

# Survey Data Regarding Proposed Banking Policy

August 29, 2016

	Faculty	Administration	Total
Support the Policy	36 (44.4%)	1 (50.0%)	37 (44.5%)
Do Not Support the Policy	45 (55.6%)	1 (50.0%)	46 (55.4%)

## Comments from Faculty:

"I don't understand how a student completing an independent study with me could be considered to be assisting with research that is not my own?"

As soon as they start working with me, they are working with me!

Students may have an idea but that idea gets refined and developed over many hours before it becomes something that could be the basis of an independent study. At that point, how could that project not be considered to belong to both the student and myself?

Under this system, I would have no incentive to work with students on independent studies because they would never count toward the banking system."

"I do not support it in its current form, though I do appreciate admin is finally addressing this issue university-wide.

20 points is too high. Also, limiting points earned for multiple students further exploits faculty, particularly in departments where faculty may find themselves teaching, in effect, a fourth course when expected to offer an independent student for multiple students if the regular course can't ""make"" due to official minimum enrollments.

I understand the tendency to make points higher for grad over undergrad, but in fact undergrad independent studies can be far MORE work, given their lesser ability to work independently.

SERVING (as opposed to chairing) on master's thesis committees, etc. should be worth more."

1) For DIS, according to the language in the document, a faculty member would receive fewer points for a DIS with two students (1.5 points total) than with one student (2 points total). Or, it could be read to mean that faculty receive 2 points for the DIS and .75 per student, which means 2.75 points total for a DIS with one student and 3.5 points for a DIS with two students. If the policy is meant to be 2 points for the first student and .75 per additional student, that should be clearly stated.

2) Faculty should be able to take the course releases that they have earned in the combination that they and their Chairs, in consultation with the Dean, deem appropriate and feasible. Saving banking points and having the possibility of taking more than one release per year is one of the only ways faculty can gain enough course release time at once to significantly advance projects to publication, especially when the research is not local.

3) This comment takes into account items 3. and 5. of the policy document. Faculty should either be allowed to take their earned course releases in a timely fashion (e.g. guaranteed within two years of completing the point total required for a course release) or, if they are not allowed to take their course release in a timely fashion, they must be given the option to instead take monetary compensation in the form of overload pay for their labor, equivalent to the three credit course they earned release from. The current combination of 3. and 5. opens the door to indefinite delays by administrative fiat on faculty's earned course releases. This is part of the problem with how the current banking policy has been implemented: at one point the administration ""froze"" faculty's banked course releases for several years. If faculty are not going to be allowed to take their course release on a reasonable timeline, faculty should have the option to wait longer for their course release or be paid. Leaving a loophole that allows the administration to simply not compensate faculty for their labor is neither appropriate nor acceptable.

4) Faculty should retain all points earned until such time as they have enough points for a course release. The points shouldn't be cleared until they're spent. The fact that the work was done and the tuition revenue for those credit hours was generated doesn't disappear just because X number of years have passed, and neither should the banking points. If the administration wants to clear the banking points earned more than three years ago to start the new system, the faculty should be compensated monetarily for those points at prorated overload/banking credit-hour equivalent rates. In smaller departments or departments without graduate students, it can take faculty much longer than three years to accumulate the points needed for a release. Likewise, there are structural disparities in opportunities to earn banking points within individual departments. Those faculty should not be denied compensation for their work with a shift to a new system just because it takes longer to accumulate points. Some faculty were also denied the course releases they earned, for many years, because of a ""freeze"" on banked course releases. These faculty should not be denied compensation now because they were made to wait

5) Retiring faculty and faculty who do not want their banking points should be able to contribute their points to a common departmental bank in their home departments as a contribution to junior faculty working towards tenure and faculty in the department who for structural reasons do not enjoy the same opportunities to earn banking points.

"Comments below are in sequence from top of policy document to outlined exemptions and procedures

## POLICY

1. A total of 20 points for a course release is excessive. COAS Banking Policy is 15 points and that is far more reasonable.

