

Faculty Welfare Committee  
January 16, 2013

Attendance: Jim Carper (chair), Tambra Jackson, Christine Lotter, Eva Monsma, Jeremy Searson, Diane Monrad, Bethany Bell, and Zach Kelehear

#### Old Business:

We discussed and approved the minor changes that were made to the College of Education Faculty Awards Announcements. These changes were minor and included clarification of eligibility and clarification that monetary awards are subject to availability of College funds. We thank Bethany Bell for her work in making all the initial revisions to the award documents. Draft changes to the documents were sent to all committee members for comment through email prior to this meeting.

#### New changes:

1. Nomination information goes to Lynda Tilley
2. Nomination letters are limited to two pages single spaced. Bethany applied this page limit to the nomination letters and for the teaching awards also to the student letters.
3. Deadline is Feb 25, 2013
4. For the Maiden Service Award the monetary incentive is not dependent on the budget, so, I removed any reference to that.

#### New Business, Discussion

1. Dean Watson has asked us to give input on sabbatical requests. Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee appreciate Dean Watson's commitment to faculty governance and faculty input on this important decision. As the committee is currently constituted, however, we believe we are unable to fulfill this request. We believe that our committee constitution with two of our tenure track members having requested sabbaticals for the 2013 year, two members on non-tenure track, and one at the Assistant level we are unable to fairly rank order sabbatical requests. Although published procedures only state that "A request for sabbatical leave *must be approved by the department chair and dean*" we believe that the creation of new criteria in the middle of the process might be judged as unfair. We do not recommend changing the policies (or doing something that appears to be a change in policy) in the middle of the process and fear that a change in process at this time might put the Dean or College in jeopardy of faculty grievance. We also do not know what the budget limitations are for this round of funding and the application states that approvals should be dependent on the current budget.

We did, however, discuss recommendations for the current selection process as well as some possible future directions. For the current round of sabbatical requests, we suggest that each of the department chairs within the College of Education rank order the applications from their respective departments and submit these ranks to the Dean. We also suggest that department chairs provide information to the Dean on how the faculty member's course load during the sabbatical will be covered or not covered by the department. A similar process to this was outlined in a memo from Mary Ann Fitzpatrick to the faculty of the

College of Arts and Sciences on August 21, 2012. We suggest then that the Dean use this information from department chairs to make final decisions based on budget considerations and the rule that no more than 10% of faculty from one department can be on sabbatical leave. We also suggest that the Dean seek advice from the University Provost or others outside the College of Education in areas in which conflicts of interests occur (For example: having a department chair among the applicants who must also rank order proposals).

The Faculty Welfare Committee is available to work with the Dean's Office to develop criteria or rubrics for evaluating sabbatical proposals. These criteria or rubrics would be reviewed by the full college faculty before being used to evaluate future sabbatical proposals. The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that developed criteria or rubrics need to be shared with faculty before proposals are submitted so that faculty members know the evaluation criteria prior to writing their proposals.

2. Digital measurement system: January 23<sup>rd</sup> all faculty Webinar on the system, all APR committee members and chairs are requested to attend and all other faculty, 30 minute presentation in 274N at 11am. After the presentation, we need to communicate to Dean about faculty buy-in for the system and how the College will use the system.
3. Jim Carper brought up some upcoming issues (change of name of early career award, general communication initiative, agenda for standing committees) to be referred to Faculty Welfare (see attached handout). We will discuss these at the next meeting
4. Eva updated us on COE's process of establishing a salary compression plan. A DRAFT of the COE plan was presented in EC for feedback. It is not yet approved. It will have multiple phases and all of those are not established. The initial phase will have a merit component that will involve ranking tenure track faculty by department based on merit as a merit component is expected by the Provost. This ranking process is to occur at the department level by Feb. 28. Once the plan is approved, it will be distributed to FWC for feedback.

Next meeting: Not meeting on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, will vote on Incentive Grant through email.

February 20<sup>th</sup> 11am in the Blatt Conference Room (TBD)

March 20, April 10<sup>th</sup>

Issues referred to Faculty Welfare Committee:

1. Might Early Career Service Award be renamed Early Career Citizenship Award?
2. "A suggestion to promote equity in the College. Please consider for the College-level that there be instituted during the job candidate's campus visit confidential time with someone in HR (or elsewhere). This is a time when the candidate may ask about parental leave, campus climate (re: LGBT or other), etc. without any concern that these questions and the information shared be used by the hiring committee or others in the final decision-making process. The College and the candidates both benefit by having our strongest candidates understanding more fully the policies and climate of USC before making their final decision. Other universities (e.g. Colgate University) have instituted this confidential HR time as part of their candidate's campus visit, I recommend USC does as well. Perhaps this idea should go to Dr. Christine Curtis for university-wide consideration as well, but there's no reason why the College of Education could not act in advance of a campus-wide initiative."

General Communication Initiative:

In order to promote timely communication with the faculty, Steering Committee members act as conduits to communicate Steering Committee information within departments/committees. The same process should hold for all standing committees. Communication could include a summary of key action items and requests for faculty feedback/questions. Faculty feedback would be shared at future Steering Committee meetings.

At the end of each standing committee meeting, the committee should agree on a specific statement or information to be transmitted to each department at the next monthly department meeting or by email, as appropriate.

Agenda for each standing committee to consider:

1. Are there prescribed duties that should be modified or removed?
2. Do you need student representation (are students representative in any way?) [Should student organizations be fostered?]
3. Can any duties be changed to opt-in duties?
4. Does the committee need seven members? How should they be selected?
5. Would the committee want the power to convene subcommittees?