Council of Directors Meeting Minutes

November 12, 2018


1.0 Call to Order.
The meeting was called to order by Pat Sims.

2.0 Adoption of Agenda
The agenda was adopted by the Council after adding “website” issues to the agenda.

3.0 Approval of Minutes
Stacy Reischman Fletcher will add who was in attendance the previous meeting, including who was available remotely.

4.0 Committee Reports

4.1 Executive Committee Report 10/09/2018
The Executive committee report was sent to the CoD just after the Executive team last met with the Provost. Pat Sims recapped the meeting. Issues addressed were: the timeline for reorganization proposal updates and not rushing the work to get documents done; “change” fatigue among faculty and Directors; operational processes and efficiencies; modifying how GEC course add/drops show up in Director worklists.

In terms of the last issue, Directors can either see all adds/drops or no add/drops. There seems to be a variety of plusses and minutes to either option. The CoD is in favor of how the present system links science lectures and labs (which helps reinforce the lecture/lab corequisite). The council asks: can adds be separated from drops (because we view them differently)? Is the ability of the software determining our policies? The CoD continues to realize how crucial advisers are in the approval process. The CoD is not sure they want to lose their role in the adding/dropping of graduate courses. Can Directors assign a proxy, one that we determine to suit our school?

Some overarching problems were identified: How customizable can the software be? How can GEC approvals be managed differently so Directors are not approving 100s of GEC courses? The CoD Executive team can contact iTech (Nicol Green?) about this after meeting with the Provost. Current processed simply take up too much time for too many people. The council views this (approving GEC add/drops) as one issue, but how systemic is it? A series of SOAR examples were shared. Directors who have tried to seek assistance her have not been given much help. Our SOAR issues (and presumably those of others) cannot be replicated. Example: there are people who are retired who are still listed in SOAR as IORs.

It was confirmed that there should not be a separate GP Bulletin.

The current Faculty Handbook revision process was restated. The Executive team tried to share with the Provost that the “secretive” nature of FHB committees is perhaps creating undo suspicion.
The Director exit process. This is already on the Provost’s radar already and has since come up in our expanded CoD meeting. We will bring this up in our meeting with the Provost next week.

We discussed library membership on the CoD. Should it be the three heads or one representative. We have since spoken with Dr. Eye and as he suggests we will have one representative per year with a one-year term.

4.2 Standing Committee Reports
4.2.1 Professional Development Committee – Ann Marie Kinnell
No report. Ann Marie Kinnell and Pat Sims should meet to discuss the future of this subcommittee and professional development. Maybe this happens at our monthly social meeting?

4.3 Ad Hoc Committee Reports
4.3.1 Faculty Handbook Committee – Ward Sayre
So far, the bylaws have been addressed. A question in the committee now is should handbook changes come from individual committee members or should come from the bodies they represent. Some members the FHB committee are in favor of recommendations coming from individual committee members; some committee members are in favor of all recommendations coming from governance groups. (In the future, all university policy changes will be hyperlinked in the Faculty Handbook, which is potentially problematic unto itself.) Discussed were additional questions about how the FHB committee is populated. It was explained. AS a governing body with a member on the FHB committee, the CoD expressed that their concerns should rise up through the council to our representative.

5.0 Old Business
5.1 Operational Efficiencies
5.1.1 Workflow Process for Drop/Add
Covered in 4.1 above.

5.2 School Titles
5.2.1 Director, Associate Director, Program Coordinator
We reported to the Provost that we are mostly using the term “Program Coordinator.” The CoD will all use the term Program Coordinator. (There were two outliers).

As for what term we should use to replace “department” there are a couple of options. The Executive team will as the Provost. Program? Unit? It needs to be something that is consistent.

6.0 New Business

7.0 Discussion Items

7.1 Expanded Council of Directors meetings with Provost and Deans
The Provost has concerns about the kind of interaction that happens in the expanded CoD meetings. Several points were brought up in the meeting: Maybe he can come as an observer only. Perhaps he can be less scripted? What about the Deans being in the room—is this a less than optimal part of the dynamic? Perhaps it is the design of the agenda? Can the agenda be built to have some deliberate discussable points? Can the agenda be a spin-off of our Director-only meetings? There is some hesitance (on behalf of the directors) to speak up in the expanded meetings? Is there a fear of retribution for speaking candidly in these meetings? Have we found the right set up for the meeting? What is the Provost’s purpose for this meeting? Are there too many purposes for a single meeting? The Executive Team will bring this up at our next meeting with the Provost. Expressed were that sometimes it seems
that our greatest concerns are the ones the Provost wants to hear the least (example: schedule, technology, etc). The Directors know we need to make this a different kind of meeting.

7.2 Teaching Workshop
There is a workshop coming in January. We are in favor of faculty having the ability to sign up for some but not all of the workshops. We are not sure Dr. Miller’s idea for the workshop meshes with the request. Some directors have been in meetings where it sounds like attendance is expected.

7.3 Registration
SOAR is open again for student registration for the spring. The Directors then with restraint discussed the new schedule and its impact on students and schools. Several Directors attested to the fact that we were asked to move to a MW or TTh schedule.

7.4 Staff Emeritus
This is an ongoing dialogue. Faculty Senate favors the idea of honoring meritorious staff upon their departure from their positions. It is meant to be a recognition of good work and good service.
A recommendation is running its way up through the Staff Council. Staff Council is meeting with HR soon to discuss implementation and potential obstacles. The Council of Directors has not officially endorsed this idea. (The question was raised as to if we have this process for non-tenure track? One director stated that, yes, this can happen on the academic side and told of a recent Instructor who was awarded such.)

Dr. Rehner made a motion and Dr. Schroeder seconded that we support the proposal for implementing Staff Emeritus that is already underway at USM. The council voted unanimously to approve this.

7.5 Queries
Dr. Iglesias shared a list of SOAR queries he often uses. The directors are looking to consolidate all helpful queries. Directors need consistent access and knowledge of what queries are possible.

7.6 Workload Policy
Sections 1/3 and 3.1 were removed from the document. The council had an extensive discussion about the proposed workload policy. Member of the council brought up points that need clarification, points that seem to work counter to other (reorganization) initiatives/proposals under review, points that seem contrary to the spirit of shared governance, and other. Here is a summary of the discussion:
- The definitions that start on page 2 does not include many of the titles that have been under discussion throughout the reorganization.
- Reassigned time for directors and coordinators is left out of this document.
- Course reassignments for research beyond the set range in not clear. Is course buy out the only way to be reassigned from teaching?
- We are a research-intensive institution, so how can we incentivize seeking research dollars while maintaining the teaching aims of the institution? The amount of money brought in through grants is one issue; the other issue is maintaining the mission of the university as an academic institution.
- We do think we need a workload policy, but we are not sure this is it.
- We appreciate the transparency in the process at this point.
- Can directors share the feedback we are giving our Deans? Pat Sims asked that directors share their faculty feedback with her as she prepares a conversation with the Provost.
- Is this document parallel to other policies outlined in other reorganization proposals? This policy and those outlined in some reorganization proposals do not seem to line up at this point. Dr. Kinnell is very involved in Initiative #1 and agrees that there are inconsistencies between the workload policy and Initiative #1.
In the end, in how many places will we have workload policies? *Faculty Handbook? Employee Handbook?* Can they be the same policies?

Differential loads based on highest degree offered in a unit should be the call of the Director. What do we do if people teach across the curriculum? (There was some general discussion about “differential loads”).

Initiative #1 tried to be clear that directors are the ones to make workload decisions. This policy does not seem to capture this.

Loads in teaching, research, and service are not addressed for directors and other administrators. Is the teaching load for research active directors 1/1? The council definitely saw that this is the minimal appropriate load.

Section 1.4 and workload reports. We learned that there has been inconsistency in how these have been done in the past according to colleges. Notwithstanding, what calendar should workload reports be on? The council thinks is should be the academic year, not the calendar year. Overall, this part of the document is unclear.

The directors see how the procedures in the document places a lot of responsibility (i.e., work) on the directors.

Overload:
- Compensation is only covered in the workload policy—and not in reorganization Initiative #1.
- Sections 1.1 and 4.0. It sounds like the Dean could override director decisions. Example: overload in Fall with compensation via a lessened teaching load in the Spring. (We could call this “load shifting”). The document talks about full workload FTE for the year.
- Directors acknowledge that overloads are the exception.

The tone of the document is objectionable. The council views it as heavy-handed and, further, the document does not seem to be in the spirit of collegiality. Example: the word “dictated” in 4.0 Ex: Section 6. “Responsibility of ...”. The tone here is extremely objectionable.

The sections that were struck (1.3 and 3.1) were the most specific in the original document and also the most objectionable. The 4/4 load is nowhere in the document anymore. Can we bring it back in worded in a better way? The directors also see how the struck sections are strangely referred to throughout the rest of the document.

This policy does not account for faculty who have to teach certain classes in specific areas—it assumes that faculty in programs can teach across the unit.

7.7 Initiative #1
- Comments are included in 7.6.

7.8 Initiative #2
- The CoD needs more time to discuss. It was suggested that we replace our next expanded CoD meeting with a meeting dedicated to addressing this initiative.

7.9 Director Exit processes
See 4.1 above.

8.0 Announcements
The meeting concluded before we were able to address the following items.

8.1 Committee on Committees: Dr. Teresa Welsh submitted her name
8.2 January 14th 2019: Guest Amy Miller to discuss scheduling
8.3 Spring CoD meetings will be held in OMH 102

9.0 Good of the Order
10.0 Adjourn