

11-18-2013

FAPAAC minutes 11/18/2013

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee, "FAPAAC minutes 11/18/2013" (2013). *Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee*. 24.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa_affairs/24

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 November 18, 2013

Humanities 112

9 a.m.

The following topics were discussed: OIT focus group call for participants, follow up from October 28th topic on sabbatical supplements, discussion of faculty salary report, and other business.

Present: Vicki Graham, Roger Wareham, Tom Ladner, Dave Roberts, Peh Ng, Tom Johnson, Hannah Goemann, and Athena Kildegaard.

Absent: Sara Haugen, Kevin Stefanek

Reviewed and approved committee minutes of October 7, 2013 and October 28, 2013.

R Wareham welcomed new committee members Tom Johnson and Hannah Goemann.

OIT focus group call for participants: – R Wareham has been contacted by Jim Hall, Computing Services, about seeking opinions from Morris faculty, students, and staff for a focus group discussion about the services provided by the technology departments at the University of Minnesota. The purpose of the focus groups is to better understand how technology is serving the needs of the campus, and how they can improve service to us. This includes services from the technology groups at Morris and from the Office of Information Technology (OIT) at the Twin Cities. An outside research firm named “Stamats” was hired to moderate the focus groups. The discussion will revolve around IT services for the campus. Participants will receive a \$50.00 gift card for their participation. J Hall is contacting UMM governance committees and seeking volunteers. The focus groups will have separate meetings for faculty, students and staff. R Wareham asked for any volunteers and D Roberts, T Ladner, H Goemann and R Wareham will participate.

Follow up from 10/28 topic - sabbatical supplement:

R Wareham shared to the committee that we have talked about sabbatical supplements during many meetings and most of this semester. In previous years, UMM has requested and complained to the Twin Cities Provost office about language in the memo explaining the faculty sabbatical supplement program. We could ask them to change language or make other recommendations as to what we would like to see happen with the information we receive. The most important thing is to see more money given to our campus for faculty sabbatical supplements. A handout was shared from the Provosts office on the program that is sent to the Dean each year and what the allocation amount is. In the cover letter for 2013 – 2014 it states how much the UMM allocation is which is \$30,000. In 2012 -2013 it does not list an amount but references an attached spreadsheet which states the \$30,000 allocation.

P Ng’s request to the Provost office for more money for UMM’s allocation was successful and an additional \$10,000 was given to UMM for the 2013 – 2014 fiscal year. More discussion from committee asking how many faculty take a sabbatical and some reasons for not taking one is they can’t afford it and not sure of a guarantee for a replacement while being out. One suggestion is to propose a \$40,000 allocation to become the normal. R Wareham asked if there is value in exploring issues on the allocation amount. Should we do a survey to determine the will of our colleagues? A member asked how long has UMM been receiving the \$30,000 allocation and R Wareham said at least since 2000.

More discussion followed on how the allocated amount is distributed on our campus. Right now it’s figured out by how many are going on leave and then a percentage of salary is split among all taking the leave at UMM.

Some people feel the pot should be split equally rather than a straight 5 or 10 percent; others feel the percentage way is the way to go.

Is this an issue is worth exploring? How would we do it? We would have to talk about it on campus and give a recommendation to Dean after we have an informed opinion from our colleagues as to whether it should be awarded on a competitive basis, by percentage, or as a flat amount. The Dean would like something in writing. This is an issue that comes up every year so clearly there are different thoughts among people on how it should be handled. A subcommittee was approved to make recommendations on how to proceed; K Stefanek, D Roberts, A Kildegaard agreed to work on this.

Faculty Salary Report: D Roberts had suggested that on some of the graphs/tables the last summary lines be defined with a space separating information from the chart. Other discussion included asking if we should still include table 5 on the Morris -14 faculty salaries because a new group has been formed. Should this table go away or remain until the new group is approved? R Wareham asked what the committee thought of the overall report. We basically have used the same format over the last 3 years and just update it with the new salary information. It has gotten longer because of more charts. Could we go with a shorter summary and do we need all the graphs?

V Graham will review and send any recommendations and suggested changes to R Wareham. T Ladner agreed to help with revisions as well.

Motion to adjourn.

Submitted by Jenny Quam, Staff Support