

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, September 24, 2013

Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at ___3:07_____ PM__ by_Elaine Brooks_

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

Administration	Rachel	Kincaid	(13-14)	Present
Staff Council	Derek	Rodriguez	(13-14)	Present
SG President	Brandon	Bonds	(13-14)	Absent
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(13-14)	Present
Adjunct	(vacant)		(13-14)	
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-14)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Excused
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Present
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(11-14)	Excused
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Ivan	Miestchovich	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Excused
Education	Polly	Thomas	(13-16)	Present
Education	Matt	Lyons	(11-14)	Present
Education	Paul	Bole	(11-14)	Present
Engineering	Enrique	La Motta (SE)	(11-14)	Excused
Engineering	Malay Ghose	Hajra	(12-15)	Present
Engineering	Nikolaos	Xiros	(12-15)	Present
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler (SE)	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Robert	Montjoy	(13-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	John	Kiefer	(11-14)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Christine	Day	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Connie	Atkinson	(11-14)	Excused

Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(11-14)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Alison	Arnold	(11-14)	Excused
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)	Excused
Sciences	Elizabeth	Shirtcliff	(11-14)	Absent
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Steven	Shalit	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Mark	Kulp	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Absent
Sciences	Tu	Shengru	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	(vacant)			
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of minutes from the 8/26/13 meeting:

___Dinah Payne_____ moved and __Greg Seab_____ seconded to approve the minutes of the 8/26/13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Elaine Brooks):

- a) Dr. Greg Seab agreed to serve as the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian; Rachel Kincaid agreed to return as the representative from the Administration.
- b) Dr. James Payne has initiated a monthly roundtable discussion with seven senators. Dr. Payne elaborated that the whole point of the roundtable is to try to get information out to the faculty and to have an open discussion of issues that faculty have not vetted through their chairs or dean. It will be informal, with a different group each semester. The first meeting is Thursday, October 3 at 3:00pm.
- c) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be proposing several changes to the Faculty Senate By-Laws and will send something out around ten days before the next Senate meeting. One thing will be to change elections to the last meeting in the spring to allow the transition team the entire summer to work with the leadership team. There were so many issues this time that Senate Executive Committee hit the ground running; there needs to be a few more months to prepare. Connie Phelps, Marie Morgan, and Dr. Brooks are on this Senate Executive subcommittee. Hopefully, voting will take place at the November meeting. The idea is to put things in order, including the Website and SharePoint.

- d) Dr. Brooks attended the University Council meeting this morning and invited Dr. Gregg Lassen to give an update. Dr. Lassen thanked Dr. Brooks for being invited and would like to be invited back so that we can have a conversation. There is a lot going on, and they are trying to be as transparent as possible – communication, communication, communication. He will come as often as he can to have these discussions. We have some challenging times ahead of us; the budget situation is difficult with cuts over \$14 million in the last few years, and we would like to grow ourselves out of it. He has recast the three R's to recruitment, retention, and reduction in expenses. We are making progress in recruitment; it is not where it needs to be, but we believe that we are turning a corner and we can grow. Retention is an everyday issue; we can do better. He acknowledged that we have been working on the third R, reduction in cost exposures, for a long time. He is not going to be Pollyannaish about it – he cannot say that we are done cutting costs, but they are going to make it as transparent as possible.

The President has created two committees in which he will be involved. Both are action-oriented. The President asked him to chair the Strategic Agenda Implementation Committee. We have to convert these great ideas into action, and he is optimistic about our future. We have great faculty members, great staff members, and a great location. We have been moving from a state-supported model to a self-funded model. Our success is not guaranteed, but we can thrive in that new environment. We are dealing with change management in a change-resistant organization, and this is hard. The first two R's are easy; the third R is scary.

He will also be co-chairing the Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee with the Provost. They are still in the process of naming members, upwards of twenty. We cannot wait for the committee to do everything. RCM is a tool to let us analyze and reduce our expenses. He does not want to give details about areas that might be affected because staff in those areas have not yet been informed of any decisions. He looks forward to a team-oriented approach. He would like to hear about cost-saving measures and would like to implement some of them. Some things are nonthreatening, such as utilities and property issues, and we will do as much as we can with these. But some things will involve human beings. Of \$100 million in the budget, 75% is salary. His intent is to protect human beings first and foremost. They will cut unoccupied positions first, and there may be a freeze before they cut something else. There will be the least impact on human beings as much as possible, but it would be a lie to say that they might never have to impact human beings. They will focus on mission-critical. For some things that are not mission-critical they will have to make an item-by-item analysis to reduce costs. He is committed to the process. We will grow ourselves out of the problem. His door is always open.

5. Resolution on establishing a Lactation Room on UNO's campus (see Appendix 1):

Dr. Dinah Payne moved and Dr. Christine Day and Beth Blankenship both seconded to accept the resolution. Discussion followed. Dr. Greg Seab asked what the legal obligations are. Ms. Blankenship replied that the Affordable Care Act requires it. They already have a room (bottom floor of Milneburg Hall), and the resolution will allow them to get some funding for it and possibly a second room. No special equipment is required. Dr. D. Payne then moved and Dr.

Robert Montjoy seconded to suspend the rules, for which there was unanimous agreement. Dr. Vern Baxter wondered why the resolution was kind of vague than more specific, but the resolution was not changed. Dr. D. Payne called the question, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

6. Employee Recognition Program:

Dr. Brooks, along with Ms. Phelps and Ms. Morgan, were at a meeting with Ranzy Montet and others with the idea to create an Employee Recognition Program, and Dr. Brooks asked Mr. Montet to give us some information as to what this might entail. Mr. Montet said that one of the things that he was looking for when he got here was an Employee Recognition Program. We used to have one. He would like to partner with Faculty Senate and Staff Council to revitalize the program. We could start small, get buy in, and grow, possibly starting with an employee of the month and year, and possibly free parking also. Dr. Lassen had told him that he might be able to get him money. Dr. Brooks added that she will be sending out a written charge to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

7. RCM:

Dr. Brooks stated that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had met three times and had been discussing issues with the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee. It became clear that the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee should be charged with understanding the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM model as used in the University and compare to our peer institutions that also use RCM. Dr. Brooks expects that the committee will meet and bring their ideas of what RCM should be back to the Senate.

8. Committee reports: Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee on UNO Faculty Workload and Evaluation Policies (Dr. Vern Baxter; see Appendix 2):

Hearing no objections from Faculty Senators, Dr. Brooks invited everyone in the room to participate in the discussion.

Dr. Baxter reminded the Senate that a draft resolution was proposed at the first Senate meeting, and the committee was charged with drafting a revised resolution. Committee members decided that they needed to have a discussion of issues before they could put together a new resolution. They hoped to close out the deliberations and propose a new resolution at the next meeting.

The first issue has to do with distribution of effort. Several senators had raised issues about that, and the committee proposed three options:

Option 1 is pretty much what is in the current workload policy sent out by the Provost on August 20.

Option 2 is that the distribution of workload should be reflective of effort and that suggests a larger standard weight for teaching and a smaller standard weight for research while affirming the current university research mission.

Option 3 is that the distribution of workload varies across disciplines and programs and any policy regarding that distribution must originate at the college level in collaboration with the impacted departments and the Provost. The actual statement of workload may or may not include percentage distributions associated with research, teaching, and service.

The committee would like to have some discussion of these options.

Dr. Polly Thomas stated that her preference is option 3 because we are not one size fits all. She wanted to know what a director is, and it was determined that a director is roughly equivalent to a chair. She believes that Option 3 acknowledges that we are different across disciplines and that we as faculty, in conjunction with chairs and deans, should set the policy.

Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht gave a summary of the comments that the committee got. There was confusion about how the weights are linked to our actual workload; the 40/40/20 is not a direct reflection of how we spend our time. The College of Business prefers the 45/45/10 that the Provost initially proposed. Other faculty think that the weights should reflect the amount of time that we spend. The reason for not doing that is that it shifts what we value and may undervalue teaching and research. Some departments are producing research, but the latest realities have minimized the research in some departments, especially with the reduction in size.

Provost Payne asked if he could clarify some things. There are two pieces, the workload policy and the annual evaluation. The link is the weights. The reason that he placed the weights there initially is that they used them where he previously worked. The Colleges of Business and Sciences want 45/45/10. His concern is from the SACS viewpoint. Our mission says that we are an urban research institution; if you have weights not at least equal in teaching and research, it is problematic. The Board might start questioning if we are an urban research institution. But if one looks at the policy, one can shift the weights; the flexibility in the weighting scheme is really up to the departments. His only concern is that if weights are not reflecting substantial or equal amounts of research to teaching, if SACS comes they could say that we are not valuing research – are we a research institution?

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked if it would it be possible if different colleges had different weights?

Provost Payne responded that he was not discounting teaching, but he was worried about SACS looking at our mission and questioning how we align what we do with our mission. He reaffirmed that is up to departments to decide on the weights. Variability is built into the system and substitutions are allowed. His big hurdle is trying to get us over the SACS piece.

Dr. John Williams said that the 45/45/10 model is in their accreditation (Business), but it can still be addressed by department chairs.

Dr. Laszlo Fulop asked about the difference between a research institution and UNO.

Provost Payne answered that SACS looks at our Carnegie classification and at our research activity. The UL System has already put us in a high research category, and the Board of Regents sees us as a high research institution. Most of our peer institutions are urban research

institutions. SACS comes in and asks the question if we are maintaining our research status. Our tuition is so low. The UL system wants us to look at peer institutions. He thinks that we should look at the input side also, e.g., tuition. We need to price programs differently and get more resources for research priorities.

Dr. Steve Striffler stated that he was at an institution that had 40/40/20. We have to start somewhere.

A Liberal Arts professor said that he does not want to start at 40/40 but rather 60/20. The expectations of 40/40 match up with a 2/2 schedule, and they are on a 3/3 schedule. We will still be a research institution.

Dr. Dimitrios Charalampidis expressed his concern about the percentages used to weight the evaluation.

Dr. Andre Goss had two concerns about the policy: (1) One rigid policy that we all have to adopt. Some flexibility in colleges seems prudent at the departmental level; and (2) that .667 number is the one that he likes the least because it suggests that we can only move so far. It does not reflect the reality of being a chair. There needs to be more flexibility in colleges creating their own numbers, and the buyouts need to be weighted differently.

Another faculty member wanted to respectfully disagree on the reality of workload vs. evaluations. We are already competing for funding on a national level. We cannot produce papers and competitive grants on a 40-hour work week. For colleges that have a far higher teaching load it reflects a fundamental imbalance.

Dr. Montjoy stated that he has spent almost his entire career doing 40/40/40. There is no way to do a precise formula, even at the college level, because an individual's research patterns change every year. Even if we reduce it to the departmental level, an absolute rule would not work. He thinks that we need a benchmark. He did a site visit this spring where each chair worked it out with individuals, but the university as a whole was 40/40/20. It seems that a standard like 40/40/20 is a good one. The committee might want to deal with schools like Business separately.

Provost Payne said the .667 for the calculations was not just random; it is based on the teaching load.

Dr. Thomas asked if SACS require percentages of teaching/research/service.

Provost Payne replied that they do not require assignment of percentages, but they want to see that we are fulfilling our mission. The point of the weights is that we are lining up what we say we are going to do with what we do. There has been a disconnect in that happening. There is a second reason to do the weights that involves the issue of compression/inversion; if there is more of a ranking, we can prioritize and do some calculations, which would allow allocation of free resources sometime in the future.

Dr. Peter Schock's concern as chair of a department of 21 members who have research commitments is that if they do not meet the 40%, it pulls a person down. This is looked at as a punitive issue. He has successfully used evaluations in recent years in moving faculty to become more research productive, and most of them are back on track with research projects.

Dr. Eliza Ghil stated that they had a policy of differentiated percentages for tenured, tenure track, and instructors, and they thought that it was a method of acknowledging accomplishments of all types of faculty members. Since we have not had raises in years, this new policy looks punitive. Because there have been no merit raises in a long time, this numeric evaluation produces a feeling of persecution.

In concluding the discussion, Dr. Baxter did not sense a complete consensus.

Dr. Brooks added that there are many good opinions from which to work.

Dr. Baxter said that the committee will take the comments and come up with a resolution for the next meeting.

Dr. Baxter moved on to issue two: There should be a workload policy for instructors, and the committee believes that there should be two parts, one for full-time instructors and one for part-time. What is the mechanism for developing a policy?

Ms. Blankenship stated that we need a policy and it needs to be crafted.

Dr. Thomas said that in her college there are professors of professional practice who are not tenured and not expected to do research.

Dr. Goss added that there are a series of job descriptions like that. These include artist in residence and teacher in residence. He wondered if we are going to have something that comprehensive that encompasses all positions.

Ms. Phelps offered that the Library has a separate workload policy.

Dr. Richard Speaker wondered if maybe we should try to get all the workload policies in place so that we can look at them and possibly place them in SharePoint so that anybody can see them and talk about them.

Dr. Janet Smith, an instructor in the English Department, hopes that instructors are involved with the Academic Freedom Committee to have a voice. She also strongly expressed that we define what we do at the University, and our mission should reflect that. Telling the truth about what we do is very important.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked if we could move forward with the proposal. The answer was yes.

Dr. D. Payne added that she finds that instructors are a high asset in the College of Business.

Dr. Baxter then introduced issue three regarding the committee's recommendation that the evaluation policy be accepted as written.

Dr. Goss said that he read the finding by the committee to say that basically the framework works for us, but he believes that it is overly rigid for developing evaluations. They have been working in the History Department all summer, and he has not found any other institution that ranks journals. Most use 1-5, but 1-10 might be okay. The rigidity is not making their task easier.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht explained that the committee's reading is that those examples are not required, but that we need to have a 1-10 ranking.

Dr. Thomas asked if the document that we are referring to is the September 20 one, to which Dr. Brooks replied yes. Dr. Thomas then asked why grade distributions and samples of exams are important. What distributions are we looking for? The sharing of exams is pedagogically unsound. Also, there are no references to external funding. She thinks that this is a grave omission, and she is not ready to go forward.

Dr. Baxter asked Dr. Thomas if they could invite her to their next meeting, to which Dr. Thomas replied okay.

Dr. Goss referred to a letter from one of his colleagues that went back to the punitive aspect. This is going towards post-tenure review; UNO has post-tenure review, but it has never been part of the discussion.

Dr. Brooks stated that Provost Payne wants to make a change in the policy.

Dr. Goss responded that we have already made that change. He believes that our policy is in compliance with the UL System, and Provost Payne needs to know that.

Dr. D. Payne said that she does not feel that it is punitive. But the number of faculty that she has seen who do not work for a living – she finds that punitive. She would prefer to be unbelievably positive because the folks who are not doing their job will finally have to be rated for not doing their job.

Dr. Striffler said that it was not clear to him what is punitive. Do people want the numbers changed? Is there some process that would be better?

Dr. Schock said that what bothers him is that the existing post-tenure review is broken down into three areas, and he feels that the percentages put people on a track towards remediation. He appreciates everything that the Provost said about SACS and reaffirms the research mission, but he thinks that we can do without the weights.

Dr. Goss added that the document in front of us contradicts the faculty handbook on post-tenure review. Some awareness of existing policy maintains continuity.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht would encourage any other additional comments. Please send them to her to or to Dr. Baxter. It is difficult to separate those feelings of being under attack. What is a more effective method to do what the Provost wants to do? Evaluate people across disciplines, across departments?

Dr. Brooks added that Provost Payne extended his deadline to January to come up with a policy, and she feels that we should not be rushed to come up with the right decision.

9. Old Business. None.

10. New Business. None.

11. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50pm

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Oct. 16, 2013

Appendix 1 (Resolution on establishing a Lactation Room on UNO's campus):

Whereas applicable law encourages and/or mandates the availability of lactation facilities and

Whereas the University of New Orleans wishes to comply with applicable law and best practices of ethical business,

The Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans is fully supportive of measures to be taken to provide compliant facilities to satisfy legal and moral obligations to familial health and wellbeing for students, faculty and staff at the University of New Orleans.

Appendix 2:

Issues for Faculty Senate Discussion of Proposed Workload and Evaluation Policies, 9/24/13

To: UNO Faculty Senate Members

From: Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Professional Ethics (AFTPE)

Re: Issues for Discussion regarding Proposed Faculty Workload and Evaluation Policies

The UNO Faculty Senate, at its meeting of August 26, 2013, charged the AFTPE committee with preparation of a revised resolution for the President and Provost regarding a proposed faculty workload and evaluation policies, the latest version of which were offered by the Provost on August 20. The AFTPE committee met September 11 and decided that, in light of input from several Senators, further discussion of the proposed workload and evaluation policies is warranted before another resolution is prepared. The committee offers instead of a resolution several issues for consideration by the full Senate.

Issue 1:

The first issue has to do with the distribution of faculty effort in the proposed workload/evaluation policy. Committee review of input from several Senators suggests a discussion is warranted of three main options regarding the distribution of faculty effort (see below). The implications of this discussion go beyond simple agreement about workload distribution to engage deeper issues of faculty governance and the mission of the university.

Option 1: Accept as written that the standard weight of regular faculty duties is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Deviation from the standard will be articulated in workload assignment letters issued annually by Chairs/Directors to each regular faculty member.

Option 2: Distribution of workload should be reflective of effort and that suggests a larger standard weight for teaching and a smaller standard weight for research while affirming the current university research mission.

Option 3: Distribution of workload varies across disciplines and programs and any policy regarding that distribution must originate at the college level in collaboration with the impacted departments and the Provost. The actual statement of workload may or may not include percentage distributions associated with research, teaching, and service.

Issue 2:

The AFTPE committee recognizes that both full-time and part-time instructors are essential to fulfill the instructional mission of the university and they should have a workload/evaluation policy. That policy should have two sections; one for full-time instructors and another section for part-time instructors.

The AFTPE committee proposes that departmental chairs and instructors work with the Provost to craft the policy. Whether a workload policy for instructors should be crafted as sections of the regular faculty workload and evaluation policies or whether separate workload and evaluation policies should be crafted for instructors can be determined through the process.

Issue 3:

The AFTPE committee reviewed the evaluation policy. It found that the policy requires a 1-10 rating scale to facilitate comparison among individuals and departments, but allows enough flexibility for departments to develop evaluations tools consistent with their disciplines' expectations. It also includes a mediation process if departments, deans and the Provost do not agree. The AFTPE recommends accepting the evaluation policy as written.