

Minutes of the Dornsife Faculty Council Meeting

Date: February 5, 2020

Room: Irani Hall, Room 321

Present (15): David Crombecque, Marianna Chodorowska-Pilch, Gerald “Jerry” Davison, Antonio Elefano, David Ginsburg, Bob Girandola, Devin Griffiths (*president*), Yuka Kumagai, Sri Narayan, Jessica Parr, Andrea Parra, Michael Petitti, Gioia Polidori (*vice president*), Alisa Sánchez, An-Min Wu (*secretary*), Emily Zeamer.

Absent (4): Melissa Daniels-Rauterkus, Shannon Gibson, Joe Palacios.

January meeting minutes

- January meeting minutes will be voted for approval together with February meeting minutes next month (DFC March meeting). An-Min to update the meeting minutes to include Gioia’s comments.

Updates

- Dornsife Budget
 - Based on the meeting with Dean Stott yesterday, **Devin** reported that Provost has just started the budget conversation with Dornsife leadership. Provost mentioned that some big adjustment will come over time – relating to revenue, lawsuit payment, and administrative built-up. These are wider contexts that can affect Dornsife budget. The good news is that Dean Miller is approaching to Provost on tax structure change.
 - **Devin** also mentioned some progress made about salary benchmarking, but don’t think that much adjustment would happen this year.
 - **David C.** asked how the ‘Dornsife campaign’ is doing now? No information has been provided from Dean’s office for a while.
- Quick update on senate actions OCAP resolution.

Devin reported that so far three faculty council co-signing the letter DFC came up with. The Law school, on the other hand, now introduced their own resolution on this topic. **Antonio** thought the Law school signed the letter, and **Devin** explained that the Law school re-crafted its resolution from the Dornsife’s original resolution (not the updated letter sent to other faculty council). **Devin** added that the Law School’s resolution will be on the agenda of the next Senate meeting; the argument would be whether OCAP should be suspended. The concerns of the Senate Executive Board might be 1) legal liability and 2) afraid that HR potentially turn this procedure internally. In any case, Devin thinks we should make strong statement on our thought in suspending OCAP. **Jessica** reminded that there are only two weeks away from the

Senate meeting, and stated that we may wait to see how things come out before deciding whether to send our open letter. It might have stronger impact if the statement or action comes out from the Senate.

David G. asked which faculty councils (FC) have co-signed the current (Dornsife) letter; the concerns are understandable but we may have a large number of people considering all FC signed up. **An-Min** asked where open letter will go to. **Devin** answered that schools that have signed up including Dornsife, Social Work and Anneburg School; possibly Rossier School and Keck School will sign up too. Also the letter will address directly to Provost and President, and will take it from there.

Jerry restated that the OCAP procedure links to faculty suffering with limited faculty input. At the last Senate meeting, we were told about the change to 30 days (on decision appeal), but this was not written anywhere. **Gioia** has the impression that the 30 days will be changed in the Faculty Handbook. **Jessica** confirmed that it will be, around next Fall; there has not been second read on this change in the senate. **Emily** added that perhaps there is other legal structure (e.g. legal protection for employees) that we can also turn to. **Devin** will circulate the Law School's proposed resolution and asks for feedback next week.

The Council concludes to wait for the Senate meeting before deciding whether to send the open letter.

Updates from Caucuses and Task Forces (3:00-3:30)

- **Devin** first updated that David C. will start looking at merit guideline, and asked that track-based caucuses (i.e. RTPC, TT) should look at the merit guidelines and linking these to a proposal together. Dean Stott has indicated this is the direction he's like to see, as he's in the process to consolidate the procedure. **Devin** thinks this is promising for us to plug (our proposal) in potentially at the end of this year.
- **DEI (Alisa)**
DEI will meet again for the first time in spring next week, and aims to finalize goals to accomplish in a short term (by end of spring) as well as in a long term. Areas to focus on including:
 - Student issues—Reached out to students on housing issues as well as hearing from studnets – will have discussion during the DEI week
 - Faculty issue – We have seen lots of progress in Dornsife; guideline and resources for Dornsife will be available at the end of this year. The Caucus is pressing to make sure the DEI lead role being clarified and is also documenting on the search process.
 - Website – This will happen from Kimberly Freeman's office. DEI Caucus is working together to help the DEI side of the website being revamped.
- **Part Time (Jessica)**
The Part Time (PT) caucus met today, but only two people. The Caucus has recirculated last year's survey and received 15 responses (the result has not yet been

compiled). Clearly the support is very different from department to department, depending where the PT faculty is housed in. Some comments are not what we can control (e.g. contracts to be provided sooner). In the meeting today we talked about having a Dornsife-specific new faculty orientation that DFC may be able to do and invite all ranks of faculty (FT/PT, TT/RTPC).

Devin agrees that orientation would be nice for new faculty. **David C.** thought Dornsife had orientation before. **Jessica** confirmed that, but not anymore and no one knows who is responsible in Dornsife for that. Maybe DFC can take over the orientation and asks Deans to participate. Maybe one in fall and one in spring semesters, and institutionalized so it will not fall through anymore.

Emily said that she has attended the last orientation (two days). **Devin** indicated it is the incoming DFC president to think about how we launch the orientation; we can start the conversation this spring. Dean Stott can be a point person in school. If the program is long enough, we can then have a split on ranking (RTPC/TT) for different issues. **Gioia** added that maybe RTPC and TT caucuses can come up with lists of discussion points for a day; we can work on this in spring and launch it in fall. We could leverage our budget about this, maybe have a reception. **Jessica** said that it will be a good time to inform people about mentorship – everyone should have one in the department. Other potential contents of the orientation, raised by various Council members, include benefits, CET (**Gioia**), school structure (**Devin**), faculty governance, DPS (**Jessica**), what DFC can do, OCAP (**David C.**), who to ask when things come up, Ombuds, ethics in research, work-life balance (**Emily**). **Gioia** will reach out to Kat Reynolds to know who's in charge so we can take it from them.

- **RTPC (Gioia)**

During the meeting with Dean Stott yesterday, **Gioia and Devin** discussed about the idea of having Faculty Development Directors (FDDs) for RTPC. Dean Stott thinks that the RTPC system is different from TT and the stakes are lower so the workload of FDD for RTPC will not be as much as FDD for TT. Therefore 3 courses releases for 3 FDD is unlikely to happen.

Gioia mentioned that it might be good to discuss with John Holand about the idea of FDD; the RTPC Caucus can work on a formal proposal to request one FDD (instead of 3 in the previous document). One other option would be to possibly incorporate this in a long run into the mentoring guideline. John Holland is currently drafting the mentoring guideline so we can reach out to have our inputs. We can include the responsibility of mentors and mentees, and to request every Teaching faculty from Lecturer to Associate Professor to have a mentor. As to Research faculty – maybe we can potentially ask research faculty inputs to know their mentoring support status. So first to ensure everyone has a mentor, and later on we can work on the FDD position to oversee the mentoring.

Alisa thinks this process makes sense; after the one-on-one mentoring coverage is set up, we can see whether the FDD for RTPC is needed. **Devin** added that the FDD

system (for TT) actually works in a way that FDD only gets in when someone is failing. **Andrea** thinks this position is important as someone needs to make sure chairs is doing the work (to assign mentors).

Jessica suggested to add the line in merit review guideline to ask mentors being identified. **David G.** added that in Environmental Studies the mentor/mentee information is entered in an internal contract and the review is done annually already. The system, consists of mostly non-TT, is working well.

Sri added that we need to make sure the mentor is effective, which **Gioia** responded that's why the FDD is needed. **Alisa** thinks that DFC is playing a role of FDD now and should be the one to request for the FDD. **Gioia** came back to course release and asked maybe we can request half a course release for FDD.

The discussion was then slightly shift to promotion. **Emily** said that figuring out how to go up for promotion needs a lot of support, and more urgently is for chairs to know no slots limits for promotion each year. **Gioia** responded that Dean Stott already sent the messages out to chairs about this a few months ago, and **Devin** added if the message is not out to certain departments, please let us know and Dean can follow up on that. **Jessica** suggested to ask Dean Stott to remind all chairs about this in first All Chairs meeting in the fall.

Emily suggested to include something about whether this person is ready for promotion in the merit review. **Jessica** added that clarifications about who requested letter writers also whether someone going for promotion can recommend who to be on the internal promotion committee (FPC) are needed. **Devin** thinks this is often not 'policy' but 'practice' – for some departments the mentor is on FPC and for some the mentor is not; and in some departments the mentor is not on FPC but the FPC will reach out to the mentor. **Andrea** added it will be good to establish the calendar to relieve time pressure on letter writers such as Chairs. **Devin** suggested to have An-Min to forward the minutes to the caucuses to set up timelines.

For the remainder of the discussion related to RTPC mentoring and promotion, **Alisa** suggested to give resources on where faculty should go to during the orientation. **Marianna** thinks mentoring can take away time and resources for those assigned as mentors, and we should think what the role of a school is. The FDD seems a bureaucratic role. **Gioia** responded that some people are not aware of the process such as promotion and thus mentors are needed. **David C.** said that there will be people who do not think they need mentors, even though there will be mentors who want to mentor for services; how should we manage this situation. **Sri** expressed that mentoring is not a day-to-day work, and mentors only weight in when mentees need it; also sometimes mentors can give advice for things that mentees are not clear about. **Devin** thinks that we should let mentees opt-out for having a mentor and added that the function of merit review is to provide mentoring in business but the system is broken here.

With the various opinions expressed in this discussion, **Devin** suggested to circulate FDD information on TT and ask two caucuses (RTPC and TT) to look into this further. We can write two documents on two options on this subject (FDD) and think what will work.

- **TT (Devin)**
No new item to report, except to revamp on what we have and to combine with the mentoring guideline.
- **Salary and Merit (Devin)**
Sergio has done UCLA salary analysis. Still waiting for salary information from Dornsife and hope to do analysis on it when receiving it. We will think how we write the salary proposal.
- **A&O (Jerry)**
No new item to report since the OCAP proposal was crafted, except DFC has been pushing it on the Senate and Faculty Responsibility Committee.

Discussion of Elections, Awards, and Working Group Announcements

Devin plans to send the announcement out (to Dornsife faculty) next week; including the information about the upcoming election and conference sponsorship.

- **Working Group**
Devin asked about whether we need to discuss on ‘Working Group’ proposal, and Jessica also asked whether we have any examples about the working groups. **Emily** responded that this can be social events such as networking, and not only for academic purposes. **Devin** then suggested to call it ‘networking group’ proposals
- **Service Awards**
David C., Alisa and Jessica came up with the Awards proposal (hardcopy draft made available during the meeting). **Jerry** asked what difference is this Service Award from the Robenheimer Award at the University. **Jessica** answered that the Robenheimer is only for tenured track, and our Dornsife awards are open rank. **Jessica** added that we can potentially set this to be one for TT and one for RTPC to balance between the ranks. **Jerry** thinks even having this award restricted for RTPC would be good, but **Devin** added that one important work DFC tries to do is not to separate RTPC and TT and Jessica said that junior TT faculty often get shielded away from services, so the Council decided to keep this broad and wide.

One question raised by a council member is who should be nominators (students, faculty, chairs). **Jessica:** we should also keep this open; great if students want to nominate that. **Emily** suggested nomination by email instead of letters so less hurdle for nomination and **Jessica** suggested not to ask for CV from nominators. **Emily** said maybe we can ask nominees to provide CV. **Devin** asked if we should include

monetary values of the awards and all responded positively. (**Jessica**;) we do not need to say how many awards to be given out. **Andrea** asked who to be on the Service Awards committee. No decision was made on this item.

An-Min will be collecting the Service Awards nominations; **An-Min** will like to look up whether to use survey for collecting nominations. **Devin** responded this will be okay since we will ask CV from nominees later. An-Min said that we do not want the dates being overlapped with the DFC election schedule to confuse people, and **Jessica** responded the due date is March 25, so it will not have schedule conflict (DFC election should be closing around March 23). The Service Award will be given in May.

- Election and future meetings

An-Min asked for a help on DFC Election Caucus. This will ensure not to miss nominations or statements. **Devin** encourages everyone to recruit for DFC nomination.

Gioia asked about the May meeting dates, whether we should change dates due to the exam day on current schedule. **David C.** suggested to move meeting to 4-6pm since most exam slots go till 4pm. This will also work to follow with the end of the year dinner. All Council members agree so the May meeting will be still on first Wednesday (May 6) but on 4-6pm. **An-Min** will send the outlook invite for the rest of the meetings this year.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 pm.

Respectfully,

An-Min Wu