

University of Dayton

eCommons

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

4-24-2020

## 2020-04-24 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

April 24, 2020

Zoom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.

**Senators Present:** Emma Adams, Paul Benson, Connie Bowman, James Brill, 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, Jay Janney, Catherine Kublik, Suki Kwon, Laura Leming, Sayeh Meisami, Lee Miller, John Mittelstaedt, Leslie Picca, Jason Pierce, Maher Qumsiyeh, Fran Rice, Eddy Rojas, Andrew Sarangan, Andrea Seielstad, Andy Strauss, Tereza Szeghi, Asari Vijayan, Kathy Webb, John White

**Senators Absent:** Joanna Abdallah, Sam Cika

**Presenters:** Kelly Vibber (Department of Communication)  
Janet Bednarek (Faculty Board)

**Guests:** Stefanie Acevedo, Christopher Agnew, Amy Anderson, Amy Anderson, Philip Anloague, Philip Appiah-Kubi, Debbie Archambeault, Jackie Arnold, Janet Bednarek, Courtney Belt, Jana Bennett, Elana Bernstein, Deb Bickford, Mandy Bingaman, Ann Biswas, Darden Bradshaw, Colleen Brennan, Tonya Breymer, Christopher Brough, Susan Brown, Maria Burkett, Una Cadegan, Dr. Cas ??, Leah Ceperley, Carrie Chema, Ying-Ju Chen, John Clarke, Joy Comingore, Kim Conde, Joseph Craig, Ericka Curran, Douglas Daniels, Simanti Dasgupta, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Gloria Dodd, Pat Donnelly, Samuel Dorf, Monica Duffy, Jason Eckert, Elizabeth Eichler, Aicha El Yamani, Youssef Farhat, Emily Fehrman Cory, Michael Fields, Kathleen Fischer, Ellen Fleischmann, Marie Gaeke, Brenda Gerhardt, Erin Gibbemeyer, Hunter Goodman, Daria Graham, Sharon Gratto, Steve Hall, Casey Hanley, Kayla Harris, Beth Hart, Jeanne Holcomb, Andrew Horner, Natalie Hudson, Kelli Huesman, Emma Hughes, Margaret Hutter, John Inglis, Joel's iPhone, Michelle's iPhone, Tracey Jaffe, Eric Janz, Ashley Jonas, Julie Jones Ruse, Daniel Kapusta, Kathy Kargl, Maureen Keane-Sexton, Kristen Keen, Gregory Kennedy, Ryu-Kyung Kim, Susan Klosterman, Eric Knorr, Jane Koester, Jennifer Koesters, Carissa Krane, Amy Krug, Michael Krug, Miriamne Krummel, Brenda Lecklider, Autumn Lockwood Payton, Amy Lopez-Matthews, Liz Maloney, Connie Mathes, Katie Mathews, Ben McCall, Edward Mccarthy, Jim McCutcheon, Nancy Miller, Brennan Mooney, Julianne Morgan, Sabrina Neeley, Grant Neeley, Paul Nguyen, Lakshmi Nittala, Rae Oh, Judy Owen, Don Pair, Hayon Park, Arcia Patterson, Michelle Pautz, Cynthia Payne, Carolyn Phelps, Danielle Poe, HZ Pu, Julia Randel, Lis Regula, Mark Ryan, Mary-Kate Sableski, Angeline Sangalang, Teresa Saxton, Kathleen Scheltens, Kristina Schulz, Cilla Shindell, David Sievers, Thomas Skill, Andy Slade, Larry Smith, Eric Spina, Yvonne Sun, Stephanie Sweet, Tamara Tabo, Kelly Thobe, Kimberly Trick, Hsuan Tsen, Joseph Valenzano, Jivanto van Hemert, Paul Vanderburgh, Alan Veliz-Cuba, Kelly Vibber, Caroline Waldron, Marguerite Wallace, Samuel Wallace, Anastasie Weaver, Lisa Wellinghoff, Andrea Wells, Jane Westendorf, Jayne Whitaker, Joel Whitaker, Deborah Wilcox Powers, Joy Willenbrink-Conte, Adam Williams, Julie Wolters, David Wright, Xinyan Yan, Judy Yang, Jerome

Yorke, Hailing Yue, Andy Zvakos, Mary Ziskin, Denise, Diane, klas, Marie, Mary, Paula, Said, TTiffany

