

10-17-2014

2014-10-17 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, "2014-10-17 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2014). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 107.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/107

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 Joint Academic Senate/Educational Leadership Council
Friday, October 17, 2014; 3:00 pm
KU West Ballroom

Present: Jason Pierce, Myrna Gabbe, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Danielle Foust, Joe Mashburn, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Jasmine Lahoud, Leslie Picca, Laura Leming, Paul Becker, Mike Brill, Paul Bobrowski, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Erin Malone, Kevin Kelly, Joe Watras, Philip Anloague, John White, Elizabeth Kelsch, Eddy Rojas, Aaron Altman, Ed Mykytka, Austin Hillman, Paul McGreal, Harry Gerla, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Sean Gallivan, Angela Busby-Blackburn, Dominique Yantko, Paul Benson

Guests: Dan Curran, Steve Cobb, Maura Donahue, Grant Neeley, Shauna Adams, Mary R. Kelly, Michele Welkener, Christ Agnew, Una Cadegan, Vincent Miller, Susan Trainum, Fran Rice, Carolyn Phelps, Tim Wilbers, Don Pair, Michelle Tedford, Shawn Robinson, Juan Santamarina, Dorian Borbonus, Miriamne Krummel, R. Alan Kimbrough, Terence Lau, Janet Bednarek, Patrick Donnelly, Sharon D. Gratto, Andrea Seielstad, Jayne Robinson, Harold Merriman, Brad Duncan, Deb Bickford, Jon Hess, Mary Carlson, Anne Crecelius, Susan Brown, Bro. Daniel Klco, Shannon Driskell, Bro. Tom Oldenski, David J. Wright, Caroline Merithew, Bob Brecha, Sawyer Hunley, Karen Bull, Ken Bloemer, Jennifer Speed, Douglas Lemaster, Laura Cotten, Gwyn Fox Stump, Re'Shanda Grace-Bridges, Melinda Warthman, Jennifer Koesters, Ann Garcia, Trevor Collier, Adrienne Ross-Green, Jamie Lockett, Brandy McFall, Lynne Yengulalp, Sangita Gosalia, Maria Ollier Burkett, Pamela Gregg, Judith Huacuja, Molly Schaller, Corinne Daprano, Sarah Dickson, Elaine Laux, Jerry Duncan, David Ausdenmoore, Rebecca Wells

Absent: Andrew Slade, Rebecca Whisnant, Jeffrey Zhang, Jamie Ervin, Erin Brown

Opening Prayer/Meditation: S. Gallivan opened the meeting with a prayer.

Announcements:

- C. Krane welcomed all guests, particularly this year's Leadership UD cohort.

Consultation:

Presentation by Steve Cobb, Chair, Board of Trustees, Dan Curran, President, and Paul Benson, Interim Provost and joint Academic Senate/Educational Leadership Council (ELC) discussion of summary Fall Board of Trustees' Meeting. C. Krane explained the membership and role of the ELC which goes beyond the bounds of the Academic Senate. D. Curran stated that this debrief with senior leadership about the Fall Board Meeting was one way to enhance consultation with the faculty. D. Curran and P. Benson plan to do something similar after each Board Meeting going forward. He thanked C. Krane, the Academic Senate, and the ELC for the opportunity.

S. Cobb gave a brief summary of his ties to the Dayton community, work history and connections to UD (graduate degree from UD). This is his eighth year on the Board and his second as Chair. He stated that the Board has expertise in governance, strategy, and

components of leadership and all care deeply about the well-being, success, and long-term viability of the university. His view of the role of the Board is to “Keep nose in and hands off.”

P. Benson gave an overview of the educational issues before the Board and the schedule of meetings held during the week. He stated that three new members were oriented to the Board on Tuesday. He briefly reviewed the topics of his Interim Provost report to the Board, including enrollment and retention. His goals for the next two years include enrollment/retention, intercultural learning objectives, recruitment strategy for Latin America, new academic programs, experiential learning opportunities, and interdisciplinary collaboration. He reported about some successful efforts of the School of Law in light of drop in enrollment. P. Benson also summarized the topics under discussion at the Finance and Administrative Committee, including a review of academic programs, centers and institutes to ensure alignment with strategic priorities and control costs; strategies and associated costs for domestic minority student recruitment, retention, and graduation rates; and ongoing renovation of 1700 building.

D. Curran reported that the university was in a strong financial position even though we lost about 8% of endowment this year due to outside influences. He announced that \$35 million in debt had been retired in recent years and that a new bond for \$35 million had been approved. Other topics discussed included the pricing of the university, UDRI renovation costs, and housing.

The floor was opened to questions from Senators/ELC members. L. Picca asked about support for domestic diversity given UD’s issues with retention of minority students and faculty/staff and what some call a “chilly climate” for minorities. P. Benson replied that a new Assistant Dean position was being filled and an early warning system had been implemented. It was stated that Student Development was also working on these issues. D. Curran added that discussion about persistence and financial need were continuing. He believes that new tuition plan is helping with these issues as well. J. Dunne expressed concern that Board does not interact much with faculty. S. Cobb replied that the Board does not want to “go rogue” and undermine the structure of the university or bypass proper procedures, policies, or strategies. S. Cobb relies on D. Curran and P. Benson and other administrators to be the links between the Board and UD. The dinner with the Board that Senators were invited to attend was briefly discussed. The dinner was seen as a success by many participants. D. Curran announced that there would be other similar opportunities to encourage faculty-board interaction. C. Krane, President of the Academic Senate, has open invitation to discuss issues with S. Cobb. A. Altman asked about how academic quality is quantified for the Board. P. Benson stated that the following statistics were reported to the Board: retention rates, graduation rates, racial and ethnic composition, national rankings, research funding, and peer-reviewed publication rates. The Board does not want to say how specific units are run, just overall strategy.

R. Wells asked about the interactions and opportunities for engagement between the Board and faculty and why such interactions must be channeled through D. Curran as President of the university. She also asked what steps were being taken to reorient the Board regarding governance in higher education and to facilitate the work of faculty to restructure the

organization and to revise policy and procedures so that both shared governance and an overall positive climate will thrive. D. Curran responded that they were working with the Academic Senate and ELC to enhance shared governance. S. Cobb stated that with any large organization, efforts of communication and community building can always be improved. The Board of Trustees has three areas of responsibility: 1. Hiring and performance of the President of the university. 2. Long-term viability (stewardship) of university. 3. Broad policies. He explained that large organizations need discipline to facilitate cooperation and communication through proper channels. R. Wells stated that she appreciated the efforts to provide opportunities for interactions, but thinks that the social nature of the types of events mentioned diminishes the seriousness of faculty engagement. P. Benson responded that every level of the university has specific responsibilities and a part to play in the process.

Minutes: The minutes of the September 19, 2014, meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as corrected with 3 abstentions.

Committee Reports:

APC: E. Mykytka submitted the following report in writing:

The Academic Policies Committee is working on two initiatives relating to the Common Academic Program. First, it is in discussion with Assistant Provost Sawyer Hunley with respect to more clearly defining the processes by which faculty are appointed to both the CAP Committee (appointed by ECAS) and the CAP Leadership Committee (appointed by the APC). The processes under discussion would seek nominations via the University Nominative and Recruitment Committee during the mid to late Spring Semester and likely involve consultation with the academic units to ensure the appropriate academic areas are fully represented. Current membership in the two CAP committees is detailed in the attached document (APPENDIX A). Second, the APC is reviewing a draft proposal developed by the CAP committee for the two-year evaluation of CAP and is in the process of providing initial feedback on that proposal.

FAC: H. Gerla submitted the following in writing:

The Faculty Affairs Committee ("FAC") completed its task of reporting to Executive Committee of the Academic Senate ("ECAS") on the requirements for membership on the University Nominating and Recruiting Committee ("UNRC"), and the appointing authority for members of that committee. The FAC was also charged by ECAS with developing suggestions on how the UNRC could be utilized more, and how it could be of more service to the University. The FAC answered ECAS's questions on the membership requirements for the UNRC. The FAC also developed suggestions to improve the utilization and utility of the UNRC, and transmitted them to ECAS.

The FAC has been considering, and continues to consider the relationship between the processes and procedures in the University's Non Discrimination Policy and the procedures specified in the bylaws of the Faculty Committees on Academic Freedom and Tenure and on

Grievances. The bylaws of the two faculty committees specifically exempt claims brought under the University's "Sexual Harassment" Policy from the purview of the committees. However, the University no longer has a separate "Sexual Harassment" Policy. Some of the provisions of that policy have now been subsumed into the much broader University Non Discrimination Policy.

The FAC has considered the issue at its last three meetings. At the FAC's last meeting, on October 15, 2014, the FAC discussed the issue with David Sipucic, the University's Title IX/504 Coordinator and Equity Compliance Officer. Consideration of reconciling policies and procedures of the University's nondiscrimination and anti-harassment policy and those of the two faculty committees is continuing in the FAC.

SAPC: J. McCombe submitted the following in writing:

The SAPC has met twice since the September Academic Senate meeting.

Our first task for this year is revisiting the work done last year by SAPC on procedures specified in Senate's Amendment to DOC 2012-04 Academic Honor Code Revision (October 2012).

We clarified the history of the document, noting the Honor Code has been implemented differently in the various units which have raised questions. In addition, that document included the establishment of an Academic Dishonesty Incident Report. We are working on Sections IV and V to clarify the procedures and specify the timelines and processes for appeals and the conditions under which students can be dismissed from an academic unit, as well as the appeals process for dismissal from the University.

There continues to be need for discussion among the deans and with the Provost's office about whether we should allow an academic unit to expel students from the unit for academic dishonesty violations when they have not been expelled from the University. At very least, we need to make sure that units must inform the provost's office so that students' progress can be tracked.

In this first SAPC meeting, Dean Eddy Rojas stated that he sees the Deans' concerns and recommends that if we need a review committee that could handle appeals at the level of the Provost's decision, we should establish a new committee.

There is a pragmatic concern among many of the deans' offices that trying to establish a more clear policy for dismissal will draw attention away from the need to implement carefully and consistently the Academic Dishonesty Incident Report that the Senate established over a year ago. Given the unevenness of past practices across deans' and department offices in the reporting of academic dishonesty violations, there is still a good deal of administrative work to be done in getting the new reporting process fully implemented.

When we reach a final revision, we will need to send them to CCPD for review and GLC also for their review before returning the recommendation to the Deans' Council.

Suggested Revisions:

- 1) In specifying conditions for expulsion, remove VP for Student development and include the Dean of the student's home unit on the list of concurring bodies.
- 2) Regardless of prior record of honor code violations, the instructor, department chair or program director of the course where the violation occurred, dean of the unit where the violation occurred, and the Dean of the student's home unit, agree that the circumstances surrounding the honor code violation were of such severity that they warrant expulsion from the University.
- 3) Remove the statement that a Dean or the Provost can NOT increase the recommended course of action made by the instructors or Department's chairs. This is to allow for the circumstance where an instructor or department chair may not be aware of a longer history of academic dishonesty.

John McCombe was then tasked with these will revisions in light of our conversations and send an invitation to the next meeting on October 6.

During this second meeting (Oct. 6th), the primary order of business was to discuss John McCombe's edits to our draft of the academic honor code violation policy.

1. We determined that the penalty could increase at any point in the process.
2. We removed references to the VP for student development.
3. We removed the requirement that the instructor and department chair/program director must approve of the dean's decision to expel the student.
4. We determined that if the chair is also the instructor, the associate dean will step in for the chair in the appeals process.
5. We changed the composition of the review committee, replacing two tenured professors with two full time faculty preferably those who have tenure.

Upon completion of this task, we discussed the concerns the Deans' Council had with our previous draft. Dean Rojas added that he would like to see some guidance regarding punishments that can be levied by the Dean's office. The question was raised whether the student's behavior record should be brought to bear on the dean's decision. It was then pointed out that should the student's conduct record be reviewed for the purpose of determining punishment for an honor code violation, that student should not be punished for those behavioral infractions twice.

An updated, revised version of the policy will be distributed in advance of the next SAPC meeting on October 20, 2014.

Additional questions that still need to be addressed include:

- The Honor Code provides that normally the maximum penalty for an honor code violation is an F in the course with no provision for the student to receive a W. Does this mean instructors can refuse to allow a student to drop a course after an honor code violation? What if a student decides to drop a course for another reason unrelated to the honor code violation?
- Can students who receive an F in the course for an Honor Code violation retake the course? Should the original F count or not count towards the student's GPA?
- Can a person hearing the appeal recuse himself or herself because they are the accusing instructor? This has been partially answered with respect to department chairs, but what if an associate dean is the accusing instructor?
- What does the phrase "without regard to motive" mean in the honor code? What happens if a violation occurs in group work, and one member of the group claims ignorance of the cheating that was happening?

Next SAPC meeting: Monday, October 20 at 9:00 in HM 257.

ECAS: C. Krane introduced the next agenda items in lieu of a formal ECAS report.

SET Implementation Announcement: L. Hartley announced that the new SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) was set to go. See the October 17, 2014 folder on the Academic Senate Porches site for the implementation plan and other information. The SET website can be found on the LTC site at <http://go.udayton.edu/set>. There will be drop-in training sessions in the LTC as well as web-based training. Faculty questions can be directed to SET@udayton.edu and student questions can be directed to HelpDesk@udayton.edu.

The vendor is CoursEval. The process has already been used successfully this semester. The window for semester-long classes will open December 2nd and be open for 10 days.

Update from Ad Hoc Committee for Evaluation of Administrators: C. Krane explained that an ad hoc group had been formed to gather issues and work quickly. ECAS discussed the initial report at the October 17th meeting. Further discussions will be held. L. Leming reported that the ad hoc committee's report stressed the following points:

- The need to be more transparent about what evaluations of administrators are being done and on what timeline. We also invite greater participation in the reviews.

- Better communication about closing the loop when feedback has been given that in fact the review happened and efforts have been made to incorporate feedback towards enhancing performance and overall administration.
- Recognition that while annual evaluations do take place but placed emphasis on periodic comprehensive—we used the word multi-faceted—reviews and that terms of office and schedule for reviews be information that is easily accessed. Different administrators have different terms of appointment so we recommend that the multi-faceted reviews occur at least every 3-4 years.

Additionally, the initial focus should be on key academic positions: provost, association provosts, deans, and department chairs with the understanding that the policy can and should be extended to a broader range of positions as implementation unfolds.

A document will be emailed to faculty after the meeting. Feedback should be sent to ECAS.

Update on Administrator Searches: P. Benson announced that the VP for Finance and Administrative Services search (committee chaired by Bill Fischer) is progressing. On campus interviews are expected to happen at the end of October or early November. The Dean of the School of Law search (committee chaired by Jim Durham) is being advertised. There are 35-40 searches for Deans of Law Schools currently being conducted in the US. Off-campus interviews are expected to be held in mid-January with on-campus interviews a few weeks later. The search for the Dean of the College (chaired by Sue Trollinger) is progressing. After much consultation with the College faculty, the description has been finalized and the position will be advertised soon. The committee is hoping to do off-campus interviews during the second half of January with on-campus interviews a few weeks later. P. Benson encouraged everyone to recruit for these positions as appropriate.

UNRC Call for Nominations: C. Krane explained the Senate Parliamentarian position and encouraged Senators to nominate people for this position. If no nominations are received, ECAS will discuss options. E. Hicks announced that the names of the confirmed nominees to be considered for the Maternity Leave Review Panel had been sent to Associate Provost Pat Donnelly. She announced that nominations were still being accepted to be considered for the search committee for the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration until Monday, October 20th at 9:00 am.

ELC September Meeting: C. Krane reviewed the membership of the Educational Leadership Council and gave a brief summary of the September meeting that featured an overview of the role of UDRI by Mickey McCabe. The slides will be shared with the Senate. The next ELC

meeting will be held on November 17th. The agenda is not yet set. Possibilities include Advancement and student athletes. Please send any suggestions to C. Krane.

Academic Scheduling Committee Task Force: Co-chairs L. Hartley and P. Anloague provided a brief update of the work of the task force. The survey instrument was piloted, revised and deployed on October 16th. They hope to have some preliminary information to report at the November Academic Senate meeting. A handout was provided to help Senators prepare for the discussion at the November meeting. The task force has sought broad consultation on this issue. P. Anloague read the list of who has been consulted during this process. L. Hartley announced that the task force would be meeting with the Chairs Collaborative group in November to continue a discussion started in October. There are no assumptions that anything will be changed. This is data collection to help inform decisions. The charge of the task force was to study and make recommendations, but we don't know what those recommendations will be yet. Although this task force is operating on a pretty quick timeline, P. Benson stated that the issue was very complex and it is possible that more consultation may be necessary so making changes in 2015 may not be feasible. Any change in class schedule has impact all over campus. Other types of changes are also being considered. R. Frasca asked if there were any plans to look at alternative ways of scheduling classes. P. Anloague responded that the task force had not, but welcomed suggestions. C. Daprano asked if changes in weather had been taken into consideration. P. Anloague said yes, but more data may be needed. J. White asked what anecdotal information had been gathered. L. Hartley responded that anecdotal information pointed to it being impossible to walk the primary routes in good weather, much less bad weather.

C. Krane thanked L. Hartley and P. Anloague for their work and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks

APPENDIX A

CAP COMMITTEE 2014-2015

1. Juan Santamarina (CAS, Humanities)
2. Sawyer Hunley (Assistant Provost for CAP)
3. Jennifer Creech (Assistant Registrar)
4. Joe Mashburn (CAS, Sciences)
5. Jim Dunne (Business)
6. John White (SEHS)
7. Don Pair (Associate Dean, CAS)
8. Joan Plungis (Libraries)
9. Lee Dixon (CAS, Social Sciences)
10. Elias Toubia (Engineering)
11. Student
12. Student

Ex-Officio Members:

13. Riad Alakkad (Associate Dean, Engineering)
14. Terence Lau (Associate Dean, Business)
15. Katie Kinnucan-Welsch (Associate Dean, SEHS)
16. Fred Jenkins (Associate Dean, Libraries)

CAP Leadership Committee 2014 – 2015

1. Sawyer Hunley (Chair)
2. Christine Schramm (Associate VP & Dean of Students, Student Development)
3. Teri Thompson (CAS, Humanities)
4. Denise Taylor (Engineering)
5. Don Pair (Associate Dean, CAS)
6. TBD (Arts, CAS)
7. Mary Kay Kelly (SEHS)
8. Charles Wells (Business)
9. Todd Smith (Physics, CAS)