**College of Liberal Arts Faculty Council Meeting**

**Minutes**

Meeting 2, October 8, 2014

3:30pm – **5:00** pm / **AS – 124B** (enter through room 124)

Attendance: Misty Jaffe, Chris Karadjov, Lynda McCroskey, Jennifer Reed, David Wallace, Ragan Fox, Ann Johnson, Ebony Utley, Caitlin Fouratt, Isabella Lanza, Jim Miles, Margaret Kuo, Emily Berquist, Barbara LeMaster, Francisca Gouzalez Flores, Charles Ponce de Leon, Kimberly Davis (Staff), May Ling Halim, Sabrina Alimahomed, Emir Estrada, Gwen Shaffer, Hyowon Ban, Charles Mahoney, Yutian (Kate) Chen, Enrico Vettore, Teri Yamada, Sophia Pandya, Mari Correa-Chavez, Suzanne Dillman, Carl Fisher, Araceli Esparza, LaRese Hubbard, Bill Mohr, Steven Rousso-Schindler

1. Call to Order – 3:30 P.M.
2. Approval of Agenda by acclamation
3. Approval of Minutes September 2014 (Unavailable will be included in next meeting)
4. Reports
   1. Executive Committee: Chair’s Report (Jaffe’s report)—Retreat update and Tracy Mayfield tentatively scheduled for November 12 CLA FC meeting to discuss IP and Predatory Journals issues.
   2. CLA PR Committee (Karadjov’s report)—Demo PR student profiles are available/will be available on the CLA website. There are still six departments that need to identify and schedule student profile filming. Chris will forward information to the faculty/departments. (Steve Rousso-Schindler) Eighteen profiles are completed. PR Committee focus is on (1) departments with no student profiles and (2) alumni profiles for each department. A problem with where to locate the completed profiles resulted in ideas to post them on the CLA and departments websites, as well as to set up a monitor at ATLAS so students might view them when they wait to see an advisor. Brochures are being made for promotional purposes. Departments only need to identify excellent students, and for Round 2, alumni who have specifically utilized their degree in the major for furthering his/her career, and contact the PR Committee.

The PR Committee projects a minimum of six (6) student/alumni profiles to be completed each term (12 per year). Once a department has a completed student profile, they should identify alumni to be profiled during Round 2 of the project.

Steven Rousso-Schindler previewed two completed student profiles (one from Political Science/Syria and one from Psychology/Autism) for the CLA FC. Each profile showed how the students were specifically tied to each department and how coursework has helped them worked toward their careers.

* 1. Dean’s Report (Wallace’s Report)—(1) Intentional GE has received buy in/support from the campus deans and the GEGC. The Academic Senate will create an ad hoc committee that will set up the procedures for which themes and courses are identified. (2) October 7 the President’s Cabinet meeting was devoted to the issue of sexual violence and abuse on campus. The discussion highlighted the “Red Zone” (first six weeks of semester) when females are prime targets for sexual violence. There will be required training for all faculty, staff, and students focusing on substantive issue/awareness and prevention. The university is less concerned about compliance and more concerned with helping students. The Chancellor’s Office will set the mandate; however, until then there is institutional support for our campus. We have CAPS for assault/abuse victims to go. The CAPS office provides emergency appointments, so professors can “walk” students there for help. Further, faculty and staff should be aware that one must report abuse/violence cases if victim is a minor (under 18); however, adult victims should be advised if it appears they are ready to tell of an assault to stop unless they are okay with faculty/staff member reporting the incident. (3) The President will meet the CLA faculty and staff October 10 for a general address and question and answer session, followed by a wine and cheese reception in the Chart Room. The president has been asked to discuss how she views the CLA. Potential topics we will hear about include GE themes, her vision for the CLA, and research supports.

V.               New Business

A.   Elections

1.     RTP—Solicited nominees for RTP include (returning members) Kim (Full AAAS) and Downey (Full Comm Studies); (new members) Herscovitz Assoc. Journ), Eriksen (Full Soc), Jenks (Full Hist), Seyburn (Assoc. Eng), Grobar (Full, Econ), Hubbard (Assoc, AFRS), Velcic (Full CLWS).

(Fox) noted the policy limiting each department to one representative might be revisited to allow for two department members at different levels serving on the RTP. Such a policy would solve problem of finding volunteers to serve on work-intensive committees. As only 30 CLA faculty going through RTP 2014-2015, this is a light work load; however, a problem persists.

Motion to move forward the list of nine (9) RTP members for one year only (McCroskey). Second (Fox). Motion passes unanimously.

 2.     Alternates: PARC, FPPC, URC—Barbara LeMaster (by acclamation) will serve as alternate FPPC. Still seeking alternates for PARC and URC.

B.    Reconstitution of FPIC (Faculty Personnel Issues Committee)

1.     Predatory Journals and RTP—Tracy Mayfield tentatively on schedule for November 12 (if she is released from jury duty).

2.     RSCA recommendations---(ATTACHED BELOW) Recommendations reflect to augment the 1200 maximum word count on application (Kimberly) and the margin and font for faculty history section.

Motion to propose a third page (Pandya) Second (LeMaster). Motion fails (2 votes for, all others against).

A movement was made to add “Scholarly and creative activities, and funded grants” to part #6 (Graig) of the document.

Motion to approve the document as edited passed unanimously.

3. Sabbatical leave application form revision (from Spring 2014)— The discussion produced two recommendations and one motion.

The **recommendations** were:

1. That either no appendices should be allowed or the rules for their use be very clearly spelled out.  The FC felt that allowing appendices could be problematic for the following reasons: a. it can be difficult to specify what can and cannot be in an appendix, leaving open the possibility that applicants will continue writing their proposal in the appendix.

b. having the option of an appendix may cause applicants to feel they "should" provide one or risk being unfavorably compared to other proposals.

c. if there are no page limits, appendices could add too many extra pages of reading

d. it would be unclear whether or not/how the committee would be obligated to take the appendices into account in the evaluation

 e. page length: general consensus was that 5 single-spaced pages should be enough even without appendices.

 f. "Description" category: suggestion to change to a summary or abstract of the proposal, and given a word limit.  Otherwise, people felt it was not necessarily clear how the description and the background/justification should be distinguished.

Craig Stone brought up the issue of weighting of evaluation categories. Discussion generated a **motion** (LeMaster, seconded McCroskey) and passed unanimously, to ask the committee to assign weights (at its discretion) to the evaluation categories and to include those weights in the guidelines sent to candidates.

Motion made that CLA faculty be notified of the minimum number of sabbaticals offered 2015-2016 (Mohr). Second (Pandya). Motion passes.

VII. Adjournment 5:06 PM

**Recommendations from 2013-14 RSCA Committee for changes to RSCA forms and procedures.**

***(Approved by Faculty Council 10/8/14 for approval for implementation 2014-15)***

2013-14 Committee: Susan Carlile (Chair), Kim Vu, Misty Jaffe, Martine Van Elk, Hugh Wilford, Elizabeth Dahab, Bonnie Gasior Courtney Ahrens, Sarah Schrank.

1. Change page limit requirements (currently 2 pages for body of proposal) to 1200 words. Have an electronic submission process whereby faculty submit Word documents to the Dean's office, copied to Chair/ASM, and receive a confirmation of receipt.

2. Specify that the body of the proposal cannot include a bibliographic reference section or footnotes; in text citations are allowed.

3. Remove "proposal clusters," as they are remnants of the University process that is no longer in place.

4. Specify that proposals should be intelligible to faculty members outside the discipline, and state that this criterion will be applied to both the Description/Background and Significance sections of the evaluation.

5. Merge "Description" and "Background and Significance" in the description of the sections of the proposal and on the rating sheets.

6. Change faculty history to 3 pages, 12 pt. Times New Roman, 1-inch margins. State that it shall only include scholarly and creative activity and funded grants.  Also, separate headings should be provided to separate peer-reviewed/referred publications/presentations from other publications/presentations. Allow a 4th page for previous RSCA awards and their outcomes.

7. Application form:

a. Add percentage values to the application form:  
 40%: Description, Background and Significance

30% points: Research design/Methodology

10% points: Anticipated outcomes and goals

20% points: Faculty History

b. Background and significance: add "previous work in **the field**" and

"Locate project in the context of its contribution to the discipline/creative domain."

c. Research design/methodology: remove reference to timeline. Add: "Specify the project tasks that will be completed during the semester in which RSCA will be taken and clearly indicate, in the case of collaborations, what your contribution will be.

8. Align evaluation form with categories, above. Remove reference to student involvement on rating form. Correct faculty history to 5 years.
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