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FDDE Committee  
Meeting Notes  
Feb. 5, 2013

**Attendees:** Troy Beckert, Helga Van Miegroet, Kevin, Lucy, and Virginia Exton (over speaker phone)

**Statistics:**
Email Michael Torrens about availability of stats

The data we're looking for:

1. Retention:
   a. Are we losing percentages of women/Hispanics?
   b. % Stay
   c. % Leave
   d. % Promote

2. Associate to Full Professor by gender:
   a. Years to full w/ 2012 data
   b. Looked like that about 13 years after tenure women reach full at about the same rate as men
   c. Some male professors reach full 2 or 3 years after they reach associate

3. Continuity w/ previous FDDE Statistical Reports
   a. Faculty Gender by Tenure Status by College, (data derived from AAA raw numbers in Appendix 2)
   b. Percentage of Women Faculty by College (all ranks)
   c. Raw Data from AAA Office detailing Faculty Rank and Gender by College
   d. Raw Data from the USU AAA Office, Faculty Gender by College (all ranks)
   e. Faculty Race by Tenure Status Compared with National Availability
   f. Comparison of USU Faculty Racial Background to Other Demographic Groups
   g. USU AAA Office Raw Data Detailing USU Faculty Race and Rank by College
   h. USU AAA Office Raw Data Detailing USU Faculty Race by College (all ranks)

4. Limiting factors:
   a. Data starts in 2007 and runs to 2012. 2006 data is available and Michael Torrens indicated that it is unreliable.
Implementation Issues - Welcome Plus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires - Benefit-Eligible (All Faculty Ranks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Staffing WP:**
   a. Who populates WP task force?
      i. Current and former members of FDDE committee willing to serve on WP
      ii. Work with Janis Boettinger to identify additional members (volunteers) - FDDE cannot do it all
   b. WP participants would need to meet once/year
   c. Need to train WP members
      i. In terms of training wp members, once we have an lms system, it could sit behind that and you could see who did the training, when, if a test is involved did they pass.... Your committee should be thinking of what that training consists of, so it is ready as soon as the lms is available. *(from BrandE Faupell)*
   d. Two WP members to meet with each candidate;
      i. One WP member coming from the FDDE Committee
      ii. Neither WP member can be from same College as candidate
      iii. WP members only address Cache Valley Community issues
      iv. Focus is on social support systems within the valley i.e., schools, local and community organizations and family support groups.
      v. Facilitate connecting candidates with relevant valley resources
   e. Create a packet for search committees to give to each candidate highlighting Cache Valley community resources

2. **Getting WP on Hiring Committees' Agenda:**
   a. Faculty search committees need to be aware from the outset that WP is available for each candidate
      i. *PeopleAdmin* applicant tracking system to alert search chairs about this. Let me *(BrandE Faupell)* ask around about this as an option.
   b. Include WP information when Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity (AA/EO) office meets with hiring committee
   c. That each candidate is given the opportunity to meet with WP as part of the interview-day schedule
   d. Candidate can choose to meet with WP if they desire
   e. WP would only meet with candidates who request a meeting

3. **Feedback:**
a. Need instrument to track each person WP meets with (paper, email, or web instrument) and gauge how we are doing and what we can do better or need to change
b. Troy Beckert volunteered to develop feedback survey

Faculty Senate Open Discussion:

Glen McEvoy (last year’s FS president) and Renee Galliher (current FS President) held an open discussion on changing the size of the FS and/or possibly the size FS Standing Committees.

Reduction of Standing Committees Size:

1. Serious concerns with committee not reaching a quorum
   a. FDDE has only had a quorum once this year
   b. Smaller is better for managing meeting
      i. Change RCDE member so he/she reports to both RCDE and CEU Eastern/Blanding
   c. Do not need to have the three Faculty Senators on each standing committee
      i. Chair of each standing committee represents committee at the Faculty Senate
      ii. Need alternative chair in case chair can not make FS meetings
   d. Limit standing committee membership to 10 people
      i. Drop membership to 10
      ii. Make five members active, each with an alternate
      iii. The five alternates come from the faculty senate?
      iv. Four active members alternate between colleges and fifth member represent RCDE (and CEU Eastern/Blanding and Extension?)

2. Lack of recognition for Faculty Service:
   a. Faculty need to focus on what the Faculty Code states is critical to attain P&T
   b. Lack of credit for service (payment, reduction of duties, acknowledgement of service)
   c. Committee service is an important job but faculty are constrained by not having reduced teaching/research workloads on top of service
   d. Representation from each college is important but too often members lack motivation