

**\*\*Approved\*\***  
**FC Minutes**  
**February 14, 2018**

- 1) Call to Order: meeting called to order at 3:36 p.m.
- 2) Approval of Agenda: approved.
- 3) Approval of Minutes from December 13, 2017, meeting: approved.
- 4) Reports
  - a) Dean's Report:
    - i) The college is now in the throes of hiring season, and I am encouraged by the stream of wonderful finalists I have met throughout the process.
    - ii) A sophisticated phishing scam designed to mimic a Dropbox notification email has been circulating. If you have fallen victim to the scam, contact the CLA Technical Services Office immediately.
    - iii) I am glad to report that live music has been reinstated at this spring's commencement ceremonies (new commencement coordinator might have underestimated CLA members' voice and persuasiveness). However, other recent changes to commencement, namely its time and location, will stand. I have moved the traditional 1 p.m. ceremony to 2 p.m. to better facilitate the change in attendees between the morning ceremony (9 a.m.) and the afternoon one. Additionally, the change in location from upper to lower campus solves some of the issues of securing the previous location and of accommodating attendees with disabilities. The upper campus location is more vulnerable to firearm threats, and the new site will improve accessibility, thereby mitigating the common complaints about general access and inadequate shuttle service. These changes are positive ones, even if the rollout of the changes has been imperfect. Lastly, keeping the tradition of having faculty greet students as they receive their diplomas, which I support, is being considered, and the student fee to apply for graduation has been reduced from \$45 to \$37 (a lower fee compared to other universities).
  - b) Chair's Report
    - i) Save the date for this year's CLA retreat, which is scheduled for March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018. *Question* from *Elizabeth Dahab*: Has a location for the retreat been secured? *Answer* from *Misty Jaffe*: Yes, the retreat is scheduled to take place in the Anatol Center.<sup>1</sup>
- 5) Introduction to new CLA Director of Research, Chi-Ah Chun (5 minutes)
  - a) *Comments* from *Chi-Ah Chun*: I have taken over the role of CLA Director of Research from Kim Vu, who did an excellent job in that capacity. I am here today to introduce myself, to provide information about funding opportunities, and to make a request of the faculty present. Please be aware of upcoming ORSP deadlines for two funding mechanisms: 1) The ORSP Internal Research Grant is currently accepting proposals for internal grants designed to help faculty prepare proposals for major external funding. Consideration for funding will be given to

---

<sup>1</sup> The FC Exec has since discussed the possibility of scheduling the retreat later in the semester and moving it to a different location. More information to come. [Rene H. Treviño]

discipline-specific research (single PI; potential \$10,000 award) and to multidisciplinary research (multiple PIs; potential \$15,000 award). The proposal deadline for this award is March 5, 2018. 2) Applications are now open for the ORSP Summer Student Research Assistantship (SSRA), which provides financial support during the 2018 summer intersession months for students to undertake full-time research and scholarly activities in collaboration with a faculty research mentor. Students who apply are required to submit their CVs, their transcripts, and a brief letter of recommendation, and they can submit up to two applications, only one of which can receive funding. The award amount is \$4,000 per student for 8 weeks of research activity. The deadline for applying for this funding is also March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018. There is an overall benefit to the college in having faculty and their students apply for these awards, as funding allocation is based on the percentage of applications per college. I also encourage you to consider serving as a reviewer for these awards (my office is looking for a diverse representation of CLA disciplines in its reviewers). Also, this is university-level service for junior faculty in need of such service and could help all faculty learn how to put together these applications. *Question* from *Laura Ceia* and *Araceli Gonzalez*: Can a faculty member serve as a reviewer to either award and also submit applications for them? *Answer* from *Chi-Ah Chun*: Yes. *Chi-Ah Chun* added that there is an opportunity for faculty to submit their grant proposals in progress to one of the two grant-writing workshops funded by the Chancellor's Office. Nominations to participate should be sent to *Simon Kim* (Associate Vice President, Research and Sponsored Programs). *Dean Wallace* added that he would be surprised if this opportunity was given to humanities faculty. *Eileen Klink* added that the Chancellor's Office is supporting a humanities-specific project, funded at \$441,000 and aimed at helping faculty to prepare students for advanced study.

6) New Business

- a) Election for Faculty Council Vice-Chair: *Theresa Gregor* announced the two nominated candidates, *Lynda McCroskey* (Communication Studies) and *Clorinda Donato* (Italian Studies), and made it known that nominations could be taken from the floor (no additional nominations received). *Dean Wallace* reminded the FC that the new Vice-Chair would be elected to finish out this academic year (2017-2018). *Lynda McCroskey* delivered her statement of interest, during which she stated that her goal is to reach out to and encourage junior faculty to serve on the FC. She noted that she has served actively in the FC, including in the Exec, and enjoys the work. She concluded by saying that she is very pro-CLA and that she thinks *Clorinda Donato* would be a good choice for Vice-Chair as well. *Clorinda Donato* delivered her statement of interest, during which she reciprocated the compliment, noting that *Lynda McCroskey* would also be a good choice for Vice-Chair. She then expressed her dedication to guaranteeing faculty governance, which, based on her experience in private education, she sees as one of the primary ways of improving a university. For this reason, and despite not having served as much on the FC, she would welcome the opportunity to serve on the Exec since it oversees the site of CLA governance. After paper ballots were tallied, *Clorinda Donato* was elected FC Vice-Chair by a margin of 20-19. *Marcy*

*Lascano* then announced that the next college election would elect members for the CLA Review Committee for President's Faculty Achievement Awards.

b) Forum re: CWLC proposed de-departmentalization

- i) *Comments from Dean Wallace*: Shared governance is really important, so I would like to thank people for showing up and being active during this process. This issue is complex, in part because the guiding policy, AS 95-19, is antiquated and awful. The policy, however, will go to CEPC for review and revision (*Provost Jersky* has already signed off on this action). In any case, changing the status of a department is of great import, so I did not enter into this process lightly. Be that as it may, CWLC has a history of conflict and dysfunction that needs to be resolved; for instance, this is the third time the department has an external chair, which is a reflection of the intradepartmental dysfunction. So, why the change now? There is reason to believe that the existing conflicts and dysfunctions cannot be resolved on their own. Intractable differences among TT-faculty have negatively affected the work environment for all department faculty, to the point where *Dan O'Connor* and I have seen a steady stream of faculty visiting the Dean's office to file complaints. Moreover, curriculum innovation in CWLC has ground to a halt at a time when CWL and Classics are both very dependent on GE to stay viable. More specifically, enrollment in Greek and Latin are chronically low and might not be viable much longer. I went into this process with openness and with the spirit of shared governance. I put forth draft proposals, met with faculty, and met with *Nobert Schürer* (Academic Senate Chair) about policy issues. My draft proposals did not include the mention of Classics joining RGRL: that idea came from Classics faculty. The proposal currently on the table, which is my best hope of resolving these issues, would make CWL an independent program whose FTES and number of majors would make it viable. Classics, with its fewer than 25 majors and the aforementioned enrollment issues related to Greek and Latin, would be less viable, so the best course of action would be to increase its viability by finding it a home department. One such potential home, RGRL, would be good for Classics, in terms of curriculum synergy, and for RGRL itself, which would benefit from increased FTES. Ultimately, I do not want to lose any of these programs or their components. Some, such as the single subject teaching credential in Latin, are unique in CA and therefore vital. I would like to thank *Misty Jaffe* and the AS Exec for dealing with this issue. Going forward, I could entertain a second proposal, which could be taken up at the FC's March meeting, that calls for establishing CWL and Classics as two independent programs. So why speak today in advance of the vote on the current proposal? In essence, I have to follow AS 95-19. I could withdraw my initial proposal, but I will refrain from doing so since no second proposal is on the table. I would not, however, oppose a new proposal calling for a two-program solution. *Question from Jeff Blutinger*: If the FC votes yes on a later 2-program proposal, which proposal is binding? *Answer from Dean Wallace*: That is the Provost's decision, per AS 95-19. *Question from Laura Ceia*: Who has the last word on this? *Answer from Dean Wallace*: Provost Jersky.

- ii) *Comments from Markus Muller:* I would be happy if CWL and Classics could thrive in their present state as a joint department. As department chair of RGRLL, though, I am obligated to look at the potential benefits and pitfalls of this merger for all concerned parties. I am not trying to convince you to vote in any particular fashion, but I would remind you that RGRLL is a merged department itself (from the early 1990s). I do, therefore, believe there is a potential for curriculum synergy between Classics and RGRLL. I also believe that Classics would be a good compliment for RGRLL in terms of GE FTES since RGRLL does not offer large GE courses. Moreover, RGRLL houses the World Languages Single Subject Teaching Credential Program, so Classics' Latin credential program would fit in. Overall, RGRLL could provide a larger, viable umbrella department for Classics faculty. On the other hand, unresolved issues related to lecturer entitlements make the merger problematic. The Dean's office, CFA, and the departments themselves can work to resolve these issues, however. Ultimately, if this merger goes forward, we all could benefit from a detailed transition plan and from protected status for affected programs.
- iii) *Comments from Paul Scotton:* I have few new remarks today since I have stated my position in my formal response to the Dean's proposal. Essentially, my contention with the proposal is procedural. RGRLL and CWLC were each given a single ballot for a single-option process. The result from CWLC was a 12-8 aggregate vote in favor of the proposal, but Classics faculty has not been able to express their preference on whether or not to split from CWL *and* on where to end up after a potential split. Likewise, RGRLL voted on one ballot whether or not to admit Classics faculty into their department *and* on whether or not to split CWLC. On the point of curriculum, students who minor in Ancient Studies can now emphasize in classic archeology, so CWLC has been active in curriculum development. Also, the decline in Greek and Latin enrollments is not unique to CSULB; it is a nationwide trend caused by universities doing away with language requirements. Although there is not one specific solution to this problem, CWLC has implemented its own strategy to combat it. Moreover, there is no real curriculum synergy between RGRLL and CWLC. No one here has ill will; this is simply a difference of opinion. *Follow up from Misty Jaffe:* With respect to future proposals, a disaggregated vote is possible. If resulting vote totals are not overwhelming in one direction, a further disaggregated vote is possible as well.
- iv) *Comment from Misty Jaffe* in response to a comment on this point from *Eileen Klink:* AS 95-19 has been referred to the Academic Senate to be rewritten, and the CEPC is undertaking the writing of formal policy on programs. AS 95-19, though, can be interpreted at the moment to apply to the formation/dissolution of a program, so the policy can also be interpreted to provide programs with the same protections afforded to departments. This issue of protections for programs could be resolved by the AS Exec or by Provost Jersky in an MOU. *Comment from Dmitrii Sidorov:* We need to consider, from the perspective of the Russian program, the potentially harmful consequences of allowing into RGRLL an influx of Classics students studying Greek. *Response from Markus*

*Muller*: I am not sure if implementing the merger will automatically create such negative consequences. *Question from Laura Ceia*: Would department lecturers affected by the merger face lesser protections as part of a program? *Response from Dean Wallace*: Protections are not guaranteed for programs under current AS policy, but it has been college policy to treat lecturer entitlements in programs as we do those in departments. Provost Jersky is willing to write an MOU in support of this college practice, but AS policy would have to catch up to it. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: We should keep in mind that the proposal on the table does not include such an MOU. *Comment from Paul Scotton*: lecturer entitlements could be imperiled by the merger, which would create a larger pool of graduate assistants and lecturers in a single department (GA entitlements could conflict with those of lecturers in some cases). Future department contractions could negatively impact lecturer entitlements as well. *Response from Dean Wallace*: GA entitlements constitute a single aspect of how we determine the order of work assignments. The college also considers what faculty normally teach and the degrees they hold. In the last round of cuts, only one entitlement was not met.

- v) *Comment from Kathryn Chew* [on speaker list established before the meeting]: It is terrible to be in limbo with respect to the current proposal. I have seen problems arise alongside the change in management in CWLC, and I am worried about the health of Comp Lit, especially about it losing courses and being cannibalized in favor of Classics. The proposed split needs to happen to mitigate harm. *Comment from Vlatka Velcic* [on speaker list established before the meeting]: I am speaking in order to urge you to respect the CWLC faculty vote in your deliberations. The department is facing a unique situation with many extenuating circumstances that need timely resolution. I was hired in CWLC department in 2001 and was promoted to full professor in 2011. This information is relevant because from the moment I was hired in CWLC it was obvious that the working atmosphere in the Department is very difficult, to say the least. I am talking about a uniquely hostile situation that predates most of the people currently working in the department. We are talking about decades of silence and sweeping things under the carpet hoping that the situation will get better and that reason will prevail. I am proud of my CWLC faculty who have found courage to vote for the split and the Dean's proposal despite their reasonable fear of retaliation (because the vast majority of them are lecturers). The Dean's proposal on the table is fair, but I worry about the wheeling and dealing happening after the vote. The Faculty Council has a proposal on the table that is dealing not with abstract rights but with a unique situation with many extenuating circumstances that needs a timely resolution now. In casting your vote please do not forget that CWLC has voted by a clear majority for the split, and that we need a resolution this semester. [Prior to speaking, *Vlatka Velcic* requested to pass around a handout that included excerpts from the completed 2010 and from the partially completed 2017 CWLC external review. On the basis of the former being a completed review (and therefore public information) and the latter coming from an incomplete review and reflecting the writing of a single reviewer, the Exec did not allow

for the handout to be disseminated. However, excerpts from the 2010 evaluation are provided below following the official minutes.] *Comment* from *Clorinda Donato*: I am heartened to hear of the potential for a second proposal that would establish two separate programs. I am disturbed, however, by the fact that the current proposal would only grant one part of CWLC the privilege of being a stand-alone program. Keep in mind that RGRLL voted a resounding no to the current proposal and that *Dmitrii Sidorov*'s point stands: the Russian program could be negatively affected by an influx of language students from Classics; besides, the merger will not automatically lead to an increase in enrollment above the viability threshold. Also, it is still unknown how the implementation of EO changes will affect existing departments/programs, let alone new ones. Lastly, Classics has not been able to vote on a new chair, and an election for a new chair should be held.

- vi) Written comment from pre-meeting Google poll: "The central reason offered for thinking that Classics should be subsumed within RGRLL is that 'there are disciplinary connections between Classics and RGRLL, both of which 'share a concern for teaching language, culture, and literature.' Yet, those same disciplinary connections also hold, and possibly hold more strongly in some cases, for departments such as History, Philosophy, Religious Studies, and at least one or two or three others. Were each of these other departments queried or consulted, the outcome of which was negative? If not, is there some other reason, other than the one cited above, that favors RGRLL? As a former Classics minor myself, I hasten to add that, not only does 'language, culture, and literature' too narrowly define the subject matter of Classics, but that any argument which leaves Classics to rest upon the study of Greek and Latin languages would itself rest on a fallacious misunderstanding of the very subject matter of that otherwise autonomous discipline."
- vii) *Question* from *Corey Wright*: Has an answer been provided to the question posed in the pre-meeting Google poll? *Answer* from *Paul Scotton*: It is my understanding that an informal proposal for Classics to join the History department was met with a resounding no. Keep in mind that the supposed shared concern—"language, culture, and literature"—is one aspect of Classics, which is more than teaching Greek and Latin, and that no concrete curriculum idea has been developed to justify the stated shared concern between Classics and RGRLL. *Question* from *Adam Kahn*: What is the preference of Classics faculty in all of this? *Answer* from *Paul Scotton*: I cannot speak for all faculty, but my sense is that Classics faculty would prefer to become an independent program, and such a move would be justified since Classics brings in more FTES than some other CLA programs and departments. *Comment* from *Elizabeth Dahab*: A merger between RGRLL and Classics would be dangerous at best. RGRLL has its own issues, which would be exacerbated by a merger. I would prefer to maintain department status, but issues have come to a head recently that warrant a split. Classics becoming an independent program, rather than joining RGRLL, is the best of two bad scenarios. It would mean a demotion of sorts for Classics faculty since programs are not regarded as highly as departments in academia at large.

*Question from Emily Berquist and Amy Wax: Can Classics faculty vote on whether or not to split and on where to go? Answer from Misty Jaffe: No, the upcoming vote is on Dean Wallace's initial proposal, which presents as a package the CWLC split and RGRLL receiving Classics faculty. Comment from Eileen Klink: Whereas departments are guaranteed certain protections by Academic Senate policy, the same cannot be said at the moment for programs. This raises the question of what happens to faculty if a 2-program solution fails; where will they go? We therefore need to be aware that we are setting a precedent for future actions of this kind. Comment from Jeff Blutinger: As the director of the smallest and youngest program (Jewish Studies, established 2005), I can say that programs can be as viable and visible as departments: they are no less real than departments. Response from Kimberly Walters: Coming from International Studies, this is true, but programs are dependent on the good will of the CLA Dean at any given time. Comment from Gabriel Estrada: I would be interested in learning more about this process, contributing to a CWL curriculum (since I have a degree in Comp Lit), and I offer my support for a 2-program solution. Comment from M. Keith Claybrook: Keep in mind that our actions here will set a precedent for future personnel and procedural actions. Question from Theresa Gregor: If a 2-program solution is implemented, could the programs later apply for department status? Answer from Rene H. Treviño: Yes, but that would involve the monumental task of building up Tenure-Track faculty in order to meet faculty criteria for department status. Question from Carol Zitzer-Comfort: Will we be voting on the Dean's initial proposal now? Answer from Misty Jaffe: No, we will conduct an online vote shortly after the meeting. Question from Katherine McLoone: Is this upcoming vote related to a potential 2-program solution? Answer from Misty Jaffe: No, but the FC could recommend that, or an alternate, solution in its recommendation letter to the Provost. [A discussion about presenting a motion to vote on a 2-program solution ensued but did not come to a vote.]*

7) Adjournment: meeting adjourned at 5:27pm.

*Minutes by Rene H. Treviño, FC Secretary  
Rene.Trevino@csulb.edu*

### **Additional Information Re: CWLC**

#### 1. Questions from Google Poll

- a. "From FC member with no personal stake: At the last FC meeting, Paul Scotton mentioned that the Classics faculty was nearly unanimous against the proposal (and he could provide documentation of this). Misty said this was irrelevant since our charge is to CWLC as a department and not CWL and Classics as separate entities. I can support that argument. However, I do feel this is relevant to our charge for RGRLL. If this proposal were to go through, RGRLL, which is already opposed to the proposal, would have to subsume

faculty who do not want to be relocated. I acknowledge that it sounds like the CWLC situation is untenable, but relocating Classics to RGRLL does not appear the right solution. Normally, I would suggest separating CWLC into two separate programs and not involving RGRLL, but I would assume this would put Classics's whole existence in jeopardy. Are there any viable alternatives, or is the only option other than relocating Classics to RGRLL keeping CWLC intact as is?"

- b. "Dean spoke about MOUs, in case this happens. How is this ensured as a part of the process? Is this guaranteed by either the Dean, the Academic Senate, the Provost?"

2. Pros/Cons list generated during meeting discussion

a. Pros

- i. Need to split the department (x3)
- ii. Either proposal is fine
- iii. Dean's Proposal is fine
- iv. Complete the process asap (x3)

b. Cons

- i. The split gives one part of the dept their own program, the other must join RGRLL
- ii. Russian could be jeopardized by the dean's proposal
- iii. Pro new proposal (reject the dean's proposal and accept the next proposal to split the department into two programs [but this has not been officially proposed yet] (x4)
- iv. Lack of consultation w/faculty
- v. Lack of consultation with other synergetic departments?
- vi. The cultural archaeology portion may not fit new 'home'
- vii. Not a good fit with RGRLL
- viii. Faculty won't have a home in a dept so if the program fails, they will not have a home
- ix. Sets a precedent for everyone else at CSULB (x3)
- x. Program status is vulnerable to the good will of the dean at the time

3. Full comments and selections from handout from Vlatka Velcic:

- a. "I want to thank CLA faculty council and Misty for dealing with this issue in a timely manner and listening to all voices. I have brought a handout that's on the table with external evaluator's comments from our last two self-studies that can frame the Dean's proposal and create a context. I would like this document to be in the Faculty Council minutes. I am speaking in order to urge you to respect the CWLC faculty vote in your deliberations. The department is facing a unique situation with many extenuating circumstances that need timely resolution. I was hired in CWLC department in 2001 and was promoted to full professor in 2011. Before that I taught at 3 other universities as lecturer and TT faculty. This information is relevant because from the moment I was hired in CWLC it was obvious that the working atmosphere in the Department is very difficult, to say the least. I am talking about a uniquely hostile situation that predates most of the people currently working in the department. The last two external reviews (2010 and 2017) pointed out

tensions, stress, and the anxiety of the faculty how this affects the working atmosphere. We are talking about decades of silence and sweeping things under the carpet hoping that the situation will get better and that reason will prevail. These things are still happening. Last week was a public incident; this week, there are on-going disagreements. It is demoralizing for the majority of faculty. I am proud of my CWLC faculty who have found courage to vote for the split and the Dean's proposal despite their reasonable fear of retaliation (because vast majority of them are lecturers). They saw through the fearmongering, deceptive arguments, and mud-slinging, hypocrisy, and they resisted very direct pressure (you should have seen some of the emails). They were brave, and saw that the only way forward is to part ways and start working towards the future. Speaking now as a Comparative Literature Professor, I can say that we (TTs and Lectures) want to continue working with students and improve our curriculum (which was praised by the external reviewer), as well as to cooperate with other BA programs and departments in the college. The Dean's proposal on the table is fair. Rather than somehow subverting the Faculty will, the Dean is the first administrator who finally listened to our voices and decided to do something about the situation. Since the vote, there has been much wheeling and dealing, talking about policies, and grandstanding about faculty rights. I am all for faculty rights and writing great policies that are supportive of smaller programs. However, those are long term projects and battles. The Faculty Council has a proposal on the table that is dealing not with abstract rights but with a unique situation with many extenuating circumstances that needs a timely resolution now. In casting your vote please do not forget that CWLC has voted by a clear majority for the split, and that we need a resolution this semester. Help the process to continue. There is some talk about making us vote again; please do not do this—it will just lead to another round of bullying and harassment. We have voted.”

**b. External Evaluation Excerpts from CWLC Self-Studies in 2010 and 2017<sup>2</sup>**  
From 2010 External Evaluation:

“The Department of Comparative Literature at CSULB was created in 1966. Classics left its previous affiliation with Romance, German, Russian Languages and Literatures to join Comparative Literature in 1988.” (p.1)

“The union between Comparative World Literature and Classics has succeeded at times, especially when presided over by a chair well versed in both disciplines, but has more often been fraught with tension and, on a few occasions, demonstrations of overt hostility.” (p. 1)

Recommendation # 1: “Allow Classics to join RGRLL, as three of its tenured members proposed to us.” (p.6)

---

<sup>2</sup> Only the excerpts from the 2010 review will be provided here, as they come from a completed review and are therefore public information. The 2017 excerpts will not be included here because they reflect the writing of a single reviewer and come from a partially completed evaluation. [Rene H. Treviño]

