University of Dayton

eCommons

Spring 2-16-2024

2024-02-16 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

<div align="center">

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
(ECAS)
ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
2023-2024

MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, February 16, 2024
12:30-2pm – SM 113B

</div>

President: Erin O'Mara Kunz
Vice President: Allison Kinney
Secretary: Jon Fulkerson
Members: Jackie Arnold, Ali Carr-Chellman, Garrett Conti, Jen Dalton, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Jon Fulkerson, Tim Gabrielli, Kayla Harris, Lexie Kemble, Allison Kinney, Erin O'Mara Kunz, Joel Pruce (Faculty Board), Andrea Seielstad, Darlene Weaver

Present: Jackie Arnold, Ali Carr-Chellman, Garrett Conti, Jen Dalton, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Jon Fulkerson, Tim Gabrielli (virtual), Kayla Harris, Lexie Kemble, Allison Kinney, Erin O'Mara Kunz, Carolyn Phelps (substituting for Darlene Weaver)

Absent: Joel Pruce, Andrea Seielstad, Darlene Weaver

Guests: Art Busch (Chair, FAC), Meghan Henning (Assistant Provost, CAP)

Opening
- Call to Order 12:34 (E. Kunz)
- Opening prayer/meditation (Ali Carr-Chellman) [Prayer/meditation sign up here]
- **VOTE:** approval of minutes from the February 9, 2024 meeting
  - Approved by unanimous consent.

Announcements
- Today! Academic Senate Meeting, 3:30-5:50pm, KU Ballroom
- February 26, 2024: ELC meeting, 10:30-12pm, President's Suite, KU
  - Discussion of Zoom vs in-person meeting. E. Kunz will announce the decision when she sends out the agenda.
- February 23, 2024 meeting of ECAS
  - Decided to host via Zoom.
- March 8, 2024: Joint Faculty/Academic Senate meeting (moved from February 2), 12-2, KU Ballroom
- March 8, 2024: ECAS meets at 2-3:30 (instead of the usual time)

Agenda Items
- **DISCUSSION:** FAC Draft Workload Report
  - Reminder that the charge was to review faculty workload, which hasn't been reviewed since 2017.
  - Art Busch, chair of the Senate's faculty affairs committee, presented a status report on charge.
  - Overview:
    - Biggest challenge was around incorporating professional faculty more thoroughly into the policy and building a policy that works for many different units
    - Examined other school policies
    - Considered other issues around adequacy of policy in addressing concerns around faculty workload.

- FAC agreed on the following goals regarding a policy revision:
  - Goal 1: The policy should provide effective guidance to units and departments/programs.
  - Goal 2: The policy needs to be flexible enough to account for diverse roles of professional faculty across the university.
  - Goal 3: The policy should include information about when workload adjustments are warranted.
  - Goal 4: The policy should include clear information for faculty on how to seek resolution of workload issues.
    - Not trying to create something controversial on this point and do not want to create a new process.
    - Only want to clarify what to do using the existing faculty grievance policy.
  - Comment: Goals 3 and 4 are connected.
- Q: Did we review unit policies? SEHS addresses many questions that have been brought up in discussions on workload.
  - FAC read them, but didn't review them.
  - Would draw on them for any changes.
- Follow-up Q: From a professional faculty member point of view, does the policy always need to have a distinction between professional and tenure-track faculty? Can it just say "faculty" instead of separating them into two groups? For example "faculty hired with expectation to do research." Could the policy include guidance on evaluating workload and letters of hire on a regular basis?
  - C. Phelps: Big ask for chairs. Some of the responsibility should be on the faculty member. There has been a general movement to implement appointment letters across campus.
  - A. Busch: Realizing through the review process the importance of department chairs in making workload equitable.
- Follow-up Q: Did the professional faculty survey get a good response?
  - A. Busch: Yes.
- The sense of the committee is to move towards a policy that provides guidance for unit workload policies.
  - A. Busch: Clarified that FAC is coming up with a report on what changes they recommend on the policy.
- E. Kunz: Unclear on distinction between what senate has control over and what goes into the faculty handbook.
- E. Kunz: Two concerns that she hoped the committee would address:
  - 1) Believed that the policy is unclear regarding how service fits into workload. For example, if we have 4 classes worth of commitment per semester and most tenure faculty teach 3 classes with a course release for research, then where does service fit in?
  - 2) Variation on what it means to teach an individual class within and across disciplines. Different time commitment for different faculty.
  - Response from A. Busch:
    - Existing policy does a pretty good job of highlighting what types of things should be taken into account when considering equity (class sizes, level of commitment, etc.). However, recognizes that implementation leaves something to be desired.
    - Agree existing policy is deficient on service, but FAC hasn't coalesced on an agreement of what it means. Other universities have some bureaucratic approaches, but the committee didn't like that level of granularity.

- - Course reductions are a rough tool to deal with inequity.
  - ○ Clarified that policy doesn't have a percentage of time devoted to activities.
    - ■ But recent research expectation policy relied on the current workload policy to raise teaching loads for faculty who had not been research active.
  - ○ Discussion of specific issues on campus regarding workload and unit-specific workload policies.
  - ○ Q: Do professional faculty contracts include anything about service?
    - ■ C. Phelps: All contracts are the same except for those with administrative responsibilities.
    - ■ C. Phelps: Hire letters, however, have significant variation between and within units. The trend on campus has been to increase the integration of professional faculty within departments. There is a tension between including people in discussions and exploiting people for service
    - ■ A. Busch: The feedback in the survey so far is that non-teaching responsibilities are not well-described for professional faculty.
  - ○ Comment: FAC was concerned about quantifying service obligations numerically.
    - ■ There is a recent study out on this subject.
  - ○ Would it be useful to describe service as important to the life of the university?
    - ■ It has an impact on promotion for everyone.
    - ■ Autonomy is sometimes at odds with equity.
  - ○ J. Fulkerson: Do the goals FAC outlined above address everything that needs addressing? Several comments:
    - ■ Would like to have systemic inequities identified in the report. For example, discrepancy for hours in the classroom for music professors and credits taught for calculus.
    - ■ Advising is a particular concern. Sometimes service, sometimes compensated.
    - ■ Course releases matter for this. Concerned that we are being overly prescriptive.
    - ■ Part of the report should highlight where we know inequities are occurring. Name specific inequities and gaps in the policy.
    - ■ Highlight that the policy itself seems to do pretty good, but that implementation is where the shortfall occurs.
  - ○ Once the report comes out, what happens next?
    - ■ Discussed having the report go to the provost office and allowing them to write a new policy to bring to ECAS for consultation.
    - ■ General agreement that this should be the approach
- **DISCUSSION:** [APC Draft Proposal](), CAP Course Review Workshop Model
  - ○ APC has a draft proposal to move CAP course review to a workshop model, rather than individual course review.
    - ■ Currently seeking feedback from across campus.
    - ■ This is being discussed today as part of the feedback to APC.
  - ○ Comment: Generally felt it was an improvement over the previous model. Not sure faculty in their department would be super engaged in a workshop. Concerned about logistics. High commitment from faculty in some components.
  - ○ Comment: Believes the overall approach is good and believes it is an improvement over the past. Appreciates that it is closer to faculty development rather than pure assessment. Wants there to be a feedback loop between CAP-C and CAP-L.
  - ○ Comment: Expect there to be more challenges for some components (e.g. capstone), but could be a cool opportunity for faculty to collaborate.
  - ○ Comment: Concerned for faculty who will have to attend multiple workshops if a course satisfies multiple components.
    - ■ Response: Believed it isn't too big of an ask, particularly as the course benefits from being able to satisfy two or more requirements.

- ○ Comment: Liked the overall plan and role of CAP-L. Thinks it will help in the long term because it will more directly connect to what is actually happening in the classroom compared to the current course-level assessment approach.
- ○ Comment: Concerned about the consequences for not participating in the workshop.
  - ■ Possible to have a warning for someone who didn't participate and then lose CAP designation?
  - ■ What happens for faculty on sabbatical when their course is up for review?
- ○ Comment: Concerned about logistics of terms on CAP-L and the size of the time commitment.
  - ■ M. Henning: Current discussion about reducing total time commitment, particularly for first and third year.
  - ■ Q: Who oversees the workshop?
    - ● A: Entirely on CAP-L.
    - ● Response: Concerned there should be checks on process, particularly for CAP-L.
    - ● C. Phelps: Accreditation will like the model, but will want to see checks and balances.
    - ● M. Henning: Expect high involvement by CAP office in process and they have an obligation to report out to APC.
- ○ Q: Who is responsible for collecting feedback? Particularly with regard to students?
  - ■ M. Henning: Depends on who is on CAP-L and the approach they wish to take for the workshop, but expects the CAP office will be involved.
- ○ Would it be possible to put a process block in the appendix of the proposal.
  - ■ General discussion of processes and procedures.
  - ■ Agreement that it may be valuable to not be overly prescriptive on procedures.
- ○ E. Kunz called time on discussion.
- ● **DISCUSSION AND VOTE:** Social Science CAP Requirement Additional Daylighted courses, AY 24-25
  - ○ "Daylighting" refers to providing temporary, emergency curriculum approval with a definite end ("sunset").
  - ○ There were four additional courses submitted to be added to the daylight list: SOC 204, SWK 204, SOC 334, ANT 3/2XX.
  - ○ E. Kunz: Expecting one more course to be added to the list next week. The Registrar set a deadline of February 23 for any changes.
  - ○ General discussion of courses being considered.
    - ■ Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work plan to offer the proposed ANT 3/2XX course as SSC 200 for next year and eventually have it created as a standalone course. The discussion concluded that this course is not being considered today for temporary approval.
  - ○ Discussion of whether the daylit courses to date would be enough to solve the problem of insufficient sections of SSC 200.
  - ○ *Motion to approve SOC 204, SWK 204, and SOC 334 to count towards the social science component for Academic Year 2024-25.* (J. Fulkerson, A. Carr-Chellman second)
    - ■ Discussion.
    - ■ T. Gabrielli called the question.
    - ■ Vote: 10 in favor, 0 oppose, 1 abstain.
    - ■ *Motion passed.*

The following items were tabled until the next meeting of ECAS.

- ● **DISCUSSION:** Co-Majors
- ● **DISCUSSION AND VOTE:** Program/Certificate approvals
  - ○ MINOR-HRE: Minor in Human Rights in Engineering (program change request)
  - ○ BA, Race and Ethnic Studies (new program proposal)
    - ■ Relevant email
    - ■ Degree program proposal

Motion to adjourn (J. Fulkerson, A. Kinney second).
- Approved with unanimous consent.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05.

Respectfully submitted by Jon Fulkerson, Secretary of the Academic Senate.