

Faculty Senate
March 7, 2007

1) The meeting began at 7 pm. Seth Brown chaired. The senators introduced themselves and the opening prayer was offered by David Klein.

2) Chair's report.

The Chair brought four items to the Senate's attention:

i) Because the Senate has not met with Father Jenkins this year, an invitation was extended to him to have dinner with the Faculty Senate. Father Jenkins has accepted this invitation and a dinner/meeting will be scheduled in late March or April as Father Jenkins' schedule permits.

ii) The Chair made mention that he is sitting on a recently formed University committee that will explore how best to recruit outstanding Catholic faculty. The chair will soon send out a general e-mail asking faculty to report on practices (good or bad) that they have seen implemented during the interviewing/hiring processes for prospective Catholic faculty.

iii) As the new Senate will convene in May, the chair asked the current Senate to consider nominations for new officers. The nominating committee will be chaired by Philippe Collon.

iv) The current Senate has issued few formal proposals and resolutions this academic year. If a Faculty Senate committee wishes to put a proposal or resolution forward during the current academic year, this must be done at, or before, the final meeting (in April) of the '06 Senate.

The senate broke for committee meetings at 7:15 pm and reconvened at 7:55 pm.

3) Committee Reports

Administrative Affairs: Mike Etzel reported. The first issue discussed was the status of the Academic Articles revision. The floor was given to Charlie Barber, who mentioned that a draft of the revised articles was imminent. Discussion of their circulation prior to the April meeting of the Academic Council was not yet resolved. Barber stated that he would advocate their presentation to the entire Faculty Senate. Approval of the revised articles was originally slated for the May '07 meeting of the Board of Trustees, but this deadline is not likely to be met.

Secondly, it is the intent of the Administrative Affairs committee to put forth a resolution on the recently concluded ECDC review. The committee will draft a resolution when a formal report on the ECDC review is issued by Colin Jessop and other members of the ECDC review team.

Academic Affairs: Mark Dehmlow reported. The committee discussed their recent meeting with Dennis Jacobs regarding the status of TCEs. The meeting included a discussion of the move to an on-line format for TCEs and the advantages of using a multi-item measure versus a single-item (Question 17) measure for evaluation. Vaughn McKim questioned the mechanics of the on-line TCEs and how student responses might differ between a TCE completed on-line and one that is filled out in the classroom. The motivation for the on-line format was also questioned. It was acknowledged that on-line forms will clearly expedite processing and tabulation. Departments can also tailor on-line TCEs. Seth Brown pointed out that the on-line format circumvents a problem that can arise in smaller classes, i.e., the possibility that an instructor may recognize students' handwriting. Mark Dehmlow indicated that the on-line format is not necessarily permanent and that the move to on-line evaluations can be considered a pilot study.

Benefits: David Klein reported. The Benefits committee has recently met with Denise Murphy from Human Resources to discuss health care issues. The meeting focused on the prevention and wellness programs that are being proposed for university employees. Studies suggest that employers save three to six dollars for each dollar invested in such programs. As currently planned, employees would voluntarily complete a health risk questionnaire (*ca.* 60 questions) to provide a medical profile that would drive the selection of a wellness/prevention program for participants who are at risk of developing medical conditions. The committee has concerns about the privacy of this initiative since the employee's name and e-mail address must be provided on the questionnaire. However, the university plans to use a third party, possibly WebMD, to screen the questionnaires and generate profiles. Lifestyle coaches will then contact and work with high-risk individuals. As incentive to participate, the University will deduct \$10 from the monthly premiums of each employee who completes the questionnaire. Some discussion followed, with senators voicing their concerns about both the effectiveness and intrusiveness of the program. Linda Sharp suggested that the questionnaire is "self-selecting" insofar as those involved in high-risk behaviors and life styles are not likely to participate, while more health-conscious individuals will comply. Noreen Deane-Moran voiced a concern regarding the professional qualifications of the lifestyle coaches and their ability to direct a program that is suitable for each participant. David Klein indicated that the questionnaire (a prototype was distributed at the meeting) has not been finalized and can be revised. It was suggested that a straw poll be conducted to more accurately gauge the Senate's disposition on this topic. The question, as formulated by Seth Brown, asked the Senators if they had an objection to having the University move forward with the prevention/wellness plan. Seven senators objected, while thirteen did not object.

Student Affairs: Kelly Jordan reported. The committee is drafting a resolution related to the new graduate student health care plan. The resolution will stress that the plan should be comprehensive and be comparable to plans offered at peer institutions. Also, there are some concerns that some levels of care might be dropped in the new health care package. Hence, the resolution will state opposition to any compromise in the current coverage. With the assumption that better health care will attract better graduate students, it is the view of the committee that improved health care for graduate students is in keeping with the University's goal of improving its profile as a research institute. The health care plan is due to be unveiled in May or June.

4) Colin Jessop reported on the Academic Affairs committee meeting with Dennis Jacobs regarding TCEs. Discussion points included the advantage of using a combination of TCE questions for evaluating teaching effectiveness as opposed to question 17. The operationalization of ACPET, the Advisory Committee to the Provost on the Evaluation of Teaching, was also discussed. The perception that instructors may be inclined to "teach" to the TCE was also mentioned. The latest ACPET report recommended reducing the emphasis on TCEs in important tenure/promotion decisions. It was suggested that four other elements should also be considered: Course design, implementation, evaluation of student work, and student perceptions. (These are further expanded upon in the document "Evaluating a T & R Faculty Member's Teaching" that was made available at the meeting). In short, a department is expected to closely follow a candidate's teaching history for several years and use more comprehensive criteria for tenure and promotion decisions. These ACPET recommendations will not apply to SPF. Evaluation of SPF teaching will be done in a department-specific manner.

The administration agrees on the value of multi-item TCEs. During the meeting with Jacobs, the question was raised as to whether TCEs actually improve teaching. It has been noted that the number of favorable TCEs has increased along with grades. Dennis Jacobs believes that the review of teaching should be more transparent. Because of a vacated position on ACPET, a third

member of the Faculty Senate is required to sit on the committee. Colin Jessop nominated John Gaski. He accepted the nomination and was elected by affirmation. It was asked if there had been any student input on the new approach to evaluating teaching. Seth Brown said that there had been student involvement in the early stages of the TCE overhaul. It was noted that ACPET does not have a student representative. The question of student compliance on completion of the on-line TCE forms was raised. Colin Jessop mentioned that some incentives are being discussed. Yale, for instance, releases grades earlier for those students who complete their on-line evaluations

Colin Jessop also provided an update on the ECDC review. A Faculty Senate resolution supporting the expansion of ECDC is to be drafted soon. The ECDC review committee recently met with John Affleck-Graves. He recommended that the Senate should forward a proposal to the Provost after reading the ECDC committee report.

5) Old/New Business. None Raised

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Prorok, co-secretary

Attendance Roster

March 7, 2007

Present

Anthony Trozzolo
Carlos Jerez-Farran
Charles Barber
Claudia Polini
Collin Meissner
Colin Jessop
Dan Lapsley
Dan Lindley
David Klein
Don Sporleder
James Rakowski
John Gaski
John Adams
John Robinson
Kelly Jordan
Kevin Misiewicz
Lei Li
Linda Sharp
Mary Prorok
Mark Dehmlow
Michael Brownstein
Mike Etzel
Noreen Deane-Moran
Orlando Menes
Robert Howland
Salma Saddawi
Seth Brown
Susan Youens
Tim Schoenharl
Vaughn McKim

Excused

Al Miller
Barry Keating
Chris Beesley
Christine Becker
David Ladouceur
Gail Bederman
Judy Fox
Jeff Talley

Julia Marvin
Meredith Chesson
Nasir Ghiaseddin
Philippe Collon
Robert Norton
Tom Gresik
Timothy Ovaert
John Stamper

Departments without

Representatives

Theology
Computer Science and
Engineering
Electrical Eng

Absent

Peter McQuillin
Richard Pierce