

Eastern Michigan University
College of Arts and Sciences, College Advisory Council

Minutes: 15 February, 2024

Pray-Harrold 219
3:30-5:00

Melissa Jones (WGST, Chair), Grigoris Argeros (SAC/SOC), Joe Breza (PSY), Jim Egge (Associate Dean), Marisol Garrido (WL), Jason Gibson (MATH/STAT), Katy Greenwald (ENVI), Heather Holmes (CHEM, Secretary), Caralee Jones-Obenc (AAAS), Andre Kashliev (Comp. Sci.), Marianne Laporte (BIO), Laura McMahon (HIST/PHIL), Julian Murchison (SAC Dept. Head), Deron Overpeck (CMTA), Eric Portenga (G&G), Heather Shouldice (Music & Dance), Daniel Seely (Ling/Eng), Jonathan Skuza (PHY/ASTR), Amanda Stype (ECON), Tom Suchan (ART)

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes – 25 January, 2024
 - a. motion to approve, second, passed 13-0-1
3. Elections: Grad Council
 - a. Social Sciences (Winter 2024); Natural Sciences (Fall 2023/Winter 2024)
 - b. We still need representatives. No volunteers or nominations.
4. Standing Subcommittee Reports
 - a. Arts (02 February, 2024): Chair, Melissa Jones;
 - i. motion to approve, second, passed 16-0-0
Discussion: There was a higher-level class (Music) that was listed as a pre- and corequisite. Changes were made, and the issue was resolved.
 - b. Sciences (02 February, 2024): Chair, Heather Holmes;
 - i. motion to approve, second, passed 16-0-0
5. Elected Subcommittee Reports
 - a. Personnel (no update)
 - b. Budget Subcommittee
 - i. Heather Shouldice and Andre solved a tech problem that was going to make us move rooms. Saving us, they the projector communicate with the computer.
 - ii. Overview of data collected in process to develop metrics for distribution of section/program coordinator faculty release time. You can see the draft in the shared drive: [DRAFT: Budget Subcommittee Coordinator Release](#)

- iii. The Data are in a spreadsheet in the drive: [CAC Program Coordinator Release Data - All Programs 1-30-24](#)
- iv. Weights haven't been given yet, and they aren't committed to these metrics; it's still a work-in-progress.
- v. There are concerns about how PTLs are being counted in these metrics – need to look at FTE of PTLs rather than the numbers of PTLs.
- vi. The metrics will give us a number for each department so they get an amount of release time that the department can distribute as they wish.
- vii. Question: We're talking about giving back release time for UG coordinating as well? Not necessarily. The new guidelines will potentially determine release for faculty chairs (in place of DHs). This model is working successfully in places. Caution – don't ask anyone to do the chair job for less than 3 hours credit.
- viii. The rubric won't apply to individual programs within a department.
- ix. See the document [“AY24 Copy of CAS release time survey responses 01_23_2023”](#) for more information. The metrics were distilled out of the responses to what departments already do with their release time for coordinators.
- x. Grad coordinator release may be rolled in together with coordinator positions – that's a decision at the Dean's level.
- xi. Counting faculty for interdisciplinary programs: Initially, they thought of it terms of students, and to give a factor of 1.1 for each one in the program. So if there were 100 students, they get credit for 110, because it's more difficult to advise, etc.
- xii. Initially talked about the administrative workload in the department – how much of a DH a department the department has. With a full time dedicated DH, they do most of the admin work, but with less than that of a DH, those departments should get more release time. There would be baselines such as “What does it take to make sure small departments get release for a program coordinator?” And how do you measure the portion of the DH? Number of faculty or other?

- xiii. Departments that don't have a DH should very much get some release (interdisciplinary, for example). Int program chairs would be equivalent to Department Chairs for comparative purposes.
- xiv. There have to be metrics that actually capture the real workload of the department functioning the way it should, not just surviving.
- xv. This document isn't at a point where we should be sharing it with colleagues.
- xvi. If we have thoughts about what metrics would be useful, please send them to the Budget Committee.
- xvii. For depts that have a number of programs and wouldn't qualify for this type of release, was there discussion about equitability for them? Yes, for example, all the programs in G&G would be rolled together, and together, they would decide how to distribute the time. There is a problem in assumptions in the reorganization proposal, because there could be programs with chairs that are larger than small departments with a DH.
- xviii. Where in the metrics is the "our department does this stuff that other departments don't" metric? This is simply program coordination, not the DH job.
- xix. We don't want to tie this to reorganization, which is in very preliminary stages. If and when reorganization happens, release time should be redistributed based on what happens then.
- xx. We need to put DHs in the formula, and build the model on the structure that we already know.
- xxi. A lot of departments are in survival mode, where DHs are doing the job that the secretary used to (like deal with registration), faculty are doing administrative tasks...

6. Faculty Concerns

- a. Delayed pay for PTLs doing non-instructional work
 - i. CAC could write a letter of concern to the dean who could bring it to the Dean's council. Personnel committee will do this. This affects everyone

who gets paid on a paper PAF (like faculty summer pay) because of Human Resources disfunction.

- ii. The letter will be in the Google drive, then circulated by email, and sent by next Thursday.

b. Reorganization Questions and CAC Role

- i. The Dean circulated her recommendations, and this time is for discussion.
- ii. Interdisciplinary programs would like a careful consideration of structure for these, and have a well-thought-out space that could welcome additional ID departments, not just folded into the administrative structure of existing departments, because that makes it seem like a program within a department. ID departments are working together to respond to the proposal with the recommendation that they all fit under a single administrative unit, like “School of ID Programs”. The CAC can support the IDs in this endeavor. It needs to be obvious where IDs live.
- iii. For small departments, there is no clear direction on how they would not be drowned under larger departments and lose their autonomy. The CAC can give explicit support to departments that don’t want to lose a voice.
 - 1. The reorganization is all about administrative structure, and this proposal is on a gradient to complete college reorganization, and we’re talking about them like they’re the same. We need to keep separate administrative reorg and department shuffling. The question would better be asked as “Which DH do you want?”, not “What department do you want to merge with?”. The wording “Who do you most closely align with?” is closer to department reorganization.
 - 2. This could in principle affect very little, except some folks are sharing DHs. In terms of identities, it doesn’t have to affect anything. An example: Can History and Philosophy split into two departments under one DH and each have a CAC representative? That could actually lessen the voice of the smaller departments because there would be more voices.

- iv. Concern that if we don't reorganize, we will GET reorganized.
 - v. We've been invited to provide input, but that doesn't make anything set.
 - vi. Change of subject: A message from FTL about reorganization – they want to be able to do service work and participate in shared governance. We need to discuss this further when we have more time.
 - vii. We asked the administrators to come up with a proposal for us.
 - viii. It isn't clear from the proposal what they see the reorganization looking like. The onus seems to be on the faculty to come up with the details. Can we use this as an opportunity to imagine how things could be structured better at the department level?
7. The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 without the remaining items on the agenda.
- a. Dean's Remarks
 - b. Faculty Remarks
 - c. Chair Remarks
 - i. Impact Reports and CAC Curriculum Review Process
 - d. Adjournment