Faculty Senate 2018–2019

MINUTES: October 17, 2018

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

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

Present: B. Ade-Oshifogun, S. Badenas, K. Bailey, A. Baltazar, S. Bell, A. Coria-Navia, B. Dent, H. Ferguson, O. Glanz, T. Goodwin, D. Habenicht, K. Hall, J. Lim, P. Lyons, B. Maguad, M. Murray, N. Nosworthy, R. Orrison, R. Perez-Schulz, D. Randall, A. Solis, D. Taylor, R. Wells.
Regrets/absent: D. Davis, S. Brown-Fraser, D. Fortin, C. Gane, B. Gibson, C. Stuart, C. Arthur, A. Luxton.
Guests:

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

[2] Minutes of September 19, 2018 Senate Meeting. **MOTION**: Move to approve minutes as amended (K. Bailey). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED**.

[4] Committee Reports   R. Wells

> The Senate officers received many sets of minutes: Undergraduate Council (5/7), Graduate Council (2/7, 5/2), Faculty Policy and Development Council (4/16, 5/21, 9/17), Academic Operations Council (4/16, 4/30, 5/16, 5/30—agenda only, 9/17).
>
> Undergraduate Council—voted (5/7) for the AU UFO steering committee to report to UGC. We considered this issue as #6 below.
> Graduate Council—Officers did not see any major items that needed to be reported to full Senate.
> Faculty Policy and Development Council—we considered a proposal for large classes to be counted as double teaching load as agenda item #7.
> The FPDC also voted that faculty applying for promotion or tenure will need to have an external letter. This policy change has already been put into practice this year.
> We considered several actions on changes to how advising load is calculated as agenda item #8.
> Academic Operations Council—we considered a change in the under minimum enrollment class cancelation date as agenda item #5.
> The AOC also discussed the problem of what do to with late registrations. There is no solution yet.
>
> **Undergraduate Experience Curriculum Change Timeline**—Kenley Hall met with Don May (Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Initiatives and ACE Committee Chair), Lisa Ahlberg (Undergraduate Council Chair), Christon Arthur (Provost), Anneris Coria-Navia (CTL Director), and Vanessa Corredera (Chair of Ad Hoc BA Definition Committee) to talk about the undergraduate experience curriculum change timeline. There was a consensus at this meeting that there had not been enough dialogue with and between the faculty. This group of leaders decided to facilitate several actions to increase dialogue with and between the faculty. (1) Ask the chairs to have some discussion with their faculty, (2) the senate officers would facilitate meetings with the faculty, and (3) there would be a survey of the faculty. Because of this, the process will not meet the timeline. However, the leaders are not concerned because we will have more discussion. There has been more synergy in defining the BA than the BS, so the latter needs work as well. The timeline will need to be adjusted once these discussions are complete.
>
> **AU UFO Steering Committee, Graduate Faith & Integration, Race and Justice.** No report.

[5] Under Minimum Enrollment Class Cancelation Date—Are current practices appropriate?

> [5/16 action by AOC; 10/1 discussion by UGC]
>
> From the Academic Operations Council: "VOTED to move the drop date for low enrollment classes in Fall semester to the Wednesday after First Stop. The deans will be notified of low enrollment classes immediately after First Stop."
>
> Note: The motion refers to the Wednesday of the week before classes start in Fall semester. There is no statement about Spring semester. The current scheduled drop dates for Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 are the

Tuesday of the second week of class. Executive committee referred the issue to the Senate, but did not take any action to make a recommendation.

Senators noted that there were many options between a date five days prior to the start of the semester and six or seven teaching days after the start of the semester. Given that there is a registration day on the day prior to the start of the semester, senators suggested that some of these other options should be weighed. Late financial clearance, problems of advising when small classes are canceled, timing of monetary transfers from church entities for student summer work, and other such issues suggest a date between the early date voted by AOC and the current late practice.

MOTION: "The Senate appreciates the proposal to move to an earlier below-minimum-enrollment course drop date. However, we are concerned that a drop date prior to returning student registration Sunday may be too early. Therefore the Senate REQUESTS that the AOC reconsider this decision and provide additional guidance on how earlier drop dates (including the beginning of the first week of school) might affect operations." (T. Goodwin) Seconded, **VOTE PASSED**.

[6] AU UFO Steering Committee Terms of Reference—Move reporting from direct-to-Senate to reporting to UGC and GC?
[5/7 action by UGC]

The UGC requested that the Senate create a steering committee to develop and implement the AU Unified Framework of Outcomes. The AU UFO Steering Committee currently interacts with the following committees under the Senate's purview:

- Undergraduate Council (including ACE Committee, Honors Council, Academic Policy Subcommittee, PDRC)
- Graduate Council
- Faculty Policy and Development Council: Effective Teaching and Learning Council
- Academic Operations Council: Institutional Assessment Committee

The UGC has voted the following change in terms of reference:

"Reporting lines and related appointments

- UGC → Undergraduate Faculty and the Faculty Senate
- UGC ← Subcommittees of the UGC (members appointed by the UGC)
  - Admissions Subcommittee
  - Program Development & Review Subcommittee (PDRC)
  - Academic Policy Subcommittee
  - **Andrews University Unified Framework of Outcomes (AUUFO) Subcommittee"**
- UGC ←Standing Committees of the UGC (members appointed by the Provost)
  - Andrews Core Experience Committee (formerly the GE Committee)
  - Honors Council"

Senate Officers' Action [10/10]
"**MOTION:** To maintain synergy, the Senate Officers RECOMMEND that the AU UFO Steering Committee continue to report directly to the Faculty Senate and that the AU UFO Steering Committee be placed as a regular item on the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council (standing committees of the Faculty Senate) agendas." (H. Ferguson) Seconded, **VOTE PASSED**.

Senators discussed why the change might be needed, and why it might not. One concern is that curriculum committees need to have direct contact with the AU UFO Steering Committee, and that if the Steering Committee reports to the Senate, it may be too far removed to have that contact. There is also a feeling that work on implementation should be under the direct control of curriculum committees. However, the AU UFO Steering Committee also has been working on implementation in assessment and faculty development,

which are not under the curriculum committees. Moreover, the Steering Committee has been proactive in interacting with all concerned committees, departments, and faculty.

Eventually, the discussion of the AU UFO Steering Committee's role turned to the original mandate for the committee, and the question of if that mandate had been turned into terms of reference by the Steering Committee. That has not happened to date.

MOTION: "That the AU UFO Steering Committee create terms of reference." (D. Randall). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

During the discussion on the motion, the senators noted that the motion does not presupposed an answer about to whom the AU UFO Steering Committee should report, and that that discussion would need to be readdressed when the terms of reference were returned to the Senate.

[7] FPDC Recommendation: Assign a double teaching workload to classes averaging greater than 50 students?
[4/16 action by FPDC]

From FPDC: "We recommend that these courses [with 50 or more students] count as 2 classes in a workload calculation. This would encourage faculty to teach the large classes and reward them for doing so." (Note that 11 courses with 50 or more students are listed, but the senators were able to identify several classes that were not on the list and should have been.)

The senators reviewed additional unsolicited suggestions from faculty in addition to this voted policy. There were numerous concerns about the policy as currently constituted, but also concern that some policy be created so that faculty do not have to beg for relief from the workload imposed from large classes—it should be a matter of reasonable policy.

MOTION: "To RETURN the large class teaching load policy voted by the FPDC on April 16 to the FPDC for further discussion on concerns raised by Senators and faculty, and to REQUEST that the revised working policy be returned to the Senate along with the minutes of the FPDC. (Wells). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

The Executive Secretary was tasked with creating an attachment that listed concerns including extended time for departments to return feedback on 2:803:3

Concerns:
1. Some departments have been asked to submit department-specific adjustments (WP 2:803:3), but others have not. These requests should be made to all departments with a clear target date for response.
2. There may be concerns about morale if some faculty are able to reduce workload, and others are not, despite similar credits generated.
3. We need to think through the implications of incentivizing very large classes.
4. Teaching techniques play a big role in what a large class is—how does this policy encourage the best teaching techniques?
5. This policy has a bright line at 50 students—what happens if a student drops the class and the enrollment falls to 49? Is there any possibility of prorating or creating multiple levels with > x1.00 load, to avoid this brightline difference between x1 load and x2 load?
6. How is enrollment calculated? Rolling average? By teacher? By semester? By section? By some combination of these?
7. What happens to contact hour classes that already have higher loads than the number of credits assigned to the class? What is multiplied—the credits or the contact hours?
8. What should be done about large graduate classes?
9. How was the list of candidate classes identified?

[8] Academic Advising and Workload: Should academic advising be removed from teaching workload calculation and assigned to a single professor for each major?

[5/16 AOC consensus and 5/21 & 9/17 FPDC discussion and actions]

Actions on advising load have been taken by two standing committees of the Faculty Senate.

Academic Operations Council (5/16)
It was the consensus of the Council to assign one person in each academic department to advise students in a given major and require advisor training."

Faculty Policy & Development Council (5/21):
"Teaching load is 24 credits. For UG courses the formula is 1 UG credit is equivalent to 1 load credit. For graduate the formula is 1 graduate credit is equivalent to 1.5 load credit. The number of advisees that is part of load will increase from 15 advisees to 30 advisees."

Faculty Policy & Development Council (9/17):
"The current formula of faculty advising 30 students as part of their teaching workload, with the potential for overload pay if they advise more than 30, may work well for a large departments. However, small departments which do not have 30 advisees per faculty may have less advising to do without any modifications to their workload. And, currently the faculty-student ratio is 1:9 with a goal of 1:12. If the current advising expectations overloads some faculty what would happen when we grow to the 1:12 goal? These are two of the many complications.
MOTION: Advising students is a part of the teaching expectation, without overload compensation consideration. The teaching workload would include advising 30 students and teaching the equivalent of 24 undergraduate credits. Faculty would advise more than 30 students shall have adjustments made to their service workload expectations.
MOTION: So as to recognize the work of faculty who are exceptional in advising students, a new faculty status – Advising Faculty – be available to them."

These changes in policy would affect (functionally increase) the workload of 66 faculty given current advising responsibilities. The senate officers made the following recommendation to the Senate:

MOTION: To RECOMMEND to the Faculty Senate that all policy or practice changes regarding academic advising be initiated from the Faculty Policy and Development Council and that the FPDC create an ad hoc committee to address, at minimum, the following issues before returning a policy and practice recommendation to the Senate:
- How does a change in academic advising load policy to include up to 30 advisees as part of workload ensure a balanced load for all faculty?
- When additional advisee load is assigned to service load, what is reduced from service expectations?
- If the AOC consensus that only one advisor be available per major is implemented, what will be the consequences for work load and emotional care load for that faculty member?
- Has this change in policy been reviewed by chairs and faculty who will be most affected by the change in policy?"

The Senate was in agreement that these issues should be returned, but wanted to emphasize that the role of faculty as academic advisors should be continued in those situations where it is working and effective (while recognizing that there are already situations on campus where non-faculty advising is also effective).

MOTION: "The faculty affirms with the FPDC that faculty should maintain their role as advisors." (D. Randall). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

MOTION: "To RECOMMEND to the Faculty Senate that all policy or practice changes regarding academic advising be initiated from the Faculty Policy and Development Council. That the FPDC create an ad hoc committee with representation from the Academic Operations Council and the Advisors' Council to address, at minimum, the following issues before returning a policy and practice recommendation to the Senate:

- How does a change in academic advising load policy to include up to 30 advisees as part of workload ensure a balanced load for all faculty?
- When additional advisee load is assigned to service load, what is reduced from service expectations?
- If the AOC consensus that only one advisor be available per major is implemented, what will be the consequences for work load and emotional care load for that faculty member?
- Has this change in policy been reviewed by chairs and faculty who will be most affected by the change in policy?" (T. Goodwin) Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] Worship & Prayer

Worship (R. Wells). 1 Kings 19. God responds to Elijah during difficult times. God helps Elijah with self-care and acknowledges that the road is difficult. When Elijah gets to Horeb, God is gentle with Him. God gives him purpose and supports him with additional workers. Only then does God correct Elijah's perspective.

[3] Effective Teaching and Learning Council and Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence   A. Coria-Navia

Professional development offerings have been very well received. We are at or above capacity in all of our professional development offerings thus far this year.

The call for proposals for Andrews University Teaching and Learning Conference has been sent out. Andrews University Professor of Engineering Gunnar Lovhoiden (former senator) will be the keynote speaker this year. Senators were encouraged to please consider submitting, attending, and encouraging others to do the same. The AU TLC is a good way to let others know about what excellent teaching techniques developed across the university.

Augsburger nominations are currently being collected. Because of a change in procedures, we currently have 55 nominations. We moved to anonymous nominations at the Senate's request, and now we are flooded with nominations, including many that have no narrative. We had planned to give certificates to nominations—but this is devalued if so many names (especially without narratives) are sent in. This is only day 3, so maybe we need to re-think the decision to do anonymous nominations (for many reasons, including not knowing how valid the nominations are) or accept nominations without narratives.

Next Faculty Senate meeting: November 14, 2018.