**Faculty Council Collaborative Scheduling Initiative Subcommittee Report**

March 17, 2023

<u>Operation Overview</u>

1. In the Fall of 2022, a Faculty Council subcommittee was formed of representatives from every school, and the Faculty Welfare Committee. A total of 13 served. Those serving on the subcommittee are comprised of: Clint Smith, Krisha Marcano, Jeff Hammer, Kara Anderson, Brenda Daniels, Jared Redick, Kjersten Lester-Moratska, Molly McCarter, Betsy Towns, Phyllis Pancella, Allison Gagnon, Jeff George, Kait Dorsky (Secretary), and Andy Paris (Chair).
2. The Committee met on four occasions during Intensive Arts in December of '22 (12/5, 12/7, 1212 and 12/14) for 4 hours each meeting, totaling 16 hours. Agenda for these meetings are attached at the end of this report.
3. In February 2023, the CSI Subcommittee hosted three sessions (2/16, 2/21, and 2/28), inviting faculty to gather and get more information about CSI and the conversations that arose in the subcommittee meetings, and to give faculty an opportunity to voice their own ideas and reflect on the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. The documents made available to the faculty that were intended to prompt questions around CSI are attached at the end of this report.

<u>Intensive Arts Meeting Day 1</u>

> Agenda: After establishing community practices for the group, we embarked on a discussion about our institutional values, what we as a subcommittee felt was important about what we do at UNCSA, as a foundation on which to base our recommendations.

> Outcome: A set of values discussed as important to use as a foundation for our work included: learning by doing/hands-on learning; preparation for a career— not only the skill to get a job, but also the decision-making and flexibility needed to keep a job; teaching how to learn; teaching the individual student/meeting them where they are; developing the Citizen-Artist; fostering a life-long love of the arts; fostering a humane, diverse institution; flexibility/responsiveness; lunch breaks; snack breaks; Communication; Community; Transparency. The mission statement that was written from this set of values—the mission statement for the subcommittee's work—is attached at the end of this document.

> **Recommendation: We believe the mission statement [Appendix A] reflects the subcommittee's vision for our institution, as well as the pillars of the new campus strategic plan. Our hope is that the different aspects of this mission statement be considered in the larger conversation around CSI, and larger conversations about how the campus operates.**

Agenda: The purpose of Day 2 was for a representative from each school on campus report to the group how their school generally operates: department structure, size, curricula progressions, culture, daily/semester schedules, etc. During and after each report, questions were asked for clarification and conversation-inspiring purposes.

Outcome 1: The discussions around schedules revealed several important factors. It became clear there has been previously very little checking in or coordination amongst the schools in terms of the schedule, or why the schedules are set up as they are. The different progressions and timelines, the nuts and bolts in how the different arts were learned and practiced was essential to start the more difficult conversations about how we are getting in each other's way and how we could help each other to solve problems and become more efficient.

Outcome 2: All schools reported some form of one or more of the following:
   a. Invisible hours [time not accounted for in curricular models, i.e. courses required but uncredited, or course credits and hours not aligned.
   b. Student and faculty over-extended with extra-curricular requirements via the performance calendar
   c. Creative dropping of the ball—what we do to 'make it work.'

Outcome 3: The pace of the school year often feels unsustainable—to both faculty and students. Mental and physical injury sometimes seems related to this pace.

Outcome 4: It was clear from this discussion that a number of the art schools are already engaged in curricular reviews. Reporting out to each other- the impetus, the process, the reasons decisions are being made, the ideas and innovations that are arising—was extremely helpful for the other schools to hear. If everyone is doing this exercise on their own, it is a slower process of growing further apart, and consensus is harder to reach. But sharing with each other sparked ideas, and notably improved the communal aspect of the exercise.

> **Recommendation 1: Deans/Provost establish a structure to establish communication/collaboration between representatives from each school who are working on schedule and curriculum development, rather than each school working on their schedules and curriculum completely separately.**
>
> **Recommendation 2: Establish a curriculum review working group, to track progress and:**
>
> - **generate ideas outside the boxes we can sometimes get trapped in at our own separate divisions**
> - **establish limits to work hours**
> - **align hours worked with credits earned**
>
> **Recommendation 3: Curricular review needs to precede the next step in talking about the nuts and bolts of the schedule. If we continue to schedule the same amount of stuff (classes, productions, commitments), we will continue to run into the same scheduling challenges.**

[The above discussion continued into Day 3. For the purposes of this report, I will separate the next discussions by the day in order to clarify the structure of the discussions and outcomes]

Intensive Arts Meeting Day 3

Agenda: Discuss 'Banded Time' and 'Collaborative Days.'

1. "Banded Time"

   Outcome 1: Discussions around Banded Time reflected the notion that historically, leaving an option for folks to voluntarily teach, rehearse, work, etc, during that time meant that pressures (whether they be internal or external) mount to fill the time. This committee inherited the idea of the two hour campus block of time, and wanted to give voice to our vision of the concept. There was discussion around whether it was a construct that was ultimately helpful. So eventually, later down the track, it might be useful to revisit it. But since the consensus was that we do need to build some blocked off air in the schedule, this seemed a worthy investment.

   Outcome 2: We discussed possible uses for the time. To those who practice interdisciplinary study, this time slot did not seem like enough in a semester to implement an interdisciplinary class, or project; that it was better used for purposes of wellness, personal choice time—which of course could be used for collaborations but was not built expressly for that purpose.

Outcome 3: When and how to implement the 2 hours during the week proved challenging. This discussion started to cross over into the curricular review piece, as it means, in most schools, taking something out, or trying to squeeze something someplace else (a practice we all agreed would not be in line with our mission statement). So, it is important to note that the two pieces—establishing Intermission (banded time) and undertaking curricular review-- are intertwined.

> **Recommendation 1: The first recommendation is that we call this 2-hour block 'Intermission.' The entire group felt it better reflects the intent of the block of time, and this name feels in line with the mission statement and the purpose of CSI as it pertains to our campus specifically.**
>
> **Recommendation 2: It is the recommendation that—for the present—the block be Wednesdays from 12:00-2:00 (or 12:30 to 2:30), essentially expanding what is now called the 'golden hour.' Wednesday because it is mid-week and could be useful in that place. Expanding the golden hour slot helped smooth quick adoption of the idea. In order to put it someplace else, or in addition to the Golden Hour, curricular review would already have to take place to make room for a new 2-hour block. There was an acknowledgement that this would not give room for those serving on committees to take all of this the time for themselves, though many would have it every other week.  So, this recommendation is for now, and then it is recommended it be revisited further along in the process, to see if committee work can be separated from Intermission.**

2. "Collaborative Days"

Discussion: It took a bit for us to decouple these from Wellness days. But the discussion flowed better when we did. Taking days off, or leaving these days unstructured did not seem beneficial to the committee. But making time in the schedule seemed much-needed, so if we take whole days, how could they be best used?

Outcome 1: One thing was clear: high school students would benefit by being able to go on field trips and age-appropriate community building activities and events. It was also clear that a lot of structure would be required, if there were no classes.

Outcome 2: Using these days to provide space for community work around the schedule, EDIB, safety, mental health, social media, consent, and whatever other unforeseen community issues arise seems prudent, even essential, to accomplish a more just, equitable and healthy learning environment. As much as we all wish

we had the time in the schedule to have these discussions we want to have now, these days could provide that needed space.

Outcome 3: The question arose, "who takes responsibility for these days?" Different folks on campus will have different ideas about how best to use them, including admin, students, deans, faculty and staff. This seems like a larger discussion, but one that should not stop the creating of this space for some form of community enrichment and engagement.

Outcome 4: The subcommittee discussed that intermission and Collaborative days so not lend themselves to promoting interdisciplinary study. That being said, if folks are strategic and there is time, some cross disciplinary work could occur.

Outcome 5: There was consensus that 'Collaborative Days' needs another name, but we have not come up with the right one just yet. Perhaps as the form of these days takes better shape, a new name will reveal itself.

Outcome 6: Some possibilities that came up for how to operate these days: Of the six days, different stakeholders take a day to program; a committee is formed to schedule the days; a theme is chosen for the year and the days are programmed to touch on the theme in different ways.

Outcome 7: There was also the possibility floated that community building could include a picnic, or an all-school activity that is purely for fun.

---

**Recommendation 1: Form a subcommittee with representatives fom all stakeholder groups to generate ideas and be empowered to decide how to operate these days.**

**Recommendation 2: If there are three days, our recommendation is that what is now In-service be incorporated into these days. Another option would be, at least as a first-year trial, two collaborative days, with one in-service day.**

**Recommendation 3: Form a subcommittee to focus on the timing of the 'Collaborative Days'. One recommendation that came from the group was that there be one Tuesday, one Wednesday, and one Thursday, spread throughout the semester, that make up the three days.**

**Intensive Arts Meeting 4**:

Discussion: We used this day to finish our discussion of Collaborative Days and to begin to synthesize our discussions into possible recommendations and next steps, which I have related to you in this document.

> **Recommendation: Once curricular review has gained some traction, an outside eye on creating a new schedule may be needed. It would be prudent for that request to come from faculty, rather than at the administrative level. And the CSI Sub/Faculty Chair has someone in mind for when the time comes.**

**Additional Discussion:**

Several times, the subcommittee hit upon issues of wellness that occur on campus that did not seem to directly connect with the schedule. We think it is important to include them here, as these issues may be 'low hanging fruit' that might help pave the way for a more equal, just and ultimately joyful experience for students, as well as the rest of campus.

1. IMPROVED FOOD AVAILABILITY.
   a. There are students on campus that are food insecure. Could the campus or the System support these students being able to have a meal card?
   b. Sometimes students are working until 11:00 and have not eaten since dinner at 5:30, and there are no options for a complete meal.
   c. Varying times and food options could alleviate pressures on the schedule.
2. SAFETY AND SECURITY AFTER DARK.
   a. Especially after rehearsals. Campus police could be proactive about making sure students exiting nighttime rehearsals are seen to safety.
   b. Better lighting and on-campus parking would also help
3. MARKETING
   a. Having more and better communication between marketing and faculty could benefit both marketing and faculty. Sometimes faculty are asked to do things to promote the school. Although faculty is in step with doing this generally, having a better understanding of what is being marketed and how would improve willingness, and start important conversations about how we are facing outward.
   b. Sometimes faculty perceive that marketing is working at cross-purposes with the learning goals and UNCSA's core strategies.

Can faculty representatives participate more fully in review of strategic marketing at the different stages of these processes?

4. More/Better Health Services
   a. More health care personnel
   b. We are a 24-hour institution, but services are very close to 9-5. Weekend and evening rehearsals are commonplace. Having someone any time there are activities seems prudent, and could relieve faculty from having to be health care workers, something for which many are not trained.
5. GRADUATE ASSISTANTS
   a. Having help for faculty would allow them to concentrate on teaching and mentoring, and alleviate much of the strain on workload.

Faculty Gatherings:

Three events were sponsored by the CSI subcommittee in order to broaden our conversations to more faculty members. Each gathering brought about thirty faculty together, and at each event, CSI subcommittee members were there to prompt conversation. There was also a document made available to everyone, which is here attached.

**Summations:**

Other thoughts that are important to convey but are not necessarily direct recommendations:

1. Flexibility is a concept that came up often. Different rules may need to apply to different schools depending on the curricular progression. Whatever the schedule becomes, if we are going to make it work, flexibility is key. In other words if there is a hard rule on how many hours a student or faculty member can work in a week—which was discussed— there may be a need to adjust depending on a certain amount of production weeks which may significantly exceed the maximum, but then would need to be balanced by weeks that are significantly under maximum.

   The other aspect of flexibility is curricular. How do we serve those students who may want to deviate from a particular curricular path in their chosen art? How can we support them? Are there different avenues we can provide those students as they blossom in different ways. Past iterations of the Studio for Creative Practice was brought up several times as a positive example of different ways we can continue to serve students.

2. Since individual schools have often taken it upon themselves to push the envelope on scheduling guidelines—such as not protecting the golden hour, or not crediting work done—a higher authoritative body outside of the schools themselves will need to act as a check to make sure that whatever structures are put in place to protect time are

upheld. Whether that is the Office of the Provost, or a newly formed governing body just for this task, it may not be prudent to be left solely to the schools themselves.

3. Another theme that arose is keeping more careful tabs on the relationship between credit hours and time. We should be sure that we are assigning workload in ways that align with the desired learning outcomes, and assigning credits in ways that align with that workload.

4. There is data available that committees past (such as SWAG) have done that could be drawn upon for guidance. A workload algorithm may be necessary to invent—or to copy from peer institutions— to guide the curricular review process.

Overall Recommendation for Next Steps (from the Chair):

Besides the aforementioned recommendations of the subcommittee, there is a possible progression of next steps that could happen in tandem.

On the one hand, Collaborative days and Intermission could be implemented as soon as next year, if a group was convened soon to consult on possible days. How the days are spent could be on a TBD basis at first, and decided by end of year or over the Summer.

On a parallel track, I propose that our CSI Subcommittee break off into working groups addressing the different aspects of CSI. This would immediately involve more faculty in the process, and other stakeholders would be welcome. For instance, working groups could be formed around:

Collaborative Days (when and what)
Curriculum Review; comparing notes (credits to hours; ideas for consolidation)
Academics and
Workload; setting limits.
Ideas for Wellness in the schedule (such as Sundays off)
Campus Community Interconnectedness and Communication
Community building activities

This report was written by the Chair in collaboration with the committee.

APPENDIXES:

MISSION STATEMENT
CSI LUNCH/DINNER CONVERSATION PROMPTS

**CSI MENU: LUNCH**

APPETIZER: CSI SUB COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT [DRAFT]:

We strive to build a just, humane, and diverse institution that prepares each student for their career.

We believe such an institution is created through community, communication, and transparency, as well as flexibility and responsiveness across the institution. We do this for the wellbeing of students, faculty and Staff and to better serve student learning and faculty development.

We will develop citizen artists that are prepared with the skills and decision-making ability to enter and remain in their chosen profession. We will accomplish this through hands-on learning, student led work, teaching to the individual student, and developing a life-long love of the arts.  We will set our students up for future success by developing their ability to learn beyond the classroom and preparing them for an ever-shifting field and world.

**Questions or feedback about CSI?** Send them to fcofficers@uncsa.edu.

**CSI MENU: LUNCH**

ENTREE: KEYWORDS FROM THE MISSION STATEMENT

**Just**
1. Awareness of power dynamics
2. Equity and Inclusiveness
3. What else to think about?

**Humane**
1. Workload
    a. How many hours are too many? For students and for faculty
    b. What does a typical work week look like?
2. Giving all community members grace and opportunities for learning
3. What else?

**Diverse**

1. First Things First: What do we value about Diversity?
2. How can we create a space for a diverse spectrum of folks to feel safe?
3. What else?

**Questions or feedback about CSI?** Send them to fcofficers@uncsa.edu.

**CSI MENU: LUNCH**

DESSERT: DISCUSSION TOPICS FROM MISSION STATEMENT

**Our Mission and Purpose: What is it?**

1. Training students to get a job is important, and saving space for  them to learn how to keep a job and build a career is also important.
2. Muti-platform skill set. What skills will they need to continue to grow in their art and build their career?
3. We can't teach EVERYTHING. So what are our most essential individual and shared goals?

**Community: How do we function?**

1. Campus Community Interconnectedness
    a. Benefits and pitfalls of bringing guest artists to campus who are practitioners but not educators?
    b. Benefits and pitfalls of ambitious productions.
    c. We all share the same support systems
    d. What other ways are we connected?

2. **Campus Communication**
    a. How do decisions made in one school impact others?
    b. How could communication with administration and staff improve?
    c. How could we help each other in areas of efficiency and support?
    d. Teacher to Student; School to School; Faculty to Admin; Campus to System

3. **Connection with our surrounding area, Winston-Salem and NC**
    a. Why is connection to our surrounding area important?
    b. What constitutes connection to the community?
    c. What is within our power to connect with the community around our campus?

4. **Flexibility and Responsiveness: More work, or more joy?**

    a. Meeting the student where they are
    b. Tension between orientations toward Process and Product
    c. Avenues for students to travel when the typical road is no longer a fit
    d. What does constructive student feedback look like?
    e. Is there a 'culture of silence' around many aspects of student life (arts, academics, social, student affairs), and in many of the industries we are training students for? And if so how can we be strategic about opening up constructive dialogue?

**Questions or feedback about CSI?** Send them to fcofficers@uncsa.edu.