Meeting Summary • October 12, 2018

Call to Order
Senate President Eve Keller called the meeting to order at 11:36 a.m.

Presentations from the Interim Provost
Dr. Jonathan Crystal shared a presentation on U.S. News and World Report rankings that Fr. McShane (who was unable to attend the meeting) had delivered to the Board of Trustees. Key points included:

- In 2005, the President charged a working group with enhancing Fordham’s ratings in the categories of class size, peer assessment, SAT scores, and alumni/ae giving rate. Improvements in three of these categories helped boost the University’s ranking, but Fordham fell in the rankings in the past two years. This year, the University was ranked 70th. This resulted in part from previously unannounced changes to U.S. News’s methodology.
- To improve its ranking going forward, the University will focus on student outcomes, including retention and graduation rates, and on the perception of Fordham in the eyes of those who contribute to the peer assessment elements of the rankings.

In ensuing discussion, Senators asked questions about other ranking systems, the place of rankings in the University’s overall strategy, and specific elements of the ranking methodology.

Dr. Crystal then provided the Provost’s Report, in which he addressed the following topics:

- Faculty Searches: A larger than usual number of searches for tenured/tenure-track faculty are underway, with 18 searches in Arts and Sciences, six in the Gabelli School of Business, three each in the Law School and the Graduate School of Education, and one in the Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education. Discussions are ongoing with the Graduate School of Social Service. Dr. Crystal acknowledged Rafael Zapata, the Chief Diversity Officer, who has spoken with search committees in an effort to broaden the pools of candidates.
- Reimagining Arts and Sciences: The Working Group on Reimagining the Structure and Function of Arts and Sciences will be submitting its report next week. Dr. Crystal said that he looks forward to meeting with the Working Group and to responding to the report that it has been assembling.
- Online Learning: With regard to online learning, Dr. Crystal confirmed that the addendum to the Course Development Agreement has been distributed to deans, who will, in turn, share it with affected faculty. He noted that the Teaching and Learning Online Group, co-chaired by administrators from the Provost’s Office and Fordham IT, is eager to work collaboratively with the Senate’s newly formed Online Learning Committee.
- Faculty Fora: Dr. Crystal has been holding open forums with faculty in the schools and colleges and looks forward to visiting the remaining schools soon.

Approval of Minutes
The Senate approved the minutes of the meeting of September 7.

Key Conversation: Research at Fordham
Senate President Keller introduced a wide-ranging discussion on the topic of research by noting that the Senate Executive Committee has recommended the Senate take up a major substantive area, crossing the schools and colleges, at each monthly meeting. This month’s topic concerns research and faculty...
workload. She then invited Dr. George Hong, Associate Vice President and Chief Research Officer, and Dr. Crystal to deliver presentations.

Dr. Hong delivered a presentation outlining his strategies as CRO. He mentioned the overarching priorities of the Office of Research, including integrating and strengthening interdisciplinary research, sponsored research, global research, and faculty-student research collaborations. He described a series of initiatives under each of these headings.

An extensive discussion followed Dr. Hong’s presentation, including the following points:

- The development of important strategic research consortia must proceed in tandem with support for research in other areas. Dr. Hong said that his office would be distributing a Request for Proposals for additional consortia.
- There appears to be a need for greater coordination between the Office of Research and individual schools to ensure that faculty are fully aware of the opportunities available to them through the Office of Research and external funding sources. Dr. Hong encouraged faculty to contact the Office of Research to discuss their projects.
- With regard to global research, it appears that Fordham is privileging certain geographical areas at the expense of others. Dr. Hong responded that he wants global research opportunities to be available to faculty across all the disciplines.

Senate President Keller summarized the discussion, noting an overall need to balance the advance of university-wide, strategically-driven research priorities with the promotion of opportunities for faculty who do not find their work reflected in those priorities. Concretely, she suggested that the Office of Research visit each school at least once a year to deliver a presentation tailored to the needs of that school’s faculty.

Dr. Crystal then spoke about faculty workload. The University is seeking to establish itself as a research institution while continuing to hold up close contact between students and faculty as a hallmark of the educational experience. Dr. Crystal added that his office has been gathering data on faculty members’ current workloads, as well as on the coverage of sections by different categories of instructors. He mentioned initiatives that other institutions have taken with regard to faculty workload, juxtaposing them with possible counter-arguments against adopting those initiatives at Fordham. He noted that he was actively seeking ideas and questions from senators.

A robust discussion followed Dr. Crystal’s presentation. Senators raised these points:

- Even institutions that Fordham doesn’t consider its peers have lower teaching loads. Many institutions have developed creative models to achieve lower loads (e.g., alternating teaching loads between years: 3-2, 2-2, 3-2, etc.).
- If it would help with teaching load, might we consider raising enrollment caps to 40, 45, 50, or even more? It’s not clear that adding 5-15 students to a section of 35 alters the experience significantly. Could we consider models where the most effective teachers lead very large sections with graduate or undergraduate teaching assistants?
- In thinking about workload, how can we account for different teaching contexts? A small class for majors or graduate students represents different work than a large core course.
- It was noted that both Fordham and other institutions already address faculty workload, and the relationship between research and teaching, in customized ways. Solutions at Fordham should maximize flexibility at the school and departmental levels.
- Is it possible to increase the size of the tenured/tenure-track faculty in line with the additional revenue expected, e.g., from the deployment of online programs via 2U?
- Might it be possible to try some of these ideas as pilot programs?
• The University should consider input from colleagues’ professional associations, many of which have begun to provide guidance on implementing differential workloads.

• What is the role of service in this conversation? To what extent might Fordham be able to resist the trend toward a multiplication of administrators at the upper echelons?

Senate President Keller summarized the key ideas of the conversation: Faculty workload is a vexed issue, but there are a number of vibrant ideas on the table for consideration; it is necessary to continue gathering data on who currently teaches what; decisions should be made locally where possible; there need to be transparent mechanisms for faculty members to be consulted and to provide input as the Faculty Development Committee takes up this topic in detail. Senate President Keller invited Dr. Crystal to return to the Senate for further discussion in early 2019.

**Announcements and Updates**

Senate President Keller reported on a variety of matters, including:

• *Academic Calendar:* This year, the first day of classes in Arts and Sciences, a Wednesday, was treated as a Monday, with negative consequences for pedagogy. With the collaboration of the Provost’s Office, the fall 2019 calendar has been changed so that next year, it will be in the second week of classes that a Wednesday will become a Monday.

• *Faculty Lists:* In the past, lists of faculty eligible for nomination and election have occasionally included errors. Senate President Keller met with the Provost’s office to discuss the issue, and the following measure was established: starting this January, the Senate Office will email faculty at the beginning of each semester to ask if they are on leave, so that lists can be updated.

• *Provost Search:* Witt-Kieffer, the executive search firm that is managing the search, will provide an update at the November 9 meeting of the Senate.

• *Online Learning:* The report of the Task Force on Online Learning, submitted at the end of last academic year, is now available on the Senate website. (An executive summary of the report is appended here.) In advance of the incorporation of an Online Learning Committee into the University Statutes, that committee has been established informally. It will be collaborating with the Provost’s Office in its work.

• *Updates to University Statutes:* Two resolutions from the Senate’s 2017–2018 meetings have been incorporated into the Statutes; two are in process. There will be a meeting between the Senate, President’s Office, and Legal Counsel to prepare the resolutions for the next Board of Trustees meeting.

• *Medical Assistance Fund:* Faculty colleagues raised concerns about the Medical Assistance Fund following Human Resources’ public presentation on this topic. Senate President Keller and Senator Mozes, as chair of the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee, are in active discussions with HR and Finance. There is time to resolve these issues before the end of the year, when receipts are eligible to be submitted. The Senate has received a commitment to “work collectively” on the issue.

• *November Meeting:* The key topic for the next meeting of the Senate will be diversity.

The Senate adjourned at 2:34 p.m.
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Executive Summary

Given the increasing prevalence of online learning in higher education, it is critical that faculty and administrators collaboratively and productively leverage their knowledge, experience and expertise in all phases of the online learning process. To do so effectively requires a clear understanding and negotiation of the roles and responsibilities of faculty and administration in this process.

It is with this goal in mind that the Task Force responded to the charge established by the Faculty Senate in September of 2017 to address both immediate and long-term issues in relation to online and hybrid education. The immediate issues centered around the 2U contract that had been signed with two schools, GSE and GSS, in June 2017 by the administration. The longer-term issues addressed gaining a better understanding of the status of online and hybrid education across the University and the role of the faculty and faculty governance in these initiatives.

In response to the immediate 2U partnership issues, the Task Force compiled a list of faculty questions and concerns about the faculty role in the vetting, term setting and approval of the 2U contract, specific 2U contract terms, intellectual property and compensation in course development, and the 2U contract implementation process. Given what was learned about the lack of adherence to faculty governance processes in the 2U contract decision making process, the Senate passed the Task Force’s immediate recommendations for action in December 2017. These recommendations included the affirmation of the faculty’s responsibility for both subject matter and online delivery methods; a request that the Provost take responsibility to ensure that proper faculty governance processes in these matters are followed going forward; and the formation of a sub-committee of the Salary and Benefits Committee to address immediate intellectual property and compensation issues in relation to course development. During the Spring 2018 semester, the Task Force and a sub-committee of Salary and Benefits met with key stakeholders from the administration and 2U representatives. This dialogue yielded partial progress toward addressing governance issues arising from the 2U contract.

The Task Force embarked on its broader charge by first obtaining information about the online initiatives across the University with a focus on the role of faculty in all phases of online program decision making. Some schools were found to have fairly robust programs with substantial experience, such as GRE and GSS; other schools were more in the nascent stage. The group also found that faculty involvement in the decision-making processes varied widely by school and seemed to be diminishing in certain areas of online decision making. Similarly, the group found that faculty governance structures dedicated to online decision making varied widely by school and college. In addition, no university level structure was found to currently exist that would allow faculty and administration to collaboratively address University-wide online or hybrid learning issues.

These findings resulted in a set of recommendations. To address the lack of a university-wide systematic and workable governance structure for online learning, the task force recommended both short and long-term strategies that required clear explication of roles and responsibilities on the part of faculty and administration in the online learning process. The short-term recommendations pertained to immediate faculty governance issues in relation to the 2U contract implementation,
emphasizing the need for more direct and efficient communication mechanisms between faculty and 2U representatives. The long-term recommendations concerned the development of governance structures at the University and school/college level. At the University level, the Task Force recommended the creation of a standing committee of the Faculty Senate to work with the Administration to establish procedures for the vetting and selecting OPMs, to develop online program and course standards, and to formalize the roles and responsibilities of faculty and deans in online learning. At the college and school level, the Task Force recommended the development of structures that were accountable to the relevant academic bodies and more responsive to the faster decision-making process necessitated in a rapidly changing digital world.