

10-29-2013

## 2013-10-29 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](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2013-10-29 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2013). *ECAS Minutes*. 298.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins/298](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/298)

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

Approved  
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate  
October 29, 2013  
KU 312, 8:15-9:30 AM

**Present:** Abdullah Alghafis, Phil Anloague, Harry Gerla, Linda Hartley, Emily Hicks, Carissa Krane, Terence Lau, Ed Mykytka, Carolyn Roecker Phelps

**Absent:** Paul Benson, Joseph Saliba, Dominic Sanfilippo

**Guests:** Jim Farrelly, Pat Donnelly

**Opening prayer/meditation:** C. Phelps opened the meeting with a prayer.

**Minutes:** The minutes of the October 22, 2013 ECAS meeting were unanimously approved.

**Announcements:**

- Next meeting—November 5, 2013, 8:15-9:30 KU 312
- The School of Business Administration is investigating online proctoring services. ECAS is invited to participate with a small group to view one of the services on Monday, November 4<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 pm in Miriam Hall 101. FYI—this conflicts with the first ELC meeting. A. Alghafis asked if the MBA program would be all online or only select classes. T. Lau stated that there would be two distinct programs—one all online MBA and an in-person MBA program. Costs for the service are still to be determined.

**Reports**

APC: Ed Mykytka reported that the committee had not met since the last ECAS meeting.

FAC: L. Hartley reported that the committee had not met since the last ECAS meeting.

SAPC: T. Lau reported that the committee had last met on Monday, October 28<sup>th</sup>. An update about the CAPC report to ECAS was given. The committee discussed the University's Political/Electoral Activities Policy (last amended 20 April 2012). Members of the committee had brought the issue to the attention of ECAS and requested that the SAPC review and discuss the policy in light of its effects on the academic climate of the University. The guiding question of the SAPC's discussion was "Is the current policy one that would promote civic awareness, as well as civil and informed discourse about a range of political issues?" The committee considers the existing policy to be too restrictive of students' political activities. The SAPC acknowledges the importance of the University's 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status and that, accordingly, the institution, as a whole, should never attempt to create propaganda to influence legislation or promote particular candidates for office. That said, however, members of the SAPC believe that the current "Political/Electoral Activities" policy could be strengthened in key ways:

- A policy, or set of practices, could be established for students, specifically—since the current policy applies to faculty, staff and students.
- Because students are the primary focus of the University's educational mission, there should be a document that frames political/electoral activities in an academic context—one in line, perhaps, with documents such as *Habits of Inquiry and Reflection*.

- There are instances in which the current document appears contradictory or confusing—perhaps because of its multiple audiences—and a revised student policy might offer clarification on what types of political/electoral activities would both serve student academic interests and maintain the University’s 501(c)(3) status.

The SAPC has looked at the policies of Notre Dame University and Georgetown University. Both have robust student political activities policies and still maintain their Catholic and 501(c)(3) status. T. Lau asked what the consequences of violating the current UD policy. There needs to be a clear discipline policy. Being a highly residential campus puts UD students in an awkward position. Why should they not engage in discourse in their homes? We should be encouraging students to engage in civil discourse.

The committee’s next meeting is November 11, 2013 (9:00 a.m. in HM 257) and the agenda will consist of a discussion related to the SAPC’s proposed role in the revision of the SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) instrument and process.

A related conversation about student groups and their advisors in relation to hosting activities occurred. A. Alghafis commented that the Graduate Student Association had been told by their advisor that they could not host activities that may be seen as political or religious because they supposed to focus on academic concerns. C. Krane explained that the Honors Program seeks partners on campus to co-sponsor activities that fall outside the traditional academic silo of the Honors Program. She commented that they had been very successful in these partnering opportunities such as co-sponsoring a Seder that was well-attended. C. Krane also stated that all flyers, posters, etc. must have the official stamp of approval and that this process is above and beyond an advisor’s approval.

#### **Old Business:**

ELC agenda. C. Phelps discussed the draft agenda provided with the meeting materials. The question of who approves the agenda was raised. C. Phelps answered that the President’s Office sets the agenda. C. Krane asked if there had been any further discussion of including staff on the ELC since many staff members are in charge of academic issues and could provide more diversity to the ELC. C. Phelps explained that the goal was to keep the group small. People would be invited according to the topic.

P. Anloague asked if we should have an introduction to the purpose of the ELC. E. Mykytka stated that we should have deliberate conversation about the goals and objectives of the ELC. P. Donnelly expressed concern about the tension between having too little and too much information. L. Hartley commented that the ELC needs to have a conversation about the processes for consultation. T. Lau said that ECAS should go back to Dr. Curran to get more concrete information.

A lengthy discussion about the lack of consultation over the years on various issues, including facilities was conducted resulting in a significant change in the suggested agenda for the November 4<sup>th</sup> ELC meeting. We will ask that the first meeting focus on the role and objectives of the ELC within the framework of the university’s strategic plan.

#### **New Business:**

Agenda for the Meeting of the Academic Senate on November 15<sup>th</sup>. C. Phelps asked what documents/business from standing committees would be ready for the November Senate meeting. E. Mykytka reported that the APC might have the department and degree programs document and the statement on Honors distinction on transcripts ready for the next regular meeting of the Senate.

Agenda for Special Meeting of the Academic Senate on November 8<sup>th</sup>. It was agreed that there would be no committee reports at this special meeting and that the minutes of the last meeting would not be approved until the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Copies of the questions have been forwarded to Tom Burkhardt and Joyce Carter. The most appropriate framework for the meeting was discussed at length. It was agreed that a statement on conduct will be made at the beginning of the meeting. All comments must be civil and address the issues, not specific people. Everyone will know and must follow the rules of engagement. The principles of order will be provided up front. Although this is a special meeting, the normal Senate meeting rules apply. Relevant information, meeting guidelines, and meeting goals will be sent to senators prior to the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:43 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	Proposal	
Instructional staff titles	Provost's office		FAC		
Information Literacy			APC		
Academic dishonesty	SAPC				
Change in Constitution	ECAS				
SET	ECAS		APC	Proposal	
SET	ECAS		FAC	Proposal	
<b>Tasks ongoing</b>					
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	