FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

MARCH 18, 2014

Members Present: John Bagby, Michael Berube, Blannie Bowen, Darlene Clark, Betty Harper, Krishna Jayaker, Lawrence Kass, Kenneth Keiler, Ellen Knodt, Patricia Koch (Chair), Richard Kubina, Gretchen Kuldau, William Lasher, Angela Linse, Salvatore Marsico, Karyn McKinney, Margaret Meloy, Adam Muchmore, Ann Ouyang, Brad Pinter (Vice Chair), Timothy Pyatt, Hampton Shirer, Robin Veder

Members Not Present: Kimberly Blockett, Kathryn Jablokow, Venkataraman Shankar, Stephen Snyder, Alexandra Staub

Meeting was called to order by Chair Koch at 8:30 am.

1. Chair's Report (8:30-8:45)
   a. Review and Approval of Minutes from 1/28/2014: Vote: Minutes accepted unanimously without correction.
   
   b. Report from March 17th Officers and Chairs Meeting: Vice Chair Pinter described several items of interest that were raised at the Officers and Chairs Meeting, including that ARSSA is working on a revision of the Academic Drop procedure that improves the schedule of warnings given students. Educational Equity is working on improving monitoring of hiring committees' implementation of Affirmative Action procedures. Libraries, Information Sciences, and Technology is discussing the University's planned change from Angel to Blackboard.

2. Subcommittee Meetings (8:45-9:30): Continued work on the following tasks:
   
   a. Faculty Development (FacDev): Discussion of and finalizing report for the subcommittee charge on guidelines for unit status naming (B1).
   
   b. Faculty Rights & Privacy Issues (FRPI): Discussion of subcommittee charge on Protection of Faculty during budgetary contractions (A3; HR 70, 23, & 76; P3 and 6).
   
   c. Promotion, Tenure, Absences, & Leaves (PTAL): Discussion of and finalizing of report for the subcommittee charge on Administrative Communication & Transparency (A1; AD14).

3. Break (9:30-9:45)

4. Full Committee Meeting (9:45-11:00): Full committee discussion on the following topics:

   Guidelines for the Review of Changes in Academic Organizational Units – The
Recommmdations Regarding AD14 Administrative Reviews – The subcommittee will shortly send the updated document to the full committee for final approval. There was some discussion regarding if some of the recommendations were too burdensome for administrators. The report should be ready for the April Senate meeting.

Faculty Tenure Rates: 2013-2014 Annual Report – It was observed that there was little change from last year and that the high success rates at the sixth-year review might be indicative of the successful operation of the system. However, once again it was noted in the report that female faculty leave at a much higher rate than male faculty for positions at other universities. It was recommended that this issue be examined in more depth to determine that reasons why women find positions at other universities more attractive than remaining at Penn State. Vote: The committee unanimously supported sending the report to full Senate.

Revisiting of AD77 – This agenda item was deferred until the April meeting.

IRC Report on Striking the Right Balance of Faculty Appointment Types – There was vigorous discussion of the IRC report. Members raised several concerns, including: 1) the tone of the report being too confrontational, 2) the need for faculty involvement in addressing the report’s central questions (not just administration), 3) the need for the report to have had consultation with Faculty Affairs before being placed on this afternoon’s Faculty Senate agenda, 4) the exclusion of data from the Medical and Law schools and the consequences of such decisions, 5) the need to address variation within appointment types, 6) the need to prioritize academic values in defining a TT/FT ratio, and 7) the need to develop policy to guide hiring decisions at the departmental level.

The committee then discussed possible responses and agreed that Chair Koch would speak in open Senate on the behalf of the committee. The focus of her comments would be as follows: Despite general agreement with the substantive aspects and implicit conclusions of the report, Faculty Affairs believes there are three central issues that are crucially missing in the current form of the document. 1) The data reported bear closer scrutiny, including clarification (possibly disaggregation) of variation within appointment types and benchmarking with peer institutions. 2) Faculty, including Faculty Affairs, should participate in the development in conjunction with administration, of a plan to articulate answers to the central questions described in the report. Part of that plan should be an articulation of the work expectations of the various appointment types. 3) An important guiding principle in the formation of such a plan - and in answering the central questions in the report - should be a focus on academic values.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Pinter