FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes
3/13/07

Present: Marian Harris, Bob Howard, Marinilka Kimbro, Cathy Tashiro
Absent: Steve Hanks, Johann Reusch
Recorded by Cathy Tashiro

This meeting was entirely devoted to reports on program feedback on Draft Workload Policy. In general, faculty feedback was positive about the concept of a workload policy and the importance of demonstrating the full range of faculty workload. While there was some wariness expressed about the specificity of credit assignments, it was felt that this policy represents an important first step. While there was support for the concept of a workload policy, faculty expressed some specific concerns and suggestions for improvement, which are listed below.

CSS
- Document should indicate what the baseline level of scholarship should be. Reductions in workload should be to compensate for scholarship and service beyond the baseline expectations for tenure-track faculty.
- Publications considered a part of baseline scholarship expectations – how would we define what is above and beyond the reasonable here?
- As it stands, it is unrealistic from a funding perspective, and if piloted in one program, would actually detract from the goal of parity across programs.

Nursing
- Workload decisions best done at the program level.
- Policies should be broad, general, and flexible enough to meet the needs of different programs.
- Concern about effect on distribution of resources to programs and subsidizing other programs.
- Deprofessionalizes what we do, increases competition, and we get credit for scholarship and service through merit and promotion.
- Other areas that should be included: membership on 3rd-yr. review committees, doctoral committees, review of manuscripts, review of P&T files from other institutions, leadership on national or international professional committees and organizations.
- Can we ever make a list that's all-inclusive?
- 3-credit classes may demand as much or more work as 5-credit classes.
- General concern about the disproportionate impact on smaller programs of service expectations for committees that need a rep from each program.
- Supportive of the concept of making all that we do visible.

Education
- It's unprofessional to quantify, can't and shouldn't be done.

- We can handle this informally, and don't need to quantify. Professional expectations will create equitable workload.
- Can it be done? Can we ever quantify accurately and fairly quantify everything we do.

Social Work
- 20% salary recapture for one-course buyout seems high to me. Should be closer to the real cost, i.e., 16.67%
- Question about timing of credit for scholarship – following year? Refereed or not? Do chapters have to be refereed?
- Credits vs. course releases in document?
- Difficult to quantify that which is qualitative in nature.
- Some of the service tasks listed in first section not mentioned in workload reduction part.
- 3 years of teaching individually-developed course – consecutive or not? Potential conflict between 2 principles on teaching new and low course enrollment.
- Concern about how to determine significance of workload of committees.

Business
- Credits towards academic workload should be viewed as broad guidelines, not statutorily defined.
- Instead of looking at workload in terms of course credits, define in terms of courses.
- Unrealistic, will never happen, not enough resources.

IAS
- Need to include international seminars and lectures.
- Is it really viable to be assured of teaching a course we develop for 3 years?
- How are independent studies credited?
- What about concentration coordinators?
- Development of the CORE has been incredibly time consuming and should be compensated.
- Dislike the direction because of the complexities of assigning credits – who will check, how to decide equivalencies when on paper people are doing the same things, but are putting in vastly different efforts, etc.