Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes
February 6th, 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 3:00pm
   Those Present: Kate Ellis, Karen Pugliesi, Roger Bounds, Jose Luis Cruz Rivera, Andrew Stevens, Laurie Dickson, Rodrigo De Toledo, Donna Simon, Blase Scarnati, Blue Brazelton, Lisa Tichavsky, Gretchen McAllister, Tarang Jain, Gioia Woods, Maribeth Watwood, John Georgas

2. **Approval of Agenda and Minutes - Kate Ellis**
   Motion to approve the Agenda and 1/9 FSEC minutes. Agenda voted on and **approved**. Minutes for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meeting of 1/9 voted on and **approved**.

3. **Faculty Senate President's Report - Kate Ellis**
   Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis gives a brief report.
   - FSEC Member Mohamed Mohamed has stepped down as the chair of the Rights and Responsibilities Council, and the Co-chair position of the COFS working group.
   - Senator Gretchen McAllister has graciously agreed to step into the role of the Rights and Responsibilities Council Chair for the remainder of the semester.
   - Mary Harmon has agreed to step in as Co-Chair of the COFS working group.
   - Due to changes in work assignments, FSEC Member at Large Karina Collentine has stepped down.
   - Senate President Kate Ellis has begun discussions with Parliamentarian Blue Brazelton, regarding filling these positions or leaving them vacant for the final 2 FSEC meetings of the semester.
   - The Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) is having a meeting at Arizona State University (ASU) this Thursday. Senate President Kate Ellis will be attending this meeting.

4. **Provost's Report - Karen Pugliesi**
   Provost Karen Pugliesi gives her report.
   - At the last Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment meeting NAU presented four new degree paths, these were approved at this meeting. They will now go to the full board where a vote for their approval will occur.
   - The agenda of the ABOR meeting at ASU will also include a presentation of NAU's institutional metrics.
   - The final NAU related topic on the ABOR meeting's agenda is a vote for the approval for our enterprise and forecast metric targets. These targets were set in conjunction with Board Staff and Board of regents.

- Provost Pugliesi mentions the recent good news regarding the Mellon Grant. This grant will support our initiatives around indigenous peoples and fund the seven generations initiative.
- Provost Pugliesi announces that we are coming close to holding a public forums for faculty to discuss and voice opinions on the search for the new associate Vice Provost for curriculum and assessment.
- Provost Pugliesi also gives an update on the search for the next Vice President for inclusion, diversity, and engagement. Four candidates will be coming to Flagstaff in the coming weeks. In the period they are here, students, faculty and staff will be able to meet them and learn more about each candidate.
- On March 27th, the Early Childhood Learning & Development Center will be having a Grand opening. They will be opening up to 25 young students between the age ranges of 3 to 5 years old.
- We are continuing to move forward with the 100% career ready initiative. A proposal has been submitted to the elevating excellence committee looking to obtain resources needed for extensive work across the curriculums.
- Provost Pugliesi discusses the workload policy: She mentions a need to work with deans, chairs, directors and other academic leadership to engage with them in their roles regarding the workload policy.
- Provost Pugliesi also mentions the importance of the workload policy aligning with the universities goals in their elevating excellence 2025 plan. In this plan we have established an agenda with our priorities, this policy is aligned to meet these priorities, centered around education.

5. **DRAFT Workload Policy – Blue Brazelton**
   Parliamentarian Blue Brazelton leads a discussion with FSEC members and administrators to voice concerns and opinions on the workload policy.

   President Cruz Rivera provides the following comments regarding the workload policy.
   - President Cruz Rivera commends all who have support and worked on this document for the last 2 years.
   - This document is a manifestation of our goals to develop equitable policies and practices for everything we do at NAU. Policies cannot be equitable if they are not transparent and people can see the parameters that guide the decision making.
   - This document coincides with the investment we have made as a university into our faculty. Looking at the resources that we have to advance our vision and mission, we must look at budgeting our time, talent and energy of our faculty and staff.
   - We must ensure that our students have the classes that they need and the support to progress toward their degree and have good post college outcomes.
   - President Cruz Rivera commends the idea of a flexible document, so that different colleges and departments can form a new policy, based on the parameters of the university wide policy, which is best tailored to their department.
   - President Cruz Rivera also voices concern that this document should not be seen as a collective bargaining agreement. This document is being developed directly with the Faculty Senate not on a bargaining table between academic leadership and faculty

members. We want to assure that this policy will be set with guardrails so that it may not be weaponized against faculty and administration.

- Ex-Officio Gioia Woods support President Cruz Rivera's comments and how it preserves faculty rights, welfare and equity. She expresses her department's excitement for this policy. FSEC member Blase Scarnati also supports these comments.
- FSEC Member Rodrigo De Toledo feels that we are close to the approval of the document but wants to suggest edits that colleagues of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) wanted to share, these suggestions will be shared once the full FSEC discussion begins.

Full FSEC Discussion regarding the workload policy begins.

- Senate President Kate Ellis voices a concern regarding research-based faculty. These faculty need to have a clear outline of what the faculty contract period is, along with a special accreditation accommodation statement. This is because different accreditations are required for different programs, these can be standalone or separate from the workload policy because of these requirements.
- FSEC Member Blase Scarnati raises concerns about the opening sentence on paragraph 2, Section J located on page 7. This sentence goes against the individual department's ability to choose whether or not to use a college-wide policy or unit level policy that fits with the needs of the programs within the college.
- Provost Karen Pugliesi voices her concerns in requiring each department to create their own faculty workload policy.
  - Concern that departments all over the university may not be as well acquainted with university policies, thus making it more difficult to effectively create a workload policy. These departments would be potentially better off adopting a college level workload policy as their own.
  - The second concern is that allowing each department to create a workload policy would be an extreme burden on faculty, academic leadership and others who must review, create, and update these documents.
- FSEC Member Blase Scarnati voices his concerns and mentions a previous situation in a college where many documents and policies were created unilaterally by a leader. These documents then funneled specific and diverse departments into following the same policies, even if not effective. We want to put the strongest level of decisions in the hands of those it affects directly.
- Senate President Kate Ellis agrees with Dr. Scarnati, but brings up a new point. What if a department wants to use a college policy that is created bottom up, starting with faculty and departments? With such difference in departments, class sizes, curriculums how would it be possible to create a policy that would cover all of these?
- Provost Karen Pugliesi responds with the idea of creating cluster policies. These are policies created by departments that can be used for multiple departments. This would not be a college policy that could potentially funnel departments in but support them with a workload policy that best fits their needs.
- Ex-Officio Gioia Woods expresses her support for Dr. Scarnati's comments and spirit of the amendment. She also expresses a friendly disagreement with Senate President Kate Ellis, she believes that with department level created policies filtering upward

toward academic leadership, there will be more material and ways to see common ground and similarities in policies, in which a college level document can build from that.

- FSEC member Rodrigo Bastos De Toledo brings up comments that he has received from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS).
    - Concerns regarding the statement that unit level workload policies may specify factors that are general equivalency of 15% of the workload per class. One of the parameters considered for this, is student demand which can be related to class size.
    - This can cause faculty members, with smaller numbers of students in class, to be given less credit for their courses.
    - Setting up parameters and guardrails to prevent faculty members from being assigned lower than 3 credit hours for a course that is intensive, but has a lower number of students by design, should be implemented.
    - For example, if there is a class that is required for students to graduate, that currently has 7 students enrolled but has a 15 student minimum enrollment course. This course will still be taught, due to it being required for those students but the faculty member could be assigned lower credit on their workload because of the low enrollment.
    - Suggestion to remove student demand and either remove the lower proportion of work or add a guardrail to the policy to help protect faculty from that.
- Provost Karen Pugliesi responds by saying she believes that this is a very rare scenario, we could eliminate the word of student demand in this statement.
- Dr. Pugliesi also mentions a scenario regarding publisher provided platforms, learning platforms, and learning materials and assessments that 3rd party companies offer. These resources are used mainly in online work, and can be used to complete tasks, such as grading, teaching of certain material, etc. which would create a non-equitable scenario for those who are not able to use this but teach the same course and get the same percentage accounted for in the workload.
- Ex-Officio Gioia Woods agrees with Dr. Bastos De Toledo's statements and has heard similar comments from the College of Arts and Letters (CAL).
- Dr. Woods also suggests that we can alter the language in the statement of the policy where it says units are to determine the percentages and criteria of workload percentage for each course. Perhaps adding the guardrail in this statement could protect faculty members in departments from academic leadership giving a lower percentage of workload for faculty.
- Senate President Kate Ellis restates the concern of faculty members to the Provost and Vice Provost attending: there is a fear that a faculty member is going to teach a class, then this class has a low enrollment rate, but is required due to student demand and a need for this course. This can give the leadership power to give the faculty less workload credit for this course and lead them to be overloaded.
- Provost Karen Pugliesi also goes back to Dr. Scarnati's suggestion. She says that this was not stated to give power to the deans and imposed their policies on everyone, but the collaboration between departments takes a large amount of effort, and there is value in encouraging and supporting cross program collaboration to create better policies that positively impact multiple programs.

- Ex-Officio Gioia Woods restates the priority of these documents is to be created ground-up from departments, this can ensure that the faculty the policies are impacting the most have the greatest say in each department's workload policy.
- Senate President Kate Ellis suggests the FSEC Members to look at changing the language of this document and email the FSEC and provost where a vote for approval can occur.
- The FSEC will draft the necessary changes so the policy can go back to the Full Senate meeting in 2 weeks.
- FSEC Member Lisa Tichavsky suggests to add a preamble to the workload policy containing information from the President's comments.

FSEC member Blase Scarnati suggests this change be implemented in the Workload Policy

Individual departments or schools will choose whether they will use a college wide or unit level policy (or some combination thereof) that is fitting with the needs of programs within a college.

Other members of the FSEC Agree.

Motion to move this to the Senate in 2 weeks after language changes that were discussed in this meeting

This motion is approved

- Faculty Senate President discusses the next steps for the Draft Workload Policy.
  - This will be shared and discussed at the full senate meeting that will occur in late February.
  - After this discussion, if it is appropriate, a vote will occur on whether or not to move this policy to a faculty vote.

6. **FSEC Resolution – Kate Ellis**
   Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis discusses amendments for the FSEC resolution on DEI education.
   - Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis suggests and amendment to change the language from "liberal" studies to "general" studies. The goal of the document is to be heard and read by those and changing language to be less combative can encourage everyone to read and understand the content. This is also the language that the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) uses.
   - Other members of the FSEC agree and this change is made.
   - This document, if approved, will be forwarded to Chair Manson and Penny Dolin, the Faculty Senate President of Arizona State University.
   - Faculty Senate President Kate Ellis thanks all FSEC members for their hard work on this resolution.

   Motion to approve this Resolution.

   This Resolution is approved.

7. Council and Committee Reports—Elections
No reports from any Councils or Committees.

8. New Business/Old Business/ Adjourn—Kate Ellis

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:54pm
Motion to Adjourn Approved