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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
November 17, 2011; 1:30pm
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

Present: Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Jesse Grewal, Emily Hicks, Antonio Mari, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, Andrea Seielstad, Rebecca Wells

Absent: Jonathan Hess, Joseph Saliba

Guest: Pat Donnelly, Jim Farrelly, Linda Hartley, Shelia Hassel Hughes, Aaron Witherspoon

Opening Meditation: Jim Farrelly opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: The minutes of the November 10, 2011 ECAS meeting were approved

Announcements: The next meeting of ECAS is December 1, 2011 from 1:30-2:30 p.m. in SM 113B.

J. Farrelly reported that 31 faculty members attended the Faculty Board/ECAS co-sponsored luncheon meeting on faculty workload this past Tues., Nov. 15 from 12-1:30 PM in the KU East Ballroom. The Faculty Board is developing a Faculty Exchange Series (FES) workshop for next semester as a follow-up session to this discussion.

P. Benson reminded everyone of the STARS celebration of faculty research day that will occur on Weds. Nov. 30 from 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM in Sears Recital Hall. Students are encouraged to attend the presentations.

Old business
Agenda for Dec. 2 full Senate meeting. A. Seielstad asked ECAS for input on the inclusion of the following items for the December 2 meeting of the Senate:

1. Student evaluation of teaching (SET) proposal (FAC)
2. MPA program proposal (APC)
3. Titles for instructional staff, policy on emeritus status (FAC)
4. Performance dashboard (Office of the Provost)

Performance dashboard. ECAS agreed to table this agenda item and place it on the January Senate meeting agenda instead. ECAS would prefer to have Provost Saliba present the performance dashboard to ECAS first and then the Senate.

Student Evaluation of Teaching proposal. L. Hartley, chair of the ASFAC, reviewed the background of the proposal as well as the work completed by the FAC last year and this year on the proposal. ECAS began a discussion of whether or not the proposal was ready to be presented to the Senate or needed further revisions.

G. Doyle opened the discussion by indicating that he was opposed to implementing two separate forms/processes – one for formative and one for summative purposes – since this separation is not supported by the literature on student evaluation of teaching. S. Hughes responded that the relevant literature on this topic does indicate that student surveys are not sufficient for formative purposes. Further, the
literature on this topic does not comment on whether or not the processes of formative and summative evaluation should be split. L. Pedrotti asked if it makes sense to more clearly separate the two processes. P. Benson followed by asking about the difference between formative and summative evaluation. He asserted that summative assessment includes formative elements and that the processes are intertwined. R. Wells suggested that the formative process needs to be customized for different faculty members. A formative process should give faculty flexibility in terms of the design, content, and instrument.

P. Donnelly raised the issue that existing formative processes and procedures would not be able to be used for promotion and tenure (P&T) review decisions according to the recommendations currently in the SET proposal. P. Benson asked for clarification of the phrase “least subjective and controversial” questions (II A. 1, p. 2).

From a student perspective, A. Mari raised the issue of how formative assessments are and should be used. Students are sometimes upset when they give feedback (formative and summative) which is not reflected upon and used by the individual faculty member.

R. Wells indicated that she did not feel the SET proposal should call for the development of a survey instrument. L. Hartley indicated that the proposal recommendations call for the creation of a sub-committee and that the sub-committee would be charged with creating the SET instrument.

A. Seielstad attempted to summarize the issues of concern with the SET proposal as expressed by ECAS. These issues included the following: 1) summative needs to be more clearly defined in the proposal; 2) the proposal needs to address the question of whether or not formative assessments be separated from summative evaluation; 3) when and how will the newly developed instrument be reviewed after being designed and implemented?; 4) need to address the current practice of using formative assessments for summative purposes and how separating the processes may impact unit P&T documents, processes, and procedures.

A. Seielstad then called for a vote to determine which of the following items, in addition to the MPA program proposal, should be included on the Dec. 2 Senate meeting agenda: 1) SET proposal, 2) titling proposal and policy on emeritus status, and, 3) intellectual property proposal. ECAS voted to remove the SET proposal from the Dec. 2 Senate meeting agenda (9 remove; 1 abstain). ECAS then voted to add the titling proposal and policy on emeritus status to the agenda (9 include; 1 abstain). Finally, ECAS voted to add the intellectual property proposal to the agenda (9 include; 1 abstain).

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano
Standing committee work assignments. Below is an updated list of assigned standing committee tasks:

<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>*UNRC policy doc</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Review final document</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Consultation issue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Work to resolve issues</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Faculty evaluation (SET)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Purpose of eval (revision)</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLC docs (3)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA proposal</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>S/APC</td>
<td>Develop instructions</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student honor code</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>S/PC</td>
<td>Review for issues</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP proposal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Review Appendix A</td>
<td>later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property rights</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Nov. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles/emeritus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Nov. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks not yet assigned</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Work due</td>
<td>Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Voting representation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report and proposal</td>
<td>??</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>Faculty workload</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report and proposal</td>
<td>Mar. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks ongoing</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Work due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of CAP dev</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hear monthly reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks completed</td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Work due</td>
<td>Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP&amp;CC voting rights</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer recommendation</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>S/APC</td>
<td>Develop form</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities for Senate meetings

1. Top priorities
   a. Student evaluation (FAC) -- Need this to move forward on this issue yet this year
   b. PA program -- Needs to get to Board of Trustees in January

2. Next priorities
   a. Grad School documents -- These are issues where we have no policy (or lack clarity), and that is needed sooner rather than later
   b. Titles for instructional staff, policy on emeritus status (FAC) -- Pat Donnelly needs this for next year’s contracts

3. Needs to get done, but not time-sensitive with regard to a month or two
   a. Intellectual property rights (FAC)
   b. Application of the academic misconduct form (APC/SAPC)
   c. PDP document (APC)
   d. JRC document
   e. Faculty workload (FAC) -- important, but won’t be ready until spring

Other priorities for our work in ECAS

1. Consultation issue -- Need to resolve this issue so that we can move forward together
2. Voting rights committee -- Need it to get moving so it can report by April
3. UNRC -- Need to constitute it for future committee population