

3-18-2011

2011-03-18 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2011-03-18 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2011). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 24.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/24

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

Approved
Minutes of the Academic Senate
March 18, 2011; 3:00 p.m.
KU West Ballroom

Present: Vinod Jain, George Doyle, James Dunne, Leno Pedrotti, Shawn Swavey, Heidi Gauder, Paul Benson, Katherine Trempe, John McCombe, Tony Saliba, Jonathan Hess, Arthur Jipson, Ruihua Liu, Stephen Richards, Rebecca Wells, John White, Kevin Kelly, Sheila Hughes, Matt Shank, Caroline Merithew, Joseph Saliba, Partha Banerjee, Andrea Seielstad, Judith Huacuja, , Carolyn Phelps, Corinne Daprano

Absent: Lisa Kloppenberg, Kimberly Trick, Heidi McGrew, Thomas Brady, Kara Dickey, Alex Renner, Emily Jirles, Jim Pappadakes, Carol Harper, Briana Hollis

Guests: James Farrelly, Linda Hartley, Fred Jenkins, Phil Anloague, Sawyer Hunley, David Wright

Opening Meditation: Tony Saliba opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: Minutes of the February 18 meeting were approved

Announcements:

J. Huacuja announced that the next Senate meeting will be Friday, April 15 in KU Ballroom at 3:00 p.m.

J. Huacuja also announced the names of the newly elected Senators for the 2011-12 AY (Linda Hartley – Arts, Terence Lau – Business, Phil Anloague – Education, Vinod Jain –Engineering, Kim Trick - FT-NTT, Emily Hicks – Library, Carissa Krane – Natural Sciences, Laura Leming – Social Sciences).

J. Huacuja asked that the chairs of the Senate subcommittees prepare end of the year reports for the April 15 Senate meeting. These year-end reports should summarize the committees' evaluations of issues. The reports should indicate major points of dialogue concerning the issue, positions the committee takes on issues and a clear statement of action the committee advocates for next year. These year-end committee reports are critical for a smooth transition into the new academic year 2011-2012.

J. Huacuja reminded everyone that voting for the Senate Voting Rights proposal (Senate Doc I-11-01) has been extended till March 21 at midnight.

Old Business

Common Academic Program (CAP) Committees. S. Hunley delivered a CAP update to the Senate. The update consisted of a review of the CAP & Competencies Committee and CAP Leadership Team – the purpose of each committee, how the committees were composed, and next steps for both committees (see attached PDF file - Common Academic Program Update).

G. Doyle asked for clarification of the criteria and procedures that will be used by the CAP & Competencies Committee to review course proposals for CAP. S. Hunley indicated course proposals will be submitted to the committee for approval and the committee would use criteria from the CAP Senate document to review these proposals. J. Dunne asked about the rationale for including four ex-officio members on the CAP & Competencies Committee. S. Hunley indicated that the Senate document calls for this representation.

Committee Reports.

Academic Policies Committee. J. Hess reported on the three issues the APC has been discussing this semester. He reported that the APC has confirmed the nominees to the CAP Leadership Team. The committee has also agreed to continue their discussion of the Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal. Further, the committee will continue to review/discuss the Student Academic Misconduct Form that was proposed last year by the SAPC. The APC looked at existing UD policies and procedures regarding student academic misconduct and will suggest a plan for implementing the proposed form. The implementation plan will be presented at the next ECAS meeting. The APC's next meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 28 at 2:30 PM.

Student Academic Policies Committee. C. Daprano reported that there have been no meetings or new action. The committee will compile a year-end report for the Academic Senate meeting on April 15.

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate .

UNRC Bylaws Manual: J. Huacuja reported that revisions to the draft UNRC Bylaws Manual had been reviewed by ECAS. The committee voted to endorse the manual at the March 11 ECAS meeting and to put the manual forward at today's Academic Senate meeting.

Senate Voting Rights Proposal. J. Huacuja reported that faculty forums regarding the voting rights proposal were communicated to faculty in several emails, in a FacStaff announcement, and as an article placed under the "faculty" tab at the Porches web site. In addition, four forums were conducted to inform faculty of the proposal. Voting for the proposal is now taking place.

Graduate Faculty Status Proposal. J. Huacuja reported that the proposal entitled "Revised Criteria and Application Process for the Granting of Graduate Faculty Status" presented to ECAS by Brad Duncan, Assoc. Dean of GPCE was discussed and sent to FAC for further review.

Consultative Process. J. Huacuja reported that ECAS had some discussion regarding the Academic Senate's consultative role in the creation of new University positions and the selection process for those positions in light of the recent appointments of a new Vice President for Student Development and Vice President for Mission.

University Nominating & Recruiting Committee. A. Jipson reported that the UNRC implemented a process for collecting self nominations to the CAP committees and received several nominations that were forwarded to ECAS. UNRC has also continued to work on a process for digitizing Senate documents. A. Jipson then reviewed changes that were made to the UNRC Bylaws manual after review of the document by ECAS.

Senate members raised several questions and comments regarding the UNRC Bylaws manual. J. Dunne asked how the UNRC will work with the Deans during a committee nomination and recruitment process. A. Jipson indicated that the UNRC chair and secretary would be in regular contact with the Deans. In addition, the chair of the UNRC would deliver regular reports to ECAS and the Academic Senate regarding the work of the UNRC.

Several members of the senate suggested changes to the manual. J. Hess suggested: 1) removing the phrase "via email" in D. 1. Volunteer Lists since technology will surely change; 2) replacing the phrase "all Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty" with the phrase "all eligible faculty" in D. 1.; and 3) replacing the phrase "necessary to fill vacancy" with "appropriate to fill vacancy" in B. 3. Appointment of the Four University Faculty Representatives to the UNRC. H. Gauder suggested changing the term "ex-officio status" to "non-voting status" in Membership of University Committees. S. Hassell Hughes had several other minor edits that she will forward to A. Jipson.

Faculty Affairs Committee Report

Intellectual Property (IP) Rights: R. Wells reviewed Senate document (94-8) UD Intellectual Property policy and procedures and discussed the FAC's charge to clarify the ownership of online course materials. Currently the document reads:

Textbooks, manuals, or training materials developed in conjunction with class teaching are excluded from the "significant use" category, unless such materials were developed using UD-administered funds paid specifically to support the development of such materials (Section 3.3.1.1).

R. Wells reported that in the opinion of the committee, materials developed for online courses should be excluded from the "significant use" category just as materials developed by faculty for the classroom are excluded. Thus, FAC is proposing that an Addendum be made to the current UD IP policy. The Addendum would state that intellectual property rights for online courses operate in the same way as for traditional courses unless there is a written agreement between the faculty member and the University specifying otherwise. S. Hughes indicated that the added wording proposed by FAC allows for joint ownership of online course materials by both the faculty member and university or for the parties to negotiate a different arrangement that is specified in a written agreement. R. Wells added that, in particular, the Addendum would allow for a negotiated agreement when faculty members are being paid over and above their regular salary. J. Hess asked if the Addendum would apply to part-time faculty who may also be teaching at other universities. R. Wells indicated that the policy would apply as long as it allows for joint ownership of online course materials. J. McCombe asked if the proposed Addendum was intended to clarify ownership rights for faculty *teaching* an online course. R. Wells indicated that the FAC intended to clarify ownership rights for faculty who *develop* an online course. J. White stated that well designed online courses require significant up-front investment of faculty time and resources.

R. Wells reported that the proposed Addendum will be formally provided to Legal Affairs for review and placed on FAC's issues list for follow through next year.

Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching: R. Wells reported on the FAC's discussion of the student evaluation of teaching form and process. After much discussion the FAC concluded that the purpose of student evaluation of instruction is to gather data about **individual faculty members' methods of instruction and professionalism**. With this purpose in mind, the committee agreed that there is a need to change the current form and process. The reasons for this change are that: 1) current practice has out-lived its usefulness and is misused and abused; 2) the current instrument is not appropriate for the measurement of student learning; and 3) student satisfaction is not a direct indication of quality of instruction.

The members of FAC understand that measures of **student satisfaction** and **student learning** may be important for accreditation purposes or promotional purposes. However, those outcomes should be measured using methodologies appropriate for those specific purposes. The current evaluation instrument does not serve the stated purpose of gathering data about **individual faculty members' methods of instruction and professionalism** and should be replaced. The committee believes that new methodologies should be considered that address the frequency of evaluations and, if a survey is designed, the electronic administration of that survey.

Considerable discussion of this topic by members of the Senate ensued. While acknowledging that some changes could be made to the current instrument, several senators voiced support for a university wide standard form to measure student evaluation of faculty teaching that is and would continue to be used for student feedback, evaluation, and administrative review (e.g. merit, tenure, promotion decisions). Several thought that measuring student "perceptions" of the course and instructor are valid observations that we need to continue to collect. Others mentioned the value of the instrument for

ongoing faculty professional development as well as having a standard form and procedure that was used throughout the university.

Members of FAC recognized the value of collecting data both for administrative review (summative evaluation) and professional development (formative evaluation) yet felt these are separate issues and that the current instrument does not necessarily address both issues. FAC members also felt there are other ways to gather additional information on teaching effectiveness. According to current research that the FAC examined student “perception” of learning doesn’t measure student learning outcomes or levels of learning. FAC members agreed that the assessment of student learning outcomes would be especially helpful for students and faculty members as well as being increasingly called for by accrediting bodies.

J. Huacuja asked what categories/questions should be included in the evaluation form given FAC’s initial response that the form needs to be changed. R. Wells indicated that research shows students can reliably give feedback on methods of instruction and professionalism. Provost Saliba asking whether it makes sense to have a university wide evaluation tool when methods of instruction vary so widely across departments and units. Also, is there a need to develop two instruments; one of which would be used for administrative review purposes only? Provost Saliba suggested that it may make sense for the Senate to decide this question first and then either revise the current instrument or come up with two different instruments. S. Hughes suggested that a revised instrument might contain some university wide items as well as appropriate discipline and department specific items to assess methods of instruction. Further, that although the current instrument does allow for customization this is not done in practice. Customization might be more easily accomplished through the use of an online instrument.

R. Wells thanked the Senate for the lively discussion and announced that the next meeting of the FAC is scheduled for March 25 at 12 noon in MH 710.

Consultative Process: R. Wells made a motion to table this agenda item for the next Senate meeting on April 15; G. Doyle second; the motion passed. Provost Saliba asked for more specifics regarding what the Senate means by “consultation.” He added that he believes the discussion should be confined to issues of “consultation” regarding policies and procedures not personnel decisions. J. Huacuja agreed that ECAS would develop a list of points regarding the consultation process.

K. Webb announced that a Faculty Legacies exhibit is currently on display in the first floor gallery space of Roesch Library.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano