



Faculty Senate

Minutes

Wednesday, October 7, 2015

3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks

Anne Wallace, Chair of the Faculty Senate

The Chair called the meeting to order and stated that due to the importance of the big item on the Agenda, namely the revised Faculty Workload Guidelines that we would change the proposed order of the agenda, especially since Ray Carney is not yet on hand to speak for the SECC, and the Chancellor is still on his way. She brought the attention of the Senate to the statement by Faculty Assembly Chair Steve Leonard in the News and Observer in the Under the Dome column concerning Senate Bill 670. Faculty Assembly is in the peculiar position of defending the Board of Governors against intrusion in BOG affairs by the state legislature. This is a matter of principle for exactly the same reason that Faculty Assembly and our Senate protested the Board of Governors' intrusion in the matter of the closed Centers on several campuses. We live in an age of intrusiveness due not only to the pervasiveness of media but also the sheer size of everything. Our discussion today follows along the same lines. Evaluation should be done "close to the ground." At the same time, the Chancellor and Provost have to put evaluation into practice the state system. I hope we will conduct the debate today in the same vigorous spirit with which it has been conducted on e-mail since late summer, with a common mission and with respect. Provost has ceded her time today in order that this discussion may take place as fully as possible.

Approval of Minutes

Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:

The Secretary called for motion to approve the minutes of September 2, 2015. Moved, seconded. Minutes approved.

Remarks

Frank Gilliam, Jr., Chancellor-Elect:

I only have two brief points. One, I continue to seek student and faculty input about our strategic vision. I already met with some of you last Friday. We have also received thoughtful responses by email, and have some good input. We will have another meeting with faculty on October 27 at 5:30 in the EUC, and a couple of weeks after that meeting we will meet with students. The Planning Committee has also provided feedback. I encourage you to attend the forum. I would not want faculty or students to think they had not had a chance to participate.

Two, as for Administrative Reorganization, we need to build a strong team and a strong infrastructure, to support our strategic goals. Julia Jackson-Newsome is now in the Chancellors office as a special advisor along with Julie Boyd. Bonita Brown has resigned. We will continue to announce changes as they occur. We are pretty far down the road with the HR position, also with the Associate Counsel. The General Counsel search is also in process.

Committee Briefs

Beth Bernhardt, Chair, Scholarly Communications Committee

Bernhardt brought attention to the Scholarly Communications Forum on "Rights and Responsibilities of Authors: Understanding Copyright and Open Access in Modern Scholarly Publishing" by Christine Fruin, J. D., MSLIS from The University of Florida on October 28, 3:30-5:00 in the Alexander Room of EUC.

(Ray Carney detained so the Senate moved to the next item of business)

Presentations

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload Guidelines, Joy Bhadury, Susan Collins, Steve Yarborough

The Chair announced that Bruce Kirchoff had resigned as Chair of the committee after the bulk of work had been done, and thanked Bruce for his generous contributions of time, thought, and expertise in this process. Joy and Steve would

frame the discussion around the Revision Report, the Revised Faculty Workload Guidelines, and Track Changes Faculty Workload Guidelines, along with a Proposed Revision to Section II.C “Workload Assignments for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty.” Yarborough then read a prepared statement about the background to the work of the committee, which started this summer and has just been completed:

On June 3, 2015, Junius Gonzales, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, sent UNCG Provost Dana Dunn a memorandum asking her to submit a revision of the UNCG Faculty Workload Guidelines which the University had submitted in August 2014. Gonzales explained that UNCG’s policy had met the minimum requirements for this document, but asked Provost Dunn to revise the policy to address the following issues: a) “The current policy has insufficient information regarding overloads— how they are assigned, limits per semester or academic year (per Policy 300.2.13) and how they are approved” and b) “Either include or reference your guideline that addresses UNC BOG Policy 700.6.1[R] regarding independent studies.”

Upon receipt of the Gonzales memorandum, Provost Dunn informed Anne Wallace, and they agreed that the Senate would propose to her a revision that met Gonzales’ requirements, as well as address some additional requirements specified by the Provost. These additional requirements, as specified in the Committee’s charge, were that the document the Committee produced should have the following features: faculty loads should be set at the individual faculty level; faculty workloads should be monitored at the Dean and Provost levels; clear standards should be named for how faculty workloads are set and adjusted.

The Sept. 18 draft was submitted to the Provost for comment. The Provost was able to support most of the document, but wanted revision in some areas. The most significant of these requested changes had to do with the assignment of teaching loads to tenure-line professors. The draft the ad hoc committee had sent her contained the following language: a) In departments that do not offer graduate degrees, six courses per year or 18 semester hours are generally assigned to teaching for each tenured/tenure-track faculty member; b) In departments that offer Masters degrees, five courses per year or 15 semester hours are generally assigned to teaching; c) In departments that offer Doctoral degrees, four courses per year 12 semester hours are generally assigned to teaching.

In this draft, it was clear that teaching loads were to be set individually, but set in relation to the department’s expectations with respect to the faculty member’s contributions to its graduate programs and with respect to a number of additional justifications for reduced teaching workload. In her response, the Provost said that she would want to revise this language to set expectations for teaching loads at individual faculty level and not base it on any “departmental standards.” Her justification for explicitly setting expectations at individual level was the following: “Most departments consist of multiple programs serving different levels of students (undergrad, masters, and doctoral). All faculty within departments do not participate uniformly across all programs within a department. For this reason, department level policies with department wide targets don't work well.” She also mentioned the fact that increasingly faculty teach across departments in unit-wide programs. The Committee had been unanimous in its preference for department-level basic teaching workload from which the individual’s teaching load could be adjusted up or down based on the individual’s overall workload. However, the Committee took the Provost’s recommendation seriously, and agreed that, because in some departments with graduate programs, not all faculty members may actually participate in them, it should revise the workload guidelines to eliminate the department-wide standard teaching loads. However, committee members differed in how to accomplish this and still protect individual faculty members from exploitation, avoid creating a situation that would engender unnecessary conflicts among departmental faculty, while still giving current and newly recruited faculty a clear indication of what their teaching workload would be.

In the final draft submitted to the Senate, the following changes were made:

First, the Committee added a separate section authorizing unit and departmental guidelines. Such language is not in the policy that is currently in force. Many departments and units currently have their own guidelines, and the Committee did not want to rely upon tradition to ensure that such specific guidelines could continue to be used, when approved by the appropriate dean. This new language affirms that, “When deemed appropriate by the dean or faculty assembly of the unit, all departments within a unit must develop workload policies that are designed to accommodate the needs and missions of those departments. Second, the Committee produced two schemes for assigning workload for tenure-line faculty:

First scheme:

- Total workload is 24 semester hours
- Normal annual teaching workload is 18 hours (allows 6 hours for the research/creative activity)
- A non-exclusive list of 7 examples of contributions, beyond those for the 6 hours of reductions already allowed above, which could justify adjusting teaching workload further from the 18-hour base

- Leaves to department/unit guidelines the priority rankings and expected contributions for receiving each kind of adjustment.

Second scheme:

- Total annual workload is 24 semester hours
- Normal teaching workload is 18 hours (allows 6 hours for the research/creative activity)
- A non-exclusive list of 15 examples of contributions, beyond those for the 6 hours of reductions already allowed above, which could justify adjusting teaching workload further from the 18 hour base for any faculty member (including tenure-line)
- Expresses expected teaching workload reductions based upon contributions necessary to support graduate programs (restricted to tenure-line graduate faculty):
 - An additional 3 semester hours for contributing as the department expects to masters programs (for a total teaching workload of 15 semester hours)
 - An additional 6 semester hours for contributing to doctoral/masters programs (for a total teaching workload of 12 semester hours)

My understanding of the difference in philosophy between the two is as follows. 1. The version sent to the Senate is based on the assumption that all faculty activities are valuable, and therefore no one kind of contribution—such as contributions to graduate programs—should be prioritized. Rather, given the different missions of the various units and departments across campus, the kinds of contributions that justify teaching load reductions and their priorities should be left to the units/departments per applicable workload policies). 2. The amendment is based on the assumption that all faculty activities are valuable, but that activities which are necessary to allow our degree programs to function properly are essential, and—given the limited number of teaching workload reductions that will be available to each department—reductions that support degree programs should take precedence. Graduate programs are singled out in the amendment because the standard load (the 18-hour norm for tenure-line faculty) is aimed at supporting the undergraduate programs; reductions of this type are common across the system; The University Standard Teaching Load (5 courses per year for UNCG) is based upon the Carnegie classifications, which are based upon universities’ graduate degree offerings and the research productivity necessary to support them.

The Committee, in a split decision, submitted the first version to the Senate. After the ad hoc committee submitted this version, it received a large number of responses from Senators and other faculty. Many supported it, but many expressed dissatisfaction with that version and described preferences for schemes that more closely resembled the second version. At this point 3. The Committee decided to ask that the Senate consider that second version in its deliberations, in comparison to the first. That second version has been distributed to you, and it will soon be submitted in a motion as an amendment to the version submitted as part of today’s agenda, so that the Senate can deliberate their relative merits.

A second significant suggestion from the Provost about the draft we had sent her on Sept. 18 concerned the section on the monitoring of teaching workloads. Specifically, she said that the first part of it is fine, but the last part needs to be reworked so that what feeds up from the department to the dean and then from the dean to the provost is a justification at the individual faculty level for any reductions below 6 courses per year. After negotiations with Alan Boyette, the Committee reached an agreement that justifications would only be necessary when “workload falls below 15 semester hours (five organized courses) or their equivalent, per year” – the average expected across all full-time faculty by UNC-GA. That is what you see in VI.3.

Motions

The Chair made a motion to put the First version on the floor for discussion.

Seconded.

A second motion was made to put second version on the floor for discussion.

Seconded

Discussion, Q/A:

The rationale/motive for moving the evaluation from the departmental to the individual level was because there are a number of graduate programs across the campus to which some faculty in a department do not contribute. The Provost thought (and the committee agreed) that the teaching load should thus be set at individual level.

The assumption seems to be that grad classes/programs are more work and this creates a sort of class system.

It depends. Some undergraduate classes have 90 students where grad classes may only have 5. The original UNC policy already distinguishes number of classes based on institutional focus (doctoral program, masters, undergraduate only). This is not about classes, but graduate supervision (committees, guidance, advising, etc.). The degree programs need to function properly and thus the faculty must have time to do that work.

Has the committee thought of “squeaky wheel” syndrome? There’s a lot of stress for individuals to negotiate effectively; there could create difficulty if a dept. head does not recognize the individual faculty member’s contribution and, research shows women typically do not get the benefits of negotiation as well as men.

The committee initially did prefer department level; but with feedback, tried to make the individual level work. We should add in that teaching loads should be set not annually but every 5 years, allowing for exceptional situations. The issues of negotiation was discussed and there’s a protection build into the policy. Heads cannot operate arbitrarily—every department has to have department faculty-approved workload guidelines.

From the trenches of a doctoral program, I teach 4 courses/year (2 undergrad and 2 MA/PhD). There’s probably not a lot of difference in work load. Funding for doctoral students took an immense amount of time to secure. Negotiating every year for teaching will take an inordinate amount of time. We’ve had this 3 tier system since 1988.

The amendment could be improved by adding “how many doctoral or MA students are necessary to count” which would eliminate the need to negotiate.

Version #1 would be a nightmare for the dept. head. Version #2 recognizes something about human nature that makes the amended version much more workable.

Perhaps we should quantify teaching. We’re always talking about reducing. Shouldn’t we instead “credit” people for what they are doing? In music, for doctoral students finishing their dissertation, that’s 3 credit hours; teaching 6 students piano instruction is the equivalent for 3 credit hours.

Counting doesn’t work for our department because if I have 2 students in a doctoral program, I’m working to get 4 and if I have 4, I’m trying to maintain.

Our teaching workload cannot be separated from research workload. There are many complications there. The system we have been using has worked—successful teaching and research with the dept. making decisions. A highly individuated system would be destructive for dept. health.

My concern is for faculty governance and that this process is being driven by obtrusiveness. Our first priority should be to protect our jobs for the welfare of our students. What has been working for the past 20 years is a collective, collegial relationship between faculty and dept. head. Are we opening ourselves to a regime of authority we don’t want?

The departmental and unit guidelines are referenced throughout so that faculty retain control. This policy with amendment is more expansive than what we have now. Let’s keep the policy as close to what it is now while addressing Provost Dunn’s needs. In the end, whatever this body does is advisory to what the Provost submits. She hopes for some consensus, but there may be some differences.

Provost Dunn sees the establishment of faculty workload policy as a joint endeavor wherein faculty governance applies to how workloads are managed to achieve the required institutional targets. Faculty governance does not include the setting of those targets as that is done by the BoG. We have requirements for teaching workload set by the BoG that we cannot negotiate. The differentiation by level of programs is the norm for universities nationwide.

Our department starts with 6/year even though we have a master’s program. Will we get a reduction?

Probably not since the first clause in the workload assignment is that we have to meet instructional needs. Concern about “average” language that suggests if one faculty teaches less, another has to teach more.

Would an individual approach to setting teaching load inadvertently set us up for some unintended consequences?

There were differences of opinion on the committee regarding the individual vs. department approach.

Opposition to university policy that comes down to touch an individual was expressed.

Provost Dunn explained the Annual Review and Post Tenure Review DO apply to individuals, not departments.

Vote for Language of Amendment (individual)—Version #2--(then will work on wording changes):

All in favor: 17 Opposed: 15; Abstention: 3.

Discussion ensued on word changes to the policy, of which there were minor edits made.

Motion to approve Version #1 as amended (to become Version #2) to provide as a recommendation to Provost Dunn.

In favor: Unanimous.

Call to extend meeting 10 minutes. So moved. Seconded. Passed.

Ray Carney, SECC Campaign Chairman

UNCG did very well last year. We are revered as a leader in this campaign. We received three SECC awards. The system had 18, 671 donors for a total of \$3.8 million. UNCG was 6th out of 51 institutions, 38% participation. Our success is based on campus commitment to service. Last year, 924 donors gave an average of \$238. As of 10/6/15, UNCG has 160 donors pledging \$441,000 (7% participation). This year, we are highlighting smaller organizations like Operation First Response for giving. All contributions are anonymous and tax deductible. Even if you do not contribute, please go online and choose, "I don't wish to participate."

Adjourn

Move to adjourn. Seconded.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Carmichael

Secretary, Faculty Senate

Approved November 4, 2015