

Spring 1-19-2024

2024-01-19 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

**Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
(ECAS)
ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
2023-2024**

MEETING MINUTES

FRIDAY, January 19, 2024
12:30-2pm – SM 113B

President: Erin O'Mara Kunz

Vice President: Allison Kinney

Secretary: Jon Fulkerson

Members: Jackie Arnold, Ali Carr-Chellman, Garrett Conti, Jen Dalton, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Jon Fulkerson, Tim Gabrielli, Kayla Harris, Precious Henderson, Allison Kinney, Erin O'Mara Kunz, Joel Puce (Faculty Board), Andrea Seielstad, Darlene Weaver

Present: Jackie Arnold, Ali Carr-Chellman (virtual), Garrett Conti, Jen Dalton (virtual), Weibke Diestelkamp, Jon Fulkerson, Tim Gabrielli, Allison Kinney, Erin O'Mara Kunz, Joel Puce, Andrea Seielstad, Darlene Weaver

Absent: Kayla Harris, Precious Henderson

Opening

- Call to Order 12:33 (E. Kunz)
- Opening prayer/meditation (Tim Gabrielli) [\[Prayer/meditation sign up here\]](#)
- **VOTE:** approval of [minutes from January 12,2024 meeting/](#)
 - Approved by unanimous consent.

Announcements

- Today: Academic Senate Meeting, 3:30-5:30, KU Ballroom
- January 22, 2024: Next ELC meeting, 10:30-12pm, KU 316, Presidential Suite
 - Agenda has been distributed.
 - Plan to debrief regarding this meeting at the next ECAS meeting
- Remaining ECAS Library Dean Candidate Meetings
 - January 22, 2024, 1:45 pm, Roesch Library 215
- February 2, 2024: Joint Faculty/Academic Senate Meeting, 3:30-5:30pm, KU Ballroom
 - Timing for this is in the midsts of the "Critical Conversations" occurring across campus
 - Discussion regarding possibility of deferring this meeting until after these Critical Conversations occur
 - Discussion of what the content of this meeting would be and how it could depend on what is in Critical Conversation tour
 - *Motion to delay the joint meeting until after tour is done for a suitable date in March (J. Fulkerson, T. Gabrielli seconds)*
 - Vote: 8 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain. Motion passes.

Agenda Items

- **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE:** [Charge](#) to APC regarding the Revision of the Social Sciences CAP Requirement, [proposal from Social Science Chairs](#) (see also [DOC 2010-04](#))
 - Discussion of timeline for implementation of the proposed changes and the need to separately consider addressing urgent issues for the next academic year.
 - Given it is an actual change to CAP, it is important this has appropriate consultation.
 - However, it is likely that not addressing this for next year will affect the ability of students to graduate in a timely manner.

- Discussion regarding if the proposal should highlight disciplines or highlight departments.
 - Particular question around Human Rights Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and other transdisciplinary coursework.
- Discussion of consultation and when we should expect the work to be complete.
- Q: Should we include anything about possible emergency measures?
 - Discussion of ways to brainstorm emergency measures and value of separately considering the two issues.
- *Motion to approve the charge with discussed changes* (J. Fulkerson, W. Diestelkamp second)
 - Vote: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain. Motion passes.
- Discussion about the possibility of “daylighting” courses
 - “Daylighting” refers to temporary approval of a course with a definite end date (“sunset”)
 - When CAP was new, the associate deans approved these.
 - We should consider how that might work for any emergency measures that may occur. Possibility that ECAS or CAP-C approve courses.
- **DISCUSSION:** [Co-Major in Neuroscience](#), builds upon Neuroscience minor
 - [Email exchange](#) regarding advising for co-major
 - Suggested [Language](#) to be added to the Academic Catalog for CAS
- This would be UD’s first co-major.
 - Co-Majors can only be listed as second majors.
- Discussion of credit hour requirements and how it compares to other degrees on campus.
 - Double majors, majors and minors, concentrations.
 - Opens the door for creative curriculum options across campus.
- Comment: Believes new structure does require Academic Senate consultation.
- Comment: The new structure may need additional institutional scrutiny.
 - There may be potential operational concerns that haven’t been surfaced in the proposal. Example concerns would be the need for common definitions in the catalog and compliance with state regulations.
 - Discussion about implication for overall catalog requirements.
 - Current proposal is written to be offered within current resources, so this isn’t about our ability to deliver the program.
- May require a proposal that goes to the senate.
 - Comment: supports this idea.
 - Would potentially delay the proposal being included in the 2024-25 catalog if it requires a full proposal.
 - Proposal would need to go through APC.
- Q: Does the proposal have to go back to the department for approval?
 - Likely not, proposal is for Senate only.
- Q: Once proposal is completed, is that when APC would consider the co-major question?
 - Not sure on the order.
 - Co-major would require more discussion.
- *Motion to request a full Senate proposal for Neuroscience major to be submitted to ECAS for the purposes of sub-committee review and full discussion by the Senate* (A. Seielstad, A. Kinney second)
 - Vote: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain. Motion passes.
- Decided to discuss the general approach to co-majors in a future ECAS meeting.
- **DISCUSSION:** Consultation
 - President Erin O’Mara Kunz: Opening a general discussion of areas where more consultation should be had.
 - What changes need to be made to current processes? Where can improvements be made?
 - Q: What prompted this?
 - Discussion with Tom Skill regarding Blue Sky and best approach for getting feedback.
 - Questions were raised regarding priorities given budget limitations.
 - Comment: Feels there is some difficulty in getting feedback from constituents.
 - Comment: There is a knowledge gap and potentially a communication issue.

- Comment: This isn't only communication. Sometimes this is a procedural issue where things seem to happen without a lot of participation.
 - Ex: How CSIT or BlueSky working groups were formed.
 - Comment in support of this comment. Additional examples where this has occurred.
- Comment: Senate is the only place where consultation is meant to occur, which includes two-way communication. We are entitled to information.
 - Believes a key area where this was an issue was the two programs that were ended. That requires more collaboration regarding what are the criteria and Senate should have input on this.
 - Within BlueSky, there is a budget component that should be reported out regarding why priority was placed on the BlueSky elements instead of other things.
 - Concerned about impact of BlueSky on faculty and where the proposed changes relate to our legislative authority.
 - Senate can and should be proactive on getting information on these pieces.
- Provost Weaver: More understanding now of how much people actually understand BlueSky.
 - Communication challenges are real and there are different levels of engagement across campus.
 - Believes the real issues around recruitment and financial aid haven't been clearly communicated.
 - Student body is getting smaller and competitive pressures mean we have to respond.
 - Administrative effort to more clearly describe the enrollment concerns.
 - Retention is even more important in this environment.
- Comment: Among faculty, believes they understand the admissions challenges. However, it seems like BlueSky occurred in a less transparent environment than prior changes.
- Provost Weaver: CSIT analysis had flaws and things are in progress. We need better tools in place for ongoing review. Want to avoid the Sword of Damocles.
 - Comment: How these things are calculated seem like they should be the purview of the faculty.
 - Comment: We have to have some things that don't necessarily generate money for the university.
- Discussion of role of Senate in assessing budget issues.
- Need to reevaluate program closure document. Believes the Provost will support it.
- Joel Pruce: Faculty Board is discussing some of these issues. Feedback from recent survey includes budget process seems opaque and concern that we regularly have budget concerns.
 - Comment: More disclosure at UD than at other universities.
- Comment: How were timeline and process determined for program closures?
 - Response: That was created by the Provost Benson and there isn't a policy in place.
- Comment: The BlueSky initiative has a big impact on faculty.
- President Kunz: Has additional plans to work with the BlueSky sponsors further.
- President called time on discussion.

Meeting adjourned 2:29.

Respectfully submitted by Jon Fulkerson, Secretary to the Academic Senate.