

Faculty Senate Meeting October 24, 2017

In attendance: Lora Harris, Jerry Frank, Dave Secor, Lee Cooper, Jeff Cornwell, Elizabeth North, Sook Chung, Dave Nelson, Cat Stylinski, Melanie Jackson & Amy Griffin (by video conf).

Submitted by: Lora Harris

1. *Introductions* – each member name, role, and experience faculty shared governance (action item: need to update website of faculty senate members).
2. *Role of Faculty Senate* - Secor spent time explaining roles and attendees (including Nemazie, inviting VP of Education, etc.). Senate as place where shared governance occurs and inclusive of other groups (but student and FRA reps do not vote), in recent years there has been more organization for other groups at the Center (staff, students, FRAs). Duties include responding to policy issues and revisions, executive council and President's office can initiate these reviews (e.g. computing power, faculty evaluation that then was coupled with faculty development). Also critical to consider academic issues and ethical issues and grievances. Also general charge to improve effectiveness of UMCES (strategic plans). Some challenges: small institution and repeated rotations do occur (25% of faculty engaged in various shared governance tasks), distributed nature of the labs. Some important examples – implementing director lab reviews and insuring that senators are truly representative. Nuts and Bolts: Quarterly meetings unless more are needed; Regents award nominations; Set agenda and help organize UMCES Convocation; Senate Chair term is 3 years; Senators 3 years with renewal for 3 years; 2 senators CBL/HPL/AL and 1 senator IMET. Senate Chair represents at CUSF. Senate also carries out Director Reviews and has been involved in President and VP Reviews. UMCES has been a model for shared governance in U of M system. Goodwin: Also critical for Senate to set tone to facilitate thriving faculty.
3. *Transitions* – Cat Stylinski rotating into Vice-Chair position. New senator from CBL – Helen Bailey. Upcoming election from AL for new senator.
4. *Approvals* – Election plans for CBL and AL. These are essentially mirrors of one another. Some discussion of alternate senator terms and making sure there is no time when no alternate is available. Staggered terms helps with this.
5. *GSC representation* –At the moment, GSC is only represented on the senate and we discussed the idea of encouraging GSC to have seat at the table for Admin Council. We are happy to endorse this to the Administrative Council and will request its consideration. There was broad support of this (no dissent) at the meeting.
6. *Faculty Evaluation Annual Reviews*- Newly proposed language in annual and comprehensive review UMCES policies regarding use of different categories for evaluation to replace “satisfactory” with “fully successful”. Background is that both terms have been used in the past by different Laboratories. The senate feedback is that “fully successful” is not recommended and that “satisfactory” provides a better sense of this category. There was some discussion of removing reference to doing research related to the UMCES mission to replace with discovery, application, integration, teaching and advisement and whether that may lose an important message related to this policy. Requesting that faculty think of our mission may be a wise thing. Goodwin: Do faculty have in their annual reviews some position statement against which achievements could be compared. Response: In practice this occurs with annual written reviews related to written goals.

7. *Faculty Evaluation Comprehensive Review* – “Fully Successful” we prefer not to have as above. Other changes related to drawing faculty across laboratories for comprehensive reviews was accepted by the Senate. The Senate asked that policy be revised to accept promotion reviews in the place of 5-year comprehensive reviews. The Senate discussed at length whether there should be a waiver for comprehensive reviews for those faculty receiving a series of Excellent scores on their Annual Evaluations. The Executive Council is concerned about review work load for the evaluation committee (typically comprised of tenured full professors). On the other hand, requiring comprehensive reviews of all senior faculty contributes to rigor and center-wide transparency in evaluation and performance standards. The Senate decided to query individual laboratory faculty on their preference.
8. *Regent’s nomination* – On track for this and letter is being drafted. Goodwin: Also a point to discuss other national and international award nominations. Is it possible to make a running list of these? Make sure that we are keeping this in mind. Likewise - National Academies nominations.
9. *Open Access Pubs* – This was raised at admin council. IMET does have policy on this focused on students that uses some tuition return funds – particularly research credits. Next priority could be junior faculty. Some lab directors have provided feedback that startup should be used for that. Soft money faculty feel that making this a requirement is too onerous and there are ways around open access issues. The recommendation was that labs should look at this in terms of GEC allocations.
10. *Junior Faculty Retreat* – Lora discussed challenges of finding leadership amongst junior faculty to galvanize next steps for junior faculty retreat. Suggestions were made to have this first year’s example organized largely by senators as a way to set a path forward for future retreats. Elizabeth North has offered to help Lora with this effort over the winter and spring.
11. *HPL Mentoring Group* – Elizabeth went over HPL document included in materials for today’s meeting. Question regarding mentoring committees – these really operate as a supportive circles to help with networking. A second committee is set up just to give feedback on promotion materials (career advancement committee). Questions from senate: what happens if members of the career advancement committee are on that person’s promotion committee? Other details: Horn Point now acknowledging sponsorship and mentoring roles by senior faculty. Lightning talks as part of weekly seminars to get news out on what everyone is doing. Also Director review lunches.
12. *Update from VP’s office* – Thank you from VP’s office and felt MEES colloquium was great – big kudos to Victoria Coles. Thought that having faculty events on Friday was successful. Also a reminder to fill out spring courses – ACTION ITEM. Next year want to formalize role of PCC – approval of courses. Environment and Society faculty members had a conference call recently to try to get better relationship with behavioral science department at College Park. Start that foundation in fall of 2018. Start of student newsletter.
13. *Student updates* – IVN meetings have begun and they have had 2 so far (this was one of the suggestions from the diversity and inclusion proposal).

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Make sure website is updated with new faculty senators and roles.
2. Secor, Harris, and Stylinski will draft statement supporting policy changes to annual review with amendments related to (1) retention of Satisfactory rating over Fully Successful; (2) retention of language related to faculty performance as it relates to UMCES mission and service to the state; and (3) inclusion of an exemption for Comprehensive Reviews for faculty undergoing promotion reviews.

3. Senate members will solicit opinions from their lab faculties on two items:
 - a. Comprehensive reviews are required every 5 years for all tenured faculty with exemptions for those who are undergoing promotion and those who have received a series of Excellent or higher annual performance scores by their Directors. Faculty review committees are typically drawn from multiple laboratories, but because faculty are typically tenured full professors, putting these committees together can be a problem. Still the same committee can review multiple faculty. The Senate is requesting feedback on the waiver for "Excellent" faculty. By bringing all tenured faculty into a review cycle doesn't this increase rigor and help set the bar for performance, also helping all senior faculty stay in the fold in terms of understanding how continues to develop? Alternatively, is this too administratively burdensome to support from both the Evaluation Committee standpoint and that of the faculty submitting their review?
 - b. The Senate is currently trying to organize a retreat for junior faculty. Directors have indicated that they are willing to support a well organized retreat. Initial planning on theme development has occurred but there are indications that junior faculty have mixed feelings about the investment of time and effort in this. Before we move to the (top down) concrete planning part of this, which will likely be done by Senate members, the Senate asks for firm confirmation by the junior faculty that this is something they wish support. **This action item was completed shortly after the meeting.**
4. Goodwin's office would like to create a running list of awards for which faculty may be considered in addition to the Regents. Suggestions of awards, etc should be shared with Lori Stepp and Goodwin.
5. VP of Education would like to ask that faculty senators to remind their colleagues to fill out the spring course survey.