

FACULTY SENATE MEETING Minutes

May 2nd, 2019

3-5:00pm

Lib 206

Prepared by: Glaucia Silva

Members Present:

	Present		Present		Present
Dilshod Achilov		Cathy Gardner	X	Chad McGuire	
Scott Ahrtens	X	Michael Goodman	X	Cristina Mehtens	
Nick Anguelov		Karen Gulbrandsen	X	Ziddi Msangi	
Robin Arkerson	X	Adam Hausknecht		Molly O'Brien	
Brian Ayotte	X	Alfa Heryudono		Aminda O'Hare	X
Paul Bacdayan		Shannon Jenkins		Grant O'Rielly	X
Carlos Benavides		Arpita Joardar		Chandra Orrill	
Michelle Bowers		Shakhnoz Kayumova	X	Ricardo Rosa	
Eric Casero		Marni Kellogg	X	Doug Roscoe	
Ralph Clifford	X	Guarav Khanna	X	Frank Scarano	X
Antonio Costa	X	Saeja Kim	X	Monika Schuler	X
Geoff Cowles		Anna Klobucka	X	Amit Tandon	
Cathy Curran		Hilary Kraus	X	Jennifer Viveiros	X
Rob Darst		Jonathan Kush	X	Stephen Witzig	X
Ana Dempsey		Eric Larson			
Chris Eisenhart	X	Wayne LeBlanc			
Shari Evans		Elizabeth Lehr			
Rebecca Flanagan		Crystal Lubinsky			
Jennifer Fugate	X	David Manke	X		

15 GUESTS:

Mohammad Karim, Provost

Kathy Carter, Interim Dean of CCB

Chan Du, Associate Dean of CCB
Terrance Burton, Dean of Library
Magali Carrera, Associate Provost
Tsfay Meressi, Associate Provost of Graduate Studies
Marguerite Zarrillo, Ram Bala, Jay Wang, Karen Barnett, Chancellor Johnson

FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA
May 2, 2019 -- 3:00pm-5:00pm, LIB 206

- Call to Order - 3:00
 - Welcome to final meeting of year, first meeting of incoming cohort of Senators. 2/3 continue on. Only active Senators in AY 19/20 can vote.
- Review and approval of minutes from the April meeting (3:05): Wayne Leblanc motions, Grant O’Rielly seconds--approved
- President’s Report
 - Forum with President Meehan. Overview for vision of online college, which doesn’t include us. Several concerns were raised, good turnout; only forum open to the public in the UMass system. About 150 attendees; they left impressed by our engagement, but there’s no reason to believe that our feedback will change anything. After next BOT meeting the IFC will discuss whether to issue a statement. Advisory council was mentioned, not clear what form that body would take. It was made clear that students admitted to online college wouldn’t necessarily be qualified to be admitted to any existing UMass campus.

Senate elections involves Qualtrics. University security requirements made the process challenging and some emails may have ended up in Spam folder.

- Election of Senate Officers for AY 19/20 (3:09): Today’s election being overseen by Senators Achilov (PSC) and McGuire (POL).

Ballots are now being circulated; senators have to sign in to receive ballots. Instant runoff of voting system. Rank candidates for each position. Will count votes based on first majority; if anyone gets 50%+1 of the votes, they get elected, etc.

- Report from the University Curriculum Committee (3:20-3:40)
 - Professor Spencer Ladd: accepted and approved everything. Summary of approvals:

- 11/5/18: Honors College full proposal. Initially not approved, revisions asked; approved revised version.
- 12/7/18: NUR 105 Human Nutrition to BIO: approved. UNV 101, discussion of faculty evaluations. All year discussion about College Now, UNV 101 and review of faculty teaching.
- 12/20/18: new academic program submission: Interior Architecture + Design. Approved via consensus vote. No revisions required.
- 2/28/19: Honors College. UCC review: approval is contingent on a clear plan for staffing Honors courses in a financially appropriate manner.
- 4/2/19: New minor: Global Health, presented by Dean of Nursing. Approved via consensus vote.
- 4/17/19: Minor proposal in Data Analytics. Consensus vote, no significant revision requested. CON, intent to realign new academic units. Approved by consensus vote.
- 5/1/19: UNV 101. Motion 1: The UCC finds that UNV 101, as currently offered by College Now program, satisfies relevant academic and accreditation requirements and warrants 3 credits. Motion 2: College Now recently established a faculty advisory council composed of 6 full time faculty and one administrator. They have committed to working with UCC to ensure that the evaluation of the instruction of any credit bearing courses offered by College Now will be overseen by UCC. UCC finds that this arrangement satisfies relevant academic and accreditation requirements. Motion 3: assuming motion 1 is approved, the UCC finds that sections of UNV 101 that are not associated with equivalent counseling and support services to those provided by College Now does not satisfy relevant academic and accreditation requirements and accordingly any such sections would not be sufficient to meet the 3 credit hour standard .
 - Motion to affirm UCC recommendation for Motion 1: Moved by Grant O’Rielly, seconded by Beth Lehr. Approved.
 - Motion to affirm recommendation for UCC Motion 2: Moved by Anna Klobucka, seconded by Adam Hausknecht. Approved
 - Motion to affirm recommendation for UCC Motion 3: Moved by Beth Lehr, seconded by Frank Scarano. Approved.
 - Proposed transfer of Med Lab Sciences has not been discussed by Faculty Senate; UCC reviewed matter, faculty were surveyed and were in favor of transfer. Adam H moves approval, Anna K seconds. Approved.

- Report from the Student Course Rating Committee (3:40- 4:00pm)
 - Professor Ken Manning (report was sent to Senators prior to meeting).
 - MG: We will not be voting on this matter today. Opportunity to discuss what the committee has been learning.
 - KM: update of progress given during prior meeting. Committee consists of 6 members, 3 admin, 3 faculty. Met almost every week during the semester. Follow through on 2009 charge in the CBA. Recommendations: new questions (n=11+2). Two open-ended questions at the end. Questions have been group into course design and assessment, instructional practices, and course impact. Of the 10 current questions, five are effectively restated. Looked at questions that are utilized in a number of universities; great overlap in nature of questions. Also identified questions that had reliability and validity data available (n=7).
 - Currently, direction is from negative to positive. Recommend to continue with this direction, but somewhat agnostic about it. Maybe go in the other direction. If we go online it would be easier to invert direction. Standard is from better to worse; we are outliers.
 - How are evaluations used? They tell us something, but not everything. How do we use this data and what does it tell us about teaching performance? They should be looked at but not weight too heavily. They have value about student feedback, but student feedback is subject to bias, including capturing information about instructor likability as opposed to performance. Also, comparing scores is often of very dubious value, at best. Data can be misused and mishandled. Data have less utility in providing information on student learning than in instructor job performance.
 - Delivery method: some universities use online, some use paper. Potential problem with online delivery is response rate, which is much lower than pencil and paper evaluations. Thomas Ladd reported that a test effort in his college to try online evaluations resulted in a steep decline in their response rate, which would lead to data of limited utility. Some research suggests that low response rate in online evaluations can be overcome. UMass Amherst has implemented student course evaluations online and they and other universities have useful recommendations for increasing response rate. But efforts may not be successful, and have the potential to make course evaluations significantly more burdensome for instructor and/or student.
 - Two key issues: getting data quality; using data properly. If one of those is messed up, disservice is done. We need to test online methodology first.
 - David Manke: do other universities use the same scale? Yes. DM: bothered by no strong opinion. A 4-point scale would be better. Another concern is

comparing faculty. Without context, comparisons are invalid. KM: that's why one has to take the data with a grain of salt. Doesn't disagree.

- Question: could set aside 10 minutes to do online evaluations in class. KM: there may be an issue of anonymity. Follow up: students currently receive email from UE, not from faculty member. MG: in their department what does the trick is to announce in myCourses.
 - Saeja Kim: were all the questions accepted? KM: no. SK: chairs don't assign courses to instructors that are not well prepared. KM: if we do nothing, we will still have the old questions. New ones may not be perfect, but Senate may discuss whether they are better.
 - MG: how did UMass Amherst assess validity? KM: doesn't know.
 - Susan Krumholz: this is the beginning of the work. KM: this is a recommendation. If we can't agree, 10 questions remain. Deliberations should begin; committee feels that suggestions are improvement.
 - MG: next step: refer matter to Federation? Cathy Curran: contract expires in July 2020. Beginning negotiations on new one. There is requirement in new CBA that new questions be validated. Negotiation team will look at it. Ultimately will have to be voted on and approved; Faculty Senate will have the opportunity to review the matter before any final decisions are made.
 - Adam H. Perhaps the wording may or may not be changed. At what point would we consider wording of questions? MG: any time after today.
 - Jennifer Fugate: maybe could move on the deliberation of mode of delivery and then content.
 - Cathy Curran: should there be two surveys, one for fully online and one for fully face-to-face?
 - KM: some universities only have open-ended, others only multiple choice.
 - Kathy Miraglia: there is inherent bias in any of this. How do we test for bias? (students taking course as requirement, others as elective, etc). MG: could sort instructors by category.
 - Susan K: some of the best models ask students what grade they expect in class.
 - Viviane S-H: expected grade would also help address degree of difficulty.
 - Adam H: double-listed and triple-listed courses. Grad/undergrad courses pose particular problems.
 - MG: there's a lot more to be discussed. In parallel to discussion about how to measure teaching performance quantitatively, we need to discuss other ways to assess it.
 - Adam H: used to serve on university committee. Knew that a particular dean was trying to predict how a faculty member would teach based on two data points.
- Election results:
 - President: 34 votes; 32 for MG

- BOT rep: Grant: 19/33; Ralph Clifford for alternate
- Social Sciences: Jennifer Fugate
- Natural Sciences: Saeja Kim
- Business: Cathy Curran
- Engineering: Grant O’Rielly
- CVPA: Anna Dempsey
- Library: Hilary Kraus
- Law/SMAST/Education: Chandra Orrill
- Humanities: Elizabeth Lehr
- Nursing: Jennifer Viveiros
- Recognition of Emeritus faculty (4:00-4:15pm)
 - MG invites Chancellor Johnson to present recognitions:
 - Susan Krumholz (present), Marguerite Zerillo (present), Heather Miller (absent), Judith Sims-Knight (absent)
- Other Business – If needed (4:45-5:00pm) Meeting adjourned at 4:15