Pathways to Success Study Team

February 10, 2012 Meeting Minutes

9 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.; CIT Dean’s Conference Room


Discussion
Team members brainstormed items that they would like considered in conducting their charge, including the following:

• exploring temporary; lecturer; part-time; librarian, clinical, and 12-month faculty workloads *(note, a comprehensive roster of all titles currently in use at Georgia Southern that carry faculty rank has been requested)*;
• considering contact hours in addition to credit hours when reviewing workloads;
• examining different types of faculty activities, including, but not limited to, dissertation committees, clinical practice, and educational supervision;
• discussing how to develop a culture that values different tracks emphasizing service, teaching, or research and creative activity;
• implementing a differential workload model where increasing emphasis in an area needs to be ‘earned’ (e.g., faculty member who is recognized for teaching would be rewarded by moving to a 4/4 teaching load with a reduced service and research expectation);
• addressing non-resident faculty tracks; and
• exploring tracks for resident faculty who teach primarily online.

The brainstorming session generated several other focal points. It was noted that the model ultimately put forward needs to preserve the flexibility and variability of workloads in different departments and colleges—especially since departments will be the ones to define exactly what constitutes teaching, scholarship and service for each track in their discipline. Along the same lines, the expectation will be that colleges and departments align their promotion and tenure guidelines to conform with the recommended models.

In the discussion, there appeared to be some disagreement over the extent of the Study Team’s charge. For instance, is the charge to build in flexibility by creating different percentages of effort required in teaching, research and creative activity, and service OR is there the possibility of developing tracks that do not require one or more of the traditional three legs of the stool? (For reference, the Board of Regents promotion and tenure criteria are reproduced below.)

For Reference
Board of Regents Promotion Criteria
The minimum promotion criteria for all institutions in all professorial ranks in the University System of Georgia are as follows (*§ 8.3.6.1 Board of Regents Policy Manual*):

1. Superior teaching
2. Outstanding professional service to the institution, and/or the community
3. Outstanding research, scholarship, creative activity or academic achievement
4. Professional growth and development

Note:-worthy achievement in all four of the above need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two.
Board of Regents Tenure Criteria
“Each USG institution, with the exception of Georgia Gwinnett College…, shall establish clearly stated tenure criteria and procedures that emphasize excellence in teaching for all teaching faculty (§ 8.3.7.1 Board of Regents Policy Manual).”

The minimum tenure criteria are (§ 8.3.7.3 Board of Regents Policy Manual):
1. Superior teaching; Demonstrating excellence in instruction
2. Academic achievement, as appropriate to the mission
3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community
4. Professional growth and development

Noteworthy achievement in all four of the above need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two.

It was also noted that the department’s mission, college’s needs, and University’s mission will drive the implementation of the faculty differential workload model. For example, the selection of faculty tracks must be a discussion and agreement reached between the faculty member and department chair to ensure that the needs of the institution and students continue to be met.

Several colleges are currently working on revising promotion and tenure policies. The Team requested that draft policies be shared with them. It was further recommended that colleges hold off on finalizing their policies until the Pathways Team’s work is complete.

There appeared to be some disagreement on the second part of the Team’s charge—recommending a university level promotion and tenure review committee. It was noted that the Provost’s intention was to build in faculty review at the university level—enhance faculty governance.

Finally, it was suggested that the Team solicit broader input from the university community (perhaps via forums) for its work and not operate in a vacuum. Additionally, it was suggested that when dealing with colleagues about the Team’s charge that the work be cast as an opportunity to avoid becoming a gripe session.

Action Items
A request was made that a non-tenure track faculty member be added to the committee. Mark will ask the Provost.

Meeting adjourned 10:30 a.m.

Next Meeting: Friday, February 17th, 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., CIT 3150