Department Faculty Meeting

May 3, 2022
Noon – 1:20
In person: Gould 102
On-line: _____

Agenda items

12:00 - 12:05	Welcome	Campbell
12:05 - 12:10	Approval of minutes	Campbell
12:10 – 12:50	Teaching Faculty discussion	Campbell
12:50 – 1:20	Short topics	Campbell

Present

Dan Abramson, Marina Alberti, Rachel Berney, Chris Campbell, Andrew Dannenberg, Sofia Dermisi, Wendy Freitag, Himanshu Grover, Keith Harris [arrived 12:35], Larissa Maziak, Mark Purcell, Qing Shen, Alexis Wheeler, Jan Whittington

Approval of Minutes

Rachel moved to approve April 19th meeting minutes
Mark seconded
8 yes
0 no
1 abstain

General Updates

Qing noted that Teaching Assistant (TA) nominations close Friday, May 20th. [As some faculty had not seen the original announcement regarding TA nominations, Qing agreed to recirculate it.]

Teaching Faculty Discussion

Christopher provided updates regarding the status of the Associate Teaching Professor search. The job description was drafted and submitted for review, approval, and posting. While the position must remain open until the closing date stated in the job description, the search committee – comprised of Rachel and Bob Mugerauer – can begin reviewing applications before the closing date.

Christopher then opened a discussion about "the qualities we would like to see in this candidate." [CLOSED DISCUSSION]

As Keith (a potential candidate for the Associate Teaching Professor position) arrived at this juncture (12:35pm), Christopher paused discussion of hiring criteria for the teaching faculty role and transitioned to a discussion of merit review.

Merit Review

Reminding faculty that he recently forwarded a copy of Dean Renee Cheng's letter on merit reviews, Christopher asked them to update and submit their CVs and Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) for the 2020-21 academic year. Noting the department does not have a common template for FARs, he suggested it might be easiest for Larissa to send each faculty member their previous FAR, so they can update it for this year's merit review submission.

Jan expressed concern about the lack of a standardized UDP FAR template, stating it's a compliance problem. Christopher clarified the Faculty Code requires each department to adopt a recommended FAR format. He called for volunteers to create a standardized FAR template for the department. Jan volunteered, if someone more senior joined her. Qing and Marina declined.

Dan agreed that it is important to have someone more senior assist with the template design, as only the most senior faculty can see everyone's FARs and draw upon them to create the standard template. Christopher clarified that everyone can view each other's FARs, even though review is top-down based on seniority.

Sofia stated junior faculty members should be involved too, because the resulting template will have a longer impact on them. Christopher pointed out junior faculty are already represented, as Jan is the third most junior faculty member in the department. He further noted the two most junior faculty cannot participate in this process because it is inappropriate for Himanshu to participate during his tenure process, and Rachel is "full up" with other obligations, including the teaching faculty search committee.

Christopher stated the department just needs someone to author the FAR template, addressing research, teaching, service, and – if so desired by the faculty and as requested by Renee – EDI.

He asked Jan to proceed on her own with the drafting process for now, to which Jan agreed. Jan asked whether the FAR is a matter of public record; Christopher confirmed that it is.

In response to faculty questions about how to access last year's FARs, Christopher asked Larissa to circulate the link to where they are housed. Christopher also encouraged faculty to review the FAR guidance in the Faculty Code, starting at Section 24-57 (Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations).

Regarding faculty raises, Christopher pointed out the Chair currently assigns merit-based raises based on "meritorious" faculty recommendations. However, faculty can make those decisions directly, as is done in Architecture. Christopher needs a faculty request if they want to decide merit raises among themselves.

Teaching Faculty Discussion (*cont.*)

At the conclusion of the merit review discussion, Keith and Wendy left the meeting to allow a closed discussion of the teaching faculty hire to continue.

[CLOSED DISCUSSION]

Meeting adjourned at 1:24pm.