

The initial questions (black type) are those of Chapter President John W. White and are based upon the latest banking proposal. Sent via email July 19 2016.

Provost Traynham's responses to those questions are in blue type and were sent via email July 20, 2016.

White's follow-up to the Provost are noted via red type and sent via email July 20, 2016.

Earle,

My team and I cannot speak for the bargaining unit on the merits and drawbacks of the proposal until we get feedback from those faculty members affected by it. We will gladly solicit their feedback as soon as the majority of them are back on campus and regularly checking their email.

In the interim, I have a number of objections to the proposal:

1. Why is a graduate DIS weighted more heavily than an undergraduate DIS? Implicit here is the suggestion that the former is necessarily more time consuming and/or more important than the latter when such differentiation cannot be quantified across departments, programs, faculty, students, etc.

The heavier weight placed on graduate DIS is a result of faculty feedback to the deans and reflects the view that graduate DIS courses typically require more time on the part of the faculty. The deans agree with this view, although we all realize that there are variations.

I (JwW) contend that the view that a graduate DIS is inherently more work for faculty is unfounded, especially if faculty are doing their jobs well. Graduate work tends to build upon a more solid knowledge base, thus requiring less (re)teaching of major concepts. Graduate students tend to require less hand-holding from faculty in terms of assignments, papers, and projects (they are more capable of working independently) and their work tends to be of better quality, thereby requiring fewer corrections, remediation, and reassessment.

Undergraduate DIS encompasses the majority of DIS at UNF and most closely relates to UNF's primary mission.

Undergraduate DIS has a direct and meaningful effect upon a number of **BOG metrics**, including time to degree completion, 4-year graduation rate, and arguably on cost to degree completion.

We should encourage and value undergraduate DIS. Thus, I believe that a viable

and equitable solution would be for a faculty member and her/his chair to 'weigh' a proposed or completed DIS based upon the work performed therein (to include number of students enrolled and the scope of work entailed) rather than upon a universal and untenable view of the efforts required in teaching different levels of students.

2. What is the rationale that a DIS may not “assist” a faculty member in terms of research or lab work? There is no such provision in place for faculty engaged in normally contracted teaching duties. Moreover, if UNF is genuinely believes that students benefit from working closely with faculty on such things as research projects, why should the work done therein not further our understanding of issues/phenomena and/or be disseminated via conferences or journals? Students can learn a great deal by being involved in a faculty member’s research projects.

Tenure track faculty are assigned a portion of the FTE for research. The deans agree that if a student assists the faculty member in this effort, the faculty member does not merit additional compensation.

The compensation under discussion (DIS) is not for conducting or disseminating research; it is for the additional and thus far uncompensated work that faculty do in order to engage students in learning specific content as outlined in a DIS contract. That a faculty member—and a DIS student—may learn something along the way that might be disseminated is a positive outcome of such learning.

Two analogies: The work conducted by students in labs has on numerous occasions assisted faculty in their research. These common practices are not under question. Similarly, if my colleagues or I publish pieces about innovative teaching methods that result at least in part from our contracted teaching duties, we are by no means prohibited from citing that research on our vitas or from using those publications in seeking sabbaticals or awards. So why would DIS be different in this regard? The line between teaching and research is by no means as clear (nor should it be) as the position above suggests.

A corollary to the proposed approach is that faculty will be less inclined to engage in DIS, to include students on research projects, or to list students as co-authors on presentations or publications.

Finally, I feel it important to note what I see as two competing paradigms here: one is a view that faculty will seek to abuse the system to get research assistants or to receive additional compensation via an eventual course release (i.e., to "double-dip"); the other is that faculty will continue doing what they have been doing for years: using DIS wisely to benefit students and further their own lines of inquiry. While I agree that faculty should not abuse the system, I trust my colleagues to do what is right and ethical (and to be called to task when or if they fail in that endeavor).

3. Why provide retroactivity only for faculty within departments or colleges with a set 'banking' policy already in place? Faculty across all departments and colleges at UNF have completed independent studies (with no compensation and in many cases under leadership that refused to consider any form of banking). Further, it is relatively easy to determine who has conducted DIS, theses, and dissertation work over the past three years.

We agree with this point and will adjust the guidelines to permit all faculty to participate in this retroactive credit.

I appreciate this change.

John

--

John W. White
President
United Faculty of Florida, UNF Chapter
j.white@unf.edu