Nov 29 Update from Marj Corcoran, liaison to Deans' Task force on Enrollment Growth:
We had a meeting last week, we clearly will not have a preliminary report by Dec 1. We looked at enrollment numbers, which was interesting. The enrollments in some courses are going up faster than the overall enrollment, indicating that the mix of students is changing, probably being more heavily weighted toward premeds. The number of students taking math 101/102 is going up faster than enrollment, probably indicating that fewer students are coming in with AP credit in calculus (ie, they are not as well prepared as students in the past).

We are still in the information-gathering mode, but there was already some consensus that the university should provide for permanent staff to run the big labs, and we will have to add additional sections of some large classes.

Ken Whitmire pointed out that, when the decision was made to increase enrollment, Natural Science sent a packet of information to the provost pointing out the additional resources they would need. No action was taken, basically the university did not provide any additional resources to deal with increased enrollment, then all budgets were cut by 10%. I asked to see a copy of the information sent by Natural Science to the Provost, but we haven't gotten it yet. We will have another meeting in December.

ADVANCE Retention and Climate Committee Charge

**Charge:** Institutionalize faculty development that changes the departmental climate and promotes faculty excellence in all areas: teaching, research and service.

Nov 30: Update from Stan Sazykin, liaison

I had a meeting with Jan Rinehart Monday afternoon. She briefed me on the ADVANCE program and where it is going in general. She then gave me an update on their committees work and specifically on the retention committee (which is where I think I am a liaison).

Regarding the liaison process: She explained that in general, these committees work slowly and in her opinion, they don't want liaisons to attend committee meetings. Rather, Jan would prefer to update the liaisons herself. In other words, they seem to prefer that I should be a liaison to Jan rather than to the committee directly, and would communicate their results this way.

Regarding the retention committee: Jan explained that this committee focuses on the issues relevant to full professors and also to some extent to associate professors. They are looking at different issues such as salaries relative to peer institutions, at ways department chairs at Rice allocate resources (lab space, etc) and assign teaching. While some of the issues are relevant to gender non-discrimination, Jan feels that it is valuable to summarize how this is implemented in general at Rice and how this can be improved for retention of full professors purposes. Their biggest problem is sparse data for associate and full professors. The retention committee struggles to find any data, as relevant information has to come from department chairs and many simply don't have stated policies. I asked how the Senate can help, but Jan answered that their committee hopes to gather needed data on their own. The retention committee is expected to have a first-draft report completed (Jan thinks February), which will be the first meaningful communication from the committee to me.
ADVANCE Assessment and Evaluation Committee
Nov 30: Update from Duane Windsor, liaison
The faculty chairs are Mike Wong (Professor of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering) and Marcia O’Malley (Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering & Materials Science). The committee (which met in September, October, and November) has focused on annual reviews of associate professors with respect to research, teaching, and service. The committee has examined the present University policy (reviews every three years and annually past the ninth year at associate professor rank), gathered internal documents, and gathered external documents from several peer universities. A key concern or issue appears to be whether all associate professors understand what it means to be a full professor. Some departments reportedly do annual reviews prior to the ninth year change in required reviewing cycle (from three years to every year). Jan expects that the committee will make a report in January or February, with draft report initially going to me as Senate liaison.

Jan received materials concerning the annual faculty performance review system (which includes all ranks) in the Jones School, Schools of Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Engineering and forwarded to the committee.

There was a department chairs retreat in early October. The Provost wants written annual reports in all departments on all faculty (assistant, associate, full). The department chairs committed to such reviews for assistant professors; and want to consider further about associates and fulls.

ADVANCE Recruitment Committee Charge
- Charge: Institutionalize lessons learned about faculty recruiting and search processes.

Dec 7, 2010 Update from Jane Tao, Senate liaison.
I met with Jan in early November and also in December about the Recruitment Committee, chaired by Mike Wong and Marcie O’Malley (http://advance.rice.edu/Content.aspx?id=86). The long-term charge of this committee is to institutionalize lessons learned about faculty recruiting and search processes. The current goal, however, is to develop guidelines/policies to mentor associate professors, and to facilitate associate professor promotion to full professor. The Committee has met monthly since September except November. The committee has noted that: (1) there were no clear guidelines on associate professor promotion/review; (2) different departments followed different practices in providing annual/periodic reviews of associate professors. It is also unclear about the roles of the annual/periodic review and whether it should be a part of the PT dossier, as discussed at the recent Chairs’ Retreat. The Committee is now asking for external letter request from Rice school deans, and to gather promotion guidelines at other universities.

Jan expects to have the first draft recommendation for associate professor mentoring and promotion in January 2011. In the draft, there will be summary of the research for other university, and a set of good practices and recommendation. The committee is also organizing an Associate professor workshop sometime in March 2011. The workshop will discuss what full professor is like (or the expectations) and what the promotion process is for associate professors. Some case studies (originally from Harvard) will also be presented.

** The Committee’s interpretation of the current Rice guidelines is: Rice wants all associate professors to be promoted to full professor by their 9th year; associate professors will be reviewed at least one every three years before 9 years, and will be reviewed annually after 9 years.