

1/16 Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Kara Brown, Zach Kelehear, Doyle Stevick, Stephen Thompson, Kellah Edens, James Carper, Tandra Jackson, Eva Monsma

Not in attendance: Allison Anders, Margo Jackson,

- Opening remarks: Enabling faculty initiative and moving towards an electoral system
- We need to focus on what we have to do and our priorities.
- 30 days to get a proposal out to faculty for the bylaws. If we come to a consensus we can then distribute it to be voted on. It may fail, but if we are going to make this jump to faculty leadership we need to have a process in place.
- Aggressively pursue potential leaders for the college

Election processes:

- Procedures: the first paragraph of the election procedures. Maybe cap at 1000 words their vision.
- We want to focus on getting things out with 2 weeks notice.
- At the faculty meeting we would have a time slot for Q & A.
- Concern: Getting people to step up.
- The group agreed on the timeline. We want to have it set by April 1st, and then we could have a final committee meeting at the end of the year to transition.
- Action Item: Before anyone is chosen, we propose so that all the chairs agree that they are released from all service.
- The election piece needs to be proposed already to the department chairs.
- Should the whole EC see the whole proposal? Not only on the election procedures. We want to focus on them reaching a consensus so we can keep the process moving.
- We want to make the position as attractive as possible. If the departments are small are there specific obligations where they can't afford to have a staff member participate? If you feel like you can take a sabbatical you should be able to do this. We want to encourage people to step up.
- Non-negotiable, in the absence of a stipend and a release we protect you from these other factors.
- People can opt in but they can not be obliged to do it. We want to craft a specific language to take an EC.
- We would like to propose:
- The steering committee would like to propose that the dept chair consider as a matter of practice that any faculty member who is elected consensus consider this as a matter of practice be excluded from all other service obligations at the college level, department level and program level.
- How do you tally service? Depending on the committee there are points associated with it. If we don't have that it may not be easy to add that. It's important but not an issue for the chairs

but the departments. We as a committee can discuss this with the faculty to represent the maximum commitment of service. Constitutes the highest level of service for APR purposes. They similarly we would propose that a faculty member who service in such be awarded full credit as it relates to TMP and APR review during the years served.

- Everyone seems to like this language. Maybe include a statement of justification for the proposal.
- Zach: Similarly, we would propose that a faculty member who serves in such a capacity be afford full participation credit for service in APR reviews.
- They need to be assured that they will be able to dedicate the time necessary. We want to have depts. Provide that assurance via a release or other communication.
- We don't want people who are picked by the dean's office or it's my turn to do it. We need folks who have the time to be fully committed to it.
- We need to make it different than how it was in the past.
- Make sure we provide a description of everything that is entailed so people fully understand.
- Do we have this in ITE? We think it is word of mouth. No description, etc.
- For clinical faculty there is a ranking system of service. Are you a leader, etc.? But not for tenured track.
- When adding merit components we need to be stream-lined.
- The way the college operates now, they are going to pre-allocate funds which will be distributed within the dept so peers will only be reviewed within their dept so all dept are equivalent internally.
- We want a collective agreement that this is considered a Best practice.
- The strategies need to have meanings to help measure there effectiveness.
- People realize there is significant commitment involved.
- We want to facilitate continuity.
- Given the particular year and focus, activities will more than likely be full of intense service based on past committee experience.
- We need to figure out clear process steps. These steps are important in case a battle emerges.
- APR ought to be a faculty function for them to consider at the dept level and present it to the faculty as a whole to adopt it within their dept.
- We want them to consider with the committee and if they approve, take it to the dept level for approval.
- Having dept chair sign off.
- The dept chair may have a reason for selecting a person based on the value added to the overall committee.
- ITE tends to be whoever would like to do it and has been met with resistance in the past. It allows so many of our people to opt out. Equity and service issues have been an issue identified. We want them to reconsider how faculty is selected for the committee (i.e. skills, etc.), so we have a consensus from the faculty and made public.
- If they are willing to do it, it should go into the APR.

- Kellah has a great model focused on an assignment process. But you have to be on the committee to assess the skills.
- Small dept may need to do a rotation type of involvement. So they talent and skills luxury is not applicable. So everyone is getting the experience through the rotation. The talent matching may not be possible because of the dept size.
- Using smaller dept as example to show others what they do.
- Service equity: Can Eva announce this issue at the meeting are asking the steering committee members to speak to their chairs about the most equitable and effective method for aligning skills for participating opportunities.
- Special Situations: If both faculty members are off, it is decided via voting. Does this make sense?
- Have someone select a running mate. First alternative would be to have someone run. Second is being open to who ever may come forward.
- How much of the description is what is actually accurate. It is very open for initiative. The elections and the platform will provide a check on some of these concerns. The platform becomes the agenda? So both people would have platforms? In the future the faculty chair would have their platform, not the elect.
- The area of overlap is easy to pursue. Both parties can be equally involved to some degree. The only issues would be if 2 people disagreed, then it would be the committee that would need to work out the issue.
- The election process would be enough to carry the agenda to make things happen. We would hope that the person selected would have the motivation to move their platform forward.
- The impression one gets from our bylaws is that faculty is here to serve the administration. We want to shift it from an administration focused set of bylaws to a faculty set of bylaws.
- Do we need to vote on a set of amendments to the bylaws before taking it to the committee? If we have 2 spring faculty meetings then we can take the first set to the meetings and then work on the other issues going forward. So those bylaws can go out to the meeting in April.
- We will revisit the runner up and logistics in the document distributed this morning in until the next meeting. If there are better ideas or concerns, please make sure those are communicated.
- Will we accept absentee ballots? Yes we think we should. Have a staff member collect the absentee ballot.
- What about using Survey Monkey? We didn't know if that was secure enough.
- Effectively during the summer there is no faculty rep, have the faculty chair and rep be assigned, but they wouldn't have to come to specific meetings.
- We don't want to burn up our meetings with documents so they need to be distributed prior to the meeting so we could target a faculty meeting on the 20th.
- Want to make sure we have elected staff from faculty welfare committee.
- T&P and APR chair who are elected by the dept are the ones who expertise and welfare are more closely linked to the faculty welfare committee. The participants weren't sure they agreed with this perspective. The burden on welfare committee is high and putting APR would only add more burdens. Who defines what committees do? The dean's office? Can they change the

definition of what is part of the committee responsibilities? Could we be excluding untenured faculty? We are going to table this issue for now.

- The dept chair has the right to select or recommend sabbaticals. It ultimately is an administrative decision who gets the sabbatical. If he can't fund all, it may not happen. We need to be sensitive about this when going through the bylaws. He thinks the whole document needs to be revisited and have a clear understanding of the current view of faculty going forward. Maybe things need to be completely re-written? Doing a comprehensive review may not be possible this year but in the future.
- Media process: We can reject or suggest bylaws revision as to whether it should be one of our tasks.
- Regarding sabbaticals, we want to be the conduit and we need to be clear about the process. The process should help provide clarification for all issues going forward. Ranking shouldn't be done without knowledge of the budget. The dynamics seems to be unclear even though they were submitted through USC policies. This should be for future discussion.
- Also regarding sabbaticals, are there any other kinds of guidelines or factors to consider? Should the committee consider them? We may want to consider this for the future. We would like to have a criteria based review but not responsible for the ranking.

Going forward:

- Adhoc: 2 waves and take 4 or 5 of the committees regarding issues that would require an adhoc committee.
- Discussing the social committee.
- Lack of funds available for lectures – would like to discuss with the lecture committee and encourage faculty to come forward. Also details in the marketing of the lectures to get faculty and students interested.
- The Dean will not be able to attend the Diversity Forum as information to the committee.
- We will set this meeting for January 29th at noon. Postpose any additional scheduling until the next meeting.

Zach's note submission: Given the significance of faculty governance in supporting the mission of the college, in advising the dean in his/her critical work, and in cultivating a positive teaching and research climate we support protecting the leadership responsibility of the chair and chair-elect from service beyond that required of their specified leadership roles.