

COA Minutes Sept 17, 2013

COA Members Present: Meryl Altman, Kent Menzel, Scott Spiegelberg, Manu Raghav, Francesca Seaman, Jeane Pope (recorder), Larry Stimpert (VPAA)

- 1) Jeane Pope selected as recorder
- 2) Agenda – to make agenda:
 - a. Larry invited to provide thoughts
 - i. 5 course teaching load – talking with deans; will come back with written comments & a plan
 - ii. (handouts) questions about faculty governance:
 1. right now there is no post-performance review: this is problematic because there is no opportunity for feedback or reflection
 - a. timing? 2, 3, 5 years?
 2. there is no merit pay – distribution is not as fair and equitable as it could be.
 - a. Even raises not good stewardship of university resources.
 - b. This is a small numbers problem
 - c. People need to be noticed (both in positive and negative ways)
 - iii. Discussion ensued –
 - b. How will 3-2 affect the SOM?
- 3) Meryl will be 403(b) Rep from COA

COA Minutes October 8, 2013

COA Members Present: Meryl Altman, Kent Menzel (recorder), Scott Spiegelberg, Manu Raghav, Francesca Seaman, Larry Stimpert (VPAA). Mark McCoy (Dean SOM) visiting.

The background of COA's investigation of a 5 course workload was explained to the Dean of the School of Music.

The Dean is agnostic on the issue and receives mixed reviews about the potential for a change. He wishes to approach the issue in detail only after a decision has been made for CLA. It would appear that the majority of SOM faculty do not wish to move to a 5 course load.

SOM load is calculated differently from CLA and is governed by National Association of Schools of Music. SOM uses a 3:2 ratio of applied hours to classroom hours (exa: 18 applied hours = 12 classroom hours). SOM has a goal of 200 majors based on their needs across all of the ensembles supported by the school. The ensembles combined offer 260 places for performers, though many of those places are filled by CLA students as well as SOM students fulfilling multiple roles. At this point in time SOM has 135 majors.

21st Century Musician initiative will promote a radical rethinking of musical education. The new model will develop more a more "relevant" and "flexible" musical performer to better meld with the modern musical economy. Majors will earn more credits based on additional courses created from work the students are already doing.

The theoretical and approximate cost of shifting to a 5 course load for 2013 would have been \$98,000 and 3.8 FTE faculty above and beyond current staffing. 20 full time and 32 part time faculty staff SOM at this point in time.

COA continues to observe that there remain many issues surrounding the transition to a 5 course load. The VPAA observes that there may be "slack in the system" across the campus that can be taken up to resolve the puzzle of a 5 course load. The VPAA further observes that there are ways to achieve a workload adjustment that have yet to be explored.

COA Meeting
November 12, 2013

Present: Meryl Altman (chair), Kent Menzel, Manu Raghav, Zhixin Wu, Scott Spiegelberg, Francesca Seaman, Larry Stimpert

Absent: Jeanette Pope

Approval of minutes from October 8 and October 29.

Meryl is pursuing a follow-up on the 2010 report on Women and Family, but it may not fit into the agenda for this semester.

The Committee discussed Larry's questions about merit and salary adjustments.

1. "Once faculty members are tenured and fully promoted, there is no formal performance review ever. Wouldn't it be a very useful exercise for tenured full professors to be evaluated every three or five years? Or, as an alternative, should we return to the expectation that every tenured faculty member prepares an annual report (or a biennial report)?"
2. "We do not have a systematic approach to merit pay, but we do have merit in the form of professorships, faculty fellowships, release time, etc. Is this the way we want to award merit? Our current approach likely excludes some faculty members from consideration for professorship and fellowships, does not apply university-wide performance evaluation criteria in a systematic way, and does not address issues of poor performance. Can we design a better approach that is widely perceived as equitable, fair, and motivational?"

The committee agreed that we should fix what we have rather than come up with a new merit pay system. The committee agreed that if there is post-tenure evaluation we want to have a system that is meaningful but not burdensome, and developmental. Finally, the committee agreed that we should keep these two issues separate, that review should not be tied to pay.

The committee identified issues to be addressed in fixing the current merit pay system, especially the nomination process for teaching awards and professorships. The committee also discussed which parts of the current system that are the most effective in increasing scholarly output, particularly money for travel and time off for research.

Tuesday, December 10, 2013
Minutes for COA

Present: Meryl Altman (chair), Kent Menzel, Manu Raghav, Zhixin Wu, Scott Spiegelberg, Larry Stimpert, Jeanette Pope, Francesca Seaman (recorder)

COA reviewed notes from last minutes, and discussed questions brought up in the survey designed by Meryl.

The committee discussed options for post-tenure review :

HANDBOOK; it discusses misdemeanor, harassment policy, standard level of performance and possibility for termination of contract

Normally the VPAA's office approaches drastic problems, and solves them.

Is there a need for another mechanism for reviewing a faculty member?

Post – tenure review: as a reflection on teaching, and as developmental instrument for a faculty member

It could provide an opportunity to showcase one's own work.
It should be a way to better connect faculty to development.

What is the value of an annual report?

What is the point of an annual review?

Are we dealing with faculty under-performing? Or are we trying to encourage faculty development?

Post-tenure reviews might be a way to celebrate faculty's achievements

We agree that a post-tenure review should not be modeled after the tenure review.
One idea is to have faculty make a 5-year plan

We considered different intervals in-between reviews. The report would provide a summary of achievements and a plan for the future.

The three-year cycle could be productive.

Who would do the review? Would the SOM have independent reviews?

We could, for example, nominate full professors whom we respect, and they would form a committee.

Who would respond to the reports in a meaningful way?

How do we develop a greater leadership among faculty?

Should the Chair be involved? This is an issue we will discuss next semester.