

**Approved: FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, Oct 10, 2018

3:30-5:00/AS 384

1. Call to Order: 3:30
2. Approval of Agenda: 3:33
3. Approval of Minutes from meeting from Sept 5, 2018 meeting: 3:35
4. Reports
  - a) Dean's Report

Thanked faculty for service.

    - Follow up to big announcement: Center will be funded to look at Labor Studies (a bequest, but not coming right now; however, might be able to get some funds sooner than ultimate bequest).
  
    - Budget: 8 million deficit so no extra money to give to colleges. Another “tight-belt” year. Probably won’t have to pay back half-million \$ loan. Benefits are frozen at 2013 level, so need to cover benefits for hires who exceed that level. Will be covered somehow. This gap will persist though. Faint glimmer of hope for the future.
  
    - Beach 2030: Four discussion sessions thus far; still four left. Monday is next one. Substantive discussion and developing hashtag and summary statements for Nov. 14 sessions. Other topics can be proposed (e.g. What is it like to be Muslim on this campus?). Summary of 20-some topics received from university from all the colleges.
  
    - Second proposal for GE: Eliminates three graduation requirements --writing intensive, race and ethnicity, and global knowledge. If the global knowledge and race and ethnicity courses were offered for lower division, for most majors, we can make units issue go away with double-counting. 100 level. Proposal will go through faculty governance on floor of Academic Senate.

*Markus Müller:* At the Dept Chair meeting they discussed the fact that the administration appears to be frustrated with way we assess – other colleges think they know diversity. Our strategy could be to link our discussion to university mission statement – many statements overlap with what we do here – reach out to higher admin in Brotman Hall, to alumni, students, parents. Give the Nov 14 event a narrative to support what we do at CLA.

*Jeff Blutinger:* In addition to GE policy, there is a separate doc that will specify what it means to be D1 or writing intensive – but not a public policy (in an ad-hoc committee right now).

b) Chair's Report: Update on Chairs' discussion of GEGR; Upcoming review of RTP document.

- Statement of principles from Chairs' meeting?

*Jeff Blutinger:* Significant discussion about high-unit majors in other colleges that want to do away with GE (e.g. Engineering does not see the value). Why should we ruin our program for Engineers? Let them opt out.

Chair's report.

New FPIC will revisit RTP issues:

- "Higher standards" language for Full prof.
- Does our doc reflect Interfolio issues?
- Definition of a "program" (Programs are considered independent for some purposes and affiliated with depts for other purposes. Unclear.)

c) Vice Chair's report (Rene Treviño): FC website

- CLA Committees: Representation on committees – need to centralize and make them accurate. Need corrections.
- Use this website's calendar. Scholarly intersections and other CLA events can be kept here.
- We can add videos. Inclusive excellence workshops are available (two so far). Other videos can be posted.
- Minutes, agenda, meetings times/dates here: [cla.csulb.edu](http://cla.csulb.edu)

d) Budget Committee (Emily Schryer) – Travel awards, dept operating allocations, planning discussion for meeting in Nov.

e) Inclusive Pedagogies: Stacy Macías – Going well. Next one on Deafness in November. Need to recruit from other colleges. Most who attend are from CLA.

f) Elections.

## 5. Elections

a) Need two new members for FPIC:

Adam Kahn (Comm) and Isabella Lanza (Human Dev). Voted in.

b) Need two new Elections Committee members:

Yuping Mao (Comm) and Margaret Kuo (Hist). Voted in.

c) Need one member for URC (first and third Thurs. 1 – 3). No one volunteered.

Will need member for Sabbatical leave committee (?).

d) Current composition of RTP committee: we have exhausted all means to populate committee from different academic areas. Need to make an exception/suspend policy for a year. Two potential members will be from same area, but one is from a program that is housed in dept of other member.

Vote: Yea/Nay to suspend the rule that no two members of the same academic area may serve on the CLA RTP committee for this year, as at least one of our current nominees needed to make up a committee of 10 is from the same academic unit as an existing member.

- Approved with one abstention.

We will send a formal statement to avoid a conflict of interest and make sure that the new members are not in same group or they will recuse themselves.

6. RSCA: We are in process of reviewing May minutes discussion on 'Proposed Revisions on RSCA Policy' (FPIC and EXEC committee made recommendations). Need to revisit and prioritize these issues (this powerpoint was circulated) and get to action items. Several proposals made (black, blue, and red fonts). Proposals 3, 4, and term of service, MGSS should be its own committee, Prop 5 (RSCA Committee and probationary faculty members).

- Prop 5: Probationary faculty may serve on RSCA (would need to change Constitution – right now two members are probationary and have been exempted). Discussion: Nine members total. Proposal: No more than two probationary faculty allowed to serve.

*Isabella Lanza*: It is difficult to not have tenure and be on this committee. On sub-committee, if there is a conflict, this information could be shared outside committee and leave the probationary faculty vulnerable, especially when reviewing a colleague's work from your own department.

*Jeff Blutinger*: For probationary faculty looking for service, this is a good opportunity, but of the 9 committee members, 8 had their own proposals submitted. Thus, some probationary faculty will be reviewing fellow members' work.

*Araceli Gonzalez*: Same could be said for associate profs who will be going up for promotion. Probationary faculty are certainly qualified to do this committee's work. Maybe have a policy of what to do when a committee is split – then policy can be referred to instead of arguing.

*Wanette Reynolds*: Why was this originally proposed?

*Rene Treviño*: To reduce the burden of service on tenured faculty and give opportunities to probationary faculty. Also there were probationary faculty voted in by mistake.

*Craig Stone*: There was a time when if you served on committee, you could not submit a proposal, and then perhaps the people who did serve would get a stipend (\$2,000). The issue has been getting faculty on the committee.

*Jeff Blutinger*: Limit the probationary faculty to no more than 1/3 of the committee. Probationary faculty are not required to serve.

*Isabelle Lanza*: They need to know that they will be reviewing their colleagues' work (from same dept) and if this gets out, there could be consequences. Shouldn't but it could.

*Adam Kahn* [?]: Can chair be strategic about dividing work so that probationary faculty do not want to review colleagues from own dept.

*Jeffrey Scott Zeiser:* Why does current policy of exceptions need to be changed? If there is a need, there can be an exception, but why make it policy?

*Markus Müller:* We need to assume that people are professionals and will do the right thing. Plus the university has some ways of dealing with someone trying to give you a bad evaluation. Think about what you learn from reading these proposals. Helpful for probationary faculty. Look at this more as an opportunity rather than a concern about tenure.

*Isabella Lanza:* Did learn a lot, but it was a concern. Nice if probationary did have a say in opting out reviewing from own dept.

*Gwen Shaffer:* Can we still keep it as an exception?

*Rene:* More expedient to keep as an exception.

*Araceli:* Very thankful for opportunity to serve on committee – learned about process and other disciplines.

*Rene:* Options: 1) Maintain exception; 2) let it discontinue (would be a problem right now); or 3) “2/3 must be fulltime tenured Associate or Full professor rank, but remaining up to 1/3 can be probationary”

*Jeff Blutinger:* Moves #3 – 23 ayes; 6 opposed; 7 abstentions. So resolved.

- b) Issue of word count and images: doesn't need to be a change to policy – just a change to instructions – there is 1200 word cap – but some disciplines include images that includes text (several paragraphs), which is not included in word count. Should words in images count toward overall word count? Need a policy instead of leaving it up to subcommittees.

*Barbara LeMaster:* Also – some had images without words. How to count this.

*Jeff B.:* Lack of familiarity across disciplines about how to address this.

*Jeffrey Scott Zeiser:* Principle of brevity. Need a limit.

*Rene:* Or specify how they be treated.

*Barbara:* Doesn't like number of images specified.

*Jeff B.:* Add page limit rather than word limit so images don't get abused.

- Brief discussion ensued about images, words, and disciplinaryity.

*Craig S.:* Limit of 100 words embedded in images.

Back to reports:

- 4. g) Senate: GE policy (discussed above in 4. a & b; ongoing).

h) Graduate council (Markus Müller). In the Sept 27 Grad Council meeting:

- Clorinda and Norbert volunteered for subcommittee for awards.
- Main issue: SEF. Received 13% (% of grad students at university)
  - \$500 for each grad program (for events, fieldwork, not for waivers)
  - \$ leftover for college-wide resources, voted to give this \$ to grad programs (thus, \$700 each).
  - GS 700 policy (advisors may now release holds)
  - Next meeting: GA allocation (has been historically disproportionate)

- Seems university is not keen on pushing grad studies. We have several programs on the edge. We discussed how to support them, for example, out-of-state tuition waivers. We don't know how this is being done (not transparent). Need to appeal to Jody directly or some get allocated? Don't know. Maybe she goes by GPA, which is not always the most significant aspect of student's record. Talk to your chairs about this. With whole GE business, grad studies seems like a 'side show' – cannot compete with Tier1 universities. Without any waivers, some programs can't survive. Some colleges get allocations and have a process. We don't.

7. Interfolio experiences (especially problems of alignment with CLA policy).

*Rene*: Need feedback (e.g. folders are not numbered or lettered and other folder label issues).

*Dmitrii Sidorov*: Would be nice to get proof of submission

*Rene*: Once it is submitted, it's locked, so you can't resubmit or add before deadline.

Index issues.

- Please send to us all of your comments – from candidates *and* evaluators. Opportunity to give feedback.

*Barbara LeMaster*: Open-period letters will be given to chair who will find a way to upload them.

8. Adjourned: 5 pm.