

Academic Assembly Meeting No. 3

Monday, October 10, 2022

2:05– 3:35 p.m.

ADAL Stuart T. Rolfe Community Room, Shane P. McInnis (officio, Provost), Margit McGuire (officio, Associate Provost), Katie Oliveras, Kyle Peet, Russell Powell, Gabby Robinson, Bryan Ruppert, Patrick Schoettmer, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, Thompson, Phillip Thompson, Rev Michael Reid Trice and Glenn Yasuda

Guests: Colette M. Taylor, Arnie Derr and Katherine Raichle

I. Opening Remarks, Frank J. Shih

2:09

a. Meeting was called to order at 2:00. strategies at the school/college level to the university level. We can

this information is not available at this time, Provost Martin can bring this data to a future meeting. Lastly, Provost Martin will bring back written reports to AcA so they can be shared.

### III. Systemizing Faculty Workload

2:50 – 3:37 p.m.

Shane P. Martin, Jodi O'Brien and Collette Taylor

The recent revisions to the Faculty Handbook did not address faculty workload or what the University expects from faculty regarding student support, teaching research and creative works. There are concerns about the lack of equity across campus about the variety of expertise that is demonstrated differently in individual workloads. This conversation relates to merit reviews and how to equitably reward faculty.

We are currently working on revising the Annual Performance Review (APR) process by reconsidering the definition of service and expectations for curriculum, teaching, preparedness and outcomes for students. In general, faculty evaluations need to be more comprehensive on how faculty are contributing to the University and how they can be rewarded. As a part of Reigniting Our Strategic Directions, the APR Working Group is undertaking recreating an APR process that is comprehensive, equitable, interdisciplinary and uniform across campus, programs, curriculums, titles and so forth. This process needs to be flexible to meet the needs for the variety of faculty with different expertise that helps build our institution as a whole. Challenges include reforming student evaluations, faculty not getting elected to institutional service positions and varying sizes of classes and lecture. This group is currently working on getting baseline of minimum expectations while remaining fair and encouraging faculty to contribute. Once a new APR process is launched, we will be able to better understand what works and what does not work. Then we can fine tune it. School of Law AcA representatives were concerned about how their school fits into this prospective process. Their APR process requires a strenuous writeup with no impact. Assembly members would like to see better communications from the Deans on how new faculty fit into faculty performance as a collective.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.