

DULUTH CAMPUS FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DFAC)
February 3, 2015
3 pm Rm 162

****MINUTES****

Present: Ben Clarke, Jon Holy, Emily Onello, Terri Rose-Hellekant, Melissa Walls

Guests: Alan Johns, Ken Wallace

I. Call to order – 3:04 by Ben Clarke

Review of minutes – January 6, 2015. Moved, Walls. Second, Holy.

II. Old Business –

a) Post-Tenure Review – Ballot and vote plan. Ken Wallace reviewed the policy and answered questions about who was eligible to serve on the committee. The term is for one year, and the vote will be conducted the week of February 16. Ben will send a letter to eligible voters (tenured faculty) announcing the upcoming vote and explain the eligibility for those on the committee (tenured, full professor, not department head). The committee of three top vote-getters will set procedures for reviews moving forward, and will convene to start reviews sometime after the March 20th deadline for annual reports being submitted to department heads.

ACTION: Letter from Ben, vote to eligible faculty.

III. New/Reviewed Business – (meeting order of topics varied from agenda)

a) Dean's Update – Alan Johns

1. Alan had his weekly phone call with Dean Termuhlen covering post-tenure review, early career faculty support, LCME update of faculty numbers.

2. LCME faculty update shows that we now have 41 faculty at the school (not FTE's), which reflects a net increase of 8 faculty since 2011. Alan answered questions about the faculty included in the report, and announced that there are two new faculty searches being initiated prior to the end of the academic year – one in each department.

3. Indigenous Health Native American Task Force draft report is being circulated with a final expected to Alan in about a month. He thanked Melissa for her work on the task force. He said the four main areas of the report include curriculum, reporting structure, school climate and research.

4. Alan reported that Deans Jackson and Termuhlen discussed research foci for the Duluth campus and there are expectations to be further defined.

5. Melissa Walls reported that the Blue Ribbon Subcommittee report included errors for reporting Duluth campus research projects and their level of extramural support. Jim Boulger is assisting UMTC personnel to identify and correct these inaccuracies. Alan suggested that many of the Department Indicators Report errors may have been corrected.

ACTION: Group requested FTE faculty data to be consistent with LCME reporting, and Alan said he would provide that information. Alan offered to review at the Department Indicators Report develop an accurate research funding appraisal for the Duluth campus.

- b) Faculty Senate/Trachte replacement – Ben Clarke reported that due to teaching commitments George Trachte cannot make the regular meetings of the Faculty Senate committee. He was elected to the Senate position in October. The vote will be reviewed and Ben will request the next vote-getter will be asked to assume George's place.

ACTION: Ben will follow-up

- c) Faculty Merit Scoring – Melissa Walls opened this agenda item by reviewing the topic as discussed at the Faculty Assembly meeting on February 27. She highlighted the emotional impact of the annual report causing anxiety in most faculty with greater impact on junior faculty. She listed several troubling issues to the faculty. The metrics for evaluation are individualized by department, and merit increases are tied to the same form. Confusion arises since some definitions are not clear and instructions for how to complete the form are vague. Faculty are concerned to the potential uses of the gathered data since the only obvious application is to assess the promotion for the probationary faculty. The discussion included also some historical perspective.

Additional discussion included:

1. Information distributed following the Assembly meeting – a memo from Ken Wallace/Faculty Affairs dated May 2013 distributed to all faculty, and the biomedical sciences faculty evaluation metrics (2014) shared with CDH and Alan Johns.
2. FAC discussed the flaws with a % distribution system for merit. This model disadvantages junior and mid-career faculty and promotes increasing systematically salary inequities.
3. FAC suggested that each department clarify expectations for faculty appraisal of productivity.
4. FAC also suggested that each department review the 7.12 statement carefully. This statement provides the metrics for evaluation and will ultimately be used by the P&T Committee to advance junior and mid-career faculty. The committee also asked: "How would the 7.12 statement look different if each department had their own versions?"
5. Guidelines need to be established to accurately assess effort. For example, annual report forms enumerating teaching effort should account for preparation time, teaching contact hours with students, and accounting for alternate venues including PBL, lecture, small group activities, active learning, assessment, etc.

ACTION: Each department head should share their metrics for annual appraisals with the faculty.

IV. **Adjourn** – 4:10pm

Respectfully submitted,
Jeannette Lang