any open slots, so the committee will hold off on voting to approve until all of the slots are filled. Pina is going to work on getting a third lecturer for the lecturer committee. Discussion of needing a rep from CLASS on the RTP subcommittee, and Jim agreed to step off the RTP subcommittee and let David serve as the FAC/CSCI rep.

8. New Business:

- a. FAC Suggested Schedule Change
 - i. Meet on 10/29
 - ii. Cancel 11/5
 - iii. Meet on 11/12
 - iv. Cancel 11/19
 - v. Meet on 12/3 (already scheduled)
 - vi. Duke is suggesting modifying the FAC meeting schedule so that FAC meetings don't occur the same week as the Academic Senate meetings.
 - vii. David moved to approve the schedule change. No one objected or abstained. The motion passes by abstention, and the schedule change will be posted to the website.
- b. [25-26 FAC 1](#): Academic Dishonesty Policy (Alexander)
 - i. Committee discussed the revisions to the cover document related to the recent passage of 25-26 CIC 1 in Senate last week (9/23/25; revised 24-25 CIC 50). Pina suggested a small language change to the cover letter. There were no changes made to the policy itself.
 - ii. Jim moved to approve 25-26 FAC 1. No objections or abstentions. 25-26 FAC 1 passes.

9. Old Business

- a. [Discussion of WSCUC Notice of Concern](#) (continued)
 - i. Last meeting the committee indicated we wanted to ask Fanny Yeung to come to a future meeting. She's out of the office this week but hopefully she can attend our next meeting in two weeks.
 - ii. Duke asked if we wanted to have a portion of the discussion of this item in a closed meeting, and shared the following language in the chat:
 - 1. **Section 4: Closed Meetings** Meetings of the Committee or its sub-committees may be closed to visitors during deliberations on personnel matters. Such closure shall be determined by the Chair, who shall indicate in the published agenda whether the meeting or a portion of it is to be closed.

2. When FAC discussed BAC 3 a few years ago the committee had a couple of closed meetings and took anonymous meeting notes. Duke asked committee members to message him/let him know if they are interested in that.
 3. The committee discussed which items from the notice of concern are related/relevant for discussion in FAC. Silvina clarified that while the items may be relevant to faculty, they aren't necessarily policy items so not relevant to FAC (since the committee deals with policy). Further discussion on how the call for shared governance and planning involvement seem very pertinent to FAC and the committee's charge, as it applies to policies and shared governance. Duke mentioned that ExCom has asked each of the standing committees to review the WSCUC Notice of Concern, so we need to proceed with that task for at least one more meeting. There was a closing comment about how we would all like to move forward in a way that benefits our institution.
- b. [Discussion of 23-24 BEC 18: Voting Procedure Amendment](#)
- i. There is a Constitution Task Force being formed. This does not preclude FAC working on potential amendments. Duke and Jim volunteered for the Constitution Task Force.
 - ii. The amendment (23-24 BEC 18) would have passed if only a very small number of additional faculty (4 to 6 – if memory serves) had voted on it; even if they had all voted against it.
 - iii. Committee discussion: The current practice basically gives a de facto veto to those who don't participate - there's more power in not voting than in voting no.
 1. Can we offer yay/nay/abstain options for voting and only count the votes cast?
 2. Suggestion to have a simpler system and use the majority of votes cast? The more complicated a voting system gets the less faith people have in it. Abstentions make it more complicated.
 3. Question about what the current threshold is for participation?
 4. This is the proposed change from two years ago:
 - a. "An amendment shall be adopted by a majority vote in an election in which a majority of the Regular Members cast votes. Alternatively, if less than a majority of eligible voters cast votes, amendments may be adopted upon approval of a minimum of one-fourth (1/4) of eligible voters. University-wide elections shall have a minimum length of ten (10) academic days. The University Faculty shall not delegate the power to amend this Constitution except in *pro forma* cases provided for in Section 5 of this Article."
 5. This is the existing Amendment language:
 - a. "Amendments to the Bylaws of the University Faculty shall be made by the University Faculty by a majority vote in an election in which a majority of the Regular Members cast votes, or two-thirds (2/3) approval vote in an election in which at least one third (1/3), but less than a majority of the Regular Members cast votes, provided that the election lasts a minimum of ten (10) academic days. Approved amendments are effective immediately or on a date specified on the ballot, whichever is later."

6. Next steps: Do we try to pass the amendment again as is or change it?
 - a. Comment: Suggestion to make it a simple majority of the votes cast – though understand the desire to make it challenging to update/change a foundational document.
 - b. Comment: A simple majority can make it easier for very few people to decide changes/making important decisions – that threshold can be important.
 - c. Comment: There isn't a great barrier to voting in these cases, but people may not understand what the outcome may be and then just don't vote.
 - d. The University Elections usually happen during finals week. There's a theory that the timing of the elections may be causing some of the lack of engagement because faculty are busy.
 - e. Comment: Could extend the length of the election/window of response time to make it easier to catch more faculty/make it easier for them to vote. Another committee member seconded this idea to encourage more participation.
 - f. Questions about whether 10 academic days are two weeks? Yes, and the proposal is to make it 20 academic days or four weeks of total time for voting.
7. Duke did a straw poll to gauge interest based the four proposals:
 - a. Murray: Could we amend the voting procedure to allow for abstentions. (no straws)
 - b. Fencsik: How about a simple system: The majority of votes count. Abstentions makes it more complicated. 4 straws
 - c. **Murray: Increase minimum to 20 days. Have a way to engage in for and against arguments. 8 straws**
 - d. Austin: Keep language as BEC 18: Threshold of $\frac{1}{4}$ of eligible voters needed to pass. 4 straws
8. Committee wants to extend the voting period for sure; but comment was made about how the much longer voting period may also present challenges in the context of other deadlines earlier in the academic year. The committee also discussed how different actions taken on this issue may privilege different groups.
 - a. Questions – could we vote by department? Or could we use petition-based votes (like signing a petition to get things on a ballot?) kind of like an absentee ballot option.
 - i. From the Constitution:
 1. SECTION 4: Amendments to the Bylaws may be proposed by: A. A two-thirds (2/3) vote of approval by the Academic Senate. B. A petition of five percent (5%) of the regular faculty. C. The President of the University
9. Discussion of the history of amendments and policy changes that relate to lecturers.

10. Question about whether or not the lack of votes causing this amendment to fail has been shared broadly amongst the faculty to communicate the importance of faculty votes.
11. Another straw poll from Duke:
 - a. Fenscik: How about a simple system: The majority of votes count. Abstentions makes it more complicated. 3 straws
 - b. Austin: Keep language as BEC 18: Threshold of $\frac{1}{4}$ of eligible voters needed to pass. 5 straws
12. Duke asked if someone can take the lead on making these changes to the existing amendment procedure – increasing the voting period, and then keeping the language of BEC 18 with the $\frac{1}{4}$ threshold for voting. Pina had already agreed to lead this and will rework and update the previous document for voting at the next FAC meeting. Committee members should prepare to discuss and vote on this at the next meeting.
- c. [Discussion of 23-24 BEC 13](#): Add Lecturers to Regular Faculty for University
 - i. Tabled until a future meeting.

10. Discussion

- a. Anything for the good of the order?

11. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 3:46pm.

12. On Hold for Future Meetings

- a. [Discussion of Time, Place, and Manner Policy](#)
- b. [Discussion of 24-25 FAC 20](#): Academic Calendars 2027-2034
- c. [24-25 FAC 24](#): Policy on Emeriti Faculty
- d. [ITAC Recommendation for ExCom and Senate](#)
- e. [Draft 23-24 FAC X](#): Prohibited Consensual Relationships Policy
- f. [Discussion of FDEC Policy Guidelines](#)
- g. [Discussion of Constitution, Article II, Section 2](#): No person shall be a Regular Member of more than one Department