CAS Senate Meeting Minutes for October 20, 2014


Members Absent: S. Bernhardt, L. Criston, A. Fiscella, P. Mink, T. Richards, P. Roe, S. Shabo

Members Excused: W. Boyer

President Fox called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

1. Consent Agenda
   A. Approval of the agenda The agenda was approved.
   B. Approval of minutes from September meeting. The minutes were approved. Senator Morgan asked that there be added to the minutes lists of Senators excused and absent.

2. President's Remarks (Alan Fox)

   President Fox thanked Deni Galileo for serving as Secretary and Senator-at-large this year, as well as the other faculty who answered the request for at-large-Senators. Dean Watson was traveling this week so there were no remarks from the Dean.

3. Report on special election for at large senators (John Morgan, chair COCAN)

   Prof. John Morgan discussed the CAS Senator-at-large election in which 161 faculty voted. There were 10 candidates. There were 2 ties in the election. Some of the elected at-large Senators will serve 1 year because they are on sabbatical in spring 2016. Others will serve 2 years. Elected were Beth Haslett (1 year), Eric Rise (1 year), Deni Galileo (2 years), Larry Duggan (1 year), Ted Davis (2 years), and Blake Smith (2 years). We will have another election this spring as required.

4. AAUP officers to discuss workload document revision (Gerry Turkel, Calvin Keeler)

   Profs. Gerry Turkel (AAUP Contract Maintenance Officer) and Calvin Keeler (AAUP/UD President) discussed workload document revision. Prof. Turkel opened by reminding the Senate of the lunchtime meeting community forum on campus finances (email notification sent previously to all faculty). The President of national AAUP, Rudy Fichtenbaum, will be visiting and will speak on the financial state of the University of Delaware. He went on to discuss the issue of workload document revision. Previous to the current CBA, workload could be calculated in what was called “dual currency”: credit-contact hours or teaching-contact hours. The use of both currencies by both Departments and individual faculty in calculating workloads was allowed, but created problems for some departments and faculty. In the negotiations of the current contract, which included Dean Watson, (in place through June 2016), there was a committee that looked into problems of these dual workload currencies. The
committee, which included Dave Smith (then AAUP Grievance Officer) and Dean Watson, recommended that credit-contact hours be the sole currency. Academic units should convert all instructional activities into credit-contact hours. In the current contract, Footnote 4 to Article 11.8 is now Appendix B. If academic units do not have their own conversions to credit-contact hours, then the conversions in Appendix B shall apply.

Gerry Turkel met on last Thursday, October 16 with Vice-Provost Matt Kinservik and Dean Watson to discuss if the AAUP and the administration have a shared understanding of this issue. The AAUP recognizes that though it may be necessary for unit to reform their workload policies to change the language, it would violate the CBA to increase teaching workloads as part of this review.

Furthermore, workload reviews are supposed to originate with the faculty, then go to the chair, then to Dean, and so forth. Unless the faculty initiate a change in workload documents there should be no change.

Dean Watson and Vice Provost Kinservik agreed that teaching workloads are not to be increased as a result of any wording changes to Departmental workload documents. If a Department wants to take this opportunity to make other changes, this is fine, as long as it is Department-initiated, but the intent is language clarification rather than a substantive change in workload. If a faculty member has a concern during the workload review process in any academic unit, it is suggested that he or she contact the AAUP. There should be no contentious issues here.

Senator Morgan mentioned several types of activities that are not covered by Appendix B, such as review sessions, courses that take much more time than the number of credit hours that the course is listed for, and that advising may not be figured into workload if the threshold of 30 students is not reached. Dr. Turkel responded that academic units are free to depart from the conversions in Appendix B to create their own appropriate conversions.

**A verbatim transcript of this presentation is attached at end of Meeting Minutes**

5. **New Business- At end of meeting.**

6. **Ed Affairs**

President Fox asked for items that needed discussion. Senator Galileo identified items D, E, and F as needing discussion. After some discussion it was decided that it would be best to go through the proposals one-by-one.

A.  **Revise Minor in Religious Studies**

Approved unanimously.

B.  **Revise Mass Communication Concentration**

Approved unanimously.
C. **Revise Interpersonal Communication Concentration**

Approved unanimously.

D. **Revise BS Chemistry**

Approved with the stipulation that the course number be added to a course in the side-by-side comparison of old and new curricula.

E. **Revise PhD Linguistics**

Senator Galileo asked about the rationale of dropping the qualifying exam and requiring two “publishable” papers. After discussion, a motion was made to send it back to the department for further clarification about the definition of “publishable” and single vs. multi-author papers. It was seconded and was approved 17-5.

F. **ADD Major: BS Honors Actuarial Science**

The larger proposal was missing from the APA form. The resolution also need to state it was asking for provisional approval. It was passed with the understanding that the larger proposal document would be completed and forwarded to the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee.

G. **Revise BA Math Education-XMS**

Passed unanimously.

H. **Revise BS Math Education-XMS**

Passed unanimously.

7. **Old Business** New Business

Senator Morrison asked the purpose of the Steering Committee and if it identified issues for the year. President Fox responded that the main charge of the SC was to prepare the agenda, but not determine issues for the Senate.

Senator Morrison asked if a CAS Budget Committee should be formed. President Fox stated that it may be premature and/or redundant to form such a committee until the Faculty Senate Budget Committee gets further under way. Senators Morgan and Haslett endorsed the idea of a CAS Budget Committee. It was stated that any budget committee’s role should be to advise the Dean on priorities. This will be brought up in the Steering Committee and the Senate will be informed of any action.

The CAS breadth requirements vs. university breadth requirements was discussed about possible alignment. Senator Rise stated that the CAS Undergrad Studies Committee handled university breadth requests.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

11/9/14 Deni S. Galileo, CAS Senate Secretary
ALAN FOX: The dean is not here. He’s traveling this week, so that’s why he’s not here to present any comments. But we do have a couple of guests from the AAUP who are here to talk about the Collective Bargaining Agreement. So Gerry Turkel and Calvin Keeler from AAUP, we’ll give them the floor for a few minutes.

GERRY TURKEL: Thank you, thanks, Alan. I just want to thank the Senate for inviting Calvin Keeler and me to discuss issues around the CBA, especially Article 11.8, which deals with workload.

Before getting into that issue I’d like to take a minute for advertising. We have a guest speaker; the President of national AAUP will be coming to the university on November 10. And he is going to discuss issues around the financial condition of the University of Delaware. Rudy Fichtenbaum, who is President of national AAUP, is a Professor of Economics at Wright State University. He has done numerous analyses of college and universities’ financial conditions, including two studies that he did of the University of Delaware. So you’ve gotten a flyer or two on this, and there will be more forthcoming, but I encourage you to sign up early. There is a lunch, and for those
of you who sign up early, you’re guaranteed to get to the carving station and the lobster tails. Others, it may be a little more sparse. So please do come to that; I think it will be an important event, to give a sense of where the university is financially, beyond all the discussions that we’ve been having of Resource-Based Budgeting.

So the central issue is the issue of workload policies for individual departments, as that is required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and some of the changes that have occurred over the last couple of contracts. So I just want to put that in a bit of perspective, so that we can understand the changes and what some of the concerns are. If we look at the predecessor to the current agreement, the contract that covered 2010 to 2013, that contract, as did all the contracts before, formulated workload, left it up to units to formulate workload, either in the currency of credit contact hours, or of teaching contact hours. And there was a footnote, which I will allude to a little bit later on, footnote 4, which provided the conversions of instructional activities into credit contact hours, and also into teaching contact hours. What I would call this kind of dual currency approach generated problems in academic units, not only in our college, but across the university. Just for example, what kinds of problems did this create? One was, could units use both currencies, that is,
could you have a workload agreement that articulated workload both in terms of credit contact hours and also in teaching contact hours. And that was problematic in some instances. Secondly, could an individual faculty member’s teaching workload be formulated as both credit contact hours and teaching contact hours? That led to a number of problems. Often they were solved before reaching grievance stage, but that has been an issue for some time.

So in the negotiations of the current contract that covers us until 2016, in order to deal with this problem, there was a letter of understanding between the AAUP and the university administration and Dean Watson was a member of the administration’s bargaining team. There was a letter of agreement in the previous contract that established a committee to look into problems of workload and to try to come up with some way of categorizing the different ways in which faculty were involved in instructional activity. That committee was established after the contract was ratified, and it included David Smith in Biological Sciences, who at that time was also the AAUP Grievance Officer, and also Dean Watson. And they investigated this issue and they attempted to account for all the different types of instructional activity, and to try to assign different credit contact hour values to them. And this effort kind of broke down when it became clear that
instructional activities change and an exhaustive list would just be impossible to formulate. New things kept coming up and combinations of activities, so that was dropped. And instead what the committee recommended was that credit contact hours be the sole currency and that academic units should formulate workloads by converting all instructional activities into credit contact hours. So Article 11.3 of the current contract states in part -, let me just read a little bit of this, this is the current contract: “Workload is defined as teaching, including instruction in regular academic year courses, with assigned credit hours, and mutually agreed-upon instructional assignments, such as thesis, dissertation, seminar, and special problems supervision… research, including sponsored research; advising; committee work; and University-administered consultative and organized activities, not only inside but also outside the University, when such activities by mutual agreement bring benefit and/or prestige to the University.”

Article 11.8, which is of specific concern, states the following: “The express purpose of this agreement is to maximize flexibility among chairs and directors on the one-hand while protecting the rights of faculty members on the other. Teaching workload assignments are accounted for in terms of credit contact hours.” Right, no longer teaching contact hours. Credit contact hours “are articulated in departmental workload
documents and are administered through departments. In the
development of workload documents, faculty must consider the
fair allocation”, the fair allocation, “for teaching, advising,
supervising dissertations, clinical instruction, and other
significant forms of activity that support the instructional
programs of the department. Thus, these specific instructional
activities need to be converted into credit contact hours.” And
it goes on to say “The 2010-2013 Collective Bargaining Agreement
(specifically, Footnote 4 to Article 11.8) contains credit
contact hour conversions for several common instructional
activities”. That included chairing a dissertation, theses,
advising, and so on. “These conversions are available in
Appendix B to this Agreement”, so it was moved from the footnote
to an appendix. And, importantly, “Should units not have a
detailed policy on credit hour conversions, the conversions in
Appendix B shall apply”. So Appendix B becomes a kind of a
default. So that’s where we are in the contract language, and
the question of how to go about making some changes.

And I met with Thursday, this past Thursday, with Dean Watson
and Vice Provost Matt Kinservik, in order to determine whether
the AAUP and the administration, and particularly the Dean of
College of Arts and Sciences, whether we have a shared
understanding of departmental reviews and changes that may be
needed, in light of this new contract language. Are we, in
effect, on the same page, or is this going to be a significant kind of issue, where there’s disagreement. I expressed the AAUP’s interpretation, that comes from the Executive Council, and was our articulation of it during contract negotiations, that, while it may be necessary for academic units to reformulate their workload policies, and to use the language of credit contact hours to make some conversions, it would violate the CBA to have increased teaching workloads as a result of such reviews and changes.

Article 11.2 of the CBA, moreover, requires that workload policies, “shall be developed by the faculty of the academic unit, reviewed and approved by the chair or unit head, ...” So these are supposed to originate with the faculty, and then come to chairs and then the appropriate dean, and the AAUP Contract Maintenance Officer and the Provost. So after the department they have to be approved by all of those levels. Dean Watson and Vice Provost Kinservik agree that workload reviews and changes should be neutral with regard to a unit’s instructional activities, and that workloads are -, teaching workloads and workloads generally, are not to be increased as a result of any changes. And we specifically talked about the last time we had a workload change in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. That was a really major change, because that’s when we went to 12 credit contact hours was a full workload for a faculty member.
And that was really a major change and it kind of led to a number of conflicts, to be blunt about it, between the AAUP and deans in several colleges, up to and including the Provost at that time. My sense is that no one wants a repeat of that. These should be changes that are changes in language and expressing what the current workloads are. Now if a faculty and a department wants to take this as an occasion to make some changes, that’s fine, that can be done at any time. But certainly from the perspective of the AAUP, and based on the conversation that I had with Dean Watson and Vice Provost Kinservik, I do think that we are on the same page. Workloads are not to be increased in any of these changes.

In addition, a further concern that emerged is how to review problematic cases, if there are problematic cases. And the way that this happened the last time, when we had a change in the CBA, and the way that workload agreements, workload policies are reviewed when they occasionally change, is that the faculty votes, the chair approves, it goes to the dean, and the AAUP, and then the Provost. And I’m concerned about that process, that we kind of wind up with the AAUP after a significant decision has been made by the dean. And instead of that, it may be a better approach, if there’s a problematic case, if the dean thinks that there’s some issue, that there’d be consultation and discussion before any decision is made, whether to approve or
disapprove a workload policy in an academic unit. This was not discussed in any detail, but I think this will be an issue that is subject to further discussion. Finally, should there be any issues that emerge with this process, that are of concern to a faculty member in an academic unit, at any stage, that faculty member should contact the AAUP. The earlier we get into these the better it is to kind of come together, think through, and resolve any potential problems. So I know that the contract language can kind of, we can all get glazed over by this. But there will be -, in fact my department did a review of the workload policy that we have, and I think our changes were pretty cosmetic, you know, just kind of changing language in a couple of places. That’s generally what should happen across the college and across the university. I don’t see why there should be any contentious issues here, given that there’s no substantive change. It’s a change in how this is going; a more unified, uniform way to express workload. So, Calvin, if you have any kind of comments, your sense of things on this.

CALVIN KEELER: No, I would just say I agree with what Gerry has said, and our discussions in the Executive Council have followed along these lines consistently, and so I don’t have anything substantive to add. I would add that we appreciate the chance to come and talk, and would welcome the chance to come other
times if other issues or questions arise, either this forum or in your departments or wherever else you think it might be useful.

ALAN FOX: Does anybody have any questions for Calvin?

RAKESH: Yes, I do actually.

GERRY TURKEL: Yes, please.

RAKESH: So please excuse my ignorance, but is this the 2014 through 2016 CBA?

GERRY TURKEL: This is the current CBA through 2016. And there are two members of the AAUP Bargaining Team that were involved in this. Ted Davis was on the Bargaining Team and Kevin Kerrane, who kept meticulous notes of the discussions that we had. And I don’t think this was, as I recall, a contentious issue or one that--; there were questions of language, but not of substance, really.

RAKESH: So sorry, one last question, I won’t ask any more after that. So some departments [UNINTELLIGIBLE] four contact hours and some are one or two contact hours, whereas sometimes when
the chair assigns courses they say, OK, two courses a semester or something like that. So these are some departments where I think such issues might create problems; where you say everything has to be counted in contact hours. So then to specify what the workload you can’t say two courses but [OVERLAPPING VOICES].

GERRY TURKEL: Right, you know, the central principle is that, unless the faculty wants to make a change in what the current practice is, there should be no change. And myself or Calvin or other people on the Executive Council, if people in your department have some questions, get in touch with us, and we’ll go over things before it goes too far down the road.

RAKESH: It’s already in the CBA, right?

GERRY TURKEL: Yes. This is in the CBA.

RAKESH: So you’re saying that when the workload agreement is made by the department we should [OVERLAPPING VOICES].

JOHN MORGAN: Thank you, John Morgan, Physics and Chair of COCAN. Could I ask senators when they speak to please identify
themselves by name, which will make it easier for our secretary to prepare minutes. That was Rakesh from Mathematics --

RAKESH: But I’m not a senator.

JOHN MORGAN: But you’re not a senator, OK, that’s fine. In my other duties, I’m on the Steering Committee of the AAUP, to which I was elected in 2012, and I’m also on the membership drive committee at the AAUP. And I would like to say that in order to have an effective union, which can overview the workload process, it’s good to have an active AAUP departmental representative in every department, who keeps track of what’s going on. And I would encourage as many people as possible to join the union and to become active in it in monitoring what’s happening.

There also are some practical issues I’d like to just mention, which are likely to come up in reviewing workload documents. I’ll start with my own department, about some activities that are not currently recognized in the old footnote 4. One of them is proctoring out-of-class exams in the evenings. If you give, say, three midterm exams, which last two hours each, and you have to prepare them and proctor them and make allowances for kids who are entitled to extra time, it does become significant.
Another issue, which I think is even more significant, is supervising Teaching Assistants in courses which have discussion sections or laboratory sections, particularly when the Teaching Assistants are themselves first-year graduate students, often from overseas, who don’t really know how teaching in the U.S.A. is done. Some responsible faculty member should be keeping an eye on what they are doing, and probably having weekly meetings for an hour or so. That I regard as teaching. It’s certainly not research, and I think the departments that are in this situation should take account of that.

I would also move over to Music, where I had some discussions a few years ago with Heidi Sarver, who is the Band Director. Marching Band is a one credit course. Many years ago a dean, who is no longer here, thought that this must have been an extremely light teaching load, just a one credit course. Well, in reality, of course the band has something like a dozen hours of practice every week and then there are the road trips. And certainly the students have to attend the road trips, the faculty member has to be there, and that really needs to be accurately reflected in any workload document. It’s not a three hour a week job. And the administration should be smart enough to recognize that it’s not a three hour a week job.

Also advising. I certainly think that advising, responsible advising, should be taken into account. A point I made several
years ago to Dave Smith and to Tom Apple when he was the Provost, and he appreciated this, is that the practice in the old footnote, which does not allow pro-rating of advisees, means that if you are assigned fewer than 30 advisees, it can’t be part of your workload, and therefore you can’t be evaluated on it. So it doesn’t matter whether you do a good job or a bad job of advising, it has zero impact on your annual evaluation. And that just isn’t right.

GERRY TURKEL: The way I want to respond to that is to first of all say that the Appendix is an exemplar. Departments, academic units are free to depart from that, and to think through issues of instructional activity and how they should be valued. And it just becomes very difficult to account for every kind of instructional activity. The discussion, I think, should be within departments, if they are so inclined to think through changes to their current workload policies.