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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
September 1, 2011; 1:30pm
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

Present: Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Jasminder Grewal, Emily Hicks, Jonathan Hess, Antonio Mari, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, Joseph Saliba, Andrea Seielstad, Rebecca Wells

Absent: None

Guests: James Farrelly

Opening Meditation: Paul Benson opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: The minutes of the August 25, 2011 ECAS meeting were approved.

Announcements: The January meeting of the Academic Senate will be rescheduled for January 20 and will be held in the River Campus Auditorium.

Old Business:
Agenda for September meeting of the full Academic Senate: J. Hess reviewed a draft Academic Senate meeting agenda for Sept. 16. C. Daprano will send Jackie Estepp the unapproved minutes from the April 15, 2011 AS meeting so they can be posted on the AS website in advance of the Sept. meeting. J. Hess will ask all standing committee chairs to give committee reports. R. Wells agreed to give the FAC report in Linda Hartley’s absence. Sundar Kumarasamy, VP of Enrollment Management has agreed to give an admissions update at this meeting and Pat Donnelly, Assoc. Provost for Faculty & Administrative Affairs will review the UD Gender Equity in Faculty Salaries report that was recently posted on Porches.

Student evaluations issue: J. Hess reviewed the FAC’s proposed work on student evaluations. He reported that once this work has been completed L. Hartley will provide a written report to ECAS which will include proposed recommendations. If ECAS approves the report it will be presented to the AS for approval. The report and recommendations would then become a proposed Senate document and be put forward for a faculty vote.

Members of ECAS discussed the FAC’s proposed work items. A. Mari expressed the view that students were dissatisfied at having to complete the same evaluation form every semester for every class. He also reported that students were dissatisfied with a perceived lack of follow through when students have used the evaluation form to express their concern with a particular instructor.

Discussion continued regarding FAC’s proposed recommendation to mandate consultation when a new instrument is developed. R. Wells clarified that the external consultant would assist a UD committee in developing an instrument (or several instruments) conducive to UD’s needs. The expectation would be that the consultant would be an expert in questionnaire design and student feedback. A. Seielstad added that the recommendation to “mandate consultation” is currently being considered by the FAC. This recommendation may or may not become a part of the FAC’s final report. G. Doyle expressed concern with the added time needed to bring in an external consultant. He also felt that some members of the AS would perceive this as restarting a process that has been started several times in the past.
**CAP and Competencies Committee (C&CC) Voting Rights:** J. Hess reviewed background information regarding this issue. APC reviewed a proposal from the C&CC and offered their recommendations. The APC’s recommendations mirrored those favored by ECAS. C. Phelps reviewed the following resolution from the APC:

On 8/29/11 the APC met and discussed the voting rights of the CAP Competency Committee.

The CAP document states that “the Competency Committee will be composed of a minimum of nine members plus three ex officio members. The ex officio members are the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program; Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar or designate...Each undergraduate dean as the option to serve or to appoint a designate as an ex officio member in addition to the ex officio members identified above.”

Per the unapproved minutes of the ECAS of 4/15/11, it was recommended that the voting structure of the Competency Committee parallel the General Education Committee with ex officio members voting. However, due to the larger proportion of ex officio members on the CAP committee, ECAS recommended that the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Registrar or designate have voting privileges, the deans or dean designates should not.

After discussion of the issue, the APC voted. With a vote of 6 to 1, the APC voted to support the recommendation of the ECAS: Voting members of the CAP Competency Committee should be the faculty members, student members, the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program; Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Registrar or designate.

**Standing committee work assignments:** J. Hess reviewed the updated list of tasks to be assigned to the standing committees and asked ECAS for changes to the assignments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>N/C</th>
<th>Prev</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Work due</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP&amp;CC voting rights</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Offer recommendation</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Offer final report</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP proposal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Review Appendix A</td>
<td>Oct. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of CAP dev</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Hear monthly reports</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Rec. on purpose of eval</td>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property rights</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles for part-time faculty</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee membership</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>Complete the list</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*UNRC policy doc</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Review final document</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty workload</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>Report and proposal</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Consultation issue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECAS discussed several of the tasks listed above.

J. Hess indicated that the work assigned to the UNRC cannot be completed until ECAS constitutes the UNRC. While constituting the UNRC was an agenda item for today’s meeting there wasn’t sufficient time for ECAS to discuss this task today and thus J. Hess will hold this agenda item over till the Sept. 8 ECAS meeting.

J. Farrelly suggested appointing an ad hoc committee of 3 FAC members, 1 Faculty Board representative, and 1 other members (possibly Pat Donnelly) work on a proposal regarding the faculty workload issue. J. Saliba raised two questions as possible starting points for a discussion of this issue: 1) do we have the right faculty workload policy in place; and, 2) are we fairly implementing our faculty workload policy? R. Wells asked if UD
has access to data that the sub-committee could use to compare faculty workload at UD with our peers and competitors. L. Pedrotti suggested asking the FAC to constitute this ad hoc committee so they could review the issue and have a proposal put together by a March 2012 deadline. J. Hess will discuss constituting this ad hoc committee with L. Hartley, FAC chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano