

12-3-2010

## 2010-12-03 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2010-12-03 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2010). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 21.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/21](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/21)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

Approved  
Minutes of the Academic Senate  
December 3, 2010; 3:00 p.m.  
St. Mary's Hall Room 113B

**Present:** Judith Huacuja, Bradley D Duncan, Andrea Seielstad, Heidi G Gauder, Paul Benson, Leno M Pedrotti, Corinne Daprano, Katie Trempe, Antonio Mari, Rebecca Wells, Vinod Jain, George Doyle, James Dunne, Mathew Shank, Thomas Brady, Art Jipson, Paul Benson, Leno Pedrotti, Jon Hess, Joseph Saliba, Emily Jirles, Carol Harper, Briana Hollis, Carolyn Phelps, Sheila Hassell Hughes, John McCombe, Ruihua Liu, Kevin Kelly, John White

**Absent:** Lisa Kloppenberg, Laura Hume, Thomas Brady, Shawn Swavey, Tony Saliba, Kimberly Trick, David Biers, Brianna Hollis, Kara Dickey, Alex Renner, Heidi McGrew

**Guests:** Kathleen Webb, Edward Mykytka, David Wright, Deborah Bickford, Patrick Donnelly, Mark Martley, Adrienne Niess, Fran Rice, Michael Krieger, Amy Gullen, Joan Giglierao, Emily Hicks, Ione Damasco, Rachel DeHart

**Opening Meditation:** James Dunn opened the meeting with a meditation.

**Minutes:** Approval of the minutes of the October 15 meeting was deferred until the next scheduled meeting.

**Announcements:**

J. Huacuja announced that the next meeting Senate meeting will be January 14, 2010, as scheduled, since no other dates are available for rescheduling in February.

**Old Business:**

D. Bickford provided a brief update on the Common Academic Program planning. The Assistant Provost search is underway and work of search committee nearly finalized; the Provost has been consulting with the APC in that process. Bill Trollinger was appointed as the 1<sup>st</sup> year humanities coordinator. First-year chairs wrote learning goals for all humanities commons courses, and pilots are being solicited for fall implementation. A joint SBA and CAS seminar has been convened by Bro. Ray Fitz and Dr. Pat Johnson, exploring issues related to practical ethical action. Plans are underway for the development of the CAP Faculty Institute that would provide options for faculty development and engagement building upon the foundation established by the Faculty Development Committee and LTC. Updates on the CAP process may be found at <http://provost.udayton.edu/cap/>.

Academic Policies Committee (APC). John Hess announced that the APC had three items of business since the last meeting. (1) It has been consulting with the Provost on appointing the assistant provost for the Common Academic Program. (2) It also reviewed a proposal for a program in medicinal and pharmaceutical pharmacy in the chemistry dept. ECAS asked APC to evaluate the proposal and

determine if this needed to go to the Senate for action. APC determined that it did not require Senate action because it does not cross any units or require any units to make changes or provide resources to it. Rather, it was designed to serve students that want more focused treatment of analysis and synthesis of pharmaceutical chemistry within the B.S. requirements for a chemistry degree. Only two programs will be affected – biology and chemistry – and both approved the proposal, as did the AAC. The program requires virtually no additional resources, few risks, and it potentially strengthens the program and could attract students here. The proposal requires approval from the Board of Trustees but no Senate action other than what the APC and ECAS have undertaken by way of review. (3) The final item of business was regarding student academic misconduct procedures and forms for reporting. APC members had questions about whether APC or SAPC should resolve this matter, and ECAS will be resolving this issue. Meetings will be on Mondays from 3:30 to 4:30, and the next meeting will be on January 24.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). Rebecca Wells reported that the FAC has continued to deal with the same three issues discussed previously. (1) It is reviewing a statement that has been proposed by way of intellectual property rights for faculty developing online courses. (2) With respect to the issue of titles for part-time faculty, the FAC has enlarged the scope to include titles for all instructional staff. This includes emeritus and adjunct faculty. The primary purpose of the project is to promote consistency across all units so that everyone is using titles in same way. (3) The committee has made considerable headway with respect to the issue of student evaluation of instruction, and has reached some conclusions. Recognizing the culture of UD as a student-learning-centered learning culture and given that culture, members of FAC believe it is important to gather feedback from students regarding student satisfaction and student reporting of instructional practices and professionalism of faculty in the classroom. Those would be the primary purposes of gathering feedback from students. Information gathered would not be shared with students for course selection, nor would it be a measure of student learning. We understand the feedback may become part of administrative reviews of faculty instruction; but consistent with existing university policy requiring multiple measure of faculty teaching evaluation it should be just one component. FAC is also brainstorming ways of offering or advance alternative measures to assess effectiveness of teaching in terms of student learning. Following the presentation, a question was raised about why FAC is studying the 3<sup>rd</sup> issue. The issue actually came to the Senate via the SAPC who last year considered methods of informing students of the purpose of the evaluation and conducting it. ECAS referred the matter to FAC for evaluation of the underlying purposes and content of the evaluation form.

