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Guests: J. Farrelly, Thomas Skill, Paul Vanderburgh, David J. Wright, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, Sawyer Hunley, Patrick Donnelly, Conor Kutner, Brian Turner, Karen Bull, Nita Teeters, Fred Jenkins, Deb Bickford, Shannon Miller

Absent: Ralph Frasca, Joe Watras, John White, Tony Saliba, Jamie Ervin, Abdullah Alghafis, Yong Song, Karen E. Swisher

Opening Prayer/Meditation: L. Leming opened the meeting with a prayer.

Minutes: The minutes of the December 13, 2013 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved with corrections (26 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).

Announcements: C. Phelps announced that Honors courses will be designated on transcripts and listed in the catalog starting in Fall 2014.

Committee Reports:

APC: J. Dunne reported the APC met on Friday, January 17th. The committee continues to work on the consolidated document of degree programs. The document will be ready for ECAS soon. The committee also discussed a possible policy for undergraduate certificates.

FAC: L. Hartley submitted the following report in writing.

1) Since the last regular Senate meeting, the FAC has met once.

2) Intellectual Properties: FAC reviewed the latest revision to the Intellectual Policies revision to include co-ownership for faculty who teach fully online courses. We had a question about the definition of the term ‘co-ownership’. Co-ownership is defined as “each party shall own an undivided interest. In other words, either party is free without the other’s permission. And either party has no duty to account for or share any revenue they may receive from the IP. Furthermore, the only thing that each party cannot do with their undivided interest is offer an exclusive license, because the other party has rights as well.” (M. Willenbrink) FAC voted to approve the recommended revision to this portion of the intellectual properties policy and will forward this recommendation in the form of a Senate proposal to ECAS.

Note: The complete revision of the Intellectual Properties Policy is near completion and it will be helpful if this component has Senate approval so that it can be included in the revised IP policy.

Proposed revision to DOC 12-01 to replace DOC 12-01 suggested revision for 3.3.1.1:
“Course materials developed for teaching courses delivered fully online shall be excluded from the “significant use” category unless such materials were developed using UD administered funds paid specifically to support that development. In that case, such materials will be co-owned by the creator and the University, unless an alternative agreement is reached between the creator and academic unit. The formal development of online course materials initiated by departments or units, supported by UD resources, and intended for purposes beyond the efforts of a single faculty member for his or her own teaching constitutes significant use. Textbooks, manuals, training materials, and other course materials for courses that are not delivered fully online are excluded from the “significant use” category unless such materials were developed using UD administered funds paid specifically to support that development.”

3) Instructional Staff Titles: FAC forwarded ECAS the proposal to create a Research Faculty title. ECAS discussed this proposal today and have further questions of clarification. It was recommended that the Dean’s council address these questions which include a) non-academic units with faculty; b) where is the home of research faculty (within the department, or other); c) what determines the limitations of term, if any (such as what if their grant no longer exists); and d) if research faculty would fall under faculty or staff status in regards to applications of by-laws and university procedures.

The proposal reads: “The Research Faculty position is open to both new and existing full-time employees of the University who engage in research and mentoring of students. These individuals do not hold a tenured, tenure-track, or joint appointment. The purpose of the Research Faculty position is to allow these individuals to compete for outside grants that require applicants to hold an academic title. It is expected that research faculty will obtain grants/contracts sufficient to cover a significant portion of their salaries and to support students.”

4) SET: FAC discussed recommended revisions to the Faculty Handbook section for Student Evaluation of Teaching submitted by the SET committee. Revisions were suggested to the SET committee’s recommendations and will be forwarded to ECAS for further discussion.

5) FAC’s next meeting will be held on January 30 @ noon in St. Mary’s 113.

SAPC: J. McCombe submitted the following report in writing.

The SAPC has not convened since the December 2013 Senate meeting. The next scheduled SAPC meeting is set for Monday, January 27th at 9:00 in KU 207. During that meeting, the SAPC will receive an update from Laura Leming regarding on-going discussions related to the student political/electoral activities policy. In addition, the SAPC will have reviewed a draft of the SET Revision Proposal and will have an opportunity to offer feedback.

ECAS: C. Phelps reported that ECAS meets at 9:30 am on Fridays this semester in St. Mary’s 113B. ECAS is currently reviewing the research faculty title, a proposal for a new Global Business major in the School of Business Administration, and a draft of the consolidated SET proposal.

Report on IT Security: Tom Skill provided an overview of information security (handout of slides). He reviewed the state of IT security in higher education and detailed a few of the recent data breaches in higher education. There are several institutional consequences of a data breach: damaged reputation, diminished academic integrity, decreased enrollment, loss of donor gifts, high migration costs, and
potential fines and penalties. The University of Dayton hired a nationally known security expert to assess UD’s security and recommend solutions/next steps. UD is doing many things well, but improvements can always be made. Recommendations include:

1. Enhance governance, policy processes, and establish an “Executive Policy Committee”
2. Execute a risk-focused data discovery and classification analysis to determine where all data is located
3. Acquire & deploy central management tools
   - Automate monitoring and standards enforcement
4. Enhance passwords & system access standards
   - Mobile device security & two-factor authentication
5. Address security on third-party “hosted” systems & “bring your own device” (BYOD)
6. Review cost/benefit of database encryption

T. Skill stated that there are over 100 terabytes of active data on campus and that bad things often happen from the inside. He stated that one of the challenges in higher education is balancing acceptable risk and maintaining the academic tradition of openness. He stressed the importance of everyone adopting new behaviors and practices. A few critical academic issues include protecting student and faculty data, preventing fraud and theft (grades/tests), and implementing “leading practices” against key-loggers. Skill mentioned several recent events of key-logging in attempts to change grades at academic institutions, including an incident here at UD in December 2013.

T. Skill explained how implementing a two-factor authentication system (username & password PLUS additional randomly generated code) could improve our data security. He asked everyone to have discussions in their units and invite people to send feedback to him (T. Skill). P. Benson asked what happens if you forget the second factor such as a key fob, etc. If people can’t log in, they can’t work. Skill recommends the software method on a smart phone. It was noted that not everyone has a smart phone. Many institutions are successfully using two-factor authentication across the country. The cost of implementing a two-factor authentication is currently being explored, but no decisions have been made yet. If two-factor authentication were to be implemented, it would be implemented with faculty and staff first. There are additional complications when implementing with students.

T. Lau noted that the university does not have records retention policies. J. Saliba asked about disaster recovery plans. T. Skill explained that all electronic data is backed up, encrypted, and stored off campus. He welcomes feedback for the campus community.

eCommons: Kathy Webb introduced the eCommons, a new service from the University Libraries to showcase UD’s scholarly and creative output as well as preserve the university’s records such as the Academic Senate documents. A handout of slides was provided. The system can be used to provide open access to research through self-archiving, to store and preserve institutional digital assets, and create global visibility for the institution. The decision to provide this service stemmed from the University Libraries’ recent strategic planning process. A wide variety of content can be showcased by the service including faculty scholarship (with appropriate copyright permissions), student scholarship, electronic journals, workshops, conferences, symposiums, open access e-books, university records, image galleries, and other data files. Monthly author readership reports are generated and the author dashboard can be used to gage the impact of your work.

K. Webb explained the initial process of populating the database with the work of several departments. Individuals and departments interested in using the new service should contact Kathy Webb or their assigned library liaison. K. Webb stated that the system is highly discoverable through multiple platforms, including Google. The system has the capability to be a full electronic journal publishing platform, including all backend functions.
With support from the Graduate School, the Provost, and the University Libraries, a pilot project has been launched to provide funding support to faculty who want to use open access publishing but do not have grant or other funding available. The eCommons site can be accessed here: http://ecommons.udayton.edu

K. Webb stated that student scholarship such as Capstone and Honors projects (with faculty approval) could be added to eCommons. Stander posters have already been added and will continue to be archived on eCommons. D. Sanfillipo commented that this would be useful for students’ job searches, etc.

In response to an inquiry by J. Saliba, K. Webb announced that she was “mildly optimistic” that OhioLINK would receive some additional capital funding after several years of flat budgets.

**Title IX:** Mary Ann Poirier and Lori Shaw presented an overview of recent improvements to UD’s Title IX/Nondiscrimination policy and processes. Handout was provided. M.A. Poirier explained that UD is subject to this law because we receive federal funding. There are several other federal and state nondiscrimination laws that are also being included under this umbrella policy because Title IX has the most technical requirements including a 60-day time frame in which to investigate and close complaints. L. Shaw stated that the university is in the process of hiring a full-time Title IX coordinator.

The Department of Education is charged with enforcing Title IX. In 2011 they sent the “Dear Colleague” letter to colleges and universities which highlighted aspects of the law that were not being adequately followed. Also in 2011 UD’s Sexual Misconduct Education Prevention & Response Task Force Report was issued. In 2012 UD issued a nondiscrimination statement, appointed a part-time Title IX Coordinator, appointed a Sexual Violence Prevention Education Coordinator, and began training Title IX investigators and deputy coordinators. In 2013 UD issued the mandatory reporting policy and published refined Title IX investigatory procedures and protocols for students. The initial focus was on student procedures since most complaints involve students, the issue of sexual assault on college campuses is a growing national concern and has been the focus of DOE efforts, and because employees have additional protections under Title VII that students do not have.

A coordinated, focused plan to improve policies/processes for faculty, staff, and visitors was implemented in 2013. A best practice is to develop a one policy, one process framework that applies to all forms of discrimination and to all members of the community to eliminate confusion, gaps in coverage, and to promote the development of expertise. UD now has the following:

1. Nondiscrimination & anti-harassment policy PLUS
2. Equity complaint process PLUS
3. Nondiscrimination Resource Center website

Improvements include the following:

1. Clear, fair, consistent and up-to-date policies and procedures that apply to every member of the community and every type of unlawful discrimination.
2. User-friendly complaint and reporting process.
3. Unprecedented access to information and resources via the new Nondiscrimination Resource Center, accessible by a link in the footer of every UD webpage.

L. Shaw reviewed the new website and discussed the mandatory reporting policy which extends our duty to report to all forms of unlawful discrimination. Complainant’s name does not have to be revealed in most cases, but all incidents must be reported. Questions concerning retaliation protection and the role of the new policies in relation to existing faculty policies were discussed. L. Shaw stated that this process protects the faculty member’s right to file grievance through faculty process except in cases involving sexual discrimination (which has been the case for years so no change). This process replaces the grievance process in the employee handbook. The process also preserves the Bias Related Incident Process (BRIT) for cases that do not rise to the level of a policy violation, but may still warrant action. An appeal process is also provided. The role (or lack thereof) of faculty consultation in the approval of this policy was raised.
There will be a series of campus-wide informational meetings about the new policy and website in February and March.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks