CoCD Meeting

04/06/22

Minutes

Attendees: Rebecca Gorman O’Neill, Brian Hutchinson, Layton Curl, Sheryl Zajdowicz, Andrew Bonham, Elizabeth Ribble, Matt Makely, Andrea Borrego, Adriana Nieto, Todd Laugren for keah Scheunemann, Steve Beaty, Chad Harris, Chris Jennings, Ford Lux, Rachel Sinley, Grant Denn, Lynn Butler, Rob Preuhs, Deborah Horan, Jessica Rossi-Katz, Art Fleisher, Jess Retrum, Deanne Pytlinski

1. Updated course coding-guest Connie Sanders

Sent document with new instructional method codes

Aka Delivery formats

Group discussed what changes seen since covid and increasing online formats and varieties

Need approval from senate and curriculum committee

Student hub registration system and public search, can search by instructional methods (delivery method) hard to tell which online are synchronous or not

Main campus code and online---tuition same, but fees are different. This issue is out of scope for this committee.

Other considerations, veterans, international, on-campus testing, etc.

Proposed drafted options: in person, asynchronous online, synchronous online, hybrid online (classes delivered online 100% with scheduled times through live virtual meeting technology and asynchronous online instruction)

Hybrid in-person (scheduled times on campus, and asynchronous parts)

synchronous asynch is familiar to high school students from covid

hyflex-classes are delivered in three ways 1 in person; 2) 100% online using virtual meeting to attend same live in-person meetings and 3) 100% online with no scheduled meeting times. Students are able to choose and change their mode of participation throughout the semester.

Field

Self paced asynchronous online

Study abroad

Feedback??

Question about parts of terms—hard to see these in current system (Matt Makely) is this beyond the scope of this work?—not part of this scope, but do have another mini-committee (Courteney Rocheleau) to try to work with IT and Banner on a solution to that. Banner was set up wrong, so may either re-do Banner or go to Workday. Students also cant search by part of term. Going to try a new tool in communication module in Banner 9

Rob Preuhs—another delivery they would like to see is like the hyflex, but without the synchronous part. In terms of student registration, right now they sign up for two sections (?) what is the best signal to students. Essentially two sections, taught by one faculty. (stacked class). Have to work with Metza to get one canvas shell. Connie suggested cross-list the in-person and asynchronous. (College of Business uses)

Adriana—about the student hub part of term—asked for clarification.

1. Katherine McFarland

Strategic enrollment updates

Staffing

Have some senior leadership roles to fill-chief enrollment officer (underway)

Also exec dir of financial aid (candidates coming soon)

Additional fin aid

Student communication—

Pulling a 12 month calendar of communication—have working groups and a project manager on this. Looking to collect all communications going to students, put in calendar to look at opportunities or over-communication. Looking to automate as much as possible.

Support:

Announced this week—the roadrunner promise (expanding what we’ve been doing) this was in the early bird

Starting in Fall for students whose families have adjusted income of $60,000 or less, if first-year

Doing reach out to get them to fill out fafsa and cafsa—getting some good traction

Reporting, tracking, systems

Looking at success of marketing campaigns

Seeing if students apply, attend, retained.

Opportunities with events we are hosting in programs, partnering on funding and communication. Looking for interesting student stories, interesting courses, ways of learning.

We are inviting some who haven’t registered yet, can still participate in a job fair (connect with prospective students)

Questions: Matt Makely asked about the consulting in financial aid. Is this completed? What were suggestions and are we implementing?

A lot has been done, particularly around automation

Student verification process automate too

So that staff can serve more as advisors in fin aid

In spring, students were packaged much faster. Inbound call center wait has been low—indicates working, but more to do.

Also questions about recruitment/outreach at fairs at high schools, etc.

We do visits, and also community college visits

There is a calendar you can check out

In Fall, admissions staff is largely out on the road

We do have a small team, but looking to prioritize.

Made a note about Lakewood H.S.

Matt suggested maybe faculty who need service (though stretched thin too) could help

Adriana-on supports, currently if 2400 EFC or lower, we use this policy. Now changing. How is this being communicated to students? Answer—will be an automatic process.

1. Vote on workload -Grant Denn

Summary to reduce from 24 to 18

Opportunity to do even less with augmented scholarship and service

Questions: Brian Hutchinson, on page 1 says go to 3/3 with no increase, and then on page 3 read provost tatum’s desires, seems this is saying there will be increase of expectations. We need to vote with our eyes wide open. Is this fair?

Grant-this is the proposal that the provost is giving, but it is up to him

Elizabeth-Provost Tatum definitely wants increase in research. Not explicit, but apparent in multiple ways. Gave example where a classroom is being merged—to meet need to increase class sizes (despite no conversation with stakeholders, MTH and JMP—

knowing this is coming, we may want to decrease our teaching workload now.

Jacob—also on the committee. Agree, provost can increase expectations without us signing off on it. Also hear that what that scholarship looks like is determined by guidelines. Faculty also may have more bandwidth to deal with what we are already doing.

Jess Retrum-reiterate that when he brought up scholarship, asked us what is getting in the way of supporting faculty doing this. We would be better teachers and we would better serve our students bringing them in to our research. Heard him say I would like to remove barriers. Could interpret this as he has high standards for scholarship, but could also see this as wanting better for our students.

Elizabeth—also hears from CLAS dean as an expectation for more scholarship.

Matt-the whole thrust was to reduce teaching load. I have heard more that this is at the department level, whether the scholarship is increased. Down the road, our colleagues will be grateful for the reduction. Regarding whether we can afford this-Give Middlemist some credit, wouldn’t approve something that would bankrupt us.

Adriana-I do support. I have questions about process. Why didn’t the provost come to the entire council of chairs? Why only going to EC? This is not inclusive. But also question of sovereignty of our own guidelines. What is the role of the provost—can he come back and say, I don’t like this, add more. This is on the agenda in a few minutes.

No one has asked us for a vote, EC just felt this was important so that we could represent.

Layton—concerned that there is currently no funding. Spring 2023 is the latest implementation date, but this hasn’t even been approved yet.

Vote:

In favor of the redlined version of the reduced workload proposal?

Yes: 7 in person 15 online (22)

No: 2 in person 5 online (7)

Abstain: 2 in person 2 online (4)

So, yes. CoCD majority voted in favor.

Question—will this happen in spring 2023? Impression that wants this to happen

Concern-some departments will be winners, some real losers

1. Handbook revision task force

Vote on changes to Section X

Yes: In person-7, online 22 (29)

No: in person- 0 in person and on-line

Abstain: in person 2 onine-0

Passed

Questions feedback Section II-

about removing reconciliation meeting—what is the history of this?

AAUP—check it for consistency.

Comment from Senate EC—faculty are not present at the reconciliation meeting

Adriana—concerns about retention of underrepresented faculty with the clarification that those on a PIP cannot go up for promotion. (Deanne will look up what Chalane Lachuga’s response was and email to the whole body. Follow up—in response to that concern that faculty of color would be disproportionately affected, Dr. Lachuga suggested that there be an appeal mechanism. This was added to Section II).

Vote next meeting

1. Bethany Fleck and Liz Goodnick

About guidelines approvals process

Already made some revisions

Why necessary?

Trying to clarify and make sure faculty have say and vote in the process

The revisions reflect feedback from EC of Chairs

In particular, now input and advice of a committee (before just input of faculty)

Also added must be consistent with standards or expectations

Still retain, there must be a vote

If disagreement in college/school, need a faculty committee to decide at college level

Buffy-is the all department chairs committee—is it college or university wide? Layton made a point that one college only has one department—so committee of one?

Our experience is that this is not enforced.

Adriana-if it were, then that threatens autonomy of department

Intent is to encourage college level equity—who are we to say?

Greg-yes, it’s always been interpreted this is the Dean’s and the Dean’s college to review. So no reason to think it’s a university chairs committee.

Jess-perspective of CHAS—we have a basement, we all have to meet these minimum standards, then department can take it from there.

Back to the vote of faculty and approval –

All full-time? In second iteration-Cat I and II crafting (intention to be voting also)

Think about – should each group vote on its own, or as a body? As a body. If a cat II felt they shouldn’t have a say in cat I, they can abstain.

Jess—Cat II in her dept. just teach

Buffy—the concerns in EC about departments going rogue—this has been addressed by the reference to accreditation and handbook. Suggestion language changes to must, instead of should. Response: Maybe, but doesn’t really matter.

Does it have to be a committee or just all full-time?

Could be a committee of the whole

Committee size is not determined by this. Its up to the chair’s discretion.

Greg—does think it needs to be must. I don’t agree with the thought behind all of this. Taking this out of the hands of the chairs is inconsistent with the spirit of the leadership model, with chairs as managers and supervisors. No evidence of anything wrong with current system. So don’t support. This was discussed by the EC—the handbook does say Chairs have to have input of faculty for guidelines changes, so if they are not seeking that, they are in violation and should be reported.

Andrew—removing a tool from chairs authority is not a good idea, supported Greg’s comment.

Liz—not sure there is a huge problem. If most departments do it this way, not sure why it’s a problem to codify. Considering the workload reduction, there is fear that administration will change guidelines. Chairs are not voted on by faculty. This is timely considering the fears. We do know of some examples of chairs that do not seek input or ignore input. Input needs to be taken seriously. Understand some faculty may act in bad faith, but doubt it is most. I know there is conflict/confusion about role of chair. Is chair supervisor? Colleague? Administration?

This definitely takes a position—chair is more of a representative of the department. The leader, organizer, but faculty as a whole make the important decisions. So yes, this is what we are doing. Provost talks about the control over guidelines being with the faculty. Want to ensure faculty have a real say in writing and changing. Innovation comes from collaboration.

Send additional questions to Bethany and Liz—and they can compile those and send back to Buffy.