

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Oct. 21, 2013

In attendance:

Clint Buhler (CB)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Robert Carlson (RC)

Curtis Larsen (CL)

Jennifer Ciaccio (JC)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Rebecca DiVerniero (RD)

Erin O'Brien (EO)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Del Parson (DP)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Sandy Petersen (SP)

Jim Hendiges (JiH, for Amijo Comeford)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

RC: Thanks for coming—NS is on his way, and a few others might be late. There aren't any minutes from the last meeting because I forgot to write them down [*JDH note: I was inadvertently absent*], but we can all agree that we had a meeting.

© I want to report that I have invited President Nadauld to attend all our meetings, and he knows this. It's a good step for us; he's trying to take an interest in what faculty are doing.

SP: I just want to give a brief report on the Teaching and Learning Committee. Last spring, Don Hinton and President Nadauld talked about a Technology Committee—back when we were talking about MOOCs, etc. Don Hinton put together this committee to look at technology on this campus, and it's morphed into this new committee. We look at best practices, supporting faculty who are interested. One of the things we've made clear is that nothing is required; it's an opportunity to foster teaching excellence on campus. Thus far, we've talked about many possibilities and options; one of which is connecting with Josh Stanley in the Teaching and Learning Center. Many of my faculty didn't even know it exists, and it's there as an opportunity for all of us to learn more about technology. We also look at videos and technology, newsletters, conferences, and other resources for faculty wanting to improve their teaching—to put a stronger focus on campus-wide pedagogy. We've noticed that when the President has campus-wide meetings, they're always about construction—who's moving where and what buildings are happening, etc., and there's not much regarding teaching. Every year we have a Teacher of the Year award, but it's never mentioned again. So there's not much of an emphasis on good teaching, but there *is* one on technology, which is a piece of that, but it's a broader perspective on what teaching is. It might turn into a clearinghouse for all the good on campus that people maybe aren't aware of. It's still up in the air; if you have suggestions, things you'd like to see happen, let me know. We've talked previously in the committee about what happens after you present at a conference—we all know we're supposed to do *something*, but we don't know what. Perhaps the committee could house that—those who want to do a presentation, to share their presentation and research or writing with others, would have a space to do that. Josh Stanley's area, which is supposed to be devoted to teaching and learning, is wide open, and we could do much more there if we chose. So, while it's in the planning stages, let your voice be heard.

RC: What should *we* do to take advantage of this committee better?

SP: At this point, I think it's just be aware that there *is* such a Committee, that its focus is on teaching and learning, and that we want to have a stronger presence and stronger emphasis on the good work people are doing on campus outside of buildings and construction.

RC: Can I make a suggestion for your mission? The Board of Trustees has made conscious effort to highlight faculty accomplishments, but we don't always know what those accomplishments are. They're open to suggestions, so if you find out good things that faculty are doing, if you could pass the information to me and I'll be happy to spotlight them for the Board of Trustees.

SP: Wonderful—will do!

RC: Any other questions?

SP: The current mission statement for the committee, and we're still wordsmithing, is to foster teaching excellence by providing resources, opportunities for enrichment, and strategies to recognize high-quality teaching.

RC: The Faculty Excellence Committee, which sounds like it has a similar mission, is also revising their mission statement, so you may want to work with Ami Comeford to make sure you don't duplicate.

SP: I've talked to Angie Child about getting together for that.

RC: It sounds like they would be distinct, but getting together would be good to be sure. Now, EO has been working on Academic Integrity issues, and I've asked her to make a report. She's spent a lot of time on this (EO passes out two documents).

EO: Some of you, if you were here for our week of in-house meetings before classes started, I talked a bit about what current policy allows. It turns out that current policy is a bit like the Bible—you can get it to say whatever you want it to say, and it contradicts itself in a couple of different places. So my job has been to clean it up a little bit and to try and make it better reflect current practice, because it doesn't. And to build in a couple of extra components to ease some pressure from faculty and students—basically, to involve administration in the process a bit more. There are two handouts; the first is information that you might have available if you are a faculty member. There's an excerpt from the Faculty Handbook, which is quite vague—even if you read it, you'd have a hard time understanding it. It has links to certain protocols, but not to how to deal with stuff. But there's a short list of things that you're allowed to do—this mirrors what it says in the policy to some extent. If you're looking for a shorthand version of what you can do, this *kind* of covers it—it's not exhaustive. The other handout is the actual policy. There are number of minor changes clarifying certain things, like what constitutes “days”—we're going with academic business days, meaning those days when school is in session, and changing some timelines with those clarifications. The big changes that I have put in are as follows: On page 1, I just inserted that departments can add on to this policy, which several departments have done—Psychology has done this with plagiarism. Nothing prohibits departments from doing this; I just added in a line to let them know they *can* do that in case they aren't aware. On page 2: I didn't feel comfortable making unilateral changes, but there is in here that if a faculty member is aware of misconduct, s/he is required to discuss the issue with the student. That's all it says. In my personal experience, having sat on an ad-hoc Appeals Committee, “discuss” is too broad. Sometimes “discuss” has been just “Hey, you've been caught doing this, this is the punishment we're giving you, and if you want, you can appeal it.” That seems a bit much. So in a comment, I mentioned that it should be clarified and guidelines should be established on what constitutes a “discussion” versus a notification—it's to explain the charges and the evidence, and give the student the opportunity to say something if they have a different version of events. In particular, if other students have come forward to report the student, if the alleged student has a different story, s/he should be documenting things, and this is the opportunity for a faculty to request that documentation. The conversation doesn't necessarily have any effect on what the faculty member does, but it's more than a simple notification. Basically, it's so that a committee doesn't have to deal with appeals unnecessarily. Sometimes, it seems like the ad-hoc Appeals Committees have been established when all that was needed was a faculty-student discussion. I'd like to put that in there. That's my recommendation—it's just a guideline and can be written as such so that faculty members that read “I have to discuss this” have better information.

CB: So putting a comment on the paper that contains the plagiarism isn't sufficient?

EO: Well, it's something...you could say “come and see me if you have any questions.”

RC: We've talked before about having an automated system, and part of that system could be a form for a summary that is sent to student that includes some or all of this. That would be one way to implement this.

EO: I've not included that automated system in the policy because it seems like a standing rule and it could change every few years as technology changes, and it seemed best not to codify it. So I left the site out, even though it's definitely a part of what we want to get done.

CL: But the system will be a central clearinghouse for information.

EO: Currently, I haven't put that in, but I can. I have even added in who will be notified when—such as, with a second strike, that faculty will be notified that an offense isn't the first.

CB: Is that required, for a faculty member to notify about *any* instance of misconduct?

EO: Yes, that's what we've discussed.

CB: I've had lots of plagiarism on my papers, but I don't think it was always on purpose. I want to dock the student and make them aware that it's plagiarism, but I don't know that it warrants notifying the entire university and making it a bigger issue.

EO: The way we've discussed it is that it gives faculty the opportunity to have their stories. It's not to get students into more trouble—if the student keeps making the same infraction time after time, and continually claims “Oh, I just didn't know any better,” it becomes hard to defend if they've been caught several times, and faculty can call them on that—the consequences will be ramped up. The first time, if you're pretty sure it's the first time, and it's minor, of course we all agree that you don't go crazy with the punishment, but if they keep doing it, that indicates a different, larger pattern. Some students have been guilty of plagiarism and claim “I just didn't know,” and you realize only later that they've done it in multiple classes. We're just trying to prevent that, that's all. It's also meant to encompass situations such as we have with, for example, a lot of the Chinese students, who have a different sense of what “original work” is. If they've been guilty of a serious infraction, and they're spoken to, and then they're guilty of a *less* serious infraction later, it's clear that they're trying to improve; it's not throwing the book at them because the work still isn't “good.” It allows

acknowledgement that they're improving. It's not meant to be *always* negative for the student; it can be a documentation that the student is working to improve.

CL: But if you're assigning several papers throughout the semester, and the student has a small problem at the beginning of the semester, it may not be noteworthy and wouldn't need to be reported, but later in the semester, it might be.

EO: It's worth discussing. Some faculty have found an apparent one-time issue in a class, but sometimes students learn that if they can't get away with it in one class, they'll just try again in another class. For that reason, it's a good idea to document even first-time infractions, so that patterns like that can be documented. But again, you would say "This is the infraction, and this is the seriousness of it; this was the punishment." It's not meant to make it bad on the student; just to let him/her know that s/he can't hop from class to class and see where s/he can get away with it; there will be a notice and we'll see that it's a pattern. That's why even the first time you might want to document it.

RC: The reason we're trying to create a simple on-line form is so that reporting, even the first time, isn't burdensome—the faculty member can make a comment that an infraction was small, and the student was docked five points or whatever. If that's the extent of reporting, we hoped that that would *increase* the amount of reporting. That way, repeat patterns can be seen sooner rather than later. Right now, we've had six cases of plagiarism reported officially in three years, and we know that isn't accurate! So we're trying to find a way to create a balance—we don't want a burdensome reporting process, but we *do* want a way to accurately represent the actual offense, which sometimes is cumulative. We don't know what the balance is; that's why we have had this discussion about what "discussion" means and what kinds of reporting are sufficient, and so forth.

EO: So these are just my recommendations—the actual reporting process still has to be worked out; we're still discussing it. Faculty have to be happy with it; if they don't use it, it might as well not exist. An automated summary could be part of it; something that says something like "If you have any questions, you're welcome to talk to your professor or department chair or whomever." The Academic Integrity Committee—not to be confused with the Academic Appeals Committee; the two are often confused in this policy, and it should always be the latter, and it's mislabeled in the document!—a number of us talked to Tim Eicher, who's chaired that committee, and the policy currently suggests that the committee can mete out punishment, but they've never done that as far as records go. So I've changed the document to indicate what seems to be done—more in line with what people have actually *been* doing. So as for sanctions: they can be imposed by a dean or the Academic Vice-President, and we're going over the department chairs because they already have too much to do! In part it's because of their increased teaching loads, but it's also because with those loads, they are likely to have these students in their *own* classes, and we were concerned that this could create a bias. As faculty, the chairs could be aware of every infraction for a student in one of their own classes, and that could create uncomfortable situations for such students. Bypassing people they might have in a classroom would make things easier on the students and take the pressure off of the chairs. That's why the committee has been replaced here with "dean or Academic Vice-President." That includes the stuff in there about what you as faculty can do...there are timelines, too. If there's a sanction, they must be reported within 10 academic days, and sanctions ideally made through the central processing system, and the automated system would automatically kick out information to the dean of the school, or to the Academic Vice-President if there are multiple offenses across multiple schools. At that point, it becomes difficult for one dean to deal with it.

RC: One reason we want a centralized system is that it would make this all automatic, and faculty wouldn't have to try to figure out who to contact.

EO: Anywhere that "department chair" was listed, it's been replaced by "dean and Academic Vice-President"—it could be "and/or" to be more accurate. A lot of other details clarifying time frames... For section 4d, at the bottom of page 3: because there are different levels of administration involved, I left it vague—I just said "any member of administration involved in the process based on the above protocols may undertake an investigation." That could be a dean or the Academic Vice-President. It seems like anyone involved based on the above rules can do this. Recommendations?

RC: I worry that if the Dean of Students imposes him/herself in the process, then s/he could be responsible for that, and I don't think it's what's intended.

EO: Does it need to be the academic deans?

RC: Maybe specify "President, Academic dean, or Academic Vice-President," or something like that.

EO: I have a note in there saying that, as an alternative, it could be restricted to the dean of the school in which the current offense occurred—to eliminate the President and Vice-President; the idea that the President would start investigating something at that level would be too much at that point. How do people feel about that?

RC: I like that wording a lot. We don't want students to cherry-pick the dean that they think will be best for them.

NS: Up above, you say that the Academic Vice-President may impose sanctions; can that just say "dean"?

EO: The Academic Vice-President becomes involved at the point at which multiple infractions have occurred across schools. It doesn't preclude the dean of the *most recent* problem from doing the investigation. A lot of the new text on that page after that has been removed. There are a couple of things in here where it's not clear *why* it's in here. For example, if a student appeals a sanction within the appropriate time period, the time frame can be extended by 10 days

after resolution of the appeal. If the sanction stopped at the faculty member, and it's being appealed, it doesn't seem like it's affecting the time line for anything beyond that, so it seems unnecessary. If this goes to a dean or the Academic Vice-President, it's out of the faculty member's hands, so there should be nothing to appeal. Is there an example when that isn't true? Where a faculty member and dean/Academic Vice-President would be doing something at the same time? I suppose a student could be failed from a class and simultaneously expelled from a program...?

RC: If it's all one offense, then no.

EO: Yes, that's how it seems to me. So extending things seems unnecessary; it just prolongs things. I'll delete that unless someone has a specific situation...? In cases of multiple instances of substantiated misconduct, a faculty member, or dean (including the Dean of Students), Academic Vice-President, etc. can impose sanctions at any time. The Dean of Students has been in there already—should s/he be in or out? Later in the policy, when appeals are clarified, s/he becomes a potential advocate for student.

CL: It doesn't say that the Dean of Students can *remove* sanctions.

EO: Impose them, yes, but later on, at the bequest of some faculty that felt that there was a bad interaction as a result of the faculty member being responsible for the appeals process *and* defending punishment, we ask the Dean of Students to be the lead at the Academic Integrity level, and given that a dean is standing in for the faculty member, I had some people recommend that the Dean of Students can act as the advocate for the student *if* the student wants.

RC: S/he already has the power to impose a variety of sanctions for non-academic integrity issues. I think this may have been in here originally because if a student was involved in non-academic problems *and* plagiarism *and* academic problems, the dean would want to take that *all* into consideration in creating...

EO: Can we just make it that the reporting just goes to him/her? So everything could be taken into account?

RC: That would be better.

EO: OK. I left the Academic Integrity Committee in here; I didn't touch the Appeals Committee because that seems like a separate issue. Basically, the changes I added in that it's not just a faculty member that can be imposing sanctions, are because that's what policy says. We increased the size of the Academic Integrity Committee on the recommendation of Tim Eicher, who was the chair of that committee.

NS: In 11A, you may want to be specific about which member of the administration.

RC: Yes, like in the previous section.

EO: So even though we've clarified who can impose sanctions, in here it's anyone that can impose sanctions? It's about those that *have* imposed sanctions...those that are *able to* impose sanctions.

RC: Expanding the Appeals Committee size is critical; in the past, a student could have had an appeal supported or overturned by just two people. The committee had to be five people, but required only three to show up, and the vote of the majority ruled. It wasn't a firm enough process. So the size had to be expanded, and it has to include a student, which wasn't before—a student had to be assigned to the committee before, but didn't have to show up. This ensures that there's peer involvement.

EO: Having seven members brings it up to where five people have to be present for a vote to take place, and one must be a student, to ensure peer representation.

NS: It can be any student?

RC: The Student Association President assigns two; at least one of the two has to be there. And hopefully both, but they've been notoriously hard to get to show up.

EO: A large part of the rest of the changes are about hearing guidelines. Because the dean will already be there, I got rid of the fact that the dean can attend *ex officio* because he/she'll be involved after the changes in policy. I added the line that says that the Dean of Students can be there at the appealing student's request—it's an option. The complaining faculty member will be represented by his/her dean; the faculty member may or may not be present as determined by the faculty member and his/her dean. That came up from lots of discussion as to whether that was helpful to the process, but it seems like it should be decided on a case-by-case basis. Last but not least: the appeals are getting changed again based on recommendations from the Academic Integrity Committee as well as Bill Christiansen. It used to be that the Academic Vice-President was where the buck stopped—if s/he disagreed with a decision, s/he could overturn it. We are clarifying this so that the committee's guidelines allow for due process. Appeals can only be heard on the basis of due process having been afforded, *not* because the end point doesn't like a committee's decision. As long as due process was followed, the Academic Integrity Committee's decision sticks. I think I've made it clear that the Academic Vice-President or President (if there are multiple-school infractions) can reject all or parts of the committee's decision, stating reasons based exclusively on due process based on the Academic Integrity Committee, but they can only request that the Committee revisit the issue and repeat their process, and that's all. They can't come up with their own sanctions.

NS: They can't get another group to look at it?

EO: We could ask for a new committee be assembled, but there's an official Academic Integrity Committee that serves on campus. We could add to the policy that an ad hoc committee be assembled, but honestly, having the threat of having to

doing it over again will make sure that everyone is a stickler for due process! If someone feels it should go to a new committee, that can be added into the policy.

NS: The problem is if you do that, it might be just be used if someone didn't like the outcome.

EO: The big thing is that it's all about due process.

RC: I can imagine a legitimate case can be made if not all five people were there, or a student appointee to the committee wasn't available, so the committee would have to be reconvened.

EO: And Bill Christiansen is completely on board with that—he doesn't need to be the person to make or change decisions.

SL: When will this be implemented, or has it been implemented?

EO: No, you're the first step.

RC: What's going to happen is: this is reviewed by the Executive Committee, then taken back to your constituents. We don't want to take too long on this because it's going to be incorporated...well, we don't know where it will be incorporated. That's one thing we have to decide.

EO: What you're seeing here currently resides in the student policies section, not under the faculty policies. What exists in faculty policy is this (holds up document).

RC: And that's been removed.

EO: I just got off the web site this last Thursday.

RC: Oh, good, they put it back.

NS: It could reside in one and just be referenced in the other.

EO: One of the things we've talked about is having an Academic Integrity web site, where all of the policies are, and the faculty and student guides just reference that. That way, it lives in just one place; that could also be where reporting happens. Ideally, we'd like to encourage all of the departments that have their own individual policies to provide them and have them available there on that web site as well. So it'll be a "one-stop shop."

CB: Could you send digital copy of that to us to distribute to our constituents?

EO: Sure.

SL: I don't want to make work, but could you summarize the four major, bullet-point changes for us to present all this to our constituents?

EO: Sure, I can do that.

RC: Hopefully that'll be this week...?

EO: Yes. I'll tweak this as we've discussed.

RC: Then we'll discuss it and how we want to present it as policy—if we want to keep it in the student policies, which I don't think is a good idea even though it's the easiest thing, or request that it be removed from the student policies and placed into its own policy where both the student and faculty policies will reference it. It's something that both students and faculty need to be able to find easily. It's not about one or the other, but it affects everyone. Once we have a version we're comfortable with, it has to go to legal counsel before it gets posted, and I know it will get tweaked there.

SL: Does it have to go to the Board of Trustees?

RC: Eventually, but I'm just talking about preliminary stuff for the 30 day discussion period. Thank you very much EO for that.

EO: I'll tweak this and send it out to you and send it to RC and he can forward it.

RC: Our next item: at our last Academic Council meeting, which is mostly composed of deans, and then NS and I to represent Faculty Senate, an issue came up basically at the request of the deans and Academic Vice-President Bill Christiansen, who brought it up. They are suggesting that we change a policy. Currently, the deans have a maximum, discretionary workload allotment of three credit hours per year, and they want 24. That means the deans will have, at their discretion, up to 24 credit hours of work release to assign however they want, independent of the Faculty Workload Committee. Currently, the policy is that they have this three-credit-hour allotment for special cases; everything else must get approved by the Workload Committee. With the new policy, that'll mean 24 credits per dean that no one else would have to be aware of—I suppose that eventually they'll have to report to the Academic Vice-President, but they can approve assignments on their own discretion. The net result will be that, with 120 hours of work release floating around, the Faculty Workload Committee would have nothing to do, and they've voted to disband—no requests for release would ever be made to them again. The faculty would then be removed from the process of evaluating workload release.

EO: When Bill came to talk to the Workload Committee—the Committee never had any enforcement power; it was just a recommending group. Last year, we recommended five different workload changes to the workload model, and none of them were passed by the deans because they didn't have to. What we asked for was that to maintain at least some degree of a campus conscience, there has to be an annual audit by the Faculty Senate. So everything would have to be reported. Of course, the deans were all concerned about people giving away the bank; the faculty were concerned about being used and abused and not getting sufficient release time. So the annual report would be where issues would be able to be brought up.

RC: That has not been approved or brought forward to Academic Council, so we haven't heard that yet—it hasn't been part of any discussion. What *was* voted on, against our vigorous objections, was that this change will be enacted. It still has to be approved by a couple of other committees—it should have to go to University Council, and maybe the Board of Trustees has to approve it. I've expressed concern to the Academic Vice-President because—the reason I link the workload and professional development changes—for those that don't know, we've lost one-third of our professional development budget this year, with a verbal assurance that if we run out of money, the Academic Vice-President will find money somewhere. It depends on how much the Professional Development Committee approves.

SL: What's the reason for that?

RC: A couple of reasons. The deans felt that they hadn't specifically budgeted for those costs and they have to fund 25% of faculty professional development, and so they wanted out of the process and have 100% of it come from the Academic Vice-President's professional development funding account. But that 25% was money we were counting on, and it hasn't been replaced. So basically we go from funding 75% to funding 25%. What I expressed to Bill Christiansen was that over the past few years, the Faculty Senate has worked hard at increasing faculty involvement in governance, and these two steps are taking us backward. I sent the last e-mail to him this morning after he was further trying to explain and justify the workload release change. The Workload Committee, whose chair was a dean, not a faculty member, initially unilaterally disbanded the Committee, and I pointed out that they didn't have the authority to do that because it's a matter of policy that the Committee exists, but it's been rendered impotent with the other change if the deans have all the discretion. I also expressed displeasure with this to President Nadauld, with whom we met on Friday, and talked about how this affects faculty involvement in supervising—well, not just supervising; I also mentioned checks and balances, but it's more than that. I also brought up that when you make decisions, it's often from one point of view, but that misses things that other points of view might have. Right now, the deans will be making these decisions without having any faculty point of view at all. In terms of overall, across-campus equity, that's an issue that's come up quite frequently: some deans have been freer about giving out workload release than others. And what's appropriate? When you make one decision to offer workload release for *one* faculty member, other faculty members then have to pick up the slack, and those evaluations need to be addressed. Sometimes, the deans think that these credits only cost \$550 per credit hour because they just replace them with adjuncts, but that's not going to be the case—we're at a point where we've saturated our adjunct capability, and replacing these is to the point where we need new faculty, so this will cost more than they say it costs. I assume I'll get a response from Bill on this, but I'll keep you in the loop when I hear more.

EO: Another issue that was raised was this issue of faculty involvement. Bill offered, as a compromise, that in policy it currently says that decisions must be made in consultation with faculty, but there are no guidelines for what “consulting” is going to be.

RC: I think that right now he would say that these last two decisions *were* made in consultation with faculty. They “consulted” with us; we disagreed, and they did it anyway.

EO: He himself was concerned that decisions would be made when a dean would meet with a single faculty member, and that would constitute “consulting with faculty,” and that would be the end of the process. The committee as a whole raised that there should be some detailing of what “consulting with faculty” should constitute, and that deans should be organizing within-school committees so that they have to talk to a *group* of faculty.

RC: Part of the impetus for this was *not* to take authority away from faculty—I know that wasn't the intent. But Bill is moving toward a model in which the schools have more autonomy, which is fairly typical for a university—some things are done at a campus-wide level, but a lot of things are done within schools. But our current structure is that faculty consulting and involvement is *only* done at the institutional level—if that's taken away, there's no replacement at the school level. For some of these workload decisions, they can affect things *outside* the school. For example, changes to the curriculum process: a similar thing was done, only the process included allowances to ensure that faculty remained involved. So there are school-level Curriculum Committees that will make many decisions, and they are made up mostly of faculty members; things that affect *outside* the school go to the campus-wide Curriculum Committee. This seems reasonable and ensures that faculty remain involved. Nothing like that was done in this case. That may be what we end up pushing for: involvement of mini-committees at the school level. Right now, faculty have effectively been removed.

EO: I'd still advocate for Faculty Senate involvement. One of the things that was a benefit in the “new” old system of the Workload Committee was that you had across-campus information, so there was a degree of fairness and information. If a dean was being unfair to their faculty, it wasn't just known within school where people just kind of grumble; instead, it was known at a broader level, which introduces a degree of accountability. It's not that they get punished, but there's a degree of public “shaming” for not being good to their faculty. If faculty in one school know something's going on in another school, they can use that in their discussions with their own deans.

RC: One of the other facts about this that is disappointing is that the Faculty Workload Committee was working toward a more uniform workload model. Right now we have a “workload model” that is by *no* definition of the word a “model.” The current “model” is a hodge-podge of individually approved workload-release allowances without rhyme nor reason nor pattern. There was an attempt being made to create a pattern, to say “Here's how to evaluate these requests for

workload release” so that there’s consistency across campus—so if you put in x amount of time, that’s worth one credit of workload release, etc. There was a movement toward doing that, but this of course undermines that entirely, and there’s no overall means of comparison of which I am currently aware. We are still working on this discussion—it’s ongoing. Having approval of this at Academic Council should *not* be the end point, but I don’t know.

SL: Is there any useful benefit to making faculty aware of this change? Or is it already accomplished?

RC: I don’t think it’s been fully implemented yet. President Nadauld suggested that we could at least consider the magnitude of the discretion for each dean. From my perspective, he wants to give autonomy to people over certain areas, and doesn’t want to overrule Bill, but we’re working in our discussions with Bill and hopefully he can see that faculty are a valuable part of this process. Right now, he’s coming from the perspective that the deans have his ear, and their perspective carries a lot of weight with him because he *was* a dean just recently, so he knows their side of things better than he knows our side. We’re trying to explain how faculty can be *helpful* for the process.

CL: The current workload model is a bunch of exceptions—will that be pushed down to the schools?

RC: No, those will persist, but there’s so much discretion now on top of that that they can add to it almost any way they want.

CL: But if a dean has 24 credits at his/her discretion, that means that if s/he gives them out to things that become ongoing, then they’ll run out. I don’t see that this supersedes the need for a campus-level committee.

EO: Bill did say that he thought that anything that happened above a school level would need to go to him and potentially get built into a workload model, or something like that. There’s lots of complicating factors here. That fact that all these super-institutional positions, such as the chair of undergraduate research, or the Dixie Forum director, or the head of the Women’s Resource Center—positions like those, which are clearly across departments, have now been assigned to individual deans. Those deans are responsible for getting release for faculty to do those, but of course one thing that’s happened recently with the Dixie Forum is that if someone holds a position for a semester, a dean can pull a person out of that position, saying “We need you in the classroom, so you have to give that up” and we end up with an almost tragedy of the commons in which everyone agrees something should happen, but no one wants it to come out of their pool of release hours.

NS: Have those things been assigned? I remember an e-mail that specifically said that those were assigned.

RC: No, what EO’s talking about is a previous decision made at the end of last year or the beginning of this one, I don’t remember—where they were trying to give *more* accountability and release time to specific programs and have deans be in charge of specific things. For example, one dean would be responsible for the curriculum committee and process, and others for other various things. So there would be specific accountability, not because of interest, but it would be on some kind of rotating basis and some affiliation that if that program. Even if it affected the whole institution, if it seemed like it was more logical for it to be in one school or another, it would be under the supervision of that dean. That was a separate decision, and he hadn’t discussed with us how that would affect workload decisions. For example, if you look at the workload model, it’s something like 60 credits of release time in the model, maybe a little more, but they’re more than doubling that allotment as basically free and unsupervised additions. It will allow them to do all sorts of workload things that would never have passed the committee previously. It allows them flexibility to do lots of things.

CL: In the past, the three credits the deans had in the past were for temporary things, not ongoing things.

EO: Yes, but often as a temporary fixes when there was an intention to bring things to the Workload Committee eventually, and things sometimes were kicked back, and sometimes they went through. One of the reasons that Bill did this is that he wanted to give release time to sort of “subprogram” coordinators, and that got kicked back because of this intention to have an overarching, mathematical model for calculating credit. But he just keeps giving it to his faculty, and he’ll continue giving it under the current model. Or, I guess Phil is doing that.

JC: So is this pushback because the Workload Committee went too far?

RC: I think it’s that there was a bit of a stalemate because we’d heard about this actual model coming around. So when things came to Academic Council, for example, we would say “Well, how does this fit compared to other things? Is there a way to evaluate whether this deserves one, two, three, etc. credits compared to what other people are getting?” One thing we’ve heard consistently from faculty is that if department chairs can’t get six workload release credits, who else works harder than they do? That seemed to be a standard, and they took some of the credit hours away from the department chairs, and if that’s the standard, then we want to compare that with the new requests, and lots of things were getting rejected because none of them required as much time as department chairs had to put in. One of the points we made was that we know that the department chairs get a bit of a stipend, but it’s about whether or not they can have lives! There’s only so much time in a day to have all the department chair duties *and* full teaching loads, and that can lead to burning out. That was the faculty perspective, and I think the administration felt frustrated, so they found a workaround.

JC: So is this going to increase the workload for department chairs?

RC: That’s at the discretion of the deans, I’m sure they could, under the aegis of calling it something else that’s in addition to “department chair.” There’s so much flexibility, it’s basically *carte blanche* on how the deans can use the release credits.

There were no guidelines whatsoever, and that's what we're concerned about. And I heard murmurings at the end of the meeting from the deans "that faculty don't trust us."

EO: Unfortunately, they're working with precedent, I think: there have been cases in every department across campus where faculty felt that there were examples of inequity.

RC: And inequity works in lots of different ways. Some schools have people do lab-coordinator-like things with no work release; some do get work release, and there's a tremendous amount of inconsistency. Now, instead of addressing the inconsistency, they have flexibility.

SP: To get back to the previous point: in the previous system, how would an individual faculty member determine who was getting release time and who wasn't?

JC: You had to ask.

SP: So there was no transparency.

RC: In order to get it before, because the deans had so little discretion, it had to go to the Workload Committee.

EO: And that was part of policy—it was built into the policy, and you could access it on-line.

SP: But my question is how would an individual faculty member know *who* was getting workload release for something?

RC: The model would have a list of individual cases where workload release was allowed for what positions and what the positions do. You may not know *who* did things in that position, but you'd know the position. Right now, as far as I know, *maybe* they'll report to the Faculty Senate, but as of right now, that's not part of what was approved.

EO: And that's part of the value of talking about this to constituents, to get faculty to insist on school-level faculty committees and that a faculty form of auditing is the only way to maintain transparency and equity. If this all goes behind closed doors again, to whatever one or two individuals feel is appropriate, it feels like we're going to go back to the previous system, which a lot of faculty felt was *not* always fair.

RC: I don't know what the answer is except that we're continuing the dialog. If you notice situations where this is starting to be implemented—I don't know if it's been approved at enough levels that the deans can start doing this. Academic Council is just one level of the traditional approval process, but the Academic Vice-President is under the impression that this *isn't* a policy change and therefore doesn't require the full approval process.

SL: Are the total number of exemption hours increasing in this?

RC: Absolutely—it should about triple.

CL: You said that nothing that was standing was eliminated, but stuff was added...?

RC: Yes; this gives flexibility to add a lot. Most likely what will happen—for example, for the inequities—is that the schools that have the most money will add more. We don't want it to be a school-versus-school argument. We want a way of assessing equity without getting to those kinds of issues. And to have some accountability and verification and having faculty involved to create transparency, which we won't have now...at least, not as much. Maybe we can get some things instituted at the school-level, and maybe we can get some sort of reports or justifications, and maybe that would help, but that wasn't specifically discussed. So that's my report.

JiH: One thing I'll add about the professional development: I can see the motives. The thing about professional development that must be frustrating for the deans is that at one deadline, only one person may apply; at another, nine people might apply. It's really hard, even if you budget for it...I know Don consistently gets a lot, so I think he just knows to set aside a lot of money for that. But complaints came from other deans that didn't always experience an influx, but then do during another round.

RC: That's a bit disingenuous...before the requests come to your committee, the deans have to approve them. They have a chance to nip them in the bud before they get to you. In the past, they've completely ignored that because they didn't want to be the bad guys.

JiH: I talked with many deans before the first round, and a couple of them said "Oh, I'm not funding this; Bill Christiansen is." The deans should have a say, but I don't think they should take money away from the budget...!

