In our December and January College Senator Meetings, the College Senators discussed five major areas of importance and interest:

I. Continued Commitment to the Processes and Content of the Faculty Handbook

The Faculty Handbook continues to be a top priority area for College Senators and is an opportunity for collaboration between faculty and administration to build trust and carry out shared governance. While the ad-hoc Faculty Senate committee is focusing on process, the College Senators are starting to think about content. College Senators are reviewing past work of the College Senators to take a more policy-focused approach and to work with the entire Faculty Senate to codify important processes and practices in the Faculty Handbook.

II. Dean’s Office Staffing Concerns

College Senators noted the upcoming changes of Associate Dean Anne Hardcastle moving to the Provost’s Office. While this can be a positive, in the sense that College-level perspectives and advocacy is moving to the Provost’s Office, College Senators also noted challenges with inadequate staffing and qualified expertise being present in ODOC.

The College Senators have advocated to the Interim Dean and advocate in general for the following best practices:

(a) Recruit more College Chairs as Associate Deans within ODOC. Considering that ODOC is the office to support current Chairs and Program Directors, College Senators advocate for more Associate Deans that have experience being Chair.

(b) Ensure that ODOC has staffing representation from across all Divisions in the College to bring disciplinary-diverse perspectives to ODOC conversations. Certainly, other areas of diversity should be sought out as well - gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, etc.

(c) Aim to codify a process where ODOC Associate Dean positions are open to all qualified internal candidates being able to apply rather than just being appointed positions. This is an opportunity for the university to adapt equitable hiring best practices that will enable access to more diverse candidates.
III. Transparency with Additional Details Pertinent to Compensation and Fringe Benefits

College Senators are advocating for more transparency around compensation and fringe benefits and would like the Interim Dean to advocate for this as well. In regards to compensation, informal faculty peer benchmarking is revealing major gaps that are not being presented to the faculty and are not fully captured in the way information is presented to the faculty. It appears that a finer grained compensation analysis needs to be done and College Senators are advocating for this.

Similarly, College Senators noted more transparency with Fringe Benefits. What is working well? What is not working well? College Senators advocate for HR to implement a systematic evaluation process to identify areas of strength and concern. College Senators noted challenges with finding a new PCP (primary care physician) and other physicians. How do we compare to our peer institutions in regards to benefits? College Senators advocate for transparency, more benchmarking, and more frequent evaluation of fringe benefits.

IV. Concern Over the Number of Visiting Positions in the College and Inadequate Long-term Planning in regards to Faculty Lines

College Senators noted concern over the number of visiting positions in the College and the challenges associated with long-term planning and contract lengths (e.g. one year contracts). College Senators advocate for permanent lines automatically (when enrollment needs exist) OR allowing longer term visiting faculty contracts (including contract lengths beyond one year and contracts extending beyond four years). College Senators have asked the Interim Dean of the College for department by department comparisons of faculty lines and numbers.

V. More Support for Teaching Professionals who are Productive with Scholarship

College Senators advocate for rewarding Teaching Professionals (TPs) who are scholarship productive and help us embody the Teacher Scholar model. College Senators advocate for a more flexible workload to enable scholarship-intensive TPs to move to a 60-20-20 or 70-15-15 workload distribution (teaching-scholarship-service). Some departments seem to offer such flexibility and others are not. How can we be equitable?