

Executive Committee
November 3, 2017

Present: Ram Pendyala (chair), Susan Squire (secretary), Brent Vernon, Anthony Lamanna, Esma Gel, Huan Liu, Gregory Raupp, Nancy Cooke, Samantha Brunhaver, Andreas Spanias, Angelia Nedich

Absent: Marcus Herrmann, Jitendran Muthuswamy

Guest: Dean Kyle Squires

1. Meeting Minutes. The minutes for the October 6th meeting were approved.
2. Dean's Dissertation Award. The group reviewed the original email sent out to the units on the process and requirements of applying for the award.

Dean Squires provided a presentation of his view of the current state of the program. There were 16 nominees and 2 awardees for 2017-2018. Suggestions for improving the program include:

- a. Students should add awards and honors to their CV's;
- b. We should consider asking schools to do more down selection because the subject matter; experts are in the school and can say who ought to emerge;
- c. Are we asking for the right application materials?
- d. Where do we have opportunities?
- e. There should be no more than 2 nominations per school period (12 names);
- f. If a program doesn't have a top pick then ok to not move a nomination forward;
- g. Let schools follow their own selection process pulling in program chairs;
- h. Start process sooner. This year the first reminder went out August 1st;
- i. Should the directors or associate directors be invited to session to assist with development of a converged model?
- j. Should we ask students to add a paragraph on the broader impacts of their research to their nomination materials? Should be described in ways that non-experts can understand;
- k. We need to showcase awardees on dean's office website/video;
- l. EC will review the information presented by Dean Squires and submit a proposal.

3. Discussion with Dean Squires.
 - a. Faculty Workload. We're taking a look at faculty workload from the perspective that it has not been updated for a while. There isn't a current model to share. Anything formally proposed for the EC to review wouldn't be radically different from what the schools have been doing. We can correlate workload to research. The directors having flexibility and capacity to make decisions is a requirement. You can use a workload model to incentivize certain behaviors. The plan is to share an updated document with directors over course of this month. The dean wants to have a strawman to look at and get people thinking about this. It won't be longer than one page. It was mentioned in discussion that the percentages don't seem to have relationship with actual workload (40/40/20). That language is in the faculty evaluation document draft. There is an old document currently in use that the schools implement in different ways. Annette will send the workload document to EC.

- b. Course Buyout. If you have a 4 course load you'd have to buy out for more courses. It's a strange alignment with your research funding, how much you're paying – they don't match. Someone else is setting course load that faculty have to buy out with their research money.
- c. Online Teaching. Does anybody have experience teaching online -- in the context of workload – setting aside the time you spend building the class? What's an estimate of the workload of doing it? Kyle would claim it's less time than when you're actually teaching the class. Susan feels it's more time consuming. Online students ask more questions. She has more interaction with online students. What about preparation of content and design versus teaching the class the second time? The first time you teach a course it should count as a heavier load than subsequent classes. Trained TA's should serve as the front line of online class. If you develop an online class you should get the first option to teach. Right now our model is in SCH. Supplemental pay should be dealt with at the dean's office. You need a faculty workload model in order to handle this. Ed plus now manages the online programs. Based on the way that the current revenue flows come back to the Schools, staffing the course the way we have done is really difficult to financially afford. We have to think of other models. We have lecturers who work heavily in the online world. Think about these issues for now. We have to figure it out. It would be a good idea to identify a smaller subgroup to put together a first skeleton workload model.

Kyle will brief the EC on a couple of issues and then get school directors caught up. He would like to use the EC as a sounding board – a closing of the loop from the EC to the directors.

Next Meeting: December 1st; 1-2 p.m.; BY 660