**CLA FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING & ALL-FACULTY MEETING**

Friday, May 3, 2024

11 am to 2 pm

LA4-120

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING (11 am)

1. Call to Order, Approval of Agenda
2. Meeting called to order at 11:05 by Chris Karadjov.
3. Attendance:
	* In person: Chris Karadjov (JPR), Emily Schryer (Human Development), Maddie Liseblad (Journalism & Public Relations), Jeff Blutinger (Jewish Studies), Araceli Esparza (English), Rezenet Moges-Riedel (ASLD), Aparna Nayak (RGRLL), H. Isabella Lanza (Human Development – in place of Ann Kim), Dmitrii Sidorov (Geography), Anand Commissiong (POLSCI), Adrià Martín-Mor (RGRLL), Janet Muñiz (SOC), Lily House-Peters (Geography/ESP), Jolene McCall (IST), Kate Flach (History), Carie Rael (History), Isacar Bolaños (History), Sabrina Alimahomed (Sociology), Yousef Baker (I/ST), Stephanie Hartzell (COMM), Varisa Patraporn (SOC), Araceli Gonzalez (Psychology), Maricela Correa-Charez (Psychology), Dario Valles (CHLS), Ann Tran (AAAS), Alice Nicholas (AFRS)
	* Over Zoom: Crystal Lie (CWL), Yuping Mao (COMM), Martha Franco (SOC), Anna Bax (Linguistics), Rigo Rodriguez (CLS)
4. Approval of Agenda
	* 1. Motion to approve the agenda by Jeff Blutinger. Seconded. All in Favor.
5. Old Business:
	* 1. Vote on RSCA Policy Changes (Second Reading of the Document, led by Araceli Esparza and Steven Osuna)
* For article 4.1 (lines 123-128) several amendments were proposed. The original text is as follows: “In establishing its rankings, the RSCA Awards committee will take into account the merit of the proposed work, the applicant’s track record/productivity as the result of prior awards, and the resources the applicant has and will have to accomplish her/his scholarly and creative work. Awards shall be based primarily on the quality of the proposed research or creative activity as manifested in the proposal. Proposals are expected to be clear to reviewers outside the discipline.”

The CLASP team proposed the following amendments to article 4.1 intended to improve equity and clarity of the policy: *In establishing its rankings, the RSCA Awards committee will take into account: the merit of the proposed work; the applicant’s track* ***record*** *as the result of prior awards;* ***how access to research support, or lack thereof, impacts faculty history in order to work toward equitable outcomes for those with access to fewer resources (e.g. assigned time, funding, and other types of research support) or life events (e.g. leaves of absence, major service or administrative roles, changing publishing timelines, etc.);*** *and the resources the applicant has and will have to accomplish their scholarly and creative work. Awards shall be based primarily on the quality of the proposed research or creative activity as* ***outlined*** *in the proposal. Proposals* ***should be clear and accessible*** *to reviewers outside the* ***applicant’s*** *discipline.*

Paul Laris suggested an amendment to the amendment, proposing the following text: *In establishing its rankings, the RSCA Awards committee will take into account: the merit of the proposed work; the applicant’s track record as the result of prior awards; how access to research support, or lack thereof, impacts faculty history in order to work toward equitable outcomes for those with access to fewer resources (e.g. assigned time, funding, and other types of research support) or* ***how life events impacts faculty history (e.g. leaves of absence, major service or administrative roles, changing publishing timelines, etc.) in order to work toward equitable outcomes;*** *and the resources the applicant has and will have to accomplish their scholarly and creative work. Awards shall be based primarily on the quality of the proposed research or creative activity as outlined in the proposal. Proposals should be clear and accessible to reviewers outside the applicant’s discipline.*

* + Dmitrii Sidorov sponsored the proposed amendment to the amendment. Seconded. 4 in favor. 24 opposed. 1 abstention. Motion did not pass.
	+ Motion to approve the CLASP team amendment to article 4.1. 28 in favor. 1 abstention. Motion passed.
* Proposed amendments to articles 4.1.1 and 4.1.4 include changing “scholarly” to “scholarship” (line 130), and adding the phrase “community-engaged and applied research” to line 136, changing “creative development” to “creative activities, development” (line 136), and changing “or” to “and” (line 136). The amended policies would read as follows: For article 4.1.1: *Significance of the research, scholar****ly****, or creative activity.* For article 4.1.4: *Extent to which the project will promote the faculty member’s*

*scholarly,* ***community-engaged and applied research,*** *or creative activit****ies,*** *development, direction,* ***and*** *purpose.*

* + Motion to approve the amendments by Jeff Blutinger. Seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.
* Proposed amendment by the CLASP Team to article 4.1.5 (lines 137-138) to add community research outcomes as part of RSCA Evaluation criteria. An additional amendment was proposed by Jeff Blutinger, adding the definition of Scholarship of Engagement from the University RTP document. The proposed amendment is as follows: *Probability that the project will lead to peer-reviewed publication, exhibitions, external grant proposals;* ***scholarly collaborations and partnerships with communities outside the university that result in non-traditional scholarly or creative products, including, but not limited to, exhibits, nonprofit reports, policy development, among other scholarly, applied, and creative outcomes. The University RTP policy states: “The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact”.***

Additional proposed amendment to remove article 4.2.3 (lines 148 -152) and renumber subsequent 4.2 sub-articles. Article 4.2.3. describes a process which is no longer practiced that involves making and distributing 5 paper copies of each MGSS award applications.

* + Motion to approve the amendments by Anand Commissiong. Seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.
* Proposed amendment to article 5.1.3 by Kimberly Davis in the dean’s office, to add the phrase “and/or CLA dean’s office staff” to the end of the sentence on line 197.

Friendly amendment to the amendment by Aparna Nayak and others, to change the phrase to read “with support from the CLA dean’s office as needed”. The amended article would read as follows: *Individual reviewers submit their scores to CLA Dean's office staff, who will remove reviewer identities. Those scores will then be normalized by the RSCA committee* ***chair with support from the CLA dean’s office as needed****.*

* + Motion sponsored by Jeff Blutinger. Seconded. 28 in favor. 1 abstention. Motion passed.
* Amendment to article 5.1.5 (line 199) to replace the words “as necessary” with “before finalizing scores”. The amended policy would read: *The panel shall meet to discuss and resolve ties* ***before finalizing scores****.*
	+ Motion to vote by Araceli Esparaza. Seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.
* Amendment to article 5.1.6 (line 200) proposed by Kimberly Davis to add the phrase “and the CLA Dean’s Office Staff” to the article. The revised article would read: *Final scores are sent to the RSCA committee chair* ***and the CLA Dean’s Office staff,*** *who compiles a master ranking*.
	+ Motion sponsored by Jeff Blutinger. Seconded. 26 in favor. 3 abstentions. Motion passed.
* Amendment to article 5.1.7 (line 202) proposed by Kimberly Davis to replace “distributed to” with “shared with”. The amended article would read: *The master ranking will be* ***shared with*** *all members of RSCA.*
	+ Motion sponsored by Jeff Blutinger. Seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.
* Motion by Lily House-Peters to approve the revised RSCA policy with all of the approved amendments. Seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

ALL-FACULTY MEETING (12 pm – 2 pm)

1. Dean Deborah Thien
* Dean Thien thanked Faculty Council for doing the important work of revising the College RTP policy. Edits to the policy should be focused on making the policy as clear and specific as possible and any ambiguities be clarified, both for the sake of the candidates, the College RTP committee, and the dean’s office.
1. New Business: Presentation of RTP Revisions (May Lin, Varisa Patraporn, Rigo Rodriguez)
* The CLASP team presented an overview of the current College RTP Policy, and the new revised University policy focusing on the three major sections of the policy: Instruction and Instructionally-related activities, RSCA and Service.
* The team also summarized feedback that has been received in all three of the RTP areas from various forums to-date. Please see slides for exact details.
* The goal of the current meeting is to solicit more feedback on the policy so that a draft of the revised policy can receive a first reading in Faculty Council in early Fall 2024.
* The remainder of the meeting was broken into 3 segments: Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities (12:45-1:10pm), RSCA (1:10-1:35pm), and Service (1:35-1:50pm).
* Discussion ensued and recommendations were recorded by Rigo Rodriguez and the CLASP team to incorporate into the new RTP draft.
1. Motion to adjourn meeting at 2pm. Seconded. Meeting adjourned.