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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
November 22, 2010; 11 a.m.
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

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

Guests: James Farrelly

Opening Meditation: Brad Duncan opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the November 15, 2010 meeting were deferred.

Announcements:

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

Old Business:

J. Huacuja announced that a member of ECAS requested a review of the decision we made last meeting regarding the recommendations for voting rights on the Senate. She summarized the history of the Senate’s action, reading from the agenda of November 22. Her summary was as follows as copied directly from the agenda:

ECAS will ask for a “sense of the senate” concerning SACVI’s Senate Voting Rights proposal. At the November 8 and November 15 ECAS meetings, ECAS determined that the Senate Voting Rights proposal needs more work to develop additional research on senate voting rights in order to address the balance of votes across administrators, faculty and students. ECAS heard concerns that the 2nd component of the Senate Voting Rights might not pass unless it considers adding a faculty or student vote. Additional research will seek to determine criteria for the appropriate ratio of administrative, faculty and student senate votes. Criteria will include faculty and student votes within the various areas spread across the schools and programs. This research will be presented for discussion at faculty forums and at senate meetings before a revised Senate Voting Rights proposal is brought forward for senate discussion and a possible vote.

ECAS largely supports both components of the Senate Voting Rights proposal:

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.

ECAS determined not to split the components and not to offer them as separate proposals. ECAS is concerned that splitting the components could possibly marginalize the latter component. ECAS determined to prevent a loss of momentum by keeping both components in the proposal and to move forward both items along with a consideration of how best to constitute an appropriate balance of votes. This work will require an expanded or new subcommittee to undertake this expanded charge.

A sense of the senate will:

1. Consider the viability of the current Senate Voting Rights proposal.
2. Consider criteria for granting additional faculty voting rights on the Senate.
3. Consider criteria for granting additional Deans (such as Dean of Students and Dean of Admissions) voting rights on the Senate.
4. Consider criteria for granting additional student voting rights on the Senate.
5. Consider supporting additional research to determine criteria for the appropriate ratio of administrative, faculty and student Senate votes. Criteria would include faculty and student votes within the various areas spread across the schools and programs. This research would be presented for discussion at faculty forums and at Senate meetings before a revised Senate Voting Rights proposal is brought forward for Senate discussion and a possible vote.

If the Senate concurs with the ECAS decision to further develop the proposal, the Senate will be asked to vote in support of a one year extension of temporary voting rights for the Dean of Graduate Programs and Continuing Education. The voting rights will be in place through May 2012.

Upon conclusion of this summary, B. Duncan indicated that he was the member that asked for review. He indicated further that he agreed with ECAS’ decision with one exception: namely, that the committee’s proposal should be memorialized in Senate documents and on the Senate website and assigned a document number. He further suggested that the matter be tabled until the Senate discussion would occur and that only at that point would a new committee be appointed. Furthermore, he requested clarification about whether committee members
serving on the original panel would be asked to serve on any future committees that may be constituted to address the matter.

ECAS members discussed the matter. It was generally agreed that no document number should yet be issued, as ECAS was not ready to present the proposal to the Senate. Furthermore, it was agreed that ECAS is broadening the charge, changing the questions we are considering, and reopening the matter for discussion such that it would be premature to commit to a particular document, course of action, or committee structure and composition. The majority of members agreed that the original committee should be disbanded, as determined in the Nov. 15 meeting, and that there should be no expectation by anyone of future service. While one or more members of the past committee may be invited to serve again, a new committee will be formed once ECAS determines what the appropriate scope and charge should be for further consideration of this matter.

All agreed that the committee’s original charge, its resulting recommendations, and ECAS’ action would be presented at the December 3 Senate meeting for the purpose of gathering information and ideas about how best to proceed from here.

The documents have been acknowledged in the minutes and will be available for review on the Senate web site as soon as the can be posted by the Office of the Provost. Our minutes reflect ECAS support for the committee’s work and an abiding concern that the issues not lose steam. ECAS members generally agree that the best outcome will ensue from keeping the issues joined and integrating consideration of other related issues, such as the issue of faculty governance and representation that will occur with the addition of additional deans with voting rights.

Furthermore, it was agreed that the issue of whether to vote on renewal of the extension of voting rights of the graduate school representative does not have to be resolved on Dec. 3. ECAS would have until March to determine what, if any, further action is required under the Constitution and put forward a recommendation to the Senate, and members agreed it would be best to see where we were with the proposal regarding voting rights before moving forward with that vote.

ECAS members reiterated praise for the prompt and well-crafted recommendations developed by the original committee and requested that B. Duncan relay their appreciation to each committee member.

Questions from APC representative. L. Pedrotti relayed two questions from APC chair, J. Hess. Specifically, (1) do we plan to bring chemistry proposal forward at the Dec. 3 faculty meeting, and (2) how should APC proceed with the Academic Dishonesty form? It was agreed that the chemistry proposal would not be ready for the December 3 meeting. Furthermore, ECAS should determine how best to proceed with the Academic Dishonesty form in coordination with C. Dapra-no, Chair of SAPC, and that issue will be placed on the next ECAS agenda for further discussion and resolution.
Proposed B.S. Degree Program in Medicinal and Pharmaceutical Chemistry Bachelor of Science, Senate Doc. I-10-06. J. Huacuja introduced a discussion about the process of approval that should accompany this proposal from the Department of Chemistry, particularly with respect to what, if any, Senate action may be required. Members reviewed a 1995 document from the Office of the Provost summarizing review processes for university decisions. The matter has been referred to APC for review to see whether its rationale has been fully articulated, whether there are any concerns about the program, and whether the program has the potential to have any university-wide implications. APC will then bring its recommendations back to ECAS. ECAS will then need to determine whether the matter needs to be presented to the full Senate for review because it involves university-wide issues, or whether it can just move it along in the university process without further Senate action.

ECAS members clarified that the charge to APC should include analysis of whether and to what extent any of the recommendations contained in this proposal may have implication beyond the Department of Chemistry. APC will continue also to address questions and concerns raised by ECAS in previous meetings, ensure that any necessary revisions are coordinated with the Department of Chemistry, and resubmit the revised proposal to ECAS, along with recommendations about further Senate action.

New Business.

Members unanimously agreed to nominate H. Gauder to serve as ECAS representative to the University Nominations and Recruitment Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Seielstad