Student Academic Policies Committee. Corinne Daprano reported that the SAPC is considering ramifications of new eighteen (18)-credit-hour guidelines that will enable students to take that extra credit hour without paying an additional fee for that early in their career at UD. Additionally, they are beginning discussion of additional student representation to the Senate.

University Nominating and Recruitment Committee (UNRC). A. Jipson reported that the committee has met twice in person since the last Senate meeting. It is reworking the entire document and hoping to present it again to ECAS after the first of the year. In particular it is re-examining the composition of the committee, its operations, and methods of recruiting faculty. At the same time it is actively developing a list of interested faculty, has consulted with Jack Ling about methods of recruiting that

may enhance diversity, and is planning additional means of outreach such as faculty exchange series and presentations for new faculty and staff. Finally, there have been some changes in the membership, Heidi Gauder replacing Rebecca Wells on the committee. The next meeting will be on December 10 at 10 am.

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS). Judith Huacuja indicated that ECAS has been considering 2 issues: the Department of Chemistry proposal on pharmaceutical chemistry and the proposal regarding revisions to the composition of the Academic Senate which was on the agenda for discussion at this Senate meeting.

The discussion then turned to the matter of the composition of the Senate. Brad Duncan, as a representative of the subcommittee that deliberated on the matter at the behest of ECAS, and Judith Huacuja, on behalf of ECAS, summarized the issues and procedural history for all Senate members.

The crux of the subcommittee's recommendations was that those occupying deans' positions for the graduate school and the library should have voting positions on the Senate, but not the deans of enrollment and students. No provisions were made for additional faculty or student members of the Senate.

ECAS discussed the proposal and appreciates that both components will require a vote. The concern in ECAS was regarding the likelihood of the recommendations being met with success across campus if we do not first have a conversation about a number of core issues such as criteria for representation on the Senate and the ratios and numbers of administrators, faculty and students that should serve. Several ECAS members reported that when a proposal had been made in the past recommending that the dean of libraries have a voting position, there was lot of concern about the need to add a faculty vote on senate to counter the additional administrative vote. The fear among some ECAS members was that if we took the two proposals apart and tried to move one to a vote, i.e., the graduate school position, the other one would become marginalized and lose momentum. Therefore, ECAS determined that we should keep the two issues together and send them back to a new committee with a new charge to research and consider the issues in light of the broader issues of representation between faculty, administrators, students as well as the appropriate criteria for representation at the university. The intention was to energize the proposal, not stall it.

J. Huacuja then announced that the discussion would be for information gathering purposes only and that no vote would be taken on any issues. She invited discussion about the following issues:

1. The Viability of the Senate Voting Rights Proposal.
2. Criteria for granting additional voting rights for (a) faculty, (b) students, and (c) administrators.
3. Interest and viability in conducting additional research, including gathering models and guidance from other institutions, to determine criteria for the appropriate ratio of administrative, faculty, and student Senate votes.

Senate members raised a number of questions and comments. It was indicated that the Constitution does not give guidance as to criteria for membership or representation ratios. Some were interested in

knowing how representation was determined at the time the Senate was reconstituted in the 1980s and how things have changed across campus since then. Others asked about proportionality between departments, i.e., whether it should make a difference that the library of 16 faculty members would have 2 representatives while departments with much bigger faculties would have less representation. The issue of representation of part-time and full-time non-tenure-track instructional staff was also raised, as was the need to consider further student representation.

Some emphasized the need for greater representation of tenure-track faculty and suggested that there be a focus on ratios rather than actual numbers such that, for instance, the addition of 1 administrative position might warrant the addition of 4 additional tenure-track faculty to preserve current ratios. Many noted that a reassessment of Senate representation was also warranted by the number of other university changes that had occurred over time, i.e., in the role of the provost, the addition of more associate provost positions, the change in the graduate school leadership, the growth in online and continuing education, changes in student development reporting to the academic side of campus.

Overall, though, many members indicated support for the subcommittee's proposal as well as for the idea of studying the representation issue further for additional recommendations. It was suggested that the proposal be brought to a vote that included the recommendations for the 2 dean members as well as language indicating that subsequent study of representation and proportionality would be done.

In the end, a straw poll was taken to gauge the Senate's collective opinion about the matter. The issue presented was whether the matter should (1) be referred back to the committee as proposed by ECAS or (2) should go directly to a vote on the subcommittee's existing proposal (add as voting members those who occupy positions as the deans of library and graduate school) with some additional language indicating that the faculty and student representation issue would be examined further and describing the next steps for doing so. In the end, of the 24 members remaining at the time of the vote, 2 members voted for the ECAS method proposing that the matter be deferred for vote until all the issues could be addressed and 18 voted for the 2<sup>nd</sup> option of a prompt vote on the 2 deans' positions with language approving further study of representation and proportionality. It was suggested that this be brought for a vote in the Senate perhaps in February or March so there would be time for a full vote by the faculty in the event the proposal was approved by the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Seielstad