

Faculty Affairs

Minutes November 2, 2018

Present: renée c. hoogland, Poonam Arya, Ewa Golebiowska, Daniel Golodner, Marisa Henderson, Ekrem Murat,, Linda Beale, Patricia McCormick, Karin Tarpenning Ellen Tisdale, Jinping Xu, Annmarie Cano, Pilar Miranda (new student rep.)

Absent with notice: Jocelyn Ang

Absent: Kypros Markou

1. The meeting was called to order at 12:05pm

2. Current and future meetings

rch announces that she could not get somebody from the administration to come to the meeting. Hence, the discussion on RCM will be continued on Dec. 7, when Jeff Bolton will be our guest. rch will additionally invite Darin Ellis to talk about Academic Analytics on Dec. 7. We will focus on the Climate Survey and the follow-up on the Mentoring Survey in January 2019.

3. New Associate Provosts for Faculty Development and Faculty Success and of Faculty Affairs

AMC announces that Boris Baltes unexpectedly will not be attending the meeting and elucidates why her and his new positions in the provost's office were created. The major consideration was to provide faculty support outside and beyond OTL. The issue of faculty retention was added to Boris' portfolio: up till now there has been little information-gathering about why faculty leave WSU. The office of Institutional Research has some, but not much.

A major task of AMC's office is to support faculty professional and career development, and to expand and reinforce faculty recognition. There is a list of new seminars on the provost's website that begin to address faculty needs. E.g., 38 people recently attended a seminar on "bullying of female faculty," an event co-hosted by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Many came with personal stories. It turned out that personal and professional harassment are hard to disentangle. While gender is key in such situations, there is also woman-on-woman bullying going on, and race as well as sexual orientation play a role in interconnection with gender. The fact that women are recognizably bullied sometimes obscures bullying on other grounds.

The purpose of the seminar was to try and define what bullying behavior actually is—and what can be done to stop it. One important outcome of the seminar is the need for by-stander intervention training. Another is that faculty feel that the administration should do something to prevent these practices. The question is what.

LB points out that administrative bullying is much harder to address than inter-faculty bullying. AMC posits that a chain of trainings will be required to address all forms of bullying. She will be working with smaller groups to develop strategies. AMC will send the Survey data on the bullying seminar to rch, who will share them with the cttee.

In response to a query by PMcC, AMC suggests that faculty members aware of bullying/sexual harassment situations contact the new Title IX director, Brandy Banks.

DG suggests that WSU should not protect themselves but the employees.

AMC says that the provost wants the whole academic lifespan to be covered by faculty support, e.g., people who have children mid-career. She further wants to focus more on

associate and full professors: what do they need? Suggests it might be helpful to involve emeritus faculty in such efforts.

LB posits that centralizing all of this might not be the best way forward. Faculty mentoring, for example, is perhaps better served on the local level.

AMC appreciates the feedback. She is organizing small group meetings with faculty on a number of issues.

EM asks if there is any training available for mentors.

DG says that there is no support for mentors.

AMC will discuss this with the provost. She wants to provide services but not to insert herself into every individual situation. There will be a mentoring-collaboration-sponsor meeting on Dec. 3, at 12-noon at the OTL.

rch points to potential correlations between bullying/harassment and (lack of) faculty mentoring.

PA suggests training full professors on how not to bully. References men on T&P cttees. nitpicking promotion files into order to invalidate a (non-male, non-straight, non-white) candidate's case/credentials.

rch appreciates the effort to provide services currently offered to students being expanded to faculty, but wonders what the faculty "recognition" effort will consist of.

AMC says that she will focus on solving equity concerns regarding the composition of award cttees. and on training cttee. members on adjusting biases. Additionally, she will make sure that the provost's website will be revamped to increase transparency about and provide accurate information on who wins what awards. Suggests that Academic Analytics may be helpful in identifying people who have not, but should have been nominated for prestigious (inter)national awards.

PA posits that there should be rubrics for awards. AMC agrees. EG suggests using a blind review process. PA says that self-nominations are meaningless if one's chair is against one (rch's afterthought: this circles back to bullying).

LB mentions that there should be pressure from the provost on deans and chairs to watch equity in award nominations.

JX asks after the creation of endowed chairs.

LB explains that the policy cttee. has been working on pushing the development of different (and not so expensive) types of titles for endowed faculty positions. Susan Burns (development) has indicated that the bigger dollar positions are more lucrative but that she will work on alternatives once the big fundraising campaign is concluded.

MH asks about serving academic staff.

AMC respond that most of the services covered by her office are both faculty and academic staff-oriented, but will be talking about developing special services for A-staff as well.

4. Minutes April 20, 2018

The minutes were reviewed and formally approved.

5. RCM

rch suggests that the cttee. prepare for our discussion with Jeff Bolton on Dec. 7., partly based on the RCM presentation for the academic senate on Nov. 7.

LB indicates that it is important for faculty and academic staff to realize the ways the currently developing model fails to take into account the differences in cost and recruitment for

undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. There are also significant differences along disciplinary lines and in terms of marketing. Any RCM system should be sophisticated enough to take in the real complexities. The current RCM proposals do not fulfill these requirements.

LB further explains that the senate/budget cttee. leaders were initially not allowed to sit on the RCM task force (because they served on the budget advisory cttee.). This means that the RCM steering cttee. has for two years largely functioned without faculty. LB currently serves on the cttee.

rch will distribute documents available so far to be used for our RCM discussion on Dec. 7. Please read and prepare for our conversation with Jeff Bolton.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair .