

Present: Bin Fu, Jae Sok Son, Maysam Pournik, Jaime Ramos, Thuy Vu, Mataz Alcoutlabi, John Abraham, Douglas Timmer, Jorge Vidal (ex-officio member), Jong-Min Kim

Guests: Dean Ala Qubbaj and Associate Dean Nazmul Islam, Robert Freeman, Rajiv Nambiar, Hasina Huq, Emmett Tomai, Jungseok Ho, Fitra Khan, Constantine Tarawneh, Dumitru Caruntu

Absent: Anil Srivastava, Immanuel Edinbarough, Shiekh Ariful Islam,

1. Introduction by John Abraham
2. Remarks by Dean Ala Qubbaj
 - a. Thanked old chair (Dr. Crown) and new chair (Dr. Abraham)
 - b. University made investment in merit and equity with goal to achieve 25% percentile of R2 universities (College received \$200,000 for merit and \$150,000 for equity)
 - c. Equity adjustment - there was no consideration of years of service but future cycle with consider years of service; equity decided by university with equity decided on after merit consideration; Staff also got equity with significant amount; lectures also got good equity
 - d. Merit – would like to have it based on performance and decided by College/Department; will probably get \$300,000 every year for College; one idea is to put aside 20 to 30% of total merit fund aside for several exceptional faculties (another idea is put 50% into this special merit fund); Department chairs did not feel comfortable deciding on whom should get extra merit benefit; need to consider various factors (research product, dedication to students, support toward accreditation process, etc...); Merit could be used by chairs to empower them to incentivize their faculty
3. Birthday celebration for Abby, Nambiar, and Timmer
4. Remarks by Tarawneh
 - a. Faculty presence - should consider presence and availability of faculty on campus and to students; maybe should develop a policy
 - b. Lab condition - should consider consistency in labs in terms of online/in-person
 - c. Merit – should incentivize performance to encourage faculty to go above and beyond; also helps chairs have criteria to decide on how to distribute merit funds
 - d. Chair evaluation - should consider how chairs are evaluated as currently evaluated by department committee, resulting in chairs not being able to take action as needed; maybe should be evaluated by College Council or College committee along with Dean
5. Remarks by Islam
 - a. Faculty presence – should have a policy as cannot have 100% online
 - b. Workload policy – it has been revised last year but annual evaluation has not been updated based on new workload policy
 - c. Evaluation – maybe service should be evaluated by college committee with teaching and research evaluated by department
 - d. Chair evaluation and Dean evaluation – needs to be done every 3 years
6. Remarks by Department chairs
 - a. Huq – Employment requirement should be specified to help chair; serving two programs and at two campuses, which is very hard to manage and affects merit policy decision making process
 - b. Caruntu – faculty should not be forced on how to conduct the class (online or in person)

- c. Emmet – want a broad set of criteria for merit selection by chairs; was only given one week this year to decide on merit so time was limited
 - d. Freeman – will do the merit selection with help of department associate chair; merit is very important decision making process; currently merit seems to be more like cost of living
 - e. Time frame of the merit should be considered (how many years for)
 - f. Ho – evaluation and merit should be similar
 - g. Rajiv – maybe should make the merit fund into three pots (10% for chair, 10% for dean, and rest based on annual evaluation by each department committee)
 - h. Fitra – should incorporate workload policy on annual evaluation
7. Science is doing 60% of special merit decided on criteria (new major grants, new publication in some journals, prestige awards) and each faculty need to apply for it and then college committee decides on distribution of this fund
 8. Chair evaluation – should be done by group that knows their work (so maybe dean should do it); some chairs are happy with department faculty evaluating them; need to ensure junior faculty are engaged and supported to keep them happy; maybe have a system in place to support them (suggestion to invite them to one College Council meeting)
 9. Summary by Abraham
 - a. Faculty should have a physical presence on campus as part of policy or employment
 - b. Merit – need to have a policy with two pots of funds with one for everyone and remaining funds as special based on performance in the past five year (maybe shorter time is better)
 - c. Chair evaluation – consider changing the evaluators system
 - d. Annual evaluation – should be adjusted based on workload policy

Adjourn: 1:33 pm