

University Faculty Meeting

Friday, January 27, 2023

Agenda:

1. Welcome (Noel Painter)
2. International Learning Committee (ILC) on Global Learning Outcomes (Rachel Core, ILC chair)
 - *Note: The ILC has been working on developing Global Learning Outcomes (GLOs) for a number of years, including the piloting of GLOs in select 2021-22 courses and assessment of the pilot's outcomes. More information on the work that led us here can be found in the 2021-22 ILC annual report.*
3. Load/Curriculum Reform (3:2 plus 1), proposal introduction (Melinda Hall, Faculty Senate chair)
 - *From Melinda Hall: On January 20th, the University Faculty Senate passed a Workload Reform Proposal (the "3:2 Plus 1 Reform") with endorsement (16 Yes, 2 Abstain, 1 No). I will formally introduce this document (attached to this message) for the meeting on January 27th, with robust discussion planned for the February Faculty meeting. Please review the document. Thank you!*
4. Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
 - *By petition of the faculty, this topic is included on the meeting agenda: A discussion of Faculty Annual Reviews, up to and including waiving them in the context of the current financial environment.*

The meeting was called to order at 12:00

1. Opening Remarks and Welcome (Provost Painter)

Provost Painter welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending.

2. International Learning Committee (ILC) on Global Learning Outcomes (Rachel Core, ILC chair)

Rachel Core, along with Paula Hentz and Chris Jimenez presented a "International Learning Committee and Global Learning" Power Point. Dr. Core provided a brief introduction that including her background in international learning, and presented the 2022-2023 ILC Committee membership and charge. Ms. Hentz showed the ACE Model (Academic Council on Education) for comprehensive Internationalization as a preface to the proposed three global learning outcomes (GLO). Dr. Jimenez added the committee's work on creating a GLO Curricular Inventory table. Discussion followed with faculty in attendance that will inform the next steps of the ILC's proposal to the faculty for the general education reform that would recognize and value international learning as a core part of the Stetson general education curriculum.

3. Load/Curriculum Reform (3:2 plus 1), proposal introduction (Melinda Hall, Faculty Senate chair)

Melinda Hall presented a revised 3:2 Plus 1 proposal. Melinda explained that all faculty should have received an email with the revised proposal and encouraged all faculty members to contact her if anyone has any questions.

4. Faculty Activity Report (FAR)

Provost Painter began by acknowledging the volume of discussion that has surrounded the FAR and explain that the FAR has been a longstanding expectation at Stetson that predates the implementation of a merit pay structure. He then stated that there is a broad recognition that work on adjusting the FAR to be contemporary is appropriate at this time. He explained that the university recognizes the value in the alignment between staff and faculty evaluations.

Melinda Hall presented a “Faculty Annual Review by faculty petition” Power Point. Melinda presented and explained the requirements for a faculty annual review as required by SACSCOC. She then explained the history of how FAR and merit are related to each other.

The petition for this agenda item is as follows “Place on the agenda of the January 2023 University Faculty meeting a discussion of Faculty Annual Reviews, up to and including waiving them in the context of the current financial environment” (12/17/22)

Alan Green presented the following motion with a second by Steven Smallpage.

- The faculty vote to suspend the FAR, except for those faculty who need to participate in the FAR process for Tenure and/or Promotion purposes, and to suspend the merit review process for all eligible faculty, for one year.

Faculty who should participate in the FAR process for Tenure and Promotion include tenure-track faculty who have not submitted a review portfolio or tenure portfolio this academic year and Associate Professors who plan to seek promotion in the near future and desire a FAR as evidence for their portfolio.

Additionally, the faculty charge the Faculty Senate with forming a task force to work with the Deans to reform the reporting instrument and merit review process in time for the Spring 2024 annual review of faculty work in 2023. If insufficient progress has been made in revising the reporting instrument and/or merit review process by that juncture the work will continue, but faculty annual review will recommence, employing the existing reporting instrument and/or merit review process until a new instrument and process has been approved by the faculty and administration.

Call to Question by Robert Askew with a second from Chris Ferguson.

119 responded, 69 Yes, 42 No, 7 Abstain. This did not reach the required 2/3 majority of the voting members.

Additional motions were presented by Wendy Anderson and Alan Green.

Carolyn Nicholson requested that the president of provost provide some insight as to if this type of motion is allowed, to which the provost responded that while the FAR was developed in a collaborative effort between faculty and administration, the action of administering faculty evaluation through the FAR process is one for which administration is solely responsible. Provost Painter stated that rather than suspending FAR, the university should suspend the merit process. The common point of agreement seems to be that FAR process should be realigned with the expectations of the university and the desires of the faculty.

Dr. Anderson presented a friendly amendment to Dr. Green's original motion.

- "Additionally, the faculty charge the Faculty Senate with forming a task force to work with the Deans to reform the reporting instrument and merit review process in time to inform faculty work in 2024, which will be reviewed in Spring 2025."

Dr. Mieras also added the following language as a friendly amendment.

- "FAR is suspended and that the exception will be recognized for this year alone in examining all portfolios for T&P."

At the end of the scheduled time a motion to extend the meeting was not received. This was left on the floor with no further action taken.

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM