

11-19-2001

2001-11-19 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, "2001-11-19 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2001). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 40.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/40

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.

Academic Senate Minutes - November 19, 2001

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

November 19, 2001 - KU West Ballroom, 8:00 am

Presiding: Betty Youngkin

Senators Present: Bartlett, Bartley, Charbel, Cherrington, Conniff, Crum, Dandaneau, Doyle, Eimermacher, Erdei, Gerla, Hall, Hary, Kloppenberg, Lechleiter, Morman, Pedrotti, Fran Pestello, Fred Pestello, Phelps, Saliba, Sargent, Youngkin, Yungblut

Guests: There were 60 – 80 guests in attendance

Foreword: In accordance with Article V, section B, 1, a, a Special Meeting of the Academic Senate may be called by the President of the Academic Senate in response to “A decision of the Executive Committee.” The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate voted unanimously on November 16, 2001 to convene such a meeting. In addition Article II, section B, 3, g calls for consultation from the Academic Senate for “Selection, review, and retention of the President and Vice Presidents.”

1. Opening Prayer: Brother Tom Wendorf opened the meeting with a prayer.
2. Roll Call: Twenty-four of thirty-seven senators were present.
3. Approval of Agenda: Since this meeting was specially called, it was necessary to approve the agenda, which was to discuss and vote on two resolutions concerning the presidential search.

By a voice vote, the agenda was approved.

4. Approval of minutes: The minutes of October 12, 2001 were approved as written.

5. Letter from Search Committee:

President Youngkin read an e-mail message to the UD community from the presidential search committee. The committee thanked the university community for its participation in the open forums held for each presidential candidate. It further stated that the search committee “promised” to consider the responses of the faculty, staff and students in its decision.

6. Letter from Senator Finan:

A letter was written by Senator Finan, chair of presidential search committee and chair of the UD Board of Trustees, to President Youngkin, asking her for a letter expressing the evaluation of the Academic Senate concerning the two candidates for the university president.

7. Academic Senate Excerpts:

Pertinent passages from the Constitution of the Academic Senate were read to validate the calling and purpose of the meeting (see foreword).

8. Report from Provost:

The Provost expressed his appreciation to the UD community for their participation in the interviewing of the presidential candidates. He said that the on-campus interviewing process went well and was complete.

9. Use of Paper Ballots for Voting:

It was proposed that paper ballots be used for voting. The proposal was passed by a voice vote.

10. Response to Academic Senate Leadership:

A senator expressed his thanks to the leadership of the Academic Senate for responding quickly to the concerns of senators and other faculty. The senator went on to say that the late stages of the search procedure were done in haste, and that appropriate consultation with the UD community was hurried to meet the deadlines of the search committee.

11. Vote to hear Resolutions:

A motion was made to hear the resolutions. It passed by voice vote.

12. Presentation of Resolutions:

Resolution #1: “RESOLVED THAT it is the sense of the Academic Senate of the University of Dayton that neither finalist for the position of President of the University of Dayton meets key qualifications as outlined in the position description, including that any person chosen as President of the University of Dayton possess sufficient academic credentials and qualifications to earn the respect of the academic community of the University of Dayton.

The Academic Senate of the University of Dayton bases this conclusion on what it views as an insufficiency of academic credentials, and a lack of a sustained and substantial record of scholarly productivity and academic institution-building on the part of both the candidates.”

Discussion

1. It was reported that SGA discussed the resolution at length and was principally troubled that the candidates do not have sufficient credentials. They also expressed concern that a different search might yield the same results.
2. It was stated that in addition to a president with a substantial academic record, the university also needs a president with a history of institution-building.
 3. A new president will likely make major changes in key administrative positions.
 4. The primary responsibility of the president is to articulate the mission of the university and appoint administrators who will do likewise.

5. Neither candidate responded adequately on the question of racial diversity.

The vote was taken.

Yes: 22 No: 0 Abstain: 0

Resolution passes

There were 23 members of the Senate present at the time of the vote. According to the constitution, the Provost votes only in the case of a tie. All other members voted.

Resolution #2: “RESOLVED THAT it is the sense of the Academic Senate of the University of Dayton that the search process for the next President of the University of Dayton should be extended in order to identify well qualified candidates and to allow deeper consultation with faculty, staff, and students.”

Discussion

1. The search committee did not have strong faculty, staff, and student input in the final selection. Hopefully, a new search committee will have such input.

2. Will it be the same committee using the same procedure? The search committee may be reconstituted depending on the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

3. The faculty must be more proactive. We did not do well the first time. There should be more faculty and an academic senior administrator on the search committee.

The vote was taken.

Yes: 23 No: 0 Abstain: 0

Resolution passes

There were 24 members of the Senate present at the time of the vote. According to the constitution, the Provost votes only in the case of a tie. All other members voted.

It was asked if the consulting company would be changed. There may not be time, because we do not know the reason behind “mediocre” results thus far.

It was pointed out that a petition has been circulated around campus to include Marianists who were interviewed in the final on-campus interviews. Over 500 signatures have been collected from faculty and staff.

13. Adjournment: The Senate meeting was adjourned at 8:50 am.

Respectfully submitted: George R. Doyle, Jr., Secretary of the Academic Senate