

December 6, 2019 Minutes

Attendees: Catia Cividini-Motta, Svetlana (Lana) Yampolskaya, Matthew (Matt) Foster, Debra Mowery, Maura De Jesus, Ruby Joseph, Marilyn Stern, Andrew Samaha, Elizabeth (Liz) Ingram

Absent: Telisha McKenzie, Tracy-Ann Gilbert-Smith, Taja Sumpter, Christina Dillahunt-Aspillaga

Approval of November 8th, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Ruby made the motion to approve the minutes and Andrew seconded the motion. Minute meetings were approved with no corrections.

Discussion on Promotion Guidelines

- Historical background and context were provided for Mario's request that the governance council members review the CFS and CBCS research faculty promotions guidelines. It was mentioned that an outside reviewer had commented on the high standard of leadership that CFS research faculty going up for promotions were expected to meet. CBCS does not use the term "leadership" and wondered if a conversation to consider other language that would be consistent with the CBCS promotion criteria was needed.
- Faculty who had reviewed both documents (CFS and CBCS promotion guidelines) discussed their opinions on the two guidelines:
 - CBCS guidelines have more information than the CFS document. There was some general agreement that the CBCS guideline goes into much more detail and makes accommodations for those who do not fit the strict guidelines. There was consensus that CBCS guidelines were a little more flexibility than the CFS guidelines. Historically, most requirements had been more geared towards tenure-track faculty, but research faculty were still being held to those same standards – the CFS guidelines do not appear to have caught up with that and there still needs to be some more flexibility.
- The question was raised as to whether both (CFS and CBCS) guidelines) were necessary. It was noted that two separate guidelines can be confusing. A faculty member noted that the CFS document does not add any additional information to what is outlined in the CBCS document and most council members agreed with this observation. However, a few other members suggested that the CFS guidelines should be kept because CFS is very different from other departments in the College.
- To help improve the clarity of the CFS promotion guidelines, it was suggested that the guidelines should include clear and specific definitions and terms. For example, it was reported that the CFS guidelines mention leadership, but it is unclear what leadership actually means. It was agreed that the CBCS guideline is much more specific, and clearly specifies faculty assignments. It was suggested that the governance council could define or add more to the CFS guideline. In general members agreed that the CBCS guidelines were clearer and more specific than the CFS guidelines.
- Others stated that the CFS guidelines be kept because those guidelines are more responsive to CFS employees. If we use the CBCS guidelines, then we will know that we will be in compliance and it will make everything very clear.
- There was mentioned of a difference in wording. The CFS guidelines mentions three main evaluation areas Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. CBCS guidelines do not use the term "Scholarship" in their document. Instead it uses the term "Research and Scholarly Work." It was suggested that the CFS guidelines should use the same terminology for the main evaluation areas as CBCS or add a slash after scholarship and add the CBCS terminology, "Research and Scholarly Work."

- The committee was reminded to discuss only non-tenure research promotions not tenure faculty promotions. It was noted that that there is a problem because although non-tenure faculty do publish, they do not publish as much as tenure faculty. In the CBCS guidelines, faculty are recognized for their publications.
- It was suggested that would it be worth asking others in the Research Professor line as they might want to be involved in making the decision. A questionnaire should be made for them to respond to before recommendations are made to the leadership group. It was suggested to have an email/meeting and to give those in the specific faculty positions information to get their opinion. Everyone seemed to be in favor of this idea. In addition, the key faculty who had raised the issue regarding promotions as well as supervisors of those faculty in the designated faculty lines should also be included in any meetings.
- The Council revisited the idea of asking those in the research line for their opinion and discussed how this input should be obtained and the following were among suggestions discussed: email, have a meeting, or send out an email and an invitation to attend the next Governance meeting.

Discussion of Mentoring Survey Results

- Council was given a chance to review the report. Mentoring survey response rate was at 40%.
- Ruby and the team of faculty and staff involved in the development, analysis and writing of the Mentoring survey report were recognized for their work and the level of detail in their analysis.
- Mentorship program has been a subject in the Department for a long time which is why, the survey was given to CFS faculty and staff. Based on the results from the survey, it was suggested that the council submit a proposal to leadership of what the mentoring program might look like. Information from the leadership meeting, suggests that providing mentorship might pose an issue as far as job description, supervisor approvals are concerned; and that there will need to be clear guidelines and proper gatekeeping on who gets to be assigned as mentors (i.e. to ensure that they are meeting expectations).
- Council members discussed possible selection process for identifying mentors and mentees and the need for mentoring training.
 - Responses included possible need for mentorship training
- The group was asked whether based on the survey results there was a need for a mentoring program in CFS and there was general agreement that there is a need.
 - One council member expressed that there is a need for mentoring especially at the staff/administration level. With no current mentorship program for staff /administration when people retire the information goes away with them. She reported that she tries to soak up all the information possible before people leave the University. Some council members agreed this assessment.
- A faculty member reminded council members that a mentorship program also already exists at a college level. This program supports Faculty however, not many CFS faculty are taking advantage of it. It was evident that some council members were unaware of this program's existence.
- It was suggested that the CBCS should also have a staff/admin mentorship program and that they (CBCS) should also supervise and manage that program.

- Council members were reminded that resources can be found on the CFS website (resource pages).
- It was suggested that starting with a pilot would be helpful to see if a mentorship program works. There was a motion that we start a pilot mentoring program. It was seconded, and council agreed to this motion.
- It was suggested that supervisors should be mentoring their employees. Also suggested that maybe CFS should require supervisors to have the responsibility of matching their staff to their mentors.
- A suggestion was made to update the research expert sheet that had been developed in the past and to other areas of expertise to be used as another resource for faculty, staff and administration.
- In addition, council members were reminded that USF also has lots of resources (including Online Training/LinkedIn Learning on MyUSF pages) for USF students and employees and that there are lots of outside variables in which a mentorship program would be more beneficial (specific units).
- Council members filled out a mentoring proposal survey so the results will be tallied to see what the pilot program might look like.

Plan for Spring elections

- Call for nomination via email in January from Maura.

Schedule next meeting

Schedule via email. Maura will send out a Doodle poll to schedule next meeting possibly for late February.

Meeting was adjourned.