**Draft Faculty Council Minutes**

Wednesday, Oct 19, 2016

**Present**: K. Claybrook, M. Jaffe, B.LeMaster, C. Stone, J. Gomer, D. Toji, A. Garcia-Orozco, L. McCroskey, J. Russell, J. Asenas, R. Pfister, E. Dahab, K. Chen, I. Mitchell-Smith, A. Esparza, E. Klink, L. Li, D Sidorov, C. El Ouardani, K. Walters, C. Karadjov, J. Blutinger, M. Ahland, M. Finney, M. Lascano, P. Dieveney, D. Dewitt, R. Haesly, M. Halim, J. Miles, G. Galvez, L. Sterling, J. Acevedo-Rivera, L. Ceia, J.Haldipur, CJ Murphy, L. Baralt, A. Hawk, L. Ramirez, D. Wallace, B. Manke

1. Call to Order: 3:30
2. Approval of Agenda: 3:38
3. Approval of Minutes from meeting from Sept 7, 2016 by acclaim
4. **Reports**
	1. **Chair’s Report**

Jaffe ncouraged attendance at Town Hall with the Provost in Lecture Hall 150 Friday Oct 21 @2pm with wine and cheese in Chart Room after. Pedagogical Intersections project planning is underway with ad hoc committee with plans to have one maybe two projects/presentations this semester and a full program in Spring..

* 1. **Dean's Report**

Parking on upper campus is “wonderful”. Please express your appreciation to the Administration. The Provost has a budget “road show” on Thursday, October 20 from 11 a.m.-12 p.m. Anatol Center (AS-119) Budget picture is that we are likely okay this year; however, next year sans a tax increase we likely will encounter a shortage.

1. Time certain (3:45-3:55) Discussion of **Associate Dean Position description**.

 Jaffe explained that the Dean and FC Exec reached an impasse regarding the minimum rank in the position description for the Associate Dean of Curriculum and Personnel. AS 02-04, the policy governing the process, does not specify what happens in this case. Following advice from the Academic Senate Chair, both the Dean and FC Exec met separately with the Provost to voice their rationales. Those rationales were distributed by email and on paper to the FC. While there is no provision in the policy for a binding vote, the FC Exec decided to solicit input from the CLA FC, but with a limited time for discussion given the full agenda, and do a non-binding poll. Eileen Klink stated that the Academic Senate Exec and the Provost had approved an Associate Vice President position with a minimum rank of Associate Professor[[1]](#footnote-1) and stated that while it was not ideal, it has become harder in the CSU to attract qualified candidates due to the high cost of living so the inclusion of Associate Professor expands the pool of candidates and there were no concerns about rank from the CFA. Additional discussion included a reminder that the vote was nonbinding; the concern that excluding Associate Professors from the search did not recognize their capabilities; the point that the pool was not just an internal one, but external/national; and the idea that attracting more candidates carried no risk. A paper ballot was distributed and the results were 27 in favor of a minimum rank of Associate, 12 in favor of a minimum rank of Full.

1. **Elections:** Jaffe thanked the Elections Committee (Lascano, Gregor, Robinson, Chen) for navigating the Big Pulse software and conducting recent elections.
	1. A new call for nominations for two PARC members to replace members who had to resign has just been sent out because we did not have enough candidates to elect alternates to step in. We still need alternates Jaffe pointed to the recurring problem in recruiting candidates for high-commitment committees and encouraged members to self nominate or to encourage others to apply.
	2. The Budget Committee was formed this year following the new policy, which included nominations from both the Dean and FC Exec. The Exec sought nominations through a general call to the faculty. 5 people were needed on the committee. The union of the Dean’s and Exec’s nominees met this requirement. Barbara LeMaster (LING), Dave Whitney (PSY), Steven Rousso-Schindler (ANTH), Jason Raibley (PHIL) have joined Paul Laris(GEOG), Kevin Johnson (COMM), Jennifer Reed (WGSS) and Markus Mueller (RGRLL). David Hood has agreed to serve as alternate. The committee has met and approved travel funds and departments O/E budgets
2. **I Appreciate and Respect You project:**

Craig Stone distributed posters to faculty council members and introduced the *I Appreciate and Respect You Project*. It is a “linguistic landscaping” project that uses language in virtual and real public space on campus: posters with the project phrase will be positioned in and around CSULB buildings and grounds with QR codes that take smartphone viewers to CLA websites where they can listen to a speaker of that language saying the phrase and read other, department-specific information about those speakers. Stone explained that the goal of the project is to reaffirm our appreciation and respect for all languages spoken at CSULB, to encourage learning more about our own diversity on campus and to stimulate empathy for others in the process. This is the first initiative of an ongoing project titled *The Puvungna Arts Empathy Production Project*. It focuses on ways to foster “empathy production” that grew out of the recommendations of the Report on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies in the CSU, which found that many faculty and students did not feel respected or appreciated. The project also functions as an oblique form of advertisement of diversity of academic programs and elsewhere on campus where languages and cultures are respected, taught and valued. The project is a form of linguistic landscaping in which we highlight, identify those heritage languages, languages of instruction that are taught or used here at CSULB. Example is found at <http://www.csulb.edu/ais>

Departments and programs can participate in the following ways and other inventive ways are also encouraged to meet the interests and goals of each department: 1) Create a written/video biography of the person translating these term; 2) Create a written/video about what the language means to them (students or faculty); 3) Create a poster with a QR code connecting to a page or post of your department webpage; 4) Post posters on campus. A request was made to the Dean to support this project by hosting a webpage to include tutorials on the process. The CLA website would also provide a comprehensive list of links to all of the websites at CSULB participating in the project. More information will follow as this website to support the project is developed.

1. **Scholarly Intersections**

Jaffe reported that the ScINT Committee (FC Exec plus Jane Howell , Jake Wilson and Jennifer Asenas) met and decided to fund all Fall 2016 proposals. A copy of awardees and proposals will be posted on the CLA FC page. In order to be able to fund all events, the Committee was forced to strictly limit the maximum award amount to $1000, the maximum honorarium amount to $500 for honoraria, and to cut back hospitality to $100. The committee discussed modifying the guidelines and procedures for the next funding cycle, including the need to address perceptions by some junior faculty/new faculty perceive ScINTs to be dominated by more senior faculty and to encourage junior faculty to apply. Proposed changes (attached) were distributed for consideration. Discussion that followed, and the very large number of self-nominations for the ScINT committee prompted Jaffe to recommend the proposal be amended to change the committee structure so that only one person from the Exec be included. Revised guidelines will be brought to the next meeting for discussion and vote.

1. Time certain: (4:30-5pm) **Graduation 2025**: information and discussion

The Dean introduced the topic of the new Graduation Initiative and turned the floor over to Associate Dean Beth Manke, who gave a brief PowerPoint presentation that included the following information.

* By 2025 the goal is to increase the 4 year graduation rates for freshman to 39% and transfer rates to 45%
	+ Currently CSULB is at 16% and the goal is to increase these rates to 20% by 2017 and 39% by 2025. CLA is currently is 26%
* CSULB has been provided with a one-time support of 2 million dollars to work on this goal at CSULB. The focus in CLA is to target the 2013 cohort with the goal of eliminating the barriers to graduation and to inform students how they can graduate earlier than they believe that they can.
* ATLAS has identified 720 CLA students who could graduate in the Spring or Summer of 2017. And has already met with many of these students. Most had no idea that they could do this.
* CLA goals are to:
	+ maximize student employability,
	+ support career readiness,
	+ build ownership for student progression among faculty
* The Action Plan is to implement strategies to eliminate hurdles to graduations of students who want to complete their degrees in Spring/Summer 2017
* One issue that disadvantages CLA is that students are counted by the major that they first declared and not by the major that they graduated in. As students in STEM fields often change their major to one in CLA these students are not counted in our college.
* To achieve these goals, CLA has submitted and is awaiting feedback on a proposal for this funding.
* Internships:
	+ If you are interested in internships, contact Beth M. about new possible opportunities for internships. The current goal is to train agencies on how to implement meaningful educational experiences with students who are placed with them.
* Undeclared Students:
	+ David Wallace indicated that we have about 2,000 undeclared students on campus that CLA could do a better job of marketing our CLA Degrees with interdisciplinary minors to these students.

10) Announcements: From Standing Rock to Palestine presentation tonight. Task Forces attached to this initiative available (see University)

Adjournment: 4:58pm

Attachments:

Scholarly Intersections Proposal

Dean and Exec Rationales

**\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*\* Scholarly Intersections guidelines for 2017-8**

1. Timing: no change
	1. Keep the deadline at about the 4th week into the Fall semester, **but** announce in May, late August and September in order to facilitate planning.
	2. Spring call will be contingent on having funds left over
2. Participation
	1. Limit individual faculty members to participation in 2 proposals.
	2. Departments can sponsor (financially or otherwise) any number of proposals.
	3. For 2017-18, encourage new/junior faculty to apply; perhaps earmark some awards for first-time organizers
	4. Ask applicants to indicate if they have been funded in the past and to provide details on past funded events\*\*
3. Budget
	1. Impose a strict $1000 limit on any one event
	2. Limit hospitality to $100 per event\*\*
	3. Limit hotel costs to the lowest rates at local hotels with which the University has a contractual arrangement
	4. Limit honoraria to no more than $300 per person and no more than $600 per event\*\*
4. Committee membership: elect 3 committee members for 2-year terms.

\*\* items on which there were varied opinions on the committee

**Rationales for rank of Full Professor in Minimum Qualifications**

1. ***Background/history*** from previous search for Associate Dean of Enrollment Management (EM). Discussion about this position involved a comparison and contrast with the AD for Curriculum and Personnel. At the time, the FC Exec preferred the EM position be advertised with a minimum rank of Full Professor, but acquiesced to a minimum rank of Associate Professor while affirming its position that it would not be appropriate to advertise below the Full Professor level for the Associate Dean for Curriculum and Personnel.
2. ***Respect for our RTP process and criteria***Promotion to Full Professor attests to a faculty member’s high qualifications and accomplishments as a scholar, teacher and campus citizen. The promotion to Full is not pass/fail, especially in CLA. It requires excellence. It means that person has balanced leadership/service with scholarship and teaching responsibilities. We expect our deans and associate deans to have demonstrated that they have the same level of accomplishment and met the same challenges as the faculty they lead.
3. ***Leadership and Management*** An Associate Dean is an academic leader, not just a bureaucrat. To lead teacher-scholars, one must be an accomplished teacher-scholar; this is a baseline for having the credibility and respect that are needed for both effective leadership and management. This is particularly the case for the AD’s interactions with Chairs and Full Professors. In some cases, these interactions—around personnel issues—involve issues of judgment with respect to standards and performance (letters of reprimand, for example, in the most extreme cases). The AD needs to exercise that judgment from the same rank as those he or she interacts with.
4. ***RTP*** The AD for Curriculum and Personnel is the face of the College in the RTP process, running information sessions and overseeing process/procedure. In this role, it is expected that the AD be able to speak from a position of personal professional experience in being evaluated for promotion to both Associate and Full and in having taken part in evaluations of colleagues to the ranks of both Associate and Full.
5. Being a Full Professor is also critical for a person in this position to be able to ***do the job without concern for future RTP*** evaluations by anyone they are working with or supervising. We recognize this with Chair appointments, where there is a strong preference for Full Professors. Sometimes the pool for Chair is small, and an Associate is the best choice, but in recruiting for an Associate Dean with an external search, there should not be an assumption of a too-limited pool.
6. Related to #5, there could be a ***potential chilling effect*** on applications from Full Professors who may infer that the inclusion of the Associate option indicates that the Full Professor pool is not deemed sufficient.

Dean’s Rationale

Colleagues,

I advocate for including associate professor status as a minimum requirement and full professor as a desired qualification for the following reasons.

• CLA included associate professor (not full) as a minimum criterion in its most recent AD search.

• Associate professors have served and currently serve as effective associate deans at CSULB; indeed, this week I received an announcement of an associate dean position in the Humanities at CSUN that lists associate professor as a minimum requirement.

• I suspect we need to cast a wide net to get a strong pool for this search. Qualified external candidates in the last two CLA AD searches were scarce, and my informal conversations with possible internal candidates suggests to me that if we narrow the search criteria too much, we risk a failed search.

• The search process is intended to sort out the relative strengths of applicants. The Faculty Council has elected excellent members for the search committee, and we should let them fulfill the functions for which they have been elected.

As I understand it, the executive committee’s position is that only a full professor (or someone who holds the equivalent qualifications at the time of appointment) would be qualified for RTP, curriculum, and personnel matters, and only a full professor could command the respect of full professors in the college. I find these rationales unconvincing for the following reasons:

• At CSULB deans (not ADs) are charged with the responsibility for RPT reviews. Further, in CLA an AD has the responsibility only for managing *procedural* issues for RTP reviews; the *substance of reviews is done by the dean*.

• On curricular issues, associate (even assistant) professors routinely contribute both curricular innovations and serve in oversight positions such as the college’s curriculum committee. Arguing that only a full professor could be qualified to serve these functions as an AD makes sense if only full professors served in curriculum review functions in the college, and that is not the case.

• The executive committee’s position that only full professors could deal with personnel matters is problematic for three reasons. First, at CSULB, deans of colleges have ultimate responsibility for all personnel matters. Second, the process of standing for full professor has little to do with understandings of the complex personnel processes; experience with those processes is much more important. Third, associate professors in CLA and at CSULB more generally have served successfully in positions that involve personnel issues (e.g., as department chairs).

Also, I should note that before any associate professors would be advanced to finalist status, I would insure that he/she understood the stipulation that he/she could not stand for promotion while an MPP and discuss with him/her the possibly implications for his/her future.

David

1. The AVP searches were ultimately advertised with a minimum rank of Full Professor [↑](#footnote-ref-1)