

Minutes for Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting

February 10th, 2012

Present: John Kulig, Daniel Lee, Burrett McBee, Nick Sevigney(chair), Evelyn Stiller(scribe), James Whiting.

Guests: PT&E Advisory Group and Julie Bernier : PT&E Advisory Group members attending: Barbara McCann, Mary Cornish, Annette Holba, Eric Hoffman, Robin Parker

1. Eric Hoffman – discussed the process observed while developing the revised tenure and promotion policy and guidelines. During fall 2009 the Promotion and Tenure Task Force recommended that a group be formed to revise the promotion and tenure policy and guidelines. During February 2009 the PT&E Advisory Group was formed for this purpose. Since that time the group incorporated best practices and extensive faculty feedback to develop the current revision of the promotion and tenure policy and guidelines. Today the group is seeking final feedback from FWC.
2. Issues raised concerning the revised promotion and tenure policy and guidelines:
 - a. Generally, FWC felt that the revision reflected a great improvement over the previous promotion and tenure policy by incorporating opportunities for regular feedback for applicants, by stating the standards with greater clarity, and taking into account best practices.
 - b. The specification that all Instructors who achieve their terminal degrees will be promoted was questioned as unnecessary and potentially problematic.
 - c. The term, *student centeredness*, was questioned as being a buzz word and not adding clarity.
 - d. The section specifying the expectations concerning teaching/librarianship appeared to use language appropriate to teaching professionals and not librarians. We were assured that this section was closely coordinated with librarians and that the language used in this section applies to their activities as well.
 - e. Concern was expressed about ensuring equity if applicants apply early for promotion since different Deans could apply different standards.
 - f. Clarification was requested concerning how the types of scholarship were to be applied. The types exemplify possible ways faculty may engage in scholarship, as opposed to all being required.
 - g. Another type of scholarship was requested to be added to the scholarship section that would cover efforts by faculty to expand into new scholarly areas (eg women's studies) or to expand into a new area of knowledge necessary for curriculum development.
 - h. There was a question about committee formation and whether the fifth committee member has to be external to the applicant's department. There is no requirement that each committee have external members.
 - i. Changes to the P&T policy include a change in schedule for when the applicant declares intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure.

- j. There are plans for a paperless process using Mahara, but these revisions are not addressed in the revised policy.
 - k. The revision also includes annual training for the Department Chair and the P&T Committee Chair.
- 3. Technically, the faculty do not need to vote on the proposed revisions to the P&T process, but Julie will ask for endorsement at the March faculty meeting.
- 4. The Faculty Welfare Committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposed revisions.
- 5. Mary indicated that the group would like to keep the vote for faculty endorsement limited to tenured and tenure-track faculty. This appears to be an issue for the Steering Committee to discuss. John is the FWC representative on the Steering Committee.
- 6. Julie: explained the projections for salary increase that she provided to the FWC. She created four models which projected the impact of awarding \$235,000 discretionary funds using four approaches as follows:
 - a. 1.83% across-the-board raises.
 - b. Increase salary by discipline and time in rank, based on averaged salaries of our comparator institutions. This approach addressing hiring concern according to Julie.
 - c. Increase the promotion increments from \$8000/\$10,000 to \$9,000/\$11,000 and provides everyone NOT getting a promotion an approximate \$1,347 increase.
 - d. Is based on salary deficit by rank which is 4.8%, 6.6%, and 7.64% for Assistant, Associate, and Full respectively.
- 7. Total cost for all models is \$338K to cover benefits, but Julie does not have a specific sum to work with at this time.
- 8. Julie needs ½ million to fund 2% raises and another ½ million to fund raises shown in models. The PSU Cabinet has approved Julie's strategies for improving PSU's salaries in relation to its comparators' salaries.
- 9. FWC comments on question of salary inequities: Why not hire people at higher salaries? What is cumulative effect of people seeing disparate salaries in different disciplines? Salary disparity within department is more problematic for people.
- 10. Julie feels that these additional raises will help PSU to catch up to comparator institutions.
- 11. FWC wishes to involve other faculty in reviewing these options for salary increases.
- 12. December 9th minutes were approved.
- 13. Next agenda: In the face of adjunct unionization Julie has directed us to reconsider adjunct representation.
- 14. March 9th next meeting