

**Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the November 7, 2016 meeting**

Attendance: Kena Fox-Dobbs, Gwynne Brown, Kristin Johnson, William Haltom, Nancy Bristow, Brendan Lanctot, Pierre Ly, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Noah Lumbantobing, Alisa Kessel, Shirley Skeel, and Emelie Peine.

1. Call to order: 4:04pm

2. Announcements

None

3. Approval of the minutes of October 24th, 2016.

M/S/P unanimous

4. Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Kessel reported that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) requested clarification on what is a quorum for standing committee meetings, and she responded on behalf of the Senate (quorum is majority).

5. Updates from the ASUPS President and the Staff Senate representative

No updates

6. Discussion of Faculty Senate priorities pertaining to faculty work/life balance

At the Senate retreat in August, 2016 the Faculty Senate generated a list of its top four priorities for the 2016-2017 academic year. Kessel suggested that the Senate discuss the second of these priorities (Faculty support/balance/workload). At the retreat this priority was divided into four parts:

2a) address bias in teaching evaluation

2b) address ambiguity in Code language about promotion to (full) professor

2c) improve quality of life for faculty: workload, family and medical leave support

2d) increase and/or reconsider distribution logics of professional development support (financial)

In regards to 2a, Kessel pointed out that both the PSC and the COD were charged to work on biases in evaluations, and a recent Wednesday at Four topic also addressed this issue, and therefore the topic was already being discussed.

The Senate then discussed 2b. Kessel proposed the Senate consider the following key questions: What do we think the language should say? Does the Code say that? If not, do we want to amend the Code? And in terms of process, Kessel asked these questions: How does the Senate have this conversation? What does the Senate want to do about this? Ramakrishnan remembered from the retreat that the Senate thought it was important to have a forum for junior and non-full faculty to discuss the issue. Kessel clarified that the promotion survey data from 2015-2016 suggested there was variation among departments and programs in their interpretations of what “distinguished” was in reference to, across all review criteria, or just in regards to service. The Senate then discussed the research that would be needed to work on these questions, and specifically the types of information and feedback that would be useful.

Some potential themes for information gathering or broader discussion included:

- What are equitable criteria for promotion?
- How important is each category (teaching, professional growth, service, advising) for promotion in different departments, and at the university? What do you think of the relative importance of each category should be?
- Analyze data to understand trends and patterns across campus.
- How is being a Full professor different (from tenured Associate professor)?
- Department guidelines for review can be changed/managed within departments, but a university-wide definition would require change to the Code.

Kessel will summarize the Senate discussion for Bartanen, and will also communicate with Ellen Peters (OIR), Jennifer Neighbors (PSC chair) and Monica DeHart (former FAC member) and then report back to the Senate on their conversations.

The Senate then discussed 2c. The conversation revolved around researching and understanding sources for the “over” part of the “overworked” sentiment felt by many faculty. This included discussion about whether there are biases among faculty in regards to who carries “over”? Examples included expectations for summer research mentoring in the sciences; the size and distribution of advising loads among departments and faculty.

Kessel also mentioned potential shifts in how the university thinks about credit/unit loads to include summer mentoring, lab units, and sustainable models for experiential learning. The conversation then moved on to consider how the Senate might best gather information on this. Potential sources of data included advising loads (Academic Advising), course loads (Registrar), 2014 faculty service survey, and senior theses (departments).

The Senate formed two subcommittees to investigate questions and ideas raised in conversations above. The 2b Subcommittee (promotion to Full): Gwynne Brown and

Alisa Kessel. The 2c Subcommittee (workload): Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Brendan Lanctot, Kristin Johnson, and Kena Fox-Dobbs

Kessel clarified that the next Senate meeting will be November 14.

7. Meeting adjourned at 5:20pm.

Minutes prepared by Kena Fox-Dobbs.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly

Secretary of the Faculty Senate