

## **University Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes**

**November 9, 2018**

### **Call to Order**

Marie McAllister called the meeting to order at 4:06 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), Jo Tyler (COE)

### **Approval of Minutes**

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

### **Officers Reports**

#### **Other reports**

Craig reported that on Oct 29 he exchanged emails over the 2018 AAUP revisions to the Recommended Institutional Regulations regarding Tenure and Academic Freedom with Joerg Teide at the national office and he clarified where changes were made. They seemed to be cosmetic; some bullets were deleted but no substantive content changed. He reported that on Nov 4 at the AAUP VA Executive Committee meeting, he discussed this with Brian Turner, chair of the Association of State Conferences, and he agreed: the Council made these changes, but they did not require approval by the Association because they are minor and do not affect policy. UFAC is therefore taking this issue off the table.

### **Items of Business (including Motions)**

#### *Discussion of Old Business items.*

#### Motion on Faculty Marshals

In response to comments from the UFC and others, we revised the motion and rationale 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. There are six Faculty Marshals in total: two undergraduate Faculty Marshals and one undergraduate Grand Marshal as well as two graduate Faculty Marshals and one graduate Grand Marshal. The graduate Faculty Marshals will be drawn from among the graduate faculty. Faculty Marshals shall be full-time members of the faculty with at least five years of**

**service; Grand Marshals must have at least 10 years of service. All Marshals 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. Both Faculty and Grand Marshals serve three year terms 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.***

***[Note: The one suggestion from UFC that we declined to implement was some kind of required distribution across colleges. Graduate marshals will by definition be drawn mostly from COB and COE, where most graduate faculty reside, and we did not want to set up a system whereby nearly all marshals would come from those colleges.]***

Annual evaluation and merit pay.

We returned to discussion of the proposal to modify the Annual Evaluation and Merit Pay Plan. Jo and Xiaofeng reported some reactions from COE and COB. Apparently there was some debate over whether an S/U system is basically like P/F, and whether that is “fair” to people who excel, since this is not recorded. This concern did not change minds on the committee, and in response it was pointed out that our proposal does specify that if there is merit pay, one’s award depends on how many S’s one gets.

We agreed that in the rationale, chairs should be encouraged to include in the APR an account of the strengths and weakness of the faculty’s performance

In our discussion today, it appeared that our sentiment had changed on point 2. (The memo sent in October is copied below.) The consensus now seems to be that receiving a U—even one—is unacceptable, and makes one ineligible for merit pay. Also, regarding point 4, rather than three years, today’s consensus appeared to be that two U’s in any two years triggers review.

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).

At 4:45 Craig left the meeting to attend a memorial gathering for Diane Hatch. Marie took over keeping notes of the discussion.

The committee considered suggestions from Rosalyn Cooperman on behalf of the P&T Committee noting that any review system must be consistent with the P&T process and P&T standards, and suggesting that the review system needs to clarify teaching, professional development, and service obligations for faculty with special assignments. We noted that while merit pay and the general procedures involved in annual reviews are University processes, the specifics of annual review are determined by each college, so do not directly fall under UFAC's purview. On the second, we agreed to seek more information about how and by whom faculty with special assignments are currently assessed so that we can consider the suggestion.

#### Mentoring and Third Year Review.

The Committee agreed to begin requesting input from various stakeholders about ways to strengthen UMW mentoring and pre-tenure review. Marie will ask the UFC to solicit suggestions on our behalf and to recruit faculty members who may be interested in helping with this Spring 2019 agenda item.

### CAS "Chair" vs. COB and COE "Associate Dean"

The Committee returned to the question of how the COE and COB title of "Associate Dean" compares to the CAS title of "Chair." We have invited the Provost to come share her perceptions. At present we see three major issues growing from the difference in structure.

One involves faculty welfare: in CAS the people who conduct annual reviews and lead programs are faculty members chosen by their peers through a transparent process, serving a specified term, taking on duties clearly laid out in the *Faculty Handbook*, and evaluated according to processes defined in the *Handbook*. This is not the case in COB or COE.

The second involves equity: titles, roles, etc. should be parallel across the colleges if, as the information we have received suggests, there is extensive overlap between the duties of CAS chairs and COB/COE Associate Deans.

The third involves the desirability of faculty input on administrative structure when that structure involves oversight of faculty and curriculum. We support the faculty input and transparency seen in the COB faculty's recent discussion about whether the current Dean and Associate Dean structure should be replaced by a Dean, Associate Dean, Chair structure, and trust this input will continue.

### *Discussion of New Business items.*

Immediately before our meeting a memo was received from Associate Provost John Morello regarding revisions to certain Handbook sections on faculty, in response to Governor Northam's Executive Order #13. The Committee will read these for its January meeting unless Dr. Morello indicates that immediate action is required, in which case we will consider them electronically.

**Announcements** The next meeting will be in Combs Hall 348 on January 14, 2019.

**Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM.