

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.