FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, February 22, 2012
3:00-5:00 PM – TSC 303-4, WTC

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Bowen, R.; Currie, J.; Derhammer, N.; Dominiak, M.; Embrick, D.; Fine, J.; Fitch, A.; Hermansen, M.; Jay, W.; Kaplan, D.; Kilbane, T.; Lash, N.; Leone, G.; Lococo, M.; Lucas, L.; Mirza, D.; Miller, H.; Penckofer, S.; Ramsey, G.; Rose, H.; Ruppman, T.; Schneck, M.; Schoenberger, A.; Udo, M.; Wojcik, E.

Guests: Keogh, V.; Pelissero, J.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:06pm by Gordon Ramsey.

2. Invocation – Janis Fine.

3. Approval of January minutes. Motion: Jay; Rose seconded. Motion passed 17-0-2.

4. Chair's Report

   o The Faculty Senate "dry run" meeting originally scheduled for today will be postponed until the April meeting date, due to last-minute logistical problems by several senior administrators.

   o Faculty Senate proposal: this is still planned to be ready for the April meeting of FC. The next Faculty Senate Task Force meeting will be April 17; we will handle task force business until then by e-mail.

   o Elections: we are still short on candidates in Natural Sciences and the Institutes. Please encourage your colleagues to consider nomination, and encourage them to encourage other colleagues. We will extend the nominations deadline to Friday, February 24. We may need to extend the election deadline by a few days as well.

   o Dean's Evaluation Committee: we are still working on the sample proposal for the Dean's evaluation form. When we have one, the committee will send a draft to John Pelissero and then to Faculty Council.

   o Faculty and Staff Lounge: committee members are still awaiting a tour of the space. We will prod.

   o University Senate: I've had a meeting with S. Romeo and T. Bohak of the Unified Student Government on the issue of a University Senate. I asked them, "What you want from a University Senate?" They answered: a voice, representation, a channel of communication. I laid out the committee structure of the Faculty Senate proposal, which included a representation of students on the Student Development & Affairs Committee of up to 50%. I also proposed to them that the Faculty Senate, the Staff Council, and the Unified Student Government should give annual reports to each other of their activities, interests, and initiatives. The USG reps indicated that they were pleased, and will present the ideas in the Faculty Senate proposal to the USG.

- Teaching load: the research UPC has now met and reported on the teaching load issue. The RUPC report is a little disappointing: it uses grant application/success data as a gauge of "research productivity." But why not publications, conference presentations, *etc*.? (The RUPC membership consists of 2 to 3 SSOM, 2 CAS sciences, 1 IRB, Teresa Kilbane, and Sam Attoh. There are no members from CAS Humanities.) There was some discussion of the "two-tier" issue as well at the RUPC meeting; also some discussion of the evaluation of undergraduate research projects.
    - Discussion: need for Humanities representatives on the RUPC. Also, is there a disconnect between our teaching load policy and the annual "green form" faculty performance evaluations?

5. Discussion: Academic Concerns of the Faculty
    - John Pelissero: the 2009 teaching load policy for Lakeside Campuses proposed a five course load in general, as an "expectation." The "research active" and "research intensive" categories have been left to the schools and departments to determine. The policy ties in with the 2009 Strategic Plan and Transformative Education documents. Also in the Strategic Plan is a tie-in of teaching load policy with specific tactics--*e.g.*, Moving to 75% of core teaching being done by full-time faculty. There's been more hiring of non-tenure-track full-time faculty, teaching up to seven courses per year, to help realize this.

      Undergraduate counseling: this is not in the teaching load policy; it is been left to schools' chairs and deans to implement. But advising, I think, is part of the general expectations of teaching, even if it is not quantified. Service *is* used in annual performance evaluations.

      "Digital Measures" on the horizon: this is an online "portfolio" system for faculty members the captures all teaching/research/service activities. (SSOM faculty used a similar tool, "Sedona," as part of the reaccreditation process last year.)
        - Question: were faculty involved in the designing and testing of the system? JP: the deans vetted it two years ago when Digital Measures made its proposal, but faculty have not yet been involved in its testing. Question: can faculty be further involved in testing of the "Digital Measures" tool at this point? JP: a good suggestion. The Office of the Provost will be showing the production version to the Council of Deans as early as next month. After that, we could bring it to the Faculty Council, if you'd like. Question: there are great differences between giving lectures to 150 18-year-olds and a seminar to seven graduate students. Are different weights accorded in these cases? JP: this is up to the deans. (Vicki Keogh, Dean of Nursing: it is a dean/chair decision--we *can* do these trade-offs. But it has never been a possibility, in our school, to trade-off *e.g.* PhD advising for course reductions.)

      JP: Merit awards: all 10 deans last year received a lump sum of 2.75% of total faculty salaries in their units and then were told to allocate that increase to faculty on the basis of merit within the range of 0% to 4%, with raises of more than 4% made only on the basis of special appeals to the administration.

- There followed a general discussion of issues having to do with faculty performance and evaluation. Among the points made:
    - There are serious issues having to do with differential merit raises; they are damaging to faculty morale, in various ways.
    - So-called "merit" pay raises, if they are intended as incentives to greater and more innovative productivity on the part of faculty, may not be useful for that purpose. There is a large body of research showing that beyond a certain point monetary incentives lose their efficacy. Much more important, especially in intellectual professions, appears to be greater control over one's time, and indeed, more time to have control over. For example, time reductions for research might have a higher value than increases in salary.
    - The fact remains, however, that some faculty are more productive than others; more productive faculty should be rewarded more highly than less productive ones.
    - The new teaching policy has shifted incentives. Faculty who want a lower course load in order to have time to do research focus on continuously producing publication-oriented research, and cut teaching commitments, undergraduate advising, dissertation supervising, service work, *etc*. to a bare minimum in order to do it. The University's continuing emphasis on publications and grant application success as the key factors in allocating merit pay increases and promotions drives this. This emphasis makes it impossible for a faculty member who chooses to teach, rather than produce quantities of published research, to be rewarded on a par with high research producers.
    - Another effect of the policy is a two-tier system: a faculty member who is "research active" (or even "research inactive") may get less success in obtaining leaves, less grant application support, fewer summer grants, etc. Permanent *de facto* stratification might ensue.
    - In the SSOM, we have a different model. What matters is a department's work as a whole: a kind of "division of labor" model. The real and persistent inequalities in the SSOM are between departments. There's a great variation in teaching and research among the various departments there. Both within and between Basic Sciences and Clinical departments there is great variation, and performance cannot be standardized.

6. Motion to adjourn (Lash), seconded (Bowen). Meeting was adjourned at 4:56pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary