

Minutes of the ARHU Collegiate Council November 18, 2011.

The council met in Rm 2123 of Tawes Recital Hall.

Attendees: Sam Kerstein (Philosophy, Chair); Shelby Sender (School of Music and Graduate Student Representative); Tajeh Ebram (English and Undergraduate Student Representative), Katherine Murdock (Music), Paula Barriga-Sanchez (History and Classified Staff Representative), Giuseppe Falvo (School of Languages), Thomas Zeller (History); Yui Suzuki (Art History & Archaeology); Bernard Cooperman (Jewish Studies); Naomi Feldman (Linguistics); Audra Buck-Coleman (Art); Katie King (Women's Studies); Jeffrey McCune, Jr. (American Studies and Women's Studies); Walter Dallas (Theatre, Dance & Performance Studies); Charles Rutherford (Associate Dean; ex officio and Dean's Representative).

1. New Members.

The two new student representatives, Tajeh Ebram (Undergrad) and Shelby Sender(Grad), were welcomed.

2. Dean's Remarks.

Charles Rutherford conveyed the Dean's apologies at not being able to attend the meeting. She asked that the Collegiate Council help develop ways to present the research activities of the College to the rest of the university that seems to understand the Humanities as engaging in "scholarship" but not "research." Members asked for guidance as to format, content, and concreteness. Prof. McCune asked for a template or specific questions that people could fill out/respond to. It was unclear to members what the audience for this document would be, and members asked why the College should accept the terminologies of outsiders. Rutherford agreed the issue was largely semantic, but stressed that until more was known about the self-perception of the departments in ARHU, it would be difficult for the Dean's office to construct an effective characterization of our work.

Giuseppe Falvo felt this was an ongoing challenge of metrics—how to measure achievement. Katie King called for a good-faith conversation with members of other sections of the University community instead of fantasizing about their opinions. Bernard Cooperman wondered whether we "concede the game" by adopting the "research" rhetoric of other fields, thus implicitly agreeing to the irrelevance of our own categories of knowledge. Charles Rutherford added that there was work in ARHU that met the criteria for "research," pointing to a recent proposal by Naomi Feldman.

Charles Rutherford went on to emphasize that there were many audiences for the College's "story" including the Vice President for Research.

Naomi Feldman mentioned the Language-Science Efforts program that sponsored productive meetings with poster presentations, short talks, and meetings, all of which led to real contacts across the fields of Language study.

This model could be extended to the rest of campus. Sam Kerstein underlined the consensus position that to be effective in generating useful information from faculty, the Dean's request had to be concretely framed.

3. Salary compression

Rutherford reported Dean Thornton Dill's observation that the issue of salary compression seemed to belong properly to the Administrative Council or APAC rather than the Collegiate Council since APAC was specifically charged with considerations of fiscal matters. The issue will be discussed at the upcoming retreat for the Administrative Council in January.

He mentioned that APAC was already collecting data and affirmed that the Collegiate Council was not excluded from treating the topic.

In response to Katie King's request for further information on the topic, Charles Rutherford mentioned data on the public website

www.collegiatetimes.com/databases/salaries. He also noted that there were two separate questions before APAC: salary compression per se, and comparisons of UMD salaries with those at peer institutions.

Thomas Zeller noted that as elected representatives, it behooves the members of the Council to express their concern to the Dean. Sam Kerstein posed the question of whether there should be a formal motion to put the Council's concern on record, and it was agreed that recording it in the minutes was sufficient. Kerstein wondered if it might not be inappropriate to treat salary compression issues in the Collegiate Council since junior faculty members might find themselves in the uncomfortable position of having to make possibly controversial statements at a delicate stage of their careers. Naomi Feldman expressed the view that we need not duplicate committee work between APAC and the Council.

4. DRIF (Designated Research Incentive Funds)

Audra Buck-Coleman expressed concerns about the way in which calls were issued for applications for DRIF. She suggested that the single annual call was not flexible enough. She asked if, at least for the travel support section of DRIF allocations, there might be two calls per year. Charles Rutherford noted his own ongoing role in the administration of DRIF disbursements. He noted that there had been a steep decline in the amount available (from \$150,000 some years ago to less than \$50,000 last year). Moreover, even though some units in the College are financially "in the black," the Dean's Office itself is overcommitted and cannot add to these funds. He liked the idea of some accommodation for a second call and ongoing allocations as the year progressed.

There was considerable discussion about whether, in allocating funds, the College should take into account not only the merit of the proposals but also the resources already available to individual applicants. It was pointed out

that distinguishing between “junior vs senior faculty” or “those who already had their own research funds and those who didn’t” were difficult to enforce and complicated to assess. Thus an effective need-based selection criterion was very difficult to develop. It was suggested that Chairs, who already evaluate proposals for merit, might also be asked to indicate the relative need of applicants. It was also suggested that applicants be asked to indicate on their applications whether they had other resources upon which they could draw, and if so, how much those might be. It was also suggested that the call for applications stress that the College funds were limited and that therefore individuals were encouraged to look to other sources if they could. Audra Buck-Coleman moved formally that the College be urged to issue the call for applications for DRIF funds in support of travel for scholarly purposes twice a year. Seconded by Bernard Cooperman. Passed unanimously.

5. Dean’s Forum.

The Council agreed that the Dean’s Forum was an excellent idea. Charles Rutherford was asked to clarify with the Dean when she might want to hold it.

6. The next Council meeting will be December 9 in the Dean’s Conference room 1102 Francis Scott Key Hall.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernard D. Cooperman