MINUTES OF ARTS & SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, December 2, 2015, 3:30pm || Suite 1600 Student Union

Minutes

1. Chair Caldwell called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

2. Introduction

3. Roll Call

Attendance
ASFC Present: Liz Roth (ART), John Kinder (HIST), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), Lloyd Caldwell (TH), Allen Finchum (GEOG), Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Andy Fullerton (SOC), David Meinke (BOT), Kim Burnham (MICR), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Ed Burkley (PSYC), Lan Zhu (STAT), Erik Ekman (FLL), Apple Igrek (PHIL), Barry Lavine (CHEM), Stephen Nemeth (POLS)

ASFC Absent: Jan Marks (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (ZOOL)

Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder, Assistant Dean Lewis

4. Approval of the Minutes
   a. Motion to approve – Liz Roth. Seconded by Lori McKinnon. Minutes approved.

5. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion to approve – Unanimously approved.

6. Standing Committee Reports
   a. College Policy and Planning – Barry Lavine
      i. Lavine: We had our meeting with the Provost along with several follow up questions via email, which have now all been answered. We are in the process of drafting the additions to the personnel document for the College of Arts & Sciences with regard to clinical faculty. In January, we will have something to submit to the Dean’s Office.

   b. Curriculum, General Education and Extension – Leticia Barchini
      i. Barchini: The committee consisted of three student representatives, representatives from Botany, Art, Geography, Psychology, and Math. We were also assisted by Assistant Dean Martindale and Associate Dean Wikle. We evaluated 46 proposals for new courses. The majority of these were approved after going back and forth. At least one was not approved and we asked them to resubmit their proposal for next semester because it needed more preparation.

      There were many documents that pertained to course numbers, course titles, course descriptions, and prefixes. This requires very detailed work by the committee, especially in regards to careful reading of course descriptions. The idea is that the descriptions and course titles should help the students and accurately describe the course to help avoid any type of misunderstanding or ambiguity.

      We also had to consider courses that were proposed for general education. General education courses are regulated by the university and have specific criteria set by the university. The committee looked carefully at these proposals to ensure that they met the criteria set by the university. A couple of the proposals were found not to be inline with the university principles.

      There was a big folder that involved modified courses, new courses, and new programs including additions and options added. We first had to consider prefix changes. These were tricky to decide. Prefix changes was quite an issue, particularly with the use of the biology prefix. We decided that we needed more feedback from the Integrative Biology Department. We voted positively on this (yes).

      There was a reaction by the committee against many of the options added. We were extremely surprised by the maturity of the students on the committee. The students felt that some of the designations were misleading, and this feeling was shared by committee members. The vote on the designations in question was unanimously no. Of course, there are other considerations in regards to using these designations to attract students and the budgetary implications that are involved here. We revisited this decision with the new considerations in mind and voted to accept the recommendations in questions.
I have to say that it was a pleasure to work with this committee. We met three times a week for five weeks. The members of the committee were engaged and there was a true effort to be fair and engaged. The students were amazing and the atmosphere of the committee was outstanding.

c. Rule and Procedures – Liz Roth  
   i. No report.

d. Scholarship – Jennifer Shaw  
   i. No report.
   ii. Caldwell: Shaw is not able to attend today, but I can say that I have been working with her and the Scholarship Committee on last minute President Scholarships Awards. Her committee has done some really stellar work on very short notice.

e. Tenure and Promotion  
   i. No report.

f. Sabbatical Leave  
   i. No report.

7. Old Business  
   a. Discussion of Proposed Changes in Language Requirements  
      i. Caldwell: In regards to the proposed changes in language requirements, I sent the letters and documents to the ASFC as they came through. These are now in the hands of a sub committee chaired by Associate Dean Wikle. Caldwell requests feedback on this topic from the ASFC.
      ii. There are no comments on the foreign language requirements from the ASFC at this time.

b. Supplemental Pay Relating to On-Line and Summer Courses  
   i. Caldwell: I asked Assistant Dean Lewis to attend this meeting and discuss her plan with the ASFC. Dr. Fullerton has also done some stellar work on this topic as well. As a recap, we started this process several years ago. The pay scale that we had was not working and was costing the program too much. The ASFC put together a subcommittee that worked on the pay scale. We revisited their work at the previous ASFC meeting. The issue that we face this year is that we came up $400,000 short because Central administration is taking a larger split from 60%/40% to 55%/45%. I found out last week that this may be revised again to a 50%/50% split. Today we are discussing pay equity issues. We want to make sure that the pay is not a disincentive to teach these courses. The university was not interested in this until they saw something that they could use to help pay their costs. We already operate at a deficit in this college, and we want to be sure that we are wise with our resources so that we can be sure that our students are served and that our professors are paid commensurate with their efforts.
   
   ii. Gregg: All of the money is going to the university, and this is becoming a disincentive. This reminds me of issues by other universities. Some of the younger faculty are struggling financially partially as a result of this. I was hoping to start developing an online course based on the introductory course that I teach. I was not expecting to make any money from this, but I saw this as a good way to support a graduate student. Now this looks like it is evaporating.
   
   iii. Igrek: I agree that there is not much we can do right now, but is there any way to address the larger issues at a future date? Could we discuss in the future whether or not the split will be pushed to 50%/50%? It seems that right now we are not part of this discussion.
   
   iv. Caldwell: To be clear, are you asking whether or not we (ASFC) can be part of the discussion for the proposed change of the split to 50%/50%?
   
   v. Assistant Dean Lewis: It seems to me that you will want to make a recommendation to the general faculty council.
   
   vi. Caldwell: Is there a motion to discuss the profit sharing of outreach between the university and the various colleges with the general faculty council?
      v. Assistant Dean Lewis: Please do not forget that this is also linked to the block tuition waiver that happens over the summer. That is actually one of the biggest amounts of money that is lost. You might consider raising these two issues.
   
   ix. Assistant Dean Lewis: Because of block tuition, in-state versus out-of-state tuition, fee waivers, and the split increase with the university, the functionality of our pay scale changed. I tried to address the issue of being able to offer some courses with lower enrollment, and so I went back to a per credit hour model until a course hits the 100% enrollment threshold. I was trying to stick with the current pay scale that the committee proposed and we adopted as closely as I could, but account for trying to offer classes at a lower enrollment because sometimes we need to offer these courses rather than simply not offering the course all together or losing money. My approach came from the outreach and online perspective. One of the main issues about the current pay scale is the difference between upper division and lower division courses because the student credit hour money is the same. Many upper division courses lost considerable money. Prior to the new pay scale, the pay per student credit hour was raised from $50 up to $70, but it was not quite based on a faculty member’s salary. I realize that with this system, a faculty member can make less than before with the current system because of the change in the floor. I understand that this really does not work. I have talked to the Associate Deans and Dean Danilowicz about the pay scale, and we are working on signing contracts for the coming summer. I think moving
forward for this year, we should stay with the current pay scale with the caveat that the low-enrollment courses cannot lose money. We will stick with the minimums on the current pay scale (meeting a 15-student minimum for lower division courses, and a 10-student minimum for upper division courses, 6-student minimum for graduate courses). Depending on the salary and the projected income, the course will not be offered if it loses money.

dx. Caldwell: As a side note, do not forget that there was an option for smaller classes to be negotiated between the Department Head and the Dean. This would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

xi. Roth: Just to be clear, this still means that A&S will not offer the class unless it makes money. Is negotiation still a possibility?

xii. Assistant Dean Lewis: We would need to negotiate the salary.

xiii. Dean Danilowicz: To clarify, the big change is that the courses that do not make money will be canceled. This is the only way that we will recover that deficit. This is not something we want to do, but we have to do something to fix the pay scale until we adopt a new pay scale. This is the emergency plan that we have to use.

xiv. Gregg: If you teach online classes in your load, does this affect that?

xv. Dean Danilowicz: Not at all because that would be in-load.

xvi. Gregg: Then it becomes a decision by the department head as to whether or not it is economical to teach that course.

xvii. Dean Danilowicz: As a quick clarification, when I asked Assistant Dean Lewis to come up with this pay scale, I asked her to create something that would correct our current problem. There will likely be no popular solution to fix this, but I asked her to come up with something. She generated this scale, and that is why it is up for discussion by the ASFC. We are open to suggestions to models that could work better than this model.

xviii. Finchum: Since we allow students to pay block tuition, which is effectively 15 credits – if a student does not take all 15 credits, can the superfluous courses be credited to the college where the student took the extra course? Right now, central administration is just keeping this money.

xix. Caldwell: This is something that you might want to bring to the Deans meetings.

xx. Dean Danilowicz: I do believe that this is a faculty council issue.

xxi. Roth: To be clear, is the new proposal being withdrawn until next year?

xxii. Fullerton: I am presenting the floor, which is very low and it produces a lot of inequality. For a graduate class, the floor is $1,275, and for an undergraduate course it is about $2,500.

xxiii. McKinnon: In regards to the legal implications for this summer, are all of the summer contracts signed where we would need to go with the new plan?

xxiv. Assistant Dean Lewis: We would honor any contracts that have already been signed. We plan outreach really far in advance. We need something that we can use right now. Once enrollment reaches 100%, my new proposal is exactly the same as the previous proposal. No other college pays outreach by salary. It is by student credit hour. Business pays $50 by student credit hour, which was our previous pay scale.

xxv. Dean Danilowicz: This year for example, if all of the outreach courses themselves between online, summer, supplemental, and international courses – if we do not net $2.6 million dollars out of that, we are in a budgetary hole. As a college, we are already running at about a $150,000 deficit.

xxvi. Barchini: So the online courses are helping with this in a significant manner?

xxvii. Dean Danilowicz: Absolutely. The revised pay scale does have a higher pay scale than Business receives. There are faculty who teach their courses at a lower rate, but I think that they just have a lot more students. So they make up for it in volume.

xxviii. Barchini: If online courses generate money, can the college predetermine which courses are likely to bring in a lot of money and encourage departments and faculty to offer more of these courses?

xxix. Dean Danilowicz: The example that I give departments as the number one class would be a science class with a lab online. Geology has one, and it is always full with a waiting list. I have talked to departments for two years about this, but not all departments are willing to do this. And they could make a fortune.

xxx. Barchini: Would it be possible to encourage them by paying them more?

xxxi. Igrek: To Assistant Dean Lewis – I actually would make more with the new pay scale with one of my classes because of higher enrollment. Have you looked at the larger budgetary picture to see whether or not there are some ups and downs and that the decrease in the budget outweighed some of those bumps?

xxxii. Assistant Dean Lewis: Given the fees and things like that, if you have high enrollment, we will not lose money. The solution was to try to offer courses with low enrollments due to accreditation and constraints such as fire codes, labs, and things like this. By their nature, some courses cannot meet the 100% threshold. I am trying to provide a solution where we can offer some of these lower enrollment courses, but we will not lose money. This model provides incentive to keep maximum enrollment high. I have talked to department heads about this.

xxxiii. Meinke: The pay scale seems needlessly complex, and the message that is sends is that the value of your course is dependent upon the number of students enrolled. This discourages people from teaching small upper division courses, and it encourages people teaching large courses. And it seems to infer that you have more work to do if you teach a large course. This may vary from discipline to discipline, but in my department this is not true. Why not increase the base by reducing the added benefits that one receives by teaching larger sections?

xxxiv. Assistant Dean Lewis: This was the scale that the committee came up with, and I just tried to modify based on the problem that we had with classes losing drastic amounts of money. You have to have incentives for people to teach large classes or people won't have them.
xxxv. Igrek: This is a recurring issue that higher enrollment courses seem to subsidize lower enrollment courses. We keep coming back to this circle.

xxxvi. Caldwell: Given how late we are, do you feel like we should revisit this subject with a subcommittee and come back with a different set of recommendations? Or, should we let things ride for the moment and see what the university does in regards to profit sharing? We could revisit this in September of next year. Or is there another option? I am looking for an action that we can take today.

xxxvii. Assistant Dean Lewis: We would need to move quickly to make any changes. We cannot table this for another year.

xxxviii. Roth: It took us two years to come up with this system. I think it is unrealistic to think that we can come up with another quickly.

xxxix. McKinnon: What if we changed the salary percentage bumps beyond 100% to reflect smaller increments? Would this help us save money?

xl. Assistant Dean Lewis: The really high numbers are not an issue. We just don’t have that many classes with very high enrollment.

xli. Dean Danilowicz: Early in the fall, we start signing contracts for the coming summer. If we have a new pay scale created sometime during the spring, we can use this for the contracts starting in the fall. Otherwise, we have to wait another year before we can use the new pay scale when creating contracts.

xlii. Meinke: Forming a subcommittee on this sounds fine to me. Why not request an alternative plan that has either a five percent increase per number of students and a 0% increase? We then have three plans.

xliii. Assistant Dean Lewis: If you have a zero percent increase, then there is no incentive to teach a large class.

xliv. Meinke: No, that’s not true. You would still get a summer month pay. It is simply independent of the number of students in the course.

xlv. Assistant Dean Lewis: It is the large enrollment courses that make this all possible. You have to provide incentives for people to offer large enrollment courses or people won’t have them.

xlvi. Roth: We still need to determine our current course of action.

xlvii. Caldwell calls for a vote to approve a subcommittee to address this issue. ASFC votes against forming a new subcommittee.

xlviii. Nemeth: Are we planning for the 55%/45% and the 50%/50% split with central administration?

xlix. Dean Danilowicz: That scenario has not yet been brought to the Deans. Ultimately, I think what is important is for us to find the model that works. We can always tweak it later. It will be an awkward year and we may have some angry people, but we cannot be $400,000 in the hole as a college. In regards to the model, do we start with something scaled to a faculty member’s actual salary or do we start with an even scale? From our perspective, it does not matter financially, but there are equality issues here. Faculty that are professorial or are in departments that have a higher base salary, they believe that they deserve more to teach the same classes for a variety of reasons. Faculty who are in departments who are paid less view this the opposite way. The recommendation from the previous committee was to create a model that is scaled by salary, which is unlike the other colleges. It would make our lives simpler if it was not scaled to salary. We can revisit this issue.

l. McKinnon: I still think we should bring this up to the general faculty council.

li. Fullerton: We should guarantee that if you teach during the summer that you will receive equitable pay and something comparable to what you received in a previous summer, but also that there is a higher chance that the class could be canceled. I don’t think there is any way around having both equitable pay and allowing everyone to teach his or her courses.

lii. Assistant Dean Lewis: Dr. Crauder and I can work on something if you prefer this come from the Dean’s Office.

liii. Caldwell: The Dean’s Office will come up with more variations of the model. If you want to have input into their work, please email them.

8. New Business
   a. Recommendations for ad hoc Committee to Review Budget Reduction Proposals
      i. Allen Finchum has volunteered to be on the committee that assesses proposals for budget cuts. Barry Lavine also volunteered. Lloyd Caldwell will be the third.
      ii. Dean Danilowicz: This group will review this with me from the perspective of “if a student is going through the college, how would these cuts affect their experience?”

9. Dean’s Report
   a. No report.

10. Announcements
    a. No announcements.

11. Announcements