The meeting opened with Dr. Georghiades addressing item 1 (junior faculty and COE seed funding).

1. Dr. Georghiades described the philosophy behind seed funding as a means to encourage collaboration. Teams can then go out and get larger grants. It’s not specifically aimed at any level of faculty (junior or otherwise).
2. He clarified that the process is not weighted more toward senior faculty; in fact, mid-level faculty are the most active. But all levels are encouraged to utilize the program.
3. New faculty bring new blood, new ideas. Junior faculty working with senior faculty do not have to necessarily take the back seat.

Before moving to the next item on the agenda, Dr. Anand addressed an item left over from the last meeting, namely the teaching load of junior faculty. Committee members received a handout with histograms showing the distribution of teaching load (pictures includes below):
Next, Dr. Anand addressed item 2 (expiration of startup funds).

1. Startup funds must be spent in the first 3 years, when the mid-term review occurs. Start-up funds, by definition, provide financial resources for new faculty to begin their scholarly work, so the funds must be spent according to that express purpose. They are not intended to fund an ongoing research program. This is clearly spelled out in your offer letter.

2. If a delay occurs, such as a setback in getting a lab ready or in receiving equipment, faculty can request a special exception with the Dean’s office through their respective department head.

The meeting continued with a discussion of item 3 (expectations regarding number of classes/preparations in teaching portfolio for tenure review).

1. Questions included: what is an appropriately sized portfolio? Do departments have guidelines? Are there informal expectations?

2. Dr. Anand explained that there is no minimum number; rather, the goal is to demonstrate the ability to teach various classes. If someone only teaches one course over the years before applying for tenure, that is a red flag.

3. Informally speaking, a suggestion would be around 4 courses, at least one of which is a graduate level course and one of which is a large course. One or two courses is probably not sufficient.

4. It’s helpful to get your course preparation out of the way so that you can later focus more on your research program.

Dr. Anand then addressed item 4 (mid-term review process).

1. The process is standardized. A mid-term review case goes all the way to the dean through the college committee, the department head and the departmental committee. The department head submits a preliminary report to the college reflecting his/her own assessment and the departmental committee’s assessment. The Dean takes the college committee recommendation into consideration and makes her own assessment. The Executive Associate Dean then gives feedback to the department head. Lastly, the
department makes a final recommendation based on input from the departmental committee, the college committee, and the dean, and gives a written assessment to the candidate.

2. Sometimes a candidate is given a 4th year, if they show promise. This gives them one more year to make the necessary changes.

3. There was an attempt in the past to simplify the process and do it all online. The college spent a lot of money to buy the software and gave it to the departments to develop. Nothing ever got done, which is why we still use the old system.

The discussion then turned to item 5 (mentoring from T&P members).

1. This is neither encouraged nor discouraged. You cannot avoid T&P members in your department; you will need to find ways to work together. Both parties must be careful to do everything above board.

2. Mentorships are a good thing, since we learn by observing and building relationships.

After Dr. Anand departed, the committee discussed other agenda items.

1. Approval of minutes – We should technically approve them before they go out. Dr. Staack will approve via email before distribution.

2. Distribution of task among council members.
   a. Agenda preparation – Dr. Staack
   b. Minutes preparation, review, and distribution – Dr. McClarren
   c. Regular updating of webpage – Dr. Gratz
   d. Maintaining JFAC membership list – Dr. Gratz (Arin will send email list to him)
   e. Maintaining Junior faculty list – Arin will find out who has this list. Include tenure and non-tenure track; arranged by department would be helpful. Is it useful to make it a listserv? Can we have IT do this? Needs to be updated each year – includes those who are one year into tenure.

3. Are we meeting in summer? No, the last meeting will be in May.

4. Arin will find out date of April meeting and contact Dr. Staack.