Full Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
January 23rd, 2023

Please email corrections to Faculty.Senate@nau.edu.

1. **Call to order - Kate Ellis**

   Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis called the meeting to order at 3:01pm

   - **Those Present:** Kate Ellis, Roger Bounds, Karen Pugliesi, Tarang Jain, Andrew Stevens, Pete Fule, Zach Smith, Kara Attrep, Blue Brazelton, Jon Lee, Karen Sealander, Sibylle Gruber, Kristie Wright, Taylor Lyster, Nora Dunbar, Carie Steele, Pamela Stetina, Stephen Meserve, T S Amer, Gretchen McAllister, Judith O'Haver, Emi Isaki, Juane Heflin, Karina Collentine, Stephen Meyer, Paul Bakke, Donna Simon, Laurie Dickson, Jennifer Rossetti, Victoria Damjanovic, Benjamin Keeler, Samantha Clifford, Deborah Mariage, Astrid Klocke, Jill Navaran, Catrin Edgeley, Julie Piering, John Tingerthal, Michael McCarthy, Katie Cinader, Gioia Woods, Maribeth Watwood, Michael Leverington, Lisa Tichavsky, Nicole Price, Scot Raab, Jennifer Duis, Joshua Emery, Ann Werboff, Blase Scarnati, Meredith Heller, Christy Arazan, Yvonne Luna, Cindy Ivy, Miriam Espinoza, Lisa Bliss, Sam Meier, Alice Gibb, Hal Tagma, Rodrigo Bastos De Toledo, Jason Bradley, Dawn Rivas, Sakenya McDonald, Aimee Quinn, Mohamed Mohamed, Corrine Gordon, Marjaneh Gilpartick, Neal Galloway, Genna O'Donnell, Sara Abercrombie, Austin Guida, Laura Bounds, Mahendra Joshi, John Georgas, Amy Rushall, Natalie Cawood, Jane Marks, Jennifer Russell, Michelle Mack, Oaklee Rogers, Blake Rayfield, Emily Manone, Mary Harmon, Natalie Cawood, Marco Geserick, Kristie Wright
   - **Those absent:**

2. **Approval of Agenda and Minutes - Kate Ellis**

   Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis motions for a vote of an approval for the Agenda and 1/21 Full Senate Minutes. **Agenda Approved, 1/21 Full Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Approved.**

3. **Faculty Senate President's Report - Kate Ellis**

   Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis elects to skip her Report in order to allow more time to discuss the Draft Workload Policy.

4. **Provost's Report - Karen Pugliesi**

   Provost Karen Pugliesi elects to share a shorter report to allow more time of discussion for the Draft Workload Policy.

   - 3-4 weeks ago a message was sent from the Provost office regarding the transition that is occurring in relation to online and innovative educational initiatives. This is due to the departure of Vice Provost Gayla Stoner.
   - To aid this loss of leadership for NAU Online and other programs Gayla Stoner assisted, the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) has instructed us to come up with a transitional plan for the future of NAU Online and Statewide.

- Gayla Stoners portfolio of tasks she has managed at NAU have been distributed to other Vice Provosts.
  - John Georgas will be overseeing NAU online and Personalized Learning, along with developing a new business and operational plan for NAU online that will be presented to ABOR at the end of this academic year.
  - Yvonne Luna will take on the leadership for statewide, and workforce development partnerships.
- Later this week there will be an Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Meeting, NAU will be reading their institutional and forecasting metrics for the future of NAU. Four new degree paths for NAU will also be shared at this meeting.

  Question: *In the FSEC meeting you discussed a report that you have received regarding NAU Online and Personalized Learning, will this be shared?* Provost Pugliesi states this is under review.

5. **DRAFT Workload Policy – Discussion Facilitated by Blue Brazelton, Parliamentarian**
   The Faculty Senate engaged in a discussion regarding the Draft of the Faculty Workload Policy that was sent to senators in November. Over this time senators were expected to share this with faculty and gather concerns, suggestions, and reactions from faculty members to share in the discussion.
   - Provost Pugliesi gives senators context about the document:
     - A task force was created specifically for developing and creating the workload policy began their work in September of 2021.
     - Work on this policy has included input from senators, faculty and the academic leadership assembly.
   - It is mentioned that a point to keep foremost when reading this draft policy is that this document is a framework policy that local departments will follow. This policy is meant to be broad so that adaptations can be made at the local level, since many departments are so unique.
   - Context is given regarding the priorities of the university, teaching being the most important. This is not to take away from the importance of research, scholarship and creative activities which is supported by the Workload Policy.
   - In the view of Provost Pugliesi and President Cruz Rivera, the work of faculty designing, advancing and delivering our academic programs is of paramount importance.
   - It is imperative to effectively meet student demand for coursework in order to maintain their momentum for graduation.
   - Provost Pugliesi shows an interest in the business of translating "assignments of effort" so that faculty have a full-time workload without being overburdened.
   - Provost Pugliesi mentions that it is not an option to raise tuition in order to provide students with classes and material that betters their learning experience and enables them to graduate on time. ABOR agrees with this and is looking to change a policy that would restrict the flexibility we would have in changing the pricing of tuition.
   - Provost Pugliesi answers a common question regarding the workload: *Is this workload Policy regarding college level or department level?* The workload policy was created to be a framework of all university workload policies. Departments will

- have the option to create their own, but it must follow these guidelines put in place to ensure the protection of the faculty in these departments.
- Discussion of enrollment metrics:
  - Compared to fall of 2019 we are down 9% in enrollment.
  - The headcount of faculty is up 1.5% since 2014.
  - These metrics do not represent each unit as a whole, only on a university level.
- Request that further comments that are not mentioned in this discussion be emailed to Senate Admin Andrew.Stevens@nau.edu

- <u>Questions, Comments and Feedback from the Senate</u>

- Ex-Officio Gioia Woods mentions a concern regarding deans deciding what policy the departments will be under. Suggestion to have the lowest unit (faculty in departments) create their workload policy, and have their deans approve these policies. Also, concern has been raised that the process for consensus, with the deans and other academic leadership in the faculty member's college, are not always trusted. What would happen if these leaders and faculty member could not reach a consensus on the policy that has been created?
- Senator Blase Scarnati suggests that we do not implement college level documents before a unit or program level, if a college level policy is created before, it may create a bottlenecking scenario where policies made in departments must conform to the higher level document's policies.
- Provost Pugliesi addresses these concerns with the section of the policy that states that the decision of specific department policies are chosen with consultation and in conjunction with unit leaders.
- Senator Mohamed Mohamed begins his point by thanking Provost Pugliesi and the FSEC for all their hard work on this document. He suggests the removal from the policy (Section F) that allows administration to count some classes as less than 10% of the workload.
- He also suggests that colleges should produce the governing document for all departments and programs, then the college caucus of senator's work with them to ensure they are created with faculty interest in mind.
- Senator Rodrigo Bastos De Toledo, discusses concerns from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS). Firstly, there are concerns of the amount of power of decision making that is given to the chairs and directors. Suggestions to combat this are a transparent feedback loop in which departments would work in collaboration to approve these policies. Currently, as the policy stands, it seems that chairs and directors have the power over these policies and even what percentage each class would be worth in regards to workload. Secondly, there are concerns of research faculty and that they are not being depicted properly in this policy. Also, questions on aspects of teaching that are being moved to the section of service.
- Provost Pugliesi responds and agrees with Rodrigo's concern regarding research faculty, they will look to insert something addressing these concerns. There is also agreement in looking to add a process of assessing these policies to ensure that they

- are achieving their goal of establishing consistency in faculty workload. Reassurance that there is empowerment that is offered to leadership at the college and unit level, this empowerment is regarding the creative use of resources that units have.
- Provost Pugliesi also address the concerns regarding a three unit courses lower than a 10% value regarding workload. She states that in most circumstances there is an opportunity, if a faculty member wants to teach something very specialized that may serve a small number of students, in the example given it was two to three students, and the faculty member would still like this to appear on their workload, this assignment could be given a value under 10%.
- Senator Tarang Jain discusses concerns brought to him by faculty in the College of Health and Human Services. First, there is a lack of consideration for professional clinical programs. There is also little distinction between undergraduate compared to graduate students and smaller class sizes versus large class sizes. A suggestion was made that standards for clinical professors and professional programs should be added to the document. Team teaching was also a concern, as this document does not take into account the complexity of delivering course with multiple faculty and emphasizing that all involved or present in class should be given that workload credit. The nursing department also suggested that we look into supervised clinical experience and student related activities required for the clinical and professional programs. Accreditation should be added to the section of nontraditional classes. Next, faculty meetings are essential to department success, and should be listed under service. Finally, many faculty are licensed professional and must continue their education credits to maintain their healthcare license, this should be listed under professional development. Travel time to clinical sites should also be noted.
- Senator Pete Fule brings up concerns from the school of forestry. Dr. Fule discusses the importance of this document and the clarity that should be put into creating this. Due to ever shifting leadership in higher education, it is vital that we ensure the document is worded in a way so as it guarantee it will not be used against faculty in the future. An idea is brought up to provide examples in this document to make it easier to understand it. There is concern regarding the mechanism of buyouts, when a faculty member has funded buyout of their course, NAU hires someone at a price much less than what it took to buyout that course, questions have been raised of where this money goes. Dr. Fule brings up that this document is strongly focused on setting a 3-3 teaching load, leaving little time for faculty to do research, these time barriers may be asking a lot on current faculty and prove to be a challenge when looking to recruit more faculty members. There is not a clear role for faculty when approving these workload policies at the college and unit levels.
- Senator Jennifer Duis brings up topics that her department has been discussing. Firstly, there are concerns regarding the 60% teaching load for research active faculty, this load may crush research activity. Also, there were questions about service on dissertations, capstones, office hours, etc. Question raised: *Since we know that teaching quality goes down when faculty are overloaded, how does it serve us as a university to reclassify some student related items as service to enable higher teaching loads?*
- Senator John Tingerthal agrees with Jennifer and mentions what was discussed with other Engineering faculty. John raises the question that since many student related

tasks are being moved to service, how will this impact performance reviews? In performance review, service does not carry as much weight as other categories thus leading to be less important, and a drop in the quality of teaching. What processes are in place to ensure that the unit level decisions are uniform and equitable across the entire institution?

- Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis explains the upcoming process for this draft workload policy. At the end of the discussion time today there will be a section to discuss next steps. This document will take however long it will take to be completed, there is no time line. If it is not approved by the time by the time of spring semester, we will continue our current processes.
- Provost Pugliesi clarifies to senators that a 60% teaching workload is the standard for tenure track faculty across campus. However, as is the case now, faculty will be able to negotiate for a lower teaching load in favor of research. The document states that Tenure Track faculty must teach a minimum of three units per year, and no more than twelve units per year (a 3/3 load). Research Faculty have a different load expectation.
- Provost Pugliesi was also surprised to hear that faculty were stating that many items were being changed to fall under the "Service" category, when in reality they were looking to do the opposite, bringing duties which have been assigned to service, but are directly related to the teaching mission of the university back under teaching.
- Provost Pugliesi also address the concerns and comparisons to other universities such as ASU and U of A. They have different policies due to the different goals that these universities look to achieve, leading to some policies at NAU will be less focused on research. We still support research using funds and resources to promote research, from both external funds and, internal funds.
- In this document, honoring faculty decision making and career choices are extremely important, thus giving flexibility in this document can assist faculty in these changes and decisions.
- Question raised: *There is inequality in all workplaces, so what will this document do to change that? What main contributors seen as the major changes and how will this establish anything different for the career track faculty?*
- Senate President Kate Ellis responds: This document is providing guidelines to negotiate between faculty members and chairs. There have been comments from faculty saying they have been overloaded, in all areas. This policy provides guidelines and limitations which faculty will use to negotiate there SOE's and so they are protected from unreasonable demands. This gives faculty the power to go to the chair and negotiate their workload, and if there is an expectation from the chair or dean for them to work beyond the guidelines of the document, the faculty member has a path of recourse.
- Provost Pugliesi discusses that the reasoning for this document is to create guardrails and to provide consistency, transparency, and promote equity amongst faculty members in departments and schools, colleges, and then the university.
- Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis discusses the variability of faculty weekly work hours. This document looks at averages

6. **Next Steps – Kate Ellis**

Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis discusses the next steps for the workload policy, along with addressing the positive and negative feedback of faculty.

- Senate President Ellis discusses how almost all feedback received about the workload policy has been negative, she was wondering if any senators had positive remarks regarding it and whether or not we should continue the process of approval.
- Ex-Officio Gioia Woods shares the large amount of praise she has heard about this document. Faculty members are happy to have protection and guardrails when negotiating with chairs for Statement of Expectations (SOE). People have a positive tone toward the implementation of ceilings and floors to ensure they are protected. The flexibility of this document enables units to create and tailor a policy to their specific unit. This urge to make the document the best it can be should not be addressed at negativity, but growth for the policy.
- Senator Aimee Quinn discusses how her unit it extremely excited regarding the policy beginning at a faculty and department level to tailor it to their needs.
- Senator Mohamed Mohamed advocates for this policy and commends Provost Pugliesi for her patience and hard work. He mentions many things he has suggested that everyone worked in collaboration with Provost Pugliesi and the FSEC to and implement successfully into the policy.
- Senator Rodrigo Bastos De Toledo thanks Provost Pugliesi for her hard work. One suggestion Rodrigo has is to look at add guard rails regarding courses that are valued at less than 10% of a faculty members workload.
- Suggestion that there will be a clarification in section F, the enrollment guidelines established by the office of the provost. Will this be in conjunction with the unit for the best pedagogical practices, or will we get guidelines before we approve this?
- Provost Pugliesi says that recent practices have dated back to 2008, which are eight students for a graduate course and 15 students for an undergraduate course.
- Provost Pugliesi asks a question regarding, what do deans currently do? Especially since there has been mentions of distrust between faculty members and deans. We need this collaboration and work with academic officials and these deans are placed to support and help faculty.
- Provost Pugliesi also raised concern about asking for every department to create a workload policy, this is a lot of work for the university as a whole.
- Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis will put the workload policy as a priority in regards to changes for the FSEC meeting in early February and bring it back to the Full Senate in late February.
- Kate thanks all senators for their hard work on this policy.

7. **New Business/Old Business/ Adjourn—Kate Ellis**

Kate Ellis encourages faculty to complete the Veteran Support training so that NAU qualifies as a Veteran Supported Campus.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:01pm
Motion to Adjourn Approved