

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Campus Governance

10-28-2013

FAPAAC minutes 10/28/2013

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa_affairs

Recommended Citation

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee, "FAPAAC minutes 10/28/2013" (2013). *Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee*. 25.

https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa_affairs/25

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Monday October 28, 2013

Humanities 112

9 a.m.

The following topics were discussed: engagement survey, prior meeting discussion of conversation with Dean Finzel, and faculty salary report, and other issues.

Present: Sara Haugen, Kevin Stefanek, Vicki Graham, Roger Wareham, Tom Ladner, Dave Roberts, Peh Ng

Absent: Laddie Arnold, Athena Kildegaard

Review/approve committee minutes of October 7, 2013 were tabled until next meeting.

Committee member update: R Wareham reported that Tom Johnson will be replacing Cyrus Bina for the Social Science faculty representative. The appointment will be affirmed (presumably) at campus assemble on Tuesday. Also, student Laddie Arnold is joining the scholastic committee (also on the campus assembly docket), so we will be getting a new student representative to the committee as well. We have not learned from MCSA who the student replacement will be. (note: student Amanda Goemann has now been named to the committee)

Engagement survey: R Wareham asked the committee if anyone has concerns on the new engagement survey which replaces last year's Pulse Survey. There were some questions from the campus community on confidentiality of survey responses and will the information be shared to campus? The engagement survey closes on November 1, 2013. R Wareham asked S Mattson about the confidentiality of survey and she noted that the survey is confidential and is being administered by the Hay Group, an external vendor. Hay Group will be the sole recipient of surveys completed online and it maintains a confidentiality policy that prohibits any person at the University from viewing the survey responses of individual employees. All identifying information, such as employee names, will be removed and responses will be grouped by department. If there are fewer than 10 responses for a department, the results will be grouped with results from the next level above in the campus, college or unit hierarchy. R Wareham shared that last year we received numerous emails to complete the Pulse Survey and the committee's contention was that if we were widely recruited to fill it out then U of M should at least let us know when the results would be available. While the results were released they were not widely acknowledged or publicly announced. In discussions with the committee, Chancellor Johnson did send out in May an email stating the pulse survey results had been released. R Wareham will ask S Mattson if the campus is going to have access to results of data from engagement survey. According to Sarah Mattson: "UMM has been told, and the FAQ says, that high-level results will be shared with leaders and the public in early 2014. After receiving them,

leaders are expected to share the results with their teams or departments as they begin to create action plans.”

Discussion of meeting with Dean Finzel: D Roberts did a search on Google and found memos about the sabbatical supplement program. The memos are from prior years with the older versions mentioning a \$1,000,000 total pool for sabbatical supplements. The most recent memo did not talk about the total pool but about minor changes to the program instead. All memos allude to an attached spreadsheet which does not seem to be available online. We could ask the Dean if he receives a similar email and does he receive an attached spreadsheet? D Roberts will send email link to committee and R Wareham will ask Dean if he has received any emails on this? Other discussion included ways to enhance the sabbatical supplement amount, some campuses use external funding to supplement and what is the most strategic way to receive support for the sabbatical program? Dean Finzel has encouraged us to invite other administrators to a committee meeting. Maybe discussing topics that were brought up at the open forums on workload? For background checks, UMM HR bears the cost not central U of M HR. J Quam asked to have S Mattson respond to who receives background check result and who responds to a denied check if a felony conviction is revealed? She will send email to R Wareham on clarification.

Other: P Ng who is serving on a subcommittee looking at the sabbatical and development leave policies, shared that the Provost wanted them to look at the current leave structure and compare to other big 10 schools. The subcommittee is looking at different models and the Provost wants the faculty development process to be made clearer. The subcommittee will be talking to deans and the finance and will try to make this process easier. All results could have an impact on our campus. A UMM faculty member is currently entitled to a sabbatical every 7 years and faculty are eligible for a single semester leave after two academic years of service (probationary faculty) or after four academic years of service (tenured faculty). Some members felt it should be the Dean who leads this process on our campus and helps make the program successful, and manageable so all probationary tenured line faculty get a chance for leave in their first five years.

Next meeting: - R Wareham reminds committee that he shared a draft electronically of the faculty salary report and we have talked about minor corrections regarding charts and content. Please review report and we will discuss at our next meeting which is three weeks from today, November 18, 2013. He'd like to have it ready for distributing by the beginning of December.

Motion to adjourn and approved.

jq

Submitted by Jenny Quam, staff support