

MINUTES

Management / APSCUF Faculty Meet and Discuss

Session 354

Wednesday, July 26, 2006

12:00 p.m. – Sullivan Board Room

APSCUF representatives were: Mark Cloud, Fay Cook, Cindy Allen, Reynol Junco, Howard Congdon, Steve Hicks, Matt Girton, and Cheryl Orndorf as recording secretary.

Management representatives were: Roger Johnson, Tara Fulton, Linda Koch, Jill Reitz, Deana Hill, Bob Little, Alan Anderson, Karen Harvey, and Denise Shoemaker.

I. Enrollment Issues and Staffing

The agenda was moved at management's request as J. Reitz was in attendance for this issue only. J. Reitz provided enrollment information. If everyone were to be registered the head count total enrollment would be around 5125, which is right in the ballpark of where we were last year at this time. As far as remaining seats there are very few general education seats and many are overenrolled. Hold notices are being sent out. This is the first year we've cancelled scheduled classes for students who have financial holds. August 4 is the deadline. There will be some appeals that will be denied. S. Hicks asked if this is the year to start this policy in terms of numbers. This sounds like something that will upset the student count issues. R. Little reported we did do this in the spring. The auditor does not want us to admit students who haven't paid, so this is not new, but a tightening up on the issue. What's really new is actually cancelling the classes and giving back the seats. M. Cloud pointed out this issue will have students on faculty doorsteps. He asked is LHU still accepting students. J. Reitz responded yes. The financial planning was based on plus 80 students. At this point it is neutral or short 80 students from the plan.

R. Johnson distributed some initial overload information and by Friday management will send more clear information. We do have the faculty FTE and student FTE partially, but he wanted to call attention to the overload figures and say that the fall overload costs or annual costs are very difficult to even estimate at this time of the year, because overload is not calculated until the spring. In addition, it depends on who teaches what and the salaries of those faculty members. It is complicated. R. Little explained overload is viewed as complement, so it is in the complement process. H. Congdon commented he'd like to see what kind of overload assignments we have in the fall vs. spring. D. Hill reported HR will provide the historical information by Friday, but the 06/07 is not yet able to be done. S. Hicks asked LHU is still hiring. Roger responded we are still hiring, but we have pretty much eased up the slack. The overload that people are willing to do has been made known. He thinks we are pretty close and we are ahead of crisis schedule. The 259.09 for 2006 (on the overload report) includes all projected. R. Johnson thought Friday might be optimistic for more information, but hopes it is possible.

II. Approval Meeting Minutes for May 31 and June 21, 2006

The approval of the May 31 and June 21, 2006, meetings was postponed.

III. Grievance Update

S. Hicks reported an amendment for 06-001LH is forthcoming.

IV. Proposal to Change Graduate Faculty Load to 4 SH Credit for Every 3 sh of Graduate Course Teaching

M. Cloud reported in conversations about another grievance in terms of overload and graduate credit management suggested a change in the awarding of graduate credit overload. This was discussed at APSCUF Executive Council. It was considered a good idea by Council, not just for the summer situation, but also in terms of the policy in our current system, which creates a divide of graduate faculty and undergraduate faculty. We could have more faculty teaching graduate classes and it would encourage some of them to have a dual load. R. Johnson responded it turns out to be a little more complicated in terms of cost analysis, but the question is how much more and what are the benefits. Management would like to hear a little more detail and how it would work. This was Dr. Aggrey's initiative and it seems to have some benefits in terms of equity, but we're not sure how it will work financially. A person who teaches all undergraduate is easy and a person teaching all graduate is easy. The difficulty has come when someone teaches mixed loads. M. Cloud responded APSCUF will try to craft some language to get moving on this and maybe we can fine craft some language that covers all issues that need to be addressed. R. Johnson remarked he hopes to have more people teaching graduate courses, but there are financial considerations.

V. 2007/08 Academic Calendar approval

The Academic Calendars for 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 are now approved by both sides and can be distributed.

VI. Search Committees for Clearfield Director and Director of Distance Education

M. Cloud proposed the following composition modeled after the deans' search committees:

Clearfield Director Search: APSCUF requests 4 faculty; 2 elected from Clearfield campus faculty, and 2 elected from main campus faculty, in addition to 2 managers and 1 student.

Director of Distance Education Search: APSCUF requests 4 faculty; 2 elected from A & S, 2 elected from E & HS, in addition to 2 managers and 1 student.

There was a discussion regarding last month's meeting on this issue and whether or not said composition was agreed to by management. R. Johnson will report back on this issue shortly.

VII. Celebration of Scholarship Day (a class Day)

M. Cloud reported S. Marvel presented to APSCUF's Executive Council the ad hoc Task Force's recommendation and concepts for the *Celebration of Scholarship Day*. Executive Council approved the concept with some suggestions and recognizing the challenges that lay ahead as it is a class day and a lot responsibility to making it a worthwhile experience. R. Johnson responded there is a tentative date that would be the logical target of April 25 or 26. Koch expressed concern with students not having class that day and how they would react the night before. M. Cloud responded this is something the task force will have to look at as well as many other issues. R. Johnson reported the faculty intent is to have assignments with full student involvement with projects and integrating the activities in the syllabus. There will be some faculty members who will say I will teach my class on this day and that room will not be available, but it is hoped the majority of faculty will participate.

VIII. Computing services

M. Cloud asked for an update regarding the computing services issue raised at the last meeting. R. Little reported *Barracuda* is now being tested. *Qurb* becomes a very expensive investment in order to include students and there needs to be some involvement on local desktops, so that

was a consideration. *Barracuda* has a system wide approach and there is no good way to test it without doing what we are doing. Input is needed and the computing center needs to know that we are getting email we want. H. Congdon asked if the screened email goes somewhere where it can be reviewed for possible email that shouldn't be rejected. *Barracuda* makes a determination if it is known junk email. You will sometimes see Spam in the Re line. If it sees it for 200 times it will consider it spam. If something is there that is not Spam, then you let J. Heiney know via email or call him. He can make sure that it gets fixed. Or, you might have something you regularly get and are not getting now and if that happens let J. Heiney know. R. Junco asked if someone sends something that gets rejected will they get a message back from *Barracuda*. R. Little responded yes.

R. Little reported there is something in place now on the lhup.edu/discussions page. Go out and try it and let's see what we think of that.

IX. Locking Side Doors

M. Cloud reported after forwarding an email outlining the locked doors, concerns about the condition of the campus grounds, and an issue about the band members not being able to stay in the dorms. He noted the doors are not locked now and that is step in the right direction. The beauty of the grounds is better. R. Johnson reported the band members issue is not advantageous to them or to us.

X. Composition of Finance and Accessibility/Disabilities Committees

M. Cloud reported a draft has been shared for the finance committee, but it hasn't been shared with APSCUF Executive Council yet. Management has some modifications to that draft. Specifically, management would like to have B. Lloyd as a member by virtue of expertise and he has agreed. Executive Council will look it over and report back. M. Cloud asked about the accessibility/disabilities committee. Management will get back to APSCUF on this issue.

M. Cloud reported the President had recommended Parente Randolph to work with the fiscal management committee. It is a group that has experience in higher education. The dilemma is they've been doing our audit every year. M. Cloud is concerned there could be some conflicts of interest. His question is there independence. He wants an independent review of it. R. Johnson responded that is one reason we want Mr. Lloyd on the committee. The first consideration on the committee is for consistency. The investigation should red flag some problems and then we can work on accuracy. He is not sure we want to go down the path of auditing the auditors. R. Little responded Parente Randolph has independent certified public accountants and they come in to audit our financial practices. M. Cloud responded APSCUF was hoping to get some understanding for the committee, but actually carrying out something above and beyond what was done in the past. He will discuss the issue with B. Lloyd.

XI. Review Format for Dean's Evaluation of Faculty

R. Johnson reported about this time last year we brought to this group a format for evaluation by deans. K. Harvey distributed a copy of a draft evaluation and explained management would appreciate feedback on any of the wording and how it corresponds to the CBA Article 12. There is difficulty in interpreting the language, particularly with "effective" teaching. K. Harvey thinks they will be looking at student evaluations. Two examples of questions she looked at as chair when doing evaluations is "how much did you learn in this course compared to other courses" and "how well did this course make you think in depth about the subject." There are other means of evaluating effective teaching that need to be discussed. S. Hicks asked about the use of the word draft on the form distributed. Management explained the

initial document is a draft and then the faculty member will have opportunity to address issues. It is not considered the final document until the line “Delete this entire...” is deleted. The status of the document is basically determined by the faculty being evaluated and gives an opportunity for productive conversations with faculty members who have other things to say and disagree with the evaluation. R. Junco expressed concern with the line “please know that no documents may be...” R. Johnson responded that over the years we’ve become stricter and stricter about the deadlines on adding materials. We used to be much more lenient on that and we got into some very messy situations. If new information comes up it goes to the interview stage where the dean may indicate “pleased to report additional publications that did not make the deadline, but should be taken into consideration.” The deadlines are there and need to be observed. There have been situations where documents were considered at some levels and not other levels, etc. K. Harvey commented that missing documents is up to the faculty member to make sure the folder is complete before it goes to the dean. S. Hicks asked what happens if someone doesn’t respond. Does the draft become the real thing and get sent on? Management responded if it is not returned or signed, then the faculty member has a year without evaluation. There are presently six or eight that have not been completed. H. Congdon asked then if a faculty member can avoid a negative evaluation from the dean forever. Management responded it would not be in the personnel file. D. Shoemaker reported if it is a temporary faculty member, it is filed in the temporary personnel folder, but it still shows draft status. This will need to be discussed at the next Executive Council meeting and APSCUF will report back to this body on this issue.

XII. Faculty Duties and Responsibilities August 20-24

R. Johnson reported that because we will have students whose schedules will have been deleted and students will have appeals denied, etc management requests that faculty begin working on August 20. S. Hicks pointed to Article 23.1A of the faculty CBA. R. Johnson responded he is requesting leave papers be filed for those who do not report to work beginning Monday the week of August 20. S. Hicks responded that APSCUF will grieve this issue if management holds up to this.¹

XIII. McGuire Approvals

APSCUF approved the following McGuire Approval requests: (N. de Silva)

XIV. Individualized Instruction

APSCUF approved the following Individualized Instruction: (C. Hughes – HPED303 to be instructed by P. Auringer)

XV. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held Thursday, August 31, 2006, 1:00 p.m. in Sullivan Board Room.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Dr. Roger Johnson
Interim Provost and VP of Academic Affairs

Dr. Mark Cloud
APSCUF Chapter President

¹ R. Johnson subsequently rescinded this request.
Meet and Discuss Minutes