Senate ExComm meeting 3 nov 2020.

present: j sokolowski, n brown, d burdige, j rhoades, w yusuf, l tolle.

regrets: c richels.

proceedings:

1. Emeritus issue.

submitted by K hawkins: to be eligible for appt, a faculty member shall be recommended by his/her chair and approved by dean, VP Acad, and president OR initiated by provost & VP Acad.

Therefore, lack of clarity surrounded recommendation: from provost to chair or from provost to dean, or some other sequence.

this was not sent to committee. if provost was not going to proceed, then does it go directly to the president.

n brown: coming from a dept that did not want to give an emeritus designation and fought hard. they were overruled. that was the impetus for the provost level push. until then it was always the chair. it was not worth anything in particular other than a title.

d burdige: there was some conflict regarding bestowing the title.

n brown: the chair and/or faculty member may not be aware of process. these are rare.

d burdige: very rare. it seems like a pro forma title to those outside or unfamiliar.

j sokolowski: i hear that we can leave the wording as it is, and we do need it modified from present form. should stand for itself.

consensus given.

2. workload issues:

senator burdige brought up that this is a resource issue at dept level that is separate from workload computation and those two things need to be separated. workload piece needs to document in a fair way what each member is contributing from a workload standpoint. this was assigned to committee to look at and we will see what they come up with. we should get our thoughts together when Ctte I get back to us.

n brown: quagmire and difficult to achieve universal policy; eg, committee participation: it has nothing about quality, time, contributions. it is just a listing. in some colleges you get points for that. there are significant differences between committee tasks and schedules. once you get into quality it is difficult to assess. investigation is needed. why is provost passing it to us?

j sokolowski: he thought faculty could do a better job. there is certainly a separation between how work is assigned at dept level versus a catalogue of what each member is doing. these should be separated. there should not be necessarily any connection from an accounting standpoint.

l tolle: I’m not sure what you mean

j sokolowski: you lack at resources of dept and if, say, member assigned 2-2 workload, what has to be done to support classroom commitment in that dept is one thing. if a member who has that load has research, ctte assignments, etc. that should be catalogued from effort standpoint. however, the two are not related as far as overload and from a money standpoint. it just catalogues contribution of level of effort not tied to any more formal compensation or accounting, SCHEV rules, etc.

d burdige: that connection was falsely made by provost in context of workload analysis policy. he brought up the issue from sociology re teach loads. if you come up with a fair policy of contributions, the overwhelming majority of faculty will have more than 12 hours. are they going to show SCHEV that everyone does 24 hrs/yr. why are we collecting? what good is it?

l tolle: there are faculty who believe teaching load needs to be decreased, but that can only happen if there is a policy on service, right or wrong.

n brown: can you connect those? how is teaching connected to service?

l tolle: this was issue of the sociology dept. there was a desire for release time for service to cut into teaching load. that is why it was changed to "workload."

n brown: this is mainly from Arts & Letters and others, but less in prof. colleges. they have a heavy load of Gen Ed teaching. that is a choice. they want those courses. they are asking for resources to have a 2-2 teaching load.

j sokolowski: i think that is correct. if they do not get more resources from a faculty standpoint then that is what you have to do.

w yusuf: there is a larger service teaching load in terms Gen Ed. using adjuncts has resulted in pushback with implication that full-time faculty are teaching bigger or more classes b/c the university has made a decision to reduce adjuncts.

d burdige: the two are totally disconnected. if A&L are teaching more classes. either we teach fewer classes & less students or we hire more faculty to cut teaching load. those issues are separate from workload analysis.

w yusuf: approach to change it via teach load/workload policy does not address root cause. in A&L there has been less transparency than in other colleges. A&L are largely unaware that their dean has a policy. there is a disconnect between what has been going on and solutions. there have been efforts to have a consistent policy but there is a lack of awareness.

j sokolowski: there are some colleges/dept that do not do a good job of assigning things.

m ouellette: sense of unpaid work & differential service/supervision loads.

j burdige: these are structural problems in colleges & departments.

l tolle: was A&L policy sent to everyone?

m ouellette: my dept did, but I am not sure everyone in college saw.

n brown: maybe we should continue gathering info.

j sokolowski: k hawkins says it is more about student credit hrs than 12/12 reporting. does this even go to SCHEV?

n brown: at one time, i was told money was appropriating for summer school from a diff budget & pay could not be apportioned as in regular school period. however, this was not the case and it is recommended to find out SCHEV rules in this regard.

w yusuf: in the interim, some of the concerns that could be alleviated could be solved via communication and policy. eg, my dept has not seen policy, in 12 yrs I have not had a meeting with chair re workload.

j sokolowski: there is one place where admin does not do a good job of holding people to account for upholding policies and if we did that from a leadership policy, it would be different. accountability is not happening in most cases. provost and pres. did not like to hold a hardline.

d burdige: issue is more bad management and poor communication. regardless of what Ctte I find, we may be back at square one.

3. pres and provost meeting:

n brown: possible merger with EVMS could be something to discuss.

j sokolowski: budget updates.

4. arising:

n brown: present idea that we have monthly meetings with pres and provost and most of the issues we have to bring up have to do with academic not necessarily other issues. could we not have split, every other month, of meetings without the president in attendance.

w yusuf: good idea. we have a lot more issues to discuss with provost that do not necessarily need to be part of conversation.

j rhoades: we have a new president coming in and if we lessen the loads, we might have a situation in which we do not meet with president as often as you like.

l tolle: those with experience, what do you think?

d burdige: I do not think we have ever felt inhibited from speaking if the president is also there. is it the best use of president's time? is it important that he hear things from the faculty? there is an advantage to having both in meeting. with new pres, it may be better to have more face time to get a sense of the dynamic.

n brown: main point was to avoid extra meetings and to have provost by himself to have an extended conversation. there are issues coming and there are issues that it might help to make the provost aware of.

j sokolowski: could we try for spring and see how it works out?

d burdige: if the goal is to deal with things more directly with the provost, we could try it now as pres. is drawing out the door.

l tolle: has president ever stated a preference for fewer meetings?

n brown: at one time, the pres and provost were not regularly meeting with exec. ctte.

j sokolowski: we can give it a try in the spring, then.

d burdige: re pass/fail option being floated. this should have been part of a plan earlier. we need to discuss with provost in january, not mid-march.

n brown: could we rephrase to say, "could we have a plan?" having a plan would be good, just in case.

j sokolowski: there is still a group that meets regarding COVID planning. getting this in front of the provost and pres. is key b/c their ctte will need to approve things.

j rhoades: were students aware? could we recommend that there be student representation.

j sokolowski: there is no representative from students. there were no students on either of the committees dealing with covid.

w yusuf: looking at senate meeting agendas. there are a lot of issues remaining. Ctte C has 5-6 issues that need to go on the agenda. would it be worth thinking about having a backup mtg?

j sokolowski: was waiting to see last mtg & the Ctte G efforts. we will see what happens this month. if need arises, we will get a backup mtg so we do not have a big set of issues left over at the end of the year again.