



Faculty Governance Council

January 4th, 2016
12:00pm - 2:00pm
Dean's Conference Room (4307)

Members: Dr. Katie Vogel-Anderson (Chair, PTR), Dr. Mike Katovich (Senator, PD), Dr. Karen Whalen (Senator, PTR), Dr. Ken Sloan (MC), Dr. Cary Mobley (PC), Dr. Bram Hartzema (POP), Mr. Tom Munyer (PTR), Dr. Jackie Jourjy (Distance Learning – Orlando), Dr. Karen Sando (Senator, PTR), Dr. Kristin Weitzel (Senator, PTR) Dr. Richard Segal (Dean's Office), Dr. Diane Beck (Ex Officio)



AGENDA TOPICS

A decorative banner with a ribbon-like shape, featuring a central rectangular box containing the text "AGENDA TOPICS". The banner has pointed ends on both sides.

Accept Minutes from the November 30th Meeting

Endowed Professorship

Incentive Program



Faculty Governance Council

Minutes from January 4th, 2016

Members: Dr. Katie Vogel-Anderson (Chair, PTR), Dr. Mike Katovich (Senator, PD), Dr. Karen Whalen (Senator, PTR), Dr. Ken Sloan (MC), Dr. Cary Mobley (PC), Dr. Bram Hartzema (POP), Mr. Tom Munyer (PTR), Dr. Jackie Jourjy (Distance Learning – Orlando), Dr. Karen Sando (Senator, PTR), Dr. Kristin Weitzel (Senator, PTR) Dr. Richard Segal (Dean's Office), Dr. Diane Beck (Ex Officio)

Absent: Dr. Segal

Guest(s): Dean Johnson

Accept Minutes from the November 30th Meeting:

Endowed Professorships: Procedure to make sure endowed professor is performing at highest level. Not lifetime appointments. Want to make sure they continue to perform at high level. If not, then award to others in college (creates opportunities to use in recruitment to entice senior/prominent individuals).

Peer-review committee would have 5 members: 2 would come from T&P committee. Same member can meet more than one criteria on list (e.g. on T&P and also full professor in dept) but would still have 5 members total

Ideally keep process inside college. Would only really go outside in smaller departments where there are limited number of full professors/discipline experts in dept.

FGC doesn't need to vote on this procedure.

The college has two such reviews scheduled this Spring. This type of review process has been confirmed with Angel Kwolek Folland, associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs Vogel-Anderson asked members if they had any items for the December meeting. Since the December meeting is scheduled two weeks away, most members agreed that there is no need to hold that meeting. The council will only hold a meeting if Dean Johnson decides to speak to this committee in regards to the incentive program. Dr. Vogel-Anderson will speak to Dean Johnson and decide if a meeting is needed for December.

Incentive Program: Dr. Guzick made clear that historically, COP bonuses were very large and only included narrow group of faculty (funded research faculty)

First objective – create something that is more equitable across faculty

Effort tool will be important to define one of elements of incentive program

Don't imagine greater than 10% for service unless have administrative title

It is important to remember that the incentive program is to reward those who exceed their expectations; incentives and expectations are separate.

Merit pay and incentive awards are also separate.

College Awards:

From Outstanding Student Org Advisor and down to last award (Best Teaching or Clinical Practice Innovations Paper) – relative associate dean in that area would create criteria for award.

RVU in College of Medicine – normalizes work/effort

Premise of incentive program: Have people that go above and beyond and really do quality work – how to incentivize this?

Effort tool – AAR/FAR – can't exceed 1 (or 100) – end up condensing numbers

Feel pretty good that workload tool has got things about right – but we need to have pilot data to confirm.

Source of money – will be salaried funds recovered from grants (from research faculty) – 5% of salary from research faculty will be pool. Will determine allocations.

Spot that will be tweaked moving forward in this program will be RWU, based on pilot data (currently being collected).

2 kinds of faculty: faculty expected to get extramural funding and faculty who are not

Faculty who are expected to get extramural funding – grant writing falls under dept research – this does not get added to effort (RWU)

Clinical faculty – get to claim dept research for scholarly output

Incentive program caps at 20%

Merit raise and incentive program are separate

Scores used for annual evaluation and for merit-based pay. Not eligible for incentive pay if get unsatisfactory in any area of annual evaluation.

Off book activities (WPPD, MTM, etc.) – will become part of assignment. Will have to see how it plays out before imposing certain limitations regarding participation in these programs.

May need to build separate unit within this program to incentivize developing a program

Incentives paid out after academic year (in October) – annual reviews would have been completed for previous year.

Clarifications to wording:

Dean Johnson/executive committee will make a change clarify sentence number two under the annual evaluation guidelines, as follows: “As noted above this ranking will also be used for determining eligibility for college-level awards and incentive program participation.”

In the section pertaining to faculty who are greater than 80% funded from an entrepreneurial program, there is some confusion about a 20% or 25% incentive cap. This might need to be voted on by FGC at a later date.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45am.