

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

Feb 6, 2014 MINUTES

2:00PM– 3:30PM, Westside D

Attendees: Marion Becker, Jolenea Ferro, Bill Haley, Ryan Henry, Kathleen Heide, Celia Lescano, Meng, Daniel, Ray Miltenberger, Rachael Powers

Guests: Julie Serovich, Nancy Wisgerhof

Topic	Discussion	Action
Review of Minutes: Dec 12th	Chair Heide welcomed the participants to the meeting and introductions followed. Members were asked to review the minutes of the Dec 12th meeting . Following a motion by Bill Haley and seconded by Marion Becker, the minutes were approved unanimously.	Dec 12 th minutes approved
Dean Serovich update.	<p>Governor has released his budget and it looks favorable; however, the delegates are not in session yet, so we will need to monitor changes as they occur. Board of Governors requested the state of Florida to provide 50 million dollars to distribute to universities based on performance rating. The bottom 3 universities will not receive performance funding. The amount of dollars distributed will be a percentage of the universities budget. USF performance rating looks good.</p> <p>The Dean has met with groups of faculty representing all the departments of the college to discuss research and scholarship; These sessions have provided insight to the work of the faculty, grant funding and support needed by faculty. As a result of these discussions the Dean is considering organizing a Research Council in the college, headed by Howard Goldstein, to help resolve research issues and provide added support to the faculty from the Dean’s Office. Research dollars are up at USF, where most other universities are experiencing a decline as much as 3%.</p> <p>On-line courses: College is in the process of identifying courses that may need an update or added support. USF has a template to evaluate on-line courses; the Dean feels the college should use the same template internally to strengthen the opportunity for success.</p>	

<p>Annual Faculty Evaluations Guidelines</p>	<p>Chair Heide requested each committee member to bring to this meeting a summary of their department guidelines for annual evaluation and promotion: Bill Haley & Daniel Meng represented School of Aging Studies. SAS has a written Governance document and a Faculty Activities & Evaluation guideline; reports are completed on-line. Faculty members are required to submit a CV. Faculty are evaluated by the evaluation committee, the Tenure & Promotion committee, and the Chair. The committee meets and reviews the materials submitted; open discussion follows and a rating is determined by majority vote. All discussions are confidential; the chair of the evaluation committee submits a written recommendation and summarizes the discussion that resulted in the rating. This information provides feedback to the reviewed faculty member. Faculty members are rated by three factors: Teaching: rating is based on in-class instruction by student evaluations, grade distribution, syllabi, course outline, directed research, internship supervision, and mentorship of students and development of new courses. Research: weight is given to quality of research through the degree of scrutiny by peers, prominence of publication, and amount of contribution by faculty member to work product. Service: activities in the university and community to include student advising, mentorship, membership in organizations that increase the visibility of SAS and USF. Year 2012-13 evaluation research rating results: of 11 faculty members total, 7 ranked Outstanding, average 12.1 publications. Lower rating would be 4-6 publications.</p> <p>Social Work represented by Marion Becker: Evaluation Committee elected each year at retreat and comprised of 6 tenured faculty. All materials loaded in FAIR for review by committee. Committee members elect a point person who reviews the materials submitted by one or more faculty members. The Point Person writes a report & a rating recommendation and brings it back to the full committee. Open discussion follows and a ranking is decided by majority vote. Point person writes the review and it is loaded into FAIR. Weight is given to the achievement of their faculty assignments, prominence of publication (although social work has fewer publication), and community service. Nine faculty members – 6 faculty comprise evaluation committee.</p> <p>Criminology represented by Chair Heide and Rachael Powers. An evaluation committee comprised of 3 tenured faculty complete</p>	
--	--	--

the evaluations. Faculty provide a list of all publications, research activities for the year; more weight is given to SSCI submissions. A rating of Outstanding requires two publications per year. Faculty are encouraged to write grants, but credit awarded for grant activity has not been firmly decided. No discrimination has been made based on the author order on publications. Many faculty publish in groups; however, sole authored publications are noted. At times faculty members have spent numerous hours on grant proposals that were not funded; they typically receive little credit for this time. 15 faculty and 4 Instructors.

Child & Family Studies represented by Ray Miltenberger and Jolene Ferro. CFS has a written Governance Document and Guidelines for Tenure & Promotion. The department is comprised of four division directors and an overall chair. Each director completes the evaluation for their faculty and staff and then the Chair reviews all the evaluations. The department has a small number of faculty, diverse disciplines and types of positions. Weight is given to the faculty duties and assignments and the percentage of time allotted for the activity; were they able to achieve what is expected? Areas of review are faculty teaching, research grant submissions, contracts and awards, prominence of publications, presentations, technical reports, and community activities.

Rehab represented by Ryan Henry. Areas of review and evaluation regarding research are publications, grant administration, training grants awards, and meeting the department mission statement.

MHLP represented by Celia Lescano provided the following information from the governance document: **Evaluation of Faculty**

Assignment. Assignment of faculty duties will be negotiated with individual faculty members through discussion with the Chair and/or their immediate supervisor.

Evaluation. Faculty within the Department of Mental Health Law and Policy will complete a self-evaluation and will receive a written annual evaluation from the Department Chair and/or their immediate supervisor. Untenured faculty and those in junior ranks will also receive annual feedback as part of the evaluation regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Annual

	<p>evaluations will include an appraisal of research (grant seeking and acquisition, publications, dissemination of findings), teaching (including training and technical assistance), service, and when appropriate, administration. Annual evaluations will take into account the percentage of assignment to each of the formal evaluation categories including research, teaching, service, and when appropriate, administration. USF awards also are considered in the evaluation process.</p> <p>Communication and Speech Disorders – no representative in attendance.</p> <p>Following the discussion of the evaluation process and evaluation of research, each department provided information with respect to rating of teaching. Several departments required submission of syllabi and other materials. Student teaching evaluations were used by all departments, but the weight given varied. A question was raised whether a department could require submission of syllabi and other materials under the existing union contract. Chair Heide to inquire further.</p> <p>Chair Heide Thanked everyone for sharing of the information. She requested another meeting of the FC to complete the discussion of evaluation process and to attend to remaining matters requested by the Dean’s Office. These include: Input requested for Research Associate/Technical Assistance RE: promotion; College plan to manage SCH; Strategic plan.</p> <p>Dean Serovich reiterated that it is important faculty have a rigorous, fair evaluation and feedback is provided to assist the faculty member to improve. Open dialogue is needed with the evaluator and specific information provided to help mentor junior faculty.</p>	
<p>Next meeting TBA</p>	<p>Fall Assembly scheduled for April 16, 2014 in the Atrium Lobby, 2PM – 3:30Pm</p> <p>Meeting is adjourned.</p>	<p>Carroll to send doodle poll</p>