AMP Subcommittee 3 (Faculty & Pedagogy)
03/22/16 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Shari McMahan, Diana Guerin, Susan Glassett-Farrelly, Paul Levesque, John Carroll, Adelina Gnanlet, Bill Hoese, Jidong Huang, Su Swarat

---

1) Review of minutes from last meeting

No discussions took place of the minutes.

2) Debrief AMP senate retreat

- Diana suggested that we should reverse the 2 sections to have the pedagogy section first, which would lay the foundation for faculty section on tenure density. The group agreed with with the suggested change.

- The group discussed the themes raised in AMP retreat on Friday:
    - Paul: Make stronger statement of "making use" of the FDC, not just as a supporting role
    - Diana: There were calls for a specific number in terms of recommendations for tenure density.
    - Diana: An argument raised was whether the report should discuss full-time vs. part-time distinction, not about tenure/tenure track vs. adjuncts.
        - Susan commented that the perspectives on this issue varied greatly by college and disciplines. Diana commented that we could break down the data on different types of faculty by college, but getting faculty data has been difficult.
        - Adelina: What percentage of our work should be teaching vs. research? Tenure density cannot be ignored, as tenure/tenure-track faculty contribute to scholarship. Having a goal for tenure density would be helpful.
        - Susan/Paul: How could we include part-time faculty so that they are more aware of and connected to the university?
        - John: Could develop a part-time faculty handbook that provides important information that a faculty member should know.
        - Adelina: More help from full-time faculty to part-time faculty would be helpful to get them on board and stay retained.
    - Diana: Should we set a concrete goal for density level?
        - Shari commented that we should put a number or a range down, recognizing that departments/colleges could vary depending on their situations.
        - Susan also commented that we should put down a number.
    - Adelina: RTPs have not been linked to any of the discussions of the 4 AMP subcommittees, which does not help with motivating faculty.
        - Shari: We could build certain things into lecturer contracts, but difficult to do with tenure-tracks.
        - Paul: It's down to the department. Minor edits (e.g. including HIPs) should be able to be done to the department standards without much hassle.

- Su: A number of comments are focused on diversity training for faculty; Need to help faculty to develop “cultural competency”, and broaden their understanding of diversity. Diana commented that we need to have data on other types of “diversity”.
- Susan: Need to get tenure/tenure-track faculty teach lower level courses. Shari acknowledged that this is very important.
- Shari: Importance of post-tenure review – how to encourage tenured faculty to be productive?
- Diana: The salary issue is not addressed, but probably should not addressed in our subcommittee’s report.

3) Bill asked what will happen to the retreat outline?
   - Shari: Outline is probably done at this point. We need to go back and work on the full document.

4) Diana suggested that we need to extract themes from the discussions/reflections.
   - Possible themes:
     - Diversity
     - Tenure density
     - Workload/work condition
     - Etc.…
   - Su’s office will combine the two documents (“discussions” and “Reflections”) and put the comments under themes before the next meeting.