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Minutes of the Academic Senate
September 25, 2009
Kennedy Union West Ballroom; 3:00 p.m.


Opening Prayer: P. Donnelly opened the meeting with a prayer.

Minutes: The minutes of the April 24, 2009 were approved as submitted.

Announcements: D. Bickford announced that Dr. P. Hart will be stepping down as the director of the honors and scholars program as of June 30, 2010. A search committee has been formed and will meet shortly. The committee will be interviewing internal candidates for this position. A. Jipson announced that Dr. Jody Miller will be the featured speaker at the Mary Jo Huth Memorial Speaker Series on Monday, October 12, 2009. Dr. Miller’s presentation will focus on her book entitled “Getting Played: African American Girls, Urban Inequality and Gendered Violence.”

Information:
1. T. Skill gave an update on BANNER implementation (see attachment). A question was directed to T. Skill asking what the acronym EAP referred to: Enterprise Resource Planning.
2. H. McGrew gave an update on Contingent Faculty Issues (see attachment). G. Doyle asked for clarification as to why part-time faculty can teach a maximum of nine semester hours. J. White responded that the teaching of nine semester hours or its equivalent is a normal load for full time faculty at the University of Dayton. B. Duncan asked if part-time faculty have taught more than four courses during any one semester at the University of Dayton. The answer was no unless there were emergency situations. S. Grotto stated that part-time faculty are not eligible for unemployment benefits. R. Kearns noted that UD’s pay for part-time faculty is equivalent or better than other universities.
3. D. Biers gave an update on Post-Tenure-Review (see attachment). J. Farrelly noted that the University of Dayton tried to implement post tenure review from 1994-96 and it was unsuccessful.
4. A. Mari reported on the election on new SGA senators.
5. P. Donnelly gave an update on the CAP process. Donnelly mentioned the following items: common themes, feedback, diversity, service learning, and the next steps in the
6. Cap process. P. Palermo asked how the CAP task force was evaluating the extensive (over 200 pages of material) faculty feedback that addressed suggestions and criticisms. P. Donnelly stated that the task force met over the summer and considered and incorporated many of those changes into the working document. J. Amin expressed concern as to how the CAP program would address the diversity concerns.

Standing Committee Reports:
1. FACAS-D. Biers. Post Tenure Review. See attachment from FACAS.
2. APCAS-J. Huacuja. See attachment from APCAS.
3. SAPCAS. R. Kearns. See attachment from SAPCAS.
4. ECAS. D. Darrow reported that all of the working groups of the general education committee have met. There are approximately 75 faculty members who have accepted their working group assignments. ECAS has asked the APC about the feasibility of developing a new hard copy advising bulletin or possibly modifying the architecture of the online bulletin to make it more user friendly. ECAS has also agreed to sponsor with the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Development Committee a November meeting to discuss the issues surrounding post-tenure review.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is scheduled for Friday, October 23, 2009, 3:00 p.m. in Kennedy Union West Ballroom.

Respectfully submitted by: Lloyd Laubach
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What is an ERP?

- ERP stands for "Enterprise Resource Planning," a comprehensive set of software applications delivered by a single vendor designed to work together, making one system using a unified database.
- In higher education ERPs generally include HR/Payroll, Finance, Student, and relations information systems.
**Terminology**

- **SunGard**: SunGard Higher Education (vendor)
- **Banner**: ERP product provided by SunGard HE (product)
- **Luminis**: Web portal used to access Banner application
- **LCMS**: Luminis Content Management System
- **Project Summit**: Name of University of Dayton’s ERP project
- **ODS**: Operational Data Store (“datamarts”)
- **EDW**: Enterprise Data Warehouse
- **Banner Document Management Suite**: Electronic Document Imaging
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Energetic and committed team</td>
<td>• Lack of short-term observable results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over 1000 successful Banner implementations</td>
<td>• Learning curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will move users towards single sign-on</td>
<td>• Challenges of decentralized environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide students with web self-service</td>
<td>• Lack of existing processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positions UD for future growth</td>
<td>• Work load requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved access and visibility to data</td>
<td>• Potential unbudgeted costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business process improvement</td>
<td>• Staff resistance to adoption of new processes and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administration/quality and retention</td>
<td>• Perceived as an &quot;IT only&quot; project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved integration between systems</td>
<td>• Maintaining momentum/enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elimination of shadow systems</td>
<td>• Perception that &quot;go live&quot; is &quot;go perfect&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summit SWOT Analysis
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Anticipated ERP Benefits

• Cost Avoidance / Transferable Maintenance
• Improved Access and Visibility to Data for Analysis and Decision Support
• Business Process Improvement
• Admission / Enrollment Quality and Retention
• Self Service
• Robust "role driven" Portal
• Reduced Exposure to Legal Liability
• Improved Integration Between Systems
• Potential for Improved Morale and Collaboration
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| PEER INSTITUTIONS USING BANNER (Board Approved Comparison Set Institutions) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Peer Institution | FTE | Financial | HR/Payroll | Banner | Peoplesoft | Oracle |
| Baylor University | 13,829 | Banner | Peoplesoft | Banner |
| Creighton University | 6,563 | Banner | Banner | Oracle |
| Drexel University | 16,742 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Duquesne University | 9,231 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Hofstra University | 10,920 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Lehigh University | 6,084 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Loyola Marymount | 8,289 | Banner | Oracle | Oracle |
| Miami University | 15,531 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Saint Louis University | 11,816 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Seton Hall University | 7,735 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| University of Denver | 9,257 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| University of San Diego | 6,719 | Banner | Oracle | Oracle |
| Villanova University | 8,933 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
| Xavier University | 5,201 | Banner | Banner | Banner |
Progress to Date

- Dec. 2007: Contract Signed
- Feb. 2008: Organization Readiness Assessment
- Mar. 2008: Project Kickoff
- Apr. 2008: UDC Strategy & Assessment, Data Standards Kickoff, Test & Training System Available
- June 2008: Training Center Operational
- Aug. 2008: Hardware Partitioning, Upgrade to Banner 8
- Feb. 2009: Luminis Kickoff

The Future

- May 2009: Student EM Suite
- July 2010: Finance GL/AP, Purchasing, Budget/FA, Student A/R, UDRI
- Dec. 2009: General Student Academic History
- Nov. 2009: Student Catalog/Schedule
- Mar. 2010: Student Registration & Records
- Feb. 2010: Financial Aid Data Load
- Jan. 2010: HR Payroll

Adapting to an ERP

"Going Live" does not mean "Going Perfect"
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**Key Enhancements**

**Student Self-Service**
- Dynamic Course Catalog
- Dynamic Class Schedule
- Search for classes by term or a range of dates
- Online Registration
- Online View or Enroll
- Final grade details and course information
- Grades
- Admissions
- Account balances
- Financial Aid
- Address verification
- Transcripts
- Degree evaluation

**Administrative**
- Electronic Personnel Action Forms
- Pre-populated Information (in the works)
- Real-time views or advances
- Enhanced student advising reports
- Capable of identifying available courses
- Academic students integrated with Banner

### Slide 13

**Key Enhancements**

**Finance Self Service**
- Create a purchase requisition
- Create a purchase order
- Create budget transfers
- Approve documents
- View departmental operational budget status:
  - By summary or detailed level
- View year-end to date tracking budget status activity
- Compare budget status between fiscal years
- Download budget status query results to a spreadsheet
- View departmental encumbrance activity

