

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE
 Minutes

Date: Tuesday, 2/14/2017

Time: 1:03 pm – 3:04 p.m.

Present: Michael Sachs (Pres., CPH), Sue Dickey (Secy., CPH), Elvis Wagner (Vice Pres., COE), Tricia Jones (Past-Pres., SMC), Donald Hantula (CLA), Michael W. Jackson (STHM), Sharyn O'Mara (ART) Teresa Gill Cirillo (FSBM), James Korsh (CST), Jie Yang (KSoD), Paul LaFollette (Fac. Herald, CST), Raghbir Athwal (LKSM), Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Donald Harris (LAW), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Ken Thurman (COE.), Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon (TFMA) Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: William Cabin (SSW), Cornelius Pratt (SMC), Melissa Ranieri (Pharm)

Guests: Guests: Istvan Varkonyi, Director, GenEd (1:00 p.m.); Provost JoAnne Epps (2:00 p.m.)

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Meeting called to order at 1:01 p.m.	President Sachs called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. Requested approval of FSSC Minutes of 1/17/17 & 1/31/17.	Minutes approved as corrected.
2. President Michael Sach's Report	Deferred for guest speakers. -Reported a number of scheduled guests for near future. -Names sent to Provost's office for the campus smoking cessation initiative. Haven't heard back from that. Things are fairly quiet. -Diversity committee meeting at 4: 00 pm today. Moving along.	
3. Guest, Istvan Varkonyi, Director, GenEd	Here is my update on Gen Ed: It's been a year since I've been here. Interesting things have occurred in the university over past 8 – 10 mos. These events have taken some wind out of sails. In my last meeting with Provost Epps, she indicated to me that I should slow the process down with GEEC in terms of moving proposals forward. We are caught this academic year. There's not that much happening. I understand where she's coming from. Before we put curriculum under microscope, we need to look at the financial model. I'm not a fan of RCM. It's been detrimental to GenEd over past 2-3 years, especially the past 4 semesters. Inter-professional Education (IPE) with other disciplines is not incentivized. Everything is designed to keep students close to home & drive up credit hours within a college. Take it in this college & not that college. Does not incentivize students to engage with other faculty & students at the University. She is right in terms of slowing the process down, but frustrating. We are in our 10 th year of the GenEd curriculum. There was a self-study in 2013, for which we have a review. The next is due in 2017-18, & there should be another curriculum review. I won't happen. Peter Jones is leaving GenEd, I'm leaving. Right now, we've got to wait & see with new leadership & RCM revisions. Peter, as a senior staff member, is part of a Bb site to post different concerns about the RCM review & what it might mean. Some deans have said under no circumstances should anything happen to GenEd while we are	

moving through the RCM review. We should fine tune some things, but it won't really happen until the 2018-19 or 2019-20 academic years. Provost Epps lifted the moratorium on the development of new GenEd courses, but there is hesitancy to bring any forward. The current inventory: 160 some-odd courses are approved. In the old CORE, there were 400+. I wouldn't recommend that again. It dilutes the purpose of what GenEd should be. The general message is: To be postponed until further notice.

MS (Pres): Update. We gave Provost Epps a list of suggested names of people for the new position of VP of Undergraduate Gen Ed.

KT (COE): Can you tell us about budgeting? Are you part of the tax?

Dr. Varkonyi: There is a question as to whether or not the mindset of the faculty was even represented ~ the tax table was more in understanding the commonwealth. Not even I, as member of College X or spokesperson of a dean's office, was represented. Most GenEd people are NTTs so this doesn't help their political spot. NTTs cannot really articulate that "I'm now a spokesperson of my college & this is the way we want to do it." Our budget has been decimated, I can tell you that, by the previous provost. So I'm seeing a sense of that commitment around building a sense of commonwealth with the GenEd curriculum is slowly or quickly eroding. It's human nature.

PL (FacHer): I had a sense that Temple University was on cutting edge of GenEd curricula when it happened 10 years ago.

Dr. Varkonyi: Now that, in a collegial sense compared to others, we are left behind, even though Temple University was on cutting edge. I've been going to a national, annual conference over past 7 years. Cal State North Ridge, Utah & others have moved into 'pathways.' In 2006-07 & 2007-08, we were very much on the cutting edge, but we've lost that momentum. Other models are more coherent. Students are saying, "I don't see how this curriculum hangs together." It's basically a hybrid core. A debacle. There are ways in which we can develop it. In May, when Peter Jones & I met with Hai Lung Dai before.... That died on the vine. This year, there was some momentum until 4 weeks ago until we were told to hold. Whoever becomes the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies will have a challenge. It needs to be tightened up & looked at in a critical way. We ran focus groups with students, associate deans, and others. We got an A+ vibe with students. Department chairs & Associate Deans didn't understand consistency & coherency. Associate Deans were concerned about RCM.

SO'M (Tyler): Adamany was a proponent. The Arts were soundly defeated on the Senate floor. Larger colleges had the power to vote in their power & dollars.

PL (FacHer): In the beginning, we were rewarding innovation. Now, we are rewarding the program as it exists. In our department, our GenEd courses were very exciting 7 years ago & they're not very exciting anymore.

Dr. Varkonyi: It should be looked at & updated every 7 years. The program is not financially incentivized. As for putting courses under a microscope – there is no way to do that. Right now, deans have more power than the Provost. That kind of power struggle is there. I worked under the core curriculum. I've been here for 28 years. There is a lot of give & take. The Senate, under Bill Nathan, didn't go anywhere. OK, I'll write the curriculum. We still have that tension.

MS (Pres): Will you be meeting with the RCM evaluation team?

Dr. Varkonyi: No. I haven't been asked. The Provost's portfolio is under review. (Peter Jones's portfolio for undergraduates has 9 units under it.) A self-study has been put together. Janice Decosmo, Washington, someone from Ohio State University & James Whitney, Rutgers are on the team. There will be reshuffling of certain units.

MS (Pres): So if we were to make a recommendation to Ken Kaiser, CFO, to speak with you about GenEd, would you talk to him?

Dr. Varkonyi: I'd be glad to. I don't know where this program will be in 18 months.

PL (FacHer): The Honors Program also.

Istvan: It's not doom & gloom. I think it's a very sound program. But there are good & bad things.

MS (Pres): The timing may slow down. There will be a new president in 2018, that may have ideas.

KT (COE): Your insight about RCM is good. In our college, we are very concerned about the tax. Implications. There are important data to get to that team.

MJ (STHM): What impact has the large number of adjuncts & NTTs had?

Dr. Varkonyi: They're doing the brunt of the heavy lifting. Some colleges seem more concerned about creating a collective ~ faculty development. That is not generalist enough. It's different from teaching your majors & minors, rather than GenEd students. Some colleges have done a fine job. CST & COE have coordinators who bring adjuncts into the fold. More outreach is needed with TLC/CAT now. They are not to be blamed. They do a fine job under the conditions in which they have to operate.

	<p>There needs to be a lot more development for these faculty other than, 'here's the syllabus; go teach it.' Progressive, formerly mid-sized courses ranging from 30-65 now have 90 students. Also 99+ student courses have increased, that were approved with recitations. Those have now died. Putting an adjunct in front of 150 students paying their tuition is happening. There is a quality v. cash flow issue. This sounds crass but</p> <p>JK (CST): That's happening everywhere.</p> <p>Dr. Varkonyi: The growth of these courses is problematic, especially when we recertify them. There are various kinds of assignments with community engagement. "I did this with 35, but I can't do it with 95." I can't blame the faculty member & say you're not meeting the mark. These are the conditions under which things exist.</p> <p>MJ (STHM): Do we ever examine the quality?</p> <p>Dr. Varkonyi: We shouldn't be evaluating the personnel, but the courses' content. SFFs don't tell us much unless there are real outliers & red flags. I see this but can't do anything with it except go to Peter Jones & the Associate Deans. We've got an issue here, could you please go to department chair & have them follow up with the faculty member? It doesn't go anywhere.</p> <p>MJ (STHM): What about OLL... will GenEd go that way?</p> <p>Dr. Varkonyi: What with Washington, D.C., in terms of higher education... in 7, 8 10 years... these courses will be done at places like Community College of Philadelphia or other schools online & then students will come to Temple as a finishing school to finish their major. Policies in the 'for profits' will have more of an inroad down the road.</p> <p>MJ (STHM): So TU will look more like K-mart or Target.</p> <p>Dr. Varkonyi: Remember, in the mid-1990s, we didn't have resources to keep buildings open and talked about mothballing. We opened up admissions. Remember that?!</p> <p>MJ (STHM): We want to thank you for your service. You have been appreciated.</p> <p>Dr. Varkonyi: Thank-you. Our undergrads are really our bread & butter, & we should stay true to our commitment.</p>	
<p>4. Vice President's Report – Dr. Elvis Wagner</p>	<p>As taken from VP Wagner's written report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elections—timelines 2. Updated committee vacancies list (see below). My major committee concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CATA—we need four more - EPPC 	

- RPPC
- University Sabbatical Committee
- UTPAC (A&C)

3. Cheryl and I (mostly Cheryl) will send out individual emails to people whose terms are ending will be encouraged to re-up.

5. I need to email Michele Masucci about RPPC, but I'm not sure exactly what I'm supposed to ask her.

5. EPPC—doesn't seem to be as active as in years past. Any info about this committee?

6. Work on reducing the # of committees or size of the committees.

You all got the email with the upcoming committees as was distributed to the full Faculty Senate email listserv. There is a written report in the handout that was created by Cheryl Mack regarding the vacancies. There is a slightly updated vacancies list. There are not many volunteers. We are emailing those who have 2017 expiration of their terms people to see if they will re-up.

CATA is the most important committee & there are 4 openings.

Others include:

Sabbatical

UTPAC (3 sections): 2 in A, 1 in C. Constantly refilling b/c people go to administrative roles, etc.

EPPC & RPPC are committees worth bringing up. My reporting on vacancies is pretty standard otherwise.

I was supposed to reach out to Michelle Masucci with regard to RPPC, according to the minutes. I don't have a good interpretation about what I'm supposed to be reaching out about. There are 10 on RPPC, but not sure whether they're doing anything.

DH (CLA): We wanted clarification from her about whether she wants our input. If she says yes, we would populate RPPC.

MS (Pres): If she says no, I would hate to get rid of RPPC.

KT (COE): I would approach & ask her how that committee would serve. I think at one point that committee had money to distribute for grants-in-aid.

EW (VP): Yes & now they don't have those purse strings. Isn't that why we wanted to move away?

PL (FacHer): Should this devolve & go to the Vice Provost? In meantime, she has named her own committee.

TJ (PastPres): In meantime, we revised the charge (with Michael Jacobs having a significant role). Right now we (FSSC) has no voice about research policy in this University. We should reach out to her. It's not her decision.

KT (COE): That's why I want to ask how we can serve her operation.

JK (CST): From faculty point of view, we should put forward what the faculty want. These are faculty committees.

EW (VP): I will reformulate this now that it's clearer.
Now, Educational Programs & Policies Committee (EPPC): How active is it and what role is it serving? Is it meeting? Trish Jones is on it.

TJ (PastPres): Peter Jones, as Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, has been the chair. It did meet regularly, because of Peter. He was trying to set forth some form of agenda. We should look at this redistribution of the VP portfolio of the 9 elements. This has the potential to have a massive impact on undergraduate education. It is serious business. Why didn't we know this?

KT (COE): I chaired EPPC eons ago. One of our roles was to approve new charges. I don't know what was former Provost Hai Lung Dai's argument about our charge. He said that it was only to approve across colleges.

TJ (PastPres): Should we ask Jodi to come in again?

PL (FacHer): This is the place where Peter Jones brought to us the first new rules about the bookstore, Student Feedback Forms (SFFs). Before when I was on it, it was pretty dormant. This is a committee that we need to sit on. When Trish was on it, she brought it back to where it needed to be.

EW (VP): That is what happens naturally... it goes to someone's agenda who is in a leadership role.

TJ (PastPres): Peter never said no when we wanted something on the agenda. It might not have been discussed in exactly the way it was wanted. I don't know that that could be guaranteed.

MS (Pres): do you want me to invite Jodi?

TJ (PastPres): Yes & Peter. I would like to ask him one question: What do we need to protect?

PL (FacHer): He has a deep understanding of the Council of Deans.

MS (Pres): Anything else?

<p>5 Old Business</p>	<p>Nominations committee (Past President, Trish Jones, Chairing):</p> <p>We have a slate & another point of discussion about the slate.</p> <p>Happy to report that I would like to say that President Michael Sachs & Secretary Sue Dickey have agreed to run again for a second term.</p> <p>Cornelius Pratt has agreed to be nominated as Vice President (VP). He will be on Sabbatical during fall, 2017. How do you feel? Can we think of a work around? Progression? The VP usually steps up to run for the Senate Presidency. The person in the role of Secretary usually steps up to run for VP. I would hate to have him not be able to be put forward because he's been awarded a sabbatical. That's the report of the Nominating committee.</p> <p>Q: Has he been an officer before?</p> <p>TJ (PastPres): He's served on University Tenure & Promotion Committee (UTPAC), Steering, International Programs Committee, and in the past, Educational Procedures & Policies Committee (EPPC). He has a lot of knowledge about the Faculty Senate Process. I will bring it forward to the Representative Faculty Senate next week.</p> <p>KT (COE): I am worried about Cornelius not being around fall semester. That's when committees are getting up & running. I would feel more comfortable if we had a plan for that. (This has nothing to do with the individual).</p> <p>TJ (PastPres): The FSSC can appoint anyone to that office as a fill in.</p> <p>PL (FacHer): Rarely, but there are important occasions that the VP has to accomplish, such as kicking people into getting their committees up & running.</p> <p>TJ (PastPres): Could that person be identified for the fall?</p> <p>MS (Pres): Accepting the slate means a motion from the committee: Voting on accepting the slate as reported to the RFS for officer positions. Anyone can be nominated from the floor.</p> <p>NEW TOPIC:</p> <p>KT (COE): I'm concerned about the Committee on Disabilities: In order to get ad hoc committees as regular standing committees, what do we need to do? We will make a motion. VP Elvis Wagner will put the wording together & we will vote on it at our next meeting.</p> <p>KWW (TFMA): Did they petition to become a standing</p>	<p>Motion passed unanimously. No abstentions.</p>
-----------------------	--	---

<p>6 New Business</p>	<p>committee?</p> <p>KT (COE): They don't have to.</p> <p>TGC (FSBM): I would like to look at the other committees. I thought that we were appointing a committee on Committees.</p> <p>EW (VP): A lot of that work has been done in the past. Trish & I will meet about that.</p> <p>TGC (FSMB): We need to provide support for the VP role, since some of these committees that aren't doing a lot. Are we spinning our wheels? Should we downsize to become more efficient?</p> <p>None.</p>	
<p>7. Guest: Provost Joanne Epps</p>	<p>MS (Pres): Welcome, Provost Epps. Thank-you for joining us.</p> <p>Provost Epps: Good to be here. Since I last saw you, I've found a new email product called SANEBOX. It's for when you send an email & you assume you'll get an answer, but might not. You can give sanebox a command that if the person doesn't answer in X time, put this back in my inbox. You have asked me for the faculty's diversity statistics. They didn't arrive. People on my team did not answer my email. I wondered, what is up?! I now have an answer, explanation & follow up.</p> <p>I have no idea what historically happened with the statistics. It's how they're compiled. We don't compile them as you asked for it. That's appropriate. It's not public information. The reason is that this creates risk for the university if the information gets lost or mis-used. What would you all like to do with it? We need to figure out how to partner in a way that we can achieve common goals. The assembling of that report doesn't exist. I've been talking to a couple of people about how we might think about this issue. Temple is a state related school. We are constricted in ways that private institutions are not. Law won't let us throw money in ways that they do at private universities. That's my best information for now.</p> <p>TJ (Past Pres): This is the 1st time in the many years we've been requesting that information that someone has been thoughtful enough to tell us why this information has been so difficult to get.</p> <p>Provost Epps' UPDATE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. There will be 3 Dean reviews. The deans to be reviewed are Dr. Peter Doukas (Pharmacy), Dr. Bruce Stronach (Japan) & Dr. John Mattiacci (Podiatry). 8. There will be several program reviews. International undergraduate studies, for example. It's very helpful to talk people at other organizations. There are ways to integrate residence life with academics that we've not 	

done at Temple. For example, at NYU, the Mueller noodle family left them a fantastic endowment. There are faculty living in many of their undergraduate residence halls. This costs and brings in money. My point is that this makes living in the NYU dorms very popular with undergraduates. It gives them access to programming & other stuff that off campus students don't get. These are really good ideas moving forward within our financial ability.

9. RCM Review: Deans' meeting to occur this week. People who wouldn't always agree, but the CFO & the team will meet with them to talk about process. Deloit is coming & then what.... How will deans be involved, moving forward? An agenda from the deans for cohesive responsiveness... talking about ways to fix & improve RCM. It's a zero sum game. If there is a fix to advantage someone, someone else will not be. We want some transparency. To what extent & for what purpose would adjustments be made? No art school can sustain itself, for example. Not everybody will love every decision. Optimistic that this review will be productive, but not that it will satisfy everybody.

Q - MS (Pres): So this is not repeal & replace, but repair. What about the open position of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies?

Provost Epps: This is a hard & big job. We are hoping for a robust series of candidates. We're working on a job description. Hoping for an internal candidate who is already familiar with Temple, but if we don't we'll have to go outside. What should portfolio look like? It's grown over time. Is it structured correctly? It won't be radically different.

MERIT QUESTIONS SENT TO PROVOST EPPS FROM FSSC:

From the FSSC's list of Q's:

1. Please clarify the funding available for merit (e.g., number of units, how distributed amongst schools/colleges and Provost's office)?

It is strictly governed by the language of the Temple/TAUP contract. 1.25% of a faculty member's salary is divided into units of \$600.00 each. This is based on the preceding June's salary. NTT & TT distributed within the parameters of the contract. There were 100 units through the provost's office last year. This year there are 85 units. These are for things are not typically rewarded with merit in the traditional teaching, service and scholarship triad. This is 85 total units out of 3703. I award them through my office, but the schools & colleges pay for them. Service that

typically doesn't get rewarded in the schools & colleges.

PL (FacHer): Sometimes in our college, the conversation goes, "Yeah, he did some good stuff with service, but he can get merit from Provost, so we won't award it here." I'm not sure that's a good model.

Provost Epps: Correct. Correct.

EW (VP): What comes out of their budget?

Provost Epps: As a dean, there was never a time that I could not award the minimum of 1.25%, but could go up to 1.7%. I'm looking at article 20 of the contract, "1.375., 1.125 year 2. In 3rd year, 1% with additional 0.25- 0.75. I'm calling that 1.25%.

EW (VP): Will we know?

Provost Epps: Yes. By contract, this is knowable.

2. How is this funding determined per school/college (e.g., does it depend on the number of faculty AND their salaries)?

Provost Epps: totally by salaries, not by schools.

MS (Pres): So in schools where people are paid less, the get less...

Provost Epps: I believe that the Faculty Senate can be very helpful in this process. The people in TAUP Contract negotiations should be requested to get the merit for less well paid people in lower paid schools adjusted.

3. Are all schools and colleges required to have a policy statement about how merit decisions are allocated or made in terms of criteria? This would be similar to the school guidelines for standards applied to decisions on tenure and promotion or third-year review.

Provost Epps: I have to tell you how much I learned in answering these questions. The guidelines on the website under past Temple President, Ann Weaver Hart, need updating.

4. Are there different policies for merit for NTTs across schools/colleges? For example, in some colleges NTTs are not allowed to apply for merit for non-teaching activities even though they are asked to do them. In other schools/colleges the rules are different.

Provost Epps: They are eligible for merit for work well done IN THEIR ASSIGNED DUTIES. Even if they are asked to do more, such as producing scholarly articles, we can't give merit for it. It is not permitted in the contract. People can only get merit for work well done in their assigned duties. For example, if their contract says they are hired only in the area of teaching, this is the only category for which they can get merit unit(s). This does not include service unless that is stated in their letter or contract. I'm making a note to self with this to remind the deans to get this right. In the spreadsheet that comes to our office, the deans have to identify what category in which they are assigning merit. It is on us as an institution to make sure that it's done effectively.

KWW (TFMA): In my college, NTTs can direct shows, but are given stipends. Can they then get merit?

Provost Epps: Yes, but if they are paid, that should be known because some stipends are very modest. They are not excluded for merit. Merit is for above & beyond what was already compensated. I use a different word than "double dip."

JS: So if assignment is only one leg of tripod, that's all for which you can be eligible.

JE: Yes.

5. How do certain extra compensation categories (e.g., Laura Carnell professorship) affect merit and is this handled in a consistent manner across schools/colleges? One could argue that, with shrinking merit pools, those who have this extra compensation could be withdrawn from consideration for merit.

Provost Epps: This is a poorly worded question. They are not illustrative of that problem. They are not financially compensated. The question presumed shrinking merit pools, but the pay has gone up, so pools are not shrinking. There was a category of star-hires. They might possibly be identified as well compensated. This is an interesting concept. We would treat that the same way as stipends & course relief like the Carnell Professorships. Not awarding merit would seem like a disincentive for the kind of work we would want people to do. Therefore, there aren't categories of people who are excluded.

6. Is there a standard across the university for what is considered to be meritorious work? There seem to be subjective interpretations of this among various faculty from year to year. It would be nice if there was a standard document to refer to when making decisions on a merit committee.

Provost Epps: There is. The schools and colleges have the prerogative to develop guidelines. The devil is in the details. It is the opposite of the one size fits all. It is possible that merit differs. Faculty could decide that they don't like that. I wouldn't like that....

S O'M (Tyler): Would schools' collegial assemblies put the guidelines together or would deans?

JS (Boyer): In Boyer, the Collegial Assembly did this.

Provost Epps: What if it doesn't work that way? That's where it would start. There's no grieving merit. Some of this is going to happen not necessarily even in the way the unit would want. This is a system that depends on the good will of the participants. When the merit committee comes together & makes a recommendation to the dean, you can know the dean's recommendation. They don't know the merit committee's recommendation. There is a sense that people have that deans are going against the merit committee's recommendations but it is not particularly accurate.

PL (FacHer): It is typical that members of some merit committees say to each other things like, "the dean would never go for that. Let's not recommend."

JS (Boyer): Officially, they're called salary adjustment committees now.

7. Is there a recommended/required process within each school/college for determining who should get merit, understanding that the ultimate decision/recommendation comes from the Dean?

Provost Epps: Yes, there is a process. This is in the TAUP contract. Salary adjustment comes to the provost office.

8. Does the Provost have the final decision on Merit awards, e.g. can the Provost overturn recommendations from the Deans?

Provost Epps: How would that possibly work? The Provost would return to the dean with information that violates the contract. The faculty could negotiate for some review process. I can tell you that I don't want to be in a situation where someone says I got one unit, think I should have gotten two. Technically, the answer to this question is yes, but I wouldn't want to be in that position.

MJ (STHM): Commented.

Provost Epps: There are piles on my desk. I just found the document that you gave me last semester, but I

haven't forgotten about that.

9. The merit committee for a college makes recommendations to the Dean, and the Dean then makes the final decisions. Can the merit committee's recommendations be shared with individual faculty members and with the merit committee members? This would greatly increase the transparency of the process, and individuals can see the extent to which the Dean accepted the merit committee's recommendations. Can recommendations be shared with individual faculty members?

Provost Epps: You need to negotiate that. Right now, it's a contractual term. On a personal level, it doesn't seem like that much of an additional transparency level. That's what I was told. I don't think that's a good move.

EW (VP): You have said that there doesn't seem to be a big difference between committee recommendations & what the dean awards. That's on the website, but that's where the transparency breaks down. Why is it so hard to see what the committee recommends & what the dean decides?

Provost Epps: I agree, but the contract doesn't provide for that. I would encourage you that if you want that transparency, negotiate it!

PL (FacHer): Would you be willing to collaborate in a "meet & discuss" amendment with the TAUP?

Provost Epps: Yes.

JS (Boyer): We are informed by our chair that when merit is recommended, we get that info.

Provost Epps: Let me just tell you what article 20 b para 9 of the TAUP contract says. (Reads.) Copying unavailable: <http://taup.org/>

KT (COE): Our college committee is specifically told not to recommend the number of units.

Provost Epps: Reading on from TAUP contract. So a faculty member would know where a dean & a chair would disagree then.

JK (CST): Unless you wanted to know & the university didn't agree about this in negotiations.

10. The administration has been quite laudatory about the faculty's productivity (especially in scholarly pursuits), yet the merit pool has remained the same. How

recommendations for increasing the merit pool best be made?

Provost Epps: The Merit pool is specified in the TAUP contract. We would love if the FSSC would make recommendations to increase the merit pool for scholarship.

11. If the FSSC were to have some recommendations for revising the Merit review process, how would this be presented to the Provost?

Provost Epps: We would love if you would make recommendations.

TJ (PastPres): I want to give money back to the pool in my college. Could we do that? A pat on back doesn't touch the needle for me. Specify that it goes to an NTT?

MJ (STHM): There are precedents that the mayor had gone into some investment pools. He put money into investments that would come back in other ways.

MS (Pres): This is creative.

PL (FacHer): Merit guidelines are out of date. Are there any thoughts about re-constituting a committee?

Provost Epps: I looked the document & thought, this needs to be revised. I put it on the April agenda. One thing is missing: The contract requires that TT & NTT be separated. That is not in the guidelines. I am loathe to promise another committee...

PL (FacHer): There are some colleges where deans don't recognize that faculty should be recognized.

Provost Epps: You need to hold the deans accountable for what this contract requires.

KWW (TFMA): The maximum award is what? 1.75%. As for folks in the College of Liberal Arts who get things like 22 units... how does that work?

Provost Epps: I'm not actually able to answer that question.

JS (Boyer): This is one of the reasons that the committee names were changed to Salary Adjustment Committees.

Provost Epps: That was easy when all that money came from the University before RCM. That has changed. I believe that the salary adjustment process is not over. I would try to accomplish this without the guise of merit. I

	<p>could give out merit as merit & then over time, give out different money to adjust inappropriately salaried people. To extent that the deans are paying for it, you are allowed to ask, separate from the merit process. It must go through HR. Assuming you have the money in your college to pay for it.</p> <p>KT (COE): There are mechanisms for salary adjustments.</p> <p>MJ (STHM): In residential settings with faculty living in... this is an old concept. Faculty lived In the stadium with the players.</p> <p>Provost Epps: At some universities, there are faculty who live in the dorms. If they want to go to a movie, they provide the tickets. An interesting concept. It's always fun to come. Thanks for inviting me.</p> <p>MS (Pres): Thanks for coming!</p> <p>MS (Pres): Next time we meet we can revisit these questions & the diversity stats.</p>	
8 Adjournment	Meeting adjourned.	Adjourned at 3:04 p.m.
Respectfully submitted, <i>Sue Dickey</i> Sue Dickey, PhD, RN, Associate Professor & Faculty Senate Secretary, 2016-17		

Next meeting: Representative Faculty Senate, Friday, February 24, 2017: 1:45 p.m.
 FSSC, March 7, 2017, 1:00 p.m.

SBD/sbd 2-14-17; updated 2-20-17

ADDENDUM: Questions About Merit for the Provost responded to on 2-14-17

1. Please clarify the funding available for merit (e.g., number of units, how distributed amongst schools/colleges and Provost's office)?
2. How is this funding determined per school/college (e.g., does it depend on the number of faculty AND their salaries)?
3. Are all colleges and schools required to have a policy statement about how merit decisions are allocated or made in terms of criteria? This would be similar to the school guidelines for standards applied to decisions on tenure and promotion or third-year review.
4. Are there different policies for merit for NTTs across schools/colleges? For example, in some colleges NTTs are not allowed to apply for merit for non-teaching activities even though they are asked to do them. In other schools/colleges the rules are different.
5. How do certain extra compensation categories (e.g., Laura Carnell professorship) affect merit and is this handled in a consistent manner across schools/colleges? One could argue that, with shrinking merit pools, those who have this extra compensation could be withdrawn from consideration for merit.
6. Is there a standard across the university for what is considered to be meritorious work? There seem to be subjective interpretations of this among various faculty from year to year. It would be nice if there was a standard document to refer to when making decisions on a merit committee.
7. Is there a recommended/required process within each school/college for determining who should get merit, understanding that the ultimate decision/recommendation comes from the Dean?
8. Does the Provost have the final decision (e.g., can overturn recommendations from the Deans)?
9. The merit committee for a college makes recommendations to the Dean, and the Dean then makes the final decisions. Can the merit committee's recommendations be shared with individual faculty members and with the merit committee members? This would greatly increase the transparency of the process, and individuals can see the extent to which the Dean accepted the merit committee's recommendations.
10. The Administration has been quite laudatory about the faculty's productivity (especially in scholarly pursuits), yet the merit pool has remained the same. How would recommendations for increasing the merit pool best be made?
11. If the FSSC were to have some recommendations for revising the Merit review process, how would this best be presented to the Provost?