

Minutes for CAS Faculty Senate meeting
December 10, 2018
103 Gore

Present: J. Alcantara-Garcia, E. Bell, E. Donnelly, L. Duggan, D. Flaherty, P. Gentry, D. Galileo, J. Gizis, E. Gutman, R. Hanley, A. Hayes, T. Holden, K. Jasinska, J. Lobasz, D. Lopez-Gydosh, E. Lyman, J. Martin, B. McKenna, S. McKenna, J. Morgan, J. Morrison, O. Olabisi, J. Pelesko, A. Sarzynsky, K. Schroeder, D. Smith, L. Timmins, S. Zdenek

Also present: J. Angelini, A. Barrier, K. Logan. (Department representatives with curriculum proposals were also present but in the event did not speak.)

1. The meeting was called to order at 4:01 PM
2. The agenda was approved.
3. A resolution honoring Andrea Barrier for her service was approved. The text of this resolution is included below.
4. The minutes of the November 2018 meeting were approved.
5. Remarks from the Senate President D. Smith

He would like to make this meeting as short as possible.

6. Remarks from Interim Dean J. Pelesko

He provided updates on three major topics.

University Senate update: The University Faculty Senate postponed vote on the new graduate college until the February 11, 2019 meeting. [D. Galileo informed us that an open hearing may be held the Monday beforehand.] The senate approves changes to the faculty handbook related to promotion that should be discussed in departments. There was a change to Section 4.4.1 of the faculty handbook on the promotion and tenure. Department documents should include criteria in all three areas of research/creative activity, teaching and service. Another resolution called for a mentoring plan in the college or department bylaws. Departments and the college will need to work on developing these plans.

CAS Advising update: The dean reminded the senate to look at the May 2018 CAS Faculty Senate minutes. Assistant Dean C. Shenkle gave an overview of the new advising system, including plans by CAS that depend on budget approval. J. Pelesko is giving an update, but he noted that additional budget resources have not yet been approved. Overall, there is concern university-wide about the quality of advising. Accessibility of advisors, accuracy of information, and consistency of advising are key issues. The Blue Hens Success Collaborative (BHSC) has been rolled out, but Pelesko noted that it is not implemented in CAS and requires training for advisors. CAS is the only UD college that does not have professional advisors for the first two years. CAS

planned to hire professional advisors but did not receive approval to hire these advisors. The dean hopes to have approval in January to increase the number of professional advisors. The plan going forward would be to conduct those searches in the spring semester, and at the same time have a conversation with each department to discuss how we will make this transition. Challenges include that some departments will continue to have their own professional advisors, so their roles need to be worked out. Other departments have a small number of students who wish to continue to advise them; this can continue, but they will need to use the BHSC system so that all students have a uniform experience. He is looking forward to the discussion of advising and has invited student Karin Logan to participate.

Update on CAS hiring and budget planning: Budget meetings and position planning meetings with all departments are completed. The college is currently finalizing TA allocations. (This process happens ahead of formal central authorization of the budget because the summer would be too late for departments.) A budget meeting with the Provost is scheduled for February 18, 2019. University-wide statistics suggest that the university needs to hire at a faster rate. His best estimate is that CAS needs to hire on average about 50 faculty per year over a five-year period. CAS is reviewing approximately 90 hiring requests from departments.

The dean gave a special thanks to the members of the P&T, Ed Affairs, and executive committees for the tremendous amount of work they have done so far this semester, and extended happy holidays to everyone.

In response to questions from senators, the dean noted the following: The university budget model is still expected by the end of December; it is not yet available. The advising model conversation has been for undergraduates, and has not included graduate students. The dean noted that shifting the load of undergraduate advising to professional advisors may aid graduate advising. The dean will send out copies of his slides.

7. Ed. Affairs Consent Agenda (30 items, listed below). All items were approved.
8. Ed. Affairs proposals for individual consideration:
 - a. The 4+1 BA-MPP 2019-2020 4+1 Program Proposal was approved.
 - b. The Minerals, Materials and Society Certificate 2019-2020 Graduate New Program was approved.
 - c. The Politics and Social Justice Minor 2019-2020 Undergraduate New Program was approved.
9. Report from COCAN (J. Morgan)

J. Morgan has begun asking committee members if they would like to continue service. He will next solicit volunteers for any vacancies. He noted that CAS has never had an

email list of CAS full-time faculty. He uses the AAUP to generate an appropriate list. There was a discussion of whether the CAS should maintain such a list.

10. The CAS Senate next held a discussion of undergraduate advising.

J. Alcantara-Garcia: She raised the need for advisor training and a resource to get answers to questions.

O. Olabisi: She raised concerns about workload assignment. Her department has advisees in blocks of 30 and faculty often have 60-90 advisees. She would like to know if the department chairs are discussing how teaching (course assignment) loads may change under the new system if faculty are no longer advising so many students. The dean noted that faculty will still have juniors and seniors to advise, and that the conversation about what to do with newly available faculty time (service, teaching, research) should be happening at the department level.

E. Lyman: He stated that the physics department is pleased to keep option of advising their majors. One colleague raised a question about legal exposure for advisors who make mistakes leading to delays in graduation. [The answer was not known. The dean will find out.]

J. Lobasz: She is not satisfied by the software advising for students plotting out their ideal four-year academic plan. She shows them 'degree audit' and uses pen and paper, but there is not a good tool for mapping. Transfers have said that other institutions had better tools for mapping a full curriculum. She noted that students reported that the Associate in Arts (AA) program had a better advising tools.

L. Timmins: She noted that the students have the perception that some faculty don't know what they are talking about. (There was a recent article on this.) Professional advisors will solve this, but we also need to work on addressing unrealistic student expectations. We cannot guarantee that they will get everything they want.

J. Morrison: He would like to see a really clear definition of advising. He gets questions on complex issues that he has no expertise in. He can send them to others, but it is difficult when different advisors have different answers. The elements of our responsibility are not well defined. Students are demanding accurate information but it's becoming more of a challenge to stay up to date.

E. Lyman: He notes that in recruiting, he tells students that faculty advising in a small department is a strength. This is driving his department's interest.

J. Morgan: On legal liability, there should be some sort of written memorialization of what is said to students by advisors. He argued that if the student has been given

inaccurate information, it is often possible to waive requirements or approve a substitute course to avoid any legal problems.

K. Logan: She was asked to attend the meeting to give a student's perspective. She agreed with J. Lobasz's call for better software tools. She checks everything related to her program requirements, but information is in many different places and is sometimes inconsistent. There should be a single resource for prerequisite information, graduation requirements, and when the course is offered.

J. Gizis: He expressed concern that conversations with advisors should not be used to override written policies.

A. Sarzinsky: She would like a general statement of what is expected for the advisor. She advises 80 students, and knows the details in her own department, but often gets questions outside her purview related to other departments [examples: foreign languages, study abroad option]. She needs to send students to the correct expert. There is a need to communicate with students and advisors. Advisors need to know what they are supposed to know, and what experts to send students to. After seven years she still doesn't know in some cases who can answer the student's questions. There is a need for resources. The dean agreed that this is the key problem. Professional advisors are meant to address this issue. Once students are juniors and seniors, their questions are usually more department/discipline related.

J. Lobasz: She echoed the concerns raised by A. Sarzinsky. Raises the example of which math classes count for which math requirements. Students feel very frustrated.

J. Martin: [On the AA Program advising differences] It's not software. The AA program gets students for their first two years. Full time faculty take on advising for the first year, sometimes first year and a half. When the students are ready in sophomore year, they go to the professional advisors. He advises students in all majors. There's a concern how this will affect AA, because this might cut all the full-time faculty out of the advising role. The Dean noted this is why we need one-on-one conversations.

J. Pelesko: It's really important that we not break all contact between faculty and students in the first two years. Mentoring will always be a faculty responsibility -- always, through all four years.

O. Olabisi: She is concerned that good advising takes a lot of effort and there is no recognition for good advising. This is similar to the problem of acknowledging committee work that the Senate has been discussing this semester. Faculty who put a lot of work into advising get no recognition. How will that issue be addressed going forward?

D. Galileo: He has great expertise due to his years of service so he could advise students better than any professional advisor. Professional advisor could handle course advising but students even in first year can need conversations about deep issues, like when to get into research. CAS should promote a pool of faculty advisors in the departments who can handle conversations that are more discipline specific than professional advisors can handle. He would be willing to be a department-specific advisor for first two years students in addition to the professional advisors.

K. Logan: She agree that a dual role would be desirable. Students have professional career questions.

L. Duggan: He asked if any UD colleges require a meeting or approval every semester by advisors. Should there be?

J. Morgan: Mandatory advising was suggested by Provost T. Apple. There was protest by both faculty and students due to the enormous workload and time demands. For example, imagine an advisor meeting with 150 students in a two day window before registration opens. At that time, J. Morgan suggested focusing on students most in need of advisements, and requiring meeting with GPA's below 2.0 (academic probation). Other senators agreed that this now seems to be a policy.

A. Sarzynsky: She went to a college that had mandatory advising and for well-organized students, it was obnoxious. She sends an email to all advisees at start of each semester to inform them of her office hours. She sets expectation to meet so that they will able to choose courses and meet graduation requirements. We faculty need to set the culture.

T. Holden: She has concerns about professional advisors. She reported that her department has had problems with the transitions from summer advising. An example of a problem area is that special topic courses sometimes meet breadth requirements and sometimes do not. The dean noted that the professional advisors would replace the large group of graduate students with only a little training who currently advise in the summer. This should help with the problem.

J. Morgan: He raised the issue of workload in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) mentioned. There is a provision for counting 30 undergraduate advisees as ½ credit; 720 advisees would be a full load which is clearly absurd. He is concerned that professional advisors would be responsible for 300 students. This goes to the culture. It is unfortunate that the CBA going back twenty years is based on the idea that 30 advisees is a reasonable number of advisees, and it has gotten us into this mess. The administration in Hullahen Hall and trustees need to recognize that high quality advising is not cheap. We need to change the culture and this provision in the CBA should be a priority in negotiations.

J. Martin: In BHSC, some students get ranked as needing more advising. His personal experience is that there is no necessary connection between this ranking and what he sees them as capable as doing in the classroom. He would like to know the matrix that makes these predictions. The dean explained that there is a machine learning model with no simple matrix. He suggested that AA meet with the BHSC people.

J. Morgan: He made a comment about prerequisites based on his experiences in introductory physics classes (often taken as juniors or seniors). Students can forget the information if the prerequisite was taken years before. Another issue he has observed is that just barely satisfying the prerequisites can be a problem: A grade of D- in math probably means you will do poorly in physics. Advisors should not be afraid to recommend that students who get really low grades retake the course. It might delay graduation but it is better to graduate in five years than to flunk out.

D. Smith: The Senate President has taken notes. He is not exactly sure how we will move forward but they will discuss in the next executive committee meeting and give an update in the next senate meeting.

New Business:

E. Gutman: Speaking on behalf of the students, she reported that they are complaining that many professors are scheduling exams for 24% on the last days of the semester to evade the prohibition on such exams being worth 25% or more. She suggests changing the requirement of 20% or less.

T. Holden: She asked why do we not know our final exam schedule at beginning of schedule? Other senators noted that a new system for university final exam will start next semester to fix this problem.

J. Morgan: Back in 1970s, the final exams were in January and two weeks long. Many students have to take two exams back-to-back or even three exams in the same day. He believes the final exam period should be lengthened.

Adjourn at 5:17pm.

**College of Arts & Sciences
Faculty Senate Resolution**

WHEREAS Andrea Barrier has faithfully served as a member of the College of Arts and Sciences Educational Affairs Committee ever since 2010, and as its chair for the past 3

academic years, during which time she invested thousands of hours carefully reviewing hundreds of proposals for new courses and new programs, and

WHEREAS Andrea Barrier is now on the verge of beginning her retirement leave from the University of Delaware, therefore be it

RESOLVED that the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate expresses its profound gratitude to Andrea Barrier for her many years of service to our college, and gives her its best wishes for her retirement and all her endeavors in the future.

Consent Agenda

1. Approved Field Electives for the Political Science Major and Minor 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
2. Approved list of elective courses from other departments 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
3. Development Concentration International Relations Concentration Requirements: 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
4. Energy & Environmental Policy Major Requirements: 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
5. European Studies (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
6. Fashion Design and Product Innovation (BS) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
7. Fashion Merchandising and Management (BS) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
8. Foreign Languages and Pedagogy (MA) 2019-2020 Graduate Program Revision
9. French Studies (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
10. International Political Economy Concentration Requirements: 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
11. Japanese Certificate 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
12. Japanese Minor 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
13. Museum Studies Certificate 2019-2020 Graduate Program Revision
14. Music - Conducting Concentration (MM) 2019-2020 Graduate Program Revision
15. Music - Performance Concentration (voice) (MM) 2019-2020 Graduate Program Revision
16. Music - Teaching Concentration (MM) 2019-2020 Graduate Program Revision
17. Music Minor - Applied Music-Principal Instrument 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
18. Music Minor - Musical Studies 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision

19. Political Science - American Politics Concentration (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
20. Political Science - Global Politics Concentration (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
21. Political Science - Law, Politics & Theory Concentration (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
22. Political Science - Politics, Groups, and Identities Concentration (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
23. Political Science Major Requirements: 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
24. Political Science Minor 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
25. Regional Specializations: 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
26. Science of Language Specialization 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
27. Spanish Minor 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
28. Biological Sciences (BS) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision
29. Interaction Design (MA) 2019-2020 Graduate Program Revision
30. Linguistics (BA) 2019-2020 Undergraduate Program Revision