

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**JANUARY 15, 2014
(Continuation of the December 4, 2013 Meeting)**

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Genovese, Goodell, Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Kalafatis, Karem, Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeldt, J. Lieske, Liggett, Little, Majette, Marino, C. C. May, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, Rickett, Sridhar, Steinberg, Visocky-O'Grady, M. Walton, Welfel, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich, L. Wolf.

Bond, C. Brown, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, McHenry, Sadlek, Thornton, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Boboc, Delgado, Gorla, S. Kaufman, Margolius, Meier, Rashidi, Talu, Vogelsang-Coombs.

Artbauer, Berkman, Boise, Boychuk, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Sawicki, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett, B. White.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M. She welcomed everyone to this extraordinary meeting of the Senate today to finish the unfinished business from the December 4, 2013 meeting and to deal with some new business that has come through the University Curriculum Committee and the Admissions and Standards Committee relative to the 4 to 3 conversion.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the January 15, 2014 Meeting

Dr. Goodell stated that the Steering Committee has proposed the Agenda for today. She asked if there was any discussion about the Agenda for today.

Dr. James Marino commented that since this is not an ordinary meeting to clear up Old Business, could we dispense with the usual reports, items II, III, and IV.

Dr. Goodell noted that Dr. Marino was proposing a motion to dispense with items II, III, and IV of today's Agenda,

The motion was seconded. Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote. The motion to dispense with Items II, III, and IV was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate needs to approve the remainder of the Agenda as amended with one modification from Dr. Bill Kostead, chair of the University Curriculum Committee.

Professor Bill Kostead stated that if everyone looks at the list of items from the University Curriculum Committee, the list actually relates to Health Sciences programs under A. 1. x. which is the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences. The Honors and Scholars Program was also submitted. Moreover, added to that list is the Post Bac for NEOMED students and

rather to take a look at the instrument and any other issues that faculty might have. She added that this will probably not be the end of the discussion.

A. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Student Evaluation Instrument (Report No. 33, 2013-2014)

Dr. Jeff Karem commented that he hoped everyone had a copy of the most recent SEI instrument. If not, he did bring extra copies.

Dr. Karem stated that he wanted to give everyone a quick update on the process of the review and the revisions UFAC has gone through because he knows this is a proposal that is challenging for a lot of folks. He wanted to make clear UFAC

instrument over the break. He is just mentioning all of this to let everyone know that UFAC is really trying to incorporate the feedback.

Dr. Karem said that he is asking for Senate's approval of this core instrument today because this is the first step towards approving the entire process. Following our discussion. He will report to Senate on several crucial policy considerations that need to be considered to move forward. Dr. Karem highlighted briefly some changes in this document since the last Senate meeting. UFAC is adding a "not applicable" option and made clear that these answers won't be tabulated. In other words, if the question doesn't apply, you are not forced into answering in a way that forces a statistical problem. UFAC added a "Neither agree nor disagree" option and scaled that with number 3 within the one to five scale. They rescaled final assessment questions away from an "excellent-

Dr. Karem replied that UFAC made that proposal at Senate actually last time and there was broad consensus that there needed to be an option in there for “Neither Agreeing nor Disagreeing.”

Professor Kalafatis commented that there has to be a box underneath that doesn't come with the numbers. These numbers may be thrown because that's a physical problem.

Dr. Karem responded that he does think that “Not Applicable” is distinct from “Neither Agree nor Disagree” and UFAC kept that in there for that reasoning.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that he shares a similar misunderstanding because he thought that at the last Senate meeting Senate, we were close to agreeing on a four-level scale where that basically “Disagree” was what was equivalent to “Not Applicable”. He reported that the College of Science caucus met and talked about this for another hour yesterday. It is not that they have a problem with the questions or even actually these answers as long as there was an expectation that no one is going to try to calculate a mean on the first twelve. If it is just the distribution, they are okay with it but the idea of trying to calculate a mean with that series is what concerns the College of Sciences.

Dr. Karem noted that Dr. Krebs raised a really good question. He stated that what we would calculate statistically has not been determined yet. So that is the next step and UFAC did not

Disagree”. Instead you have “Not Applicable” as another response but it is out of the calculations. You can’t separate that from the scale that we have here. Statistically, it just gives you meaningless results. Dr. Berlin Ray went on to say that it is not a problem in the sense that you just take out “N

than at the university level but this should be addressed. He asked Dr. Karem if UFAC

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE

PAGE

going in one direction and then the numerical tendency going in another direction which seems to her to be about as close as you can get to balancing out those two tendencies.

Professor Berlin Ray asked Dr. Karem how many faculty he heard from who teach on-line classes.

Dr. Karem replied that he heard from between five to seven people in the most recent round and one individual said “Thi

Dr. Goodell stated that UFAC is proposing a modified SEI Instrument with the amendments as proposed to eliminate “Neither Agree nor Disagree” and to add an option “Unknown or Not Applicable” to the expected grade and that this unified instrument would be used as a poll across all colleges.

Professor Karem said that he will need to discuss with Testing Services and college offices how quickly this can be implemented. He noted that Testing Services has said that if colleges can approve their expanded forms by mid-March, they could run with this in the fall but he doesn’t know based on all of the other work that is going on, if that’s going to be a realistic target point. When he talks about the policy considerations he has learned a lot from Testing Services. They met with UFAC for two hours and were

tendencies lie. He noted that country-wide, there is a lot more division on what to do with respect to comparing to your peers – there are some very different ways of deal with that issue. We need to talk about that in the future.

Dr. Karem noted that the good news/bad news is that before we do that, we actually need to make sure that we have a database that allows comparisons. At present, there is not a unified database for collating and comparing evaluation scores. All of the SEI information is accumulating in data-files in Testing Services. Testing Services, with a very small staff (they are working very hard there) is simply running data sheets through scan-tron machines and not assembling results in a digital data base. It is possible to calculate means or comparisons, as Professor Kalafatis suggested, but you in a

Senator Ekelman commented that one of the things that Dr. Karem hasn't mentioned is that years ago we developed a process or a procedure of how to distribute the questionair

getting grades lower than colleagues, then that case can be made. But he doesn't know if there is consensus as to how you could build that into the system. He noted that he has never heard any evaluation system that does that.

Dr. Lieske commented

budget doesn't distinguish between administration and janitorial services or technical support – all of them lumped together is non-faculty salary. So, you can imagine for every single year there is a large spread sheet called salary information. The Budget Office provided information for the previous three years which he analyzed and put together and summarized on the next page, "Findings of Salary Expenditures Summary." He noted that the first finding has to do with comparison of full-time and total salary expenditures. We have the previous three years laid out and you will see for faculty salary expenditures the approximately 80% of the total salary expenditures as related to full-time faculty and that number is pretty constant with the previous three years. Similarly the number for the previous three years for non-faculty is about 83%.

Professor Resnick reported that the next finding had to do with the total salary expenditures as a percent of the operating budget. Again, for the previous three years, with the total faculty salary, not full-time faculty salary and the total non-faculty salary, not full-time non-faculty salary and those numbers often trend in similar directions. They maybe dip down a little bit and it's hard to say if there is a

Senator Krebs asked if this does not require summer employment. Professor Resnick replied that it is the measuring year is over a twelve month period.

Senator Helen Liggett reported that this past summer many faculty got a notification in their mail box that summer employees that were not employed more than half time would be ineligible for health care benefits. Professor Resnick said that he is not sure, therefore, he couldn't answer Dr. Liggett's question.

Vice President Jesse Drucker responded that it is a standard notice that is sent out concerning anyone who is working less than half time. Half time or less is not eligible for health care benefits.

Professor Liggett stated that her memory of it was that it was explicitly tied to the Affordable Health Care Act as if this were a new policy and she wondered if that was the case. Vice President Drucker said that he would have to review that and he would provide an explanation.

Professor Berlin Ray asked for some clarification. For part-timers, in order to be eligible for health insurance, how much do they have to teach in a twelve month period? Professor Resnick responded that he believed part-timers have to teach eight credit hours per semester. His understanding is that it would be sixteen credit hours over the twelve month period. Vice Presidee(i) 0.2 0 0 0 sc q 0.24 0 0 0.24 281.959 413.52\$587.76 is thaitsc q c

forward, if we are thinking about where our resources are going, where they have been allocated, Senate needs to bear in mind where some of these resources have already gone. In previous reports from Senator Andrew Gross, we have seen that there has been shifts in spending from academic to non-academic. This is a different

added that he welcomes the chance to look at more data and not to look at phone books again.

Senator Joel Lieske commented that Jeff Karem did another great job. He noted that he is trying to figure out the decline in the number of tenure-track faculty from Dr. Karem's figure. It seems to be almost 450

Ms. Clare Rahm, Associate Vice President, Campus Support Services, stated that the information she would like to draw to Senate's attention was in the packet for the December 4, 2013 Senate meeting. She noted that at this point in time, she wanted to frame where this opportunity for discussion exists. There is a consultative process that is voluntary on the part of the university administration to seek from stakeholders their opinions related to proposals on parking rates. At this point in time, as she stands before Senate, she has visited with Student Government, she has visited with her Advisory Committee and she has visited with representatives from organized labor – SEIU, FOP, etc. She noted that Senate is the last on her tour of groups that she would like to listen to, the feedbacks provided prior to any consideration of these proposals by senior administration. So, this is the precursor for the point in time when Vice President Stephanie McHenry would make a determination as to what she will be asking the President and, in turn, what the President may be asking the Trustees to act on. Ms. Rahm noted that at this point in time, she wanted to briefly summarize what is in the handout which is a commitment to holding the white hangtag pricing as it is. What that means is that for students, the white hangtag is still less expensive than the rate we charge

year to the tune of \$400,000. He asked Mr. Tim Long if that is right. He noted that he is pulling this off the top of his head. Dr. Duffy asked, "Why are we raising parking rates if last year we were \$400,000 ahead of the game and we are ahead of the game this year as well? So, why raise rates and what do we get?"

Dr. Duffy asked, “The \$2 million was spent over what period of time?” Dr. Duffy stated that he didn’t doubt that the \$2 million was spent but as he remembers, the \$400,000 was in excess last year. So how do we end up with an excess last year?

Ms. Rahm stated that the timing of the year-end close was such that funds were available in the operating budget and hay5 0.2 (6o /Cs1 cs.04 cm BT 50 0 0 50 0 0 Tm /TT1 1 Tf [(CU) -0

Dr. Lieske complimented Ms. Rahm on collecting parking fees. He commented that right before Christmas he went to an event and asked the attendant, this was about 7:10 PM, how many cars had been charged the \$10 fee, and it was 68 cars so he imagined we were at least at 100 so that's \$1,000 and if you multiply that by 300 on a weekend, that could have been \$3,000. He asked Ms. Ram, "What's your data? How much are we getting?"

- 2. Proposed Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: (Report No. 38, 2013-2014)**
 - a. Psychology PhD Program**
 - b. Psychology MA Program**
 - c. Psychology PsyS Program**

end of this month, she is wondering, and perhaps the Provost knows what the time table is for the approval of transition guides.

Professor Kosteas replied that UCC is working through transition guides as they get them. He knows that that has been the case.

Dr. Teresa LaGrange stated that all of the programs that have submitted transition guides have been provisionally approved by the UCC. She added that those who have submitted transition guides, thank you very much. For programs that have not met and been reviewed by the UCC, they will be posted in Black Board and they will be reviewed but they are provisional. She added that they can't really communicate any final approval on those transition guides until they are sure there are not going to be any modifications to the programs.

Provost Mageean stated that in general, people are actually ahead of schedule of where they thought they would be and so thanks and commendations to everybody.

Dr. Lehfeldt commented that she just entered a department that didn't have a deadline until December for program revisions and then she turned in her transition guides by January 7th and she has to start training her faculty to do transition advising so she just wanted to make sure that she has accurate information.

Provost Mageean stated that they have to parse things out to get them through the

Professor Marino stated that the first proposal is revisions to the Math 4+1 Program regarding admission to the program. He noted that there are two significant changes. Under the old rules applicants took three out of four 200-level math courses in

Senators to vote. The Admissions and Standards Committee's proposed revisions to Admissions Standards for the Math 4+1 Program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**2. Proposed Admission Standards for the new MEHPE Program
(Report No. 41, 2013-2014)**

Professor Marino reported that the MEHPE Program (Master's of Education in Health Professions Education) is a new program and the Admissions and Standards Committee is proposing that they actually have admissions standards. He noted that it is basically a holistic process. This is a professional program for people who are primarily working health professionals already. To summarize, a student must have a completed bachelor or terminal degree; official transcripts from all degree granting institutions; a personal statement by the applicant describing previous educational experiences, alignment of the MEHPE degree with the applicant's personal or career goals and the applicant's commitment to completing the MEHPE as a member of a two-year cohort; a

Professor Little stated that her department voted on the curricular changes they made but she doesn't remember this summary. She added that they are a real small department so she thinks that she would remember. She said she just wanted to make sure that this wasn't a competing program in a different department.

Dr. Goodell commented that it has gone through the Graduate Council already.

Dr. Little again stated that someone should be able to tell her what department this proposal is from.

Provost Mageean said that if you had a competing program, that issue should have been dealt with in Graduate Council.

Dr. Jianping Zhu, Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, stated that the issue was discussed at Graduate Council and they had a similar program on campus.

any of the other colleges are thinking along the same lines.” Dr. Goodell asked Professor Little if she wanted to move a motion that the proposal be tabled at this point.

Professor Little commented that she wished that Dr. Liz Lehfeldt hadn't left the meeting already. She needs some counseling because she doesn't really want to sabotage a potentially viable program even though it does make her a little nervous.

Dr. Goodell reminded Professor Little that it is not from the CASAL program. It is not the Counseling faculty.

Dr. Little stated that it's not Nursing. Professor Little stated that she sees a lot of overlap in her program and their program.

Professor Marino reported that he will admit that the Admissions and Standards Committee only looked at the admissions section of this proposal and they looked at it very narrowly.

Professor Little remarked that somebody spoke to this. She asked, “Does the UCC or the Graduate College look at competitive programs internally?”

Dr. Jiaping Zhu stated that Graduate Council sent the proposal back to actually contact other academic units.

Professor Little commented that she doesn't believe her department was contacted. She added that as Dr. Goodell said, the Education College does not meet to

wouldn't be discussion in the Education College because that's where the proposal originated.

Dr. Little noted that as Dr. Goodell pointed out, they have some governance issues in their College.

Dr. Marino stated that he will forward the original proposal to Dr. Little since he has the whole proposal.

Dr. Goodell asked if there was any further discussion or questions. There being no further discussion or questions, Dr. Goodell asked Senators to vote on the motion to suspend voting on the proposal and passing it back to the governance structure within the college for further discussion. The motion to suspend the proposed Admissions Requirements for the new MEHPE Degree was approved unanimously by voice vote.

At this point, Dr. Goodell stated that Senate could now vote to end the meeting. Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady moved to adjourn and Senator Jim Marino seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel