

[In these minutes: CLA Faculty Workloads, Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures, Resolution on Dependent Tuition Remission, Subcommittee Reports]

### **Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs**

Thursday, March 9, 2000

300 Morrill Hall

3:00 PM

### **MINUTES**

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the view, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

---

**Present:** Richard Goldstein (Chair), Josef Altholz, Avner Ben-Ner, Carol Carrier, Daniel Feeney, John Fossum, Roland Guyotte, Robert Jones, Cleon Melsa, Larry Miller, Sam Mok, George Seltzer, Tom Walsh, Carol Wells

**Regrets:** Carole Bland, Robert Fahnhorst, Andrea Hinding, Marti Hope Gonzales, Charlene Mason, Marcia Pankake, James Perry, Geoffrey Sirc, Sheila Warness

**Absent:** Meghan McCauly

**Guests:** Ellen Berscheid, Tom Clayton, Mary Dempsey, Darwin Hendel, Ed Prescott, John Sullivan

---

**1. Approval of February 15, 2000 Minutes:** The minutes were approved as presented.

### **2. Key Issues Status Report/Update**

- Professor Goldstein reviewed a handout that outlines issues currently before the committee and their status.

### **3. Faculty Workloads – Discussion with Ellen Berscheid**

Regents' Professor Berscheid provided the committee with a handout and briefly summarized the information found on it (see attached):

- There has been much confusion and argument over faculty workloads within the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) since semester conversion took place.
- Central administration promised faculty that semester conversion would be "workload neutral," but many faculty within the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) believe that the College's new semester teaching workload rule has increased teaching load and is not neutral.
- It would be helpful if SCFA were to determine if the change in workload between the quarter and semester systems is neutral because the issue continues to be controversial and a source of growing faculty distrust of both central administration and the college administration.

- Most faculty were informed of the new rule when they were asked to develop department workload policies that conformed to the new rule; some departments (e.g., Psychology) have been unable to develop a policy acceptable to the college and are working without a department workload policy.
- It is widely perceived that departments no longer have the flexibility they had previously to meet department-wide teaching, research, and service goals because, apart from some "formula exemptions," the new teaching guideline is directed to individual faculty members, not to departments..
- It is widely believed that teaching workload was increased because CLA projected it would receive lower tuition revenues under the semester system.
- Justifications and explanations made by administrators for the increased workload have included: the increase is small; the current administration need not honor a promise made by a previous administration; the neutral workload promise referred the entire system and so some colleges may work more and others less and still satisfy the promise.

Comments:

- If CLA courses under the quarter system had matched the University's new credit-per-hour rule, semester conversion may have been workload-neutral or even have decreased slightly, but the typical CLA course module was 4 credits for 3 hours of in-class instruction under the quarter system (e.g., 87% of Psychology courses under the quarter system were of this type).
- The Tenure Code allows departments the flexibility of developing workloads, but faculty set goals for appropriate workloads.
- Several Regents' professors feel responsibility for settling this issue because they urged faculty not to unionize; if faculty had voted for a union, an increase in teaching load could not have been made without negotiation and approval by the faculty.
- It would be appropriate for the dean to determine how many instructional hours there must be, but then the department should be able to determine how that is reached.
- CLA is large and its departments' missions are diverse; "one-size-fits-all" rules across departments are inappropriate.
- SCFA should determine if the change was neutral and report its findings to FCC.
- The dean did not present the new teaching rule to the CLA Assembly for approval.
- Consideration was given to filing a formal grievance, but it was felt that the issue could be handled within the faculty governance system.
- The new semester workload policy in General College also was perceived by faculty to increase teaching workload but in response to complaints, the dean revised the policy and the General College faculty recently voted on and approved the revision.
- It is not certain what will happen if and when SCFA and FCC reach a determination.
- SCFA cannot be the decision-making body, but it can have influence on implementing necessary changes.
- Professor Goldstein will draft a letter to Dean Rosenstone asking for his position on the issue as well as inviting him to a future SCFA meeting.
- Any rule that is developed should be based upon courses and not credits.
- Professors Miller, Melsa, and Altholz will develop a position statement on behalf of the committee and it will be considered at the next meeting.

**4. Retirement Subcommittee – Action on Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures**

Comments and concerns about the proposed Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures:

- Faculty emeriti should be able to receive mail at their departments, but that has not been stipulated in the policy or administrative procedures.
- The policy should account for female emeriti.
- Other institutions do not have anything similar to this policy or administrative procedures and are very interested in the final product.
- If SCFA approves the policy and administrative procedures, it will be presented to the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty Senate, the administration, and the Board of Regents.
- The Faculty Senate will act upon the policy and administrative procedures at its April 20 meeting and the Board is scheduled to consider the policy at its May meeting.
- The language regarding grievances is not compliant with the revisions recently made to the Grievance Policy, but that issue will be resolved when both policies are considered by the Regents.
- Faculty emeriti should be able to sit in on classes with the instructor's permission and that is not necessarily the same thing as auditing a course so the language within the policy is questionable.
- Policies that were available at other institutions were gathered and information from them was added as appropriate to the policy and administrative procedures that were developed for the University.
- The Retirees' Association has been pleased with the process in which the policy and administrative procedures were created.
- A motion to approve the policy and administrative procedures with the indicated revisions was seconded and unanimously approved.

#### **5. Tenure Subcommittee**

Mary Dempsey provided an update on the Tenure Subcommittee:

- About half of the units have submitted their post-tenure review guidelines for review.
- Guidelines were developed to make sure each set of guidelines was uniformly reviewed.
- At a recent AAHE convention, a 1 1/2 day session was devoted to post-tenure review.
- After the guidelines are reviewed, the next step will be to gather quantitative data to measure the impact.
- Grants are available from the AAHE to develop a mechanism that would measure such an impact.
- The Tenure Subcommittee must develop an interpretation for 7.12 statements that have been changed and how probationary faculty should be handled under those statements.

#### **6. Benefits Subcommittee – Action on Dependent Tuition Resolution**

John Fossum presented a resolution on dependent tuition remission for consideration and action:

- Information from other institutions was gathered and seven out of the eleven Big 10 institutions offer at least fifty percent tuition remission to employees' dependents.
- From analysis made last year, fringe benefits for civil service employees would go up by 1/4 percent and 1/5 percent for academic employees.
- The proposal should be considered as a savings instead of an expense because it is a retention tool that would eliminate costs associated with hiring new employees.
- The proposal calls for 50% tuition remission after five years of service and it would then become 100% coverage after ten years of service.
- The benefit is only available to children in undergraduate programs and they must go through the normal admission process to receive the benefit.

Comments:

- The University of Chicago offers 100% coverage and that information should be added to the other data.
- The benefit is a good recruitment tool, but there should be a way to waive the waiting periods for star candidates.
- Units would receive the same revenue for those students utilizing the benefit as those students that do not have access to the benefit.
- Employees' children who are in General College would be eligible to receive the benefit because it is considered a program leading to an undergraduate degree.
- The Institutional Research Office will confirm the analysis made available in the resolution before the administration will implement any plan.
- A motion to approve the resolution was seconded and unanimously approved by the committee.

### **7. Survey Review Group – Discussion with Darwin Hendel**

Darwin Hendel informed the committee of the work of a SCFA subgroup that considered satisfaction survey and needs from any survey to be conducted in the future:

- The performance measures, under the Critical Measures implemented by the previous administration, contained an expectation that there would be a periodic survey to measure employee satisfaction with the University.
- The first survey was conducted in 1997 and the summary of the results are available on the web.
- The questions that appeared on the first survey were developed by Human Resources and reviewed by the Senate structure.
- The subgroup that considered the survey and how the next should appear has met twice.
- The subgroup determined that the first survey was too general since it applied to all employee groups so no issues distinct to class could be included.
- The next survey should focus only upon faculty, but exact content and timing of the survey are yet to be determined.

Comments:

- There must be a purpose to conducting the survey before content and timing can be determined.
- The subgroup should meet again to decide upon the purpose and timeline of the next survey.
- Professor Hendel has returned to teaching in the College of Education and Human Development so there will be a different representative from the administration. However, he would like to continue on the project.

### **8. Charge Review Group – Update on Meeting with Linda Fisher**

Professor Goldstein met with Linda Fisher about the proposed revisions to SCFA's charge:

- The changes would eliminate any reference to academic professionals, but a new duty would be added, which stipulates that the committee "interact with the Academic Staff Advisory Committee (ASAC) on all items that jointly impact academic staff and faculty; such as benefits and retirement."
- The proposed amendments will go before the Faculty Senate at its meeting on April 20.

### **9. Faculty Development**

Carol Carrier and Robert Jones provided an update on Faculty Development:

- The Board of Regents heard a presentation by a panel of faculty describing different aspects of faculty development.

- A faculty development task force has been created to assess current programs and what would make an effective program.
- A survey will be conducted to determine what the needs of faculty are at the University.
- Information on programs available at other institutions will also be gathered and considered.
- Whatever program is developed will not just be made up of workshops.
- The task force is scheduled to complete its project by November, but the Regents would like something sooner than that.

## 10. Faculty One-Stop

Carol Carrier provided an update on Faculty One-Stop:

- A link to the USave website has been added to the faculty one-stop site.
- Staffing changes have caused the system to be down, but hopefully that has been corrected.

## 11. A Appointments

Professor Goldstein informed the committee on an issue that ASAC has been considering:

- ASAC has proposed changing the term of A appointments and it is not certain how the change will affect faculty on A appointments.
- Modifications would include the ability to earn vacation, but that may be difficult to implement with faculty who have B appointments and cannot earn vacation.
- Different A appointments will not be developed for the faculty and academic staff classes.
- The Benefits Subcommittee should work with ASAC to better understand the proposal.

## 12. Frequent Flier Miles

Professor Goldstein updated the committee on one of the many issues the Benefits Subcommittee is considering:

- University policy stipulates that frequent flier miles must go to the University when travelling on business, but it is not certain why when grants may pay for the travel.
- A representative from Travel Services will attend the April Benefits Subcommittee or SCFA meeting to discuss this issue further.

## 13. Academic Appointments

- Professor Goldstein updated the committee on the status of the academic appointments project: Professor Bales indicated to FCC that the report drafted by Brandl's working group was not sufficient.
- Professor Morrison suggested a group of people from the working group and joint committee come together to further consider the issue.

**14. Adjournment:** Professor Goldstein adjourned the meeting at 5:10 PM.

----

**THE CLA "SEMESTER CONVERSION--WORKLOAD NEUTRAL" PROBLEM:**

## A BRIEF FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS <sup>1</sup>

*"In his State of the University address Sept. 30, President Yudof said that the U 'is a community built on trust,' and at its core is integrity. 'Today I focus on reciprocity, the explicit and implicit promises we make to each other, to students and staff, and to the people of Minnesota,' Yudof said" (Kiosk, November, 1999).*

### 1. The Problem

When the University of Minnesota's central administration decided to convert to the Semester system from the Quarter system, it promised the faculty that Semester conversion would be "workload neutral," a phrase that was taken to mean that the workload of the faculty would not change in amount or kind with the conversion.

Subsequently, the College of Liberal Arts administration established a Semester teaching load guideline<sup>2</sup> that it believes to be workload neutral. In contrast to the Quarter system guideline of 5 courses per year, the Semester system guideline is 4 courses per year. The new Semester rule is believed by many CLA faculty to represent a non-trivial increase in teaching load and, thus, a betrayal of the administration's "workload--neutral" promise.<sup>3</sup>

### 2. Action Requested

Given the controversy surrounding the new Semester teaching load rule, and the erosion of trust it has generated not only of the CLA administration but also of the Yudof administration, it would be useful if SCFA were to settle the matter by making a judgment of fact: Is the CLA Semester teaching load rule "workload-neutral" or is it not?

### 3. The Perceived Teaching Workload Difference in CLA

---

<sup>1</sup> This document was prepared by Ellen Berscheid (Department of Psychology; CLA Senator) in consultation with many people, none of whom is in any way responsible for its contents. Many of the events leading up to the Semester rule have been pieced together from various sources and represent guesses as to what actually took place.

<sup>2</sup> The new rule is referred to as a "guideline" by the College, rather than a policy, apparently because the Dean is not empowered to establish educational policy by proclamation and without faculty consultation and approval. The difference between an enforced guideline and a policy is not clear.

<sup>3</sup> Because this document was prepared for SCFA's deliberations, it does not consider the implications of the perceived betrayal for students, although this, too, is a faculty concern.

Under the Quarter system, the modal course module in CLA was 3 contact in-class hours/4 credits. Calculating the professor's in-class contact time plus his or her class preparation time (using the extremely conservative figure given for student preparation time on the Quarter system in CLA Classroom Grading & Examination Procedures 1998-1999, which was 3 hours per week per credit, including class time, which translates to 2 hours out-of-class preparation per one hour in-class for each credit), the difference between teaching workload pre- and post-semester conversion appears to be approximately 72 hours, or an increase of almost two 40-hour weeks of teaching work per year, or 4 additional weeks of teaching (at 2 courses per week per semester at 18 hours each course per week).<sup>4</sup>

Quarter System: 5 courses X 10 weeks X 3 hours in-class = 150 hours  
150 in-class hours X 2 hours prep each = 300 hours  
Total = 450 teaching hours

Semester System: 2 courses X 14 weeks (F Sem) X 3 hours in-class = 84 hours  
2 courses X 15 weeks (S Sem) X 3 hours in-class = 90 hours  
174 in-class hours X 2 hours prep each = 348 hours  
Total = 522 teaching hours

Difference: 522 - 450 = 72 teaching hours per academic year

### 3. Consequences of the Difference

Apart from the consequence that CLA faculty perceive they must now reallocate at least 72 hours per academic year from scholarship and service activities to teaching activities and the effects this reallocation has on hiring and retention of faculty, the most important consequence of the difference is the widespread belief that the administration broke its promise to the faculty, without whose support and considerable effort the conversion to semesters could not have been made. Moreover, it should be noted that many faculty did not vote for a faculty union because they trusted that: (a) Mr. Yudof would honor the promises made to the faculty by the previous administration; (b) their interests would be protected by the faculty governance system, including the FCC and the SCFA. Many faculty have

---

<sup>4</sup> This calculation does not include ancillary time consuming duties, such as additional class office hours per week per course. The administration's alleged "savings" in moving from 5 courses to 4 are discussed in section 9.d of this document.

observed that had the faculty been protected by a union, an increase in teaching workload could not have been instituted by fiat and without negotiation with the faculty.

#### **4. Faculty Consultation About the New Workload Rule**

Most CLA faculty heard about the new Semester teaching rule in the 1998-99 academic year when each CLA department was asked to revise its departmental workload policy to conform to the new teaching rule. The rule was discussed in the CLA Council of Chairs several times throughout that academic year. The Council of Chairs, however, never formally voted on nor formally approved the new rule; because Chairs are appointed by the Dean and serve at his pleasure, it is not clear that such a vote, even if it had been taken, would have reflected faculty consent. Moreover, the CLA Assembly also did not approve the rule. Some departments (e.g., Psychology) have yet to construct a workload policy that is mutually acceptable to the CLA Dean and to the faculty; as a consequence, they are working without a departmental workload policy.

#### **5. An Exacerbating Feature of the New Semester Workload Rule**

Under the Quarter system, departments were permitted flexibility in meeting their teaching, research, and service obligations to the College and the University so long as the department as a whole met the teaching load guideline. Such flexibility often was reflected in departmental workload policy, congruent with the Section 7a.1 of the Tenure Code ("Goals and Expectations"), which states:

"The faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty. The goals and expectations will be established in accordance with standards established by the University Senate. *They can provide for flexibility, so that some faculty members can contribute more heavily to the accomplishment of one mission of the unit and others to the accomplishment of other missions* (emphasis added). ...The dean reviews the goals and expectations of each unit and may request changes to meet the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit."

Exacerbating the demoralizing effect of the new rule is the fact that it is targeted not to departments but, rather, to individuals. Apart from a number of formulaic course "exemptions" granted by the College to departments to be distributed as the department chair sees fit (i.e., X number of "administrative" course exemptions for administrative work and a smaller number of course exemptions

for scholarship), only the CLA dean is empowered to grant changes to an individual faculty member's workload upon request of the department chair.

It should be noted that the course "exemptions" for administrative work are perceived to be fewer under the Semester system than they were under the Quarter system when the chair negotiated with the dean the workload for him- or herself and for other departmental administrators. With respect to scholarship and service exemptions, chairs typically granted course exemptions to their faculty members on a need basis but only when the departmental teaching obligation had been met and only when it was ascertained that the department could "deliver" the curriculum. In order to deliver the curriculum, many faculty routinely and willingly increased their teaching loads from time to time; that is, the department's focus was on cooperative delivery of the curriculum rather than on individual faculty members' teaching loads.

In sum, it is believed that departments no longer have the flexibility they had prior to semester conversion to deploy their faculty to meet the department's mission most efficiently and sensitively.

#### **6. An Extenuating Circumstance That May Have Prompted the New Rule**

It is widely perceived that CLA may have been motivated to increase faculty teaching load because Semester conversion was expected to place the College in a precarious financial position for at least two reasons:

(a) It was anticipated that students would enroll for fewer credit hours per year under the Semester system than they had under the Quarter system. Because tuition is charged on a credit basis, it was feared that tuition revenue would decrease under the Semester system for this reason alone.

(b) It was feared that tuition revenue would decrease for another reason: Prior to Semester conversion, CLA had been granting 4 credits for courses that met for 3 hours per week (again, the typical course module in CLA). The Faculty Senate voted that upon Semester conversion, the number of credits awarded a course should equal the number of in-class contact hours. Thus, rather than receiving 4 credits worth of tuition dollars for a 3 hour per week course, the College would receive only 3 credits worth of tuition dollars after Semester conversion.

Both factors were expected to result in a serious shortfall of tuition revenue for CLA, an event that would be exacerbated by another factor: More than most colleges in the University, CLA is dependent upon tuition revenue to finance the activities of the College, including its teaching activities. This is true even when compared only to other colleges in the arts, science, and engineering complex. For example, according to a University of Minnesota Instructional Cost Study (1994-1995) conducted by the Office of Planning and Analysis, October 21, 1996 (Exhibits III and IX), the percentage of total

instructional cost per FYE student provided by state funded instructional costs in 1995 were: 58.8% for General College; 60.3% for the College of Biological Sciences; 61.9% for the Institute of Technology; and only 47.4% for the College of Liberal Arts. Thus, CLA students receive a significantly lower portion of their instructional costs from the state and, as a consequence, their tuition dollars must fund more of these costs.

It might be parenthetically noted that the fact that CLA is somewhere near the bottom of the barrel in state-supported instructional costs, and, as a consequence, more dependent on tuition revenue than other colleges, has been variously described over the years by central administration officials as an "anomaly," an "historical accident," "an unfortunate inequity," and as a situation that "must be corrected in the future." However, the opportunity to correct the situation at the time of Semester conversion was not seized. It was not seized, it is suspected, because in addition to the "workload neutral" promise, central administration also made a Semester conversion "budget neutral" promise.

#### **8. The Faculty "Workload Neutral" Promise vs. the "Budget Neutral" Promise**

At the same time the administration promised the faculty that Semester conversion would be workload neutral, it also promised colleges that Semester conversion would be "budget neutral." One implication of this policy apparently was that there would be no redistribution of state instructional funds to achieve greater equity in state support for CLA instruction in order to ameliorate CLA's anticipated financial plight. Thus, many suspect that when the workload neutral promise collided with the budget neutral promise, central administration chose to honor the budget neutral promise and, at least in the case of CLA, turn a blind eye to a possible violation of the workload neutral promise to faculty by a dean who was justifiably concerned that his college would experience a financial melt-down with the conversion to semesters. (It should be noted that because of the inadequacies of the PeopleSoft accounting system, CLA administration contends that it still does not know the actual extent of the shortfall in tuition revenue in the Fall of 1999, the first semester under the conversion program; nevertheless, as of Feb. 7, 2000, the College's best estimate of loss of tuition revenue due to Semester conversion is over \$3 million.)

#### **9. A Pot Pourri of Explanations, Excuses, and Justifications Offered by the Administration for the New Teaching Rule**

To the widespread dissatisfaction, in some cases anger, within CLA for what has been perceived as a violation of an important promise to the faculty, various administrative officials, both central and college, have offered a number of responses that have enveloped the workload controversy in a dense fog

that often has obscured the issues. Some of these administrative responses are recounted here, along with comment (\*) on each:

(a) *"The teaching increase -- if it is an increase -- is so trivial as to be beneath notice ."*

\* This oft-heard defense by administrators attempts to paint faculty who contend that Semester conversion in CLA is not workload-neutral as "small-minded." It is quite true that the perceived increase is believed to amount to petty thievery by the administration -- not grand larceny. However, such underhanded "chiseling" for relatively small gain is seen as all the more distasteful and unseemly, especially when viewed against a backdrop of the administration's frequent reminders to other segments of the University community, particularly faculty and students, that they are obligated to honor their promises. Moreover, if the administration truly considers the size of the increase trivial, the question arises if it also would consider a decrease of precisely the same magnitude to be trivial. In sum, to determine whether the impact of a pebble in a person's shoe is "trivial," one asks the person whose shoe it is in -- not the person who put it there.

(b) *"The promise was made by the Hasselmo administration, not the Yudof administration; the Yudof administration need not be beholden to promises made by former administrations."*

\* Given the rapid turn-over of administrators at the U of M, when the day arrives that the faculty cannot trust a new administrator to honor the promises of the previous administrator in that post, the University will not be able to run on "trust." Each member of the University community will want every agreement, promise, understanding, and custom to be codified into legal and enforceable contract.

(c) The promise only implied that semester conversion would be neutral "system wide," not for each college or for each department or faculty member.

\* This suggestion appears in a memo dated February 4, 1999 from Peter Zetterberg to President Mark G. Yudof regarding the "Status of Semester Conversion." In this memo, and after noting that "faculty and staff cooperation has been tremendous" in effecting semester conversion, Mr. Zetterberg responds to the question "Will the semester conversion be workload neutral for faculty members?" His response includes the following:

"Campus-wide, there should be no change in workload. The content of the curriculum is more or less the same. There are 30 weeks of instruction in the academic year. The size of the faculty in 1999-00 will be approximately the same as in 1998-99.

"Locally, at the department level, there may be some changes. This will depend on how instructional workload is defined in terms of the above components and on how a department's curriculum was converted. [Note: The components referred to are: number of course sections taught; level of course sections; number of preparations required; credit value of the course sections taught; the enrollment in each course section; the contact hours for the course sections taught.]

"...Some colleges and departments have converted the curriculum so that it is comprised of mostly 3-credit courses. Others have retained the same mix of courses as in the quarter-based curriculum (e.g., mostly 4-credit courses)....

"In departments with a curriculum of mostly 3-credit courses, the number of courses taught by a faculty member per term may be greater on semesters, even though the total credit value of the courses taught is approximately the same or maybe even less."

First, it should be noted that the administration's promise of workload-neutral was not taken by anyone to mean that the promise referred to "system-wide" workload. Had such an interpretation been made before the fact of conversion, it is probable that the faculty would have been alarmed and would have failed to provide "tremendous" effort and cooperation to effect the conversion. It is especially likely that CLA faculty would have become alarmed, for CLA is the major teaching college within the University, doing 45% of the University's teaching and graduating 24% of its Ph.D.s (Julia Davis, CLA Today, Fall, 1992). A "system-wide" promise would permit CLA, or any other college, to experience a 100% teaching increase, for if teaching in other colleges was then reduced commensurately, the administration could maintain that the conversion was workload-neutral.

Second, the credit value of a course is irrelevant to a faculty member's workload. The University may decide to grant 4 credits for a course that meets 3 hours per week or it may decide to grant 3 credits or 2 credits. The workload-neutral promise referred to workload -- not credit load. Thus, what is relevant to the workload-neutral promise is the amount of work the faculty member is obligated to devote to teaching. Most faculty would agree that in determining the amount of work teaching a course entails, the factor that accounts for the lion's share of the variance is amount of in-class time and preparation time.

Third, both the CLA Quarter and Semester system teaching workload guidelines refer to courses - not credits. In sum, discussion of credits taught is irrelevant in terms of the workload-neutral promise (although relevant to tuition income).

In enforcing the new teaching rule, it should be mentioned in fairness that the CLA dean has sometimes displayed sensitivity to size of course enrollment (e.g., seminars with fewer than 5 students

count for nothing, unless a special petition is made to the dean and approved by him; enrollments of 600 plus with many different lecturers may count as one course for each lecturer). But because interpretation of what constitutes a "course" may depend upon the dean's disposition, there is no guarantee that future interpretations by the present dean or future deans will not be arbitrary or capricious.

*(d) Arguments in CLA Dean's Letter (January 22, 1999) to Department of Psychology's Chair Regarding Teaching Workload (Letter Appended)*

This letter, which was distributed at a Department of Psychology meeting, was greeted with puzzlement, suspicion, and derisive laughter for a variety of reasons, some of which will be addressed below:

*(d.1) "This exercise [of determining the effect of the new teaching rule on faculty workload] can quickly turn into something akin to counting the number of angels on the head of a pin...."*

\* To the contrary, it should have been possible for the College to estimate quite closely what the effect of the new rule would be in contrast to the old rule. Even if the instructional curriculum of CLA had not been computerized at that time (it seems doubtful it wasn't), one assumes the College had access to its printed course schedules for the past several years. These course schedules provide both in-class contact hours and credit information for each class taught and thus permit a calculation of the percentage of courses in each type of course module (e.g., 3 contact hours per week/4 credit) under the Quarter system. Moreover, the course modules and schedules proposed for post-Semester conversion most certainly were available to the College, for each required the College's approval. In sum, given that CLA is a major teaching college of the University, one would have thought that the administration would have carefully determined the impact of the new rule before it was put in place. The College's implicit contention that the necessary information to make the estimate of impact was, or is, not available strikes many as disingenuous.

*(d.2). "Remember that a four-credit course being converted to a three-credit semester course should cover the same quantity of material, so there should be only minimal (if any) additional class material to prepare."*

\*This statement has struck faculty as incomprehensible, if not risible. Given the modal course module in CLA under both the quarter and semester systems (3 in-class hours per week), the addition of 4

or 5 weeks for each of 4 courses hardly suggests that there "should be only minimal (if any) additional class material" to prepare for each course (except for those lecturers who are capable of talking very slowly -- slow enough to stretch out 10 weeks of lectures to 14 or 15 weeks).

Moreover, many faculty were laboring under the belief that the decision to convert to the Semester system was at least partially prompted by pedagogical concerns. It was believed that the additional weeks would do the course material greater justice -- more lectures, exercises, and, possibly exams would result in greater and richer student learning experiences. But if it is true that professors are expected to cover the same amount of course material in 14 or 15 weeks as in 10, what is the justification for not covering the material in 10 as before and giving the student an opportunity to learn more in the additional weeks?

*(d.3). "These small increases will occur in those situations where under quarters, the number of credits for courses exceeded the number of schedule student contact hours."*

\* The phrase "those situations" accounts for the vast majority of courses within CLA. The precise number of such courses requiring a "small increase" should have been available to the College, as previously noted.

*(d.4). "Balancing the other side of the ledger are a host of routine, course-related activities that decrease as one moves from the five-course load under quarters to the four-course load under semesters."*

\* Even if faculty were to agree that the activities listed represent a savings in time (which most would not; see response in d.2.), it seems unlikely that the savings would add up to 72 hours or 4 teaching weeks per year.

*(d.5). "As you know, other changes will also occur as we move from quarters to semesters."*

\* It is true that single-Quarter leaves of 10 weeks become single-Semester leaves of 14 or 15 weeks. This year in CLA, this amounted to an additional release time of 4 or 5 weeks for the 19 professors -- out of 500-plus professors -- who were able to enjoy this saving.

Sabbatical supplements may grow in number but they have not grown in quality. As most administrators and faculty know, few can afford to take sabbaticals on half-salary. The administration

and faculty governance have worried that few professors take sabbaticals at the U of M in contrast to other universities, but no revision of the sabbatical policy has been made. This saving of faculty time is mostly a chimera.

Finally, it is stated that "Under semesters, departments have research course releases that they can assign to faculty in their unit to facilitate faculty research and creative activity." This is not new under semesters, as previously noted; it is not even clear that the research exemptions now permitted are as liberal as they were under quarters.

#### **10. Concluding Comment**

It would be hard to decide what has undermined faculty trust more -- the new Semester teaching rule itself or the arguments that have been offered to try to persuade faculty that the rule is workload-neutral. The matter continues to poison faculty trust and needs to be put to rest, one way or another, for: *"...everything we value at the U of M stands on a bedrock of trust. Without it there is no possibility of mutual respect, no personal or professional honor, no loyalty to this great institution, and no commitment to our compact with students" ("Promises to Keep," by Mark Yudof, Kiosk, January 2000).*