

Faculty Council Meeting
Wednesday, February 6, 2019
3:30PM to 5:00PM
Anatol Center

I. Call to order: 3:31PM

II. Approval of agenda: Approved unanimously

III. Approval of minutes from December 5, 2018 Faculty Council meeting: Approved unanimously

IV. Reports

A. Dean's report:

•*Dean Wallace:* Another FC meeting without Misty. Memorial and reception in her honor: Friday, February 8th, 2019, 12:30PM, Anatol Center

-200 people have RSVP'd, feel free to come and go, we'll be here for 3 hours

•*Barbara LeMaster:* It will also be live streaming; Malcolm (Finney) will send out the link.

•*DW:* If you read email in the last hour, I just sent a Beach 2030 follow up. The university is moving from brainstorming to a more structured plan. To prepare us well to participate in that larger conversation, I would like to move forward with two white papers: one on inclusive excellence and one on student success. I am looking for a lead faculty member for each white paper and have a stipend to offer. Please let me know if you are interested. White papers should be finished in the summer. We should discuss them at the retreat.

-I ask you all to think about topics for the other two white papers. Inspired by job interviews I have been doing, I have thought about the possibility of creating an MA/MS in interdisciplinary studies. It may be possible to make an argument at Chancellor's office to create a position for a degree like that.

-If there's faculty interested in working on a feasibility study, that would be good.

•Budget: I'm optimistic about it. The first goal (knocks on wood): to be able to fund RSCAs that still haven't been funded.

-CSU budget in general is very optimistic; Gavin Newsom is a CSU friend. We haven't started this well with a governor's budget in a while.

•Diversity: As a result of the discussion that took place at the retreat, Provost and administrators are thinking and looking for diversity hires. Our college is well positioned for that type of hire. This could be a good opportunity to develop more tenure lines for this college. Also, we could think about creating a link on our page with information for underrepresented minorities.

•Assigned Time (AT): I did offer Misty AT for her position as Faculty Council (FC) chair years ago but, because she had so much work, she wasn't able to take it. Then offered I offered her development money and it took her 2 years to spend it.

-I'm very careful about AT. At Academic Affairs the first think they look at is who is getting AT and for what. I'm sympathetic with this request, I'll put it on my list and see if we get to a place that that would be a possibility. However, the priority is the RSCAs and Small Faculty Grants (SFG).

Adam Kahn: What are your feelings about the "Dean's Conceptual Ideas on General Education and Graduation Requirements" document?

DW: That is a unanimous document, I wrote parts of it. This document is not meant as a way to eliminate faculty governance, but the Deans are trying to understand the Executive Order 1100 (EO) and the problems it creates. It's different in every college. For some colleges it can put General Education (GE) in peril. I sat across from the Deans from the 5 colleges that have high unit majors and believe the changes of EO would create real difficulty for them in managing their load. My primary concern is protecting undergraduate GE enrollments. In no scenario would this be good.

-Those colleges with high unit majors tried to figure it out and realized they won't be able to do it. Their primary concern is they don't want to put their students in the position that they have to take an extra semester or year. They don't want to water down their requirements in a way that could threaten their accreditation. Also, the substance of graduation requirements (Human Development, Writing Intensive, etc.) are central values at this institution.

-At that Deans meeting it was said: we don't want a one and done. I think some kind of hybrid approach that would meet the same learning outcomes of shared expertise could be a path for some students.

Kevin Johnson: The university has not done an appraisal of the resources that are necessary for this kind of initiative. Here's an EO and now we have deans spending time thinking about how this affects students; this takes their time, the FC time. When the question becomes allocation in a comprehensive manner, we spend so much time talking and using resources, but really don't know how it's going to turn out.

DW: In our office we have the best system for tracking instructional expenses, including GE, probably better than any college in the CSU. You can't get good data that would show what a particular change would mean. We spent considerable time in the Dean's office trying to figure this out (with Beth Manke); conversations with other Associate deans: we don't lose a whole lot in terms of capstones because those high unit majors are trying to do that within their own majors. My best guess is that this change to GE will not be of the same magnitude as the 2012 change: that one was devastating for our college. We lost a fair amount of FTES.

Norbert Schürer: But it is still unclear what, exactly, we stand to lose with these GE/GR changes.

DW: All I can tell is I'm not panicked right now.

KJ: Is not necessarily about the resources, but about the actual change. There's no comprehensive assessment of the mental power it takes to discuss this.

DW: The Chancellor's office has yet to take this into account.

KJ: We could have the University Resources Council say what something like what this means for the university: quantity of hours discussing it, procedural dimension.

DW: I take your point and perhaps can put it on my list of things to talk with the Provost.

NS: Yes, Chancellor's but also, we take a lot of stuff in faith. I ran the numbers and other CSUs get to do the same majors with lower unit counts, so this claim is not necessarily right. There is a rhetorical force to the expression "high unit."

DW: Other campuses have other GE policies. I have to admit I do not have that level of knowledge of how to compare it with other CSUs.

Teri Yamada: Kevin, your point is well taken. Ethnic studies chairs have brought this up: what does this entail? My understanding is that Jody Cormack has written some sort of description of this process to present to the EPCC. There doesn't seem to be data out there, it's frustrating.

DW: If we pass the GE policy and get to the Graduation Requirements (GR) policy, I believe right now there's good faith in other colleges to do something good about that. A faculty group could build an alternative highway: learning outcomes, etc. The Dean of Engineering met with Ethnic Studies faculty. He gets it.

TY: He's enthusiastic. But he doesn't understand how long it takes to create an online course, for example. Who's going to do that, etc.

Yousef Baker: Would it be correct to say that the tectonic plate under this is the graduation timeline? Is this having repercussion at the Chancellor's office? Can we tell if this is a long term thing or next year this will change? Situation at Community College system: they introduce changes change year after year. Are we in that process? In a year or two the Chancellor will ask for changes again?

DW: My understanding is that there is a push from legislators. We don't take the approach of other campuses: we're flexible. Chancellor's office decision: we need to simplify, need to make things transferrable with Community Colleges.

•We are one of the most dramatic success stories in the CSU system in terms of raising our grad rate. I want to put on the table the broader range of things we're doing. We have 92% graduation rate.

•I've talked to you about migration patterns before: ¼ of students who get to CSULB are completely undeclared. About 500 students declare us, but eventually we have 1,000. We don't know who they are or where they came from. Beth Manke has pushed for this, fought the good fight. We're now going to be able to see where and when we get students.

DW left at 4:09.

B. Chair's report

Rene Treviño: RSCA changes: we've accomplished quite a bit, can put a stop and go on with changes of policy and procedure.

-Topics discussed and decided upon: treatment of images over embedded text, defined terms of service, allowing probationary faculty to serve in RSCA committee, chair selection process, mathematical definition of "badly split" in a proposal

•Interfolio: We'll see if the college committee has recommendations. One change that we requested has already been completed. Some people were having problems finding files. Good sign that they're responding to recommendations.

•Graduate Council: Will be looking into 2 issues:

- 1) release time for theses or comps supervision
- 2) allocation of graduate students' assistantships

•If you have feedback, contact Cory Wright (CLA Director of Graduate Studies).

Malcolm Finney: The college had a committee years ago that looked into compensation for supervision of theses. We can go back to that.

BL: After directing 3 theses you'd get one WTU in consultation with chair.

MF: My understanding is that it was 1 unit for every 6 units you supervise.

BL: You'd have to track it yourself, and make sure your students are signing up for 698. It's a slippery concept. Most people don't know about it.

Eileen Klink: Each department have had to negotiate that with the Dean's office.

RT: Any understanding of past practices, communicate with Corey Wright. He'll appreciate having it.

RT: Retreat: Please send ideas for themes, topics, etc. Many ideas already: Beach2030 as a possibility, increasing Faculty diversity. We'll do the wine and cheese reception.

C. Elections

•Elections committee: Maggie Kuo and Yuping Mao: Three elections: 1) have been working on CLA 2019 Spring CLA Awards Committee Election; 2) will vote today for the President's Award for Outstanding Faculty Achievement committee. We'll go by acclamation; 3) third election: University Resources Council; one spot available, we encourage you to nominate yourself.

KJ: It's a valuable committee, I've learned about finances and been in touch with different offices and resources university wide. The committee gets to review curricular changes after they go through CEPC and before Senate; and gets to see proposals for new majors, minors. The committee makes sure there's a fair process.

RT: Importance of this committee for our college.

D. Inclusive Pedagogies

RT: Upcoming Inclusive Excellence events:

- 1) Experience of visually impaired students
- 2) Event in collaboration with College of Education, theme TBD

E. Senate

Chris Kradjov: CLA representatives serving on the Academic Senate (AS) would like to serve the will of the college faculty, so we need your input on this, and on other, important issues. Some recent developments in the senate include a change to RSCA policy. The AS voted in approval to allow up to 6 units of release time for each RSCA award. The AS will, however, leave it up to the respective colleges to decide whether or not (and how) to implement.

•The AS also voted in approval to allow colleges to interchange SFG and release time.

•Also, the AS is going to consider requiring faculty who receive three consecutive RSCA awards to serve on the RSCA committee.

V. Election

Maggie Kuo: We'll vote by acclamation for the members of the President's Award for Outstanding Faculty Achievement committee. The list of candidates was sent out by email.

-Election result: all approved. New committee members: Bonnie Gasior, Suzanne Dallman, Barbara LeMaster, Malcolm Finney, and Norbert Schurer

RT: Members change yearly

VI. New Business

A. Constitution Review: Committee Alternates

Tabled

B. Release Time for Faculty Council Chair

RT: David mentioned he wants to focus on RSCA and SFG, but in our Exec Committee meeting we told him we want to move forward with rationale to request AT of 3 WTU for FC chair. We will find out about other colleges that have FC: how many members? how often they meet?

NS: Is there a report about where the AT in the college goes?

TY: We brought that up, we're going to try to find it.

EK: It should be easy, departments have that info.

NS: Keep in mind that AT is not necessarily the only form of compensation. Dean Wallace has, as he mentioned, the funds to pay faculty to write white papers on Beach 2030 phase 2.

Jeffrey Scott Zeiser: If we're claiming it's administrative work, we should be making that argument instead of academic development.

BL: He referred to it as money for professional development, but it's all one pot, they call it different things.

EK: Student success fund. They offered 5 lecturers teaching 5 comp classes, they could take stipend of reassigned time. They don't want to report AT, but they have to, it's workload. It's one pot always.

YB: Are we attempting to make the case for chair of FC or for something bigger?

RT: The former would be the priority, we'll see how easy the process is.

KJ: The latter might be the condition for the former.

•Discussion about the issue of transparency.

RT: Issue of where the funds come from. Flexibility with them? How to make our case? In math they have 10 people in the FC. We have many standing committees too. Other than number of people, committees, meeting frequency, ideas on arguments to present?

YB: Can we quantify how hard it is to get people to serve on committees?

NS: Tie it to the University's strategic goals. Inclusive Excellence? RSCA policy creates extra work for FC.

RT: Also, procedures like the proposed departmentalization of Classics/Comparative Literature last year. That meant additional meetings, it was required from us based on the University's constitution to do that work. We have past evidence of what it took in just one case. That is part of the discussion.

KJ: We could try converting course time: how long are meetings/how long are classes, quick trade off. That is quantifiable.

RT: At least 6 meetings plus semester, plus chairs meetings, virtual meetings, etc.

C. Dean's Conceptual Ideas on General Education and Graduation Requirements

RT: When a document like this is created we usually support it (chair's report in the past), but in this case people have more questions, so we're not automatically supporting it. This is meant to report to or influence Academic Senate.

NS: I find DW's statement that this document was not meant to undermine shared governance somewhat questionable. In my opinion, it undermines the current proposals in the works. One thing FC could reinforce is that some of the deans can come forward with curriculum maps. The deans' group is at once deferring to our expertise yet making suggestions about how to perform our duties. The AS would benefit from more specific proposals.

RT: The suggestion of creating "badges" would mean an incredible amount of work. UC Davis has them. Students earn digital badges that equal course credit. The system would require implementing a particular software. They're proposing a curricular change without saying who would be responsible for it. Many questions unanswered.

YB: I'm confused: senate has committees, ad-hoc committees, different players and different forces have different agendas.

NS: There are colleges that make the claim that they have high unit majors: Engineering, COLA, etc. I truly believe that there are colleges that believe they can't fit this in their GR. Others don't seem to believe in GE. Also, the 2025 goal expects that just a specific percentage of students graduate.

KJ: Element where it seems the Chancellor doesn't know what he wants in terms of the EO. Vagueness to which everyone there is working, they need to reply to the EO, they are not sure of what to do.

NS: The EO 1100 is a completely personal thing: there was one student who was not able to count GE from one college to another, he was the nephew of the governor's chief of

staff. You're right, the Chancellor doesn't know what it means or what we're supposed to do.

TY: Isn't it true that there's an option for the campus to ask for exceptions? That never comes up in these conversations.

NS: Specifically, the exception of extending the deadline. He did kind of gave us an extension at the end.

EK: Issues: 1) Try to fulfill Graduation rate, 2) Also, Community Colleges. Under the master plan we were in charge of the curriculum. California promise: arguments: pedagogical, what students need. Multiple measures to bring students in. Many students coming in with 6 units of AP, skipping first year. Some campuses are asking for up to 9 units of exception. Our campus tends to believe that it's better for our students if we think about graduation, but our concern would be the liberal arts.

TY: For instance, Monterrey Bay passed a language requirement for all students. For some reason on this campus we can come together to request exceptions like that.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

**Minutes taken and respectfully submitted by Jeannette Acevedo Rivera,
FC secretary.
APPROVED.**