UNIVERSITY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
March 10, 2025

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in 111 Harrison Hall on Monday, March 10, 2025. Members absent: Will Brinley, Kevin Brinley, Cheryl Chafin, Mastano Dzimbiri, Brad Goldie, Michael Gowins, Patrick Houlihan, Haim Kassa, Jeffrey Kuznekoff, David Motta, Thomas Poetter, Nelchi Prashai, Ganiva Reyes, Andrea Ridilla, Caitlin Spyra, Scott Walter, Bev Wilgenbush, Tammy Patterson

1. **Call to Order and Announcements and Remarks** – Rosemary Pennington, Chair of University Senate Executive Committee
   a. The CIM information regarding Computer Science PhD has been updated and was available to you prior to this meeting.
   b. Spring is very busy for us and it will be a pretty rapid pace as we will be meeting pretty much every Monday in April and the first Monday in May. We ask that everyone please keep in mind the following:
      i. When asking questions, only ask a single question. If we have time, I will circle back to you for additional questions.
      ii. Also, if you have comments that you would like to make prior to Senate, we ask that you be mindful and keep those speeches to 2 minutes in accordance with our laws and so that we can get through the work that we are called here to do.

2. **Approval of University Senate Minutes**
   a. University Senate Full Meeting Minutes_02.24.2025 (Results: 44 - yes, 00 - no, 00 - abstain)

3. **Consent Calendar:** The following items were received and accepted on the Consent Calendar:
   a. Curricular Items 02/26/2025
   b. Graduate Council Minutes 02/25/2025
   c. LEC Meeting Minutes 02/18/2025
   d. LEC Meeting Minutes 02/25/2025

4. **Old Business**
   a. SR 25-12 CSE - Computer Science, Doctor of Philosophy, Tim Cameron, Associate Dean and Professor, Marnie Saunder, Associate Dean and Professor, and Beena Sukumaran, Dinesh & Ila Palival Dean of the College of Engineering & Computing - The curriculum document can be accessed at https://nextbulletin.miamioh.edu/programadmin/ - click on 'title' and type **Computer Science*'** in the Search section. Click on 'Computer Science, Doctor of Philosophy'. ***Discussion and Anticipated Vote on March 10, 2025*** - (Results: 33-Yes, 00-No, 10-Abstain)
      i. Agenda
         1. Support from Department
            a. Support from CSE Department: 25 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 maybe's

b. CSE allowed all voting members of the department to vote, including TCPLs. Of those who voted, it was close to 50-50 TT/TCPL.

2. Workforce Considerations for PhDs in Computer Science

    a. Employment Trends for Computer Science PhDs - graph provided in slideshow presentation

    b. Initial Median Salary for PhDs - 2 graphs provided in slideshow presentation

    c. Median basic annual salary for research doctorate recipients with definite post-graduation plans for non-postdoc employment in the United States, by broad field of doctorate and employment sector: 2023

        i. Field of doctorate

            1. Doctorate recipients reporting annual salary

                a. Total with definite Plan - A = 100,000

                b. Academe = 72,200

                c. Industry or business - B = 124,000

                d. Government = 94,662

                e. Nonprofit organization = 90,000

                f. Other or unknown - C = 80,000

            2. Science and engineering

                a. Total with definite Plan - A = 110,000

                b. Academe = 75,000

                c. Industry or business - B = 125,000

                d. Government = 95,000

                e. Nonprofit organization = 99,000

                f. Other or unknown - C = 73,549

            3. Agricultural sciences and natural resources

                a. Total with definite Plan - A = 85,000

                b. Academe = 70,500

                c. Industry or business - B = 97,000

                d. Government = 78,250

                e. Nonprofit organization = 78,372

                f. Other or unknown - C = 55,500

            4. Biological and biomedical sciences

                a. Total with definite Plan - A = 110,000

                b. Academe = 67,750

                c. Industry or business - B = 120,000

                d. Government = 83,000

                e. Nonprofit organization = 84,000

                f. Other or unknown - C = 58,500

            5. Computer and information sciences

a. Total with definite Plan - A = 160,000
b. Academe = 100,000
c. Industry or business - B = 170,000
d. Government = 130,000
e. Nonprofit organization = 126,000
f. Other or unknown - C = D

6. Engineering
a. Total with definite Plan - A = 120,000
b. Academe = 90,000
c. Industry or business - B = 125,000
d. Government = 101,396
e. Nonprofit organization = 110,000
f. Other or unknown - C = 81,000

7. Geosciences, atmospheric, and ocean sciences
a. Total with definite Plan - A = 82,000
b. Academe = 65,000
c. Industry or business - B = 110,000
d. Government = 79,000
e. Nonprofit organization = 100,000
f. Other or unknown - C = D

8. Health
a. Total with definite Plan - A = 95,000
b. Academe = 82,000
c. Industry or business - B = 115,000
d. Government = 100,000
e. Nonprofit organization = 101,000
f. Other or unknown - C =96,000

9. Mathematics and statistics
a. Total with definite Plan - A = 120,000
b. Academe = 65,800
c. Industry or business - B = 145,000
d. Government = 110,000
e. Nonprofit organization = 110,000
f. Other or unknown - C = D

10. Multidisciplinary/ Interdisciplinary sciences
a. Total with definite Plan - A = 129,000
b. Academe = 90,000
c. Industry or business - B = 150,500
d. Government = 103,000
e. Nonprofit organization = 100,000
f. Other or unknown - C = 75,000

11. Physical sciences

      a. Total with definite Plan - A = 115,000
      b. Academe = 65,000
      c. Industry or business - B = 120,000
      d. Government = 94,000
      e. Nonprofit organization = 107,000
      f. Other or unknown - C = 72,198

12. Psychology
      a. Total with definite Plan - A = 80,000
      b. Academe = 70,000
      c. Industry or business - B = 100,000
      d. Government = 80,000
      e. Nonprofit organization = 90,750
      f. Other or unknown - C = 72,000

13. Social sciences
      a. Total with definite Plan - A = 85,000
      b. Academe = 73,000
      c. Industry or business - B = 125,000
      d. Government = 100,000
      e. Nonprofit organization = 95,000
      f. Other or unknown - C = 75,000

14. Non-science and engineering
      a. Total with definite Plan - A = 75,000
      b. Academe = 70,000
      c. Industry or business - B = 92,000
      d. Government = 93,000
      e. Nonprofit organization = 77,000
      f. Other or unknown - C = 82,000

15. Business
      a. Total with definite Plan - A = 140,000
      b. Academe = 139,500
      c. Industry or business - B = 160,000
      d. Government = 150,000
      e. Nonprofit organization = 140,000
      f. Other or unknown - C = 157,500

16. Education
      a. Total with definite Plan - A = 76,700
      b. Academe = 70,000
      c. Industry or business - B = 85,000
      d. Government = 90,000
      e. Nonprofit organization = 84,000
      f. Other or unknown - C = 88,000

17. Humanities

        a. Total with definite Plan - A = 60,000

        b. Academe = 58,500

        c. Industry or business - B = 72,500

        d. Government = 79,245

        e. Nonprofit organization = 63,427

        f. Other or unknown - C = 58,000

18. Visual and performing arts

        a. Total with definite Plan - A = 60,000

        b. Academe = 57,000

        c. Industry or business - B = 70,000

        d. Government = D

        e. Nonprofit organization = 50,000

        f. Other or unknown - C = 57,500

19. Other non-science and engineering

        a. Total with definite Plan - A = 74,230

        b. Academe = 69,750

        c. Industry or business - B = 90,000

        d. Government = 93,000

        e. Nonprofit organization = 92,000

        f. Other or unknown - C = 74,000

    ii. And, the unemployment rate for computer science PhDs in the United States was 1.6% in 2021. This is based on data from the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Survey of Doctorate Recipients.

    iii. D = suppressed to avoid disclosure of confidential information.

    iv. A = Total with definite plan includes doctorate recipients who did not report employment sector.

    v. B Industry or business includes doctorate recipients reporting self-employment.

    vi. C = Other is mainly composed of elementary and secondary schools.

3. Current Graduate Degrees Awarded in CEC - See graph provided in slideshow presentation

4. Budget Impact Statement

    i. Projected Enrollment

        1. Head-count full time

            a. AY25-26 - Year 1 = 2

            b. AY26-27 - Year 2 = 6

            c. AY27-28 - Year 3 = 10

            d. AY28-29 - Year 4 = 14

        2. Head-count part time

-   ii.   Projected Program Income
  1. *Tuition (paid by student or sponsor)
     a. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $41,269
     b. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $126,282
     c. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $193,262
     d. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $262,005
-   iii.   Expected state subsidy
  1. Other income (if applicable, describe in narrative section below)
     a. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $5,330
     b. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $5,330
     c. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $5,330
     d. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $5,330
  2. *Tuition Assumes 40% Ohio Residents & Tuition Increase of 2% Per Year
-   iv.   Total Projected Program Income:
  1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $46,599
  2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $131,612
  3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $198,592
  4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $267,335
- b. Program Expenses
  -   i.   Personnel
    1. Faculty (e.g., tenure-track, clinical, professional)
       a. Full
       b. Part time
    2. Non-instruction (indicate role(s) in narrative section below)
       a. Full ____ 1 Assoc. Dean for Research, Graduate Studies, and Innovation
          i. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $17,250
          ii. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $17,595
          iii. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $17,947
          iv. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $18,306
       b. Part time ____
    3. Benefits 39.5%
       a. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $6,814
       b. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $6,950
       c. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $7,089
       d. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $7,231
  -   ii.   New facilities/ building/ space renovation
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $0
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $0

3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $0
4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $0
iii. Tuition Scholarship Support
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $0
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $0
    3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $0
    4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $0
iv. Stipend Support for E&G GAs
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $36,720
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $74,909
    3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $76,407
    4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $77,935
        a. Benefits 16.5%
            i. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $6,059
            ii. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $12,360
            iii. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $12,607
            iv. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $12,859
v. Additional library resources
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $0
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $0
    3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $0
    4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $0
vi. Additional technology or equipment needs
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $0
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $0
    3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $0
    4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $0
vii. Waived Tuition for E&G GAs
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $41,269
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $84,188
    3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $85,872
    4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $87,589
viii. Other expenses (travel, office supplies, etc) (if applicable, describe in narrative section below)
    1. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $1,500
    2. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $2,000
    3. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $2,500
    4. AY28-29 - Year 4 = $3,000
c. Total Projected Expense:
i. AY25-26 - Year 1 = $109,611
ii. AY26-27 - Year 2 = $198,002
iii. AY27-28 - Year 3 = $202,422

iv.   AY28-29 - Year 4 = $206,920
       d.   Net
           i.   AY25-26 - Year 1 = ($63,013)
           ii.   AY26-27 - Year 2 = ($66,390)
           iii.   AY27-28 - Year 3 = ($3,830)
           iv.   AY28-29 - Year 4 = **$60,415**
   ii.   Senator Questions and Comments
       1.   Senator: Regarding tuition, who is actually paying the tuition? Are you expecting students to pay that 267 out of pocket?(A) That is the total revenue for 14 students. A lot of this tuition is counted off through assistantships. We take our existing 10 lines in CEC and transition those into a preference for a PhD as they are already existing. Those are all covered through the assistantships/ grants.
       2.   Senator: What happens if the grants don't come through?(A) We feel strongly that that will not be an issue. The amount of the GA is so small that the amount needed would be reasonable. We can look at Choose Ohio First and they are very favorable about matching funds.
       3.   Senator: Is there any reason to believe that in year 5 that you would be operating at the same as year 4 and in a 5 year period this would be in the black?(A) Yes.
       4.   Senator: Motion: Bring to floor for a vote.
       5.   Senator:I am frustrated about how the programs have been sold as recruiting faculty. We train great faculty and then they leave. I hope that university puts the same energy into retraining all faculty and not those in just a select few colleges.

5.   **New Business**
   a.   Policy Revision: Degree Honors and Distinction Policy, Zeb Baker, Executive Director, Honors College - ***Presentation only; Discussion and Anticipated Vote on March 31, 2025***
       i.   Current Policy Language
           1.   To graduate with University Honors, a student must have completed the course and program requirements of the Honors College. To achieve University Honors with Distinction, students must achieve the University Honors course and program requirements, achieve a 3.50 cumulative grade point average upon completion of the required credit hours for graduation, and complete an approved large-scale project or an intensive pre-professional experience.
       ii.   Proposed changes to existing policy
           1.   To graduate with University Honors, ~~a student must have completed course and program requirements of the Honors College. To achieve University Honors with Distinction~~, **Honors College** students must ~~achieve~~ **complete** the ~~University~~ Honors course and program

8

requirements, achieve a ~~3.5~~ **3.25** cumulative grade point average upon completion of the required credit hours for graduation, and complete an approved **Honors Senior Project** ~~large scale project or an intensive pre-professional experience.~~

 iii. Why change this policy?
  1. Resolves unfinished business related to transition from Honors Program to Honors College
  2. Aligns policy with practice
   a. For example, there is no such thing as a Distinction project any longer.
  3. Rewards all Honors College students for successfully completing program requirements

 iv. To earn University Honors….
  1. Every Honors College student must complete six (6) total Honors experiences (classes or course extensions, research, study abroad, internships, campus and community engagement, teaching)
  2. Every Honors College student must complete an Honors Senior Project
  3. Every Honors College student must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.25 to remain in Good Standing

 v. Honors College GPA data
  1. 3.74 Current average cumulative GPA for all Honors College students, Fall 2024
   a. CAS: 3.76
   b. CCA: 3.85
   c. CEC: 3.64
   d. EHS: 3.81
   e. FSB: 3.73
   f. Nursing: 3.67

 vi. May 2024 Graduates GPA Data
  1. 81.6% May 2024 Honors College graduates finished with a cumulative GPA of 3.50 or higher
  2. 93% May 2024 Honors College graduates finished with a cumulative GPA of 3.25 or higher
  3. 96% expected for May 2025 graduates with a cumulative GPA of 3.25 or higher

 vii. What does this mean?
  1. 11.4% May 2024 Honors College graduates finished program requirements but earned nothing
  2. These students did everything that the Honors College asked of them to complete program requirements but have nothing to show for it. That's unfair.

 viii. Proposed changes to existing policy

1. To graduate with University Honors, Honors College students must complete the Honors course and program requirements, achieve a 3.25 cumulative grade point average upon completion of the required credit hours for graduation, and complete an approved Honors Senior Project.

ix. Senator Questions and Comments

1. Senator: Which is it cumulative or required credit hours? I think what you mean to say is 3.25 cumulative average, but the language used is not what I think you intend. I think that this may create confusion for students. (A) What does the registrar say? (R) That you need 124 hours to graduate, so if it is an elective or honors college does matter. So, what I am suggesting is that it may be confusing for students.

2. Senator: I think the 3.25 needs to be above what the average is for the entire student body.

3. Senator: Did you consider just a cumulative GPA for just the honors courses?(A) No because students are already in the honors college upon arrival their first year.

4. Senator: What is unfair then about having a GPA requirement? You have positioned that having the 3.50 as being unfair, but couldn't the same argument be made that having a 3.25 is unfair for those who are below a 3.25?(A) There aren't many students who get to the end don't have at least a 3.25. There aren't many who have totally bombed out on a major that they started and then realized they aren't well-suited for. For those who have participated heavily with the honors college, we consider that on a case-by-case basis and an exception can be made. And students can opt out of the honors college and not get university honors. The unfairness would be that they got to the end and have earned the 3.25 GPA but still don't rise to the level of university honors if the GPA requirement is still a 3.50.

5. Senator: Faculty labor for the honors senior project and if you are working, getting that recognized for workload documents?(A) Marko and I are working on that. We don't have the funding to compensate faculty in the same way we do with honors contract courses for teaching. We need to think about how to award faculty for their time spent. There are ways I would like to see that happen that I haven't shared with anyone yet. This is something that I think we positively need to think about. These students fall somewhere between a regular student and a master student. We will have to figure out how.

6. Senator: How many students are there right now?(A) Overall we have 2019 we have offered at of them an off ramp for the honors college. I'd like the faculty members to say no so that they don't feel like it is not time well spent.

7. Senator: How does 3.25 compare to other universities?(A) This is the national average for Honors College.

b. Graduate Degree Requirements - Doctor of Nursing Practice, Jason T. Abbitt, Acting Associate Dean of the Graduate School - ***Presentation only; Discussion and Anticipated Vote on March 31, 2025***

    i. Reason policy is needed

        1. Existing policy for Ph.D and Ed.D. did not describe the DNP program

        2. New policy needed to describe DNP credit hours, committee membership, other requirements for earning the degree

    ii. Policy modeled from PhD/Ed.D policy and adapted to DNP program

    iii. Policy reviewed and approved by Graduate Council on Oct. 22, 2024

        1. Discussion focused primarily on Forming DNP Examining committee

    iv. Senator Question and Comments

        1. Senator: So do you have a Doctorate of Nursing, and there is no PhD?(A) Correct, this is the Doctor of Nursing Practice.

c. Proposed Policy Change: Teaching, Clinical Professors, & Lecturers (TCPLs) - Melissa Thomasson, Associate Dean for Faculty Excellence & Professor of Economics - ***Presentation only; Discussion and Anticipated Vote on March 31, 2025***

    i. Faculty Composition Task Force

        1. Proposed Policy

            a. The three-year average ratio of T/TT faculty to all full-time instructional faculty shall be no lower than 60.00%.

        2. Rationale

            a. Protecting T/TT faculty positions is essential for the Teacher-Scholar model

            b. No reason to cap TCPL faculty positions when there is protection of T/TT faculty positions

            c. Historical averages of the proposed ratio are 60-75% for FSB and most other divisions

    ii. Senator Questions and Comments

        1. Senator: I appreciate the spirit of this. This is different from what we got in our packet, and it is not consistent with what you said. This turns it on the head. This enshrines the TT faculty. The way the policy states it is confusing and doesn't match the rest of the policy. And we need to change the language to protect the teacher-scholar model and rather state protect tenure. We also need consistency within the policy structure and it is confusing as is. I would suggest that we change the language in the rationale from to protect the teacher-scholar model to protect tenure. (A) If we wanted to change it we could put that TCPL could be no higher than 66.67 percent for consistency within all the divisions.

2. Senator: The metric in the policy library doesn't include VAP. You are making up a new metric? We don't have the correct language in the packet. (A) We struck the 29, so it may have been miscommunication. The language on the slide is what we are proposing..

3. Senator: We keep talking about this every year and it keeps getting lower and lower and I personally think that the % should be the same across the university?(A) The committee felt strongly that this is the best policy for FSB given its work.

4. Senator: 60% is TT and the other 40% could be anyone. There isn't a cap?(A) We don't see any reason to cap TCPLs.

5. Senator: The reason why we have the system we do, is because the administration wants to have flexibility and to keep cost low. Why is FSB allowed to do this and others are not? (A) We think this is more friendly to TCPLs than existing policies in the other divisions.

6. Senator: Initially when these were created we used percentages and not ratios. Can anyone explain if we can have the word ratio in the same sentence as percentage? I am saying this because I don't think we can. I think we would need to change this to a 3 year average and take the word ratio out. (A) I think that you may be right.

7. Senator: I appreciate the way you are thinking about VAPs in the ratio. However, I do think that it is interesting that 60% could be TT and the rest could be VAPs given how this is written. I am interested in how all the scenarios would play out given how this is written and protecting all continuing faculty. (A) We would be interested in a TCPL floor. Talking to the Chairs, and Deans they have said that they would actually like to have TCPL than VAPs, but weren't able to do that because of the cap.

8. Senator: As context, a year ago we voted to raise the cap on EHS we went in and revised the cap to 29%, but you have said many times that there isn't a cap but if I am reading this correctly there is a cap of 40%. (A) It actually is more like 66% would be more compatible.

9. Senator: You should look at the policy to make sure the language is consistent as I believe that it is going to confuse people in the future with how it is written out. Taking FSB and making its own section would make it a lot clearer. (A) We could do that or we could change it to 66% to make it more comparable to everyone else.

10. Senator: Maybe the other divisions should change their denominator.

11. Senator: What we really need is a proposal that is for everyone so that they are all similar rather than having a separate policy for FSB. Everyone could have a cap that would include how many VAPs they need versus TCPL. What you propose here could have a 40% cap on TCPLs. I would rather see either 2 policies, but what I don't want to see us do something separately for the business school then what everyone

else does. (A) The other divisions could have thought differently so that you get autonomy. The senate voted to give autonomy to all divisions and that is what we are doing.

12. Senator: What is the penalty if a division is in violation to the cap (A) I don't know the penalty issue. I do know that Academic Personnel watches this closely and when a hire is proposed they check it and if the division is at the cap the search is denied.

13. Senator: It is bad practice to assume anything in policy. It is a bad practice to not state the goal of the policy, because it leaves it to open.

14. Senator: I caution us, I think this should be studied more, because limiting us on VAPs scares me because of people needing to take leaves. I think the idea of what you are proposing is fine, but I think we need to think about overhauling the entire policy. (A) I know that this isn't perfect but that this is better than what we have now. Under the current policy we could have 90% of VAPs.

6. **Provost Update**
   a. The Sense of the Senate's did go to the Board of Trustees and Rosemary did a great job presenting them on Friday. The Board of Trustees did not pause the work as requested in the SOSs. Nor did they sanction an appeals process.
   b. Discussion started last spring with the deans. The reason for this was that deans were becoming aware of the different workloads across the university. This came up at UPT because pre-tenure people were coming up for tenure with different teaching loads. And the BOT said that FY24 was the last year we could dip into reserves to balance the academic affairs budget, which is in a deficit. So that is when we started having a conversation about this and it had not been updated in about 14 years. I know why because it is very complicated. Norming is never a perfect science. Because APEIP also introduced workload revisions, there were two divisions who had completely revised their workload guidance. We didn't want to discount that work they have done by changing things dramatically again. I do expect that there will be discussion and tweaks along the way as we work to get this right. It is true that I didn't consult with senate. I did however update senate. Also, I did go to all the divisional meetings at the beginning of the year to talk to faculty about this. I recognize that is not consultation. Having been ad dept chair and dean, I know that workload is assigned by the supervisor. I know that this is not popular to say, this is something that managers do as part of their role. I hear you that you are upset that you was not consulted but it made logical sense to work with the deans on this initially. I had to move quickly. Shared governance is wonderful, but it is time consuming. I had to balance the budget this year as I was not able to dip into the reserves this year.
   c. Dr. Creamer will be here in April to help explain the budget.
   d. Current Workload Policies - Continuing Faculty on the Oxford Campus

i. Workload Requirements for Faculty - Current Policy (for tenure line faculty on the Oxford Campus): Faculty at Miami are currently expected to teach either a 3/3 or a 3/2.

    1. The University norm for teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty – assuming research productivity, teaching and advising, and service that satisfy expectations – is either three and three or three and two (using the three credit hour course as the unit of account), depending on disciplinary standards and benchmarks and labor-intensive pedagogical practices. To the maximum extent possible, each faculty member is expected to teach across a range of courses.

ii. Pre-Tenure Workloads - Teaching Load for Pre-Tenure Faculty (Current Policy)

    1. Probationary faculty: course reductions

        a. Departments will provide a reduction in teaching load of one course per year in each of the first and second years of the probationary period.

    2. Probationary faculty: leaves

        a. It is the University's intent to award all probationary faculty a research leave or the equivalent in course reduction spread out over multiple semesters during their probationary period.

iii. Differential Teaching Load - Current Policy

    1. Departments should have written differential workload policies to recognize the varying strengths of faculty. These differentiated workload policies must be approved by the divisional dean and the Provost's office.

    2. Deans, in conjunction with chairs and the Provost, will establish expectations regarding each department's total teaching contribution and some parameters with regard to distribution of teaching resources at various levels of instruction. Each chair should be made mindful of these targets when making individual teaching assignments.

    3. The research activity of faculty should be judged by production and quality. That is, colleagues cannot simply opt to be "research active" but must show on a consistent basis that they are producing *above* departmental expectations.

    4. The research activity of faculty should be re-evaluated on a regular basis (e.g., a rolling average over the last three years). It is not a one-time determination.

    5. All faculty not on leave are expected to teach every semester.

    6. A critical component of differential workload policies is the ability to tie excellence in teaching, research and service to significant salary gains. In particular, faculty who are excellent teachers and whose teaching loads exceed department norms should be compensated at levels that

recognize their important contributions, just as our most productive researchers should be awarded for their contributions.

    e.   Moving to WLE
- i. Tracking in 3 ways:
  1. WLE
  2. Weekly hours
  3. Credit hours
- ii. Peers measure in credit hours and WLE
- iii. Examples: KSU and OU

    f.   Faculty Workload Norms - Please see graph provided in Slideshow presentation
- i. Standard TCPL Faculty
- ii. Standard T/T-T Faculty

    g.   Benchmarking
- i. Kent State University
  1. "All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department are expected to carry a maximum workload of 24 credit hours per academic year. Full-time non-tenure track faculty members are expected to carry a maximum workload of 30 credit hours per academic year. The workload for each individual faculty members is assigned by the Chair with the approval of the Dean. "
  2. TT = 4/4 and TCPL = 5/5
  3. "Since the nature of work differs among departments, load regulations cannot be applied uniformly. Therefore, each department chairperson, along with the departmental faculty advisory committee, shall specify which kinds of loads shall be the equivalent of twenty-four credits of formal course teaching per academic year, with appropriate adjustments being made for graduate teaching, research involvement, direction of laboratory and studio sections, and excessive number of preparations by a new faculty member, and unusually large class sections. Upon approval by the collegial dean, these specifications shall be filed with the dean and the human resources. All regular full-time faculty in the department shall be informed of these departmental understandings."
- ii. Miami's Language
  1. Faculty workload assignments at Miami University are guided by the institution's core mission: excellence in teaching, research, and service. Consistent with this mission, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute at the highest levels of quality across these three domains. Teaching, clinical, and professional licensed faculty (TCPL) also play a significant role, contributing with excellence in teaching and service. This document builds upon existing faculty workload norms, offering greater clarity and procedural detail.

2. In allocating workload responsibilities, the University acknowledges that faculty members contribute to our core mission in diverse and multifaceted ways, depending on their roles and departmental contexts. While common norms for teaching, research, and service extend across the University, the definitions of excellence in these areas may vary in alignment with the specific context and expectations of different units and fields.

3. As such, the judgement of the department chair is integral to workload assignments, ensuring that all faculty are contributing comparably to the University's mission while adhering to university-wide workload norms.

iii. Benchmarking: Kent State (R1)

1. Look back of 5 years
2. Divisions/Departments break the Workload Equivalents into points.
3. Workload equivalencies given for:
   a. Research productivity
   b. Course instruction
   c. Research instruction (student supervision)
   d. Administration
4. Each Dept. has an FAC, Faculty Advisory Committee

iv. Benchmarking: Ohio University (R1 in 2022)

1. "A standard 3 credit hour didactic course is defined as reflecting 10% of total faculty workload. A standard teaching load for tenure-track faculty on 9-month contracts with be 15 semester hours per academic year (3/2). A standard teaching load for instructional faculty on 9-month contracts will be 24 semester hours per academic year (4/4)."

2. "Each school/Department should establish and publish criteria for assignment of teaching workload credit outside the standard 10% per 3 credit hour didactic course."

3. "Additional criteria cannot create an additional need for adjunct faculty instruction."

v. Benchmarking: Ohio University (R1)

1. "Tenure-track faculty may negotiate a range of 40-60% of total workload being ascribed to teaching with 10-20% assigned to service, and the remainder research. *The teaching needs of the school or department will be a basic consideration in determining whether a faculty member may be given a teaching workload that deviates from the standard 50%.*"

2. "Research may comprise 30-50% of a tenure-track faculty member's total load."

vi. Benchmarking: Ohio University

1. "The primary metric for assessing research activity is peer-reviewed publication in national or international outlets. For each 10% or total

workload assigned to research activity, the faculty member is expected to achieve 1 peer-reviewed publication in a national or international outlet in a two-year period. This metric will be assessed in a rolling fashion meaning each faculty member will be expected to achieve the required metric in any two-year period. (Thus, faculty with 30% research workload assignments would be expected to achieve a minimum of three acceptable peer-reviewed articles in any two-year period; those with 40% research workload assignments would be expected to achieve a minimum of four acceptable peer-reviewed articles in any two-year period, etc.)"

2. "Book authorship: Authoring a book or serving as first editor of an edited volume may count as 10% of workload assignment. One authored or edited book may be counted toward research workload in any rolling two-year period. The period through which a book can count toward workload may be variable (i.e., the same book could be counted across multiple years) with sufficient documentation of yearly progress and sufficient assurance of eventual publication. Authoring a book chapter may count as 5% of workload assignment."

    a. 5% is .5 WLE, thus 1-2 chapters a year constitutes a 3/2

vii. University Guidelines: Oxford TT and TCPL

1. Workload equivalents: all faculty must have 10 WLE
2. 3 credit hours is the standard measurement
3. Service Limits = 2 WLE
4. Differentiated Load
5. More transparency around the way load is assigned
6. Research norms s/b determined at the divisional/ dept. Level
7. Academic advising of undergraduate students = service

viii. Updates

1. "These criteria provide a model of norms across campus, however disciplines vary significantly. Modifications can be made with approval from the deans."

    a. Guidelines meant to norm BUT

    b. Determinations at the local level due to variations in disciplines and disciplinary standards.

    c. Added: In fields where book publication is a standard part of publishing, a single-authored, peer-reviewed book from a selective academic press will count as five articles. OR in fields where book publication is a standard part of publishing, the value of a book will be determined at the divisional level.

h. Senator Questions and Comments

        i. Senator: Just to be 100% clear. This is prospective as you are not describing the existing policy here correct? (A) This is what we are using to think about how to transcribe work now. So, yes this is what we are using to detail how workload norms are being followed. We are putting a process on how we get to the 3:3 or 3:2 workload.

        ii. Senator: Was this shared with the departments, because what was shared with individuals in our department, we didn't see this? (A) This is part of the documents that the deans have. It was shared with the chairs, and the chairs were told about this around December I believe. We then broke this down with the chairs last semester.

        iii. Senator: How are you accounting for departments who have lost a lot of faculty and are struggling? (A) This has been happening since the beginning of time here at Miami and resources are following where the students go.

        iv. Senator: In your discussion of the previous system you said that some departments are not following the norms. With the new system what is going to be put in place to ensure that the norms are going to be followed or will we need to put in another system for that? (A) When times were good it created inequity and workload was not enforced. Now times are different and the financial situation will force us to follow these norms moving forward. So, I am sure that Deans and Chair will be watching this in the future. We predict that Miami is going to do well, it is just a challenge right now.

        v. Senator: I don't see anything in the examples as it relates to different norms. Our guidelines took that into consideration that different departments might have different academic norms and it took that into account. So, the average might be 2 articles or it could be 4 articles for different departments. (A) Research calculation I recognize that creating those research norms have been very upsetting. There is language in our policy that says that modifications can be made with the approval of the Dean; this criteria provides a model of norms, and disciplinary expertise should hold sway. That is why I think these calculations regarding research and what counts should be made at the disciplinary level as there are some other calculations that took place there too.

7. **Adjournment**