Minutes of the Faculty Life Committee (FLC)
September 15, 2011

Present: Timothy Howe (Chair), Sylvia G. Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Robert Hauck, Carol Holly, Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (Assistant Provost & Associate Dean for IGS), Alan Norton (Vice President and Treasurer), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (Provost & Dean of the College), Paul Wojick.

Chair Howe called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

David Castro agreed to look at the FLC website and report on the current state of affairs with regard to application and nomination procedures for the next FLC meeting. Following Howe’s request, Castro accepted to work with Jo Beld in the revisions of the section of the Faculty Manual corresponding to “Evaluations,” a subcategory of the Tenure & Promotion procedures, as it appears in the document drafted by the T&P Committee.

Upon Howe’s request, Robert Hauck volunteered to represent the FLC at the Benefits Committee.

Dean Marci Sortor proposed an extension of the initial October 1 deadline to February 1 as the new deadline for the submission of “the career plan” document by the post-tenure-review candidate(s) to the Department Chair. After a brief discussion, the FLC recommended to Dean Sortor November 1 to be the deadline for such procedure. The resulting vote on this issue was to adopt November 1 as the definite date for the submission of “the career plan” document. Dean Sortor also stated that she will send a message to Department Chairs reminding them to request the annual two course-survey from their faculty.

Howe requested that we briefly reflected on and considered the FLC goals for this academic year, from the list of objectives drafted and revised as of 05/17/2011. The points to contemplate in 2011-2012 were “Evaluation of advising as per the ideas proposed during the process to establish a post-tenure review,” “mentoring at every stage in a faculty member’s career, with CILA support and suggestions,” “efficient and appropriate allocation of faculty time,” and “explore issues associated with faculty conducting research activities with undergraduates without either financial compensation nor FTE.”

NEW BUSINESS:

Rebecca Judge will prepare examples of targeted questions about “advising” to present them to the FLC at the next meeting. Another aspect to be considered at our next meeting will be “the mechanics of grant allocations.” There will be information shared within the FLC on the exact amount of grant allocation for faculty development with the aim of later mentoring faculty on grant opportunities, availability and use.
The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sylvia G. Carullo / Secretary pro tempore
Faculty Life Committee · St. Olaf College
Minutes for the Meeting of 20 September 2011

Present: Jo Beld, Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauck, Carol Holly, Tim Howe, Beckie Judge, Phyllis Larson, Alan Norton, Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex officio), and Paul Wojack.

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:33.

2. The minutes of 13 September 2011 were approved.

3. A wide-ranging discussion of Faculty Development Grants and Released-time grants addressed several issues. Chief among them were the most effective allocation of the funds that Faculty Life has at its disposal, application deadlines, and the paucity of applications received in 2010–2011. As the result of this discussion the following items emerged as significant.

   a. The committee is prepared to reconfigure the grant structure currently in place if it seems as though the faculty stand to benefit from those changes.

   b. In order to answer questions with regard to the allocation of funds the committee needs concrete information on just how much money it has. Phyllis Larson will obtain this information in time for the next meeting.

   c. Three options regarding the grant structure were identified, including (1) maintaining the current structure, (2) maintaining the current structure with a modified schedule of deadlines, and (3) diverting funds from professional development grants to released-time grants with later deadlines.

   d. Tim Howe will be asking department chairs to conduct informal polls during department meetings as to why so few applied for grants last year. Chairs will also be asked to follow up on these questions by raising awareness of the opportunities that Faculty Life makes available and the upcoming deadlines for application.

   e. The deadline for Released-time Grant applications will be moved from October 5 to October 19.

   f. Jo Beld advised the committee to consider making a direct connection between the grants offered and institution-wide initiatives and to consider practices at other institutions as we deliberate these issues.

   g. Dean Sortor advised the committee to be goal-oriented in our deliberations and in any requests that may come out of these conversations, and to consider the long-term results that will come of any decisions we make. What sort of college do we want? What role can this committee play in making this that kind of college?
4. Jo Beld advised the committee that we need to remind departments to revise their professional activity statements in order to reflect the revised policies & procedures for Tenure and Promotion. The most important things in this regard are (1) the new and significant difference between tenure with promotion and promotion, and (2) the need for concrete information regarding expectations.

5. Beckie Judge and Dean Sortor reported that the post-tenure review process is in order and that an announcement will be distributed to department chairs shortly.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 5:03.

Respectfully submitted,

David Castro
21 September 2011
Faculty Life Committee – St. Olaf College

Minutes for the meeting of October 4th, 2011

Present: Tim Howe (chair), Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauck, Carol Holly, Beckie Judge, Alan Norton, Meg Ojala, Paul Wojick, Marci Sortor (ex officio), Isabelle Wattenberg (student rep), Mary Cisar

The meeting was convened at 3:30 in Buntrock Commons 143

1. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of the FLC meeting of 9/27/11 were approved.

2. Mary Cisar addressed the committee regarding the topic of academic advising practices. Mary is a part of a study group formed by the steering committee. Mary first gave some background information regarding earlier studies in the mid-2000’s and the shift in advising thought-process to one with more of a teaching-aspect to it. Mary outlined broad areas being discussed by the group and follow-up committee discussion was centered around these areas:

   - advisor loads
   - how advisees are assigned
   - what makes advising high-impact: Relationships? Mentoring?
   - models for assessing advisees
   - FY advising vs. within major
   - T&P post-tenure review – assessing advising, reward,
     Beckie Judge pointed out to the rest of the committee that advising now officially counts as a part of teaching for the review.
   - study group needs
   - revisions

The meeting adjourned at 5pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Bob Hauck
Present: Marci Sortor, Sylvia Carullo, Paul Wojick, Tim Howe, Robert Hauck, Jo Beld, Phyllis Larson, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Meg Ojala, Bruce Hanson, Dan Dressen, Corliss Swain, Carol Holly, Rebecca Judge, Matt Richey, Isabel Wattenberg.

● Meeting was called to order promptly at 3:30 pm by the chair, Tim Howe.

● Tim introduced Matt Richey (associate dean of the natural sciences), who is chairing a study group on Mentored Undergraduate Research. The study group consists of 6 members and will complete it’s work this fall. Matt began by pointing out that undergraduate research has been steadily growing in importance and scope during the last few decades and this was generally considered a positive trend. He then gave a quick overview of the work of the committee and sketched out some of the questions that the group will be looking at. These include:

  – What is the right scope of undergraduate research at the college?
  – What are the advantages and disadvantages of doing undergraduate research in the summer as opposed to during the school year?
  – What is the proper way to recognize and compensate faculty who supervise undergraduate research?

Matt emphasized that the issue of undergraduate research is a huge one and the main task of the group will be to narrow down the list of questions and give direction for further study. It should not be understood that the study group would come up with a definitive solution. He also pointed out that any changes
in the college’s approach to undergraduate research would have a significant impact on faculty life and that is why the Faculty Life committee is being consulted.

Becky Judge asked whether we are interested in increasing student demand for or faculty supply of undergraduate research opportunities. Matt responded that the student demand is clearly there. Discussion ensued as to the reasons for the demand. Possible reasons included college advertising that highlights student research as well as a growing number of classes which incorporate student research into their curricula. Matt noted that the emphasis for the study group would be on examining the intrinsic value of student research rather than on advertising.

- Another item of discussion was ”high impact” experiences for students, which have been formally defined as experiences involving participation in off campus studies, internships, directed research or learning communities (e.g. great conversation). The committee discussed the meaning and nature of high impact experiences and there was general agreement that these experiences should be transformative and often involve a social aspect.

Some further questions considered at the meeting included:

- What role should Independent Study and Independent Research courses play in undergraduate research?
- How does supervision of undergraduate research affect one’s case for tenure and promotion?
- Concerning evaluation for tenure and promotion, should supervising undergraduate research be counted as a teaching activity or as scholarship?
- Is supervising undergraduate research beneficial for a faculty member’s own research?
– Should faculty members try to choose research their research areas so they are related to the undergraduate research they supervise?

Carol Holly noted that the changing expectations as far as supervision of undergraduate research by faculty members could create some uncertainty for untenured faculty members.

- For the remainder of the meeting Dan Dressen who is co-chairing a study group on learning communities with Corliss Swain, described the work of the group. The group is comparing the models of the various learning communities (e.g. Great Conversation, American Conversation, etc.) on campus with the aim of possibly recommending changes to the first-year experience. One possibility would be a linking of the first-year writing and religion courses. There was general consensus from the committee as to the high value of the learning communities and a general desire expressed to make such opportunities available to as many students as possible.

- The meeting ended with a brief discussion of the logistics of evaluating the grant proposals which are due the Wednesday after fall break. It was agreed that the committee would use the beginning of our next meeting on Tuesday, Oct 25 to discuss the guidelines for evaluating the proposals.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hanson
Faculty Life Committee  
Minutes for the Meeting of 8 November 2011  

Present: Jo Beld, Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Carol Holly, Tim Howe, Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (ex-officio), Alan Norton (ex-officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex-officio), Isabelle Wattenberg, and Paul Wojack. The meeting was convened at 3:30 PM.

1. Jo Beld informed the committee that the Wabash Center in Indiana is holding a workshop on assessment and faculty development from December 1-3. St. Olaf needs to send three participants to the workshop. Jo expressed the wish that a member of the FLC attend the conference, and David Castro said he will consider the possibility.

2. Student representative, Isabelle Wattenburg, reported on the Student Senate’s discussion of the final exam policy. She addressed the proposal for changes to the policy, brought to the Senate by a member of the faculty and students. The committee briefly discussed other formats for final exams.

3. Tim Howe then raised the question of faculty development: What have we learned from the grant process? Do we have a problem? The committee concurred that the process of reviewing grants worked well, in spite of the fact that we didn’t spend all of the available funds. The suggestion was made to revise the committee web-site in order to clarify the guidelines for grants applications. Another suggestion addressed the possibility of alerting faculty in the summer of grant application deadlines in the fall.

The committee also considered ways to encourage the submission of more “high quality” proposals. Suggestions included:

- Soliciting letters from former grant recipients, to be published on the FLC web-site;
- Offering a workshop on the writing of grant proposals, possibly through CILA or with the support of the Boldt Chair;
- Holding an informational meeting on faculty development in the spring and the fall;
- Creating opportunities for release-time grant recipients to be recognized and/or to present their research to the community;
- Making more release-time grants available to the faculty, in addition to recommending to the Dean other ways of promoting faculty development.

4. The committee briefly considered ways in which we could use the funds left-over from this grant period. Deans Larson and Sortor will discuss the matter and report back to the committee.

5. Boldt Chair, Solveig Zempel, arrived at 4:15 PM to report to the committee on the successful Writing Workshop for Tenure-Track faculty that was offered during the
summer, 2011. The committee discussed the possibility of institutionalizing faculty writing workshops, fully supported by the college and housed in a space dedicated to faculty development and faculty retreats. The Faculty Writers Program at St. Thomas was mentioned as a possible model for St. Olaf.

6. The committee then launched into a fairly wide-ranging discussion of how we might further support faculty development and foster a community of scholars at the college. It was determined that we will devote the next FLC meeting (November 15, 2011) to this topic.

Having proposed a schedule for committee meetings for the rest of the semester, Tim Howe adjourned the meeting at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Holly
11/11/2011
Faculty Life Committee
Minutes for the Meeting of 15 November 2011

Present: Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Robert Hauck, Carol Holly, Tim Howe, Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (ex-officio), Alan Norton (ex-officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex-officio), Isabelle Wattenberg, and Paul Wojick.

The meeting was convened at 3:30 PM.

1. In response to a question from Paul Wojick, Deans Sortor and Larson updated the committee on the status of the Center for Experiential Learning (CEL) in general and the Academic Civic Engagement program (ACE) in particular. The study group assigned to look at the center’s programs, efficacy, reporting structure and skill set has submitted its report to the President. There is a recognized need to consider how to serve more students, and how to better integrate the programs we have. As concerns ACE, the Deans reported that it has shown its value, particularly with its combination of classroom/out-of-classroom experiences. The courses that have been developed as part of ACE are a valued part of the academic program.

Dean Larson will keep the committee apprised of developments related to the review of the CEL.

2. The committee continued its wide-ranging discussion of how we might further support faculty development and foster a community of scholars at the college. Dean Larson shared her observations regarding challenges to and opportunities for faculty development at the college. These included

1. Unpublished scholarship: A significant amount of faculty scholarship languishes in an unpublished state. The faculty writing workshops implemented this last summer by the Boldt chair appear to be an efficacious way of addressing this problem.

2. Teaching as inquiry: Faculty might be encouraged to explore the connection between research and teaching, particularly if teaching is viewed as a vehicle of inquiry.

3. Quiescent scholars: Some faculty may find themselves presently out of step with scholarship in their fields. The post-tenure review process might be helpful in identifying ways to support and reinvigorate professional activity among these faculty.

4. A vibrant intellectual community: A big challenge facing St. Olaf is how to create a mutually supportive intellectual community.

5. Work/life balance: Dean Larson observed that it is possible to spend too much time on teaching responsibilities, that teaching tends to take up whatever time a faculty member has, whether teaching two courses or three in a semester. She suggested that there may be ways to teach as effectively with a smaller time investment.
Of Dean Larson’s five observations, the committee focused most of its energies discussing how to nurture an intellectual community. The general consensus was that faculty life could be enhanced by increasing the opportunities for engagement with fellow scholars here on campus. Among the ideas floated were

- faculty seminars in which participants share common readings, modeled after some of the Boldt seminars. These seminars in the past have involved release-time and/or stipend support.
- the creation of a Faculty Development Center which would provide both an administrative and a physical space dedicated to the promotion of professional activity among our faculty.
- a program featuring a shared reading by a prominent author. The author is invited to campus to present a lecture and engage with the faculty.
- promotion of opportunities outside of the campus-wide committees for faculty to become involved with the campus community. This was advocated as a means of both fostering scholarly exchange among faculty and promoting the development of the campus community.
- increasing the recognition given to professional accomplishments. The Provost’s Sabbatical Series serves as a model of a way to stimulate faculty development by raising community awareness of the interesting work of our colleagues.

It was generally affirmed that promoting scholarly engagement on campus contributes to the goals of the college by enhancing the classroom experience, by elevating the status of scholarly inquiry as a means of understanding and improving the human experience, and by improving our ability to retain and attract a diverse and energetic pool of young faculty.

Dean Sortor challenged the committee to articulate a vision for the College’s strategic plan of what it means to be a community that is engaged in a lively quest for excellence in terms of scholarship and teaching. Tim Howe asked that committee members consider what initiatives we might support as a means of promoting this strategic activity.

The FLC will not meet on November 22. It will discuss salary distributions at its November 29 meeting. At its December 6 meeting, the FLC will review sabbatical applications.

Tim Howe adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Judge
21 November 2011
Faculty Life Committee  
Minutes for the Meeting of 29 November 2011

Present: David Castro, Bob Hauck, Carol Holly, Tim Howe, Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (ex-officio), Alan Norton (ex-officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex-officio), Isabelle Wattenberg, and Paul Wojack.

The meeting was convened at 3:30 PM.
Minutes for the meeting of November 15 were approved.

1) Alan Norton gave a presentation to prepare the committee to make an informed recommendation on the wage pool for faculty compensation to the Board of Regents. He began by reading a brief article that illustrated how difficult it is to predict the future of market values and rates of inflation in this confused economy.

Alan reviewed the AAUP Faculty Compensation Reports and St. Olaf’s ranking for faculty salaries compared to other ACM colleges and compared to the ACM/GLCA colleges combined. He showed us the increase in faculty compensation compared to the CPI-U over the last decade.

St. Olaf ranks 5th of 14 colleges in the ACM and 10th of 26 in the ACM/GLCA. The increase in faculty salaries for continuing faculty members at St. Olaf has been better than the average (AAUP) over the past 3 years. The increase for continuing faculty was 2.7% for 2011-12. Since 2006 the increase has been ahead of the rate of inflation. St. Olaf salaries and total compensation for 2010–2011 were slightly below the AAUP (IBB) 80th percentile.

FLC did not make a formal recommendation at this meeting but members agreed that we would like to stay on the current trajectory, keep the goal to reach and maintain the 80th percentile, and recommend that salaries keep up with the rate of inflation. (To stay ahead of the rate of inflation the salary increase would have to be more than 2.5% for next year.) There is concern that the compensation package at St. Olaf be competitive with other institutions to attract and recruit new faculty. The viability of our recommendation depends on many unknowns such as net revenues from the comprehensive fee, rates of inflation for energy and food in particular, the fluctuating market, and other variables.

Committee members would like more information concerning faculty members’ attitudes toward compensation. Marci said she would look into getting information from last year’s HERI survey.

On December 6, a sub-committee of the FLC will meet to discuss sabbatical proposals while others continue a discussion of faculty development.

Tim Howe adjourned the meeting at 5 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meg Ojala
December 4, 2011
Minutes of the Faculty Life Committee (FLC)
December 6, 2011

Present: Jo Beld, Sylvia G. Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Timothy Howe (Chair), Carol Holly, Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (Assistant Provost & Associate Dean for IGS /ex-officio), Meg Ojala, Isabelle Wattenberg, Paul Wojick.

Chair Howe called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

I. While the Sabbatical Proposal Sub-Committee met in another room to discuss and evaluate sabbatical proposals, the rest of the members present addressed the faculty compensation topic and considered the percentage in wage increase to recommend to the Board of Regents, through Alan Norton, for 2012-2013. This group general agreement was to propose a 3.0% increase. The consensus finally reached by the FLC was to proceed with the recommendation to Alan Norton of a 3.0% increase in salary compensation, for 2012-2013. David Castro volunteered to draft an explanatory letter on the FLC recommendation of 3.0% increase of faculty salaries that will be eventually presented by Chair Howe to Alan Norton.

II. Discussion on the support and expansion of faculty development continued and centered on:

- Consideration of a center as a centralized place—both administratively and physically—, especially destined for meetings, activities and events, intended to foster and support the professional growth of faculty as scholars. Reference was made to several existing St. Olaf centers for faculty that support teaching/learning, characterized by being more student oriented, such as the Center for Innovation of Liberal Arts (CILA), the Center for Interdisciplinary Research (CIR), and the Collaborative Undergraduate Research and Inquiry (CURI) program, among others. The members’ comments on an ideal Faculty Development Center mainly represented it as a location for discussing and sharing scholarly inquiry and research. Jo Beld suggested the FLC to do some research on Faculty Development Centers of other nearby institutions, e.g.: Carleton College, Macalester College, the University of St. Thomas.

- Attention to mentoring faculty on leadership, engagement and scholarly innovation. One of the suggestions discussed to enhance the quality of professional life was to set groups or subunits that will focus, for instance, on the presentation or publication of scholarly works. This arrangement will contribute to promote scholarly interaction among faculty: a faculty member is encouraged to share with colleagues a scholarly paper that is to be presented or that has already been presented at a conference. The ultimate objective(s) of such presentations are to assist or advise faculty members to be as productive as possible, and/or to stimulate and support productivity among other faculty members.
The relationship between teaching/research, the former regarded as a way to inquiry. Jo Beld provided the FLC with a document that briefly summarizes the work of the St. Olaf Assessment Sub-Committee and the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation, and it illustrates that duality and its dynamics (“Faculty development and assessment of student learning: How can they support each other?”).

III. The Sabbatical Proposal Sub-Committee presented to the rest of the committee the outcome of their evaluations. As a result of a discussion on this matter, the FLC recommended for approval the twenty six sabbatical proposals that had been submitted.

NEW BUSINESS:

Matters to be considered and discussed in the near future:

- sabbatical proposal guidelines and dynamics behind writing a sabbatical proposal, with the aim of later mentoring faculty on submitting a clear and scholarly sabbatical project.
- ample variety of ways to encourage and support faculty development. Phyllis Larson’s handout, “Notes on faculty development,” dated 11/28/2011, stands a guide for the FLC to take into account in this debate, particularly the points included in each of the “three areas to be addressed [by the FLC]: a). strengthen the sense of community / support for faculty work,” b). support for faculty to think about teaching as inquiry, and c). mentoring.”

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sylvia G. Carullo
Minutes of the Faculty Life Committee (FLC)
February 14, 2012

Present: Sylvia G. Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Timothy Howe (Chair), Rebecca Judge, Alan Norton (Treasurer/ex-officio), Marci Sortor (Provost and Dean/ex-officio), Isabelle Wattenberg, Paul Wojick

Chair Howe called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

The minutes of our meeting on December 6, 2011 were approved without amendment.

The committee continued its discussion of potential amendments to the sabbatical application process. Particular attention was focused on moving application deadlines forward in order to allow for more thoughtful interaction between applicants, department chairs and others (including the members of this committee) who are involved in this process.

The committee also discussed the idea of creating a faculty research forum or colloquium that would be held once a month during community time. The primary objectives of this forum would be to create an environment in which we are more aware of the work that our colleagues are doing and to stimulate conversation and interaction related to our work as scholars.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Wojick
Present: Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauck, Carol Holly, Tim Howe (chair), Alan Norton (ex officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex officio), Paul Wojick

Meeting called to order at 3:35

1. The minutes of 14 February 2012 were approved.

2. The sabbatical application process. The substance of the conversation we had last week, including both the dates and process of application, was relayed to Phyllis Larson, who will present our thoughts to Faculty Governance Committee because any such changes require a change to the Faculty Manual.

3. Once upon a time the director of CILA used to be a member ex officio of the equivalent of the Faculty Life Committee. Current director Gary Miur would like to reinstate that policy. While any member of the St. Olaf community is welcome to attend all but a few meetings of this committee, ex officio status would confer voting franchise. It was voted that FLC would recommend the addition of the CILA director as an ex officio member to the Faculty Governance Committee.

4. Professional Development Grants for Summer/Fall 2012. It was decided that $6000 would remain a firm upper limit, that the current list of allowable expenses will remain as it is, and that the line for “stipend” on the budget sheet shall be removed.

5. Deadlines. Applications for both Professional Development Grants and NEH Summer Stipends must be received by high noon on 20 April. Mellby nominations must be received by high noon on 13 April.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully submitted,

David Castro
28 February 2012
Facility Life Committee – St. Olaf College
Minutes for Meeting of February 28, 2012

Present: Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauk, Carol Holley, Tim Howe (Chair), Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (ex officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex officio), Paul Wojick and welcoming Richard Allen from Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Meeting called to order at 3:35.

1. The minutes of 21 February 2012 were approved.
2. The day’s discussion concerned the question of stipends.
   It was decided that the subject was complicated but made further so by unclear and ambiguous language in the FLC description and budget.

A thorough discussion that included looking at former language and considering a) purpose of stipends and b) how best to define them, concluded in the following actions:
1. Elimination of bullets 2 and 8 in the document FLC “Professional Development Grants”
2. New language for the ‘stipends’ section of the Grant Application:

Stipends: Stipends are intended to support collaborative projects. Leadership stipends have a maximum rate of $100/day, up to an individual maximum of $2000, or a project maximum of $2,500, should there be multiple leaders. Participant stipends have a maximum of $50 per person per day. Individual stipends may not exceed $2000 per person with a project maximum of $4000.

It is felt that the new language makes the intent of the committee clearer and more transparent.

3. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40.

Respectfully submitted,
Gary Gisselman
Faculty Life Committee
Minutes for the Meeting of 6 March 2012

Present: David Castro, Bob Hauck, Carol Holly, Tim Howe, Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (ex-officio), Alan Norton (ex-officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex-officio), Richard Allen, Sylvia Carullo, Gary Gisselman, and Paul Wojack.

The meeting was convened at 3:30 PM.
Minutes for the meeting of February 28 were approved.

Marci Sortor gave a report on the progress of the Strategic Plan 1.1 Study Groups, which include Internships, Off-Campus Study, Mentored Undergraduate Research, Learning Communities, and Student Advising. The study groups met in the fall to explore ways in which high impact learning experiences can be enhanced and made more accessible to students. Marci gave the committee a draft of the goals developed by each study group and described them in detail.

Tim led a discussion of questions and concerns related to the quality of faculty life at St. Olaf. The group talked about subjects for further discussion and possible goals for the committee for the rest of the semester. Topics to think about before our next meeting on March 27:

1) Community life. What kind of community do we have? What kind of community do we want? What can we do as a committee to build and support community life?

2) Work life. What are the problems? What is good about our work life? How can we balance different kinds of work, such as teaching, scholarly and creative work? What are the issues and needs at different stages of a career?

Phyllis reported on the upcoming visit of Jeanne Narum. Jeanne will meet with the Faculty Life Committee on April 10.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meg Ojala
March 26, 2012
Faculty Life Committee – St. Olaf College

Minutes for the meeting of March 27, 2012

Present: Tim Howe (chair), Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauck, Carol Holly, Alan Norton (ex-officio), Meg Ojala, Paul Wojick, Richard Allen, Marci Sortor (ex-officio), Phyllis Larson (ex-officio), Joe Beld, Mary Carlsen

The meeting was convened at 3:30 in Buntrock Commons 143

1. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of the FLC meeting of 3/6/12 were approved.

2. Jo Beld addressed the committee regarding “proposed elements in a special appointment review.” This included dossier contents as well as rationale for the review process- specifically how it differs from a T&P dossier, who reviews it and why. This proposal blends components of the reappointment review and requirements for tenure/promotion reviews.

3. Mary Carlsen addressed the committee regarding orientation and development of new tenure-track faculty. Data was presented on new hires and comments and questions centered around what we are currently doing to offer support (getting to know them, mentoring, and providing discussion places), what can potentially be done to support them (begin earlier in year, provide consistent mentoring opportunities, understand their demographics, provide structured and unstructured time), and possible next steps in this process (fall orientation).

Meeting was adjourned at 5pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Bob Hauck
Faculty Life Committee
Minutes for the meeting, April 3, 2012


Meeting was called to order at 3:35 PM:

1. Minutes of the meeting of March 27, 2012 were approved.

2. The committee revisited the issue of whether or not the directors of Government Foundations and CILA should become ex officio members of the committee. After thoughtful discussion, the committee decided against inviting these individuals to join the committee. It was thought prudent instead to ask them attend our meetings whenever their contributions might be helpful to the committee. We also discussed the need for additional untenured and some non-tenure track faculty on the committee.

3. Tim read Sylvia Carullo’s recommendation that all departments craft a statement regarding expectations for service. Much discussion on expectations for faculty work, departmental and college-wide, emerged from this recommendation. The committee considered the possibility of following up on Sylvia’s recommendation after obtaining “buy in” from the leadership group. Suggestions were made as well that the committee write a Handbook on faculty expectations; ask T&P to discuss with us the role that service plays in tenure and promotion decisions; and/or form a Task Force to pursue these issues further.

The meeting was adjourned at 5PM.

Respectfully submitted by Carol Holly
Present: Rich Allen, Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauk, Carol Holly, Tim Howe (chair), Phyllis Larson (ex officio), Alan Norton (ex officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex officio)

1. Meeting called to order at 3:30

2. The minutes of 3 April 2012 were approved.

3. Invited guest Jeanne Narum lead this meeting in brainstorming creative solutions and possibilities that would empower this committee to work toward transforming the campus community for the better. Based on a theme that emerged over the course of her conversations throughout the day, Jeanne began by having the committee brainstorm on “what it would take to foster faculty.” The following is a loose listing of the items that were raised and/or suggested.

   • Socializing
     mentoring of new faculty
     teaching new faculty how to deal with the expectations of this community
     What is this community about?
     what to think about
     time on task
     institutional mission
     Engaged faculty that take risks, that have a stake in this community
   • Leadership Development
     especially of department chairs, who set the tone for the community
     of risk taking
   • Celebrating differences
   • Regarding truly strong proposals
     review our RFP to encourage a theme or concept to support
     RFP could include Institutional Impact, built-in Assessment, a five-year plan
     Consider a venture fund that is tied to the Strategic Plan
   • View of the Faculty Life Committee
     how it can move the institution forward?
     how can we nurture a committee in which “ideas matter?”
     this committee is a brain trust for administrators, to aid them in nurturing faculty
   • The nature of faculty work: what is appropriate to add or drop from work loads?
     no work is added without removing an equal amount of existing work
   • Who is doing what? What exciting research is happening on campus?
4. Jeanne then asked us to propose substantive things that can be accomplished by the end of the school year. The following four items were suggested.
   a. Identify, expunge “trash work” (e.g., considerations of membership, trivial stuff)
   b. Funding an initiative
   c. Revising the RFP for development grants
   d. A faculty research series or forum
It was decided that next week we will talk about items (4c) revising the RFP for development grants, and (4d) establishing a faculty research forum.

5. Meeting adjourned at 5:00

Respectfully submitted,

David Castro
11 April 2012
Present: Rich Allen, Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Carol Holly, Tim Howe (chair), Rebecca Judge, Phyllis Larson (ex officio), Meg Ojala, Marci Sortor (ex officio), Paul Wojick

The meeting was called to order at 3:34. Minutes from the April 10 meeting were approved.

Committee Actions and Announcements

1. Virginia A. Dekker Groot Endowed fund. The College has recently received an endowed fund to support faculty engaged in research and course development involving a language other than English. The fund will offer annually a grant for $35,000 towards a one-semester leave for a faculty member pursuing a curricular or research project entailing extensive work in a language other than English, and a grant of $8000 for faculty development opportunities for research or course development involving foreign language, such as travel to sites in preparation for hosting field-supervised off-campus programs; supplemental support for faculty research and pedagogical projects in foreign languages; and on-going language skills education and refinement for faculty members.

2. Faculty development grants: Gary Gisselman, Sylvia Carullo, Meg Ojala, and David Castro will meet on Tuesday, April 24, to read the professional development grant applications submitted to the committee.

3. Salary recommendations: Those members of the Faculty Life Committee (FLC) not involved in reading the faculty development grants on April 24 will meet with Allan Norton to discuss salary recommendations and parameters.

4. Future FLC actions and events: On Tuesday, May 1, the committee will conclude its discussion of salaries, decide on next year’s Mellby lecturers, and consider action items for next year. FLC Chair and Host Extraordinaire has invited the FLC to his home for a barbeque on May 8.

5. Mellby lecturer: This spring’s Mellby lecture will be offered on Thursday, April 19. Paul Wojick and Tim Howe will pass out programs. Bob Hauck will introduce the Mellby series.

6. Faculty research fora: The FLC discussed the desirability of instituting a monthly forum during community time that would feature faculty presentations of on-going research. Meg Ojala and Gary Gisselman volunteered to work with the Dean’s Office to implement this program next year.
7. Service expectations and recognition: The committee returned to the questions of how to recognize service as category for faculty evaluation, and how to communicate service expectations to new members of the faculty. Discussion focused on discerning the proper roles of the FLC, the administration and department chairs, and the individual departments in developing and communicating expectations and standards. The committee reached an informal consensus to recommend that the topic be further explored at the November, 2012, leadership luncheon.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca P. Judge
April 24, 2012
Facility Life Committee

Minutes for the meeting on April 24, 2012

Present: Tim Howe, Chair; Rich Allen, Sylvia Carullo, David Castro, Gary Gisselman, Bob Hauk, Carol Holly, Rebecca Judge, Meg Ojala, Paul Wojick; ex-officio: Marci Sortor, Alan Norton.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 PM.

1. Minutes of the meeting of March 27, 2012 were approved without amendment.

2. The committee divided into two subcommittees for the first hour of work at this meeting. Subcommittee one reviewed faculty grant applications. Subcommittee two engaged in a preliminary discussion, focused on a presentation of data by Alan Norton, of the faculty salary pool available for next year.

3. The committee reconvened as a whole in order to discuss and make decisions regarding faculty grant applications for the remainder of this meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul Wojick