

**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report
February 6, 2019**

The Executive Committee met on January 16th and January 23rd.

The XC discussed and endorsed the proposed name change of SIGS to the Graduate School. This requires only a change in name within the SIGS Bylaws and can be approved administratively by the XC. The XC approved updating the SIGS Bylaws to reflect the new name.

The XC discussed the impact of the additional week closed over winter break. Issues identified included concerns about effective admissions and advising could be; grade changes being delayed; more incompletes filed, requiring more work to correct after the break; tension on HSC between UofL staff and ULP employees. Recommend exploring a shorter option of 2-3 days instead of a full week.

The XC generated a list of recommendations regarding the parking strategic plan.

The XC began exploring the desirability and feasibility of the university providing Blue Books and Scantron test forms to all students.

The XC discussed a proposal to move the withdraw deadline from the end of the 8th week of classes to the end of the 7th week to allow more time for students to be advised and register for late-start courses. The XC was generally supportive of such a change.

Provost Boehm and Associate Provost Goldstein presented on Academic Analytics. UofL is in the final year of the contract and considering renewal (Cost will be \$130,000/year for three years). The Provost believes we could use it more effectively, especially for program review, endowed chair reviews, assessing outside offers, contribution of individuals to programs. The XC recommends continuation, but only for program review and not to assess the productivity of individual faculty.

Associate Provost Goldstein reported that the CPE is requiring us to rethink how we assess teaching effectiveness. Provost Goldstein has convened a workgroup of associate deans charged with proposing a set of 3-4 questions that would be included on all course evaluation instruments.

Submitted by David S. Owen

Addenda

Parking

Feedback for Bob Knaster and Mark Watkins regarding Long Term Parking Strategies:

- Sell the underutilized parking garage downtown.
- Is there an analysis on the difference between what do we pay vs what we would be willing to pay?
- Need to analyze and account for the impact (mostly negative) on our relationship with community if we charge for parking in evenings and on weekends. How much damage would we be doing to this relationship in the interests of generating revenue?
- How much data do we need to collect to make the red parking zones viable? For this strategy to work, considerable data will be necessary in order to accurately predict usage.
- Important to consider the university's values, which are not reducible to only generating revenue.
- Introduce a rate for part-time faculty for all passes.
- Parking garage where College Book Warehouse was?

Academic Analytics

The general consensus of the Executive Committee is that, if deemed cost effective, Academic Analytics could be legitimately used for program assessment. However, using the tool to make assessments of the research productivity of individual faculty should not be permitted as there are too many limitations and problems when used to assess individual productivity.

Specific Comments:

- It is only one measure of productivity, but how would it be put into context? What prevents it from being weighted most heavily—since it is a quantifiable metric—than other considerations?
- Lacks transparency to faculty.
- Potential for abuse (over-reliance, decontextualized use)
- Has disciplinary inequities. E.g. performing arts are not represented at all, disadvantages some humanities disciplines and scholars.
- Does not rank or weight different journals and venues, which is not consistent with how we holistically assess faculty performance.
- Measures productivity in the abstract without taking into account factors such as different teaching loads, research funding, travel budgets, etc. All of which our current holistic assessment of faculty does.
- Not clearly a positive return on investment.
- Used to identify individuals/programs that fall below expectations, but not to reward those that are above expectations.