

CHSS CFC Meeting April 11, 2017. 11 am, Deans Conference Room, CHSS

Dean Robin Dorff and the following CFC Members were present:

Elizabeth Giddens (English), Brandon Lundy (Geography and Anthropology), Steve Collins (Political Science and International Affairs), Tim Hedeem (School of Conflict Management), LeeAnn Lands (History and Philosophy), Terry Carter (DWMA), Neysa Figueroa (Foreign Language), Dorothy Marsil (Psychology), Kenneth White (Sociology and Criminal Justice), Sarasij Majumder (ISD), Chuck Aust (Communications).

CFC Members Excused: None

Today's volunteer for minutes: Sarasij Majumder (ISD)

Previous Minutes:

Motion to approve–Ken White: Minutes (Brandon was the volunteer) passed.

1. Dean Dorff: CHSS update on initiatives, developments, policies, etc.:

Good news is additional faculty lines can be approved given the allocation of new monies.

Dean Dorff's suggestion to compensate the faculty members if they wish to give up offices did not get much support from the administration. Dean Dorff will continue to fight based on existing policy at Coles College of Business. CHSS will allow faculty members to have computer (desktops) at home as well as laptops and will provide docking station if they wish to give up their office. UITS will extend technical support to the faculty member's office computer and accessories. It will be voluntary office give up.

Dean Dorff has appealed at the Provost council meeting that the problem of space (offices and classrooms) must be recognized as a university-level problem. Second, faculty should be distributed across the two campuses. Third, dean Dorff suggested the domain approach to all things space should be ended. Offices should be occupied based on needs and not based on domains so that unused space at the university level can be used by colleges in critical need of space. Going forward with scheduling problems need to be solved by shifting away from domain approach because that creates lot of stress for the faculty and staff since scheduling cannot be finalized at the last minute.

Tim Hedeem commented that it might be easier to reserve space for Gen-ed because the sizes of Gen-ed classes are larger. Dean Dorff agreed with Tim and suggested that some of the lab based classes also need such advance space allocation.

Dean Dorff informed that the university is exploring “Pathways” for enrollment management. There will be waitlist for those who do not qualify. The waitlisted students have to complete 30 credit hours before joining KSU. The university is trying to decide how to identify such pathways—whether they should be determined by course clusters or by majors. In the case of cluster approach, students take courses that do not progress them towards an identifiable major.

Steve Collins asked, if there would be a cap on how many students can be accepted.

Dean Dorff clarified stating that the cap will be based on a combined matrix created from high-school GPAs and SAT scores and below the threshold there will be different gradations. Students will be admitted conditionally, unconditionally and rejected based on the gradation. The projection is that 600 to 800 students will not be admitted. CHSS will not get all these students. They will be evenly distributed.

Dean Dorff further said that CHSS gets large number of students who migrate from other colleges. This makes the cut-line trickier. Conditional guaranteed admission is different from transfers who go to the general pool. Allocation of seats is based how many students are admitted. Dean Dorff’s proposals follows North Carolina State University’s example. North Carolina State faces the same problem of students without College Homes—students initially interested in engineering major cannot clear the requirements then start exploring options. Engineering college for instance send these students on other colleges. Dean Dorff is going to propose that if engineering get resources they have to accept some more students.

Dorothy Marsil asked about the Paulding campus.
Elizabeth Giddens asked when will this start? Dean Dorff replied that the enrollment management will start in 2018 in a phased manner

Elizabeth Giddens said that this system raises lot of questions regarding advising

Dean Dorff replied that an enrollment management task force will be set up to manage the transition.

2. Ken White acknowledged receipt of approved CHSS bylaws and P&T guidelines:

Neysa Figueroa asked if there was any data available on the level of participation?

Dean Dorff said a large proportion of faculty voted and he was pleased with the level of participation by faculty.

Brandon Lundy enquired about the timeline to make changes at the department level.

Dean Dorff responded by clarifying that changes have to be made as soon as possible. While there is no hard deadline, the changes have to be in department governance documents at least before the new cycle begins (i.e. August 2017)

Tim Hedeem remarked that one can opt out of following the P & T guidelines by the citing the rule that one is following last two years' faculty handbook guidelines.

Dean Dorff said the changes in respective department's P & T guidelines should give primacy to the requirements of the discipline. However, the final forms that the department guidelines will take will emerge out of a dialogue and moving back and forth for alignment between the college and the departments.

3. Workload pilot model discussions:

Elizabeth Giddens wanted to clarify the expectations from faculty in different workload plans. And how will the workload issues be resolved in the context of merit raises. She further said that this has not been discussed in English. And Dr. Giddens asked if the workload document only meant for geography and anthropology or for all the departments.

Brandon Lundy replied that in drawing up the workload document, he followed the Coles College model. But this document is not a policy but guidelines for the chair. And these guidelines can be used to distribute workloads and assess faculty member's performance only after the faculty member has been promoted to "Associate Professor" rank. Dr. Lundy also clarified that the workload document is not suggesting any large shifts of teaching, research, and service obligations. It only suggests small shifts based on past performance.

Dean Dorff expressed his dislike for tracks. He directed the CFC to the university-wide workload policy that lays out that total number of courses that each faculty has to teach each year is 10. Factoring in RCA and services, we end up with six courses, Dean Dorff affirmed. Dean Dorff saw the workload document has the potential to clear the discrepancy regarding workload. He said that it doesn't have to look the same in every department

Steve Collins asked if this is specified in the draft document.

Tim Hedeem and Dean Dorff said yes.

Tim Hedeem and Sarasij Majumder enquired what role the guidelines will play when the chair of a department has to evaluate the performance of a faculty member in the context of giving a merit raise.

Tim Hedeem asked further clarification of how the workload document will work vis-à-vis a full professor.

Elizabeth Giddens asked if it is justified to base the workload document on past performance.

Dean Dorff said that the work load document is not meant for determining reward and punishment; instead what should guide the use of the workload document is a spirit of flexibility regarding a faculty member's willingness to change the emphasis of his or her interests in a given ARD/FPA year. He requested further discussion in an open and frank manner to ensure useful implementation of the document as and when required.

Ken White suggested the document should come from the Dean's office.

Tim Hedeem proposed that CFC can centralize the discussion on workloads

Dean suggested there can be discussion at the department level and the discussions can be brought back at the CFC.

Dean emphasized that a guideline on workload is necessary because the faculty, the deans and chairs should speak somewhat the same language regarding workload issues. Moreover, faculty workload must not be any different but can be differently distributed.

Ken White suggested there can be service task force to look at the service specifications

Elizabeth Giddens suggested service commitments should be taken into account at the time of merit raise.

Elizabeth Giddens also raised the issue of lecturers. She asked if the workload document will affect the lecturers. The workload distribution reassignment may put more pressure on lecturers. She also informed that lecturers in English teach upper-level and graduate courses.

Dean Dorff responded by saying that there is no easy answers to complications suggested by Dr. Giddens. However, workloads of the lecturers can certainly be negotiated at the department level.