

1-16-2014

## Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2014-01-16

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2014-01-16" (2014). *All Committee Minutes*. 201.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/201](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/201)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlange1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlange1@udayton.edu).

## Minutes for the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate

January 16, 2014

In attendance: Jamie Ervin, Ralph Frasca, Harry Gerla, Linda Hartley (Chair), Emily Hicks, Carissa Krane, Kurt Mosser, Leslie Picca, Yong Song, Eric Taglieri, Katie Willard, Pat Donnelly (ex officio)

Absent: Abdullah Alghafis, Paul McGreal, Tony Saliba, Joe Watras

Guest: Matt Willenbrink

Meeting called to order by Dr. Linda Hartley at 12:05 pm

1. Approval of FAC Minutes from December 5, 2013.  
Motion to approve by Emily Hicks, Second by Kurt Mosser. The vote was unanimous in favor of approving the minutes.
2. Announcements:  
Next FAC in 2 weeks in SM 113B.  
Senate meeting on Jan 17.
3. Update on SET Collaboration: A single SET document was generated as a proposal to be discussed at ECAS on Jan 17. After ECAS revisions are made, the SET Proposal will go to the FAC, SAPC, and APC for review and comment. Then it will go to the full senate.
4. Intellectual property document with reference to the revised paragraph on Online Courses.  
Questions of co-ownership came up. Matt Willenbrink was present at the meeting to answer questions from the FAC.

M. Willenbrink described the differences between intellectual property and other types of property. Co-ownership has an additional default mode as compared to other property. Undivided interest allows co-owners to freely use and exploit the co-owned intellectual property without financial burden. However, co-owners cannot offer exclusive license for co-ownership of IP. With reference to the UD intellectual property policy with regard to the development of online courses, faculty leaving the university can take the IP outside of the university and market and sell property, but not exclusively. The University also cannot license exclusively.

L. Hartley reviewed email correspondence she had with Matt Willenbrink.

H. Gerla asked if the definition of co-ownership should be included in the revised IP policy. P. Donnelly expressed concern about the inclusion of additional terminology. E. Hicks suggested that as a compromise, the definition could be included in the senate proposal, rather than the Policy statement. L. Hartley asked about process for moving forward. Is a formal senate document proposal needed? P. Donnelly indicated that the entire 40 page IP document is being revised and will be brought to the Academic Senate for Legislative Concurrence. L. Hartley and E. Hicks followed up and stated that, by taking on this issue of revising the online IP policy, the senate is now amending the recommendation made in 2012 (approved in Legislative Concurrence), and therefore, the revised paragraph on IP for online courses, should be brought to the Senate for Concurrence.

H. Gerla suggested that if revisions to the entire IP document are in the pipeline, why vote on this single paragraph in advance? L. Hartley indicated that the FAC could make a recommendation about the online course policy to ECAS. ECAS could then forward/not forward to the full Senate. M. Willenbrink indicated that the revised IP document is going through the University process for revision and approval, and will eventually reach the Senate (anticipated Spring, 2014). The process has begun with the President. M. Willenbrink indicated that it would be helpful to get concurrence on the IP policy for online courses before Feb 27.

L. Hartley proposed that we recommend the revised online IP policy to ECAS with the suggestion to include the definition of co-ownership. ECAS could then make a decision about the recommendation with the possibility of bringing it to the full Senate in the Feb meeting.

H. Gerla proposed as a compromise, the federal definition of co-ownership could be referenced. "Co-ownership as defined in federal copyright law."

P. Donnelly also asked about including the definition of significant use.

L. Hartley made a motion to vote to recommend the revised IP policy paragraph for online courses, and that this recommendation be forwarded to ECAS. Motion was seconded by H. Gerla. Seconded. Vote in favor was unanimous.

#### 5. SET Committee Revisions for Faculty Handbook.

L. Hartley referred the committee to the revisions of the Faculty Handbook suggested by the SET Committee.

A. 8.H.4: Proposed: "A faculty member shall not remain in his or her classroom during the time that students are completing the evaluation instrument." (Delete "Each department will ensure that someone other than the course professor or instructor administers the evaluation instrument.")

Suggestion—keep the second sentence rather than scratching it. The SET will be administered by someone other than the course professor or instructor. Discussion ensued. It was determined that the issue of administration is dealt with elsewhere in the SET document.

FAC recommends to Adopt #4 as revised by the SET Committee.

B. DISCUSSION OF 8.H.5: SET Committee Proposal. Department chairpersons shall establish procedures and other safeguards to assure that faculty members do not obtain access to the evaluation results until after the due date of final course grades.

Comment RE: #5---The Chairperson cannot be responsible for establishing procedures and safeguards when they do not control the process. Therefore, the following revision was suggested.

FAC recommends the following revision:

*8.H.5: FAC Revised. "Faculty shall not be given access to the evaluation results until after the due date of final course grades."*

- C. DISCUSSION OF 8.H.6 (SET Committee addition): Access to results of the evaluation will be limited to the individual faculty member, the department chair, the unit dean and the T&P committees.

FAC recommends the following revision:

*8.H.6: FAC Revised: Data access and use of SET results will be made available to the individual faculty member, his or her department chair, his or her dean, and other administrators (e.g. provost, LTC staff) who need such information as part of their job functions. In addition, the Instructor SET report will be made available for T&P and merit review purposes based upon current Unit/Department approved policy, procedures, and bylaws.*

*Note:* The FAC determined that in the future, an exception may need to be added to include possible access for faculty/course comparison purposes.

- D. DISCUSSION OF 8.H.7: SET Committee Proposal: "Students completing the Student Evaluation of Teaching in class shall be given adequate time to complete the evaluation at the beginning of class. Adequate time means at least fifteen minutes." (FAC recommends adopt SET revision)

- E. DISCUSSION OF 8:H:8: (FAC recommends keep as is)

- F. DISCUSSION OF 8:H:9: SET Committee Proposal: "The uniform evaluation instrument is, however, flexible and adaptable for the more specific needs of each unit, department or program. If the software allows it, units and/or departments may add up to six additional closed-ended items (maximum of 3 or unit and 3 for department) with approval from the Office of the Provost in cooperation with the LTC and SET System Administrator.

FAC recommends the following revision:

*8:H:9: FAC Revised: "The uniform evaluation instrument is, however, flexible and adaptable for the more specific needs of each unit, department or program. Units and/or departments may add up to six additional closed-ended items with approval from the Office of the Provost in cooperation with the LTC and SET System Administrator."*

Meeting adjourned 1:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carissa Krane