Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
March 15, 2007

Present:	P. Bacdayan	M. Baum	C. Benevides	D. Boerth
	D. Borim	K. Curran-Kelly		Q. Fan
	E. Fisher	L. Forker	P. Gibbs	L. Goodman
	B. Jacobskind	Y. Kim	A. Klobucka	R. Kowalczyk
	K. Langley	R. Laoulache	S. Leclair	Y. Magrass
	H. Michel	B. Mikolajczak	S. Peterson	D. Rancour
	F. Scarano	B. Stevens	E. Winiarz	

Excused:	P. Currier	S. Haines	S. Krumholz	J. Leffers
	A. Mollo			

Absent:	D. Bergeron	B. Bouchard	L. Brodeur	E. Carreiro
	J. Fobanjong	D. Georgianna	J. Griffith	A. Gunasekaran
	A. Hausknecht	G. Koot	W. LeBlanc	P. Longo
	J. Marlow	B. McFarlane	G. O'Reilly	P. Owens
	T. Puri	S. Scott	B. Singh	F. Sousa
	S. Wang	H. Xu		

Guests:	A. Garro	R. Panofsky	E. Peacock	M. Taylor
	S. Lane	M. Carrera		

The meeting began at 3:40 p.m. in Group II, Room 227.

1. Approval of the February Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

B. Jacobskind made a motion to accept the February Faculty Senate meeting minutes as stated; K. Langley seconds. Minutes approved.

2. Faculty Senate Steering Committee Report

2.1 Update on Strategic Planning Groups

Provost Garro reported that at the strategic planning retreat, around 15 people per group performed SWOT analyses using the strategic plan from 2000. The Chancellor's update on the 2000 strategic plan was provided in her university address. The SWOT analyses performed were developed from existing goals that were expressed in the 2000 strategic plan including:

(1)   Recognition of UMass Dartmouth
(2)   Undergraduate teaching programs
(3)   Graduate teaching programs
(4)   Innovative teaching technologies

The Provost's web site (www.umassd.edu/provost/plan) allows faculty to see the results of the SWOT teams' reports. An entire set of objectives is now completed. Provost

Garro is aligning these objectives with the existing goals; the SWOT teams will develop implementation strategies from these goals. It will probably take another month to complete this task. Provost Garro will release the plan to the university community in early to mid-May. Further results will be placed on the Provost's web site (www.umassd.edu/provost/plan).

2.2 Update on Evaluation Process for Dean Peacock

The committee to evaluate Dean Peacock was charged by the Provost last Fall. Surveys have been developed and mailed out; surveys have also been returned and evaluated. The committee's report will be turned in by April 2, 2007 given that April 1st will fall on a Sunday.

2.3 Introduction of David Millstone, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

Postponed to April meeting.

2.4 Report from the Board of Trustees

P. Gibbs reported on developments at the Board of Trustees meeting. Martin Meehan has been named the new Chancellor of UMass Lowell. He appeals to both the UMass Lowell faculty and students. The Board of Trustees (BOT) approved two new doctoral programs for UMass Dartmouth: Nursing and Afro-American Studies.   The BOT also approved a 3.4% increase in fees for students. The money from the fee increase will be used to increase financial aid for students. Any funds not used by a campus will go into a foundation fund that stays with that campus. A student civic advocacy proposal is putting forward a higher education consortium meeting at the state capitol on April 25, 2007. Faculty are requested to give their students that day off to attend the consortium.

3. Committee Reports

3.1 Student Financial Affairs Committee (postponed from February meeting)

S. Peterson reported for the committee. A report from this committee was attached to the e-mail reporting the Faculty Senate meeting minutes from February. Two committee meetings were held in the Fall, one in the Spring. Lou Bianco chaired the committee; other committee members included: Yong Kim, Bruce Power, Carlos Benavides, and a student representative. The committee provided important checks and balances for student financial aid. P. Bacdayan raised a concern regarding the source of funds for the new financial aid available. No knowledge regarding the source was offered.

3.2 Instructional Technology Update

M. Carrera reported on changes forthcoming in WebCT. These include an upgrade from Vista 3 to Vista 4 that will simplify the interface for the software itself. (UMass Online is

providing the upgrade.) Training in Vista 4 will begin in April 2007 and continue through August. Where are we in terms of getting faculty to use Vista? How many people are using WebCT? (Users defined as the total number of people using each system.)

System	2004-2005 Enrollments	2005-2006 Enrollments	2006-2007 Enrollments
Coursebuilder	5922	4614	-
Intralearn	521	-	-
WebCT	537	5713	12,965
Total	6980	10,327	12,965

Intralearn was phased out in 2005 and Coursebuilder was phased out in 2006. 150-160 faculty are currently trained on WebCT Vista; 20 TAs are also tained on the system. R. Panofsky commented that approximately 1/3-1/2 of students enrolled use WebCT in their classes. Magali commented that the biggest problem with students is that they don't use computers configured with Java and Microsoft Word to be able to download documents from WebCT Vista. K. Curran-Kelly asked if e-mail can be broken out of WebCT and used separately on students' UMass e-mail accounts. M. Carrera said she didn't think so but that they are currently testing electronic portfolios for students to use in the future. S. Leclair asked if there will be any systematic assessment of the value of using WebCT in classes. Magali answered that there are no plans for such an assessment.

M. Carrera demonstrated an electronic program – "Turnitin" – that can be used to assess potential plagiarism in student papers. The program is not on the umassonline server but rather on its own server. Faculty need to go to the Turnitin web site, use their log-in name and a password to get onto the site. Four faculty are currently using Turnitin as a pilot test. Faculty can submit student papers to Tunitin or students can submit their own papers to the site. An "originality report" is generated with "code blue" meaning that the paper is okay and "code red" meaning that the paper has a problem. A problem paper can be opened; if the entire paper is shown in red, then the entire paper is plagiarized. When a paper is submitted, it is first checked through the Turnitin database and then through the UMass Dartmouth database to see if it was already turned in for another class. The program does a good job of checking papers against established Internet-based web sites. However, it doesn't recognize footnotes so you still have to check papers yourself. Turnitin works in languages other than English too. It can catch a paper that has been purchased. If a paper has been submitted already to another class, Turnitin will pick that up in the UMass Dartmouth database but it doesn't identify "who plagiarized first."

Turnitin needs to be taught to students to check their papers first before handing them in to the professor. Professors will be given a sample paragraph to be put in their syllabi regarding the use of Turnitin. During the third week of April, Instructional Development (ID) will teach faculty about Turnitin in the Library Browsing Area. ID will also email instructions to faculty regarding how to use Turnitin. Turnitin can be used in classes starting September 2007 although the start date for setting up accounts will be May 1, 2007. R. Panofsky commented that D. Milstone is worried about concerns of due process

if a student is accused of plagiarism. He plans to work with the Ethical Standards Committee regarding this issue.

B. Jacobskind made a motion to thank Magali Carrera, Tracey Russo, and Beverly Johnson for getting faculty up to speed on WebCT. ??? seconds. The motion passed unanimously. The financial support to use Turnitin from the Provost's office was also acknowledged by the Senate.

4. New Business

B. Jacobskind expressed concern regarding the softening of boundaries between the academy and the support services for students, especially with respect to grade appeals and other things that affect how we do our jobs as teachers. She remarked that the SFAAC needs to address this concern so that students don't contact department chairs regarding a grade they don't like in order to convince the department chair to "deal with it" or "fix it."

B. Jacobskind made the following motion to addressing this issue:

"The SFAAC should examine the boundaries between the academy and students where some university officers or administrators have interfered with established protocols such as the grade appeal or other processes that should actually be addressed by faculty."

??? seconded the motion.

Provost Garro remarked that established federal guidelines require some complaints to go to certain offices and not to be sent back to the faculty member. He elaborated that many cases are constrained by confidentiality.

P. Bacdayan offered a friendly amendment to Barbara's motion in the form of a question:

"Under what circumstances would a student complaining about grading take a different channel other than the official grade appeal process?"

S. Peterson suggested another friendly amendment to Barbara's motion, also in the form of a question:

"Do you know of an instance where a student has gone outside established processes and where they have gone to?"

Both were accepted.

K. Langley suggested tabling the motion and its amendments to the next Faculty Senate meeting. Q. Fan seconded the motion. The motion carried; original motion postponed.

Motion to adjourn. B. Jacobskind moves; D. Boerth seconds. Motion carries. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.