

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (Approved)

Wednesday, Nov 7, 2018, 3:30-5:00

AS 384

1) Call to Order: 3:31

Rene Treviño: Misty Jaffe is on medical leave, unfortunately. Rene will chair for rest of semester, so please contact him with FC issues,

2) Approval of Agenda. Agenda Approved as is.

3) Approval of Minutes from Oct 10, 2018, meeting.

Minutes approved as is.

4) Reports

a) Dean's Report:

- i. Beach 2030 on Nov 14 & 15. There will be eight general discussions (and one for staff). Rene has been leading them and he will get talking points out to all before Nov 14-15.
 - The game site is frustrating on a few levels. The game metaphor undermines the seriousness of the process. 280 characters. Be involved as you can. Think in short sound bites and work in threads.
 - Great topics. Always use a #. Need a # to find relevant comments for sorting. This is just one way to generate information. White papers in Spring. In Dec. FC meeting, we will reflect on what we saw and decide on white paper issues. There will be stipends for four faculty who will lead white paper efforts.
- ii. Retreat at Lake Arrowhead (Deans and many Dept Chairs). Discussion of how to increase racial and ethnic minorities in tenure-line faculty. CLA best so far. Other colleges need to do more. But CLA also needs improvement. Need more LatinX faculty given student population. Some good ideas were raised; we need to share expertise across colleges. Re: hiring committees, some are on committees for first time, which is an issue. Dean reaffirmed commitment to diversity, but diversity more broadly.
- iii. GE/GR: Update: EO1100 Exec Order: GE education on all CSU units must be limited to 48 units – only 9 at upper division - B, C, and D only categories. Thus, all of our Capstone and HD, Global Knowledge, and Writing Intensive courses are no longer GE. This past summer, group met to try to save upper division five slots – race and ethnicity, global knowledge, and one writing intensive. Second group was charged with it – brought back a proposal that eliminated three requirements GEGC debated the proposals → CEPC debating and will send proposal to floor of academic senate.
 - Deans and Assoc Deans are meeting tomorrow to sort out their concerns and real implications. If we keep the GR's we may be adding 9 units (which will conflict with another Exec Order). Can we work on a consensus proposal instead of fighting it out on floor of Academic Senate? Need to create an informed policy.

Adam Kahn: Was the GEGC closer to the first or second?

Dean: They kept some of their GRS, but Dean hasn't seen it, and until we see what will be on the Senate floor for debate, we will need to sort out underlying issues and impact. For example: Some depts are almost entirely dependent on GE to survive. Others are not. In Dec. meeting Dean will have and lay out information more clearly. We have strong representation on GEGC and CEPC. In Academic Senate, If we are up against other Colleges with high unit majors, we will lose. Thus, Dean is trying to figure out other possibilities/options. Trying to build a coalition to survive and build coherent GE.

Adam Kahn: Are we the only college concerned with the FTE issue? Could there be FTE sharing – develop courses with high-unit majors?

Dean: Probably not. But College of Science and Math – they know they can't fulfill the upper division requirement, so they would be delighted to have 'Math in Arts Admin.', for example. But also in lower division, the latter course would not work. Also, Health and Human Services has lots of HD requirements. High-unit majors, and they are growing, so not concerned about loss of HD.

Clorinda Donato: All of this has to be done by end of Spring?

Dean: Yes (which is why he wants to get a clear understanding of the issues and make the right proposals. Difficult to predict.) We might have to have our first Academic Senate CLA caucus to advocate. Nightmare scenario: 2012 proposal that was sensible was changed on floor of Senate – and it damaged literature and philosophy. Dean is not that worried about defending our undergrad foundation courses – must more concerned with graduate requirements going away. If race and ethnicity and global knowledge requirements were to be fulfilled at the lower division level, might be easier – higher unit issues would go away. Writing Intensive course – maybe split the 5000 words to two courses, one lower and one upper in major and have 2500 in each course. Compromise. In December – a more information forthcoming.

b) Vice Chairs Report (Rene Treviño)

- i. Struggling with institutional memory within our committees. Chairs of each committee can manage roster and minutes – may be in place for December meeting. Try to better organize standing committee meetings.
- ii. New two-week enrollment process. Trying to get clarification, New university-wide process for Open University students – any student can enroll within first two weeks without permissions, thus we can't manage our enrollments in our courses. Beth Manke might attend our Dec. meeting. We need clarification: Is this new rule it CLA-specific? If so why? Scheduling kickoff yesterday? Anyone attend? No response.
- iii. Beach 2030: By Friday or Monday, will send out an event guide with summaries of past events, suggested hashtags, and short blurbs. Four leaders under CLA account – Rene, Richard Marcus, Beth Manke and Dan O'Connor will be moderating discussions.

- RSVP. Opens 9am on Nov. 14th: Log in and play a card, limited to 280 characters, and please attach hashtag.
- There are a couple different ways to engage with a card – you can rate it or reply to it.
- Emojis: Wanted/Uncertain/Alarming. Is this a response to the content of the comment or that the comment was made?
- Can create clusters of conversations. (looks like a complex atom)
E.g. #Strongerwithliberalarts
- After the event, a visual map and strategic plan for the next 10 years will be created. Data will be aggregated and summary will be provided to us (we will have access to data for six months).

If we are not strategic, lots of content will be buried.

Clorinda: Will there be an equal amount of engagement across the Colleges?

Rene: CLA are ahead.

Clorinda: Then it is not really an inclusive process. Assumed this was going on in every college. Other colleges might opt out as they did with GE. Thus, what will happen with strategic planning? Other colleges will not be left out.

Jeff Blutinger: If it is designed to justify admin's rationale, can we game the system?

Repeat the same things so they would not be disregarded. We might want to think about how we could be strategic.

Rene: Event Guide will have the suggested hashtags. So you will have detailed summaries about each topic and you can use the hashtags. There will be a schedule of conversations with particular time slots (will be sent out with the Guide and a demo of how to engage with this platform.)

Brief discussion of potential strategies and mentions of Machiavelli.

- Email Rene if you have questions.

c) Inclusive Excellence Workshop (Wanette Reynolds): Wed., Nov. 28, 12:30 – 2 pm. Topic is Deaf and Hard of Hearing Access at CSULB. Panel: faculty, students, disability services coordinators. No location yet. TBA. Flyer will be sent out.

d) Elections. Update: Sabbatical Leave. Slate of nominees set. Quick turnaround. Big Pulse license expiring. Ready by end of day tomorrow and results by Monday. Committee needs to convene next week/soon.

e) Senate update? No.

f) Interfolio: Summary of Round 1 feedback (see doc sent out).

- i. Adding language to the policy to handle tech issues (e.g. highlighting text).
Can Interfolio team work it out? Should put info into policy doc.
Don't try to upload spreadsheet – convert to pdf.

- ii. Making recommendations to Interfolio team:

- 1) E.G. Indexing system, Submission confirmation.
 - 2) Policy alignment: Folders are not College-specific , If we are always going to have the Works-in-Progress folder – should we indicate to not use or should we change policy? Also – PDS – complicates indexing. Do we want to align policy with Interfolio organization of it and format?
- iii. Dept and College-level evaluators: will be second round of Interfolio feedback for them.
- Dept evaluations about finished. Any evaluators in room?
 - One member replied that it was easy.

Isabella Lanza: Her evaluator said that they wish they could have added notes. Also – her committee submitted evaluation early and needed to go back to add something and could not do so (so penalized for submitting early). Locked out after submission even though before deadline.

Rene: Recommendation: don't lock file until deadline.

g) Rene: RSCA (continued from previous meeting).

Thanks for comments from last meeting – will help RTP process.

i. One loose end from last time:

- Should we specify number of embedded images? No action? Or should we specify that applicants can embed images and will not be penalized for doing so. Give piece of mind to those in disciplines who use images. Do we want to explicitly address it? Or leave it open.

Barbara LeMaster: I would just agree that if we don't do anything more, we need to say that nobody will be penalized if they have images. Original issue was that some of the evaluators wanted to penalize those who had images.

Clorinda: Same number of words, but different amount of space.

Jeff B.: Since there's nothing in the policy about images, it led to a disagreement about images with significant text. Needed to know what the policy was to be consistent.

Rene: There's policy and there are guidelines/template. Put in template – images will not be penalized. But if there is a significant amount of text with an image, evaluators might be upset.

Jeff B.: Word count limits were approved by FC on May 6, 2015. But no number mentioned.

Rene: The fillable form recommendation made, but was not implemented.

Leaving as is will leave room for future issues. Maybe don't change policy, but make changes in guidelines or template?

Barbara: For guidelines for reviewers and instructions for candidates should be the same.

Rene: Evaluators have the same sheet (rubric).

Emily S.: 1200 words – text in images count in word count.

- Jeff: Fillable form doesn't count words in text. So this needs to be clarified. So if someone includes a table of results, the names and words in table would count toward total.
- Yuping Mao: Will these policy changes affect this year or next?
- Jeff B.: Next year – policy changes need to be voted on at college level.
- Rene: Yes, if we change policy.
- Wanette: If there are concerns that candidates will be using screen shots of images in tables, then just say that you can't use illustrations, and photos are allowed just as long as they don't include screenshots of text. No penalty except those that contain a significant amount of text.
- Michael Ahland: Wants to put a picture of a database/screenshot – just to show what it looks like. So wants to know what the instructions would be.
- Clorinda: What do they do in College of Arts?
- Rene: Motion?
- Gabriel: Specify that in the guidelines that images and graphs are acceptable, but screenshots of prose are not
- Jeff B: Friendly amendment – to screenshots with lengthy prose.
- Gabriel: “Lengthy”? Have a word count: maybe more than 8 words.
- Barbara: Words in image part of overall word count
- Adam: But you have to label graph, then words would count
- Gabriel: MOTION: Include in RSCA guidelines – “Embedded images are Acceptable, but they should not contain large sections of prose (written as part of application).” 3 abstentions. Resolved.
- ii. Rene: NEXT issue. RSCA Policy: Definition of Faculty History over last five years ('this academic year included' - but not in guidelines so this is causing confusion?) Does it need to be specified?
- Jeff B: Last year, there was disagreement – Five yrs since date of application? So if we're in 2018, in June 2013, has five years passed?
- Adam: On submitting guidelines -- “From five years previous – from Sept.”
- C.J.: Used to be submitted in Feb or March.
- Adam: “Forthcoming” what does this mean?
- Clorinda: It means it has been accepted
- Rene: 4.4.4 Five actual years or academic years?
- Jeff B.: Last 5 years: the academic year the proposal is submitted and the prior 4 academic years.
- Rene: Guidelines do not follow policy, and the template doesn't specify.
- Adam: No matter how you interpret guidelines, it conflicts with policy. Correct the guidelines and modify template to indicate the same information.
Fall 2014 – Spring 2019?
- C.J.: Should we put in time periods so that we don't have to guess?
- Motion: Move to make the guidelines and template match the policy. Passed.
- Adam: Motion: Guidelines' 'forthcoming' means 'accepted'
- Rene: It's in the policy.
- Adam: Do we need to include proof that it has been accepted?
- Rene: No need.

Jeff: Guidelines amended to reportable history of publication should parallel/conform with second paragraph of policy. (4.4.4).

Barbara: In RTP – the only thing we want to know is if it has been published, then presentations would not be given. In RSCA, we should allow them to list publications.

Discussion.

Chris Karadjov: RSCA should not parallel RTP – issue of “creative” activity – e.g. as a journalist his journalism doesn't matter for RTP but does for RSCA. Legitimate for RSCA.

C.J.: Would like to clarify with reviewers – were there proposals – ?

Jeff B: There have been applications that were related to creative fields from creative depts. Yes, if it is relevant to field and previous work.

Rene: Peer-reviewed, refereed, and coauthors acknowledged – does that suffice?

C.J. : Applicants are required to say what they did with RSCA awards – they can put in in the reports of previous RSCA awards.

Rene: Current guidelines related to headings under faculty history suffice.

Agreed.

Two minutes left:

- The RSCA Committee will convene next week. Chair selection – elected by members. Last year, appointing chair was appealing, but should try to elect first. Better if Dean's Office doesn't have role of asking someone to be Chair.

Jeff B.: Re: Last year's RSCA Committee -- Chair must rank all proposals, but should not have a proposal under review. Jeff was the only one who had not submitted a proposal. He asked Kimberly if there has ever been a committee where all have submitted – she said no.

Adjournment: 5:01.