

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

February 18, 2014

Minutes

Present: T. Hale (President), R. Beebe (President Elect), S. Henney (Secretary), M. Duncan, R. Johnson, J. Johnson, F. Khoja, J. Davis, A. Lopez Pedrana, J. Quander, R. Sadana, P. Simeonov, S. Koshkin, J. Herrera, G. Lund, S. Zhou, C. Rubinson, HM. Wang, U. Bose, A. Lopez Pedrana, M. Portillo, T. Chiaviello, S. Penkar, C. Stewart, J. Tito-Izquierdo,

Absent: P. Deo, K. Hagen, G. Preuss (Past President),

Approval of minutes:

Minutes of February 2, 2014 were approved unanimously.

Announcements

UH System Board of Regents will meet on 2/26/14

A&H has a Faculty Senate vacancy. A special election will be held within 30 days.

Future presentations:

- Jennifer Bloom, Senior Assistant General Counsel – OGC (3/4/14)
- Diane Summers, Executive Director of University Relations – New UHD Web Site (3/4/14)
- Dr. Bill Gilbert – Ombuds (TBD)
- Pat Ensor – UHD Library (TBD)
- Dr. Phil Lyons – UH System Summer Salary Study (3/18/14)

Guest: Dr. Bradley on Campus Improvements

Presented the aspirational plan for campus expansion and improvement. Also gave an update on the Main Bldg garage/Welcome Center project.

Please see attached powerpoint presentation.

Q: Why can't faculty park in the Vine St parking? The top level is mostly empty.

A: Yes, it is definitely underutilized, not sure why. We need to find a way to utilize it more efficiently.

Q: Why are the gates to Naylor periodically open? No parking was available there today.

A: Not sure.

Q: How many spaces in Vine St?

A: 500. Only for student use, if they have paid for garage parking.

Senator Cindy Stewart: Intellectual Property (IP) Task Force

Dr. Stewart reviewed the membership and charge of the task force.

UH System BOR does have an Intellectual Property Policy. All component universities are obliged to follow this policy. Anything we would develop would be subordinate to this policy.

Please see attached ppt for more detail on these important issues:

How does the BOR policy compare to best practices in IP practice?

- Technology and Copyright ownership: In contrast to the UH System policy, the UT System policy clearly provides statements for what is owned by the creator and what is owned by the creator. This is a best practice in policy.
- Current IP law states copyright derives at time of creation of content, not nature of carrier.
- BOR has a very broad definition of “university research;” ANY use of university resources implies that it is university research.

Ownership of online materials.

- If the material is interactive, then it functions as “technology” and is owned by the UH System.
- Best practices is to provide a clause specifically limiting educational resources. This is done in the UT System policy.

Recommendations:

- Provide a link to the System Intellectual Policy website from our website.
- During their next meeting, FS Presidents should discuss standing IP issues.

Q: If you want to own something, then you can't use university computers at all?

A: You have to be very careful. You want to look closely at the definition of “University Research.”

Note: The University still owns your work, according to this policy, if you do your work on weekends and with all of your own resources. It is an overreaching policy. The University owns all products. If you try to circumvent by putting everything on your own website, you risk running afoul of ADA requirements.

Q: So the minute you use your teaching materials for University, then it comes under UH System ownership?

A: There appears to be an exception for “traditional materials;” they will not assert ownership over traditional materials (written lecture notes, handouts, paper quizzes).

Q: Where do we lie on the policy curve regarding best practices?

A: Almost all policies are outdated and do not adequately address online education. Some big players—UT, Indiana, etc.—are very advanced in their policies and include the issues of online pedagogy.

Q: Does this apply to “e-products” like e-books?

A: The policy says they won’t assert ownership over copyrightable materials; once something becomes “interactive,” it is technology and thus UH System can assert ownership.

Guest: Dr. Williams: NSSE Data

This is part of our effort to select a topic for our QEP for SACS re-accreditation. The QEP is a major initiative and plan of action designed to improve student learning.

Note on interpreting triangles: The hollow triangles indicate a statistically significant difference with the control group, but effect sizes are quite small. We are not that different from the comparisons.

Be sure to check out the slide showing “Highest performing [items] relative to Southwest public” and “Lowest performing [items] relative to Southwest public.” These provide a snapshot of where we are doing well and where students report need for improvement.

Q: The “perceived gains” by students looks similar to many of our learning outcomes.

A: Yes, also derived from the LEAP outcomes, which influenced our own learning outcomes.

HIPs: We are a little bit behind in terms of percentage of students having HIPs experiences. However, the effect sizes are small.

Advising: We chose to administer the Academic Advising module. We need to focus on academic advising moving forward toward graduation. Seniors are not reporting the types of experiences we expect. Our first year students are reporting more involvement with their advisors than seniors.

Q: Has this data been sorted by college?

A: It is possible, but the numbers get smaller. A professor has done this in regard to HIPs, but there were no significant differences by college.

Note: Many of our comparison group schools (in the public Southwest) are residential.

Q: Wouldn't advising be easier in a residential school?

A: Yes, they are trying to compare our students to students with a much different experience.

Note: There is something called "intrusive advising," either by stick or carrot. For example, requiring students to get advised.

Note: Senators note that there is a difference between faculty mentoring and advising.

Note: Faculty interaction with students is specifically addressed in the survey.

Academic Policy Committee: Dr. Burnett

Curriculum support committee policy is on its second revision. A copy of the revised policy is attached.

The revised portions include: Name, Purpose, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, and section 4 reordered to conform to actual procedure.

Q: If you want chairs to be involved in the selection of representatives, then should written in the policy.

Q: Is the honors program covered by the policy? It has a Council elected by the Senate.

Q: Curricular changes can be submitted by the committee. What is the scope of the curricular control of the committee when other majors provide courses to their degrees?

A: Will bring these items to committee.

Adjourn 3:53