

3-16-2012

2012-03-16 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, "2012-03-16 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2012). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 83.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/83

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, March 16; 3:00 p.m.

KU West Ballroom

Present: Paul Benson, Caroline Merithew, Shelia Hughes, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Jonathan Hess, Leno Pedrotti, Carissa Krane, Arthur Jipson, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Emily Kaylor, Joe Castellano, James Dunne, Rebecca Wells, Kevin Kelly, Corinne Daprano, Philip Anloague, John White, Megan Abbate, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, George Doyle, Joseph Radisek, Andrea Seielstad, Paul Vanderburgh, Antonio Mari, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Kimberly Trick, Heather Parsons, Jesse Grewal, Joseph Saliba

Guests: Brad Duncan, Pat Donnelly, Deb Bickford, Katie Kunnucan-Welsch, Angie Petrovic, David Wright, Mark Masthay, Matthew Lopper

Absent: Nicholas Michel, David Johnson, Kaitlin Regan, Terence Lau, Dimitri Tsiribas, Paul McGreal

Opening Meditation: Heather Parsons opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: Minutes of the February 24, 2012 meeting were approved

Announcements:

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is April 13, 3:00-5:00 p.m. (KU Ballroom).

J. Hess announced that ECAS has added an additional ASenate meeting scheduled for Friday, April 27.

J. Hess announced that the date for the spring faculty meeting has been changed to Thursday, May 10, 3:00-5:00 p.m. in Boll Theater. A reception will follow in the Torch Lounge.

P. Benson announced that the Celebration of the Arts is scheduled for April 17. Tickets are required.

J. Castellano announced that all faculty, staff, and students are invited to attend the RISE Symposium which is scheduled for March 29-31, 2012.

C. Krane announced that the Honor Student symposium is scheduled for March 23, 2012.

L. Hartley announced that for the first time a breakfast has been added to the Stander Symposium schedule. The free breakfast will take place on April 18 from 8-9:30 AM in the Main Gym of the RecPlex. 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.

Committee Reports:

Academic Policies Committee (APC). C. Phelps reported that the APC has been reviewing and discussing the: 1) CAP Competencies Report, and 2) Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal Process (UDPPP) document. The committee hopes to have the PDP proposals ready for review by the Senate in April. The APC will next meet on Weds. March 28 at 8:30am in St. Joe's 325.

Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC). G. Doyle reported that the SAPC made the suggested changes to the Academic Honor Code and will be presenting the revised proposal to the ASenate today.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). L. Hartley reported that: 1) FAC met on February 28 to revise the SET document according to feedback received from senators and other faculty across campus. Revisions were made and the newly revised document was sent to ECAS on March 8. We appreciate everyone's input and believe that this final document satisfies the majority if not all of the expressed concerns.

2) We were charged with reviewing our current faculty workload guidelines. As a reminder, our faculty workload ad hoc committee

a) reviewed archived workload documents to determine if these are still pertinent and appropriate;

b) reviewed other university's workload guidelines; and

c) developed suggested revisions to the current guidelines.

Currently the title of the document reads: *University Guidelines for the Allocation of Responsibilities for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty* - removing the word 'workload' from the document, as the revision emphasizes not only teaching load, but recognizes responsibilities for research and service. FAC plans to finalize the recommended revisions as soon as we are able and submit this proposal to ECAS prior to the April meeting. It is our understanding that ECAS will utilize a system to assure that this document receives university wide attention and feedback before it goes to a vote.

3) Proposal to Revise Description of Faculty Outside Employment and Additional Services

As a reminder, 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. We had the opportunity to discuss this proposal during one meeting thus far, which produced a wide variety of comments, suggested revisions, and questions yet to be answered.

The FAC will next meet on Thurs., March 29 at 3:00 PM in St. Mary's 113B.

Executive Committee of Academic Senate (ECAS). J. Hess reported that he, C. Daprano, and Jackie Estep met with Rachel Bilokonsky and Andrea Wade to discuss archiving of Senate documents. R. Bilokonsky is doing some great work on building a searchable archive of Senate documents, minutes, and administrative records (membership, Constitution, issues list, etc.). If senators want to see what the archive looks like, go to <http://drc.udayton.edu> and select "Communities & Collections."

He also announced that the ECAS has decided to drop the use of Roman numeral "I" on Senate DOCs. This was done in the past to signify new Senate documents instead of revisions to previous documents. However, this numbering system has not been consistently followed in the last several years.

J. Hess reported that ECAS has decided to change the membership criteria for the faculty representative to the JRC (Judicial Review Committee): 1) ECAS will select a faculty representative every 3 years from incoming Senators (ECAS will consult with Student Development regarding the eligible candidates prior to making its choice); and, 2) ECAS has asked Student Development for greater openness in the process of selecting faculty for the judicial review boards.

Senate DOC 12-04 Academic Honor Code. G. Doyle reviewed changes made to the academic dishonesty incident report form. He also indicated that SGA had reviewed and approved the changes. Discussion of the document and changes followed this presentation.

P. Vanderburgh suggested that some description of the incident would be helpful instead of just checking the incident box. A. Mari noted that the student handbook defines each of the problems listed on the report form. K. Trick also agreed that it might be a good idea to include a description of the offense since the circumstances will vary. A. Mari explained that the SAPC wanted the form to be short so faculty will actually fill out the form. C. Phelps suggested adding space on the form for an explanation of the offense on the back of the form.

P. Vanderburgh also suggested changing the acronym A&S (Arts & Science) to CAS.

G. Doyle made a motion to approve Senate DOC 12-04 with the two minor changes noted above. The motion was seconded by A. Mari. **Senate DOC 12-04 "Academic Honor Code" was approved by a vote of 31 approved; 0 opposed; 1 abstain.**

Senate DOC 12-06 Academic Standards and Progress Policy. B. Duncan reviewed background information and revisions made to the document (see attached PowerPoint slides). Discussion of the document followed this presentation.

G. Doyle asked whether transfer credits count towards the time limit. B. Duncan indicated that students will have to request approval of these transfer credits. K. Kelly asked for a clearer statement regarding the statement that "it is the responsibility of any graduate student on academic probation to meet with his or her academic advisor or program director...." (2.3 d, p. 3). He suggested that the paragraph specify that this is a faculty not student initiated process. J. Saliba suggested that item 2.3 d is a statement about procedures and should not be included in the policy. Additionally, he felt the responsibility for setting up this meeting should be on the student. B. Duncan stated that he believes units should specify how they notify students and that item 2.3 d should be kept in the document. C. Phelps suggested removing the first sentence of 2.3 d (p.3) "it is the responsibility of any graduate student on academic probation...." and starting the paragraph with the second sentence as follows: "A Grad student on academic probation must complete a written academic recovery contract with his or her graduate program director..." (p. 3).

K. Trick asked if there were any concerns that the revised policy will cause problems for current students in terms of the time limits regarding academic progress. B. Duncan indicated that students can use the time limit extension form to make an appeal regarding a particular course.

T. Saliba made a motion to approve Senate DOC 12-06 with the minor change to item 2.3 d noted above. The motion was seconded by P. Benson. **Senate DOC 12-06 "Academic Standards and Progress Policy" was approved by a vote of 33 approved; 0 opposed; 0 abstain.**

Motion to re-order agenda. L. Pedrotti made a motion to re-order the agenda so that Senate DOC 12-03 Student Evaluation of Teaching could be moved ahead of DOC 12-07 and DOC 10-01 amended for discussion. No objections to the motion were noted.

Senate DOC 12-03 Recommendations for Revision to the Process for Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET). S. Hughes summarized the major concerns that had been raised at the last ASenate meeting regarding the SET proposal. Discussion of the revisions to the document followed this presentation.

T. Saliba asked if the ASenate was giving the SET committee final approval over the SET instrument (II. 1. B. SET Instrument). S. Hughes stated that any instrument proposed by the SET committee must be approved by the ASenate (see II. 1. A. i.).

A. Mari stated that he believes the formative process discussed in the proposal "should be" included not left to the departments to decide if they want to implement. S. Hughes asked how valid the process and data would be if departments and faculty were resistant to collecting this formative data. A. Mari stressed that, in his opinion, removal of the mandate to conduct formative assessment would remove rich student evaluative feedback. L. Pedrotti suggested that the SET committee could recommend a required formative process.

J. Hess asked if the proposal allows for the creation of multiple instruments that might be used in different contexts (ex. graduate versus undergraduate courses). S. Hughes replied that it does allow for this variation.

R. Wells made a motion to approve Senate DOC 12-03. The motion was seconded by A. Seielstad. **Senate DOC 12-03 “Recommendations for Revision to the Process for Student Evaluation of Teaching” was approved by a vote of 29 approved; 1 opposed; 2 abstain.**

Senate DOC 12-07 Graduate Retake Policy. B. Duncan reviewed background information and revisions made to the document (see attached PowerPoint slides). Discussion of the document followed this presentation.

G. Doyle asked why a graduate student needs permission to retake a course when this permission is not required at the undergraduate level. B. Duncan replied that the graduate program directors wanted to be consulted in the process. V. Jain asked if the class is a core requirement is it up to the program director to approve the retake. B. Duncan agreed that it would be the responsibility of the program director to approve a retake. J. Dunne asked if the Graduate School had benchmarked this retake policy with other universities. B. Duncan replied that he was not aware that other universities have such a policy.

K. Trick suggested that the sentence that begins with “Matriculated graduate students may retake at most...” (p. 2, paragraph 2) was not a clear statement. K. Kelly suggested revising the sentence as follows: “To exclude a grade C or F from their cumulative grade point average, matriculated graduate students may retake at most one graduate level course of no more than four semester credit hours.”

A. Mari made a motion to approve Senate DOC 12-07 with the minor change noted above. The motion was seconded by G. Doyle. **Senate DOC 12-07 “Graduate Retake Policy” was approved by a vote of 31 approved; 0 opposed; 0 abstain.**

Senate DOC 10-01 (Amended) Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor’s Plus Master’s (BPM) Degree Programs – Amended. B. Duncan reviewed background information and revisions made to the document (see attached PowerPoint slides). Discussion of the document followed this presentation.

T. Saliba made a motion to approve Senate DOC 10-01 (Amended). The motion was seconded by A. Jipson. **Senate DOC 10-01 (Amended) “Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor’s Plus Master’s (BPM) Degree Programs – Amended” was approved by a vote of 28 approved; 0 opposed; 0 abstain.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano