

10-1-2013

2013-10-01 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, "2013-10-01 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2013). *ECAS Minutes*. 294.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/294

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 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
October 1, 2013
KU 312, 8:15-9:30 AM

Present: Abdullah Alghafis, Phil Anloague, Paul Benson, Harry Gerla, Linda Hartley, Emily Hicks, Carissa Krane, Terence Lau, Ed Mykytka, Carolyn Roecker Phelps, Joseph Saliba, Dominic Sanfilippo

Absent: none

Guests: Jim Farrelly

Opening prayer/meditation: J. Farrelly opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the September 24, 2013 ECAS meeting were approved with corrections.

Announcements:

- Next meeting—October 8, 2013, 8:15-9:30 KU 312

Reports

- FAC—L. Hartley reported that the committee had not met since the last ECAS meeting. The next meeting is Thursday, October 3, 2013.
- APC—E. Mykytka reported that the committee will meet Friday, October 4, 2013.
- SAPC—T. Lau reported that the committee had not met since the last ECAS meeting.

Old Business:

Consultation. This issue was not discussed.

Educational Leadership Council. This issue was not discussed.

New Business:

Request from Teacher Education Department. P. Anloague brought a request to ECAS asking if the Academic Senate would ask Roesch Library to postpone the disposal of books from the teacher education collection until the various legislative bodies consider the issue of storing the books elsewhere on campus instead.

E. Hicks provided two documents as background materials. She stated that space for the Libraries is at a premium with more room needed for special collections such as the U.S. Catholic Collection. The 6th floor of the library holds several collections, including education, art, music, and religion. The criteria used to identify books for possible removal from the teacher education collection were in accordance with the "Guidelines for Deaccessioning Library Materials" approved by the University Library Council in 2006. No title on the list for consideration had circulated since the library implemented the current online catalog in 1994 and OhioLINK contained at least 5 copies of each title with many titles having upwards of 30 copies in OhioLINK. An initial timeline of six weeks was given for the department to review the list with the possibility of an extension offered. The chair of the department subsequently asked for an additional 6 weeks which was granted. The goal was to identify approximately 1/3 of the titles from the list that could be removed. E. Hicks stated that the library's focus was on the information, not the physical books. She said that the information was readily available through OhioLINK which was

an extension of UD's collections. A significant portion of the library's annual budget goes to provide OhioLINK resources to the UD community.

P. Benson stated that this was a typical activity between the library and departments because space is at a premium. He said that we do not want to set a precedent that ECAS deals with space issues. J. Farrelly stated that the issue needed to be handled at the dean level and that it is a part of a much larger space issue. ECAS decided that this issue was not within the purview of the Academic Senate and declined to consider the issue further.

J. Saliba suggested that the broader issue of the future of libraries be a topic at a future ELC meeting.

Division of SET Tasks: C. Phelps and L. Hartley led a discussion of the SET-related tasks that need to be accomplished and which AS committee should be assigned to work on each task. L. Hartley stated that what we want to do depends on whether the instrument is online and which vendor is used. The committee decided to assume the instrument would be online to aid the work of the committees. A small committee with representatives from each of the standing committees will be formed to bring together the work of the committees into a unified document for ECAS to consider. The proposed timeline to complete this work is February 2014.

After much discussion the following assignments were made:

The APC committee will be responsible for the development of policy regarding the instrument and its delivery (i.e. Will the instrument proposed by the SET committee be used? If not, what changes need to be made in the instrument? How will a new online SET instrument and process be delivered? Will incentives be used to improve response rate? Should a standard set of instructions be developed and incorporated? How do we address confidentiality or anonymity?)

The FAC committee will be responsible for the development of policy regarding use of SET for faculty evaluation (i.e. How will the results of the new online SET process be applied or used? How will the results of the new online SET process be reported? What kind of data will be generated and in what forms/formats; who will see what information? How will this new policy be implemented (i.e., tenure, non-tenure)? How do the potentially new policies fit with the current policies regarding pre- and post-tenure review of faculty members? Do current university SET policies need to be modified for the new SET policy and procedures?)

The SAPC committee will be responsible for input to policies of the APC regarding student information (i.e. How will confidentiality of student responses be maintained? What can and/or should be known about respondents? Will incentives be used to improve response rate?)

L. Hartley said that the SET committee members were willing to consult and work with the committees by providing background data not in the final report. J. Saliba suggested that including legal affairs at some point might be useful. He reminded the committee to keep other universities' best practices in mind. L. Hartley confirmed that reports from other universities informed the SET committee's work. P. Anloague suggested that the FAC consult with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee about how the new SET policies would fit with the current P&T policies.

J. Saliba asked what evaluation instrument would be used for the fall semester. If another pilot is conducted, what would be its purpose? L. Hartley stated that if a pilot were to be conducted, David

Wright would need ample lead time to make it happen. She will check with him to find out how much lead time would be needed. P. Benson said that any pilot would need to be voluntary only. J. Farrelly suggested asking for volunteers at the October meeting of the Academic Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 A.M.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Hicks

Work in Progress

Task	Source	Previously assigned	To	Work due	Due
Consultation	ECAS	ECAS	ECAS	Open communication	ongoing
Department Processes	ECAS		APC	Proposal	
Honors distinction on transcripts	ECAS		APC	Proposal	
Intellectual properties			FAC		
Instructional staff titles	Provost's office		FAC		
Information Literacy			APC		
Academic dishonesty	SAPC				
Student Businesses	SAPC		SAPC		
Change in Constitution	ECAS				
SET	ECAS		APC	Proposal	
SET	ECAS		FAC	Proposal	
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	
Summer tuition	Faculty		SAPC	On hold until tuition model is further developed	