

MINUTES**Management / APSCUF Faculty Meet and Discuss**

Session 361

Tuesday, February 20, 2007

12:30 p.m. – Bentley Private Dining Room

APSCUF representatives present were: Mark Cloud, S. Hicks, Matt Girton, Fay Cook, Howie Congdon, and Cheryl Orndorf as recording secretary.

Management representatives were: Roger Johnson, Bob Little, Linda Koch, Karen Harvey, Deana Hill, Sue Malin, Tara Fulton, and Denise Shoemaker

A moment of silence was observed in recognition of Ron Jury. APSCUF is giving a donation in honor of him to the foundation.

I. Approval Meeting Minutes for November 14, and December 19, 2006 and February 1, 2007

The approval of the minutes of November 14 & December 19, 2006, and February 1, 2007, was postponed.

II. Grievance Update

S. Hicks reported 06-007LH, 06-008LH, and 06-013LH have been voted to arbitration. In addition, it seems 06-001LH seems to be getting settled at the state level. This has not been received in writing yet. Talks are going on locally about finalizing details to settle 06-004LH, 06-005LH, and 06-006LH. APSCUF asked for an extension to file a grievance on the issue of the Individualized Instruction LART680 until the next meeting. Management approved the request for an extension. There is a possible individual grievance to be filed tomorrow afternoon.

III. Fall/Spring developmental program cap

APSCUF asked if M. Hanna Long is being kept in the loop. Management announced first that Haven Achievement Program (HAP) is a temporary name for the program. There is no formal cap. M. Hanna Long thought ADC could handle 120 students. If more than 120 are accepted, additional support resources will need to be found. Not all students who meet the requirements will be in the program. The intent of the program is to provide adequate support for a finite number of students who are at risk. APSCUF asked how the number of at-risk students is being determined and is it possible to have a formal cap on the total number of HAP students. Also, who is defining adequate support? Management responded that because of the enrollment process, it is very hard to tell who is the most at risk of the at-risk students and how many will actually start in the fall; the predictors are hard. M. Hanna Long is in communication with S. Lee and looking for a new faculty member and graduate assistant in that department.

IV. Classroom Behavior Policy

APSCUF's overwhelming response to this is it should be in the student handbook and Academic Policy and Procedures manual as a policy. Having it in such places will give faculty confidence that this is uniform across the campus. Management took "Policy" off the top and replaced it with "Expectations for," but it may be changed back. Also, because LHU does not use the word expulsion in the existing policy, the last line of this document has been changed to reflect a more generalized approach. It may be modified slightly to include Distance Education. M. Cloud will write a letter to Roger informing him of the Executive Council's response to this item. The President and the Academic Regulations Committee will be kept in the loop by management.

V. Assistant Deans and Assistant Provost

APSCUF appreciates management asking for feedback. The very notion of expanding the management ranks in the current environment where faculty are being asked to have larger class sizes and cut overload will not be received well by the faculty. It doesn't seem like an

environment where there are extra funds, especially when it is combined with a 10% increase in management system-wide (although that is not the case here). That being said, APSCUF recognizes management has a right to expand as it sees fit and if it exercises that right APSCUF does not feel it should come from the faculty ranks. Some issues of concern include, if it's a part-time manager will the faculty member be replaced, and what type of work this person should be doing. In the past, when there was a faculty member serving in this type of position, there were complications with having that person sitting in and leading meetings or completing certain documents. Management appreciates the input.

VI. Academic Landscape Project

Although APSCUF has not had time fully to review and absorb this document, it expressed concern with the process. While this is a draft and management is now seeking input, APSCUF would like to have had input in the first draft. Questions about who to put at the Courthouse Annex could have been discussed? Criminal Justice didn't want to move, it was clearly not voluntary and wasn't the kind of shared governance process for which APSCUF advocates. Some departments had discussions about space needs, but those things didn't seem to be addressed in this draft. Faculty are looking for ways to have a feeling they are involved from the ground up. It looks like as the result of the insertion of the Student Success Center in one place or another, there were wholesale ripples throughout the campus. Management responded it does not have to be wholesale, but could be minimal. One priority expressed was to keep the departments together, but that won't necessarily be the feeling if it means Courthouse Annex. Some departments have different disciplines that could be separated in some ways to be more flexible. Management needs to find out what the units would be and go from there. APSCUF believes something of this magnitude, should warrant a campus-wide forum as the best way to get some feedback.

VII. Withdrawal of \$500 Award for Presidential Awards

APSCUF reported it was asked in the last few years to change the name of the Faculty Awards Committee to include "Presidential" and now it seems there is not enough money for the awards. APSCUF has learned the provost's progress fund is paying for the presidential awards and is wondering why that is and why isn't it something that could come out of the Presidential Initiative Fund. It doesn't feel very "presidential" anymore. Management reported some money has been located to give awards, but it is not as much as previously. There are some restrictions on how the university spends funds. There could be other creative ways in supporting faculty, and it doesn't necessarily need to be in the form of cash. Management will inform APSCUF when it knows the amount.

VIII. Winter Intercession

APSCUF asked is there any more detail on how to go forward. Management reported the problems are technical. Whether LHU wants to do this is a large question. From a strict APSCUF perspective, it is an opportunity for more work for its membership. However, there are concerns about quality issues. For example, how to provide library support and what is the role of the librarians? How will the courses receive technical support? The original sense was it would be more Distance Education, but those students call the reference desk, so library support is needed. Management suggested an investigatory task force to look into the technical and quality issues. J. Mitchley, J. Theeuwes are already talking about this in terms of student aid, how to count tuition, etc. P. O'Hara-Mays, D. Hill, and some faculty members should be on the task force. This would not be a meet and discuss committee. Management is meeting with Clarion soon and will know more about it. The exterior view is that it is great, but management wants to sit down and talk more extensively with Clarion about it.

IX. Visiting Scholars Teaching Foreign Language for Credit

APSCUF has not had a chance to discuss this issue. It would seem LHU is looking for some accommodation to provide more foreign language teaching opportunities and to deal with visiting scholars in some way. It looks like management may be looking to come to some kind of local agreement. APSCUF believes that anytime APSCUF and management can come together in agreement to benefit the institution, that's all very positive. However, it has to be an environment where the desire to come to local agreements is mutual. Management and APSCUF ought to be able to get together on local issues for the benefit of the institution. Management noted this point. Management does not want to get out ahead of the foreign language department. It has been discussed, but the faculty members have not agreed this is something they even want to do in the department. This issue will need to be discussed in a future meeting.

X. Individualized Instruction

APSCUF is withholding its approval at this time, but wants to be sensitive to the students' needs. Management reported its intent is to handle thesis, by that or any other name, within the strict guidelines of the CBA and has asked the graduate council to devise a way to meet the conditions of the CBA and in the mean time try not to harm students.

XI. Budget Issues

M. Cloud reported a new item will be on the next agenda about the budget issues. He has gotten more phone calls from chairs about the cut backs and the increase in classroom sizes, etc, which does not jibe with the record numbers of enrollment. Why is LHU in such a budget crunch?

XII. Guidelines for Chairpersons for Personnel Planning

R. Johnson distributed a copy of an email that was sent to chairpersons. There are some things on the memo which have been refined slightly. The format for the annual report has been simplified.

XIII. Summer Pairing of Sections

R. Johnson distributed some guidelines [not "policy" to maintain flexibility] for summer pairing sections and asked if it seems reasonably clear? APSCUF approved the document.

XIV. Search Committee for Dean of A&S

Management is appointing J. Penman in place of S. Lee due to the need for her expertise in education on this committee. L. Koch is convening.

XV. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled in Bentley Private Dining Room on Tuesday, March 20, 12:30-2:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

Roger Johnson
Interim Provost and VP of Academic Affairs

Mark Cloud
APSCUF Chapter President