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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
November 15, 2010; 11 a.m.
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

Present: Judith Huacuja, Bradley D Duncan, Andrea Seielstad, David Biers, Heidi G Gauder, Paul Benson, Joseph E Saliba, Leno M Pedrotti, Corinne Daprano, Rebecca Wells, Katie Trempe, Antonio Mari

Guests: James Farrelly, Bob Wilkens

Opening Meditation: Corinne Daprano opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the November 1 and November 8, 2010 meeting were approved.

Announcements:

There will be a Senate meeting Friday, December 3 at 3 p.m. in Kennedy Ballroom.

Reminder: the Faculty Board and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate invite all members of the faculty to the forum “The Voice of the Faculty in University Governance: Silent or Silenced, Consulted or Ignored?” The forum will be held on November 16 in KU West Ballroom from 12:00-1:30 p.m.

Old Business:

The substantial majority of this meeting involved discussion of the recommendations set forth last week by the Senate Sub-Committee to Address Constitutional Voting Issues (SACVI) in its Proposal on Revisions to the Composition of the Academic Senate. J. Huacuja summarized the results of the last meeting, drawing from the following summary included in the November 15 ECAS agenda.

As submitted by SACVI, the proposal puts forth for a vote the following two components:

4.1 Concerning the Associate Provost & Dean of GPCE

The SACVI proposes that under the list of voting Deans in Article IV, Section A.2. (Deans) of the Senate constitution, the words “Graduate School” be eliminated and the language “Dean with university level oversight over graduate programs and policies” be added.

4.2 Concerning the Dean of University Libraries
The SACVI proposes that the Dean of University Libraries be granted a voting seat on the University of Dayton Academic Senate and that the words “University Libraries” be added to the list of voting Deans in Article IV, Section A.2. (Deans) of the Senate constitution.

At the end of our last meeting, a motion was made to refer the document to the Academic Senate for a vote “as is” as a single proposal with the two components listed below. The motion failed with 2 in favor and 8 against it.

While it appears there is support for the two components of the proposal, some ECAS members believe there is further work to be undertaken to ensure successful passage of the proposal.

In preparing for the above-mentioned vote, ECAS determined three possible voting options:

1. Support the singular proposal with the two separate components in the proposal, as is, and send to the full senate for approval.

2. Instruct SACVI to conduct research and consider a possible 3rd and 4th component of the proposal to include faculty and student representation.

3. Separate out and accept only the first component supporting the graduate school representative recommendation, and send the second component supporting the voting rights for the library dean back to the committee for development.

ECAS’ meeting time ended with the votes on item 2 and item 3 postponed until the November 15 meeting.

Also to be discussed:

ECAS should consider what research to undertake in order to guide discussion about equitable distribution of votes across the academic community.

ECAS should consider the need for open forums before the proposal is brought to the senate.

Following this summary by the chair, a lengthy discussion ensued. Some members initially expressed interest in moving the graduate school issue forward, but sending the library issue for further deliberation in light of faculty representation issues. Others expressed a preference for resolving the library issue first. Many discussed the benefits of resolving all issues together, including additional issues of faculty representation and potential voting rights of the deans of enrollment and student development.
Most members expressed concerns over the need to add other faculty representation if the number of administrators is expanded. This led to a discussion about the potential need for “redistricting” in light of student enrollment and the size of faculty represented in different units.

In the end, it was not possible to reach agreement on the substance of the proposal. The majority of the members agreed that both issues should be kept together for further deliberation and consideration, that the Senate should be consulted for guidance on how to proceed and that the existing committee should be disbanded and lauded for its work and for advancing the discussion efficiently and with such cogent and concrete recommendations. In short, it was agreed that following input from the Senate, a new committee should be created with an expanded scope of issues for consideration, including but not limited to issues of faculty representation, administrative roles and the criteria for determining who should vote, among others. Members also addressed the importance of establishing a research plan to determine different models that may exist for equitable distribution of voting rights in other universities. The importance of hosting open forums as the matter proceeds was also emphasized.

All members were in agreement that this was an important set of issues that should not lose momentum and were committed to the idea of regrouping and reformulating an expanded scope for delegation to a new committee, once input could be gathered from the Senate at its December 3 meeting. The issue of the graduate school representative could be resolved through extension of the temporary voting rights granted by the Senate this year, but that could be addressed as a separate matter and does not need to take place immediately since authorization was granted through this academic year.

The committee chaired by B. Duncan was officially disbanded and commended for its thorough and excellent work and detailed report. ECAS will present the issues to the Senate and gather information for the purpose of re-crafting a new charge for further consideration and resolution of these important issues.

**New Business:**

**January Senate Meetings:** J. Huacuja announced that the Senate meeting date in January is currently set for January 14, although the semester begins Tuesday, January 18. There are no other Fridays available in January because the other Fridays are board meetings or faculty meetings. After a brief discussion, it was agreed by a vote of 9 in favor and 1 opposed that the January 14 meeting would be suspended. J. Huacuja will pursue the possibility of deferring that meeting until February, depending on availability of rooms.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Seielstad