

9-26-2008

2008-09-26 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2008-09-26 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2008). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 7.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/7

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

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
3:00 p.m., September 26, 2008
Kennedy Union 331

Senators Present: P. Benson, D. Biers, L. Cook, M. Daniels, D. Darrow (presiding), G. Doyle, B. Duncan, C Duncan, T. Eggemeier, J. Firestone, R. Frasca, H. Gauder, J. Greenlee, J. Huacuja, V. Jain, A. Jipson, P. Johnson, N. Jolani, R. Kearns, L Kloppenberg, G. Knape, T. Lasley, L. Laubach, R. Marek, F. Martin, H. McGrew, M. Moss, D. Poe, S. Richards, J. Saliba, A. Seielstad, L. Snyder, S. Swavey, K. Trick

Senators Absent: A. Abueida, C. Bowman, T. Brady, A. Reichle, M. Shank

Guest: K. Bull, R. Burrows, J. Farrelly, L. Frericks, S. Gardstrom, S. Gratto, B. Harrison, T. Hart, J. Mashburn, J. McCombe, D. Murray, D. Pair, L. Rismiller, K. Schultz, T. Skill, P. Vanderburgh, K. Webb, D. Wright

1. Opening Prayer: Senator Poe opened the meeting with a prayer
2. Roll Call: Thirty-four of thirty-nine Senators were present.
3. Minutes: The minutes of April 25, 2008 (outgoing Senate) were approved as written. The minutes of April 25, 2008 (incoming Senate) were approved as written.
4. Announcements: President Darrow thanked the senators for the hard work they have been involved in this semester.
5. University Laptop Policy: Associate Provost Skill presented the status of the new UD laptop policy which will become effective for the fall semester 2009.
 - a. The Provost charged a committee of twenty-four members to review the present laptop policy and to consider real and perceived costs to the students.
 - b. Any new policy must support the students' and departments' needs inside and outside the classroom/office.
 - c. It was assumed that the students are very computer savvy – better able to purchase a high end computer system.
 - d. Many families/students prefer purchasing their own system.
 - e. Students have a negative perception of the Tangent computers required by UD.
 - f. UD will not mandate a computer, but will issue specifications that the students' computers must meet. These specifications will vary with the unit.
 - g. UD will have a preferred provider (HP).
 - h. It is also expected that MAC's will make up as many as 30% of the computers – mostly in the college.
 - i. UD will support the HP's and MAC's it provides.
 - j. In some cases UD will support non-HP's and non-MAC's for a fee. But generally students will be responsible for any computers not provided by UD.
 - k. Students will not be able to get on the network with non-UD computers if they do not meet standards, such as anti-virus, anti-spyware, etc.
 - l. It is likely that students with computers purchased outside UD will have problems the first week on campus. UDIT will provide some assistance.
 - m. UD will provide rental computers for a fee.

Questions:

- a. Are there possibilities of trade-ins or upgrades? Possibly.
- b. Will faculty/staff be able to move to MAC's? MAC's are more expensive than HP's. There is ongoing discussion at the deans' level.
- c. Why did we go with HP rather than DELL? HP was more aggressive with UD; DELL did not seem as interested. HP and DELL performances are comparable, but DELL's price is 30% higher.
- d. How will you encourage students to go with UD's provided HP's. UD will strongly market HP. Administrators and faculty will be mostly HP.

6. Revised University of Dayton Honors and Scholars Program The Academic Policies Committee moved the revised Honors and Scholars Program to the floor. There were some statements of concern.

- a. The program seems to rely heavily on the development of new Learning-Living Community courses. What happens if they can not be developed in enough numbers to satisfy the need? The Honor's program believes that it will be able to develop sufficient LLC's, although it will require a significant effort. It is working with the College to that end.
- b. There was also a question about how to control rigor across courses in different departments. The Honor's program was aware of this potential problem and will be overseeing these course developments.

The vote for the program was: in favor – 28, opposed – 0, abstained – 2.

7. Standing Committees Report

- a. Faculty Affairs Committee – Senator Laubach reminded the Senate that a survey on the Maternity Leave Policy was conducted last spring. The information was compiled and reviewed with Associate Provost Untener. The APC hopes to offer suggestions/modifications to the policy by the end of the fall semester.
Question: Does the policy include fathers? – No
- b. Academic Policies Committee -- Senator C. Duncan reported that the APC just finished work on the revised Honors and Scholars program, see above. It is presently occupied with the Common Academic Program. A process has been developed to obtain feedback from the faculty during the fall semester. The CAP report and process developed by the APC will be delivered to the ECAS soon. The ECAS will then determine a date for release to the Senate and faculty. It is expected to take a year to finish the review and modification. It will be another year to set up the structure – funding, courses, etc.
- c. Student Academic Policies Committee – Senator Kearns reported on:
 - i. The SAPC is considering a new, much shorter student assessment of instruction form. It is not necessarily considered better than the present, longer form. It was noted that there are now multiple evaluation procedures for pre-tenured faculty, and will likely soon be the same for post-tenured faculty. Therefore, a new assessment form is not being considered as urgent.
One suggestion was that there be different forms depending on the unit/department.
 - ii. Upper-class students have not yet been exposed to the new Honor Code. How will that be done? It was mentioned that the part-time faculty will be discussing the Honor Code.
 - iii. SGA is concerned that some students are not being adequately represented. The

first group is the applied practices in SOEAP. The second group is the communication students presently combined with the humanities.

- d. Executive Committee of the Academic Senate – President Darrow reported on:
- i. The ECAS nominated several faculty to serve on the Provost Search Committee.
 - ii. The ECAS reviewed the job description for the Provost position.
 - iii. The ECAS has received a letter from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee asking about “collegiality” in determining promotion and tenure, and a uniform set of procedures for “stopping the clock” during the pre-tenure period.
 - iv. The Senate has been asked to consider the present Intellectual Properties policy for both on-line and classroom courses.
 - v. It was again noted that the Faculty Handbook be brought up to date. Part time faculty expressed interest in working on the Faculty Handbook.
- Question: When will the provost search begin? There will be an ad in the Chronicle this month.

8. Adjournment Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

George R. Doyle, Jr. Secretary of Academic Senate