

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

**Faculty Council Meeting Minutes**

**May 9, 2018**

- 1) Call to Order: meeting called to order at 3:32 p.m.
- 2) Approval of Agenda: approved with the addition of Graduate Council report [item 5e. below] and a report from Associate Dean *Dan O'Connor* [item 6a.ii. below].
- 3) Approval of Minutes from April 11, 2018, Meeting: approved.
- 4) Reports
  - a) Dean's Report:
    - i) After attending the most recent event of the CLA "Understanding Borders" Initiative, I am even more convinced of the value of the initiative and its timely theme.
    - ii) Unfortunately, I do not have much to report on GE. I will say, however, that department chairs have been very active in dealing with this issue and that we might get more direction from *Provost Jersky* in the fall. My discussions with chairs have been encouraging and have shown me how resilient CLA is in the face of challenges. Personally, I am trying to manage the political aspects of this process as best as possible and am thankful that we have strong CLA representation on committees that will have the most impact on GE changes.
    - iii) I am glad to see that the process of adding the Graduate Council to the CLA constitution is moving forward.
    - iv) Thank you to the review committees—RTP, RSCA, and Sabbatical—for their work this academic year.
    - v) We are, unfortunately, facing a bigger potential budget deficit this year compared to last year. *Terie Bostic* has, however, done excellent work with managing the budget, so we are close to avoiding a deficit. Administration considers CLA a conservative college with respect to spending, so there is no panic from Brotman Hall in that regard. In the big picture, there is encouraging news from Sacramento. If the state legislature raises CSU funding, Governor Brown will not line-item veto the funding increase. The CSU Chancellor did not implement the tuition hike, which is also good news; still, the budget situation will likely negatively affect critical tenure-line searches; I have asked departments for proposals nonetheless. *Provost Jersky* will not commit to a college budget until after seeing data on the university budget and on retirements/FERPS.
    - vi) *Question* from *Misty Jaffe*: Have the funds for next year's Student Excellence Fund been received? *Answer* from *Dean Wallace*: Yes, and we received the expected amount. Also, that fund does not currently fund the Graduation 2025 Initiative, but *Provost Jersky* is merging those pots. *Question* from *Misty Jaffe*: Are there any plans to reopen participation in Graduation 2025? *Answer* from *Dean Wallace*: No, since funding and work on that initiative is already completed.
    - vii) I would like to emphasize the importance of shared governance and thank the FC Executive Committee, which has been particularly productive this academic year.

b) Chair's Report

- i) Thanks go out to *Lynne Bowman*, who has been so helpful with setting up and breaking down the Anatol Center. I would also like to thank the FC Exec, the Elections Committee, the FPIC, and the rest of the FC standing committees for the work they performed over an academic year that required several extra meetings.
- ii) The FC has transitioned to a new website. It will offer us improved functionality, especially with respect to events.
- iii) The CLA Retreat was a success, in my opinion. The use of Thought Exchange went well, specifically. I hope that more people will use the platform readily, so that ideas do not come exclusively from the FC Exec. The conversations from the retreat on GE and Inclusive Excellence are still active on Thought Exchange, so you can still contribute some new thoughts or see the results of the conversations to date. Going forward, we can take the recommendations from the Inclusive Excellence discussion and enter them into a new Thought Exchange. Existing results have already been sent to the Strategic Planning Committee. The draft document on Inclusive Excellence I prepared with *Anna Sandoval* can also be used to prioritize actions for next year. The President's Commission on Inclusive Excellence, on which I sit, needs to do more to make its goals, actions, and presence known, so I hope to see more action on that front. GE Thought Exchange results will be shared with the chairs' group. Our priority should be formulating fundamental principles of GE as a college, and our representatives on the AS, CEPC, and GEGC need to mobilize in unity.
- iv) The addition of the Graduate Council to the CLA constitution was presented to the general faculty at the Retreat. No amendments were proposed, so the proposal will go out for a vote as is.
- v) *Comment from Barbara LeMaster*: I would like to thank *Misty Jaffe* for her work as chair and express my wish for her to stay on in that position.

5) Committee Reports

- a) Elections: Election of Executive Committee (to continue throughout meeting): *Theresa Gregor* asked FC members to consider serving in the future on the Elections Committee. Service on the committee requires intermittent work both academic semesters, and the election process is relatively easy thanks to the Big Pulse election software. Nominations were then taken from the floor for members of the FC Executive Committee. The following nominations were put forth: *Rene H. Treviño* for Vice-Chair, *Misty Jaffe* for Chair, and *Chris Karadjov* for Member-at-Large. All three nominees then delivered their statements of interest. Nominations for the Member-at-Large position were solicited from the floor. Receiving none, *Chris Karadjov* was unanimously elected through acclamation. Other nominations for Chair were solicited from the floor. Receiving none, *Misty Jaffe* was unanimously elected through acclamation. Other nominations for Vice-Chair were solicited from the floor. Receiving none, *Rene H. Treviño* was unanimously elected through acclamation. Nominations for Secretary were solicited from the floor, but none were received. Nominations for the remaining Member-at-Large position were again solicited from the floor. *Barbara LeMaster*

- was nominated and delivered her statement of interest. No other nominations were received, so *Barbara LeMaster* was unanimously elected through acclamation.
- b) Budget: *Report from Kevin Johnson*: The main accomplishment of the budget committee this year was splitting the CLA Travel Call into two, one in March for June-October travel and one in September for November-May travel. This effectively reduces the length of time faculty are required to carry the debt of travel. *Question from Misty Jaffe*: could the Budget Committee provide the FC with the rationale behind the allocation of technology funds? How did the selection process work? *Comment from Barbara LeMaster*: The committee, on which I served, read and reviewed the proposal rationales, but the order of proposals funded was not explained. *Answer from Kevin Johnson*: Proposals were ranked based on a combination of quality and previous years' allocation. I can clarify this for the FC after revisiting the original paperwork. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: This clarification should be a priority for the committee going forward, and, ideally, circulated before the next round of proposals.
- c) Inclusive Pedagogies: The committee organized and conducted three faculty workshops over the academic year. The workshops, which focused on inclusion and pedagogy, were organized thematically: one on African American experience (October 2017), another on Latina/o/x and Chicana/o/x experience (November 2017), and another on Asian American experience (May 2018). The latter two workshops were filmed and posted to the Faculty Council web site. The committee is currently considering expanding its scope beyond the college level by building alliances with like-minded campus entities, such as the BUILD Program and the Multicultural Center.
- d) Academic Senate: From *Misty Jaffe*: The Academic Senate has spent a considerable amount of time over the academic year responding to EO 1100 (GE). There has been a division in AS between those that believe GE should be grounded in disciplines and in interdisciplinarity and those who believe GE should be held within majors. Debates are on the floor, and they will continue to be a focus for us. *Question from Cory Wright*: Has the new CLA rep for GEGC been announced? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: No, but that information will be sent out shortly.
- e) CLA Graduate Council – *Cory Wright*: For academic year 2016-2017, the Graduate Council made all 6 of the permitted nominations for HOGAR recruitment scholarships. Of those 6 nominations, the HOGAR selection committee awarded 5 CLA students (all 5 accepted). In academic year 2017-2018, the Graduate Council again made 6 nominations, and the HOGAR selection committee again awarded 5 CLA students (4/5 accepted). Over this time period, CLA has successfully competed for \$40,000 in HOGAR scholarships. Also, assigned time for thesis supervision is being worked out in the Dean's office. On another note, the Graduate Studies website is a great resource for students, so do point them in that direction. As for the Student Excellence Fund, of 5,245 graduate students tracked in ES/OGS data, 686 (13%) were from CLA. This amounted to \$16,575 of the overall \$127,500 remaining SEF funds. The CLA proposal was accepted in full. A minimum of \$500 was budgeted for graduate programs for events/programming, student support, etc. The remaining

- funds were tentatively budgeted to CLA for material support, infrastructure/collateral for recruitment, etc., under the guidance of the Graduate Council; expenditure of those remaining funds will be discussed at the next Graduate Council meeting at the beginning of AY18. Lastly, *Beth Manke* is working on promotion and recruitment for CLA. The Graduate Council will guide the college's effort in this regard. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: It is encouraging to see so much support for recruitment and promotion, given how crucial they are to CLA's growth.
- f) End-of-year reporting from standing committees: Reports from the Grade Appeals Committee, the Scholarly Intersections Award Review Committee, the Steering Committee on Inclusive Excellence and High Impact Teaching Practices, the Budget Committee, EPCC, the Sabbatical Leave Committee, the Elections Committee, and the RTP committee were distributed to the FC prior to this meeting. The RSCA Committee and the FPIC reported in previous FC meetings. Reports from the Awards Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee are pending.
- 6) Old Business
- a) [Time Certain (4:05-4:35)] Changes to RSCA review process and policy [w/time certain for report from Dan O'Connor at 4:15]
- i) Follow up on the 10/11/17 resolution regarding RSCA Committee composition: ["the FC **passed a resolution** to suspend for one year the stipulation (13.1.b.) in its constitution preventing professors at the rank of Assistant from serving on the RSCA Committee.] From *Misty Jaffe*: This resolution aligns with the recent recommendations from the RSCA committee and the FPIC. At present, we need to either 1) vote to extend the suspension of the stipulation or 2) vote to make the suspension permanent (as part of the whole RSCA revision package). We should consider whether this offers enough protection for probationary faculty and when changes should take effect. *Question from Clorinda Donato*: Would probationary faculty at any point in their career be allowed to serve? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: Beginning in their second year might be ideal, but that is up for debate. *Question from Clorinda Donato*: Did any probationary faculty serve on the committee this year? *Answer from Misty Jaffe and Barbara LeMaster*: Yes, and it went well. *Question from Clorinda Donato*: How was their experience? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: I received good feedback from them. *Comment from Araceli Gonzalez*: I was one of those who served (currently in my 5<sup>th</sup> year) and had a good experience. In my opinion, I do not think that serving on the committee provides that much of an advantage to probationary faculty with respect to the RTP process. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: With PhDs, we are all qualified to serve; this is not necessarily a question of experience. *Kevin Johnson moved* that the FC extend the suspension of the stipulation preventing probationary faculty from serving on the RSCA committee. **Motion seconded** by *Barbara LeMaster*. *Comment from Cory Wright*: Do we have a sense of the portion of the RSCA service performed by full professors? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: Not exactly, but, in general, some faculty perform more service than others and may feel overburdened by it. This, however, is not the key issue for the RSCA

committee. *Comment from Cory Wright:* I worry this could overburden probationary faculty. *Comment from Rene H. Treviño:* To prevent against that, we could limit the number of probationary faculty that serve at any given time. *Misty Jaffe* called **motion on the table to a vote**, and the **motion passed unanimously**. *Question from Misty Jaffe:* Should we make this permanent through the RSCA revision package? *Theresa Gregor* **moved to permanently suspend the stipulation**. *Question from Kevin Johnson:* Could we table the issue in order to further consider the protection of junior faculty? We need to fully consider the year-after-year ramifications of this. We could reconsider once we take up the full RSCA revision proposal. The question came to a vote and the **FC voted to table the issue**. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* Let us turn our attention to the recommendation by the RSCA Committee that the RSCA policy should specify the treatment of embedded images and the overall word count. *Comment from Araceli Gonzalez:* The RSCA recommended word count is stated in the RSCA application but not in the policy. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* The FPPC has revised the university-level RSCA policy to address this. *Question from Araceli Gonzalez:* Is this reflected in the recent proposal from the RSCA committee? Perhaps this can be clarified in the instructions for the RSCA template. *Question from Cory Wright:* So, the RSCA committee would have discretion to recognize and handle egregious cases of embedded images? *Comment from Barbara LeMaster:* The use of embedded images is discipline-specific, so the word count issue should be worked out. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* Maybe having examples to review would help us to decide how best to proceed. **Issue tabled.**

- ii) From *Dan O'Connor*: I am here to report on the CLA “Understanding Borders” Initiative, which many of you have been involved in. This is a 2-year thematic cycle funded by endowed funds from former CLA Dean Dee Abrahamse. The purpose of the initiative, which emerged in relation to the 2016 election, is to enhance the university’s intellectual milieu. A call for proposed themes was sent out, and the theme of “Understanding Borders” was chosen. We have held four events this spring across CLA and have ideas for the upcoming fall semester. A report will be circulated at the end of this semester, and we are open to suggestions for next year, i.e., keynote speakers or other ideas.
- 7) New Business
- a) [Time Certain (4:35-4:45)] Endorsement of CLA Chair’s letter on GE: *Comments from Cory Wright:* I support the letter in spirit but am worried that other colleges would appropriate this language. I also wish the statement was more strident in defending GE. *Response from Misty Jaffe:* As far as I know, other colleges have not appropriated the letter language for their own benefit, but we cannot stop that from happening. At the moment, we can endorse the letter, which will not preclude us from doing more on this front. *Michael Palomarez* **moved that the FC endorse the letter**. *Barbara LeMaster* **seconded the motion**. *Question from Wanette Reynolds:* What is the impact of using broad (as is) versus using specific language? *Response from Misty Jaffe:* More specificity raises more questions, so

leaving it broad will suffice for the time being. **Motion on the floor was brought to a vote and was subsequently passed near-unanimously (1 abstention).**

- b) [Time Certain (4:45-5:00)] Discussion of safety issues for faculty: *Misty Jaffe*: The FC would like to raise the issue of faculty safety, whether in relationships between faculty and students or among faculty. Keep in mind that you do not need to go into full detail or give specifics when discussing issues. In this discussion, we would like to get a sense of the following: are you happy with university/administration responses to troubling incidents, or are there perceptions of inadequate responses? Are there established protocols for such incidents, and are they effective? *Question from Emily Berquist*: Is there an established protocol for handling these types of incidents? The History department has raised this question in the past. *Answer from Soumitro Sen*: You can refer students to the CARES (Campus Assessment, Response and Evaluation for Students) Team. *Comment from Adam Kahn*: Keep in mind that the leadership makeup of CARES has changed, so there might be a change in the quality of service they provide. *Comment from Dmitrii Sidorov*: In my experience, there was little to no response to office break-ins, so lack of reporting might be an issue as well. *Comment from Soumitro Sen*: There is also the issue of how we define disruptive behavior by students. This semester, there have been cases where disruptive behavior by students has pressured faculty to be more lenient on them. *Comment from Michael Ahland*: I, along with other colleagues, have felt threatened at times by students. One incident of note went on for some time, and, once it was reported to CARES, the feedback was outstanding; their response was impressive, and we felt better about the situation. *Question from Helen Hu*: Is it possible for people to give specifics about these incidents in order to compare them? *Comment from Barbara LeMaster*: Specific incidents would include a student or faculty member threatening to use a weapon (the latter happened in one case I know of), stalking, and other inappropriate behavior. In the case of the faculty member just mentioned, they got reinstated after the incident. *Comment from Clorinda Donato*: In one instance I know of, a student walked into class and threw books at the instructor. Campus police subsequently removed the student from class. The response was good at the time, but the student was persistent in coming back to class. *Comment from Misty Jaffe*: Collecting examples of these types of incidents is a good next step in this inquiry. *Question from Kevin Johnson*: Could we have someone from the CARES leadership team visit the FC? *Answer from Misty Jaffe*: Yes, that is a great idea. *Comment from Soumitro Sen*: Campus police visited new-faculty orientation and spoke about this issue. Perhaps they could do the same for the FC. The campus police force is also a great resource in the event that a student comes to your office in a threatening manner. You should call campus police immediately in that situation. *Comment from Helen Hu*: Last year, a student reacted violently to a low grade. Other students called campus police without the student's knowledge. *Dan O'Connor* was quick in removing the student from class and even showed up at the next class meeting as a preventative measure (student did not show up). CARES should have sent someone but did not. *Dan O'Connor*, though, was very helpful throughout the process. *Comment from Clorinda Donato*: All of this is exacerbated by the fact that there is a crisis

in CSU counselors, which leads to lengthy response times and a high level of students seeking help. *Comment from Kevin Johnson:* There were two incidents in COMM that went unresolved: 1) a student with a restraining order tried to enroll through open enrollment. Campus police was called, but they arrived late, removing the student during class. The student returned to class thirty minutes later. 2) A student determined to be a threat was removed by campus police during class, only to be deemed not a threat and return to class. This is not comforting and very troubling. Will this practice exacerbate the problem, by drawing attention to “problem” students? In all, these situations were not handled well. *Comment from Katherine McLoone:* The story *Helen Hu* told about *Dan O’Connor* is touching, but that is not his job; it is the job of CARES. Online training modules in this area are not as effective as face-to-face training would be. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* That is a good point. *Comment from Adam Kahn:* Most of these issues stem from lack of training. *Comment from Misty Jaffe:* So this is a structural issue? *Comment from Helen Hu:* Keep in mind that a student has the freedom of not reporting to CARES, even when requested to visit. *Comment from Soumitro Sen:* True, so what is stopping a student from denying help?

8) Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

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