

4-1-2011

## 2011-04-01 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2011-04-01 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2011). *ECAS Minutes*. Paper 229.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins/229](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/229)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

Approved  
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate  
April 1, 2011; 9 a.m.  
St. Mary's Hall Room 113A

**Present:** Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, Judith Huacuja, Antonio Mari, Leno Pedrotti, Joseph Saliba, Andrea Seielstad, Rebecca Wells, Katie Trempe

**Absent:** George Doyle, Heidi Gauder, Carolyn Roecker Phelps

**Opening Meditation:** Katie Trempe opened the meeting with meditation

**Minutes:** Minutes from the March 25, 2011 ECAS meeting were not available and will be reviewed at the April 8, 2011 ECAS meeting

**Announcements**

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is scheduled for April 15, 2011, in the KU Ballroom at 3:00pm. After the final Senate meeting is adjourned newly elected Senators will be seated.

**Old Business:**

Reporting & Recording Academic Misconduct L. Pedrotti reviewed the APC's recommendations on Reporting & Recording Academic Misconduct specifically the Academic Dishonesty Form created by the SAPC (2010) and modified by the APC (2011). Key changes made by the APC included adding a student signature and the Dean's signature to the report form. In addition, space on the form for a description of the penalty that was assessed for the incidence of academic misconduct.

A. Mari stated that he believes that not only the Dean's Office but the student and department also need copies of the completed form to allow the department and advisor to have more contact with student to follow-up regarding the incident. He also stated that previously SAPC did not add a "penalty and explanation" description and Dean's signature line in order to streamline the form.

ECAS members discussed description of the penalty and its usefulness to track what penalties have been assessed previously as well as privacy issues and who would have access to the form. L. Pedrotti indicated that APC would likely restrict and safeguard access to the form even within the department. R. Wells reviewed discussion at the session with outside consultants retained to review UD's disciplinary policies. She reported that the consultants indicated that at their universities reports of Academic Dishonesty violations reside with other disciplinary actions in student development. Each unit of the university has an Academic Integrity officer who made sure these violations went to Student Development. The 1<sup>st</sup> violation resulted in an "F" but the student could retake course; the 2<sup>nd</sup> violation resulted in a suspension. She also raised the issue of housing the violations electronically. L. Pedrotti reported that some APC members opposed that idea because of access/confidentiality issues. P. Benson reported that currently there is no automated system in place to access these forms electronically and that would pose practical problems for the units. P. Benson also indicated that if a faculty member is concerned about a student's record when, for example, writing a recommendation letter for the student they can make a request to the Dean's Office to review the student's file.

ECAS members then continued the discussion relevant to issues of consistency in practice across the various units. L. Pedrotti reported that the APC found that the existing Honor Code policy was being

used by all the units but there appeared to be inconsistency regarding the process. For example, it appears that there may be underreporting of these violations (i.e. faculty members who deal with a violation with the student and never report the violation to the Dean's Office). J. Huacuja thought that many faculty aren't familiar with the process and wondered if there was a better way to communicate that process to faculty so that the Honor Code and process for dealing with violations was included on course syllabi.

There was also discussion of the consistency of penalties. Several members of ECAS suggested that many faculty members would resist a uniform policy regarding Academic Misconduct penalties.

A. Seielstad then raised several issues regarding the process for recording these violations. Namely, that the proposed form needs to clarify: 1) that students always have access to their files; and 2) when the Honor Code violation is reported. L. Pedrotti indicated that the APC did not intend for the form to move forward at the level of accusation instead the form would be signed and put in a student's file in order to record a violation that was admitted to by the student. The first violation by a student would reside in the Dean's office only and subsequent violations would then be dealt with by the Dean's Office. Several members of ECAS voiced support for the idea that the student's department and department chair should also have access to the form.

A. Seielstad then raised the issue that there should really be two forms – a notification form (“I acknowledge I have received notification of this violation”) and a decision form reporting the violation and any penalties assessed. ECAS discussed this issue but the matter was not resolved.

A. Seielstad also suggested that the consultants engaged by the Provost to examine UD's disciplinary policies/processes could make recommendations regarding the process and reporting of academic dishonesty with those incurred on the student development side. The Provost reported that there is consistency regarding penalties on the student development side but not an academic side.

J. Huacuja asked A. Seielstad to draft text to add to the proposed Academic Dishonesty Report form. One would be a statement indicating that by signing the form the student was acknowledging notification of the violation and associated penalty. The second statement would address whether or not the student's department chair should sign or just receive a copy of the form.

Meeting adjourned 10:15am

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano