Minutes

Present: Baker, Bannan-Ritland, Barcher, Bauer, Behrmann, Bon, Brazer, Brozo, Buehl, Castle, R. Chung, Cozart, Dabbagh, DeMulder. Dimitrov, Duck, Earley, Ford, Fowler, Fox, Galluzzo, Goor, Gorrell, Grant, Hall, Hardy, Hicks, Hjalmarsone, Isenberg, Jackman, Jerome, Kaffenberger, Kalbfeisch, Kayler, Kelly, Kidd, King-Sears, Kitsantas, L. Levy, Maxwell, McCreadie, Moyer-Packenham, Murphy, Nasser, Ndura, Osterling, Parker, Peters, Pierce, Razeghi, Reybold, Rioux-Bailey, Samaras, Scruggs, Self, Shahrokhi, Shaklee, Shockley, Sprague, Steeley, Sterling, Strawn, Sturtevant, Suh, Taboada, Talleyrand, Tate, Thomas, Upperman, Weller, Werner, Williams van Rooij, Wong

Approval of November Minutes

Mike Behrmann: Special Education has no programs in West Virginia; they are in Virginia and DC. Minutes approved with this one correction.

Announcements

Jeff Gorrell: Met with architects for the Thompson Hall project, floor plan is completed, ready to begin the renovation.

Joan Isenberg: An important alert is coming for all CEHD licensure programs. Please pay close attention to this e-mail, and do not delete it.

Fairfax Education Association – Leonard Bumbaca

Leonard Bumbaca is president of FEA, represents Fairfax County teachers, proud of partnership with GMU, having discussions on ways to reach out to GMU alumni, graduated from GSE, discussed handouts which were available on the tables – Professional Development Opportunities and Advocacy pamphlet. Contact information available on literature. Handed out some business cards.

Address: 3917 Old Lee Highway, Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: 703-352-7300
Fax: 703-359-2982
E-mail: LBumbaca@fairfaxea.org
Website: http://www.fairfaxea.org
Discussion of Faculty Teaching Load

There have been ongoing discussions about moving some tenure-line faculty to a 2-2 base teaching load instead of the current 2-3 teaching load. Three ideas were distributed via e-mail. These are tentative and call for faculty reaction to each of these or other proposed alternatives. Faculty groups spent 30 minutes discussing each of these key ideas, followed by sharing and further discussion across groups.

General faculty comments:

- Need to set different standards for university scholars and university researchers. Heavier teaching load for university scholars.

- Some adjustments are rewards and some are capacity builders. Some rewards are already in place.

- University scholar role needs to be redefined: only one faculty in university scholar at the moment.

- What problems are these ideas supposed to solve? Why are we presented with answers without knowing what the problem is? Need to look more carefully at what is happening in the college to determine the barriers.

- Response: We need to be able to continue the rise toward a stronger research university with more external funding. In addition, teaching load is an issue with recruiting and retaining faculty. Most research universities have a base 2-2 load.

- Capacity building is the main issue.

- Recruitment also relates to recruiting coordinators with insufficient benefits for this activity.

- In movement toward becoming a research university, we have an increasing expectation of productivity for scholarship and the need to quantify this.

Comments on Item #1 – (aimed at new tenure-track faculty):

- Understanding how this works in terms of the tenure schedule: if no tenure-track study leave, three years of 2-2, one year of 2-3, one year of 2-2 due to tenure release, and then back to 2-3.

- Would continue to have course releases due to grants.

- None of these ideas are designed to take the place of something else already in place. Current practice is all new faculty get 2-2 in first year. Item 1 extends this.
- Will new faculty get a 1-2 if everyone else has a 2-2? Answer: No, the 2-2 will be extended for three years.

- Expectations of scholarship and research productivity will increase for those on a 2-2.

- Will the number of university researchers go down? Will more people choose the university scholar role?

- Impact of this on the programs will be significant, as more adjuncts will be needed.

- Teaching excellence will not go down, but more faculty will be needed if we don’t want to use more adjuncts.

- How long will this transition take? What is the implementation plan? How will it impact students?

- Have we decided as a college that Research 1 universities should also have teaching excellence and if so, should we not represent that?

- Need to prioritize development of adjunct faculty, amount of work we are putting into working with our adjuncts.

- We cannot go to a 2-2 system for ALL tenure-line faculty AND keep the mentoring system. This is not possible budget wise. There are also concerns about internal equity.

- An initial 2-2 role for new faculty makes sense and will be a good first step in moving in this direction.

- Competition with recruitment from Research 1 universities, should offer 2-1 for initial year for tenure-track faculty.

- We have done a good job with recruitment to date.

Comments on Item #2:

- Mentoring points for working with adjuncts should be included.

- We need to deal with workload issues quickly.

- Need a transparent system, accurate and timely. Need a way to record this and collect it. Coordinators think that the proposed course credit is too low. Needs to be raised by size of program.
• Current policy has an inherent inequity, receive credit for serving on dissertation committees, but not pre-dissertation committees.

• More faculty need opportunities to work with doctoral students.

• Need a current list of all faculty and their areas of expertise/interests. Chairs could then recommend people who may not have easy access to doctoral students.

• Mark Goor created yellow pages for all faculty. Will send out to faculty again.

Comments on Item #3:

• Raises questions as to how many people will want to be at the university researcher level. More thought will need to be given to this.

• Jeff asked: Assuming we have the money, how many people think we should move in this direction? If expectations were the same and we stayed at a 2-3 vs. expectations were raised and we went to a 2-2, which would you choose?

• Need to talk more about buyouts for grants.

• The discussion will be on-going.