

Minutes of Mar. 9, 1994

1. Meeting called to order by chairperson Rost at 8:02AM.
Present: C. Anderson, T. Beckett, B. Brothers, J. Feist-Willis, D. Hovey, P. Kasvinsky, H. Mettee, V. Phillips, D. Rost, J. Zupanic.
Excused: M. Beaubien, K. Kougl, J. Scanlon
Absent: K. Sebastian
2. Corrections to minutes of Mar. 2, 1994. D. Hovey noted that the point made on p3 f was actually somewhat stronger than what the minutes suggested. D. Hovey moved that it be changed to read that we would ask the provost for clarification. The motion to amend the minutes was seconded and passed unanimously.
3. D. Rost reported on his discussion with the President and Provost following the FAC meeting in Columbus. He reiterated that the regents report is a wake up call to refocus on undergraduate education. The report does not mandate how that should be done at the department level. By March of 95 OBAR must be able to go back to the legislature and show that state system has refocused back on undergraduate education.
4. V. Phillips noted that her area might only be able to show a 90% distribution of overall time to teaching by leaving off all of the time they spend on research above a total weekly work time of 50 hours per week.
5. B. Brothers noted that this whole issue is not really a matter for the APC to be discussing. It is a union-management issue: The latest agreement calls for the issue to be addressed.

D. Rost admitted that he was out of line in bringing it up. Rost noted his frustration with trying to get across the point to the faculty that there is no specific mandate or framework.

D. Hovey argued that Rost was not out of line because the administration forced the issue by demanding that the departments submit their proposed policies.

H. Mettee agreed that it was appropriate to bring up DWP up at the APC. It affects how departments and colleges plan their activities. If they are having trouble with a DWP then we should try to help.

6. B. Brothers stated that the trustees need to take the first step. We do not want our departments to write the policy yet given what we have to go on now. We should wait until guidelines and a framework come from the top. The only guidelines now are the union agreement. The DAC will not attempt to examine departmental workload policies until they get guidance from above.

C. Anderson noted that while this was true, conversations should be taking place.

7. B. Brothers noted that in some colleges the student/faculty ratio may have to come up. In A&S bigger class sizes could bring other time modifications so research time could be allocated. If a faculty member has less than 36 hours of teaching time assigned then a form must be signed to account for the time.

8. C. Anderson and J. Feist-Willis discussed an excellent example of how a mission and goals statement in the School of Education will ultimately be tied into a workload policy.

P. Kasvinsky and B. Brothers emphasized that the mission and goals statement has to be done first. A&S still has a long way to go on mission and goals. We need to be thinking about quality not just the number of lecture hours.

C. Anderson noted that in two years the state subsidy model will be revamped to include quality as a reimbursement factor.

The mission and goals and university workload policy must be in Columbus by this June.

9. D. Hovey noted that the prevailing interpretation across campus is that departments should be writing their workload policies right now and should not wait for anything else to happen. This appears to be a 180 degree reversal of committees discussion today.

C. Anderson - B. Brothers is right, mission and goals first

D. Hovey - You mean forget DWP

C. Anderson - Yes, until mission and goals done

J. Feist- Willis - That is the message we got

We have not spent time on workload policy
except we do have a draft because we know
we need to look at FTE

10. On mission and goals H. Mettee noted that some activities including community outreach activities like judging science fairs might not rank very high on many departmental lists but they are important in helping the university achieve its overall goals.

B. Brothers noted this was a good example of the kind of activity that we now have an opportunity to work into our mission, goals and workload policy.

11. D. Rost announced that the Provost would like the APC to review the mission and goals statements. The review would not be for acceptance or rejection but just as a sounding board.

12. D. Hovey distributed a proposed resolution which will have to be discussed at a later meeting.
13. We will not meet during the next 2 weeks. Members should submit a list of the times they cannot meet next quarter to D. Rost.

Meeting adjourned at 8:53 AM

Respectfully submitted



Jim Zupanic
Secretary Temp