Minutes

Faculty Affairs Committee

**October 12th, 2016**

6:00 p.m.

Faculty Staff Commons Conference Room, Bone Student Center

**Members Attending:** Mary Dyck, John Baur, Cassandra Mattoon, Marie Dawson, Michaelene Cox, Hannah Picciola, Febin Chirayath

**Not Present:** Jihad Qaddour

**Guests:** Susan Kalter

**Call to order: 6:02**

**Approval of minutes:** Minutes from 9/28/2016 were approved.

**Update of the Faculty Associate Policy Updates:**

Legal has them currently. Dr. Hill sent them to legal. The hiring one may have a slight change and the other is being reviewed. When he gets them back, Cassandra and Dr. Hill will meet again and conduct a survey or type of poll to gain input from other faculty to help decide what they will do with them.

We may want to take it off of the senate review list because it is something that would not need to be changed in future years.

Senator Kalter advised this if the policies are truly items that simply restate legal mandates, but advised against it if there were substantive items within the policies under the faculty associate and lab school administration’s discretion.

**3.3.5 Distinguished Professor Policy**

Discussed the Distinguished Professor Policy Recommendations from previous committee:

Distinguish different titles for positions and ranks. Having a rank implies that everyone will get to it at some point, although this does not happen. The policy defines it as a designation that they are appointed to. There should be clear guidelines to obtain a higher rank, and there would be a transparent process for obtaining this rank.

The eligibility is clear to some and is different for different colleges (Business vs. Nursing). Receive $5,000 added to your base salary. We need to look at the comparator institutions and how they handle similar situations. (Iowa State, Ball State, etc.) Process seems to be initiated by the department and deans.

A problem is that the provost should make the guidelines instead of the FAC. Possibly give this policy to the Provost office for them to clarify these guidelines and decide who will take on the responsibility for creating guidelines and being in charge of its completion (bullet points on page 7).

“Dear Susan” Letter Discussion:

There is not a transparent process and it is too political. There are several steps of review and ultimately it is up to the Provost to recommend to the president (two per year). Have someone from every college represented, no way to not make it any less political.

Currently, the process is that your chair is supposed to nominate you for the designation. It is very surprising that they want to take the dean out because they would help in the identification process. Not all of the colleges are aware that they should look at who they should put up for recommendation. The comparator colleges do not have a feeder system or process that they would go through in obtaining that designation. They have three awards (College Researcher, Outstanding College Researcher/University Outstanding Creative Activity Award, Distinguished Lecturer). In theory, a candidate would need to receive these awards before receiving the distinguished professor designation.

Is there a letter set up by the provost office to notify departments to make their recommendations?

A candidate must meet eligibility requirements. It also must be assessed by two scholars outside of the University and reviewed by most distinguished professors. In practice, that has changed from when it was merely a smaller committee. A letter was sent out on August 2nd that states that Deans should forward all nominations by October 14th. Eligibility should be clearer in the policy as it is in the letter.

Adding faculty who are not yet distinguished professors could be a problem because they get on the committee and become acquainted with those on the committee, and are able to lobby in the future for their own designation. Hypothetically, should be self-motivated where you are motivated to achieve the award.

As a committee, we decided to look at what other institutions are doing and use their process as a model.

Need to talk with Provost Krejci about how she perceives the process, and why she believes that it needs to be reform. May need to revise the letter so that it includes more of the policy requirements.

Research the Distinguished Professor Policies or Honorary Ranking Policies for these institutions (\*Bring information found to the next meeting):

* Ball State: Baur
* Bowling Green: Michaelene
* Clemstate: Hannah
* Miami of Ohio: Febin
* UC Riverside: Dawson
* UC Santa Cruz: Dawson
* UNC Greenbourgh: Mattoon
* Wisconsin Milwaukee: Dyck

Questions raised:

Conflict between the University Professor and Distinguished Professor policies?

Designate the University Professor Policy as external only, and Distinguished Professor Policy as internal only?

Whether administrators apply or not, will not get the salary until they step out?

**Adjourned: 6:56**

Submitted by, Hannah Picciola