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Approved Minutes
Meeting of the University of Dayton Academic Senate
March 29, 2019
Kennedy Union Ballroom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.
Corinne Daprano, President


Absent: Vijay Asari, Paul Benson, Neomi DeAnda, Rowen Gray, Kevin Kelly, Laura Leming, Willow Lopez, Connor Savage, John White

Guests: Deb Bickford, Bob Brecha, Susan Brown, Leah Ceperley, Tyler Dunham, Jim Farrelly, Kristen Keen, Jane Koester, Doug Luftig, Ben McCall, Ryan McEwan, Brooke Palmer, Rebecca Potter, Katie Schoenenberger, Emily Shanahan, Matt Sierschula, Eric F. Spina, Bobbi Sutherland, Paul Vanderburgh, Shuang-Ye Wu

1. Opening Prayer/Meditation: Fran Rice

2. Minutes of February 22, 2019: Approved without objection

3. Announcement by Kristen Keen of Green Dot Week. Information on The Green Dot Program at UD can be found at https://udayton.edu/studev/dean/greendot/index.php

4. Committee Reports (reports are appended)
   a. APC – Anne Crecelius
   b. FAC – Mark Jacobs
   c. SAPC – Lee Dixon
   d. ECAS – Corinne Daprano

5. Presentation by Jason Pierce (CAS Dean) and Rebecca Potter (Sustainability Program Director) on the new BA/BS in Sustainability. (Presentation is appended.)

Mary Ellen Dillon asked if the course Environmental Ethics & Environmental Economics should be part of the major. Rebecca Potter responded that the major has an environmental ethics component and an elective for environmental economics.

Marcus Rumpfkeil commented that the major was not in a single dept. and asked if there was any consultation with outside industry groups. He also asked how will we know if our students who graduate with this major will be employable. Jason Pierce commented that we have other
CAS programs that are freestanding, and that CAS will provide the necessary resources for the major. Rebecca Potter responded by saying that employment after graduation was discussed and is addressed in the proposal. She noted that our students with a sustainability minor have been experiencing positive returns for employment, and that students with a sustainability major from ASU have a good employment record.

Mary Ellen Dillon asked if the major could be expanded to include additional tracks. Rebecca Potter responded that it could be.

Tereza Szeghi asked about the administration and oversight of the major. Rebecca Potter responded by saying that the sustainability program has an advisory committee.

Suki Kwon asked if other courses could be added to the major? Jason Pierce responded that the course requirements of the major could be changed using the same process used for other majors (PIM).

Markus Rumpfkeil asked if the BS in sustainability could be linked to our graduate programs? Rebecca Potter responded by saying that we have a graduate certificate in sustainability and that we have no current plans for an MS in sustainability, but it is worth considering.

A motion was made to approve both proposals. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

6. Presentation by Anne Crecelius (Chair of APC) on Actions Pertaining to Degree Programs, Academic Senate DOC 2014-04. (Presentation is appended. Report is appended. Revised Doc 2014-04 is appended.)

A motion was made to make two small changes to the document. The motion was unanimously approved. A motion was made to make two additional small changes to the document. The motion was unanimously approved. Jason Pierce commented that the small changes to the language were made to bring the document into alignment with the expectations of the HLC.

A motion was made to approve the document. The motion was unanimously approved.

7. Presentation by Lee Dixon (Chair of SAPC) on the Report on Academic Misconduct. (Report is appended.)

Anne Crecelius asked about record keeping for academic misconduct reports. Lee Dixon responded that it needs to be better described.

Leslie Picca asked about the idea for a centralized office. Will it help or take away? Lee Dixon responded that a central office would provide more resources and uniformity. Hopefully it would provide help to reduce the faculty workload.
Jim Dunne asked about what the undergraduates think, would it be valuable to survey the students? Lee Dixon responded that the SAPC had some input from the undergraduates on the SAPC, but could use more input from the student body.

Brad Hoefflin commented that the idea of legal counsel sounds great, and the other recommendations as well.

Sam Dorf commented that technology advances constantly and we do not want to compete in a tech war. There are for-profit companies out there helping and hurting.

Myrna Gabbe commented that she advocates for a central office and believes that it will help us be more process oriented which will help with DEI.

Suki Kwon commented that she is concerned with bias, and would stress the need to improve. Second, the recommendation for submitting the assignment needs to be more broad to include art classes, etc…

Markus Rumpfkeil commented that it is often easier to detect cheating in non-native English speakers, especially when they submit work with perfect English language skills. We need bias training for instructors. Where do we go from here? Lee Dixon responded that some are easy to follow up on, like changes to the document. For the deeper issues, we probably need more discussion.

Shannon Driskell commented that the Math department has wondered about how different cultures treat this issue and maybe we should have a discussion with CIP. Lee Dixon responded that that was a great idea.

Anne Crecilius asked if there was a discussion concerning the student’s record versus protected record? Do faculty understand the confidentiality rules? Lee Dixon responded that we need to have that conversation and faculty training.

Tereza Szeghi commented that we need faculty training for cultural sensitivity. Lee Dixon agreed.

Myrna Gabbe commented that the students do not always get clear expectations as to what was not allowed in their classes. Expectations differed among instructors.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Todd Smith
4a: Academic Policies Committee Report  
March 29, 2019  
Submitted by Anne Crecelius, chair

Activity of APC for the 2018-2019 Academic Year since last reported on February 22, 2019. APC continues to meet nearly every week on Fridays at 2:15 in SM 113B.

- We reviewed the proposal for a certificate in Group Facilitation and Leadership and approved pending an updated letter of co-sponsorship and minor edits.
- We are reviewing two proposals from Health and Sport Science that cover a reorganization of program offerings and include a new Bachelor of Science in Health Science and Bachelor of Science in Sport and Wellness.
- We have had brief conversations regarding the draft of a final report from the Transfer Credit Task Force.

Our next meeting is Friday, April 12, 2019 in SM 113A

4b: Faculty Affairs Committee Report  
March 29, 2019  
Submitted by Mark Jacobs, chair

Discussed issues pertaining to the bylaws of the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Specific issues identified:
- The title for section VI should be updated to reflect the name of the policy which it covers.
- In section III A, the definition of the term “dismissal” needs greater precision and there is confusion introduced by the phrase “specified term”.
- Section VII A 4 is stated awkwardly and reflects asymmetry in the amount of time each party has to evaluate information. It is possible the when the term “Hearing” is used, what should have been used is the term “pre-Hearing”
- Section VII A 2 should state that if evidence is available it must be shared at least 14 days prior to the hearing. The section could be integrated into VII A 1 for improved clarity.
- Section VII D should be moved either in front of VII A or integrated with VII C to improve clarity.
Discussed issues pertaining to the bylaws of the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Specific issues identified:

- Section VII C 3 should include a limit on the time to request the printed or electronic copy.
- Section VII C 6a should indicate that in cases of dismissal the administration should make its case first.
- Section VII C 6b should indicate that faculty can cross examine witnesses, not just the administration.
- Section VII D 5 should have the phrase “after the hearing has concluded” removed so as to ensure that confidentiality is maintained permanently.
- Section VII E 3 and 4 should clarify that the President may reject the recommendations put forward in the report, not the report itself.
- Section VII E 4 should clarify what, if anything, gets reported to the faculty and through what mechanism, e.g. report to ECAS, and when.
- Section VII E 5 should add that the records should be transferred at the close of the process.
- Section VIII B should be deleted as it is redundant to the modified VII E 4.
- Section VIII C 2 should confirm that the records remain permanently confidential.
- Section IX A should have the phrase “at any time” removed.
- Section IX B should add the approval of another faculty body after the committee’s approval. It should be determined which body is most appropriate, e.g. ECAS, Senate, full faculty.

Reconciled the items the FAC identified with the feedback from Chris Agnew, chair of the FCAFT.

The report was approved and sent to ECAS.

4c: Student Academic Policies Committee Report
March 29, 2019
Submitted by Todd Smith for Lee Dixon, chair

The SAPC finished its report on Student Academic Misconduct. The report was given at the March 29th meeting of the Academic Senate.

4d. Executive Committee of the Academic Senate Report
March 29, 2019
Submitted by Todd Smith for Corinne Daprano, chair

ECAS is meeting every week on Fridays at 11:15am in SM113B and has engaged in discussions and work on the following topics:
• Discussion of the UPTPTF report and its recommendations. ECAS discussed a plan for going forward. The discussion included creating charges to the subcommittees to look at the four key policy revisions/recommendations of the report, bringing to campus a nationally recognized speaker for the fall semester to enhance discussion, encouraging department and unit level discussions, and creating summer engagement groups.

• Discussion of the 2/19/19 SAPC report on Student Academic Misconduct with SAPC chair Lee Dixon (Associate Professor and Chair – Psychology). Discussion included what evidence should be submitted with an academic dishonesty report, what a central office would look like and its function be, how to avoid bias, and the need to submit a report with each incident.

• Discussion of the Proposals for a new Bachelor of Science in Sport and Wellness, a new Bachelor of Science in Health Science and consolidation of selected majors within the Department of Health and Sport Science. Corinne Daprano explained that these new degrees were a reorganization of the degrees within HSS and some of the previous majors would become concentrations within these new majors. It was moved to send the proposals to the APC. The motion was approved.

• Discussion of the UNRC. UNRC has made a request to modify the UNRC nomination template. The proposed nomination template was discussed and a motion was made to approve the new nomination template. The motion was unanimously approved. UNRC also reminded ECAS that many faculty members are off-contract in the summer and any pool of nominees created by UNRC in the summer would be limited.

• Discussion of the action items for the Academic Senate’s UPTPTF implementation plan. A motion was made to send a charge to FAC to Review #1 and #2 of key policy revisions in light of Faculty Handbook revisions. The motion was unanimously approved.

• Discussion of the Transfer Credit Task Force interim report. ECAS will invite the task force to an ECAS meeting for additional discussion.

• Discussion of the charge to the SAPC to conduct a faculty policy review as a follow up to the UPTPTF report. A motion was made to approve the charge. The motion was unanimously approved.

• Discussion of the creation of two working groups: Campus Engagement on Promotion & Tenure Policies Working Group and Policy Review of Promotion & Tenure Policies Working Group. A motion was made to approve the creation of the two working groups. The motion was unanimously approved.

• Discussion of the report regarding Senate DOC 2014-04 (Actions Pertaining to degree programs and academic departments report). (GUEST: Anne Crecelius, chair of APC)

• Discussion of the CAPC nominations. A motion was made to approve Jon Fulkerson as the SBA representative to CAPC. The motion was approved with one abstention. A motion was made to approve Bill Trollinger as the CAS representative to CAPC. The motion was unanimously approved.

• Discussion of the proposed academic calendar for the next five years (GUEST: Jennifer Creech, Registrar).

• Discussion of a resolution from ECAS to the Academic Senate concerning the adoption of the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force Report and the prioritizing of the evaluation of the recommendations laid out by the UPTPTF and the development of appropriate policies to address the recommendations made by UPTPTF in an appropriate time frame. A motion was
made to approve submitting the resolution to the Academic Senate. The motion was unanimously approved.

• Discussion of the importance for the subcommittees (APC, FAC, SAPC) to submit an end of the year report after the last Academic Senate meeting.
BA/BS in Sustainability

- **Rationale**
  - University, College, Hanley Sustainability Institute
  - Student demand, employment opportunities

- **Noteworthy elements**
  - Interdisciplinary
  - Experiential learning built in
  - Complements existing curricular offerings
Collaborative Development


- 2006 - Planning for the SEE Initiative
- 2007 - Course development begins, creation of team-taught cross-disciplinary courses
- 2010 - Launch of the Minor in SEE
- Currently over 100 students enrolled in the SEE Minor
Collaborative development of BA & BS degrees through:

• Support from the CAS Office of the Dean.
• Development by the Sustainability Major Planning Group representing units and departments across the University of Dayton.
• Input and guidance from the LTC staff, leading a backward design process.
• Open meetings with faculty, staff, students, throughout the process, from developing the learning objectives to design of tracks and courses.
• Feedback from all Dept. Chairs contributing to the curriculum (over 15).
• Engaged discussions and revisions made in CAS Sub-councils.
• Discussion and revision through the AAC approval process.
• Endorsement from HSI Director, Dr. Ben McCall.
• Discussion/feedback with ECAS improving clarity in the Senate Proposal.
Arts & Science:
Tracks supporting Student Interest & Faculty Expertise

- Working within accreditation structures, both the BA and BS share a curriculum that teaches the skills and develops the competencies required to address these critical challenges of our time.

- Specific tracks in Energy (BS), Sustainable Watersheds (BS), Urban Sustainability (BA), and Food Systems (BA) enable a student’s vocational development and prepare graduates for their future careers.
Education for the Common Good

- Supports the systems and societal approach to Sustainability in line with the Sustainable Development Goals.

- Complements existing majors in ways that further the vocational paths of our students.

- Degrees that are outward facing, responding to the issues of our times, and preparing students for the careers of the future.
6. Presentation by Anne Crecelius (Chair of APC) on Actions Pertaining to Degree Programs, Academic Senate DOC 2014-04.
Presentation Overview

- Charge
- Process
- Report Components
- Revisions to Document
Charge from ECAS

- Review document and develop report which may recommend revisions
- 9 Specific questions
  - Consultation, process, and procedures
  - Current with state guidelines
- Included in APC year-end report
APC’s Process

• Internal Discussions
• Consultation and guest visits
  – GAA Executive Director, Associate Provosts, Registrar, Deans and/or Associate Deans
• Informal survey to department chairs, program directors, and past proposers
• Examination of peer institutions
Report Components

• Overview of process
• Specific responses to each question from the charge
• Summary of revisions to policy
Revisions to the Document

• 9 major revisions made, with rationale provided in the report
  – Proposals, Approvals, Consultation
• Committee’s main intent was to ensure thorough, transparent, and efficient review of program proposals
Revisions to the Document – Proposals, format, actions

• Restructuring and reorganization of sections
  – Flow and clarity
• Reorganization of proposal formats and addition/rephrasing of certain elements
  – Alignment with PIM
  – University priorities (DEI, assessment)
  – Greater guidance for proposers
Revisions to the Document - Proposals, format, actions

• Updated section on graduate proposals
  – Alignment with changes on state level

• Condensing 2 sections on discontinuation
  – Reduce length of document

• Addition of merging/splitting degrees
  – Called for in charge
Revisions to the Document – Approvals and consultation

• Expanded approvals section
  – Increase clarity, allow for cross-unit

• Removal of graduate approval flow
  – Reference to up-to-date state guidelines

• Additional language re: university-wide proposals
  – Clarify legislative authority of Senate
Revisions to the Document - Proposals, format, actions

- Additional section on consultation and appendices of templates for consultation and letters of support
  - Clarification, efficiency, and standardization
APC Membership

- Chair: Anne Crecelius (SEHS)
- Aaron Altman/Vijay Asari (SoE)
- Neomi De Anda (CAS-HUM)
- Sam Dorf (CAS-Arts)
- Jim Dunne (SBA)
- Laura Leming (CAS-SS)
- John Mittelstaedt (SBA Dean)
- Jason Pierce (CAS Dean)
- Lynne Yengulalp (CAS-NS)
- Deb Bickford (ex officio)
- Philip Appiah-Kubi (Faculty Board)
- Noah Leibold (SGA)
Motions

- Section 3.1.1 strike “undergraduate”

- Section 3.1.1.1. 1) e) ii) Replace current bullet with:

  “In addition, please address how achievement of these goals will be assessed. A complete assessment plan should be provided for undergraduate programs which do not hold programmatic accreditation. For all other programs, a complete assessment plan is not necessary, but attention should be given to the resources and timeline for programmatic outcome assessment.”

- Same replacement for 3.1.2.2 1) e) ii)
Overview
On September 7, 2018 the Academic Policies Committee (APC) received a charge from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS) to: “review Senate DOC 2014-04 Actions Pertaining to Degree Programs and Academic Departments, and develop a report which may contain recommendations to the existing processes and procedures.” The charge provided a number of questions to focus the work of APC and requested a report of the work that included specific changes and a rationale for these changes. This report makes reference to the Revised Senate DOC 2019-XX Actions Pertaining to Academic Programs, submitted concurrently.

Process
The committee began its work in September 2018. Initial discussions within the committee explored the specific questions raised in the charge from ECAS, which included:

1. When a new degree program involves coursework from multiple departments and/or units, what is the appropriate level of consultation (e.g. dean, associate dean, department chairs)? Specifically, is there a difference between administrative and faculty consultation? Furthermore, if administrative support is given, for example from a dean’s office, should it be required to detail the level of discussion/consultation that occurred within that unit?

2. What level of commitment/support is needed from stakeholders? Is a letter of support sufficient or are more formalized documents necessary?

3. What level of detail is required when issuing a letter of support? Is it sufficient to state that the resources are in place and/or will be in place or is there a need for specific numbers, timelines, etc.?

4. Does DOC 2014-04 follow current Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) processes for the initiation of a new graduate degree program?

5. What should be the process for merging or splitting academic degree programs?

6. Is there a need to revise the proposal formats and approval processes for actions taken on departments and degree programs?

7. Are approval processes current and appropriate?

8. Can proposals be considered if letters of support are still pending?

9. What are the standard faculty body approval workflows in each unit for new programs? Is this information accessible to proposers that may be working across units?

Following internal discussions, a number of actions were taken by the committee over the course of the fall semester to gather information from various individuals and groups. To begin, Brad Duncan, Executive Director of Graduate Academic Affairs was consulted regarding the current procedures and processes of approval of graduate programs, both internally and at the
state level. The Registrar, Jennifer Creech was consulted early on regarding the program inventory management system (PIM) and what changes are or are not possible to this technology. Deans and/or Associate Deans from all academic units were invited to an APC meeting, and representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the School of Education and Health Sciences (SEHS) were able to attend. With the associate deans (Poe and Hartley), the processes and procedures relating to program development and approval were discussed. Associate Dean Poe also provided a helpful document from the AAC of the College that explained expectation for consultation. Associate Provost Carolyn Phelps attended an APC meeting in order to provide the perspective of the Provost’s Office on the work of the APC.

In January 2019, the committee also requested feedback from department chairs and recent proposers of new/revised programs via a Google Form survey distributed by email. The results of the non-scientific survey of department chairs and program directors yielded a low response rate (9/46, 20%). In general, the responses centered on a desire for consultation to occur at the level of the department, via department chairs. These responses matched much of what had already been discussed by the committee.

In January 2019 the committee also reviewed a collection of peer institution academic program proposal guidelines that was collated by Justin Keen, Director of Assessment and Student-Centered Analytics. Specifically, the committee had asked Justin to investigate to what extent peer institutions include assessment of student learning as a requirement of proposals. The query resulted in a range from the few programs that had minimal requirements for assessment in program proposals to institutions that require complete curricular mapping and assessment plans. The committee agreed to add a section to program proposals regarding generalized programmatic assessment.

Committee conversations in February 2019 continued discussions that A. Crecelius and J. Dunne had with Brad Duncan in December. Namely, the Executive Director of Graduate Academic Affairs raised concerns about the timeline of review of graduate proposals, particularly those deemed to have university-wide impact and therefore involvement of the full Academic Senate, beyond just the Executive Committee. The committee drafted new language regarding graduate proposals and asked B. Duncan for feedback. A few suggestions were made that were not included in the revised document. The rationale for not including these changes is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
<th>Rationale for not making change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stating the Executive Committee of Graduate Leadership Council as the approving body for graduate programs, and only Graduate Leadership Council for those programs with University-wide impact</td>
<td>The committee hesitated to make this change given the lack of faculty representation on the Executive Committee of GLC (comprised of associate deans and GAA administrators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adding “(or concurrence, in the case of new graduate programs)” to various points of section 4.2 (Determination of University-wide Impact)

A separate section that includes the constitutional language regarding the typical action of concurrence for actions from the GLC was added that also states the Senate retains the right to act with legislative authority if it wishes.

No specific changes to the document regarding timeline of review and approval of proposals were made. The committee respects the need for efficient review. However, faculty input in approval of academic offerings is imperative. Specifically, B. Duncan raised concerns regarding a lack of action by the Senate in the summer months. To our knowledge, there is no document that prohibits the Executive Committee from meeting in the summer months. However, the committee did not think that it was necessary nor appropriate to mandate summer senate action in the revisions to the current document.

In addition to consultation, in writing and in person with the campus community, the committee engaged in a number of deliberate conversations during meeting times. Much of the conversation revolved not only on proposed revisions to the policy, but also more broadly on the process of consultation on campus. In the end, the recommendations below focus around the committee’s intent to ensure thorough, transparent, and efficient review of program proposals.

Responses to Charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When a new degree program involves coursework from multiple departments and/or units, what is the appropriate level of consultation (e.g. dean, associate dean, department chairs)? Specifically, is there a difference between administrative and faculty consultation? Furthermore, if administrative support is given, for example from a dean’s office, should it be required to detail the level of discussion/consultation that occurred within that unit?</td>
<td>Based on discussion and feedback, chair-level consultation is most appropriate. We suggest revisions to the policy that address this issue. In addition, we provide guidance for dean’s office support letters that specifically address the need to explicate the level of discussion/consultation that occurs within a unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What level of commitment/support is needed from stakeholders? Is a letter of support</td>
<td>The consensus was that stakeholder support and need to document this support varies with what the role of the partner may be. In the case that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient or are more formalized documents necessary?</td>
<td>the stakeholder support is critical to the offering of the proposed program, sufficient evidence of support must be included in the proposal at the time of review, ideally at the unit-level but definitely by the time it is reviewed by the Academic Senate. In the case where a stakeholder is supporting a program indirectly, a letter of support is sufficient and proposals may be considered without these letters in place. However, before final approval, letters should be obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What level of detail is required when issuing a letter of support? Is it sufficient to state that the resources are in place and/or will be in place or is there a need for specific numbers, timelines, etc.?</td>
<td>We have provided templates to add clarity to what should be included both in consultation and in letters of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does DOC 2014-04 follow current Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) processes for the initiation of a new graduate degree program?</td>
<td>No, the prior document was not up to date. We have revised the policy by directing proposers to the current ODHE requirement documents online. It is worth noting that the state-level processes are still under review and revision and therefore it may be necessary to further revise the document when these processes are finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What should be the process for merging or splitting academic degree programs?</td>
<td>An additional section was added to the policy to address these actions. (3.1.2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there a need to revise the proposal formats and approval processes for actions taken on departments and degree programs?</td>
<td>Based on feedback on conversation, we did revise the proposal formats to include additional information that is relevant to review proposals and up-to-date with university priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are approval processes current and appropriate?</td>
<td>The process for graduate programs was revised and the overall approval process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process language was updated to provide more clarity on necessary levels of review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Can proposals be considered if letters of support are still pending?</td>
<td>See response to charge item #2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What are the standard faculty body approval workflows in each unit for new programs? Is this information accessible to proposers that may be working across units?</td>
<td>These workflows can be accessed in the Program Inventory Management System (by clicking preview workflow). Yes, this information is available to proposers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

It was decided fairly early in the process that revisions to the policy were prudent. We summarize the majors changes and our rationale below.

**Summary of Revisions to the Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Revision</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring and reorganization of sections</td>
<td>The committee made changes to the order and ways in which sections were organized in order to provide a better flow for the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization of Proposal format and addition/rephrasing of certain elements</td>
<td>Some of these changes were made to better align the program proposals with the elements that are included in the electronic program inventory management (PIM) system. Other changes were made in keeping with University initiatives (diversity, assessment, etc). Overall, the structure of the proposals was approached from more of an outline perspective rather than fewer narrative sections. The committee discussed that at some point, a more comprehensive overhaul of PIM could be considered such that proposals could be initially entered and move through the workflow electronically. However, at present, the current document/narrative structure seems to be sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated section on graduate proposals.</td>
<td>Given the likely change from a two-stage proposal process to a single proposal process that is being evaluated by the state and likely implemented, substantial edits to the initiation of a graduate degree program section were made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condensed to one section on discontinuation versus two (for suspended and non-suspended programs)</td>
<td>This change was made primarily to reduce the overall length of the document and number of different sections. In consultation with Provost’s office, this was deemed to likely have little impact as most programs are not formally suspended prior to discontinuation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of section on merging/splitting academic degrees.</td>
<td>Change called for in charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Approval Process section was expanded to provide examples of representative faculty bodies as well as provide guidance for when programs may cross departments/units.</td>
<td>This section was identified in the charge as an area for review and based upon previous work in drafting policy for review of undergraduate academic certificates, the committee included additional language to clarify steps in unit-level approval. In addition, we anticipate a rise in programs that originate from multiple departments and/or units and therefore wanted to address this possibility while reducing potential barriers caused by confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of section on approval for graduate programs and reference to external approvals.</td>
<td>Given the similarity of approval processes and the original differences in structure of these sections, we condensed the approval section to one single approval thread, highlighting where graduate programs differ. For clarity, we added language regarding external approval for new degrees, programs with external accreditation, and graduate programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional language regarding determination of university-wide impact for graduate programs and concurrence vs authority legislative action.

Based on the comments and feedback from B. Duncan, we included additional language that explains the legislative action of Senate that is allowable by the Constitution.

Addition of a section on consultation and appendices providing templates for consultation and letters of support.

Given the importance of consultation in the proposal process and the number of points in the charge related to letters of support, the committee included a dedicated section on consultation as well as templates in order to clarify these processes.

Summary and Conclusions
Actions pertaining to academic degree programs and/or departments are important to the maintenance of high-quality academic standards at the University of Dayton. In this report and the proposed revisions to the guiding policy document 2014-04, the committee believes that we provide guidance for thorough, transparent, and efficient review of program and department proposals. As new program structures develop and expectations for review and assessment of programs are defined, it is anticipated that this document will need to be reviewed and revised again.

APC Membership
Chair: Anne Crecelius (SEHS), Aaron Altman/Vijay Asari (SoE), Neomi De Anda (CAS-HUM), Sam Dorf (CAS-Arts), Jim Dunne (SBA), Laura Leming (CAS-SS), John Mittelstaedt (SBA Dean), Jason Pierce (CAS Dean), Lynne Yengulalp (CAS-NS), Deb Bickford (ex officio), Philip Appiah-Kubi (Faculty Board), Noah Leibold (SGA)
PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

TITLE: Actions pertaining to degree programs and academic departments (Revised)

SUBMITTED BY: Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

DATE: Revised March 29, 2019
      Approved March 14, 2014

ACTION: Legislative Authority

REFERENCES: Constitution of the Academic Senate of the University of Dayton Article II. B, DOC 94-10, DOC 96-02, DOC 96-03, DOC 12-05, DOC 12-09, DOC 14-04
1 Background and rationale

Article II. B. 1 of the Constitution of the Academic Senate gives the Academic Senate the legislative authority “to initiate and formulate academic and educational policies which have significant University-wide impact as determined by the Academic Senate including amendment, revision, or rescission of existing policies.” Further, this article states “In considering which policies have significant University-wide impact, the Academic Senate shall analyze how these policies affect items such as program quality, content, economic feasibility, and consonance with the University mission. To be considered University-wide, the policy must apply to more than one educational unit. Legislative Authority shall not extend to the implementation or administration of such policies. Article II. B. 1. a indicates that the legislative authority of the Academic Senate includes “Degree requirements, standards for development of curriculum program evaluations, curricular options.”

This document sets forth the formats and policies that are to be used when academic units propose the following actions:

- The initiation, suspension, reactivation, splitting, merging, renaming, or discontinuation of both graduate and undergraduate academic degree programs, and

- The creation, renaming, splitting, merging, or discontinuation of academic departments.

This policy is a revision to DOC 2014-04 Actions pertaining to degree programs and academic departments. The prior document streamlined and replaced prior Senate documents that governed these actions (Academic Senate Documents 94-10, 96-02, 96-03, 12-05, and 12-08.) The revision in 2019 was undertaken to update the policy based on changes to graduate degree program proposal processes and further clarify consultation and approval processes.

2 General information on actions pertaining to academic degree programs and departments

For all actions pertaining to academic degree programs or departments, early consultation with the Provost’s Office is required and should precede submission of a formal proposal to approval bodies. In addition, relevant Program Inventory Management (PIM) electronic edits should be initiated during development of the formal proposal to alert the Registrar that actions on a program are forthcoming.

3 Proposals

Proposals to initiate or change the status or structure of academic degree programs and/or academic departments should originate in the academic unit(s) in which the degree program or department is housed and should follow the formats and approval processes detailed in this document. This section details proposal formats for individual actions taken on departments and degree programs. However, a proposed action to be taken on an academic degree program may or may not be accompanied by actions to be taken on one or more academic departments. Similarly, proposed actions relating to an academic department may or may not be accompanied by actions to be taken on one or more academic degree programs.
When a proposal includes several linked actions, the proposers need not duplicate information by proposing each of the actions separately. Rather, in this case of linked actions, a proposal should use a format that succinctly incorporates the proposal elements described in this document, while clearly explicating the nature of the proposed linked actions.

### 3.1 Academic degree programs

In this document the term “academic degree programs” includes academic programs identified as “majors” within a broadly named academic degree. The scope of this policy does not include smaller scale academic programs such as minors, concentrations, and certificates (See DOC 2018-02 Undergraduate Academic Certificate Policy (Revised) and DOC 2007-03 Guidelines for the Development of Course-based Graduate Certificate Programs).

#### 3.1.1 Initiation of academic degree programs

There are many reasons for an academic unit or units to initiate an undergraduate degree program. Such a program should be consistent with the University mission and be economically feasible.

#### 3.1.1.1 Initiation of undergraduate academic degree programs

The proposal to initiate an undergraduate academic degree program should be developed by the department(s) and the unit(s) that would house the proposed program.

**Format for a proposal to initiate an undergraduate degree program**

The proposal to initiate an undergraduate degree program should address, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following:

1) Proposed Program
   a) Title of Program
   b) Department(s) and Academic Unit(s) in which the program will reside
   c) Description of the program
      i) Brief summary for inclusion in the University Catalog
      ii) Focus and disciplinary purpose and significance
      iii) Unique features of the program (e.g. international study, community engaged learning, research, etc.)
d) Rationale for the program

   i) Evidence of need
   
   ii) Opportunities for employment and/or post-graduate studies of graduates of the program

   iii) Discussion of similar programs at the University and peer institutions.

e) Goals of the program

   i) This section should address what the overall goals of the program are and how these align with institutional learning goals, strategic priorities, and/or mission.

   ii) In addition, please address how achievement of these goals will be assessed. A complete assessment plan is not necessary, but attention should be given to the resources and timeline for programmatic outcome assessment.

f) Components of the program

   i) Proposed curriculum

      1) If possible, please identify in what way the curriculum is aligned with the program goals (Section e, i)

   ii) Other requirements of the program (if applicable)

2) Impact of Proposed Program

   a) Prospective 5-year Enrollment

      i) Should include supporting evidence.

   b) What, if any, effect is anticipated on other degree programs and/or departments?

      i) Evidence of consultation with all identified stakeholders should occur and be documented.

   c) In what ways will the proposed program support the University foundational commitment to diversity, equity, and intercultural inclusion?

3) Resources for Proposed Program

   a) Description of the availability and adequacy of resources (e.g. faculty, equipment, software, library resources, space, etc) needed to deliver the program.

   b) Are new and/or addition resources required for the delivery of the program as proposed? (Yes or No)

      i) If yes, please describe what will be required, including costs (provide data), availability, source(s) of funding (including a discussion of any cost sharing agreements), and discuss how expected new revenues will justify expenses.
ii) If new faculty resources will be needed, describe the type of faculty line, anticipated responsibilities of this new line and its contributions to the proposed program, and an anticipated timeline for the hiring process.

iii) Evidence of consultation with all identified stakeholders should occur and be documented. The Libraries should be among the stakeholders consulted. If additional faculty are requested, this must specifically be addressed in letters of support from the Dean’s office and consultation with the Provost’s office.

d) Has a budget been submitted to the dean’s office? (Yes or No)

i) Letter of support from Dean must address resource implications and early consultation with the Provost Office should address financial analysis. Guidance for these letters is provided in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

4) Consultation and Approval Process

a) Description of approvals from each body (group, date and decision).

b) Documentation of consultation

i) Please include a list of those who were consulted, and the corresponding response or lack thereof.

ii) Recommended format and forms found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

5) Additional Documents (as needed)

The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.1.1.2 Initiation of graduate degree programs

The procedures and proposal format associated with the initiation of a graduate degree program are substantially different than those for an undergraduate degree program. New graduate degree programs must be proposed according to guidelines established by the Chancellor’s Council on Graduate Studies (CCGS), a state-wide body that, in part, makes new graduate program approval recommendations to the Chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). Note that the CCGS Guidelines have been developed to be in close alignment with Higher Learning Commission (HLC) expectations for new programs. HLC must ultimately approve new programs at all levels. Close adherence to CCGS guidelines during the development of proposals for new graduate degree programs will facilitate and greatly simplify interactions with HLC following State approval.

The CCGS Guidelines can be found HERE. However, CCGS Guidelines are subject to regular change. For the most up-to-date version, be sure to contact the University of Dayton’s CCGS representative - currently the Executive Director of the Office for Graduate Academic Affairs. The University’s CCGS representative should be consulted early and frequently during the proposal development process to ensure that all university and State level proposal requirements are met.
In addition to the various proposal elements required by the CCGS guidelines, proposals for new graduate programs must also include the following:

1) A description of the effects and actions to be taken (if any) on other degree programs and/or departments or units that are impacted by the proposed graduate program;

2) Documentation of consultations with all affected departments or units when multiple departments or units are involved; and,

3) Letters of consultation and/or support from or on behalf of faculty and chairs of all affected departments, academic deans (critical when new investments or faculty are required), external consultants/constituents and others with a stake in the development of the new program.

Additional supporting documents, including a letter of support from the Provost (especially helpful during state-wide review), are encouraged and may be included as well. The Proposal must then be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document.

3.1.2 Suspension and/or Discontinuation of academic degree programs

Suspension of a degree program means that the University will not, for a specified period of time, accept students into the program. A proposal to suspend an academic degree program—whether undergraduate or graduate—must include provisions to continue the program for a specified period of time to allow students who are enrolled or recruited into the program at the time of suspension to graduate or transfer to another program. The University will provide resources necessary to allow students matriculated or recruited into the program at the time of suspension to complete the program or transfer to another program. Programs cannot remain suspended indefinitely. Normally, a suspended program should be either reactivated or discontinued within a period of two years after the suspension of the program is initiated.

Discontinuation of an academic degree program means that the University will not accept new students into the program and will not provide resources to continue the program except for the resources necessary to allow students enrolled or recruited into the program to complete the program or transfer to another program and to provide assistance to faculty and staff who may be dislocated as a result of the discontinuation.

The suspension or discontinuation of an academic degree program can have a significant effect on faculty, staff, and current and prospective students. Alternatives to the suspension or discontinuation of a program should be considered. The initiation and processing of a proposal to suspend or discontinue an academic degree program must weigh the advisability of continuing the program and the potential use of reallocated resources (including human and financial) against the adverse effects on faculty, staff, current students, and prospective students. Policies and procedures must ensure that careful consideration occurs before academic degree programs are suspended or discontinued. Careful consideration is of particular importance when the suspension or discontinuation of a degree program would result in the termination of faculty, staff, or administrators. The University Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Faculty Handbook govern the termination of faculty resulting from the discontinuance of a program or department.
It is not necessary to suspend a program before it is discontinued. If there is no likelihood that the program would be reactivated in the near future, then the program should be discontinued without first being suspended.

3.1.2.1 Suspension of an academic degree program

The proposal to suspend an academic degree program should be developed by the affected department(s) and the unit(s) housing the affected degree program.

Format for a proposal to suspend an academic degree program

The proposal to suspend an undergraduate degree program should address, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following:

1) Program Details
   a) Title of Program
   b) Department(s) and Academic Unit(s) in which the program resides
   c) Description of the program
   d) Rationale for the suspension of the program
      i) If appropriate, alternatives to suspension that were considered.
   e) Components of the program
      i) Listing of faculty members that teach in this program.
      ii) Enrollment in the program over the last five years, by year.
      iii) Courses in the degree program and service courses that will be not offered during the suspension period.

2) Impact of Suspension
   a) Effects on current faculty and staff that support this program.
   b) Effect on current and prospective students
      i) consultations with Enrollment Management
   c) Proposed actions related to prospective students that have indicated a desire to enroll in the program
      i) identification of programs to which current students might decide to change to.
   d) Disposition of facilities, library and information resources, and other resources used to support the program.
3) Timeline

a) Plan and timetable to be used to review program status and to decide whether to discontinue or reactivate the program at the end of the suspension period.

4) Consultation and Approval Process

a) Description of approvals from each body (group, date and decision).

b) Documentation of consultation
   i) Please include a list of those who were consulted, and the corresponding response or lack thereof.
   ii) Recommended format and forms found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

5) Additional Documents (as needed)

The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.1.2.2 Reactivation of a suspended academic degree program

The proposal to reactivate a suspended academic degree program should be developed by the affected department(s) and the unit(s) housing the affected degree program.

Format for a proposal to reactivate a suspended academic degree program

The proposal to reactivate a suspended academic degree program should address, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following:

1) Reactivated Program

a) Title of Program

b) Department(s) and Academic Unit(s) in which the program will reside

c) Description of the program
   i) Date the program was suspended
   ii) Actions taken since suspension
   iii) Brief summary for inclusion in the University Catalog
   iv) Focus and disciplinary purpose and significance
   v) Unique features of the program (e.g. international study, community engaged, learning, research, etc.

d) Rationale for the reactivation of the program
i) Evidence of need

ii) Opportunities for employment and/or post-graduate studies of graduates of the program

iii) Discussion of similar programs at the University and peer institutions.

e) Goals of the program

i) This section should address what the overall goals of the program are and how these align with institutional learning goals, strategic priorities, and/or mission.

ii) In addition, please address how achievement of these goals will be assessed. A complete assessment plan is not necessary, but attention should be given to the resources and timeline for programmatic outcome assessment.

f) Components of the program

i) Proposed curriculum

   1) If possible, please identify in what way the curriculum is aligned with the program goals (Section e, i)

ii) Other requirements of the program (if applicable)

2) Impact of Reactivated Program

a) Prospective 5-year Enrollment

   i) Should include supporting evidence.

b) What, if any, effect is anticipated on other degree programs and/or departments?

   i) Evidence of consultation with all identified stakeholders should occur and be documented.

c) In what ways will the proposed program support the University foundational commitment to diversity, equity, and intercultural inclusion?

3) Resources for the Reactivated Program

a) Description of the availability and adequacy of resources (e.g. faculty, equipment, software, library resources, space, etc) needed to deliver the program.

b) Are new and/or addition resources required for the delivery of the program as proposed? (Yes or No)

   i) If yes, please describe what will be required, including costs (provide data), availability, source(s) of funding (including a discussion of any cost sharing agreements), and discuss how expected new revenues will justify expenses.
ii) If new faculty resources will be needed, describe the type of faculty line, anticipated responsibilities of this new line and its contributions to the proposed program, and an anticipated timeline for the hiring process.

iii) Evidence of consultation with all identified stakeholders should occur and be documented. The Libraries should be among the stakeholders consulted. If additional faculty are requested, this must specifically be addressed in letters of support from the Dean’s office and consultation with the Provost’s office.

d) Has a budget been submitted to the dean’s office? (Yes or No)

i) Letter of support from Dean must address resource implications and early consultation with the Provost Office should address financial analysis. Guidance for these letters is provided in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

4) Consultation and Approval Process

a) Description of approvals from each body (group, date and decision).

b) Documentation of consultation

i) Please include a list of those who were consulted, and the corresponding response or lack thereof.

ii) Recommended to use format and forms found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

5) Additional Documents (as needed)

The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.1.2.3 Discontinuation of an academic degree program

The proposal to discontinue a suspended academic degree program should be developed by the affected department(s) and the unit(s) housing the affected degree program.

Format for a proposal to discontinue an academic degree program

The proposal to discontinue an academic degree program should address, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following:

1) Program Details

a) Title of Program

b) Department(s) and Academic Unit(s) in which the program resides

c) Description of the program

d) Rationale for the discontinuation of the suspended program
1) Date of suspension (if applicable)
ii) Actions taken since suspension (if applicable)
iii) If appropriate, alternatives to the discontinuation that were considered
f) Components of the program
i) Enrollment in the program over the five years (prior to suspension, if applicable), by year.
ii) Courses in the degree program and service courses that will be eliminated or altered.

2) Impact of Discontinuation
a) Effects on current faculty and staff that support this program.
b) Effect on current and prospective students
   i) consultations with Enrollment Management
c) Proposed actions related to prospective students that have indicated a desire to enroll in the program
   i) identification of programs to which current students might decide to change to.
d) Disposition of facilities, library and information resources, and other resources used to support the program.

3) Consultation and Approval Process
a) Description of approvals from each body (group, date and decision).
b) Documentation of consultation
   i) Please include a list of those who were consulted, and the corresponding response or lack thereof.
   ii) Recommended to use format and forms found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

4) Additional Documents (as needed)

The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.1.3 Merging or splitting of academic degree programs
Academic degree programs may be reorganized via merging or splitting of existing programs. As these actions result in new university offerings, the proposal guidelines for a new academic program (see section 3.1.1.1 for undergraduate and 3.1.1.2 for graduate) should be followed. Proposers need not
submit a separate proposal to discontinue the existing programs. However, the proposal must identify and address the impacts of the merge/split in terms of:

a) Effects on current faculty and staff that support this program.

b) Effects on current and prospective students
   i) consultations with Enrollment Management

c) Proposed actions related to prospective students that have indicated a desire to enroll in the existing program(s).

d) Disposition of facilities, library and information resources, and other resources used to support the program.

3.1.4 Renaming of academic degree programs

Renaming of an academic degree program—whether graduate or undergraduate—may occur for a variety of reasons. If the renaming is not part of significant changes to the structure of the academic degree program, the proposal format described in this section may be used. The proposal to rename an academic degree program should be developed by the affected department(s) and the unit(s) housing the affected department.

Proposal to rename an academic degree program

A proposal to rename an academic degree program should include the rationale for the proposed name change. In addition to the proposal, letters of endorsement or objection and documentation of consultation with affected departments or units (where appropriate) should be included. Additional supporting documents may be included. The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.2 Academic Departments

The proposal formats described in this section apply to actions taken on academic departments that house or support undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or both. As noted previously, when the actions on an academic department also involve actions on one or more academic degree programs—whether undergraduate and/or graduate— the proposers need not duplicate information by proposing each of the linked actions separately. Rather, a single proposal should be developed using a format that succinctly incorporates the proposal elements for each action as described in this document while clearly explicating the nature of the proposed linked actions.

3.2.1 Initiation of an academic department

The proposal to create an academic department should be developed by the unit(s) that will house the department.

Format for a proposal to create an academic department
The proposal to create an academic department should address, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following:

1) Proposed Department
   
   a) Title of Department
   
   b) Academic Unit(s) in which the department will reside
   
   c) Description of the department
      
      i) Focus and disciplinary purpose and significance
      
      ii) Unique features of the department (e.g. international study, community engaged learning, research, etc.
   
   d) Rationale for the department
      
      i) Evidence of need
      
      ii) Opportunities for employment and/or post-graduate studies of graduates of the program
      
      iii) Discussion of similar programs at the University and peer institutions.
   
   e) Goals of the department
      
      i) This section should address what the overall goals of the department are and how these align with institutional learning goals, strategic priorities, and/or mission.
   
   f) Components of the department
      
      i) Curriculum of programs to be housed in the department
         
         1) If possible, please identify in what way the curriculum is aligned with the departmental goals (Section e, i)
   
   g) Administrative structure of the proposed department
      
      i) Include line of reporting

2) Impact of Proposed Department
   
   a) Prospective Enrollment
      
      i) Should include supporting evidence.
   
   b) What, if any, effect is anticipated on other degree programs and/or departments?
      
      i) Evidence of consultation with all identified stakeholders should occur and be documented.
c) In what ways will the proposed program support the University foundational commitment to diversity, equity, and intercultural inclusion?

3) Resources for Proposed Department

   a) Description of the availability and adequacy of resources (e.g. faculty, equipment, software, library resources, space, etc) needed to deliver the program.

      i) If new resources will be needed, describe what will be required, including costs (provide data), availability, source(s) of funding (including a discussion of any cost sharing agreements), and discuss how expected new revenues will justify expenses.

      ii) Evidence of consultation with all identified stakeholders should occur and be documented.

   b) Projected additional costs associated with the department and evidence of institutional commitment and capacity to meet these costs

      i) Letter of support from Dean must address resource implications and early consultation with the Provost Office should address financial analysis. Guidance for these letters is provided in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

4) Consultation and Approval Process

   a) Description of approvals from each body (group, date and decision).

   b) Documentation of consultation

      i) Please include a list of those who were consulted, and the corresponding response or lack thereof.

      ii) Recommended to use format and forms found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

5) Additional Documents (as needed)

The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.2.2 Discontinuation of an academic department

The discontinuation of an academic department can have a significant effect on faculty, staff, current students and potential students who have applied to the University for enrollment in the programs offered and supported by the department. Alternatives to the discontinuation of a department should be considered. The initiation and processing of a proposal to discontinue an academic department must weigh the advisability of continuing the department and the potential use of reallocated resources (including human and financial) against the adverse effects on faculty, staff, current students, and prospective students. Policies and procedures must ensure that careful consideration occurs before academic
departments are discontinued. Careful consideration is of particular importance when the discontinuation of a department would result in the termination of faculty, staff, or administrators. The University Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Faculty Handbook govern the termination of faculty resulting from the discontinuance of a program or department.

The proposal to discontinue an academic department should be developed by the affected department and the unit(s) housing the affected department.

**Format for a proposal to discontinue an academic department**

The proposal to discontinue an academic department should address, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following:

1) **Department Details**
   
   a) Title of Department
   
   b) Academic Unit(s) in which the department resides
   
   c) Description of the department
   
   d) Rationale for the discontinuation of the department

   ii) If appropriate, alternatives to the discontinuation that were considered

   e) Components of the department

   i) Listing of faculty members that teach in the department

   ii) Enrollment in the programs housed by the department over the last five years, by year.

   iii) Courses in the degree programs housed in the department and service courses offered by the department that will be discontinued.

2) **Impact of Discontinuation**

   a) Effects on current faculty and staff that support this department.

   b) Effect on current and prospective students

   i) consultations with Enrollment Management

   c) Proposed actions related to prospective students that have indicated a desire to enroll in the programs housed in the department

   i) identification of programs to which current students might decide to change to.

   d) Disposition of facilities, library and information resources, and other resources used to support the department.

3) **Consultation and Approval Process**
a) Description of approvals from each body (group, date and decision).

b) Documentation of consultation
   i) Please include a list of those who were consulted, and the corresponding response or lack thereof.
   ii) Recommended to use format and forms found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.

4) Additional Documents (as needed)

The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 of this document before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.2.3 Merging or splitting of academic departments

The proposal to merge or split academic departments should be developed by the affected departments and the units housing the affected departments.

Format for a proposal to merge or split academic departments

The format for a proposal to merge or split academic departments may be developed by the proposing unit(s). The proposal should provide, in a summary narrative of approximately five pages, (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the rationale for the merging or splitting of the departments. Proposals should address changes in the need for faculty, staff, and other resources related to the merger or split and changes in the structure of degree programs or other departments related to the proposed split or merger. Proposals should include any other relevant information listed in the formats described in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

In addition to the proposal, letters of endorsement or objection and documentation of consultation with departments or units (where appropriate) should be included. Additional supporting documents may be included. The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.

3.2.4 Renaming of academic departments

Renaming of an academic department —whether graduate or undergraduate— may occur for a variety of reasons. If the renaming is not part of significant changes to the structure of the department, the proposal format described in this section may be used. The proposal to rename an academic department should be developed by the affected department and the unit(s) housing the affected department.

Proposal to rename an academic department

A proposal to rename an academic department should include the rationale for the proposed name change. In addition to the proposal, letters of endorsement or objection and documentation of consultation with affected departments or units (where appropriate) should be included. Additional supporting documents may be included. The proposal must be reviewed and approved via the process detailed in section 4.1 before formal submission to the University Registrar and other affected University administrative units.
3.3 Consultation

Broad consultation by the appropriate bodies (both faculty and administrative) is a necessary and important part of all proposals for changes to academic programs and departments. With this in mind, the process of consultation is further explicated here:

A. When asking for a consultation, proposers need to give adequate time for those reviewing the proposal to carry out the review. In most cases, one month is recommended. Consultation requests should clearly state what is being requested. Templates for requesting and responding to consultation are included in Appendix 6.1 and 6.2 of this policy and are recommended for use in order to provide consistency in the process.

B. Requests for consultation should be directed to department chairs or program directors. When a proposal may cross academic units, Dean’s offices should be used as a resource for directing the most appropriate departmental-level consultations (e.g. groups of department chairs, leadership meetings, etc). In consultation with affected faculty, these groups can give a consultation on behalf of a department and/or pass the consultation request on to the appropriate department or program committee.

C. When asked for consultation, department chairs or program directors should respond within one week acknowledging receipt of the request and indicating a timeline, or process for handling the request.

D. If recommendations are made:

   - Proposers can make the change
   - Can explain how the concerns were addressed
   - Can explain why they have chosen to leave the proposal unchanged

E. In cases where consultation has been requested, but a proposer has not heard back from a department, the proposer should submit the proposal and detail the attempts that were made to consult.

F. As indicated in proposal formats for all actions pertaining to both academic degree programs and departments, consultation and its result must be documented.

4 Approval processes

The process listed in section 4.1 below is to be used for the approval of all actions to be taken on all academic departments and all academic degree programs—whether graduate or undergraduate. Additional information regarding external approvals is also provided.
4.1 Approval flow for actions on academic degree programs and departments

Generally, a proposal will be initiated by one or more chairs of a department, program directors, or deans. While the College and the Schools may have additional and varied requirements, sequential approval is required by the following bodies:

1. College and/or School (faculty or appropriate representative faculty body and dean)
   a. Level of review and approval should include:
      i. Appropriate representative faculty bodies (e.g. departmental curriculum committee, unit academic affairs committee)
      ii. Dean
   b. If more than one department or unit is proposing the program, the Provost’s office, in consultation with ECAS, will determine the appropriate level of approval that is needed from each unit. At minimum, a letter of approval and support from the dean of all units involved is required.
   c. All consultation, review, and approval should be documented in letters of support or appendices to the proposal, preferably using the templates provided in Appendix 6.1.

2. Graduate Leadership Council. Required only if the action has impact on one or more graduate programs.

3. Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and, if the proposal has University-wide academic or educational impact, the Academic Senate. Refer to section 4.2 of this document for guidelines related to the determination of whether or not a proposal has University-wide impact.

4. Provost and Provost’s Council

5. President

6. Board of Trustees

Each step above may require a response document addressing concerns raised before approval is granted. If significant changes are made, the proposal will be returned to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for additional review.

New degree programs that represent a new major only but still grant a current degree (e.g. Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science in Education) do not need external approval. New degrees however, will require approval from the Higher Learning Commission. Proposers should work with the Provost’s office regarding external approval processes.

For programs that require external approval from accreditors, additional proposal elements may be required by these external bodies. Proposers should work closely with the Dean’s Office and Provost’s Office regarding program-specific accreditation requirements and processes.

For new graduate programs, after the Board of Trustees approves the new program proposal, the Executive Director of the Office for Graduate Academic Affairs coordinates sending the proposal out for state-wide external review and comment. When the Ohio Department of Higher Education and HLC approves the Full Proposal, the approval process is complete.

4.2 Determination of University-wide impact

If the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate determines that a proposal has significant University-wide academic or educational impact it sends the proposal to the Academic Senate for legislative action.
In this case, the action of the Academic Senate is considered a recommendation to the Provost with regard to the proposal. If the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate determines that the proposal does not have University-wide academic or educational impact, it may forward the proposal directly to the Provost with its recommendation. In this case, the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate should be reported to the Academic Senate and recorded in the minutes of both the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the minutes of the Academic Senate.

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may choose to submit the proposal to one or more standing committees to solicit an opinion regarding the disposition of the proposal before submitting the proposal to the Academic Senate or to the Provost. Article II. B. 1. of the Constitution of the Academic Senate states “In considering which policies have significant University-wide impact, the Academic Senate shall analyze how these policies affect items such as program quality, content, economic feasibility, and consonance with the University mission. To be considered University-wide, the policy must apply to more than one educational unit. Legislative Authority shall not extend to the implementation or administration of such policies.”

Normally, proposals involving the initiation, suspension, discontinuation, or reactivation of degree programs should be sent to the Academic Senate for legislative action since the nature of academic degree programs offered by the University significantly affects the quality and content of the curricular options offered by the University. Normally, proposals involving structural changes to an academic department should be sent to the Academic Senate for legislative action if those changes are linked to changes in degree programs or if those changes might impact the curriculum and student enrollment in courses housed in academic units other than the one in which the department is housed. Proposals to rename an academic department or degree program should be sent to the Academic Senate for legislative action if the name change might significantly impact other academic units.

Regarding graduate degree programs, Article II. B. 2. of the Constitution of the Academic Senate states “Legislative Concurrence is defined as the authority to review, to approve or disapprove, or to make recommendations concerning educational policies that are formulated or initiated by all Committees, Councils, and Boards. While retaining the right to initiate and formulate all the educational and academic policies of the University in areas of its competence, the Academic Senate recognizes that various University Committees, Councils, and Boards are already engaged in an advisory capacity in such work. Therefore, all Committees, Councils, and Boards, including, but not limited to, the Graduate Council, Library Committee, and Research Council will recommend educational policies within their respective purviews. The Academic Senate will ordinarily act upon such policies by Legislative Concurrence. The Academic Senate, however, retains Legislative Authority in the above areas if it wishes to exercise that authority.” Therefore, in most cases regarding actions on graduate degree programs, after approval by the Graduate Leadership Council, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will act with legislative concurrence. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may choose to submit the proposal to one or more standing committees to solicit an opinion regarding the disposition of the proposal before submitting the proposal to the Academic Senate or to the Provost.

5 Other actions on academic departments or degree programs

The actions on academic degree programs and departments described in the earlier sections of this document are not exhaustive. Other actions such as the transfer of a degree program from one unit to
another can be envisioned. For such actions, the proposing unit(s) should consult with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and develop a proposal format and approval flow that is consistent with those detailed in this document.

6 Appendices

6.1. Template for request for consultation
The linked template is recommended for use to help standardize requests for consultation. Proposers should complete this editable PDF and send it with the proposal to those from which consultation is sought. Proposers are encouraged to identify any additional impacts that may not be listed on this template.

6.2. Template for response to consultation request
The linked template is recommended for use to help standardize the response to requests for consultation. This editable PDF should be completed and returned to the proposers in the agreed upon timeframe. Additional comments that are specific to the proposal should be provided in narrative form.

6.3. Guidance for Dean’s letter of support for a proposal originated from own unit
A Dean’s letter of support should be included with all proposals that originate from that unit. The Dean’s letter should address:

- Is the unit able to deliver what’s called for in the proposal? Consider:
  - Faculty resources
  - Advising
  - Facilities
  - Other resource implications
- In what ways does the proposed program align with unit-level strategic initiatives?
- Have budget projections occurred (in consultation with Provost’s Office) and does the proposed program align with the university’s goal of responsible financial stewardship?
- Other relevant information for consideration of the proposed program.

6.3. Guidance for Dean’s letter of support for consultation with unit
When Deans are providing letters of support for proposals as part of the consultation process, it is important that these letters include:

- Whether the proposed impact on the unit is indirect and the letter represents a letter of support OR the proposed impact on the unit is direct and the letter represents a required letter of consultation.
- If the impact is direct:
  - Is your unit able to deliver what’s called for in the proposal? Consider:
    - Faculty resources
- Advising
- Facilities
- Other resource implications

- Does the proposal potentially overlap or compete with academic programming in your unit? If yes, please explain.
- Has consultation occurred with the appropriate departments and academic programs in your unit? What’s the outcome of those consultations?
- Does the proposal carry any accreditation implications for your unit? If yes, please explain.
Student Academic Misconduct Report Conducted by SAPC

Completed February 19, 2019

INTRODUCTION

The Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC) of the Academic Senate was given the following charge in September of 2017:

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate requests that the SAPC investigate the issue of student academic misconduct on campus, paying particular attention to how student misconduct has been enabled by technology. In doing so, they should attempt to identify the prevalence and form of academic misconduct in each academic unit. They should also explore the current academic honor code, as well as structures and practices in place to prevent and adjudicate student academic misconduct. They may also wish to examine faculty and student experiences with academic misconduct and the academic honor code.

It should be noted that during AY 17-18, the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) was exploring ways to help faculty to understand how they can help their students pursue academic integrity and how to avoid academic dishonesty. The FDC looked at many facets of academic integrity during the academic year and because of the overlap between their work and the charge to the SAPC on academic dishonesty, the SAPC collaborated with the FDC while working on their charge and members of the SAPC attended most of the events offered by the FDC during AY 17-18. A webpage containing a summary of the work of the FDC on academic integrity and resources for faculty members can be found at:

https://www.udayton.edu/ltc/development/resources_faculty/integrity.php

The SAPC began working on its charge by reviewing the relevant documents concerning the University’s policies on academic dishonesty. In particular, the document DOC 2012-04 Academic Honor Code Revision (Amended) from 10-19-2012 which can be found in eCommons. The SAPC then held a series of fact finding meetings with members of the FDC and representatives from the Offices of the Dean from each of the four units who are responsible for issues of academic dishonesty in their units. The meetings with FDC members were attended by David Wright and Susan Brown. The College of Arts and Sciences representative was Cindy Shafer, the School of Engineering representative was Scott Segalewitz, the School of Education and Health Sciences representative was Mary Lou Andrews, and the School of Business Administration representative was Randy Sparks. The SAPC also met with Angie Petrovic and Kim Trick to discuss the expectations of the NCAA for academic honor code policies for member schools.

Initial findings from these meetings indicated that the different units handled academic honor code prevention and incidents differently. In particular, SBA has implemented a set of training and policies that have reduced the average number of academic honor code violation incidents, with twenty-one being reported in AY16-17. SOE had the highest number of recent incidents, with sixty-eight incidents reported in a recent fifteen month period. SOE indicated that online classes were presenting a particular
challenge to maintaining academic integrity due to recent advances in computerized tools for cheating. CAS and SOEHS reported less than a dozen incidents in a typical year.

The suspicion among SAPC members was that the overall number of academic honor code violations was higher than the reported number of incidents that were reaching the Dean’s offices. That is why SAPC decided to conduct a survey of the instructors to provide better data for interpreting the climate on campus concerning academic dishonesty. The results of that survey will be presented later in this document. There was also general agreement that the problem of academic dishonesty was greater in larger than smaller classes. Smaller classes allow instructors to assign more individualized, scaffolded assignments, which makes violating the academic honor code more difficult. Furthermore, there was a sense that technology plays a significant role in the ways in which students violate the academic honor code. For example, websites such as coursehero.com and chegg.com are portals where students can and do post their completed assignments and papers that other students can either purchase or trade for by posting their own assignments and papers.

The common forms by which students are committing academic dishonesty has not changed very much; i.e. submitting someone else’s work as their own or accessing sources of knowledge not permitted to them during assessments. What technology has changed is the ease with which students can acquire these things, and the anonymous nature of such acquisitions. It is reasonable for instructors to assume that any assignment that has been previously released has been archived with its solution on the internet. This includes both materials from publishers and original assignments created by the instructors. “Study aides” on various websites are often sorted by school, instructor, and course. The primary suggestion for instructors to combat academic dishonesty is to personalize assignments using either something specific to the individual or an event in the recent past. Assigning the same assignment from a previous term will allow students who wish to view a good example of a graded submission an easy opportunity to do so. Some students will view the online example in a formative way, but others will use what they find in an academically dishonest fashion. It is imperative that the students be informed about what is acceptable and unacceptable use of online resources, and that the instructors consider what is available online to the students when they create assignments. The National Education Association in 2017 published the following article on technology and cheating that provides a good introduction: http://neatoday.org/2017/09/15/why-students-cheat/

Concerning athletics, the NCAA requires the member schools to have an academic honor code and to investigate and adjudicate incidents of violation of that honor code. The University of Dayton is in compliance with this. However, an incident that is found to not be a violation of the academic honor code might still be an NCAA violation if the student athlete is found to have received impermissible academic assistance. Consequently, it is important that good lines of communication exist with the athletics department during an academic honor code violation involving a student athlete.

To better inform their discussions and findings, the SAPC then set out to create a University Faculty Survey on Academic Integrity. The FDC had arranged for Brenda Quaye, the Coordinator of Academic Integrity at Miami University to give a talk on Academic Integrity on Feb. 2nd, 2018 in the LTC. Dr. Quaye was kind enough to share a faculty survey on academic integrity that was used at Miami University which was used as a starting point for developing a survey for the University of Dayton. The SAPC was aided in developing the survey by members of the FDC who were willing to test preliminary versions of the survey and to offer feedback.
SURVEY SUMMARY

SAPC created a survey regarding academic integrity in the spring of 2018. This survey was distributed to all UD instructors and was completed by 164 responders. Of these responders, there was a nearly equal distribution among Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Full-time Lecturers, with nearly 16% of responders being either department chairs or program directors.

The vast majority of responders felt they were knowledgeable regarding the current Academic Honor Code policy and reporting processes, with only 10% answering either 1 or 2 on a five-point scale that ranged from 1 = “not knowledgeable at all” to 5 = “extremely knowledgeable.” Seven out of ten respondents stated they knew where to find the document that contains the latest revision of the Academic Honor Code and eight out of ten responded that they had read the University of Dayton’s Academic Honor Code since its last revision in 2012. One out of four respondents stated that they either did not know or were not sure of the fact that faculty are required to report suspected cases of academic dishonesty. Respondents almost unanimously reported that they are required to submit a written report of suspected academic dishonesty directly to either their chair or dean, or the chair or dean of the student’s major.

Nearly all respondents stated that they have a statement on their syllabi regarding the Academic Integrity and the Honor Code, and the majority discusses it in their classes. When responders have a question concerning academic integrity policy and processes, the first person or resource most all of them turn to is their respective department chair.

Just over a third of respondents reported not having encountered a suspected case of academic dishonesty in the 2016/17 and 2017/18 academic years; a little over a fourth responded having encountered one or two cases in the same time period; about one out of six respondents reported having encountered more than two suspected cases. Of those who suspected an academic dishonesty case, roughly half submitted a written report, while the other half did not. Of those who completed a report, the majority responded that it took less than 15 minutes to complete, whereas about 13% stated that it took longer than half an hour.

With regards to suggestions for how the reporting process might be improved, there were many varied responses (e.g., “The form is fine. It is the appeals process that is exhausting, as the instructor must present the information in person again at every stage. It should be sufficient for the form to suffice”; “The dean’s office should take these cases seriously. They are increasing in frequency partly because the dean’s office is so soft on our response”; “We need a central office to handle academic misconduct. The dean’s office model is not effective at managing a student body this large”; “Make it an online process, with the ability to attach documents. Also, abolish the requirement of a "student meeting." This is a complete waste of time.”)

The reasons given by respondents who did not submit a written report of suspected academic dishonesty incidents included that the instructors handled the situation themselves, they did not feel they had enough evidence, the process is too laborious, and they were concerned about the incident being a part of the student’s permanent record.

Responses regarding graduate academic integrity incidences mirrored those of undergraduates, except with fewer responses.
With regard to how respondents help encourage a culture of academic integrity in their classes, responses were varied. Many, however, fell into the following categories: placing the honor code on syllabi; assignments and quizzes; discussing the honor code in class; using turnitin for assignments; creating multiple versions of exams; creating assignments that make cheating more difficult.

Approximately 2/3 of respondents supported a central university office that would intake, investigate, and adjudicate reported cases of academic dishonesty.

With regard to further suggestions as to how the university can encourage greater academic integrity or other concerns or suggestions related to academic integrity and/or the Honor Code, there were many varied responses. Examples of some of the most common:

- The university needs to take cheating and academic dishonesty more seriously. A stronger set of repercussions would also create a stronger academic environment and raise the academic integrity standards of the student body as a whole.
- I would like to have a clearer sense of expectations university-wide and for how to proceed should I expect plagiarism.
- We need to do something about students posting class materials online on for-profit sites where they earn money for students who download their notes- often these materials are quiz questions, study guides, etc. Sites like study blue, etc.
- Make penalties required and substantial. Students with multiple offenses should be expelled
- The expectations and consequences must be conveyed to students and the expectations and process must be conveyed to faculty. This needs to be constant and sustained. If it begins with the administration, my hope is that it will eventually become more accepted among both students and faculty.
- Have classes where the rooms aren't so full that the students are pretty much sitting in each other's laps.
- Give instructors more resources to help us understand and combat the different ways of cheating (e.g., farming out projects, etc).
- Workshops on plagiarism and academic dishonesty should be a part of student and faculty orientation.
- More education directed toward foreign students and especially those coming to UD for the summer/during the summer. Some students do not perceive their actions as dishonorable or as violations of university policy or they don't care.
- I would like to see the information and policies more readily at hand.
By establishing an office that handles cases of academic dishonesty across the university.

Make it more a part of student orientation and emphasize it in the residence halls. Put signs up on campus that encourage students (and everyone) to be honest in all our endeavors.

**SAPC RECOMMENDATIONS**

After consulting with parties across the university, discussing the survey’s findings, and reviewing the incident form and procedure, we concluded that our current practices can be improved with a view to combating implicit bias, improving consistency, supporting vulnerable students, and supporting and protecting instructors and chairs.

To that end, we recommend the following:

1. That the number of students and desks per classrooms are evaluated to ensure that professors can walk through the isles and monitors students.

2. That the academic incident form be made easier to fill out by enlarging the box in which instructors describe the incident. Currently, only a few typed lines will print.

3. That a separate form be created for receipt of students’ signature. We heard reports of students refusing to sign the incident report form, believing that it is, or can be construed as, an admission of guilt. Because student signatures document awareness of the accusation, they are necessary for protecting instructors against the charge that they punished a student for an honor code violation without communicating the violation to the student.

4. That the form requires instructors to inform the student by email to document both that and when the student was notified. This modification to the form will make it consistent with the procedure for filing a report, outlined in the University of Dayton catalog. Currently, the form states: “Within 10 business days of becoming aware of a possible honor code violation, the instructor will notify the student of the incident via university e-mail and, if possible, in person. The instructor will disclose to the student the requirement of attending a “student meeting” to maintain access to the appeal process.”

5. That the form requires the instructor to provide the department chair or program director in which the incident occurred a copy of the report and the problematic assignment. This amendment to the form will make it consistent with the procedure for filing a report, as outlined in the University catalog. Currently, the form states: “If the student does not discuss the incident with the instructor within five business days, or decides not to appeal, the instructor shall inform the department chair or program director in which the incident occurred and send the report to the student’s dean.”

6. That the form and the procedure be updated so as to require that the student work accompany the report.

7. That the form and the procedure be updated so as to require that a copy of the form and assignment in which the incident occurred be given to the accused student. This measure will aid students when seeking consultation and appealing the judgment.
8. That under “Maintaining Incident Reports” in the catalog, the process and timeline for expunging files is made transparent.

9. That the procedure, outlined in the University catalog, be replaced by a clear checklist.

10. That when cheating is detected in the OLR, only the instructor of the course is informed. The current practice, which is to inform the dean of the student’s unit and instructor, does not conform with the procedure outlined in the catalog. To ensure fairness to the student, the dean should receive an incident report only after the instructor communicates with the student.

11. That each department develop guidelines for reporting violations and holding students accountable. Guidelines should provide recommendations regarding what counts as cheating and the range of reasonable punishments. We believe that issuing guidelines encourages greater and more equitable reporting within each department, and can be used to promote students’ understanding of departmental expectations and support the instructor’s and chair’s judgments.

12. That the Senate consider recommending the establishment of a central office for reporting and judging accusations of academic dishonesty, and for staying up to date with the latest advancements in technology that students use to cheat. This permanent office could also be used to continue and extend the work that David Wright and the Faculty Development Committee began on combating academic dishonesty, and staying up to date with best practices for preventing dishonesty and encouraging academic integrity. The office would establish close tie with other entities that should be involved (e.g., the LTC, student athletics department, UDIT (Isidore), student development, the Provost’s office, etc.).

To combat implicit bias, it is necessary that instructors consistently report and assess accountability. But we found that instructors do not consistently file reports for a variety of reasons. We hope that filing a report to a central office will relieve some of the burdens associated with reporting violations. We maintain that a central office can more consistently review and judge each case, reducing the chance that bias influences decisions regarding academic dishonesty. Moreover, we expect a central office to be better than the instructor at handling allegations that students bought work online. Instructors often suspect student dishonesty, but are either unsure how to proceed or find it too laborious to pursue.

Instructors report concern regarding cheating within the international student body. However, cheating transcends cultural and national boundaries. The belief that international students (a nationally diverse group) cheat more readily contributes to biased reporting and punishments assessed. Should instructors expect cheating from international students, they will be caught more often. And, for written assignments especially, it is easier to recognize a bought assignment from an international than a domestic student. A central office set up to receive and pursue these accusations will not make it easier to hold domestic students accountable, but we hope that it will encourage instructors to pursue suspected cases and make accountability more equitable.

13. That the University designate a point person with whom students could discuss accusations of academic honor code violations without fear of incriminating themselves. This is especially important for international students, who report feeling vulnerable by the accusation. This is in part a consequence of not being fully integrated into the larger UD community. But they also have more dire concerns about the status of their visa and scholarship.