Faculty Welfare Minutes

February 13, 2009
Rounds 014, 2:30pm

Members present: Mary Cornish, Roxana Wright, Dan Lee, Ann McClellan, Cathie LeBlanc, Pat Cantor, Anne Kulig

Guest: Julie Bernier

The minutes from the November meeting were approved as written.

New Business:

A. Tenure Track Workload Policy from Provost (see Appendix A)

Provost Bernier shared a draft of a Workload Reassignment Policy/Process with the FWC. Before her arrival at the meeting, the FWC came up with the following list of questions/comments. The answers that arose during the discussion with the provost are also included along with additional comments that came up during the discussion.

1. Will all faculty members complete the plan or only those who will deviate from normal? Will it be done every year?
   a. All faculty, every year.
   b. Strengths of this plan—provides flexibility for faculty members. Not all departments held to same standards. Positive response to recommendations in P&T Task Force report. Allows planning ahead for work in addition to current process of reporting afterward. Might help those who are over-extended to say no to additional commitments.
   c. Additional questions/concerns—will this be used as an evaluation tool? What is the impact on P&T? Advising is not currently in the plan.

2. What do “3 units” look like in service or scholarship?
   a. It isn’t clear—Provost agrees that this needs to be defined (by the faculty?) but doesn’t feel we can wait for this to be defined before we move forward with implementing the work plans
   b. Concern that sometimes “unit” is equated with “credit” and other times it is just a marker
   c. Can faculty members who are currently “overworked” use the plan to bring their workload back to a manageable level? If yes, we need to make it clear what is reasonable for a “unit” of work in each area.
   d. A unit in teaching does indeed equal 1 credit so depts. who are teaching 4 credit classes who allow reassignment of teaching to 8 credits per semester (rather than the 9 credits shown in the sample plans) must reassign the extra unit to scholarly/creative activity which means additional work in that area.

3. What is the process for developing a plan? It is not currently described.
   a. Part of the process would involve discussion with and getting approval of dept chair for the details of the plan
b. What if the chair and the faculty member disagree about what is “fair”? Is there an appeals process for the plan?

c. How will faculty be held accountable? That is, what if someone doesn’t meet what they put on their plan?
   i. Would affect pay raises
   ii. Also would affect ability to reassign in future.

d. Need to add something about how success in the plan would be measured to the form. That is, the form needs a place for the faculty member to indicate outcomes and evidence that will be provided to show that that part of the plan has been completed successfully.

e. Timeline for the plan would have to be in the spring semester before the fall schedule due dates so that the chair can plan for the appropriate amount of reassignment in teaching.

4. Is it possible to renegotiate the plan if opportunities come up midyear?
   a. Yes
   b. What is the process for renegotiation?

5. Where does advising belong?
   a. Everyone is expected to advise between 20 and 40 students as part of their service commitment
   b. Can include additional students as part of service component of plan but not as part of a reassignment of teaching to service
   c. Any reassignment to service would require prior approval of the Provost

6. How do overloads work?
   a. Can do overloads only if there is no reassignment or if reassignment is paid for by an outside grant
   b. A dept may not decrease its teaching (number of seats provided?) or use adjuncts to accommodate reassignment

7. To present this to the faculty, we feel that it will be really important for the Provost to clearly articulate the goals and philosophy behind the new process.

8. We also feel that there is a potential equity issue since some departments currently do not have enough resources to handle their students and so will not be able to participate in any reassignment. Because of this and many other issues (including our continued commitment to teaching, we also feel that it is necessary to make it clear that a faculty member who receives reassignment is not “better” than a faculty member who does not.

9. The type of plan for librarians and 12-month faculty will have to look different since there is not the same emphasis on teaching for them.

10. Provost sees a pilot of this program with departments (Social Science, English, others?) who are getting some reassignments beginning Fall 2009 with full implementation for the following Fall semester. The pilot will emphasize the need to include indicators and evidence of success. In particular, there needs to be some way to measure goals in teaching.
   a. For example: “Describe your plans in the areas of teaching improvement, curriculum development, learning new teaching methodologies, etc.”

11. We suggest that all instances of “scholarship” on the form be changed to “scholarly/creative activity”.

Action: Provost will share policy with the chairs and hopes to implement a pilot program for Fall 2009 with the departments who have already negotiated reductions in teaching loads (Social Science, English, others?)

