CHSS College Faculty Council Meeting

November 13, 2018

11:00am-12:15pm

Deans’ Office Conference Room

**Attending:** Kerwin Swint (Deans’ Office), Steve Collins (CFC Committee Chair, SGIA), Brandon D. Lundy (GEOG and ANTH), Chuck Aust (SOCM), Al Churella (Minutes, HIST and PHIL), Beth Giddens (ENGL), Tim Hedeen (SCMPD), Tim Martin (PSYCH), Jennifer McMahon-Howard (SCJ), Federica Santini (FL), Sarasij Majumder (ISD), Jonathan Arnett (TCID)

**AGENDA and MINUTES**

NOTE: Minutes from the previous (10-09-2018) CFC meeting were approved electronically, prior to the current meeting.

1. Dean Swint: New CHSS initiatives, developments, policies, misc.
   1. No new policies
   2. The Dean acknowledged that CHSS staff are under considerable stress, and that there are plans to have a monthly staff recognition.
2. Updates:
   1. Limited Faculty Parking Spaces in West Deck: Dean Swint talked with Caleb Lee (Parking and Transportation), who indicated that he would bring the matter to the attention of the Parking and Transportation advisory group. The Dean indicated that it was unlikely that the University would reduce the number of student spaces in West Deck, in order to permit additional faculty parking. One CFC member mentioned that the original agreement to build the West Deck stipulated that a certain number of spaces would be reserved for students, in exchange for the use of student fees to guarantee the construction bonds – but that it is probable that agreement has expired, and is no longer an impediment to the expansion of faculty parking. Another CFC member indicated that some spaces could be designated as first-come, first-served, and open to all members of the university community – sending the message that faculty, staff, and students are all equally valued members of that community. Another CFC member emphasized that faculty who are late for class, because they are unable to locate a parking space, might inconvenience forty or more students. Another faculty member noted the difficulty and danger associated with walking to the Church Lot at night, in the rain, following evening classes. Dean Swint observed that the Big Owl Bus stops at that parking lot, but the faculty member noted that that would still require a lengthy wait in the rain.
   2. Bookstore Problems: The Dean has received no answer from the Bookstore, regarding the unwillingness to order sufficient books (or any books at all, in some cases). One CFC member observed that, while students can order books from Amazon or some other off-campus source, Financial Aid will not pay for those purchases. Students are thus forced to pay for books out of their own pocket or else wait for weeks while the Bookstore orders more copies. This is a situation that has a negative effect on student success.
3. Implementation of Proposal to Halve the College P&T Committee
   1. The proposal to resize the CHSS P&T committee (from 22 members to 11 members), passed a vote of the college faculty. It will now move to the Senate agenda, probably in January.
4. Dean’s Search: Visit from Tom Fitch (Storbeck Pimental Consultants)
   1. The Dean left the room at this point
   2. No minutes were taken of this portion of the meeting, in order to eliminate any possibility of bias in the search process (members of the University community who might apply for the CHSS Dean position will have access to these minutes, to a degree that off-campus applicants would not).
   3. Tom Fitch concluded his remarks and left the room; the Dean returned.
5. CFC Study on Salary & Equity Relief (Morale Survey)
   1. The CFC Chair thanked committee members for their suggestions in response to the draft Morale Survey. He will distribute an updated version, incorporating those suggestions, for further feedback and discussion.
   2. There followed considerable discussion regarding the appropriate issuer for the survey. The discussion emphasized the importance of maintaining anonymity and avoiding any perception among respondents that personally identifiable data can be traced back to them.
   3. Discussion as to whether we will incorporate open-ended questions into the survey: to do so increases the likelihood that respondents will perceive that their anonymity might be compromised, to avoid them limits the usefulness of the survey.
   4. Discussion regarding whether the survey should be submitted to the University IRB for review and approval. Some CFC members noted that this is an internal, informational survey, not part of program of research or dissemination to off-campus audiences. Other CFC members noted that it would be prudent to submit all surveys to the IRB.
   5. Discussion of the possibility of employing the Burruss Institute to administer the survey. The Chair noted that the Burruss Institute is affiliated with the CHSS School of Government & International Affairs, and that that affiliation might enable CHSS to use the Burruss Institute for free or at reduced cost – he will look into the matter. The Dean indicated that his office might be able to cover the cost of the survey.
6. Salary Issues
   1. The Dean has mentioned the salary issue with the President, who has acknowledged that it is an important issue.
   2. CFC chairs from various colleges met with Interim Provost Ron Matson, regarding the absence of additional salary equity funding. He was unaware of any plans to disburse additional salary equity funding this semester.
7. Faculty Workload Plan Implementation
   1. The following items will be incorporated into the CHSS faculty guidelines:
      1. Metrics for Scholarship and Creative Activity (numbers of publications, etc.) to guide promotion and tenure decisions.
      2. A framework, with examples, for potential workload options.
   2. The Dean emphasized that the implementation of the new workload model is entirely separate from the existing and ongoing requirement that each department establish clear metrics for Scholarship and Creative Activity.
   3. One faculty member asked that an appeal process be embedded into the college’s workload model guidance so that faculty will know that they have a right to appeal - to the Dean of CHSS - a chair’s recommendation to change an individual’s workload model. Dean Swint supported adding this language to the college’s workload model guidance.
   4. One CFC member expressed concern regarding Service obligations under the new workload model, particularly involving the curtailment of reassigned time for faculty who serve as assistant chairs, minor and certificate program coordinators, etc. If faculty will be expected to undertake such service, in the absence of adequate reassigned time, then this might constitute a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.
   5. CFC members commented that it is unrealistic to expect that faculty members allocate 10% of their workload to Service; for most faculty the percentage is considerably higher than that.
   6. The Dean noted that it should be possible to reprioritize service, perhaps by having less frequent department meetings, etc.
   7. Follow-up comment that some matters (such as promotion and tenure guidelines) have been in constant flux for ten years or more, and that some stability in that area would reduce faculty Service obligations and alleviate the stress of faculty members seeking promotion and tenure.
   8. One CFC member observed that there are no clear guidelines as to the measurement of Scholarship and Creative Activity as part of the Post-Tenure Review process, and that that was an issue in the most recent CHSS P&T Committee meeting.
   9. One CFC member commented that the average KSU faculty member produces one publication every 3-4 years, and that that statistic would suggest that it is unrealistic to expect faculty to produce two articles every five years.
   10. One CFC member asked whether merit pay increases would be available to teaching-focused (4-4) as well as balanced (3-3) faculty
   11. One CFC member asked whether faculty assigned to a 4-4 model (by a department chair) could appeal that decision. The Dean indicated that faculty would be required to move to a 4-4 model if both the department chair and the dean’s office agreed that that model was appropriate. The Dean also noted that he will be responsible for evaluating the equitable assignment of the various models, to ensure consistency within departments and among departments.
   12. One faculty member asked whether there is a path back from a 4-4 model to a 3-3 model, given that the 4-4 model would severely restrict the ability of a faculty member to engage in Scholarship and Creative Activity.
   13. The members of the CFC made several suggestions, regarding items that might be incorporated into the new workload model:
       1. There should be a 4-3 option, to minimize the disruption to a faculty member’s career induced by a rapid swing between a 3-3 and a 4-4 model.
       2. The two-year window regarding the production of Scholarship and Creative Activity is too narrow, given that many research projects extend over longer time periods; a three-year window would be better, but is still very tight; a five-year window was suggested, but the Dean doubted that the senior administration would find that acceptable.
       3. There should be a clear statement in the workload guidelines that faculty can present evidence of ongoing Research and Creative Activity (as an alternative to published research projects), in order to retain balanced (3-3) status.
8. College support for open access fees for online journals
   1. Tabled

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Meeting summary prepared by Albert Churella