

4-24-2009

2009-04-24 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, "2009-04-24 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2009). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 12.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/12

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
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
3:00 p.m., April 24, 2009
KU West Ballroom

Senators Present: P. Benson, D. Biers, C. Bowman, L. Cook, M. Daniels, D. Darrow (presiding), G. Doyle, B. Duncan, C. Duncan, T. Eggemeier, R. Frasca, H. Gauder, J. Huacuja, V. Jain, A. Jipson, P. Johnson, N. Jolani, R. Kearns, G. Knape, L. Laubach, H. McGrew, M. Moss, D. Poe, S. Richards, J. Saliba, A. Seielstad, M. Shank, L. Snyder, S. Swavey

Senators Absent: A. Abueida, T. Brady, J. Firestone, J. Greenlee, L. Kloppenberg, T. Lasley, R. Marek, F. Martin, A. Reichle, K. Trick

Guest: P. Anloague (HSS), J. Farrelly (Faculty Board), K Webb (library)

1. Opening Prayer: C. Duncan opened the meeting with a prayer.

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

3. Minutes: The minutes of February 20, 2009 were approved as written.

4. Announcements: none

5. New Business:

a. DOC-08-04: University Nominating and Recruiting Committee

ECAS presented a document that outlines the procedure for nominating and recruiting faculty to serve on various committees at UD. ECAS proposed approval of the procedure.

Comment 1: The document seems to favor the appointment of academic senators to this committee – suggest that non-senators make up committee and that they be rotated.

Response 1: Academic senators are a starting point. Friendly Amendment: The first committee will develop a procedure for staffing itself as far as method and length of term appointment. They will submit their decision to the Academic Senate at the October 2009 meeting.

Comment 2: This committee should report to Senate.

Response 2: Friendly Amendment: The chair of the UN&RC will report to the Academic Senate at the April 2010 meeting as to any problems or success over the past year.

Call the vote: For: 29 Opposed 0 Abstain 0

b. Operations Manual

Under VII – Actions taken this year -- reviewed document for possible changes.

i. DOC 08-01 should not be in manual because it has not passed the Senate yet

ii. DOC 08-02 should indicate approval as of February 20, 2009.

Call the vote: For: 29 Opposed 0 Abstain 0

6. Committee Reports: Annual Reports, 2008-2009

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

In addition to the day-to-day business of assigning proposals to standing committees, setting agendas, and attending the ELC, the Executive Committee has completed the following:

1. **Provost Search**—Submitted a pool of names for the Provost search committee to President Curran
2. **Updating Faculty Handbook**—Recognizing the need to update the faculty handbook and make it more accessible, the Executive Committee asked Dr. James Farrelly to work with Associate Provost Untener to identify or tag areas in the handbook that need to be made current, submit a list of these issues to ECAS, and explore converting the handbook into a searchable format. Dr. Farrelly reported on his progress at the March non-meeting (no quorum).
3. **Taking charge of University Committee Rosters**—See Doc 08-04.
4. **Part-time Faculty issues**—ECAS has been in an on-going dialogue throughout the year with Senator Heidi McGrew and Associate Provost Untener on a variety of issues associated with part-time faculty. It passed on to FACAS for consideration and issue connected to titles.

5. CAP2: Moving the Process Forward

Recognizing the need to build on the momentum created by the CAP Draft Report, submitted to the APC last August, and the constructive suggestions of all those who submitted and reviewed the feedback to the draft report, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate notes the following:

1. That significant work in this process has been completed by both the CAP subcommittee and the university community as a whole;
2. That the feedback on the CAP report indicates a general acceptance of the seven student learning outcomes contained in the *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* and in the approved University assessment plan;
3. The feedback also indicated a general acceptance of many of the themes highlighted in the *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* document and the CAP proposal, including integrated learning, diversity and international/intercultural education;
4. That there is a need to provide the University community with a more extensive summary of both the feedback to the CAP proposal, and to then construct a path for future development of the proposal and a clear process for completing the task of general education reform;
5. That there needs to be greater involvement of the University community in the development process. The CAP feedback indicates that there are existing groups ready to move forward with the process of developing concise and concrete proposals for revitalizing and revising contributions to general education to deliver an academic program *common* to all students that meets the University assessment outcomes and builds upon the philosophical foundations of the *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*;
6. That a process needs to be developed over the summer that will organize the efforts of existing groups, identify other areas in need of exploration and development, and include deadlines.

In sum, a substantially revised draft of the CAP proposal is called for that a) establishes a common academic program based on the seven student learning outcomes in *Habits of Inquiry* and the approved University assessment plan; b) weighs the constructive proposals and concerns presented in the

extensive feedback provided last fall by individuals, departments and units; c) incorporates appropriate concrete proposals from affected units for revitalizing and revising contributions to general education that meet the University's assessment outcomes for student learning; and d) results in a formal proposal, including implementation plan, that can be discussed by the Academic Senate and the university community beginning at the Senate meeting of March 26, 2010.

To accomplish this task, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate has appointed and charged a three-person *coordinating and writing task force*. The task force will be chaired by Senator Pat Donnelly and include Drs. Danielle Poe and Margaret Pinnell. The task force is charged to do the following:¹

1. Familiarize itself with the original *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection* document (which references assessment material); assessment material pertaining to the current general education system housed in the CAS Dean's office; the CAP report; the responses to the CAP report submitted by individuals, departments and units; and curricular developments and discussions already underway that have an impact on a revised CAP (Summer 2009);
2. Solicit any additional needed commentary from the University community on the strengths and weaknesses of the CAP proposal and create a more extensive and detailed summary of the responses to the CAP proposal to be shared with the Academic Senate and University community at the September 25, 2009 Senate meeting (Summer 2009);
3. Using the assessment of feedback from the CAP proposal, the other sources in 1), and the seven student learning outcomes, create a list of tasks to be completed by groups in the broader academic community and develop a statement of work to be completed by each group, including specific charges and a timetable. This list should be shared with the Senate early in the Fall 2009 semester (Summer-early Fall 2009);
4. Work with these groups as they generate their proposals, coordinating efforts among them (Fall 2009);
5. Provide monthly updates on progress to the Academic Policies Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Senate as a whole.
6. Use its assessment of the materials listed in the first bullet point and the proposals created as a result of its charges to produce a plan for revising the current general education system that:
 - o creates a common academic program that promotes more intentionally the distinctive student learning outcomes of the University assessment plan, and;
 - o includes a list of required resources and proposes an implementation plan (including pilot programs).

This document must be submitted to ECAS by March 10, 2010 to be placed on the agenda for the March Senate meeting.

The office of the College of Arts and Sciences' Associate Dean for Integrated Learning and Curriculum will provide administrative support to the task force. The Provost will provide a summer stipend to committee members.

In addition, the Executive Committee is aware that many departments, committees, and other units that have already begun work on proposals pertaining to undergraduates' common academic experience that advance the student learning outcomes in the approved University assessment plan. The Executive Committee asks that they stay at the table and continue their efforts, accepting their charges from the

¹ ECAS concluded that the coordinating/writing task force should consist of three persons: a Chair, who is a sitting Senator; a faculty member from one of the professional schools; and another faculty member. It also believed that at least one of the three should be someone who served on the first CAP subcommittee in order to ensure continuity of process and to build fruitfully on their experience.

task force and working in concert to achieve their common goals. The Executive Committee also asks that they bear in mind the following:

- That the common academic experience for undergraduates at UD should be at once more intentional and more distinctive;
- The developmental perspective embodied in the original *Habits of Inquiry* document and CAP proposal;
- The need to create mechanisms and curricular opportunities for students to integrate their learning within the CAP and between the CAP and their major;
- The role that co-curricular educational activities might play in achieving the assessment outcomes.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Policy on Intellectual Property -- The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS) charged the FACAS to study the issues concerning the current University of Dayton policy on intellectual property. To that end the FACAS was given permission by ECAS to develop an *Ad Hoc Committee* to develop an **addendum** to the currently existing policy. Senator Shawn Shavey will chair this *Ad Hoc Committee* and will report on its progress to FACAS. The attached letter was developed during our FACAS meeting of March 24, 2009 and we have invited the following faculty/administrators to be members of the *Ad Hoc Committee*:

Henrici, Kelly; Law School

Rowley, Jim; School of Education & Allied Professions

Sandner, Lisa; Legal Affairs

Skill, Tom; UDiT

Suttman, Erick; Music

Sweeney, Pat; Engineering

Webb, Kathy; Library

Wright, David; UDiT

Academic Policies Committee

This academic year the APC has accomplished a number of tasks including:

1. Recommendations and approval of DOC I-07-04 -Honors and Scholars Program Proposal
2. Recommendations and approval of QRC document
3. Approval of DOC 08-03- Proposal for New Graduate Degree Program: Master of Science Bioengineering
4. Presenting campus community with CAP Proposal and requesting feedback in the manner of written or oral comments. As a part of this, APC held four open forums in October and November. During these sessions faculty and staff assessments of the CAP Proposal were recorded. All feedback, oral and written, was put in electronic format and recommended to be placed on the Senate webpage for the campus community to review.

Student Academic Policies Committee

1. Over the course of the past academic year, the SAPC addressed concern regarding the new Honor Pledge that was approved by the Academic Senate during the 07/08 academic year. Specifically, the concern was that the university at large was not aware of the implementation of the new Honor Pledge. It was provided to incoming students during orientation for the 08/09 academic year, but none of the

other students were notified. The second concern was how faculty could readily access the Honor Pledge in an effort to include this with their course syllabus. It currently resides on the UD home web page under H for Honors Code/Pledge.

2. The second charge of the SAPC was to address the current student assessment of faculty teaching tool that is currently in place at UD. Last year, there was a draft of a new evaluation form that was not discussed during the 07/08 academic year as the SAPC was focused on the new Honor Code/Pledge. In comparing the two versions, i.e., the existing evaluation form, and the new drafted evaluation form received little support from any members of the SAPC. After numerous discussions with members of the SAPC, it was agreed upon that a new committee would be formed to address how best to implement a new faculty evaluation of teaching form. The new committee, E.R.I.C. (Evaluation, Review and Innovation Committee) was formed, and currently consists of two faculty members each from SAPC and FAC. Additional members consists of four undergraduates (two from SAPC, two from SGA) and one graduate student representative.

During the initial meeting of ERIC, it was agreed that the committee would address two issues:

- a. There was lengthy discussions regarding the current “script” that supposedly is to accompany the actual assessment tool, explaining the reasons behind faculty evaluation of teaching. It quickly become obvious that the existence of the script was in question, and if such a document exists, is it actually read to students prior to filling out the evaluation form.
- b. Student representative from SAPC and SGA asked to be given an opportunity to construct a new script that would accompany the evaluation form. The initial draft of their efforts were presented to members of ECAS on the 20th of April, 2009. Members of ECAS were supportive of the student’s efforts, but recognize that additional work is needed on this document as well. The plan is to have the revised script available for the Fall (09) semester faculty evaluations
- c. In the fall of 2009, members of ERIC will work with faculty on campus who have extensive knowledge in the construction of an effective assessment tool. Once the committee has reached an agreement as to how best to proceed, it was recommended that ERIC and SAPC seek input from a recognized expert at the national level.

7. Outgoing/Incoming Senators

Dave Darrow thanked all the outgoing senators for their work over the past year. He then welcomed the incoming senators. Each senator introduced him or herself.

8. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm

Respectfully Submitted: George Doyle – Secretary of Academic Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Incoming Senate for 2009 - 2010
3:45 p.m., April 24, 2009
KU West Ballroom

Senators Present: P. Benson, D. Biers, T Buckley, M. Daniels, D. Darrow, G. Doyle, B. Duncan, T. Eggemeier, R. Frasca, H. Gauder, J. Hess, J. Huacuja, V. Jain, A. Jipson, R. Kearns, G. Knape, L. Laubach, R. Liu, A. Mari, J. McCombe, H. McGrew, M. Monalisa, S. Richards, J. Saliba (presiding), A. Seielstad, M. Shank, L. Snyder, K. Sunday, S. Swavey, R. Wells, J White

Senators Absent: T. Brady, P. Donnelly, L Kloppenberg, T. Lasley, J. Malone, three unelected student senators.

Guest: none

1. Roll Call: Thirty-one of thirty-nine Senators were present.

2. Election for Executive Committee

SBA – R Wells
SOC. SCI. – D. Biers
SOE. – B. Duncan
SOEAP -- L. Laubach

3. Election for Officers

President – D. Darrow
Vice-President – R. Kearns
Secretary – L. Laubach

4. Committee Chairs

Academic Policies Committee – J. Huacuja
Faculty Affairs Committee – D. Biers
Student Academic Affairs Committee – R Kearns/G Knape

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm

Respectfully Submitted: George Doyle – Secretary of Academic Senate (outgoing).