

Minutes
College of Education Faculty Council Meeting
October 29, 2014
9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
COED 205

Members Attending: Lyndon Abrams, Lindsay Flynn, Susan Harden, Jennifer Hathaway, Do-Hong Kim, Pam Lassiter, Drew Polly, Rebecca Shore, Ellen McIntyre

1. Call to Order

a. Approval of September 24, 2014 Minutes

Susan Harden made the motion to approve the minutes. Drew Polly seconded the motion. September minutes will be revised to remove specific names unless motions were made. Minutes (with changes) were unanimously approved.

2. Dean's Report

- The Dean will attend the beginning of each Faculty Council meeting for 15 to 20 minutes. She will then work in her office in order to be available for consultation. If she is not available, the Associate Deans can also serve in this role. A question was raised regarding whether this is considered best practice for faculty governance. Responses included a discussion of past practices of former Deans in the College along with practices at other universities. The Faculty Council is interested in maintaining a balance within the meetings, providing both time for consultation with the Dean and discussion among only the Council members.
- The Dean addressed the questions raised regarding salary compression in the last Faculty Council meeting. Last year, the Chancellor provided funding for faculty market raises. These were available only to Associate and Full Professors and were based on the statistical formula the Dean shared with the faculty last fall. The Dean did not have input into these raises—they were based on the statistical analyses provided to the Dean via a spreadsheet. There was also a smaller amount of money provided to each College to address raises for Associate or Full Professors who were considered to be a flight risk. The Dean asked the Department Chairs to provide compelling arguments for their faculty members they believed fell into this category. Overall, 5 to 6 faculty members received raises from this allocation of funds. In this academic year, no money will be provided to address faculty salary compression, though all faculty members will receive a \$1,000 raise to their base salary. Instead, as the Chancellor explained at convocation, EPA staff received market based raises because “it’s their turn.” In the college, approximately 6 staff members received raises through these funds. Though the Dean will not provide information regarding particular faculty members’ salaries, all salaries are public information and as such, any faculty member can research yearly salaries and determine who may have received raises. If additional funding becomes available in the future for raises such as that provided last year to address flight risks, the Dean is interested in the Faculty Council considering the process used to determine salary increases and providing guidance. This process must involve the Department Chairs since they are in the best position to know the work of their faculty members. Next fall may be an appropriate

time for the Faculty Council to consider this issue. The Dean will also inquire into the process used in other Colleges.

- A question was raised as to whether there might be a recommendation that the faculty begin to advocate for themselves at the state level. The Dean suggested that Betty Doster might be able to provide guidance with this idea.

3. Workload Policy Review Committee Update

- The Dean once again addressed the question regarding the future path of the University's Carnegie classification. We are currently categorized as a doctoral granting institution. All other institutions at this level have a teaching load of 3:3. Institutions categorized as high research activity have a teaching load of 3:2. So, while we may ultimately be striving to move toward a high activity classification, there would be no change in teaching load. However, there will be an application process in place for faculty members to request a 2:2 load.
- In regards to the role of faculty governance in the workload policy decisions, Faculty Council is one vehicle for faculty members to share their input. Faculty members can also provide feedback to the Workload Policy Review Committee. While the faculty will vote on the final product presented by the Committee, as indicated by policy, the final decision will rest with the Dean. However, the Dean is interested in all faculty members providing input.
- A concern was raised that the current proposal being worked on by the Workload Policy Review Committee will lead to two tiers of faculty members and may become divisive. Constructive ways for those who may disagree with this current path (and thus believe all faculty members should carry the same teaching load) to share their ideas were discussed. It was stressed that if this is a concern, the question needs to be raised soon.
- Concerns regarding the privileging of certain types of research were addressed. The Review Committee is making an effort to ensure all types of research are addressed. There was also a discussion of the influence that student enrollment has on the workload conversation, evaluation methods, and the ultimate intent of the policy from a University point of view.
- The question was raised whether dissertation work would be considered within the new workload policy. This is beyond the scope of the Review Committee's work. They are tasked with considering research including the quality and production of research. However, there are other paths to a reduced teaching load, and dissertation work might be considered one of those alternate paths. This led to questions about the RPT document and whether revisions were needed to more clearly link dissertation work with research since it is now more closely linked to teaching. The Faculty Council would like to revisit this idea in its next meeting.
- Council members will continue to remind faculty members of the many different routes for providing input to the Workload Policy Review Committee. Faculty members will be encouraged to participate in the discussion and engage in the feedback process.

4. Giving Green

- The time to contribute is coming to a close.

5. Faculty Mentoring

- Council members shared what they had learned about how mentoring is conducted across departments. It seems that for many faculty members, the responsibilities of a mentor are unclear and more often address the logistics of the job rather than teaching or research. (However, information is provided in the Faculty Handbook. See <http://education.uncc.edu/resources/faculty-resources/faculty-handbook/faculty-responsibilities-mentoring> for more information.) Though Chairs were told this year that new faculty members should have input into the selection of mentors, this has not occurred in the past. Most faculty are aware of the existence of the University-wide mentoring program offered through ADVANCE. Some departments actually assign two mentors—one departmental and one research. Consistently, there seems to be no formal structure for providing support for research or for Associate Professors looking forward to promotion. Ideas were shared from Council members' experiences at other institutions regarding a more formal approach to this type of mentoring for research.
- Moving forward, the Faculty Council will revisit this topic, especially to discuss ways to offer support for research and support for Associate Professors.

6. Meetings Schedule Conflicts

- Council members with class conflicts will be able to make adjustments for the final meeting of the fall semester, so no change will be made in the time for the next meeting.

7. Other Business

- A suggestion was made that in addition to considering how to advocate at a state level for the needs of faculty that the Council consider ways to advocate for faculty within the College by addressing things we can control. This might help improve morale or climate.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 11:00 a.m.

Next Faculty Council Meeting:
Wednesday, November 19, 2014
9:30 am – 11:00 am
COED 205