

10-26-2007

2007-10-26 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2007-10-26 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2007). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 2.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/2

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

[Approved December 14, 2007]

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 26, 2007

KU West Ballroom, 3:00 P. M.

Senators Present: D. Biers (presiding), C. Bowman, A. Brian, L. Cook, R. Crum, D. Darrow, G. DeMarco, G. Doyle, C. Duncan, A. Fist, R. Frasca, E. Gustafson, A. Jipson, P. Johnson, J. King, R. Larson, T. Lasley, L. Laubach, R. Marak, M. Moss, J. O'Gorman, M. Patterson, R. Penno, Y. Raffoul, D. Sink, L. Snyder, T. Stevens, T. Sutter, R. Wells

Senators Excused: P. Benson, W. Diestelkamp, T. Eggemeier, R. Kearns, L. Kloppenberg, C. Letevac, F. Pestello, D. Poe, J. Saliba, A. Seielstad

Guests: D. Bickford, T. Skill, J. Untener, D. Wright, T. Westendorf, K. Webb, K. Bull, J. Farrelly

1. Opening Prayer: Senator Darrow opened the meeting with prayer.

2. Roll Call: Twenty-nine of thirty-nine Senators were present.

3. Minutes: September 14, 2007: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved.

4. Announcements: D. Biers announced that while the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees unanimously approved the University Promotion and Tenure Policy, the document was tabled at the meeting of the full Board. It had not been distributed to all members in advance of the meeting. It will be voted on at the January meeting. Elections for the University committee that is stipulated by the policy may be held before January so that, given final approval, the University can immediately begin implementing the policy.

5. Report on the Student notebook Initiative:

T. Skill provided the Academic Senate with an update on the student computer requirement. The Academic Senate has responsibility for the academic oversight of the requirement. D. Wright and K. Bull were also present. He acknowledged them for the work they do in relation to this requirement. He reviewed the history of the computer requirement which began in 1999 and which became a notebook requirement in 2003. He reviewed the progress made by UD faculty and students in the use of technology for instructional purposes, making use of information obtained through surveys of both faculty and students. The discussion that is currently taking place will result in a modification of the implementation of the requirement in the Fall 2009. What is proposed is that students will bring their own units based on minimum requirements provided by the University. This will require changes in process for protecting the UD infrastructure, in software distribution and support, and in hardware service. It will also require faculty to work with students who have a wider range of computers with varying capabilities. Academic programs will need to articulate clear hardware requirements. Final decisions will be made by January 1, 2008. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

- It was asked if the decision to be made was not if, but how to make this change, and if changing vendors had been considered. Skill responded that it was the case that the decision to have students provide their own computer had been made. The decision to change the manner of implementing the requirement is related to the perceived and real added cost of attendance. Analysis suggests that a change in vendor would not reduce this problem and might well diminish the service.
- It was asked if UD should be in the business of repair once this change is made. Skill noted that we need to recognize the struggle students would have in accessing repair service if they have purchased the machine from someone distant from Dayton. He suggested that a focus on major brand machines might enable UD to provide service for limited types of machines.
- It was asked if UD has looked at how other institutions manage these issues. Skill provided copies of a detailed report on the notebook requirement that does include such information.
- It was asked if it would be possible for UD to sell service contracts. Skill indicated some difficulties of such an approach. He noted that the expectation is that there will be more Mac users than currently and that that poses some complications. UD will continue to use Novell network functionality.
- It was noted that this may be so complicated that the frustration and extra effort may offset the perceived saving for parents.
- Students on the Academic Senate indicated that they think the proposal is a good idea but want on-campus support for hardware problems. Skill indicated that he will meet with SGA to discuss the proposal.

D. Biers expressed the thanks of the Academic Senate for the report.

[6. Doc-07-01 Changing reporting of “grade in progress” from “P” to “IP”](#)

The Academic Policies Committee and the Student Academic Policies Committee both recommend the proposed change. This will hopefully eliminate confusion in submitting grades. Currently, a ‘P’ is sometimes understood to mean “pass” and is submitted when an ‘S’ for “satisfactory should be submitted. The Academic Senate voted using legislative authority and set out in Article II. B. 1.d. of the Senate Constitution. The vote was 29 for, 0 against, with no abstentions.

[7. Doc 06-11 Review of Tenured Faculty, Senate Discussion:](#)

The Faculty Affairs Committee is working on the development of this document. The first section of that document, “Foundation and Philosophy” was presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for review at their October meeting. Senators Doyle and Wells presented that portion of the document to the Academic Senate. It was noted that the emphasis of FACAS has been on the professional responsibility for such review remaining under faculty control and with the articulation of a developmental, not an evaluative, process. The presentation was followed by questions and comments:

- What is the deficiency in the current annual review process that makes this necessary? Is it simply duplication? Some annual review processes are developmental as well as evaluative. It was suggested that annual reviews rarely involve peer participation and focus primarily on evaluation.
- It was suggested that this would be redundant because sabbatical applications call for peer review. It was noted that what is called for is peer review of the application but not of the faculty member’s teaching, research, and serve accomplishments and goals.
- It was asked if such a review would include review of teaching and classroom skills. It was suggested that the review would need to look at teaching, research, and service. The particularities of each faculty member would need to be taken into account. Some faculty teach more, others do more research. This can change over a career for individual faculty. The hope is that a process will emerge that will look at each individual in the context of a particular department as well as in the University context.
- It was asked why the word “tenure” is in the title of the document, since the process does not seem to have anything to do with tenure. Wasn’t the intent of the Board in asking for the implementation of

post-tenure review to identify faculty who might be removed? Moreover, doesn't this approach assume a level of collegial civility that while a hope, is not a reality. Will faculty really conduct consultations with thoroughness since they will need to continue to work with colleagues? It was noted that the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board has indicated that they prefer a developmental approach and that they have seen this part of the document and responded favorably to the approach.

- It was noted that while many units of the University have reviews that are in part developmental, these are usually between a faculty member and a chairperson. Chairpersons change. This approach would be more collegial and would ensure that there is a memory that extends beyond one person.
- It was suggested that the annual review process, if modified slightly could meet the expectation of the Board. The proposed approach might change the culture of the Academy and violate the notion of what it is to be a tenured professor. Tenure should be viewed as a mark of trust in a professional. This approach might result in cycles of self-promotion rather than in the desired collegiality.
- This will add one more task to faculty workload. Faculty are already involved in peer review of tenure-track faculty as well as for promotion. Some departments also do peer-review for adjunct faculty. Will this process have significant enough results to make it worth the additional work?
- It was asked if a study has been done about what sort of processes are in use at UD. It was noted that the Provost committee that worked on this issue had done this work. It was further suggested that any process needs to be very streamlined.
- It was noted that some departments give faculty no written feedback in the annual review process. This might help.
- It was suggested that such a process needs to recognize the ebb and flow of a career.
- It was suggested that this could involve an inordinate amount of time to move poor performers marginally up and also result in fewer resources given to high performers. Faculty in general do a good job. If this is about poor performers, then it needs teeth.

7. Committee Reports:

Faculty Affairs Committee: G. Doyle reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee will continue work on the Review of Tenured Faculty, has the Evaluation of Faculty teaching on its agenda, and will be receiving the Maternity Leave Policy for review.

Academic Policies Committee: D. Darrow reported for the Academic Policies Committee. A committee has been appointed to work on recommendations for curricular reform related to the *Habits of Inquiry* document. Members are: Don Pair (College of Arts and Sciences, chairperson), Sandra Yocum Mize (humanities), Roger Crum (arts), Leno Pedrotti (sciences), Pat Donnelly (social sciences), David Salisbury (business), Kevin Hallinan (engineering), Corinne Daprano (education), and Fred Jenkins (library). They are in the process of organizing and expect to begin meeting next semester. Members of the former working groups have been invited to a meeting on November 2 at 3:00 PM. Academic Policies is working on the proposed assessment plan and the graduate certificate programs.

Student Academic Policies Committee: A. Fist reported for Student Academic Policies. They are reviewing the Honor Code document as received from last year's committee. They want to determine the best approach for University-wide standardization of a policy. They also want to work with student development as the student handbook is revised to be sure that policies about student behavior in their academic life are developed in conjunction with policies related to other aspects of student life.

Executive Committee: D. Biers reported for the Executive Committee. He reminded Senators and members of the University community that all items brought to the Academic Senate must begin in the Executive Committee. They are then assigned to the standing committees as appropriate. If items are

brought directly to a standing committee, the chairperson of the standing committee should refer these to the Executive. The Executive Committee is attempting to get a handle on University committees. They are in a mess in terms of having accurate and promulgated information about who is on the committees, what the terms of membership are, and what the charges of the various committees are. The Executive Committee is discussing re-establishing a Nominating Committee to try to ensure that more faculty and more diverse faculty are able to be involved in the University committees. The Executive Committee is also beginning work on written policies and procedures for the academic Senate. P. Johnson is coordinating that work and suggestions should be sent to her.

8. Adjournment: Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Johnson