

11-17-2006

Student Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-10-20

University of Dayton. Student Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Student Academic Policies Committee, "Student Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-10-20" (2006). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 143.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/143

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

Student Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

Minutes from the meeting of October 20, 2006

Approved 11/17/06

Present: Dale Courte, Tom Eggemeier, Mark Brill, Danielle Poe, Andrew Fist, Russell Hardie

Minutes of the Sept. 29, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved.

Discussion of the proposed text for the new Honor Code was tabled to insure the proposal for a University P&T Committee could be discussed.

There was a brief background discussion to insure all members understood the basics of the proposal and the underlying motivation.

The following concerns and issues were raised:

- It would have been better had the proposal made specific recommendations as to how to bring about consistency across units, rather than leaving all that to the University P&T Committee.
- The difference between procedural and substantive matters was not sufficiently described. Some examples of each may help to clarify.
- Concern was raised over the resulting shortening of the time some will have to submit P&T materials. The existing schedule in the College is already short, considering the turnaround time for many professional journal submissions. It seems further shortening is undesirable.
- It is unclear in the proposal how procedural inconsistencies within a unit would be addressed. The point was raised that there are many differences within the College from department to department. A specific example would be how peer teaching reviews are conducted, especially the level of transparency in the process. It is the understanding of the members present that these inconsistencies would be addressed at the unit level. But could concern about such inconsistencies be brought to the University P&T Committee?
- It is understood that the University P&T committee would not judge substantive appeals because it would lack the discipline-specific experience. However, the point was raised that with the breadth of disciplines existing in the College, a similar lack of such experience may exist in the unit P&T Committee. The members present felt it is important that the department input be appropriately weighted when making P&T decisions. It was pointed out that this is the case in many institutions and would be the expectation here.

- Given the relative size of the College, a concern was raised that the number of seats from the College may be too low. Only one seat from the Arts and Humanities may be insufficient.
- It was unclear from the document what the approval process is for procedural recommendations the University P&T Committee would make.
- The point was raised that it seems odd the candidate must sign a statement that the procedures were or were not followed. Inconsistencies in process may not be apparent at the time of review.

Many points above will be provided to FACAS as input concerning the proposal.