**CLA FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA**

Wednesday, April 5, 2023

3:30-5:00 p.m.

Anatol Patio and Conference Room, AS Building

1. Call to Order
2. Meeting called to order at 3:36pm by Gwen Shaffer
3. Call to Order
4. Meeting called to order at 3:35pm by Gwen Schaffer
5. In Attendance: Gwen Shaffer (Journalism & Public Relations), Adrià Martín (RGRLL), Crystal Lie (Comparative World Literature), Karissa Miller (Psychology), Rene Trevino (English), Justin Gomer (American Studies), Paul Laris (Geography), Shae Miller (Sociology), Alice Nicholas (Africana Studies), Wayne Wright (Philosophy), Raven Pfister (Communication Studies), Moyang Li (English), Anand Commissiong (Political Science), Emily Schryer (Human Development), Yuping Mao (Communication Studies), May Ling Halim (Psychology), Chris Rosales (Chicanx/Latinx Studies), Steven Rousso-Schindler (Anthropology), Sandra Arévalo (Human Development), Ilan Mitchell-Smith (English and Medieval Studies), Azza Basarudin (WGSS), Robert Chlala (Sociology), Kimberly Robertson (American Indian Studies), Jolene McCall (International Studies), Rajbir Judge (History), Gino Galvez (Psychology), Suzanne Perlitsh Wechsler (Geography), Jessica Brooks (Classics), Barbara LeMaster (Linguistics), Mary McPherson (Communication Studies), Rezenet Moges-Riedel (ASLD)
6. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve by Anand Commissiong

Seconded by Jolene McCall

All in favor: Unanimous

1. Approval of Minutes from March 1, 2023

Motioned by Jessica Brooks

Seconded by Jolene McCall

All in favor: Unanimous

1. Reports
	1. Q&A with the Dean (Deborah Thien). Rather than the typical announcement Dean Thien held a Question and Answer period:
* The Dean announced that Day at the Beach will take place on April 15th. A flyer is available. Everyone is encouraged to attend. This is a real opportunity to recruit with intention.
* *Question*: With regards to the 6-unit RSCA pilot project - Where is the extra money coming from to support 6 units? There is concern that that money will be taken away from extra RSCA awards that might otherwise be offered.
* *Answer*: The norm has been to offer 120 RSCA awards. This proposal will allow for 20 6-unit award in addition to the norm. We typically have “extra” because faculty can apply for both RSCA and MGSS but can only accept one. As requests flow through the system and faculty accept some awards and decline others, we can assign the newly available awards to additional faculty. When we are able to go above baseline it is often for that reason. The cost for 20 extra RSCA is relatively small for the College. The College typically receives 120-140 requests for awards. The additional 20 units of 6 RSCA awards are not significantly more than what would be normally approved.
* *Question*: Regarding 6 units – if someone does not qualify for 6 units will they get bumped to 3 units of RSCA?
* *Answer*: There is a committee that is working on how to implement the 6-unit RSCA pilot. The committee will discuss that topic with Faculty Council in today’s meeting.
* *Question*: Do we know yet which departments will get searches for the upcoming year?
* *Answer*: Not yet. The College received 21 requests for tenure-line searches. We will probably get around 10. The requests were just sent forward. We will not about the results for several weeks.
* *Question*: New tenure-lines are important but what is College doing to retain faculty – particularly faculty of color? For example, a lot of faculty from the 2018 cohort, in particular, have left the university.
* *Answer*: The Dean’s office is very conscious that recruitment is only part of the process. The loss of faculty from the 2018 cohort in particular, is partly result of COVID and represents a larger trend. The Dean sees it as crucial to create conditions for retention. There have been conversations at the university around spousal hires. The Stepping Stones program has also been important for creating cohorts of faculty across different departments. The Dean welcomes input about what more we can do.
* *Question*: Are we asking the people who left why?
* *Answer*: Yes. We do exit surveys. But people also leave in different manners. Some people leave immediately, and others take a break and then leave.
* *Question*: Is there historical data on hiring and recruitment?
* *Answer*: Yes that data is available. There are Equity reports for the university. That information is available on the University website. However, the Dean has some concerns about how the form in which that information is currently provided on the website and would like make CLA information more thoughtful. But Dean will send the currently available information to Gwen Shaffer and will request additional information from the university.
* *Question*: Will the strategic planning committee who are dealing with this and other issues continue after this year?
* *Answer*: Funding for this project will finish this semester but we do want this work to continue in some iteration. The Dean’s Office is looking for possible funding from Beach 2030 to continue that work in some format.
* *Question*: It’s important that recruitment over the past several years of people of color has been good. The issues are faculty evaluations, workload issues, and cost of living. Another major issue is department culture. This is where some retention issues lie. This is where we need to engage in a more active way. This is where exit interview information will be really helpful to get at practice.
* *Answer*: There are faculty equity advocates in every college and part of the role is to promote recruitment. However, as you note, the record for recruitment in CLA is quite good and advocates have focused on other related roles. Retaining faculty in departments is one of those areas that is important.
* *Question*: Do you take into account retaining histories of departments when making decisions about hiring?
* *Answer*: This is a conversation the Dean’s Office has being having with chairs, exploring vision and programmatic issues for hiring during a period with limited lines of hire. The track record of departments with regards to diverse recruitment and retaining of faculty is important. The Dean and the Chairs are developing a plan for how to do this.
	1. Faculty Council Chair’s report (Gwen Shaffer)
* With regards to the work of the Equity task force – we can and must continue that work over the next academic year. Faculty Council representatives are the body on campus who have to make the final revisions and codify those changes. This may be a topic for a retreat in May.
* In terms of ballots - thank you for self-nominating to committees. We have received twice the number of self-nomination for the RTP committee and other committees compared with last year. Please look out for an email regarding the Budget committee. You will need to vote for budget committee as Faculty Council representatives.
	1. Faculty & Staff Assistance Program (Corrie O’Toole)
* Corrie O’Toole was asked to come and report to Faculty Council about the Mental health resources available for Faculty and Staff on campus.
* There are many resources available and any type of problem can be brought to them. All of the services are confidential. Some examples of services include: Professional problem identification (on campus or on Zoom), Short-term counseling (up to 8 sessions) & professional coaching. Community resource referrals are also available and Corrie O’Toole can also make presentations to faculty and staff groups on campus.
* A useful resource is [www.mylifematters.com](http://www.mylifematters.com) (Password: go beach). Here faculty, staff and their families can have 24/7 access to a counselor by phone for up to 8 sessions. A diversity of counselors are available. Faculty and staff can also access free consultation for legal and financial issues, national resource referrals for elder care, childcare resources, and “Concierge” services – e.g. referrals to pet sitters or house sitters. Please call 562-985-7434 for more information.
1. New Business
	1. Draft criteria for a 6-unit ad hoc RSCA award (Paul Laris, Mary McPherson, Gwen Shaffer)
* There are multiple factors involved in establishing the criteria for a 6-unit RSCA. One of the main things that the sub-committee has being working to develop is a Guide for justification for 6 units. To justify 6 units the proposed project should be more complex. Some examples might include: survey development, community engagement, or a project that requires more time sample collection. Another rational might be a project that significantly involves students and mentoring, on or engages community members, and/or advances diversity, equity and inclusion goals, or similarly advance college priorities. A third rational might be a project that involves submitting a grant to a major funding institution.
* Another factor that the committee has been considering focuses on application. Specifically, do people need to apply for both a 3 unit and 6 unit RSCA? The committee is proposing that we not require two separate applications. If you are interested in a 6 unit RSCA, you have to apply for that RSCA and justify why your project is eligible. You will only be considered for the 6 unit RSCA is you obtain a minimum of a B score (e.g. 25/30 or 85/100).
* The third factor that would be considered would be faculty history. Have you demonstrated a track record that says that if we give you the six unit, you will put those units to good use?
* So the decision would be based on a rubric that considers the combination of those three factors: meeting the minimum score, a solid justification of the project, and faculty history. Proposals that applied for 6 units, but which don’t meet the criteria, or which are not among the top rated, would automatically be considered for 3 units.
* *Question/Comment*: There are several pressing issues: One issue is that there is currently no mechanism in place that normalizes scores. In the RSCA committee, members are divided into groups, each of which is provided with a set of proposals to evaluate. Each subgroup scores and then determines which projects are fundable or not fundable. These scores are not always comparable across groups. There needs to be some mechanism for comparing across groups. A second issue is that a predictor of future research is past research, however faculty history is only weighed 20%. But follow through is an issue. Perhaps Faculty history should be weighed more heavily both for the 3 units and the 6 units RSCA.
* *Answer*: With regards to normalizing, the committee has discussed creating a template of sample applications that RSCA committee members can use to normalize their scores across groups.
* *Answer*: One problem with weighing history more heavily is that it can create issues of equity. For example, you may have someone who has had a family member to take care of during the past years, or some other factor that has interfered with productivity. Also, the committee agrees that faculty history is important and should be considered for 6 unit (which is why it is one of the three factors considered in the proposed rubric), however, we can’t change the weight of faculty history in the 3 unit RSCA without changing the College policy documents around RSCA.
* *Question*: Can we even develop a criteria for a 6 unit RSCA without changing the current RSCA documents? Especially since the RSCA documents specify 3-unit RSCA awards?
* A discussion ensued about whether the policy documents need to be changed to allow the piloting of a 6 unit RSCA.
* *Question/Comment:* How would you compare a 3 unit vs 6 unit proposal given the timeline of the work? Does a 6 unit proposal have to be a year-long vs a semester long project? What are the expectations? If someone submits a proposal for 6 unit, then that faculty member is proposing a scope of work that presumably exceeds what can be accomplished with 3 units. This makes the project more problematic as a 3 unit project. Why don’t we allow people to apply for two 3-unit RSCAs instead? Or perhaps have a section in the 6-unit RSCA application where the researcher would specify what they would do if they only received 3 units instead of 6?
* *Question:* Regarding the 85% (B) score cut-off for a 6 unit RSCA - what if you don’t meet that criteria but have a good justification?
* *Answer*: The proposal would not qualify. We only want top proposal to move forward.
* *Question*: Why don’t we just get everyone to apply for 6 units, and then award the 6-unit RSCAs to the highest scoring top 20 applications? Do we need to factor in justification?
* Several other ideas were put forward including:
	+ Requiring faculty to apply separately for the 3-unit and 6-unit RSCA awards
	+ Requiring faculty to choose to apply for either the 3-unit OR the 6-unit awards (but faculty cannot apply for both).
* There was also a discussion about the end goal of piloting a 6 unit RSCA. We have limited resources, does piloting a 6 unit RSCA represent baby steps towards offering all faculty 6 units? Or is money just being taken away from a limited pot, negatively impacting faculty?
* Gwen Shaffer and the committee will criteria proposal for a 6 unit RSCA on OneDrive, and encourages people to make comments
* This topic will be revisited in May along with proposed RTP changes
1. There was a motion to adjourn at 5:02pm.

Motion to adjourn by Chris Rosales

Seconded by Jessica Brooks.