

Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting

**Wednesday, February 24th, 2016, 12-1 p.m.
Faculty Room, 207 Low Library**

A. The meeting began with updates from EVP David Madigan:

1. A new University-wide capital campaign was soon to be announced; intellectual themes would be basic to it. More on this campaign would be disseminated in due course.
2. The constituency of the Uris space-planning committee was announced; its first meeting as to take place soon after the spring break.
3. Sakai, the system on which CourseWorks currently runs, was due to give way to a new system.
4. Concern was expressed about campus climate issues from diversity to inclusion; EVP Madigan urged that A&S faculty engage actively as leaders in discussion of these issues.

B. Discussion steered by Professor David Schiminovich, chair of the Policy and Planning Committee.

PPC was addressing the following issues this semester:

- Review of Tenure and Promotion procedures;
- Review of the governance practices/policies in centers and institutes;
- A&S strategic planning initiatives;
- The need to compile an MIT-style faculty survey on the status of women at Columbia.

The following issues were discussed at the meeting:

1. *Compensation for departmental chairs, directors of graduate studies and directors of undergraduate studies*
 - Compensation differed widely across departments, which were divided into the bands of small, medium, and large. Course relief for chairs: practices varied

- widely across departments. Other compensation: chairs of small departments received a stipend of \$5,000, 4 points of leave credit; chairs of medium-sized departments received a stipend of \$6,000, 8 points of leave credit; chairs of large departments received a stipend of \$7,000, 12 points of leave credit.
- How to create an equitable measurement of workload for the various officers (Chair, DUS, DGS) across departments? Rose Razaghian (Executive Director Planning and Analysis) gave a presentation of the ratio of students (first undergraduate, then graduate) to FTE faculty. This presentation offered approximations only, with certain matters needing further attention in light of faculty queries. So, e.g., were Masters Only students included (Professor Sharyn O'Halloran)? Since many departments housed cross-departmental faculty, was the FTE count potentially an inaccurate metric (Professor Sarah Cole)? Since various language departments served the needs of other departments, was that faculty work not necessarily reflected in the FTE metric as deployed for this Faculty meeting (Professor Joseph Howley)? Many students might require advising in a given department even though they do not appear on that department's official roster (Professor David Helfand).
 - Further concerns: (i) First-time directors of graduate and undergraduate incurred especially taxing workloads that arguably merited special compensation (Professor Howley). (ii) Information about compensation practices at peer institutions (Professor Jean Howard)? It had yet to be gathered. (iii) The burdens of the Chair, etc., could not be measured just be a metric of student/faculty ratios (Professor Haruo Shirane).

2. *Arts and Sciences Space Policy*

A policy document had been written in 1998. Key features of it were: (i) no department or person had an automatic claim to particular space; (ii) full-time faculty had a right to office space, and non-full-time researchers were entitled to temporary space; (iii) on the Morningside campus, no more than one office could be held by an individual.

- Reactions to this policy? (i) Departments with sequestered spaces should not lose them; there should be some departmental protection against the apparent policy that no department had an automatic claim to space (Professor Pamela Smith); (ii) for pre-tenure faculty, the sharing of offices was an acute problem (Professor Howley); so too for language lecturers (Professor Madeleine Zelin).
- There was strong support for the policy-item stating that individuals could only occupy a single office. The scale of this particular problem was unclear; nor was it

clear how the policy would actually be enforced, and a clear structure for implementation was also needed.

3. Timely Replacement Policy

Faculty lines did not exist as such; the distribution of lines was determined by the IBS process, but the lines themselves did not have a natural or guaranteed 'home'.

Professor Schiminovich presented a proposed amendment to the TRP which had been framed by the Provost. Essential to it were the considerations (a) that faculty lines supported with new finding initiatives (e.g., diversity hires) were *not* incremental positions; and (b) that only positions that were solidly funded by new endowment support were incremental and would qualify for the TRP.

- Reactions: when did the TRP start (Professor Cole)? July 1st 2015. If an endowed chair came to a department, would that chair be incremental (Professor Zelin)? Yes, the person would be replaced, but in line with IBS policy. Were enrollments rising (perhaps via SPS?), with pressure therefore rising to increase faculty size (Professor Page Fortna)?
- EVP Madigan: clarification about the relation of the TRP policy to the IBS process. The TRP defined the number of appointments to be made, the IBS process determined where the lines went.

4. Two further issues briefly announced:

- Adjunct numbers and compensation: the Executive Committee planned to address the salary issue.
- MAO pass-through: the plan was to phase out targets for MAO programs so as to give relief to those programs that did not meet targets while retaining the incentive-based approach to MAO programming. PPC had discussed this issue, and was near agreement on acceptance of the new pass-through proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.56.

Respectfully submitted by Gareth Williams for the PPC.