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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
January 31, 2014
SM113B, 9:30-10:45 AM

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

Absent: Paul Benson, Joseph Saliba

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Paul Vanderburgh (for J. Saliba), Elizabeth Gustafson

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

Minutes: The minutes of the January 24, 2014 ECAS meeting were approved.

Announcements:
- Next meeting - February 7, 2014, SM 113B, 9:30-10:45 AM
- Sign up for opening prayer/meditation
- ELC dates—3:00-5:00 pm on 2/18, 3/18, 4/16, 5/12; location tba
- A copy of the January 14th Provost’s Council agenda was shared
- D. Sanfilippo announced that the SGA representatives to Academic Senate committees had been determined for this semester:
  o CAP- Stephen Brown, Dominic Sanfilippo
  o FAC- Eric Taglieri, Katie Willard, Zack Martin
  o APC- Jasmine Lahoud, Stephen Brown
  o SAPC- Andy Kurzhals
- The evaluation of administrators issue will be added to the task list and will be discussed at a future time. C. Phelps will draft a document for discussion.

Reports
APC: E. Mykytka reported that the committee will meet today. They will discuss the draft SET proposal.

FAC: L. Hartley reported that the committee met Thursday, January 30th to discuss the draft SET proposal. The committee had several questions, comments and revisions. The small collaborative group meets at 3 pm today to review the feedback from the three standing committees. A revised version will be sent back to ECAS for review and placed in the Senate working documents folder on Porches which is accessible to all faculty. T. Lau asked about some troubling language in the introduction to the survey. L. Hartley assured him that the language had been removed after discussion with Tom Skill and others.

SAPC: T. Lau reported that the committee met on Monday, January 27th. The committee discussed the latest draft of the SET proposal. A small group is continuing to work on the student-run businesses on campus issue. T. Lau indicated that the committee currently has no other assignments.

Old Business:
Discussion of Dismissal for Academic Dishonesty: E. Gustafson provided a handout of the School of Business Administration’s procedures for handling student academic dishonesty and briefly reviewed the penalties set out in the Honor Code. Currently, SBA dismisses a student from the school if a second offense is not cleared. The student gets a warning letter after the first offense and is required to discuss the incident with someone. Question from SBA: What if a second offense occurs in the middle of the semester? Should dismissal be immediate or at the end of the semester? They are looking for guidance from ECAS. No other unit currently dismisses students for a second offense. Several recent examples of offenses were discussed. P. Anlogue stated that there were different degrees of offenses and each instance should continue to be evaluated individually. E. Gustafson stated that a typical first offense is plagiarism. D. Sanfilippo agreed that many students come to college without knowing how to cite properly. A. Alghafis stated that international students coming through the IEP program are shocked by the stricter standards in ENG classes. There needs to be something put in place to reduce the gap between IEP courses and regular courses.

T. Lau commented that any changes may trigger changes to the Honor Code. He also stated that there are several issues that need to be clarified such as the 10-day clock (when does clock start?) and a chair’s ability to reduce or enhance a penalty in appeal process.

Is a university-wide policy needed? Should there be a centralized unit that handles the penalty phase? D. Sanfilippo stated that the University of Virginia has a very well-articulated policy that might be a good model.

This issue will go to the SAPC for further discussion.

Revision to DOC 2012-01 Intellectual Property Regarding Online Course Materials: L. Hartley briefly reviewed the history of Academic Senate revisions to the university’s intellectual property policy. The previous revision passed by the Academic Senate was never implemented. This portion regarding online course materials will be reviewed by the Academic Senate at its next meeting. The most recent revisions will be added to the updated university IP policy and the entire policy will come to the Senate for discussion at a later date. H. Gerla made motion to put this document on the next agenda for the Academic Senate and D. Sanfilippo seconded. The motion was approved.

New Business:

Anti-discrimination/harassment policy: C. Phelps announced that open forums would be held soon to invite comment from the university community. Lori Shaw, Title IX Coordinator, is willing to meet with any of the standing committees to discuss the policy in more detail. C. Krane inquired whether new processes and procedures documents have been developed and if yes, would they be open for discussion as well. C. Phelps said that the website included processes and procedures, including a flowchart of how different types of complaints would be handled. The necessity of existing faculty processes and procedures being reviewed to ensure consistency with this policy was discussed. Concern about faculty not understanding their role as mandatory reporters was raised. H. Gerla stated that Title IX law is not new, but UD’s decision to handle all complaints involving protected classes with this policy was new to the campus.

The FAC and SAPC will review the policy and procedures with attention toward inconsistencies with other policies/procedures.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 A.M.
Respectfully submitted by Emily Hicks

**Work in Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Previously assigned</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Work due</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Open communication</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Processes</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional staff titles</td>
<td>Provost’s office</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Constitution</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAPC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks ongoing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP Competency Committee oversight</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Hear monthly reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Hear monthly reports; Emily Hicks, chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer tuition</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAPC</td>
<td>On hold until tuition model is further developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>