

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, August 26, 2013

Kirschman 137

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at ___3:02_____ PM__ by_James Lowry_

Current roster of Faculty Senators

Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Present
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Present
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(11-14)	Present
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Ivan	Miestchovich	(13-16)	Present
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Present
Education	Polly	Thomas	(13-16)	Present
Education	Judith	Kieff	(11-14)	Present
Education	Paul	Bole	(11-14)	Absent
Engineering	Enrique	La Motta	(11-14)	Present
Engineering	Malay Ghose	Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolaos	Xiros	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler (SE)	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Robert	Montjoy	(13-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	John	Kiefer	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Christine	Day	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Connie	Atkinson	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Alison	Arnold	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Andrew	Goss	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Present

Sciences	Elizabeth	Shirtcliff	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Steven	Shalit	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Mark	Kulp	(11-14)	Excused
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Absent
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Absent
Sciences	Leslie	Cobar	(13-16)	Absent
Sciences	Tu	Shengru	(13-16)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

2. Approval of minutes from the 4.25.13 meeting

____Elaine Brooks_____ moved and __Richard Speaker_____ seconded to approve the minutes of the 4.25.13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Election of officers for 2013-14 (Andrew Goss)

1. Prior to election process taking place, Andrew yielded the floor to Dinah Payne for outgoing president's remarks. Dinah outlined the difficult and challenging period of time in UNO's history due to the extensive change occurring. She articulated she did her best to be an advocate for the faculty and encouraged everyone to work together as a team for the betterment of UNO.
2. Election started with the office of president
 - One nomination to begin which was Polly Thomas
 - Cherie Trumbach nominated Elaine Brooks
 - Derek Rodrigues nominated John Kiefer
 - Polly requested the opportunity to make remarks which was granted. All of those nominated made remarks.
 - First election no majority was reached so a runoff election between Polly and Elaine was held.
 - Elaine won the run off lection and therefore was elected president of the senate
3. Election for vice president was held next
 - One nomination to begin which was James Lowry
 - Polly Thomas was nominated but declined the nomination
 - John Kiefer and Cherie Trumbach were nominated
 - It was brought to Andrew's attention that the bylaws state there can only be two member of the SEC from each school. This eliminated James Lowry and John Kiefer from contention.
 - Cherie Trumbach was elected vice president
4. Election for Secretary

- No nominations were listed to start
 - Marie Morgan was nominated by Connie Phelps.
 - Connie Phelps was nominated but declined
 - Marie Morgan was elected Secretary
5. Faculty Advisory Council representatives for the UL system was elected next
- Elaine Brooks was nominated by James Lowry for primary representative
 - Elaine Brooks was elected as primary representative.
 - Cherie Trumbach was nominated by James Lowry as alternate
 - Cherie Trumbach was elected
 - Discussion about making the senate president and vice president automatic representative took place. This would require changes in by laws which may take place at a later time.

Dr. Goss indicated that other by-laws changes were also needed.

Dr. Goss announced that, as with last year, people will be asked to nominate themselves for the various Senate committees, but everyone should assume that they are on the same committee until further notice.

Dr. Brooks had to leave to teach her Monday class at the Jeff Center but said that she would be available to lead the meetings for the rest of the semester. Dr. Trumbach ran the remainder of the meeting. Before proceeding, Dr. Goss thanked the outgoing officers for their service: President Dr. Dinah Payne; Vice-president Dr. James Lowry; and Secretary Dr. Matt Zingoni.

4. Committee reports.

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee - Resolution on UNO Faculty Workload Policy (Dr. Vern Baxter; see Appendix 1):

Provost Jim Payne sent out the proposed workload policy originally on June 18 and a slightly revised version on July 17. Senate Vice-president Lowry called for a joint meeting of the Senate Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee and the Senate Executive Committee on July 29. The committees decided to draft a list of concerns and met on August 1 with President Fos and Provost Payne to discuss the workload policy. After that meeting, the committees decided that they still needed to draft a resolution and met on August 19 to finalize the resolution, distributing it to the faculty on August 20 (see Appendix 1). That same day, Provost Payne drafted a revision that incorporated the requested changes.

Today, we see that our role as a committee is to consider the workload policy. The initial plan was for the Senate to take up the resolution, but what does the Senate want to do with the workload policy as written? Discuss it at the next meeting or move ahead as rewritten? It is up to this body to decide if this is the workload policy that we want or if we want to discuss it further.

Question: Did the previous discussion deal with both documents or just the workload policy?
Dr. Baxter: Both documents.

Question: How will the policy affect instructors? Dr. Baxter: Good question. I would be happy to take it back to the committee.

Question about the 4/4: Dr. Baxter: One of our concerns was the language.

Question about the workload percentages of 40/40/20 and how we spend our time: The concern is the difference between the evaluation rate and the workload rate. How does the Provost feel about that difference in rates? Dr. Baxter: He thought that 45/45/10 was appropriate. Comment: My concern is that you cannot have 40% of your time devoted to research. Dr. Trumbach: It is more the weighting of importance and not the time.

Comment: If I remember, if you have grants that will buy out your time, you might end up teaching far less, so it would shift. Dr. Baxter: It is not a monolithic policy that fits everybody.

Question: Where does Ph.D. production fit in? Dr. Baxter: More with service; one of the reasons why we thought that 10% for service was too low.

Question: What about workload for the administrative piece? Dr. Baxter: The Provost built into the policy that you can adjust your workload for administrative duties. That did not seem problematic to us.

Question: Nowhere do I ever see M.F.A.s addressed. Don't forget us. Dr. Baxter: It was included.

Does the Faculty Senate want more deliberation on this policy or to accept it as presented? Our resolution is mostly moot, but we can revise it.

Comment: I would like for the committee to provide us with a resolution on the workload policy and the evaluation policy.

Dr. Baxter: We will meet and produce something for the next Senate meeting and come up with a new resolution. Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht: We will definitely take up the question of instructors and the percentages. If there is anything else, let her or Dr. Baxter know.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee (Dr. Trumbach):

A few weeks ago, we were called into a meeting with the Senate Executive Committee and the Committee that did the workload policy. At that time, it was clear that we needed to meet with the Provost and with Greg Lassen (Vice-president for Business Affairs). Both meetings lasted over three hours and were very detailed. We asked a lot of questions and got a significant amount of answers. We were given details about the budget and RCM. We talked about the colleges being in the red and asked questions about restructuring. On the restructuring side, it is clear that the discussions are happening more on the administrative side (deans and chairs).

RCM is activity-based budgeting in a university setting; RCM does not dictate restructuring. We talked about the overhead and money going to non-academic places. Both are high-priority items. They're looking at various contracts, and a number of things are in the works, such as what was done with leasing the bookstore (instead of the university paying money, we are getting money). There was discussion about adjuncts, as there are rumors going on about that. Dr. Trumbach encouraged everyone to attend the Provost's open forum. At the meeting, the Provost said the intention was to save people's jobs. For the past few years we have been operating \$5 million in deficit; there was extra money, but it had been sheltered in the past, and we have reached the end of that pot. Their objective is that we are no longer operating in this manner. Greg Lassen spoke to us about how we have to understand how the model has changed over the past several years, from the state funding 70% to funding now only 28%. There is a much more market-driven approach, and we have to be in a position to survive that. That is not going to change, and we have to adjust our thinking accordingly.

Question: There is clearly a lot going on. Is there a timeline when we will learn something from the Administration? Dr. Trumbach: We asked for two things, and they are progressing a little more slowly than what the Provost had originally envisioned: (1) A plan of when things would happen (and Dr. Trumbach's impression is that the plan has not yet solidified); and (2) a calendar of the budget cycle.

Comment: At the last Chair's meeting, the Provost gave the numbers for non-academic overhead at 62%, and he would like to get it down to 45%. Dr. Trumbach: That is correct.

Question: There is a rumor floating around that people in Administration got raises. Did the committee ask that? Dr. Trumbach: Not at this time.

Dr. Baxter: The President told him in a meeting that there is the possibility of a hiring freeze, so it might be two years before he has a staff person, and within two years, he is not sure how much he will have left in his department. This year, we need to unravel those non-academic overhead costs and support the academic mission.

Dr. Trumbach: Greg Lassen has been here for a month, and they have a lot to unravel about the budget. Where they thought the money was, it is just not there. That cushion does not exist. The objective is that there will be an open process, and we will be able to see where the money is going.

Question: Is there an electronic version of the budget? Trumbach: Not yet. Morgan confirmed that the Provost thought that we should be able to have one.

Question: Will the committee be pursuing this overhead issue? There needs to be transparency at all levels. Dr. Trumbach: I would say that we are going to look at everything.

Dr. Trumbach strongly encouraged all committees to put language in their charges as to how they need to operate.

The biggest thing now is the overhead. If anyone has any issues that they want this committee to address, let her know.

5. Old Business. None.

6. New Business. None.

7. Announcements.

2013-2014 Strategic Agenda (President Peter Fos):

President Fos sent an email at 3:30pm today about his 2013-2014 Strategic Agenda (see Appendix 2 handout) and his decision to form a Strategic Agenda Implementation Committee. He would like three representatives from the Faculty Senate, three from the Staff Council, and three from the students. He will contact Dr. Brooks regarding the faculty representatives.

UNO Cares (Christy Heaton, Enrollment Services):

UNO Cares is the university's early alert system. Ms. Heaton introduced Nicole Ralston (First-Year Experience), who announced that, as of today, there was a new UNO Cares System that was now in our roster in WebSTAR. It is really intuitive, with a tab, where, once submitted, the report on the student goes directly to them.

Academic Affairs Update (Provost Jim Payne):

- (1) He needs the help of the Senate to constitute the Academic committees. Contact Bill Sharpton to get that underway.
- (2) They are slowly processing the fuller curriculum mapping.
- (3) They audited all policies this summer. Policies are all over the place.
- (4) The Academic Affairs Website was redone this summer. On the left-hand side are links to policies and procedures of the UL System and the Board of Regents. He wants to make it easy for people to find policies and procedures.
- (5) They went through an assessment of GenEd this past spring and will start looking at revising guidelines.
- (6) They are doing peer analysis, not just for the strategic plan but also looking for peers for legislative purposes and another set of peers for aspirational schools.
- (7) President Fos mentioned the Business Planning piece and strategy. They want faculty, staff, and students involved in that process.
- (8) He wants to promote and profile faculty and programs on the Academic Affairs Website. He also wants to get a list of faculty expertise and a profile by college and department of current initiatives and community partnerships. He will send a template to fill out and will put the information on the Website.

8. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42pm

Respectfully submitted,
Matt Zingoni (through elections),
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2012/13
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Sept. 18, 2013

Appendix 1:

August 26, 2013

Faculty Senate Resolution about Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policies

The UNO Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure offers the following resolution for consideration of the UNO Faculty Senate:

Whereas, the University of New Orleans (UNO) Faculty Senate agrees that a fair faculty workload and evaluation policy is essential to fulfillment of the university's mission; and whereas, the UNO Faculty Senate agrees the current faculty workload and evaluation system makes inadequate distinction between sufficient/insufficient rating and insufficiently aligns performance evaluation with faculty workload policy, the UNO Faculty Senate agrees that reform of current faculty workload and performance evaluation policies is sensible and appropriate.

However, the Faculty Senate has serious concerns about the faculty workload policy proposed by Provost Payne on June 18, 2013 (revised July 17, 2013) and about the performance evaluation policy proposed by Provost Payne on June 24, 2013. There are four main areas of concern: (1) inadequate time for department and faculty transition to a new workload/evaluation system; (2) lack of clarity about how to resolve disputes between departments, Deans, and the Provost over department faculty evaluation criteria; (3) implications of language about teaching loads contained in the workload policy (p. 2); and (4) distribution of effort proposed (45% research, 45% teaching, and 10% service) does not accurately reflect the typical distribution of duties performed by UNO faculty members.

(1) Not enough time for department and faculty transition to new workload system.

Major changes are taking place across the UNO campus, most specifically transition to Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budgeting process and new policies about apportionment of indirect costs that materially affect many aspects of the proposed faculty workload and evaluation policy. The very mission of the university is under review, discussions are underway about reorganization of colleges, and recent trends suggest increases in class size and curriculum changes in many departments.

Departments and faculty need flexibility, more time to transition to new workload requirements and shifting obligations within departments. The proposed policy implies a shift of emphasis from service to additional research and it will take time for some faculty to ramp up research programs. It is not fair to change the rules of the game so quickly.

