

9-17-2013

2013-09-17 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2013-09-17 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2013). *ECAS Minutes*. 292.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/292

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
September 17, 2013
KU 312, 8:00-9:30 AM

Present: Abdullah Alghafis, Paul Benson, Harry Gerla, Linda Hartley, Emily Hicks, Carissa Krane, Terence Lau, Carolyn Roecker Phelps, Joseph Saliba, Dominic Sanfilippo

Absent: Phil Anloague, Ed Mykytka

Guests: Jim Farrelly

Opening prayer/meditation: D. Sanfilippo opened the meeting with a prayer.

Minutes: The minutes of the September 10, 2013 ECAS meeting were approved with corrections.

Announcements:

- Next meeting—September 24, 2013, 8:00-9:30 KU 312
- C. Phelps requested that everyone send their class schedules for next semester as soon as possible so that the ECAS meeting time can be set.

Reports

- FAC—L. Hartley reported that the committee had not met since the last ECAS meeting. The committee is currently setting up a subcommittee to discuss intellectual property. The committee will also revisit the use of special faculty titles (e.g. Distinguished Professor, Emeritus, and Research Professor). J. Saliba stated that there has been some inconsistency in the use of these titles across campus so clarification is needed.
- APC—P. Benson reported that the committee had not met since the last ECAS meeting.
- SAPC—T. Lau reported that the committee met with Bill Fischer and Debra Monk to discuss the current policy prohibiting student-run businesses to operate on campus. The current policy was put in place primarily to stop solicitation in the dorms and limit liability. There is an existing committee of administrators and faculty (no students) to review requests for an exemption. However, few students go through the process and no exceptions have ever been granted. B. Fischer and D. Monk are open to revisiting the policy. Jay Janney was also present at the meeting to talk about the entrepreneurship program and the business competition. The committee will draft a document for discussion.

Old Business:

Consultation:

C. Phelps gave a brief summary of the work of an ECAS sub-committee from last year (C. Phelps, C. Daprano, and H. Gerla) tasked with drafting a document about consultation for discussion. Initially, the sub-committee looked at how to improve consultation. They discussed a two-pronged approach of 1) procedural issues and 2) how to improve communication and hear about decisions earlier.

Several questions were introduced into the ECAS discussion:

- What is consultation?
- What are the Academic Senate's role/responsibilities in consultation?
- What are the university administration's role/responsibilities in consultation?

- How is the Senate constitution being interpreted? Is the language inconsistent? Does the list of items provide clarity or complicate the issue?
- Does the constitution afford the Senate the authority to consult on policies only or actual items/actions as well?

H. Gerla commented that limiting consultation to policies doesn't make sense with some of the items listed in Article II, sections B.3 of the Senate constitution. C. Phelps stated that the list of items/issues causes confusion. The possibility of proposing changes to the Senate constitution was discussed. P. Benson asked about the possibility of addressing the issues with a statement of practices or procedures that could be developed in a shorter time frame to avoid a long, drawn out process of constitutional change. T. Lau stated that any action short of constitutional change would not be enough to satisfy his constituents. P. Benson expressed concern that the level of faculty frustration will continue to grow if we do not attempt to address issues in the near term. It was noted that doing something now does not negate the ability to pursue constitutional change later. The new ELC may be a place to discuss related procedural issues. J. Farrelly stated that the Processes and Procedures of the Academic Senate (DOC 2007-05) could be the appropriate place to incorporate clarifying language about issues of Senate consultation.

Examples of recent campus events were discussed as they relate to communication and consultation (e.g. proposed outside employment policy, Deltak contract, health care). P. Benson stated that some faculty members are not satisfied with the consultative role as defined by the Senate constitution. The differences between communication (hearing about things) and consultation (ability to give feedback) were discussed. C. Krane commented that perhaps we are not being consulted because we do not have policies stating that the Senate should be consulted. H. Gerla suggested that the Senate should be more proactive about seeking opportunities for consultation. The question of shared governance versus shared administration was discussed. J. Farrelly stated that the President of the Senate sits on President's and Provost's Councils and the person in that position should not be asked to keep issues confidential from ECAS. This structure is in place to facilitate communication and consultation, but is not being used appropriately.

New Business:

The agenda for the September 27th Academic Senate was reviewed. The agenda includes:

- Kristen Altenau—Sexual Violence Prevention Education Coordinator
- Health Care Benefits—Joyce Carter
- SET committee final report discussion

Discussion:

P. Benson expressed concern that the Senate might not have enough time to discuss the SET report if the discussion of health care benefits goes longer than expected. J. Saliba recommended and ECAS members agreed that the committee reports be moved to end of the meeting. T. Lau suggested that J. Carter state what's not changing about health care benefits at the beginning of her presentation before giving details about cost increases. H. Gerla suggested that any slides be made available before the meeting. J. Farrelly advised that we plan for an overflow crowd.

C. Phelps suggested that a "sense of the Senate" be taken at the September meeting to provide direction for moving forward. If the Senate does not want to move forward with changing the SET instrument and process, then any further work would be a waste of time. If the Senate is willing to move forward, then the next steps in the SET process could be twofold:

1. Task the APC with developing processes for the administration of a SET instrument

2. Task the FAC with looking at how SET data would be used

The committees would develop documents for Senate action. C. Krane questioned where the work of the two committees would intersect because they must come back together eventually. J. Farrelly suggested that Senate approval of the process to moving forward be sought, rather than a “sense of the Senate” so Senate members had clarity about what their vote meant. C. Krane clarified that this would be a vote on the path for moving forward, not on the SET instrument. C. Phelps agreed to send an email explaining what the Senate would be asked to vote on.

T. Lau asked what timeline would be necessary to a run a trial SET process in Fall 2014. L. Hartley stated that it would depend on what we were trying to test. There was general agreement that no tenure-track faculty would participate in any trials to avoid complicating the tenure and promotion process and that any trials would be on a small scale. L. Hartley stated that SET best practices suggest a gradual unit by unit roll out process for full campus implementation. T. Lau asked if the implementation timeline would take the cost of software and infrastructure changes into consideration. L. Hartley stated that the SET committee had discussed these issues early on and that David Wright (committee member) has been in communication with Dr. Skill (CIO). However, decisions about resource allocation were beyond the scope of the SET committee charge. There was general agreement among ECAS members that if a Fall 2014 SET trial were to be planned, and then Senate approval would need to be secured by February or March 2014. C. Phelps stated that the FAC and APC committees would be asked to complete their work by February.

Student representation on FAC:

D. Sanfilippo explained that one of the student representatives to the Senate has an extremely tight schedule and asked if it was possible to have two students on the FAC this year. No objections were made. D. Sanfilippo will contact L. Hartley with the additional name.

Diversity Council:

The Provost is developing a University Diversity Council. C. Phelps will send information to E. Hicks (chair of the UNRC) to facilitate building a pool of candidates from the faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 A.M.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Hicks

Work in Progress

Task	Source	Previously assigned	To	Work due	Due
Consultation	ECAS	ECAS	ECAS	Open communication	ongoing
Department Processes	ECAS		APC	Proposal	
Honors distinction on transcripts	ECAS		APC	Proposal	
Intellectual properties			FAC		
Information Literacy			APC		
Academic dishonesty	SAPC				
Student Businesses	SAPC		SAPC		

Change in Constitution	ECAS				
Tasks ongoing					
SET Committee oversight	ECAS		ECAS	Hear monthly reports; Linda Hartley, chair	
CAP Competency Committee oversight	Senate		APC	Hear monthly reports	
UNRC			ECAS	Hear monthly reports; Emily Hicks, chair	
Summer tuition	Faculty		SAPC	On hold until tuition model is further developed	