

4-15-2011

2011-04-15 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, "2011-04-15 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2011). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 25.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/25

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 Academic Senate
Friday, April 15; 3:00 p.m.
KU West Ballroom

Present: George Doyle, David Johnson, Shawn Swavey, Sheila Hughes, Carolyn Phelps , Joseph Saliba , Paul Benson, Katherine Trempe, Antonio Mari, Paul Vanderburgh, Art Jipson, Heidi Gauder, Leno Pedrotti , James Dunne, Rebecca Wells, Jonathan Hess, Ruihua Liu, Tony Saliba, Kevin Kelly, Matt Shank, Kim Trick, Heather Parsons, Heidi McGrew, Caroline Merithew , Andrea Seielstad, Judith Huacuja, Corinne Daprano

Absent: Lisa Kloppenberg, Thomas Brady, John McComb, Vinod Jain, Kara Dickey, Alex Renner, Emily Jirles, Jim Pappadakes, Carol Harper, Briana Hollis

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Terence Lau, Pat Donnelly, Carissa Krane, Laura Leming, Kathleen Webb, Brad Duncan, Francois Rossier, Alexander Morgan, Linda Hartley, Phil Anloague, Sawyer Hunley, Deb Bickford

Opening Meditation: Andrea Seielstad opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: Minutes of the March 18, 2011 meeting were approved

Announcements:

J. Huacuja announced that a Faculty meeting will be held on May 10 in Boll Theater at 3:00 p.m.

J. Huacuja welcomed the newly elected senators to the Academic Senate.

J. Huacuja reminded the chairs of the Senate subcommittees to submit end of the year reports.

Old Business:

Committee Reports.

Academic Policies Committee. J. Hess reviewed the attached APC report.

Student Academic Policies Committee. C. Daprano reported that there have been no meetings or new action since the March 18 Academic Senate meeting.

University Nominating & Recruiting Committee. A. Jipson reported that the UNRC completed the changes to the committee's bylaws suggested by ECAS and the AS. He agreed to assist the next UNRC committee chair with next year's transition since, according to the UNRC Bylaws, the committee will need to be reconstituted next year.

Faculty Affairs Committee. R. Wells reported that FAC has completed their work on a Graduate Faculty Status proposal which will be discussed and voted on at today's meeting. She also discussed the items that the committee will work on next year: 1) student evaluation of instruction that will be led by S. Hughes; 2) titling and emeritus status led by K. Trick; and, 3) an addendum to the Intellectual Property policy led by R. Wells

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. J. Huacuja reported that the APC's Academic Misconduct Report has been reviewed by ECAS and will be sent back to the APC for further discussion.

J. Huacuja also reviewed the recommendation from the recently passed Senate Voting Rights proposal (DOC I-1101) that will be implemented by ECAS next year:

Further recommendations: The Academic Senate was reconstituted in 1981, and since that time many changes in the size of the administration as well as the faculty and student bodies have developed. Due to the many changes across the University of Dayton these thirty years, a reassessment of Academic Senate representation is warranted. The Senate will charge a sub-committee of faculty and administrators to undertake a study examining the possible need for greater representation of faculty and students. This study would consider the proportional representation of faculty, students, and administrators at the University of Dayton, and would strive to articulate ideal ratios for representation of faculty, students and administrators. The sub-committee will report to the Senate its findings by April 2012.

The Voting Rights sub-committee will be constituted after the UNRC is reconstituted for the next AY.

New Business

Graduate Faculty Status. Brad Duncan, Assoc. Dean of GPCE reviewed the proposal titled DOC I 11-02 *Revised Criteria and Application Process for the Granting of the Graduate Faculty Status*. The FAC and ECAS have reviewed and voted to support this document. R. Wells made a motion to approve Senate Document I-11-02; A. Mari second. The proposal was approved by a vote of 24 approved; 0 opposed; 3 abstentions.

Review Senate DOC 1 07-05 (Processes & Procedures of the Senate): J. Huacuja reviewed several minor changes to the document based on ECAS and the AS's work this year. A. Seielstad made a motion to approve these changes to Senate DOC 1 07-05; A. Jipson second. The changes were approved by a vote of 24 approved; 0 opposed; 3 abstentions.

J. Huacuja then thanked Jackie Estepp, Sr. Administrative Assistant, Office of the Provost for all her administrative assistance to ECAS and the Academic Senate this AY.

Consultative Process. J. Huacuja read a draft statement to the Academic Senate (AS) entitled "Statement on Senate Consultation in Appointment & Hiring" (see attached document). The draft statement was approved by ECAS by a vote of 5 approved; 2 abstentions. Additionally, ECAS voted that J. Huacuja would introduce the draft statement at the AS meeting later that day for comment by the AS by a vote of 7 approved; 0 opposed; 0 abstain. It should be noted that the Provost was not present when this statement was presented and voted on by ECAS at the end of today's ECAS meeting. J. Huacuja also read the definition of consultation as written in the Constitution of the Academic Senate, Article II.

Provost Saliba objected to ECAS's interpretation of the Senate Constitution's definition of consultation. Provost Saliba noted that he and President Curran believe Senate consultation is not needed unless the issue involves a policy. Both believe it is prudent to have consultation with the AS but do not believe it is necessary to consult the Senate on executive decisions.

J. Huacuja noted that there have been recent calls for more discussion and consultation with faculty by members of the Senate. She also explained that in practice the Senate is interpreting consultation to mean the AS will be consulted in cases of "the selection, review and retention of the President and Vice Presidents" (UD Academic Senate Constitution, Article II, 3.g.).

Provost Saliba responded that he welcomes discussion with the AS regarding an effective consultation process. He feels strongly there is a need to clarify the Senate's intent. He assured the Senate that when appropriate the president feels strongly about consulting with the Senate. Further, he feels ECAS has a different interpretation than the President and Provost of the consultative process and this warrants further discussion to resolve these differences in interpretation. Provost Saliba added that there is no history of the President and Provost consulting ECAS and the Senate over all hiring decisions.

J. Huacuja concluded the discussion by expressing appreciation for the Provost's efforts to engage with faculty this year. She also thanked A. Seielstad, vice president and C. Daprano, secretary of the Senate for their service this AY.

CAP Update. S. Hunley delivered a CAP update to the Senate. She reported that Juan Santamarina, Humanities was elected chair of the CAP & Competencies Committee. The CAP Leadership Team will be meeting next week. She also added that the Faculty Development Group is conducting faculty development workshops regarding CAP, course development, and CAP proposals.

Before adjournment of the Senate meeting H. McGrew thanked J. Huacuja for serving as president of the Senate this year. J. Huacuja will assume the duties of chair of the Visual Arts Department for the next AY.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano

After adjournment of the Senate meeting Provost Saliba conducted voting to elect: 1) three members of ECAS (Humanities, SBA, Dean's representatives); and, 2) ECAS officers for the 2011-12 AY.

The following members of the AS were elected to ECAS: J. Hess (Humanities), R. Wells (SBA), and P. Benson (Deans).

The following members of ECAS were elected to serve as officers of the Senate: J. Hess (president), A. Seielstad (vice president), and C. Daprano (secretary).

The members of the AS then met with their respective Senate Committees and elected the following chairs: C. Phelps (APC), L. Hartley (FAC), and G. Doyle (SAPC).

STATEMENT ON SENATE CONSULTATION IN APPOINTMENT AND HIRING

ECAS formally expresses concern about the University's creation and hiring of new Vice Presidential positions without notice or consultation with the Academic Senate and urges the Offices of the Provost and President to ensure appropriate consultation in advance of future decisions of the like.

Broad consultation promotes compliance with the University's Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Policy,¹ ensuring that opportunities for hiring, promotion, additional pay, leadership, advancement, and other tangible benefit within the university be widely announced across campus with equal opportunities for all qualified to apply and receive due consideration for such opportunities.

Consultation is also consistent with the Academic Senate's authority under Article II of its Constitution² to exercise legislative or concurrent authority over matters that impact the academic and educational development of the University and to propose or to comment upon policies other than those academic and educational including the selection, review and retention of the President and Vice Presidents, Program Directors, Chairpersons, and Academic Deans.

Broad consultation also results in better, more-informed decisions and policy-making within the university, more sound organizational structure, and goodwill and collegiality within the campus community.

In this instance, the newly created positions, while clearly also involving issues of personnel and administrative oversight, directly impact the learning environment and direction of the academic programs and reputation of the university. They involve matters over which the Senate has express consultation authority and interest. Additionally, the resulting appointments did not involve open search processes that might have enabled consideration of a diverse pool of candidates.

WHEREFORE, ECAS conveys its concern to the Office of the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees about past appointments that took place without Senate Consultation and requests that appropriate notification and opportunity for consultation take place in future hiring, appointment, promotion, and decision-making involving the creation of new positions or programs.

¹ <http://campus.udayton.edu/~hr/hrwebsite/Policies/AEEOPol.htm>

² <http://academic.udayton.edu/senate/constitution.html>

APC Report to the Academic Senate

Academic Senate meeting, April 15, 2011

Jon Hess, APC chair

APC business conducted since the last Academic Senate meeting

Student Academic Misconduct Form

- In our previous meeting, surveyed all colleges and schools about their record-keeping practices related to student academic misconduct, we reviewed the proposed form, discussed the issues, developed our recommendations for revisions to the proposed form and for implementation, and asked Leno to write a summary.
- In this meeting, we reviewed Leno's excellent summary and made some revisions to our recommendations. We submitted those recommendations in memo form to ECAS for their consideration.

Program Development Protocol Document Review

- In response to the APC's request, the Provost worked with ECAS to develop a summary of degree development protocol. This summary referenced two existing senate documents, 94-10 and 96-3, which APC members were previously unaware of. Although the new document was closely aligned with the older ones, there were two areas that we felt warranted further discussion
 1. The proposal process (which was less of a concern that the suspension process when document 94-10 was created) needs to be streamlined to make the work less burdensome, especially in cases where there is no risk and few costs associated with the new program. We propose replacing Appendix A with a more streamlined set of guidelines to make this process more functional.
 2. The procedure outlined in document 94-10 is not suitable for the university as it operates today. The newer procedure is more appropriate, and we believe this section needs to be updated as well.
- These revisions should be done in the fall, when there will be adequate time to complete the task. Doing it now means we'll be half done and have to start over with a new committee. This task will go on the September 2011 agenda for the APC.
 - Our year-end report contains a summary of all the specific decisions the APC made regarding this document.

Agenda for next year

- *PDP proposal* -- Develop specific recommendations and send that to ECAS
- *Student academic misconduct form* -- Work on final revisions on the student academic misconduct reporting procedures, assuming ECAS sends that back to the APC
- *Implementation of CAP*
 - *Work with Sawyer Hunley & CAP Leadership Team to advance curriculum* -- The APC will need to stay in conversation with Sawyer Hunley and the CAP Leadership Team as they work to support development and implementation.
 - *Oversight of CAP & Competencies Committee* -- This committee reports to the APC. They will need to begin by developing a process and criteria for evaluating and making decisions on new course proposals. The APC will need to provide oversight for this process.