B. Other business from the Provost
   a. Using Sloane grant to deal with parental leave so that faculty can take an entire semester (doing some other activity besides teaching for some of the semester) rather than just 12 weeks

Old Business:
   C. Adjunct representation on FWC
Continued discussion of the issue. Ultimately, we don’t know what the will of the faculty is on this issue and so we will ask for discussion and straw poll at next faculty meeting.
Options: 1. change definition of “faculty” to include adjuncts (which gives them the right to attend, participate in and vote at faculty meetings as well as faculty elections); 2. designate an adjunct observer (non-voting) to all principal policy-making committees; 3. designate an adjunct observer (non-voting) to FWC; 4. designate adjunct full voting member to FWC; or 5. election of an adjunct full voting member to FWC.

Action: Mary and Ann will write up the discussion items and the straw poll for the next faculty meeting.

D. Dissolution of the Grievance Resolution Committee
Action: Mary will draft motion and report of justification for the March 4 meeting.
(Note that the March 4 faculty meeting agenda was packed and so we voted via email to postpone our discussion until the April meeting)

E. Workload—tabled the discussion until our next meeting.

Appendix A

Tenure Track Faculty Workload Re-assignment Policy

The assigned duties of all tenured and tenure-track faculty consist of teaching, scholarship, and service. The distribution of effort may vary from one faculty member to another and from fall semester to spring semester, however, the distribution must balance the teaching and scholarly interests of individual faculty members with their responsibility to deliver academic programs of high quality.

Current: In order to build a model for this process, let’s assume our current model is as such:

Faculty are responsible for 36 units per year, 18 units/semester.
18 units are assigned in the following manner:
Proposal:

Same as above…
Faculty are responsible for 36 units per year, 18 units/semester.
18 units are assigned in the following manner:
12 units teaching* + 3 units scholarship + 3 units service = 18 units

*Faculty must have a minimum of 9 units teaching, 3 units scholarship, and 3 units of service.
The final three units may be “reassigned” from teaching to the category of service or scholarship to be determined based on faculty member/Dept. Chair negotiation and based on department need (re-assignment for service requires provost approval). A “workplan” approved in the spring prior to the academic year will be the basis for workload distribution and subsequent faculty evaluation at year’s end.

Sample workload re-assignment:
9 units teaching # + 6 units scholarship + 3 units service = 18 units

# The faculty member’s workplan will describe the work to be completed with the “re-assigned time”. It must be approved by the Chair in light of the proposed workplan and departmental curricular needs. A faculty member teaching 12 credits is considered to have a normal load. Overload continues to become effective at > 12 credits of teaching or if total exceed 18 units/term.

Relative to current curricular revision process: the ability to “re-assign” faculty time is based on departmental curricular needs. Through curricular revision and changes in scheduling practices, departments may re-assign faculty time, providing they:

1) Meet all needs of major requirements, both in their department and in offering adequate seats to support other majors’ required courses.
2) Continue to offer an equal number of Directions and FYS seats
3) Do not add to adjunct costs (this includes overload) i.e. a department can maintain it’s same level of adjunct support but may not increase in order to achieve workload reduction.
Examples of workload assignments:

**Typical load**
12 units teaching + 3 units scholarship + 3 units service = 18 units

**Faculty member engaging in greater than normal scholarship**
9 units teaching + 6 units scholarship + 3 units service = 18 units

**Faculty member teaching an overload**
13 units teaching + 3 units scholarship + 3 units service = 19 units (1 cr. overload)

**Department Chair - normal load**
6 units teaching + 3 units scholarship + 9 units service = 18 units

**Department Chair teaching an overload**
9 units teaching + 3 units scholarship + 9 units service = 21 units (3 cr. overload)

---

**Faculty Workplan for FY11**
To be completed in spring prior to academic year

Name: ________________________________
Department: ___________________________
Number of years teaching at PSU: _______ Academic rank: ____________________________

Proposed Workload Assignment: (See attached Workload re-assignment policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals greater than 18 require Provost approval.

Using the outline below, provide a workplan for the next academic year that supports your workload request. (ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY)

**TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP**
Describe your plans regarding teaching (develop, or prep to teach new courses, use new pedagogy, introduce technology into your courses, foster active learning, engage undergraduates in research, etc.)

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITY
Describe your plans for scholarly and creative activity next year.

SERVICE AND OUTREACH
Describe your planned on-campus service activities, plans to engage in off-campus outreach or service, or any consulting or leadership roles you will take in your professional organization.

Workplans are due to Department Chairs by (date). All workload reassignments and faculty workplans require final approval of the Department Chair and will always balance the teaching and scholarly interests of individual faculty members with their responsibility to deliver academic programs of high quality.

Faculty member signature

Date

Chair note:

Department Chair approval

Date