CHSS College Faculty Council Meeting

14 March 2017

11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m., Dean’s Conference Room

**Draft Minutes**

**Attending:** Chuck Aust (SOCM), Terry Carter (DWMA), Steve Collins (PSIA), Neysa Figueroa (FL), Beth Giddens (ENGL), LeeAnn Lands (HIST-PHIL), Brandon Lundy (note-taker, GEOG-ANTH), Sarasij Majumder (ISD), Dorothy Marsil (PSYC), Ken White (presiding, SCJ).

**Ex-Officio:** Dean Robin Dorff

**Guest:** Dawn Baunach (SOC-CJ)

1. **Minutes:** Dean Dorff requested some minor changes to the previous minutes. Dorothy moved to approve the minutes with changes. Beth seconded. Minutes were unanimously approved with changes. (See attached.)

* Great job LeeAnn on last month’s minutes!

1. **Dean Dorff: CHSS update on initiatives, developments, policies, etc.:**

* Merit and budget decisions are currently taking place within the College.
* Mobile and space options are being discussed regarding faculty offices (w/ John Anderson).
  + Found enough space for tenure-track lecturer hires for next year. Not enough space for online faculty hires, even if they share though.
  + Other requests to find additional space are being circulated.
  + The proposal to offer a modest stipend (i.e., non-instructional summer pay) to faculty who give up their offices has not been approved.
    - HR and legal determined that “compensation” for working from home was not permitted.
      * They argued that no amendments to BOR contracts are permitted.
      * They also interpreted this initiative as falling into the gratuity clause (i.e., pay someone not to work), which is not the case.
      * Parking permits were also not permitted as compensation because it was not being provided to all faculty.
      * Nothing in the BOR contract specifies faculty must have an office. (“Details of the contract will be provided elsewhere.” – i.e., nowhere are faculty positions specified at the BOR or university levels. Therefore, the dean should have unlimited options because the college is responsible for providing all the details of the position.)
      * No decision has been reached.
  + Can we provide shared offices or other forms of off-setting compensation (i.e., adjusted workloads)?
    - TBD
  + The Dean’s office is most concerned about space issues affecting new faculty hiring decisions.
  + Can some of the “compensation” funds be used for construction to build out new offices (Dorothy)?
    - More space is already being carved out, but this space is already assigned.
    - Other space cannot be utilized due to floorplans and regulations.
      * Carmen works closely with facilities on all new build outs.
* Next year’s faculty lines needs were presented at the Dean’s Council budget meeting.
  + List of 20 new faculty lines were presented by the dean to the Dean’s Council.
    - These are new positions, not vacant positions.
    - Decisions were data informed based on College bottlenecks.
  + Four emergency hires were already approved.
  + Three new positions have also been approved. (Ongoing prioritization is taking place with Chairs).
    - These are not enough!
    - Prioritization did take place (7 positions in advance of the full budget next year because we are the college with the most serious bottlenecks based on Gen Ed courses and other serious challenges based on our size and growth).
      * Some strategic prioritization is taking place at the level of the President and Provost.
      * Dean, Chairs, and departments determine whether these positions are for lecturers, tenure-track faculty, etc.

1. **IRB Policy Change Concern – Classroom activities are/have been exempt from review, because “instruction” is not “research” – Elizabeth Giddens:**

* Robin will be meeting at 1:30 pm today with Chris Ziegler to discuss recent changes to IRB guidelines.
* Instruction versus research? What is the difference and how should the IRB handle these proposals differently?
* The IRB presented new changes to the Dean’s Council, but they did not clarify certain aspects of the IRB procedures. That is why there is the need for the additional meeting with Robin.
* There seems to be some internal contradictions in how the IRB are making decisions.
  + Are they interpreting some of the federal guidelines differently in comparison to other offices around the country?
  + Partly a problem of vague federal language in the laws regulating IRBs.
    - Universities must determine their policies based on these federal laws.
* The IRB has become a barrier to some effective pedagogy (e.g., practice-centered learning).
  + Cannot get summer review of projects due to the IRB committee only meeting during the academic year, which is creating a bottleneck of research proposals intended for the summer.

1. **Proposal to “streamline the ARD process” – presented by Dawn Baunach (SOC-CJ:**

* Filling in for Susan as the chair representative from the Chair’s Council.
* Looking for feedback to make the faculty review process more efficient/streamlined.
* They are proposing shortened evidence that still gets the major initiatives and accomplishments across (see attached).
* They also proposing removing the connections between goals and outcomes between ARDs and FPAs.
  + Data would still run through digital measures.
  + Citations would still be input, but not linked to the FPA goals of the preceding year.
* They also propose putting a limit on ARD narratives to one page.
  + Expectations would be made clearer to faculty.
  + Clear prompts would be provided to faculty.
* Goal: Shorter more efficient review process.
* All three areas would be affected (one-page narrative for each, 250-300 words with a half page response from chairs).
  + Beth expressed concerns about merit raises being based on these narratives. Therefore, teaching narratives may need to be a bit more lengthy to readily engage with student evaluations, course corrections, clarification/explanation for materials and approaches, etc.
  + Chairs should consider providing best practice narratives within each discipline/department to help improve faculty narratives (Terry).
  + Faculty should be on the college committee that is revising the ARD/FPA process? Faculty need to have a voice in the decisions (i.e., transparency and sense of fairness). (LeeAnn)
  + These narratives are important because they provide context. Therefore, faculty should not be limited in what evidence they decide to provide in their narratives (Chuck/Terry)?
  + Some information could still be provided in the “accomplishment” area (i.e., unsolicited student feedback; peer letters; etc.). (Steve)
  + One-page narrative for untenured faculty may be a disservice. (Ken)
    - Differences among ranks of what is expected/required should be considered by the chairs.
    - Chairs are feeling the effects of the competitive environment that faculty operate in (Beth).
    - What evidence can we provide to ensure diverse faculty concerns are being registered (Neysa)?
  + Long narratives are sometimes the outcome of uncertainty.
    - How are student evaluations weighted in these decisions?
      * Some clarity on this will be provided in the next iteration of the Faculty Handbook.
  + A CV is not enough to provide insights into what goals/accomplishments are being achieved.
    - There needs to be space to expand upon goal/accomplishment.
  + Narratives should help justify what is “noteworthy” as it relates to the new P&T Guidelines.
    - There remains a need in the college to be able to document what is noteworthy and why.
    - If the department is already determining what is “noteworthy,” we may not have to elaborate in a lengthy narrative.
  + Chairs want summaries, faculty want narratives (Ken).
    - Is there an option to include an addendum for faculty who wish to provide more?
    - Could an option be to provide as a response if a faculty feels they are being misunderstood (w/ no limit)?
  + More words may not add additional clarity (Robin).
    - This is partially an outcome of the P&T process/system that is too adversarial and overly complex already.
  + Could a one-page executive summary be an option (Chuck)?
  + Could there be individualized feedback from chairs to specific faculty (e.g., diminished returns if they provide too much information)?
  + Some departments have already done away with the narratives at the tenured-level or made them options. Tenured faculty would likely not want to see this go away (LeeAnn).
  + Digital Measures is much more of an impediment to faculty’s time during the ARD/FPA process, not the writing of the narrative.
  + What are best practices regarding the review process at other USG institutions?

1. **Vacant Positions Funding Question –** *Faculty query: Vacant positions have apparently been allocated to the Provost; these positions have merit pool amounts tied to them; last year, the Dean got additional merit pool based on vacant positions; this year, those monies will not come to the college; the Provost will get the funds; so, how will funds be used? Who benefits from those funds moving forward? How much money is this in real terms?***:**

* Funds from vacant positions revert to the Dean’s office, not the Provost. These positions stay in the College (i.e., replacement hires; no reallocations within the college occur)
  + The college only has one vacant position this year.
  + How are salary differentials determined?
    - Variances typically stay within the department if the need is there.
    - Typically these funds can only go toward temporary hires (limited term faculty/part-time faculty to meet stopgap needs).

OLD BUSINESS (to be revisited):

1. **Workload pilot model discussions – Elizabeth Giddens:**
2. **Pathway to tenure-track positions for lecturers discussion (whether lecturers are doing de facto assistant-level work without the same teaching schedule, due process protection, contract expectation, etc.)? – Elizabeth Giddens:**
3. **International Campus Community Concerns - Request for clarification on hiring practice regarding diversity, especially concerning the hiring of international faculty. Request for single point of contact place/space/center designed to support and serve international campus community members for visa, other paperwork, and community networking and social support:**
4. **Salary Equity v. Merit Raises – Can/Should these be de-linked in the budget? - Geography and Anthropology DFC, Dr. Brandon Lundy:**
5. **CHSS P&T Guidelines – Townhall (today) at 12:30 p.m. – CFC will need to acknowledge receipt of final, approved guidelines at our April 11th meeting:**

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.
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1. Minutes: Dean Dorff requested some minor changes in the previous minutes. Minutes were approved with changes. (See attached.)
2. Dean’s announcements:

* Academic Learning Center (ALC) will not be in this year’s budget. The money for USG buildings is primarily going to complete a project at Georgia Tech. Recall that money had already been invested in the design of the ALC. Unfortunately, this impacts our college in particular and the availability of office space. (It was noted we are at least four years away from having any substantial new office space on campus.)
* The Dean, et al., are working on incentives to support faculty willing to work from home. Nothing has been settled yet, but we’re considering laptops, screens, printers, recurring incentive payments, and the like. We’re also looking at mobile lab and other spaces, though likely not mobile classrooms. It was noted that we need private space to engage with students in ways that meet FERPA requirements. It was also noted that temporary classrooms have a way of becoming permanent. The Dean will be running these incentive ideas past the chairs at their regular meeting this Friday. He would like to get the incentive plan to faculty soon so that we know how many would like to participate. The Dean will circulate the plan to CFC for feedback before it is publicly announced to the CHSS faculty.

1. Faculty Supervision Buy-out Proposal: Thierry Leger reminded those present that in 2012 we established a policy on supervision of graduate students. That point system allowed course reassignment or faculty development funds for the mentoring of theses and dissertations. We did this because most college faculty at the time didn’t have a “graduate level” teaching load. The system required 10 points for a course release or $300 faculty development funds per 1 point. It ended up that few people took advantage of the policy. Had faculty tried to cash in this money, CHSS would have owed $200,000. Because CHSS had extra cash this year, we looked at reimbursing faculty for accumulated points and ending this unsustainable policy. Currently we’re trying to pay the currently owed funds via a “buy out proposal” (see attached).

Right now the buy out proposal doesn’t allow those on 12-month contract to accumulate cash in points, but it is likely that portion will be eliminated. It was noted that extending the program to 12-month faculty would be a good will measure. It was noted that we have to finalize the buy-out plan quickly because we need to disperse the funds that are currently available.

The buy out proposal has been circulated to chairs and program directors and should have been distributed to all affected faculty.

The other major concern is what the new policy for graduate student mentoring will be. It was noted that departments will have the flexibility to accommodate those faculty who mentor a number of students with a reduced teaching load. Departments might also consider that mentoring as service, and then lower the faculty member’s service requirement. It was clarified that we likely won’t replace this mentoring policy with another free-standing mentoring policy, but we’ll incorporate the mentoring of graduate students into each department’s faculty workload policy.

1. Equity/compression: Ken White has met with the President regarding equity/compression and our 2015 and 2016 CFC letters. The President indicated that it is unlikely that KSU can do anything of significance about equity/compression this year, but perhaps can do something “significant” with next year’s budget. Ken asked that it somehow be communicated to faculty that we will be tackling this issue.

The Dean has had a follow-up conversation with the President regarding equity/compression, and hand delivered the 2015 and 2016 equity letters to the President (now his third copy of the letter). Associate Dean Leger has also recalculated equity/compression needs recently and it’s about $600,000+ for CHSS, and that information was given to the President. The baselines were recalibrated for assistant, associate, full. So, the President has the full history of equity/compression issues for CHSS, including the method of calculation. The Dean expects to hear a formal response from the President on this matter.

The amount of any equity money coming this year will likely become available in May/June, as usual.

CFC will wait to hear the formal response before taking any further action on the equity/compression matter. If we don’t hear anything by fall 2017 -- or see a line item in the following year’s budget -- then we need to follow up with the President.

1. Campus Carry: It is still unclear if the campus carry proposal will be approved by the state legislature and Governor. It is unclear how much control faculty/administration/staff will have in dictating policies specific to their campus (e.g., whether or not faculty members can choose to allow guns in their office).
2. Clarification on Political Activity: The email from President Olens has been misunderstood by some (many?) on campus. It has been interpreted to mean that faculty should not lobby the legislature or other politicians. It was pointed out that faculty cannot represent the university on matters related to the university. Faculty can act on their own behalves to speak to issues of relevance, including education matters. They should not use campus email, letterhead, or other university resources in conveying political opinions. Dean Dorff offered to help organize some clarification of this issue and how faculty can speak to socio-political issues. A lively discussion ensued as to whether departments or representative bodies could speak to issues of socio-political concern.

The meeting adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

**ARD Revision Proposal**

**Justification**: Faculty, chairs, and members of the dean’s office are spending too much time formatting and reviewing ARDs. The process is cumbersome and results in documents that are excessively long and redundant. It is also difficult to identify the important events in each area of review because they may be buried in the document rather than prominently listed at the beginning of the relevant section.

**Plan**: ARDs will now consist of a CV generated in Digital Measures and a narrative that highlights major accomplishments in relevant evaluative areas (TSM, RCA, PS). The submission packet will include

* A **CV**
  1. *departments can decide if they want a complete CV or a CV with only information from the year under consideration*
* A one-page, maximum, **narrative** shall be submitted for each section.(see attached template)
  1. departments can decide whether to shorten this narrative, have only one narrative today, or have only the CV
  2. Departments can decide whether chairs will comment after each section (TSM, RCA, PS) or whether there will be only one summary comment at the end of the document.
* For the **FPA** we have two options.
  1. We will revise the FPA to a one-paragraph narrative for each of the three areas of review (see the FPA new format draft)
  2. The FPA from the year of review will be submitted, with an indication of the status of each item (see below)
     + *departments can decide whether to have the FPA from the year under review included in the packet*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I will revise my course ANTH XXXX to include new lectures and new lab exercises. | Completed |
| I will revise and resubmit a paper for publication to the Journal of Amazing Research | Ongoing |

**Process**: Faculty will still input information in DM. Chairs that wish to pull the CV themselves will have that ability. It is possible to select material for a CV for one specific year, or if chairs wish, they can require a more detailed CV. FPA goals will still be submitted through DM and will be formatted as they currently are.