



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

**Bunn Intercultural Center.  
Georgetown University  
3700 O Street, N.W. (Box  
Washington, DC 20057-1057**

**Telephone (202) 687-7107  
Telefax: (202) 687-8295  
Email: [aoffei@georgetown.edu](mailto:aoffei@georgetown.edu)  
WebSite: <http://facultysenate.georgetown.edu>**

**MINUTES OF THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Wednesday, November 16, 2011, 4:00 p.m.**

**Leavey Program Room**

**(approved Dec. 12, 2011)**

**PRESENT:** Biesenbach-Lucas, Bloch, Boettcher, Buschman, D.Collins,S.J., Cumby, M.Danielsen, Davis, Diamond, C.Dover, H.Engler, Eshkevari, D.Gibbs, Goldfrank, Hyams, Iglarsh, Kertesz, Kirkpatrick, Leister (Qatar, 2 yrs.), G.Luta, McFadden,S.J., A.Mitchell, E.Moore, P.O'Connor, P.O'Malley, Pfeiffer, T.Potter, Rebeck, Sadowska, Schiwietz, Sheppard, Terrio, Toporowicz, Treanor, Turner, Vroman, Withy,

**ABSENT:** Anderko, Arend, Augostini, Bhanot, Byrne, Carter, Cohn, Colie, DeFina, M.Donoghue, L.Donohue, Dutton, Ecelbarger, Ernst, Evangelista, Federoff, Feinerman, Francomano, K.Gale, Gillis, Jung, Kessler, Kondratyev, J.Koons (SFS-Q campus), Lancaster, Lieber, Luciano, Malkova, Manuel, Mara, Marquez, McCabe, Mezey, N'Guemo, J.O'Donnell, R.Ortiz, Pishuvaian, Ross, Salles-Reese, Singer, Soldin, J.Walsh,S.J.(SFS-Q, fall 11), T.Walsh

**GUESTS:** Cynthia Chance (Faculty Records), Sherrell Williams (GMS Project), John Pierce (University Registrar), Artemis Kirk (University Librarian), Mark Muehlhaeusler (Lauinger Librarian Copyright), Salva Patel (Library IT), and Shu-chen Tsung (Digital Services & Technology Planning), Marcia Mintz (Assoc. Provost).

The meeting was called to order by Wayne Davis, Faculty Senate President at 4:10 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from Oct 13, 2011 were approved with minor modifications with votes as follows:

Aye	Nay	Abstain
18		6

Committee Appointment

Jason Brennan was confirmed to Business Practice Advisory Committee with the following votes.

Aye	Nay	Abstain
20		2

### Georgetown Management System (“Workday”)

Cynthia Chance (Director, Faculty Records) and Sherrell Williams (GMS Project) presented and demonstrated the system to the Faculty Senate.

A cloud computing system is replacing the current system (Genesys) in January 2012. The new system is called Workday (Georgetown Management System); it is a human resources and payroll system that has been used for several years by corporations; Georgetown University was its first higher education client. Since GU, other academic institutions such as Cornell and Brown Universities have now also begun using the system. It is not necessarily designed for academia but there are improvements that will be made as the system launches.

Advantages to the new system include a desk top reporting functionality available to administrators and Dept. Chairs, who can, for example, quickly categorize the manner in which staff and faculty are paid, and their appointment information.

Supervisory organizations are used to allow for business processes that begin at a lower level and move up the hierarchy. The current format of the system is, therefore, much more like a payroll system versus a human resources system. The University is meeting with other academic institutions using the system to come up with a system that has a much more academic feel. For instance, sabbatical status would show up as part of an individual faculty’s profile.

There is a self-service functionality that negates the need for paper work. Faculty and staff can enter the system and change their biographical information, back account, benefits selections, and direct deposit information, etc. This information (such as bank accounts) is confidential to the individual.

### “Open access”

Mark Muehlhaeusler (Lauinger Librarian Copyright Office); Salwa Patel (Interim Head of Library IT); and Shu-chen Tsung (Assoc. Univ. Librarian, Digital Services and Technology Planning) presented on “open access” and preservation of faculty research.

Princeton University’s decision to open up their faculty research to free access prompted the discussion here at GU. Mark Muehlhaeusler distinguished two separate issues. “Open access” denotes making publications freely available on the internet, which means the faculty member gives up publication rights and journals lose a source of revenue. Some journals charge hefty subvention fees for open access publication to compensate.

The second issue concerns putting published material in the new “institutional repository” for faculty scholarship. There was discussion of what types of scholarly work would be acceptable and how it would be “mandated” or implemented. Faculty raised the issues of the rigor of scholarly work uploaded; student theses and lecture materials were examples of potential “scholarly” work which may or may not be appropriate for this venue.

The advantages presented were that the faculty work would become accessible via searches

such as “google”, and that the library can assist faculty with maintaining some copyrights to their published work, so that again faculty work can gain wider accessibility. Mandating depositing of faculty work has significantly increase the visibility of some universities (e.g., Liege).

The Librarians were asked to perhaps provide training on the various resources available to faculty as well as more in depth demonstrations of the system and how it will potentially be launched and used.

It was suggested that faculty at large have input, perhaps via the Library Advisory and Scholarly Communications Committees, in making decisions as to what types of scholarly work would be acceptable and how this would be implemented. Who will exercise editorial control?

The librarians recommended that they be invited to come back to the Senate in early Spring 2012 semester for further discussions. In the meantime, the faculty was encouraged to go on the library websites <http://www.library.georgetown.edu/scholarly-communication-copyright> for additional information, and to contact Mark Muehlhaeusler at [mpm97@georgetown.edu](mailto:mpm97@georgetown.edu) for further assistance and input on this matter.

### On-line Student Course Evaluation

John Pierce, the University Registrar presented on online course evaluations to the Senate.

The University course evaluation process for the Main Campus has been delegated by the Main Campus Executive Faculty (MCEF) and the Senate to the Registrar. The Medical Center and the Main Campus are both currently using the online system in place. The Law Center and the Medical School use their own system and process, which is different from the Main Campus and the rest of GUMC. The University is in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of online evaluations, and it is using the same software that is utilized by the Medical School at GU.

The online evaluation system was approved by the Main Campus Executive Faculty to become the default system for the 2011-12 academic year with paper option still available. The MCEF also approved the online evaluation system to become the only system available in fall of 2012. The ultimate goal is to have one system, regardless of which system the University and the faculty decide.

There were 3 conditions set by the MCEF that had to be met for the online evaluation system to become operational. The first condition was the ability for the faculty to use the system synchronously, in class, perhaps on the last day of class. This option is available and can be used by next fall. The second condition was to have in place an application (app) that can be used on smart phones and/or other devices if the students do not want to bring a laptop, or don't have access to a computer in class. There is currently an app in place and will be available for use by spring 2012 semester. The third and final condition was that response rate remains at the current paper version rate of about 70%. John stated that research has demonstrated that the online response rate is similar to the paper evaluations. In the last 3 semesters of online evaluations, the response rate has been about 70-80% overall. However, when it is used as the default method of evaluating, the response rate drops to around 50%. John stated that if the faculty member is enthusiastic about the process, encourages the student to participate and conveys the importance of their input in course improvements that the response rate should be comparable to paper versions.

The issue of confidentiality with regards to the comments section was also raised. John assured the faculty that the comments would continue to be confidential; however, they would be a permanent part of the evaluation as it is stored on line.

For this fall, Faculty should have received an email to cue them in to picking an option (online vs paper) and if no option was picked by Monday 11/14 the default for the course would be the online evaluations. The evaluation period will begin about 7 days prior to last day of classes and will remain open during study days.

Finally, a new feature of the online version is that faculty can choose from a variety of questions submitted by faculty in evaluating courses that may not follow a normal course format. For example faculty who teach courses with labs or clinical portions could add up to 5 more questions more relevant to such courses. This option is new and has not been available in the paper format; it is viewed as a positive change on the online version.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

LE/WAD/jhg

*P:\FACULTY\_SENATEMINUTES 2011-2012\SenMin 11-16-11 (approved 12-12-11).doc*