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MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 25, 2005 – 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. in St. Mary’s 113B

PRESIDING: David Biers

SENATORS PRESENT: Biddle, Biers, Buchino, Eloe, Gerla, Huelsman, Penno, Pestello, Rapp, Webb, Yungblut

1. Opening Prayer: D. Biers gave the opening prayer.

2. Roll Call:

3. Approval of ECAS Minutes for April 11, 2005: The April 11 minutes were approved as written.

4. Announcements:
   a. D. Biers stated that the May 2 and May 9 meetings will be canceled. The ELC Retreat will be held on May 9, and the next ECAS meeting will be held on May 16.
   b. It was determined that ECAS meetings will be held during the Summer as needed.

5. Old Business:
   o Standing Committee Reports:
     Academic Policies Committee (APC): J. Biddle stated that P. Eloe’s subcommittee completed their work on the review of Thematic Clusters and distributed the draft to the ECAS members. The subcommittee voted on it and it is ready to be moved to the ECAS. D. Biers stated that the G.E. committee would begin an evaluation of clusters to develop a plan and submit it to the ECAS by October 15 with final approval from ECAS by November 1, 2005. J. Biddle stated that the subcommittee looked at the previous charge, identified what wasn’t done and requested that this be completed. D. Biers took a vote for moving this item forward and it was approved unanimously. It was suggested to contact Corinne Daprano, chair of the General Education committee, as soon as possible to inform her of this charge. J. Biddle said the Provost’s Council subcommittee that the APC is assigned to, Catholic and Marianist Mission and Identity, met and discussed the charge of taking stock of the various initiatives which is currently underway by the Rector’s office. The next meeting will involve looking at the work the Rector’s office did and deciding where to go from there.

     Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC): L. Yungblut stated someone on their committee wants to talk about part-time faculty issues and they have contacted Joe Untener to speak to them in the Fall. H. Gerla reported that
Legislative and Consultative have been used wrong. The Senate is given authority to initiate policies in the academic areas “university-wide.” This should not be taken literally because very little of what is done applies to all units; it really means across units. Other groups are given concurrent authority to create or initiate proposals, but our Consultative authority is really approving or disapproving items that impact the academic policy across units. If the President’s Council, or the APC, or some other group that is not a body of the Senate comes up with issues, the Senate has to consult, i.e., approve or disapprove them. The technical name for this action is Legislative Concurrence. The third action is Consultation which is what our opinion is on something. A lot of issues that have been identified as Consultative actually fall into the category of Consultation. The question was to what extent could things such as the First Year Experience, the Marianists, etc., come up with proposals that would affect the academic life of the university and the answer is they are perfectly free, to but the Senate has to vote on them. They cannot come into effect until the Senate votes on them if it affects the academic core of the university as determined by what the Constitution says. For example, a single department could change its requirements and it does not have to go through the Senate as long as it affects only that unit. Technically, if it impacts units (more than one unit) it does have to go through the Senate. Legislative Authority covers Academic Affairs degree requirements, standards for development of curriculum program evaluations, curricular options, general curriculum degree requirements and honorary degrees, grievance process, standards of evaluation, sabbaticals, professional development, research, and promotions.

D. Biers said the issue had been raised if the Stander Symposium has been evaluated. J. Rapp said that Deb Bickford is having a meeting on this and he will report after the meeting. It was agreed that there needs to be some sort of feedback mechanism. It was reiterated that the Stander Symposium came out of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. The Provost’s Council looked at it after the ECAS. It was commented that the symposium needs to be faculty-driven.

Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC): N. Buchino said the students questioned why their elections did not coincide with the Senate elections. It was explained that this would eliminate any seniors participating and there would have to be a guarantee that the student would be coming back in the Fall. There was good feedback on having a faculty mentor. It was felt that the students do not have a good understanding of what the chair’s responsibilities are to the Senate, and they were not comfortable on saying whether a student should be the chair or not. They liked the idea of the chair being a student and they felt thought the faculty mentor would help. There are four items that need to be discussed in the future about the Honor Code. Steve Hileman, the new SGA VP, is going to set up a campus-wide forum next fall to talk about these four topics. D. Biers asked if a student would be the chair of the SAPA in the fall. The ECAS decided that Steve Hileman will be the SAPC chair. K. Webb will join the SAPC and be their mentor.
6. **New Business:**

*Debrief from April Senate Meeting* – D. Biers said several people thanked him for having presentations open to the university. It was suggested that a better job needs to be done in communicating back from the committees to the campus. It was felt that presentations and hand-outs, along with a brief overview of the essential points that were made, could be sent to the department chairs to disseminate to their faculty. The question was asked, how do we close the loop and come back to the Senate? The faculty needs to be able to react to reports from committees (for example, First Year Experience) before a decision is made or action steps are taken with the Senate being the forum. It was stated that D. Biers is the link from the Provost's Council to the Senate. It was stated that sometimes there is not enough time for feedback because of the timing of meetings. It was suggested to invite the Committee chairs to the ECAS and report on their progress. This information can be disseminated to the full Senate. It was mentioned that the First Year Committee had two Faculty Exchange Sessions on their work and break-out sessions for suggestions. It was suggested to bring in chairs from the Provost’s committees to present to the ECAS.

- **Where do we go from here?** – F. Pestello stated that the next steps on the Vision of Excellence is to send a version to the ELC. The Ad Hoc committee gave their recommendations and S. Wilkinson incorporated their revisions. This will be sent electronically for another chance to comment on it and then will be finalized. The next stage is Focusing the Vision for 2015 and the ECAS will be involved in it and how the Senate will participate in this. The Senate will also be involved in the Foundational Issues. This will be worked on during the summer.

- **Need for Summer Meetings** – Everyone needs to give their schedule to J. Wilson.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Judy Wilson