Academic Senate Minutes   Academic Senate

11-15-2013

2013-11-15 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Approved
Minutes of the Academic Senate
Friday, November 15, 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, Andrew Evwaraye, Jasmine Lahoud, Shawn Cassiman, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Andy Kurzhals, Terence Lau, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Eric Taglieri, Kevin Kelly, Joe Watras, Philip Anloague, Zack Martin, Ed Mykytka, Katie Willard, Harry Gerla, Abdullah Alghafis, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Yong Song, Karen E. Swisher, Dominic Sanfilippo

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Mark Nielsen, Sawyer Hunley, Deb Bickford, Scott McDaniel, Katherine Schmidt, Emily McGowin, Robert N. Parks, Lucas Martin, Benjamin Heidgerken, Pat Donnelly, Jamie Riley, Noyra Valentin, Claire Schrader, Cilla Shindell, Brad Kallenberg, Brad Duncan, Bill Marvin, Kwok Tung Cheung, Dorian Borbonis, Juan Santamarina, Rebecca Wells, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, John Rowe, Peggy DesAutels, Jayne Robinson, John Inglis, Danielle Poe, Albert Burky, Shannon Miller, Margaret Pinnell

Absent: Paul Bobrowski, John White, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, Jamie Ervin, Paul McGreal, Joseph Saliba

Opening Prayer/Meditation: D. Sanfilippo opened the meeting with a prayer.

Announcements: C. Phelps welcomed three visitors from Leadership UD. She explained that agenda of the current meeting would need to be suspended in order to continue the discussion from the November 8th special meeting.

K. Webb moved to suspend the current agenda with a second from L. Hartley. The motion was approved (30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

Continued Discussion of UD Health Care Plans From November 8th Special Meeting:

M. Gabbe proposed the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommends the University reconsider the disproportionate increase seen in 2014 for coverage for employees (and employee families) where both spouses are UD benefit-eligible.

K. Mosser seconded the motion.

Discussion: J. Dunne asked for an explanation of why the increase is considered disproportionate. K. Webb explained that it is the percent of increase that is disproportionate. For example, a 16% increase for employee + spouse Advantage plan ($367 to $426) vs. a 132% increase for both spouses UD benefit eligible ($184 to $426). If you use the plan, the increase will be more.

Point of information from J. Farrelly: In 2007 the couples' policy was changed so each spouse paid ½ of the family plan. At that time there were 100 couples working at UD.

A. Alghafis asked what the extra cost to UD was for insuring spouses and dependents of GA's and what percent was that of the total cost to insure everyone at UD. C. Phelps responded that she would ask HR.

R. Frasca stated that it was a net benefit or bonus to have both spouses working here. Now the cost would be the same as employee plus spouse who does not work here.

M. Gabbe stated that the benefit was not a bonus because only one spouse gets the benefit. S. Cassiman stated that someone with a spouse off campus had other options. If both spouses work here there was no other choice.

Further discussion led to wording changes in the resolution which are reflected above.

C. Krane stated that part-time people are also seeing disproportionate increases. C. Phelps commented that the open enrollment period was closing on November 15th (day of the meeting) so any resolutions the Senate puts forward are for the future beyond 2014.

The question was called and seconded. It passed (29 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain).

The resolution passed (27 yes, 0 no, 3 abstain).

J. Mashburn proposed the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommends that Human Resources, after consultation with the faculty and staff, reconsider the balance between premiums and total out-of-pocket expenses for 2015's health benefit plan.

S. Cassiman seconded the motion.

Discussion: T. Lau commented that as someone on the Human Resources Advisory Council (HRAC) he would appreciate some guidance as to which way the Senate would want this to go. K. Mosser explained that we do not know for sure what people want yet. J. Robinson voiced support for more direction saying that out-of-pocket expenses are the real problem. K. Kelly stated that he had not had time to consider the issue and could not support a directional resolution. J. Dunne agreed. C. Phelps stated that some people like the current balance.

The question was called and seconded. It passed (30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

The resolution passed (29 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain).

S. Brown commented that people with chronic illnesses had not been specifically addressed by the resolutions that had been considered so far. He proposed the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommends the University consider constructing a salary-based sliding scale for premiums, co-pays, deductibles, and out of pocket costs in order to lessen the burden on those who are most vulnerable.

A. Slade seconded the motion.

Discussion: A. Slade stated that Tom Burkhardt mentioned that a sliding scale model had been considered and discarded. Further discussion led to wording changes in the resolution which are reflected above.

Point of information: K. Webb stated that the Hay Classification pay ranges are being adjusted and some Hay-classified employees will receive salary adjustments to bring them in line with the new ranges and to help offset the increased health care premiums.

The question was called by K. Mosser and seconded by J. Mashburn. It passed (30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

The resolution passed (26 yes, 1 no, 4 abstain).

L. Leming moved to adjourn the meeting with a second by H. Gerla. The motion passed (29 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain).

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

A motion was made and seconded to postpone all November 15th agenda items except approving the minutes of the previous meeting and the CAPC update. The motion passed (30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

Minutes: Minutes of the October 18, 2013 meeting were approved with corrections (26 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain). Motion made by L. Leming and seconded by J. Mashburn.

Announcements: C. Phelps announced that ECAS will send the proposal to designate Honors courses on transcripts to the Provost's Office with strong support for the proposal. K. Willard expressed gratitude on behalf of the students.

Committee Reports: (Submitted in writing)

APC: J. Dunne reported that the committee has met twice since the last senate meeting. They have taken the following actions:

1. **Degree Programs & Departments**. . The committee continues to wait for review and comment from the academic units. Based on this review, we will forward the proposed document to ECAS, hopefully within the next few weeks.
2. **Honors Courses**. The committee reviewed a proposal from the University Honors Program to note courses taken for honors credit on students' academic transcripts. We met with the Director of the Honors Program and with representatives from the Registrar's office. We reviewed information gathered about comparable universities and their practices. The committee concluded that this proposal is feasible, is consistent with many similar universities, and will assist our students. We sent our findings to the ECAS and recommended that the senate communicate support for this proposal to the Provost's Office.
3. **Student Evaluation of Teaching.** The committee is conducting a review of the recommendations of the SET Committee with a focus on five questions to us from ECAS: the proposed instrument, how it would be delivered on-line, whether incentives will be used to improve response rate, what standard instructions should be used, and if any information about student respondents should be known – for improved understanding of results. In our deliberations, Linda Hartley from the SET Committee assisted us. We are now drafting our findings.
4. **Undergraduate Certificates.** The university presently has a policy for Graduate Certificates but not policy for undergraduate certificate programs. We have begun gathering information about this topic – from similar universities and other sources. Part of our initial deliberations focus on not only defining and understanding certificate programs but also differences/similarities with majors, minors, concentrations, emphases, tracks, and any other similar academic programs. We are continuing our deliberations.

FAC: L. Hartley gave the following report:

1) Since the last regular Senate meeting, the FAC has met once.
2) Intellectual Properties issue update: The FAC subcommittee (P. Donnelly, P. Vanderburgh, S. Cassiman, M. Willenbrink – UDRI, and L. Hartley) met October 18. After much discussion, we were not able to resolve the issues during this meeting. We requested that Matt Willenbrink create a suggested revision to the Senate's original proposal to amend the current Intellectual Property policy. Yesterday I received a response from Matt Willenbrink (UDRI) which will be addressed by FAC in the near future.
3) Instructional Staff Titles:

a. Clinical Faculty Appointment (or another title yet to be determined) – Dr. Barbara De Luca (SEHS Associate Dean) plans to provide FAC with recommended suggestions on the title(s) and description that will satisfy the SEHS.
    b. Distinguished Service Professor – FAC reached unanimous consensus on the revision of the DSP title definition and brought this forward to ECAS.
    c. Research Professor – FAC is in the process of gathering more information for the investigation of the title and description of Research Professor.
4) SET: FAC continues discussion to address our assignment by ECAS. The SET committee provided us with a new draft of suggestions on the uses of SET. We will continue this discussion at the next FAC meeting.
5) FAC's next meeting will be held on November 21 @ noon in St. Mary's 113.

SAPC: J. McCombe reported that the committee has met twice since the October Senate meeting. Two issues have been discussed, and will continue to be discussed in future meetings:

Issue #1 – The University's Policy on Political/Electoral Activity

The SAPC began its discussion of the University's Political/Electoral Activities Policy (last amended 20 April 2012) at its 28 October 2013 meeting. Members of the Committee brought the issue to the attention of ECAS and requested that the SAPC review and discuss the policy in light of its effects on the academic climate of the University. The guiding question of the SAPC's discussion was "Is the current policy one that would promote civic awareness, as well as civil and informed discourse about a range of political issues?"

The SAPC acknowledges the importance of the University's 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status and that, accordingly, the institution, as a whole, should never attempt to create propaganda to influence legislation or promote particular candidates for office. That said, however, members of the SAPC believe that the current "Political/Electoral Activities" policy could be strengthened in key ways:

- A policy, or set of practices, could be established for students, specifically—since the current policy applies to faculty, staff and students.
- Because students are the primary focus of the University's educational mission, there should be a document that frames political/electoral activities in an academic context—one in line, perhaps, with documents such as *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*.
- There are instances in which the current document appears contradictory or confusing—perhaps because of its multiple audiences—and a revised student policy might offer clarification on what types of political/electoral activities would both serve student academic interests and maintain the University's 501(c)(3) status.

Proposed Action:

SAPC member Laura Leming has agreed to take leadership on the following:

- Invite participation in a sub-set of the SAPC, to include faculty from the SAPC, faculty from the Department of Political Science, student SAPC members and representatives from organizations such as (but not limited to) the College Republicans, College Democrats, and College Libertarians.
- This group will generate a list of "talking points"—issues that should be foregrounded in the type of student political activities the SAPC is advocating above and then bring those items to the attention of the SAPC prior to the drafting of a new student policy.
- Laura has agreed to report back to the SAPC at its 25 November 2013 meeting on the status of the efforts to move forward on this issue.

Issue #2 – The SAPC Role in the Revision of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Instrument and Process

At its 11 November 2013 meeting, the SAPC began its discussion of our committee's role in the proposed revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) instrument and process. The SAPC charge, as delivered by ECAS, was to provide input to the APC regarding to two related questions: 1) How will confidentiality of student responses be maintained?; and 2) What can and/or should be known about respondents?

Question #1 – *Confidentiality of Student Responses*

SAPC member Tom Skill has participated in conversations related to this issue—working, in particular, with David Wright and members of the LTC team. Tom was able to provide some context on the vendors who were selected for taking part in the administration of the SET pilots in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.

In short, both vendors encrypt the online data that students submit—using a process similar to the way in which online banking data is encrypted. As a result, students should be reassured that their responses should be confidential. However, much like occurs currently with the paper/pencil SET process, those administering the SET forms should remind students that instructors will not gain access to the SET data until after grades are posted.

As Tom suggested, however, online SET administration does differ in one key respect from the current paper/pencil format. There is the potential—at the vendor level—for connecting individual students to the responses they produced. Obviously, this information would not be requested, except in the unlikely instance that a student expressed a desire to commit self-harm, or perhaps if some other criminal intent were to be expressed in the SET information.

Before moving further on the issue of confidentiality, Tom has asked for clarification from David Wright and the SET Committee (chaired by Linda Hartley) related to the following questions:

1. It appears that with both vendors, it is possible for the SET administrator to connect student responses with the actual student. If this is accurate, can the SAPC receive clarification on the following?

> a) What policies, restrictions and/or disclosures have other universities developed to manage this?

> b) Are there ways to further restrict this so that student privacy is better protected?

> c) Is it possible to completely disable the ability of UD to connect individual students to their responses?

Question #2 - What can and/or should be known about respondents?

The latter question included with the SAPC charge is perhaps even more complicated than the first and will need to be discussed in greater detail.

During this meeting, there was vigorous discussion around the possible merits of, and potential risks associated with, gathering demographic information from the students completing the revised, online SET form. The following questions have, once again, been submitted to David Wright and the SET Committee to support future SAPC conversations:

1) **It appears that both vendors have the capacity aggregate demographic data on students. If this is accurate can you respond to the following:**

a) What kinds of "out of the box" crosstabs does the vendor provide? (For example, can we see gender by average response, race by average response, major? Other demographic info?)

b) If these crosstabs are available, can we limit access to them if the number of respondents is low -- to avoid compromising confidentiality? Is any of this "automated" so that we don't have to manage 2500 course sections?

2) **Overall, there may be a perceived concern that faculty or departments might retaliate against students who make unpopular statements or give very low scores was expressed by at least one student.**

a) How have other schools addressed this concern -- either with building good policies and practices that ensure trust or by having clear protections that ensure that no one with a vested interest will ever have access to the data?

3) **The question of data retention emerged. The concern was over a disgruntled faculty member getting "discovery rights" on this data to support a bias claim for tenure or promotion.**

a) Have other schools implemented data retention policies to limit these discovery concerns?

b) Do we have any plans for this or for archiving this data?

4) **Based on the pilot assessments you coordinated, do you have data that might shed light on the following:**

a) Level of student satisfaction with the on line process - key likes and concerns?

b) Any expressed concerns about student privacy (did we address the fact that it is possible to connect identities to responses?)

David Wright has promised to respond to the above in advance of the next schedule SAPC meeting.

Next SAPC Meeting: 25 November 2013 (9:00 a.m. in HM 257). The SAPC plans to continue its discussion of our committee's role in the SET process and also receive an update from Laura Leming regarding progress involving the SAPC's other current topic of discussion: the University's Policy on Political/Electoral Activities.

ECAS: C. Phelps reported that although much of our time has focused on the special meeting of last week, ECAS has continued discussion about the ELC, its role, and what is the intent/goal of establishing this new body. The focus has been on consultation and the opportunity to participate in discussions that are more strategic in nature.

Actions taken since the last Senate meeting:
- Assigned to ACP a request for honors transcriptions for undergraduate students. This was consultative issue. ACP recommended that ECAS communicate to the Provost's Office strong support for this proposal. ECAS voted to move that recommendation directly to the Provost.

CAPC Update: J. Dunne and J. Santamarina presented a brief overview of the history of the Common Academic Program (CAP), its components, student learning outcomes, its administration, and the work of the CAP Committee, including process, interpretation and application of CAP document, and the course approval. Go to http://www.udayton.edu/provost/cap/index.php for further information or to submit CAP course proposals. The CAPC Update slides are available on the Senate Porches site in the November 15, 2013 folder.

Discussion: T. Lau asked of the catalog will show that a particular course is a CAP course. J. Santamarina responded that the learning outcomes will appear when you click on a course name. He stated that the course approval process has been a careful and deliberate one as the CAPC learned the process. The committee meets weekly when school is in session. In spring 2014 the committee membership will start to rotate.

C. Phelps asked the presenters to comment on the responses that course proposers could expect to see from the committee. J. Santamarina stated that there were 4 basic responses:
1. Proposal is withdrawn from consideration—frequently used when significant rework is needed or the proposer wants to go in a different direction
2. Proposal is approved with no changes
3. Proposal is approved with minor edits
4. Not approved

Number 3 was developed from necessity to help streamline the process.

S. Hunley commented that UD is one of the first to do this in nation and that we were being used as a model.

D. Sanfilippo delivered kudos to CAPC committee for making CAP coherent for the undergraduate students.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks