

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Nov. 18, 2013

In attendance:

Clint Buhler (CB)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Robert Carlson (RC)

Curtis Larsen (CL)

Ani Comeford (AC)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Ross Decker (RD)

Del Parson (DP)

Christina Durham (CD)

Sandy Petersen (SP)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Nate Staheli (NS)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

RC: Welcome! We have a special guest today: for those of you who don't know her, this is Christina Durham, the newest Board of Trustees member. She wants to see how the Faculty Senate is doing, and asked to come to a meeting. We'll have President Nadauld—he's been invited to attend, and I expect he will when he has time. He's busy getting things ready for his last few months in his position. Our first order of business: we didn't have a meeting two weeks ago because of the meeting about the presidential search that NS and I were called to at the last minute. Our last meeting was October 21—has everyone read minutes from last meeting? Are there any comments? (None.) If there's no other comments, can we approve them? (XX moves; AC seconds; all aye; no nay, no abstentions; approved). Now, we've had a chance to introduce changes to the Professional Development policy—Jim Haendiges came and spoke to us about this, and we've had a chance to discuss them; I want to know if we're ready to move on to getting those into the formal policy approval process. Is there any feedback about those proposed changes right now? Just to review the policy approval process: anyone on campus can *create* a policy—that's what we've done; we proposed a policy change—then it goes to the policy office, which may require in this case a cursory legal review, and then a general policy review by Martha Talman. Once their office is satisfied with the specifics of how it's structured and worded, it is presented for public discussion for 30 days. Then it goes through the committee approval process, but it hasn't started that yet. Are we ready to start that?

SL: The substantive changes in this policy were the three review dates?

RC: Yes, the change from three to four application dates; the process itself will change fairly significantly in that there will also be changes in terms of the criteria they will use—it will no longer be a rigid, tiered process and ask applicants to articulate their own needs and explain how their particular professional development request satisfies that need. There will still be emphasis given on presenting research, but new approach allows for faculty that are keeping up in their field but not presenting research to attend a conference at least some of the time.

SL: So my comment is: I've been talking to members of the Professional Development committee that are in my faculty, and they're assuming that this is implemented. So why are we going through the approval process if the committee is working under the assumption that the proposed is already in force?

RC: They're only working under the assumption that the change in application dates is accepted. We voted on that last Spring to expedite that change because there was no apparent disagreement about that change. I've spoken to Jim specifically that they were supposed to continue to approve applications based on the *current* rules.

SL: They're not.

RC: That's what you're hearing from Verle? There may be some confusion.

NS: I sit on that committee as well, and it may just be a matter of semantics. All the applications that were approved would have been approved under the new guidelines, too.

SL: He's presenting to our faculty that the tier structure is already gone. I agree with the new policy—I think it's appropriate—but he's presenting it to us as if this policy has already been adopted.

RC: That was not the intent of the instructions I gave to the committee chair. We'll talk about clarifying that miscommunication. Right now, because we have extra money, the difference is not a change—all conference presentations are being approved within the context of their \$6000/3 years limit.

NS: I think the problem is that people on the committee are bridging it into the new policy.

SL: That's a problem. If we're following this approval process, that's an issue.

RC: It is. I talked with the chair specifically about this, so I'll bring it up again so that the committee as a whole becomes aware that they're still following the *current* guidelines. Thanks for bringing that up. Any other issues? I want to propose that start the actual policy approval process—we had an opportunity for everyone to hear from their faculties. Any feedback about those core changes?

SL: Our faculty support it.

RC: There were concerns when we first brought it up about how it was going to work, so I'm happy people have come to understand it, and it sounds like it has widespread support. I would accept a motion to accept the current proposal (DP moves, TF seconds). That means we'll take the proposed changes and submit them to the policy office. They will review them. Previously, we'd intended for this to be folded into the larger Faculty Rights & Responsibilities policy, but we'll recommend it as a stand-alone policy for now—it can be folded into that policy later, but we're not going to hold it up pending approval of the whole Rights and Responsibilities policy. They will review it prior to campus-wide review. Then it'll go through Academic Council, then University Council, and then the Board of Trustees. We'd expect to be able to implement it by next Fall fully.

SL: Do we have a feel on how long it takes from the time it gets to the policy office and when it would be available for campus-wide review?

RC: No, we've never submitted anything to the policy office. Under the current system, everything's been generated *from* the policy office. So we don't know.

AC: It would depend on how much work the policy writer has currently.

SL: Has any expectation been given to the policy office?

RC: Not in a general sense; I'll coordinate this with the Vice-President of Academic Affairs because once it's past their office, it's about a 5-6 month process to get through all the other meetings without any special exceptions, so we need their approval quickly. That shouldn't be a problem: it's a short policy, and there's nothing legally dangerous about it. So with support from higher administration, it will jump the queue, as it were, of the list of their priorities—we can't be at the bottom of that because some of those won't be addressed this year, so we'll get it expedited as much as possible. But I don't know how long that will take, except that I'll strongly encourage speed.

CB: So the change in the funding that we discussed last time, that stripped it of a bunch of funding, took three weeks to get through, right.

RC: That didn't go through any formal approval process; it was an executive decision by the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. We had no say in it.

CB: I find it strange that something like that can happen in three weeks, but something like this takes so much longer.

RC: That was an issue that came up quickly in Deans' Council and decided there almost as quickly—it did not follow any standard approval process.

NS: We often talk about practice and policy, and sometimes policy is created to adjust to practice. In this case, we have an old policy that faculty generally support, and they want the new policy with new dates and this change; we've talked about it in our faculty, but do we have the ability to get it a general faculty vote?

RC: I'd still follow SL's concern that that's a bad precedent. We should go through the policy process. It's a concern when other things don't follow it, so if we violate it, there'll be concern that other issues will violate it, too. But I think we can get it implemented completely by the beginning of next Fall. But we should go through the process just in case something comes up that we don't anticipate.

SL: What NS has described has happened with this policy.

NS: We need to admonish the current Professional Development committee to double check if the applications they approved were approved using the *current* policy rather than the new, unapproved one, and make adjustments as necessary.

RC: At least the application process follows the old forms. The changes would create new forms and we'll find the expertise to get them on-line—it'll have a different structure. Right now, the application process *looks* the same, but what you're pointing out is that the *evaluation* process might have been compromised. We'll focus on that. We can address whether it's been just miscommunication or if there's been a problem with their evaluations. Is there a call for a vote?

AC: I call.

RC: All in favor of submitting this to the policy office? (All aye, no nay and no abstentions). Great—thank you very much! NS has to go soon, so he's up next about the last general Faculty Senate meeting.

NS: I don't have too much to report. Many of you were in attendance at that meeting. There were about 25 members there. We discussed the policies that were in place that might affect faculty. We went through four policies: the Textbook policy that there were changes to that faculty felt strongly about—just for everyone's information, that policy was approved by the Academic and University councils—they took out section 7, which allows faculty to sell books.

RC: It took out the reference to the ownership and all those contentious issues.

NS: There were two others that had minimal impact: the Graduation policy and another...I can't remember which one. The last one was the Accommodations policy—we had some reservations about the content of that policy and asked for

guidance from administration. When it came to a vote in Academic Council, I was going to make a case, but it was made for us that it was unclear what the content of this portion of the policy would do—it was suggested that we form a small subcommittee including Bill Christiansen. That has not happened yet, so there's not yet any clarification on what that portion will do. Also, we talked about essentially where you can find what policies are being discussed and how you can comment on them, and explain the process. It was a consensus or general understanding that faculty are not clear on how policy becomes policy and how the faculty can impact the policies—we encouraged all faculty members to be committed to reviewing policies and being involved in the process so we have a say on how it will affect us. The attendance wasn't great at the meeting, so we need to do something different to encourage more attendance.

SL: Have you discussed with RC about ways to increase attendance at those meetings?

NS: We haven't—well, casually we did.

RC: But it'd be a great topic.

NS: That'd be more for discussion in here. The most attended meetings are at the first of the year—the ones with a box lunch.

SL: An idea I had was to have a raffle.

AC: The university won't let us do that.

CD: State law prohibits that—it's a gambling thing.

RC: Not if they don't pay to enter. Well, we can call them “door prizes,” or something different.

IJ: Can we also get a longer head's-up notice in advance of the meetings next time?

RC: I sent out a schedule; should I send out another one? That was a crazy week for me, but I'll try to advertise those better. Anything else, NS?

NS: No, the hour was spent just discussing things on the docket.

RC: OK, the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities policy—the subcommittee has finished evaluating the draft and has produced a multi-page summary. That is available to be looked at—I'll send that out. What they tried to do in it was highlight the topics that they think will be of most interest to and impact on faculty, and things that change from the current policy, so we can start to hone in on the topics we need to address. They highlighted issues that might be problematic that we may need to change. Today I want to talk about one of those that AC brought up in the Faculty Excellence Committee meeting about a change proposed for student evaluations.

AC: The Faculty Excellence Committee is charged with dealing with all things pertaining to faculty evaluation—student, peer, supervisor, RTP, PTR, etc. In looking at this draft, right now evaluations for tenured faculty are different from those for probationary faculty in terms of student evaluations. They're done at least once per year for full-time tenured faculty: tenured faculty can opt out of evaluations in the Spring, so they're evaluated once per year. In the new policy, there are distinctions made between probationary and full-time tenured faculty for peer and supervisor evaluations—each are two times per year for probationary faculty, then for years 3–5 it's once per year, and then every other year thereafter for classroom visits. It's the same for peer review—their frequency goes down after you're tenured. In the proposed change, student evaluations are slated to be *every* semester, for *every* course, regardless of probationary or tenured status. Because that's a change, and it's an area that the Faculty Excellence Committee has dealt with in the past—if the others go down in frequency, why are these consistent? Those have been wrapped up in broader discussions of the validity of student evaluations, especially since our response rate is very low—if you have only 40% of your students evaluating you, is that a good barometer? So we'd like to have you talk to your constituents about their feelings about student evaluations and their timing, especially for tenured and post-tenured faculty, in terms of their frequency. In addition, for faculty who teach multiple sections of the same class during one semester: do they need evaluations for every section? Is there an expectation that each is somehow being taught differently?

CL: There's no labor for us anymore.

AC: You still have to upload them to your portfolios.

RC: There is a potential distinction on how often they're *collected* and how often they're *used* by us.

AC: There's no distinction in the policy; there's just an expectation that they all have to be uploaded to the e-portfolios.

ST: I thought everyone was being evaluated and it was the faculty member's responsibility to upload them to the portfolios...?

AC: It is. Right now, the tenured faculty can opt out in Spring. That's done through the administration—they'll send out an e-mail in the Spring and give you option then to opt out.

ST: If I opt out, my students wouldn't even have one available for me?

AC: Correct. In the new policy, regardless of probationary or tenured status, it would be all courses, every semester, regardless of multiple sections.

CD: I taught as an adjunct but I can't recall the evaluations—is there a question in the evaluations about what the students anticipated as a grade in the course?

AC: Yes, it's a standard question.

DP: I'm on the Post-Tenure Review Committee. I think it's interesting that when I first came here, the whole emphasis was solely on the classroom, and we were evaluated on that. There's so much more on the checklist now, such as Professional Development, creative endeavors, scholarly activities, etc. Do the faculty know how much it's changed? It's like moving the goal posts. Now, a teacher that's done fantastically in the classroom, when being evaluated, may have reviewers saying "Well, he hasn't done this, this, or this"...

RC: On the committee, there's those possible considerations, but we were assured when that policy was created that primacy would remain on teaching—teaching would have more weight. Is that not how you're evaluating those?

DP: There's no weighting—just checks.

RC: So you treated each one equally.

DP: Equally, yes. I brought this up during the evaluation process—this person is an unbelievable teacher, but others on the committee were saying "Well, but he hasn't done this and this..." He was still recommended, ultimately. But other people were recommended *higher* than one just doing good teaching because they were doing other things.

RC: This is the first time we've had this committee and had it function, so it's good to know how it's working and how that policy is being implemented.

AC: If you would all take that back to your constituents—find out if they're comfortable with the current system and with having evaluations every semester—what the Faculty Excellence Committee is asking you to do is send that feedback directly to Angela Child—to expedite that process, she'll compile all the feedback. We'll look at that as a committee, and recommend back here what we've discovered.

ST: By when?

AC: By our next meeting on January 9. We want to act on it and make recommendations as soon as possible.

SL: Could you send us a summary of the proposed evaluation schedules?

AC: Sure. I'll just send out the draft's recommendations.

SL: It might be good to compare the current vs. the proposed schedules in a table.

AC: I can put that together. The other area we're looking into is the e-portfolio process, both from the submitter's perspective and the reviewer's perspective, including the difficulties in evaluating them and finding information in them. We're also collecting that information; I'll send out the information on that, too. We're getting feedback in small doses, individually, about the e-portfolio process from both applicants and reviewers, about the difficulty in finding information and how time-consuming the evaluation process is, and we're interested in recommending ways to streamline the process for both those submitting and those evaluating, so that more faculty will be involved in evaluating process. Right now the percentage is very small because of how time consuming it is—they don't feel that they have three hours to go spend on one portfolio. Please ask the folks in your divisions from (1) those that have submitted—what do they like, what don't they like, what is livable, etc., and (2) from those that have reviewed. I'll forward those same questions to everyone here—just a heads up, please ask your faculty! We'll meet with Munir (Mahmud, current RTP Committee Chair) at our first meeting in January to get his perspective.

RC: Should we get Dennis Martinez (chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee), too?

AC: I'll work on that—we'll do tenure first because that has some issues that we need to address. But that policy is now not going to be in alignment with new Rights and Responsibilities policy either.

RC: We do want to increase faculty participation because there's two steps to the tenure process; the within the division step, where you are evaluated by your peers that ostensibly know your field the best, and then there's the campus-wide evaluation step. We're not getting as much participation at the within-division level. We need to find a way to make that better so campus-wide evaluators have that feedback from the people that know each applicant's field the best. So any feedback would be very helpful. And we're getting more faculty applying because of the change in the timing, so more people have gone through the process, and it wasn't always pleasant. OK, a quick update on the Tobacco policy. Thanks to all that voted: we had good participation from the faculty, and a couple things fascinated me about the vote. I submitted a summary on the faculty vote to the University Council, who were waiting to vote on it. First, every school had votes for both of the two major options, which to me was a bit disappointing. Dean Grady created a petition for Health Sciences that implied a kind of unanimity that wasn't there. The vote there was 4 to 3, not unanimous. There was a big difference between subfields within Health Sciences in how faculty voted when it came to allowing smoking in personal vehicles parked on campus. I've received good feedback from all schools; there was no unanimity anywhere. There was a slight majority vote for allowing smoking in personal vehicles on campus—about 52%, and 40% of faculty voted in total. About 11-12% had no preferences, and the rest (close to 40%) wanted the ban extended to vehicles. That's what I sent to University Council, and that will be passed onto the Board of Trustees. The two staff associations also had votes; they voted to ban smoking in vehicles, but it was also not unanimous. One thing that was gratifying about the process was that in the last University Council meeting, the process failed a bit. The policy had gone through the normal review process; then it came to the discussions that the faculty had. The Board of Trustees has been very good about working with us, and it resulted in 2-3 significance changes to the original policy, but that information was never disseminated to the other constituent campus groups until we showed it to them. That necessitated the delay at

University Council in voting on it so they could hear of the changes. We don't know how it will change the policy process in the future, but it points that when there's substantive changes, we have to make sure that there's still a process to get feedback from across campus. For example, we changed the general terminology of "tobacco analogs and their derivatives" to an explicit list of specific substances that will be outlawed—a change most people seemed to want, but it was new, and it wasn't passed on. I don't know what the University Council vote is—Marilyn is still collecting that information from other council members, but that'll be passed on to the Board of Trustees and they will vote in their meeting this Friday.

NS: Just a political process question: Faculty Senate has two votes on University Council. I voted the same as RC. My question is if, in the future, there's a policy that has a 50-50 vote from the faculty, should we split our vote to represent faculty that way? Or will the majority take both votes?

RC: We tried to represent *you*, not our personal views.

IJ: If it's that close—52-48—I would split the votes, but if it's not, don't.

NS: Is there precedent on this?

DP: I'd go with majority of faculty.

RC: I'd tend toward that because we're outnumbered on those committees.

AC: It doesn't send a strong voice if the Faculty Senate leadership is split. It's important that faculty appear unified that way.

NS: I was just curious.

RC: Thanks for the feedback! Regarding the Textbook policy: that section has been removed. I am of the option, and the policy office agrees, that the lawyers will put it back in. So just because the President and Academic Vice-President voted to remove it, the lawyers may not be happy with it. So that issue may not be over.

CB: Why? There's no precedent for that, from what we've gathered—it doesn't exist anywhere else, so how can it be a legal issue?

RC: Treating textbooks as "gifts"—and some are worth more than \$50—is, from some legal perspectives, an open issue.

CB: Whenever I get a desk copy for my private use, the statement I get with it from the textbook company is that if I no longer want it, I am legally obligated to return it to them. Turning it over to the university would be against the law according to their legal policies.

RC: I don't know where this will go. I have recommended that if it comes back from the lawyers, we will have to have a meeting with our legal counsel to discuss more palatable and reasonable options. Having them put it back and us say that we don't like it puts us back at square one and we don't get anywhere. We want a policy that works, and turning ownership over to institution is ridiculous. Only one faculty member in their history had ever had a policy like that, and it was a small community college in Arizona. Everywhere else, no one asks—you take the textbooks with you to teach somewhere else.

AC: One of the areas to pay attention to if that comes back in is not just the gift issue, but how to dispose of them.

Originally, it was the department chairs—are department chairs supposed to have a palette for them outside their offices?

RC: There's a partial solution to that: the bookstore has agreed to accept them as donations because they have a system to distribute them to where needed.

AC: But in the policy, it says the *department* will take ownership of them. That's outside of the gift/reselling issue, and it's one of the major issue faculty had with it. That can't possibly be a legal issue—that's a practical issue.

RC: But if we don't need to give them up, that's a moot point.

IJ: The Education people are moving out of their building—they cleared out a bunch of their old textbooks, and sent them to the library.

RC: But you won't want all of them. That just means *you'll* have to get rid of them. Thanks for feedback on that, and I'll keep you up to date on what happens with this.

SL: If I can go back a moment to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy: I was asked what was the impetus for creating this policy to begin with?

RC: I can only answer that partly. Part of it was that our current, related policies were outdated and illegal. Then it was considered prudent at the time—not sure I agree with it now after the process has gone on—to say "let's just do this all at once in one package." It was thought to be helpful, initially, when initially envisioned, but I don't think it's been the best. Right now, we're of the mind that we're going to start breaking pieces off, like Professional Development—we're not going to wait for the big one for that anymore. If there are other specific changes that you think need to be implemented sooner than later, we're open to addressing those first, piecemeal.

SL: So that came from the former policy writer?

RC: Yes—she saw several separate policies that needed to be addressed and proposed bundling them together. It made sense at the time, but it hasn't worked out quite as we foresaw.

AC: The Faculty Handbook has some outdated information, too, that isn't consistent with policy, and faculty are interested in having that changed, too. For example, the office hours policy is completely outdated—it isn't followed in most

departments, anyway. It's based on a community-college, teach-every-day model. It also doesn't account for release time vs. teaching time. It needs to be adjusted for that—those teaching more hours would have more office hours.

RC: The handbook has a lot of issues, and we'll have to address that. But it's also held up while this big policy is being done—no one's excited about tackling the handbook until then, because it might just have to be revised again. Now, onto the presidential search—there's a subgroup of the Board of Regents that is charged with presidential searches in general throughout the state. They came and visited our campus two weeks ago, and NS and I attended the meeting. It was interesting; they described the process. One thing you will find is that it will not be transparent in the middle of process—there are sensitive issues, and they will not update us about which candidates are progressing through system, because many candidates have current jobs and won't want it to be public that they're looking for a different job. So until they have it narrowed down to three finalists, we probably won't get any updates. That was the primary thing I took about the process. They will include a variety of constituencies in the committee—it could have up to 15–18 people. There will be faculty on the committee. We don't know which; I assumed they've extended invites, but it's only been two weeks, so perhaps not yet. We've encouraged them to look widely across disciplines to have wide representation. They've set criteria, and there's Board of Regents policy that outlines the criteria that you're welcome to look at. They plan on following that process; they're not set on a particular time frame. They know that President Nadauld's last day is June 30, but if they don't have an acceptable, qualified candidate by then, they'll continue to look. There will be many public forums to discuss the candidates, but not until the finalist stages.

CD: There will be some public comment at beginning. At the outset, they'll have some faculty and some staff and they will have community members on the committee, four people from the Board of Trustees—the chair and the vice-chair—some alumni, and the current student body president, and four Board of Regents members, plus the community, faculty, staff. There will be some outreach and public forums at beginning because they will want to know what qualities are important to the community and the campus so they can find a good match. From that, they'll put together a job description, and then get applicants. So if there's input about, for example diversity, meeting faculty needs, etc., they can be in job description.

RC: When we hear more information, I think they'll tell us who's on committee—I got the impression that they'd at least tell us who the committee members would be, but I don't know when.

JDH: Do you know if there will be opportunities for faculty to meet with the finalists one on one?

CD: I believe the committee will review the files, and winnow it down to the finals—I don't know if they'll have interviews with individual faculty. I'm not sure, but there will be representation by faculty.

SL: There will be *multiple* faculty positions on the committee?

RC: More than one, but I don't know how many.

CL: Both you and NS will be on committee?

RC: We haven't been told that.

CD: What they're doing is trying to get good cross representation. In some instances, we want people that represent several interests. A lot of names were put forward in several meetings, and I'm sure the Board of Regents is having that same discussion about who would be helpful to have on that committee.

RC: They didn't tell us the exact make-up, but did say that they want people that represent various interest groups.

SP: The faculty will be very interested in that process, so a link would be great.

RC: I'd like to mention one thing about the Board of Trustees: those members have been very open in reaching out to faculty and asking for faculty viewpoints. And CD's new, but of all the Board of Trustees, they're the *most* open about reaching out to us. That's as good as we could hope for, that they care about faculty opinions and ask for them regularly. That's a good sign.

RD: Best way to pass input on to them would be...e-mail?

RC: I would guess these initial forums, when they ask about criteria for the new president. That would be the best time. Right now, ask the faculty that you represent what they're looking for in a president—what do we want? I know some people are interested in issues such as diversity, and what it means to be a university and how a president would establish what DSU is—we've made the transition in name, but we're still establishing our identity in practice. So if your faculty have ideas about what it means to be a "teaching university," which is a fairly unique niche—most teaching institutions call themselves "colleges." Our niche is different, and we should have some say in what that means. So start collecting those ideas from the faculty that you represent; we'll compile those and that will help in establishing those criteria. I want to mention one thing about the workload release changes that happened recently: this was a bit distressing because the initial reaction to this led to some unfortunate conclusions. Here's the change: the deans were given authority to approve up to 24 credits of work release with no constraints. We've talked about this before; the immediate consequence was that that Faculty Workload committee had nothing to do—that was only way faculty had to find out about workload release issues and to have any input on the process.

CL: It's workload reassignment, not release—they're not being let off of work.

AC: That's a great clarification.

RC: With no oversight, though, it can become release. With the workload reassignment, we want to recommend changes to this process, and we had this discussion a month ago. We need some feedback, and here's my recommendation: we suggest that any *ongoing* workload reassignment issues—anything that lasts more than one academic year—must go through the Faculty Workload committee. If there's a one-time emergency thing, the deans will have discretion and can bypass that, but recurring things would require evaluation by the Faculty Workload committee. That was one of the proposals. The other issue was that we have to have a way of knowing what the deans have decided: right now, there's no transparency—the proposal was made quickly, but there has to be public presentation of what workload assignments are for each school and why they were made so that we can compare them between schools. Faculty have been concerned about whether or not there is equity between schools—with unlimited discretion, it may be just be a budget issue—those schools with bigger budgets would have more flexibility, but no one would ever know if one program has work release for someone, say, coordinating adjuncts, but another school is asking a faculty member to do that as part of their regular responsibilities. Those kinds of equity issues are important, and transparency is required for that. So there has to be a reporting mechanism—at the very least, it could be reported to Academic Council.

AC: Don't those have to be in the workload model that is approved by University Council every year? It seems that last year there was a workload model that came up at University Council that was addressed, and they had to approve. If the reassignments were ongoing, it would become part of the workload model that would then have to be approved by University Council every year.

RC: That's what I'm recommending be done. Right now, the deans think they can use these however they want and there's no reason for them to go through that process.

AC: And it wouldn't go into the university's workload model, even if it's an essentially permanent change?

RC: Yes. And this all came out of the Deans' Council, not Academic Council.

AC: I'd ask: does that mean that we abandon the workload model as well? Is that gone?

RC: They want to keep the current workload release, but want to add this on top of it. This impetus for this was that a number of workload issues were brought up because of questions of equity. For example, with department chairs—they were an important barometer. They have *this* much work, and get *this* much workload reassignment. Consistently, AC, NS, and I have asked about the equivalency for these vs. what's given to department chairs? That's stalled a number of those workload release requests, and this is a workaround for what they viewed as stalling, and now they don't have to worry about approval. It's a direct, blatant attempt to work around oversight by faculty. I'm sad to say that, but there's no other purpose.

AC: So all of the workload requests that the current committee made and were sent to Academic Council have been sent back to the deans? Right now, we're operating under this expectation that the deans will look at those and approve or disapprove them?

RC: We have no idea if this has been implemented yet. It was approved at that level that seems to bypass the workload policy model—it seems to be outside of that, and they seem to feel that it's appropriate to go this route, so I'm not quite sure how it's consistent with current policy. That's my report. If you have more suggestions, because talking this through helps us articulate a way of addressing this, I think approaching this from a "how does this deviate from the workload policy model" and if this is an ongoing thing is the best way to try and address restoring some oversight.

AC: It just seems that if it's on a permanent basis, then it would *have* to be implemented into the workload model that's in Banner, right? Because that's what they're trying to do: to create something in Banner that will keep track of all of that workload. So it would have to go through whatever process to get into Banner. Maybe we need to ask for the transparency at the end of the year for those workload reassignments that were implemented on a permanent-position basis, that those go through University Council before they're put into Banner and become part of the official university workload model.

RC: Perhaps we then need a system to assess what qualifies as "permanent" or "ongoing."

SW: Even for those that aren't ongoing, don't the faculty members have the right to know how those hours are being distributed?

RC: Right. Asking for a report of that is clearly something that is appropriate, and we'll ask for that. But if you have other ideas on how to address this issue, we'll take them.

SL: So this administrative change obviously hasn't been made generally known to faculty?

RC: Correct. I brought it up in this meeting a month ago, and you're welcome to bring it up to your faculty, but no, the deans haven't made it known.

AC: The members of the Workload Committee represent every area on campus, and they're aware of it—ours let us know that the committee has been disbanded.

SL: OK, they voted to disband—that's a reaction, not an effort to address if it's a problem.

RC: Right, but right now, they won't have any more requests.

SL: So the issue is not being presented in the light of day—it's just been decided, and the committee, in a reactive mode, said "If we don't have a role to play, we'll disband."

CL: How did things get to the Workload Committee before?

RC: Deans had to submit them.

CL: After they were discussed with the chairs, and chairs with faculty, and *then* to the deans. If it wasn't being solved at those levels, then maybe now it's getting solved.

RC: Well, of course it's getting solved.

CL: Part of the reason that this happened was because the Workload Committee was mired down trying to make things equal that nothing was happening. And these are actually *helping* faculty.

RC: That's what the deans were perceiving. But the problem is that with their solution, there is literally no oversight of what they're doing. It could be completely arbitrary.

SL: It seems to me that the decision to disband the committee was a hasty, emotional decision.

RC: It was. So here's what happened: when they submitted that request to disband, I immediately responded that they did not have the authority to do that under the policy—current policy requires there to be a Faculty Workload Committee. So they are *not* disbanded. They exist, but they have no intention of meeting in the near future. So it's in name only. The issue is whether or not they will have a real function.

AC: When Brent Hansen first brought this issue before the committee, I happened to be there because they were going to consider my request. They talked about it, and it was a thoughtful decision on their part. They'd already submitted a bunch of requests to Academic Council that had gotten tabled by the council and the Academic Vice-President. So for all the work that they were doing, nothing was happening. So they said "There's a problem with people continuing to submit requests to us, when nothing is going to happen." I'd suggest that they voted to disband themselves in a moment of "Well, Academic Vice-President already disbanded us." His decision made their committee null and void, so they voted themselves into not meeting because it had already been decided for them.

SL: I have a hard time believing that the deans made this decision out of malice.

RC: I didn't say that.

SL: I know you didn't—but it seems that the Faculty Workload Committee should re-insert themselves with direction from a body such as ours, saying that we *do* have an opportunity to oversee this for releases of more than one year in duration.

IJ: If they were doing all that work and it was going nowhere, they were spinning their wheels.

RC: SL is proposing a different way to accomplish what they were going to do, and that may be part of this—to determine what is "ongoing" may be a way to insert themselves. But the problem is that under the current practice, they're a passive group in that they have to *receive* requests, and they recognized that they wouldn't be receiving any more requests.

SL: Well, OK...I don't want to belabor this, but if the deans are reporting releases—

RC: We haven't gotten to that point.

SL: OK, but if they do, then that serves as a trigger point for this committee.

RC: Exactly. I think we can re-insert them into the process, but right now, there's this limbo where right now they don't have anything to do. We have to develop a strategy in which faculty do have an active role in this process. We have to find the way to get them into the process.

AC: Also, this committee is a pretty new committee because prior to this, the Workload Committee was mostly deans, and presided over by a dean. Two years ago, the policy was changed so it was a *Faculty* Workload Committee, and a dean would serve as a non-voting chair. But that it should be presided over by faculty, and all the faculty members were elected by their divisions to represent faculty. So now it's essentially a return to the previous process, which is faculty are not involved in university faculty workload models. There are arguments to be made for expedited cases, and arguments on the other side, too—I'm not sure which is the better one, but it's a return to the old idea.

RC: Part of why I felt so strongly about this is that getting things to the Faculty Workload Committee went through an approval process. This was done almost immediately to functionally change the policy back. That's my concern, and I think we need to ask them to slow down and go through this thoughtful process, which would be the best approach to both transparency and having faculty involved and still have an expedited process. The ironic thing is that things kept getting tabled at the Academic Council, which is predominantly deans.

AC: It's *all* academic deans.

RC: And the Faculty Senate President and President-Elect. So we would raise concerns about if a proposal was considered in this context, and in terms of equitability, and either those concerns would be acknowledged or not. It's not true that none of them were approved—I *know* that many have gone through and were accepted, and workload was reassigned for them. So this is all curious about why it happened the way it happened. I just want more dialogue about it, and if we need a change to the process, we can make one. Are there other issues people have that come from your faculty?

CD: I forwarded that presidential search policy to you as a PDF.

RC: Great—as soon as I get back to my computer, I'll send it to all faculty directly. Any other issues?

AC: When is our next meeting?

RC: First Monday after school starts in January. I'll go check.

AC: Could you send out the Spring schedule again?

RC: Yes.