

**College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences  
Fall Faculty Meeting - October 24, 2003**

**Notes from Small Group Discussion**

**Introduction**

Following are notes from the CFAES Fall Faculty Meeting discussion groups. These faculty met after Dr. Moser's State of the College address. Faculty were divided randomly into groups, each with the discussion questions found below. Thus, summary notes for all the discussion questions represent faculty opinion and are framed within the context of Dr. Moser's State of the College address. Click here to read a manuscript of that address.

Discussion questions were initially generated by the Executive Committee of Ag. Faculty Council (Ron Hammond, Daral Jackwood, Peter Thomison, and Steve Prochaska). These questions attempted to capture the essence of current issues impacting not only our college, but also CFAES faculty as a collective and as individuals.

---

<p><b>Question #1 - What incentives will be available to reward and motivate faculty? Will these incentives be available across FAES or only at the discretion of the department chair?</b></p>
---

Summary Notes from Verbal Report Back

- Incentives should be determined and distributed at the department level; they could include release time, lab or course equipment/space, dollars
- Salary adjustments - merit pay out of grants
- Options could include: resources to advance professional development if integrated with teaching and research, release time, reallocation of duties
- Decisions made with balance of college and departments
- Initiate steps for full professor rank
- Find a way to retain a portion of indirects to the individual
- Flexibility in appointments - % salary paid, raise the remainder. A disadvantage may be that these individuals may not get involved in common goals of department or college.
- What programs do we need to keep to protect budget lines?
- Differential staffing

Group 1 Notes

Incentives

- Some granting agencies do not allow salary support
- Incentives should be given at Department level

Time

- Department releases faculty's time to write a grant or learn new techniques.
- Give Chair funds to cover faculty responsibilities.
  - Chair response: Who do we get to cover what the faculty member was doing, not just teaching?

SRA - Special Research Assignment could be used.

- Reward could be for lab or course (not personal)
- Re-establish innovative grants program in Extension
  - Chair response: Give incentives to Department so the Department Chair then gives it out as they feel necessary in Teaching, Research and Extension.

Reward productivity and Impact - not dollar amounts or number of students.

Figure out a way to get overhead dollars from grants back to College - BE Program in Engineering.

#### Group 2 Notes

- Question should probably be what the incentives should be, rather than "will be".
- Salary adjustments through merit pay; compensation for good work, e.g. out of grants, department allocations.
- Providing resources to advance their professional development, e.g. funding for workshops, meetings.
- Interpretation with teaching and research support, e.g. student salaries, undergraduate research support.
- Time release or help with specific jobs, e.g. funding for student help in teaching.
- Re-allocation of duties to what someone is really good at.
- Review of incentives should be made available through a balance between FAES and departments.
- Incentive steps for full professors

#### Group 3 Notes

- Money / cash - a way to return some portion of indirects to those who generate them -to the individual P.I. (in budget restructuring environment this will work differently than in the past - according to Steve Slack)
- Office of research and other colleges

### **Question #2 - How will departmental faculty targets be determined?**

#### Summary Notes from Report Back

- Departments should have flexibility and not be constrained by funding lines.
- There should be flexibility between faculty and staff.
- RBB will determine budgets by department size, not stakeholder needs
- How are targets to be handled in multidisciplinary projects?
- Be flexible based on performance
- Cooperative positions across departments (e.g., Animal Science/Food Science) - let the market decide

#### Group 1 Notes

- Department wants flexibility in determining targets. They should not be constricted by the three lines of funding.
  - Staff / Faculty conversion - give this flexibility to Departments.

### Group 2 Notes

- RBB will determine department budget. Department size will follow from that. Targets are set by RBB.
- Departments will determine their needs based on stakeholder needs.
- Should be determined based on multidisciplinary, but control would remain under departments.
- Targets should remain to avoid losing positions but should be flexible, based on performance and resource allocations.

### Group 3 Notes

- Steve Slack explained caps for faculty and all the challenges involved; insufficient information provided to us to make recommendations.

<b>Question #3 - Define a productive faculty under RBB and the new Academic Plan. (Extension appointment, research/teaching appointment)</b>
--

### Summary Notes from Report Back

- Define productivity by what is produced and the impact, rather than the dollars, etc. that were put into the effort
- Base determination on what the faculty member was hired to do and did they do it.
- The definition for productivity resides within the departments, with general college-wide guidelines.
- What may seem superficial - (number of students advised, research grants, vs. generation of knowledge, political support of Extension)
- No single model defines faculty productivity.
- Lots of grants/teaching hours.

### Group 1 Notes

- How should we define a productive faculty member under RBB?
- Reward productivity and impact and not dollar input, number of students, number of extension programs, etc.
- Can't overlook faculty that produce the resources needed for running the department.

### Group 2 Notes

- Definition resides with departments. Productivity assessed based on expectations for individual faculty, within University guidelines.

### Group 3 Notes

- For teaching - seems to be number of students (large course enrollments)
- For research - direct and especially indirect costs via grants
- For Extension - outcomes of program efforts, level of local county support.

- We need to realize in Extension that some program areas / specializations and geographic locations will generate more cost than others
- For Extension programs - need to consider how we evaluate them, behavior change is more demanding than expectations via resident instructions.
- Concern expressed about RBB not encouraging quality of teaching and generation of knowledge.
- Concern also - no single model that defines productive faculty - too many different facets of the science and the state.

**Question #4 - Will the FAES mission change as it related to commodity groups as we operate within the new funding paradigm?**

Summary Notes from Report Back

- It has already changed
- As long as budget lines are a major part of funding, we need to engage groups in helping with the direction of our mission areas
- It continues to evolve and is influenced by funding.
- Mission with groups - want change; the level of service will likely change
- Advocacy in terms of dollars
- Can't afford to lose commodity groups - both college and groups are changing
- We need to stay aligned with commodities

Group 1 Notes

- It is changing and has changed. We are dealing with commodity groups differently.
- Commodity groups have been our advocates. Grow advocates for our future.
- As long as our line item funding is important we must work with these commodity groups.
- Engage our commodity groups in the direction of our mission.

Summary: RBB is forcing us to be more flexible and responsive. How do we become more flexible and more responsive?

Group 2 Notes

- Mission will continue to evolve but will be influenced by mechanisms of funding.

Group 3 Notes

- It is important for commodity groups to understand our new RBB scenario.
- These groups need to support research that allows commodities to adapt to Ohio.
- Some change will occur with technology, needs, and funding.
- We need to do a better job explaining how their dollars are spent and what the groups receive in return. Discussed new vs. long term commodity support where more established groups focus on advocacy and tax dollars, compared to newer commodities who will pay for a position.
- Mission won't change; the level of attention / service that we can provide will change.

**Question #5 - How will faculty performance be evaluated under the new funding paradigm?**

Summary Notes from Verbal Report Back

- Will be based on productivity and input
- Scholarship and financial connection to the college
- Departments make decision on cost/benefit analysis
- Will be a challenge for Extension - require a behavioral change

- Budget restructuring is in conflict with our mission - the comparison could be problematic
- What we now have is not bad to begin with.
- Experiment with buying time at end of year.

#### Group 1 Notes

- Evaluate productivity and impact and not number of programs, number of students, and Number of dollars.
- Evaluate them on what they were hired to do and did they do that.

#### Group 2 Notes

- Based on scholarship end, financial contribution to the organization.

#### Group 3 Notes

- We'll add components related to money, such as classes taught generate income, direct and indirect costs, release time donated, etc.
- Department making decisions based on cost/benefit analysis much more than in the past.
- Qualitative evaluation more important than in past for Extension?  
Example: it doesn't matter if 450 people attended the program, how did their behavior change?
- It will make life more difficult for Extension faculty.

<p><b>Question #6 - Should the model of clinical/research faculty be instituted within FAES?</b></p>
--

#### Summary Notes from Verbal Report Back

- In favor of it, but there are concerns about space, start-up packages
- There will be a problem of maintaining them, if they are successful; they will be targeted by other institutions
- What other things can chairs ask them to do?
- How will it apply to teaching and extension
- Departments should maintain ultimate control
- Could work well in some instances; not so well in others
- See a need for it, but need to make sure we don't utilize it at the cost of regular faculty
- We should use it, but the individuals will need to be able to generate income; allow them to have larger salaries. In doing so, will it create a caste system?

#### Group 1 Notes

- Most were in favor of this but space and equipment is an issue
- Could cost college dollars if the research facility is not successful in getting (external sp?) grants.
- If they fail they will leave, if they are successful they will also probably leave.
- What can the department ask these people to do as service to department?
- Loss of tenure system.

### Group 2 Notes

- Teaching Extension should be an option for non-tenured positions within the Department allocations.
- Model should be accepted with Departments retaining ultimate control.
- Should not be restricted to research only.

### Group 3 Notes

- Could work better in some places than others. e.g. multi - year grants could support this approach where you can expand into new fields; but not at the expense of ongoing programmatic areas.
- Integration of teaching, research and Extension has a synergistic effect.
- Concern - don't compromise this integration in the name of RBB.

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>
-------------------------

- Budget restructuring is forcing us to be more flexible and responsive.
- Our strength is in our ability to integrate teaching, research, and Extension.
- Although a great deal of control is needed at the departmental level, the college should not abdicate control completely.
- We need to market our image across campus.