

2-24-2012

## 2012-02-04 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, "2012-02-04 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2012). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 84.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/84](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/84)

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 Academic Senate

Friday, February 24; 3:00 p.m.

KU West Ballroom

**Present:** Paul Benson, Caroline Merithew, Shelia Hughes, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Jonathan Hess, Nicholas Michel, Leno Pedrotti, Carissa Krane, Arthur Jipson, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, James Dunne, Rebecca Wells, Dimitri Tsiribas, Kevin Kelly, Corinne Daprano, Phil Anloague, John White, Megan Abbate, Vinod Jain, Joseph Radisek, Andrea Seielstad, Antonio Mari, Emily Hicks, Kimberly Trick, Jesse Grewal, Joseph Saliba

**Guests:** Sean Gallivan, Patrick Donnelly, Bob Kearns, Mark Nielsen, Dan McCray, David Darrow, David Wright, Jayne Brahler, Shannon Miller, Steve Wilhoit, Brad Duncan, William Fischer

**Absent:** David Johnson, Kaitlin Regan, Emily Kaylor, Joe Castellano, Terence Lau, Tony Saliba, Partha Banerjee, George Doyle, Paul McGreal, Paul Vanderburgh, Kathy Webb, Heather Parsons

**Opening Meditation:** Phil Anloague opened the meeting with a meditation

**Minutes:** Minutes of the January 20, 2012 meeting were approved

**Announcements:**

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is March 16, 3:00-5:00 p.m. (KU Ballroom).

The 2012 Stander Symposium will take place on April 18, 2012. The deadline for submitting project proposals is March 12, 2012. Dr. David Suzuki will deliver the keynote address on April 16 at 7:30 pm in the KU Ballroom.

Provost Saliba has asked for suggested new titles for the CAP (Common Academic Program). The suggested titles should be: 1) distinctive, 2) descriptive, and, 3) invite discussion.

The University of Missouri Interactive Theatre Troupe will be on campus March 19-20 to present a workshop for faculty on the issue of differences and difficult conversations in the classroom. Faculty are encouraged to attend one of the workshop sessions.

This week the School of Engineering has been celebrating 100 years (1911-2011) of Excellence in Engineering Education and Research.

**Committee Reports:**

**Academic Policies Committee (APC).** C. Phelps reported that the APC has been reviewing and discussing three documents from the Graduate Leadership Council (GLC) – 1) Retake Policy, 2) Standards and Progress Policy, and 3) Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor's Plus Master's (BPM) Degree Programs. The committee hopes to have the proposals ready for review by the Senate in March. The APC will next meet on Weds. March 7 at 8:30am in St. Joe's 325.

**Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC).** A. Mari reported that the SAPC has not met yet this semester. The committee is waiting for feedback from the ASenate on the proposed modification and additions to the Academic Honor Code before meeting again.

**Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).** L. Hartley reported that FAC is discussing the following: 1) Faculty workload, and, Outside Employment. In terms of the Faculty workload guidelines the FAC has been charged to: 1) review archived workload documents to determine if these are still pertinent and

appropriate; 2) review other university's workload guidelines; and, 3) directly report to FAC with recommendations and plan.

After the adhoc committee finished their work, the FAC has met twice to discuss the recommendations and subsequent revisions. Some of the issues that we have discussed include teaching load vs. faculty responsibilities, to include research and service; and providing a baseline of teaching load within the document. We have tailored the recommendations toward tenure track faculty which should provide additional clarity from the current document. FAC hopes to have their work completed and sent to the Executive Committee by mid March.

Regarding the Outside Employment policy the FAC has a new proposal which outlines recommended changes from the current policy for outside employment (found in the Faculty Handbook, pg. 43-44). The introduction of the proposal states: "This proposed revision is needed to create greater clarity for faculty and administrators, and to create more consistency with the revised policy for staff that was adopted in 2008. For example, it specifically states that time spent on outside employment should not exceed an average of eight hours per week. The revision clarifies some provisions of the current description." The FAC is in the beginning stages of reviewing and discussing this proposal.

The FAC will next meet on February 28 at 1:30pm St. Mary's 113B.

**Executive Committee of the ASenate(ECAS).** J. Hess provided the ASenate with an update on the consultation issue. He indicated that he is planning to extend an invitation to President Curran and other administrators to meet with ECAS whenever they think consultation would be useful. He will also invite the president and others as appropriate to join ECAS 1-2 times every semester on designated dates for conversation.

J. Hess also reported that Student Development has put forward a proposal to change the composition of the Judicial Review Committee (JRC) so that instead of automatically including the Senate Vice President or designee on the JRC only faculty members with relevant experience would be considered. ECAS will continue to discuss the proposal.

J. Hess also reported that several faculty members had indicated to him that Senate documents have not been accessible to faculty prior to ASenate meetings now that we've moved working documents to an ASenate Porches group. J. Hess reported that working documents will continue to be posted on the ASenate's Porches site and all faculty, administrators, and staff will be given access to the site. Approved ASenate documents will continue to be posted publicly on the ASenate's website.

**Senate Doc 12-03 Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching (SET).** L. Hartley provided an overview of the SET proposal and mentioned the feedback that the FAC has received from various units and departments (i.e. SBA, SOEAP, SGA, Dept. of ENGR, SCI, and MTH). She explained that in undertaking their charge to examine the current SET instrument and process FAC was operating under the assumption that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the current SET. She then reviewed the four recommendations contained in the current SET document.

Members of the ASenate then provided feedback on the document from their various units. K. Trick indicated that in terms of FT non-tenure track faculty a concern was raised regarding the use of a SET instrument as the only measure for evaluating their teaching. Unlike FT tenure track and tenured faculty there is no policy that requires the use of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness for the instructional staff.

J. Dunne reported that he met with SBA administrators and that their concerns centered on standardizing formative assessments across a department without allowing individual faculty to pursue

their own formative assessment options. SBA administrators did support having a committee of experts revise the current SET instrument and the on-line implementation of the instrument.

L. Pedrotti received feedback from the Math and Science Chairs regarding the document and their concerns were similar to those expressed by the SBA. Namely, they were opposed to requiring standard formative assessments plans.

J. McCombe reported on the Department of English feedback indicating that faculty in his department were concerned with on-line administration of the SET instrument. While they recognize the benefits of on-line administration they were also concerned about response rates and many were opposed to forcing students to respond to the instrument in order to attain an adequate number of responses.

C. Krane reported on feedback from the Science chairs and Department of BIO. They feel that on-line administration is best determined by the expert group charged with developing a new SET instrument. They also expressed concerns about response rates, student perception of anonymity and agreed with previous comments that the recommendation to create formative assessment plans for each department or unit is overly burdensome. S. Hughes agreed that there are already practices in place for formative review but questioned how many faculty actually conduct formative review on a regular basis.

C. Daprano then reported on feedback from SOEAP administrators and faculty. She reviewed the three primary concerns expressed by the SOEAP including that: 1) there was general concern over using a standardized, "one-size fits all" instrument that would be used for all departments/units across campus. Specifically, there was concern over using the same instrument to measure effectiveness given the differences between undergrads and graduate students as well as for face-to-face versus on-line or hybrid courses; 2) there was general concern over creating an on-line process for collecting SET data since substantial resources would need to be devoted to fully creating an infrastructure for such a process to occur, while others expressed concerns about confidentiality issues, lower response rates, and possibly having to coerce students to complete the SET to have an adequate response rate; and, 3) there was some concern over the fact that the proposal does not seem to suggest a way to evaluate student learning outcomes.

D. Wright, Director of Curriculum Innovation and E-Learning, echoed concerns expressed by the SOEAP regarding the necessary resources and infrastructure needed to analyze SET data if we were to implement on-line administration of the SET instrument.

J. Hess reported that based on feedback from G. Doyle the SOE supports the current SET instrument and does not see a need to revise the SET instrument/process.

J. Dunne then suggested that FAC consider splitting the proposal into two documents. Namely, one that proposes a new SET instrument and process that would be used primarily for administrative review and a second proposal for a University wide policy that calls for a regular review of each unit's formative practices and plans. S. Hughes agreed that separating the two processes might move the document forward as well as rewriting sections A.2. Units and/or departments will be required to develop their own plans for formative SET procedures to allow for relevancy and uniqueness to each unit and/or department and B.2. Draft a proposal to guide the development and approval of unit and/or departmental plans for formative review to soften the language in the recommendations.

A. Mari then indicated that removing a "required" formative process from the recommendations might raise student concerns that they were being silenced in the new process. He stated that students are concerned when a faculty member appears to not connect with students and their feedback from the SET process does not seem to matter or make a difference.

J. Hess asked senators to forward any additional feedback to L. Hartley and S. Hughes so further revisions could be made to the proposal before the March ASenate meeting.

**Senate DOC 12-05 Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal Process (UDPPP).** C. Phelps reviewed the proposed amendment to Senate DOC 94-10 Initiation, Suspension, Reactivation, and Discontinuance of Undergraduate Degree Programs. Several friendly amendments were made to the document. J. Saliba suggested that the department or program approval process be included in the “Approval Process” and that it be included as the first step in the process. K. Kelly suggested that items 4 and 5 in the “Program Proposal Process” should follow item 1 so the 8-item proposal process should be: 1, 4, 5, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8. A. Mari made a motion to approve Senate DOC 12-05 with the two minor changes noted above. The motion was seconded by C. Phelps. **Senate DOC 12-05 “Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal Process” was approved by a vote of 27 approved; 0 opposed; 0 abstain.**

**Senate DOC 12-04 Academic Honor Code.** C. Krane reviewed background information regarding the proposed changes to the Academic Honor Code. Discussion of the proposed changes followed her presentation.

K. Trick asked what follow-up will be done when one or more Academic Dishonesty Incident Report is placed in a student’s file. C. Krane responded that the SAPC was aware of that issue but follow-up procedures are the responsibility of each respective Dean and were not included in the current document. P. Benson clarified that the APC had previously discussed that particular issue and there was general agreement that these multiple offenses would be dealt with by the Deans’ offices.

A few additional minor changes were suggested to the Academic Dishonesty Incident Report including: 1) removal of “possibly a double major” text in the document; 2) replace “if the student feels that an accusation...is unfair” with “if the student believes that an accusation...is not valid”; 3) use of SOEAP instead of EDU; and, 4) addition of “or program director” to item 1 (Appeal to the Department Chair *or program director* in which incident occurred).

E. Hicks asked about the process for dealing with an “Abuse of library privileges or shared electronic media” since this could fall under the purview of library faculty and staff who might not be the student’s instructor. C. Krane noted this concern and the other suggested changes so they could be incorporated into a revised Academic Dishonesty Incident Report.

J. Hess asked the members of the ASenate to contact K. Crane with further comments. The ASenate will review revisions to the document and possibly vote on the proposal at the March ASenate meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano