**CLA FACULTY COUNCIL SPRING RETREAT: POLICY-PALOOZA**

**AGENDA**

Friday, May 5, 2023

11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.

Anatol Patio and Conference Room, AS Building

1. Call to Order
2. Meeting called to order at 11:37pm by Gwen Shaffer
3. In Attendance: Gwen Shaffer (Journalism & Public Relations), Adrià Martín (RGRLL), Paul Laris (Geography), Shae Miller (Sociology), Alice Nicholas (Africana Studies), Emily Schryer (Human Development), Yuping Mao (Communication Studies), 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), Jolene McCall (International Studies), Suzanne Perlitsh Wechsler (Geography), Jessica Brooks (Classics), Barbara LeMaster (Linguistics), Lily House-Peters (Geography/ESP), Christy Jocoy (Geography), Stephanie Hartzell (Communication Studies), Norbert Schürer (English), Aparna Nayak (RGRLL), Maddie Liseblad (Journalism & Public Relations), Lori Baralt (WGSS), Araceli Esparza (English), Roberto Ortiz (Sociology), Gabriel Estrada (Religious Studies), Elizabeth Dalish (Comparative World Literature), Michael Ahland (Linguistics), Katherine McLoone (Comparative World Literature), Emma Daugherty (Journalism and Public Relations), May Lin (AAAS), Tina Matuchniak (English), Kathryn Chew (CWL/CLSC/RST), Barabara Kim (AAAS), Seiji Steimetz (CLA-Dean’s Office), Chris Warren (CLA), CJ Murphy (Sociology)
4. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve by Emily Berquist

Seconded by Michael Ahland

1. Approval of Minutes from April 5, 2023

Motion to approve Minutes from April 5th after small amendment of typo in Call to Order: Jessica Brooks

Seconded by Sandra Arévalo

1. Policy presentations
	* **Equity Task Force on Faculty Evaluation**: Proposed revisions to the CLA RTP policy (Emily Berquist Soule and Raven Pfister)
* Emily Berquist Soule and Raven Pfister presented the proposed policy changes developed by the CLA EFT RTP Policy working group. The presentation focused on proposed revisions to several key components of the CLA RTP policy including student evaluations, scholarship of engagement, disclosure of peer review process, service (focused on an acknowledgment of cultural/identity taxation), and a continuum of scholarship appendix.
* All of the recommended changes can be found in the document drafts appended to the minutes. The text in green represents the proposed amendments.
* None of the proposed changes have yet been approved. Any changes need to wait until the University RTP policy document is finalized. Faculty Council will begin to work on the proposed changes in the academic next year.
* Some of the Q&A from the presentation:
	+ *Question*: You state that the new language does not devalue traditional research but is designed to help create a level playing field. Could you provide an example of what you mean by this?
	+ *Answer*: One of the things that the new language attempts to define are terms related to community research. For example, a definition of community-based research focuses on collaborative partnerships with communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge.
	+ *Question*: Is this what used to be called community outreach under service?
	+ *Answer:* Yes. We are trying to create a more broadly inclusive continuum of research.
	+ Question: In the policy document, do you define what peer reviewed means?
	+ *Answer*: Yes. The revisions include language describing types of proof of peer review. In terms of copies of reader reports, it is specified in the proposed revisions that reader reports (should they be included as proof of peer review) can be used against the candidate by evaluators. This language is there to make candidates aware of how reader reports could be used in their file, and to make it clear that if candidates are concerned, they can submit one or more of the other forms of proof of peer review.
	+ *Question*: Do these documents acknowledge or include the Collective Bargaining agreement?
	+ *Response*: The university RTP policy has not yet been passed. There will be a university wide vote in the fall.
	+ **Equity Task Force on Faculty Workload**: proposed revisions to the CLA RSCA policy (Araceli Esparza and Yuping Mao)
* Araceli Esparza and Yuping Mao presented the proposed policy changes being worked on this year by the CLA RSCA policy working group. The proposed changes reflect feedback provided by Faculty Council in a previous session.
* All of the recommended changes can be found in the document drafts appended to the minutes. The text highlighted in yellow represents the proposed amendments.
* None of the proposed changes have yet been approved. Faculty Council will begin to work on the proposed changes in the next academic year.
* Some of the Q&A from the presentation:
	+ *Question*: Does the RSCA policy include a priority for people just coming off 3 years – pre-tenure?
	+ *Answer*: No such priority is outlined in the policy.
	+ *Question*: Are faculty who are pre-tenure and in their first 3 years eligible for small faculty grants?
	+ *Answer*: Yes. They are eligible for Small Faculty Grants but not for assigned time.
	+ *Comment*: That isn’t clear to people and needs to be made clear to applicants.
	+ *Question*: What is the rate of non-funding for CLA RSCA?
	+ *Answer*: The rate of non-funding is very low. On average 120 applications are funded per year out of an average of 120 to 140 applications submitted. The College also typically finds money for some extra applications. However, it is important to remember that there are ups and downs in terms of funding for RSCA from year to year and we need to account for down years as well.
	+ **Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee**: draft criteria for a 6-unit RSCA award pilot initiative (Paul Laris, Mary McPherson and Gwen Shaffer)
* The CLA Ad Hoc Committee has been charged with drafting criteria for a 6-unit RSCA award pilot initiative. The goal for this meeting is to open a discussion for ideas and feedback on the proposed criteria. The committee reminds Faculty Council that the options are to either create these criteria with feedback from Faculty Council or to not work on this and let the Dean’s office or RSCA committee to develop the criteria instead. The criteria the committee has been asked to develop is not official policy and has not been voted on by Faculty Council.
* The current draft of the proposed 6-unit RSCA criteria are appended to the minutes. This is a working document and not intended to be a final draft.
* Some of the Q&A from the presentation:
	+ *Question*: Realistically, there is no project that just takes 3 units to complete. Why can’t we just have people apply for two 3-unit RSCA?
	+ *Answer*: Once you are scored at a certain level, how do we make this decision? Your justification for 6 units should be weighed in the evaluation.
	+ *Comment*: I have concerns for equity issues regarding the weight given to Faculty History. This may disadvantage parents, those with disabilities, people in the humanities.
	+ *Comment*: There is an overall problem of how to quantify projects and research productivity. A book is only one publication, whereas someone can write multiple articles.
	+ *Question*: There is a basic question of whether a 6-unit RSCA is warranted. What is the purpose of a piloting a 6-unit RSCA? What goal does it serve? It seems to create distinctions that could be really problematic.
	+ *Answer*: Dean Thien is looking at this from a different perspective. There is a demand for a 3/3 teaching load. The 6-unit RSCA pilot represents a move towards providing a 3/3 load for some faculty.
	+ *Question*: Would this require two separate RSCA committees? One evaluating 3 unit and one evaluating 6 unit RSCA?
	+ *Answer*: We don’t know yet.
	+ *Comment*: One of the issues with the proposed criteria is that if an applicant is applying for a 6 unit RSCA, then they have to justify the 6 units being requested by making it clear that the outcome is spread over two semesters. But if the project is rejected for a 6 unit RSCA award (and is automatically then considered for a 3 unit RSCA), then this would create an unrealistic time-line for a 3 unit RSCA.
	+ *Question*: Can’t we just give 6-units of RSCA to the top 20 scoring applications?
	+ *Answer*: We could do that tomorrow, but it creates issues with justification and history.
	+ *Comment*: Adding a 6 unit RSCA creates an issue of workload burden for the RSCA committee.
	+ *Question*: This 6-unit RSCA is a pilot. How would the College evaluate the success of the pilot?
	+ *Answer*: This is a great question for the dean and we will direct this question to her. Evaluating the success of the pilot in not the charge of the ad hoc committee.
	+ *Question*: Do we want to weigh justification less than faculty history?
	+ *Answer*: That is a question for faculty council – do we weigh these differently or the same as for a 3 unit project?
	+ *Comment (from several attendees)*: Our biggest concern is equity – we put our trust in the strategic planning process to deal with equity issues.
	+ *Question*: Should we maybe think about the 6-unit RSCA as an equity pipeline? It could represent a way to create balance.
	+ *Answer*: Does that mean only faculty who meet certain criteria would be eligible? Who would meet those criteria?
	+ *Question*: Is the criteria for the 6-unit RSCA consistent with the proposed changes from the EFT committee?
	+ *Answer*: No. At this point it is not consistent. However, this is a draft document and is open to change.
	+ *Comment*: We tasked the EFT to develop new policy criteria for RSCA for a reason. We need to use their policy documents for RSCA.
	+ *Comment*: If the dean wants to go outside of current RSCA policy (which would be the case for a 6-unit RSCA application), then we would have to suspend our current policy for that to happen. People are uncomfortable with this.
	+ *Comment* (from the Ad Hoc Committee): If Faculty Council feels that the 6-unit RSCA evaluation criteria are not ready to pilot then the criteria are not ready. It is up to Faculty Council representatives to make this decision.
	+ *Question:* In terms of the timeline - Is there time to reconcile the EFT RSCA policy amendments with the 6-unit RSCA pilot criteria? Is this realistic?
	+ *Answer*: Applications for RSCA go out in the fall. It would be difficult to approve the proposed EFT RSCA amendments to policy and reconcile those changes with the 6-unit RSCA criteria before RSCA applications have to go out. This timeline is probably not feasible.