**CLA FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA**

Wednesday, Feb. 1, 2023

3:30-5:00 p.m.

Anatol Patio and Conference Room, AS Building

1. Call to Order
2. Meeting called to order by Gwen Shaffer at 3:37pm
3. In Attendance: Gwen Shaffer (Journalism & Public Relations), Maddie Liseblad (Journalism & Public Relations), Adrià Martín (RGRLL), Crystal Lie (Comparative World Literature), Karissa Miller (Psychology), Rajbir S. Judge (History), Rene Trevino (English), Justin Gomer (American Studies), Roberto Ortiz (Sociology), Paul Laris (Geography), Suzanne Wechsler (Geography), Margaret Kuo (History), Jessica Brooks (Classics), Matt Lesenyie (Political Science), Shae Miller (Sociology), Alice Nicholas (Africana Studies), Wayne Wright (Philosophy), Raven Pfister (Communication Studies), Tina Matuchniak (English), Eileen Klink (English), Maricela Correa (Psychology), Moyang Li (English), Anand Commissiong (Political Science), Gabriel Estrada (Religious Studies), Emily Schryer (Human Development), Yuping Mao (Communication Studies), Stephanie Hartzell (Communication Studies), May Ling Halim (Psychology), Christopher Rosales (Chicanx/Latinx Studies), Rezenet Moges-Riedel (ASL Linguistics & Deaf Cultures), Steven Rousso-Schindler (Anthropology), Sandra Arévalo (Human Development), Ilan Mitchell-Smith (English and Medieval Studies), May Lin (Asian American Studies), Barbara LeMaster (Linguistics), Mary McPherson (Communication Studies)
4. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve by Mary McPherson

Seconded by Gabriel Estrada

All in favor: Unanimous

1. Approval of Minutes from Dec. 7, 2022 town hall break out groups

Motion to approve by Christopher Rosales

Seconded by Jessica Brooks

All in favor 34 (2 abstentions)

1. Reports
	1. Dean’s report (Deborah Thien)
* Dean Thien thanked faculty for their service, energy and commitment – particularly for their participation in the Town Hall meeting in the fall. The dean also acknowledged Dr. Linna Li and the East Asia Subcommittee of International Education Committee for their work in organizing the Lunar New Year Event.
* Dean Thien is continuing visits to departments. She is hearing many of the same concerns across departments including investment in Liberal Arts, hiring, enrollment, etc.
* In terms of enrollment, student numbers are better than expected this semester. Dean Thien acknowledged the work of faculty in improving these numbers.
* On Saturday April 15th the university is holding an event called Day at the Beach. This event offers an opportunity for students who have been admitted to come and visit campus. The dean emphasized the need for CLA departments put themselves out there, particularly for “Discovery” majors.
* The Provost is exploring ideas around alternative scheduling. What could we do differently that would benefit students? The Dean is encouraging some brainstorming on this topic. This is not an action item. Just a topic to think about and discuss.
* The Dean has been looking at the distribution of service load across CLA, examining service across 14 College committees. One of the stand-out patterns is that 75% of service on these 14 committees was done by women. This is despite the fact that the gender breakdown on campus is 45/55. What do we want to do about that? How do we want to address that? This is something to think about moving forward.
* On the hiring front there may be fewer hires this academic year but there is as yet no clear data. There has been some success with lecturer conversions over the past few years. The Provost seems interested in this as exploratory option.
	+ *Question*: Does lecturer conversion lead to more tenure lines in a department?
	+ *Answer*: The Provost’s view at this point in time seems to be that lecturer conversion fills a tenure line for that department. The possibility for lecturer conversion has always been there in the collective bargaining agreement but hasn’t generally been utilized.
* There is some new information about the 6-unit RSCA pilot which was discussed in the Town Hall meeting in December. The main concern about a 6-unit RSCA pilot was the likelihood that instituting a 6-unit RSCA would lessen the number of RSCAs available overall, which would create inequity across faculty. Dean Thien has worked out a way to conduct a pilot in the 2023/2024 year, offering the same number of RSCA (120) available in a typical year, while converting 20 of those awards to a 6 unit award. Why would we want to do this? Every year the College is approached by faculty requesting extra time for research projects. A 6-unit RSCA would allow these projects to be supported. There has also been some concern about the potential for some disciplines being more supported by RSCA awards than others. However, the dean’s office has no data to support this concern. Most faculty across disciplines receive RSCA awards pending available funds. There is no clear pattern of disparity in the RSCA awards awarded to social science vs humanities departments.
	+ *Question*: Would the 6-unit RSCA be limited to a single academic year? Could a faculty member be allocated 3 units of assigned time in Spring, and another 3 unit in fall?
	+ *Answer*: No. Because of the way that funding works, all 6 units would need to be used in a single academic year.
	+ *Question*: Could a faculty member use all 6 units in the same semester?
	+ *Answer*: This could be possible but would need to be negotiated with the faculty member’s department.
* Dean Thien also discussed another pilot project which would offer some lecturers 3 units of service and 12 units of teaching in a 15 unit contract. The pilot would involve 4-6 lecturer appointments for the Fall 2023 semester. The value of this program is that it both compensates lecturers for service, and offers necessary service for departments which need that service/role fulfilled.
	+ *Question*: What would the application process look like?
	+ *Answer*: Lecturers are normally hired at departmental level. Applications would have to be done at the department level. They are still working out what that would look like.
	+ *Question*: Would the appointment be for the entire academic year or just one semester?
	+ *Answer*: There is a possibility for reappointment to a 3/12 load but it is not automatic. A 15 unit load may look different from semester to semester.
	+ *Question*: Would these lecturer service roles go to smaller departments automatically? Who would merit such a position?
	+ *Answer*: It is complicated in a college with 27 departments. Larger departments can also have service demands. The decision would be made factoring in various considerations.
	1. Faculty Council Chair’s report (Gwen Shaffer)
* Faculty Council Chair Gwen Shaffer spoke briefly about a potential topic for the next Town Hall or retreat. Over Winter Break, some department chairs and other faculty members attended a Leadership Workshop. A focus of that workshop was a discussion on the topic of reimagining majors, thinking about interdisciplinary majors, combining majors, collaborations between majors, and mapping out those courses. This may be a useful discussion for the next Faculty Council Town Hall meeting. The alternative to not creating a collaborative plan across departments in the college, is the possibility of future conflict between departments.
	1. Budget Committee update (Steven Rousso-Schindler)
* The CLA Budget committee reviewed the College of Liberal Arts SEF-T proposals and approved $902,171 in funding. Approximately $97,829 will be carried over to next fiscal year.
* Next academic year, there is $600,000 in carryover funds available, plus a likely additional $300,000. That means that there will very likely be two travel calls again next year.
* Regarding the request for a more granular budget, information for the 2019-2020, and 2020-2021 budgets will be posted on the website. A link will be sent to Gwen Shaffer.
	1. CLA Strategic Planning Team 4 (Emily Berquist and Raven Pfister)
* The CLA Strategic Planning team 4 is charged with developing recommendations to increase equity in the RTP process including lecturer evaluations. As part of this process the team hosted a CLA Lecturer Faculty feedback forum on November 18th.
* Some of the current goals and tasks that the team is working on regarding RTP include:
	+ Trying to implement strategies to eliminate inequities in the use of SPOT evaluations
	+ Accounting for scholarship of engagement as a form of RSCA in RTP. There is currently no method to evaluate this type of scholarship for RTP purposes.
	+ Clarifying how peer reviews are accounted for in RTP. They are not trying to change the policy regarding peer reviews but rather to clarify to applicants that readers’ reports are not required
	+ Establishing protocols and practices to eliminate any inequities in RTP arising at the departmental and/or program levels.
* Lecturers are evaluated differently than tenure and tenure-track faculty. The Strategic Planning Team 4 is also tasked with making recommendations about policies and practices regarding lecturer evaluation. Some of the current goals/tasks of working group include:
	+ Recommending revisions to the lecturer evaluation form. These revisions would create a space on the form to allow lecturers to explain the conditions of course assignment and scheduling (e.g. if the lecturer had minimum prep time for a course in a particular semester, was assigned a course where they lack some expertise, etc.). A challenge of this process is that the lecturer evaluation form is not a CLA specific document.
	+ Establishing protocols and practices to eliminate inequities in the use of SPOT evaluations for lecturers
	+ Proposing a 3 WTU professional development assigned time award for CLA lecturer Faculty. This award could be used for exceptional service, pedagogical research work or RSCA
	+ Creating a comprehensive lecturer faculty handbook
	+ Communicating with lecturer faculty about the possibility of choosing to be evaluated by portfolio
	+ Creating lecturer advocacy positions
* The team will send their feedback, documents, and recommendations to the CLA ad hoc committee. They will be soliciting information about the recommendations from Faculty Council.
* CLA Faculty Council is the body that will take these recommendations and use them as a resource to help craft the policy changes that will then by voted on by Faculty Council members.
1. New Business
	1. Soliciting proposed amendments to the [CLA RSCA policy (2013)](https://csulb-my.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/g/personal/gwen_shaffer_csulb_edu/EZaHOcK3JwJEmkVyHoy0vPcBbZSSpIYSTKhhQ_yz_S6BSg?e=psOmzH)
* For RSCA policy there are some changes that need to be made. Language in the policy as it currently stands states that no more than 2 members from the same department can serve, and only people with tenure can currently serve. This makes it difficult to fill the committees.
* Gwen will send out a link to the current RSCA policy document in One Drive. Feedback is requested and welcome.
* A discussion ensued about the current RSCA policy. Several issues were discussed:
	+ Having more than 2 members from a department could create problems with the balance from departments in the social sciences vs humanities.
	+ The challenges with finding faculty to take part in service roles may stem in part from lower numbers of tenure/tenure track faculty. These changes wouldn’t address that issue.
	+ Having non-tenured faculty serving on RSCA can be very helpful for them. It gives fresh perspective on research, and can be fun. Perhaps tenure-track faculty could be eligible to serve on the RSCA committee after their 3rd year review?
	+ Is now the right time to work on revising RSCA policy considering the likelihood of the College piloting a 6-unit award in the next calendar?
	+ Do we need to make revisions accounting for a possible 6 unit RSCA award? Do changes in evaluation accounting for a 6 unit RSCA need to be part of this process of revisions?
	1. Draft criteria for a 6-unit RSCA award (building on 12/7 town hall discussion)
* Dean Thien wants our feedback about the process of allocating and evaluating 6-unit RSCA awards. This pilot is likely to take place. It is important for CLA Faculty Council to be proactive and have a voice in the evaluation process.
* A discussion ensued about the 6-unit RSCA pilot project and the feasibility of faculty council in developing the evaluation for the 6-unit RSCA award. Several questions/issues raised in the discussion included:
	+ *Question*: What would the timeline of the pilot project be?
	+ *Answer*: The pilot would likely be for just the next year.
	+ Would the policy specify conditions from for a 3 vs 6 unit award being offered?
	+ We shouldn’t make developing this evaluation the role of the RSCA committee. Faculty Council needs to address this.
	+ It needs to be made clear that just because Faculty Council may develop a process for evaluating and awarding a 6-unit RSCA, it does not mean that Faculty Council as a whole necessarily agrees with this potential change to RSCA. There are still long-term equity and feasibility concerns.
* It was suggested that Faculty Council develop an ad hoc committee to work on this process. The charge of the ad-hoc committee would be as follows: 1. Developing criteria that constitutes a 3-unit project versus a 6-unit project, 2. Creating an application and scoring system, and 3. Drafting a “model” proposal for a 3-unit project and a “model” proposal for a 6-unit project, to serve as guidance for what each might look like.
* Three members self-nominated to serve on the committee: Paul Laris, Mary McPherson, & Gwen Shaffer.
	+ There was a motion by Anand Commissiong to form an ad hoc committee with the 3 members listed above serving.
	+ The motion was seconded by Jessica Brooks.
	+ 34 in favor with 2 abstentions.
1. There was a motion to adjourn at 5:02. Motion by Eileen Klink. Seconded by Christopher Rosales.