

12-12-2014

2014-12-12 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, "2014-12-12 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2014). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 109.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/109

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, December 12, 2014; 3:00 pm
KU Ballroom

Present: Jason Pierce, Andrew Slade, Myrna Gabbe, Linda Hartley, Danielle Foust, Joe Mashburn, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Jasmine Lahoud, Leslie Picca, Laura Leming, Paul Becker, Mike Brill, Ralph Frasca, Kevin Kelly, Philip Anloague, Elizabeth Kelsch, Aaron Altman, Ed Mykytka, Jamie Ervin, Austin Hillman, Harry Gerla, Erin Brown, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Sean Gallivan, Angela Busby-Blackburn, Paul Benson

Guests: Wiebke Diestelkamp, Terence Lau, Susan Brown, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, Deb Bickford, Sawyer Hunley, Jim Buckley, Sharon Gratto, José A. Camberos, Sarah Dickson

Absent: John McCombe, Rebecca Whisnant, Paul Bobrowski, Jeffrey Zhang, James Dunne, Erin Malone, Joe Watras, John White, Eddy Rojas, Paul McGreal, Dominique Yantko

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

Minutes: The minutes of the November 14, 2014, meeting of the Academic Senate were approved.

Committee Reports:

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

The Academic Policies Committee has been reviewing the priorities currently used by the University Calendar Committee in developing future academic calendars. Particular attention has been given to the priorities that were deemed most relevant to assessing the trade-offs to be made in relation to two proposed specific calendar options that were proposed by the Calendar Committee for each of the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years. These options differed primarily with respect to (a) the length of the Christmas Break/January intersession and (b) the possible incorporation of a week-long Spring Break that would include St. Patrick's Day. As a result of this review, the APC's initial recommendations include the following:

1. Full-time faculty be surveyed at the start of the Spring 2015 Semester to obtain additional information that would shed light on the faculty's current perception of the academic value of the January intersession and the trade-offs to be made if it were possible to incorporate a week-long Spring Break—and, in particular, one that includes St. Patrick's Day—in future academic calendars. A draft of a possible survey was shared with ECAS this morning and, once a few suggested revisions are made, the APC chair will contact the Business Research Group to discuss implementation of the survey in mid-January. The Provost has graciously agreed to fund the cost of implementation. The survey will address the faculty's general perception of academic value of the January intersession and a week-long Spring Break and will also solicit some specific preferences

in this regard. The results will be used to help the APC update the general list of priorities and inform the faculty representatives who serve on the University Calendar Committee.

2. The academic units and other relevant offices (such as Campus Ministry, Student Development, and the Center for International Programs) also be consulted to catalog specific activities that were scheduled for the January 2015 intersession as well as other potential activities that might be curtailed if the intersession was to be shortened in future years. This would appear to be especially relevant in assessing the aforementioned trade-offs as this year's combined Christmas break/intersession is only three weeks in total duration and, thus, is one about week shorter than in the previous four years.
3. Students also be consulted via the SGA representatives on the Senate with respect to the perceived value of the January intersession and the trade-offs to be made if it were possible to incorporate a week-long Spring Break in future academic calendars.
4. If it becomes desirable to extend the Spring Semester by scheduling the May commencement exercises to occur later than the first full weekend in May, significant study of the potential advantages, disadvantages, and campus-wide impacts would be needed since the change would substantially impact the Summer term and the effects would be far-reaching.

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. See proposed DOC 2014-11 on today's Academic Senate agenda.

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

The SAPC had originally planned to meet on December 1st, but that meeting was postponed. The SAPC did not feel compelled to meet because progress continues on the draft revisions to the Policy on Academic Misconduct.

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 (GLC) for further consultation. In addition to making some additional, preliminary revision suggestions, the GLC requested additional support documents, and has invited the Chair of the SAPC to attend the January meeting of the GLC's Executive Committee. Those supporting documents—which consist of a summary of major changes to the existing policy and a flow chart outlining the revised procedures—are in progress and will be submitted to the GLC and to the SAPC prior to its January 2015 meeting.

Next SAPC meeting: Monday, January 12th at 9:00 in HM 257.

ECAS: C. Krane reported that a draft charge for the new Information Literacy Task Force had been reviewed by the executive committee. She stated that the final report from the ad hoc Academic Schedule Committee had been submitted to Interim Provost Benson. She thanked everyone involved in that process, especially co-chairs, Linda Hartley and Phil Anloague. ECAS has been working with the APC and the Calendar Committee on academic calendar issues and priorities. ECAS has also been discussing the evaluation of administrators. C. Krane reported that ECAS participated in a conference call with President Curran about his decision to step down in 2016. C. Krane discussed ECAS/Senate involvement in the search for a new president with Steve Cobb, chair of the Board of Trustees. She explained the importance of completing the tutorial about Title IX issues and cautioned everyone to look for the email that has a non-descript subject line. C. Krane announced that there had been no self-nominations for service on the UNRC Committee and that E. Hicks was stepping down as chair and off the committee as of December 31st. C. Krane asked Senators to recruit someone from their unit to serve on the UNRC. She explained that if no one was willing to take on the UNRC duties, then the mechanism to populate university committees would revert back to the process where administrators hand-picked faculty to serve. P. Benson stated that the UNRC contribution has been of great significance to him this year. He thanked Emily Hicks for her service. C. Krane reminded us that if we want a voice, then we must populate the committee.

The next ELC meeting will be Monday, December 15, 2014 at 9:30-11:30 am in KU. The agenda will include the January Board of Trustees meeting, strategic planning, the upcoming presidential search, and the draft charter for the ELC.

Announcements:

C. Krane introduced Zack Goit, the new Academic Senate Parliamentarian. He is a law school student and President of the Law School's Federalist Society. He will begin his duties as Parliamentarian in January.

DOC 2014-11 Proposed Amendment to the Competencies Sections of the Bylaws of the Faculty Hearing Committee on Grievances, and the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure: H. Gerla, chair of the FAC, reviewed the rationale and proposed changes to the bylaws to accommodate the new, more broadly-defined nondiscrimination and anti-harassment policy adopted by the University in January 2014. The bylaws reference the previous sexual harassment policy and needed to be updated. After much discussion and review, the FAC proposed that the competencies of the two hearing committees be amended to remove the current exclusion for matters involving "sexual harassment" and to put in its place exclusion for matters covered by the university nondiscrimination and anti-harassment policy. Notwithstanding the proposed new exclusion, the Faculty Hearing Committee on

Academic Freedom and Tenure will be able to independently review and make findings on claims that a faculty member's actions were protected by principles of academic freedom. See DOC 2014-11 for the specific changes. W. Diestelkamp asked if the hearing committee and the Title IX process could make different findings. H. Gerla said yes and that both processes only make recommendations to the relevant decision maker. He explained that if the issue is not academic freedom then the hearing committee is bound by the findings of the Title IX process. H. Gerla explained that the FAC plans to review the jurisdiction of promotion in rank since under the current bylaws, one committee handles tenure-related issues and the other handles promotion-related issues. The committees were established prior to tenure and promotion to associate professor being linked at UD. P. Benson stated that an issue with tenure/promotion to associate professor would go to the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure because they are now linked.

L. Leming moved to approve DOC 2014-11 and L. Picca seconded. ***The motion was approved (25 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).***

Academic Scheduling Feedback and Discussion: P. Benson provided an overview of his observations about the proposed scheduling changes and explained that there was no way to reach consensus, but that the academic mission was in the forefront. He apologized for the delay in releasing a draft schedule, but key personnel were out of the office. Here are six of his observations:

1. The challenges involved with transit time to and from Fitz Hall have been studied carefully.
2. This is a significant, campus-wide issue.
3. The proposed changes in the course schedule have been reviewed extensively by the Office of the Registrar.
4. Whatever changes may be made to the formal class schedule, exceptions will continue to be made (with appropriate approval) in order to accommodate important academic priorities.
5. Comments posted to the feedback form distributed by the Provost's Office to faculty on December 1st are generally positive.
6. Due to the seriousness of large numbers of students routinely arriving late to class or modifying their course selections to avoid Fitz Hall classes, a decision must be made soon about the proposed change.

P. Benson explained that the proposed change keeps the start time on MWF the same and adds an additional five minutes between classes. Graduate classes currently starting at 4:30 will keep the same start time with an additional five minutes added between classes. An additional class period has been added at 8:00 am on TTH to help accommodate late afternoon conflicts. C. Krane stated that the schedule changes were not final yet and that our discussion was of a draft schedule. M. Brill asked if requiring professors to start and end on time was considered. L. Hartley stated that it was discussed, but that it would not solve the larger issue. P. Anloague stated that this particular issue was not mentioned in the survey results as a contributing factor. E. Kelsch stated that her constituents (Education students) agreed that 15 minutes between classes would help. J. Lahoud stated that it was unreasonable to make such a change

for a small number of students. A. Hillman stated that a recurring complaint was the chapel construction. He asked if any decision should wait until that project was over. P. Anloague reported that 32% of survey respondents said construction was an issue. However, construction projects are a moving target. L. Hartley stated that the time trials showed that even on routes without construction, there were still problems getting to the destination on time. An additional concern relates to students starting to avoid taking classes in Fitz Hall based on travel time. A. Busby-Blackburn reported that her constituents (adjunct faculty) had a range of responses to the proposed schedule from some thinking it is good to do whatever will help the students to others who worry about safety issues at night and being away from home longer. Others are concerned that a longer break between classes would cause students to skip classes. L. Picca reported that faculty in the Social Sciences expressed concern about the impact on child care and a lack of visibility/safety at night. J. Mashburn expressed concern about the scheduling of science labs. P. Benson stated that labs will continue to be exceptions and that Patsy Martin has said that all current labs could be accommodated.

E. Mykytka expressed concerns about the continued conflicts between 75 minute classes and 150 minute classes. K. Kinnucan-Welsch reiterated this concern. C. Krane expressed concern about the earlier start times on TTH for students and faculty. She also asked why safety concerns are not being addressed beyond scheduling changes. P. Benson stated that changes have been made to the timing of the lights on Brown Street, but that further changes are not possible since Brown Street does not belong to UD. In addition, the Main Street construction project has pushed more traffic to Brown Street. He reiterated that safety is a priority. S. Gratto expressed concerns about safety and about the lack of time to process the changes, particularly related to the composites. She explained that the music faculty are concerned about issues that are programmatic and curricular because most performances are at night. With the extended schedule, it is likely that the marching band would have to practice after dark. She asked about starting classes before 8 am. T. Lau stated that the idea of an extra class period on TTH was good, but asked what about the plan for utilizing the new slot. P. Benson explained that it would help relieve existing pressures on the schedule at this point. He stated that the decision about next academic year must be made by the end of December. He asked people to continue to send feedback. He stated that chairs would have six weeks to readjust schedules.

Proposed Policy on the Evaluation of Academic Administrators: C. Krane explained that the first step would be a policy for the evaluation of administrators under the purview of the Provost. Step two would address other administrators. The policy has been revised based on the November 14th conversation at the Academic Senate meeting and the November 18th meeting of the Provost's Council. C. Krane opened the floor for discussion. J. Mashburn asked if the committee would put together guidelines for procedures. P. Benson said yes. He explained that some evaluations needed to happen in 2015 so they would be conducted in tandem with the committee's work. A. Altman asked if in light of the Board of Trustees' hands-off approach, how long the faculty would wait to evaluate the president. There was no answer.

Addition to the agenda: The agenda was amended to add the following topic. L. Leming proposed the following statement be added to the minutes of today’s meeting to record a point of appreciation for the students, staff and faculty who have been part of the efforts this week to raise consciousness against racism:

“The Academic Senate wants to affirm in our minutes the efforts of the students, staff and faculty who over the last week have organized and participated in both the Ferguson Teach-In and the non-violent direct action to address the issue of racism that divides our country and has been seen in events on our campus. These efforts to educate and create opportunities for civil discourse that will help us move forward as a country and as a campus community are welcome, important and appreciated.”

An incident of racism on UD’s campus in response to the silent protest outside of KU and derogatory comments on Yik Yak were also discussed. S. Gallivan proposed that the statement be postponed until January to allow for more discussion and possibly better align with Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. M. Brill stated that it was a good idea, but asked if this sort of statement was within the purview of the Academic Senate. L. Leming said that in her opinion waiting would be a missed opportunity to support these efforts. K. Webb and L. Picca expressed support for the statement. M. Brill stated that the anonymous Yik Yak comments were rude and disrespectful and needed to be dealt with sooner rather than later. M. Gabbe asked why these incidents were not disseminated widely like the safety reports from Public Safety. R. Frasca questioned whether it was necessary or appropriate for the Senate to make a statement on a topic that was not on the agenda and that faculty were not informed about before the meeting. Several senators expressed support for the statement to be made a resolution. L. Leming made a motion to have the Senate adopt the statement as a resolution and E. Hicks seconded. The statement language was modified to reflect a resolution:

Resolved, that the Academic Senate affirms the efforts of the students, staff and faculty who over the last week have organized and participated in both the Ferguson Teach-In and the non-violent direct action to address the issue of racism that divides our country and has been seen in events on our campus. These efforts to educate and create opportunities for civil discourse that will help us move forward as a country and as a campus community are welcome, important and appreciated.

The resolution passed (23 yes, 0 no, 2 abstentions).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.
Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks