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**Faculty Senate Meeting:** Monday, Oct 29th 12:30-1:45pm KSU Center Room 300

# Call to Order

# The meeting was called to order by Senator Jennifer Purcell at 12:30pm.

* 1. **Welcome – Dr. Jennifer Purcell**

Dr. Purcell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

* 1. **President’s Update – President Pamela Whitten**

President Whitten: One of the things I appreciate at KSU is the value and emphasis placed on active progressive ideas related to fostering a campus respectful of diversity and inclusion. I’m very interested in how we might expand our current office of Diversity. You don’t have to limit your input to me today but what are the opportunities to increase or expand the kinds of things we do. Could I have some ideas or insights from you?

Senator JoAnne Lee commended the Office of Diversity and Inclusion for their great job working with Part-Time Faculty (noting a workshop this summer). She said the workshop uncovered many things that Part-Time faculty would like to be involved in and aware of and expressed her hope that they would be included in the Office’s future work.

Senator Joya Carter Hicks expressed her hope that University wide diversity initiatives continue such as the Diversity faculty fellowship as well as those focused on other areas (ex. sustainability, disability). She said she would like these to stay in the strategic plan of the Diversity Office.

Senator Ginny Boss said that her comment related to a later agenda item on workload and noted the hidden labor around campus supporting students and faculty of color. She suggested that there are ways we could recognize this hidden labor in ways that would benefit everyone on campus.

Senator Nic Cleborne said that he’d like to see more work on outreach to the community, especially in Cobb. He noted that KSU has had some nasty incidents with people off campus influencing how diversity is perceived and referenced the conversations under the Golden Dome last year. He noted that there are opportunities for town and gown conversations.

Jonathon McMurry (Visitor, Office of Research) noted that he runs a program for Masters students from underrepresented groups going on to biomedical PhDs, and that we lose a lot of students because they can’t afford the fees. He said that it would be very helpful to have a graduate student fee deferral program. He said he believed that UGA had a similar program and that he would look into it and report back.

President Whitten closed by encouraging all to contact her by email or phone or in person to share thoughts and ideas on this topic.

* 1. **Provost’s Update – Interim Provost Linda Noble**

Provost Noble announced that four national searches have been launched for Deans in the Colleges of Arts, CHSS, Engineering, and Continuing and Professional Education. Search committees have been formed and campus communication will be coming out soon identifying members of the committees. Search firms have been hired in each search and the committees are meeting soon to receive their charge. Search committees were formed typically with every department having a rep, the CFC chairs, a student rep, and a staff rep. Next Provost will be involved in the selection of Deans.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**

Motion to approve (Bohannon). Motion seconded (Collins). Approved unanimously.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

Motion to approve (Lee). Motion seconded (Brasco). Approved unanimously.

1. **Reports**

Motion to disseminate reports electronically (Bohannon). Seconded. Approved unanimously.

1. **Old Business**
2. Intellectual Property (IP) Policy – Dr. Jonathan McMurry (Office of Research)

Dr. Jonathon McMurry reported that they collected feedback after the last Faculty Senate meeting and are now presenting the policy in final form. He noted the following changes to the revised policy from the last version presented.

1. Define on p. 6 that IP generated by students not under a grant or other university auspice is theirs.
2. Section B below, added a statement that the first $5000 of net revenue on University assisted textbooks/course materials etc. go to creator prior to a split to recover KSURFs costs.

Senator Marianne Holdzkom asked about the $5000 threshold that is included specifically for textbooks and course materials and said that her faculty are still wondering about royalties on historical monographs, articles etc. Without that threshold she’s been asked to vote no and said she needs that clarification.

Dr. McMurry responded that those are not expressly included, and it would depend whether the work is University assisted or individual effort. A GRAship would make the work University assisted. If you have a specific case to make you can certainly talk to the Office of Research in advance to establish an understanding. Significant resources (those not available to the general public) would count as University assisted.

Senator Brian Starks asked why not broaden it to include other works?

Dr. McMurry responded that it comes down to whether or not you are you using public resources for private gain, that textbooks are a concession from the research office, and that they are not willing to expand the threshold category to include other kinds of University assisted work.

Senator Joanne Lee noted that many Part-Time Faculty create works in their regular jobs (ex. developing curriculum) and that KSU is their part-time jobs. How do you address this?

Dr. McMurry responded that this would seem to be individual effort and therefore belong to the creator.

Lee followed up to ask if PT Faculty are writing curriculum that go into D2L, who owns those?

Dr. McMurry responded that this is addressed in the policy. He said, “it is yours and the university has the right to freely use it”.

Senator Brian Starks asked that since the contract is between faculty and book publishing house, and the Office of Research is not a party that that contract how would they insert themselves into that in a way that is consistent with contract law.

Prof. McMurry responded that if the work is University assisted (ex. a GRA) then faculty are obligated to disclose to the University through the Research Foundation and there would be agreements made and contracts written. He said that if you have the next best seller, write it on your own.

Senator Noah McLaughlin asked about any policy for open education resources or copyright free textbooks?

Prof. McMurry asked for clarification that this is a case of a faculty member writing something they want to give away and said in that case Office of Research would want that happen. There is the issue of the University does have an interest in the commercial value if they supported it. If you tell KSURF you want it to be open access they will likely approve that. He said he handles IP disclosures in the Office of Research—"we want to do what you want to do”. He said there are rules that have to be observed and it’s not allowed to take public resources for private gain.

Senator Daniel Rogers asked about the definition of significant University assisted saying it useslanguage of “Typical/Additional”. He wanted to clarify, to the extent that departments already differ in what is typical with regard to those resources, then that threshold would differ by department?

Prof. McMurry said that this is right, that he is not a lawyer and that Legal affairs has worked on this language. He said that they have further defined typical resources in the document to include use of your office and your telephone. If you have a question come to them to ask. If you want to maintain ownership of your work come talk to us and we can work out a MOU to protect your individual effort.

Senator Doug Moodie asked if this would come as a policy through the Policy Process Committee and back through Senate for an approval vote.

Prof. Gwaltney (Chair of Policy Process Council) said that this presentation is part of the shared governance process and that if Senate wants to vote on this policy then now would be a good time to do that. He noted this version could also go to other bodies.

**A motion was introduced to endorse the revised IP policy as presented today (Bohannon). Seconded (Tis).**

**The vote result was:**

**YES: 5**

**NO: 26**

**Therefore, the motion failed.**

1. Conflict of Interest and Commitment

Senator Jenn Purcell explained that she spoke to Andrew Newton (Legal Affairs) who was not able to attend the meeting and relayed that there are now FAQs and Guidance documents on the COI website. She shared her understanding from Senators that timeliness of response to these requests is still a concern. She asked for questions, discussion or motions from the floor.

Senator Joanne Lee said that she filled out COI request after the last Senate meeting and did not engage in the activity (attending the SACCS visit as a committee member) because she did not receive approval in time.

Senator Marielle Myers said that we were told last Senate meeting that the Provost would be doing all approvals. She asked how this will work with a new Provost coming and inquired how faculty will meet workload expectations when we can’t do service tasks due to not having received response.

Senator Purcell asked if the Provost or President would like to respond to these questions and concerns.

Provost Noble responded that she wanted to apologize saying she thought all approvals had gone out and learned today that they were still in her office. She said that the good news is that the new documents clarifies a lot of what doesn’t need to come forward for approval and should streamline the process. She said she thought this round of requests was a “good exercise”. She also noted that the new Provost won’t be approving these because it is impossible for one person to do so. She said the intention going forward is to push these down to the Deans and that these two things will improve timeliness.

Senator Purcell asked if those who have submitted requests for activities that the FAQs say do not need approval can go ahead and proceed with these activities.

Provost Noble said yes and that her office will get the approvals still in her office out in the next two days.

Senator Ginny Boss said that at the last Senate meeting the concern was raised about faculty being asked to disclose profit/money on COI and we were assured that we would not have to make these disclosures. She noted that some approvers in the process have been asking for disclosure of amount of compensation. How can that be addressed?

Senator Purcell suggested that a conversation with the Deans council would be in order to clarify that disclosure of compensation amount is not required. She asked for any additional questions, concerns, or motions from the floor. Hearing none she moved to the next agenda item.

1. Overload Approvals – Dr. Humayun Zafar

Senator Humayun Zafar noted that a faculty member in his department had a study abroad and was not paid his overload for an August class yet but that this should be taken care of soon. He went on to say that as a result of this issue, he has reviewed the BOR overload policy and that it clearly states overloads can be paid to cover teaching, research, and service (while we have been told it is only going to be used for teaching in cases of faculty illness). He further noted that the USG Affordable Learning initiative guidelines indicate that these funds can be used to pay faculty overloads (both documents were displayed). He stated that there appears to be a disconnect between how the BOR overload policy is being enforced on our campus and what the BOR policy says.

Provost Noble responded that both of these policies allow for institutional flexibility and that institutions have the freedom to allow certain things. She said we have reduced the consistent everyday use of overload pay here at KSU and that in accordance with the policy they should always be temporary and always for emergency purposes.

Senator Zafar responded that the policy does not mention emergencies.

Provost Noble stated that she is very familiar with the policy because she wrote the policy. The problem was not the policy but the practice that has been in place at KSU.

Senator Purcell said that one question that has surfaced looking at our budget constraints that we have at the institution, concerns when faculty are pursuing external funds that allow for overloads. Are these permitted? She said FSEC is hearing that the Office of Research is telling faculty that there will be no overloads paid from external grants. She noted that this is unfortunate because it is one way to incentivize that additional work.

Provost Noble responded that typically institutions don’t bring in grants with overload pay. Typically, the faculty compensation is an indirect or summer pay or something else. It’s not a traditional practice to write a grant to say that in additional to my salary from August-May I will get an overload as part of the grant. This is one of the challenges of managing workload.

Senator Sandra Pierquet asked for some examples of the misuse of overloads.

Provost Noble said it was a very common practice to pay overloads for faculty to chair committees, to redesign a website, to advise students etc. most of the activities we reviewed were part of normal workload.

Jonathon Lyon (Chemistry) said that he has worked at another USG institution 9 years and there it would be typical to balance these activities with a course release. Will this be possible going forward at KSU?

Provost Noble responded that this is what drives our need to discuss workload.

Senator Heather Pincock asked if the Faculty Senate could see the data that Provost Noble and Associate Provost Matson said they had reviewed regarding overloads.

Associate Provost Matson stated that he is working on a list of all the overloads reviewed in the study. He said he has a list of words used to justify the overloads going back 2 years and that he will be happy to distribute.

Provost Noble said that at the end of June (June 29) she signed 281 overload pay requests. When she called Provosts at other comparator institutions in the USG they had not signed more than 5 in the entire fiscal year.

Senator Heather Pincock responded that the prominence of overloads is not in dispute but that we have different theories about why that is and that it will probably come up in the workload discussion. She thanked Provost Noble and Associate Provost Matson for sharing the data.

Senator Humayun Zafar said that questions his departmental colleagues have noted that many administrators were drawn from his department and that as a result they don’t have teaching faculty to cover their course demands. This has been done through overloads. He noted that hiring Part-Time faculty or Lecturers creates issues with accreditation and asked how this should be addressed.

Provost Noble reiterated that this is why faculty workload issues need to be addressed. She said that we never mandated that overload would never be paid. It’s not a never. It’s when it is justified and when you need it. She stressed the need for longer term solutions from a faculty resource perspective.

1. Faculty Salary Studies – Dr. Humayun Zafar

Senator Humayun Zafar stated that a draft report of the salary study from last spring has been completed but not distributed. The committee saw a presentation but never read the report.

**A motion was introduced requesting that the Faculty Salary study draft version completed in May 2018 be released (Zafar). Seconded (Pincock).**

**YES: 34**

**NO: 0**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

1. Elections
	1. Parliamentarian
	2. KSURF Faculty Representative
	3. FSEC Past-President (Spring 2019)

Senator Jennifer Purcell explained that she has received nominations for each of the openings.

**A motion was introduced to vote for these via Qualtrics.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

1. **New Business**
2. Policy Process Council Updates – Dr. Kevin Gwaltney

Dr. Kevin Gwaltney (Chair of Policy Process Council) explained the purpose of the council and the shared governance process related to new policies. He reminded everyone that Senator Doug Moodie is the Faculty Senate representative to this council and introduced Stephen Gay to discuss the two policies before the Senate.

Stephen Gay- Executive Director, Office of Cybersecurity (UITS) and KSU’s Chief Information Security Officer presented on both policies. He summarized them as follows:

* 1. Cellular, Wireless Communications Devices, and Services Policy

This is a repurposing of existing policy about devices. The policy has been updated to focus more on services because this is where the real costs are. The reason for this is the discovery of devices being paid for by the University that are in drawers and not being used. The policy outlines accountability and auditing on these devices (in line with USG requirements) and the criteria for determining needs. Tethering is added to the policy.

* 1. Technology Purchasing, Relocation, and Surplus Policy

The existing policy is fairly draconian, and it is really not UITS’ job to restrict access to technology. The policy has been revised to empower faculty/staff to purchase the technology they need without approval in a secure way. The policy covers anything that doesn’t raise security concerns (ex. monitors, printers, scanners, mouse, keyboard etc.). These items can now be purchased without IT approval.

**A motion was introduced for the Faculty Senate to endorse these policies. Seconded.**

**YES: 25**

**NO: 1**

**The motion passed.**

1. Faculty Workload Recommendations – Drs. Linda Noble and Ron Matson

Provost Noble said that they have been getting good feedback for moving forward. By way of big picture context, she explained that she had heard a lot on this campus about inequity, lack of transparency, and inconsistency across colleges re: workload. She explained that the Workload Working Group put together these recommendations for implementation in the Colleges under the existing expectations. She emphasized that the recommendations are “not about raising your standards or changing your standards”. She said they require specifying quantity, quality, and timeline under existing P&T expectations. She said this would be determined by the disciplines within the respective Colleges. She next invited Associate Provost Ron Matson to talk about how the recommendations fit with existing policy.

Associate Provost Matson said that he had served on the working group and is now working on trying to incorporate the ideas in the recommendations into proposed revisions for the current Faculty Handbook. He stated that these revisions don’t change anything but just clarifies things. Up until now, when chairs have asked what is the norm/base to determine course releases, he has told everyone 3/3 but that wasn’t specified in the Handbook. This will codify that the norm we are setting is a 3/3 starting point. He noted that not everything is a 3/3 (because some courses are not 3 credits) but that this is the starting point. The Handbook also says “or equivalent”.

 The recommendations refer to the Scholarship/Creative Activity (S/CA) norm being 30% with a minimum of 20%. In the current Faculty Handbook for teaching faculty (tenure/tenure track), it says “in order to get promoted and tenured you have to do scholarship” but it doesn’t specify how that fits into workload. The proposed revisions will specify this with 30% being the base/norm and 20% being the minimum to give us some numbers by which we can all work around. For Service, the current Faculty Handbook already does specify 10%.

 What these changes do is gives us % of workload, % of effort that serves as the norm. It gets adjusted based on the FPA. There is already a list of various tracks that show various combinations of potential workloads for teaching/service/scholarship. These are starting norms so that across the University we are all starting from the same place and it is more transparent and equitable for everyone. It still allows flexibility in the FPAs that we’ve always had.

Provost Noble explained that she had invited some of the Deans to speak about how this is working in their Colleges.

Prof. Steve Smalt (Interim Director of the School of Accountancy, Coles College) stated that Dean Schwaig asked him to come and talk about how they developed this in Coles. He was on the first committee that undertook development of the workload tracks (about 25 years ago) and part of what drove it from a faculty perspective was a concern about transparency and what constituted a course release or a requirement for research publication or service/engagement to the profession. So, to start with it was a function of developing three tracks (teaching, research and balance track). Each category had workload percentages adjusted depending on the track. The committee decided what constituted a course release for research outputs. The Coles workload document has evolved over the past 25 years. For example, the introduction of the DBA (now PhD) has necessitated changes (due to accreditation) to types and quality of research output and that they now have five tracks (Doctoral research track to teaching track). He explained that the annual FPA meeting is focused on selecting a track (based on the ARD) and that he has had faculty move in both directions this year and that this is done through a collaborative decision between the chair and faculty member. He said everyone up and down the continuum respects each other for what they are doing. He explained that it has allowed us to attract a great cadre of faculty into the School of Accountancy and develop an international reputation for doing R1 research despite being an R3 University.

Senator Nic Cleghorne asked what do these tracks looks like.

Prof. Smalt replied that they range from research faculty with A+ editorships on 1/2 teaching load to teaching faculty on 4/4 with balanced track on 3/3 and adjustments in each case for percentages to teaching and service.

Provost Noble asked that we hold questions and let each of the Deans speak first and next introduced Dean Preston.

 Dean Jon Preston (College of Computing and Software Engineering) explained that prior to consolidation they did not have a flexible workload model. They adopted it at a Departmental level within the College 4 years ago and they range from 5/4 teaching emphasis to 2/2 on research emphasis and everything in between. He said this allows them to honor those who want to be more teaching focused and also honor those who want to be more research focused (publishing and bringing in grants) and use those grants to buy faculty down to a 2/2. They can invest in that and allows them to focus resources in different areas and have flexibility.

Dean Kerwin Swint (College of Humanities and Social Science) said that his College has heard from him and that once everyone realized the recommendations weren’t asking an increase in scholarly output that was good news. He explained that over the last year CHSS has been working to clarify expectation with P&T committees. Clarifying teaching load is in process. He explained that in their college years ago there was a more teaching focused track but that in recent years they got away from that and that a purely teaching track wasn’t allowed and was actively discouraged. He explained that this barrier will be removed and it will free up those who want to be on a teaching track. He mentioned that in his old department there are people who want to do more teaching and less research and that this will allow them to do that. The recommendations will allow more flexibility and CHSS will be working towards a spectrum which includes a balanced track. He said that is where CHSS is heading and they will be working with their Departments to get there.

Provost Noble explained that in the long run they hope this will be beneficial to faculty and that this will allow expectations to be much clearer to new and current faculty. She said that as an old associate director at CETL, she appreciates the comments from the Deans that emphasized faculty contributions across the spectrum of research, teaching, and service—and that all are valuable. She said we need to come to terms with the mission of this institution and recognize that faculty experts can contribute to that in different ways and still be a valued part of this team.

Senator Anissa Vega said she appreciated the valuing of various tracks in the presentations but that the policy talks about “not performing”. She asked Provost Noble to speak to the idea of a punitive policy for faculty who do not perform every semester according to their workload agreement.

Provost Noble replied that she did not intend it to be punitive. It is intended to make it possible to make reassignments as needed. If, as a faculty member, I am not doings something in one area then my workload could be readjusted and that is the purpose of the policy.

Senator Anissa Vega responded that the policy reads as punitive.

Senator Jenn Purcell commented that she can now see the punitive language in the document that she did not on first read and said that if there is an opportunity she would go back and make more edits but that she hopes the intent of the document is received and that the language can be crafted as needed in each discipline. There is a redirection of workload assignments based on productivity and what you have in the pipeline. There are also stages in between. That is not clear in this document but in conversation that is part of the understanding. You are not automatically off the tenure track, there are stages such as if you want to teach more classes and have a lower S/CA load that is certainly an option.

Senator Anissa Vega asked was it not possible to revise the document so it’s not so punitive. She noted that a Dean could interpret it to be very punitive and enforce it that way.

Provost Noble said that the CDA pointed out that the examples were not helpful and so they were removed. She said we can nuance this. She said that the important language is going to be in your College and Department expectations. She said we can nuance this however you want to so that it doesn’t send the message that we didn’t mean to send.

Senator Jenn Purcell said that her concern is that spending so much time revising this document would distract from turning to the work in our Department guidelines if anything needs to be changed there.

Provosts Noble explained that all expectations have to be approved at the Provost office to make sure there aren’t misinterpretations of the recommendations.

Senator Marielle Myers stated that this document has caused great stress and anguish for many people for many weeks and asked that there be recognition and understanding about the impact that the lack of clarity of language has had. She pointed out that it has taken up a lot of time and increased our service work as we have been trying to understand this. She said that the collective impact of this document along with COI, along with IP, along with everything else has been very negative for culture and climate on the campus.

Senator Bryan Gillis said he was very happy to hear what everybody said in their remarks which is basically that you go in for your ARD/FPA and decide on your track. He explained that the fervor in his department came from the example of 1 publication in a peer reviewed journal per year from Sam Houston University. He said that most comments came back as a result of the examples but that what is explained up here is exactly what they are doing now.

Provost Noble said that his Department’s interpretation of the examples was commonly felt around the campus. She said there was no need to defend the examples, they were meant to illustrate how comparators specify their expectations. It was not mean to set the expectations. That being said these are our comparators. We need to come to some understanding in our Colleges and Departments for what those expectations are (quality, quantity, timeline). You are essentially operationally defining your expectations.

Senator Bryan Gillis sought to clarify if Departments get to make these decisions for themselves.

Provost Noble explained that she has recirculated a version with the examples removed and advised deleting the version of the document with the examples.

Senator Brian Starks said that what is being said up there sounds like the process of what we are going through. The initial document and follow up letter looks very different. As professionals we are required to have clarity in our work. He noted that the outside consulting group and what they did was missing so much and that he found all kinds of things that aren’t mentioned at all in the report (ex. comparators have sabbaticals, some schools with 2/2 load etc.). He stated that a lot of important things were missing that caused a lot of consternation.

Senator Utam Kokil asked, for clarification sake, because it doesn’t specify for tenure track when you have received a grant and increase your research and want to adjust workload from 30/60/10 if that is possible. He said he was told he can’t move anything, is that true?

Provost Noble responded that this is what the Colleges and Departments need to be working on and specifying what the flexibility is, but the document doesn’t attempt to answer the question specifically.

Senator Matthew Wilson explained that on the Marietta campus he is expected to teach 24 hours per year, 3 hours release, and receives no credit for 5 labs he teaches every year- they count as 1 hour with no TA, GRA. Most of his classes are at night and meetings first thing in the morning. He said in his College (Engineering and Engineering Tech) they have never changed, and it’s still running like Southern Tech. He said 3/3 sounds like it will be easier for him. On top of this he is expected to put everything online with no compensation, plus committees he serves on, plus some minimal expectations in research. He asked if it helps or hurts him?

Provost Noble responded that the exercise in his College should help him because it becomes about how to prioritize in the three areas so faculty are clear about what they can do.

Senator Matthew Wilson went on to explain that during this transition, the consolidation has done nothing to help his College. It has resulted in nothing better for students or for himself personally. Things aren’t getting better. He said they were told we would have more teaching emphasis. He said at Southern Poly he got 1.5 hours for each lab he taught now he gets 1 hour. He said he thinks the President and Provost will have to come down with a “hammer and nail” to his College to say these things do exist and that they need to be followed.

Provost Noble said this is part of why they want a University wide oversight of these guidelines- so that they can help get this much more transparent and inconsistent only where it needs to be inconsistent (due to disciplinary norms).

**A motion was introduced to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Seconded.**

**The motion was approved.**

Senator Steve Collins shared questions from his constituents in SGIA. He noted that from the comments Provost Noble and the Deans have made there seems to be a disconnect between the understanding of this document and what is expected from us. It is being interpreted as sacrosanct policy but I’m hearing today no these are general guidelines and that the determination will be made at the Department level, is this correct?

Provost Noble responded yes, within these parameters.

Senator Steve Collins noted we are hearing different tracks and different levels. For example, he said the document refers to a faculty member not engaged in robust scholarly being moved to a 5/4 teaching load, but we heard 4/4 today mentioned in another College so is 5/4 sacrosanct?

Provost Noble said this has to be discussed at the College level. This document provides parameters, so she doesn’t believe you’ll get expectations where research is less than 20% or service less than 10%. But for faculty engaging some but not a lot of research a 5/4 may not be appropriate perhaps in some cases a 4/4 may be appropriate. It’s not very different from what current University models are trying to drive but it is not being implemented across Colleges consistently. There is also an accountability piece— there has to be a timeframe parameter of research productivity to justify a 2/2 load, for example. That doesn’t mean teaching is punitive it just means you’re unable to meet the research targets so maybe you’ve got to do more teaching. The accountability piece is part of the culture that needs to be talked about extensively because that’s where the inconsistency and lack of fairness seems to be perceived.

Senator Steve Collins replied that it will be refreshing to most that there is greater flexibility than the document seems to suggest. With regard to the timeline, which seems to be very aggressive and perhaps not realistic given the sweeping changes and grand ramifications, he asked is it possible for the timeline to be extended at least until next fall to give the opportunity at the College and Department level for expectations, models and timelines for changing tracks to be developed?

Provost Noble responded that Departments and Colleges are not setting new expectations unless they choose to, and that this timeline needs to be followed to have clarity in place for next year. She said things can be modified as we go forward but there needs to be a focus on getting these in place for the setting of the workload for the 2019/2020 year. Some Colleges have to have more extensive conversations than others and she is cognizant of that.

Senator Craig Brasco asked whether class size population would be a workload consideration.

Provost Noble responded that the Workload group made the recommendation to have a teaching load policy with some sort of class size metric. The workload group made a recommendation to the University to think about that.

Senator Craig Brasco asked, on behalf of a constituent, if the recommendations will result in abandoning the Boyer model?

Provost Noble said that this allows for the Boyer model (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is considered Scholarship) and that she does not believe it challenges this.

Senator Nic Cleghorne thanked Provost Noble for the helpful clarifications about the intent of the policy. He noted that many of his faculty colleagues come from R1s and that at these types of Universities there is a 3-year review for workload readjustment. This allows for the irregular stream of publishing (ex. no publications in one year, then four the next year). Is that something that we’re amenable to?

Provost Noble said she agrees this is beneficial, the current policy allows for that, that CDA is bringing a proposal for that. That’s part of the timeline specification that the disciplines need to work out for themselves.

Senator Nic Cleghorne noted that a small department means lots of service. He asked what is to prevent faculty from saying no to service and having negative consequences for the University?

Provost Noble responded that this needs to be part of the conversations because there is a heavy institutional service load at this campus and it may be time to take a look at what the priorities are about that service.

Senator Daniel Rogers asked that in cases where tracks or models don’t currently exist, can those exist at the Department level or do they need to be uniform at the College?

Provost Noble said there is flexibility to determine this. The College has to be an umbrella but Departments can then define. Coles has a College level model that the Departments then define, and this could be a good model for others. Many have asked this fundamental question about who defines what where.

Senator Daniel Rogers asked if since introducing a track or model would be a change to the guidelines if the timeline to implementation would kick in the year of giving faculty an option to follow new or old guidelines.

Provost Noble replied that if implementation is going to drive a policy change then that’s going to be a different timeline. She is hoping within the existing expectations you can get to specificity. If you decide you want to go to a track model and that’s the answer to that then that might be a longer term because you’ve got to change whatever your P&T guidelines are.

Associate Provost Matson said that it has always been in the University handbook to allow tracks. If you go to faculty affairs, guideline and faculty workload, you can see what some other units do if you just want a model.

Senator Allan Fowler asked if individual faculty workload readjustments will require Provost approval for variation?

Provost Noble responded no. Individual workload changes won’t be approved by the Provost they will be managed by Chair and Dean just like your FPAs are now.

Senator Heather Pincock clarified that the Provost office will be approving College wide expectations. Any individual change in workload would be negotiated with the Chair.

Provost Noble said this was correct and that the Provost’s approval is for the College wide expectations only.

Senator Heather Pincock said she is still not clear because Provost Noble just said that if the changes are going to require guidelines changes then that would be on a different timeline but for a College like CHSS where we don’t currently have a workload expectations document with tracks, I don’t know how our College would provide what’s being asked for in these recommendations without making revisions to our P&T Guideline documents and taking votes as a faculty in every Department on those revisions and then taking votes at the College level.

Provost Noble asked if CHSS currently has expectations in teaching, research, and service?

Senator Heather Pincock responded we have P&T Guidelines and they don’t conform to what these recommendations say.

Provost Noble said that the CHSS Dean and the Provost can talk that out, but she assumes there are expectations that can be clarified.

Senator Heather Pincock asked what the process for approving those at the Department and the College level before they go to the Provost would be? Will that go through the CFCs and DFCs will that go through the P&T Committees?

Provost Noble said that the process is for the College to determine.

Dean Swint said they have up to now been going through the P&T committees.

Senator Heather Pincock responded that this is because they are revisions to the P&T guidelines documents.

Dean Swint said that a decision to go to a more defined teaching track wouldn’t be in this go around. We can’t have a full-blown teaching track system in place according to this timeline. So that will take some more time to put in place.

Senator Jeanne Bohannon asked if there are two timelines? She said that in her Department they are going to have a very hard time to get all of this done in the timeline and asked if there is any play at all?

Dean Swint replied that what CHSS will try to get done by February 2019 is the flexibility for faculty to work with their Chair and their Dean on an optional flexibility with teaching and research. It doesn’t necessarily mean a full-blown teaching track like Coles has by this February. By the next February that might be where it is.

1. **Adjournment**

 **A motion as introduced to adjourn the meeting (Lee). Seconded. Approved.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm.