University of Dayton

eCommons

2-28-2020

2020-02-28 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

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

UNIVERSITY OF

DAYTON

DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

February 28, 2020

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

Senators Present: Joanna Abdallah, Paul Benson, James Brill, Sam Cika, Patrick Cool, Anne Crecelius, Lissa Cupp, Corinne Daprano, Michael Davies, Mary Ellen Dillon, Shannon Driskell, Jim Dunne, Deo Eustace, Mark Jacobs, Jake Jagels, Denise James, Jay Janney, Catherine Kublik, Suki Kwon, Sayeh Meisami, John Mittelstaedt, Leslie Picca, Maher Qumsiyeh, Fran Rice, Eddy Rojas, Andrea Seielstad, Tereza Szeghi, Kathy Webb

Senators Excused: Ava Abner, Emma Adams, Connie Bowman, Neomi DeAnda, Lee Dixon, Laura Leming, Lee Miller, Jason Pierce, Andrew Sarangan, Andy Strauss, Asari Vijayan, John White

Guests: Amy Anderson, Deb Bickford, Susan Brown, Paul Dagnall, Jim Farrelly, Jenifer Gerard, Sharon Gratto, Jane Koester, Sabrina Neeley, Carolyn Phelps

1. Opening Prayer – Deo Eustace

2. Minutes – Minutes of January 24, 2020. Minutes approved-no revisions

3. Announcements

- Update on open forums – Leslie Picca

Leslie provided an update on the open forums being held to discuss proposed revisions to the University Promotion and Tenure Policy (DOC 2006-10). The forums provide background on why these revisions were proposed. The forums also provide an opportunity for feedback and comments. Robust and informational feedback has been received from the 8 sessions that have taken place. Additional feedback is being gathered via a google form and email. Some sessions are being recorded. There are plans to create a video to circulate late April and again in fall 2020 before the full vote of the faculty. Voting will be open to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The revisions would not take effect until the following conditions are met 1) more than 50% of the University faculty vote; 2) more than 50% of those voting approve of the proposed policies; 3) the proposed policies are ratified by the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Timothy Eatman will be on campus March 4 for conversations related to the UPTPTF recommendations regarding community engaged scholarship, teaching, and service. All are encouraged to attend.

- Please sign up to give the meditation/prayer at the Academic Senate.

4. Elections Resolution- Mark Jacobs

According to DOC 2017-01 University Promotion Policy for Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice, the University Clinical Committee will consist of five members: three will be tenured faculty members and two will be clinical faculty members. The clinical faculty representative must have been promoted to the associate level or higher. The most recent election results included non-promoted clinical faculty. The resolution recognizes the results of the election and commits the Academic Senate to re-evaluating the policy in DOC 2017-01 for possible modifications that would broaden clinical faculty participation in the Fall of 2020. The resolution passed. Question: Has there been any movement on the question of redistricting the Academic Senate? Answer: There have been many discussions at ECAS. ECAS will continue to move this forward.

5. Online course guidelines – Jim Dunne

APC was charged to investigate and report on the delivery of 'online' courses and define the various forms of 'online', e.g. synchronous, asynchronous, hybrid, etc. There was consultation with Ryan Allen, director of e-Learning, the Deans, the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs, and benchmarked policies from other universities. The Office of e-Learning provided a number of examples ranging from faculty ill-prepared to deliver online courses, to inconsistencies in quality and requirements. Definitions were offered for an online course (aka Distance Learning Course)—a course that is taught 100% online; a blended/hybrid course—a course that combines traditional classroom-based teaching and learning as well as online coursework; and a technology enhanced course—a traditional on campus course that uses instructional technology like a learning management system such as Isidore.

APC has proposed guidelines to achieve the same learning objectives and rigor as traditional face-to-face courses. The guidelines are divided into three categories: Course Planning, Course Development, Delivery & Maintenance, and Course Facilitation.

Course Planning:
- identify the course appropriately in UD systems (i.e. Banner)
- should be of the same rigor and learning objectives as face to face classes
- must use the standard UD term schedule unless an approved exception is provided
- faculty need to acquire pedagogical and technological skills

Course Development, Delivery & Maintenance
- use Isidore as the LMS
- needs to be developed before the first delivery usually 3-6 months
- conform to required minimum instructional contact time
- must meet Universal Design for Learning principles
- must be free from copyright
- list communication modes, office hours, tech support methods
- LMS site contains detailed course schedule, learning materials, communication support

Course Facilitation
- specify communication media—email, LMS, phone
- contact students prior to start of course
- be responsive to student questions/comments
- notify all with "plan around" if a gap in availability of the LMS

- return work in the course promptly
- insure academic integrity and academic honesty-particularly for high stakes assignments

An appendix includes a list of online learning best practices and a list of resources. It is undecided if the guidelines should be included in the faculty handbook with the current section on teaching, or if it should be a stand-alone section, or stand-alone as a separate policy.

Suggestion: We need to differentiate online courses in summer and those during the academic year. There's no way that the demands would be the same. Students in the summer work, the quality and standards should be different between the two. Response: Summer courses should have the same rigor, maybe change the assignments, have the same learning objectives as those taught during the academic year. It's the same course in a shorter time period.

Question: What is the contribution of the partnership with 2U that our campus staff can't do? Answer: 2u is a 3rd part online service, value is in marketing, student support in navigating registration, and it also manages the back-end piece and the LMS platform. All videos are recorded in a studio, all are ADA compliant.

Suggestion: Before someone can do an online course, there must be some mandated training, or like your example of planning the course one semester ahead of time. This will be difficult to enforce; did you consider who would enforce this mandated training? Answer: Yes, we did. It is the responsibility of the department chair, just like in a face-to-face classroom. This is the standard we're trying to hold faculty to, guidelines would be given to P&T committees. Comment: Office of e-Learning was also discussed as being the responsible body, but we didn't think we wanted some external body to monitor what happens in the classroom.

Comment: Perhaps develop a form for faculty to fill out showing how the contact hours are achieved the first time the class is offered. The 2U upfront planning is great, the rest not so much.

Comment: you can't deliver a quality product in 5 weeks. You can't squeeze 7 weeks into 5 weeks, it diminishes the student experience. Run the risk of losing students. It's too much work! Is it possible to create quality class that runs 5 weeks?

Comment: Put forth guidelines to enhance teaching in general and ensure people are trying to achieve them for both online and face to face and then highlight what is effective in e-learning. If this policy is in the faculty handbook, should it be integrated with current section on teaching or should it be a stand-alone section. We have seen good face to face classrooms, but many of us haven't experienced online courses.

Comment: This is the first step, creating guidelines. Maybe next year APC will take this on as a comprehensive document.

Comment: Teaching is core to the institution, we need to create a parallel narrative to give guidance and direction for e-Learning, we need to look at both online and face to face, should classes be 5 or 7 weeks? This is what APC discussed, are these within the parameters of the faculty handbook—they aren't but maybe in the future. Who votes on this policy, it lies with AS. Maybe what is passed is a set of guidelines not policy—who knows? Who would enforce the guidelines is not spelled out, but if it is a policy, there would need to be a section on enforcement.

Comment: We've all experience face to face, you get instantaneous feedback, but you don't get it from an online course.

Comment: We need to be competitive in the online space. One of the challenges we need to consider is technology support; it isn't there in the evenings. Recommendation: As we move forward look at resources at being best in class in providing these classes. This is a format that makes you consider technology and office hours. We need to develop a go to resource for the HOW, not necessarily the content because content lies in the department.

Comment from e-Learning: There is support in the evenings. Support for faculty is the favorite thing we do. There is low participation in e-Learning classes, like 2. We're very eager to help and willing to share best practices. We span all the departments. Look for key indicators, are you clearly communicating? Students fear not understanding what they are supposed to do, and not knowing how to reach out to faculty. We (LTC) are here to support.

A big thank you to Deb Bickford and her support!

6. FAC proposed changes to handbook – Andrea Seiselstad

Members of FAC were thanked for their work on the revisions to the bylaws and operating procedures of the Faculty Hearing Committees on Grievances and on Academic Freedom and Tenure and the proposed policy "Response to Full-time Faculty Members Who Fail to Meet Expectations or Violate Policies Related to Faculty Responsibilities." The need for a review of these two documents stemmed from two complaints in 2018-19 that highlighted a gap between what was happening during the faculty hearing process and what was outlined in the faculty handbook.

Highlights of the revisions to the Bylaws and Operating Procedures of the Faculty Hearing Committees on Grievances and on Academic Freedom and Tenure:
- Definition of faculty to include part time faculty
- Adjustments to matters resulting in equity compliance findings
- New provisions for consideration of complaints alleging discrimination, bias or retaliation in the tenuring process
- Requirement that provost submit recommendation to faculty hearing committee prior to dismissal
- Amendments approved by senate
- Procedural modifications-clarifying dates, procedures, notification procedures

These revisions expand the circumstance faculty can request to have their dismissal reviewed

Point of information: Bylaws are held at the committee level not the Academic Senate. Both the committees are independent committees, they are not part of the Academic Senate. The committees report directly to the President. What has changed? Tampering with the faculty handbook is spilling over into the committee's rights. The charge to these committees is independent from the Academic Senate, this is not senate business.

Response: Thank you for your comments—who amends these bylaws? Historically, the Academic Senate did approve the last set of amended bylaws. Using the term "bylaws" suggests that they are created within the committee. It wasn't clear that the bylaws couldn't be changed during a grievance. The Academic Senate has nothing to do with the grievance, the hearing committee hears the

testimony and makes the recommendations. It is soundly in the purview of the Academic Senate to approve revisions.

Highlights of the proposed policy "Response to Full-time Faculty Members Who Fail to Meet Expectations or Violate Policies Related to Faculty Responsibilities." This was drafted in response to full time faculty members who fail to meet expectations or violate policies related to faculty responsibilities. The policy spells out what should be done. It is affirmative. The faculty member is put on notice, given guidance to correct, and if improvement doesn't happen the outcome could result in dismissal or it could be referred to one of these two committees. The policy is written to be helpful, not to bludgeon them.

There were no comments or questions concerning the proposed policy.

7. Committee Reports-Committee reports sent to Fran Rice will be included in the minutes.
- APC—Jim Dunne
- SAPC--Laura Leming / Suki Kwon
- FAC – Andrea Seielstad
- ECAS – Mark Jacobs

8. Adjournment: 5:10

Respectfully submitted, Fran Rice

SAPC Report to Academic Senate   February 28, 2020

The SAPC has met four times since the last Senate Meeting and we used the week we didn't meet in person to compile the report on the use of the Digital SET. We will be presenting our report to ECAS on March 6, having done a final consultation for feedback from the Faculty Development Committee. Our meeting time is Friday morning at 11:15 AM in SM 113.