

## Faculty and Funding Minutes

October 1, 2008 and October 15, 2008

Members: Alice Reckley, Jie Chen, Burton Dunbar, Michael Kruger, Diane Filion

Staff: Charles Wurrey and John Adicks

1. Review initial working charge of the committee
  - ▶ Tie in conversations to budget model in regards to planning.
  - ▶ The planning is for 3-5 years out. Short and long-term implementation needs to be considered/focus. The aim is towards 2012 since the strategic planning began in 2007.
  - ▶ Comparator institutions need to be reviewed.

TASK: John Adicks will e-mail the compiled Comparator/Aspirational list taken from the lists submitted by the A&S chairs. He will also obtain the Non-Tenure Track policy.

2. Workload release and incentives should—in part—be tied to research and grantsmanship.
  - ▶ Working on funding opportunities needs to occur one year in advance to enhance likelihood of successful grant applications.
  - ▶ Team up successful grant recipients with faculty preparing new grants.
  - ▶ Reinstate a grants workshop within the College for new (and current) faculty.
  - ▶ A&S needs a resource within the College to assist in finding grant opportunities and then managing grants post-award.
  - ▶ Engagement of John Baumann's office also recommended.
  - ▶ Provide summer salary (or a portion thereof) for grant writing.

TASK: Charles Wurrey will inquire with ORS about the Extramural Proposal Incentive Program (EPIP), to see if that program still exists or could be resuscitated.

3. How can the College recognize/reward faculty service?
  - ▶ Foreign Languages department looks at department as a whole in recognizing service (balance of duties amongst faculty). Utilize skills of individual faculty in order to meet service needs of the department as a whole.
  - ▶ Re-examine service policy in the Guidelines for Faculty Engagement.
  - ▶ Programs for faculty and students should be rewarded if they are deemed important. The goal should be to develop and engage fully-functioning professionals in all aspects of University life.
  - ▶ Convert part-time faculty to full-time non-tenure track faculty.
  - ▶ Examine advising support, which can help with recruitment and retention (especially under the new budget model).
4. The extra compensation policy needs to be revisited.
5. Flexibility is important in regards to faculty service.
6. Distance Education: What is the University/College's stance on distance education, and how can it be incorporated into Strategic Goals?

- ▶ Provide a baseline for the future.
- ▶ Can release time be granted for online course development?
- ▶ How do online courses count towards workload?
- ▶ Technology and curriculum developed and implanted towards online courses should be discussed.
- ▶ Distance Education instructors should be compensated for their work in developing and implementing their respective courses.
- ▶ Based on online courses in Art/Art History, on-campus enrollment not affected by online course offerings.

Homework for committee members: Research workload policies in comparator institutions of members' respective fields. How do they compare to UMKC's Faculty Engagement Policy? Share this information with other committee members via e-mail and at next meeting.

October 15, 2008 Updates.

- ▶ Some institutions reward probationary faculty with as much as \$5K in research funds per grant submission. Some departments in the College also provide some monetary incentives for grant submissions for all faculty analogous to this (although not so richly), but a College-wide incentive program ought to be considered for implementation.
- ▶ The F&F Committee will be looking at departmental faculty evaluation criteria that were submitted within the past year or so, and which were track-specific.
- ▶ Teaching opportunities need to be added to the research and service areas that are mentioned above in consideration of incentives and rewards. These can include, but are not limited to: service learning courses, internships and practica, and independent study courses. Development of new courses needs to be added to the workload policy as something that requires a course release.
- ▶ The workload policy needs to be made as flexible as possible, while also incorporating, or building into the policy, ways to account for extraordinary efforts (such as an exceptionally heavy advising load, very large enrollment classes, etc.) to minimize the need for waivers from the Dean or negotiations for reduced teaching loads. Weighting factors need to be re-considered.
- ▶ One issue that will need to be addressed includes the fact that while the workload policy is based on the academic year, annual faculty evaluations are based on the calendar year. Complicating this are the departmental reports of faculty productivity, which are also academic year-based.
- ▶ While not specifically a charge for this committee, space needs will become increasingly more problematic—for more teaching classrooms, labs and studios, offices and research space. Space does impact workload and vice versa.