

University Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

October 10, 2018

Call to Order

Marie McAllister called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM in Combs 348.

Attendees

Miriam Liss (CAS), Marie McAllister (At-large, Chair), Jennifer Magee (At-large), Craig Vasey (At-large, Secretary), Xiaofeng Zhao (COB) were present; Jo Tyler (COE) was absent.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 10 2018 had been approved through email communication and did not require approval at this meeting.

Officers Reports

Other reports

Items of Business (including Motions)

Discussion of Old Business items.

Motion on Faculty Marshals

In response to comments from the UFC, we revised the motion as follows:

8.2 Faculty Marshal

Faculty Marshals direct the faculty during graduation and honor convocation, and at any other event where faculty formally process in regalia. The Grand Marshal leads the party platform, carries the mace, and convenes and concludes the Commencement Ceremony from the podium. Faculty Marshals and the Grand Marshall shall be full-time members of the faculty with at least five years of service and shall be appointed by the University Faculty Organization Committee by the same process used to appoint members of faculty committees, as specified in sections 2.5 and 2.7. Faculty marshals serve a three year term and may serve consecutive terms.

Rationale: until now there has been no process by which Faculty Marshals and the Grand Marshal are selected; this proposal eliminates the arbitrary character of the appointment. The current Faculty Marshals have done an excellent job and by not having term limits can continue serving in this capacity if there are not other interested parties. However, this creates

transparency to the process and allows a variety of faculty who may be interested in this position to serve.

We discussed where this item should be placed, and decided that since it involves the responsibilities of the UFOC, it should go in the Faculty Handbook. We propose it be numbered 8.2.

Annual evaluation and merit pay.

After discussion of several questions regarding the plan to move away from our current Merit Pay system, the Committee came to consensus as reflected in the following memo, drafted on Oct 11 by Marie McAllister:

From: University Faculty Affairs Committee
To: UFC
Date: October 11, 2018

Dean Mellinger has asked UFAC to look into whether UMW's merit pay process could be simplified in the seemingly permanent absence of merit pay. Our committee agrees that simplification is a good idea. Before writing a motion with new *Handbook* language, we would appreciate getting feedback from the UFC on the general principles we propose to adopt:

- 1) Replace the current 0-3 merit pay rating system with a simple "satisfactory / unsatisfactory" in teaching, professional development, and service. (No overall rating.) Annual Performance Reviews rather than numbers would provide robust guidance to faculty members who have not yet attained their final promotion.
- 2) If merit pay ever becomes available again, give full merit pay to faculty who receive three satisfactory ratings that year, reduced merit pay to faculty who receive one or more unsatisfactory ratings, and no merit pay to faculty who receive all unsatisfactory ratings.
- 3) Allow faculty on sabbatical or leave to choose: take the rating from last year or be rated this year.
- 4) Adjust the section on unsatisfactory performance (6.9) so that an "unsatisfactory" rating in any of the three areas triggers a development plan, and three consecutive years with an "unsatisfactory" rating in any area triggers post-tenure review.
- 5) Abandon the weighting form, which exists only for merit pay purposes.

6) Accept the reality that there is no equitable way to make up for a decade of missed merit pay, so delete the reference to averaging over time from the *Handbook* (6.2.5).

7) Keep the role of Deans and the Provost unchanged (they check for equity across departments but don't otherwise alter merit pay ratings).

During our discussion, one proposal that seemed to get some traction is that a U (Unsatisfactory) would correspond to performance that would currently be labeled a "0," and an S (Satisfactory) would correspond to performance that is currently labeled as "2" or higher. Those faculty who have marginal performance (and would likely have received a "1" in the current system) will have it noted in their APRs that they have been awarded a Satisfactory rating, but that the rating was made with reservation, and the reasons for the reservation will be spelled out.

Before we go any further on this task, we will want to have feedback from the UFC and others.

Mentoring and Third Year Review constitutes a major item and will remain tabled.

Minority faculty service on search committees and other committees. We decided to leave this on the agenda for the spring, and perhaps ask Deans to look into service loads of minority faculty.

Craig reported that the 2018 revision published in the AAUP Bulletin of July-August 2018 to the Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure does contain differences from the current Red Book. He has contacted the AAUP National Office for guidance in determining where changes have been made and will report back to UFAC on this in November.

Discussion of New Business items.

The role of Implicit Bias Tests in faculty searches has come up; discussion centered on the fact that search committee members are now required simply to take one or two of these tests, but there is no guidance from HR on how to understand the test, its results, and its implications. It appears we agree that some framing and context for faculty, for search committees, would be appropriate and helpful. The question of bias in search committees against candidates who have only had adjunct positions was brought up by Marie.

Announcements The next meeting will be in Combs Hall 348 on November 9.

Adjournment The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 PM.

