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

**Faculty Council Meeting**

**Wednesday, April 10, 2019**

**3:30PM to 5:00PM**

**AS-384**

**I. Call to order: 3:35PM**

**II. Approval of agenda:** Faculty Council chair,Rene Treviño, proposed adding item in #5 in agenda, quick election for tech committee. Approved unanimously.

**III. Approval of minutes from March, 6 2019 Faculty Council meeting:** Approved unanimously.

**IV. Reports**

**A. Dean’s report:**

•*Dean Wallace*: Shared-identity groups: Change of name from “affinity” groups to “self-identified, shared-identity” groups. Thanks to Stacy Macias for pointing out that the first name was anachronistic.

-Thanks to Stacy Macias (from WGSS), Barbara LeMaster (from ASLD), and Steven Osuna (from Sociology) for coordinating the groups.

•Today took place the budget assessment meeting. The last years have been difficult in terms of budget. Now we’re breaking even as a college; we’re finishing the year in a good position, we’ll use the money for start-ups for faculty.

-There is an upcoming meeting with Provost; I will work to have a model and be able to fund unfunded RSCA applications. Faculty is now more active than when I started. 10-15% of research active faculty are not getting funded, and that can’t be. I’m looking for progress. If all goes well, I hope to be reporting about it in the next meeting. I was optimistic last year, this year am doubly optimistic.

•Academic Senate: It will pass GE, but not GR policy. I do not think we’re in a situation similar to what happened in 2012. It was critical, we have recovered from that. Changes in GE will not be traumatic for us.

•*Teri Yamada*: I have been bringing a group of chairs together to talk about GR.

•*Yousef Baker*: Can you talk more about identity groups? What do you expect the outcome of the groups will be? What will you do with them?

•*DW*: The main notion is that we want to create a college culture of diversity. Being relatively diverse does not necessarily mean that every person who identifies with a group feels welcomed in the college. Nobody is just one thing. I didn’t think it would be useful to say: “we have 250 diverse faculty, let’s put you all in groups,” that’s why the notion of affinity is important.

-I’ve told group coordinators that the groups have a choice to be public or not. Because they will get refreshments, people have to sign in. Sign-in sheets of groups whose participants prefer to remain anonymous will be in an envelope.

-This is an empirical exercise; I still don’t know what we’ll hear. Maybe we’ll see big broad cultural problems. We hope to explore the struggles of people who are not part of a certain group, for example: for example, people with hearing loss have related, yet distinct, experiences from those in the deaf community.

-Something that these groups will not be able to deal with is members’ complaints about discrimination because of their diverse identity. Those complaints will be taken to the Office of Equity and Diversity; we cannot deal with that.

-The goal will be to say: “here are things we ought to celebrate, here are some problems.”

•*DW*: We have to thank Rene for the great job he’s doing as Faculty Council chair. Thank you for stepping up.

**B. Chair’s report:**

•*Rene Treviño*: Periodic Administrative Review of CLA Dean: Faculty will get the call for nominations for the committee that will perform review of the CLA Dean. It will be a standard nomination process and the committee will need 5 tenured faculty members, 1 lecturer, and 1 staff member.

 -Also, other college committees will need volunteers to nominate themselves.

•*RT*: Interfolio: Jeannette Acevedo Rivera and I met with one of the persons in charge of Interfolio on campus. They have already put in some requests of changes to the platform based upon the feedback we have sent.

-They said they’re willing to work with us on the creation of a college-specific template that would be in place for next round. To have a CLA template would be useful because it would respond to the needs of our faculty in terms of format, order of documents, etc.

-Another issue we discussed was the fact that a lot of the info useful for candidates was only available on the evaluators quick guide.

•*YB*: One of the issues was with the index, did that come up in the meeting?

•*RT*: Yes, with the college specific template the index would change.

•*RT*: Spring Retreat: It will take place on Friday, April 26th, food and wine will be served early on.

-Topics to be discussed: Constitutional review, GE/GR (perhaps put college plan in action for GR), shared identity groups, with focus on diversity hire: we want people to apply here and to want to be here.

•*RT*: Inclusive Excellence: We had a great workshop with the College of Education on first-generation college students. Unfortunately, the video will not be available because of a tech issue.

-The CLA website is going through an update, we hope to have material to provide.

**C. Budget Committee report:**

•*Barbara LeMaster*: The Budget Committee has had 2 meetings

-February meeting: Discussion about SEF-T grants; the committee gets reports for evaluation beforehand, and wanted criteria for ranking. 40 million dollars for graduate initiative.

-March meeting: Discussion about funding for conferences. Also, looked into the notion of funding labs: there were labs that were considered CLA labs and other under department purview. We were wondering why there were those different levels or identifications. Also, we discussed why aren’t all labs funded on a regular cycle.

-There was discussion about this, but the decision was put off.

-Also, we discussed reassigned time: whether or not we’ll be able to get funded chairs, program directors, and time for research. Making a decision for one funding source means another thing doesn’t get funded. There has been no final decision regarding reassigned time for Faculty Council chair.

•*Araceli González*: Question about labs: what do you mean? What type of labs are these?

•*BL*: Usually departments have computer labs or visual labs. The CLA labs are mainly computer labs. The issue is that if you ask for money the year before, you’re lower down on the list to get money next year. That might put a lab in jeopardy of not getting updated.

•*RT*: Based on the constitution, the Budget Committee should have more of a saying on allocation of money, so that’s why they’re working on these things now.

**V. Old business**

**A. Elections**

•*RT*: Technology Committee: Anand Commissiong, from Political Science, nominated himself to be in the Technology Committee. The duties would be working on BeachBoard, the FC website. I was thinking he can start by working on the Interfolio issue, specifically creating a college-specific template. If you think of any other issues, please bring them up to me.

 -Since we have one nominee, we can have a vote by acclamation.

-Nominations? None

-Vote: All in favor

**VI. New business**

**A. Constitution review: second reading of proposed changes**

•First item: RSCA committee and consecutive terms: line 316: “Members shall not serve two consecutive terms.”

**Discussion:**

•*BL*: There have been situations where a committee makes sure a faculty member doesn’t get funding. Maybe limit to 2 terms.

•*RT*: That would be in line with RTP.

•*Adam Kahn*: If we have people willing to serve, given the struggles we have to find people, the terms shouldn’t be limited.

•*RT*: This issue was brought up because this committee is one of the outliers, it doesn’t have a limit on consecutive terms.

•*TY*: In the past we’ve had situations of committee members not granting awards or promotions to certain faculty for years. I’d advocate that we consider doing 2 terms.

•*RT*: This can change the course of people’s careers if committee members are not working in good faith. Someone can have a history with one person in departmental committees and not speak up, explain something, or protect a person.

•*Jeffrey Scott Zeiser*: Could it be a natural rotation?

•*RT*: Someone else was wondering why the director of research of the college doesn’t have a role in the RSCA committee?

•*Gwen Shaffer*: I haven’t served on this committee; [question about RSCA committee/subcommittee set up]

•*AG*: In my experience, if there is severe disagreement in the subcommittee, it should be brought to the whole committee. In the current set-up you should only read applications assigned to your subcommittee.

•*RT*: It would be good to make recommendations: how to define badly split?

•*Craig Stone*: When I served on this committee they had a rule that if you were serving, you couldn’t apply. That has been taken away. People want to serve because they learn what the committee expects, now they can apply at the same time.

•*RT*: There’s should be a better way to do it and write a successful application: not only by being on the committee or talking with someone who is.

•*AK*: It’s hard for only one person to make an impact on the decision. It’s a 3-person committee, they would have to convince the other 2.

•*BL*: It has happened in the past, we have had candidates who don’t get a sabbatical, for example.

•*RT*: We’re trying to make policy consistent; even if you’re not trying to cut off someone, you could give them a score low enough so that they don’t get it.

•*Chantrey Murphy*: Is the review process not blind? Why?

•*AG*: Because faculty research history is evaluated.

•*CM*: Considering the proposed 2 terms, committee members may not know everybody.

•*Nancy Martin*: There is a larger thing here: spirit of rotation, expected good will of committee members.

•*Ilan Mitchell-Smith*: I’d like to second that.

•*AK*: In my department: the constitution limits service on committees to 2 terms, but we have to ignore this. Otherwise, committees would be empty.

•*Eileen Klink*: In the old days we had 15-20 RSCAs for 100 applications. Nowadays we’re going for 100%. Blindness doesn’t work, committee members know faculty research.

