

TO: Senate Agenda Committee  
FROM: Academic Policy Committee  
DATE: April 4, 2023  
SUBJECT: Final report for 2022–23

**Charge 1.** In collaboration with the Provost and Chancellor's offices, survey faculty about on-ground in-person, remote online, and hybrid approaches to learning, as well synchronicity of courses. Provide recommendations based on survey data.

- a. Specific areas to obtain feedback (in addition to others identified by the committee):
  - i. Faculty perceptions of quality of their teaching and student learning
  - ii. Logistical considerations of teaching technology and any impact on faculty teaching time and/or quality
  - iii. Any changes to teaching and assessment strategies and student performance faculty need to make based on type of course (i.e. in person, online, hybrid, etc.)

**Process:** Nine questions were submitted relative to this charge for inclusion in the 2023 Fall Faculty Senate Committee Survey. There were 507 faculty who participated.

**Analysis:** AY 2021-2022 instruction modes could be divided into three domains with mixed perception of the quality of the student learning during AY 2021-2022. Definitive qualitative responses of changes to teaching and assessment strategies and student performance by learning mode did not emerge in the survey. Qualitative response themes crossed all teaching modalities. Several faculty who taught hybrid courses strongly expressed interest in on ground courses only. They found the technology distracting, cumbersome, support response slow and not always knowledgeable. Those who taught in online appear in the responses to of utilized more technology and multiple methods to engage their students with success. CATLR was referenced by faculty as core their hybrid/online success. Attendance and exams were eliminated by some with no impact on the learning in the online courses. In fact, it was noted by several faculty that there was a shift from test stress to improved learning.

**Recommendation(s):**

1. Assess faculty onboarding, ongoing training, and other professional development needs related to both in the classroom and online technology for remote online or hybrid learning modalities.
2. Evaluate hybrid, NU Flex classroom technology and support to improve the teaching and learning experience.

**Charge 2.** In collaboration with the Provost's office and the FTNTTF Committee, review faculty equity across the institution for the following:

- a. Teaching workload:
  - i. Limits on number of courses (max or min)
  - ii. Compensation procedures related to faculty paid by credit hour (known to occur in at least DMSB, CPS)

**Process:** The [Provost's resource page](#) was accessed to review current teaching workload policies for Bouvè College of Health Sciences (8), College of Arts, Media and Design (6), Khoury College of Computer Sciences (1), College of Engineering (8), College of Professional Studies (1), College of Science (8), College of Social Sciences and Humanities (11), D'Amore-McKim School of Business (1), and School of Law (1).

**Analysis:** The teaching workload policies reviewed are well developed and appear to be equitable if faculty met the criteria outlined in the school or college. There was variability in teaching expectations for NTT/TT/T faculty and for also for individual faculty teaching, scholarship, service, and research

workload across the various faculty tracks, even within the same program/college. No workload policy included compensation procedures.

**Recommendation(s):**

1. That schools/colleges in collaboration with the faculty, annually assess their workload policy for equity.

**Charge 2 Continued**

- b. **Distribution of faculty workspace:** breakdown of shared versus individual office space and any procedures utilized to determine distribution of office space

**Process:** The distribution of faculty workspace was estimated by survey. 133 tenured or tenured track faculty (TT) and 211 non tenure track faculty (NTT) responded. Procedures for office space allocation were determined through communication with college leadership. Information on the total number of empty offices across campus was unavailable, but discussions with COE staff and faculty suggest that there are a very limited number of available offices.

**Analysis:** The survey results have revealed a disparity between TT and NTT faculty in terms of their allotment of private offices. This discrepancy has created feelings of inequity and frustration among NTT faculty who feel that they are being treated unfairly.

**Recommendation(s):**

1. It is recommended that each college creates an office space allocation policy in their bylaws. This policy should outline the process for allocating office space, taking into account factors such as faculty preferences, accessibility, collaborative needs, seniority, proximity to research space, and other relevant considerations. A comprehensive office space allocation policy should also define who is responsible for making decisions related to office space allocation.
2. Additionally, it is recommended that colleges calculate and publish the distribution of office spaces, in order to increase transparency and promote equity in the allocation of office space. This information could be shared with faculty members on an annual basis, and could be used to inform discussions and decisions related to office space allocation.

**Charge 3.** Conduct a survey of jointly appointed faculty across the university to explore and provide recommendations on perceptions of:

- a. Clarity in distribution of workload percentages
- b. Clarity with merit and equity compensation processes
- c. Communication processes between unit administrators and jointly appointed faculty
- d. Unit leader adherence to approved merit/equity and workload policies

**Process:** The survey consisted of the following 11 questions. The results of the survey can be seen after each question. 351 people answered the survey, 61% were full-time non-tenure track faculty, 37% were tenure track faculty, 2% of respondents declined to answer this question. Of the respondents 31 faculty hold joint appointments (8.8%), of these 65% were T/TT faculty and 35% were FTNTT faculty, with 5 faculty declining to answer the question.

**Analysis:** While the combined results of the survey questions seem to suggest satisfactory communication, workload and merit procedures between departments/colleges regarding joint appointments, when asked to expand beyond these questions there are underlying concerns for faculty

who hold these appointments. *It should be noted that this is a small sample size and may not reflect the concerns of all faculty who hold joint appointments.*

**Recommendations:**

1. Merit and workload assignments be clarified in written policy for current jointly appointed faculty and negotiated by the departments/colleges prior to joint appointment for new hires.
2. Chairs/department heads should collaborate to clearly define expectations for service in addition to teaching load.
3. Service should be limited to the department/college for which the faculty has the largest percentage of affiliation for FTNTT faculty or for T/TT faculty whichever is considered their pre-tenure home department.
4. Regular communication between chairs/unit heads occur with joint appointment faculty to relieve the burden of the faculty having to initiate conversations.

**Charge 4.** Review NU academic plan, identify aspects of the plan that apply to the work of this committee, and provide recommendations for possible future committee charges.

**Process:** The pillars of the academic plan were compared to the committee recommendations.

**Recommendation(s):**

1. Explore ways to incorporate diversity and inclusion considerations in office space allocation and workload assignment policies. This could include ensuring that faculty from underrepresented backgrounds have equitable access to resources, as well as accommodating the unique needs of faculty involved in interdisciplinary or collaborative projects.
2. Develop guidelines for communication between departments, colleges, and administrative units to ensure that office space allocation and workload assignment policies align with the broader goals and priorities of the academic plan. This may include creating a centralized system for tracking and sharing information about office space allocation and faculty workloads.
3. Monitor the impact of the academic plan's global initiatives on faculty workloads. Consider how expanding global opportunities and partnerships may affect faculty members' needs for office space and resources and develop strategies to accommodate these changes.

Respectfully Submitted,

Darin Detwiler  
Co-Chair-CPS - Graduate Programs

Michael Jaeggli  
COE – Bioengineering

Lynn Reede  
Co-Chair -BCHS - School Of Nursing

Daniel Noemi Voionmaa  
CSSH - Cultures, Societies, & Global Studies

Jennifer Ingemi  
COS – Psychology

Gary Porter  
DMSB - Finance Group