2. Points should be pro-rated if student does not complete the dissertation/thesis/project rather than awarding zero points. UNF receives student tuition whether or not a student completes the project. Chairing a graduate thesis/dissertation requires three or more semesters of faculty time and resources (e.g., Thesis A, B, C). If a student makes it through the first two semesters but for whatever reason does not finish the third semester (e.g., accepted into PhD program, relocates, gives up), it is unfair to withhold all banking credit from the faculty member who invested over a year's worth of time in the student.

3. Valuable components of the educational program have been left off the proposed policy. Most notably these include (a) graduate level supervised research [should be included with list that receives 2 points], and (b) community-based practicum/ internship that is not part of assigned teaching load. Supervised research is oftentimes a required precursor to thesis/ dissertation work for graduate students. With regards to (a), faculty must sponsor and supervise students and students pay UNF for faculty guidance and supervision which is not part of their assigned teaching load. Supervision of a graduate student in a 3-credit experience should receive 1 point. With regards to (b), UNF has received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification and practica/internships are advanced community-based learning experiences consistent with this classification and UNF's mission statement. When students receive college credit for a practicum and/or internship that is supervised by faculty (above and beyond assigned teaching load), faculty should receive 1 point of banking credit for a student enrolled in a 3-credit practicum/internship. This is especially important for the top two majors at UNF that have been challenged by Florida's Governor to assure undergraduates from these majors are employable and/or able to enter graduate school in their field.

#### EXEMPTIONS

To exempt from the banking policy ""any independent study that assists the faculty with their own research"" is ridiculous. In order to provide adequate supervision of student research, there is always going to be overlap with a faculty member's own research. This exemption must be removed.

#### PROCEDURES

Senior faculty are systematically penalized by the procedures outlined in this document.

1. Allotment of one course release should be on a semester, not annual, basis. To do otherwise, penalizes senior faculty.
2. Limiting accrued points to the past three years penalizes senior faculty. Understandably, there needs to be some limit but three years is not sufficient. Although my preference would be 10 years, I understand that the administration may worry about owing a large number of course releases to senior faculty who have been contributing (without compensation) for many years. In fairness to those senior faculty, the accrual of points should extend back to at least the past six years. Points accrued from Summer 2010 onward should be accepted. That still leaves behind a great deal of uncompensated faculty supervised credits for which UNF received tuition. "

I would be interested in learning what other universities have in their CBA in order to make a more informed decision in further discussion on this issue. At present this seems grossly unfair to faculty, perhaps based on a serious underestimate of the time and energy devoted to these activities. Side note, I can't remember if the union had already quantified that - how much time on average do each of these activities actually take folks here at UNF? Seems like that would be important to quantifying fair compensation.

"There is wording that needs to be clarified, in the sections on independent studies. Ex. "" .75 per additional student"", to indicate that the 2pts for graduate independent study is given for 1 student, and then the .75 per student is added on to that. Likewise for the undergraduate courses.

I also think that supervising an undergraduate honors thesis is a huge amount of work (well worth it, but nonetheless), and so should perhaps be 2 points instead of just one. In my experience it is certainly comparable to a graduate independent study."

The banking policy is very biased against the sciences.

"1. supervising an undergraduate honors thesis is significantly more work than most independent studies as the process takes place over multiple semesters and ends in a thesis document, much like the masters thesis. I think 1 point is not enough. maybe 1.5 or 2 points for this. A second reader on a masters projects (who would earn 1 point for being on the committee) does far less than the supervisor of an undergraduate thesis in my experience.

2. No credit is given for mentoring students in supervised research courses and I think that there should be credit granted for this. Although this is a course which usually helps the faculty member in their research, students register and pay for the course and the faculty do more for the students than just train them on how to conduct their research.

2. the language about administration being able to defer the awarding of credit when resources are not available is very vague and could be problematic. "

How to justify that a study does not assist the faculty with their own research? A student gets involved in research with a faculty because they share some common interests in some research topics.

The exemptions in this policy are complete absurd.

They make a lot of money for little compensation to faculty. We need a better system than the one outlined above. Thank you for soliciting our feedback.

"The propose policy is heavily weighted for graduate programs. The point values should be closer for graduate and undergraduate. Mentoring 1 student per semester for 2 credit hours results in a course release every 15 years.

Two students registering for 3 and 1 credit hour would only be 1 pt, the same as one student. This proposed policy removes any incentive to take the additional student.

The exemption 'Any independent study that assists the faculty with their own research.' should not be included. This is a teaching activity that is not in the normally assigned teaching duties. It will encourage faculty in the sciences to not take students and have them take part in their research. It is evident that such efforts are not valued by the Deans and Provost. "

"Ideally, an undergraduate independent study would receive the same number of points as a graduate independent study: they require the same amount of time and energy.

Thanks. "

In a general sense, I strongly support having a banking policy like this to help compensate for the enormous amount of time we spend on these activities. My main issue with it as currently written is the relatively small number of points for Undergraduate Honors theses. This is a 2-year commitment on a project with a student - the same time as with a Masters. Also, if we have 2 Honors or Independent Study students working on different projects (thus requiring the same amount of work and time) then we shouldn't get fewer points. It should be made explicit that the reduced points would only come into effect if the students are working on the same project - and even then 1 point would not be enough for reading and re-reading (over and over again) undergraduate theses.

1. The disparity of points awarded for a graduate independent study vs and undergraduate independent study is unfair and improper.
2. The entire system seems arbitrary. Without justification, it seems to represent little more than how administration "'values' certain contributions. Plainly undergraduate education is not highly valued. Some contributions are well-incentivized while others are disincentivized. Perhaps that's the intention?
3. No plain language consideration of internship supervision.

In blunt terms, the proposed seems, at best, badly thought out and unnecessarily cheap. "

"For the most part I support this policy. However, I do find it problematic that independent studies that assist faculty with their own research is excluded. It is not wise, particularly for junior faculty, to take on students if the students' interests do not help facilitate the faculty's line of research. These types of experiences, although they do help faculty with their research, are extremely time intensive and most of the time the faculty member could have gotten the research done quicker without the independent study student. "

"I have several problems with this draft policy.

1. It requires 20 point for a course release while the current COAS policy is 15 points. While should I settle for the 5 point difference?
2. Why are faculty required to maintain documentation of our banked points? In my department/college, we provide documentation for the points we want to bank, our chair approves them, and the department maintains a list of banked points.
3. This policy only allows us to transfer three years worth of banked points to the new system. Those of us who have been banking points for much longer will lose a significant amount of points.

For these reasons I do not support this new policy."

"I support the policy to the extent that some sort of policy is necessary. I have two issues with this draft.

1. Banking is only allowed for completion. Dissertation advisors invest significant time into doctoral students, a few of whom do not complete their dissertations. There needs to be some way to compensate advisors in those instances. As written, this policy seems to hold me solely responsible for whether or not a student finishes her/his program.
  2. Doctoral committee members do not all serve the same function. On some committees, the methodologist is not a co-chair, but does contribute far more than other committee members. There should be some acknowledgment of that in this policy."
- Undergraduate and graduate DIS should be awarded the same point value (2). While graduate work is more advanced, requiring higher level intellectual input from the faculty member, undergraduate work requires more guidance and is more time consuming for

Independent study/thesis project sometimes takes more time than the regular lecture but it only takes 1 point.

"There must be a course banking system. However, as it stands this draft is incomplete and, I would argue, not entirely fair.

1) Many departments also have Supervised Research, Supervised Practicum and other 3-credit hour one-on-one courses with students. The language of these courses should be included in the discussion (along with DIS, thesis and dissertation hours), or inclusive language for all such courses should be clarified (i.e. any supervised study course for which a student must register). A Supervised Research or Supervised Practicum, for example, can be treated the same as a Directed Independent Study.

2) There is a huge problem with two of the three Exceptions. First of all, many faculty have students do projects that are directly or indirectly related to their research, whether it becomes a project in which the student has collaborated (and perhaps may publish or present with the faculty member in the future) or an independent arm of that research project. Not only does the section Exemption discourage the faculty member from including students in collaborations, but does not recognize the reality that there is very little distinction between what constitutes "assisting the faculty member with their own research" or not. Projects with students can become research the faculty member will continue later if the results yield something. Also, rarely would a faculty member work with a student if the topic of their study is not related to the faculty member's own areas of expertise, thus again potentially becoming a research project. I submit that this Exception must be removed. The second Exception that must be removed is the "assists the faculty member with their own class or lab." If a department has a Supervised Teaching course, this requires its own syllabus for the student and, as in our department, requires close guidance of the student, feedback of the student's work, evaluation of stand-alone lectures, etc. It is additional work for the faculty member that is equivalent to any other independent study course with a student. Further, excluding this discourages the faculty member from working with the student on development of teaching in their discipline.

3) The point system is unnecessarily confusing, and a counting of hours or units would be more straightforward. Since students must register for credit hours with the faculty member chair when they are working on a thesis or dissertation, I suggest that these be treated like other credited hour(s) of independent study/research course with a student. This would enable the process to consist of a count of 3-credit (or unit) hour courses, with a certain total to be designated the amount required to meet the course reduction. If a faculty member teaches 1-credit hour independent study courses (whether dissertation, thesis, graduate, undergraduate, supervised research or supervised teaching with a student), these can also be added, with 3 1-credit hour courses obviously amounting to 1 3-credit hour course. For thesis/dissertation committee members (not chairs), these could be counted as 1 credit (or unit).

Also, #4 under Procedures is unclear."

It is long overdue.

"There are several key problems.

1. The policy says that DIS that assist the faculty member with his/her research are exempt. I'm not sure what that entails, but it seems to fly in the face of the teacher/scholar model. My teaching and research always work hand in hand.
2. The policy rewards graduate work much more than undergraduate work. Graduate courses and undergraduate courses are treated the same for the faculty, so why wouldn't the banking points for DIS and thesis work also be equitably compensated for? Undergraduate DIS work takes no less time or energy than graduate DIS work.
3. The number of points is still too low. By this measure it would take 20 undergraduate DIS courses to get one course release. This is not an incentive for faculty to take on such work with students, and close work with faculty is an opportunity that UNF should highlight."

Too little credit given for the immense amount of time and energy that goes into independent studies (DIS) and the others.

"It makes no sense to me to exclude independent study that is part of a faculty member's research program. As an experimental scientist in an undergraduate-only department, one of the main reasons I maintain a research lab and an active research program is precisely to provide opportunities for students to participate in real scientific research. This exclusion effectively negates all the mentoring of undergraduate research that I do.

I also think this policy is far too stingy, particularly when it comes to mentoring undergraduate research. I routinely mentor between three and five undergraduate research students each semester. Some sign up for independent study credit, but many - who don't want to pay the extra tuition for credit hours that won't count toward graduation - don't. Given the proposed policy, it would take me many decades to earn a single course release. "

"I have three major concerns with the policy as it is written:

- 1) It is not clear that graduate and undergraduate level independent studies involve different levels of work for faculty as this policy implies (compensating with only 1 point for undergrad and 2 points for grad).
- 2) The policy is incoherent or ill-written for grad level independent studies with multiple students. It states: ""2 points for directing a three credit graduate Independent Study (if more than one student signs up for the same 3-hour study in a given semester, the faculty member would earn .75 points per student up to a maximum of 5 points for that independent study).""

So a 2 student grad IDS earns a faculty member 1.5 points but a 1 student IDS earns 2 points?

- 3) I don't support any alteration that REDUCES the compensation involved in the banking system (currently 15 points per reduction in COAS).

Here is some simple calculation:

If we take 9 month contract (4 weeks a month), 40 hour work week, and 62.5% of faculty time allocated to teaching as standard, then most faculty are paid for 150 hours of work on one course (assuming a standard 6 course load).

If we take supervising an MA thesis as an example, I might spend a year supervising a student: the total time spent would be about 40 hours (meet biweekly for an hour = 15 hours; read and comment on written drafts = 15 hours; read material to help student with research = 5 hours; read, prepare for, and conduct thesis defense = 5 hours).

So, 4 MA theses would be 160 hours worth of work, approximate to one full course. Currently, it takes supervising 5 theses to earn a course release. Under the proposed plan, it would take almost 7, which would be 280 hours worth of work, nearly double what a faculty member does for a course.

Thus, the proposal is an unfair reduction in faculty compensation."

doing an ug DIS is just as time consuming as doing a grad level ind study so the point difference is unfair. if this was adjusted, i would support th policy. in general, though the 20 points is a bit high - 18 feels much better!!

"The exemption prohibiting course banking for research does not make sense to me. If the independent study is focused on research (which a good many are) what is the point of doing an independent study that does not lead to some positive research outcome?

I am unclear why graduate and undergraduate IS is differentiated. Are undergraduate IS supposed to be less work than graduate IS?

I think giving the chairs more flexibility would enhance something like this greatly. Chairs understand the context and could make this work better than a rigid system such as this. Make guidelines for chairs to follow since they are paid to administrate things."

I do not understand why faculty would not receive credit for an independent study that assists faculty with their research. I thought the point of the mentor-teacher model was to include students on faculty research projects to teach them how research is conducted. I would never allow a student to conduct a project that I did not think had scientific merit, and I always try to publish or present any research that has scientific merit. This means that all independent studies that students conduct with me become part of my research program. I would also be unqualified to mentor students on projects that are unrelated to my research. If the exemption were left in place, it means that I would continue to receive no compensation for the extra effort I exert to involve students with research outside of the classroom. If that exemption were removed, the I would support this policy.

I support this given that all faculty are provided access to acquiring "banking" given they meet the criteria. This policy should not only benefit limited faculty members per academic unit. Independent studies should be highly justifiable and abuse of this policy should not be tolerated.

"It is clear from this document that the administration does not understand how we do research in some fields. In Biology, we all have teams of students who work in our research labs for multiple semesters if not years. It's the way we do science- without these students my research activities would come to a total halt. Most of these students far exceed 3 credits of DIS (which is another issue). Under this document this would not count at all under the exemption, since it's my research. It assumes that research, teaching, and mentorship are entirely separate activities. In Biology, they are intertwined. And I know we are not the only field that works this way. Please suggest that the admins need to learn how DIS works across the campus before they try again on

this document. Additionally, an undergrad DIS is far more work in terms of effort to train the student than a graduate DIS. They should be at least equal value.

The majority of these comments I cut and paste from last year's request for input. So I'm not convinced that anyone is actually listening to these."

I think this is really important and I'm glad that faculty are finally receiving credit for directing Independent Studies.

I would prefer to see three points or at least 2.5 points awarded for a DIS. I also want the policy to be clear that there are no time limits in terms of accruing credit, since the intention is not to push to run independent studies, but offer them in a responsible way. Students benefit greatly from such studies, producing work that prepares them for publication and successful application to doctoral programs. In the Department of English, we try to support students who have this goal in mind; therefore, it remains important that faculty are adequately awarded credit to reflect this important mission of the Department and University. Many of us (most of us) will not offer ten independent studies during the course of our career. It seems reasonable to support the work we do more completely by awarding greater credit (even if only .5 points more). Additionally, we do not offer a doctoral degree; we have a student complete a thesis every few years. Therefore, those two categories are not especially relevant to our department.

The language in the section concerning graduate directed independent studies needs to be clarified. As it stands now the graduate section implies that a DIS with one student would earn 2 points, but one with two students would earn 1.5 (.75 x 2) points. It seems what's intended is that the faculty member would earn an additional .75 points per student, now simply .75 points per student.

The proposal makes getting a course release impossible and not worthwhile for faculty to do DIS.

#3 under PROCEDURES states "There shall be no exchange of releases for monetary reimbursement." This is a MAJOR concession from the policy that is already in place in BCH (I know that this Banking Policy was modeled after the BCH policy in most other respects).

"I would like clarification of whether/why point #6 implies that the window for banking only goes back three years. This does not address Graduate Teaching Practicums, which are more like directed independent studies than they are "assistance with teaching" (one of the exemptions)."

According to this point scale, as an Instructor who teaches undergraduate students, I would need to direct 20 Independent Studies to qualify for a course release. If I directed one per semester (Fall, Spring) during my 9 month contract period, it would take me 10 years of consistently directing Independent Studies to get one course release (equivalent to one 3 credit hour course, or approximately 9 hours per week). Even if I were to direct graduate level Independent Studies, it would take 5 years of uncompensated work to be granted one course release. I don't believe that either of these options is equitable or commensurate with the amount of work that can go into an Independent Study. This disproportionate compensation may serve to dissuade faculty from directing Independent Studies, rather than reward them for their teaching and service. I strongly oppose this policy.

"Would you kindly address this issue in the policy. If the faculty member is offered an overload and declines the compensation, he/she may bank the overload under the banking policy. Thanks"

This does not address those who cannot take a course release

"This document does not accurately reflect the amount of effort involved in graduate research vs undergraduate education. Some departments do not use Independent Study, instead they use Graduate Thesis Research credits. If an MS student takes 3 credits of Graduate Thesis Research over each of 3 semesters, then graduates in the 4th semester, does the faculty mentor only get 3 credits total? This does not make sense.

The language indicating that the independent studies or graduate research cannot contribute to faculty scholarship is not reasonable. In the sciences, there may be no money for equipment and resources unless the student's independent study is related to the faculty area of research."

In addition to creating a path for receiving a course release, the policy should include an option for financial remuneration. Whether dissertation or independent study, the student pays for any credit hours and it seems only fair that faculty be compensated for their work. Faculty should have the option to choose payment for their work or accrue points toward receiving a future course release. With the current 20-point requirement for a course release, it could take a faculty member who supervises one independent study at the undergraduate level each semester during the fall and spring terms a full decade to receive a course release. That doesn't seem equitable to me.

""No one may claim credit for any work that is part of the assigned teaching workload...""

If one mentors a thesis or dissertation committee, is it then possible for the mentor to become a coauthor?

So a faculty would have to mentor and chair 7 master theses for one course release????????????????????????????????????"

"The only issues I have are 1) the difference between teaching a graduate and an undergraduate DIS. Excellent supervision of DIS should be rewarding the same. Also, some faculty who teach graduate (including myself) classes will be rewarded at a higher rate since they are the ones who would normally be doing graduate DIS. I suggest we allocate the same number of points to graduate and undergraduate DIS (2 points each); and 2) serving on a doctoral project committee should be assigned 2 points as this can be time demanding."

When I teach community-based learning courses, I end up spending more time outside of the classroom in curriculum and classroom support related activities. Most often those works cost more time than above stated works. Why isn't community based learning courses are not bankable for course release?

"AWARD. DIS are a vital academic tool for customizing instruction for our students. They also can be very impactful. The effort for DIS can be considerable. The award of 2 points for DIS's involving graduate independent studies is too low -- the effort for 10 DIS's greatly exceeds the effort for one standard class. Greater recognition of this effort by the administration is required. Not doing so reduces incentives for DIS's and thereby limits the academic experience of graduate students

AWARD. DIS are a vital academic tool for customizing instruction for our students. They also can be very impactful. The effort for DIS can be considerable. The award of 1 point for DIS's involving undergraduate independent studies is too low -- the effort for 20 DIS's greatly exceeds the effort for

one standard class (the question can also be asked as to why it is considered only 1/2 of that of a graduate DIS - what justification exists?). Greater recognition of this effort by the administration is required. Not doing so reduces incentives for DIS's and thereby limits the academic experience of undergraduate graduate students.

CONTINGENCIES. The contingencies for award of a course release are overly restrictive - as proposed, the administrative could delay awards indefinitely. Time limits on administrative contingencies should be added. Not doing so will result in abuses.

GRANDFATHERING. Prior DIS's should be counted in. A provision should be added for this if it is not already understood and agreed to."

Departments/Schools/Colleges should be able to have some additional discretion for assigning units for banking purposes. A one-size fits all policy does not do more rigorous subject-matter justice.

"The university makes full tuition for each DIS credit hour and thesis hour. That the people doing the work--the faculty--see none of this and have to accrue 20 points (equivalent to 10-20 DIS) is absurd.

Do the people in AA understand what faculty in the sciences do? We are not allowed to get any credit for providing DIS to students in which those students might be doing lab work or from which a publication might result? Is involving students in a study somehow a bad thing and something not to be celebrated?

Why not an option for direct compensation? Some faculty cannot take a course release due to departmental or program demands.

Who is to say that a graduate DIS is inherently more work than an undergraduate DIS? This seems arbitrary.

The university presents itself as providing students with opportunities to work with faculty one-on-one. Yet faculty are to do such work with virtually no compensation?

It seems that AA does not have any trust or faith in faculty. Their model seems prefaced on their belief that faculty are trying to take advantage of DIS when, in fact, we've been doing DIS for our students (for NO COMPENSATION) for years. "

The dissertation portion of this policy is unclear and unrealistic. Chairing a dissertation is not like the other courses as a "1 semester" thing. Dissertation is a term-by-term course, whose duration is determined by many factors, including the nature of the study. A quarter course-release for a supervision that may last for years is unrealistic and could well drive faculty out of dissertation work, at least as chairs. Plus, the time needed to supervise dissertations as a course is in the here and now. A release after the work is done is not nearly of as much value as having time to work with dissertation students in real time. The policy makes a lot of sense for one-term assignments, like I.S. But as proposed it will slow doctorates, already a slow process, to a crawl. And when that happens, it will have to be adjusted anyway. So why not do it right the first time?

Either the number of points needed to obtain a course release (20) should be reduced, or the number of points awarded for supervising a 3-credit undergraduate DIS should be increased (perhaps at least 2 points per course). It seems unreasonable to only offer a course release after supervising 20 undergraduate DIS courses given the amount of work involved.

A few things need to be clarified. Firstly, do points expire? For example, would a faculty member need to accrue 20 points within a certain period in order to get a course release, or will the points accrue over the entirety of that faculty member's career? Secondly, the language of the Independent Study is unclear. It should read "the faculty member would earn .75 points per additional student." Otherwise it sounds like a 2-graduate student DIS would only receive 1.5 points (.75 per student), where a one-graduate student would receive 2 points.

Will consideration be given to past DIS, thesis, etc.

Directing students is part of our job. There should be NO releases for it. Providing releases for this only incentivizes faculty to have low standards (as I have seen all too much in my department). I would support lower teaching loads for research-active faculty (and this should not include those who publish solely in predatory journals, again, which I see all too often in my department and it is awful).

I feel that at least 2 points must be given for being part of a graduate thesis or dissertation committee.

I think there should be something in here that allows faculty to include past activities to be banked. At the very least, the date from which time activities can be considered should be added here. But I would like to have at the very least a five-year backward look so faculty who have been here a long time may be correctly compensated for their service.

I support this EXCEPT I think that it is critical that honors thesis for undergraduates be the same as that for graduate students - this seems especially important given our mission as an UNDERGRADUATE institution. Faculty should be encouraged to invest in honors theses at the undergraduate level - and these take just as much time to oversee as a graduate-level thesis.