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UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
November 22, 2019
Kennedy Union Ballroom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.


Senators Excused: Emma Adams, Neomi DeAnda, Jim Dunne, Jason Pierce, Fran Rice, Asari Vijayan, John White

Guests: Amy Anderson, Deb Bickford, Laura Bistrek, Darden Bradshaw, Susan Brown, Larry Burnley, Amy Christopher, Jennifer Creech, Cara Daley, Jim Farrelly, Linda Hartley, Julie Huckaba, Jane Koester, Marissa McCray, Sabrina Neeley, Julianna Otero, Don Pair, Carolyn Phelps, Todd Smith, Aaron Witherspoon

Presenters: Jason Reinoehl, Aaron Witherspoon, Larry Burnley

1. Opening Prayer/Meditation: Leslie Picca offered a prayer
2. Minutes: Minutes of the October 18, 2019 meeting were approved, no revisions. Accepted by unanimous consent.
3. Announcements: No announcements.
4. UD’s Competitive Position: Today and Tomorrow:
   Jason Reinoehl, Vice President for Strategic Enrollment Management, presented on the current climate as it’s related to enrollment management.
   - 25 years of undergrad enrollment in the US — From 1995-2010 there has been an 18% increase in US residents ages 14 to 24. Reinoehl explained the growth that occurred in this period. In 2011 we have felt “turbulence” with declining demographic trends. In this period UD has had growth while many of our peers have suffered enrollment declines.
   - UD’s enrollment trends and elevated competitive position — Reinoehl explained a number of benchmarks (national top-50 privates, as well as local, private public institutions). He compared UD on price, Pell-grant-eligible students, 6-year graduation rates, etc. to these benchmarks. All of this puts us at a very competitive position.
   - UD’s undergraduate market environment and outlook —Reinoehl highlighted some of the following factors: we have increased our competitive position, but also increased our price position. Our core historical pool of applicants has declined demographically. Families are more concerned about ROI (Return on Investment) versus holistic learning environments. Reinoehl also highlighted how the US Department of Justice has taken a role in admission practices (incentives, deadlines, recruitment practices post-deposit). There is a magnitude of change never experienced in higher education creating a wild, wild west.”
UD’s game-plan, strategic pillars and 2019-20 — Offensive Plans: create an integrated strategy, communicating how our education meets family’s needs (e.g., hands-on learning, faculty mentoring), partnerships and collaborations (e.g., Shorelight Education, Sinclair, etc.). Defensive Plans: We need to be prepared and adapt and respond swiftly. Strategic Pillars include diversifying enrollment channels, expand key strategic partnerships, leverage data, etc. Reinoehl discussed adaptations we are making in 2019-2020: we will need to be more competitive relating to prior learning credit (we have not been competitive here in the past), we need to better position our programs versus competitors, personalize packages, extended recruitment process to the summer, help families imagine early in the process what it will be like to study at UD, develop better pathways for students to transfer to UD. Reinoehl seeks to shift dependency on “traditional” first-year students and build in flyer promise, transfer, UD-Sinclair and UDDayton Global.

QUESTIONS: Has there been consideration of “test optional” for standardized test admission. ANSWER: This is being examined and Reinoehl is exploring how it could be done in a “UD way.” QUESTION: MBA offers an immersion program, has there been thoughts about doing this with undergrads. ANSWER: We have done a few, but will explore more. QUESTION: A question was asked about how those new streams of students will get the financial resources needed to come and succeed here. ANSWER: They are seeking to balance, but also recognize that it is a short-term risk that will lead to a better educational space for all. Fixed tuition plan (we started in 2013) helps reduce student debt. Also, the university is not planning to increase tuition revenues from undergraduate populations. Paul Benson explained that revenue growth cannot come on the backs of undergraduate students. QUESTION: There was a concern about how housing costs rise independent of tuition, and concerns of pricing out future students. QUESTION: There was a concern about the alternative revenue streams. ANSWER: Reinoehl explained how the integrated model will help.

5. Update on Academic Advising Task Force — “The Case for Vocation-Based Mentoring and Advising,” Aaron Witherspoon, Director of University Advising Initiatives: Witherspoon looked at how advising fits into a holistic model of student success, explained the foundations of advising, and discussed how vocation will play a larger role in advising. Witherspoon talked a bit about Generation Z and their more complex needs. Professional advisors can contribute to the success of underrepresented students. A new model will include faculty mentoring. There will be centralized training, support, and development. Faculty will be involved in designing, implementing and training under the new model. There will also be unit/department-specific considerations in advising and mentoring. Witherspoon outlined a number of ways for faculty to remain involved in mentoring and advising (e.g, serving as a faculty mentor, offering a mini course, increase students sense of belonging, provide mentorship on research projects and presentation, etc.). He also explained a number of different mentoring models as further ways for faculty to engage in mentoring. His office will provide training (in-person and online), faculty will also have access to advising training and information as well. He highlighted some priorities and challenges. Priorities include a university council on advising, a council on faculty mentoring, centralized training, and consultation with academic units. Challenges include the financial investment, discipline-specific needs and the cultural change. QUESTIONS: How do we maximize efficiency and consider ways for faculty to take on some advising duties rather than having students having to go to two separate offices. QUESTION: How will mentoring and advising systems will interact? ANSWER: Communication will be key. We need to be very specific about language (advisor versus mentor). Sometimes those roles will be blurred, and they will take those into consideration. QUESTION: Definitions of “vocation” differ from a Catholic and a
Business perspective. QUESTION: Mental Health training? ANSWER: This will be a critical part of training. QUESTION: How will advisors get trained, what will the background be and who will they report to? ANSWER: They will come from a student services background. There are great resources from national organizations for training. They are still figuring out who they will report to, and how they will work between units and departments. QUESTION: DO we have models on campus already? ANSWER: SBA has been using this model for some time. They also have peer mentors.

6. **Update on Diversity and Inclusion Implementation** —“Overview of the President’s Diversity and Inclusion Assessment Task Force Final report,” Larry Burnley, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion: Burnley offered some opening comments on the report, who was involved, and some of the feedback on sharing the report around campus. He emphasized that our commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion (DE&I) is not an option, but it is a mission-driven imperative. He discussed why DE&I is a priority (e.g., mission, companies are requesting this from universities). He shared some mis-informed responses to the report and dispelled some of those misconceptions. In so doing, he also talked about a number of these including how we need to move from a culture of invitation to a culture of expectation for DE&I. He emphasized that all of us fall short of reflecting total excellence in these areas and there is room for improvement for all of us. The report does not make recommendation for how DE&I should be involved in Tenure and Promotion. One element that the report may not have fully addressed include issues of disability, but also accountability, and consequences. QUESTION: How can we better listen for the voices of those who may not be able or not willing to advocate for themselves? ANSWER: They are looking into this. QUESTION: How will the task force on women and gender and the task force on DE&I work together? ANSWER: DE&I report was informed by many sources. QUESTION: How did the discussion sessions of the report go? ANSWER: He is hearing affirmation and excitement, but also suspicion. There were many questions about accountability and also capacity (how are we going to do everything?). Other questions of cultural capacity (will the usual suspects do the heavy lifting?). He is very excited for the council on DE&I. Burnley ended by discussing timeline.

7. **Committee Reports:**
   Given time constraints, no committee reports were offered (SAPC, FAC, APC).  

8. **Adjournment:** Adjourned 5:34

Respectfully submitted, Sam Dorf
Academic Policies Committee
Report to the Academic Senate
November 22, 2019

Members: Deb Bickford (ex-officio – Associate Provost), Connie Bowman (SEHS), Neomi DeAnda (CAS-Hum), Mary Ellen Dillon (NTT), Jim Dunne, Chair (SBA), Deo Eustance (SOE), John Mittelstaedt (SBA – Dean), Leslie Picca (CAS – SSc), Jason Pierce (CAS – Dean), Maher Qumsiyeh (CAS – NS), Tereza Szeghi (CAS – Hum)

1. Meetings: The Academic Policies Committee (APC) has met four times since the October Report to the Academic Senate: Oct 21, Oct 28, Nov 4, and Nov 11.

2. Charges: The APC is working on two charges from the Executive Committee (ECAS).
   a. **ONE. Online courses** – investigate the academic quality and possibly develop recommendations. Recommendations could involve university policies.
   b. **TWO. 5-year CAP Evaluation.** Our Common Academic Program was established by Senate DOC 2010-04. The first undergraduate class to take CAP courses was the August 2013 entering class that graduated in May 2017. DOC 2010-04 calls for a “thorough and systematic” evaluation of CAP – to be completed after this academic year. Our APC charge is focused on developing a plan and a framework for that CAP Evaluation.

3. Activities:
   a. **For Online Course effort:** We are interacting with Ryan Allen, the director of e-Learning. He has been involved with the university’s various online courses and programs. Our focus is on the online courses not developed and offered in conjunction with 2U. We have gathered data on such courses offered over that past few years. We are in the process of benchmarking other universities. The output of our effort could be recommended policies for online course development and delivery or best practices guidelines. We plan to have a report to the Senate by the end of January.
   b. **For the CAP Evaluation:** With the help of Assistant Provost for CAP, Michelle Pautz, we have reviewed the current studies and data gathering on CAP. One meeting was held with the Assistant Provost discussing her recommendations. We have received input from the Professor Bill Trollinger, chair of CAP Committee, and Danielle Poe, Associate Dean for CAP in the College. Our goal is to offer a framework for this CAP evaluation early in the spring semester.