

10-13-2006

## 2006-10-13 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, "2006-10-13 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2006). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 72.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/72](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/72)

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).

[Approved December 1, 2006]

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON  
DAYTON, OHIO  
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
October 13, 2006  
Sear Auditorium, 3:00 p. m.

Senators Present: A. Abueida, J. Biddle, D. Biers (presiding), M. Brill, D. Courte, D. Darrow, G. Doyle, C. Duncan, T. Eggemeier, E. Elam, J. Farrelly, E. Gustafson, R. Hardie, P. Johnson, T. Lasley, W. Lockett, P. Meyers, J. O'Gorman, D. Parker, R. Penno, F. Pestello, C. Phelps, D. Poe, J. Saliba, B. Turk , R. Wells

Senators Excused: L. Brislin, C. Chen, A. Crow, G. DeMarco, A. Fist, B. John, L. Kloppenberg, C. Letavec, I. Morgan, M. Morton, M. Schmitz, A. Seielstad, L. Simmons

Guests: J. Annin, P. Benson, D. Bickford, T. Columbus, W. Diestelkamp, D. Doyle, J. Dunne, V. Forlani, B. Kallenberg, P. Marshall, D. McCarthy Smith, D. Pair, Fran Pestello, M. Patterson, T. Skill, J. Untener, D. Wright

1. Opening Prayer: Senator Poe opened the meeting with a Lakota prayer.

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

3. Minutes:

September 15, 2006: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved as written.

4. Open Faculty Forum :

Senator Biers introduced the session, noting that the two documents on the agenda, DOC 06-09 and DOC 06-10, were both issues that required wide and open participation in providing input to the Academic Senate. He encourages all Senators to make special efforts to contact those whom they represent to actively seek information and input. He emphasized that the current meeting was an information session and that no actions would be taken on these issues at this time. He introduced Senator Lasley to provide introductory remarks on DOC -06-09.

[DOC 06-10, University Promotion and Tenure Committee](#)

Senator Lasley reviewed the process of arriving at the current document. There was an ad hoc working group put together at the request of the Provost. This group was composed primarily of faculty who had experience at multiple institutions. A committee was then formally constituted through the Provost Office and in discussion with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. In constituting this group, representation from units was more of a concern. He emphasized that the committee work was guided by two assumptions. First, the University Committee should be charged with establishing some measure of consistency across units, but that each academic unit should develop its own Promotion and Tenure document. He suggested that this would ensure consistency on procedural issues such

as the connection of tenure and promotion, but allow autonomy on issues of substance such as the evaluation of the quality of scholarship. Second, the University Committee should be responsible for due process issues, putting procedural safeguards in place. For example, there should be similar processes for handling application materials. He then opened the session for questions and discussion.

- The question was raised as to what would happen if a unit and the University committee disagreed on a procedural issue. Lasley indicated that the Senate would need to resolve this in the final document.
- Certain major issue need to be decided and included in the document before the Academic Senate votes on the issue. This need was emphasized with the example of whether or not to tie tenure and promotion together. There is currently no consistency across units. Which unit “wins” and when and how is this decided? Questions like this need to be answered before approving a document.
- It was pointed out that certain issues may need to be “grandfathered.” For example, if the decision is made to tie tenure and promotion, then faculty who have been tenured at the assistant professor level may need to receive automatic promotion to the associate level.
- The question was raised as to whether or not this document is modeled after another institution. Lasley indicated that while many other institutions were consulted, this is not modeled after any particular institution. What the consultation process did do is highlight the inconsistency at UD.
- It was suggested that the September 1 deadline for the submission of materials was too early. Lasley indicated that the date had been determined by working backwards from the date needed for a final decision. In addition, the assumption was that candidates would know the previous Spring that materials were due in the Fall.
- It was noted that the document seems to go beyond the original charge of the Committee to develop consistent standards across units. The document seems to give to the new Committee responsibilities that now belong to the current Faculty Hearing Committees (Academic Freedom and Tenure, Grievances). Lasley indicated that the Committee had considered this and believed that a University Committee would be better-informed than the Hearing Committees on the processes and so would not require the information-gathering time to act on appeals. In response, it was suggested that this would seem to put the Committee in a position of conflict of interest and in the position of policing itself. It was agreed that this issue would need to be resolved in a final document and that other committee structures and responsibilities might need to be reshaped as part of this process.
- The question was raised as to whether, if promotion and tenure become linked, the unit committees and the University committee would still need to look at both processes separately.
- It was pointed out that the proposed timeline limits the productivity period for tenure to five years. Because lag-time for review and publication varies greatly by discipline, this could jeopardize faculty.

D. Biers closed the discussion thanking Senator Lasley for his work and asking that further comments be sent to Carolyn Roecker Phelps, who is chairperson of the Faculty affairs Committee of the Academic Senate, or to him.

[DOC 06-09: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton.](#)

Senator Biers noted that this document is to be considered in two stages, a review of the goals, and if the goals are affirmed, a process of developing recommendations. The current discussion is part of the first stage. The Academic Senate has been asked to determine whether or not the document captures the ideals of a Catholic and Marianist university education. The Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate has been given primary responsibility for implementing discussion to inform this decision. They have, in turn, appointed a sub-committee composed of Chris Duncan, David Darrow, Jack O’Gorman, and Rob Penno. Biers introduced C, Duncan to give an introduction to the first part of the document. He made use of a PowerPoint presentation to review the basic orienting educational aims and core learning outcomes. R. Penno noted that the sub-committee believed that this was a process of validation, that Nov. 30 was the date set for returning a report to the academic Policies Committee, and that the anticipation was that the request would be for an up-or-down vote. Discussion followed.

- The question was raised as to whether or not other learning outcomes had been considered. Duncan and P. Benson both indicated that while other models had been explored, the unique nature of UD required that learning outcomes be more closely tied to our particular mission.
- The question was raised as to whether or not the articulated outcomes also imply specific pedagogies such as engaged pedagogy. Duncan indicated that there were pedagogical and curricular implications imbedded in the learning outcomes.
- The question was raised as to the language of “create, expand, develop” used in the latter part of the document. Duncan and Biddle both noted that the Academic Senate must approve the first stage of the document before any of those considerations would be taken up. Biddle indicated that the Academic Policies Committee was beginning to look at a possible process for stage two. The expectation is that it could take several years.
- It was asked if this document should be considered a living document or “locked in stone.” Would revisions be part of this process? Duncan indicated that at this point the expectation was that the document would be accepted as written and that the changes would take place in the second stage.
- A question was raised about the use of the word “sacramental. This word seems to be a “red flag” for some members of the University community. While the word first appeared in the 1996-97 *Bulletin*, it seems a leap from the usage there to the meaning as outlined in the current document. It was suggested that it is important that the University community should understand this term and how it is being used. It was suggested that open dialogue with theologians from the Catholic tradition invited to share scholarship on the concept might be productive. It was further suggested that individuals might take responsibility for doing their own research on the term. In addition, it was suggested that these open hearings should make it a point to determine if there is concern about this term.
- It was suggested that the same problems exists with the term “vocation.”
- A question was raised about the recommendation to require a capstone course or project in each major. It was suggested that a public presentation was a very

ambitious goal for every student in every major. This question precipitated questions and discussion about some of the recommendations in the second part of the document. It was noted that the main point of the recommendations is to set high and uniform expectations and that decisions would need to be made on what that would mean in terms of curricular requirements.

D. Biers thanked C. Duncan and others for their work.

#### 5. Committee Reports:

Senator Biddle reported for the Academic Policies committee of the Academic Senate. They hope to receive a final report on DOC-06-09 by November 30 and move the issue to the Senate agenda for the January meeting. They have also asked that the Committee of General Education and Competencies compile a report of the status and assessment of the general competencies.

Senator Phelps reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate. They are working with J. Untener to arrive at a final version of the background check policy for faculty. This should be ready for the December meeting of the Academic Senate. They will be holding open sessions on the Promotion and Tenure document.

Senator Courte reported for the Student Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. They are reviewing both DOC-06-09 and DOC-06-10. In addition, work on the Honor Code is progressing. They anticipate receiving the document on the evaluation of teaching once it is sent to the Academic Senate.

Senator Gustafson reported for the Calendar Committee. They are reviewing recommendations for the Fall 2007 academic calendar. Their recommendations are due to the Provost Council November 28. Since there is not a meeting of the full Academic Senate prior to that date, recommendations will need to be reviewed by the Executive Committee. They are also looking at an examination schedule document.

6. Adjournment: Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:57 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Johnson