1. Opening Prayer – Jason Pierce (prayer)
2. Minutes – Minutes of April 17, 2020. Approved with no revisions
3. Sport Communication Certificate--Kelly Vibber provided rationale for the certificate. The certificate will benefit students from multiple disciplines, including majors in the Department of Communication, Department of Health and Sport Science, and the School of Business Administration. The interdisciplinary nature of selected courses may also be of interest to students in the Department of Psychology, particularly those interested in pursuing careers in Sport Psychology. The certificate will help students better position themselves as they seek employment. Senate approved the certificate.
4. DOC 2007-05 Processes and procedures of the Academic Senate. Updates to the document were approved.
5. Close the loop on Faculty Feedback from 4/17- There were common themes in the comments from the 4/17 AS meeting.
  - There is continued concern over the future employment of lecturers. The senate and ECAS will continue to engage administration on their behalf.
  - There is a need to monitor the workload of remaining faculty
  - ECAS will request regular updates from the new normal working groups
  - Administration should look for ways to leverage faculty expertise
  - Recommend proposed guidelines for online learning from APC be added to the Academic Senate website. The senate will continue to work with the LTC and eLearning to ensure online learning is a positive experience.
  - Recommendations for a survey of the faculty to learn how they are involved or would like to be involved with the community in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.
  - Need to find ways to develop community among students to help increase fall enrollment.
6. Presentation by Student senators
  - The students are concerned their voices are not being heard before key decisions are made. They recommend a student town hall meeting similar to the one held for faculty and staff. They also recommend surveying the whole student body.
  - There is concern over teaching inconsistencies in the online environment and that professors are unfamiliar with video conferencing technology. They recommend standardization and guidelines for online teaching plus a requirement for professors to be trained in the use of available technology.
  - There is concern that some classes, like labs; art classes; and the student teaching program, cannot be taught effectively in an online environment. Students encourage the use of step-by-step videos of lab experiments, develop a creative solution for art classes, and consider using a hybrid learning system with some students in a classroom while others are online.
  - Although this was an informal survey, 1200 students participated. Survey results are attached to the end of this document.

#### Additional comments from student senators

- The community aspect of UD is missing in the online environment, students are not feeling connected. They miss being on campus with friends. They believe more can be done, like additional online programming from CAB, declare a UD Spirit day when everyone wears UD apparel, or make more time for face to face communications with professors.
- Believe the mental health of students is deteriorating. Many students are struggling, provide us with more health resources.
- Tuition prices need to be reviewed and adjusted for online classes.

Questions from senators: There was an overwhelming yes to the question about returning to campus in the fall, are students not concerned about pandemic issues? Response: Some are and some are not.

Question: If students don't take classes, what would they do instead? Response: Students would find jobs, take a gap year, or delay graduation. Many students don't see the value of attending UD if classes are online in the fall, especially given their experiences this spring. Some businesses are offering an extension to internships with extensions to December. Some students will attend in the fall because they can't take a gap year. Encourage administration to ask students if they would attend if classes were all online and tuition was reduced.

Question: Who received the survey? Response: It was developed by the student senators and sent to around 50 friends and classmates. They did not anticipate it being passed on to others and receiving 1200 responses.

7. Results of the Survey on Financial Stewardship and Statement of Solidarity-Janet Bednarek. There were 221 responses to the survey on financial stewardship. The findings were sent to the faculty and to administration. The three guiding principles/values identified in evaluating fiscal responsibility were teaching, the financial health of the university and diversity. The three areas where the University community might demonstrate fiscal restraint were administration (number of administrators, VPs and Directors, salaries, and staff associated with these administrators), capital plans and travel. The three areas in which expenditures should not be reduced were faculty and staff salary and employment, research and benefits. The three areas which might benefit from increased fiscal support were research, faculty salaries and teaching resources.

The Statement of solidarity, shared sacrifice, and action (April 21, 2020). This was written by some members of the Faculty Board, some members of the Academic Senate, and other interested faculty. To date there have been 232 signatures. This is a call for faculty voices to be heard in decisions. The Board will begin to create structures to have on-going faculty input that will be presented to administration as well as presented back to the faculty. A Faculty Board email address has been created to help gather input. [facboard@udayton.edu](mailto:facboard@udayton.edu).

Questions: Need clarification on the survey results, research is one of the top three goals for financial support, but travel was identified as an area that could be reduced. Response: Travel was not necessarily faculty research travel, but travel as a whole.

Question: In regard to lecturers, could lecturers be offered ½ time, or be offered semester contracts. Will they be eligible for rehire? Response: This is an area of great concern, we need to

find ways to protect the most vulnerable. The faculty board will be addressing this issue.

Question: Are there grants for travel for students? Response: There needs to be a broader conversation about the levels and types of travel.

Question: Can faculty contribute a percentage of their anticipated salary to lecturer salaries?

Response: Would not advise people to agree to salary reductions, especially not knowing what the fall semester might bring. It would be administratively difficult to do this type of thing contract by contract. The administration took cuts, but this was a small number of people. People are free to contribute to the university at any time, the Student Crisis Fund is one area that would welcome contributions. Lecturers cannot be put under contract if there are a small number of enrolled students for fall semester.

8. Committee reports-See attached.
9. Announcements and close of senate. Mark expressed gratitude to all senators for making this a successful year. Special thanks were given to student senators for their contributions. Senators completing their terms are: Anne Crecelius, M.E. Dillon, Denise James, Suki Kwon, Laura Leming, Asari Vijayan. ECAS members completing their terms: Anne Crecelius, Shannon Driskell, Denise James.
10. Election of Senate officers. The officers for 2020-21 are:
  - o President -- Leslie Picca
  - o Vice President -- Sam Dorf
  - o Secretary -- Fran Rice
11. Adjournment 5:30

Respectfully submitted: Fran Rice

# FINAL REPORT

## Academic Policies Committee April 24, 2020



University of  
Dayton

# 2019-2020 Academic Policies Committee

- Deb Bickford, Provost's Office (ex-officio)
- Connie Bowman, SEHS
- Neomi DeAnda, CAS—Humanities
- Mary Ellen Dillon, NTT
- Jim Dunne, SBA, chair
- Deo Eustace, SOE
- John Mittelstaedt, SBA Dean
- Leslie Picca, CAS – Social Sciences
- Jason Pierce, CAS Dean
- Maher Qumsiyeh, CAS – Natural Sciences
- Tereza Szeghi, CAS -- Humanities



# Overview

- APC met weekly throughout the academic year on these two challenging charges.
  - Charge 1 – Quality of Online Learning
  - Charge 2 – Plan for 5-Year CAP Evaluation
- Possible Issues for 2020-21 APC





# APC Charge 1

## On-line Learning Quality

- "The APC will investigate and report to ECAS on the delivery of 'on-line' courses. APC will identify and define the various forms of 'on-line', e.g. synchronous, asynchronous, hybrid, etc."
- Consultation:
  - The APC should consult appropriate Associate Deans from each unit to determine if there are any practices currently in place
  - The APC should consult with the e-learning staff (Ryan Allen) to capture best practices
  - The APC should consult the registrar to identify courses that have been delivered in an on-line format





# Why Quality in Online Learning is Important?

- Quality learning is a core mission to our students
- UD's academic reputation
- An expanding mode of learning
  - History at UD, particularly in graduate programs and in undergraduate summer courses.
  - As seen in UD's response to the coronavirus pandemic
  - Likely to have a strong role in next academic year and beyond



# Proposed Policy on Online Learning

- Purpose, Scope, Background
- Definitions
- Course Planning
- Course Development, Delivery, & Maintenance
- Course Facilitation
- Appendix: Online Learning Best Practices
- Appendix: Online Learning Resources



# APC Charge 2

## Develop a Framework for 5-Year CAP Evaluation

Per DOC 2010-04, a thorough and systematic evaluation of CAP will be conducted every 5 years.

(Since last CAP review was Fall 2015, needed in Fall 2020)

- Define the scope and structure of the review
- Who will be responsible
- Broad consultation



# Framework of 5-Year CAP Evaluation

- Consulted with Assist Prov for CAP, Chair of CAP Committee, and Associate Deans.
- Reviewed multiple existing studies and documents.
- Worked to balance
  - (1) large size and scope of CAP (61 credit hours -- some can be double-counted)
  - (2) current heavy faculty/administrator workload.
- Drafted a 'staggered' approach in which all CAP goals, components, and key features are evaluated over a multi-year timeframe.
- However, after the significant future uncertainties of the coronavirus crisis became clear, APC recommended 1 year postponement of this CAP evaluation.



# APC Possible Future Issues for 2010-21

- Finalize the planning for 5-Year CAP Evaluation
- Review/organize Faculty Handbook's guidance on teaching – both classroom and on-line.
- Academic credit for mini-courses – evaluate process.
- Academic calendar priorities – review.



To: Members of the Academic Senate

From: Andrea Seielstad, Chair, and Faculty Affairs Committee, Anne Crecelius, Corinne Daprano, Kathleen Webb, Sayeh Meisami, Lee Dixon, Denise James, Samuel Dorf (Fall 2019), Andrew Sarangan, Lissa Cupp, Shannon Driskell, Mark Jacobs

Date: April 20, 2020

Re: Final Report on FAC Activities During 2019-2020 Academic Year

Completed Charges: Enacted Policies regarding Faculty Due Process, Dismissal, Progressive Discipline and Performance Remediation & Hearing Committees:

The primary charge for this year's Faculty Affairs Committee involved review and investigation of the University's policies related to faculty due process in the areas of dismissal; progressive discipline and performance remediation; infringements of faculty rights to academic freedom, tenure; and other grievances that may arise in the context of teaching, research, librarianship and/or service. This work required careful consideration also of the University's Equity Compliance Processes and Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy.

Pursuant to its legislative authority over faculty affairs, the significant primary charge for this year's Faculty Affairs Committee was to finish review and policy revisions to the *Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Bylaws and Operating Procedures* (Senate Doc. 2020-01). This review was a culmination of proposed recommendations by the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure in the summer and fall of 2018 and two years of review by the Faculty Affairs Committee. FAC consulted also with representatives of the Faculty Hearing Committee, Chris Agnew, and Janet Bednarek and the Executive Director for Equity Compliance, Kim Bakota, about the expected federal regulatory changes that may be coming from the U.S. Department of Education for Title IX investigations and our University Equity Compliance Process for investigating complaints of violations of our Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy. University legal counsel also reviewed the amendments at the stage they were proposed by the Hearing Committee as well as those approved for approval by FAC that are the subject of consideration for the Senate now.

Following this process, FAC reviewed and proposed recommendations to the *Faculty Hearing Committee on Grievances Bylaws and Operating Procedures* (Senate Doc. 2020-01) to bring key definitional terms and faculty rights in parity with those for Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Additionally, and in consultation with the Office of the Provost, the committee recommended approval of a new policy entitled *Response to Full-Time Faculty Members Who Fail to Meet Expectations or Violate Policies Related to Faculty Responsibilities* (Senate Doc. 2020-13). This policy is designed to put into writing practices utilized by the University to address issues of faculty performance. It fills a void for issues that arise that do not warrant dismissal but suggest a need for improving performance and/or accessing resources to assist faculty in addressing underlying health or aging issues that may impact performance. Prior to this policy, there was nothing articulated in writing to govern action short of dismissal, requiring Chairs, Deans and Associate Provost or Provost to address such issues when they arise in a largely ad hoc manner or based on unwritten practices that may not have been known to

faculty. This written policy, thus, fills a gap between satisfactory performance of duties and serious ones warranting recommendations of dismissal and/or Equity Compliance processes. Furthermore, it is designed to be formative, put the faculty member on notice of issues of concern, and connect the faculty member with resources and plans of action for addressing them. It requires that notice be given to the faculty member; and due process is available through the Faculty Hearing Committee on Grievances or Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

All three of these policies were presented and discussed at the February 28 meeting and enacted by the Academic Senate at the meeting on April 17, 2020. Memorandum setting out the details of the committees' deliberative processes and recommendations accompanied each document and are attached to this memorandum.

Charge Requiring Ongoing Review by the 2020-21 FAC: Consideration and Approval of PRoPT Documents on Evaluation of Service, Teaching and Scholarship:

In February 2020, while the campus engaged in dialogue about the Promotion and Tenure Policy itself, ECAS charged FAC with beginning review of three documents prepared by the Policy Review on Promotion and Tenure Policies Working Group (PRoPT):

- EVALUATING FACULTY SERVICE FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE;
- EVALUATING FACULTY TEACHING FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE; and
- EVALUATING FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE.

A policy on evaluating teaching already exists and was last amended and approved by the Senate on April 11, 2008 so the FAC and Academic Senate task involves reviewing proposed revisions to that document. The other policies on evaluating service and research would be new ones.

After some discussion about how to proceed in the remaining time, FAC chose to begin with "Evaluating Service." Unfortunately, the onset of COVID interrupted these deliberations. We did not begin any discussion of the documents regarding evaluation of teaching or research so next year's FAC will have to begin those discussions. With respect to the Evaluation of Service, FAC did identify a number of questions and concerns that are worthy of further consideration in the next academic year. A meeting scheduled to hear from PRoPT co-chairs, Joe Valenzano and Janet Bednarek, had to be cancelled; and this is something for next year's FAC to consider, prior to going further with the review process. Issues discussed by FAC about the document included:

-- There were questions about the Women and Minorities section, particularly with respect to the statement about women and minorities "tending to . . ." do more service. Some questioned the inclusion of generalizations like this and wondered whether we were encouraging that pattern. Additionally, what specifically do we want to encourage, i.e., limits on tapping them for key work positions, insufficient recognition of that burden? Is there a way to state that in a different way?



-- How should equal distribution of necessary departmental tasks be distributed between faculty members (along with other service)? Is that the role of this document? How should that be accomplished? To what extent is this an enforcement issue by chairs/deans?

-- In "Significant Service," shouldn't more guidance be provided by way of paid administrative positions and those that are not? Are paid positions a category of service? Who decides that? How should compensated administrative work be counted and/or distinguished from other types of service?

-- Promotion Expectations: Is it necessary to have them in this document? Should those not be determined by the department? Some may want zero or limited service in the beginning to accommodate teaching and research. Others may want more. Also, in this and the PRT document, community and professional service needs to be included as a category of service in the early promotional and evaluative stages as well. The documents preference internal service. Not all faculty or departments which to favor that. Levels and types of service do not necessarily need to be consistent across departments or stages of promotion and tenure.

-- There was significant discussion about the extent to which it may be necessary for some departments (i.e., library) to require certain departmental service whether it contributes to advancement in other areas), but not all departments may choose to do this. Should the document decide what kind of service should be counted more than another or leave that to the department (Department)? Should classes of service be defined and departments advised to articulate which ones may/must be performed and for what purposes? To what extent should the degree and amount of service be acknowledged through different stages of a career?

-- Related to the previous point, the issue of professional service and its connection to individual advancement and professional recognition was discussed at some length. Some argued it is difficult to separate this kind of service from research and advocated for a different definition and consideration of that subject. The benefit a faculty may get from this kind of service toward their own advancement and recognition has value independent from the kind of internal service like serving on a departmental committee. Should there be differentiation between the types of service possible and their value to the faculty member in other areas? Should institutional service that does not benefit the faculty member be counted in a different way? Should local departmental service be distinguished from outside forms of research? We need people to do departmental service. Researchers want to do fancy professional advancement work. What is the way to balance these interests and is it the role of this document to do that?

-- Should we put forth a yardstick to measure/evaluate service? This document, unlike teaching, does not put forth how to measure service? Should time spent on service be documented? Impact to university? Profession? Community? How would those things

be measured? What instruments or tools should be developed? Some pointed out how this document differed from the teaching evaluation document and perhaps needed to be reframed as something different – i.e., “principles regarding service.” If we want to evaluate service, more work may need to be done developing the measures. C. Phelps indicated that a pilot project for measuring service was being developed in one department. It may be possible to examine that as a framework.

-- For types of service that also are linked to teaching and/or scholarship, how should the document encourage/reference/guide those interconnected types of activity?

These questions and an early meeting with the PRoPT co-chairs could form the basis for early discussion of next year’s FAC. The proposed revisions to the Evaluation of Teaching document and the Evaluation of Scholarship are also pending review.

#### Preliminary Discussion of COVID-related Issues Impacting Faculty:

Following the closure of the campus due to COVID and movement of courses online, the committee discussed issues related to faculty during this time of coronavirus emergency and the financial exigencies that likely will follow. This memo includes some of the issues identified at meetings held on March 28 and April 10, before the University Administration held its Town Hall and announced plans to furlough and layoff staff, grant May 1 contracts to tenure-track faculty and certain essential lecturers, reduce cost of summer online classes and take other financial measures in response to COVID. Additionally, they were held prior to the formation of the post-COVID planning group that is currently being assembled. While some issues may be resolved by administrative decision-making and/or other committees, it is likely FAC will have a role in these or other issues that arise and impact faculty. For the sake of reporting, the following issues were identified. The ones with asterisks were identified in a final meeting of April 24, 2020 as potentially having some need for consideration over the summer.

- Summer scheduling and course assignments. The issue is how we will be online in the foreseeable future, not whether. What are we doing to make online summer feasible for faculty and affordable to students? Are we going to allow people to convert brick and mortar classes online? What will be the processes for that? How will the courses be assigned? How will the pricing be determined? At the time FAC began its deliberations, many decisions had already been made about summer so there was little opportunity for impact. The university decided independently also to substantially reduce tuition for those courses that were not scheduled to be taught in an online format. Existing policies for assignment courses and expectations, even for lecturers, to teach those courses will be applied. Lessons from those courses may form a basis for planning into the Fall.

\*\*Fall scheduling. What planning should there be for fall, in the event there is still a need to deliver all or some courses in an online format? Since identified by FAC, the Provost has announced the formation of a “New Normal” planning committee that will meet between now and summer to assess and make recommendations about the possible ways we may be back in session. FAC should be consulted about and have a chance to

weigh in about scheduling matters that impact faculty prior to final decision-making. There is likely, thus for a need for input during the summer.

**\*\*What other changes should be considered for fall, i.e., in the delivery of certain courses, need for physical distance in classrooms, lab and performance work, experiential learning and other forms of teaching? In a final meeting on April 24, FAC determined this and the next two issues related to online teaching or hybrid models was an issue of high priority that may be deserving of FAC involvement over summer.**

**\*\*Guidance about online opportunities and impacts. Greater guidance is necessary with respect to designating who teaches online and offline now and in the future? What about course content? Does the faculty member who created the content get priority in teaching the course again? Can faculty be compelled to use others' course content? What about the impact of 2U and other vendors who may be contracted with to prepare certain courses and replace faculty? Related issues of academic freedom also need to be discussed. Do existing contracts, i.e., with 2U impact what we develop by way of online instruction in other aspects of our programs? Again, this was identified as of high priority over summer and into fall.**

**\*\*Coordination with faculty about defining, protecting and balancing academic freedom, diverse pedagogies and other faculty-related considerations with best practices for online teaching. While there may be a need for guidelines for faculty and students to have a better learning experience, those issues exist in face-to-face teaching as well and it is important not to get overly controlling in how faculty teach in online environments. FAC discussed inputs such as creating a site where faculty can give feedback about potential changes and best practices about teaching online; recommending training or mentorship, being involved in any decision-making about policies or guidelines to regulate online teaching; and how to adjudicate matters that might come up with respect to online teaching and interactions between faculty and students. Committees agreed that this was an important issue that might warrant consideration over the summer. It was noted that the "New Normal" group and administration were also discussing related issues. FAC should be consulted before online "regulations" are settled upon and adopted for courses across the curriculum. This was also identified as of high priority over summer and into fall.**

**\*\*Faculty workload issues. We are already seeing the additional workloads associated with moving online and adjusting to COVID-related changes. As lecturers and staff diminish, the demands on faculty workload will be even greater. Committee members emphasized the importance of FAC playing a vigilant, proactive and interactive role in the decision-making about faculty workload. This work is likely to be particularly important over summer and into fall. In the meeting of April 24, this was identified an issue of high concern.**

**\*\*Consideration of the impact and decision-making regarding lecturers: What should be the criteria and process for determining which lecturers' get contracts in the event of lower enrollment? What role should FAC and/or the Senate play in advocating for their**

interests? In the final meeting of April 24, 2019, this issue was again revisited and some members were of the opinion that FAC should monitor and weigh in on the decision-making that will go on at the higher administrative level of decision-making between May 1 and July 1 about what benefits may be provided to lecturers who are not retained (i.e., ongoing health benefits for a period of time, office space, email, phone numbers, professional identification with UD, etc.)

- Faculty evaluation of teaching during spring 2020 and future. FAC discussed the need to modify p & t requirements for recording classes during COVID. In particular and in consultation with Carolyn Roecker-Phelps of the office of the provost, it was determined that there should be no pressure from the Provost or Dean's office to "observe" a pre-tenured faculty member as part of the evaluation this semester since transitioning to online teaching and learning. Departments may evaluate the syllabus, tests, quizzes, and materials they use to teach, and any amendments to the syllabus that may have been necessitated. The evaluation should also explain why there wasn't and class observation. There was also a discussion that if someone chooses to delay the tenure clock by one year, that person can go up for promotion early and they will not be looked down upon for doing so. As time goes on, it may need to adopt more specific criteria for evaluating faculty for tenure, promotion and merit during these times. SET also needs to be reviewed with that in mind.
- Decision-making strategies in a time of crisis. As decision-making goes on in the time of crisis, it is necessary to make short-term decisions not just on what is expedient, but what is our larger picture and goals. Long-term planning is critical.
- Capitalizing on innovation and compelled change in pedagogy and research. This is also a time for opportunity. "Necessity is the mother of all invention." Some things are quite effectively done online; others, more challenging. How can this experience galvanize innovation and changes in pedagogy moving forward? How can the performing arts, laboratory classes, clinical courses requiring close physical contact with patients or clients be conducted in these times?
- Security of Position issues. This is a critical source of anxiety on campus across all statuses of employment. No one has been laid off or furloughed to date, but there is already a financial impact that will have to be accounted for. Future enrollment, particularly residential enrollment, is also an uncertainty. FAC should play a role (along with other groups) in "reduction in force" planning. What, besides tenure, seniority and employment status, should make a difference? What is the role of expertise? Departmental or unit priorities? Longevity of service? Student educational benefit? How are programs and courses selected for reduction (or expansion)? Who gets the new online opportunities or other programmatic ones that arise? There is a critical need to examine different models and begin articulating what the criteria and prioritizing factors should be by way of recommendation.

In addition to examining different models and potentially making recommendations to decision-makers moving forward, what are the sources of contributions we can make to

clarify for people what these different statuses and hierarchies may mean in times like these? For example, some people assume there is safety in promotion, but there is not. There are places where people may be able to cross into other types of teaching or obligations and some that are fixed. What information should be distributed, how and by whom about these status issues?

- The role of adjuncts. What should be the role of adjuncts and balance between adjuncts and full-time faculty? How should that be determined?
- Other options to meet financial gaps. What other options could be considered, i.e., buying time from the university; early retirement, increased course/workloads, etc.?
- Contraction of programming may need to be considered. If we can't deliver all the programs and courses at the same level, is there a need to review and contract any of our offerings. For example, there are a lot of electives and CAP courses, far beyond what is needed in a given semester. Should some of these be held in abeyance in order to perfect quality of instruction in other areas (or contraction of demand). Analysis for each unit (and across units) on what work needs to be done and who can do it needs to be done.
- Review of policies that limit people's personal finances, i.e., 100% policy and outside employment. Do these need to be altered or waived to accommodate people's emerging financial needs? Can we temporarily suspend the restrictions for outside work at other institutions? This may be particularly important to contingent faculty, but also to others.
- Additionally, it was emphasized how important it is for each of us to pay attention to our listserves, professional organizations, and collegial discussions about developments in other universities and higher education in general. What role might FAC play in assembling and posting models and ideas in our shared drive.

As indicated above, decisions have been made and other groups, such as the "New Normal" Group tasked with addressing some of these issues. Additionally, ECAS has been discussing some of these and related issues, with a recommendation for ECAS to proceed through summer. The Faculty Board will also be meeting weekly.

FAC also discussed the potential need for the Senate and FAC to contribute to governance through the summer. Some articulated concerns about requiring Senate members to do work while off contract and how this is becoming increasingly burdensome even as the semester comes to a close. There were discussions about whether this should be voluntary or compelled for those on FAC. The group also emphasized the need to carefully define a useful role without duplicating work being done elsewhere or needlessly spinning wheels. Whether voluntary or not, it nonetheless may be advisable for FAC to continue its work into the summer. FAC agreed that a number of these issues are urgent and need resolution before fall, but recognizes that the other groups who will be working over the summer, including ECAS, will be in a better position to address these over the summer and direct matters to FAC as may be appropriate. Perhaps FAC could see how ECAS intends to proceed and have an organizational meeting in the next

weeks to determine if there are any particular issues that would benefit from FAC work over summer. But that ultimately will be up to the next group and ECAS!

All in all, it was a very productive year for FAC. Thanks to each faculty member who contributed and to Carolyn Roecker-Phelps, and all the best to the returning group!

**To: Fran Rice, Secretary of the Academic Senate**

**CC: Mark Jacobs, President, Academic Senate**

**From: Laura M. Leming, FMI, Chair, Student Academic Policies Committee**

**RE: Final Report of the SAPC, 2019-2020**

**Date: April 17, 2020**

Members: Joanna Abdallah (Graduate Student), Vijayan Asari, James Brill (undergraduate student Spring 2020), Jay Janney, Catherine Kublik, Suki Kwon (Co-chair), Laura Leming (Chair), Noah Leibold (undergraduate student, Fall 2019), Eddy Rojas, Frances Rice, Thomas Skill, Andrew Strauss, John White

The Student Academic Policies Committee was charged in October and has focused all of its activity this year on evaluating the implementation of the on-line Student Evaluation of Teaching process that began in 2014.

From Aug. 29, 2019 to Feb. 29, 2020, the SAPC Committee met 13 times for 1 ½ hours per meeting. Dr. Laura Leming was named Chair of the Committee in April 2019 but special thanks goes to Professor Suki Kwon, who stepped up as Co-chair of the Committee in August since Dr. Leming was assigned to teach in India for the fall semester. Much of the initial work for this report was done under Professor Kwon's leadership.

We presented our procedures to the Academic Senate last week. Consultations were done with the Faculty Development Committee, leaders in Student Development areas that have relevance, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and a limited student survey that included students from the professional schools and the College. Previous reports and faculty research on SET were also thoroughly reviewed along with some more recent literature on student evaluations, including the 2019 Statement put forth by the American Sociological Association that warns that "a growing body of evidence suggests that their use in personnel decisions is problematic. SETs are weakly related to other measures of teaching effectiveness and student learning (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; Uttl, White, and Gonzalez 2017)."<sup>1</sup>

SAPC made an interim report to ECAS in January and presented its final report which was accepted by ECAS on March 6.

The committee made a number of short-term and longer term recommendations regarding how SET should be used which can be found in our report presented last week. We confess to a bit of confusion over whether the Senate needed to or still needs to accept the recommendations as laid out.

The SAPC was not able to act on the final recommendations presented in the April 2019 SAPC report on academic misconduct. So our recommendation to next years' SAPC is to revisit both reports, on academic misconduct and on the evaluation of SET and to see if there are practical steps to follow through on these two sets of recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa\\_statement\\_on\\_student\\_evaluations\\_of\\_teaching\\_feb132020.pdf](https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_feb132020.pdf)

## ECAS End of Year Report

26 April 2020

AY 19-20 ECAS Membership:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Anne Crecelius, SEHS                        | Frances Rice, LIB ( <i>Secretary</i> ) |
| Shannon Driskell, CAS                       | Andrea Seielstad, LAW                  |
| Sam Dorf, Fall CAS                          | V. Denise James, Spring CAS            |
| Deogratias Eustace, SOE                     | Joanna Abdallah, Grad Student          |
| Mark Jacobs, SBA ( <i>President</i> )       | Jake Jagels, Undergrad student Fall    |
| Leslie Picca, CAS ( <i>Vice President</i> ) | James Brill, Undergrad Student Spring  |
| Jason Pierce, CAS                           | Paul Benson, ex-officio                |

At the September 6, 2019 Faculty Meeting, I laid out an agenda for the academic senate. The items identified for action were: Continue work on UPTPTF recommendations, Update policies pertaining to dismissal, Develop framework for executing the CAP 5 year review, Review of SET. Each of these was accomplished.

Specifically, ECAS accepted the work of the PRoPT committee on revisions to the promotion and tenure policy and forwarded them to FAC for refinement. The senate held a variety of open forums to garner input of the whole of the faculty. The FAC completed work aligning the Faculty Handbook, Grievance Committee bylaws, and the Nondiscrimination policies with the result being improved due process protections for faculty. The APC completed development of a plan for executing the five year review of the Common Academic Program, however the decision was made to delay implementation for a year due to the COVID-19 disruptions. Lastly, the SAPC completed a review of Student Evaluation of Teaching which resulted in several recommendations.

Additionally, the APC created guidelines / best practices for delivering on-line courses and the senate sponsored and organized a session for faculty on how to gain help for students demonstrating signs of distress in the classroom.

ECAS was an advocate for faculty involvement in decision making and was successful securing a place for faculty in the Budget Alignment committees and the Path Forward committees which is focused on building plans for various scenarios that may be faced by UD in the fall.

ECAS also performed its routine duties of approving new degrees, certificates, name changes for majors, and the like.

There are several recommendations that should be considered by the next senate. These follow:

Recommendation 1 – Update the teaching section of the faculty handbook to include new modes such as hybrid and fully online courses.

Recommendation 2 – Formally accept the plan created by APC for the execution of the five year cap review.



Recommendation 3 – Finalize the changes to the university promotion and tenure policy and put the out for a vote by the faculty.

Recommendation 4 – Adjust the representation on the senate to better reflect faculty voice and reflect its governance role within the university.

Recommendation 5 – Build out a section in the faculty handbook addressing faculty service to the academy and university. This section should include specifics as approaches to formally acknowledge and reward faculty such work.

Recommendation 6 – Take action on the recommendations of the SAPC report on SET. This should include evaluating the current questions posed and providing greater education to providers and consumers of the SET data to ensure the tool's potential is maximized paying particular attention to the formative nature of the tool.

Recommendation 7 – Develop an approval process for mini-courses that includes faculty.

Recommendation 8 – Collaborate with student development to ensure that programs such as Aviate are supportive of the academic mission and students' professional development.

I would like to thank the members of ECAS listed above for their dedication, deliberation, and decision making this year. This has been a particularly unique and trying year in the life of the university. We are taught that new times require new methods and this ECAS has adapted. However, the whole of the faculty will likely need to adapt to a very differing higher ed landscape post COVID-19. It is imperative that the faculty shape what this will look like at UD and as such I continue to call on faculty, some of whom are the brightest and most capable people I have ever been privileged to work alongside, to engage in areas of service where your passions lie. UD cannot realize its fullest potential without your voice and contribution.

It has been a pleasure to serve you and the university in this capacity. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Mark A. Jacobs, Ph.D.  
Professor, Operations and Supply Management