

Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 22, 2019

Mike Wilberg (Chair), Jeff Cornwell, Jerry Frank, Mario Tamburri, Dave Nemazie, Helen Bailey, Elizabeth (by zoom), Cat Stylinski, Peter Goodwin, Sook Chung

1. Update from Nemazie:
 - a. Budget update from this past session included budget enhancement (workforce development) to develop a graduate certificate that is not a once off but a continuing adjustment
 - b. Budget cut of \$10 million dollars (200k for UMCES).
 - c. Search for VP for advancement: lots of discussion of who and what this position is, to try to push ahead large scale projects. Hybrid VP for Research and Development; "VP of Strategic Initiatives". Advertisement is on the street with application deadline mid-June. Faculty will be included on search committee. Hope to hire by the fall. Also discussions of what the office would include - potentially some staffing.
 - d. Are there plans to move from "acting" to non-acting VP of Education. There is a longer timeframe set of issues to think about movement forward that includes MEES as well.
 - e. US Census - relevance to UMCES is the number of foreign nationals who complete the form. This should include our employees, etc. This impacts funding formulas. Also looking for non-traditional housing like our dorms or apartments.
 - f. Update on ORAA - there will likely be some restructuring. This is shifting. Our feedback is that we hope the faculty senate is involved in these discussions. There are actually a lot of functions in this office. Emphasis from Nemazie and Goodwin is that we are a small institution. How can we find redundancy across the institutions and perhaps not always have place-based staffing. Lynn is working to also consider how the nuances are communicated better among both ORAA and to PIs and other related offices.
 - g. Jeff feedback - what about centralizing things like contribution numbers.
2. Convocation Feedback:
 - a. Help with distribution of postits and collection of these
 - b. Help with mingling at dinner
3. Mental Healthcare Options Committee
 - a. First time there have been enough volunteers (over 20 people!)
 - b. Focus is on distribution of information on availability of mental health care issues
 - c. Next meeting (3rd mtg) will be next week - big thanks to those who have been involved
 - d. Final report by August of 6-8 pages with focus on available resources (like an inventory), also has aspirational component.
4. Faculty Standards

- a. Last meeting included discussion with lab directors and Goodwin on our original report to include a plan moving forward
 - b. Peter's update: There had been a plan to have feedback by end of academic year. Peter has asked for summary based around annual reviews that have been completed at this stage from lab directors. He is expecting that by end of the year. Peter feels there is a conversation being had about our identity as more than a research institution. He feels strongly that we need a fair description of what the expectations are in this regard. And that this might become a model for how to set evaluations for work over a year. Important we respect individual researcher who focuses on basic research, but growth of institution will require input from faculty doing a diversity of activities. So, the lab directors are taking a look at this and then they will provide this to us. Hoping we have something in place for next academic year.
 - i. Mario feedback - director/faculty evaluation in his experience has this balance of appreciation for different flavors of work. But how to make sure this is translated to external evaluations. **Peter's feedback:** Inconsistent across labs, so that needs to be fixed. For external: reviewers can use guidance related to X% teaching, X% research, etc. **Lora's input:** But the other problem is that when it comes to promotion committees an individual lab is actually very poorly represented on committee and in terms of input. We need to have cultural agreement across UMCES so expectations are fair. **Jeff's input:** There is still confusion on emphasis of the different categories. **Peter:** Might be important to say specifically percent allocation of time. **Cat:** what about including engagement as an additional category (article Eric sent around). This was originally included in Boyer's categories. This differs from serving on a panel or being an editor of a journal or attending a workshop. More of a co-production perspective. **Sook:** What metrics could we develop in this regard?
 - c. Might need a new subcommittee to consider this to further develop
 - d. Might need to make sure this aligns with faculty reporting on activities and workload issues at USM level and the fact that we are now degree granting means we have less latitude in this regard
5. Jeff Cornwell/Elizabeth North: into their terms 2 years in July, Cat is up in August, Jerry in 2020, Sook is not sure of her start date. Mark Castro pretty recent (maybe 1 year?), Mario started this meeting but only has agreed to finish my term which is up in 1 year and a few months.
 6. Peter: we should be the best in terms of shared governance. For the USM Regents survey, it is important answer questions about "do you feel engage?" "Is there continual improved." So USM takes shared governance seriously.
 7. Elizabeth: Unsure what shared governance related to budget looks like. Don't have a basis for good/bad more/less inclusive. Would be good to have guidance on this.
 - a. Jeff: I always thought this was an odd question

- b. Mike: It is certainly not a role that Faculty Senate plays in UMCES -- We do get ask to "what degree we are involved"
 - c. Elizabeth: Faculty are involved at individual lab level on some budget decisions. Is that what they mean?
 - d. Mike: I assume Board of Regents is thinking at a higher level
 - e. Dave: Yes. The President takes in different voices and makes the decision
 - f. Mike: But we have never been given the university budget and provided feedback.
 - g. Jeff: It is opaque
 - h. Peter: Mike should ask this question at the system level (how do they interpret)
 - i. Dave: Unfortunately our current formula for budget is based on historical formula- it is just as opaque with little wiggle room
 - j. Jeff: And we are unique in run 3 different facilities.
 - k. Dave: Yes, there could be facility funds for new building — new faculties come on without operating money
 - l. Mike: It is not so much about the decisions but the communication of the decision. Because how money flows dictates many decision
 - m. Peter: Our external analysis points to the need for more flexible funds to pursue science (e.g. business plan). Right now so much is locked up in fixed costs
- 8.