UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE
Strategic Plan: Faculty/Staff Development Working Group Minutes
Dec. 16, 2010

Present: Mark Logel and Barbara Hahn (Co-Chairs), Hanns Pieper, Keith Gehlhausen, Mark Davis, John C. Schroeder, Greg Rike, Michael Tessier, Terri Ames, Keith Fox, Chris McKeag, Mark Kopta

Absent: Tiffany Griffith, Barbara Pieroni

Mark L. provided an introduction and report on the Dec. 14 Steering Committee meeting. He described our next steps as

- Today – set priorities; develop information to build cases for our goals; final version envisioned as a short document that may include supplemental information containing more detail. We are expecting to receive more information from Dr. Kazee to help us in the process and will share that with the entire group when received.
- Jan. 6 meeting – will be completing final draft (goes to Amy B. on Jan. 7). Mark and Barbara will defend our report to the Steering Committee on Jan 12 or 14.

We have been reminded several times by the President and several trustees that in order for our initiatives to be seriously considered, we need to be able to tie the goals to our students, increased enrollment, and the University mission. Providing suggestions for funding sources will strengthen our proposal.

Discussion ensued regarding what metrics are needed to justify our goals. To attract top notch faculty we need to consider teaching load, research funding and time, the quality of students we want to attract and the cost of achieving this. It was suggested that we study the efficiency of teaching regarding the number of courses taught in each department. Are there some courses that could or should be eliminated? By reducing teaching loads in this way, faculty would have time to bring in more grant money for research and projects. Need to define what we mean by ‘good faculty’.

It was stressed that we clearly relate any justification for our suggested changes to the University mission. How we state our case is important. What do we see as the return on investment of money into our proposals?

There was discussion about where we might be able to save money. Need to stop processes that are not productive or that are counterproductive (repetitious reports, for example). Could we have a central data base to make report writing more efficient? An efficiency consultant was suggested. Could we have a process review for faculty committees to seek if there is ‘value added’ by that committee? Should we suggest that every faculty member participate on two (and only two) committees?

To improve faculty satisfaction could we develop a system that will allow faculty to work to their strengths and interests? Some might choose to spend more time teaching, some in research. How can we better utilize or make time available so our efficiency is increased? We recognize the importance of
undergraduate research, but all present who have been involved in this noted how extremely time consuming it is.

It was suggested that our issue appears to be twofold: a competitive compensation package should attract the right people; that and a ‘time package’ should support their work here.

We discussed known numbers of faculty members who had been lost to UE, by either refusing an offer of employment or by leaving after being here for a time. How can we separate these in consideration of improving UE’s academic reputation as well as the quality and number of students?

Discussion continued about the comparison of faculty salaries to those at other institutions. It was determined that the group to which we compare UE is less important than our relative standing. Most important is the fact that we are currently behind whatever group to which we might compare ourselves.

A small group of this committee will meet on Tuesday, Dec. 21 to develop a draft of the document to be shared with the entire working group for review prior to our next meeting on Jan. 6 at 8:30am in SOBA 172.