

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Assembly

February 27, 2015

ATTENDANCE:

Anthropology:	J. Burnet, J. Peteet, C. Tillquist
Biology:	R. Fell
Chemistry:	R. Buchanan
Classical & Modern Languages:	R. Buchanan, W. Cunningham, G. Hutcheson, A. Leidner, A. Mastri, F. Nuessel, B. Ortiz-Loyola, C. Sullivan, L. Wagner
English:	K. Chandler, S. Griffin, P. Griner, K. Hadley, R. Heryford, T. Johnson, K. Kopelson, M. Markes, R. Mills, R. Mozer, A. Olinger, C. Petrosino, R. Ridge, G. Ridley, S. Ryan, H. Stanev, J. Turner, B. Willey, E. Wise
Fine Arts:	Y.K. Chan, J. Kim
Geography/Geosciences:	C. Hanchette, K. Mountain, W. Song, M. Walker
History:	T. Fleming
Humanities:	T. Burden, B. Harwood
Justice Administration:	D. Keeling
Mathematics:	C. Biro, G. Gie, L. Larson, D. Wildstrom, S. Young
Pan-African Studies:	L. Best
Philosophy:	S. Hanon, R. Kimball, A. Kolers, D. Owen
Political Science:	A. Caldwell, J. Farrier, M. Merry, R. Payne, L. Rhodebeck, S. Wallace, T. Weaver
Psychological & Brain Sciences:	R. Lewine
Sociology:	K. Kempf-Leonard, C. Negrey, J. Rieger, R. Schroeder
Theatre Arts:	N. Burton
Women's & Gender Studies:	K. Christopher, J. Griffin, D. Heinecken, S. Jarosi, N. Theriot

Andrew Rabin convened the Faculty Assembly at 2:05 PM.

Dr. Rabin made the following announcement:

- There will be a special meeting with Susan Howarth on March 6, 2015, at 2:30 PM in Strickler 102. Ms. Howarth will provide an update on the 2015-16 academic year budget and answer questions from the faculty.

Dr. Rabin recognized Dr. Beth Willey to discuss the Department of English's motion to allow English majors to also minor in Creative Writing. The department brought this matter to the

Faculty Assembly after discussing the issue with the Curriculum Committee during the Fall semester. The Curriculum Committee accepted the department's argument that there were significant pedagogical differences between literary history and criticism and creative writing, but was not sure how it could proceed with such a request under A&S unit policy, which explicitly stated that "Students may elect a major and a minor in the same department only if there is more than one degree program in that department and if the major and minor are in two different programs of the department (University Catalog, 177-178)." It was also concerned about additional catalog language establishing that "[n]o more than 40 hours in the major field may be applied toward graduation by candidates for the B.A. degree. No more than 60 hours in the major field may be applied toward graduation by candidates for the B.S. degree. No more than 80 hours in Fine Art (courses designated ART and ARTH) may be applied toward the B.F.A. in Fine Arts (2014-15 University Catalog, 177). The department argued that a precedent for exception to these policies existed, citing the fact that Humanities majors were, in fact, allowed to minor in Linguistics, which is housed in the Humanities Division. The department's motion was discussed briefly and approved with 1 opposed vote and 3 abstentions. The motion appears at the end of these minutes.

Dr. Rabin next recognized Dr. Nancy Theriot. Dr. Theriot presented a draft letter to the provost on the Faculty Assembly's behalf critical of the University's adoption of Academic Analytics. The motion appeared before the Assembly with the support of the following departmental chairpersons: Dr. Ron Fell, Dr. Al Futrell, Dr. Chakram Jayanthi, Dr. Tracy K'Meyer, Dr. Robert Kimball, Dr. Alan Leidner, Dr. Lisa Markowitz, Dr. Cynthia Negrey, Dr. Rodger Payne, Dr. Glynis Ridley, and Professor Elaine Wise. Dr. Theriot outlined several concerns about Academic Analytics, including, but not limited to the following: its adoption without faculty consultation; its costs being passed along, at least in part, to the academic units; lack of clarity about how the tool would be used; the omission of several significant field journals from consideration. Lively discussion ensued, including observations from the floor that the tool was poorly suited for evaluating the scholarship and productivity of faculty pursuing creative endeavors and/or translation studies. The draft then received several proposed friendly amendments reflected below. The final draft was approved unanimously. Dr. Rabin will forward the revised letter to the provost, who is requested to provide the Faculty Assembly with a response.

Dr. Rabin once again recognized Dr. Willey, who presented a report from the Faculty Senate. Dr. Willey discussed the following:

- SGA submitted a report to the provost about the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Initiative in which it outlined the following four areas as its primary areas of focus/concern: 1) space; 2) communication; 3) student success; and 4) academic initiatives.
- The University's Faculty Grievance Officer and its Ombudsman presented their annual reports (the Ombudsman's annual report for 2014 is available [here](#)).
- Part-time faculty voiced concerns about salaries and are working with senior leadership to address their issues.

- The provost noted that enrollment may dip as increasing numbers of students are opting to attend community colleges and then transferring to U of L. The University is seeking consultants who can help it recruit more international students who can help to make up this shortfall.
- The provost also reported concerns about the “gap students,” non-traditional students whose graduation rates are hovering at or near 40% versus the 60% graduation rate for traditional students.
- U of L was reaffirmed as a Carnegie Community Engagement University. The focus of the next QEP will be Engagement.
- The provost identified the following as areas of strength for A&S as part of ongoing conversations about the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Initiative: 1) internationalization; 2) sustainability; 3) big data; 4) urban solutions center; and 5) art and creative expression, culture.
- Sustained conversation emerged from the University’s recent designation of all faculty as “responsible employees” under Title IX who must report allegations of sexual harassment or violence to University Title IX officers. This means the student conversations with faculty members are not considered confidential communications; only conversations with Title IX officers are confidential. The Faculty Assembly voted to ask university counsel to address the faculty concerning these changes at a subsequent meeting.

Dr. Hadley informed the faculty that there will be an open meeting of the Faculty Senate about Dr. Willihnganz’s compensation package.

The Faculty Assembly also voted to have Dr. Rabin invite the provost to address the body concerning budget and salary issues at a special meeting to be arranged for a later date.

The Faculty Assembly was adjourned at 3:10 PM.

To: Andrew Rabin, Chair, A&S Faculty Assembly

From: AE Willey, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Dept. of English

Date: 19 February 2015

Re: request for English majors to be exempt from policy forbidding majoring and minoring in the same Dept in the case of Creative Writing minors.

We ask that the Faculty Assembly vote to allow English majors to be exempt from the policies that disallows majoring and minoring in the same dept in the case of English majors who wish to minor in creative writing. While housed in the same dept, we feel that Creative Writing and literary studies are distinct enough in disciplinary materials, expectations, and practices that they should not be considered redundant as academic programs. Based on the precedent of other departments which have been granted this exemption—Humanities with Humanities majors and Linguistics minors, Modern Languages with majors in one language and minors in another, Fine Arts with Studio Arts majors and Art History minors—we request that the A&S faculty Assembly grant this exemption for English majors wishing to minor in Creative Writing.

[ORIGINAL DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR FACULTY ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION]

**Memorandum**

**To: Shirley Willihnganz, University Provost and Executive Vice President**

**From: A&S Faculty Assembly**

**Re: Appropriate use of Academic Analytics**

**Date: February 27, 2015**

The faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences wish to formally report the flaws that have been identified with the Academic Analytics Database (AAD). These flaws, enumerated below, are so fundamental in nature that the database is incapable of accurately assessing faculty productivity. We protest the adoption of AAD by the University and reject its use for the evaluation of faculty productivity in any personnel decisions, including merit review and promotion. We also reject the use of AAD for program reviews, comparisons of UofL departments with those in other universities, and comparisons of UofL departments against each other. Our objections are noted below.

