

Faculty Council Meeting
October 23, 2024
Gould-Simpson 1024

In attendance: Susan Bridgewater, Chris Hamilton, Aneta Keilar, Cynthia Anhalt, Heidi Hamann, Paul Goodman, Ross Buchan, Xiquan Dong, Tynan Lazarus, Florian Haffner, Haijiang Cai, Brenda Frye, Todd Proebsting, Shankar C Venkataramani, Jeff Pyun, Alex Burant
Not in Attendance: Carlos Vargas, Scott Saleska, Sam Gralla, Bryan Black, Nicole Leitner

Ross – started meeting at 4pm
Minutes from September meeting were approved

Noted change of agenda to include Faculty Workload Guidelines document.

Ross discussed the goals of the document as conveyed by its initial author Brad Story; will add to next month's meeting for discussion by FC following a review and commenting phase by FC members

If we need data from the COS to perform our future subcommittee tasks, we should feel unafraid to ask; COS admin is generally agreeable to this.

A version of the Ernst & Young report (with potentially identifying information removed) and recommendations from the DHs and business office committee regrading business functions will be released soon (aiming for end of October)

Tynan asked “how will the report be released – email, accessible document, etc?” – **Ross** suggested it may be posted on the COS website, or shared by FC reps, but ultimately this will be at COS admin discretion – the intent to make it public has been made clear by the Dean though.

Heidi asked if the FC minutes are “publicly” available? They are available on the FC webpage

Ross discussed the results of the FC-initiated survey of COS faculty concerns, which noted that Salaries, Staff support, Teaching Workloads, Administrative Burdens, Faculty Attrition and Hiring/Retention of a diverse student/faculty body were the top concerns. (113 responses received, approx. 23% of faculty).

Chris summarized results of his survey of Planetary – highlighted the sudden disappearance of 2% IDC return to faculty, TAships, importance of understanding how TAs are assigned
Heidi clarified that there had been ~18 months of University-distributed IDC (however, colleges, depts and individual faculty may have alternate agreements)

Xiquan reiterated usefulness of IDC return and displeasure of cut without notice

Xiquan and Ross – Raised issue of new parking charges in UA garages over weekend, instituted since August with no consultation, has lead to tickets for faculty colleagues, students and post-docs – anecdotally, this is discouraging experimental and general work productivity.

Cynthia asked if parking is a college thing (as opposed to governed by the University) – it is not under COS control

Haijiang noted that the Faculty Senate also discussed this

Chris noted that communication is key and anecdote about his own parking experiences – “sports over academics”

Ross says we should communicate concerns – will e-mail personally and discuss with Dean.

Jeff said there is “infighting” between colleges, and we need to speak with a single voice – resents extra fees per RA, raises for post-docs and thinks we (FC or CoS) should address this directly

Tynan noted Fac/Student ratios are not an appropriate way to compare classes or class loads

Ross shifted to discussion of potential subcommittees

Discussed basics of each sub-committee

DEI; Salary Committee; Workload and Transparency Committee, Faculty Career Development Committee, Admin Reduction Committee, Budget Committee, Centralization Committee

Todd noted that salary and workload transparency are two sides of the same coin, mentioning an issue where faculty were being hired on a higher salary than existing departmental colleagues of the same rank

Ross said in his department everyone starts at the same level; could be a recommended best practice

Cynthia asked if we will get actual data about different departments

Ross stated we can get CoS data, but we will need to ask for individual departments data

Todd asked why FC cannot just look at relevant data on UA Analytics

FC Broke into groups to discuss pros/cons of various sub-committees, + identify new ones.

How do we gather data to identify and address problems/issues?

Chris said APR documents have most of the info we need, but are we allowed to view them

Are they (APR) confidential?

What data can we get?

Jeff commented on Workload distribution: if you have lots of teaching responsibility (UG and/or G) due to required classes then it is hard to accommodate the 40/40/20 for large-scale researchers
DHs often have flexibility, but not all departments (i.e. Chemistry)

Buy-outs vs reductions (who gets and for what reason)

Better metrics for comparison of teaching workloads may be required

Where can we (the FC) have impact? Where can we make effective change?

Mostly college of science, but identify issues important to us that are under UA control

Chris suggested a strategic planning committee for the FC – to document FC goals, and potentially interface with departments on strategic planning

Ross will send a survey to choose subcommittees, and ask for volunteers to each subcommittee.
3-5 members for ~5 committees

FC strategy: **Ross** feels that FC needs to be more visible, and be seen to be clearly communicating faculty concerns to COS admin (e.g. the recent survey). Even on issues where finances are limiting, generating data-informed reports and recommendations and being willing to engage with various stakeholders on campus is worthwhile.

Identify and share best practices employed across departments.

To clarify FC role vis-à-vis DH & Dean meetings, and Faculty Senate – while there is some redundancy with those meetings, this may still facilitate clear faculty-COS admin communication and reiterate the importance of issues. FC can also focus on being a more direct, visible and independent conduit for discussing COS faculty-raised concerns, and be an idea-generating body to identify solutions that the Dean can implement.