



Faculty Senate 2017–2018

MINUTES: October 18, 2017

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

K. Hall, Chair; K. Bailey, recording sect'y

Present: K. Bailey, S. Badenas, A. Baltazar, S. Bell, S. Brown-Fraser, A. Coria-Navia, D. Davis, H. Ferguson, B. Gibson, K. Hall, G. Lovhoiden, B. Maguad, S. Moncrieff, M. Murray, T. Newkirk, N. Nosworthy, R. Perez-Schulz, D. Randall, R. Siebold, C. Sigua, A. Solis, D. Taylor, R. Wells, C. Arthur.

Regrets/absent: B. Ade-Oshifogun, D. Fortin, C. Gane, O. Glanz, J. Lim, J. Sigvartsen, R. Zdor, A. Luxton.

Guests: L. Weldon, K. Logan

Votes & Actions taken (numbers [n] represent items on original agenda)

[2] Minutes of September 20, 2017 Senate Meeting. MOTION: Move to approve minutes as amended (K. Bailey). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[4] Committee Reports

R. Wells

Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Policy and Development Council, Academic Operations Council, Graduate Faith and Integration, Race and Justice, AU UFO Steering Committee. No report.

[5] Change Day Discussion

K. Hall

The following motion was made at the September 20, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting:

MOTION: "To RECOMMEND to the Provost that Change Day be a full day of activities." (C. Gane). Seconded, **TABLED.**

MOTION: "To take the tabled motion from the table." T. Newkirk. Seconded, **VOTED.**

The Senate continued discussion of the motion. Senators noted that there was a tension between giving up a full instruction day and being in the moment of Change Day while being concerned about teaching in the afternoon. Faculty also noted that with the manual labor required at most locations, faculty were quite tired by the end of the morning, and that it was difficult to teach at 2:00 pm after working all morning.

There were some suggestions about the timing and scheduling of Change Day, with particular emphasis on protecting classes and labs that meet only once every week. Senators also noted the symbolic importance of service through Change Day: Change Day was an important way for us to learn as employees and students; Change Day was also a symbol for our community—we could make a bigger impact over a longer period of time. However, working longer (i.e. a full day) would probably increase cost and complicate logistics (e.g. for on-site lunches).

The Senators noted that while all of these suggestions could be helpful, the motion on the floor concerned only a recommendation, and that the responsibility for the structure and format of the day did not rest with the Senate.

MOTION: "To AMEND the motion on the floor to: 'To RECOMMEND that the Provost consider that Change Day be a full day.'" (R. Siebold). Seconded, **VOTED.**

MOTION: "To RECOMMEND that the Provost consider that Change Day be a full day." **VOTED.**

[6] Posthumous Degrees

K. Hall

The current policy regarding posthumous degrees, as reported to the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty and the Deans' Council is:

The degree may be granted to any student, undergraduate or graduate, who was actively progressing in a degree program at the time of demise.

The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences reported to the Deans' Council that he had check benchmarking on similar policies at deanandprovost.com that showed that common practices were to place some sort of threshold on the policy. When this was reported to the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty, the vote was split between retaining the current policy and changing to a policy with a threshold for giving the degree. The Deans' Council handed this issue off to the Faculty Senate.

The Senate had several questions about the policy. As far as good be ascertained during the meeting, these degrees are recorded as regular degrees (although the length of the transcript would indicate a reduced number of completed courses). Either the family of the deceased or the University can make a request. The transcript doesn't record the degree as posthumous, and it was not clear if that was an option. The issue was raised proactively—it was not in response to a particular situation. The Senators noted that the reason given by the College of Arts and Sciences faculty at their faculty meeting that drawing bright lines about policy with a grieving family in order to refuse to give a degree would be poor timing.

MOTION: "To RECOMMEND that we retain the current language in policy regarding posthumous degrees." (R. Siebold). Seconded, **VOTED**.

[8] Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization (APIP)

Senators Badenas, Brown-Fraser, Davis, Maguad, and Siebold reported on their experience with the APIP process, as the Provost had directed APIP committee members not to discuss the recommendations themselves. The first two APIP meetings were about three hours. The committee looked at six areas:

- Contribution to Andrews University's mission
- Contribution to Andrews University's reputation
- Contribution to financial margin
- Average number of credits generated per faculty (by program)
- Average net revenue generated per faculty (by program)
- Enrollment (by major)

The committee then divided into smaller working groups for additional 3-hour meetings to look at specific schools. At the last meeting, the information was integrated—the Deans summarized the working groups' discussions and made recommendations. Some schools were able to meet with the working group assigned to them and had already been working on recommendations. Other schools and departments had no contact with the working groups assigned to them. At least one Senator noted that the process was a good start, but deserved more time and greater rigor before decisions were made.

Next, the Provost noted that there are many models of how APIP is done. At many institutions, faculty are not involved at all, which leads to conflict. The intent of working with the Senate was to be transparent. It was also required by shared governance. After the APIP committee made recommendations, the Provost shared the full report with the President and CFO, and then with the President's cabinet.

The Provost then provided the Senate with a bullet-point executive summary of the recommendations (the Deans were provided with a more complete report, but the Provost declined to provide that report to the Senate). The document notes some university-wide initiatives to strengthen academics and boost enrollment. There are also recommendations for Fall 2017/Spring 2018, Fall 2018, and recommendations 3-5 years out. Some of the details in the latter three sections were redacted from the executive summary. Most of the redacted recommendations provided to the Senate were from the Fall 2018 section.

The Senate had numerous questions about what would be done about the recommendations—specifically with how the bullet points would be moved from recommendations to actions. The Provost noted that the Deans would meet with the affected programs and begin conversations, followed by action. The Senate wanted to know if this list was negotiable in any way, given that not all of the departments had been included in discussions beyond the brief reports that the chairs provided. The Provost indicated that because of the involvement of the Deans, that this list was the list to be taken to the board. However, he also indicated that the administration could be flexible if needed. A Senator followed up this question by asking what recourse departments that were not consulted for input during the process might have. The Provost indicated that dialogue should begin with the Chair and the Dean, and then further with his office.

The executive summary indicated a further \$1 million of cuts to faculty lines. The Senate asked how much of that would come from freezing and how much from cutting. The Provost estimated cuts of between 4 and 8 full time equivalent faculty.

The Senate asked what could be shared with faculty. The Provost indicated that the executive summary could be shared, and that there was the possibility of a townhall in the week following the board meeting. People who will not be rehired should know by December so that they can look for work elsewhere.

The Senate asked about corresponding cuts to non-academic units. Those units were unable to complete the process at the same time as the academic units, and so are continuing the process. In this discussion, the Provost noted that the 9:1 faculty to student ratio that we report to the federal government is not sustainable. The Senate asked what that ratio actually represents and whether similar ratios exist for

administrative units. The ratio involves a particular formula for counting undergraduate students and faculty, and is most easily increased by moving from a model that makes use of full-time faculty to a model that make heavy use of adjuncts. This model may not be feasible at Andrews University.

The Faculty Senate took no action regarding the executive summary of the Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization recommendations.

Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] Worship & Prayer

K. Hall

Jer. 29:11 “I know the plans I have for you, declares the Lord...” S. Bell—Prayer.

The Senate welcomed two new Senators from School of Health Professions: H. Ferguson and B. Ade-Oshifogun.

[3] ETLC/CTALE Updates

A. Coria-Navia

Reminder for faculty to nominate colleagues for the Augsburg Excellence in Teaching Awards. Nominations are due at the end of the week; the nominating individual only needs to provide a short paragraph.

[8] Imagining the Future

K. Hall

Senators were asked to consider the following questions in preparation for the next meeting:

1. What future do I see for my school/program (and/or Andrews University)?
2. What role do I see myself playing to bring about that future?
3. What steps do I (we) need to take today to make that future possible?
4. What changes (infrastructure, process, planning etc.) do I (we) need to start making today to bring about that future?

The Senate raised a variety of issues in response to these questions. The issues focused on low faculty morale, attention to national and international trends in education, a focus on Adventist education principles, administrative processes that make change difficult, recruiting effectiveness, and innovations at the course level. The Senate may return to this discussion at a future meeting.

Next Faculty Senate meeting: November 15, 2017.