

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

1-24-2020

## 2020-01-24 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

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

---

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

January 24, 2020

Kennedy Union Ballroom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.

**Senators Present:** Joanna Abdallah, Emma Adams, Paul Benson, Connie Bowman, James Brill, Sam Cika, Patrick Cool, Anne Crecelius, Lissa Cupp, Corinne Daprano, Michael Davies, Neomi DeAnda, Mary Ellen Dillon, Lee Dixon, Shannon Driskell, Jim Dunne, Deo Eustace, Mark Jacobs, Jake Jagels, Denise James, Catherine Kublik, Suki Kwon, Laura Leming, Sayeh Meisami, Lee Miller, John Mittelstaedt, Leslie Picca, Jason Pierce, Maher Qumsiyeh, Fran Rice, Andrew Sarangan, Andrea Seielstad, Andy Strauss, Tereza Szeghi, Kathy Webb, John White

**Senators Excused:** Ava Abner, Jay Janney, Eddy Rojas, Asari Vijayan

**Guests:** Amy Anderson, Janet Bednarek, Jana Bennett, Deb Bickford, Darden Bradshaw, Susan Brown, Roger Crum, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Jim Farrelly, Hunter Goodman, Daria Graham, Sharon Gratto, Karolyn Hansen, Aparna Higgins, Martha Hurley, Katy Kelly, Jane Koester, Carissa Krane, Harold Merriman, Sabrina Neeley, Carolyn Phelps, Cilla Shindell, Andy Slade, Todd B. Smith, Joe Valenzano, Paul Vannderburgh, Joel Whitaker, David Wright, Shuang-Ye Wu

**Presenters:** Karen Velasquez (Director of Experiential Learning)

Janet Bednarek (PRoPT co-chair)

Joe Valenzano (PRoPT co-chair)

1. Opening Prayer/Meditation: Mary Ellen Dillon (prayer)
2. Minutes: Minutes of the November 22, 2019. Minutes were approved with no revisions.
3. Announcements: There were no announcements
4. Experiential Learning: Karen Velasquez arrived at UD in 2016, as the first director of the Office of Experiential Learning. Its mission is to promote, develop, and enhance all forms of experiential learning (EL) at the university and encourage reflective practice. The office awards the experiential learning innovation fund for faculty (ELIFF) to support faculty in the implementation and integration of creative, high-impact EL programs and activities in their courses. Additional highlights: EL hosts workshops and conferences, provides consultations and partnerships with individuals and departments/chairs and has worked with 65 different faculty from 22 departments to help integrate EL into courses. EL offers several testimonial videos, and a faculty voices series, available on the EL YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC-vFid9udBF62Yaa1m21I9Q>). The EL website includes a list of scholarly resources. EL publishes a monthly newsletter. There is an EL academic catalog listing all experiential learning opportunities. Their EL lab offers reflections, digital storytelling, video interviews, podcasts, documentaries, and concept roadmapping. The integrated EL learning and living community offers informal social events. OEL works with students from diverse backgrounds and majors and provides mentoring. Velasquez's book, *Diverse Pedagogical Approaches to EL: Multidisciplinary Case Studies, Reflections, and Strategies*, is scheduled for publication this fall. Question: Is the EL component mapped on the cocurricular transcript? Answer: This is currently undergoing a revision, with a possibly of a separate experiential learning transcript. There is an EL annotation in course offerings and on the transcript. Question: Are there groups on campus working on community-based learning groups? Answer: Yes,

the Fitz center for leadership and IACT are examples; Hunter Goodman and Castel Sweet are valuable resources. The new learning software GivePulse will be used to connect students to volunteer opportunities in the community and to track their participation in conjunction with coursework or as part of student group involvement.

5. PRoPT Final Report Janet Bednarek and Joe Valenzano

Mark J. shared that we are looking for intensive faculty input, there are plans for an open forum for some time in February and a structured guide is being created to help senators gather feedback from departments and units. This feedback will be synthesized and sent to FAC for review. The final step is to bring any proposed revisions to UPT for a full faculty vote.

PRoPT was formed and charged with identifying possible changes to the UPT policy and any policies touched by that policy based on recommendations from the UPTPTF final report. PRoPT recommends substantive changes to the UPT policy and to the evaluation of teaching and minor changes to the review of tenured faculty and university promotion policy for clinical faculty and university promotion policy for lecturers. Draft policies on the evaluation of service and research for the purposes of promotion and tenure were introduced. The taskforce proposed revisions to the UPT:

- include definitions of tenure, promotion and academic freedom
- provide further explicated criteria for promotion and tenure
- add a set of criteria for promotion and tenure to associate professor and to full professor
- add a provision for early tenure
- requires recognition of a wide range of faculty activities
- add a requirement for every person involved with evaluating and/or reviewing applications for promotion and tenure to successfully complete training in the areas of diversity, equity and inclusion; and on the requirements of all relevant promotion and tenure policies (i.e. department, unit, university) at least once every two years
- recommends adding requirement of contextualization of SET data for courses

Draft Policy EVALUATING FACULTY SERVICE FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE-- reports conducted by Caroline Waldron and Jana Bennett helped guide the development of the draft policy. The policy defines service expectations broadly for promotion to associate and to full professor as well as the role of post tenure review. The policy defines the types of service and establishes criteria for the evaluation of service.

Draft policy EVALUATING FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE defines research, scholarship and creative activity. Evaluation guidelines include multiple measures for the quality of scholarship and provides general guidance on differentiating expectations for promotion to associate and full professor.

Next steps: Encourage conversations at dept/unit level.

Question: From a student perspective-Is SET very important in the tenure decision? Answer: It varies among units, can be used to see trends developing over years and will be used to help determine if someone stays at UD or not. It is one measure, equally important is the use of peer evaluations, self-evaluations, syllabus, and exam questions, but SET is definitely a key part of this. Serious concerns have been raised about using SET scores, faculty need more formation constructive feedback. Students are strongly encouraged to participate in SET.

Question: Are these proposed changes diluting what tenure means and our evaluation for tenure?

Answer: We want to maintain the integrity of promotion and tenure. We are proposing a way to expand definitions of service, scholarship and teaching. Different doesn't mean reduce expectations. As long as you are rigorous you can demand excellence. The proposal recognizes that a lot of people do a lot of work, we wanted a promotion and tenure policy that reflects and acknowledges the various gifts brought to this university. It is a more modern definition of what it means to be a scholar and member of an academic university. It gives latitude to units to provide for the gifts their faculty bring to the table.

Question: In terms of research, (creativity or originality in the research) there is a wide range of ways this can be demonstrated, doesn't that need to be decided by the unit? Answer: Yes, the core element doesn't change, but there are other outputs that can contribute to the case, but they cannot supplant it. These changes allow the faculty to make the case that their research is valuable and should be included.

Comment: Can the averages in SET be more transparent in how they are calculated, and can the general objective of SET be made clearer? High numbers don't necessarily mean effective teaching.

Question: In regards to SET, there is no mention of demographic factors of the faculty. Why didn't that make the list? Answer: This wasn't addressed in the UPTPTF final report. This is a draft, if things need to be added please do so.

Question: Changes to the university document will include changes and additions to unit/dept documents. Processes won't change until they are changed at the unit level. Answer: Units will need to look and decide if they are in line with the revisions to the UPT. If they are, they are. If not, they need to move their unit document more in line with the university document. The mandate would be not to violate the policy. There are two areas that might require dept/unit changes—promotion from associate to full professor and the training requirement for DEI and P&T training.

Question: The training requirement will affect all tenured faculty. Is there training program in place or will this fall on the unit to come up with? Answer: Training can originate at unit level or leverage existing training opportunities like the inclusive excellence training programs. It is not unreasonable for those serving on P&T committees to be familiar with the P&T policy of their unit.

Question: These proposed changes incorporate more service, entrepreneurship, and interdisciplinary work. Seems to be pushing units to adopt changes to move the university forward, seems like the document is making more requirements than what has been outlined during the discussion. Answer: the word "may" is used, not "should" but also know that this proposal will be reviewed, and revisions to the P&T document will need to be approved. Once adopted, units will need to make sure their policies are in alignment with university policy.

Question: If the training requirement is included, won't all tenured faculty be impacted by this policy? Do we need to uniformity have training? Answer: This is a conversation at the unit level.

Comment: It is important to keep in mind that well before the new strategic vision there were glimpses that T&P policies were not in line with our values. Strategic vision casts a vision for UD as a university and a role that faculty play in university. Remember to keep the vision in mind.

Question: the service component list three forms; professional, community, and institutional. Are all three forms mandatory? Answer: No these are various types of service examples.

Question: Where do the proposed changes fit into the national landscape? Answer: The UPTPTF addressed this concern. They reviewed, researched, and benchmarked extensively.

Question: In the service policy under institutional service it says "all faculty should accept their share of faculty responsibilities..." probably don't want to use the word "should". Answer: Specific wording has not been determined yet, some of this comes from Univ of Akron. It needs to be modified to

reflect UD.

Joe and Janet thanked all members of PRoPT for their service.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM GALLERY:

Comment: In the EVALUATING FACULTY TEACHING FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE policy, please add studio and ensemble to the type of classes. [Current wording *type of class* (e.g. *seminar versus large lecture versus on-line*)]

Comment: Listening to the SET discussion makes me nervous, it's discouraging if that's the sole of evaluation of teaching. There needs to be additional methods and multiple measures used. Wording shouldn't say "may use multiple measures."

Comment: I echo concerns the way SET is used. Hopefully this will be addressed by the work of SAPC.

Comment: Service is uneven across the university. I encourage units to consider the importance of it. Just because we add a policy doesn't mean we'll begin to value service. How do we make it fairer across units possibly through workload & expectations? By adding language about what "counts" it empowers departments to reevaluate and empowers faculty to support their scholarship and service.

Comment: Concerned about who we are talking about. We do not have a definition of faculty. The promotion of clinical and lecturers should not be included in this conversation. We are taking away what constitutes faculty. Only full tenure-track faculty will be voting on this policy. Response: the promotion policy for clinical and lecturers was reviewed for only for consistency of linguistics.

Question: SET online is convenient. Now evaluation doesn't take place in same space as where learning takes place. Detriment to student and to the fairness of faculty. Spatial reality is a factor. This is a broader issue of re-envisioning how to think about candidates for tenure, we are doing well to accommodate a broader perspective for what is tenure-able in research. We can support the work locally. For candidates applying for promotion or tenure needing external letters of support, will this model serve them well when work or reputation is considered broadly outside of the university? Will this hurt faculty when applying for full? Answer: Usually people doing external reviews are given directions. The review will typically highlight what we ask, so we have to be careful what we ask in the instruction letters.

Comment from student senator. SET should be the most important part of tenure decisions; the focus should be on student assessment.

Comment: There seems to be tension between opening up scholarship and focusing on scholarship of discovery; focusing on teaching and focusing on learning, yet that isn't the focus of T&P policies.

Answer: This needs to be part of the discussions.

Comment: Shows a dedication to common good. It lifts up the focus to include community engaged and experiential learning.

Response to comment from student senator: There are so many SET comments that include biased remarks. Comments range from complimentary and constructive to plain old mean spirited. Not everyone can handle mean spirited remarks. Response from student senator: No student expects all SET comments to be taken seriously, but the ones that have actual criticism or actual concerns about teaching, or actual compliments should be kept. There are some legitimate concerns about the effectiveness of teaching in SET comments that need to be addressed.

6. Senators met with their deans to discuss logistics of meeting with departments.

7. Committee Reports: SAPC, APC, FAC (In the interest of time, send reports to Fran Rice).

8. Adjournment: Adjourned 5:25

Respectfully submitted, Fran Rice

Academic Policies Committee  
Report to the Academic Senate  
January 24, 2020

**Members:** Deb Bickford (ex-officio – Associate Provost), Connie Bowman (SEHS), Neomi DeAnda (CAS-Hum), Mary Ellen Dillon (NTT), Jim Dunne, Chair (SBA), Deo Eustance (SOE), John Mittelstaedt (SBA – Dean), Leslie Picca (CAS – SSc), Jason Pierce (CAS – Dean), Maher Qumsiyeh (CAS – NS), Tereza Szeghi (CAS – Hum)

1. Meetings: The Academic Policies Committee (APC) has met two times this term: Jan 16 and Jan 23.
2. Charges: The APC is working on two charges from the Executive Committee (ECAS).
  - a. ONE. Quality of Online Learning – investigate the academic quality and possibly develop recommendations. Recommendations could involve university policies.
  - b. TWO. 5-year CAP Evaluation. Our Common Academic Program was established by Senate DOC 2010-04. The first undergraduate class to take CAP courses was the August 2013 entering class that graduated in May 2017. DOC 2010-04 calls for a “thorough and systematic” evaluation of CAP – to be completed after this academic year. Our APC charge is focused on developing a plan and a framework for that CAP Evaluation.
3. Activities:
  - a. For Online Course effort: We are interacting with Ryan Allen, the director of e-Learning. Our focus is on the online courses not developed and offered in partnership with 2U. We have gathered data on such courses offered over that past few years. We have done some benchmarking other universities. We have a draft document reviewed by the committee. This document was reviewed at the Dean’s Council. We are in the process of two further reviews: Carolyn Phelps our Associate Provost and the Associate Dean’s of the academic units. We hope to have a report to the Executive Committee early in February.
  - b. For the CAP 5-Year Evaluation: With the help of Assistant Provost for CAP, Michelle Pautz, we reviewed the current studies and data gathering on CAP. We also received input from the chair of the CAP committee and the Associate Dean in the college. We are now drafting a document. Our goal is to offer a framework for this CAP evaluation by about March 1.

SAPC Report to Senate – January 24, 2020

SAPC is working furiously to prepare our report on the SET policy and how it has been implemented. We meet on Fridays at 11:15 – generally in SM 113A. Recently we've met with representatives of the Office of Diversity & Inclusion, Student Development, including MEC, the Faculty Development Committee and the Women's Center to hear what they have experienced or heard from faculty they work with about the impact of SET. In the next week we hope to be gathering students' understanding and use of SET to complete the input we need to prepare our report.