

Advisory Council Minutes

College of Arts & Letters

December 5, 2019

Present: Ellen Moll (CISAH), Danielle DeVoss (WRAC), Alan Beretta (L&L), Jeff Wray (ENG), Danny Mendez (RCS), Karen Kangas-Preston (THR), Jon Keune (REL), Blake Williams (AAHD), Sherry Stevens (THR, STAFF), Michael O'Rourke (PHL), Chris Long (DEAN)

Absent: Armani Johnson (UN STUDENT), Soohyun Cho (GRAD STUDENT)

For CAL (if applicable): Sonja Fritzsche, Bill Hart-Davidson

Visitors: Penny Shanks (CAL), Laura Scales (THR)

1. Call to order: 3:15
2. Approval of agenda: Kangas Preston motioned to approve; Jeff Wray seconded
 - a. Move item 5 down to accommodate a visit by Laura Scales to talk about the Inclusive Practices Committee
 - b. Motion approved
3. Approval of 15 November 2019 minutes. Mendez motioned to approve; Beretta seconded; no changes; motion approved
4. Discussion of revised CAL Signature Series matrix – Penny Shanks (CAL)
 - a. Conversation about weighting and the distinction between “key to success” and “beneficial”
 - b. The matrix presented is a working document that can be modified
 - c. Questions
 - i. Discussion of various elements of the matrix: conflict of interest, cost, the relationship of the scores with the conversation on the committee, qualifier language in the Risk Exposure section
 - ii. Possibility that there might be more than one a year – one in the fall and one in the spring, e.g.; budget can be encumbered up to ½ for future years
 - iii. There will be a deadline for proposals
 - iv. If the evaluative criteria change, then the call for proposals must change to align with the criteria
5. Inclusive Practices Committee – Laura Scales (THR)
 - a. Add IAH Rep to the committee
 - b. Discussion points
 - i. Continuing to look at engaged pedagogy grants; thinking about adding study abroad, although there is a need to be equitable about this
 - ii. Want to serve as a more active resource for CAL as a whole
 - iii. Adding an online suggestion box

c. Questions

- i. Could the college work to increase the profile of and commitment to inclusive pedagogy in undergraduate and graduate classes? The committee will look at other universities to see what they are doing on this topic
- ii. Adding members to the committee (e.g., a representative of IAH) would have by-law implications, but there could be invited guests next semester with a by-law vote in May, alongside other by-law items

6. Dean's Remarks

- a. Discussion of the Foglio Chair search, which was failed last year. Going forward, the endowment could be used to offset salary for an internal candidate, but also use it to support programming, since the chair has a connection to IAH, or the college could conduct a national search for a candidate, learning from the experience last year. REL could be more involved this time around
 - i. The position could be open to any location in CAL, but have REL be in a leadership role, e.g., as the intellectual driver
 - ii. There is no ownership of this chair by one person or unit
 - iii. Internal candidate advantages: wouldn't have to be appointed at the full amount generated by the endowment; could help develop some initiatives around the chairship; could help set the stage for the future of the chair
 - iv. If internal, could it be rotating? It could be a 3-year appointment that helps the donors get the endowment up
 - v. Opening it up to assistant professor could diversity the pool. However, the service responsibility would be a risk for assistant professors. There is an issue of finding people who are senior leadership, but a senior leader might be crucial if this person is going to take a leadership role in revamping general education
 - vi. A broader definition of 'spirituality' would also open it up. Spirituality as putting your values into practice. Want this person to bring spirituality and values to a broad swath of people through IAH
 - vii. If an external search, there would be planning in the spring, an ad out in the summer for an early fall search, bringing people to campus in the fall
 - viii. Discussion of what happens after one leaves the chair: does the title stay with the person? If the person is internal, does the salary bump remain?
- b. Diversity, equity, and inclusion position in the college
 - i. Concern about the fact that we have no acting FEA – there is nobody for people who would use that resource. The college is working to install an acting FEA in the not too distant future
 - ii. Is there a concern that adding someone at the associate dean level would open CAL up to critique by those who think it has too many deans?
 1. Perhaps but there is a need to have someone thinking about this as their sole focus, and there is too much to do under this heading for the current Associate Deans

2. The university is embarking on a diversity and inclusion strategic plan, and we need to have someone contribute to that
 - iii. We need to be clear about “Why now? Why this position?”
 - iv. Some colleges have combined FEA and Associate Dean for DEI, although there was resistance expressed to this. There is a need to put the Associate Dean in place before the permanent FEA
 - c. Consider fall and spring faculty meetings be transformed into a fall and spring college meeting, including staff and faculty of all types. This is consistent with inclusion and transparency
 - i. Staff feel they are invited last-minute; they feel there is a separation between the faculty and staff; need to feel like they belong; would need to work with unit leaders to give staff leave to come
 - ii. The last CAL meeting was raw, but real; it highlighted equity concerns
 - iii. Are there conversations that need to be had by specific sub-populations? Those things (e.g., by-law votes) are typically handled by email. If there are reasons to have a faculty-only meeting, we can call those meetings
 - iv. If this change is made, the agenda needs to be different; the agenda itself must be more inclusive; the CAC would ask the Staff Advisory Council for agenda items, facilitating a collaborative opportunity for agenda setting; the chairs can make that happen
 - d. Discussion of personnel issue
7. Discussion and action items
- a. Prep for meeting with President Stanley
 - i. Needs: minute taker, questioners
 - ii. Any adjustments we want to make to the questions for the president?
 - iii. Need to allow a lot of time for questions from the floor
 - iv. It was determined to give him the questions in advance and have him give a brief response. This will allow more time for Q&A. The questions set the tone, and it is important to have them, although they should be tighter
 - v. Can we record them for people who can't be there? Can we have a Zoom link?
 - vi. We should take the questions to our APCs and encourage faculty to think about follow-up questions
 - vii. Need to ask him about salary inequity, given the conversation at the college meeting; it is in the follow-ups
 - viii. Press for a GI3 with a core of DEI, as that would put our interests squarely in play; this involves bringing in high profile scholars who have significant potential to bring in external funding
 - ix. Could work on this and share it out with the faculty; look at documents that give us information about the president's strategic interests

- x. Dean Long will inquire with other deans about what themes emerge – build on those town hall meetings
- b. Faculty-led task force on non-tenure stream pathways – Sonja Fritzsche (CAL)
 - i. 250 non-tenure stream faculty and non-academic staff in the college; 450 tenure stream faculty – full-time and part-time; academic specialist conversations are going forward
 - ii. There is a need to have a general, open, college-wide conversation about the role of non-tenure stream faculty
 - iii. Not clear what advantages there are to promotion for people in these roles
 - iv. Need to review best practices and make recommendations on ways to make promotion meaningful, and to plan a way to intellectual leadership – promote career paths rather than just have people cover classes over time
 - v. Non-tenure stream would need to get merited for service on this committee; are there ways to make the argument that doing this kind of work and moving toward intellectual leadership has a salutary impact on teaching? Yes, but that is not often what happens
 - vi. The tenure stream process is understood to be the norm for both the fixed term and academic specialist processes, although there are significant differences between them, though
 - vii. Members of this task force need to be representative of the college and familiar with non-tenure stream faculty issues (e.g., chairs, former chairs, mentors); there would need to be a representative of UNTF on the task force
 - viii. There is fear among the tenure stream faculty about giving resources to non-tenure stream faculty before addressing inequities among the faculty
 - ix. It is important to keep the balance of the task force weighted to the non-tenure stream faculty; this is an issue of power
 - x. Associate Dean Fritzsche would like guidance on moving forward with this from the CAC, perhaps beginning with the chair
 - xi. Perhaps money should be offered to support participation in the task force?
- c. Push to spring: items d-g
 - i. Have not heard from the provost office about dean review
 - ii. CAL IT infrastructure support
- d. Minutes and action items will be forthcoming

Meeting Adjourned: 5:06

Minute taker: Michael O'Rourke, Philosophy