

## **CLA Senate Meeting Minutes: Monday, September 17 2018**

### **1. Approval of Agenda**

Agenda approved unanimously at 2:31 PM.

### **2. Approval of the minutes from May 2018**

Approved unanimously at 2:31 PM.

### **3. Dean's Report**

The Dean's report consists of three items:

#### *1. The Chancellor's goals*

The Dean reports that despite being hired on July 1, the Interim Chancellor was required to submit a set of goals for UMB by July 7, just six days later. She set 10 goals, ranging from fundraising to expanding student success. Some of these, the Dean notes, were effectively determined by the President's Office. The Provost and Deans met to discuss her goals in August, and by Oct 1 the Dean is expected to clarify CLA's role in meeting these goals. In addition to seeking faculty feedback via the Chairs, the Dean is eager to emphasize the ways in which CLA already meets many of these goals. For example, the CLA First! Program exemplifies expanding student success: it has improved graduation rates, and likely retention too.

The Moderator asks whether the Interim Chancellor had the opportunity to obtain outside consultation in setting these goals. The Dean thinks not.

#### *2. The Provost's Academic Master Plan*

The Dean reports that the Provost has been working on an academic master plan with the express goal of helping departments make necessary programmatic changes. Given that some of these changes get stuck in governance, the Dean would like to see an expedited process for small, zero-cost, "no brainer" curricular and programmatic changes. He notes the way in which this plan is separate from, but linked to the Chancellor's goals.

The Moderator asks whether faculty are involved in this planning. The Dean responds that he would "hope so", but, at present, the Provost is thinking through framework issues. For example, how should decisions be made about approving or "sunsetting" certain program proposals. The Moderator emphasizes the importance of faculty involvement in such planning even at this early stage. She offers to find faculty volunteers to serve.

### 3. *AQUAD revamp*

Finally, the Dean notes that the Provost is working to revamp the AQUAD process, specifically in the development and assessment of learning outcomes.

In addition to these three main points, the Dean reports that 20% of available funds have been reserved for “targets of opportunity”—that is, faculty of color who show up as part of the hiring process (e.g. spousal hires).

After finishing his report, the Dean takes questions from the CLA Senate.

The Moderator asks how many lines CLA got this year. The Dean reports that he is allowed to search for six, possibly seven people this year. The seventh search is joint with the School of Environment. The Dean explains that Administration and Finance are committed to not adding to the budget, and so only approved revenue-neutral lines, not replacement ones. The Dean hopes that our academic master plan will enable CLA to make a more compelling case for replacement lines. He points out that where money is being saved, Administration and Finance are investing in development, not academic hires.

The Moderator also asks whether our new Chancellor is an Interim or Permanent Chancellor. The Dean confesses that he does not know, but that it will likely depend on how well she does. However, he points out that unlike Chancellor Mills, she does not plan to act as an Interim Chancellor. Following up on the Moderator’s question, a Senator asks how the faculty can get more information about whether the Chancellor and Provost are Interim. The Dean notes that, like the faculty, he’s in the dark, but he suspects that information will come via the Faculty Council and the Faculty Staff Union.

A Senator asks the Dean whether the future of UMB Centers and Institutes are in the Provost’s academic master plan. The Dean thinks that there will be a task force on these issues. The Senator expresses concern at the lack of faculty involvement in these decisions. The Dean responds that he thought that a *faculty* task force was being instituted; the Senator reports a rumor they had heard that the task force was administration only.

A Senator asks whether either the academic plan or Chancellor’s goals will look at resources for the faculty. As far as he knows, these are not part of either, but the Dean emphasizes that he’s looking to get that piece from the faculty. He notes that the sticking point is cost. The Senator follows up, asking whether there is a channel to the Chancellor to suggest revenue neutral ideas to free up faculty resources. The Dean offers to be that channel. He notes, again, that he is under pressure to cut costs, but revenue neutral ideas might fly.

A Senator asks about the goal to increase revenue via online classes and notes, as an online instructor personally, that course caps increased by 10 without warning. The Senator asks who is overseeing this. The Dean responds that much of this decision-making is happening at the Chancellor level. The question is: why is there such a gap in online class sizes when compared to in person classes? The Senator points out that there are important pedagogical reasons that provide an answer, but asks whether faculty will have a say in online class sizes. The Dean points out that Chairs set class sizes and that in terms of revenue the focus is not online classes but large, revenue generating programs (like that in Nursing).

The Dean's visit closes with the Moderator asking the Dean to report back on the Provost's academic master plan meeting and urges him to push for faculty inclusion.

Dean's Report ends 3:18PM.

#### **4. Moderator's Report**

The Moderator invites the Senators to introduce themselves, before explaining their responsibilities as committee members. She then outlines the roles and responsibilities of the four CLA Senate Committees: Academic Affairs, Majors and Honors, Budget and Planning Review, and Standards and Credits.

The Moderator then turns the floor over to Karen Delaney, from the Registrar's Office, to outline the development of an online one-form via Curriculog Software. After providing some history of the process, the involvement of UMass Lowell and Dartmouth, and the well known difficulties with the one-form, Ms. Delaney explains that the electronic one-form will not be a smart form, but rather a form that guides completion via a number of questions. For example, the person completing the form will be asked, "Is this a new course or course change?" The form is linked to the PeopleSoft Catalog, and so it will inform the person completing it whether the course number selected is already active. Moreover, Ms. Delaney explains, the process has "work flow" built in. By logging in to the system, you will be able to track your course through governance. Furthermore, committee chairs can send back edits to the faculty member, and the faculty member can make the necessary revisions to the one-form within the system. All in all, the vendor is building a streamlined system that is responsive to the needs of our faculty, our oversight committees, as well as the Registrar's Office.

The Moderator asks whether there is still time to shape the questions. Ms. Delaney says that there is, adding that it would be especially helpful to understand common problems with the existing one-form.

Karen Delaney's report ends at 3:36PM

The Moderator asks a Senator to bring the CLA Senate up to speed on the Philosophy department's response to the Provost's memo requesting that CLA departments provide comparative department data of teaching effectiveness in tenure and promotion cases. The Senator reports that last year the Philosophy Department had a tenure case held up by the Provost for not providing comparative department data on teaching effectiveness, despite the fact that the department was not aware of any policy requiring that this information be collected and provided. After much back and forth, the case was allowed to go through, but the Provost followed up with a memo to CLA Chairs *requesting* that these data be collected and provided in all tenure and promotion cases going forward. In response, the Philosophy Department wrote a memo expressing serious concern with this request, summarizing a slew of social science research showing that quantitative data from student teaching evaluations measure discrimination (in particular, gender bias), not teaching effectiveness, and so ought to have no place in tenure and promotion cases. Two members of the Philosophy Department met with the Provost, and she was responsive to the data and their concerns, but noted that she needed a "metric of convenience." The Philosophy Department, along with allies in other departments, are committed to fighting this development

#### **6. Motion from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following NEW courses:**

After the Moderator explains what Senator should be looking for when reviewing courses, THRARTS 140 is approved unanimously.

Discussion of new course approvals ends 3:44 PM

#### **7. Motion from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following changes to existing courses:**

THRARTS 105

THRARTS 205

THRARTS 305

THRARTS 405

The Moderator proposes that the course changes be approved as a block. That motion is approved unanimously. The Moderator proposes that the course changes be approved. That motion is approved unanimously.

Discussion of changes to existing courses ends 3:50 PM.

#### **8. New Business**

The meeting closes with the Moderator asking if there is any new business. A Senator asks if the dorms are just for first year students, and inquires about what will happen to the students living there now? A Senator, currently living in the dorms, confirms that they are just for first year students, but that transition work is being completed with these students to foster independent living.

The meeting ends at 4PM