

9-27-2013

## 2013-09-27 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2013-09-27 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2013). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 92.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/92](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/92)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

Unapproved  
Minutes of the Academic Senate  
Friday, September 27, 2013; 3:00 pm  
KU West Ballroom

**Present:** Paul Benson, Andrew Slade, Myrna Gabbe, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Kurt Mosser, Stephen Brown, Joe Mashburn, Carissa Krane, Shawn Cassiman, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Andy Kurzhals, Terence Lau, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Kevin Kelly, Joe Watras, Philip Anloague, John White, Zack Martin, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, Ed Mykytka, Jamie Ervin, Katie Willard, Harry Gerla, Abdullah Alghafis, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Yong Song, Karen E. Swisher, Dominic Sanfilippo, Joseph Saliba

**Guests:** Thomas Skill, Kurt Jackson, Trevor Collier, Elizabeth Gustafson, Andy Zavakos, Pat Donnelly, Beth Schwartz, Joyce Carter, Tom Burkhardt, Jim Farrelly, Jon Hess, Steve Wilhoit, David J. Wright, Jesse Grewal

**Absent:** Andrew Ewwaraye, Jasmine Lahoud, Paul Bobrowski, Eric Taglieri, Paul McGreal

**Opening Prayer/Meditation:** John White opened the meeting with a meditation.

**Minutes:** Minutes of the April 19, 2013 meeting were approved with one correction.

**Announcements:**

C. Phelps passed around a signup sheet for volunteers to give a prayer/meditation at each Academic Senate meeting.

Don't Cancel Your Class! and other programming. Alecia Smith, Coordinator of Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Education, and Kristen Altenau, Coordinator of Sexual Violence Prevention Education, spoke briefly about Don't Cancel Your Class!, Resources and Education for Alcohol in your Life (REAL), and Relationships and Sexual Violence programming that they offer to the university community. Handouts with more information and contact information were distributed. They encouraged faculty to contact them even on short notice. Last year approximately 1,600 students were trained as a result of professor requests alone.

Health Care Benefits. Joyce Carter, Vice-President for Human Resources, presented information about the status of health care at UD, the proposed changes to the UD plan, and potential future changes to the plan. The cost of health care at UD has increased dramatically since 2001 when the total claims cost was \$6 million. The projected claims cost in 2013 is \$24 million. There are no changes proposed to the following items: doctor's office copay, urgent care copay, dental insurance, and eye care. A \$10/month discount is being offered to any employee who participates in the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) program to help offset monthly premium increases. With the monthly discount, the cost for an employee only policy will stay the same at \$36/month for Core Plan and increase by \$11/month for the Advantage Plan employee only to \$144/month. With the monthly discount, the cost for family coverage will increase from \$1 -\$5 a month for Core Plan and \$37-\$52 a month for Advantage Plan. Increases to in-network deductibles, out-of-pocket maximums, Rx copays, and ER visits are also being proposed. Married couples employed at UD (no more discounts) and part-time employees (premium cost to double) will experience increased premium costs. Newly hired graduate assistants will no longer have the option for family medical coverage. As of January 2014 new employees will not be offered a retiree healthcare benefit. New benefits include preventative care covered at 100%, coverage for pre-existing conditions, coverage for adult children until the age of 26, and Live Health Online which will provide access to a doctor for routine prescription refills and certain health issues at a cost of \$10/session.

T. Lau noted that the proposed out-of-pocket maximums for families would increase by \$2,000. He asked if the university would be shouldering a similar burden. J. Carter answered in the affirmative. She stated that the university's strategy was to balance the desire to keep premiums low and maintain the current level of

benefits. She also indicated that McGohan-Brabender were available to assist employees in negotiating medical costs and working out payment plan if necessary. The people who use the plan more will pay more. J. Carter reported that other area colleges and universities are facing even larger increases. The increased costs that UD is seeing are not an anomaly. S. Cassiman asked about the use of biometrics and issues of privacy. J. Watras suggested that alternatives to the health risk assessments be offered in the future. H. Gerla stated that employees can have the HRA blood work done at an area Lab Corps if there are no convenient times on campus. M. Gabbe asked whether preventative care is covered unless an issue is found. Then copays must be paid. J. Carter said that was correct because at that point the test becomes diagnostic. L. Hartley asked about the process of working out the health care plan each year. J. Carter explained that she and Tom Burkhardt meet regularly to monitor the cost of claims. By April of 2013 they could see the costs trending up. They researched reasons why including the Dayton area health care cost trends. The Anthem renewal comes in July. HR worked with McGohan-Brabender to explore options for every component over the summer.

SET Final Report. C. Phelps reminded Senators that the goal for today would be to decide whether to move the work on SET to committees for further discussion. We would not be voting to accept the SET instrument or other recommendations at this time. L. Hartley presented highlights from the report and the committee's recommendations. The members of the SET Committee were in attendance. J. Watras asked if the MID process could be changed to be more like the proposed instrument. D. Wright explained that the proposed instrument could be used as an alternative for MID and the results from the pilot showed positive feedback. J. Mashburn asked if the studies reflected in the research used a variety of disciplines (A: Yes), if the institutions studied have a history of online assessment (A: Online assessment is relatively new, but some have up to 15 years of experience), and whether the studies claim that the questions used in the instrument correlate to student learning (A: A large bibliography is included with the report to support the recommendations).

J. Farrelly announced that the Faculty Board and ECAS will be hosting a discussion about Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) on October 22, 2013 in KU Ballroom from noon to 1:30 pm. Box lunches will be provided by the Office of the Provost.

J. White asked if the data collected by an online instrument would be useful for accessing CAP crossing boundaries classes. D. Wright explained that the vendors chosen for the pilots all have the ability to pull data from the Banner system for assessment purposes. J. Hess stated that policies will be needed to address how data will be shared, how SET will impact promotion and tenure decisions, and options for comparing one professor's work with another professor's work. K. Mosser stated that some of his colleagues are worried about negative feedback from unhappy students online. D. Wright stated that some faculty said students provided richer information online. The timing of SET delivery can be more flexible to allow some professors to administer in class and others to provide the instrument outside of class. K. Mosser asked if any erosion of value of the data had been seen with online administration. S. Wilhoit said that an erosion of value had not been seen, but that response rate can be an issue. There are options for reminders and deadlines and recommendations for best practices should be considered. J. Grewal surmised that if the current paper instrument was completed outside of class, the responses would be the same. He also added that there can be issues of quality vs. quantity with response rates. K. Mosser stated that receiving evaluations that are representative of the class is important. It was mentioned that we do not receive 100% response rate with the current paper form. C. Krane stated that she participated in three pilots and that she received more colorful, tongue-in-cheek, and vulgar responses which she credited to the long open response period for the pilots. J. Mashburn expressed concern about providing incentives for participation. L. Leming also expressed concern about using incentives and sexist, racist, or angry comments. She also asked whether or not we should continue to run evaluations in every class, every semester which can lead to survey fatigue. She proposed to implement a process that would survey a sampling or a certain percentage of classes.

A. Alghafis stated that students prefer professors to explain how important their feedback is to the overall assessment process. Some students are concerned that their input does not make a difference. D. SanFilippo asked how to make a student feel they are important to the process. S. Wilhoit stated that the research shows that student evaluations are higher when it is clear to students that the results impact employment. The language used to introduce the current instrument was revised a few years ago to reflect this research. C. Phelps stated that the length of the current instrument detract from students recognizing the value of the feedback; her department only uses the feedback from five of the questions from the current survey. Y. Song inquired about the cost of implementing a new instrument. J. Hess confirmed that there would be costs associated with any outside vendor, but that a cost comparison is difficult because the costs of the current process are distributed throughout the organization.

C. Phelps asked if there were any objections to assigning further discussion of the instrument and related issues to the APC and further discussion of the recommended use of the instrument data and related issues to the FAC. No objections were made so the committee assignments will be made as recommended. C. Phelps thanked the SET Committee members for all their hard work.

#### Committee Reports.

**APC:** J. Dunne reported that the committee has met twice so far this academic year with the following committee actions.

1. Reviewed the role of the Academic Policies Committee (APC) using senate documents.
2. Reviewed APC activity from last academic year and the continuing issues.
3. **Common Academic Program.** In our role of oversight of the Common Academic Program (CAP) created by Academic Senate Document DOC-10-04, the committee received a presentation from the Assistant Provost for CAP, Sawyer Hunley, on progress and initial implementation. See attached 1-page overview of CAP.
  - a. Program began implementation this academic year (entering 1<sup>st</sup> year students) – students taking new CAP courses now.
  - b. CAP pilot courses, course development grants and faculty development seminars are proceeding since last academic year and continuing this year.
  - c. The CAP Committee has been reviewing course proposals for approval since January 2013.
  - d. During the transition period (from General Education to CAP), the academic units and provost office have specified a set of existing courses that will need to be accepted for CAP credit for some students.
  - e. The Assistant Provost reports much enthusiasm among the faculty involved. She says, “So far, so good.”
  - f. After two years, there will be a formal review of CAP completed by the CAP Committee in consultation with the APC – as directed by DOC-10-04.
4. **Degree Programs & Departments.** Last year, the APC drafted a document consolidating all policies (five current documents) relating to academic degree programs and academic departments. The committee is now doing final review and will forward the proposed document to the ECAS soon.
5. **Honors Courses.** A new issue came to the committee this month – a proposal from the Director of the Honors Program (Dr. David Darrow) to note in some way courses taken for honors credit on students’ academic transcripts. The committee is now gathering information about the proposal including input from the University Registrar, Tom Westendorf. If you have any input for the committee concerning this proposal, please contact me or any of the committee members.

A handout outlining the Common Academic Program Overview was distributed (see attached).

**FAC:** L. Hartley gave the following report:

- 1) The FAC has met once this fall. Meetings are generally held twice a month on Thursdays from 12:00 – 1:15 in St. Mary's, room 113B.
- 2) Dr. Donnelly provided an update on the topic of the University Intellectual Property Policy and Procedures document. The Senate passed a document in January 2012 to revise the University's IP policy (1994). However UDRI continues to work on the policy and therefore the senate's January 2012 has not yet been incorporated in the policy. The main issue is centered on the topic of ownership of online course materials. A subcommittee of FAC will be meeting with Matt Willenbrink (UDRI legal counsel representative) to discuss the completion of this revision and any issues that yet need to be resolved.
- 3) FAC discussed the SET report with a representative from the SET committee. This discussion helped provide input to the SET committee as well as ECAS, especially on the procedural issues and concerns.
- 4) FAC was recently assigned the topic of Instructional Staff Titles: Clinical Appointment, Distinguished Service Professor (DSP), (pp 53-54 of the Faculty Handbook), and Research Professor. Dr. Donnelly has provided background information of the concerns with these titles. This topic will be addressed and discussed at our next meeting. More specifically:
  - Clinical Appointment title needs to be redefined – will consult SEHS
  - Distinguished Service Professor – title has been used inconsistently with original intent. Practice has not aligned with the description.
  - Research Professor – This title, created 10 years ago and approved by the senate, needs to be revisited in light of the new category of Joint Faculty Appointment (approved last year), and the fact that there is no evidence of President or Board approval of the senate document from 10 years ago.
- 5) FAC's next meeting will be held on October 3 @ 12:00 in St. Mary's 113.

**SAPC:** J. McCombe reported that the SAPC has met three times this semester. One of the meetings was devoted to a discussion of the recommendations of the SET Committee--clarifying what would be expected of the Senate regarding this issue during the September Senate meeting. The other two SAPC meetings were devoted to information gathering regarding the Student Code of Conduct and the language in it regarding "Student-Run Businesses and Commercial Activity" in the "campus area." Several faculty members approached the SAPC with concerns that the language might be overly restrictive and discourage an entrepreneurial spirit among UD students. Subsequent SAPC meetings will continue the information gathering and discussion of this topic--in particular, the SAPC will need to decide whether the committee will make a suggestion that the current policy be revised.

Next SAPC meeting: Monday, October 7 at 9:00 a.m. in HM 257.

**ECAS:** C. Phelps reported that ECAS has been working on the following issues:

- Changes to UD health care
- The SET final report
- The ongoing discussion of issues pertaining to consultation, including the formation of a new Educational Leadership Council (ELC)

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks

Handout from APC:

<b>UD Common Academic Program<sup>1</sup> (or CAP) COMPONENTS</b>		<b>Each Component will achieve 1 or more<sup>4</sup> UD Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</b>
Humanities Commons <sup>2</sup> (Religious Studies, Philosophy, History, First-Year Writing)		1. SCHOLARSHIP
Oral Communications, Arts, Mathematics		2. FAITH TRADITIONS
Second-Year Writing, 2 Natural Science (1 lab), Social Science		3. COMMUNITY
Crossing Boundaries <sup>3</sup> (Faith Traditions, Practical Ethical Action, Inquiry, Integrative)		4. DIVERSITY
Advanced Studies <sup>3</sup> (Religious Studies, Philosophy, History)		5. PRACTICAL WISDOM
Diversity and Social Justice <sup>3</sup>		6. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF OUR TIMES
Major Capstone		7. VOCATION

1. The program, components & SLOs defined in Senate Document DOC-10-04.

2. Introduces all seven SLOs.

3. These components may be combined (other combinations also possible).

4. Some components have required SLOs.