<u>Faculty Affairs</u>
Minutes January 10, 2019

<u>Present</u>: renée c. hoogland, Jocelyn Ang, Poonam Arya, Ewa Golebiowska, Daniel Golodner, Marisa Henderson, Kypros Markou, Linda Beale, Patricia McCormick, Karin Tarpenning, Ellen Tisdale, Jinping Xu, Annmarie Cano
<u>Called in</u>: Ekrem Murat
<u>Absent</u>: Pilar Miranda (new student rep.)

1. **The meeting was called to order at 12:10pm**

2. **Minutes December 8, 2018 were approved**

3. **Mentoring**
AC presents list of activities underway at this moment (see also attachment). Based on the PPT presentation prepared by FAC members KB and KMcG last year, it appears that most junior faculty are satisfied with the mentoring they receive. Once they are tenured, there is little mentoring available, especially for mid-career faculty. It would be helpful to have more context for the information provided on the slides.
☛rch will invite KB and KMcG back.
AC: The OVPR provides $2,000 for mentors, but it is not always clear that this is money well spent. AC mentions that, in her own experience male mentors can be good yet condescending and patronizing towards female faculty.

    Standing practice is that chairs assign mentors, and that, in the context of the OVPR program, mentees choose their own. The latter program essentially revolves around grant submissions. There further is an academic staff member who offers speed mentoring.

    It would be helpful to have clear guidelines for mentors. A cttee. (or task force) consisting of faculty and academic staff will be asked to work towards consistent mentoring outcomes. Part of the new Chair training additionally focuses on how to work with mentors. EW suggests that it might be better to delay the pairing of mentors with mentees until new faculty know better what they want and need.
AC concedes that it would be better to work with mentoring networks, rather than one on one. LB shares that, in the law school, it is the T&P cttee. that takes care of mentoring. She further insists that an academic governance process should be used. Rather than a permanent cttee., a temporary task force should be installed.
AC feels that it is too early to call this any one thing yet: there are too many players at the table She suggests having a first meeting with the selected faculty and academic staff to see what can be accomplished in one or two semesters. She is arranging for new activities, especially for women and (other) minoritized groups (see attachment), plus a reading group on gender and academia. The professional development seminars will include a focus on gender and mentoring.

    The Academic Leadership Academy (whose name will be changed) is a one-year program. Participants are assigned a sponsor who will serve an an enabler, perhaps providing data and/or funds, and offer guidance. There will be an initial cohort of 20 people (50% faculty, 50% staff). There are no real costs involved, since AC runs the program herself, supported by a steering cttee. that helps with the design. The program starts with a retreat in August, to be

followed by nine monthly seminars that each focus on a particular aspect of leadership. Participants self-nominate—chairs are not to be gatekeepers. The program will launch in August 2109. Applications are due in February/March. There will an info-session soon. At the end of the year, participants will give presentations to one another and the incoming cohort. Most likely, participants will largely be post-tenure, mid-career faculty. (AC leaves meeting).

4.   Academic Analytics

rch will invite Darin Ellis back to a future meeting this semester to continue our conversation. She comments that the whole thing (and its potential purposes) feels rather chilling and typifies the increasing corporatization of the the university.

EW adds that scarce resources are being taken away from the core activities of the university in order to finance this "tool." What does it ultimately really add?

LB acknowledges that data are useful but that AA represents a major expenditure and that elements of quality (over and beyond quantity) are obscured by the system. The tool encourages the use of numbers to justify just about everything. The administration keeps sweeping more and more dollars: the question is how to deal with this trend. It is increasingly important to make sure that we have a voice. The problem with AA is first and foremost one of accessibility. It seems clear that the administration simply does not want faculty to have access.

rch states that we should demand some insight into what the tool is going to be used for. What do the administrators *imagine* it to produce for them?

KM points to the limitations of such a restricted database: in his field, for example, performances are not "counted," even though they are essential aspects of a professional musical practice.

rch suggests that the system primarily serves and is based on models prevalent in the STEM fields and the social sciences.

PA insists that it is crucial for Darin Ellis to come back.

5.   RCM

LB, recently added to the RCM steering cttee., explains that she feels that her comments are beginning to have some impact. She talks us through the first couple of slides provided by Jeff Bolton (Assistant Vice President, Budgets). The goal of RCM is to be transparent. The strategic funds amount to 6-7 million. There will be subventions in the first year to ensure that schools end up without a deficit.

This discussion had to be stopped short for lack of time. To be continued in February.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair .