

## **Faculty Senate Agenda – May 9, 2017 - MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Rachna Prakash, Patrick Alexander, Patrick Curtis, Brice Noonan, Zia Shariat-Madar, Esteban Urena-Benavides, Chris Mullen, Aileen Ajootian, Tossi Ikuta, Feng Wang, Alexander Yakovlev, Katie Mckee, Peter Reed, Mark Walker, Zachary Kagan Guthrie, Vivian Ibrahim, Alysia Burton Steele, Debora Wenger, Antonia Eliason, Stacey Lantagne, Dennis Bunch, Eric Lambert, Michelle Emanuel, Amy Gibson, Christina Torbert, Sumali Conlon, Sandra Spiroff, Tejas Pandya, Stephen Fafulas, Sara Wellman, Thomas Peattie, Chalet Tan, Meagen Rosenthal, Travis King, James Bos, Marilyn Mendolina, Javier Boyas, Marcos Mendoza, Rosemarry Oliphant-Ingham, William Sumrall, Rory Ledbetter, Robert Cummings, Michael Barnett.

- **Call Meeting to Order**
  - Meeting called to order 7:00.
- **Approval of April 11, 2017 Minutes**
  - Approved
- **Dr. Noel Wilkin – Interim Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**
  - Dual Career Accommodation Statement of Practice (Spousal Hire)
  - Donna West has led the development of the document of this “practice”, not called policy, but will codify our general past processes
  - Scheduled to go to the council of academic administrators on Monday, 15 May 2017
  - This practice begins once an acceptable candidate has been identified, and negotiations have started to get the new person to move to the University
    - Remember that any department head on campus has the ability to offer a 2-year position to someone (i.e. not the primary person they are interested in hiring), but remember that they can also decide whether or not a person is qualified for the position
      - Typically, these requests go through the Provost’s office
  - Q: Is this document for faculty that are already hired or new faculty only?
    - A: It was originally intended for new hire faculty, but it has been extended to current faculty members as well
  - Currently there is approximately \$500,000/year allocated to such hires
  - Q: These are not available for tenure track positions?

- A: Yes, that's right, because tenure track positions are so unique, a national search needs to be held. We have had instances in the past where new tenure track lines have been added to departments, but they didn't end up hiring the spouse.
    - Q: This does not speak to dual tenure track hires, and I assume that this will continue as it has been?
      - A: Yes, that's right. But remember within the two years it is possible that a tenure track position will be available.
  - Q: Will this document be distributed to the entire university?
    - A: Yes, the goal with writing this document will be ensure that the statement of practice is available to everyone.
  - Q: I see this as an opportunity to hire two incredible people. If we can designate resources to this process it would help us to get really fantastic people that we wouldn't otherwise get.
    - A: The process opens up opportunities to have this conversation. It is really important that departments know that they own this process, and we will not force departments to hire someone that is not a fit.
  - There have also been some questions about whether or not this applies to staff positions and the way that it has been written it does. But we have to think carefully about how the monies are spent because it comes from a limited pot.
  - Q: Does the creation of a new line for a coming spouse potentially take away a line from someone who is retiring?
    - A: In temporary terms, it does not. But is it up to the department to make it work after the two years.
    - Right now, the funds come directly from the provost's office, but going forward ideally departments and schools would provide some money.
  - Q: Have you ever experienced a situation where while the department is supportive, but that the dean is not, what happens?
    - A: We haven't really had a situation like that, most of the time the Deans ask if the funds are available.
    - Q: Do you see a procedural situation where the department and dean disagree and that the provost's office can get involved?
      - A: Usually we would get all of the parties involved in the discussion together and try to work out the issues.
  - Q: Who counts as a "partner"?

- A: There was some language about who counted as partner in a previous version of the document, but that has been removed with the idea that accommodations can be made for all situations.
  - Q: How does this apply to retaining faculty?
    - A: Well if a situation arose that a partner needed a position in order to retain someone, they would go to the department chair and begin that conversation and try to work something out.
  - Q: Do people need to get a counter offer to begin this process?
    - A: With this process in place that shouldn't be necessary. But open and direct conversations need to take place to make sure everyone understands the situation.
- **Dr. Patrick Curtis – Chair of Committee on Research & Creative Achievement**
  - Senate resolution to recommend change/augmentation of ORSP
  - Motion to begin discussion, and motion seconded
  - Spoke with Jason Hale about the resolution, and if this resolution passed he would get the resolution and the larger original document which includes more detailed language and justification for the points in the resolution
    - Q: How did Jason feel about the document?
      - A: He hasn't seen the document, but he is looking forward to seeing it.
  - Q: When we communicate this with ORSP, it might be good to acknowledge that they have already made strides to involve more faculty members. It doesn't need to go into the document, but that we acknowledge that this document could be used to strengthen their case to seek out funding.
  - Q: Is bullet three looking for bridge funding?
    - A: This is not bridge funding specifically, but to help people find other sources of funding that are not NIH or NSF.
  - Q: A lot of what we are suggesting here implies increased funding to ORSP, is that our intention?
    - A: That was not the original intention, but that seems to be the way things may go.
      - A: What this document could do is offer ORSP some leverage to advocate for additional funds

- Q: One thing I would like to have added to is some language so that research advocates let researchers know what their job and responsibilities are so that researchers can be prepared if they do not do those specific things.
  - A: We can add this to the larger document
- Q: If we are going to maintain R01 status we need ORSP to be better funded and supported.
  - A: The original intent of the document was to offer some cost-effective solutions to help improve the services offered by the ORSP. But I certainly see your point.
- Two “Friendly” amendments to the second bullet on page 2
- Motion to approve the document, motion seconded
  - Motion passes (unanimous)
- **Dr. Peter Reed – Chair of Committee on Development & Planning**
  - Proposed revision of Tenure Policy
  - Q: If we approve these additions does it have to go through administration and IHL?
    - A: No this is an internal document
  - Motion to approve changes to the Tenure policy
    - All in favor, passed.
- **Committee Reports**
  - Academic Instructional Affairs
    - Nothing to report
  - Academic Conduct
    - Nothing to report
  - Finance & Benefits
    - Nothing to report
  - Development & Planning
    - Nothing to report
  - Governance
    - Nothing to report
  - Research & Creative Achievement
    - Nothing to report

- University Services
  - Nothing to report
- **Old Business**
- **New Business**
  - Election of Officers
    - Chair – Brice Noonan nominated – willing to be chair
      - Approval by acclimation
    - Vice Chair – Stacey Lantagne nominated – willing to be vice chair
      - Approval by acclimation
    - Secretary – Meagen Rosenthal – willing to be secretary
      - Approval by acclimation
- **Adjournment**
  - Adjourned at 7:57