

## University Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes: November 10, 2014

Monroe 4<sup>th</sup> floor lounge, noon

**Committee members in attendance:** Eric Gable (Chair; CAS), Ken Machande (COB), Melina Patterson (CAS), Angela Pitts (CAS), Hilary Stebbins (Secretary; CAS), Jo Tyler (COE)

### 1. Discussion of motion regarding merit pay and salary increases

- Earlier this fall (2014) the CAS chairs requested that UFAC put forward a proposal to suspend the merit pay evaluations from the Annual Performance Review (APR) process on the grounds that merit pay has not been awarded for a number of years
- Jo Tyler drafted a memo that proposed
  1. Merit pay evaluations from the APR be suspended
  2. The 0 – 3 “merit level” evaluation ratings be removed
  3. Departmental peer review used to determine merit pay rankings be suspended
  4. The cycle for the evaluation of tenured faculty at the rank of professor be amended to once every three years
  5. That any funds available for faculty raises be used for across-the-board salary increases as opposed to merit-based raises

This memo was circulated via e-mail among the UFAC committee members for review and feedback prior to our November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting

- During our in-person discussion of the memo it was further suggested that we
  1. Remove proposal 3 regarding the suspension of departmental peer review on the grounds that departments already vary in the frequency with which they use peer review
  2. Incorporate information sent by the UFC chair regarding salary compression into the proposal
  3. Clarify that there are several motions that we are asking the UFC to consider under one rationale but that each of the proposals could be approved or rejected individually rather than treating all four proposals as a unified whole
  4. Put the memo in the form of motions instead of proposals
- Eric volunteered to send a draft to John Morello and Jonathan Levin to receive feedback before submitting it to the UFC
- Jo sent a revised version out to the committee via e-mail for further review, noting that proposals 1-3 are still not in the form of motions since they require new handbook language

### 2. Discussion of memo on “unethical/predatory” publishing

- Provost Levin charged the UFAC with reviewing the issue of “unethical/predatory” publications and how such publications should be evaluated in the promotion and tenure process.
- Eric drafted an initial memo on the topic that
  1. Identified two places in the handbook that language could be changed to address this type of activity (Promotion and Tenure and Academic Misconduct). However, because the language regarding Promotion and Tenure is outside of the purview of UFAC the proposal does not recommend that specific changes be made to handbook language
  2. Proposed three mechanisms (an orientation session on unethical publishing, an accessible list of funds devoted to professional activity for each college, an accessible and archived list of scholarly publications from each college) that would help to increase transparency regarding publications

This memo was circulated via e-mail among the UFAC committee members for review and feedback prior to our November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- During our in-person discussion we
  1. Discussed concerns that members of the College of Business had in advancing the memo beyond UFAC. It was suggested that we remove any suggestion that this charge originated from the actions of one college and, instead, that we should frame it as a general, pre-emptive and proactive measure that will address the possibility of “unethical/predatory” publishing in all disciplines
  2. Made further suggestions regarding language and organization of the memo such as clarifying the definition of unethical/predatory publishing especially when considering interdisciplinary fields
  3. Spent a good deal of time discussing how the addition of a “peer-reviewed” component in the handbook language regarding promotion and tenure might improve the perception of our tenure standards. However, these recommendations are outside the purview of UFAC.
- Eric agreed to revise the draft of the memo and to circulate it to the committee as well as to the provost for review before it is turned into a motion. Further revisions were made to the draft based on this feedback and the committee voted via e-mail to advance it to the UFC.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:48 pm.

Submitted by: Hilary E. Stebbins