

Minutes of Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
September 21, 2004
3:30 p.m.

Members in attendance: Roger Adams, Subi Bhadriraju, Kathy Brockway, Shing Chang, Mary DeLuccie, Mike Dryden, Jim DuBois, Kathy Greene, Kevin Gwinner, Jerry Reeck, Frank Spikes.

Guest: Provost Duane Nellis

City-University Shared tax revenues:

The meeting opened with short discussion of City-University shared tax revenues. Questions about how the monies are used and the extent of University input were discussed. Members indicated that there should be a University committee that works with this issue.

University Distinguished Professor Selection Process:

Provost Nellis was introduced and initiated a discussion about the selection process of University Distinguished Professors (UDP). Some faculty at KSU believes the process has not been open enough and that awardees are skewed in the hard sciences. Provost Nellis has met with a subgroup of UDP's and with Deans Council about the issue. His meeting with Faculty Affairs was to gather additional feedback from a faculty group about the UDP issue.

Provost Nellis reported that UDP's feel that they have worked hard to create a fair process. They have invited deans to attend their meetings and provide input. Deans overall believe it would be beneficial to have some external input into the process. It is also believed that perhaps an allocation of new UDP's across the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences might work. Or perhaps the University has too few UDP's and there is a need to expand that number dramatically. Furthermore, some deans question the need for a salary enhancement being part of the award; some believe the distinction is enough.

Broad discussion followed on issues such as "What is the purpose of UDP?" "What does the designation mean?" And, "What concerns do our faculty express about the UDP process?" There was consensus among Faculty Affairs members that there is need to correct a system that is seen as flawed. The UDP process must be made more transparent. One basic concern is the lack of published evaluation criteria. What are applicants for UDP being evaluated on? What are the criteria of evaluation? What are the nomination criteria? How is one nominee judged against others? What written guidelines are in place to guide the process?

In addition to the lack of clear criteria and need for a more open process, other concerns were shared. These include a failure to address diversity of work assignments. Some FA members believe that heavy research appointments may make

one more competitive for the UDP award than others. And, there is lack of respect for service and outreach efforts that the university benefits from. Some FA members expressed the need to consider the scholarship of teaching and the creative and technology pieces of scholarship when designating UDP. Even if they don't fit the traditional activities, the UDP should be sensitive to different pathways to distinction. Recommendations shared included the option of a one-year moratorium on awarding UDP's until the process is redesigned. During this one year moratorium the university could analyze how it recognizes outstanding faculty. A transparent and open system could be developed so that the wider University community has faith in the process. Redesign ideas could be obtained from professional organizations and other Universities and through an open forum so that all interested faculty could express their thoughts on the UDP issue.

Next meeting: October 5, 2004, Union 205, 3:30 PM

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Mary DeLuccie