

FACULTY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, March 21, 3:30-4:30

AS384

- 1) Call to Order: meeting called to order at 3:40 p.m.
- 2) Alexandra Jaffe thanked the faculty council members present for attending this special meeting to discuss the CWLC proposal to split into two independent programs. She explained that a Faculty Council vote on the proposal would be held in the days following the meeting. She explained that the new proposal had been drafted by Katherine Chew and Paul Scotton.
- 3) Katherine Chew, CWLC, thanked Dean Wallace and Academic Senate Chair Norbert Schürer for their assistance in putting the new proposal together.
- 4) Alexandra Jaffe explained that although the proposal is short, the piece about entitlements is long because it is the most complex part of the proposal and it needs to cover all of the different entitlement scenarios.
- 5) Alexandra Jaffe and the Dean addressed the 6 questions and comments that were posted online prior to the meeting:

Question 1. Can the CFA, union rep be invited for the language of the MOU?

A (Jaffe): CFA reps were consulted on the language of the proposal under consideration. They can certainly be consulted on any specific MOU language developed subsequent to the adoption of the proposal, if that comes about.

Question 2. Who has oversight over the MOU? Who ensures it will be carried out?

A: (Wallace) The oversight of MOUs is ultimately the Provost as delegated to various designees, i.e., the Dean and VP for Faculty Affairs; it is subject to normal faculty governing processes.

Question 3. Will the program directors be respectively appointed by the Dean or will the process be the same as for Departments (nomination, candidacy, voting). There seems to be rumors/misunderstandings in this regard

A: (Wallace) Current practice is to allow programs to decide if they want to follow the chair appointment practices in the chair policy or if they want to agree to a director on a consensus basis. There is no requirement that chair selection procedures take place. In some cases, it is a question of numbers. We would follow these practices—letting the programs decide.

Question 4. Question: the proposal calls for additional funding to enact the split. How much will this cost the college? (That is, what is the difference in \$ between (i) the current cost of the CWLC ASC & chair's fraction versus (ii) the proposed cost of 0.4 chair's fraction for two directors & two ASCs?)

A: (Wallace) The Dean has a different recommendation on number 4. He will support the chair's fraction according to the college formula for levels of support. The same goes for Departmental Support Staff. He said that two full-time staff positions would not be fair. Current chair's fraction is .6. So the proposal on the table costs an additional .2, since it requests .4 for each

program director. The Dean reiterated that fractions and staffing will be worked out in accordance with standard practices and formulas.

David Wallace stated that the formula has been a source of discussion since he has been at CSULB.

Alexandra Jaffe asked what this might look like as it is implemented.

Dean Wallace explained that while the support for two chairs and staff support is projected according to the formula, mitigating factors include the number of people who are being managed. He has argued about the number of bodies that make up the FTEF to complicate the formula a little more, i.e., the management of four or five adjunct faculty to make up a FTEF as opposed to one full-time faculty member.

Cory Wright asked about the dollars involved in the allocation of another .2 and as well as the allocation of the time of ASC's.

David Wallace stated that Terie Bostic will figure this out but suggested it would be on the order of \$10-\$12,000.

Eileen Klink remarked that what has been set up cannot be changed, while Dean Wallace responded that these allocations are subject to change depending on what is happening with FTEF and FTES.

Question 5. I am curious to know if there is any more detail from the dissenting votes on the "2 program solution", especially since it is proportionally higher for the Classics faculty.

A) Were faculty who voted [No] able to describe what they considered to be alternatives to a "2 program solution" other than the move to RGRLL ...

b) ... OR, do those votes essentially carry over from the [No] votes from the "Split department" decision, meaning "[No] we don't want to split, so subsequently [No] we don't want a 2 program solution."

Can we clarify this? Thanks.

A: (Jaffe) No there is not more detail and we can't speculate about how the votes are linked or not linked.

Question 6. Why do we continue to hear that the Classics Program has done nothing towards curriculum development when Chair Scotton guided a new, college wide minor in Ancient Studies to be housed in Classics through Assoc. Dean O'Connor's task force last Spring and the Program voted this Fall to offer a new emphasis in the Classics degree in Classical Archaeology?

It was noted that question number 6 was more of a comment lamenting the continual claims that the Classics Program has done nothing towards curriculum development and is a separate issue from the department having a curricular review process, which Dean Wallace has cited as a problem in CWLC. Dean Wallace stated that the Ancient Studies minor has not passed EPCC and is not related to department curriculum processes. Jaffe stated that this issue is not related to the current proposal.

The Floor was opened up for questions and comments.

Dean Wallace thanked Kathryn Chew, Paul Scotton, Alexandra Jaffe and Norbert Schürer.

Cory Wright asked how many FTES would be left for each program if implemented. The Dean answered that both would have about 200.

Barbara LeMaster explained what happens when people are borrowed. Faculty who are fulltime maintain their fulltime status. David Wallace confirmed that the “Loan-borrow” process’s intent is always to keep people’s entitlements whole.

Discussion of Vote on the new proposal

Dean Wallace explained that this proposal may reach the Provost’s desk before the allocated 22-day window for him to send the first proposal to CEPC and that the Provost might or might not pursue the first proposal.

The Dean stated that he still believes the first proposal is the better option but if there is agreement from the department and the FC on this proposal he will not stand in its way and will give his agreement. If this happens, the proposal goes to the Academic Senate for a recommendation and then on to the Provost. Even if it were to go to CEPC, a decision could be made swiftly in order to try to bring it to the Senate before the end of the semester.

The results from the last vote were reviewed. In response to a question about whether or not the FC would also be voting on the split and then the 2-program option (as CWLC department members did) Jaffe confirmed that the FC would be voting on only one thing: a YES/NO to the entirety of current proposal. Embedded in that is a split. The CWCL vote, while disaggregated in order to provide the council with maximal information about faculty wishes in both Classics and Comp Lit, has to be viewed as a YES vote by the CWLC faculty as a whole, which is the only body formally recognized in the policy.

Dean Wallace thanked everyone on the Faculty Council for coming to an extra meeting.

Alexandra Jaffe explained that the ballots will go out on Thursday the 22d or Friday the 23d. A discussion ensued about the vote coinciding with Spring Break and whether the vote should be given a longer period of time than usual to be cast. The question of when the 22 days end was also raised. The consensus was that the 22 days are working days, and so the break would likely not be an impediment. Jaffe said she would not be opposed to having the vote end late April 2 or April 3 by noon, in time for results to go to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.

Respectfully submitted,

Clorinda Donato

RESULTS of CWLC faculty vote



		YES		NO	
		#	%	#	%
Split Department	Whole faculty	12	75%	4	25%
	CWL	10	91%	1	9%
	CLS	2	40%	3	60%
2 program solution	Whole faculty	14	87.5%	2	12.5%
	CWL	9	81.8%	2	18.2%
	CLS	5	83.3%	1	16.7

