

## Senate Meeting 4/21/09

Senators attending: Wood, Curtin, Clarke, Welsh, Rieck, Khazeh, Gilkey, Weaver, Walton, Scott, Robeck, O'Loughlin, Ludwick, DeWitt, Street, McDermott, Parker, Shannon

Senators absent: none.

Quorum was present, President gaveled open at 3.32 pm

Faculty Senate Agenda

April 21, 2009

(Holloway Hall, Room 119)

(3:30-5:00 p.m.)

### 1. Announcements from the Senate president.

Readjusts original agenda so DeWitt's report on Learning Technology become a motion.

### 2. Remarks from the Provost, Dr. Tom Jones.

The most important piece of business is that the executive staff has organized an executive retreat next Weds all day regarding the Budget for 2010, to nail it down. They will look at the hiring freeze and faculty/staff positions and will try to put together a recommendation on which positions will hopefully be moved forward. At the same time, the system is doing the same thing. Also they will look at money sources for the strategic initiative and hope to move forward with the strategic plan. We have come through the budgetary issues in an ok state. We haven't felt the full impact of the problems. We should be on the road to getting back to where we ought to be

### 3. Approval of minutes from Senate Meeting of April 7, 2009 Motioned, Moved, 2nded.

Changes/comments: a few typos:

Khazeh's name,

also page 3 - on not highest ranking senator also noone with space.

And on the possible tabling of the motion last meeting:  
Discussion follows on table - no need for second - also not "would be  
'discussed'" but tabled.

All in favor as amended. Passed.

#### 4. Committee Reports.

##### a. Membership and Elections, Kelly Fiala.

Thanks you for allowing us to present. The committee is composed of 4 individuals who have discussed these issues, but would like Senate input. One question is re: vote counts - should we pass out information regarding the vote counts? They have decided that releasing vote counts might hinder participation in elections. They don't want to release vote counts, but they would be willing if someone asked to allow the vote percentages to the person who has run.

##### 1. Discussion ensues on policy possibilities.

President O'Loughlin will write a charge for the committee to look into the issue.

##### 2. Notion of Academic Department v. Academic Discipline for positions on committees. When one department has more than one discipline within it, how does that affect committee membership with regard to Article 6 Sec. 4. (

Discussion ensues.

Ends with Sen. Khazeh summarizing request to define the departments more specifically for the coming year and to look into what to do with someone in two departments.

##### b. Long Range Academic Planning, Brian Dean

Overviews the document sent. Defines - On-line is all work done on-line with hybrid as mix with occasional face to face time. Says moving from 1% to 5/5.5% of classes on-line over last 3 years; most of the on-line courses are in 2 departments. Used a Social Work study from the spring of 08 to analyze on-line classes. They looked at 3 hybrid courses & some web-enhanced courses, with same basic course. Found hybrid courses were largely non-traditional students. No significant differences with student

improvement, term papers, students perception of their own learning, and those in hybrid in generally more satisfied. Therefore can have same quality course. May need more student committment. In terms of Recommendation - because numbers relatively small, and student achievement is equal, there should not be any maximum or minimum number of on-line/hybrid courses. Should leave this in the hands of faculty & departments. Don't want much university input. There is also a state mandate to have a certain number of class hours off campus & this is a way to meet it.

Discussion follows.

Bob Tardiff adds some technical details: 1. The social work class was in the interactive television mode (almost face to face) -2. also Spring 08 was also difficult from technical point of view, when that technology had problems - so therefore he is pleased with results.

Discussion continues regarding the availability of services for on-line courses, and the ability to assess those course – whether there should be a regular report on the on-line courses.

5. Old Business:

a. Academic Policies Committee, Motion to approve a revised policy on Academic Integrity. Floor sponsor: Senator Kurt Ludwick.

President O'Loughlin wants a motion to approve the revised policy. Motioned, seconded.

Senator Ludwick: Overview of changes in the new policy: The few major changes here are re: professional programs that can recognize expulsion, etc. Big change on question of decision on whether a student can continue in coursework while decision in under appeal process. Usually student encouraged, but some cases are special, such as clinical placement when the student could be considered a danger - so that is given a bit more flexibility - the program director now gets that responsibility. A few other places - such as the definition of cheating includes purchasing...etc. Those are the major changes.

Other questions?

Motion is called.

Unanimous acceptance

Question 2: Discussion on the discrepancy between the withdrawal period change.

Senate desires in general a responsible decision on this question to be made soon rather than later.

6. New Business:

a. University Promotions Committee, Motion to approve "Transparency and Rebuttal" amended clauses to the faculty promotions process. Floor sponsor: Senator David Rieck

Moves that the Senate endorse the recommended changes to the handbook concerning promotions.  
Seconded.

Discussion ensues on question of transparency and the language of the handbook regarding the matter.

End discussion

Call question to pass the motion.

All in favor of passing with language as stands.

Unanimous ayes.

DOUG DEWITT: Makes motion that the Senate approve the policy on the learning with technology committee that the current course evaluation policy continues for 1 more year and then to develop a university policy on how to do on-line evaluations.

Charge was NOT to move to an on-line evaluation. Was looking at for those people who want to move to on-line how to do it.

Sam Gelata speaks: After reviewing options and speaking with IT the committee has decided that the best way to move forward (after suggested by IT) is with our own internally created program for evaluations. Says let's renew the contract with current course evaluations

through 2010 with no new departments using the expensive on-line programs, but keeping those fine for this year. Listwise is the cheapest of those being used. Then IT will create our own program to be housed in Gullnet. Several benefits: Cheaper (10,000/annum), faster to learn as in-house and better on-site fixes, etc. This was the proposal - looked at complexity & how those have developed.

Discussion follows. Gullnet as appropriate venue for our system. In addition, every department would be able to create their own version of the evaluation.

Motion called, Ayes have it (unanimous).

7. Adjournment. 5.02

Attachments:

Draft Senate Meeting minutes for April 7, 2009.  
Proposed "Transparency and Rebuttal" amended clauses to the faculty promotions process.