**Committee on Faculty Affairs Minutes  
Oct. 1, 2014**

**Present:** E. Borland, S. Carroll, S. Drozd, J. Gevertz, W. Keep, R. Morin, J. Neves, G. Pogue, D. Shaw, V. Tucci (chair), P. Wiita, T. Youngblood, I. Zake

**Excused**: O. Hernandez

**Minutes:** The minutes of the Sept. 24, 2014, meeting were approved as submitted.

**Ongoing business: Follow-up to 9/24 CFA visit by Provost Jackie Taylor to discuss charges on tenure and promotion alignment**

Just before CFA’s Oct. 1 meeting, Jackie emailed Val to say that Bobby had serious reservations about a combined tenure and promotion process that removed a large number of promotions to associate from college-level review. Jackie said she agreed with Bobby even though she had liked the simplicity of CFA’s proposals. She wanted CFA to know this before we moved to open fora.

**Visit by Benny Chan and Curt Elderkin to discuss CFA open forum comments on MUSE**

Benny described the issues that were raised at the recent open forum. The comments ran the gamut, from faculty who wanted the deadline extended to others who said the process took too long. One suggestion was that faculty should have a longer time to choose students for MUSE, but Benny said this might not allow the organizers to ensure diversity. There also were comments on the stipends, and whether MUSE should mean more bonus points for pre-tenured faculty. Curt noted that one of the original goals of MUSE was to give junior faculty a boost in scholarship. He and Benny agreed that in reviewing applications, they want to see concise mentoring plans and learning objectives tied to those plans. They will make that more clear in the next version of the RFP.

Bill said that for the School of Business, there is a fit issue when it comes to MUSE, in that few of his faculty participate even though the program is supposed to campus-wide. Curt agreed and noted that MUSE was started by the School of Science, so appropriateness for other schools may be an issue. Benny and Bill agreed that, in their MUSE proposals, faculty need to better explain how they will mentor from a distance if they want their plans to receive high scores. Benny said he will collect data on mentoring plans that will give more guidance to faculty on this topic. But Bill reiterated that large segments of faculty do not feel connected to MUSE and do not participate, so this needs to be addressed.

Curt said the proposals are beginning to come from more diverse areas, and Regina asked for data on this year’s proposals. The numbers are as follows: 41% from Science, 24% from Engineering, 15% from HSS, 9% from Arts & Communication, 8% from Education, 1% from Business. Benny said that this year, for the first time, he was able to fund all of the proposals. In previous years, funded projects ranged from approximately 60% to 90% of the total proposals.

Liz asked what percent of the faculty were participating and from which schools, because this might be a better measure. She noted that most of the proposals are based on faculty research, and asked if there could also be a model for research that is proposed by students. Benny said the difficulty was that it was hard for a student-written proposal to compete with one written by a professor, but it has been done in Art.

Jana said that Carnegie Mellon and other institutions have programs similar to MUSE and suggested that we look into those to see if they have identified ways to broaden the appeal. Benny said that at those schools, students generally work with graduate assistants. He also said he was working to increase the stipends for faculty and students; the issue did not come up this year but has in previous years.

**Ongoing Business – Review of disciplinary standards for fall hires and for other departments that revised their standards**

The three sets of revised standards for the English Dept. were approved. In each case, the only changes involved the combination of the tenure and associate processes.

**Outstanding charges from Steering and subcommittee members:**

Review of MUSE RFP – Paul, Jana, and Stuart. They will look at the RFP and make recommendations. Regina said the process needs to be more accessible so more faculty will apply.

Faculty Reassigned Time – Regina and Liz. CFA’s recommendations must go to the Council of Deans. The deans have not yet discussed this issue.

Clarify Service Section in Promotions and Reappointment Document – Regina and Liz

Modifying Peer Review of Teaching in Promotions and Reappointment Document

Structure and Function of College Promotions Committee moving forward – Bill, Paul, Regina  
Since CFA recommended joining the process for tenure and promotion to associate professor into a single process now CFA needs to make recommendations on two closely allied issues:

1. Should the College Promotions Committee become a College Tenure and Promotion Committee? Focus Group scheduled Oct. 29 and notice sent to faculty listserv.
2. What should be the timeline for the joint tenure/promotion process?

Chair report on comments from AFT on faculty listserv e-mail and review of Possible Options Document – attached

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Shaw