

Faculty Development and Administrative Relations (FDAR)

Minutes

02 Feb 2022

10:00 A.M. – 11:00 A.M.

Online

Minutes Recorder: Brian Hornbuckle

Minutes Editor: Diane Al Shihabi

Council Members Present

Diane Al Shihabi [ARTID], Dan Andersen [ABE]

Claire Andreasen [V PTH], Firat Erdim [ARCH], Brian Hornbuckle [Agr], Carmen Gomes [ME] , Jose Rosa [MKT], Ann Smiley [HSC], James Vary [LAS], Eliot Winer [ME], Dawn Bratsch-Prince [SVPP], Tera Jordan [SVPP]

Council Members Absent

None

I. Minutes

Motion by Ann, second by Claire to accept Nov. 17, 2021 minutes. Passed.

II. Faculty Concerns: Equity in Service and Teaching Loads

Issues: Inequities currently exist in faculty Service and Teaching loads. Some departments don't list service in the PRS, evaluations are conducted differently across campus, and the PRS is often tied to funding sources, all of which led to inaccurate representations of actual faculty workloads, particularly for faculty with administrative responsibilities. Rather than evaluating based on the full PRS, some departments/ colleges still use the old paradigm of only rewarding research, which has led to colleges not be able to fill high-workload councils or committee that are essential to shared governance. As is, the "factual summary" used for promotion and tenure documentation, does not accurately reflect the work of faculty. We also need to better define faculty work in the area of extension scholarship.

Discussion: FDAR and Provost's Office would like to work towards ensuring that faculty efforts match their PRS, especially in the area of service. All faculty are required to do service, but the amount of service should be appropriate to position and needs of their department, college, and the university. The PRS is used to evaluate faculty and must reflect what faculty are actually doing and must be kept current. To avoid inequities in service, we need a faculty evaluation process that is more consistent across the university, but that can be customized by each department. Ensuring service is acknowledged is essential. In the old paradigm, faculty were only rewarded for research. Now we have the PRS to allow faculty to get rewarded for what they have been asked to do, but we need a better way to collect information. How do we ensure service work is recognized and clearly defined? Could we create an electronic faculty accomplishment system that is more than quantitative and that acknowledge different activities/productivities among departments?

Solutions: Could invite speakers from other universities (i.e University of Maryland) and hold workshops. Distribute video on inequities to FDAR members. Have discussions within departments. Examine whether the university has too many committees. Distribute websites for review and continue discussion.

III. Faculty Concerns: Personnel Files/ Files on Workday

Issue: Faculty should know where their official personnel file/documentation is and should be able to review it and correct it if inaccurate, which is currently not the case. If a Chair and faculty member agree to an action, correction, or resolution, all documentation should be in the file. Currently faculty information resides in a number of places - Provost's Office, college (Dean), department (Chair and Secretary, and Workday.

Discussion: The official faculty personnel file is the Provost's Office office. The annual evaluation resides in department. PRS is in Workday. More functions could be turned on, but what would be the consequences? Currently thinking about which information should be in Workday, kept by the provost, and kept by the department.

Solutions: Provost's Office will provide information on what is known about where the different pieces of a faculty member's personnel file are held. Council members will then bring issue to college caucuses and ask where personnel information is stored.

IV. Faculty Concerns: Faculty Intellectual Property Rights

Issue: Faculty members are concerned that any Department chair can block a faculty member's access to their Canvas Course and give a different faculty member access to the course and its content without the author's knowledge or permission. Courses involved included recorded lectures.

Discussion. Chapter 8 is outdated and does not address online resources including Canvas. We will need to revise with input of university counsel and faculty, and we may need to move some things to Chapter 10 Discussion to continue.

V. Faculty Administrative Relationship

Issue: President Wintersteen has called for a more compassionate leadership approach, yet some Colleges appear to be moving in an opposite direction. Changes have been reported where HR is brought in early on in faculty-chair discussions, which ends the faculty's right to be heard.

Discussion: Could FDAR hold some workshops between faculty and administrators to change the culture, improve relationships, and learn how to talk effectively to resolve conflicts. Could we shift the emphasis on campus towards relationship building and problem solving rather than viewing people as the problem. Focus on changing culture to compassionate leadership. Discussion to continue.

VI. Committee Reports

A. EDI Committee

EDI is working with the Provost and CELT on how to best evaluate teaching effectiveness in a way that removes as much bias towards minority groups as possible.

EDI Committee voted against resolution on academic freedom, developed in response to actions taken by various state legislatures. EDI found the language inflammatory, in conflict with state law, and likely to cause more problems rather than solving problems. FDAR council voted in support of EDI's decision and will not forward the resolution to the Executive Board. Majority vote yes with one abstention.

EDI is currently working with the Provost's Office and CELT on a workshop about teaching effectiveness and making student evaluations less biased. This is in part in response to a petition about issues affecting Chinese faculty.

B. Facilities and Educational Resources Committee

Reported that custodial services cut at the beginning of the pandemic are being at least partially restored. FP&M made a presentation to FERC on deferred maintenance on university buildings. There is a \$450 million backlog in maintenance. \$43 million must be spent each year to not fall further behind, but the university is currently spending only \$19 million per year. There are two main problems: funds for maintenance; and funds for FP&M to have the human resources to do the maintenance.

C. Faculty Senate Recognition and Development Committee

Committee meeting next week to evaluate foreign travel grants and Big 12 travel grants.

D. Extension Scholarship Workgroup

Workgroup met on November 29, 2021 with the group led by Jim Reecy who would like to update the Faculty Handbook to recognize faculty work in "innovation and entrepreneurship." Brian thought that the two groups should combine their efforts and made that proposal. Jim later informed Brian on December 10 via email that his group will be moving ahead separately.

Solutions: The extension scholarship group needs to develop a clear proposal. The extension scholarship group should find out the current status of Jim's working group.

VII. **Good of the Order:** IT made a decision to eventually drop Google services without faculty input -may have to do with security. IT worked to make Zoom secure.

Solutions: Ask caucuses if faculty are concerned about the move away from Google. Address this issue with IT and request that they get feedback from faculty on a path forward.