

Faculty Council
Meeting Minutes
September 6, 2007

Present: Julio de Paula, Dean of the College; Jane Hunter, Associate Dean; Cliff Bekar, Associate Professor of Economics; Ken Clifton, Associate Professor of Biology; Dinah Dodds, Professor of German; Deborah Heath, Associate Professor of Anthropology; Mervyn Brockett, Assistant to the President; and Terri Banasek, Executive Assistant and recorder.

Dean de Paula welcomed Ken Clifton to Faculty Council. He announced that the primary purpose of this meeting is to build a master agenda for the 2007-08 academic year. He presented a list of discussion items for prioritization.

1. Associate Dean Hunter distributed a schedule of deadlines for chairs and faculty members for: capital project requests (September 28); capital equipment requests over \$5,000 (October 5); department budgets, to include staff requests (November 2); sabbatical requests (November 2); and tenure-line faculty position requests – both net additions and replacement of retiring or departing colleagues (February 1). She noted that this year, staff requests will be discussed separately from faculty requests (in November rather than February), as those new positions approved by Faculty Council will be filled in the 2008-09 fiscal year rather than 2009-10, as is the case for faculty positions.

In addition to the items on the schedule, Faculty Council now has the obligation to meet with review teams upon their arrival on campus for external departmental or program reviews. The team reviewing the philosophy department will be on campus on December 5. Dean de Paula and Associate Dean Hunter would like to take one meeting of Faculty Council for each of these six items.

Dean de Paula announced a procedural change in reviewing capital projects, and to a lesser extent, capital equipment requests. He would like to bring to the table people who perennially submit requests but are not part of Faculty Council – e.g., Clark Yeager, Dan Terrio and/or Patrick Ryall, and Houston Dougharty. The purpose would be to gather additional information to allow Faculty Council to make informed decisions. Dean de Paula also noted that for purposes of the 2008-09 budget, Student Life and the academic side will be sharing a budget for capital projects because all of the requests that come from the two segments are CAS requests. This will allow Faculty Council to see the big picture. Dr. Brockett pointed out that, particularly for capital projects, the source of funds is from depreciation. Depreciation for student life spaces and academic spaces are separate funds. Dean de Paula noted that last year, those funds were aggregated.

2. Dean de Paula reviewed the discussion items on the agenda.
 - a. Curriculum Issues
 - i. Procedures for reviewing symposia: This was held over from last year and should be done. There are issues of resources and quality.

- ii. Coordination between curricular and co-curricular schedules: This is also a holdover; it is a major discussion that first needs to be framed carefully with the help of the Curriculum Committee.
- iii. Collaborative teaching models: This came from the Curriculum Committee at the end of last semester. It is a set of criteria and a request that Faculty Council look at the resource allocation end of putting this model together. Faculty Council can also argue the merits of having such a program. Dean de Paula noted that there is some momentum behind this issue.
- iv. Teaching credit for student-faculty collaborative research: This also came from the Curriculum Committee last semester. How do we award credit to faculty members who are supervising research activities with students during the academic year? This happens frequently in the natural sciences and social sciences, as well as frequently in the studio arts. There is no model for awarding teaching credit and compensation, and Faculty Council needs to come up with some resolution. It was noted that it would be helpful to gather information from other institutions that do this sort of thing, and not only in the sciences. Dean de Paula responded that CUR has a resource on this issue. This ties in implicitly with reducing the faculty/student ratio.
- v. Student travel policy: Dean de Paula is looking to the possibility of broadening the policy that already exists in the mathematical and natural sciences to other segments of the College. How do we pay for it? How much should we put into this? Faculty Council needs to get an idea from chairs about what the demand is. What is SAAB not doing that could be done by the Office of the Dean?

b. Staffing Issues

- i. David Savage Award: Dean de Paula asked for advice on how to give this award. He needs a nomination process and a vetting process. He would like to present the award this academic year and asked for advice on timing. The purpose is to award service of a faculty member in our pursuit of academic excellence. This is not an award for scholarship or teaching. Dean de Paula believes this award should go to a current faculty member, not an emeritus faculty member. He will send the wording of the award to the Faculty Council for their review before the next meeting.
- ii. Policy on course release: Again, this is a holdover from last year. The idea is to have some sort of policy on course release that spells out expectations. Faculty Council needs to be expansive in its thinking so that the policy will be clear in philosophy as well as implementation. Possibilities: 1) for faculty with external grants; 2) to develop collaborative teaching; 3) for someone developing a major initiative. Again, there is a question of how to fund the policy. Dean de Paula will gather information from other institutions.
- iii. Developmental review of associate professors: According to the Faculty Handbook, the College currently requires that associate professors be reviewed every six years if not coming up for promotion. The policy has not been applied consistently throughout the different divisions of the College, and that creates the opportunity to look at the policy. There are many models at other institutions. Dean de Paula asked the Faculty Council to read through the existing policy for future discussion. This a

- time-sensitive item – there are people who are up for review this year, and they need to be informed.
- iv. Policy on whether the three- or two-course semester counts toward leading overseas programs: The practice of the person leading a program counting that semester as a two-course semester has not been applied uniformly in the last few years and needs to be revisited.
 - v. Policy on the consequences of postponing sabbatical leaves: Should the expectations be included in the policy?
 - vi. Teaching evaluation methodology: Are course evaluations enough? Should it be required that there be more than one way to look at teaching? Other institutions have procedures in place where class visitations are required in addition to course evaluations written by students. As the faculty revised the promotion and tenure criteria last year, wording was added to the teaching section that class visits were encouraged, and other materials were encouraged. The same was not said of a salary review.
 - vii. Salary reviews: This is a big issue, and Dean de Paula would like to move forward quickly. What constitutes a salary review file? It can mean anything from a binder to a box. A massive amount of work goes into these files. Associate Dean Hunter noted that it would be helpful for faculty members to have a standardized format to follow. Dean de Paula is working on a form that would provide the categories supported by reasonable documentation. The other piece of this issue is the wisdom of doing away with high, medium, and low levels of increases in favor of something that is truly a spectrum (a sliding scale) with low level and high level dictated by the budget but giving the Dean and Associate Dean the flexibility to give raises within that bracket. This could include perhaps six levels instead of three. Dean de Paula's objection is to the difference between high and medium when the pool is large. He would like to be able to send numerical messages as well as verbal messages, and a sliding scale helps that.
 - viii. Faculty committee membership: Dean de Paula pointed out that people are not running for election to committees. He doesn't mind recruiting people, but it is time consuming. The real issue is governance – what it means for this College to have a governance system when people are not running for committees. Dean de Paula asked the Faculty Council for advice on what we can do as a community to enhance the level of attention to this matter – that it is important to run for election. This may be tied to the salary issue.

Faculty Council prioritized the agenda items as follows:

Highest priority:

- David Savage Award
- Developmental review of associate professors
- Review of classical studies

High priority:

- Collaborative teaching models
- Teaching credit for student-faculty collaborative research

- Policy on course release
- Policy on whether the three- or two-course semester counts toward leading overseas programs
- Policy on consequences of postponing sabbatical leaves

Medium priority:

- Teaching evaluation methodology
- Salary reviews – file content and raise levels

Low priority:

- Committee memberships

Lowest priority:

- Procedures for reviewing symposia
- Coordination between curricular and co-curricular schedules
- Student travel policy

3. For next meeting: Classical studies review, David Savage Award, development review of associate professors (see Faculty Handbook, page 24).

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 13, 2007, 1:50 p.m.