

**\*\*Approved\*\***

**CLA Faculty Council Minutes**

**April 11, 2018**

- 1) Call to Order: meeting called to order at 3:37 p.m.
- 2) Approval of Agenda: approved with minor change to order of topics (6b before 6a below).
- 3) Approval of Minutes from March 14, 2018, Meeting: approved with spelling correction to faculty member last name.
- 4) Reports
  - a) Dean's Report: I am glad that the process of adding the Graduate Council to the CLA Constitution is moving forward. Thank you, *Cory Wright*, for advancing this work. I think the proposals to change the RSCA policy put forth by the RSCA Committee are very sensible. I did, however, add one item for the FC to consider, which will be explained shortly during the RSCA conversation. I recently attended a GE forum, which was wonderful, lively, and well-attended by ENGL faculty and other CLA faculty. I have been assured by Norbert Schürer (AS Chair) that the forums are indeed about careful consideration and deliberation and not, therefore, a smokescreen to obscure an already-in-place GE plan. The FC voted 79% in favor of the second proposal on CWLC (CWL and CLSC becoming two independent programs). I have also endorsed the proposal, and vote results and recommendations from all concerned parties will be forwarded to the *AS Chair* and to *Provost Jersky* (as per AS 95-19). Conversations in the AS are taking place with respect to the stipulated timeline in the guiding policy, with the focus of resolving this issue this semester and implementing the proposal at the start of the next academic year. Because of the bleak budget situation, we may see as few as 25 TT searches university-wide next year. *Question from Kevin Johnson*: How, if the current budget situation has been linked previously to a potential hiring freeze? *Answer from Dean Wallace*: FERPs and retirements are up, and that trend may carry over to next year; plus, the Chancellor's Office decided to defer office raises until November, which could positively affect the budget situation. *Question from Cory Wright*: Will the searches be evenly distributed across colleges? *Answer from Dean Wallace*: No. *President Conoley* has called this enrollment-based hiring situation "chilling," which does not bode well for CLA TT searches. I do not have any substantial updates about commencement, but I may have more to report after rehearsals. I met with some very well-informed students to discuss the potential CSU tuition hike. Please do lobby your state representatives to advocate for more of an investment on the part of the state legislator in the CSU, which offers students great value in return for their own investment. You may have seen an announcement for *President Conoley's* "Beach 2030" initiative, which is unlike anything we have done before. More information on this initiative can be found at <http://www.daily49er.com/news/2018/04/08/president-conoley-announces-new-initiative-to-academic-senate/>. With respect to RSCA, during my first three years (of six) as Dean, RSCA funding increased dramatically. That, however, is no

- longer the case. This is the first time that proposals worthy of funding (20, exactly) did not get funded. It would take \$100,000 to fund those proposals, but the college just does not have it. The entire process is complicated since MGSS now comes out of the same fund. Also, the process varies from college to college (some are allowed to split funding between RSCA and SFG). SFG is not covered in AS policy, which has allowed us some flexibility. I have proposed a related change to the RSCA policy: revisiting eligibility for SFG for Assistant Professors during their first three years/probationary period (more on this in item 6b below).
- b) Chair's Report:
- i) The CLA Chairs drafted a statement, which will be shared with the FC, in response to the forthcoming General Education (GE) reform. We should think about our own, college-specific response to GE reform, even if the Chairs' statement provides us with a solid starting point. It is important for the FC to consider and raise concerns specific to the college and to have a strong voice within CLA. With only a single FC meeting remaining this semester (May 9<sup>th</sup>), the FC should carefully consider the timing of any response it formulates.
  - ii) Mark your calendars for the upcoming CLA Retreat, which will be held on April 27<sup>th</sup> from 2:00-7pm in the Chartroom (wine and cheese provided!). Be on the lookout for messages regarding Thought Exchange, which we will use to generate Retreat themes/topics.
  - iii) The FC voted 79% in favor of the proposal to separate CWLC into two independent programs (CWL and CLSC). Results have been forwarded to *Provost Jersky* (as per AS 95-19).
- c) Update on CLA "Understanding Borders" Initiative: tabled.
- 5) Committee Reports
- a) Elections: *Theresa Gregor* reported the following elections results: Academic Senate: [Elected] *Misty Jaffe, Jennifer Reed, Kris Zentgraf, and Chris Karadjov*. [Alternates] *Richard Marcus, Jose Moreno, Dave Stewart, and Shira Tarrant*. CEPC: [Elected] *Danny Paskin and Gary Griswold*. [Alternates] *Jennifer Asenas and Nancy Quam-Wickam*. PARC: [Elected] *Nielan Barnes and LaRese Hubbard*. [Alternate] *Adam Kahn*. UMGSSC: [Elected] *Ali Igmén and Christine Jocoy*. [Alternates] *Maricela Correa and Alexander M. Klein*. URC: [Elected] *Robert Blankenship*. [Need alternates to serve Fall 2018-Spring 2021 on URC] *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: We will run elections this week for Lecturer representation to the Academic Senate and to the FPPC.
  - b) Budget: *Kevin Johnson* reported that the committee has not met recently and thus has nothing new to report at the moment.
  - c) FPIC: Contributions from the FPIC to the RSCA discussion at hand will be reported in item 6b below.
  - d) Senate: *Chris Karadjov* reported that the Academic Senate has approved a major in Public Relations.
- 6) New Business
- a) 2<sup>nd</sup> reading/vote on proposed changes to CLA constitution: Graduate Council membership and charge: *Cory Wright* reported that, after revisiting the issue of including a chairperson as part of the Graduate Council organization, the council added item 14.1.d to the proposed language in the constitution: "The Graduate

Council shall elect a chairperson from its representatives for a one-year term.” This constitutes the only change since a discussion of this language during the March 14, 2018, meeting of the FC. *Lynda McCroskey* proposed a **motion** to accept the Graduate Council language presented. *Katherine McLoone* **seconded the motion**. The motion came to a **vote** and was **passed unanimously**.

- b) 2<sup>nd</sup> reading/vote on proposed changes to RSCA policy: The FPIC recommended the following with respect to improving inter-rater reliability: 1) Reviewing the normalization of scores process 2) Providing models for good, acceptable, and poor proposals by clusters of disciplines and 3) Having a pre-meeting in which sample proposals are distributed to committee members and ratings discussed as a whole group. The FPIC’s rationale for these guidelines is that they should help minimize variation across raters within each RSCA subcommittee. *Comment* from *Jeff Blutinger*: Although the RSCA committee did not put forth these specific recommendations, the committee generally agrees that inter-rater reliability needs to be improved (the RSCA committee will move forward with item number two above). The FPIC also stated that it would be helpful for the RSCA committee to hold a pre-meeting in which sample proposals are distributed to committee members and ratings are discussed by the full RSCA committee. In theory, the issue of variation across subcommittees is solved by the normalization of scores. That said, a pre-meeting would help ameliorate concerns that applicants might have about the process of evaluation. Practicalities include the decision to use existing but anonymized proposals from the previous cycle (with permission of applicants) vs. committee members drafting composite good examples in all three categories with notes on what makes them good and why. *Jeff Blutinger* explained the current review process, and we discussed the following proposal by the RSCA committee: “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.” Both *Lynda McCroskey* and *Jeff Blutinger* commented that common practice is for subcommittees to discuss proposals over which they are badly split. *Jeff Blutinger* added that discussions about proposals are essential to the review process. *Comment* from *Misty Jaffe*: True, but the common practice does not align with the current policy. According to current policy, members of a panel should not know or discuss ratings with other members of the panel unless there is a tie in the ranking (after college-level normalization). The FPIC stressed the need to define “badly split” and put forth one potential definition: “a situation in which at least two of the evaluators differed by minimum of 1 standard deviation between the standardized scores.” *Comment* from *Jeff Blutinger*: While this would be helpful, it raises the issue of the review timeline. There is already a pressing need to submit scores relatively quickly, so would having to mathematically define “badly split” exacerbate the time crunch already imposed on reviewers? Would moving the RSCA deadline earlier be beneficial? *Comment* from *Misty Jaffe*: Perhaps we need to revisit the timeline along with the issues raised here. The FPIC then explained the college-level process of using z-scores to normalize proposal scores. *Comment* from *Araceli Gonzalez*: We should keep in mind that this process normalizes across subcommittees but not necessarily within them. *Question* from *CJ Murphy*: Do we have any information about who

grades harder or easier by discipline? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: No, but the hope is that doing more work on the front end of the review process will lessen such discrepancies within and across subcommittees. *Comment from Jeff Blutinger*: This is especially important since there is no guarantee of experience or expertise for reviewers evaluating proposals from fields outside their own. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: We cannot create the perfect panel for every proposal, and applicants should work to make themselves understandable across disciplines. The FPIC then recommended that subcommittees who wish to normalize their ratings do so with the raw scores prior to college-level normalization (z-scores). *Question from Jeff Blutinger*: Where in the policy does it state that deliberation within subcommittees cannot happen? *Misty*: The policy does not currently allow for the scores of all proposals to be known before the normalization process. *Question from Adam Kahn*: Are tools for determining z-scores given to committee members? This could be easily achieved with a simple Excel spreadsheet. *Comment from Araceli Gonzalez*: Calculating z-scores within subcommittees may be easy, but it is not useful for reasons already stated. It is more useful to adjust raw scores before the normalization process (reiterated by *Misty Jaffe* and *Barbara LeMaster*). *Question from Yuping Mao*: Are we trying to normalize and bring consistency to experience and expertise of evaluators? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: We are trying to normalize the evaluations, not the experience and expertise of evaluators. *Comment from Chris Karadjov*: The normalization process cannot account for issues of expertise and experience. *Comment from Carol Zitzer-Comfort*: In the Graduate Writing Exam review committee, if the two assigned readers were badly split, they would send the exam to a third reader. Even if that principle were applied here, we would still need to define “badly split” before the normalization process. *Question from Kevin Johnson*: How does a 5-5-1 split get resolved by normalization? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: It does not resolve this entirely, and we cannot insist that all ratings on every proposal fit within a tight standard deviation. *Comment from Araceli Gonzalez*: In the case of a 5-5-1 split, as with all proposals, it receives a single averaged score. *Comment from Barbara LeMaster*: In the case of a 5-5-1 split, the expertise and experience from reviewers would help the deliberation process. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: Each of the items we have discussed today, which we will revisit in May, are subject to revision: consider putting forth suggestions prior to these items coming to a vote. *Comment from Gabriel Estrada*: During this past review period, not every subgroup met; if all groups met to normalize, there would be less inconsistencies. *Comment from Emily Berquist*: During this past review period, some committee members wanted to evaluate via qualitative measures rather than via quantitative ones (a rubric, for instance). *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: Past experiences like those can be used to recommend future best practices. The RSCA committee’s fourth proposal—“The RSCA policy should specify the treatment of embedded images and the overall word count”—was addressed, followed by the FPIC recommendation on this point—adding a limit for the number of embedded images into the RSCA template. *Comment from Lynda McCroskey*: Perhaps we could follow a word-count process similar to the RTP one? *Comment from Jeff Blutinger*: The idea here is to ensure equity across disciplines. *Comment from Barbara LeMaster*: Past

experience has shown me that some RSCA reviewers are opposed to including images at all. *Question* from *Yuping Mao*: Since the inclusion of images is at times discipline-specific (social sciences, for instance), is it fair to limit the number of images? *Comment* from *Jeff Blutinger* and *Araceli Gonzalez*: At the very least, we should clarify treatment of images in the RSCA application and in the review guidelines.

7) Adjournment: meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

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