•*CS*: The major benefit from being in this committee: learning about colleagues and the quality of their work.

•*Motion*: To limit the number of consecutive terms in the RSCA committee to 2

-2 abstentions: Resolved

LINE 319: “Two thirds of the members of the committee must be full-time, tenured faculty at any rank. No more than one third of the members of the committee may be probationary faculty.”

319b. Two thirds of the members of the committee must be full-time, tenured faculty with either

associate or full professor rank. No more than one third of the members of the committee may

be probationary faculty.

**B. College vs. University comparison**

**#1 Issue: Faculty Small Grants**

•College Policy: Not addressed.

•University Policy: One of four award types.

•Question: Should the FC write Faculty Small Grants into the college policy?

•No discussion.

**#2 Issue: Number of Committees**

•College Policy: One committee (RSCA with an MGSS subcommittee)

•University Policy: Two committees (1. RSCA/FSG and 2. MGSS)

•Question: Should the FC likewise create two separate evaluation committees?

•Up for debate, people have thought one way or another about usefulness of two different committees.

•*YB*: I know little about the process, but supporting faculty members who need to move through the ranks so that they can remain having jobs is important. If it’s one committee you’re able to see all of the applicants. If you separate them, you won’t see all applications.

•*AK*: Can people get only one, RSCA or MGSS?

•*RT*: Yes.

•*AK*: How would the committee do MGSS after doing RSCA work?

•*BL*: I remember being told I was going to be doing extra work that others in the committee won’t do, because I was evaluating MGSS submissions. This is more work, right after you finish RSCA evaluations. The dean can revise what you do and recommend something different at the university level.

•*AG*: The review criteria for the 2 committees is different. For RSCA there are 120 applications, for MGSS there are 15-20.

•*RT*: Changing deadlines would impact this conversation. If we change deadlines, it would make sense to have 2 committees. We should keep this in mind.

**#3 Issue: Number of Applications Per Faculty**

•College Policy: “Faculty may apply for only one of these three awards per application cycle.” [excludes FSG]

•University Policy: “A Faculty member is allowed to receive only one award: a summer stipend, a mini-grant, reassigned time, or a faculty small grant in a given year under this policy.”

•Question: Should we allow faculty to apply for more than one award type, especially if the deadlines change?

•*RT*: We can allow them to apply to more than one, but they can only receive one. At the University level: apply for several, receive one.

•*AK*: Adds a lot more work for people serving on the committee.

•*Lily House-Peters*: It depends on the deadline, you would have to hear from the other one to make a decision. It’s a matter of tracking down people, who’s accepting or not.

•*YB*: Two different problems: committee work and faculty who are underfunded and overworked. They shouldn’t conflate and one decide over the other.

•*RT*: Part of this is about giving people chances.

**#6 Issue: Deadlines**

•College Policy: Same deadline for reassigned time and MGSS awards.

•University Policy: “The deadline for RSCA awards and faculty small grants will be set by the college.” [UMGSS deadlines set by university.]

•Question: Shall we have separate deadlines for reassigned time/FSG and for MGSS applications?

•*RT*: We don’t have control over university deadlines.

•*AK*: My research doesn’t make sense for summer stipend because of its nature, it wouldn’t be eligible. We have to keep in mind that the research agenda doesn’t have to do with quality of research.

•*Kimberly Walters*: Why would MGSS have an earlier deadline?

•*RT*: The deadline is established by the university. Everything’s earlier, Misty fought for changes to this.

•*EK*: Some colleges don’t need RSCA time, they already bought that out. Some people definitely need summer stipends or summer grants (they’re traveling to other countries). We would have to change the thought that RSCA is more valuable and important, that’s not the case, some people need to travel. In our college we have important scholars who may need one or the other.

•RT: In terms of RSCA, scheduling is important. The only guidance we have is that it’s up to us, if we want to revise the policy, we can craft new language.

**#5 Issue: Award Conversion**

•College Policy: Not addressed.

•University Policy:

\*“Awards may be used for reassigned time, faculty small grant, or a combination of both equivalent to the vacant rate for up to 6 WTU per academic year.”

\*“College faculty councils shall . . . establish procedures by which, if the college desires, reassigned time can be converted into faculty small grants and vice versa.”

•Question: Should we allow for the conversion or combination of reassigned time and faculty small grants? [may not be relevant if 6 WTU award is disallowed]

•*RT*: How do you decide?

•*EK*: It’s going to be more work.

•RT: We’re struggling to fund the 3 units, it’s going to be more complicated if they can apply for more.

•*KW*: You can apply for a small grant with the intention of converting it into RSCA.

•*AK*: It’s a shared list. There’s no certain number of Faculty Small Grants and a certain number of RSCAs, it’s a combined number.

•*RT*: We could have 3 deadlines. If people are awarded one and want to convert it: how would that look like, logistically? It’s open to us.

•*BL*: The dean was asking if we want to go in that direction.

•*Chris Karadjov*: This was just passed in Senate, it was moved to 6 with the option of college flexibility. Not one of the deans spoke against it. Our dean has been resistant to the 6 units.

•*RT*: If we address it by the end of semester it’s better, if not, we’d be behind 2 cycles.

•*Clorinda Donato*: When I got here you could get 6 units, but no release time as junior faculty. Why can’t we give people the 3 units automatically? We waste time writing the applications, evaluating them. We should ask the university to give us a 4/3 load and let us compete for another release.

•*YB*: Maybe there’s a way in which we could quantify what it looks like and create policy for the few people who wouldn’t get it. In terms of the 6 units: why can’t it just be that once the 3 units are 100% supported we move on to who gets 6 units?

•*TY*: That’s a point to make in the Exec Committee.

•*CD*: They do it at San Francisco State [*have a standard 3 unit release*]. We keep going around, every year, administration should acknowledge that this is a teaching-research institution. Other colleges understand research is essential to them, for us it is as well.

•*AK*: Are there problems with our college internally? We can’t control that you have to put together a proposal or how much money the dean has.

•*RT*: Whatever we decide we need to make clear what to expect, we haven’t done a good job at that.

•*YB*: They make us go over and over around it to make us believe we’re rewriting policy that affects us.

•*Gabriel Estrada*: Is there a motion on the table?

•*YB*: MOTION: “CLA RSCA applications for more than 3 WTU will be considered only after all eligible and qualified applications for 3 WTU have been funded.”

•*CS*: Amendment: make clear that it is 3 units in CLA; I have gotten 3 units at the university level and college and they made me reject one of the awards.

•*TY*: The reason why this RSCA ends up with this notion of 6 units has to do with history at the institution. When Karen Gould was Provost she said she was moving this college to a 3/3. Then she left. Then the recession happened, now we’re here. We’re the only college on campus that has this load. Also, the College of Education.

•*YB*: We need to discuss policy or access to budget.

•*RT*: There have been many conversations about the black holes in the budget.

•*TY*: This is a public institution, details about budget are supposed to be public information; we could request an audit, but would be making enemies in the process.

•*JSZ*: Institutional memory about budget, does it exist?

•*EK*: Terie Bostic has all that. Also, the Budget Committee.

•*BL*: The request that was made from budget committee was specifically about assigned time. Terie suggested that Beth came to the meeting. What do we want to see?

•*JSZ*: Do we have an absolute number of RSCAs? How many people applied? With that we can elaborate over the years.

•*BL*: We need workloads, releases.

•*YB*: What takes to get everybody to a 4/3? What’s the shortfall? Take into consideration all the different pots of money. What would be the problem with having a resolution written at FC asking for the information. All faculty would be united and wanting to see that data, all saying the same thing. Who amongst CLA faculty would be opposed to getting information towards requesting 4/3. What would it take?

•*TY*: In the past, the yearly state support would change drastically, sometimes you wouldn’t know for months what the amount would be. It’s a weird cycle.

•*CD*: We have to think about what it takes to write the RSCA proposal: sometimes an all-nighter, it’s too much work. And it doesn’t change anything, I’m doing that research anyway. San Francisco State and San Diego have a reduced teaching load compared to ours. Faculty needs to get together and fight for this.

•*AK*: I find it weird we have to propose research a year and a half in advance. You’re supposed to complete that research, you sign a contract. It would be better if we do it based upon what we have done. Example: get a release if you have already published an article.

•Final item: Treatment of Non-English RSCA in RTP Files: *tabled until next meeting*

**Meeting adjourned at 5:04PM.**

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

**These minutes are not official until approved.**