

10-3-2012

2012-10-03 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2012-10-03 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2012). *ECAS Minutes*. 285.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/285

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Approved
Minutes of Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
October 3, 2012
St. Mary's Hall Room 113B

Present: Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Harry Gerla, Emily Hicks, Shelia Hughes, Terrence Lau, Ruth Monnier, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps

Absent: Paul Benson, Robyn Bradford, Joseph Saliba

Guest: Jon Hess

Opening Meditation: Emily Hicks opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: ECAS did not meet on September 26, 2012 because of a lack of agenda items.

Announcements: The next meeting of ECAS is October 10, 2012 from 3:15-4:45 PM in SM 113B.

Old Business

Honor Code Revision. C. Phelps reported that the revised Honor Code document will be put on the October Senate agenda. The ASenate must vote to approve any changes to the policy.

SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching). C. Phelps reported that the SET committee wants feedback from department chairs regarding a list of possible core items and how those items relate to faculty evaluations. The committee would also like feedback from ECAS and the ASenate. A discussion of the possible items followed.

S. Hughes suggested that the perceived outcome or impact items do not seem aligned with the rationale for including these items (i.e. "students who recognize the immediate relevance and importance of the subject matter are better able to transfer knowledge....").

G. Doyle indicated that 20 of the 28 core items and open ended questions proposed for the new form were taken from the previous form. He also questioned why demographic items were being considered for inclusion in the proposed new instrument since this might make it easier for an instructor to identify particular students. R. Monnier suggested making the demographic items optional. J. Hess stated that the committee is proposing the use of these demographic items in such a way as to control for bias. Instructors would not see these demographics. J. He also suggested that demographic information might be useful for chairs to see in regard to faculty evaluations and promotion and tenure (P&T) decisions.

J. Hess further explained that a core of 6 to 10 items would be taken from the 28 items listed in the proposed items document. One to three items in any given category would be used for the final instrument after accounting for variability, skewness, and high correlations between items. The summer pilots conducted by the committee used only a few items per category and this may account for the increase in the open-ended responses. C. Phelps agreed adding that the large number of items in the old instrument may have created "noise".

G. Doyle questioned why the committee decided to leave off items such as "I would recommend this course" or "I would recommend this instructor". J. Hess indicated those types of global items are good questions but may not be valid questions. L. Pedrotti suggested including more specific items as well as the global items.

T. Lau suggested including an item regarding the grade the student perceives they will receive in the course. Such an item might also help control for bias. T. Lau also asked whether or not the SET

committee considered the title of the instrument. Instead of assessing or evaluating teaching aren't we actually asking for students "perceptions" of teaching? S. Hughes answered that this issue was brought up previously and there was quite a bit of push back from students.

R. Monnier asked who views the demographic data. J. Hess replied that department chairs might be giving access to the data for P&T or evaluative decisions as well as department P&T committees. He also indicated that the SET committee plans to make recommendations regarding how to administer the instrument so that students are given sufficient time to fill out instrument.

J. Hess requested that ECAS send the draft document regarding the proposed SET items to department chairs and senators for feedback. ECAS agreed that this would be done prior to the October ASenate meeting.

SAPC Distance Learning. T. Lau reported that the SAPC is examining the issue of cheating in Distance Learning classes. The SAPC is conducting a survey to determine what faculty members perceive is happening regarding cheating in distance learning courses. Based on the survey results the committee may then propose that faculty use on on-line proctoring service to combat cheating.

FAC Outside Employment. E. Hicks reported that the FAC is still working on revisions to the Outside Employment document and that the document will not be ready for the ASenate agenda in October.

APC Common Academic Program (CAP). L. Pedrotti reported that oversight of CAP is the CAP Competency Committee's primary responsibility right now. The APC has asked S. Hunley to send ECAS an update on the logistics of approving all the new CAP courses. Also, departments need to sort out implementation issues regarding CAP student learning outcomes. C. Phelps agreed to check with Don Pair regarding CAP implementation issues.

Other Business

T. Lau asked about the evaluation process for administrators. The faculty handbook calls for periodic evaluations but it does not appear that these evaluations are routinely done across campus. S. Hughes agreed that the evaluation process for administrators is not a transparent process. T. Lau asked if this was an appropriate issue for ECAS to address. C. Phelps suggested that ECAS discuss this issue with Provost Saliba.

C. Daprano then raised two additional issues for feedback from ECAS. On behalf of the Faculty Board she asked if ECAS was willing to co-sponsor the Faculty Association Exchange luncheon on November 13. ECAS agreed to be a co-sponsor of the luncheon. She also asked if members of ECAS were interested in attending an overview of Robert's Rules that would be conducted by J. Farrelly. Several members of ECAS indicated an interest in attending such an overview to better acquaint themselves with parliamentary procedures.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano

Standing committee work assignments. Below is an updated list of assigned standing committee tasks:

Task	Source	Previously assigned	To	Work due	Due
Consultation	ECAS	ECAS	ECAS	Open communication	ongoing
Faculty workload		FAC	FAC	Proposal	
Policy on outside employment		FAC	FAC		
18 th credit hour	Faculty		SAPC	Proposal	
Summer tuition	Faculty		SAPC	Proposal	
Scholarship distribution	Faculty		SAPC	Proposal	
Retitle for Assoc. Provost, Dean of GPCE	Provost	Sent for GLC input prior to proposal to ECAS			
Tasks ongoing					
SET Committee oversight	ECAS		ECAS	Hear monthly reports; Linda Hartley, chair	
CAP Competency Committee oversight	Senate		APC	Hear monthly reports	
UNRC			ECAS	Hear monthly reports; Emily Hicks, chair	