SIX GEESE A HONKIN'

The faculty senate has been asked to be honking geese for the Christmas tree lighting.

UPDATE ON MONDAY'S MEETING

Gary recommends that we send an inquiry to the President asking if his cost-benefit analysis of switching to a University will also include a cost-benefit analysis of remaining a College.

MEETING WITH THE PROVOST ABOUT J-TERM/CALENDAR

<u>The Agenda</u>: The goal today is to determine the scope and design of a permanent J-Term.

STEP ONE: General Discussion from Faculty Senate about Common Pluses and Minuses

<u>Possible Stipulations</u>: Voluntary, faculty payment (extra pay vs. release), trial period.

Course Release vs. Payment & Voluntary Participation

<u>Comment</u>: Higher-paid faculty members (if they got a course release) would end up being

paid more than others teaching, especially if they were teaching out-of-field.

<u>Comment</u>: Course release vs. pay depends on the length of J-Term. If it's two-weeks, then a

course release seems unfair. Four weeks, maybe it's fair.

<u>Comment</u>: If it's a course release, then we should set up a faculty rotation system so that

each member of the department gets an opportunity.

<u>The Provost</u>: I don't think the place to start this conversation is compensation inequity. J-Term

has a primary and secondary goal.

In April/May of 2009, President Turner asked Stephens to start a J-Term for the following academic year. There couldn't be any expense in terms of dorms, food service, etc. so that necessitated online and travel courses. Travel courses charged tuition (all travel costs went to students) and professors were paid as adjuncts or overloads. If you had a consistent enrollment in J-Term, then you could take a course off your load. So far, one person has taken advantage of it.

Rick asked that half of the revenue (mid to high 40s) to fund faculty professional development. The financial circumstances of the college have not allowed that to happen either time.

Question: Can I interpret the faculty development money as a kind of

carrot? It seems that the faculty senate believes that faculty participation should be voluntary. If most of the faculty are taking compensation, then can we drop the

course release option from the proposal?

Discussion: Is there downside for including both options?

<u>Comment</u>: Well, it could muddy the proposal. If we combine pay

above and beyond, and we have the promise of faculty development money, then the proposal may go over well.

Comment: I think it's more financially efficient not to allow course

releases.

<u>Response</u>: The more restrictions you put on J-Term the less likely

we'll be able to move toward something.

Gary's Recommendation: I'd like to poll the faculty senate later next week to see where

they

stand on course release versus overload pay.

Question about Faculty Development Money: The nature of the school is probably not

going to change in the short-term. How can

we get to this money?

<u>The Provost</u>: Well, the BOT is worried about building a cushion of money for the school (for emergency situations). They want to make financial cuts to get to that cushion.

Well, right now it appears that J-Term enrollment would be one way to get that

cushion.

Two things: 1) We're deep in the woods financially and it'll be difficult to get out of it. 2) A robust J-Term (with future promises of fac dev money in place) then we can generate a lot of money and do a variety of things. Essentially, we have to think long-term and build money for the institution. So, the more voluntary

we make J-Term the less effective it'll be for generating money.

Trial Period (Sunset Provision)

<u>Gary</u>: Is there any discussion about establishing J-Term/Calendar. Should it be a two- or three-

year trial?

The Provost: Thinking about the current registrations for J-Term... I think it's been building in

popularity via students talking to each other... Now, that we're two years into J-Term, the interest is growing among the student body. I think if you make the specific review date to short then you're running into trouble. I'm leaning to three, mainly because J-Term should be regularly evaluated each year.

Gary: Who would be reviewing the J-Term/Calendar?

<u>Answer</u>: The Faculty Senate.

Recommendation: We are asking the faculty to accept the J-Term proposal and the new

calendar. We're under agreement that we're proposing:

- Voluntary Participation

- Online & Travel Courses Only

Happening under the provisions of the calendar

Question: Should the faculty have anything to do with marketing?

<u>Provost</u>: It has to be promoted via first-year seminar, advisement, dorm leader meetings,

etc.

Comment: Should we the faculty be responsible for the marketing? Are you all in agreement

that we should promote it?

Question: Could we go into other schools and advertise it?

<u>Provost</u>: We could consider that later on in the process?

Question: Could each college or department consider how to make this a part of their

major requirement? Should we ask departments to come up with a three-year

plan to how they plan to use J-Term?

<u>Provost</u>: How have you proposed to alter the calendar?

Response: We're shifting the whole calendar one week to build more time into J-Term. This

should provide better prices for travel. In addition, it'll allow people flexibility

over the holidays for their breaks.

Provost: I think the current schedule of the J-Term needs to be altered if it's going to get

healthier and do something for us. I think your calendar idea is on the right track. But creating more time for J-Term without obligation to follow through on it will just create dead space. If we had the same number of J-Term courses right now, then I think the longer break would be dangerous (in terms of student attrition).

Now, there are ways to create obligation without conscription. Obligations could be departmental, rotation schedules, etc. We need to get the number of courses up from 10 to 20.

For the Next Meeting:

We need to continue this conversation about J-Term next week. Here's the hold-up:

- 1. We want it voluntary
- 2. To expand the calendar, we need large faculty participation
- 3. Should we ask departments to come up with plans of their own for using J-Term?
- 4. We also need to talk about the possibility of front-loading tuition.