

## Faculty Standards Meeting Minutes: February 6, 2023

**Present:** Dan Burkey (Chair), Lisa Holle, Elaine Lee, George McManus, Betsy McCoach, Masha Gordina, Valarie Artigas, Elizabeth Jockusch, Jeffrey Shoulson, Bede Agocha, Martina Rosenberg, Joe Maccougald (by invitation), Gladis Kersaint (by invitation).

**Absent:** Vicki Magley (sabbatical), Kevin Wan (USG)

Meeting called to order 2:03 PM via WebEx.

**1. Review and approval of minutes:** The meeting minutes from the December 5, 2022 meeting were approved. Motion: Betsy McCoach, Second: Martina Rosenberg.

### 2. Continuing Business:

- **Emeritus Working Group:** George McManus and Lisa Holle provided a brief update on the guidance document for department heads regarding emeritus faculty. Jeffrey Shoulson shared this with the Provost's office. This resulted in a meeting between Dan Burkey, Lisa Holle, George McManus and Sarah Croucher to further discuss, with additional input from Eva Lefkowitz, chair of the University Emeritus Committee. Based on this conversation and feedback, George and Lisa are making additional revisions to the document, which can be shared with the Senate at an upcoming meeting.
- **CIRE Provost/AAUP Working Group:** Dan Burkey provided an update to the group's progress. The group assembled a survey on CIRE faculty professional development opportunities and with the help of the Provost's office distributed the survey via Qualtrics to all CIRE faculty. 200 responses were received and the group is currently analyzing the data. The group is working towards a report to the AAUP and the Provost's office that is due at the end of March.
- **Faculty Review and the AAUP Contract:** The FSC invited Vice Provost Gladis Kersaint to discuss the latest information on the faculty review policies stipulated in the most recent AAUP contract
  - VP Kersaint noted that the intent here is to provide both formative and summative feedback to faculty and that it is increasingly important to document feedback to faculty due to heightened scrutiny.
  - The intention is to provide clarity and clearer expectations to faculty, department heads, and administration. Want to make sure that faculty know what their expected contributions and divisions of labor should be, and that those evaluating them are in agreement, so evaluations occur fairly and equitably. The department level is articulating the expectations for faculty, commensurate with the norms and expectations in the field.
  - Elizabeth Jockusch asked what this review was intended to look like in practice; i.e., pre-tenure review is already happening, merit reviews are happening post-tenure? Is this another review beyond PTR and Merit?

- Jeffrey Shoulson noted that this review does need to be duplicative to those processes already in place and that it is not intended as a “backdoor” to post-tenure review.
- Jeffrey Shoulson also noted that this is as much about protecting faculty as it is about holding them accountable. VP Kersaint noted that this also keeps administrators accountable, as clarity and transparency allows all parties to have a common understanding of expectations. It was noted that this may be a part of Interfolio in the future, and that simplifying and streamlining reporting is a goal/concern.
- Masha Gordina voiced concerns about the terminology of “assigning” faculty different tasks with respect to teaching, research, and service, specifically with respect to research. Jeffrey Shoulson noted that the intent was not to assign *specific* research to faculty but rather the percentage of time dedicated to each of their core activities (research, teaching, service).
- Elizabeth Jockush noted that many things are done voluntarily by faculty and how are these being captured? For example, mentoring students vs. classroom teaching? Similarly, Elaine Lee questioned how does this process account for faculty commitment for diversity in their service work?
- Lisa Holle noted that Clinical Faculty in Pharmacy are already meeting with leadership twice per year, and that percentages of expected time are explicit in offer letters – there are examples at the university of these kind of reviews and dialogs with faculty already occurring.

**3. Motion to Adjourn** at 3:30 PM – George McManus; Second Betsy McCoach

**4. Reminder of Upcoming Meetings:**

- a. March 6<sup>th</sup> 2023 – Bridget Inzirillo – to discuss 12/12ths compensation rules.
- b. April 3, 2023
- c. May 1, 2023