- 1) We object, first of all, that individual units are having to pay for Academic Analytics, without first consulting the units about the usefulness of this data base. Units should not be charged for this flawed product that was purchased without consultation with the units.
- 2) Entire disciplines and fields of study are not represented through Academic Analytics' supposedly "comprehensive" database. Additionally, in specific disciplines that may be represented, the most prestigious peer-reviewed journals have been omitted nevertheless from their database. To give just a few examples, the flagship journals for the disciplines of Composition, Art History, and Architectural History are not included.
- 3) Only journals with an assigned Digital Object Identifier (DOI®) are permitted for inclusion in AAD's journal list. This automatically disqualifies a significant number of peer-reviewed journals, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences, where DOI System subscription fees are cost prohibitive. Many of these non-DOI-bearing journals are, again, prestigious flagship journals in their fields.
- 4) It has been left to individual faculty to do the work of identifying the aforementioned gaps in Academic Analytics' database and locating the DOI for each journal (if they are used). Effort on the part of faculty to improve the AAD "product" is not a responsible use of faculty time, nor are faculty members being compensated for this work.
- 5) Any internal amendments to the AAD means that UofL will have produced a specialized, idiosyncratic database, rendering the whole structure (and rationale) of AAD's comparative analytics ineffective and useless. A UofL-tailored database cannot be used in any comparative sense against another university's (unadulterated or otherwise tailored) database.
- 6) Related to #5 above: Since departments cannot check to make sure all faculty publications are in the AAD, this data base should not be used to compare UofL departments to departments in other universities.
- 7) When measuring faculty productivity, Academic Analytics' data does not take into account the publication of book chapters, which are a common peer-reviewed venue for scholarship particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This is especially true in regard to research that is targeted to trade publications, anthologies, textbooks, etc. – scholarly

productivity that reaches wider audiences and bridges the divide between the academy and public community.

- 8) Related to #7 above: Since journals in some disciplines are better represented in AAD than journals and other types of publications in other disciplines, this data base should not be used to compare UofL departments with each other.
- 9) Academic Analytics' data does not take into account faculty teaching and service loads when evaluating the productivity of individual faculty and departments. Furthermore AAD does not take into account the particularities of teaching assignments that directly affect research productivity, such as course enrollment, course level, the availability of graders or teaching assistants, and the level of student and community engagement. We realize that AAD is not intended to measure these things, but without these factors AAD is useless and prejudicial in comparing departments at UofL with each other or with like departments in other universities.
- 10) AAD contains data on extramural dollars generated by Federal grants but not non-Federal grants and contracts. However, even with respect to Federal grants, the information contained is correct only for a single investigator proposal. On collaborative research proposals with large award amounts, the credit goes entirely to the unit (College/School) to which the PI belongs. This important omission has impact on the ranking of the College, the department, and the faculty's research profile when compared with other universities. Within UofL this omission will have direct impact on how resources are allocated across colleges/schools and how university scholar awards are distributed across units, etc. The lack of proper credit for co-PIs on collaborative proposals has been identified to Peoplesoft issues, which is not able to break down the grant dollar expenditures by co-PIs.
- 11) AAD does not consider engaged research in its calculus of research productivity. Since UofL is supposedly interested in engaged scholarship, it makes no sense to employ a database that does not even pretend to take this seriously.

[MOTION ADOPTED BY THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY]

### **Memorandum**

**To: Shirley Willihnganz, University Provost and Executive Vice President**

**From: A&S Faculty Assembly**

**Re: Academic Analytics**

**Date: February 27, 2015**

The faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences wish to formally report the flaws that have been identified with the Academic Analytics Database (AAD). We protest the adoption of AAD by the University and reject its use for the evaluation of faculty productivity in any personnel decisions, including merit review and promotion. We also reject the use of AAD for program reviews, comparisons of UofL departments with those in other universities, and comparisons of UofL departments against each other. While the faculty does not object to assessment, the flaws, enumerated below, are so fundamental in nature that the database is incapable of accurately assessing faculty productivity. Our objections are noted below.

- 1) We object to the manner in which the decision to adopt the database was made, that is, without consultation with chairs or faculty.
- 2) We object that individual units are having to pay for Academic Analytics, without first consulting the units about the usefulness of this data base. Units should not be charged for this flawed product that was purchased without consultation with the units.
- 3) Entire disciplines and fields of study are not represented through Academic Analytics' supposedly "comprehensive" database. Additionally, in specific disciplines that may be represented, the most prestigious peer-reviewed journals have been omitted nevertheless from their database. To give just a few examples, the flagship journals for the disciplines of Composition, Art History, and Architectural History are not included.
- 4) Only journals with an assigned Digital Object Identifier (DOI®) are permitted for inclusion in AAD's journal list. This automatically disqualifies a significant number of peer-reviewed journals, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences, where DOI System subscription fees are cost prohibitive. Many of these non-DOI-bearing journals are, again, prestigious flagship journals in their fields.
- 5) It has been left to individual faculty to do the work of identifying the aforementioned gaps in Academic Analytics' database and locating the DOI for each journal (if they are used). Effort on the part of faculty to improve the AAD "product" is not a responsible use of faculty time, nor are faculty members being compensated for this work.
- 6) Any internal amendments to the AAD means that UofL will have produced a specialized, idiosyncratic database, rendering the whole structure (and rationale) of AAD's comparative analytics ineffective and useless. A UofL-tailored database cannot be used in any comparative sense against another university's (unadulterated or otherwise tailored) database.
- 7) Related to #5 above: Since departments cannot check to make sure all faculty publications are in the AAD, this data base should not be used to compare UofL departments to departments in other universities.
- 8) When measuring faculty productivity, Academic Analytics' data does not take into account the publication of book chapters, which are a common peer-reviewed venue for scholarship

particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This is especially true in regard to research that is targeted to trade publications, anthologies, textbooks, etc. – scholarly productivity that reaches wider audiences and bridges the divide between the academy and public community.

- 9) Related to #7 above: Since journals in some disciplines are better represented in AAD than journals and other types of publications in other disciplines, this data base should not be used to compare UofL departments with each other.
- 10) Academic Analytics' data does not take into account faculty teaching and service loads when evaluating the productivity of individual faculty and departments. Furthermore AAD does not take into account the particularities of teaching assignments that directly affect research productivity, such as course enrollment, course level, the availability of graders or teaching assistants, and the level of student and community engagement. We realize that AAD is not intended to measure these things, but without these factors AAD is useless and prejudicial in comparing departments at UofL with each other or with like departments in other universities.
- 11) AAD contains data on extramural dollars generated by Federal grants but not non-Federal grants and contracts. However, even with respect to Federal grants, the information contained is correct only for a single investigator proposal. On collaborative research proposals with large award amounts, the credit goes entirely to the unit (College/School) to which the PI belongs. This important omission has impact on the ranking of the College, the department, and the faculty's research profile when compared with other universities. Within UofL this omission will have direct impact on how resources are allocated across colleges/schools and how university scholar awards are distributed across units, etc. The lack of proper credit for co-PIs on collaborative proposals has been identified to Peoplesoft issues, which is not able to break down the grant dollar expenditures by co-PIs.
- 12) AAD does not consider engaged research in its calculus of research productivity. Since UofL is supposedly interested in engaged scholarship, it makes no sense to employ a database that does not even pretend to take this seriously.
- 13) Academic Analytics does not currently recognize creative activity, including but not limited to, the work of faculty in Creative Writing, Fine Arts, Theatre Arts, and Translation Studies.

We therefore recommend that the University discontinue its subscription to Academic Analytics and request a response from the Provost.