**Faculty Council Meeting**

Wednesday, September 16, 2020

3:30PM-5:00PM

**1) Call to Order:** 3:32PM

*Barbara LeMaster*: Reminder that meetings are 1.5 hours, the idea is that faculty representatives share with their departments the documents and topics discussed at the meeting.

**2) Approval of Agenda:**

Motion to approve moved by:David Wallace

Seconded by:Anand Commissiong

**3) Approval of Minutes May 8, 2020 General Faculty Meeting**

Clarification from *BLM*: There are no minutes from the General Faculty Meeting to approve, but I will send the minutes from our April meeting to be approved in the next meeting.

**4) Reports:**

**A. CLA Dean’s Report**

*Dean David Wallace:*Welcome to those who are new to CSULB and to FC. This semester I am having one-on-one meetings with new faculty, it is a strong cohort.

Just had the Chairs’ meeting. We heard stories about struggles and also stories about how Faculty Champions and Leaders are helping faculty with AMI.

**Dean’s Report to Faculty Council: September 16, 2020**

1. Ethnic Studies Requirement: we are still awaiting final instructions from the Chancellor’s Office, but it is likely that the Ethnic Studies requirement in AB 1460 will be met by a lower-division GE course in a new F category for Ethnic Studies.

3 units in D category may be eliminated, we are waiting for instructions from the Chancellor’s Office. It is not 100% sure yet. Last I heard that was the plan, news should come in quickly.

1. As the Chancellor recently announced, instruction in the CSU will largely remain virtual for the Spring. I am hopeful that faculty who need to will be able to teach their classes from their offices in the Spring term.

We will probably have the same number of classes on campus that we have this semester, which means not that many at all.

1. I will be talking with the Faculty Council Executive Committee about a Fall and a Spring general faculty meeting in a Zoom town hall format. My proposal is that the Fall meeting focus on a report of the CLA 2019-20 budget with projections for 2020-21, and the Spring focus on the college’s Beach 2030 plans.

The report of the CLA 2019-20 budget with projections for 2020-21 is particularly important right now. Regarding Beach 2030, we will need to have town halls for faculty to give their input.

1. CSULB is better positioned to absorb the 5% cut in state funding than many other CSU campuses because our enrollment is slightly up this fall, and the campus has reserves to buffer cuts for about 2 years. A larger state budget cut in 2021-22 would be much more difficult to manage.

Many campuses in the North are having an enrollment decline. I want to talk to faculty more about budget. The short version is:

1. The college will need to contribute over $1 million to the Academic Affairs’ share of the 5% budget cut that came to the campus.

Good news: this is NOT a 5% budget cut to the college rather only about 2.5% because of Academic Affair’s mitigation.

Bad news: The CLA budget will be very tight. Terie Bostic and I are preparing a plan to present to the Budget Committee that prioritizes protecting the teaching schedule.

Limited Good News:

--I have already approved CLA funding for the 14 RSCA-assigned time or SGF approved for this year but for which the college did not have funding from Academic Affairs.

--The plan Terie and I will present to the Budget Committee will also recommend:

(1) support for one virtual conference registration for all of those eligible for CLA travel support

(2) $13,000 for Scholarly Intersections events (about half the usual amount given that there will be no travel or catering costs)

(3) Funding up to $5000 each for departments or independent programs to engage in anti-racist or social justice efforts (not to be used for assigned time).

Our budget will be tight.

$5,000 programs – groups of faculty meeting to plan events to increase awareness about social justice issues

*BLM*: Regarding the $5,000, would programs like ASLD be able to obtain that budget?

*DW*: ASLD would be part of what Linguistics does.

*DW*: About Scholarly Intersections: we will not be able to do any travel or catering.

*Lily House-Peters*: Are we able to give stipends to scholars from other CSUs? I have had issues in the past with paying people who are at other CSUs. Specifically, they rejected payment to a speaker from CSU San Marcos.

*DW*: Generally speaking, that is not a problem unless they are already doing additional employment at their institution. Let me check with Terie Bostic about that.

[*Post-meeting update:*

*Dean Wallace followed up via email after checking with Terie and confirmed that “paying stipends to employees of other CSUs is a challenge. We cannot pay them directly, and some campuses are better than others at taking a transfer from us and paying the faculty member. There may be some work arounds, but I think the take-away is that if someone is planning to invite a CSU employee for a Scholarly Intersections event, it’s best to check in with Terie ahead of time so we can manage the challenges of compensating them proactively.”*

*Lily House-Peters suggested that “the 2020-2021 CFP for Scholarly Intersections proposals can include a note about this, so that any prospective applicants who are considering inviting speakers from other CSU campuses know to reach out to Terie to discuss the details*.*”*]

*Suzanne Wechsler*: What are the guidelines for the use of the 5,000 of the social justice projects?

*DW*: That budget will not constitute assigned time for a single person. I will ask the Budget Committee to create guidelines.

**B. FC Chair’s Report**

*BLM*: During the Summer chairs had meetings with DW about the state of the college and encouraged him to help the college more according to faculty interests. That is one of the reasons why I did not follow up about the Strategic Plan: I wanted to see what happened with those meetings. Ethnic Studies was also a big discussion in the summer.

Also, University-wide graduate council. [*Please refer to the Graduate Studies Advisory Committee document sent before this meeting.*] Suzanne Wechsler is the CLA representative for this committee.

Congrats to the CLA colleagues who organized the ‘ScholarStrike.’ And an acknowledgement to those who made the events accessible to deaf people. In only two days they were able to make that happen.

There are Campus Conversations going on with the Academic Senate and the Provost. The first one already took place, it was about AB-1460. I will get an invitation from now on and will forward it to all of you. During the Summer there were Repopulation meetings in which the AS and the Provost answered questions about the process.

AB-1460: The CSU AS, the Chancellor’s Office and the Ethnic Studies Commission must meet and agree on what will happen and how this requirement will be implemented.

Elections: It was a herculean task, we faced the difficulty of figuring out what seats were open.

Now we have a fully populated elections committee with Michael Eisendstat, Kyoungmi Ha and Kristy Shih.

Update about committees:

-EPCC: two open seats, please nominate yourself or someone else

 -URC: 1 Alternate Remaining

 -CEPC: 1 Alternate Remaining

 -Sabbatical: 1 remaining

 -Budget Committee: 2 Remaining

-FFPC: No Nominations Submitted

-PARC: No Nominations Submitted

**5) New Business**

**A. RSCA** **Committee proposal** – FC vote on motion to approve the attached proposal – Adam Kahn. Time Certain: 3:50 p.m.

*Adam Kahn*: The RSCA committee realized that Covid-19 disrupted people’s lives and, therefore, their research. Faculty history is among the things that get considered for these awards. Many people are not able to use their reports as intended. There is more certainty now, we know that Sping will be online, at the time when we wrote this we did not know.

[*AK summarized proposals in the document sent to all FC members*.]

**Motion to approve policy changes to RSCA**

Motion moved by: Anand Commissiong

Seconded by: Shelley Gonzalez

**Discussion:**

*Shelley Gonzalez*: This was meant to protect faculty and to make sure that we are not penalized because things did not go as planned. Faculty history is important. We developed this language allowing faculty to explain that it was because of Covid that they could not finish a project. It is just to make sure that we do not get penalized. If I submitted a project that I was not able to carry out, I can submit a similar proposal.

*Stacy Macías*: I would like to know how this affects folks who are taking assigned time now.

*AK*: You may explain in your faculty history what you did with those units: “here is my project, I was not able to use it as intended.” If you are resubmitting an application, you do not need to disclose that it is the same application. It will be a completely new 3-person sub-committee. Three years from now we may have a completely new RSCA committee, we wanted something in written.

*SG*: It is tricky because we evaluate things so far in advance. When you submit you can explain that the project is in progress.

*AK*: Referring to previous projects has always been part of RSCA application. Now you would do it, but you would explain what happened with the project.

*Itxaso Rodriguez*: If you have to disclose previous projects, then you are disclosing that it is not a completely new project.

*AK*: But you are not disclosing if it is exactly the same project. Some faculty use the same award title for three years in a row. Just because it is the same title/topic does not mean it is the same project.

*SG*: And now with this document we are saying it is totally fine if it is the same project.

*BLM*: I sent this document to all chairs stating that we would vote on this at this meeting. I have not gotten any negative feedback about this. Our college does not have very many policies. If we accept the spirit of this proposal, this policy would go as a resource to the committee until we figure out where to include it.

**Vote:** 38 votes in favor of the proposed policy changes to RSCA

**B. American Studies RTP document**. Time Certain 4:10

*Brett Mizelle*: Background: the first hire in the American Studies program was Justin Gomer, in 2016. We decided we needed an RTP document. We looked at the CSULB and Fullerton documents. When creating our document, we took into consideration research and community engagement. This document has been for a long time sitting on the dean’s desk. Barbara is right that it has had a lot of eyes on it.

*Justin Gomer*: I would be happy to talk about anything necessary. We used the International Studies document as a guide. The reason was twofold: these department documents get approved and do not get updated, IS was the most recent program that had created a document. Also, they framed interdisciplinary research in a way that was important for us. This implies a consequential timeline for AS. Because it is housed in History, whoever we hire is under the History document. While historical methods are similar, there are disciplinary differences.

*BLM*: Comments, suggestions friendly amendments?

*AK*: I have a long-term concern, for future RTP committees: the language in this document is vague regarding reappointment and promotion to full. It reads as if you were requiring 3 publications for RTP. Unless that is what you mean. Issues may come up in the future that may hurt candidates. But I think it is great in terms of interdisciplinary expectations.

*Laura Ceia*: In the college RTP document nowhere does it say that there are different standards.

*AK*: College and University documents say that expectations for full need to be higher than standards for Associate and Full. There are areas of ambiguity that come up. I do not see a single instance where you are differentiating. I think it is a great document, but clarification is needed.

*BLM*: We need to look at the college document and see where there are inconsistencies. You need to look at it from an AS point of view. Is this going to apply to your most recent hire? If so, does this need to be approved in a quicker way?

*BM*: We need this approved as soon as possible. We have been working on it for a couple of years. We are happy with what we created. There are problems with the college document.

*BLM*: We need to ask the FC if we can waive the first reading.

**Motion to waive first reading**

Motion moved by: Laura Ceia

Seconded by: Jeff Blutinger

*Kevin Johnson*: I think the discrepancy that Adam is talking about is that the college level cannot be more stringent than the department level document. If you meet the department level expectations, you should meet college level document. That is the discrepancy that should be clarified.

*BLM*: We will have a committee that will be working on revisions to the college RTP document.

*JG*: We need to move this quick. I was hired under the history document and in my third year was told that I needed to use History document. This will make things difficult for a new hire in the AS program.

**Motion to approve the document as is:**

Motion moved by: Adam Kahn

Seconded by: Laura Ceia

**C. Ethnic Studies & passage of AB-1460** **– what does it mean for our college?**

*Rigo Rodriguez*: I am Rigo Rodriguez from CHLS, with me today are the chairs of the other Ethnic Studies departments: Barbara Kim, Maulana Karenga, and Craig Stone.

Background of AB-1460:

Signed into law on August 17th, the conversation has moved to implementing the law. By fall 2021 the ES courses need to be in place.

The implementation stage is important (think of desegregation laws and how schools found ways to resegregate people). It is important that the law is implemented in a way that meets the spirit and the letter of the law.

Implementation pathway: SLOs + Academic Integrity + Faculty

SLOs: focus on LOs: they are 5, they are integrated

Academic Integrity: It is essential to house courses in ES departments. Faculty in those departments have developed a body of work around race/ethnicity and have pushed for this requirement. It is important to look at the way in which our filed is constituted: race and ethnicity are the basis of what we do. For example: I was trained as a geographer. Our scholarship shows engagement. Our pedagogy is strictly linked to that engagement.

Faculty: Hiring & retaining ES faculty [*listed number of faculty in each ES department*]. We need to be able to invest in the vitality of these programs.

