

4-4-2003

## 2003-04-04 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2003-04-04 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2003). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 50.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/50](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/50)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON  
DAYTON, OHIO  
**MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

April 4, 2003  
Kennedy Union, West Ballroom

---

Presiding: Dr. Joseph Saliba

Senators Present: Bickford, Biers, Castellano, Cherington, Dandaneau, Doyle, Gauder, Gould, Gruenenwald, Hallinan, Hartley, Ilg, Kocoloski, Morman, Partlow, Pestello, Putka, Pyles, Rapp, Roecker Phelps, Skill, Telfair, Watras, Yungblut

Guests: Belle, Benson, Bork, Brecha, Columbus, Conniff, Currell, Heaton, Johnson, McCarty Smith, Moot, Roberts, Rogatto, Vitale, Wilhoit, Wilkinson, Wright

---

1. Opening Prayer: Fr. John Putka began the meeting with a prayer.
2. Roll Call: Twenty-five of thirty-nine Senators were present.
3. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of March 14, 2003, were approved as written.
4. Announcements

Adam Kocoloski began with the introduction of the new SGA academic senators, who will become voting members of the University Academic Senate in September 2003. They are Jennifer Bork, Kevin Moot, and Nicole Vitale.

5. Committee Reports

Each committee submitted a summary of their activities for the semester.

Academic Policies Committee

- a. Residency requirements document: Underwent a final review before the full senate passed it.
- b. Quantitative reasoning document: The committee sponsored two open meetings on the final version before the full senate approved it.
- c. Online registration system: The committee met with representatives from the registrar's office to learn more about the new system to be implemented, which should attend to some of the current system's failings.

- d. University calendar committee: Review of calendar issues led to recommendation for a comprehensive study of calendar priorities. It is suggested that a taskforce be formed to study the problem; implementation is under way.
- e. Report on general education rationale and goals: Revisions to this document have been completed and are under review. A final recommendation from the senate is likely next fall.
- f. Report on first year experience mission and goals: The APC will hear a summary April 10.
- g. Report on status of thematic clusters: A report will be given April 10.

#### Faculty Affairs Committee

- a. Senate Document I-03-02: The document, which seeks to amend the University's Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure, underwent a final review before the full senate approved it. The document is now up for approval by all tenured and tenure track faculty.
- b. Part time and full time non tenure track faculty: The committee also considered the utilization and status of these groups, but has tabled the issue for future discussion.
- c. Appropriate use of intellectual property: The committee has agreed it will assist in developing guidelines that would enable faculty members to feel confident in using copyrighted materials for their courses while observing the principles of fair use.

#### Student Academic Policies Committee

- a. Summer course scheduling: A draft of Proposed Summer Time Schedule Guidelines was sent to department chairs for feedback. The committee had hoped to bring to the April senate meeting for discussion, followed up by a vote in the fall.
- b. Student Assessment of Instruction: This initiative was scheduled for review this year. The committee sent a letter to department chairs and deans for feedback, which would be discussed at the April 2 meeting. The Faculty Development Committee has expressed interest in working with the committee to develop alternative forms of evaluating teaching performance.
- c. Dean's List Eligibility for Part Time Students: The committee reviewed the policy on this matter and recommends no change to the current language.

### 6. Strategic Planning Papers

Joe Saliba began the discussion by thanking Drs. Curran and Pestello for inviting the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to participate in the University's strategic planning. As part of that effort, the ECAS believes participation from entire faculty, staff and students is crucial to the success of the planning and chose to use this last Academic Senate meeting of the year to facilitate discussion.

Two faculty members and two students were invited to share their thoughts about the University's strategic planning efforts.

#### Brian Conniff—3 main points

- a. Work to define academic excellence in UD's own terms. To define selves against list of others is self-defeating. If we give faculty the opportunity to shape the terms of excellence, becomes more exciting.

b. Find aspects of Catholic Marianist heritage across disciplines  
Examples: Social justice, interfaith dialogues

c. Trust: current conditions such that there is not much room for teaching innovations.  
Need to design and support radical teaching & learning experiences.

General Education: A key component to all of this is general education. Is it at the end of its natural lifespan? More new faculty over the past few years, but not as many opportunities as before in building a new curriculum

International Education: As it is now, international education limited. It should begin early and extend through academic career. Example: Darna House

Sean Wilkinson: Challenges Academic Senate to retain a focus on this issue and to follow through with its efforts.

Believes that the future is in faculty hands, not in the administration's. The administration should look to faculty for defining academic excellence, and the faculty should look to the administration for support in carrying out academic excellence.

Renew and remake general education to make it more inclusive.

Identify faculty across the disciplines that are willing to innovate. Examples of programs that work well: Honors Program, CORE Program. Potential for Arts across the curriculum.

Look at the intrinsic assets, not the extrinsic lists.

Concern that losing the energy and vitality of the new faculty by failing to ask how they might contribute.

Jonathan Pyles and Adam Kocoloski: The Marianist identity must be preserved in any plan

Residential learning village needs to go beyond the classroom. Concerned that academic and residential lives are too separate, and that alcohol is a serious issue. One suggestion is to cohort floors; there are currently Honors and Engineering floors, but they are few and more opportunities should be available.

General Education: Time to reconsider. There needs to be ways to engage students at the start, find innovative ways.

Clusters: Thematic clusters are great opportunities for learning communities, but they fall short. Need to extend themes beyond the clusters. It seems that the University has compartmentalized humanities education.

At this point the floor was opened for discussion.

David Wright: The Faculty Development Committee is an important part of the conversation. He stresses that the conversation be continued and that more people be engaged, including part-time faculty and focus groups.

Surveys indicate that there is general faculty support for the Catholic Marianist tradition.

There is a roadblock to the innovation asked for today—student assessment forms. They stifle creativity; however, the FDC has been looking at other ways of assessment and brought speakers in to address this issue.

Q: Will this planning process replace Vision 2005? Who will author the document? What is the flow of ideas: will it be communicated to the faculty from the administration or vice versa?

A: Each school has its own strategic plan, which will continue to be assessed and reviewed. Vision 2005: this current process is not a radical break. We will review what has changed, both internally and externally. It will be a 2-way process via Provost's Council and the Academic Senate. Dr. Curran wants a tight, focused message by which we can advertise the University.

Q: How will the ideas flow? Please explain the "paradigm ambiguities."

A: Structurally, this process will be a hierarchy. The flow of communication, however, must go up and down. Various groups will communicate, but it must all tie together at the top.

Pat Johnson: We should start with the understanding of a distinctive Catholic Marianist University. We should take a signature program and begin the innovations and risks with that program.

John Roberts: One thing that makes UD unique is its strong foundation. Do not change the core beliefs and culture. There is a need for definition of outcomes, created by the parties involved.

Sean Wilkinson: The issue of process is important, especially communication among all. The idea of signature program sounds elitist, however. Building programs are less important than building relationships among programs.

Paul Benson: Good programs are ones that are fluid and open-ended. Fixed programs are ones to be wary of—isolated and elitist.

Fr. Putka: Do not wait for the strategic plan to make tactical adjustments along the way.

Laura Yungblut: Concerned that the "door does not swing back shut" after this discussion. She made a plea to those committed thus far to remain participants through various venues and to bring others into the discussion.

Steve Dandaneau: The consultants from Art & Science provide the basis for a marketing discourse. There is concern that if this is the primary form of discussion, then it is damaging. It is important to hear other voices.

Bob Brecha: UD is primarily an undergraduate institution. He is worried about the comparison with others as we grant Ph.Ds. The balance of research and teaching is hard.

Fred Pestello: The Carnegie classification system changed. This class should not "impact" us. It is true we do not have a good, solid graduate study strategy. Tom Skill will be leading

a review to amend this situation. However, we will not be moving or changing our current classification.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20pm.

Respectfully submitted: Heidi Gauder, Secretary of the Academic Senate.