

**\*\*Draft\*\***

**Faculty Council Minutes  
March 14, 2018**

- 1) Call to Order: meeting called to order at 3:40p.m.
- 2) Approval of Agenda: approved.
- 3) Approval of Minutes from February 14, 2018, Meeting: approved.
- 4) Reports
  - a) Dean's Report
    - i) Announcements will be circulated soon about candidates for the position of Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate Studies (position formerly held by *Cecile Lindsay* and currently held by *Jody Cormack* in the interim). This is an important position to CLA, so I encourage you to visit with candidates when the time comes.
    - ii) There have been some really exciting developments with respect to philanthropic gifts dedicated to creating new centers of study for CLA. More news on that front is forthcoming.
    - iii) Hiring season is winding down. Most search committees are finding themselves in the position of selecting from among their second round of finalists. This is a common issue in the college, as we are competing for excellent candidates with R1 institutions. Although this makes the process difficult for search committees, it often leads to hiring candidates that fit very well within their respective departments. *Dan O'Connor* and I have had the pleasure of interviewing such great candidates.
    - iv) Parking seems to have gotten worse in the recent weeks. Several campus projects, including in parking lots, have been completed or are now underway. Both elevators in the McIntosh Building are now fully operational and refurbished. I am hopeful that they will operate safely and consistently in the future. The Psychology building, on the other hand, has had one of its windows broken out and has an exterior part of the building cordoned off with caution tape. For a short-term fix, film will be placed on the inside of the remaining windows that will keep glass, in the event of a break, from shattering and falling to the exterior of the building. The long-term remedy is to replace the windows. This is one of many existing facilities concerns, but I am impressed with the work performed by the facilities crew once they do take action. On a related note, *Chris Burnett* (CLA Facilities Director) has a visiting appointment in China for a few months, so you should send your facilities requests to *Terie Bostic*, who is next in the chain of command.  
*Question from Jeff Blutinger:* When does Chris's time in China begin?  
*Answer from Dean Wallace:* Immediately, so he might have limited access to communication going forward. *Comment from Jeff Blutinger:* *Tony Malagrino* informed the History department that the FO2 building is unsafe at the moment. The first-floor windows are failing and cannot be replaced without addressing the asbestos-laden caulking that holds them in place. The possible presence of mold is being investigated as well. Fixes are on the horizon,

though, and will be implemented in stages. *Question from Lynda McCroskey:* Are there any updates about the fire that broke out in the Engineering building? *Answer from Dean Wallace:* Administration has been fairly close-mouthed on this, but the event, which was likely caused by human error, was quickly contained.

- v) With the recent distressing news concerning the reduced CSU budget, I encourage you to advocate in any way possible on behalf of increasing our funding. I would also encourage you to learn more about the issues at hand by attending one of the two upcoming Budget Roadshows [Monday, March 19, 1-2 p.m. in BAAC-223 and Wednesday, April 4, 3-4 p.m. in BAAC-223]. *Question from Kevin Johnson:* Any idea of how the reduced budget will affect CLA? *Answer from Dean Wallace:* I have not yet heard any specifics, but fewer TT-faculty hires university-wide is a possibility, as is the possibility of no TT hires in the college in the immediate future. The college does not want to cut courses, which will be a disservice to students, so a hiring freeze is possible (but I do not want to entertain this possibility). *Question from Kevin Johnson:* Have there been any discussions about increasing enrollment in order to offset the budget reduction? *Answer from Dean Wallace:* Yes, the result of which is a plan to increase enrollment over last year by 1000 students (500 additional first-year and 500 additional transfer). *Question from Kevin Johnson:* Does this increase, given the recent dip in enrollment, put us back where we once were? *Answer from Dean Wallace:* There are no clear answers here because of complicating factors of FTES, the student enrollment cap, and changing instructional costs. Some of this, though, introduces flexibility that can work in our favor. *Comment from Eileen Klink:* The statewide Academic Senate, along with the CFA, has been mounting a large advocacy campaign in favor of an increased budget. We are wedged, though, between the UC system and K-14, both of which receive more priority when it comes to funding. *Comment from Dean Wallace:* Arguments have been made that the CSU can handle more students, so we will likely be made to accommodate more and more students, even in the face of the bleak budget situation. *Comment from Kevin Johnson:* According to the university's master plan, we have reached our student limit, so our options will be to increase our numbers of hybrid/online courses or to revisit our master plan.
- vi) *Question from Misty Jaffe:* Are there any updates with respect to the CLA Thematic Initiative "Understanding Borders"? *Answer from Dean Wallace:* I know that faculty have volunteered to participate in this initiative, but I have not checked in recently with *Dan O'Connor* on this point. *Comment from Clorinda Donato:* I am currently participating in the initiative. A committee was formed last semester, but we have yet to meet this semester. *Comment from Dean Wallace:* This is a 2-year thematic cycle funded by endowed funds from former CLA Dean Dee Abrahamse. I will update the FC on the progress of this initiative in the future.
- b) Chair's Report
- i) We originally scheduled the CLA retreat on Friday, March 23, because that was the only Friday in the semester that the Anatol Center was available. In

our FC Exec meeting last week, we agreed that the Friday before Spring Break was far from ideal and also learned that the Chart Room has opened up at night and offers good prices/set up for events. So, we have decided to reschedule the retreat for Friday, APRIL 27, from 2:30-7pm in the Chart Room. It will end with a wine & cheese (as well as other buffet items) reception at 6pm. This meeting will also serve as our General Faculty Meeting of the year. The reschedule will allow us to present changes to the Constitution (and, potentially, RSCA and RTP documents) that the FC has voted on over the course of this year. This is required before any of those changes are voted on by the CLA faculty as a whole. After Spring Break, look for a link to a “Thought Exchange” platform, where you will be asked to comment on what you think are most important topics for the retreat. Thought Exchange allows you to answer anonymously and individually, then to review other people’s responses, indicate how much you agree with them, and to update or add to your own recommendations. The end result should be a picture of the issues people are most interested in addressing.

- ii) As you would have seen over email, *Norbert Schürer* (Academic Senate Chair) sent out a link to a survey where faculty can offer feedback on the future of General Education (GE) in light of the changes mandated by the CSU Chancellor’s Office. I encourage you to take the time to fill out this survey, and keep in mind that the FC might want to dedicate a future meeting to formulating a college response to GE changes.
- iii) University-wide elections (AS councils/committees) are currently underway. Nominations and elections for college-specific service will get underway following the spring recess.
- iv) Re: CWLC: Following the FC vote on *Dean Wallace*’s original proposal to de-departmentalize CWLC, *Dean Wallace* forwarded his letter of support for the proposal to *Provost Jersky*. The FC Exec also forwarded a letter to *Provost Jersky* that reported on the decisive FC vote against the proposal and on the attitudes of FC members gleaned from written feedback and/or comments in meetings. This material, along with other relevant material from concerned parties, has been sent to *Provost Jersky*. As this process was underway, *Paul Scotton* and *Kathryn Chew* jointly wrote a new proposal that calls for CWL and CLSC to become two independent programs. The proposal was circulated among CWLC faculty, who have already voted on the matter. This vote, unlike that for the initial proposal, was disaggregated by department component (CWL and CLSC) and by action (whether to split the department *and* how to structure the two components). The faculty as a whole voted 75% to 25% in favor of splitting the department (91% to 9% in favor for CWL; 60% to 40% against for CLSC). The faculty as a whole voted 87.5% to 12.5% in favor of a 2-program solution (81.8% to 18.2% in favor for CWL; 83.3% to 16.7% in favor for CLSC). *Comment from Jeff Blutinger*: There seems to be a discrepancy between the numbers of faculty members who voted. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: one faculty member was allowed to vote in both CWL and CLSC disaggregated votes, so the numbers will vary from the whole faculty vote. This was done to ensure those who teach in both areas were given a

chance to voice their discipline-specific concerns. *Question from Kevin Johnson:* Will we get further clarification on the vote distribution in CLSC, which voted overall against splitting CWLC? *Answer from Misty Jaffe:* Yes. More clarification will be provided at a special meeting of the FC next week. The special meeting will follow the same procedures (pre-meeting poll and a post-meeting summary) as last semester's special meeting on *Dean Wallace's* proposal. The FC will then hold a vote on the second CWLC proposal. Vote results and other relevant information/recommendations (from AS, for instance) will then be forwarded to *Provost Jersky*, who has the option of forwarding the matter to CEPC for consultation. I personally hope that he will wait until he has the voting results from both proposals before taking action.

*Question from Kevin Johnson:* Is it not more accurate (and responsible) to say that the CWLC vote in favor of splitting the department is conditional since CLSC faculty voted against the split but in favor of becoming an independent program? *Answer from Misty Jaffe:* Yes, that is more accurate since CLSC faculty in this vote expressed their desire to remain within a department but, if a split was imposed, to become an independent program (this distinction could not be determined with the aggregate vote on *Dean Wallace's* proposal).

*Comment from Eileen Klink:* In thinking of the shrinking budgets of our time, and of the Senate Exec working with programs that find themselves providing M.A. degrees but always in need of funding and with no support for TT hires, have promises for TT support been considered in this new proposal? This is essential to the health of a program if it hopes to sometime in the future meet the TT criteria for department status. Plus, we need to consider the ramifications of the precedent we set with this action. *Answer from Misty Jaffe:* This is certainly a concern, but AS 95-19 can be interpreted in such a way as to grant newly-formed programs protections similar to those granted by the policy to departments. *Comment from Rene H. Treviño:* We should keep in mind that the second CWLC proposal does not explicitly mention TT lines, although it does present a plan for protecting lecturer entitlements. *Comment from Katherine McLoone:* Getting TT faculty going forward in CWL will be difficult. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* Throughout this process, the FC has been looking out for the welfare of faculty. Our job has been to ensure protocol (AS 95-19) and to respect faculty concerns. Agreeable resolution is our next concern. *Comment from Clorinda Donato:* At the very least, this process has given us the opportunity to reexamine the role of administration and bureaucracy in CLA programs. *Comment from Gabriel Estrada:* Does the overall vote to split (though conditional) count as a "yes" vote per policy? *Answer from Misty Jaffe:* Yes. *Question from Adam Kahn:* What is *Dean Wallace's* role in this second proposal? *Answer from Misty Jaffe:* If he agrees with it, the vote results and relevant information will be sent to *Provost Jersky*. If he disagrees with the second proposal, he will begin a consultation process (as per AS 95-19). *Question from Michael Palomarez:* What was the FC vote on the first proposal, and when is our vote on the second proposal? The FC voted 79% in favor of the first proposal, and we will vote soon on the second proposal. There seems to be more consensus on the

second proposal (whether it is resignation or endorsement is unclear). If need be, the FC can disaggregate its vote to reach a better understanding of its members' attitudes toward the second proposal.

5) Committee Reports

- a) Elections: *Theresa Gregor* reported that since some of the calls for nominations for CLA faculty to Academic Senate and Senate Councils and Committees went to SPAM folders, the CLA Election Committee will accept additional nominations for any of the committees/councils until Friday, March 16, 2018 at 5pm. With the exception of two committees, enough nominations have been sent in to fill vacancies. Elections for college-specific council/committees are coming down the pipeline.
- b) Budget: *Kevin Johnson* reported that the committee approved all travel applications accompanied by acceptance notices. The recent change in travel applications—having two separate calls for applications—saved 19 faculty members from carrying undue debt. The second call for travel (which can cover September travel) is forthcoming. Award amount is \$1200 for domestic travel and \$1800 for international travel. Also, the committee approved requests for purchasing tech/equipment. Some requested amounts had to be modified because of purchase cost and accounting methods, but most of our faculty's tech needs were met. *Question from Misty Jaffe*: Can the committee provide the FC with a breakdown of the requests and the awarded funds? *Answer from Kevin Johnson*: Yes, we can make that available to the FC.
- c) FPIC: tabled.
- d) Senate: tabled.

6) New Business

- a) Proposed changes to CLA constitution - Graduate Council membership and charge: *Corey Wright*, now the CLA Director of Graduate Studies after working in the role for a year or so in the interim, reported on the process by which these proposed changes to the CLA constitution have come before the FC. The Graduate Council (GC) was charged with drafting a proposal to be added to the CLA constitution as a standing committee of the FC. Draft versions of the proposal were workshopped with *Dean Wallace*, the Associate Deans, the FC Exec, and *Brett Mizelle* (in his role with EPCC). Additional edits and changes were sent to the GC as a whole, which suggested additional edits. The GC thought it best to keep the proposal language sparse and consistent with the language in the constitution. The proposal puts forth the idea that each academic area with a graduate program shall be entitled to have one faculty representative on the GC, normally understood to be that program's Graduate Advisor. The proposal also puts forth the idea that graduate students shall be entitled to have two non-voting representatives on the GC. The representatives must be CLA graduate students in good standing, and they shall be selected by the CLA and/or ASI Student Councils to serve for a period of no more than one academic year. The main sticking point with this is that neither ASI nor CLASC want to participate in the council. ASI does not want to step on CLASC's toes, and CLASC is undergoing a leadership crisis and does not want to help. The GC will consider a plan B for incorporating student representation into the council. Additionally, the Graduate

Council shall meet at least once per semester. A quorum for council actions shall consist of one-third of its voting members. Moreover, the GC shall maintain oversight of all initiatives and policies relating to graduate studies, and it shall make recommendations for action to the Faculty Council. In deliberations involving graduate curricula, EPCC may consult with the GC, which shall function as a committee of the whole. The Graduate Council will form ad hoc subcommittees as needed. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* We should keep in mind that we do not write policy for the circumstances of any given year. The point about student representation (14.1.b) should therefore stand for the time being. The description of the structure of the committee (14.1.a) is self-explanatory, but it is worth noting that the GC has decided against forming an Executive Committee. *Question from Barbara LeMaster:* With respect to item 14.1.d, what is the rationale behind not having the council chairperson elected by faculty, which would conform to all other FC standing committees? *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* I would second this question, as *Corey Wright* is the practical organizer for the council but organizing and chairing duties can be separate. The council chair and the graduate director could work closely together, with synergy and not in competition. *Comment from Corey Wright:* After deliberation, the GC determined that there is no need for an Executive Committee. *Question from Kevin Johnson:* Should ambiguous terms such as “may,” “shall,” and “will” be replaced with more concrete terms? Plus, the language “committee of the whole” with respect to its relationship to EPCC is a bit confusing. *Answer from Corey Wright:* The language concerning EPCC was drafted in consultation with EPCC representative *Brett Mizelle*. The idea is for the EPCC to consult with the Graduate Council as needed on matters of graduate curriculum. *Question from Misty Jaffe:* How did the council determine the 1/3 quorum requirement? By the numbers of programs served? By attendance at council meetings? *Answer from Corey Wright:* The 1/3 number seemed about right given that 50% would have been difficult to achieve in practice. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* 1/3 quorum, assuming the same grad advisors show up regularly, could leave the council with a de facto Executive Committee. *Question from Marcy Lascano:* As a graduate advisor myself, I am wondering what prompted the formation of a graduate council? We do not have an undergraduate council, and the graduate awards are already handled by another committee. *Answer from Corey Wright:* This was done to improve communication between graduate advisors and to deal collectively with a number of issues, large and small (GS 700B policy, student excellence fund, etc.) *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* Additionally, the council can work on issues such as college enrollment management (not separated out from department enrollment management) and recruitment. It has huge potential with respect to the health of graduate studies across the college. *Comment from Eileen Klink:* The creation of the GC is a welcomed development since the University Graduate Council no longer meets regularly, though grad advisors can still meet informally with *Jody Cormack* at the Graduate Advisor Breakfast. The GC, specifically, can help to promote funding opportunities for graduate students.

b) Proposed changes to RSCA policy: *Jeff Blutinger* reported that 8 members of the 9-member RSCA committee are serving for the first time. This brought issues of

year-to-year consistency to light and made inter-rater reliability difficult. It did, however, allow committee members to view the RSCA process with fresh eyes and thus identify areas in need of attention. The following proposals for changing the RSCA review process were subsequently agreed upon by the committee (with 4 members abstaining from voting): 1) only half of all committee members' terms should expire in any one year [4 yes votes and 1 no vote] 2) the MGSS review committee should be its own stand-alone committee, rather than a subcommittee of RSCA [5 yes votes and 0 no votes] 3) in the event that a reviewing panel indicates that it is badly split over how to evaluate a particular proposal, such proposal may then be evaluated by the whole RSCA committee [4 yes votes and 1 no vote] 4) the RSCA policy should specify the treatment of embedded images and the overall word count [3 yes votes, 1 no vote, and one respondent left this question blank] and 5) probationary faculty may serve on the RSCA committee [4 yes votes and 1 no vote]. *Comment from Araceli Gonzalez:* Having served on the committee, I can attest that the review process for MGSS proposals is as fraught at that of reviewing RSCA; this warrants the creation of a separate MGSS review committee. *Question from Misty Jaffe:* Will there be a separate election for each committee, and how will you determine the number of MGSS committee members? *Answer from Jeff Blutinger:* No (on the point of separate elections), but this will provide faculty with more service opportunities. *Comment from Araceli Gonzalez:* On the subject of embedded images and word count, it is standard practice in Psychology (and other disciplines), so the use of embedded images with text is not a ploy to skirt the RSCA word count limit. It is good, though, that the committee will specify its stance on this in the policy. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* We will send these proposals to change the RSCA review process to the newly-reconstituted FPIC committee, which will flesh out the implications associated with these changes. *Comment from Jeff Blutinger:* Other issues to be addressed in the near future include whether or not to provide committee members with models for good, acceptable, and poor proposals by clusters of disciplines (to establish inter-rater reliability), the process of adjudicating ties, the process for selecting committee chair, the process/practice for drafting and distributing written comments to proposers, and the appropriate penalties for proposals that do not follow guidelines. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* Of all the RSCA issues addressed today, that of the standard serving term for committee members might need to be made the priority and resolved soon.

7) Adjournment: meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

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