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

**Faculty Council Meeting**

**Wednesday, May 8, 2019**

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

**AS-384**

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

**II. Approval of agenda:** Approved unanimously

**III. Approval of minutes from April, 10 2019 Faculty Council meeting:** Approved unanimously

**IV. Reports**

**A. Dean’s report**

•*Dean Wallace*: Tenure-line searches: CLA got 18 tenure-line searches, there were 27 requests. We have 30% of university’s total, which is what we should get. Three years ago we had the highest number with 20 hires.

-This has a lot to do with the proposal from the President and the Provost emphasis to increase diversity; without that we would have gotten only a dozen lines.

•RSCA: Good news: We got the funds to give RSCAs to faculty whose proposals had not been awarded. Kimberly Davis is sending out notices right now. It was a three-year struggle; we now can control our instructional cost and have a stable enough budget that Terri Bostic and I were able to fund those applications.

•More good news: We do not have a deficit.

-In the next years, we need to save up for the start-up funds of upcoming faculty.

•Shared Identity Groups: There are three coordinators in charge of organizing the groups and meetings: Stacy Macías (WGSS), Barbara LeMaster (ASLD), and Steven Osuna (SOC). They will receive all reports from groups and will read them to make sure that there are no confidentiality issues.

-I am nervous because I know the reports will reveal things that are not positive regarding negative experiences that people have had in the college.

•RTP Process: Memo from RTP committee and issue with scholarship that is not in English that you will discuss today at this meeting: this has come up a couple of times since I am dean. The current policy requires that documentation about the publication is in English, not the publications themselves. People who teach other languages should be able to publish in them. The issue is that people in the committee, outside the department, may not be able to read that RSCA. It can go two ways, there is the disadvantage of the inequality issue: we cannot guarantee that the RTP committee members can read the scholarship. [*Advantage was not mentioned*] This does not happen every year.

*Jeannette Acevedo Rivera*: If this does not happen every year that means that it depends on the committee, right?

*DW*: No, that is not a question that can be answered in an individual way. The RTP standing committee sends issues that come up and need to be discussed.

*Jeffrey Scott Zeiser*: Most of my research is in Japanese. Does that mean that my research would not be counted?

*DW*: No, that is not an issue. No one has said that an article published in another language does not count, the point is deciding how to evaluate it.

*Adam Kahn*: This is an issue of department policy vs college policy. College committees are not bound by department committees?

*DW*: There are RSCA documents at the department, college, and university levels. College documents would take precedence over any department document. It is entirely impossible for a college committee to say: “this person has not met standards” based solely upon college documents.

*Kevin Johnson*: Does the college not approve department documents?

*DW*: Yes, it does. And as we move up, the next level documents are more important.

*KJ*: The department document has been approved by the college and the university, so, it is a rigorous document. If one says that the document does not comply that means it does not respond to the other two documents. The department document would be less than the college document.

-Let’s say we determine excellence based on peer review. If the college document requires 15 peer-reviewed articles, the department document would have to require 30. The department document would always have to exceed expectations.

*DW*: This rarely is purely by numbers. It is more complicated than that.

Kevin: If excellence is rated by peer review…

*DW*: Each level of review gets to determine whether or not a file meets any or all the criteria of each document/level. Very few departments have numbers for the amount of publications expected. I look for at least 3 very good articles, but that depends on the department/area.

-You have to prove publications are peer reviewed and are pieces of substance. We have talked in the past about predatory journals. There are other journals that, although not exactly predatory, have editorial practices that do not respond to the peer review process that we look for.

-Another element to consider is that the peer-review process is completed by relevant experts in the area. There are peer-review venues that take stuff as long as it is formatted.

*JAR*: Who is a relevant expert in an area and who decides that? If I am the only specialist on nineteenth-century Spanish literature on campus, who can identify a relevant expert in my area? Also, you said that “No one has said that an article published in another language does not count, the point is deciding how to evaluate it.” Does this mean that what the FC decides will apply retroactively to people who had issues with RSCA in other languages this year?

*DW*: No, absolutely not. There will be no retroactive application of policy changes.

*Dean Wallace left the meeting.*

*Rene Treviño*: We have to keep in mind the different levels of review. Are we setting candidates to fail? Some departments require 3 publications, the college policy has no specific number.

*Yousef Baker*: There are two different logics at place: what the policy is, what David was saying: each level of authority would want to have an independent evaluation. One logic masquerades as the other.

*Barbara LeMaster*: We have the union to support candidates. That is not the way it is supposed to work: the college should not ask for 5 articles if the department asks for 3. There is space for a grievance. Also, regarding the experts, there is a process in place through which you recommend experts in your fields and ask for an external review. We need to look at the language, it should protect people.

*Because of the council members’ interest in the topic, Chair Treviño decided to alter the order of items in the agenda and have the discussion about Treatment of Non-English RSCA in RTP Files after the Dean’s report.*

*RT*: This is what the RTP policy says:

“2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process

Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such proof must be provided in English. Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited to:

a. A printout of the venue’s editorial policy.

b. Copies of reader reports.

c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.”

*RT*: This would be easy enough, but the issue is more complex.

*Clorinda Donato*: If the peer review is provided in the language, does the candidate need to review it? Then department committee has to validate the translation, so the college committee is back on depending on the departmental committee? This is clearly a diversity issue, diversity of language. I am appalled this is happening, it has never been this way.

*BLM*: This section of the policy: refers to proof of peer review in English. If we argue it like that it gives candidates a way to go to the union.

*Gabriel Estrada*: We skipped in the agenda and I do not understand what we are discussing now.

*RT*: The CLA RTP committee sent a memo to the Dean and to the FC with some issues they encountered in their review process and that they want the council to discuss. Among them, the issue of RSCA in languages other than English.

*From the memo:*

“Some files include RSCA and teaching materials in foreign languages. Some members of the CLA RTP committee raised concerns about how these materials should be dealt with. Each level of review is supposed to be independent and every member of the committee is required to read all the material in the file. Since not every member is able to read the foreign language material, how this material, especially the RSCA products, is to be independently evaluated by the entire committee is unclear. These committee members were also concerned about how this material will be evaluated by the dean and the provost. RSCA products in English can be scrutinized in more detail than foreign language materials. If the dean and the provost are unable to read that language, their reviews will not be independent either. The CLA RTP committee certainly believes that candidates whose fields are multilingual should be publishing in those languages, but we would like Faculty Council to address this issue so a fair and reasonable policy about materials in a foreign language can be developed to guide the review process and ensure the independence of the levels of review.”

*Craig Stone*: We have mechanisms for external review.

*YB*: How was this done before?

*CD*: This has never been an issue, in the past people got tenure with RSCA in other languages without problem. I got tenure with publications in French.

*Eileen Klink*: I have served on the RTP committee many times. We do not often understand the rhetoric of colleagues, and we have always operated on the basis that the department peer review was valid. The department could ask for an external review if it considers it necessary.

-George Hardt is trying to indicate some of the concerns that re coming up now. As FC we need to address them.

*RT*: Requiring candidates to find external reviewers will put an extra burden on them.

*Malcom Finney*: I served on the college committee. This was an issue raised by a memo of the college committee. This was not a recommendation. The concern was raised by one person on the committee, and it does not reflect the totality of the committee. Committee members are given the mandate to independently review and comment on the quality of research. The intent was to suggest that maybe the college should rely on the recommendation of the department.

*Charles Wallis*: In 20 years there has never been a case where the college committee has overturned a departmental recommendation. Candidates should include in their file statements from journals with details about their rankings, peer review process, etc. It should suffice that they provide this evidence. I do not think the ability to read all papers in a tenure file will determine the decision.

*David Shafer*: We could say the RTP committee is the most important committee in the college. To say you will read all documents in a file is ludicrous. The RTP should not have the power to make decisions regarding publications that they may not have the linguistic or disciplinary expertise to evaluate.

*CW*: Was there a problem with a specific file? What did the committee do?

*MF*: The memo reflects the concerns of individual members of the committee, not the totality of the committee. My recollection is that a member of the committee questioned their ability to fulfill their role of reading the scholarship. The statement of the expectation that committee members did independent evaluations was problematic.

*BLM*: We need to make a statement about the existing college documents: these documents do not specify whether or not articles have to be in English. If we want to add new language and change the policy, that process would take 3 years. I would like to make a suggestion that we write a memo stating that we read the language and it does not specify that the research itself has to be written in English. We can send the memo to the RTP committee.

*YB*: The college RTP committee, when it comes to assessing RSCA, should defer to departmental committees.

*BLM*: What we have to do right now is deal with the language, we don’t have time to deal with policy.

*Nancy Martin*: At the FC we want to celebrate and not discourage publications in other languages. We can make the point of reading in other language as similar as reading across-disciplines.

*GE*: We cannot restrict the college committee from doing what they do. When I served on the RTP committee 2 years ago, some candidates did not even put any articles in their files, they only included evidence of acceptance.

*EK*: In the last 2 years, I have seen the college overturn department decisions; people have gotten independent reviews, but that did not change the decision. We would have to change the definition of peer or independent review.

*BLM*: The document stands, it is official.

*DS*: The college RTP committee makes recommendations, the Provost decides; appeals would have to go up to the Provost. It is important to avoid suspicion from department committee.

*BLM*: I am suggesting that we give a recommendation regarding statement 2.2.6.1.

**MOTION:** Send memo to RTP committee, Dean Wallace, Provost, and department committees with our interpretation as FC that proof of peer review is provided in English by the RTP department committee.

*CD*: That is already what the department committee does. Otherwise, it should say that all proof of peer reviewed should be translated.

*BLM*: We are interpreting it simply, but that simplicity is necessary now. This document applies now, as the Dean said.

*YB*: Why can we not add in 2.2.6.2 that it is okay for articles to be submitted in other languages? The RTP college committee should defer to the departmental committee.

*BLM*: That can be a separate motion. We have to keep it simple now.

*CW*: Candidates should provide editorial statements from journals: how many people peer reviewed it, how was the peer-review process, the journal status, etc.

*BLM*: What we are saying is that proof is provided in English by the department committee.

*KJ*: Any memo has to address the misinterpretation of the phrase: “the peer review evaluation has to be in English.”

*MF*: I don’t think there was any concern about the article written in other language. The concern was that for the English articles you got to check the peer review process and that they can do that for some articles but not for others.

*BLM*: I propose a **SECOND MOTION:** The college RTP document does not specify what languages articles must be published in and it does recognize that articles may be published in languages other than English.

-The memo would also go to department RTP committees.

RT: The goal would be to support colleagues going through this process now.

*CS*: The presumption that all departments are pro-candidate in all cases is not true.

**VOTE for first motion:**

-in favor: 12 votes

-opposed: 6 votes

-abstentions: 7 votes

\*The first motion does not pass.

**VOTE for second motion:**

-in favor: 22 in favor

\*The second motion passes.

*KJ*: Regarding the first motion and section 2.2.6.2: if departments cannot provide it, peer review itself does not have to be in English. Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review.

*BLM*: The issue is: who is doing the translation?

[*Five minutes left, the council needs to vote for next year’s Executive Committee members.*]

*RT*: Are there any nominations for FC Chair? You can nominate yourself or someone else can nominate you.

*Kimberly Walters*: I nominate Yousef. [*He rejected the nomination*.]

*BLM*: I nominate Malcolm. [*He rejected the nomination*.]

*RT*: Nominations for Vice-Chair?

*CD*: What happened to the request of a course release for chair of FC?

*RT*: As of right now, our informal, verbal request has been denied. However, we are in the process of writing a formal, written report that outlines our case in favor of release time for the chair of the Faculty Council.

*KJ*: I nominate Chris Karadjov for FC Chair. [*He accepted the nomination*.]

**Vote: All in favor**

*YB*: **MOTION:** We need to make a statement about the problem with leadership because there is no release time.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:03PM.**

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

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