(2) Resolution of disputes over department faculty evaluation criteria.

A balance must be struck between the authority of the President and Provost to manage the academic mission of the university and the province of assembled faculty to establish performance expectations in the various disciplines of the university. The Faculty Senate affirms that expertise and experience in the various disciplines reserves primarily for faculty the autonomy to establish performance evaluation criteria in their respective disciplines. Recognition of this balance suggests that some sort of arbitration process should be written to clarify how disputes will be resolved between departments, Deans, and the Provost over faculty evaluation criteria.

(3) Language about teaching loads.

The Faculty Senate is concerned about the implications of the following language on page 2 of the proposed UNO faculty workload policy: “Any adjustments from the standard 12 hour load must be funded by departments/schools.” The stated mission of UNO is a “comprehensive urban research university” committed to conducting research and service in a variety of humanities, arts, sciences, and professional programs. The Faculty Senate is deeply committed to upholding this mission while acknowledging the standard teaching load expected of full-time faculty in the UL system is 24 credit hours in fall and spring semesters combined. UNO has upheld its mission by granting a six credit hour reduction in teaching load per year for engagement and productivity in scholarly and creative work. This is a core element of the public mission of the University of New Orleans and should not be sacrificed to budgetary fluctuations.

UL System Bylaws (chapter 3, sec. 1) also allow for adjustment of standard teaching load based on number of course preparations, number of students taught, and balance between graduate and undergraduate students taught. Adjustment of teaching loads depends on much more than department funding, it reflects a larger university research mission and larger considerations regarding proper pedagogy.

(4) Proposed distribution of effort is 45% research, 45% teaching, and 10% service.

The proposed weights of research, teaching, and service do not accurately reflect the distribution of effort expended by or expected of UNO faculty members. Informal surveys of departments and universities reveal very few examples outside Business Schools of the 45-45-10 weights. Many examples of 40-40-20 weights were discovered, many of which apply at Research I universities. Many peer institutions also weighted teaching higher than research. The University of Louisiana at Lafayette has a tiered workload system where each course taught equals roughly 20% of total workload.

The Faculty Senate is particularly troubled by the low weight granted service. Active scholars are expected to perform service to the profession that might include review of journal submissions and organizing sessions at professional conferences. Service to the university is also expected of every regular faculty member. Service to the department includes committee service and supervision of independent study courses and internships, undergraduate honors, MA/MS theses and Ph.D. dissertation research. Community service and outreach are also required.

Therefore, be it resolved that the UNO Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the proposed UNO Faculty Workload/Evaluation policies that will be written into the UNO Faculty Handbook:

- (1) The new UNO Faculty Workload/Evaluation policy will be implemented in January, 2015 to provide faculty adequate time to transition to changed workload requirements;
- (2) Work out a clear division of responsibilities between departments, Deans, and the Provost to govern approval process for department evaluation criteria and establish an impartial arbitration process in case of unresolved disagreement;
- (3) Revise teaching load language on page 2 of the proposed faculty workload policy that currently reads; “Any adjustments from the standard 12 hour load must be funded by departments/schools,” to read instead, “Consistent with the mission of The University of New Orleans the typical teaching load is 9 hours per semester for each regular faculty member with a three hour equivalent in research time provided they are actively engaged in research/creative activity and maintain a sustained level of research/creative productivity;”
- (4) Adjust standard weights of faculty workload to 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service.

Appendix 2:



THE UNIVERSITY *of*
NEW ORLEANS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

2013-2014 STRATEGIC AGENDA

Goal 1: To increase our enrollment through retention and recruiting

- Goal 2: To establish and launch "Global UNO"
- Goal 3: To continue the preparation for the SACS/COC reaffirmation self-study and campus visitation
- Goal4: To formulate and implement the Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) Budgeting Approach
- Goal 5: To conclude the implementation of the Privateer Enrollment Center (PEC)
- Goal6: To Increase Alumni involvement with Student Programs
- Goal 7: To increase Philanthropic Fund-raising
- Goal 8: To continue promoting the image of the University of New Orleans in the community
- Goal 9: To Complete and Implement the University Strategic Plan
- Goal 10: To Increase Research Funding