

Faculty Affairs

Minutes December 7, 2018

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

Guests: Darin Ellis, Jeff Bolton

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:34pm

2. Academic Analytics

DE explains that there have been a great deal of developments in “big data” on the student level in recent years. Ranking and aggregating data on scholarship have been going on for a few years. AA will help to formalize and widely expand these activities.

AA is a consortium model, and is member-based. The 600 universities that are part of it all pay a fee to access the aggregation tool. The data are public information, but have hitherto not been collected and made accessible this way. The data go down to the records of individual faculty members. SCOPUS—Elsevier’s abstract and citation database, which launched in 2004, and which covers nearly 36,377 titles from approximately 11,678 publishers, of which 34,346 are peer-reviewed journals in top-level subject fields: life sciences, social sciences, physical sciences and health sciences—already has such data. Further included in AA are books (ISBN-based), grants (data from the federal government), all being aggregated and made available to administrators. At WSU right now, only down to the level of Deans.

rch asks why not all members of the faculty have access to this information. DE believes this to be a fair question, being aware of misuse of AA elsewhere, where data have been used against individual faculty members, and is happy to carry it back to the administration.

PMcC asks if faculty members can opt out. DE says no: these are public data.

LB acknowledges that these data are relevant to the academic enterprise. Yet, the question of access is part of the corporatization of WSU. Lack of access to faculty equals control of data by the administration.

EG wonders what we gain from this tool and what the costs involved are. DE does not know what the subscription fee is.

DE demonstrates an individual faculty member record, to which we all have access. Faculty only have access to their own records, not to those of others. The protocol is called Faculty Insight, accessible through Research Resources on Academica.

JA mentions that the Medical School uses their own system for data collection and aggregation. It is not clear if the medical school is included in AA. DE indicates that KEW and S. Lanier may have to discuss this.

LB: the crucial difference in accessibility is that the administration can use the tool comparatively, while faculty cannot.

PMcC asks if the system allows for “grading” faculty, and generating a score, on the individual, departmental, college, and university-levels. DE confirms that the system allows for comparative ranking. These scores/rankings are national, perhaps international.

EG asks if there would be additional costs involved in giving everyone access. DE says that in small schools, with, say, 200 faculty, all have access. It seems reasonable to give people access. The question is what bodies make decisions on the basis of these data.

LB mentions that an additional issue is that, without seeing what the Deans can do with this tool, we do not really have any idea what we are looking at.

rch asks DE to come back to FAC in Winter/Spring to discuss this further.

3. RCM

JB arrives. rch asks him what RCM is going to mean for faculty. JB explains that RCM plays out on school & college levels; it will not go down to the departmental level. How, for example, do you judge an English department against a Chemistry department? These kinds of questions cannot be answered on the departmental level and explain why RCM primarily plays out on Deans/college levels.

PMcC suggest that this will generate competition among departments within a college. JB says that this is happening right now as well—same thing.

PMcC asks after libraries and athletics. JB explains that divisions are funded through cost allocations. There are 11 schools and colleges that are revenue-generating. [Please see the attached slides “New Budget Model/Flow of Funds Proposal” provided by JB for details on the various ways in which different types of units will be funded/affected].

rch wonders why we need an RCM model in the first place. JB submits that, currently, everything works on an incremental model. RCM works through cost allocation methodologies to generate a direct incentive to build revenue and reduce costs.

LB points to significant differences between RCM and the current model. First, GTAs will no longer be the responsibility of the graduate school. The graduate school currently works with an incremental model. There needs to be a discussion on Graduate Council to develop a flexible process.

Second, RCM money goes to the schools: there is no transparency at all about how it is being further distributed/spent.

Third, OVPR has grown (24% indirect costs): what happens with research if all the money goes to the Deans?

JA asks after ICR dollars (overhead). JB says that 100% of grant money flows back to the university; 49% back to the general fund, and 24% to OVPR.

ET asks who is involved in this conversation. LB mentions that she and Richard Smith have belatedly been allowed to join the steering cttee. & RCM.

EM asks how graduate respectively undergraduate credit hours are going to be weighed. JB answers that the system is based on credit hours but that, ultimately, funding will be determined by the tuition dollars generated by students. There will be a differentiated value for credit hours: e.g., international graduate students pay more.

LB submits that CLAS generates 84% of Gen. Ed. credits, many of which are generated by students from outside CLAS. A system of differentiated credit hours makes sense. The situation with grad students is very different; 100% of the revenue should stay with the major.

Conversation TBC.

4. Minutes November 2, 2018

The minutes were reviewed and formally approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair .