

4-20-2007

2007-04-20 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, "2007-04-20 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2007). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 76.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/76

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 September 13, 2007]

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
April 20, 2007
KU West Ballroom, 3:00 P. M.

Senators Present: A. Abueida, D. Biers (presiding), C. Chen, D. Courte, D. Darrow, G. DeMarco, G. Doyle, C. Duncan, T. Eggemeier, E. Elam, J. Farrelly, A. Fist, R. Hardie, B. John, P. Johnson, L. Kloppenberg, T. Lasley, M. Lofton, W. Lockett, J. O'Gorman, R. Penno, F. Pestello, C. Phelps, D. Poe, A. Seielstad, R. Wells

Senators Excused: J. Biddle, M. Brill, L. Brislin, A. Crow, E. Gustafson, C. Letavec, P. Meyers, I. Morgan, M. Morton, J. Saliba, L. Simmons, B. Turk

Guests: D. Bickford, P. Donnelly, L. Leming, J. Perry (Human Resources), D. Schroeder (Advancement), J. Untener

New Members of the 2007-2008 Academic Senate: C. Bowman, L. Cook, W. Diestelkamp, R. Frasca, A. Jipson, R. Kearns, L. Laubach, R. Marek, M. Patterson, Y. Raffoul, D. Sink, L. Snyder

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

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

3. Minutes:

March 2, 2007: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved as written.

4. Doc-06-10 University Promotion and Tenure Policy

Carolyn Phelps introduced the document and opened the floor for discussion. The following points were discussed and comments made:

- The distinction between substantive consideration and procedural considerations may need further clarification in the document.
- It was suggested that while the document is better than the initial version of the document, the history of what has precipitated this document makes it disadvantageous for faculty. Removal of the Board of Trustees does not benefit faculty. It places faculty in an inappropriate role. Moreover, further study of departmental and unit processes is needed before bringing work on this document to completion.
- In response, it was suggested that this is a faculty-friendly document that will result in fairer processes across units and will put procedural safeguards in place. While it is difficult to separate substantive and procedural issues, the Faculty Affairs Committee has tried to keep the substantive issues as close to a faculty member's University home as possible.
- It was noted that the Board of Trustees still remains the court of last resort for tenure appeals.

- It was suggested the this is an unprecedented move on the part of the Board, and faculty “would be stupid” not to take advantage of this possibility.
- The question was raised as to why the committee does not have a name. It was noted that in I. B. 2 of the document the name of the committee is specified as University Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- A question was raised as to whether or not there might be unforeseen consequences that could lead to the loss of autonomy by the units. The example of dual tracks for tenure potentially being imposed on all units was given. It was noted that the document provides a check to solve difficulties by requiring these to come to the Academic Senate.
- Questions were raised about the scope of the President’s decision-making as specified in II. B. 8. what does “administrative authority” mean. It was noted that in law this expression has a meaning that does not apply in this document and so the expression is used appropriately and does not exclude review by the President.
- It was asked if I.B. 2. allows for a unit document to preclude the appointment, by the dean, of up to two additional members on a unit promotion and tenure committee. This is the case and the reason for saying a unit “may” allow for this in its procedures.
- The question was raised about what would constitute a quorum for the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. It was agreed that the document did not need to address this issue.

Two points of discussion resulted in **amendments to the document**:

- It was suggested that II.A.1. be more specific as to what materials should be shared with a candidate at the time of hire and who should provide these materials. It was moved and seconded that this section be amended to read, “The approved University, unit, and departmental criteria and procedures will be shared with the candidate at the time of hire by the Office of the Provost.” Motion passed with 25 in favor.
- The question was raised about the meaning of “to promote balance” in section I. B. 2. After discussion, it was moved by O’Gorman and seconded by Wells that the phrase “to promote balance” be deleted. And after calling the question with a vote of 25 in favor, a vote was taken on the motion. The vote resulted in a tie. The Provost voted to strike the phrase.

T. Lasley moved to call the question. M. Lofton seconded the motion. The vote was 23 yes, 2 no, and 0 abstentions. A vote was then taken on Doc 06-10 with the two amendments. The vote was 23 yes, 2 no, and 0 abstentions.

6. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies Committee: David Darrow submitted the following report of the activities of the standing committee for the 2006-2007 academic year.

The bulk of the APC’s work this year revolved around the Provost’s charge to review the *Habits of Inquiry* report. In the Fall, the committee resolved to handle the review in two phases. Phase one was to consist of a review of the learning outcomes in sections I-V of the document to determine if they captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions. Concluding that the report had met these criteria, the committee appointed a subcommittee of Darrow, Duncan, O’Gorman

and Penno to determine whether or not the university community as a whole agreed. After conducting a series of open forums and individual presentations, the subcommittee presented its findings to the APC, which then reported them to the Senate on 30 November 2006 (Appendix A).

Anticipating approval during the Phase I review process, the APC began developing a series of guidelines for Phase II—the review of the recommendations section of the HIR document. For this purpose, the committee designed a system of working groups to review individual sections of the document recommendations with the goal of fulfilling its charge to “generate a set of recommendations regarding specific programs, infrastructure, faculty development, and resources necessary to realize the educational aims and learning outcomes.” The committee devised a draft charge to the working groups (for the latest version see Appendix B). Originally, the committee proposed the creation of five working groups that divided the task of review into the following categories:

- Working Group #1** First Year Seminar, Humanities Base, & General Education
- Working Group #2** Service & Experiential Learning, Multi/Interdisciplinary Programs
- Working Group #3** Intercultural and Global Learning
- Working Group #4** Student Scholarship and Culminating Experiences
- Working Group #5** Faculty Development, Communication, & Pedagogy

Each of the working groups was to be chaired by one or more members of the APC. Initial discussions in the winter term resulted in a decision to postpone the convocation of the fifth working group until the APC had processed interim reports from the other WGs. The original draft charge to the WGs contained certain recommendations connected to their membership. It was with these recommendations in mind that the APC began assembling lists of faculty and staff to be invited to serve as WG members in the Winter term. This proved to be a rather drawn out process, as the preliminary lists required amendment after the initial round of invitations failed to yield adequate representation from each of the divisions of the university. There was also some question as to the wording of the charges to the WGs. As such, the process has moved at a disappointingly slow pace. To date, only WG #1 has met. Discussions in the working group are headed in the direction of first, trying to determine what students should get out of a first year seminar. The following questions were raised: What is the purpose (or what ought to be the purpose) of the seminar? Are students’ educational and developmental needs best addressed through a seminar, or would they be best served by a quilt or tapestry of experiences to accomplish these goals? The WG will pick up with these questions in the fall. Hopefully, each of the other WGs will be able to have at least an electronic organizational meeting (e.g., circulation and submission of F 07 availability) before May 15.

In addition to this work, the APC reviewed and commented on the draft of an ENG department proposal to revise the current writing course sequence to make it more consistent with student developmental needs. Rather than frontloading the writing into the first year, the proposal would spread the two required semesters over the first year and sophomore year. This would also address the well-documented issue of the dramatic dip in student writing that occurs on campus between the first year and junior/senior years.

The Committee also worked with the calendar committee on the next round of academic calendars. Discussions produced a consensus to work with the registrar over the long term to increase the length of the break between fall and winter term, when possible. The calendar discussion also raised the need to continue to exam the general exam period guidelines to ensure an adequate distribution of the study days throughout the exam period.

Much of the committee's work was hampered, in both semesters, by the difficulty of raising a quorum. We urge the Senate to consider policy changes that will ensure either the replacement of faculty on leave or who resign and that will provide a mechanism for conducting routine business when a quorum cannot be assembled because of conflicting schedules.

A question was raised as to the process for APCAS consulting on the English proposal. It was noted that the proposal should have come to the Executive Committee to be assigned to a standing committee.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Carolyn Phelps submitted the following report of the activities of the standing committee for the 2006-2007 academic year.

Due to the term extensions created with the change in election times, this report covers activities from January 2006 until April 2007

The FACAS primarily worked on three issues this term: the change in time of elections, the faculty background check policy, and the University promotion and tenure policy.

Constitutional amendment to change the timing of elections. It was decided that it would be beneficial to the Senate to bring terms of office for faculty representatives in line with the academic calendar, thus improving continuity and productivity of the Academic Senate throughout the academic year. This amendment to the Senate Constitution passed in April 2006.

Faculty background checks. In August of 2005, UD implemented a pre-employment background check policy that applies to all non-faculty employees and contractors. The effort to provide the same for our faculty members followed. The FACAS acted in consultation with the Provost's office to development of a pre-employment background check policy and a set of procedures applicable to new faculty hires. This document was brought before the Senate in December 2006 for legislative concurrence which was supported.

University promotion and tenure policy. This academic year, much of the FACAS efforts have been aimed at developing the University Promotion and Tenure Policy. This policy establishes general guidelines that govern University-wide procedures for promotion and tenure review. These guidelines and procedures are designed to ensure communication, fairness, and due process throughout the review process. This policy includes opportunities to respond in the event of disagreements over promotion and tenure recommendations and provides an appeals procedure. Several open meeting have been held throughout campus to discuss this document and elicit feedback which would strengthen the document or assist in its adaptation across the units on the University. A sense of the Senate vote taken in March of this

year was supportive of continued development of the current document, and the document will come forward for vote in the Senate today (4/20/07).

Student Academic Policies Committee: Wade Lockett submitted the following report of the activities of the standing committee for the 2006-2007 academic year.

Student Honor Code: The committee's focus this year was primarily on development of a proposed university honor code and the establishment of an honor board.

A statement of purpose for the code was drafted first and approved by committee members. Attention then turned to the proposal for a university honor board, the appeals procedure and punitive issues. Legal questions concerning punitive measures were discussed with a representative of the Legal Affairs office. In order to assess the impact of the proposal on current policies and procedures, as well as to assess the level of support within the units, members volunteered to discuss the proposal with, and solicit input from, their respective Deans. That input was then discussed and some changes were introduced into the current draft.

The current draft of the proposal will be provided to the incoming committee, along with summaries of the Deans' comments and a status report detailing outstanding issues.

Input to Other Committees: The committee participated in the review of the Habit of Inquiry and Reflection document (Doc-06-09), and approved comments were forwarded to the Academic Policies Committee.

The committee participated in the review of the University Promotion and Tenure Policy document (Doc-06-10), and approved comments were forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

NCA Self Study Review: Members of the committee were assigned chapters of the self study to review, and were encouraged to provide comments via the self study web site.

7. Adjournment: Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

The first meeting of the 2007-2008 Academic Senate was convened by F. Pestello, Provost, immediately following the adjournment of the final meeting of the 2006-2007 Academic Senate. The purpose of the meeting was to elect representatives to the Executive Committee, elect the officers of the Academic Senate, and organize the standing committees. Results of this organizational work are as follows:

Members of the Executive Committee:

David Biers (Social Science representative elected for a two year term) President
Robert Penno (School of Engineering representative elected for a two year term) Vice-President
Patricia Johnson (Humanities representative in second year of term) Secretary
Thomas Eggemeier (representing the deans; elected to a one-year term to complete the remainder of a two-year term)

Robert Kearns (Natural Science representative elected to a one-year term to complete the remainder of a two-year term)

Lloyd Laubach (School of Education representative elected to a two year term)

Jack O’Gorman (University Libraries representative)

Fred Pestello (Provost)

Andrea Seislstad (School of Law representative)

Rebecca Wells (School of Business representative in second year of term)

Academic Policies Committee

Dean, college of Arts and Sciences

Connie Bowman

David Darrow, Chairperson

Wiebke Diestelkamp

Christopher Duncan

Thomas Eggemeier

Ralph Frasca

Arthur Jipson

Patricia Meyers

Jack O’Gorman

Mark Patterson

Robert Penno

Joseph Saliba

Andrea Seislstad

Faculty Affairs Committee

David Biers

George Doyle, Chairperson

Elizabeth Gustafson

Patricia Johnson

Thomas Lasley

Lloyd Laubach

Craig Letavec

Youssef Raffoul

Damon Sink

Linda Snyder

Rebecca Wells

Student Academic Policies Committee

Amanda Brian

Mark Brill

Lauren Cook

George DeMarco , Co-Chairperson

Andrew Fist, Co-Chairperson

Robert Kearns

Jessalyn King

Lisa Kloppenberg

Rebecca Marek
Danielle Poe

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Johnson