

10-12-2001

2001-10-12 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, "2001-10-12 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2001). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 39.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/39

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.

Academic Senate Minutes - October 12, 2001

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 12, 2001 - KU 310, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding: Betty Youngkin

Senators Present: Bartlett, Bartley, Castellano, Charbel, Cherrington, Crum, Dandaneau, DeConinck, Doyle, Dunne, Eimermacher, Erdei, Galioto, Gerla, Gould, Hary, Ilg, Kearns, Lechleiter, McKenna, Morman, Pedrotti, Fran Pestello, Fred Pestello, Phelps, Saliba, Sargent, Youngkin, Yungblut

Guests: Jukanovic, Montgomery, Rogatto

1. Opening Prayer: Alison Montgomery opened the meeting with a prayer.
2. Roll Call: Twenty-nine of thirty-seven senators were present.
3. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of September 7, 2001 were approved as written.
4. Update on Presidential Search

Fred Pestello reported on the time line of the Presidential Search.

- a. Off-campus interviews of several candidates were conducted on October 8 and 9, 2001.
 - b. References are being further checked during October, 2001.
 - c. Three to five candidates will have two-day, on-campus interviews between November 5 and 16, 2001.
 - d. The search committee will make a decision during December, 2001.
 - e. An announcement will be made in January, 2002.

For the on-campus interviews, three, 75-minute, open meetings will be held. The meetings will be aimed at the faculty, staff, and students, respectively, but anyone can attend any of the meetings. Each meeting will start with a slate of questions from a panel. Then the floor will be open to questions from the audience.

Betty Youngkin asked that if any senator or other member of the campus community had a

particular question, they should transmit it to her.

Sam Gould reminded the senate that it is important not only to ask good questions, but also to establish a friendly atmosphere for the candidates. We have to sell the candidates on UD. One way of doing that is to have a large turnout at the three open meetings.

5. Budget Direction

Fred Pestello reported that the budget will be finalized in January, 2002. Important issues in next years budget will be:

- a. Continued funding of technology
- b. Recruitment of more minorities
- c. Competitive salaries for faculty

It was further pointed out that UD has fallen behind in tuition compared to other universities in our category. The need to maintain good facilities, capabilities and faculty suggest a significant, but not dramatic, tuition increase.

6. Document 1-00-16, Academic Policies Affected by the New +/- Grading System

In March of 2001 the Academic Senate approved a new grading system that included a C- grade. At that time it was agreed that the affect of the C- on various university policies would have to be clarified before the new grading system could go into effect in the fall of 2002. The Academic Policies Committee developed a rationale from which to modify present policies. It was assumed that the premise concerning the new grading system would be that academic performance that was previously awarded a C will now be awarded a C+, C, or C-. After consulting with various groups on campus the APC developed three motions.

1. Under the University Competencies Program, students may demonstrate general competency in specified courses by earning a grade of "C-" or better.

A question was asked why we would even consider a C, much less a C-, as competent. Surely, a B would better indicate a distinguished student, which is one of the university's goal. The response to the question was that even a C- is a significant improvement over the Basic Skills requirement of a D in writing and oral communications. Furthermore, a C- in a math course that contains a quantitative reasoning module is only part of a course that will typically contain topics well beyond the general competencies. Finally, the default in the general quantitative reasoning competency is 80% on the online module tests. 80% would be considered a B.

The question was called:

For 29, Opposed 0, Abstain 0

Vote on Motion 1:

For 28, Opposed 1, Abstain 0

2. The undergraduate policy on Option 2 grading should state, “Grades of ‘C-‘ or higher should be converted to ‘S’ while grades of ‘D’ and ‘F’ should be converted to ‘NC’.”

There was no discussion.

Vote on Motion 2:

For 28 Opposed 1 Abstain 0

3. The undergraduate policy on transfer students and credit should include the following statement, “No credit will be given for a course in which the student earned below a ‘C-‘.”

There was no discussion.

Vote on Motion 3:

For 28 Opposed 1 Abstain 0

7. Recommendation to the Provost Council on Participation in the Graduation Ceremony Before Earning the Necessary Credits

It was recommended that students not be allowed to participate in the graduation ceremony if they have not earned the necessary academic credits. The main reason for this position is that it is difficult to administer any other policy – where do you draw the line as far as deficient credit hours. After the summer of 2002, students who complete their course work during the summer term will receive a diploma, and the academic transcript will denote graduation, but they will have to wait until December to participate in a graduation ceremony.

A couple senators expressed concern with this position, especially for parents who will be disappointed that their son or daughter has left the university, and is not likely to return for a ceremony.

It was pointed out that there is an appeal process available through the Registrar, but it is highly unlikely that a student would be successful.

It was moved and seconded that the senate accept the recommendation.

Vote on the issue:

For 27 Opposed 2 Abstained 0

8. Honors and Scholars Review

Steve Dandaneau, director of the Honors and Scholars Program, discussed a proposal to transform the present Honors and Scholars Agenda to a more prestigious program that leads the university toward its goals in Vision 2005. He offered to personally present the proposal to any

interested group on campus. Many of the changes were initiated as a result of a review of the present program by a nationally recognized expert. The proposal has been through the dean's offices and the Provost Council.

Presently, the university sponsors a Scholars Program of about 2000 students, whose entrance to is based on national test scores and high school class rank. To be inline with the practice at other universities, this present Scholars Program will be renamed the Honors Program. Entrance to the new Honors Program will be based on higher national test scores and class rank, which will reduce the initial entering number of students. However, deans may request ad hoc admission for special students, whose academic achievements do not qualify them, but other criteria do. In addition students, who obtain a 3.4 GPA after 30 or 60 credit hours and have other prerequisites, are automatically admitted. Finally, students with 30 or 60 credit hours can be admitted on an ad hoc basis by a request from a dean's office.

All students in the new Honors Program may earn an Honors Degree by maintaining a 3.4 GPA, completing a six-hour thesis, completing six Honors courses and participating in one approved leadership or service activity. Although there are many more opportunities to enter the new Honors Program, it is felt that the total membership will be less than the present 2000 in the Scholars Program. However, there is an opportunity for many more Honors Degrees than is presently allowed.

The present Honors Program will be transformed to the John W. Berry Sr. Scholars Program. Admission to this program will be limited to thirty incoming students per year. They will be required to maintain a 3.4 GPA, complete a six-hour thesis, complete the six Berry Scholar Seminars, complete a Berry Leadership Community Retreat, complete a Berry Service Retreat, and complete an approved Study Abroad or Cultural Immersion Experience. Each class of thirty students will be provided a four-year, full tuition scholarship, in addition to many other privileges.

Several questions were asked.

1. When will the new programs be implemented, and how much time is available for input? The program is tentatively scheduled to start with the incoming class in fall 2003. Comments concerning the proposal should be submitted within the next 6 – 8 weeks.
2. Will there be any necessity for Senate approval? The Senate must approve the new Honors degree. Approval will be requested during the winter semester.
3. Will a response be made to the questions from the faculty? Yes.
4. It was suggested that the proposal be placed on the Internet. It will be placed on the Senate Web Page.
5. How many students would be interested in writing a thesis? Presently, many of our students do significant research. They can now receive recognition of an Honors

Degree (assuming they complete the other requirements).

6. What happens to students who are admitted into the new Honors Program, but do not do a thesis? All honors students will be served by the new Honors Program, even if they do not participate in the requirements for the Honors Degree.
7. Isn't it likely that there will be too many students requesting to do an honors thesis? Where will the money, faculty time, and facilities come from? Extra money has been allocated in the budget; faculty will receive a restricted \$500 stipend for their efforts; and many theses do not require facilities. It was suggested that the natural sciences will be overwhelmed.
8. Why do we need extra full-tuition scholarship money if we are already getting 30 excellent students in the present Honors Program? Other schools are offering full scholarships, room and board, books, and even spending money. Last year UD lost 19 excellent students. It is thought that we are losing students because we are not financially competitive. We could do better.

9. Committee Reports

The Faculty Affairs did not have a report.

The Student Academic Policies Committee reported that it was considering a policy supported by the President's Council, that Level 3 Suspensions be noted on the Academic Transcript. The SAPC will have a proposal ready for the December 7, 2001 meeting. Among other things, the proposal will recommend against placing Level 3 Suspensions on the academic transcript.

The Academic Policies Committee anticipates the possibility of a proposal associated with the +/- grading system and the graduate programs.

10. Adjournment: The senate meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted: George R. Doyle, Jr., Secretary of the Academic Senate