RC: The good thing is: we're going to have to make a budget request for faculty professional development—we had this discussion at the last FSEC meeting—and we need to know what number to request. It would be based on two factors: the total number of requests this year *plus* some percentage we think will increase next year. We want that upward trend of applicants to continue. *Don't* pass on the information about the drop in funding in a way that will dampen requests; we need as many requests as possible, even if they're turned down. Only by having actual numbers about how much faculty have requested will we have data to support our budget request next year. I am expecting us to be able to request a minimum of \$150,000, and it could be as much as \$200,000, but it will be based on how much we have in requests *this* year. I'm cautious about having that information out, that our budget has been lessened. Bill's promised to cover it, somehow, and we'll have to hold him to that for now, but we need those numbers. If we do end up with a better system, it doesn't matter which pot the money comes from. If they fund this one account sufficiently, it'll be great. But the decision was made unilaterally; Bill made the decision, and we had no say in it. We commented afterward, but he said he didn't even need the approval of that committee.

SL: So can I restate this to ensure I understand it? Prior to this, the Academic Vice-President had a certain allotment of money, and the deans had a certain allotment of money, and those two were combined somehow to meet the needs of professional development funding requests.

RC: Essentially, except the deans didn't have a specific amount allotted for this purpose; they just had a general budget, and from *that* the money would come in varying amounts.

SL: And what happens now is that that funding ability was removed from the deans and put entirely under the purview of the Academic Vice-President.

RC: Without replacing the money.

SL: So the deans saw that and were dissatisfied, and as the total budget was formally decreased...

RC: Yes, but that wasn't the intent.

SL: ...but with guarantee from Academic Vice-President that professional development would be met.

NS: It was something of a gentlemen's agreement, a handshake. But that's one person; if someone else comes into that position, that system goes away.

RC: It makes me nervous because we were budgeting based on what we knew was in our account, covering 75% coming from the deans.

SL: That was last year...?

RC: Well, we were counting on it for *this* year.

SL: And what is that amount?

RC: It started at \$139,000, but we don't know how much was left...

JiH: The number they gave me was \$101,000.

RC: But the actual account balance was \$139,500, or something like that, and we know that receipts for summer conferences haven't been turned in yet, and those will come out of it. So we didn't know exactly what balance was—that's why they gave you a lower number, I'm positive. So let's suppose it's \$120,000: instead of that \$120,000 being 75% of our funding, it's now 100% of our funding. We would have had another one-third (\$40,000) on top of that come from the deans. So we would have had an effective \$160,000 of funding this year. Now we have \$120,000 guaranteed plus the promise that Bill will make up the difference. We have a promise instead of a guarantee.

EO: There was a little bit of a change in funding. One of the things that came up that influenced this, based on what I've heard, is that a faculty member that supervised undergraduate research must use their professional development money to chaperone their students at conferences at which the students are presenting. Where the faculty member wouldn't ordinarily go to, say, UCUR—one wouldn't ordinarily do that for professional development purposes, but were having to apply for professional development money to do that. The argument was made that with the Academic Vice-President taking on all of professional development, the deans' matching funds should now be made available for faculty mentors that need travel funds for chaperoning. There's no policy about that, and some deans have been good about it, and others I don't know. But that's the argument that he made, that the money wasn't going away, but was getting allocated into two different pots.

RC: But that's going away. We've made it clear that before professional development funds were *never* intended to account for undergraduate mentoring.

SL: So what happens to the money the deans used to have?

RC: They still have it.

SL: They have it for different purposes...?

RC: Right now, what's happening—and this is what is troubling as a trend—is that when there are conflicting requests from the deans and faculty, the deans win every time.

SL: Well, but what Bill is *trying* to do is decentralize.

RC: I know. But he's taking influence and oversight from faculty and using faculty money to do it.

SL: Just conceptually, as a faculty member, would you prefer to be two steps removed from the decision maker, or one step removed? Before, we've had the dean and the Academic Vice-President, and most of these decisions were being made before at the Academic-Vice-President level. But Bill's attempting to put that decision-making to dean level, and I'd argue that faculty might be *more* represented because they're closer to decision maker than they were in the past.

RC: And it might work that way—it *is* working that way with curriculum. But for the workload change, there's no school-level equivalent that's been proposed—they *only* took away the institution-level one. I think the curriculum proposal has a chance to be a model for what could be done with the workload. But they made one change without implementing the *other* change that would make it more like what you envision. We may end up working toward that kind of replacement model.

SL: Things might go south, but I'd prefer to have that nearness to the decision maker.

EO: We just want some checks and balances.

RC: Yes, and it can't be at the school level.

EO: Really quick, I did the math: in the current workload model, depending on if Academic Council approves the temporary release times that were passed by the committee last year, it could be 230–250 credits; the new model adds 144 credits. Just so everyone knows what this is doing.

SL: Can I just request that one thing be added to next time's agenda? Could we add a detailed discussion about the status of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy?

RC: Sure. We're finishing up the final version of the draft now. Varlo Davenport has sent around a request for subcommittee members.

SL: The concern I'm getting from my faculty is that it is *so* cumbersome that it's impossible to comment on, and it will *never* be approved. So I'd like to have a lengthy discussion about that.