Today we are asking faculty to vote and support the process of implementation of these courses.

The discussion going on right now is about lower or upper level, GE or GR requirement.

*Jeff Blutinger*: As you know I strongly oppose the second part of motion. As a chair of unrecognized ES program, I hope to be able to offer these courses. Provost Jersky said that the Chancellor’s Office is interpreting that the ES courses would be housed exclusively in those four departments. Is that right?

*RR*: I was at that meeting on Thursday and that is what I understood as well. The departments that would teach these courses are those that have been working on the implementation of this requirement for decades.

*JB*: My field has been around for 200 years and we have a large body of work.

*SW*: What do you mean by housed in? Does that preclude having cross-listed courses?

*RR*: At this point in time it means that these four depts will have the authority to offer these courses. As far as cross listing, we have not crossed that bridge yet, but the priority is that it is those four departments. Hopefully that does not come as a surprise. These departments put in the labor. It should not be a surprise to folks that this is what we have been arguing about since the very beginning.

*AK*: Could you show us the LOs? I doubt it would change my decision but would like to see them if we are being asked to vote.

*LHP*: I am on GEGC and they are talking about removing D-3 and making this category F. It felt very rapid. I support this, but it feels like the way the university is choosing to roll this out is hurting CLA. If they remove D-3 it will hurt CLA departments. The way they are using GE terms feels as backlash to CLA.

*RR*: I appreciate hearing this, that is why these conversations are important. The implementation makes it clear that the CLA ES council has to be involved in this decision making. We have to be clear about that. We are trying to communicate with our colleagues as clearly as possible. I want to hear if Maulana and Craig want to add something, they were at the CSU ES council meeting.

*Craig Stone*: We were at a meeting with the CSU AS, the Council on ES, and four representatives from Chancellor’s Office. We are involved in a collaborative process. We will be on implementation mode by next fall.

*Maulana Karenga*: I want to build on what they said; we are in a process of collaboration in which we talk about these things. Three groups involved: ES council, CSU AS and CO. This is a collaborative process with members of the task force and members of the council. I would like to see it in 3 basic ways.

1. AB-1460 represents over 50 years of struggle to expand the concept of quality education.
2. The need that our education represents our most ethical values: social justice, social struggles, intellectual history.
3. This is an extraordinary opportunity to collaborate. How do we expand the educational project?

This is a starting point. How do we apply the Inclusive Excellence we have been talking about for years?

*BLM*: We are over time by 2 minutes.

**Motion 1:** All courses that satisfy the Ethnic Studies requirement should address the five Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Motion moved by: Anand Commissiong

Seconded by: Abigail Rosas

**Vote:** approved by the majority

**Motion 2:** Courses to satisfy the Ethnic Studies requirement shall be housed in the Ethnic Studies Departments and Program.

Motion moved by: Anand Commissiong

Seconded by: Abigail Rosas

**Vote:** approved by the majority

**Motion 3:** with *BLM*’s amendment:

The FC advocates to the Academic Senate motions 1 and 2, that were passed today in the Faculty Council meeting, September 16, 2020.

Motion moved by: Abigail Rosas

Seconded by: Stacy Macías

**We will vote electronically.**

*LHP*: Yes, but with the amendment that we do not advocate for the abolishment of D-3 without more consultation with the departments that this will decimate. GEGC was ready to move on without consultation. Collaborative spirit was not on GEGC on Monday. It would affect CLA departments that have D-3 courses.

*MK*: We are concerned about that, we met with chairs of departments that would be affected. We are discussing how we can resist that. In order to get here, we had to push back. We do not want to prey on other departments. We need to work together to oppose those things. It should not be a zero sum.

*CS*: There is pressure to implement something. After that, once they have a sense that it will solidly meet the requirement, I think there will be room for more nuanced conversations. This is not about ES, it is about CLA. The College of Arts stole 1/3 of our courses years ago.

**Meeting dismissed: 5:19PM**

**Minutes taken and respectfully submitted by**

***Jeannette Acevedo Rivera*, Faculty Council secretary.**

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