UHD Faculty Senate Meeting
May 3, 2011
Minutes

Present: P. Lyons (President), A. Allen (President-Elect), J. Schmertz (Secretary)

C. Bedard, R. Beebe, R. Chiquillo, D. De la Pena, A. Gomez-Rivas, A. Eliassen, S. Farris, J. Jackson, K. Jegdic, P. Kintzele, M. Moosally, W. Morgan, R. Pepper, N. Rangel, L. Spears, K. Wright, Z. Zhou

Absent: G. Evans, J. Johnson, O. Paskelian, A. Pavelich, F. Williams, V. Zafiris

Lyons began with a moment of silence for Senator Nicole LaRose. President Flores had previously sent the university community information about her memorial and the scholarship fund in her name.

Minutes were approved. Schmertz noted that she would like any requests for changes to the minutes for the current meeting be made before summer begins, rather than next fall. This meeting's minutes will be sent out within a week as usual, with the usual deadline of the following Friday for any requested changes.

The Budget Reduction Committee Task Force report is coming out May 12. Since the committee's work is done, Senator Moosally (who was on the task force) wanted to know what sort of feedback loop would enable faculty to know what administrative decisions were made in response to the task force's report. Since President Flores was not in attendance, Lyons asked Provost Chapman to follow up with Flores on Moosally's question.

Over 18% of available students answered the NSSE survey—a big accomplishment.

The Faculty Climate Survey is coming out this Friday and runs though remainder of semester. You will have several reminders. Senators, encourage your colleagues' participation, as faculty responses will help guide next year's agenda for Faculty Senate.

Lyons noted that the most recent issue of *Hispanic Outlook* ranks UHD 26th among the top 100 institutions granting degrees to Hispanic students. We are #7 in business/marketing and #8 in ISS.

Sat Aug 20, 8-noon is the date set for the Freshmen Convocation. Tammis Thomas is asking for additional participants for discussion leaders on the common reading for the freshman experience, which will be *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks.*

There was confusion about details for that night's Student Awards Ceremony, as no public announcement had been made about it. Eventually it was resolved that the reception was taking place at 5:30, to be followed by the awards ceremony at 6.

New senators were invited to stand up and were applauded. Lyons will add them to the senate's roster. Their duties begin officially on Aug 15.

The Online Education Committee (Chair: Cindy Stewart)

Stewart said the Online Education Committee has met 5 times. They will be addressing 5 charges from Faculty Senate in order: academic honesty, preparation for teachers to teach online, perceptions of online courses by external groups, online program approval, and workload/compensation for online teaching.

Academic honesty and teacher preparation: Thus far, the committee has decided to address academic honesty and preparation for teaching web-enhanced courses together by piling these issues in with the university-wide conversion to the next generation of Blackboard Vista, which will be piloted over the summer, with plans for complete conversion by spring. Any time a new learning management system (LMS) is introduced, new training is needed—so the idea is to use the conversion into the new platform as an opportunity to provide training that includes best practices for teaching online, including ways to circumvent academic dishonesty. Current tools Respondus and Turnitin, already available at IT, will be incorporated into their own unit.

The committee plans to work with Deb Carruthers in IT to make an interactive training module for teachers that includes hands-on training. The training will include information on best practices regardless of delivery mode. Stewart would like faculty and department input on what kind of training is needed. Senators should consult with their departments so that training can be adjusted based on disciplinary needs. Please provide input to the committee by June 1.

Moosally asked if this training was to be a mandatory part of process for faculty proposing new online courses. Stewart mentioned something about "contingent access"—it was not made clear what would happen if faculty did/did not take advantage of the training.

Senator Farris asked about a long-term committee goal to investigate remote site testing. Senator Moosally said faculty needed to know that requiring students to come to campus to take an exam is an option. Senator Wright said students can only be compelled to go somewhere for an exam if they are notified early in the registration process and the information is placed on Banner. Also the test must be available asynchronously--there is a window during which students can show up but there can't be a specific time assigned. There was some confusion about what could or could not be required, underscoring the need for clearly provided information in the training being developed.

Senator Bedard asked if there would be training made available for students, e.g. on what plagiarism is? Stewart said the computing website has a link containing the university's plagiarism policy, as well as a link to Turnitin that permits students to do a sort of dry run without having their papers sent to a larger repository. Stewart thought it might be possible to provide students with training in the new BB Vista with contingent access.

Bedard asked if there would be training on how teachers can prevent plagiarism via their assignment design? Stewart said there is a literature base in online education on "authentic

assessment." If Senate decides after discussing their online needs with their departments that they would like materials on designing curricula to prevent plagiarism in online environments, please let the committee know.

Moosally noted that a date for a short-term goal on Stewart's handout needed to be changed from September 2012 to September 2011.

On the Senate charge of researching the perception of online courses by external groups: no recommendation has been developed as yet. This issue seems to be discussed in the next charge, "program approval process," where it is stated that the committee will identify programs or certifications in which accrediting agencies limit the number of courses that can be taken online, so that this information can be made available on course syllabi and to advisors. It is unclear how the committee is planning to address how online programs will be approved.

On the final charge, workload and compensation: the committee plans to develop an earlier deadline for student course evaluations. The hope is that the evaluations will be made available two weeks before end of semester, so that faculty gets more input. In the long term, the committee recommends developing a course evaluation instrument specific to online courses.

 Dean Uzman wondered what was the connection between compensation and course evaluations? Stewart responded that for tenure/promotion purposes and merit pay raises, faculty needed to amass a significant number of student evaluations. Moosally informed Stewart that this particular charge from Senate was driven by the results of the Faculty Senate survey. Issues should, rather, be things like compensation for additional workloads related to online teaching—e.g. compensation for training and start-up, and examining the relationship between class size and workload. Stipends for startup courses have been eliminated due to the current budget constraints, but can the issue be brought back strategically? Stewart said that the committee's decision not to address compensation for course start-ups was based on sensitivity to the needs of administration.

Lyons stated that discussion on online course evaluations needs to take place within context of revamping course evaluation policies overall. Moosally agreed and noted that we need to be careful about how student evaluations are made public. Faculty reacted strongly against Governor Perry's push to tie faculty pay and promotion to student evaluations.

Sikka asked if Stewart's committee was discussing intellectual property issues. The online environment makes the scholarly contributions of faculty member into their courses' pedagogical content more accessible to others. Who does the content and syllabus of an online course belong to, and what role does compensation in course development play? She understood that legally, compensation for course development means the course no longer belonged to you, which does not honor the expertise of the faculty.

Chapman agreed with Sikka's interpretation: legally, your course content belongs to the university. You can leave and take your course with you, but the course content can stay behind with the university and becomes its property. Sikka asked if faculty could decline compensation

for course development; would that be an option for retaining one's intellectual property? Chapman said yes. Sikka said this information could be part of the training info provided to faculty.

Moosally thanked the committee for taking such concrete steps in such a short time. Lyons said the committee had worked very hard.

Discussion on the Provost's plans for policy revision

Lyons stated that faculty would like clarification on policy discussions. The provost has said he will be reviewing policies quickly—which policies? What is the plan as far as moving forward this summer and allowing faculty review of policies in the fall?

Chapman said he cannot answer the question "which policies" as yet, because as he reviews policies, he keeps finding inconsistencies and state and system compliance issues. Deciding where to start is difficult. On the second question, Chapman responded privately to Lyons a week ago: he will start reviewing policies using the Academic Affairs Council. AAC will review, recommend, and revise policies over the summer and will present all policies to Faculty Senate in the fall for their review.

Moosally asked whether policy audit results will be made available to Senate? Chapman said no—he sees "no reason that [Senate] should know that kind of thing." We will deal with policies that come up, and some hit us pretty quickly. He gave the example of a failed Senate intervention in the grading policy (the request for a reason to be given to instructors whose grades had been overridden) that legal counsel vetoed due to possible lawsuits. Moosally said she understood that faculty might need to be better informed about legal implications, but she heard Chapman to be telling faculty that they did not need to know why policy changes were being made. Chapman said that he did not need Senate's permission to review policy. Moosally emphasized that the issue is not faculty input on doing a policy audit, but rather faculty input on the product of that audit. Chapman said the "product" would be the policy changes that emerged from AAC, and he or the committees responsible for rewriting policies would appear before Senate and say, "This is what we changed, this is why we changed it." Moosally asked if this meant no new policies would go into effect without review of Faculty Senate? Chapman said if legal counsel requires a change, they will make it. Lyons reminded Chapman about the Senate's motion on "emergency" policies—that FSEC should be informed of any policies that needed to be changed. Chapman said he would keep in contact with FSEC throughout the process.

Chapman says we have policies that haven't been written yet—the state 6-drop rule still has not been written into our policies. Moosally pointed out that information needs to be conveyed to the relevant policy-writing committees for them to begin their work. Chapman said he would "farm out" the policy writing to the extent that he could, if people on those committees were available over the summer.

Summing up: Moosally said her department's faculty are concerned about the provost's intention to revise the elected chair policy. She says it is now her understanding that all policies will await

review by the Senate unless there is some state-compelled need. Lyons said FSEC had asked for clarification about which policies the provost would address first, and that he now understood Chapman to be saying he did not know as yet which items would be prioritized. Chapman says the list of priorities for policy revision is in flux, as new policy problems keep coming to light.

Discussion of ORCA (Organized Research and Creative Activities) Policy: Dr. Anjoo Sikka, Chair

Sikka gave an overview of the process of developing this policy: the policy was approved in December through AAC, then revised in response to concerns from Provost Chapman, and Senate has seen versions of the policy a few times. She noted that the committee kept in mind the fact that UHD has minimal support for scholarship as it addressed Chapman's concerns.

The first change the committee made was a cap on the amount of money an award recipient could receive. The committee decided that given our restricted budget situation, it would be best to make the cap a percentage of the funds allotted. The committee placed the cap at 10%, which would currently allow some projects to receive more than the typical course release asked for. The current budget for ORCA grants is $80,000.

Section 2.3.4 adds language stating that the Senior VPA/Provost may reduce or deny funding. However, all ORCA funding must still be approved by the committee.

Section 2.5 contains the most significant changes, as it addresses the sort of product that comes out of an ORCA award. Findings from an ORCA project must be shown to have had an impact on applicant's scholarship as well as their discipline. The product should also be shared with the rest of UHD faculty.

The committee decided not to adopt two of the Provost's requests, and made him aware of their reasons. The first was the idea of giving priority to proposals that would serve as seed money for externally funded grants; it was argued by the committee that this criterion would be unfair to departments and disciplines where external funding is less available, and also that since outside grant monies shift with the political climate, there might be no solid ground on which to base the criterion. So they are making no changes to the existing criteria.

The second suggestion from the provost that did not get incorporated into the draft was the statement about chairs and deans needing to approve proposals before they move forward to the ORCA committee so that course coverage could be successfully maintained. The committee's concern was that faculty whose teaching expertise was not replicated elsewhere in the department would forever be barred from receiving course releases. Another reason for not adopting this particular suggestion from the provost is that since the Provost has the ultimate authority to deny funding approved by ORCA anyway, it would be best to have deans and chairs go through him so that the decision can be made by one person.

Sikka said the next step was for faculty to offer their input so that President Lyons and President-Elect Allen would know how to vote on their behalf at the next Academic Affairs meeting.

Bedard asked for clarification on a statement in Section 2.5 requiring the summary report be due 18 months from the end of the semester in which the grant was taken. Does 18 month requirement just refer to summary report or also to the "evidence of impact" mentioned later in that section, which presumably means the product has been published or otherwise made publicly available? Sikka said her understanding was that the 18 months referred to the summary report, but if you have submitted something, this effort should be referred to in the summary report. Provost Chapman said the key word is "peer-reviewed," and if something has been peer reviewed and accepted, that will count as "impact." He notes that some of the promotion and tenure policies would need to change to meet this standard, so that work that has been approved through a peer review process but has not been published counts toward promotion and tenure requirements.

Moosally noted that the language currently in the policy implies that it would be okay if a project went through the peer review process but things "didn't work out." Is Chapman now saying something different? The timeline of 18 months seems to presume that the award recipient's first submission to a journal cannot be rejected and then resubmitted elsewhere. We can ensure via policy that work gets submitted; Moosally noted. However, it is outside the power of policy to ensure that this work gets accepted. Chapman agreed with Moosally's point and amended his position: the intent of the policy's language should be that the end result of the 18 months should be a product worthy of submission.

Beebe noted an external grant he and Sikka submitted that got perfect scores but was nevertheless denied funding. However, he was in favor of the increased accountability now being encouraged by the policy's added emphasis on an end product. Chapman said that it is important that the small amount of money available be used to help push faculty scholarship forward and outside our walls.

Bedard asked whether this grant be used to set up longitudinal studies? There would be no way to have anything ready for peer review in 18 months if the project was designed to span multiple years, she said. Sikka felt that longitudinal studies generally depend on the next round of funding; still, longitudinal studies may not be the best fit for an ORCA grant.

Kintzele pointed out that even longitudinal studies produced interim documents that could be included in the 18 month report. Uzman added that progress reports made to ORCA would presumably be used to apply for further funding from the same source.

Sikka restated what she had heard thus far: the committee needed to clarify that the grant should result in a peer-reviewed product, but not necessarily in 18 months. Chapman added that the policy should also state that the report would come to him at the end of the 18-month period.

Allen suggested the part of the policy in question should simply be broken up: one section would mention the 18 month report and a subsequent section should state that recipients should say what they have done with the money in future grant applications and/or announce the project's completion/publication in some way. Sikka said she is not authorized to make that change

through her committee, but the change could be brought up when the policy is reviewed by AAC.

Farris said when she shared the document with her department, she received questions about Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3: must departments have ORCA committees? The answer was yes. The next question: does the committee need to be designated, or could some other body such as the Chair's Advisory Committee serve in that capacity? Sikka said the Chair's Advisory Committee would need to be specifically designated as also serving as the department's ORCA committee.

Spears said he would like there to be a requirement that applicants for ORCA grants state in their proposals what their previous grants have yielded; this provides opportunity for the kind of followup that has not previously occurred. Sikka clarified that Exhibit A already requires applicants to state whether they had received funding previously for the same project, but she understood Spears to mean the applicant should also state the results of said previous funding.

Moosally added that perhaps there should be language stating that the committee would review previous reports in considering new grant applications. Sikka said we should consider having an online repository of previous ORCA reports and products to make research expenditure more accountable. Sikka was not sure this could be added to policy at this point, but thinks we should move toward it.

Lyons said the conversation thus far indicates that the accountability we are now building into the policy amounts to an internal peer review process that can operate as such in the long term.

Sikka said that the Academic Affairs Council could make the editorial changes discussed by Faculty Senate if they agree with them; the document would not need to go through the provost again and back to Faculty Senate. Chapman agreed that all changes should be handled at the Academic Affairs Council meeting if possible.

Two more points: FAC already revised the elected chairs policy, and that is currently on hold until the committee meets with Chapman to determine if there are changes that will require broad faculty input. Susan Baker has done much good work as a former department chair in revising that policy. The Academic Appointments policy revision has gotten somewhat sidetracked, so Sikka will propose revisions to the committee herself and see what happens from there.

De la Pena's report on retention/recruitment efforts in Psychology Department
After the cold-calls last fall, psychology professors decided they needed to do a better job of reaching students. They got majors and pending majors on email lists so that event organizers could contact majors directly. He personally developed contact lists for students in his class to keep in touch with him and others in the class later on.

This group of professors developed a "Get Psyched" week and created a Facebook page and a Psychology club for those students who didn't have the grade requirements for the honors society. "Get Psyched" included a general mental health forum, a grad school talk, a student success talk on active v. passive mindsets, a careers-in-psychology event, and a research seminar

with 6 faculty members presenting on their research in order to recruit students to internships and special projects.

It was "a lot of fun," and it all cost less than $100. They set Oct 10-14 date for the next Get Psyched week and will hold a psychology club booth at freshman convocation. De la Pena talked with President Lyons about using Senate as a forum for departments to talk about what each of them is doing to boost retention and declared majors.

Lyons said that there are lots of things going on across the university, and sharing all this is important.

The activities of "Get Psyched" week tie in with the discussion on Senate effectiveness, as well as with High Impact experiences. Chapman said he would like all departments to share similar work. He said we are moving to get students to declare pre-majors at the new student orientation so that students come in contact with faculty members in their intended majors as early as possible. Other universities have shown that this boosts retention and graduation rates significantly.

Moosally said faculty are uncertain about when and how students can declare majors, and asked that faculty be informed as soon as these procedures are established so that they can inform their students.

Senate retreat and orientation

Lyons and President-elect Allen envision a Senate retreat to be worked on by a task force over the summer, to be held early in fall. They also see the first Faculty Senate meeting being devoted to an orientation on the roles and expectations of Senate . He called for a task force to develop a more concrete plan for these two events and communicate with Senators over the summer as the plans develop. Bedard and Schmertz volunteered. President-elect Allen said he would serve as well. Other volunteers would be greatly appreciated.

Lyons notes that this is the last meeting over which he will preside officially, but that senators should expect contact from him over the summer as issues requiring faculty input arise. He thanked Senate for working with him to make his presidential term an enjoyable process. Senators applauded Lyons for his hard work as president this year.

Respectfully submitted,
Johanna Schmertz, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English
Faculty Senate Secretary