**HR Self Service**
- Update tax exemption information
- Update benefits
- Update the directory profile
- Update miscellaneous biographic information
- Request time off in advance
- View a personalized benefits summary
- View pay stub history
- View pension history
- View leave history
- View personnel tax statements
- View employee spending account activity
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**QUICK NOTES ABOUT DEGREEWORKS**
- Comprehensive academic advising services
- On-line resource for students to plan their programs/courses
- Easy-to-use intuitive interfaces
- Multi-formatted advising worksheets
- Reporting on individual student progress in each program
- Integrates with Registration and the Course Catalog
- Curriculum Planning Assistant (CPA) for reporting
- Full-featured "What if" and "Look Ahead" features
- Unlimited advisor notes
- Web-based exception processing
- Degree audits in batch or dynamic mode
- ADA 508 compliance
Degree Works Access for Students and Advisors

The Power of the Portal

Greater Commitment = Momentum
Terminology

**Portal:**
A Web site that functions as an entry point to the Internet, as by providing useful content and linking to various sites and features on the World Wide Web.

---

**Current Portal Page**

**Internal Communication**
- Lacking appeal
- Difficult to find information
- No branding message
- Does not fully integrate systems
- Not utilized

---

**NEW**

**Portal: Banner-Luminis-Portal**
- Consistent with UD brand developed by 160/90 University engaged advertising agency
- Web portal used to access and integrate the majority of Banner applications through Banner Self Service
- Single sign-on interface to Banner applications
- Communications are targeted to the right audience at the right time with the right information
- Access to external sites via web based
Mission Statement

Porches is a growing and evolving digital gathering place designed to provide tailored tools and communications that meet the personal, education and business needs of students, staff, and faculty at the University of Dayton.

Objectives

1. Evolve and maintain flexibility to meet customer needs
   o Deliver new channels
2. Become a one-stop digital gathering place for members of the UD community to perform business transactions
   o 80% discrete user sign-on in the first twelve months
3. Ensure problem-free access to all Banner modules after portal login
   o Help Desk to monitor calls, report and track problem areas
4. Engage University recognized organizations to use Group Studio
   o Group Studio participation of 100 groups by the end of year one
5. Train users to personalize and fully leverage Porches
   o Provide campus-wide training opportunities

What does this mean to me?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An internal communication tool</td>
<td>Secure access to faculty, staff and student for University information and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(search, announcements, forms, events calendar and more...)</td>
<td>Users get the right information at the right time for the right reason. Less mass email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted information based on role (faculty, staff or student)</td>
<td>Information that are previously scattered and in different systems and URLs are now available through Porches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University resources will be available to all Terence</td>
<td>Self-service portal for performing all business and academic tasks from one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users can control what is and is not displayed</td>
<td>Simple and user-friendly for non-technical individuals to use to perform required tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for campus users to own, personalize and develop content</td>
<td>Information can be personalized to meet individual needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users can control what is and is not displayed</td>
<td>Current and reliable campus information in one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for campus users to own, personalize and develop content</td>
<td>Less mass email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information can be personalized to meet individual needs</td>
<td>Current and reliable campus information in one location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Slide 24**

- **Banner**
- **Finance**
  - Budget to Actual information
- **Student/Financial Aid**
  - View Grades
  - Enter Grades
  - Request Transcripts
  - View and Accept Financial Aid
- **Human Resources**
  - Time entry (select groups)
  - Budget to Actual information

**Self Service**

- **Human Resources**
  - Time entry (select groups)
- **Finance**
  - Budget to Actual information
- **Student/Financial Aid**
  - View Grades
  - Enter Grades
  - Request Transcripts
  - View and Accept Financial Aid
  - Financial Aid
  - Admit/Reclassify
  - Grant Balances
- **Accounting**
  - Account Balances
  - Degree Evaluation
  - Purchase Requisitions
  - Purchase Orders

**FUTURE…**

**GO LIVE…**

- **Banner**
- **Finance**
- **Student/Financial Aid**
- **Human Resources**
- **Accounting**
- **Group Studio**
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**NEW Group Studio** will provide students and faculty alike a place to share information for class or extracurricular activities.

- Self select a Group and communicate with its members
- Public and restricted groups
- Role-based index and search
- Group targeted announcements
- Group message boards
- Group photo albums/rosters
- Group calendar
- Group chat
- Group file sharing
- Ability to generate ad hoc groups (e.g. student organizations, research groups)
- Integration with Banner and other tools
- Integration with Banner in later phases

**Slide 26**

**NEW Group Studio** will provide students and faculty alike a place to share information for class or extracurricular activities.

- Self select a Group and communicate with its members
- Public and restricted groups
- Role-based index and search
- Group targeted announcements
- Group message boards
- Group photo albums/rosters
- Group calendar
- Group chat
- Group file sharing
- Ability to generate ad hoc groups (e.g. student organizations, research groups)
- Integration with Banner and other tools
- Integration with Banner in later phases
For more information, visit our website:

- Banner Quickplace
  http://quickplace.udayton.edu/banner

- SunGard Customer Support Center
  https://connect.sungardhe.com/customer_support

- List Serves
  http://lists.sungardhe.com

- Questions?
  projectsummit@udayton.edu
Part-Time Faculty – Statement of Practice

Summary for Academic Senate

September 25, 2009

Introduction:

Students at the University of Dayton receive approximately 25% of their instruction from 300+ part-time faculty. Part-time faculty work in nearly all academic units and most have long-term relationships with the university. Previous to this effort, there was not a clear statement of norms with regard to part-time faculty and the role they play on campus. There was wide variation in campus practices, ranging from examples that were “best practice” to some that were unacceptable. While we recognize a need for flexibility throughout campus, the new “Part-time Faculty at the University of Dayton: a Statement of Practice” makes explicit norms that establish an appropriate university-wide level of consistency.

The process used to generate the document:

A list of issues and concerns were compiled and prioritized into short, medium and longer-term (or more difficult) goals. Publicizing our list of short-term items, we conducted a series of campus meetings with faculty, Deans and the campus heads of the Academic Senate, FACAS and AAUP. With that feedback, we generated a draft of this document which was presented to the Provost’s Council for discussion. Final revisions resulted in the document linked below.

Points of note for Academic Senate:

Most of the practices recommended in the document are already fairly common at UD and most campus units require no major adjustments. However, we feel that the clear statement of “best practices” will be helpful to a variety of constituencies across campus. Some adjustments will be needed in certain areas and units to be consistent, and a few items in the statement are new practices developed while working on this issue. The main accomplishments are the:

- Establishment of a university-wide minimum salary for traditional three credit hour courses
- Commitment to raise this floor in every year that full-time salaries are increased
- Commitment to distribute budget increases in pt faculty lines to pt faculty
Establishment of a limit for individual part-time faculty to a maximum of nine credit hours per term
Commitment to process paperwork in timely fashion to ensure no delays in parking passes or paychecks

Next steps:
Distribute, communicate, and educate using the “Statement of Practice.”
Deans and department chairs ensure that practices are consistent with the “SOP,” implementing any necessary changes.

Titling (FACAS)
Investigate no-cost and low-cost benefits → tuition remission for long-term part-time faculty members
Integrate part-time faculty into the revised UD Faculty Handbook
Evaluation and rewards for part-time faculty.
Representation of part-time faculty on campus.

The full “Statement of Practice” is available at:
http://facadminaffairs.udayton.edu/docs/Part-time%20faculty%20statement.pdf

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi McGrew, part-time faculty representative to the Academic Senate
Joseph Untener, Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs
Update: Post Tenure Review

Academic Senate Meeting
September 25, 2009

Current Policy in Faculty Handbook

• Each tenured faculty member must be evaluated by peers, using a method acceptable to the department, at least once during each six-year interval.
Slide 3

History
- 2006 ???: Board of Trustee Agreement
- 2006: Meyers Report Submitted to Academic Senate - FACAS
- 2007: Post-Tenure Peer Consultation Process presented to Senate
- 2008: Post-Tenure Review Philosophy approved by Senate
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2008 Post Tenure Review Philosophy
- Guiding Principles (AAUP)
  - Post-tenure review should be aimed at development.
  - Post-tenure review should be under the control of the faculty (peer involvement).
  - Post-tenure review must not be a re-evaluation of tenure.
  - Post-tenure review must not be used to show cause for dismissing a faculty member.
  - Post-tenure review must protect academic freedom.
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2008 Post Tenure Review Philosophy
- Once tenure is granted, administrators and peers evaluate faculty members by means of the following processes:
  - Annual review
  - Promotion review
  - Sabbatical application and post-sabbatical report reviews
- Through all of these processes, even though the specific content, format, or procedures may vary by unit, faculty and administrators fulfill their responsibilities to formally monitor every faculty member’s professional performance.
2008 Post Tenure Review
Philosophy & Charge

• This set of post-tenure evaluations, if consistently and fairly conducted across all academic units, affords tenured members of the faculty the opportunity for reflection as well as peer and administrative review devoted to the purpose of professional development and career enhancement.

• Conduct an audit of current policies, procedures, criteria, and practices being used by all units and departments across the University of Dayton.

Findings re Separate Post-Tenure Review

• One Department has separate Post Tenure Review Policy & Process (peer led)

• One School has separate unit-wide Post Tenure Review Policy & Policy (suspended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
<th>Evaluative &amp; Developmental</th>
<th>Evaluative &amp; Developmental</th>
<th>Evaluative &amp; Developmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Governance</td>
<td>Separate Department procedures</td>
<td>Unit Policy &amp; Procedure</td>
<td>Unit Policy &amp; Procedure</td>
<td>Unit Policy &amp; Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Chair with one Exception</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Committee of Chairs Discuss</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Reviewer</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Review of Past Performance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Evaluative-Cumulative</td>
<td>Evaluative-Cumulative</td>
<td>Evaluative-Cumulative</td>
<td>Evaluative-Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
<td>Chair &amp; Peer Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Promotion Review (Professor)
- Rigorous Process – Peer process
- Not Developmental
- Peer review of teaching- a work in progress (in most cases)
- Substantial number of faculty have not sought promotion
  - Not worthy
  - No incentive
  - Need to get a life
- Change in Goals - Primarily based upon research and teaching, service not as valued as some procedures indicate
- Stressful process – It's the tenure process all over again
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Sabbatical Reviews
- Peer process
- Focus on plan – Consistent with goals of individual and/or department/unit
- Peer review of teaching not part of process
- Rigor varies
- Generally, no thorough review of the individuals past work
- Chairperson writes a letter of endorsement which summarizes the candidate’s most recent evaluation, describes how the proposed sabbatical will contribute to the development of the sabbatical candidate
- Some do not apply for sabbatical
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Annual Review
- Focus on dispensing money (i.e., coming up with a number) rather than communicating performance appraisal to individual (continuous improvement)
- Primarily a chair led process – time consuming
- Variability across schools and even within schools
  - Holistic Appraisal vs. Piecemeal
- Focus on just past year’s performance - scholarship is not evenly produced
Annual Review of Teaching
• Heavy reliance on student ratings
• Chairs modify ratings/evaluation based upon:
  • Class size  Number of students taught
  • Willingness to teach “undesirable” unpopular/difficult course
  • New preparations New pedagogy
  • Breadth of courses taught
  • Student comments Student complaints
  • Graduating Student Interviews
  • Review of syllabi
  • Faculty narrative descriptions
  • Involvement of writing
  • Laboratory upgrades

Annual Review of Research & Scholarship
• Peer review is implicit in the Chair’s judgment
• Non-peer reviewed products carry less weight
• The more the rigorous the peer review, the greater the weight given to the product

Annual Review of Service
• In most cases, just a listing of activities
• No good rubric for assessing service
• Chair’s appraisal based upon own internal subjective model given her/his knowledge of importance/visibility, frequency, workload of the activity.
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**Annual Review – Developmental Aspects**
- All units except College have goal setting as part of process
  - I am working as hard as I can—what else do you expect me to do?—but with no direction
- Even where there is goal setting
  - Goals tend to be the same goals every year
  - Goals short-sighted—what are you going to do for the next year
  - Goals need to be more strategic and shape the individual toward more long-term goals
  - What do you need to do to get promoted?; What can I do to help you get promoted?
  - What can you do to move the department/university forward?
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**Annual Review – Developmental Aspects**
- Goals need to accommodate individual differences
  - The schools (SBA, SDE, SOEAP) have multiple faculty models (Teacher, Scholar, Teacher/Scholar) – not clear how the models affect goal setting and chair appraisal on an annual basis
- Chairs need training in helping faculty set goals
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**Annual Review-Performance Feedback**
- Feedback processes differ both within and between schools
- Meaningful performance feedback in many cases is lacking
  - In many cases, nothing is written for the record
  - In some cases, the written appraisal handed to faculty member—no face-to-face communication
  - Focus is on money not performance—faculty satisfied with numbers
  - Debasement subjectative in dispensing money
  - Faculty satisfied with numbers
  - Difference in monetary faculty income is small—so it does not matter how I am evaluated
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Annual Review-Performance Feedback (2)

- Meaningful performance feedback in many cases is lacking
- Don't need to give feedback - all my faculty are working as hard as they can
- Faculty are satisfied with the numbers so there is no need to go over the appraisal
- I talk to my faculty all the time - we talk about strengths and weaknesses, and areas of needed improvement
- Chairs don't have time to engage in feedback - bad time of year
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My Thoughts

- We already have processes in place to evaluate faculty post tenure.
- If we want Post-Tenure Review to be a truly developmental process, we can't wait until sabbatical review or promotion review.
- Need to shape behavior - Change in smaller steps is less daunting and less onerous
- Continuous Improvement
- Need to focus on improving Annual Review Process
- Need to add some element of in-class peer evaluation post tenure to annual review - Perhaps MID
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My Thoughts

- Need to add some process for addressing problems of continued underperformance (or appeal to chairs evaluation)
- Perhaps at some point recommend post tenure peer consultation process
- Need to consider delinking the time of performance appraisal (merit) and the time of performance feedback?
Our Choice

• A new and separate peer post tenure process (go back to the former proposal of a Peer Consultation Process)
• Improve existing processes—particularly annual review
• Senate recommends a set of guidelines
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

September 4, 2009

Kennedy Union 211, 3PM

KU 211, 3-5 p.m.

Members present: Benson, Bickford, Donnelly, Frasca, Hess, Huacuja, Jain, Liu, White

Announcements

• John Malone replaces Kathryn Sunday as Student Representative for APC.
• The next scheduled meeting of the APC is 3 p.m. on Friday, October 2 in KU 211.

New business

• Jon Hess agreed to take minutes for the year, or until a graduate assistant could be found who would do that task.
• Pat Donnelly reported from the Coordinating and Writing Task Force for CAP
  o Common themes -- The Coordinating and Writing Task Force summarized the common themes in feedback to the original CAP proposal in the document, “A Summary of Responses to the Common Academic Program Proposal.” Dr. Donnelly noted that there were a wide range of understandings of CAP, some of which were not entirely accurate. The summary document does not attempt to correct any misunderstandings of the original CAP proposal.
  o Feedback -- Dr. Donnelly offered a comprehensive overview of the feedback as pertaining to all key themes, including concern about what CAP would do to majors; support for the developmental aspects of CAP and plans for integrated learning; concern about diluting humanities; concerns about proposals for arts, social sciences, capstones, diversity requirements, service learning, and interdisciplinary integrative courses; concerns about the proposal for the oral communication requirement; and questions about resources needed. For more details, see the task force’s report.
  o Diversity -- The task force felt that diversity should be integrated across the curriculum, instead of covered in a single class.
  o Service learning -- The task force is waiting to see if a proposal to create an Office of Student Learning is supported and funded.
Next steps -- The committee has created 10 working groups to address issues based on feedback to the original CAP proposal. These groups and their charges are detailed in the report “Work Plan for the Development of the Common Academic Program.” Dr. Donnelly reviewed these groups and their mission with the APC. All groups except “Crossing Boundaries” need to provide their reports to the task force by Dec. 15, 2009. “Crossing Boundaries” has until March 22, 2010.

Discussion
- Vinod Jain noted that assessment will be essential to show that the learning outcomes are being met in the new curriculum.
- The issue of whether new curriculum would be approved by the existing General Education committee or a new committee has not been resolved.
- Dr. Benson noted that it will be important for the task force to have a visual means of showing how the proposed curriculum meets the seven learning outcomes.

Processes and procedures -- The APC follows The Processes and Procedures of the Academic Senate of DOC I-07-05, posted at academic.udayton.edu/senate/. Confirmed that APC approved and unapproved minutes and issues list will be posted at Quickplace.udayton.edu – Academic Senate – APCAS. CAP documents can be found at Quickplace.udayton.edu – senatedocs – CAP Docs. All documents also found at academic.udayton.edu/senate.

Reporting to ECAS -- Paul Benson agreed to report for the APC at the Executive Committee meetings, with the assistance of Dave Darrow.

APC issues for the year -- Although other issues will arise during the year, the work with the CAP Coordinating and Writing Task Force will be the APC major task for the year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.
Student Academic Policies Committee
Academic Senate Meeting
September 25, 2009
KU Ballroom

Present – Kearns, Laubach, Nestor, Mari, Skill, Daniels, Doyle, Trick, Wilhoit

- On 9/23/09, E.R.I.C (Evaluation, Review and Innovation Committee) met to begin discussions regarding student evaluation of teaching. E.R.I.C. is a subcommittee of the SAPC that was formed in the spring of 2009. Representatives of the committee include:
  - Representative from LTC
  - Student representatives (3), one of whom is selected by the SGA VPAA
  - Graduate Student Representative
  - Faculty representatives (3) from ECAS (FAC and SAPC)

- The charge for E.R.I.C is to produce a report on:
  - UD’s current student course evaluation policies and practices
  - Current research on best practices in student evaluation of faculty teaching
  - Provide a set of recommendations pertaining to changes to UD’s policies and procedures

- After a lively discussion, it was agreed upon that our first task would be to address the current course evaluation policies and practices for undergraduates at the University of Dayton. To accomplish this goal, members of ERIC will contact chairs of departments/programs to provide information as to the current system used by that department/program in the evaluation of all who teach, i.e., faculty, part and full-time instructors, etc. In order to ensure that this audit is as comprehensive as possible, the committee requests that the Dean’s of the CAS, Engineering, School of Education and Allied Health and the School of Business notify and seek the cooperation of chairpersons/program directors in gathering this information.

On October 23, 2009, SOCHE is sponsoring a one-day workshop at Central State University. A special topics forum on “Classroom Assessment Techniques” will be offered by Dr. Thomas Angelo, who is an internationally renowned expert on assessment. The morning session (9-12pm) is entitled “Finding Out How Well Students Are Learning What We’re Teaching: An Introduction to Formative Classroom Assessment”. The afternoon session (1:30-4:30) is entitled “Fostering Critical Thinking across the Curriculum: Practical, Research-based Strategies for Connecting Objectives, Teaching, and Assessment to Improve Learning”

The committee recommends that the Office of the Provost provide funding for members of E.R.I.C to attend this worthwhile and informative meeting.

Next scheduled meeting of E.R.I.C is October 14, 2009.

First scheduled meeting of SAPC is September, 28, 2009