

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, November 20, 2014

Earl K. Long Library, Room 407

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM by Faculty Senate President Dr. Pamela Jenkins, who welcomed everyone and said that next semester the Senate will not be travelling as much.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators:

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Present
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Present
SG President	David	Teagle	(14-15)	Absent
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(14-15)	Present
Adjunct	Michelle	Esposito	(14-15)	Absent
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Absent
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Present
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(14-17)	Excused
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Ivan	Miestchovich	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Present
Education	Lena	Nuccio-Lee	Absent	Present
Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)	Excused
Education	Matt	Lyons	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Malay Ghose	Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolaos	Xiros	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Chris	Day	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Present

Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Pam	Jenkins	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Excused
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)	Excused
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Shengru	Tu	(13-16)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of the Minutes from the 10/29//14 Meeting

Dr. Payne moved and Dr. Schluchter seconded to approve the minutes of the 10/29/14 meeting as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from Faculty Senate President (Dr. Jenkins)

- a. President Fos informed the Senate on the following issues via email:
 - 1) The UL System Board Chair allowed President Fos to provide his recommendations for program closure until the last week in November.
 - 2) President Fos updated the request to the UL Board to approve the sale of the Jefferson Center.
 - 3) President Fos is awaiting the report from the Provost Search. He will allow the selected candidate to speak to the preferred candidate for the Dean of the College of Engineering.
- b. **Opening of International Center:** Dr. Striffler announced that the construction going on at the former Children's Center is in the last stages of renovation, and the International Center is due to open next semester. Funding is from private donors in 2009 (the Schlieder Foundation). The building will house several organizations. The grand opening and ribbon cutting are on January 20, 2015.

5. Senate Committee Reports

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee (Ms. Blankenship; see full report in Appendix 1):

Ms. Blankenship reported on Testing Services procedures, primarily Scantron issues. They have a new Scantron machine and problems need to be ironed out; one issue is the inaccuracies, the other is the format. The old report was much more streamlined; now we get several reports instead of one page. The program behind that is for privacy. The Digital Desk, Inc. website explains the different reports. There is some talk about going to fully digital online course evaluations because of the cost of and labor/time needed for preparing the print forms. Issues raised by the Committee included student anonymity and that faculty do not all use the digital form. The Committee's suggestions: (1) investigate how it is done at other universities; and (2) perhaps Testing Services could provide a FAQ about the new machine and how the Scantron is designed.

Dr. Roussev noted that there is nothing inherently digital about the anonymity issue; the big thing is that you have to make them do it in the classroom. Mr. Matt Moore said that he has lots of notes as he has probably installed five or six of these in his career. Dr. Seab said that he really has no problem with the individual score sheets, but he does think that there is less anonymity. The old system allowed him to put a made-up code number on their Scantron. Ms. Blankenship said that they could ask about that. Dr. Seab said that he also does not like killing trees to print 100 sheets. A gallery faculty member disagrees. She uses Scantrons in her classes and loves the new report. She suggested that maybe we need a range. And the students can have a sheet that they never could keep before. Dr. Seab reiterated that it does not have the ability to put in a secret code number. Dr. Zingoni said that the new report gives an Excel or a PDF version, and maybe there is a way to have it input directly into MOODLE. Ms. Blankenship replied that it can do that. She also said that Digital Desk, Inc. was the only company that said that they could meet all the data requirements. They are coming back and maybe we can arrange for people to meet with them.

Dr. Jenkins said that Mr. Moore needs a couple of volunteers from the Academic Procedures and Standards Committee to work with him on the calendar [re Faculty Welfare Committee report at October 29, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting].

6. Distance Learning Committee (Dr. Sathiadev Mahesh; see his PowerPoint presentation in Appendix 2)

- a. **Online Course Policy.** This is posted on their website ([University of New Orleans Distance Learning Policy & Guidelines](#))

Dr. Mahesh reported that there is the question of how we develop some standards across campus for hybrid and online courses and requested that we look at their documentation in SharePoint and comment on it. There is the question of class-size policy and what we want that to be online. There is the question of student ID verification, which is both a federal requirement and a SACS standard. How do we verify that they are the people that they say they are? Standards need to be developed. Lectures need to be recorded, and each department needs to put out its standards; there are some recommendations in the document. There are some questions about content and how to ensure that we cover what is covered in face-to-face classes. Departments are encouraged to come up with standards for that. There is the problem with ADA as anything posted online has to have ADA requirements.

- b. **The Learning House.** A contract agreement is being proposed with Learning House; it is a seven-year contract. The Committee has posted its concerns in SharePoint.

Dr. Beriss said that in terms of recording, etc., it is also important to raise the concern that the University needs to provide us with the tools to do our job; it is important to have modern computers. Dr. Mahesh said that the document makes a lot of recommendations about what should be provided. Ms. Blankenship added that they are looking at Camtasia and ordering more copies; they are trying to distribute them on campus and make a room where people can record. Dr. Beriss wants to be able to do it from home. Ms. Blankenship said that if one can open up a laptop with a Webcam, one can go into Camtasia. She also said that the standards put together last year are on the Global UNO website.

7. Discussion of Changes in Insurance Benefits (Mr. Ranzy Montet, HR Director)

Mr. Montet, along with Ms. Donna Roark, whom he introduced as the new Benefits Manager, wanted to remind us about this year's requirements for annual enrollment, where everyone has to make a decision on benefits. Mr. Montet said that Ms. Roark is unfortunately by herself and very busy this time of year, but there are other avenues from which to make our election.

The OGB Portal is very user friendly, with basically three steps: (1) "Learn about the plan": includes some comparison data; (2) "Getting to know OGB": a very valuable step that gives access to recorded webinars that talk about all of the different plans, five of which are with Blue Cross, and the sixth with Vantage; (3) Fee numbers. They have extended enrollment until Sunday, December 7, but Mr. Montet asked people not to wait and do it on that Sunday. There are also some FAQs on the second step. For Blue Cross, they have comparison data from last year to this year.

When Mr. Montet asked how many in the room on state insurance had not done their election, most people raised a hand. When he asked why, Ms. Phelps replied that they keep changing things, and Dr. Striffler indicated that he called the 1-800 number and did not find them very helpful. There was a question from the gallery if there is any way of confirming on the UNO website that enrollment was successful, to which Ms. Roark responded not yet. Mr. Montet said that they are sending a document of who is enrolled. He added that if we need Ms. Roark, we should go ahead and get a face-to-face meeting with her; she is very busy, and her last day to help is Friday, December 5. If we are applying for the first time or changing the level of coverage, we will have to do it with Ms. Roark.

Dr. Baxter stated that they have changed some of the coverage back to what they had before and asked Mr. Montet if he thought that this is the final version for what we will have to sign up. Dr. Corey said that she signed up for the family plan and was denied coverage after November 1; they did not know about the extension. Ms. Roark stated that the deadline was to make the election, but it is not to take effect until January 1; that did not sound like the issue to her, and she asked Dr. Corey to send her an email.

Dr. Mokhiber asked about the ancillary insurance policy for the deductible that we could have enrolled in in October, but that is no longer possible. Ms. Roark thought that he was talking about two new policies rolled out this year, and we can no longer enroll in them. Ms. Juana

Ibanez asked if she signed up in October, does she have to resign up to decrease the deductible and will an outcry help to get that other insurance that helps to decrease the deductible. [Secretary was not able to write down Mr. Montet's answer.] Dr. Jenkins said that, because of all that was going on at the time, we did not make a resolution. Many of our sister institutions did, and she thanked them for doing that. She has copies of their resolutions if anyone wants to see them. Someone asked if it will default to the HRA 1000 plan if we do not sign up by December 7, and Ms. Roark replied yes.

8. Update on University Positions/SACS update (Dr. Rich Hansen)

Dr. Hansen was pleased to announce that they have made an offer to Dr. Jie Chen for the College of Liberal Arts Dean, who has not given a written response but has verbally accepted. He will start sometime in June and will be here off and on for SACS matters. Dr. Hansen commended the Search Committee for their work. Three finalists have been recommended to the President and himself for the College of Engineering Dean search.

Dr. Hansen noted that we have received the SACS report on the outside review and have been found not compliant in 30 of the 90-92 standards. Some of them are real simple, with most of the issues around documentation that we did not provide. The three main issues: (1) institutional effectiveness; (2) graduate learning outcomes; and (3) distance education standards; we have to provide the same service to students off campus as on campus. There is nothing that he saw in the review that looks insurmountable. Dr. Hansen asked that we please give him some time at the end of the contract period to work on these issues.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked about the non-compliances, and Dr. Hansen responded that most of them are around that we did not provide the documentation even though we have the evidence. There are probably 25 that are fixable; actually all are going to be fixable, but the three that he mentioned will require work.

Someone asked if the Liberal Arts' appointment was effective in January, and Dr. Hansen replied that it was for around June 30/July 1. Dr. Jenkins asked when we will know about the Provost. Search Committee Chair Dr. John Williams answered that his Committee will meet the next day to assemble the survey responses and expects to make a recommendation soon.

9. Budget Committee Update (Dr. Schluchter)

Dr. Schluchter announced that they met on November 5 when the President gave them their charge. There are about 28 members. At the meeting, they discussed what they wanted to do in the future and decided that they wanted to mirror what was done on the academic side. President Fos asked her if she would co-chair the Committee with Dr. Gregg Lassen and Mr. McDonald. They met today, plus Dr. Hansen, and talked about future plans. They have an agenda and will be creating at least five subcommittees and tasking them to complete the process. The charge is to evaluate the non-academic side of the budget, develop a new budgeting process, and provide some benchmarking with spending compared to other UL System schools and our aspirational peers.

Ms. Ibanez said that the latest annual budget is not in the Library. Ms. Morgan thought that it should be there and will check.

10. Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) Update (Dr. Jenkins)

Some highlights of his presentation follow ([see Dr. Tarr's presentation slides](#)).

Dr. Tarr noted that President Fos will make a decision by Tuesday of the next week about closures effective in January. Liberal Arts had a meeting yesterday. There is a lot of anxiety about Category 3 (Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform). FGC sees Category 3 as a transformative place. For Category 4 (Closure), there had to be a 2/3 agreement. Provost Hansen added his choices to the list.

Dr. Jenkins spoke a little bit about the timing. This is the last Senate meeting of the semester. FGC expects to have another meeting before the end of the year, and they talked about having a Faculty Council meeting after the recommendations come out. She appreciates and acknowledges the work that the Committee did, but she found it very useful to hear Liberal Arts' concerns on Wednesday.

Dr. Striffler said that, looking at the Category 3 list, he cannot help but notice that if it was a small program in Liberal Arts, it was guaranteed to be a 3 or 4, but in Sciences a 1 or 2. It made him wonder if there was something problematic about the process. It is not clear what got a program into Category 3-4 so it is hard to figure out how to get out of Category 3-4. Someone then mentioned that Education is there with them. Dr. Easterlin explained that Education had started their own review process so there was something of a message that they wanted to be in the list. She said that she included different programs for different reasons and stressed that it is not true that people did not read the chairs' narrative documents. One difficulty is that we cannot sit here and talk about individual programs; these need to be separate conversations. Dr. Jenkins told Dr. Striffler that he has some really legitimate concerns and that they expect to have a method section in the final report. She also thought that the meeting that they had with the chairs in Liberal Arts' on what it would take to move to the second category was good; they did not finish, but it was a start.

Dr. Seab stated that the Committee worked very hard and felt that Category 3 programs were worth keeping; it was a positive message and a vote for improvement. Ms. Ibanez acknowledged that we have a budget crunch, and it is unfortunate that Dr. Fos will have to make decisions. Dr. Easterlin said that when FGC began this process, they were told that it was a budget issue and then three weeks later they were told that it was not. Dr. Schock added that whether we do or do not have budget issues on our hands, any decisions will not affect us for more than a year. Dr. Mokhiber said that in President Fos' opening remarks we were told that it was about revitalization, but at one point the goal changed. We need to know why it changed and how it changed. Dr. Roussev asked if any thought had been given to how the potential cancellation of some of these programs will affect the Carnegie classification and how we will look to the outside world. It is also not clear about the closing of programs' effect on departments. Dr. Beriss said that he has been approached by students in class, in the department, and on his Facebook page asking if they were going to be eliminated. Our PR campaign is relentlessly negative, and there have been lower enrollments year after year.

The Director of Alumni Affairs is already hearing from alumni about the programs to keep, discontinue, or cut. We need to consider how we talk to alumni and make them know that they

are a part of the community. Dr. Jenkins said that the narrative got away from them and that they need Marketing's help to get the right message out. FGC did exactly what they were asked to do; they did a review, but they had to do it in five months. Dr. Easterlin wanted to remind people that it is a program review/elimination, not a department review/elimination.

Dr. Hansen said that he really appreciates what the Committee did, and that they did a great job. What he sees is a three-year plan: Phase 1: eliminate some programs in the lower categories; Phase 2: review remaining lower-category programs and make them stronger; Phase 3: look at programs in the first and second categories. He did send a note to students and Student Government to try to help them understand what we are doing. Dr. Beriss said that if he were choosing a college, he would not choose UNO because he is afraid that it will not be the same college in a few years. Dr. Yaukey said that if we establish a pattern of letting faculty go without bringing in replacements, it will make it harder to hire new faculty. Dr. Corey asked what Fos expected, and Dr. Jenkins replied that he expected more recommendations.

Re the publicity, Dr. Ehrenfeucht stated that she never heard articulated our vision about what it means to be an urban research university. Dr. Watson said that if we are not providing that, Tulane will. Dr. Jenkins emphasized that Adam Norris really worked hard on this, but at the last moment it got away from him. Dr. Striffler can see that putting a positive spin on this is a bit of a challenge for Mr. Norris, but he cannot see how programs in category 3 or 4 are going to be stronger. Money is never used; it is always cut.

Dr. Jenkins concluded by stating that we will know more next week, there will be a Faculty Council meeting, and we have had a tumultuous fall. Dr. Payne wanted it on record that Dr. Jenkins has done a terrific job to lead the charge with Dr. Tarr and also to say that FGC paid attention to the details.

11. Old Business. None.

12. New Business. None.

13. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was moved by Dr. Payne and seconded by Ms. Blankenship. The meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014/15
January 8, 2015

APPENDIX 1:

Report from the Committee on Academic Procedures and Standards

November 20, 2014

Re: Testing Services

We were asked by the Senate Executive Committee to find out about some issues reported with Testing Services, namely timeliness, accuracy and formatting of scantron products, those being exam results and course evaluations.

The whole committee met with faculty who expressed concerns and posed some questions, and then a subgroup met with Amy King of Student Affairs, who supervises Testing Services. We met yesterday, so I apologize for not having had time to produce a nicely summarized and formatted PPT on screen.

The concerns were these:

Regarding timeliness, the issue referred to the long period between submitting course evaluations about a year back before getting the results. Amy explained that as being due to the demise of a long-used Scantron machine and the steps required in replacing it. Several months were spent on putting out an RFP, evaluating the responses and getting the purchase approved. That was followed by consulting on the programming, and in fact, some programming tweaks continue to this date. That long delay should not happen again.

Issues of accuracy we asked about included a failure to account for students with similar names, and a few wrongly labeled tests. The latter were found to be human error and thus a matter of noting the error and learning from it. The former is an issue of how the machine syncs the names on the scantrons with the enrollment in the course; the upshot is that if students do not include their student ID number on the scantron, there could be an error. So, include the student ID numbers.

Regarding the new machine's formatting of course evaluations and exam results:

The long-awaited first set of course evaluations to come from this machine lacked some information we were used to seeing, including columns for course and departmental averages. Ms. King told us that those will be on the upcoming evaluations, and that this had been worked out with the chairs.

Now, the new output does not look like the old reports. In the past, I am told, someone who conducted a scantron exam would, once it was processed, receive a single report with spreadsheet-style list of results, with all students on the one page. Now, they receive more than file. In one of those files, each student's results is on a single page. So you might get 150 pages in that report. Ms. King explained that this is done for privacy reasons. In the old report, you would have to cover up all the rows except the one if you wanted to show a student how their exam was scored. Now you can print out a page and share that with a student who wants to see which questions she missed.

That's the design of the package of the particular vendor's software, and we are told it's not a matter of reprogramming the reports. You can see examples of the types of reports generated at the Digital Desk, Inc. website: <http://digitaldeskinc.com/reports.html>. There are a number of different reports, including one that shows the results for each question and drills down into details like which ones people who generally did well nonetheless got wrong, for example.

More on Course Evaluations:

The course evaluation scantrons each semester cost about \$3000. In addition, they include a lot of labor. There's a six-week process of pulling all the info together, labeling, packing, sorting and delivering the course evaluation packets. Then another several weeks to run them, package and return them to departments.

So the issue is out there that we are doing some of our evaluations digitally, so why have two processes, one of which is costly and laborious, when we could do them all online? In our meeting, we raised the issues of student anonymity and participation - many departments do not use online course evals in faculty performance reports because so few students do them and any carrot or stick approach to encouraging participation has to maintain anonymity. Some folks might remember that for a few semesters, we tried raffling off a couple of iPods to students who shared their confirmation emails; some faculty offer extra credit for completing a digital course eval through the same mechanism. In either case, the student's evaluation is not shared but the fact of completing one is confirmed, and in a really small set of evaluations then it becomes hard to say we're maintaining anonymity when we do that. We'd like to see the implementation done carefully with research on other institutions that do all digital and no paper course evaluations, particularly on how they handle those two issues.

Suggestions:

FAQ somewhere online at Testing Services for faculty who want more information about using and understanding their reports

A review be conducted of other institutions who are using fully digital course evaluations to find out about their implementation, success in compliance, maintaining anonymity

-Elizabeth Blankenship

APPENDIX 2:

Distance Learning Committee

2014 Report

Master Services Agreement with The Learning House

- Seven Year Contract to manage online courses
- Concerns:
 - Total contract value - 50% of online program tuition and \$125 fee on any student in online course (changes)
 - Seven Year term - very long term in view of rapid technology evolution in IT - we have no idea of the online scenario seven years out
 - What do they provide? Training for faculty and content formatting. Can be done by us in-house, with focused teams
 - Use of Moodlerooms and the TLH site. We end up with two LMS.
 - Grade Data privacy with external site and UNO's liability.
 - Content ownership: At what point does their formatting take over our content.

Online Course Policy

- Wide variety of content/format/delivery standards across campus
 - need to streamline delivery to (i) ensure adherence to standards (ii) faculty course management (iii) competitive marketplace
- Online class size policy - Do we provide MOOCs or focused hybrid/online courses?
- Standard for student ID verification (attendance certificate for Federal and SACS standards)
- Lecture recording - standard to ensure lecture audio/video quality
- Content - ensure online content matches 37.5 hour f-t-f (faculty conduct)
- Accessibility guidelines under ADA
- Faculty office hours online + presence on campus