

12-13-2013

2013-12-13 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2013-12-13 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2013). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 98.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/98

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

Approved
Minutes of the Academic Senate
Friday, December 13, 2013; 3:00 pm
KU West Ballroom

Present: Paul Benson, Andrew Slade, Myrna Gabbe, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Stephen Brown, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Shawn Cassiman, Laura Leming, Paul Bobrowski, Carolyn Phelps, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Kevin Kelly, Joe Watras, John White, Ed Mykytka, Paul McGreal, Harry Gerla, Emily Hicks, Yong Song, Karen E. Swisher, Joseph Saliba

Guests: J. Farrelly, Thomas Skill, Paul Vanderburgh, David John Wright, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, Sawyer Hunley, Alan Demmitt, Alex Hall, Judith Huacuja, Cilla Shindell, Patrick Donnelly, Sharon Gratto

Absent: Kurt Mosser, Joe Mashburn, Jasmine Lahoud, Andy Kurzhals, Terence Lau, Eric Taglieri, Philip Anloague, Zack Martin, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, Jamie Ervin, Katie Willard, Abdullah Alghafis, Kathy Webb, Dominic Sanfilippo

Opening Prayer/Meditation: J. Watras opened the meeting with a prayer.

Minutes: The minutes of the November 8, 2013 special meeting of the Academic Senate were approved with corrections (22 yes, 0 no, 1 absention). The minutes of the November 15, 2013 of the Academic Senate were approved with no corrections (22 yes, 0 no, 1 absention).

Announcements: C. Phelps announced that graduation would be held tomorrow (December 14th) at 9:45 am.

Committee Reports:

APC: J. Dunne submitted the following report in writing.

Since the last senate meeting, the APC committee has taken the following actions.

1. **Degree Programs & Departments.** The committee has just this week received the last review of the committee's draft document from the academic units. This document consolidates a number of existing policy documents concerning various actions concerning academic degree programs and academic departments. As one of our first items of business in January, we plan to finalize the document and forward it to ECAS.
2. **Student Evaluation of Teaching.** The committee finalized its deliberations on several questions given to us by ECAS regarding the SET Committee's final report. Our recommendations have been provided to the SET coordinating group – a member from each of the senate's standing committees.
3. **Undergraduate Certificates.** We have continued gathering information and deliberating concerning a possible policy for undergraduate certificate programs. One question we are still working on is a clear definition of a certificate program that distinguishes it from other academic programs such as majors, minors, concentrations, etc. A tentative key distinguishing feature we've identified is that "certificates" may or may not "stand alone" i.e., not taken within a degree program. We have established a subcommittee of three of our members to begin drafting our conclusions and a possible policy. This will be a major focus for our work next semester.

FAC: L. Hartley submitted the following report in writing.

- 1) Since the last regular Senate meeting, the FAC has met twice.
- 2) Intellectual Properties issue update: The FAC subcommittee (P. Donnelly, P. Vanderburgh, S. Cassiman, M. Willenbrink – UDRI, and L. Hartley) reached an agreement to propose a new revision for the Intellectual Properties Policy which includes a statement about co-ownership of online courses for faculty who have developed online courses with university funds. After discussion at the recent FAC meeting, more clarification of co-ownership implications is currently being sought. We hope to reach a conclusion by our next meeting when additional information is received.
- 3) Instructional Staff Titles:
 - a. Distinguished Service Professor description revision was submitted to ECAS, and now to the Senate.
 - b. Research Faculty title – FAC has forwarded a proposal for this new title to ECAS. As the proposal reads: “The Research Faculty position is open to both new and existing full-time employees of the University who engage in research and mentoring of students. These individuals do not hold a tenured, tenure-track, or joint appointment. The purpose of the Research Faculty position is to allow these individuals to compete for outside grants that require applicants to hold an academic title. It is expected that research faculty will obtain grants/contracts sufficient to cover a significant portion of their salaries and to support students.”
- 4) SET: FAC completed their discussion to address our assignment by ECAS. Discussion and recommendations will be summarized in the SET update, along with summaries from the other Senate subcommittees.
- 5) FAC’s next meeting will be held on January 16 @ noon in St. Mary’s 113.

SAPC: J. McCombe submitted the following report in writing. The SET information was discussed during the SET report later in the meeting.

The SAPC met once since the November Senate meeting. The Committee continued to discuss its role in the proposed revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) instrument and process. The SAPC charge, as delivered by ECAS, was to provide input/recommendations regarding two related questions:

1. How will confidentiality of student responses be maintained?
2. What can and/or should be known about respondents?

Issue #1

As a group, the SAPC has discussed the issue of confidentiality, in addition to meeting with Dr. David Wright (from the LTC) to learn more about the vendors who have bid to provide the online instrument.

The SAPC learned that encryption software—much like that used in online banking transactions—is used by the vendors in question. In addition, the SAPC agrees with Dr. Wright and others in the LTC

that the vendors have a vested interest in providing a secure instrument and that a careful vetting process has already occurred in identifying the companies who might provide this service in a secure fashion.

Again, in consultation with the LTC, the SAPC has also agree to draft concise and clear language that would 1) assure students of the confidentiality of the online SET process; and 2) acknowledge some key differences between a paper/pencil system and a new, online system.

The SAPC recommended a meeting with UD's Office of Legal Affairs to ensure that any language that might appear as an introduction to the online SET form be vetted so that the University not expose itself to unnecessary risk.

The SAPC, in consultation with Lisa Sandner, Associate University Counsel, drafted the following language:

As the University moves to an online system we remain committed to ensuring student privacy.

For the online surveys, we require that students log in before submitting their responses. Logging in is used strictly for two purposes:

- *To ensure the students responding to the survey are enrolled in the class.*
- *To ensure that each student replies only once.*

The University deletes the identifying information from the survey database after the completion of the survey collection period. Once this information is deleted it is impossible to connect a response or comment to any student. Prior to deletion, the identifying information is handled with the same security standards and safeguards as other confidential student information. In addition, prior to deletion, in the rare event that a student were to make a threat to self or others via the online evaluation, the University reserves the right to take steps to identify the student in question and investigate the threat, including identifying the student who submitted the evaluation.

The LTC reports the anonymous aggregate data and comments to the academic departments and individual instructors after the last day to change grades for that semester. Academic departments and instructors never have access to any identifying information.

Issue #2 - What can and/or should be known about respondents?

During the November 11, 2013 SAPC meeting, there was vigorous discussion around the possible merits of, and potential risks associated with, gathering demographic information from the students completing an online SET form. Such information might include *aggregate* data concerning the following info:

- Gender
- Race

- International student status
- Major
- Class status (senior, junior, etc.)
- GPA

The SAPC recognizes that, in certain situations, looking at aggregate data for a particular class could, potentially, identify certain students (for example, if only one non-major, or even a small number, were to be enrolled in a particular course). Clearly, in such instances, aggregate data should not be made available to instructors. However, if there were to be sufficient diversity in terms of these demographics, an instructor might derive benefits from knowing, for example, if student learning could be correlated more closely with whether or not students were, for example, non-majors (or in some other demographic category).

This is a conversation that will need to continue in our next SAPC meeting—in particular, the Committee will need to discuss the following:

1. Given a sufficiently diverse set of student respondents, should instructors be able to request such aggregate SET data in terms of various demographic categories?
2. Are the demographic categories listed above sufficient, or would other information be potentially useful?
3. How would the process work if a particular instructor desired to access this more precise demographic information?

Next SAPC Meeting: 13 January 2013 (9:00 a.m. in HM 257). The SAPC plans to continue its discussion of our committee's role in the SET process and also receive an update from Laura Leming regarding progress involving the SAPC's other current topic of discussion: the University's Policy on Political/Electoral Activities.

ECAS: C. Phelps reported

Proposal to Rename the Department of Visual Arts (DOC 2013-05): P. Benson gave an overview of the rationale for the proposed name change from Department of Visual Arts to Department of Art and Design. He stated that much research of similar programs with a Bachelor of Fine Arts. According to the proposal, the title, "Art and Design," is the phrase most prominently used to describe academic programs that offer the professional Bachelor of Fine Arts degrees in fine arts, photography, graphic design, art history, and art education. The change in title would not involve any curricular changes at this time. Widespread consultation was obtained and the proposal was approved by the College. L. Hartley moved to accept the proposal as written and C. Krane seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved (23 yes, 0 no, 0 abstention).

Revision to Select Faculty and Instructional Staff Titles in Faculty Handbook—Distinguished Service Professor (DOC 2013-06): L. Hartley explained that the Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to provide clarity the Distinguished Service Professor title. The FAC revised the definition to clarify that the title should be awarded to current faculty and to include "service" to the criteria. J. Dunne asked if any current

faculty members hold the title. Two current faculty members hold this title. J. Dunne asked why this document is categorized as consultation. P. Donnelly stated that it falls under other conditions of service. M. Gabbe asked if potential candidates could be grandfathered this year. L. Hartley stated that she also would like to have a grandfathering period. M. Gabbe asked if the title is considered a promotion. J. Farrelly stated that the awarding of this title has no relation to promotion in rank. L. Lemming asked if the changes would take effect right away. P. Donnelly suggested that an amendment be added to designate an implementation date. J. Farrelly expressed concern for the eleven faculty members (nine retired) that are listed in the catalog and asked that they remain until they pass away. P. McGreal stated that "Professor Emeritus" does not carry an active affiliation whereas Distinguished Service Professor might.

L. Hartley made a motion to add the following amendment:

The revised title will take effect on May 16, 2015. All living Distinguished Service Professors currently listed in the academic catalog will remain.

H. Gerla seconded the motion. The motion to add the amendment passed (21 yes, 0 no, 2 abstentions). L. Hartley moved to accept the amended proposal. K. Swisher seconded the motion. DOC 2013-06 was unanimously approved.

Maternity Leave Report: P. Donnelly reported that six faculty members took maternity leave in the 2012-13 academic year. Two were tenure-track and stopped the tenure clock. Two were tenured and two were non-tenure-track. A wide range of modified duties, most related to research, scholarship and service were assigned. No in-class instruction was assigned. The policy has been changed to eliminate the summer clause.

SET Proposal in Process: The SET document coordinating committee (Linda Hartley, John McCombe, and Andrew Slade) reported on the standing committees' SET work which is being combined into one document. A. Slade reported that the APC recommends that the SET instrument be administered online for 10 days, closing at midnight on the last day of class. They recommend that no incentives be used. Draft language for the instructions will be developed. The committee recommends preserving the anonymity of students.

J. McCombe gave a shout-out and kudos to Stephen Brown for attending the December Academic Senate meeting after finals were over. The SAPC are satisfied that the encryption methods of the vendors considered are sufficient. The committee looked at how other universities handle the confidentiality issue. The committee considered what we should know about respondents. Some information would be useful for formative purposes as long as confidentiality is maintained. Who could request information is still an issue. The committee will resume discussions in January.

L. Hartley reported that the FAC committee recommends that the SET results will be shared with faculty, chair, P&T committees, etc. just as the paper results are shared now. The data will be used the same way it is used now. The eight core items will be reported just as the five items (for the College) are reported now. Individual scores and departmental averages will still be reported to the same parties as now. The committee recommends that the SET instrument be used for all faculty, but allowances should be made for those on the tenure-track. The committee recommends that a select set of old SET questions be added to the new SET instrument for a limited period of time (2 years) to give faculty time to adjust the new instrument. (For the CAS, the five core items that are reported on the Semester Report on Teaching will be added to the new SET. Other units will determine which of the old SET questions will be added, based on the questions currently used in T&P and merit decisions.) Current SET policies need to be reviewed and modified as appropriate. The FAC committee recommends that a separate policy be developed for other uses of the SET data.

The question of who owns the SET data was raised. The university owns the data which is maintained in the cloud by the vendor for as long as we have a contract.

M. Gabbe asked why the SAPC recommended to not offer incentives. A. Slade stated the pilot surveys showed good response rate without incentives so the committee did not think incentives were necessary. L. Hartley stated that they could be implemented in the future, if needed. The SET committee has a list of ways to encourage participation as well as what not to do.

M. Gabbe asked why there were different response rates for in-class versus outside of class. The SET committee recommends administering the SET in class if not getting good response rate outside of class. T. Skill stated that UDIT is currently evaluating the wireless capacity on campus. It is a two-year process.

Policy Prohibiting Illegal, Fraudulent, Dishonest, and Unethical Behavior: C. Phelps announced that this new university policy will be brought to the Senate in January. ECAS reviewed the policy and made suggestions before it was approved. ECAS also obtained assurance that future revisions would be possible. The new policy will come to the Academic Senate in January. The policy covers both faculty and staff except where separate faculty policies already exist.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks