

3-14-2014

2014-03-14 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, "2014-03-14 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2014). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 102.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/102

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
Minutes of the Academic Senate
Friday, March 14, 2014; 3:00 pm
KU West Ballroom

Present: Paul Benson, Andrew Slade, Myrna Gabbe, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Kurt Mosser, Stephen Brown, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Leslie Picca, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Andy Kurzhals, Paul Bobrowski, Terence Lau, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Kevin Kelly, Philip Anloague, John White, John Loomis, Harry Gerla, Emily Hicks, Yong Song, Karen E. Swisher, Dominic Sanfilippo, Joseph Saliba

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Paul Vanderburgh, David J. Wright, Deb Bickford, Tom Skill, Alexandra O'Sell, Sheila Hassell Hughes, V. Denise James, LeRoy Hambrick, Angela Busby Blackburn, Susan I. Brown, Pat Donnelly, Patty Alvarez

Absent: Joe Mashburn, Jasmine Lahoud, Eric Taglieri, Joe Watras, Zack Martin, Tony Saliba, Ed Mykytka, Jamie Ervin, Katie Willard, Paul McGreal, Abdullah Alghafis, Kathy Webb

Opening Prayer/Meditation: L. Leming opened the meeting with a prayer.

Minutes: The minutes of the February 14, 2014 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved (22 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).

Announcements:

- C. Phelps welcomed visitor Susan Brown who is the new Faculty Development Coordinator in the LTC.
- D. Sanfilippo announced that the SGA is offering grants for students to attend non-UD conferences.
- C. Krane encouraged Senators to attend the Honors Student Symposium next Friday. Reception at 5 pm. See website for more details.

Committee Reports:

APC: J. Dunne reported that the APC committee met once since the last Academic Senate meeting and took actions on two issues:

(1) Policy on Academic Degree Programs and Academic Departments. The APC has been working on this policy since last academic year. The policy consolidates five existing policies and makes consistent the proposal requirements and the approval processes. In the last meeting, the committee did a final review and is sent it to ECAS recommending academic senate approval.

(2) Academic Certificate Programs. The Academic Policies Committee was asked to study undergraduate certificate programs and determine whether a university policy is required. After gathering information within and external to the university, we determined that a distinguishing feature of an academic certificate program is that students may enroll and complete such a program independent of any degree program. We have made an initial determination that a single university policy is needed – covering both undergraduate and graduate certificate programs. A subcommittee has developed a first draft of the policy and the full committee reviewed it at our meeting today. We hope to complete this work and bring a proposal to the full senate in the next few weeks.

FAC: L. Hartley submitted the following report in writing:

- 1) FAC met twice since our last Senate meeting.
- 2) We have been assigned to review the Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment policy:
 - a. Lori Shaw, Title IX coordinator, attended one of our meetings
 - b. A small working group has been assigned to review this policy and compare the policy and procedures with two existing bylaws and procedures:
 - i. Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure
 - ii. Faculty Hearing Committee on Grievances
 - c. We are in the process of creating a list of concerns and recommendations which will be forwarded to ECAS.
- 3) We were also assigned the Prohibited Conduct Policy:
 - a. We reviewed the list of 20 definitions for illegal, fraudulent, dishonest, and unethical conduct
 - b. A list of recommended revisions will be sent to ECAS this week
- 4) On our agenda for the next meeting is to discuss the “Misconduct in Research and Scholarship” policy. We’ll send our input to ECAS.
- 5) Also on our list are instructional staff titles.
 - a. We proposed a Research Faculty title document. The Deans’ council reviewed this proposal and reported back to ECAS. FAC has been asked to revise the proposal with a closer alignment to the 2002 Research Professor proposal that was passed by the Senate but never signed by the president.
 - b. Another instructional title we were to review is Clinical Faculty. SEHS is in the process of proposing a document for clarification of this title.
- 6) The complete Intellectual Properties policy is assigned to FAC for review; however we have not yet received it.

The FAC’s next meeting is March 27 @ noon in St. Mary’s 113B.

SAPC: J. McCombe submitted the following report in writing:

The Academic Honor Code

The SAPC has met twice since the February 2014 Senate meeting. Both meetings concerned the committee’s on-going work on revising and clarifying the procedures related to academic misconduct.

ECAS has charged the SAPC with attending to Section IV (“Student Status with Respect to the Academic Honor Code”) and Section V (“Appeal Procedure”). Obviously, students, staff and faculty want to promote academic integrity, and across the university units and departments should be consistent in how the Academic Honor Code is enforced. As a result, the SAPC has been asked to revise and clarify those relevant sections of the document to ensure that the policies and procedures are consistently and fairly adhered to across the University.

The SAPC has been consulting with the Office of Student Development (OSD)—in particular, meeting with Debra Monk (Associate Dean of Students and Director of Community Standards & Civility). The goal of the SAPC is to align more intentionally the processes for reviewing cases of academic misconduct with how other forms of misconduct are handled by the OSD. The SAPC is invested in learning more about how the OSD works to achieve consistency and fairness.

Currently, draft revisions of both Sections IV and V of the Academic Honor Code are underway. What we have attempted to clarify in the current draft includes emphasizes the following:

- The precise window of time in which students are to be notified about suspicions of academic honesty.
- The importance of completing the Academic Dishonesty Incident Report, and where the report should be housed (i.e., the parties on campus who should receive a copy of the report) when a student commits academic dishonesty.
- The criteria for the possible expulsion of students who have committed frequent or egregious violations of the Academic Honor Code.
- The various processes by which students might appeal accusations of academic dishonesty.

Other issues require additional consultation and discussion, and the SAPC plans to have a revised draft of the Academic Honor Code for ECAS review in April.

Student Political/Electoral Activities Policy

Earlier this year, the SAPC was charged by ECAS with reviewing the current University policy on political activities, with an eye toward revising the policy in such a way to both encourage political engagement among students without jeopardizing the University's 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt status.

A smaller sub-group of SAPC members has met on multiple occasions this semester—meetings that have included students from a range of majors as well staff in the Office of Student Development.

After these conversations, the working group is committed to producing a draft document that achieves the following:

- Invokes our UD commitment to developing students who are engaged citizens and have the skills necessary to critique ideas and values.
- Encourages groups to organize and advertise events that reflect the mission and goals of their organization. (Some of these are by nature partisan, but the emphasis should be on civil discourse.)
- Encourages open discourse rather than closed-door meetings.
- Creates a culture in which the taboo is *not* knowing what's going on in politics and public discourse.
- Makes clear that student groups and the people they invite to speak do not speak FOR the university (several peer institutions have created policies that provide examples of how to do this).
- Encourages greater cooperation with Facilities Management.
- Encourages, with the federal government's guidelines for 501 (c)(3) status in mind, a less narrow interpretation of what constitutes "a substantial part of the activities of the institution," so that students have more ability to engage in appropriate political/electoral activity.

Campus Policy on Student-Run Businesses

A working group consisting of SAPC members—in collaboration with representatives of interested parties from across the University—has prepared a revised, draft policy to replace the existing Policy on Student-Run Businesses and Commercial Activity. At its next meeting (March 24), the SAPC will review the draft in preparation for bringing it to the April Senate meeting for purposes of consultation.

Next Meeting: 24 March 2014 (9:00 a.m. in HM 257)

ECAS: C. Phelps reported that a thank you letter was sent to university facilities and grounds staff and the Alpha Omega staff for their care in keeping our campus safe this winter

Work in progress

- Evaluation of administrators
- Department of Physical Therapy Proposal – to APC
- Review of the nondiscrimination policy – SAPC complete, FAC working, feedback to Lori Shaw, will also ask for feedback regarding any action on the input
- Student-run Businesses on Campus Policy to SAPC

ELC meeting on Tuesday, primary topic is the consultation and the decision process in facilities renovations, moves, etc.

Presentation of *Inclusive and Intercultural Excellence Report*: S. Hughes gave an overview of the report and the process used to prepare it. According to Hughes, the original charge to the group included four main points and the committee met all but one. The group wanted to capitalize on the compelling vision that brings together domestic diversity and international diversity in a conceptual framework. Excellence in education is dependent on diversity. The hope is to bridge issues and address concerns/challenges. The group wants to raise awareness of the current situation and ways to develop a more successful recruitment of domestic diverse students. Buy-in from everyone is crucial. The report lists draft learning goals focusing on knowledge, skills, attitudes, and actions. The report also includes key terms to aid the campus conversation.

C. Merithew asked what the Senate could do to facilitate conversations/dialogue. S. Hughes stated that fostering conversations here in the Senate first, and then hosting broader conversations/forums, etc. P. Benson asked how these goals related to CAP (Common Academic Program) and if there was any inconsistency with CAP. S. Hughes replied that the group did discuss the issue and the group did not think there were any conflicts with CAP. They want to help illuminate CAP's broad goals and do not want to put any pressure on the CAP process. S. Hughes stated that the group was not asked to create something that would weave into CAP, but obviously CAP had to be considered. D. Sanfilippo stated that the SGA would use the report to start conversations going among students. UD's lack of compositional diversity is a big issue. Many UD students have not experienced much diversity in their lives and this is one reason the climate is so difficult to change. The idea of a needs assessment was also discussed.

DOC 2014-04 Actions Pertaining to Degree Programs and Academic Departments: J. Dunne presented an overview of the APC's process and rationale for the proposed consolidated document. The proposed new document sets forth the formats and policies that are to be used when academic units propose the initiation, suspension, reactivation, renaming, or discontinuation of both graduate and undergraduate academic degree programs, and the creation, renaming, splitting, merging, or discontinuation of academic

departments. This document does not address smaller scale academic programs such as minors, concentrations, and certificates. T. Lau questioned why minors and concentrations would be excluded from the document since there are no university policies governing their creation. The APC is currently working on a document for undergraduate certificates. The issue of what is meant by “underrepresented groups” and the fact that the groups may be different for different units/fields of study was raised. The question of how to attract underrepresented groups was also raised. P. Benson stated that the demonstration of good faith efforts to present the material in such a way as to not discourage certain groups was sufficient and that reflection on the issue was an important part of the process.

L. Hartley moved that DOC 2014-04 be approved and H. Gerla seconded. The motion passed (26 yes, 0 no, 0 abstention).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks