

11-14-2014

2014-11-14 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, "2014-11-14 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2014). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 108.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/108

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, November 14, 2014; 3:00 pm
KU Ballroom

Present: Jason Pierce, Andrew Slade, Myrna Gabbe, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Rebecca Whisnant, Danielle Foust, Joe Mashburn, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Leslie Picca, Laura Leming, Mike Brill, Jeffrey Zhang, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Joe Watras, Philip Anloague, Eddy Rojas, Aaron Altman, Ed Mykytka, Austin Hillman, Paul McGreal, Harry Gerla, Erin Brown, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Sean Gallivan, Angela Busby-Blackburn, Paul Benson

Guests: Yvonne Sun, Alan Kelley, Francisco Penas-Bermejo, Patrick Donnelly, Don Pair, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Terence Lau, Paul Vanderburgh, Patsy Martin, Lindsay Elrod, Anne Crecelius, Corinne Daprano, Shannon Miller, Harold Merriman, Susan Brown, K. Kinnucan-Welsch, Deb Bickford, Tom Skill, Carolyn Phelps

Absent: Jasmine Lahoud, Paul Becker, Paul Bobrowski, Erin Malone, Kevin Kelly, John White, Elizabeth Kelsch, Jamie Ervin, Dominique Yantko

Opening Prayer/Meditation: R. Whisnant opened the meeting with a prayer.

Minutes: The minutes of the October 17, 2014, meeting of the Academic Senate were unanimously approved.

Committee Reports:

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

The Academic Policies Committee completed its task of reviewing a draft proposal developed by the CAP committee for the two-year evaluation of the Common Academic Program. The APC agreed with the CAP committee that this initial evaluation should emphasize the progress made in implementing CAP and provide a forum for surfacing both initial successes and areas of concern. The APC suggested the addition of an element that explicitly solicits and summarizes feedback from the academic units, faculty, and students with respect to implementation, not only highlighting positive accomplishments but also revealing perceptions about issues, unintended consequences, and ongoing challenges that might merit closer scrutiny. Within this context, the APC views this evaluation as a type of midterm instructional diagnosis of CAP and, like a MID, its intent should be to produce results that would enable the APC, Senate, the CAP Committee, and others to work together proactively to enable CAP achieve its full potential. At its most recent meeting, the APC began review of the priorities that are used by the University's Calendar Committee in setting the academic calendar and which were last reviewed in 2009 prior to the introduction of the January intersession. In addition to the priority given to standard elements such as the numbers of class days, starting and ending dates, holidays, and the final exam period, particular attention will be given to the duration of the intersession and the possibility of incorporating a week-long spring break that would

encompass St. Patrick's Day. This review is motivated (in part) by the fact that, given current priorities and practice, the inclusion of such a spring break would appear to require the Spring semester to start as early as January 9 in the 2016-17 academic year, limiting the intersession to single week following the New Year's holiday. The committee will continue this conversation at its next meeting on November 25 joined by the University's Registrar, Tom Westendorf. Responses received from the Graduate Leadership Council and the academic units to the APC's draft policy on academic certificate programs will also be discussed at this meeting as time permits.

A brief discussion about number of classes/days in calendar followed the report. C. Krane stated that any comments should be directed to J. Dunne or E. Mykytka. The Calendar Committee must make a decision about the 2016-17 academic year by February.

FAC: H. Gerla reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee finished reconciling the relationship between the processes and procedures in the University's Non Discrimination Policy and the procedures specified in the bylaws of the Faculty Hearing 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 Nondiscrimination Policy. The committee recommended broadening the exclusion to include all protected classes covered by the nondiscrimination policy. The committee recommended that the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure retain the right to make an independent decision on issues of academic freedom.

SAPC: J. McCombe submitted the following in writing:

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

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

During both meetings (Oct. 20th and Nov. 3rd), the SAPC worked in consultation with the Provost's Office, as well as the Deans of the Schools of Engineering and Business, in order to clarify several issues:

- 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?

In the interests of brevity, the present report will not provide detailed answers to all of these questions, but the latest draft revisions to the Academic Honor Code has attempted to clarify these procedural issues in keeping with existing University policies regarding issues such as withdrawals, for example.

In keeping with the Deans Council request this summer—when that body reviewed an earlier draft of the SAPC’s Academic Misconduct policy revision—the latest revision has now been forwarded to the Graduate Leadership Council for further consultation. In addition, the draft will be returned to the Deans Council for discussion during an upcoming meeting.

Next SAPC meeting: Monday, December 1 at 9:00 in HM 257.

ECAS: C. Krane reported that the UNRC process had failed to produce nominees for the Senate Parliamentarian position. When approached about the possibility of a law student for this position, Dean McGreal suggested using the Law School’s Dean’s Fellows process. The search is underway and the student will be given a small stipend. If this solution is successful, then the process will be formalized next year. C. Krane expressed gratitude to Dean McGreal on behalf of the Academic Senate. C. Krane reported that the ELC would meet on Monday, November 17. The agenda includes guests from UD Advancement/Development and a discussion of the draft charter of the ELC. ECAS has time scheduled with each of the candidates for the VP of Finance and Administration position. C. Krane participated in the candidate interviews for the Budget Director of Academic Affairs position.

Announcements:

Update on Administrator Searches: P. Benson announced that the Budget Director of Academic Affairs position has been filled but cannot be made public yet. The VP for Finance and Administrative Services search (committee chaired by Bill Fischer) is progressing. On campus interviews are being conducted. The Dean of the School of Law search (committee chaired by Jim Durham) and the search for the Dean of the College (chaired by Sue Trollinger) are on track.

The two finalists for the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs were announced today and the on campus interviews are scheduled. ECAS has time with both candidates and everyone is encouraged to attend the open sessions.

UNRC Membership: C. Krane announced that new committee members are needed to serve on the UNRC. She reviewed DOC 2009-01 and her expectations of the committee members. She asked volunteers to email her, P. Anloague, or E. Hicks. The UNRC process is important to increase faculty participation.

UNRC Call for Nominations: E. Hicks reported that four nominations were received for the University Honorary Degree Committee and all four have been passed along to P. Benson. C. Krane stated that a deeper pool was needed and encouraged people to nominate themselves or others. Names should be sent to P. Benson, C. Krane, or E. Hicks.

Update from Ad Hoc Committee for Evaluation of Administrators: C. Krane explained that an ad hoc group had been formed by ECAS to gather issues and work quickly. L. Leming reported on the ad hoc committee's work at the October Academic Senate meeting. This draft report of considerations was submitted to P. Benson to help inform his work on a new policy for evaluating academic administrators. He explained that his decision to focus first on academic administrators was pragmatic. The evaluation of non-academic administrators is beyond the purview of the Provost's Office and would most certainly take more time to implement. P. Benson stated that he is planning to bring a draft proposal to the next Provost's Council for discussion. It will come to ECAS and the Senate after that. He provided an overview of the structure and scope of the draft policy. Administrators to be covered by the policy include academic administrators with direct supervisory responsibility for faculty and/or direct responsibility for an academic unit, department, programs, etc. (Provost, Associate Provosts, academic deans, chairs, and others as appropriate). The full scope will be determined during year one of implementation of the policy. P. Benson provided descriptions of three categories of evaluations to be included: (1) annual performance evaluations (most frequent, most limited because no broad consultation); (2) Developmental/360 evaluations (broader participation of peers, direct reports; lengthy with consultant guidance and development plan); and (3) reappointment evaluations (widest scope of participation; timing varies). Timelines for evaluations will be public and staggered because cannot conduct all types of evaluations for each person every year. P. Benson wants to implement the policy during this academic year, if possible. J. Pierce asked about what is new in this policy. P. Benson explained that formalizing a timeline for evaluations as well as having a formal, written policy. P. Benson hopes for better consistency, particularly with chair evaluations. Some variation among chairs is to be expected given the range of department sizes. J. Dunne stated that faculty have a strong voice during the

hiring process, but little input after that. P. Benson stated that the inclusion of broad participation during a reappointment evaluation is very important. However, P. Benson acknowledged that some decisions must be made quickly. He hopes that the greater level of transparency will help alleviate some faculty/staff concerns about reappointments. P. Anloague suggested that search committees play a role during the reappointment process. S. Gallivan asked if this draft policy would meet the spirit of feedback received from the Senate. P. Benson explained that reviews have been taking place, but a lack of transparency and consistency has perpetuated the idea that evaluations are not being performed. These issues had surfaced during the 2009 and 2011 campus climate surveys. The lack of a formal policy did not help. M. Gabbe expressed concern about the lack of transparency surrounding the campus climate survey results. C. Krane stated that faculty want an expanded role in the developmental reviews. T. Lau expressed concern that a focus on academic administrator evaluations was an attempt to pick and choose issues from the Faculty Handbook. P. Benson reiterated that this was a first step. The Senate will have an opportunity to discuss further in December.

Provost Office Response and Initial Plan to Address Academic Climate Survey Results and

Discussion: P. Benson reported the steps taken since the academic climate survey results were received. He reviewed the top-three areas of greatest concern according to the survey results: (1) practices of shared governance, (2) transparency and consultation in policy and decision-making, and (3) role of Marianist values in University decision-making. Over thirty unit-level meetings of faculty and staff have been held to discuss survey results and each unit will produce an action plan to address the issues of greatest concern to that unit. P. Benson provided selected examples from unit action plans, including expanded training for supervisors in Marianist administrative values and conflict management; revised meeting structures to encourage dialogue and productive action; improved annual performance evaluation processes; implementation of an anonymous feedback system; increased opportunity for dialogue about university policies, priorities, and Board of Trustees actions (especially through the Senate and the ELC); expanded programming and financial commitments to promote diversity and foster inclusion in enrollment strategy, student learning, and faculty development; and a more transparent annual budget request process. P. Benson stated that these efforts to improve UD's academic climate are only the beginning. They will seek on-going faculty and staff recommendations, feedback, and guidance. He announced that the regular ModernThink climate survey will be conducted campus-wide in Fall Term, 2015. He encouraged everyone to contact him with concerns if other avenues cannot be used. He expressed gratitude for the trust, patience, hard work, and dedication to advancing the shared mission of our university community shown by all involved. P. Benson thanked everyone for their participation in this process.

R. Stock asked why issues such as UD's lack of gender equity are not addressed directly. P. Benson responded that specific programs aimed at domestic diversity, including women, are in the works.

Academic Scheduling Committee Task Force: Co-chairs L. Hartley and P. Anloague provided a report summarizing the work of the task force and presenting some preliminary recommendations. The primary issues of concern were safety and academic success. The survey results indicated that one third of undergraduate students have class in Fitz Hall with the biggest impact on MWF classes. Many of the faculty respondents indicated that late arrivals were common among students with classes at Fitz Hall. There is quite a bit of anecdotal evidence that incidents between pedestrians and cars have increased. The construction on campus was cited as a contributing factor, especially the closing of university circle and ongoing renovation of Fitz Hall elevator.

The task force recommendations include the following:

1. Continue to work with UD Public Safety, UD Environmental Health & Safety/Risk Management, and City of Dayton
 - Address safety concerns, especially in regards to Brown Street crossings
 - Maximize efficiency of pedestrian crossing and motor vehicle traffic
 - Consider physical changes to campus to address safety concerns
2. Increase transit time between classes on MWF
 - Preserve the same number of class time slots
 - Preserve 8:00 a.m. start time
 - Consider adding 5 minutes for a total of 15 minutes between classes
 - Consult with all affected constituents, allowing ample time for adjustment

Any change to schedule will impact every area on campus, not just academics. L. Picca asked if a fundamental schedule shift had been considered. P. Benson stated that type of change would take considerably more time to discuss. At this point, only transit time and related issues are being studied. The committee will compile their final report and send it out for feedback. There will be time on the December Senate meeting to discuss further. C. Krane thanked the committee for their hard work.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks